

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

56 VICTORIA, 1893

VOL. XXXVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE
FIRST DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA

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

1893

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

HON. SIR JOHN SPARROW DAVID THOMPSON, K.C.M.G., Q.C.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1893

Minister of Justice (Premier)	Hon. Sir JOHN S. D. THOMPSON, K.C.M.G., Q.C.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Postmaster-General	Hon. Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON, K.C.M.G., Q.C.
Without Portfolio	Hon. JOHN CARLING.
Secretary of State	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	Hon. FRANK SMITH.
Minister of Finance	Hon. GEORGE EULAS FOSTER.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER, LL.B., Q.C.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. JOHN HAGGART.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. ALDRIC OUIMET, LL.B., Q.C.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. JAMES COLEBROOKE PATTERSON.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. THOMAS MAYNE DALY.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. AUGUSTE RÉAL ANGERS.
President of the Council	Hon. WILLIAM BULLOCK IVES.

Clerk of the Privy Council - - - JOHN JOSEPH MCGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS :

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS :

GEORGE B. BRADLEY	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT	} Reporters.
E. JOSEPH DUGGAN	
ALBERT HORTON	
J. O. MARCEAU	
THOS. JOHN RICHARDSON	
THOS. P. OWENS	
ALPHONSE DESJARDINS	} Assistant to Chief Reporter.
JOHN CHAS. BOYCE	

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1893

- ADDINGTON**—George W. W. Dawson.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—George Hugh Macdonell.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Hon. Sir John Thompson, K.C.M.G.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—Walter William McDonald.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.
- BAGOT**—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William LeBoutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Eugene A. Dyer.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.
- CAPE BRETON**— $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Hector F. McDougall.} \\ \text{David McKeen.} \end{array} \right.$
CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.
CARLETON (N. B.)—Newton Ramsay Colter.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Onésime Carignan.
CHARLEVOIX—Henry Simard.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Louis de Gonzague Belley.
COLCHESTER—William A. Patterson.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Arthur R. Dickey.
- DIGBY**—Edward Charles Bowers.
DORCHESTER—Cyrille Emile Vaillancourt.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Hugo H. Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.
- ELGIN, E. Riding**—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Henry W. Allan.
- FRONTENAC**—Hiram A. Calvin.
- GASPÉ**—Louis Zéphirin Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.
- HALDIMAND**—Walter Huldphries Montague.
HALIFAX— $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Thomas E. Kenny.} \\ \text{John Fitz-William Stairs.} \end{array} \right.$
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON— $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Alexander McKay.} \\ \text{Samuel R. Ryckman.} \end{array} \right.$
HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—A. W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—Séverin Lachapelle.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Hon. James Colebrooke Patterson.
- IBERVILLE**—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. O'BRIEN's motion to adjourn debate on proposed resolution of Mr. Mulock (Binding Twine, Free Entry) 2nd February :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. AMYOT.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. McALISTER.	Mr. ALLAN.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. GRANDBOIS.	Mr. BRUNEAU.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT's proposed resolution (Customs Tariff and Freer Trade) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 28th February :—

Mr. MASSON.	Mr. MONET.
Mr. WELDON.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

On Mr. MULOCK's proposed resolution (Binding Twine, Free Entry) 1st March :—

Mr. CRAIG.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.

On Mr. TARTE's proposed resolution (respecting Separate Schools in Manitoba) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 8th March :—

Mr. PATTERSON (Colchester).	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. FLINT.
Mr. SMITH (Ontario).	Mr. ROWAND.
Mr. BRYSON.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. WELDON.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. BEITH.

On Mr. McCARTHY's proposed resolution (Tariff Reform) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 16th March :—

Ministerial.

Mr. HEARN.
Mr. OUMET.
Mr. CURRAN.
Mr. MACDOWALL.
Mr. JONCAS.
Mr. ROOME.
Mr. PELLETIER.
Mr. WALLACE.
Mr. WELDON.

Opposition.

Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. TARTE.
Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. MONET.
Mr. FRASER.
Mr. BORDEN.

On Mr. EDGAR's proposed resolution (Royal Commission *re* Charges against Sir Adolphe Caron) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply 23rd March :—

Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. MACLEAN (York).	M. LISTER.
Mr. GILLIES.	Mr. CASEY.
Sir J. THOMPSON.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. CARROLL.

On Mr. POPE's proposed resolution (Free Corn), 1st March :—

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Mr. CRAIG.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.

On Mr. DAWSON's proposed resolution (Censuring Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston *re* "Home Rule") in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 21st March :—

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. BAKER.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARD.
Mr. McNEILL.	Mr. BOWERS.

House of Commons Debates.

THIRD SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th January, 1893.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 26th day of January, 1893, for the despatch of business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER.

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election petition for the electoral district of Soulanges, by which the said election was declared void ; and in conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates and reports relating to the elections for the electoral districts of,—

Yarmouth, Peel, Pietou, Bonaventure, Charlotte, King's, N.B., South Perth, Argenteuil, North Perth, Welland, East York, East Hastings, Lennox, Mouck, Beauce, West Huron, East Simcoe.

In all of which the petitions were dismissed and the sitting member declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following notifications of vacancies which have occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of CHARLES N. SKINNER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of St. John, City and County, by resignation :

Of ALPHONSE DESJARDINS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Hochelaga, by being summoned to the Senate :

Of LOUIS GEORGE DESJARDINS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of L'Islet, by resignation :

Of THOMAS MAYNE DALY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Selkirk, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, that of Minister of the Interior :

Of EDWARD H. LEGER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Kent, N.B., by decease :

Of the Hon. EDGAR DEWONEY, Member for the Electoral District of Assiniboia East, by resignation.

Of the Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL, Member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Hastings, by being summoned to the Senate :

Of the Hon. JOSEPH A. CHAPLEAU, Member for the Electoral District of Terrebonne, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, that of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec :

Of WILLIAM BULLOCK IVES, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Sherbrooke, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown :

Of JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown :

Of JOHN FISHER WOOD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of York, Ont., by resignation.

He also informed the House that he had issued his several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that, during the Recess, the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following members :—

Of NATHANIEL BOYD, Esq., for the Electoral District of Marquette :

Of LOUIS DE GONZAGUE BELLEY, Esq., for the Electoral District of Chicoutimi :

Of SÉVERIN LACHAPPELLE, Esq., for the Electoral District of Hochelaga :

Of the Hon. THOMAS MAYNE DALY, for the Electoral District of Selkirk :

Of WALTER WILLIAM McDONALD, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of Assiniboia :

Of JOHN A. CHESLEY, Esq., for the Electoral District of St. John City and County;

Of GEORGE VALENTINE McINERNEY, Esq., for the Electoral District of Kent, N.B.;

Of the Hon. WILLIAM BULLOCK IVES, for the Electoral District of Sherbrooke;

Of JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre;

Of JAMES WILLIAM BAIN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Soulanges;

Of NATHANIEL CLARK WALLACE, Esq., for the Electoral District of the County of York, Ont.;

Of JOHN FISHER WOOD, Esq., for the Electoral District of Brockville;

Of PIERRE LÉCLAIR, Esq., for the Electoral District of Terrebonne; and

Of ALEXANDER WILLIAMSON CARSCALLEN, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Hastings.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

HON. THOMAS MAYNE DALY, Member for the Electoral District of Selkirk, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Foster.

NATHANIEL CLARKE WALLACE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of West York, introduced by Mr. Haggart and Mr. Patterson.

JOHN FISHER WOOD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Brockville, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Taylor.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Montreal Centre, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Ouimet.

LOUIS DE GONZAGUE BRILEY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Saguenay, introduced by Mr. Curran and Sir John Thompson.

JAMES WILLIAM BAIN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Soulanges, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Ouimet.

JOHN A. CHESLEY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the City and County of St. John, introduced by Mr. Foster and Mr. Baird.

GEORGE VALENTINE McINERNEY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Kent, N.B., introduced by Mr. Costigan and Mr. Foster.

WILLIAM WALTER McDONALD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of East Assiniboia, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Daly.

SÉVERIN LACHAPPELLE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Hochelaga, introduced by Mr. Ouimet and Sir John Thompson.

PIERRE LÉCLAIR, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Terrebonne, introduced by Mr. Ouimet and Sir John Thompson.

ALEXANDER WILLIAMSON CARSCALLEN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of North Hastings, introduced by Mr. Corby and Mr. Northrup.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the Table a copy of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General to both Houses of Parliament in the Senate Chamber this day, which is as follows:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In meeting you at the commencement of another session of Parliament, it affords me pleasure to congratulate you on the continued progress which the history of the past year unfolds with regard to Canada.

The increase in trade, as illustrated by the exports and imports during the period for which the official returns have been prepared, has been most gratifying and that increase has continued down to the present time, with promise that the volume of trade during the current year

will exceed that of any year in the history of the Dominion.

The revenues of the country have likewise provided for all the services for which Parliament has made appropriation, and the operation of the Government railways has been less burdensome, as regards the difference between income and expenditure than has been the case for a long term of years previously.

In Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the increase in immigration has been decidedly encouraging, both as regards the number of persons who have come from other countries, and as regards the number of homestead entries made by settlers of all nationalities.

Measures have been taken to carry into effect the agreements arrived at with the United States on the subjects of the boundary of Alaska, boundary line in Passamaquoddy Bay, and the prevention of destructive methods of fishing and the preservation and increase of fish life. With regard to reciprocity in wrecking and towing, a correspondence has taken place which indicates that privileges are demanded for United States vessels in Canadian canals, which were not anticipated, but it is not impossible that a satisfactory conclusion of the discussion may yet be reached.

During the recess a friendly conference took place between delegates from my Government and from the Government of Newfoundland, on the questions which were pending between the two countries. It is hoped and expected that the interchange of views which then took place will be productive of beneficial results and lead to an amicable adjustment of those questions.

The Statutes of 1887 relative to a Department of Trade and Commerce and to the office of Solicitor-General having been brought into force, the appointments were made which were contemplated by these Acts.

It is to be regretted that the Government of the United States were unable to accept the suggestions made by my Government on the subject of canal tolls, and that the President should have thought it necessary to impose exceptional tolls on Canadians using the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which has so long been free to the people of both countries. My Government, while ready to consider in a friendly spirit any proposals which may be made by the Government of the United States, have caused efforts to be made to hasten the completion of the Canadian canal works, which will soon afford to the commerce of the Dominion a highway within our own country.

Measures will be laid before you for the improvement of the Franchise Act, for the amendment of the laws relating to the civil service and the superannuation of civil servants, for regulating the admission of evidence in causes and matters under the control of the Parliament of Canada, for extending the system of voting by ballot to the North-west Territories, and for simplifying the laws relating to lands and land transfers in the Territories.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The Public Accounts of the past year and the Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you without delay, and I trust it will be seen that ample provision may be made for the public service without increasing taxation.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have every confidence that all these matters will receive your best attention, and that your deliberations will keep in view, above all other considerations, the welfare and stability of the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In consequence of the illness of the hon. leader of the Opposition, which I very much regret, but which I am glad to hear is not of a serious nature, I will move :

That the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the session, be taken into consideration on Monday next, instead of to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Reports, Returns and Statistics of the Department of Inland Revenue for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892 (Excise).—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

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

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th January, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The Hon. WILLIAM BULLOCK IVES, Member for the Electoral District of Sherbrooke, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Sir Adolphe Caron.

REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Foster.)

Report of the Auditor-General for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Foster.)

Statistics of the Inland Revenue Department for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.—(Adulteration of Food).—Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Foster.)

ADJOURNMENT—DEATH OF MR. ARMSTRONG.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, it is my painful duty to announce the death of one of our colleagues, my esteemed friend Mr. Armstrong, member for the South Riding of Middlesex. This painful event occurred, I believe, yesterday afternoon. For myself, I can only say that I deeply regret the circumstance. Mr. Armstrong was one of those men who added to a long experience in municipal affairs, a very thorough practical knowledge of the affairs of this country, and, as every hon. gentleman here knows, not only was he very constant and faithful in his attendance on his duties in the House, but he was a man from whom we often received very valuable suggestions. He was one of those men of sterling worth and independence who do honour to any body to which they belong. I can only say with regard to Mr. Armstrong, that I believe, in him this House has lost a very valuable member, the people of Canada have lost a very valuable public servant, and the Reform party, of which he was a supporter, have lost a staunch and faithful friend. It is impossible for me to allow this occasion to pass without bearing my testimony to the faithful and diligent manner in which on all occasions Mr. Armstrong responded to his duties here. I trust that the condolence of our friends will be sent to his bereaved family at the earliest possible moment. This is, I think, the third or fourth death which has occurred amongst members from the province of Ontario on our side of the House. I believe hon. gentlemen on the other side have not been called upon to mourn the loss of any of their friends. It is a very painful circumstance that the opening of our session should be marked by an event of this kind, and I am quite certain that all hon. gentlemen opposite will join with me in the regret which I have expressed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very glad indeed that the hon. gentleman has expressed in the terms he has his sense of the loss which the House and the country have sustained in the death of Mr. Armstrong, and I beg to say in addition that nothing which the political associates of that deceased member can say out of respect to his memory will fail to be cordially acquiesced in by the members on this side of the House. Ever since I have had the honour of a seat here I have regarded Mr. Armstrong with the highest esteem, and I have never heard any other sentiment expressed by any of the gentlemen with whom I act politically. We respected him exceedingly as a private gentleman, and even when he differed from us, as he almost always did strongly, we credited him with the greatest

sincerity. We believe him to have been a patriotic and honourable public man, whose death has been a loss to the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th January, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. McINERNEY. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to move the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I may say that the novelty of the situation is somewhat embarrassing to me. That, I apprehend, is the orthodox, customary and proper thing to say on an occasion of this kind—orthodox, because I hold that you, Sir, and every other member of this House who has spoken under the same circumstances must have an unalterable belief in its truth; customary, because I know that, for over a quarter of a century, at least once a year, something very similar to this has been said here; and proper, because I deem it meet that a young member rising for the first time to address you, Sir, and this honourable body, representing as it is supposed to represent, the power and the intelligence of this broad Dominion, should wrap himself round with the mantle of modesty—

Let him not boast who puts his armour on,
Like him who takes it off, the battle done.

It is, therefore, Sir, with the greatest diffidence that I rise to endeavour to perform the task with which I have been overloaded. I would have shrunk from an attempt to perform it had it not been that I considered it would reflect some honour on the constituency which I represent—a constituency which on six different occasions I attempted to obtain the favour of and failed, succeeding only on the seventh attempt. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have not arrived here at an earlier day—not on my own account or because I have any particular personal ambition; but, Sir, I regret that I lose, to a limited extent perhaps, the intellectual association with that great man who more than any other shaped the destiny and the legislation of this country for a number of years; I name the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. But, Mr. Speaker, his words still pulsate throughout this chamber, his memory is still rich through-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

out this country, and his works still speak loudly to the enemy in the gates. I regret also, and I think I may be permitted to express the regret, that I lose the association of that other great man, the ex-leader of the great Liberal party, Edward Blake. While we cannot say that he has gone to the same peaceful scenes, to which it may be hoped the spirit of his opponent has gone, we can say that he is carrying out a laudable ambition and a great design in taking back his high intellectual gifts to the solution of a great problem in the land of the Blakes and the O'Donnells. But, Sir, the regret which I have expressed is tempered with the reflection that the mantles of both of these great men have fallen upon worthy shoulders. It cannot be doubted that our friends—the enemy—have, in their present leader, a man of high character, chivalrous nature, and great eloquence, and that any position which they may take before the country will lose nothing from having it represented by him. As for the leader of the party to which I have the honour to belong, his great qualities require no comment and no praise from me. I may simply say to our friends, the Opposition, that, while in their last attempt to defeat the Government of Sir John Macdonald they imitated the example of Napoleon at Wagram and struck a tremendous blow at the centre, I hold that to defeat Sir John Thompson they will have to imitate Napoleon at Borodino and rout the whole line. Now, Sir, with these few preliminary remarks, I come to the matter of the Speech which was delivered from the Throne last Thursday. It tells us of the progress of the country; and, Sir, I think it is a gratifying fact that this chamber is able to answer that the country during the last year has certainly progressed. The progress of the country, it may be admitted, has not been marked by great leaps and bounds; but, Sir, it is a healthy progress. The quick-growing is the short-lived, Mr. Speaker; and the royal oak which from year to year lays its thin layers one upon the other is a thing of beauty and a joy for centuries. Now, Sir, is it true that the country has progressed? I claim that it is, and I claim that an examination of the trade returns of this country for the last year will show that it has progressed in a marked degree. I will refer, in the first place to the number of people employed in the manufacturing establishments of this country. In 1891 the number was 367,496, whereas in 1881, at the time of the previous census, we employed 112,561 less than that number. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a marked increase. In 1891 the railways of Canada carried the products of the country to the value of \$21,753,021, while ten years before they only carried \$12,065,323 worth. Coming to the exports and imports of the country, we find that in 1891 the exports amounted to \$113,963,375 and the imports to \$127,406,068; whereas ten years before the exports amounted to only \$102,137,203 and the imports to \$119,419,500. So that the total of the imports and exports for the last year was \$241,369,445,

a very large increase over the year immediately preceding, and exceeding the largest record made in this Dominion in any previous year, that of 1883, by \$11,029,619. But that is not the whole truth, Mr. Speaker. If the policy of protection carries out the design of its framers, it must, other things being equal, cause the imports and the exports of the country passing through the custom-house to gradually decrease. By encouraging the manufacture in this country of a large number of products which previously we purchased abroad, it must necessarily decrease the imports; and by promoting the manufacture in this country of our own raw material, and having it expended among the wage earners and the increased population in the land, this policy must naturally decrease the exports. Then we have to take into account the decline in the value of goods during the past ten years, which has been something remarkable. Statisticians, and all the best authorities, tell us that this decline amounts to at least one-third, which will give some idea of the tremendous gain this country has made in the last ten years, both with respect to its exports and imports. There is one other point to which I desire to call your attention, Sir, in this connection, and it is that our farmers are putting the natural products of the country into manufactured products, and some members of this House may be surprised to learn that, in the year 1892, the dairy products of this country exported to England amounted to \$12,708,407, while the dairy exports of the United States to England only amounted to \$11,038,884, or \$1,750,000 less from a country of 65,000,000 people than from a country of 5,000,000 people. With regard to the province from which I come, the province of New Brunswick, there are a few figures which I would like to submit to the House. We have been told that our industries are waning and that dry rot has settled down upon our province. The census figures, to which we are often invited to make reference, do not prove anything of the kind. What do these figures show with regard to the number of manufacturing establishments? In 1881 we had in New Brunswick only 3,117 manufacturing establishments; in 1891 we had 5,419, or nearly double the number. The amount of capital invested in these factories in 1881 was \$8,425,282, and in 1891, \$16,608,755, or nearly double. The number of employees in those manufactories in 1881 was 19,922, whereas in 1891 it reached 26,609. In 1881, the wages paid to those wage earners in those factories amounted to \$3,866,011, and in 1891 they had risen to \$5,936,021, while the value of the products increased from \$18,512,058 in 1881 to \$23,685,636 in 1891. With regard to the revenue and expenditure, which is the next point to which our attention is called in the Speech from the Throne, in 1891-92, the receipts on account of the consolidated fund amounted to \$36,921,871,

and the expenditure to \$36,765,894, leaving a surplus of \$155,977. The amount of that surplus, Mr. Speaker, shows that the finances of the country have been carefully looked after; it shows that the expenditure has been met and that no more has been taken out of the pockets of the people than was necessary for the carrying on of our public works. But the figures that I have submitted for the past year will be more than met satisfactorily by those for the year 1892, because I am informed that for the six months ending 31st December, 1892, the receipts on account of the consolidated fund amounted to \$18,559,024, as against an expenditure of \$13,842,497. I think that the financial standing of this country during the past year shows, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that this country has progressed, and progressed in a remarkable way. The next thing to which our attention is called is the admirable management of the Government railways. Instead of showing, as usual, a deficit of nearly half a million dollars, I am told the deficit will only be something like \$7,000; but, although that deficit has been so decreased, I hope the decrease has not been effected at the expense of the efficiency of the service. I trust that an eye single will continue to be had to this great principle, that the bond of confederation between the Maritime Provinces and the western provinces is the Intercolonial Railway. The building and maintenance of that railway was one of the main conditions upon which we entered Confederation, and it would be a sad day when we would see the efficiency of that service destroyed or diminished in any degree. But I claim that no diminution has taken place, and that the efficiency of the service is not impaired; and the Railway Department deserves the greatest credit from the House and the country for the manner in which that service has been carried out during the past year. The next subject referred to is the immigration in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. We are told that has increased. We are told that there has been a strong movement of population into that country of late. It cannot be denied that the North-west rebellion had a very deterrent effect upon the settlement of that country, but we can now look for a larger immigration, and I am informed that the homestead entries last year were 50 per cent more than during the preceding year, and in advance of any year in the history of the country. There is another point in that connection to which I will refer. The statisticians of the United States inform us that the surplus of wheat grown in the United States is now about 150,000,000 bushels per year, but that the home consumption is catching up to that surplus to the extent of about 12,000,000 bushels a year, so that in fifteen years at the furthest the home consumption of American wheat will be equal to the amount produced. When that day arrives a bright era will have dawned for the great Canadian

North-west, which will then become the great wheat-producing country of the world. Now, the next point referred to in the Speech is :

Measures have been taken to carry into effect the agreements arrived at with the United States, on the subjects of the boundary of Alaska, the boundary line in Passamaquoddy Bay, and the prevention of destructive methods of fishing, and the preservation and increase of fish life.

As was suggested last year by the hon. gentleman who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Government should be given credit for having tackled this question in its infancy, before important interests had gathered around it and made it more difficult to settle, and that we should be pleased and should express our gratification that an agreement of this kind has been arrived at. We are also told that the conference with Newfoundland has been satisfactory, and I hope that, as good sometimes comes out of evil, the differences that arose out of the Bond Treaty and the disputes in reference to the admission of bait that took place between Newfoundland and this Dominion may be the means of bringing about the confederation of that colony with this Dominion. We shall then all over British North America have Edmund Burke's great dream of empire carried out, of provinces separated by the material bounds and barriers of nature united by the bond of a social and moral community. We are also told in the matter of the canal tolls that a disagreement has arisen between the United States authorities and the Government of this country. By the Treaty of Washington, the treaty of 1871, there was no mention made by England that the American tonnage should be free of tolls in our canals. England simply said that she would endeavour to obtain Canada's consent to that at some future time, but neither Canada nor the mother country was bound to anything of the kind by the treaty. But the Americans, in 1885, took away from us the bonded privileges that had been given, and that long before the concessions which were enjoyed by them on our canals were taken away. We say: "Let them restore to us those privileges which they first took from us before they ask us to restore to them privileges which we afterwards took away from them." We have no desire to quarrel with that great country to the south of us; we are sprung from the same stock, and I desire to express the wish that "Love between us, like the rose, may flourish, and peace should still her wheaten garland wear." The measures prefigured by the Government appear to be of considerable importance. In the first place, there is an improvement to be made to the Franchise Act in the direction of cheapening its cost, and I may express the hope, as the trend of public opinion is in that direction, as the general tendency is in that direction, that the day is not far distant when we shall have residential manhood suffrage in this country. I express my individual view

Mr. McINERNEY

in this, but I think that, as the men of this country over twenty-one years of age are called upon to provide the means to keep up the institutions of the country in time of peace, and, as in time of war, should any enemy appear on our borders or internecine strife arise amongst us, they would have to take their lives in their hands to defend them, they should have some voice in saying how the institutions of the country should be regulated and how their government should be carried on. Among the other measures mentioned is the admission of evidence in criminal cases. I desire to call attention to the broad principle of allowing persons criminally accused to give evidence in their own behalf. I think that is an important principle, and one that will meet with the approval of this House. It may be said that it has not obtained in the mother country; but the mother country is prone to humanitarianism in her criminal law, and the question with us should be not only the safety of the individual who is accused but also the safety of the country, the common weal, and the ends of justice, as well as the individual safety of the individual require that he should be permitted to give evidence. In the United States of America that principle has been adopted in a great number of states. In Maine, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts and New Jersey a person indicted may, if such person desires it, testify in his own behalf. In Illinois, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Jersey, if accused does not offer himself as a witness, no presumption against him is to be deduced. In Massachusetts the husband and wife cannot testify as to private conversation with each other. In Massachusetts and New Jersey husband or wife is a competent but not compellable witness against the other. In Illinois husband and wife are not competent witnesses for or against one another. In Connecticut the constitution of 1874 gives accused person the right to be heard by himself and his counsel, but by statute he is not to be compelled to give evidence against himself. Now, one of the last paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne asks that our deliberations may keep in view, above all other considerations, the welfare and stability of the country; and that brings me to what I conceive to be the point of prime importance suggested by this occasion that we shall have sojourned here in vain, that we shall have been taught by wisdom, guided by example, schooled by experience, to no purpose; we shall have grasped the shadow and missed the substance; we shall have been captivated by the form and shall have ignored the principle, unless we shall have learned to dedicate our highest thought and our noblest effort to the benefit of our common country. I believe—and let him who will call it the vague phantasm of a dream—that on this northern half of North America lies the material for the building of a great nation. The prime elements of success in

any work of nation-building are permanence and progress. We should also recognize and claim that we are citizens of no mean country. Let me call your attention for a moment to some of the traits of the physical greatness of Canada. We have inland seas of vast extent, easy means of transit and of carrying our produce between countries which lie around them; we have mineral wealth beyond the power of fancy even to compute; we have rivers down which the navies of the world might move in columns; we have plains upon which the sacrilegious tramp of war has left no footprint, and which are yet to be the home of contented and prosperous millions. These are the jewels of our country. With how much proud remembrance, with what reverential awe, do we view the battlefields of our young country and walk above the graves of those who fell at Queenston Heights and Carillon. There is more in a nation's hills and vales than mineral quartz and bottom grass. Associated with the deeds of patriots, the good and true, they are standing philippics against invasion, homilies on heroic perseverance, sermons illustrating the grandest virtues of mankind. What, then, you ask me, is the patriot's task in Canada? The fusing and moulding of the descendants of the greatest races the world has ever seen. In many a smiling valley dwell side by side the peasant who sacredly treasures the legends of Normandy and Bretagne and the yeoman who stores his mind with the rich remembrances of Runnymede. Beneath the crumbling walls of Annapolis and Beausejour dwell in peace and comfort and security the sons of the loyalists and the descendants of the exiles of Grand Pre. On the banks of the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa and the St. John, within sound of the misty Atlantic, on our western prairies and the Pacific slopes, the rose, the lily, the shamrock and the thistle spring from the same sod, draw their sustenance from the same soil. The races they represent have more than once united to beat back the tide of war. Waterloo, Bannockburn and Aghrim were forgotten when the spirits of Alma, Inkerman and Balaklava joined in fight for the same cause on the wooded slopes of the colony. Not French enthusiasm, English discipline, Celtic ardour or highland daring alone smote and humbled the mistaken valour of Montgomery. The united strength of all fired the same spirit, pulsed in the same heart, nerved the one arm, struck the one blow. In peace, as well as in war, we should appreciate the saving truth of the maxim that union is strength. But, as there are various races, there are also various creeds in Canada, and one of our greatest social dangers is bigotry—"the common cry of curs, whose breath I hate like reek of the rotten fen." It is the duty of every sensible man to manacle class contentions and to put gyves on the spirit of intolerance. Men of strong convictions will no doubt continue to

differ, religiously, on principle, but there are others who deem themselves embassies from the Almighty, sent to rally in opposing lines the worst passions of men. Their letters patent, however, bear not the sign-manual of Him who bade the angry apostle put up his sword on that night of sorrow when the sacrifice was accepted in Gethsemane. Let us then, Sir, beyond that, inculcate a national sentiment, so that when the time comes for the change from the colonial to the national situation, the transition may be as noiseless and natural as the rich blossoming in spring. Purge politics of corruption, so that when parties in the struggle for or the maintenance of power, endanger the public weal, purity, bearing aloft the destiny of the country, may roll like a mighty wave across the land, followed by the brave and true, as the victorious forces at Ivry followed the white plume of Navarre. Finally, build the edifice of the country's laws in wisdom—

Build that these walls, to coming generations,

Your skill, your strength, your faithfulness shall tell,

That all may say, as storms and centuries test them,
The men of old built well.

Mr. LECLAIR (Translation). Mr. Speaker, prior to entering into the fulfilment of the honourable task which I have accepted, that of seconding the resolutions of the Address in answer to His Excellency's speech, I beg that I may be allowed to inform you with the circumstances which have led to my occupying a seat in this House. During twenty-five years, the county of Terrebonne, which I have now the honour to represent here, had for its member a man with whom I have been closely connected, a man whom I have known to esteem, and who, I trust, knew how to command the esteem of the members of this House: I refer to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau. The battles which that man fought for his party, the work he taxed himself with in order to defend the interests of his county and those of his country, almost ruined his health, and he had to renounce political life after surrendering to his electors the mandate he had so well filled during the quarter of a century. The electors of Terrebonne asked me to accept his succession. I long hesitated before doing so. I then appreciated, as I appreciate more fully at this time of speaking, the great responsibility I was assuming by coming in this House and succeeding to the man who was one of the most distinguished statesmen of this country. If these electors selected me as their representative, it is because they knew that while I had neither the eloquence nor the talents of my predecessor, I had, nevertheless, enough patriotism and devotedness to come here and work for my country and my county. I now see, Mr. Speaker, that His Excellency congratulates, in the course of his speech, the government and the country at large upon the progress which characterized the history of the Dominion during last year. These con-

gratulations, Mr. Speaker, are indeed well due to the men who governed the destinies of our country during the last 15 years. As stated by the hon. member who moved the resolutions of the Address, that policy which has entitled the present Government to the congratulations of His Excellency has made our country a prosperous country. It is that policy that has caused our country to grow and progress, during that period of the last fifteen years, more than any country in the world. We have but to throw a glance around us to see what progress has been made. We have but to look into the statistics of last year to be convinced of it. Thus, our external trade which, in 1891, was valued at \$218,000,000 reached, in 1892, the enormous figure of \$230,000,000. And that external trade was not wholly carried on with the United States, for we exported to Great Britain upwards of \$64,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, we were right, therefore, when we claimed and when we still claim that we have for our trade other outlets than the market of the great neighbouring republic. Our exports to the English markets were chiefly agricultural produce. Farming benefited by it, and it is shown by statistical records that the exports of butter, cheese, wood and agricultural implements to the English markets were larger than to the United States and every other country. Well then, Mr. Speaker, I say that through the policy of the Conservative Government, the farming interest made great strides in the way to progress. I represent here a largely agricultural country, and I must say to this Honourable House that if I was returned unopposed, I did not quite owe it to my personal merit, but to the fact that that county so much benefited by the National Policy that the farmers of that county, Liberal as well as Conservative, did not wish me to have any opposition, they were everyone of them in favour of the Government's candidate. Now the Conservative policy again contributed to the development of the country by the building of railways. If we look into the statistics, we find that in 1875 we had but some 4,800 miles of railway, whilst in 1891, that figure reached 14,000 miles. And that encouragement to the development of railways, these subsidies to railways were voted in no partial way; in fact, we find that in every county where roads were needed so as to help to the colonization, railways were built. I can quote as an instance my own county, which is now run through by a very extended railway. The Conservative policy not only promoted the growth of the country by the building of railways, but it is also owing to the National Policy that Canada became an industrial country, that the industrial establishments have increased in number, grown up and rose to the extent of solidity and wealth which they now enjoy. They were put up and have thus grown up through the National Policy. In 1881, we had but 49,000 industrial establishments in the country; these

Mr. LECLAIR.*

industrial establishments only paid at that time the sum of \$59,000,000 in wages. Now we have 75,000 establishments of that kind, and these establishments have come to pay the sum of \$99,000,000 in wages. Thus it can be seen that this policy is beneficial to all classes, that the working classes like the rest profit by it and are favoured by the results of that truly national policy. I have no doubt but that, with as wise an administration as the one we have, the country will continue its forward course in the way to progress in which it has entered. Mr. Speaker, this honourable House will be much gratified to learn, I am sure, that the Government have worked with earnestness and that they have given a great deal of attention to the immigration question in the interest of the North-west Territories. This immigration policy had the effect of causing a large number of families to come from Europe, and these families have settled on lands in the North-west. These properties have become so many homesteads, that is to say, these properties will be transmitted from father to son, from family to family and will become truly patrimonial estates. We ought to be gratified by this. But this immigration policy not only had this beneficial result, it also brought into these Territories quite a number of our compatriots, who, through want of means of support, were compelled to go away from their native land. Quite a number, I say, of our compatriots have come back and settled amongst us with the fixed determination never to leave again. For this the Government are entitled to our congratulations, and the House ought to feel gratified that they have worked upon that line. Now, Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the existing relations between our country and the American republic. We are bound by the geographical position of our country to have, as far as possible, but friendly relations with our neighbours. I have no doubt but that these relations are and will remain friendly; however, as regards the disputes which might exist between the two Governments, I think, and this House will share in my statement, that our Government will be equal to the task of protecting our rights. I rely with full confidence in the ability of the present Government. We also find that the Government have established a Department of Trade. In so doing, the Government rendered a real service to the country. With trade rests the prosperity of a country; with trade rests the happiness and the growth of a country. A country with a prosperous trade is never taken unawares. Therefore, this House, I feel satisfied, will be pleased to find that a special department was established with the object of looking into the trade interests. Some speakers and some newspapers are found who have stated in words and in print that there cannot be but disunion between the various races and the various denominations.

These fears are ungrounded, and when one knows the men who compose the ministry, one may be sure that harmony will continue to exist between the elements that make up our people. The various nationalities which inhabit this country are united under one government and make up but one nation. In concluding these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank this honourable House for the attention it was kind enough to grant to me, and I beg to be allowed to express a wish, which I hope will be realized. Let us all unite for the purpose of endeavouring to make secure the progress and happiness of the Canadian people, so glorious with respect to its past and so great with respect to its future.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, since we separated in the month of July last, events of some importance have taken place, chief of which, perhaps, is the fact that there has been a change of Government. When we separated in July, the country was ruled by the Government of Sir John Abbott; it is now ruled by the Government of Sir John Thompson. The country at large, I am sure, as well as this House, will regret the cause which compelled Sir John Abbott to withdraw from the high position which he has filled since the death of Sir John A. Macdonald. Though, in my humble estimation, the career of Sir John Abbott was not as conducive to the public welfare as it might have been, yet it is only the simple truth to say, that in his withdrawal, Canada loses the services of one of the ablest men of his generation. Perhaps the one dominant trait of the character of Sir John Abbott was his apparent want of ambition. He never seemed to care what post was assigned to him, whether he was in the front rank or in the rear; but whatever he undertook to do, he always reached the first rank in that line. He seemed to be endowed with the happy faculty of doing everything that had to be done, and doing it well, while apparently touching nothing. With regard to the change of Government which has taken place, this side of the House is not particularly concerned. It was altogether a family affair. But I am glad to offer the congratulations of this side of the House to the hon. gentleman who has been called to fill the place vacated by Sir John Abbott. There has been no public man in Canada at any time whose advancement was so rapid as the advancement of the hon. gentleman. He came into this House at a comparatively recent date, preceded by a high reputation for ability, which he had earned in his own province, which led everybody, friends and opponents, to expect a great deal from him, and that expectation has been realized by his career since he entered this House. Nay more, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that since the hon. gentleman has been called to the position he now fills, he has developed qualities of which we were not aware. We who were associated with

him all knew that the cast of his mind was positive and practical, but if I correctly read his speech delivered in Toronto, and I think I did, not only is the cast of his mind positive and practical, but he is endowed as well with a pretty large share of imagination, an imagination which not only leads him into the realms of fancy, but also has led him, I think, to take existing facts and turn them upside down. The hon. gentleman, in the speech which he recently delivered before the Young Men's Conservative Association, at Toronto, spoke of the National Policy, and he attributed to it what he called "the prosperity of the country." I may say at once that this is not the flight of the imagination to which I referred. Speaking of the National Policy, he said that it had been travestied by its opponents in a hundred different ways, one of which was that they held it applicable exclusively on the rigid line of a customs tariff; whereas he avowed it had a much broader scope and included much more, even the acquisition of the North-west Territories. This is the language which the hon. gentleman made use of:

You may remember what was the great measure which guided the party in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald; it was the National Policy, a name which has been travestied in a hundred ways, a name which has been held applicable on the rigid lines of a customs tariff, but in the mind of the statesmen of Canada meant far more than a tariff arrangement to Canada. It meant the purchase of the great North-west Territories as a home for the farmers of Canada, thus enabling them to live in their own country instead of going to the fertile fields of the United States of America; thus to have homes of their own under the British flag, and where they can enjoy Canadian institutions.

I was not surprised to see the British flag here, because the British flag is always cast as a gloss over the National Policy; nor do I wonder that those who once pinned their faith to the National Policy, and who still stick to it, notwithstanding the experience of the last thirteen years, should endeavour to find for it as a basis something else than the rigid lines of a customs tariff. I do not wonder that they should try to find for the National Policy a more meritorious basis than a customs tariff, and a great deal may be allowed, I am sure, in that respect for the anxiety of the hon. gentleman. But it is altogether too wide a flight of fancy to bring in the acquisition of the North-west Territories as a part and parcel of the National Policy. Why, Sir, the National Policy was never heard of before the year 1877, when Sir John A. Macdonald was in Opposition; and the North-west Territories were acquired as far back as 1869, and if the merit of the acquisition of the North-west Territories is due to any one man more than to another, that merit belongs altogether to the Hon. George Brown. It was he who, by his powerful advocacy, who with pen and tongue, calling the attention of the country to the vast prairies of the west and their immense possibilities, induced the Government of that day

to acquire the right of the Hudson's Bay Company over those territories. As is well known, the Hon. George Brown never was a supporter or an upholder of, or a believer in, the National Policy. So the acquisition of the North-west Territories was not at all a part of the National Policy, which was then a thing unknown, but it was accomplished in pursuance of the policy of completing the edifice of Confederation. Now, Sir, we have a new Government. At last we have that strong Government which was heralded some months ago by the hon. First Minister himself as the strongest which Canada ever had since Confederation. Whether this was another flight of imagination I will not inquire. I will not inquire whether the present Government is stronger than any of its predecessors—stronger than the Government of Sir John Macdonald at Confederation, stronger than the Government of Mr. Mackenzie in 1873, or stronger than the second Administration of Sir John Macdonald, or even stronger than the Administration of Sir John Abbott. Comparisons are odious. I shall not inquire into that subject; but one thing is certain, one thing is indisputable, leaving aside quality, and looked at quantity, the present Government is by all means the strongest that Canada ever possessed. The Dominion has now no less than fifteen Ministers to advise the Crown, and three more to advise the advisers; and if, with so much advice, the Crown is not properly advised, it is simply because the advice is radically bad, which I am rather inclined to believe. But even if the advice were tinged good it may turn out to be with Government as it is with cookery, "too many cooks spoil the broth." The hon. gentleman has taken upon himself to advise the Government to bring into force two still-born statutes, passed six years ago, and allowed from the day of their birth to moulder under the dust of useless legislation; passed, though there never was a demand for such legislation, passed, though they were never put into force, yet no inconvenience resulting. One of the hon. gentlemen who proposed the Address, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Leclair), said that legislation was necessary. These measures may have been necessary in one sense, not certainly for the welfare of the country, but for party exigencies, in order to harmonize colours and shades, so that the Orange and the Green may not offend the eye of one section, but please everybody. I take exception in this respect, and not only in this respect, but in some other respects also, to what has been said by my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Leclair), though I offered him, as well as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), my very sincere congratulations on the manner in which they have discharged the duty they have undertaken. They have discharged that duty with credit to themselves, and so as to earn the congratulations of both sides

Mr. LAURIER

of the House. The hon. member for Kent, I may say, has caught at once the true ministerial spirit. The true ministerial spirit, in these days, is to proclaim in season and out of season, on every occasion, whether fitting or not fitting, "The country is prosperous." You remember, Mr. Speaker, the scene in Othello, when Cassius has been at last persuaded by the wiles of Iago to taste of the baneful cup. He imbibes enough for his companions to notice the condition into which he has fallen, and in order to dissipate their impression he declares, "Gentlemen, I am not drunk." I am reminded of this scene when I hear hon. gentlemen opposite, members and ministers, upon every occasion, repeating, "The country is prosperous." They seem to believe that, judging from the state of things which exist all around, the people might come to a different conclusion, and so, in order to bring them back to a more orthodox mood, they keep on repeating, "The country is prosperous." They seem to believe that by making the assertion "The country is prosperous," they will convince the people, as perhaps they have succeeded in convincing themselves. Strange prosperity this, from which the people are fleeing, thousands and hundreds of thousands every year! Strange prosperity which the people will not remain in the country to enjoy! What would be the difference if, instead of prosperity, there was adversity? Would there be any different state of things at the present time? I am aware that the leader of the Government attempted, some weeks ago, to minimize the evils of the exodus. The hon. gentleman attempts to show that the state of things is not so bad as it appears, that though there has been an exodus during the last decade, the exodus is not in the same proportion as in the previous decade. Sir, all the hon. gentleman has to do is to consult his own blue book and that will tell him a very different story. The hon. gentleman is doubtless aware that his own blue book shows that during the previous decade, that is during the decade from 1871 to 1881, the population increased by 19 per cent, whereas, in the following decade, the decade from 1881 to 1891, the percentage of increase declined under the National Policy, the increase of population falling from 19 to 12 per cent. I am aware the hon. gentleman says that the figures are not perfectly accurate, that there is a discrepancy in the manner of taking the census. I do not at all accept that explanation; but there can be a stronger arraignment of the manner in which the census has been taken than the explanation now volunteered by the Government. We on this side of the House again and again protested against a census de jure, we wanted a census de facto. The hon. gentleman now acknowledges that the census is not so correct as it might be; but even if there are discrepancies, which I am not prepared to admit, those discrepancies

will not at all justify or explain the terrible falling off that has taken place in the population of the country. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote some figures from the census, and I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to them. I will take the five eastern provinces. In Ontario, during the decade, 1871 to 1881, the increase of population was 16.06 per cent. in the following decade it fell to nine per cent and a fraction. In Quebec, the increase during the first decade was 14 per cent, and during the second decade it fell to 9 per cent and a fraction. In Nova Scotia, the increase in the first decade was 13 per cent, and in the second decade it fell to 2 per cent and a fraction. In Prince Edward Island it was 15 per cent during the first decade, but in the second decade it fell to 1.01 per cent. In New Brunswick, the province from which the hon. member from Kent (Mr. McInerney) comes, there was no increase whatever during the second decade. These figures are appalling; these figures cannot be explained away by any quibbling as to the manner in which the census was taken. These figures show that the whole natural increase of population was swept away. Swept away! How swept away?—by what? There has been witnessed no such calamity as occurred in the days of old, when the Angel of Death was sent to the land to smite the first-born; and yet the result is the same as if every child born during the said years had been smitten in the arms of its mother. But I know that hon. gentlemen opposite say that the National Policy is not responsible for that condition, that there was an exodus before the National Policy, and the exodus has continued under that policy as well. Sir, this apology which is offered for the National Policy is the strongest arraignment and the most severe arraignment that ever was presented against it. There was an exodus, it is true, before the National Policy was adopted. But have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten their own history? What was the object of the National Policy? Was not the object of the National Policy to put a stop to the exodus? Do not hon. gentlemen opposite remember their own speeches of thirteen or fourteen years ago? Have they forgotten the gospels of their own policy, if I can apply such term as “gospel” to their policy. However, in order that there should be no misunderstanding on this point, let me again bring back to the attention and defective memory of gentlemen on the other side, the resolution which is the very basis of the National Policy, a resolution moved by Sir John Macdonald, while he was in Opposition, and which was to this effect:

That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion.

That such a policy will retain in Canada, thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment now denied them at home.

This was the foundation of the National Policy, and at a later date, Sir John Macdonald, in a speech delivered at Parkdale, justified the principle which had been laid down in this resolution. Thus he spoke:

Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry, but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufacturing of the United States. Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people, and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and taken up their abode in the United States, because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise, in consequence of the false policy of our rulers.

That was the object of the National Policy, and now we have the result. The object was to stop the exodus, and the result of the National Policy has been the increase of the exodus by hundreds of thousands. In the face of this state of things, what is the conclusion? The conclusion must be for every thinking man, that we have been following a wrong course; that we must retrace our steps, and that we must reform a tariff which has produced such sad results as this. But, Sir, according to gentlemen on the other side, everything is at its best in the country, and they are pleased to portray the present state of affairs in glowing terms. Trade has increased during the last year, it appears, and there is no limit to the exultation which this fact has caused to hon. gentlemen opposite. Yes, during the last year our importations actually reached the figure of \$127,000,000; that is to say that in the year 1892 the importations into Canada have not quite reached, but are very close to, the figures at which they were in 1873 and 1874. We are now coming back to the position which Canada occupied in the matter of imports twenty years ago, and this is a cause of rejoicing for gentlemen on the other side. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) rejoiced a moment ago over this fact, but he should have known that this is against the National Policy. The National Policy has not done its duty, because if it had done its duty, as it was promised it would, there would be no importations into this country. We would manufacture everything in Canada; we would not be dependent upon the United States nor upon Great Britain; but Canada should live in itself, like an oyster within its shell. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the National Policy has not done its duty. On the other hand, we are told that the National Policy has developed to an enormous degree the manufactures of this country. Well, if we take the figures of the census, we will see that it has done a great deal; but, for my part, I make a great difference between certain census returns and certain others. Taking the enum-

eration of population is not a very difficult operation, for everybody can do that; but to measure the capital invested and the manufactories in existence requires a great deal of imagination, and a great deal of imagination is to be found in the census bulletins which have been published. Of all the towns, villages and cities which have progressed the most, according to the census bulletin, I think the palm is to be given to the village of Caughnawaga. The village of Caughnawaga as everybody knows, is inhabited by the remnants of the Five Nations Indians, a once powerful tribe, not particularly distinguished for their manufacturing or trade qualities, but rather for their warlike propensities. According to the census bulletin which I have here, the National Policy has done wonders in the village of Caughnawaga. In the year 1881, there were eight manufactories in that village, and there are now forty-one. The traveller who comes down the St. Lawrence from the great lakes has occasion to see and admire the village of Caughnawaga, but will search in vain for the tall chimneys which were to be the characteristic of the National Policy. He would certainly be deceived if he were simply to look and judge by appearances, but if he turns back to the census returns, he will find that there are no less than forty-one manufactories in that village. Now, what are these manufactures? Are they woollen? I am not aware of that. Are they cotton? I am not aware of that. Are they iron? I am not aware of that. But, although the census does not say so, I presume, in the innocence of my heart, that the articles manufactured there are fancy baskets, miniature snowshoes, artistic fans and the rest. Yes, loo, at the wonderful progress of the National Policy. It is responsible for having increased the manufactures of Caughnawaga from eight in 1881 to forty-one in 1891. Perhaps, after all, there may be another side of this question. It may be that the aborigines of Caughnawaga have not been interfered with by the National Policy, as there is no protection granted to them upon their productions, and as they have the whole continent for a market, that their industries have been developed to this enormous extent. Sir, in the Speech which has been delivered from the Throne, there are one or two items which are, in my estimation, of very great interest. One of these is the paragraph with regard to reciprocity in wrecking. It says:

A correspondence has taken place which indicates that privileges are demanded for United States vessels in Canadian canals, which were not anticipated, but it is not impossible that a satisfactory conclusion of the discussion may yet be reached.

I imagine, although the Speech is rather too vague upon this point, that this correspondence has taken place in consequence of the decision of the Canadian Government with regard to American wrecking vessels, that the use of our canals would not be extended to them. If that is the object of the correspond-

Mr. LAURIER.

ence, and I can see no other, then, for my part, I must deeply regret the policy which was adopted by the Canadian Government in that respect. If the object of the correspondence was simply to vindicate on the part of the American authorities the privilege of the use of our canals for American wrecking vessels which privilege was denied to them by the Canadian Government, it seems to me that this Government would have been more within the line of their duty if they had taken a broad view of the question and constricted the Act so as to give it its full operation. The Government must be aware that when the Canadian Parliament passed the Wrecking Bill the intention of Parliament was to give to American wrecking vessels the full range of our waters, as was to be given on the other side to our wrecking vessels. What I say now applies also to the unfortunate difficulty which has taken place with regard to canal tolls. The Speech regrets, and very properly regrets, the fact that the American Government has to a certain extent shut the Sault Ste. Marie canal to our vessels by levying an additional duty upon their cargo. This is also a regrettable circumstance which might have been avoided if the Canadian Government had been more generous in dealing with the matter of rebate tolls, and if they had done at first, what I understand they have decided to do at last, we would have avoided these difficulties with the American Government. The great trouble we have always had in our dealings with the American republic has been simply this, that the Canadian Government have never been generous in their treatment of American citizens and the American republic. They always commence by refusing what at last they grant. A favour grudgingly given or a debt grudgingly paid has only one-half the merit that it would otherwise have; and if our Government in their dealings with the American Government had remembered that, the result would have been different. If we have favours to give, if we have concessions to make, we should give them and make them gracefully; then they would evoke the gratitude and the good-will of the Americans; whereas if we make them grudgingly, the conclusion on the other side will be that we yielded simply because we could not help it. It seems to me that there is only one proper mode of proceeding in all our relations with the other side: we should take a broad, manly and generous course; that is to say, we should meet our neighbours not grudgingly, but wherever it is possible to do a favour, we should do it willingly and with some grace. Under such circumstances our relations would be far more satisfactory than they have been in the past. With regard to the legislation promised us, it is, I am sure, of a very light character, except in one particular, that is, the Franchise Act, of which we are promised an amendment. If I remember rightly what was stated last year, my hon. friend, the late Secretary of State, is intrusted with the management of

that measure. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he does not believe that the best way to improve the Franchise Act would be to improve it out of existence? I put the question to him in all earnestness. For twenty years, from the year 1867 to the year 1887, the elections of this House were carried on under the provincial lists, and so far as my memory goes, there never was a single complaint as to the working of that system. But, Sir, ever since we have had the Franchise Act not an election has passed but injustices of the most aggravated character have been complained of in some part of the country. Even at this very moment the member-elect for L'Islet, Mr. Tarte, is deprived of his seat by reason of the cumbersome working of that Act. Now, Sir, I submit to the hon. gentleman whether, after all, the best system practically, the best system theoretically, the best system according to our representative institutions, is not a return to the provincial lists. But, Sir, the Speech which we have before us is not a remarkable document for what is in it; it is more remarkable for what is not in it. For instance, I see no reference this year, any more than last year, to the famous commission which was appointed, now very near two years ago, to inquire into the liquor trade—a subject as to which at one time my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, had clear ideas, but as to which he is now at sea. It is not charitable to the hon. gentleman to leave him so many years in doubt. It is not charitable to him that the commission has not yet reported. It took six months to prepare the instructions, it has taken a year to obtain the evidence, and Heaven knows how long it will take to prepare the report. I fear we may not see it this session, but the Government will in the meantime have some respite from a troublesome question. Neither do I see any reference in the Speech to another commission which was appointed by Parliament last year, one to investigate the conduct of a minister of the Crown. This was a most unusual proceeding, but I thought we would be informed in the Speech from the Throne whether we are to have the report of that commission or not. There is another matter to which no reference is made, and as to which I expected there would be some explanation; I mean the Manitoba school question. The hon. Minister of Justice made a report to Council some time ago on that question. That report was communicated to the press. I will not discuss at this time whether it was in conformity with the dignity of Parliament that a State paper should be communicated to the press before it was laid before Parliament. I will not stand on the question of dignity; but I will say that it would be a breach of the law of Parliament if that report were not immediately laid on the Table of the House, and all the more so because of the extraordinary doctrine maintained in that report. The hon. gentleman there assumed that he and his colleagues were sitting as a court of justice dealing with this question. I will not say anything as to the manner in

which they dealt with it; I say honestly that I do not wish to embarrass them. But I wish to express my dissent from the doctrine that in this matter the Government act, not as a Government, but as a court of justice. It is a doctrine to which for my part I cannot be reconciled. But of all the omissions to be found in the Speech from the Throne the greatest is, that it holds out no hope for changes in the tariff. This omission, I am sure, will spread disappointment all over the land. The ministers have been speaking recently on that subject, and in different parts of the country they have held out the hope that they would at least, to use their own language, lop off some of the mouldering branches. It looks as if they had changed their minds, and that the mouldering branches had been suddenly converted into green boughs. But, Sir, the country expected some declaration upon this question; and now that the Government have failed to speak, it becomes the duty of the House to speak, and to speak in no uncertain sound. Therefore, I will conclude by proposing, in amendment:

That the following words be added to the address:—
“We feel bound to represent to Your Excellency that in the present condition of the people of Canada substantial reduction should be made in taxation, which presses so heavily upon the great mass of the community, and we regret that in the Speech graciously delivered from the Throne, Your Excellency was not advised to hold out promises of reductions in the oppressive duties now imposed.”

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure there can be but one opinion in the House in regard to the manner in which the new members have spoken to-day and have discharged their duty. It is a matter of great gratification to us all that that duty should have been so gracefully done—in a manner which did credit to the gentlemen themselves and added to the dignity of the House. We welcome the new members, whom these gentlemen represent, as by no means a small acquisition to the talent of this assembly. I am grateful to the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition for the terms in which he has alluded to my predecessor in office. It is a matter of most profound regret to the members on this side, and to none more than to myself, that the career of Sir John Abbott, at a time it gave promise of the greatest usefulness to his country, was cut short by the hand of disease. Sir John Abbott carries with him, as the hon. gentleman has said, the regret of the whole country, but he carries with him also the profoundest sympathy of the party with which he has co-operated so long and which sits on this side of this assembly. I am grateful to the hon. gentleman also for the graceful, although somewhat sarcastic, compliments which he has bestowed upon me. The hon. gentleman gave me credit for flights of fancy and gifts of imagination which he had hitherto apparently regarded as a monopoly of his own, but in the possession of which he has been good enough to credit me with a share of this afternoon. He took away, however, my laurels completely by occupying three-quarters

of an hour of our time in proving how much more imaginative he is than I could possibly be. The hon. gentleman, in calling attention to the reorganization of the Government, and in the criticisms which he made upon it, naturally saw, as the only subject of admiration in connection with it, that characteristic which he and his party lack above all others. He saw that we were strong in numbers, and he apparently viewed the reorganization of the Government entirely from that reflective mood into which the observation of the condition of his own party would naturally lead him. Now, in commenting on the observations which have been made on this side of the House as to the condition of the country, the hon. gentleman described us as going about the country endeavouring to preach the contrary of what we know to be the facts as to the condition of the country. Well, we have taken advantage of every opportunity to state to the country what the facts, the records of the day, prove to be its condition. We have never, so far as I am aware, discussed this question without showing what the public records prove in that regard; and while the hon. gentleman has replied to us in several places, I have never seen that in any place he has cited the public records to refute a single statement we made, if I except alone the fanciful theories which he builds upon the census. But if we take the volume of trade of the country, if we take the increased industries of the country, if we take the mileage of railways or their business, if we take the business done in the banks and other institutions of the country, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) this afternoon,—if we take the record of these and simply unfold them to the people of the country, we are accused of making a hue and cry about a false and fancied prosperity. Gentlemen addressing public audiences immediately afterwards declare that this is all delusive, but do not venture to wrestle with the figures any more than did the hon. gentleman this afternoon. I have referred to the hon. gentleman as having built fanciful theories upon the census, and I think he has. He is entirely mistaken, however, in supposing that I had apologised for the results of the census figures on the ground of the inaccuracy of the census. What I did say was precisely the answer which the hon. gentleman's argument invites this afternoon, and that is that a comparison between the two sets of figures exhibited by the recent census and by that of ten years ago is a most unfair one. It is unfair because the basis of the census was practically changed in 1891, and the conditions and regulations under which it was taken, though they tended to greater accuracy, are deceptive for the purposes of comparison because they left uncounted in the population tens of thousands of people who would have been counted under the regulations of the previous census. Yet the hon. gentleman insists upon a severe comparison between the census of 1891 and that of 1881, and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

supposes we are apologising for the discrepancy on the ground of inaccuracy of the census of 1891. I do not assert that the census of 1891 was more inaccurate than that of 1881, or that the census of 1881 was more inaccurate than that of 1891. I say they were taken under different conditions, which reduced, apparently, the numerical population of the country, very greatly to the disadvantage of the subsequent decade. The hon. gentleman himself was mistaken for a moment in stating what the ratio of increase had been during the previous decade. He stated it was something about 19 per cent, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was 17½. That is merely by the way, however, and was no doubt a slip of memory. There is greater fault to be found with the hon. gentleman, when he makes the assertion that from the so-called and fancied prosperity of this country hundreds of thousands of persons are fleeing year by year. If that had been the fact, the census of the last decade would have shown an exodus of two millions of people for the ten years, at least. The hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the facts contained in the census, although his friends have been quoting them everywhere in condemnation of the Government's policy, multiplies the actual exodus tenfold in order to make an effective speech to the House. I think that if the hon. gentleman is in a position to compliment me this afternoon on the acquisition of a new gift, I am in a position to credit him with enhanced power of slighting facts and slurring over arguments in order to make an address which will be effective and brilliant, but not based on sound reason or justified by the public records of the country. The hon. gentleman made a facetious allusion to the National Policy and myself, in connection with some observations which I made upon it. I must take leave to except altogether from the assumed right of the hon. gentleman to define what the National Policy was and is. He called it a gospel. I would not like that the apostle of that doctrine should be a gentleman who does not believe in the gospel at all; and therefore I dissent entirely both from the hon. gentleman's definition of what the National Policy was and his right to define it. When I addressed the audience in Toronto at the meeting to which he refers, I was alluding to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party as having been national in a far wider sense than the sense of any mere customs tariff arrangement; and, whether I am right or wrong, I claim that we are justified in putting before the country that it was the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party from its formation, as it is its policy still, to unite and build up this country; and when the union of the provinces was accomplished the first step in that great task was taken and the task has been carried on ever since by the policy of that party, which has put on the face of this country every structure worth preserving, and which has put on the statute-book almost every enactment worth continuing. But I do

not think that I ought to object too much to the hon. gentleman's right to criticize and to be facetious at the expense of the National Policy when the hon. gentleman treated as he did his favourite theory of unrestricted reciprocity. He made but a momentary allusion to that subject, and he had to go to the Indian village of Caughnawaga to find an illustration in favour of it. After years of consideration, the hon. gentleman is able to tell us that the Indians of Caughnawaga, under free trade with the United States, obtain more for their baskets and their moccasins than they otherwise could. Now, if the hon. gentleman had been a little more impartial in the quotation he made from the debates of this House when the National Policy customs arrangement was discussed in 1877 and 1878, he would have found a much better answer to his arguments from members of his own side than he has found from our friends. He accuses us for not having legislated so as to keep the population of this country within its borders, so as to find employment for our people and prevent their going to the United States. If he had read a little more from "Hansard" of fifteen years ago he would have found that the answer which his friends and his party gave day by day was that legislation could not change that state of affairs, that it could not create prosperity, and that it was hopeless to expect such a result. If then, as they said, the task was hopeless, it is not fair to charge us with not doing what it was hopeless to expect us to do. But the hon. gentleman knows that the legislation which was then introduced has found employment for thousands and tens of thousands in this country who would otherwise have swollen the exodus, and for classes of people who had been swelling it previous to 1879. The hon. gentleman knows it, for I read it in his countenance, as well as heard it with my ears, when he proclaimed this doctrine, that there were figures and figures, that he makes a difference between some figures and others. Yes, he will take the account of the population in this country now, and compare it with the statistics made in 1881 under different circumstances and different conditions, and will decline to take any figures which tend against his own argument and in favour of the National Policy, and which show the increase of employment which has been given to mechanics from one end of Canada to the other. The hon. gentleman does make a difference between some figures and others, and that is where we condemn his reference to the statistics of 1891, in which he holds us distinctly responsible for the want of an increase in population, but declares that we are not entitled to any credit for the increased employment given to our people, by which tens of thousands have obtained employment here, of the classes which had to seek employment in the United States when the friends of the hon. gentleman were in office. I was not surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman in reference

to wrecking and towing and in reference to the rebate on the canal tolls. He is somewhat mistaken in his criticism of our action in reference to wrecking and towing. The Government of Canada are and have been willing that kind should be given to vessels of any States the same privileges as those which other vessels have at present in our canals. We have never disputed that the wrecking vessels owned in that country should pass as freely through the canals as any other vessels, but the point of difference was as to the carrying on of wrecking operations in the canals, and we regarded it as serious that privileges of that kind should be given to vessels of any other country. In one point of view it may seem immaterial. One could hardly fancy wrecking operations being carried on in a canal under ordinary circumstances, or that owners of wrecking vessels in the United States should seriously desire that privilege in our canals, and it may be that the privilege which was so earnestly pressed upon us was not of very great consequence to them. It is, however, open to considerable doubt and demands considerable caution, because the traffic in a canal lock might be completely blocked if, by international agreement, the wrecking vessels of another country were enabled to come and go at their own option in order to remove a wrecked vessel from our canals. If there is, as I assume there is, good faith on the other side, a very few words ought to be sufficient to make it clear that, if tugs are engaged in towing vessels through a canal and a slight accident should happen to one of the vessels towed, assistance could be given, and as far as I am aware that has never been prevented. But on the other hand it should be understood that operations of a protracted character in our canals should be in any case under the control of the Canadian authorities owning the canals. Let me point out that this was not contemplated in the original arrangement which was made. The principle of that arrangement was that there should be wrecking and towing reciprocally in the waters contiguous to the two countries, and the canals can hardly be said to come under that definition; but we would not stand too strictly upon that, if facilities in those canals are essential to the fair working of the agreement. We have only desired to restrict United States' wrecking companies by regulations which apply to our own vessels. The United States have felt themselves unable to agree to that on account of the bald statement in the Act of Congress that the President of the United States can only extend reciprocal privileges to us if they are extended on our side to the canals in Canada, as well as to the contiguous waters. The hon. gentleman was also mistaken in regard to the rebate on the canal tolls in Canada. That rebate has been in effect for years, and it was not made the subject of criticism by our opponents in this House or serious remonstrance on the part of the United States until a considerable time had elapsed. Last year when we were required to deal

with the matter we had to consider vested interests, because many contracts had been made in view of the tariff and rebate complained of. The proposition which we made is before the public. We proposed that at the close of navigation the alleged grievance should be removed if the concession which we considered as its counterpoise in the treaty of Washington were made on the other side. That, unfortunately, was not acceded to. The hon. gentleman says that we should immediately have withdrawn. I think that good faith to our own people, at least, justified us in asking that any action towards a change in the tolls and rebate should be postponed until the season of navigation which had then commenced had closed, and I think the hon. gentleman will not find, when the correspondence comes down, that the attitude of Canada upon that subject has been unreasonable, or such as the hon. gentleman suspected it was, unfriendly towards the neighbouring Government. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman will remember that this subject of the canal tolls and the mutual privileges accorded to the citizens of either country in the canals in the other country, is not by any means a new thing. It was as fully discussed when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power as it has been by us, and the expressions which appear on the public records then are no more favourable to the United States' contention than our own have been. The hon. gentleman's own Government felt called upon, time after time, to remonstrate with the United States Government upon the ground that American citizens were getting privileges in the Canadian canals, while the use of the United States and the state canals was practically refused them, or extended to them under restrictions which absolutely prevented their being of any benefit whatever to the Canadian people. While it was professed that a Canadian had the right to enter a state canal, he was met immediately by a customs regulation which declared that he should debark his cargo before he entered that canal. The treatment of Canada by the United States with regard to the canal question was felt to be just as unreasonable then as it has been since, and was just as strongly remonstrated against by the associates of hon. gentlemen who condemn us now for not giving way as soon as the concession was asked for. The hon. gentleman made a number of allusions to subjects which are not in the Speech from the Throne. I am exceedingly sorry that we could not afford the hon. gentleman ample room for criticism, ample room, even, for the enlarged gift of imagination which the hon. gentleman has exhibited this afternoon. But I am glad the hon. gentleman has made the allusion he did to subjects which are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I really cannot believe it possible that the hon. gentleman, coming from the province of Quebec, passed through the city of Montreal and saw

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

with his eyes the Prohibition Commission at work there, and came to Ottawa to look for its existence in the Speech from the Throne. Sir, I doubt very much indeed that the hon. gentleman was at all surprised to see that another commission, which he mentioned, was not referred to in the Speech from the Throne, when he knew that the labours of that commission had been concluded, that the commissioners had discharged the duty assigned to them under an order of this House, and when he knew that as a matter of law and ordinary practice, the report of the commission would be immediately brought down. I fancy the hon. gentleman was aware that the report simply awaited the meeting of the House in order to be laid upon the Table of the House. I shall not follow the hon. gentleman in his allusion to the report upon the question which has arisen in Manitoba, because at a very early date, I am sure, we shall have an opportunity to discuss that question more at length and with more satisfaction than we can, in the absence of the papers, and when it is not directly before the House. Therefore, I will not, at the present moment venture to express at length my dissent from the hon. gentleman's views as regards the treatment of that question by a sub-committee of the Privy Council. I am not at all in sympathy with his view that any want of courtesy was shown to the House of Commons by giving the report of the sub-committee to the press. We shall be prepared to defend that report and the principles on which it is founded when it is brought here, or when it forms the subject of discussion here, whether that discussion shall arise before it is brought down or afterwards. But I think the House must have been surprised at the unusual criticism and the unusual policy adopted by the hon. gentleman as leader of the Opposition, when he referred to the fact that there was no mention of tariff changes in the Speech from the Throne. My recollection may be very much at fault indeed, but I shall be surprised if the hon. gentleman is able to point to more than one, or two, or three occasions, in which tariff changes have been announced in the Speech from the Throne, during the twenty-six years of the existence of this Parliament. I think it would be singularly unfortunate that the Government, two months before tariff changes could possibly be made in the ordinary course of the business of Parliament, two months before they could go into effect, should indicate to the people of this country that they were going to make important changes in this or that item of the tariff. At any rate, I think that the hon. gentleman will find no precedent in this country for the motion which he has made, and I doubt very much if he will find any precedent for it in any other country. While tariff changes were announced at the time when the present fiscal policy was established in 1879, they were announced in a manner which

only indicated generally the establishment of a fiscal policy which had been forshadowed in general terms by a resolution moved in this House in a previous session. I think, therefore, that the House will not approve of the hon. gentleman's course in proposing that this House shall address His Excellency upon this subject, as if it were a most unusual thing to omit mention of tariff changes from the Speech, as if it were a most unusual thing for His Excellency not to announce what tariff changes would be made, and to demonstrate to His Excellency the unsoundness of the advice which has withheld that announcement from Parliament, and for which, as I say, no precedent can really be found. I think the House will see that a mistake has been made on this subject, and the House will be prepared to wait until the fiscal policy of the Government upon this subject is announced, and then if it pleases, to address His Excellency upon this subject in approbation or disapprobation of the changes which the Government may propose, but will not censure the Government for not having announced these tariff changes in the Speech in a manner which, as I have said, unless my memory is entirely at fault, has actually no precedent in this country. The hon. gentleman seemed to infer from the omission of any allusion to this subject in the Speech that it was our purpose to make no tariff changes, and that the policy which we intimated elsewhere of remodelling, to some extent, the tariff would not be pursued. The hon. gentleman, I repeat, has no right to draw such an inference as that from the omission of the subject in the Speech. Mr. Speaker, I heartily repeat my gratification at the manner in which the Address has been moved and seconded, and I am sure that, notwithstanding the amendment which the hon. gentleman has moved, a large majority of the House will concur in waiting until the usual time arrives for the announcement of this Government with regard to its tariff policy, before undertaking to make any declaration upon the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Justice makes it a complaint against my hon. friend and against other hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House, that they only look to one particular set of statistics which favours their own views, and that they are entirely unprepared to wrestle with the so-called facts which he and his friends are prepared to bring forward in evidence of the increasing prosperity of the people of this country. I, for my part, am not conscious that I have ever refused to meet any statements, any statistics, any figures which those hon. gentlemen opposite have to bring forward. What I have said, what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has said, what my hon. friends on this side of the House have said is this: We are prepared to deal, not with part, but with all the statistics that can possibly affect the prosperity of the

people of Canada. What we object to is, not that hon. gentlemen opposite quote certain statistics which appear to their mind to confirm the view they hold, but that they will omit, suppress, garble and distort other statistics of far greater importance in the direction of showing the prosperity of the country. That is our complaint, a complaint which I think, before I sit down, I shall be able to show to be a reasonably well established one. Sir, I, for my part, standing in my place in Parliament, and addressing my fellow-countrymen in various parts of this Dominion, have always stated that there were certain ways in which this country has progressed, that it was impossible that a people well nigh 5,000,000 strong, having well nigh half a continent at their disposal, should not increase and prosper in certain directions; but what I have stated, and what I now repeat, is this: that that progress has been wholly one-sided, that that progress has been uneven, and, to an enormous extent, it has been a mere displacement of wealth and not a creation of wealth. If you take our own older provinces, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec, despite all statistics which go to show that a certain section of the people have grown rich at the expense of the rest, and that a few men have become millionaires, thousands and tens of thousands are on the verge of pauperism, and while there has been progress, partial, uncertain and irregular in certain parts of the country, that, nevertheless, taking those five old provinces together and striking a fair and honest debit and credit account, and balancing the increase of the so-called evidences of prosperity he refers to, I am prepared to prove that, during the last twelve years, under this so-called prosperous system, the collective wealth of the people of the five old provinces has not increased one cent. That is my declaration, a declaration which I am prepared to prove in detail. I am perfectly willing to admit that half a dozen cities and towns throughout those five great provinces have increased in population and wealth, but a hundred towns and villages, equally deserving of the consideration and protection of the Government, and equally deserving of the consideration and protection of this House, having collectively quite as large a population, and being collectively, quite as important to the well-being of this country, are stationary, or retrograding; and if you put together the depreciation of property in all those towns and villages to which I have alluded, you will find that the absolute, actual depreciation of property in those places equalizes the augmentation of property in the few favoured localities to which I have referred. We contend that is the tendency of the policy of this Government. There are to-day, I grant you, a dozen times as many very wealthy men in Canada as there were under the Mackenzie regime, and there are also a

thousand times as many men in different parts of Canada who are on the very verge of destitution, thanks to that same policy. That is our position with respect to these matters. Let me tell the Minister of Justice that it is a very great mistake to confound evidences of increasing debt with evidences of increased wealth. A great many of those facts on which he rests, a great many of those facts to which he has appealed, are simply evidences, not that the wealth of the community has increased, but that there has been a displacement of wealth, that certain sections of the community, perhaps, are richer and certain other sections are poorer. It is not the best possible proof of the increased wealth of the community to tell us there are in Canada to-day a large number of persons who hold deposits in private banks and in the Government savings banks, or, in other words, that there are an unusual number of persons in a country like Canada, a young country with unlimited quantities of fertile land, which should afford unlimited opportunities for profitable investment, who are obliged or choose to be content with receiving three or four per cent interest for money, held at command, in place of seeking permanent investments. Sir, there are two sides to this question. It is well to have money in the bank, or in the Government savings banks, but it goes to show this, and the experience of every hon. gentleman beside me, and hon. gentlemen opposite will confirm it, that there are an immense number of people in Canada who have very little confidence, indeed in the future of the country. Go to any town of any importance in the country to-day. Put up farm property to auction, put up town or village property to auction, and although you will find hundreds of thousands of dollars lying in the banks established in the town, you will scarcely find one man ready to come forward and buy property for fifty, forty or even thirty per cent of its value a few years ago. Sir, the hon. gentleman might as well tell this House that it is a wonderful proof of the increasing prosperity of the people of this country that there should be an immense number of mortgages recorded over and above the number on record ten years ago. In support of that proof of increasing prosperity and increasing wealth, the hon. gentleman could, if he desired, obtain statistics enough; and had the challenge I flung some years ago across the House been accepted, had the information I asked for been obtained, had a small sum been used for the purpose of obtaining the statistics desired, a record would have been procured that would have opened the eyes of a large number of the agriculturists at least, and gone a long way to prove the true extent of the prosperity which they were enjoying under the benign reign of hon. gentlemen opposite. I should be pleased if it were

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

possible—because I am deeply interested in the welfare of Canada, quite as deeply interested as any hon. gentleman I see on the opposite benches—to confirm the declaration made by the Minister of Justice and his colleagues that Canada is now one of the most prosperous countries in the world; but I cannot do it, simply for the reason that my daily and hourly personal experience contradicts every statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, as does the daily and hourly personal experience of a large number of hon. gentlemen, if they would condescend on their honour to state the facts as they know them to exist. I am not on the present occasion disposed to enter into minute details in regard to all those points, or to explain why it is, for instance, that I doubt extremely the wisdom of a policy which in a country like Canada borrows at call, at three or four per cent, a large amount of the money of the people, in place of obtaining money for a fixed term of years at a similar or lower rate elsewhere. That is a question which may be more appropriately discussed when we have to deal with the statements of the Finance Minister, but it has a good deal to do with the wisdom of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I place our grounds for moving the amendment which we have just moved on broad facts which are known to every man who knows anything of the position of Canada. The appeal which we now make through you, Mr. Speaker, and through this House to the people of Canada, we base on the broad fact that our census statistics disclose an enormous loss of the most valuable asset that any country could possess, an enormous loss of the youthful population of Canada. We base it on the fact known to me, known to my friends beside me, known, I say, to hon. gentlemen opposite, capable of proof if they will give us the means of obtaining legal proof; the fact that from one end of the older provinces to the other there has been an enormous and utterly unprecedented depreciation of the value of not merely town and village property, but of the value of farm lands held by the agricultural community of Canada, on whose prosperity the prosperity of this whole country depends. We base it, in the third place, on the fact that there has been, as these same records show, a most enormous increase in the taxation on the people, which is but feebly and faintly represented by the sums which come into the public treasury. To the \$30,000,000 which was paid into the public treasury, and which in some sort of way may be said to have been appropriated to the benefit of the people of Canada, there are to be added another \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 which have been wrung from the tolling masses of Canada, and have not been applied to the public welfare, but which have been applied to enrich the few at the expense of the many, on condition that these few would tithe their plunder to keep hon. gentlemen opposite in power.

Mr. FOSTER. The same old story.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, which you have never yet answered and never can. The Minister of Justice was good enough to treat, I won't say with levity, but apparently with some indignation, the allusions which were made by my hon. friend beside me to these same census returns. I have observed that the use of the census statistics has upon hon. gentlemen opposite very much the same effect that the application of holy water is said to have upon a certain personage. It is a test they cannot escape and therefore it is a test they hate and abominate. I will candidly admit that up to the present time I have felt that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen in dealing with these same statistics has been such as I cannot altogether approve, and it is possible that I have been somewhat too warm at times in expressing what I thought of their conduct in this respect. Sir, I have altered my mind. I am inclined to think that in dealing with the method in which these hon. gentlemen have treated the census statistics I may have been too exigent, and it is to the Minister of Justice that my conversion is due. I have recently had an opportunity of perusing the statement made by that hon. gentleman to the people of Toronto with respect to the census. It is a statement of very great importance, a statement which was very recently made, a statement which was made under very peculiar circumstances, a statement which is undoubtedly entitled to very great weight, and I will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, take the liberty of placing it on your records. This was no ordinary deliverance. This was the first official statement made by the Premier of Canada. It was, I may say, his first official manifesto to the people over whom he was to rule. It was made in a very public way and in a very public place; it was made with all his colleagues surrounding him, and it was made in the chief city of the chief province of Canada. The subject was one which was not new to the hon. gentleman. Not merely was it one of first-class importance in itself, but it was a subject which had been often discussed in this House, and it was a subject which, for certain reasons that I will presently allude to, was one which ought to have especially attracted the attention of any hon. gentleman hailing from the Maritime Provinces, and particularly of an hon. gentleman who came from a county, which showed such a record as the county of Antigonish. Now, Sir, we will see what the hon. gentleman did say:

I admit the exodus still. There are various kinds of exodus, ladies and gentlemen. There is the Cartwright exodus, which reaches the tall figures of 1,500,000, and he soared above that even and claimed that a good many more men were lost from the Canadian population until somebody turned his own calculation about and applied it to the United States, and showed him that according to his mode of calculating the exodus, there had been an exodus from the United States of 6,500,000. There is the kind of

exodus which the leader of the Opposition described a few evenings ago as an exodus so great that we were unable to keep the beggarly 5,000,000 of people that we have in it. Ladies and gentlemen, while the population has grown in the last decade 17 per cent, and has reached nearly 5,000,000 of people, it has never quite reached that mark yet, and to talk about being unable to keep in this country the beggarly 5,000,000 we have is to talk what that great leader described a few seconds afterwards as mere trash and buncombe. What is the exodus? The facts have been ascertained within the last few weeks from the United States records. They show that the whole population of the United States, Canadian born, is 980,000.

I think the figures here are 980,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 930,000, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the States alone, not for the United States. There is a distinction. I think the hon. gentleman will find it is 980,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I believe 930,000 to be correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. However, it is a matter of little difference at the present time. It goes on to say:

How many of these have we lost in the last decade, and how many in the decade before? We have lost in the last ten years 265,000. That is a thing deeply to be regretted; but, ladies and gentlemen, the loss in the decade before was far greater, not in numbers, but in percentage. While in the decade before we had increased our exodus by 50 per cent, during the last decade it has been pulled down to a little over 36 per cent. But the assurance with which our opponents declare that the National Policy is to be blamed for having an exodus at all is something appalling to the intellect of Canadians.

As I say, Sir, the hon. gentleman has converted me. I will admit candidly that when I first read that statement, it appeared to me that it was an exceedingly dishonest statement, but when I read it a second time more carefully I discerned a saving stupidity about it which inclined me to take a greatly more charitable view of the situation. I perceived that this was one of the cases which, all divines agree offer great excuses. Here there was the "crassa ignorantia," which largely diminished the culpability of the party making the statement—I am not quite sure that I might not say the "crassissima ignorantia," and I am prepared to give to the hon. Minister of Justice all that freedom from responsibility which properly attaches, or can attach, to any gentleman who talks on a subject in perfect ignorance of the facts. Nevertheless, it is my duty on the present occasion to call the hon. gentleman's attention—not at all in the way of alleging that he willfully misstated anything, but in the way, if I may venture to say, of correction—to certain very extraordinary mistakes and errors which the hon. gentleman has fallen into in this remarkable statement. For the satisfaction of the House I may say that I have not the slightest intention of reviewing all the minor mistakes in the hon. gentleman's speech. I am afraid it would take from morning until dewy

eve to go through them all, and I will confine myself strictly on the present occasion to four capital errors which that gentleman has made. First of all, I would ask the hon. gentleman, if there is anything in the statement which he wishes to correct. I am using the statement made by the "Empire," which also appears verbatim et literatim, in the columns of the "Globe" and "Mail," and when "Empire" "Mail" and "Globe" all unite in representing that the hon. gentleman made a particular set of statements, I think we may assume that these are approximately correct. Nevertheless, if on consideration there is anything the hon. gentleman wants to explain or to withdraw, heaven forbid that I should deny him the opportunity of doing it now and here. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman does not want to qualify, if he adheres to his statements, allow me to point out what appears to me to be very extraordinary mistakes to be made on the part of a gentleman in his position. Now, Sir, I assure the hon. gentleman that on this side of the House, at any rate, we are not disposed to be very exacting; we do not expect a Premier or a Minister of Justice to be an expert in statistics. That, I think, would be unreasonable. But, Sir, I humbly submit—as Sir Charles Tupper was wont to say, I am in the judgment of the House—is it too much to expect that a Minister of the Crown, ay, the First Minister of the Crown, should, before addressing an audience on a question of first-rate importance, condescend to make himself acquainted with the rules of subtraction, multiplication and division? I do not expect too much. Now, being, as I have said, disposed on this occasion not to censure, but rather to instruct, I would like, did the rules of the House permit, to have asked for a blackboard and chalk, but I have been withheld by a fear lest my motives should be misconstrued; for as you can understand I have always been nervously anxious not to be misconstrued by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I will endeavour, without these mechanical aids, to explain wherein I think the hon. gentleman has grievously misconstrued the statistics which his own department has placed in his hands. In the first place, I find that the hon. gentleman states that the population has grown in the last decade some seventeen per cent. Now, I want to call his attention to these facts. Our population in 1881 was 4,324,000. If he will divide that number by ten, he will find that ten per cent represents 432,000 people; if he will pursue the same method with respect to the seven per cent, he will find that it represents about 302,000 people; and if he will add these two numbers together, he will find that they will make 734,000 at least. Sir, his own Canada increased 504,000; where does he get census returns tell us that the population of the odd 230,000? Sir, I would be obliged to know that the census returns are all a blunder, and the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that there are seventeen per cent additional population, being 230,000 more than his own

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

census returns show; but, until some explanation is offered, all I have to say is, that there is apparently a trifling error of 230,000, which, taken in the percentage fashion which the hon. gentleman is so fond of, means a trifling error of forty-six per cent. This, you will observe, was a patriotic error, no doubt committed with the desire of preventing people from supposing that the exodus had been as great as it really is, and it is very likely many people throughout the country who read the hon. gentleman's statement that there had been an increase of 17 per cent in the last decade, whereas, his own census returns showed an increase of about 11½ per cent, would go home feeling comforted that some wonderful discovery had been made which showed the census returns to be entirely erroneous. The hon. gentleman also talks about the exodus, which he puts down at 265,500. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that we on this side always considered the exodus to consist of two parts—one composed of the native-born population who had left Canada, and the other composed of people who had, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, come from abroad and settled here, brought at our expense, and who afterwards left our shores. As to these what has the hon. gentleman to say? Not one word, not one syllable. The trifling fact that 886,000 people were alleged by the returns of the Government of which he was a member, and for which he is responsible to have settled in Canada in the last decade, and to have subsequently disappeared, appears to the hon. gentleman to be unworthy of the slightest notice. Now, I will make the hon. gentleman an offer, a fair and reasonable offer. If in his place as Prime Minister he will rise here now and state that, having examined into the question, he has become convinced that all the statements made by the Government from 1881 to 1891 with respect to the settlement of immigrants in Canada are a sham and a delusion and a fraud, and that the money paid for those people was practically obtained from us by false pretenses, and was never used to bring immigrants at all, then I will say that possibly he was right to omit all reference to the 886,000 emigrants that the hon. gentleman's Government went on declaring, in spite of my protests, year in and year out, had been added by their exertions to the population of Canada. Now, Sir, what are the broad facts? You have an increase of population, all told, of 504,000; you have an immigration alleged to have been brought to Canada of 886,000. Does the hon. gentleman understand what these facts mean? They mean that we have absolutely lost 382,000, plus the entire natural increase. Does the hon. gentleman want to know, or do his friends or their subsidized press want to know, what was the result of our expenditure of three or four millions of dollars for the alleged purpose of bringing these settlers here? Sir, I can tell them. These same census returns

show that in 1881 there were 608,000 foreign-born people in Canada, and that in 1891 we had—what? 1,400,000 or 1,000,000? Not a bit of it. We had in Canada 645,000, a total absolute increase in the foreign-born population of exactly 37,000. To that number must in all fairness be added the number required to replace the foreign-born inhabitants who died between 1881 and 1891. That, according to my calculation, would amount to something like two per cent a year, and would represent for the ten years 122,000. But giving the hon. gentleman the benefit of all that, this result is arrived at: that we imported at our own cost and charges 886,000 people, and when the census returns are made, all that can possibly be accounted for are 159,000. Of those brought to Canada at our expense five depart and one remains. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what he must add to the exodus, if there be one word of truth in the statements made by his Government? Sir, let him deduct 159,000 from 886,000, and he will find that this item, which, in his mind, was not of sufficient importance to warrant one word of reference, represents, if these figures be correct—they are his, not mine—a loss of 727,000 emigrants who were brought here at our cost for the benefit of the people of the United States, always supposing they ever came at all, and that the whole thing was not a fraud and a sham. Now, here we have, as I told you, first of all, an over-estimate of the actual increase by 230,000. We have, in the second place, a loss of 727,000 of the foreign-born immigration, which I can see no possibility of contradicting, because, if it be alleged that a number of them replaced the existing foreign Dominion population of 1881, that only swells the exodus in another direction, and you have very nearly three-quarters of a million people brought to this country in the last decade and who have since left it. But it is when I come to the statement which, after all, concerns us most, the statement of the exodus of native-born Canadians, that the hon. gentleman has surpassed himself. I will deal with the question of the exodus of native-born population. I, for one, am willing to welcome to Canada every honest and industrious man of every nationality, always provided he comes here at his own cost and is not brought here at the public expense to take the place of better men and exclude Canadians from their occupations. On that condition I welcome everyone, but I have always contended that, in the interests of the people of this country, it is a thousand times more important to keep our own people in our own country than to promote any foreign immigration from any country in the world. Now, I will call attention to a very remarkable statement which the Minister of Justice has made on that subject. He takes the number of Canadians born in the United States in the year 1880 and in the year 1890, and he sub-

tracts the one from the other and finds that the difference is 265,000, and he tells us that that represents the total exodus. I would have hoped that a man so patriotic as the hon. gentleman would have kept that information most carefully from the public. If he has discovered that that is a correct statement, I am very sorry indeed to find the hon. gentleman giving it publicity. What is our position? It is this: We are constantly losing the flower of our youth and population. We know that these people prosper and succeed in the United States in a remarkable degree; but if, on the authority of the Minister of Justice, we are likewise to add to all the other inducements, this fact, which he seems to have discovered, that if you have 707,000 in 1880 and 980,000, or whatever the figure is, in 1890, the total loss then is just 265,000, why it follows that all Canadians who go to the United States become practically immortal. They have no death rate, or so inappreciable a death rate, he did not think it worth while to take it into account in all the ten years from 1880 to 1890. If that be so, I should say that for the safety of Canada, I hope he will keep the information to himself. We have lost all the youth, but if it becomes known that besides prospering in the United States, Canadians going there become practically immortal, I am very much afraid we will lose all the old men too. Is this a trifling, insignificant error? Why, had the population remained exactly as it was, had there not been one soul more than the 707,000 who were there in 1880, it would have represented, for the mere purpose of balancing the death rate, for the mere purpose of keeping up the number, a loss to Canada of at least 140,000 souls. A very large proportion of these 707,000, who were found in the United States in 1880, were people who had been there over ten, or twenty, or thirty years. There is no doubt whatever that the very lowest addition that can be made for the purpose of maintaining the number would have fully equalled 140,000, and when you have an emigration of 40,000 to 50,000 a year from Canada, they also have a certain death rate, which must be taken into account, not so heavy as the death rate of those who were there in 1880, but still a considerable number. I am not putting it by any means as high, but I believe all statisticians looking at the question will say that I am not taking an exaggerated view of the case, when I say that about 33,000 would be a fair number to add to the exodus, which would therefore amount in those ten years to at least 440,000 souls. If he will add together the death rate necessary to maintain the population which existed in 1880, and the number necessary to replace the inevitable deaths among those who went there during this decade, he will find he must add 175,000 souls to the 265,000, which are all he admitted to be the total loss of native-born population in Canada. We have found the hon. gentleman overestimat-

ing the census increase by 230,000, we have found him ignoring the loss of immigrants who came and did not stay here by 727,000, and we have found him diminishing the number of Canadian-born, the most important item of all, who have left this country by 175,000. It occurs to me that these are important matters, which the press and the people would do extremely well to consider a little more deeply than the First Minister has done, and it has occurred to me they put a somewhat new face on all the theories and calculations which the hon. gentleman submitted later as to the percentage with respect to these years. I will just say this: Apply the same scale of calculation to the exodus which existed between 1871 and 1880 that I have applied to the exodus which I have proved to exist between 1881 and 1891, and you will get this result: The exodus from 1871 to 1881 on a population in 1871 of 3,685,000 amounted to about 337,000 or thereabouts. On the same scale in proportion, that is about nine per cent, while the exodus which has now taken place, making allowance for the death rate, amounts to 440,000 on a population of 4,324,000. It is a little more than ten per cent, so that the fact is that the exodus has materially increased in spite of all the hon. gentleman has alleged, and that without taking into the slightest account, without making any allowance for the 727,000 emigrants who were brought to Canada at the cost of our people and afterwards left us.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the House rose, I had just concluded pointing out three somewhat serious errors into which I conceived the hon. the Minister of Justice had fallen in dealing with the extremely important question as to the amount of the exodus from Canada during the last ten years. I had pointed out in the first place that he had made a very grave error indeed in supposing that the total increase in our population from 1881 to 1891 was 17 per cent, whereas his own census statistics, if he had taken the trouble to refer to them, would have shown him that the increase was barely 11.66 per cent, in other words that he had overestimated the increase by about 230,000 souls. I had further pointed out that he had entirely and completely omitted all reference to that very important portion of the exodus which was composed of the foreign-born people, who, according to the hon. gentleman's own Government statistics—statistics published by a Government of which he was a member—had come into this country, largely at the expense of the people of this country, to the number of 886,000, of which 886,000 it now appears that only 159,000 at the very outside had remained in Canada, and therefore 727,000 immigrants had come to Canada, had settled here, according to the hon. gentleman's

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

reports, had looked about them, and had gone away again. I further pointed out that he had committed a grievous mistake in underestimating the ascertained facts as to the movement of population from Canada to the United States; that, whereas, he estimated it as 265,000, the proper amount—making due allowance for the death rate during those years—was 440,000 or thereabouts, a number 175,000 in excess of the number which he gave; and also that that circumstance proved conclusively that the immigration from Canada of the native-born population from 1881 to 1891 had been considerably in excess (on the same system of calculation) of the emigration of the native-born population of Canada between 1871 and 1881—a fact of which I could have afforded him ample additional evidence from the municipal statistics of our different provinces. The hon. gentleman and his friends will observe that, if you lose of the foreign-born population 727,000 for whom you cannot account, and if you lose besides 440,000 of the native population, the total number of the absolutely ascertained loss is made up of these two figures, and amounts to 1,167,000 in round numbers. And now I come to another portion of the hon. gentleman's speech. And here I will say frankly that, although the hon. gentleman has very seriously misstated what I stated, although he has quite misunderstood and misconceived my remarks, I entirely acquit him of any wilful misconception or misrepresentation. He has evidently read the reports of what I said very cursorily, when he said that I estimated the loss of our native-born population at a million and a half. I never thought or said that a million and a half of native-born Canadians had removed from Canada to the United States in those ten years, as the hon. gentleman in his speech distinctly infers that I stated. No such statement was ever made by me, or, as far as I know, by any one on this side of the House. On the contrary, over and over again I had expressed my opinion that, when the figures of the United States census were in my hands, they would probably show a total population of native-born Canadians in the United States in 1890 of about one million. It appears that I slightly overestimated the number. I was informed from the Bureau of Statistics at Washington—though I doubt if the last report has reached the Library—that the number was 989,000, of whom a certain number were natives of Newfoundland. I may have been misinformed. The hon. gentleman states the number to be 930,000, and I should be very glad indeed to find that the information furnished to me was incorrect, and that we were not quite as badly off as I supposed. But it was stated in the same communication that, making allowance for the natives of Newfoundland, who, of course, are included in the enumeration of the natives of British North America, the increased number of Canadians

born amounted to 265,000, which I see is exactly the number the hon. gentleman stated, and I fancy that, when the full figures are in our hands, it will be found that he is correct in saying that the apparent increase was 265,000, and that I am correct in stating the same figure. There is another quotation which the hon. gentleman has evidently not understood. One part of the charge, advanced by myself, and advanced from this side of the House, has always been that the policy or impolicy of the Government has been such that it has driven away a very large part of the younger portion and flower of our population, and that by so doing this, further and heavy loss has been inflicted upon our people, that the actual rate of increase has been reduced far below the natural rate of increase. I have observed in the comments of the hon. gentleman's press, and the hon. gentleman's supporters, that there appears to be an absolute incapacity to understand what I thought would be an absolute truism, that the actual increase in any country does not necessarily agree with the natural increase. It may be largely in excess of the natural increase under certain conditions, and it may also be largely below the natural increase under certain conditions. I turn to a country which, unfortunately, in many respects, affords too close a parallel to our own. I turn to the condition of Ireland, as shown by the late census. I suppose there is no one here who knows anything of the habits of the Irish peasantry, in regard to early marriages, but would suppose that the natural increase in that country would be largely in excess of the number of deaths. We find, however, that, whereas the population in 1881 was 5,174,000, the population in 1891 had sunk to 4,700,000 souls. It would sound almost like an Irish bull to say that the rate of natural increase in Ireland showed a decrease of 400,000 souls. Sir, one part—and I want to emphasize this—one part of our charge against the hon. gentlemen is this: that the impolicy of their system, one direct result of this most vicious system of taxation, is greatly to impair the natural rate of increase. You drive out of our country a very large percentage of the younger portion of the population, and you thereby considerably reduce and diminish the natural rate of increase. I should think that is a proposition which every hon. gentleman could verify from his own experience with the greatest ease. Some years ago a number of newspapers throughout the country took occasion to treat this question, giving the fullest possible particulars, with the names and addresses of the young men who had left from a very large number of towns and villages, and, Sir, the result was perfectly appalling. Out of a male population of two or three hundred, we would find a loss of one hundred within the space of six or seven years. In towns with a male population of two thousand, or two thousand and two or three

hundred at most, the newspapers were able to print, I am sorry to say, lists showing a loss of young men from those regions, of six or seven hundred; and so on in proportion. Now, Sir, it is a fair question, I admit, whether, in taking two and a quarter per cent as the natural rate of increase of population in a young country with an unlimited amount of fertile land at our disposal, I put it at too high a figure. All I can say is that in naming two and a quarter per cent, I have not merely followed the opinion heretofore expressed by pretty nearly every writer of authority who has dealt with the question as applied to young countries in our condition, with a sparse population and lots of land available, but we find that statement is confirmed in a most striking fashion, first of all, by the experience of the United States, taken when they had no immigration, and when the numbers of their population closely resembled ours, and next, by our own experience in the decades from 1851 to 1861, 1861 to 1871, and from 1871 to 1881. Sir, under the circumstances I am perfectly justified in stating that the effect of this policy is that the natural increase of Canada is largely in excess of the present actual rate of increase, and the cause of it is the loss of so very large a portion of our younger population. Now, there is no man on the floor of this Parliament who ought to know that fact better than the hon. gentleman himself. What is the state of affairs in his own province? Why, the state in his own province is that the population is all but stationary. While in the decade from 1871 to 1881 the population of Nova Scotia increased about 50,000 souls, in the decade from 1881 to 1891 the population hardly increased 10,000 souls: and, Sir, to come home to the hon. gentleman—thee represents the county of Antigonish—I turned up the records of the county of Antigonish, and I found that in 1881 the population was 18,060, whereas in 1891 the population was only 16,112; there was an absolute loss, by the census, of 1,948, and the whole natural increase besides. But that at my figures, at 2½ per cent per annum, which are equivalent to 25 per cent for the ten years, would amount to 4,512, and that county which the hon. gentleman represents shows a loss of close on 6,500 people during the decade. Sir, I have some right to say to the hon. gentleman that, representing such a county, coming from the province of Nova Scotia, representing, as he does, the Maritime Provinces, which show the very worst record which it is possible to imagine, which show absolutely stationary conditions—I say I have some right to say to the hon. gentleman that this state of things requires the most serious and earnest consideration of the Government. Now, let me ask, under what conditions is it that the natural rate of increase is far in excess of the actual rate of increase, or, to put it in another way, that the actual rate of increase in a country like ours falls far below

the natural average rate? In old times, as my hon. friend remarks, there were three causes—bloody war, desolating pestilence and devastating famine. When these three causes, singly or conjointly, afflicted a country, no doubt the actual rate fell below the natural rate of increase. There was also, if I remember rightly, another plague which the apocalyptic writers predicted would afflict the world in future years; over and above these three plagues there would be a plague of a noisome beast, which noisome beast. I am inclined to think the theologians who studied the question carefully, would be disposed to say, was a protective system. Anyhow, here in Canada we have neither had a desolating war, nor a devastating pestilence, nor, thank Heaven, have we had a famine, but we have had a National Policy, and you see what it has done for us. Sir, I take the case of those seven or eight states of the Union which were subjected to a terrible civil war between 1860 and 1870. I take the states of Virginia, Florida, Georgia, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, North and South Carolina and Tennessee. In 1860 their population was just about 11,000,000. They had four years of terrible civil war, and in 1870 their population was 12,487,387 souls. In those ten years those southern states, which had been subjected to the worst horrors of war, in which it is known that an enormous portion of the youthful population had perished, where their wealth was almost annihilated, had increased in population very nearly 14 per cent. Sir, in old Canada and the maritime provinces the increase from 1881 to 1891 was just 325,000 on their population of 4,156,000. In those ten years, under the National Policy, they increased 7 per cent, as against the 14 per cent increase in those southern states that I have enumerated. Sir, I think one such fact as that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen, not, perhaps, that their policy is incorrect, but most assuredly it ought to satisfy them that there is a most urgent need for considering how this enormous loss of population occurs, and how it can be stopped. To my mind, for many years back we in Canada have been exchanging gold for brass, we in Canada have been parting with the very best of our population, the choice and pick and flower of our population, and we have been receiving in return and in part—not altogether—a very miserable equivalent in the shape of some of the scum of Europe. Now, Sir, that kind of thing should not be. I have no objection in the world, I repeat, to anything being done that will bring an honest and good immigrant population here, but, to my mind, that is a matter entirely insignificant compared with the importance of keeping our own people in Canada. One true Canadian is worth any half a dozen imported European immigrants. I would ten times rather see what money we have to spend, for the matter of that, used to keep our own people in this country rather than allow it to

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

be expended for the purpose of bringing, say, 900,000 immigrants into this country, of whom we can only keep 150,000. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman, in the statement he made of my position, intended willfully to misrepresent me, but I am bound to say that when an hon. gentleman in his position has the opportunity of reading and examining a statement which took the shape of a motion made in the House and in his presence, and on which he voted, it would be the part of wisdom on his side to read and examine it, and when he had read and examined it, he then would be entirely welcome to contravene or contradict it. It so happens that, shortly after we obtained those details of the census, I made a motion in this House on the subject, and I do not apologize for taking this opportunity of reading that motion again, for the simple reason that I am prepared to stand by every word of it, and I invite the sharpest criticism of the hon. gentleman, his colleagues and his followers, and his press, on every word put on record, although I was not then in possession of anything like the quantity of facts I now have in support of it. My motion was as follows:—

That it appears from the official returns recently laid on the Table of this House, that the total population of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 1st day of April, 1891, was 4,829,344.

That it further appears from the report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1890 that the total number of immigrants stated by the said department to have settled in Canada from the 1st day of January, 1881, to the 31st December, 1890, was in all 866,171.

The House will remember that the statement is "settled in Canada."

That according to the last census the population of the Dominion on or about the 1st April, 1891, was about 4,324,816.

That the total increase of the population of Canada in the ten years now past was 504,534.

That at the rate of 2½ per cent per annum, the natural increase of the population of Canada during the last ten years would amount to 1,077,531 without any immigration.

It will be observed that I never stated, and I never intended to state, that such a natural increase had taken place. My point, I repeat, was that under ordinary and natural conditions, if the population was not violently interfered with, if an abnormal number of people had not been driven out of the country, the natural increase would have been 1,077,000, and that point I maintain.—

That at the same rate of 2½ per cent per annum, the natural increase of the said 866,171 immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada between the years 1880 and 1890, would have amounted to 110,432.

That, had the said natural rate of increase been maintained and the said immigrants remained in Canada, the total population of Canada would now amount to 6,404,944.

Then I proceeded to refer to certain statements, which it is not necessary now to read,

pointing out the huge amount of fertile land available for immigrants ; and I continued :-

That it appears from the above-recited facts that the difference between the actual increase of the population of Canada and the natural increase, together with the immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada, is 1,568,000.

That during the last ten years the actual taxation of the people of Canada has been enormously increased under the operation of the existing tariff.

That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above-mentioned returns, imperatively commands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the Administration.

That was my statement. It was not in the slightest degree a statement that there had been an emigration from Canada to the United States of 1,500,000 native-born Canadians, as the hon. gentleman states, but that, if you put together the loss of immigrants who come here, the ascertained loss of native-born Canadians, and make a reasonable allowance for the extent to which we have diminished our natural increase by this exportation of the best part of our population, then the loss would amount to the figures I have stated, which I conceive to be a totally different thing from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. The question very naturally arises in the minds of those of us who have taken pains to study and consider what these things mean, what reasonable or possible remedy can be suggested for this condition ? Sir, we do not contend, we never contended on this side of the House that the huge depreciation in the value of property in farms, in towns and villages to which I have referred, was wholly and entirely due to the protective system or enormous taxation ; but we did contend, and we do contend, that it is one important factor, that it is one cause, and a very important cause, of the loss of population, the depreciation of property and the general distressed condition of a very large and important segment of the people of this country. My hon. friend, in his place as leader of the Opposition, demands as his right that the Government, in the face of these facts, shall state what they are prepared to do, and will apply, if they can, a remedy to this state of things ; and in applying a remedy, that which lies handiest and readiest is a large reduction of those duties which press most heavily on the agricultural community. What can be more reasonable, more fair or more righteous than to adopt that course ? The hon. Minister of Justice alluded to the fact that my friend the leader of the Opposition did not introduce the question of reciprocity. For what purpose ? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite told us, did not the Minister of Justice tell us, when he made his speech in Toronto, that the remedy we had suggested, the remedy of continental free trade, the remedy of throwing down the barriers between ourselves and the United States, which, in my judgment, is the only means which can give great and durable prosperity to Canada is impossible. I do not mean to say that we cannot exist without it,

that is another question. I do not mean to say we may not have a moderate amount of prosperity ; but under no circumstances or conditions can the resources of Canada be developed as they should be developed, under no circumstances or conditions can this frightful exodus be stopped, under no circumstances or conditions can we make anything like a full use of the great resources we possess until in one form or another. I am not particular as to what form, the markets of the rest of this continent are thrown open to us, and we are able to trade on even terms with our friends and neighbours of the United States. But why suggest this to hon. gentlemen opposite ? A year or two ago they said it was no use to talk about reciprocity, because we could not get it. What is the statement now ? It is that hon. gentlemen opposite could get reciprocity, but they would not have it. They could have obtained it easily on the lines I have laid down, but those ultra-loyal gentlemen were so afraid of discriminating against British goods they would not dream of having it. If there ever was a practical discrimination against British goods, it is made by their own tariff ; if there ever was a tariff framed in servile imitation of the United States tariff, it is the tariff under which we now live. The hon. gentleman will not give us any information in regard to the policy of his party, or explain that policy, or give us the least hint as to the mouldering branches which it is proposed to lop off. I cannot tell the House, I need not tell hon. gentlemen, for they know it already, what the policy of the leader of the Government is. If ever there was a policy of looking to Washington, it is the present policy ; if a party ever followed a policy of looking to Washington, hon. gentlemen opposite are doing it. When the American Government repealed their sugar duties, straightway our Minister of Finance did so. When the Government at Washington shook their finger and told them to repeal the export duty on logs, the duty was removed. No sooner do our friends impose tolls in favour of the port of Montreal and the Americans object, than steps are taken to remove them. Like my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), I complain of no reasonable concession, of no fair concession being made to the people of the United States. I am prepared to endorse every word he said as to the policy and expediency of dealing in the broadest and most generous fashion with that great people ; but, like him, I condemn hon. gentlemen opposite because they yield to threats what they refuse to a fair request. That is not the way for a small state to deal with a large one, or with any state, nor is it the way to make Canada respected or to obtain favourable treatment at the hands of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I well know are afraid to declare what they will do until they know what the party which is coming into power in the republic is going to do. Their hope is, and in one sense it is my hope,

that now when that great people have shaken off the shackles of the protective system, the American market will be free to us and free to all the world to a very large extent. That is their hope, but until they see what they can do, these worthy gentlemen who resent American dictation so bitterly do not dare so much as to tell us what they propose. I say again, that if ever there was a policy of looking to Washington, it is the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have followed. The only thing I regret is that from first to last, during the last seven years, they have exhibited such a marvellous want of tact, dignity and prudence in dealing with the United States that they have most seriously prejudiced the case of the country whose destinies are intrusted to them. What were almost the last words of Mr. Cleveland before he went out of office on the expiration of his first term. Why, Sir, they were a threat to suspend commercial intercourse with Canada. Has this House forgotten the very remarkable declaration rung in our ears time and again by Sir Charles Tupper when he told us, in 1886 or 1887, that his colleagues had brought this country to the verge of commercial war with the United States, a thing which he said, and said justly, he regarded as one of the greatest calamities that could befall the human race. As he correctly stated, from commercial war to actual war is but a step, and a war between the two great divisions of the English race, I entirely agree with Sir Charles Tupper, would be one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall humanity. Sir, I have pointed out the relations on which this Government stood towards Mr. Cleveland when he left office, and what are the relations in which they stand towards President Harrison now? Cleveland may differ from Harrison and Harrison from Cleveland, but, alas, for us, Cleveland and Harrison are apparently one in their appreciation of the character and conduct of the gentlemen who now govern Canada. I say that these hon. gentlemen opposite by their conduct ever since 1886, have gravely prejudiced our case. While I, for my part, hope that the people of Canada will imitate the wise example of the people of the United States and shake themselves free from protective shackles, and while we may reap some benefit from the return to common sense on the part of the United States, I cannot but feel that if there are any men who have worked diligently and assiduously to prevent the establishment of such a good understanding between these two countries, they are these very hon. gentlemen who sit opposite to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of taking up even a little time in answering arguments and replying to a speech which has not at least the element of novelty to us who have been years in this House, my only excuse is, that as such matter has been brought to substantiate the amendment to the Address and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

placed upon the records of the House it might be well for a few thoughts to be added as a qualification, if not as a refutation, of some of the statements which have been made. Without attempting to traverse all the ground that my hon. friend has gone over this time, as he has gone over often before, I wish to direct the attention of the House for a very few moments to three points upon which he has specially laboured. The first is as to the exodus. It has been his endeavour to prove to-night, that not only does the exodus exist from Canada towards the United States, a fact which is not doubted on either side of the House, but to prove also that that exodus is due to the impolicy of the course pursued by the present Government. He laments the fact that there is this exodus, he deprecates it and to the bottom of his heart he is moved at the sad fact. He declares in round terms, that it is the duty of statesmanship to inquire as to why there is this exodus, and as to how it can be prevented. But the hon. gentleman forgets to-night, as he has always forgotten in this House, to go beyond declamatory statements and to attempt to work out why this takes place, and how it may be prevented. The hon. gentleman may have attended college, he may have sat in the university, he may have taken a course at the schools, but if in his school class he had committed the stupid syllogism that he has been guilty of here to-night, he would have been plucked out of the first form or rusticated for six months at least. He declares and quotes figures to show, that there has been an exodus from this country, and he also declares that it is due to the impolicy of this Government, but he has not attempted to give one single fact or figure to show that the policy pursued by this Government has caused the exodus or accelerated it, nor has he told us what other policy would keep the exodus from acceleration, or prevent people going from this country to the United States. It is a coincidence possibly that between 1875 and 1878 when there was a Liberal Administration there was a large exodus; it is a coincidence possibly that from 1878 to the present time while there has been a decreased exodus there was a Liberal-Conservative Government in power; but no man with a sane mind would contend that these coincidences stand to each as cause and effect. You have got to go deeper than that, and you have to show reasonable cause why, under a certain form of policy, a certain effect should take place. It is not sufficient to say that because two things exist side by side, therefore, one was the effect or the cause of the other. Now, Sir, it does not take a gentleman of the mind and of the reading of my hon. friend one single moment to arrive at the fact that there has been an exodus from Canada for a great number of years, an exodus which commenced before even the Liberal Government attained power in 1873, an exodus which continued throughout that Administration and which was accelerated year by year from causes which are

known, an exodus which has gone on from 1878, but in a diminishing degree, as the figures prove and as people well know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Give the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will please allow me to make my own speech in my own way. It may not be so good a way as my hon. friend's, but it is the only way in which I can do it. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend's intelligence immediately apprises him of these facts which I have stated, but will he go on to say that there is any reason why the exodus should be so great under the circumstances which have existed since 1878 as they were under the circumstances which existed between 1875 and 1878? Let us ask a few questions. Why do people leave this country and go to another? Let us go one step further, and ask the question: why do people leave the eastern states of the United States and go to the west? There has been this displacement of population; he knows it as well as any one on this side, and he knows the cause of it as well as any one on this side. Why has there been this constant outgoing of people from the north Atlantic states towards the western states for a period of ten or fifteen years to such an extent that the north Atlantic states, nine in number, as shown by the very census which my hon. friend has been quoting, have been completely stationary in the last decade, so far as the rural population is concerned, and have made but small comparative gains in the population of the cities and towns? Is it because they have been cursed by a National policy? Is it because they have had large duties on their imports and have been burdened by taxes? Is it because they have had the added burden of a war? Are these ample reasons, or is there another? If the reason is that they have had this policy of protection and this burden of taxation, is the hon. gentleman fair or reasonable in asking us to cure the exodus from this country by adopting a tariff which, according to his own reasoning, has caused the exodus from the other country? But is there not a wider and a deeper reason than all these for the displacement of population from east to west, from the country to the city and town, in this country as well as in the United States, to be found in the general evolution of society, the change in industrial pursuits, different social circumstances and different modes of living? I can tell my hon. friend what he knows, as many men do, that that displacement of population from east to west in the United States has been due to the opening up of new, wide and productive lands in the western country, and the consequent competition that took place under unequal conditions, aided by the extraordinary facilities for transporting traffic which have been developed during these last ten or twenty years,

and which have made the burden of freight but a feather's weight in the competition; so that men who wished to farm left the eastern states, where competition was starving them out, and went on the wide and fertile farm lands of the west, where they could compete under better conditions in the pursuits of agricultural life. That is one reason, and my hon. friend knows it. There is another reason. Whether it is right or wrong, whether it is to be approved of or disapproved of, it is a fact, nevertheless, a fact which you find in England, in the United States, in Canada, and in many other countries in the world—a fact which is patent to everybody who reads—that there is a disposition in these latter days to go from the country to the town, to leave agricultural work for industrial and professional pursuits. This is one other reason for the depopulation of the rural parts of the eastern states, and for increases in the population of the towns. Are these causes confined to the United States of America, or do they also obtain here? I do not go into these matters any more fully; I do not talk about the different modes of farming, the great advantages that have resulted from the use of labour-saving machinery, and all that. These questions have been discussed by thinkers and writers these last ten years, and are familiar to every gentleman in this House. But there are these two causes which I have spoken of which are at the bottom of this depopulation of the rural districts—the influx into the cities and towns, and the migration from the less favoured parts of the country for agricultural purposes to the broader and wider areas, in this country, in the United States, and in other countries as well. Now, these are reasons which are well known, which are reasonable, which any one can assent to. But to say that there has been this exodus from Canada, and that it has been entirely due to the impolicy of the present Government in imposing a protective tariff on the country is a "non sequitur"; it is something which remains to be proved, a mere coincidence, and not something that comes in the relation of cause to effect. It must always be remembered that up to a few years ago Canada had no wide areas of land to which that part of her population which was leaving eastern farms and looking for larger farming facilities could go; so that they went where others were going from the eastern states, to the broad lands in the western states; and once a nucleus is formed everybody knows how quickly it draws to it, and what a far-reaching power it has in attractiveness. One member of a family went out years ago to the United States north-west and settled there; others members of his family follow him; kindred that have ties with them become acquainted with their doings and their progress there; they are also attracted to the same country, and the stream which at first is small grows larger and larger. It was during

that time when we had no open North-west lands to which our people could be directed that the stream of population from this country seeking wider agricultural areas set towards the wider lands of the United States of America—set there in the increasing ratio I have spoken of, the stream constantly growing larger. The United States had some offset to this; we had comparatively little for another reason why people go from country districts into cities and towns is that they intend to engage in industrial pursuits and they go where the industries are. In the earlier periods that I have spoken of, the United States had this advantage for keeping a certain part of their population in the country. They had their large manufacturing works in great and abundant development ten or twenty years ago, and a large proportion of the people who were on the move from the country places were directed towards those industrial centres. They were not lost to that portion of the country, but engaged in a different kind of life. In Canada we did not have that advantage. The number of industrial institutions we had was small, their scope was not extended, and people who wished to change their mode of life from farming to industrial pursuits were directed to the great centres of industry in the eastern states; and every one who has studied the figures of population knows that the larger exodus from this country has been that of persons who went from our eastern provinces to the manufacturing towns of the eastern states. Well, Sir, I wish to put this point, and to put it strongly, that if we in Canada had had our great west opened up twenty years ago, and if we had had that industrial and manufacturing interest and power and scope twenty years ago that we have to-day, this exodus from our country would not have commenced, and we would not be in the position we are in to-day. Well, Sir, what did hon. gentlemen opposite do towards stopping the exodus during the years they were in power? Was theirs a wide, a bold, a strong policy of opening up the North-west and making those fertile lands capable of being used by our people? Sir, they trembled and stood still during the whole time that they had the administration of the affairs of this country, and at the end of it they had not even commenced to open up the fertile lands of the North-west to the streams of population who were looking for land, and who, actuated by that hunger, went in ever-increasing numbers to the great land areas of the United States of America. Sir, what did they do in planting industrial operations, manufactures and centres of industry in this country, or encouraging them, whereby that proportion of the population which makes a change from the rural districts to the cities, from agricultural to industrial life, would be kept in this country? Nothing. They allowed the manufactories of

Mr. FOSTER.

the United States, in their own words, to slaughter our manufactures in this country and thus ruin our industries; and they encouraged consequently the people of Canada to go over in ever-increasing numbers to work in the mills of that country. They never took one step, by public policy or governmental action, towards promoting the establishment of any industries in this country, where our people could obtain work and thus be kept at home to add to our wealth and progress. Neither in the shape of opening up our North-west and its broad lands, nor in encouraging manufacturers, did these gentlemen ever take a single step, and by their inaction and lack of vigorous policy they made the stream strong and broad which was taking our people continually over to the broad lands and the industrial centres of the United States. Yet these men now come to us, who have been in power and who have had a policy of development for ten or twelve years, and complain that we have not entirely stopped the exodus. Sir, a great stream is much more easily started and sent on its course than stayed once it has gained volume, breadth and force. These are some of the obvious reasons why Canada has been at a disadvantage. Will the strongest partisan on the other side of the House, and I hope there are not many partisans sitting there, contradict me when I say that it was in spite of the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite that we opened up the great North-west? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say in spite of their efforts. Every step that the Liberal-Conservative Government took, from the time Sir Charles Tupper brought in his resolution in 1880 to open up that great North-west by building its only channel of communication, the Canadian Pacific Railway, was opposed. Every step we took was fought in the House and in the country and ridiculed at every opportunity; and these gentlemen, after having failed to scotch that enterprise at its beginning, when, at a certain time, the fate of that road and the fate of Canada hung in the balance, and when the road was saved and our country was saved by the grant of additional aid, these men opposed that grant, and, if they had had the power, they would not have hesitated to destroy the Canadian Pacific Railway and inflict immeasurable disaster upon our country. These gentlemen now taunt us because there has been an exodus from this country to the United States. Sir, in this matter of population are we so badly off as these gentlemen state? Or if it be true that all truth is in part comparative, has my hon. friend done his duty as a thinker, has he done his duty as a statesman or as an honest man and a politician, in giving to this Parliament only one side of the case and steadily avoiding the other? Are there not other countries in which the population has been partly stationary or has declined? We have had one gain to-night. We have had now from the front rank a certain declaration which my

hon. friend has made, and which his party behind stands at his back in supporting, and that is that there is no salvation for Canada except by continental union with the United States, get it on what terms we may. That is the hon. gentleman's declaration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER. He said that when the delegation went to Washington, they could have had reciprocity under certain conditions of discrimination, and he taunted my hon. friend with not getting it, and he stated in the next breath that continental free trade was the only thing to give great and durable prosperity to Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. They see no other way possible by which we could get out of the state of depression in which they say we are and obtain prosperity that would be durable and permanent. My hon. friend has made that declaration to-night, after the wars in the outside constituencies are over, after his shattered forces have come together, after they have reformed themselves in line of battle. As the chosen financial and trade exponent of the party, he waves the old flag of continental free trade as the absolute necessity for Canada in the way of permanent progress. Well, on the other side of the line, the affiliation of which in trade matters with Canada is so absolutely necessary to our very existence, as gentlemen opposite maintain, have they had a stationary condition of population? Let me call my hon. friend's attention to the North Atlantic states, nine in number, and when he is going over census statistics, let me ask him to thoroughly consider that portion of it, the New England states and the North Atlantic states, nine in number, running from Maine down to Pennsylvania, taking in, of course, the great state of New York and all between, and he will find that Vermont had in the last decade a gain of 136 souls, a gain in the city population of about 12,000, and a loss in the rural population of about 12,500. He will find that the state of Maine had a gain of only 12,000 in its population, 1.75 per cent, being a gain in the cities of 31,000 and a loss in its rural portion of 20,000. Taking in all these North Atlantic states, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, he will find in that whole length and breadth a gain of 2,894,000 souls, of which all but a few thousands was in the cities, and consequently we may state that in those nine states the city population has gained slightly while the rural population has absolutely remained stationary from 1880 to 1890. If you come to Canada, you will find that the urban population has increased by 38 per cent, and that the

rural population shows a slight gain, so that in the urban population our country has increased more rapidly and in rural population has lost less, and it is more fair to take those two great stretches of country and compared the two. He went on to give certain reasons why this exodus should take place. He said an exodus should take place in the case of bloody war, of devastating pestilence or of consuming famine. Well, I am glad the hon. gentleman gave me this hint and I will say that in a certain way we have had these three evils in Canada for the last ten years. We have had a bloody war, political, partisan, carried on by my hon. friend as generalissimo. The seat of that war has been in several places—always in Canada, on every hustings where it was possible to set up a cannon, sometimes on the other side of the line, drawing up its platoons at Washington, at Boston, at New York, at Philadelphia, even in the western states, always fed and encouraged by my hon. friend the generalissimo who, two or three years ago, went up and down this country arm in arm with a gentleman who, two or three years ago, fed the United States, fed those who were hostile to us in the United States, with secret information, and who, to-day, is carrying on a stupendous propaganda with the "Sun" newspaper at its head in order to annex this country to the United States. So we have had bloody war in a certain sense. We have had also devastating pestilence. Devastating pestilence in the line of what? Constant depreciation of the country emitted from one whom, if it be parliamentary, I must call my pestilential friend the generalissimo of this army who has been carrying on the war. In this country, wherever he could find an opportunity to make a speech, wherever he could find a newspaper to voice his utterances, this pestilential emission was taken place, and not only that, but sometimes he has actually employed his pen and sent these pestilential writings of his to be emitted in the very heart of the British Empire, in London and in the provinces of England itself. And this pestilence has had its effect. If my hon. friend has any influence—and he has—if hon. gentlemen who fight with him and voice his sentiments have any influence—and they have—they have certainly persuaded those who would listen to them to believe that Canada is the last place in the world to live in, and that they had better get out of it as soon as possible; and, in the causes of the exodus to which the hon. gentleman refers, the effect of these pestilential statements of Canada's disadvantages, this constant display of Canada's deficiencies should be included as leading to the result of which he has spoken, of leading people to go to other countries from Canada in order to seek their fortunes, and, in too many cases, to their own bitter disappointment, many of

whom are now turning their faces back to this country and seeking the better land and leaving that which they have found to be the worse. So we have had these different causes at work in the line of causing this exodus. Now, my hon. friend has stated in explicit terms that the reason for the exodus has been the impolicy of the course pursued by the present Government and party, and has stated that if that were reversed the exodus would cease. That is simply blank assertion. He has given no proof in support of it, and I do not think he can give any reasonable reasons to prove it. What is the inevitable argument that comes from the condition of the North Atlantic states? That the reason why their population is not more depleted than it has been, is that they have large manufacturing industries which keep and which attract a large portion of their people. Not only there but throughout a much larger portion of the United States the condition of the rural population is about the same. Draw a line north of Virginia and east of the Mississippi, and you will find that in all that great tract of country you can hardly discover a rural section which has largely increased in population; in large sections the rural population has greatly decreased, and in many others it has remained stationary, the increase in the whole being extremely small. Leaving the matter of the exodus with these few remarks, but not exhausting the subject by any means, because it would take much longer to do that, I now go to another point made by the hon. gentleman, and that is the alleged pauperism and utter destitution of our farmers. He speaks of the load of mortgages upon Canadian farmers, of the destitution and pauperism of Canadian farmers, of the depreciation of farm lands. There, again, is the unfairness of stating but one side of the question. Would it not have been better if my hon. friend, looking to a fair discussion of this subject, had stated that there has been a depreciation in farm lands, I was almost going to say, all over the world, and that there are certain good causes for it, it does not need my going into that at any length. Hon. gentlemen read and they know the reasons to which I refer. Canada is not the only country in which this is found. In the United States it is found, where they have a high protective tariff. In Great Britain it is found, where they have free trade. My hon. friend, whom I have within my eye, has gone over a considerable portion of Great Britain in the last year. I have had the pleasure of seeing a great portion of it myself and I have kept myself informed, and I am here to-night to state that there is nothing in this country or in the United States of America that can compare to the depreciation of farm lands found in Great Britain itself and the depreciation of farming values and farming interests which to-day has taken place in that country. So there must be some cause wider than the National Policy, wider than the system pursued

Mr. FOSTER.

by the Government and party in power in this country, to account for the depreciation in farm lands, and, as my hon. friend has been good enough to read the census of the United States and to give us some of its facts, perhaps some day he may give us some information as to the mortgages which exist in that country, and to tell us whether, man by man, according to population, the mortgages in the United States do or do not over-top the mortgages in the Dominion of Canada. There is no doubt about it. The census facts are patent and open to any one who may read, and within the last few years so great and so marked has that been, that in two states commissions have been appointed to investigate the matter and try to propose a remedy. In the great state of New York, Governors' messages and assessors' reports have, year after year, gone to their legislatures deploring this depreciation, and declaring that in that state there has been a depreciation of one-third in value during the last ten years. The hon. gentleman has no doubt followed with interest the meanderings of a couple of correspondents of the Toronto "Globe," who are going through the country and reporting the state of affairs amongst the farmers. By mishap or by direction they wandered across into the state of New York, and they had the manliness and the honesty to state that the tale which they had from the farmers there as to the mortgages upon their lands surpasses anything that can be told as to any corresponding portion of the Dominion of Canada. So we must take these facts as a whole, and we must see whether there are not wide-spreading causes for this, or whether it is the effect of a policy carried out here at the time. I do not believe the farmers are, to hundreds of thousands, paupers in this country or on the verge of destitution or beggary. I believe the Canadian farmer's lot is better to-day than it has been at any time within the last twenty years, and by comparison I believe it is better than it is in any of these countries with which we have been comparing Canada to-day. Then I wish to mention just one more point. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in a smart way, if not in a very profound way, had a little fun with my hon. friend beside me, and gentlemen who belong to this party, because we have a habit of preaching up the fact that Canada is prosperous. Well, Sir, I do not think it is a thing for which we may consider ourselves blamable. We say that Canada is prosperous, and what is more, we prove it. But there is one very good reason outside of all others why we are forced to do it if we wish to keep the Canadian people at their proper advantage, and that reason is that hon. gentlemen opposite always forget to do it, but never forget to do the opposite; that is, to put the disadvantages of Canada before every audience and every reader that they can possibly reach. And so it is necessary for us to bring proof, to adduce figures,

to appeal to people's observation and experience in order to give them heart, because all do not investigate these things for themselves, and all do not have the wide view which takes the whole country in. So it is necessary for this party to say, and it is our duty and privilege to say to the people of Canada on every occasion: here is a country of great resources, here is a country of great progress, here is a country of great prosperity and happiness, and here are the figures which prove it, figures with which my hon. friends opposite never wrestle. Well, my hon. friends opposite say that the country is not prosperous, and find fault with us because we say that it is, and prove by figures that it is. But they give an altogether different idea of Canada; they ignore certain facts; they ignore the fact that there has been a large increase in the deposits of the people in the savings banks, or when they mention it they depreciate it as my hon. friend did to-night. But my hon. friend was once of a very different opinion, and stood up in this House, and I suppose in this very seat, and declared that one of the very best proofs of a country's prosperity was the amount of the savings of its people in the savings banks and other money depositories of the country. To-day when it suits him he thinks it is not at all a ground for arguing prosperity, but quite the opposite. I think, however, the people generally, and politicians and statesmen generally, are of the opinion that it is, amongst other things, proof of prosperity and good feeling amongst a people. They ignore the very great increase that has taken place in the trade of Canada, not only an increase during the past year of so many millions, as has been stated already, but an increase beyond any preceding period in this country. And when you take into account, as my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) has done, the fall in values during the last twenty years, there has been an increase of wonderful proportions in the external trade of this country. They also ignore the fact that this country's population is increasing, and the home market has immeasurably developed within the last ten or fifteen years. They forget that the farmers' products are being raised in greater proportion per head of the farming population than ever before, that they are being exported and consumed in a much larger proportion, and that the average price the farmer gets for them is greater than it was before. They forget another fact, that the average price of what the farmer has to buy is less by far than it has been at any time during the last ten, or fifteen, or twenty years. But, notwithstanding all these things, these hon. gentlemen go before the people and upon an ex parte case, leaving out of sight those things that make to the advantage and good heart of the country, they simply bring up those things which have a tendency to discourage the people, and to take hope and ambition away from them.

They talk about piling up the taxation. They forget several things. My hon. friend who sits opposite held the post of Finance Minister for five years in this House, and he did nothing towards decreasing the taxation of the people. The last Budget speech he made in this House was one of the most doleful and disheartening productions that ever came from a Finance Minister of any country as a portrayal of the condition of the country; yet with all that depression, the hon. gentleman's only resource was to add to the taxation instead of diminishing it. He forgets that during that time he increased the expenditure from year to year, he increased the debt, he increased the deficits; the trade fell off in a wonderful percentage. Yet this is the gentleman who, to-day, states that we must go back to that old policy of theirs, and that our policy, progressive and beneficial as it has proved itself in the past, and, as I hope, it will prove itself under amended conditions in the future, is the cause of the exodus, and the cause of the depression, and the lowering of farm values and so on. He talks about the great increase of taxation. Why, Sir, there is just one fact I would like to give the House. The poor man's tea is as much to him as the poor man's flour; one is as much a necessity to him as the other so far as habits of life go. When my hon. friend stood here as Finance Minister he taxed the people's tea five cents and six cents per pound. On the amount of the tea which was consumed in this country in 1892 at that rate of taxation, the people would have paid a round million and a quarter into the treasury of this country. Coffee he taxed; sugar was taxed at the rate of 2½ cents a pound or thereabouts. We have taken the duty off raw sugar, and I have this other fact to state to the House to-night that if we had kept the duty on raw sugar that we had two years ago, and applied it to this year's consumption, the people of this country would have paid over \$4,000,000 taxation more than they have paid. Yet these gentlemen say that we have taken off none of the burdens of the people. They talk about the great burden of taxation, and yet if we take the population, and take the amount of duty that is paid upon the imports, you will find, that according to the per capita of the population in one year in which my hon. friend was Finance Minister, compared with this last year of 1892, the amount per head of duties is only 30 cents higher than it was during that year of the hon. gentleman's regime; and that during this last year of 1892, the amount of percentage of tax which is paid is about 17½ per cent upon the total imports of this country. I say these things should be taken into account as well, and it is not fair to say that we have not reduced the taxation of the country. It is not fair to say that we have not taken off burdens from the people. I will tell my hon. friend more, that although, he in his

practical working of the Government for five years, did nothing of that kind, he has had the satisfaction already of seeing the burden of taxation reduced with reference to these articles that I mention, to the tune of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, which sum has been taken permanently off the shoulders of the people: and he will have the satisfaction, if he lives long enough and stays where he is on that side of the House, of seeing even more done by this Government in pursuance of its policy of diminishing the burdens and increasing the happiness of the people of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I ask the indulgence of hon. members while I address to the House a few observations upon the conduct of the Administration which is now in power, and upon the policy which the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, has defined on the floor of this House. I have no doubt whatever that His Excellency acted wisely, in the present constitution of Parliament, in selecting the hon. gentleman, who is Minister of Justice, to take charge of the Administration. I have no doubt whatever that he is better qualified for that position, than any other hon. gentleman whom His Excellency has called to his council, and so I have no fault to find with the course which His Excellency has taken in asking the hon. gentleman to constitute an Administration. I was somewhat surprised to find, that the hon. gentleman had advised His Excellency to bring into operation a statute which, although enacted in a former parliament, remained for a number of years, in abeyance on the Statute-book. It seemed to me at the time that statute was carried through this House, that it was not a wise measure, not one in the public interest, not one suited to the circumstances of a democratic country, such as Canada is. I can well understand how, in a country like England, where society is segregated into orders, and where a large number of men of great fortune are anxious that their sons, who are disposed to take part in public life, should have an opportunity of serving a species of apprenticeship in subordinate offices of Government, such a system may prevail; but in a country like this, where we are, so to speak, on a footing of equality, where the differences are differences of intellectual endowment and of opportunity, it does seem to me that it is some reflection either upon the capacity of the party, or upon the capacity of the individuals selected for those subordinate offices which have been created. It is a declaration that those parties who are selected to fill those offices are parties not qualified to assume the higher degree of responsibility that attaches to a seat in the Cabinet, and that they are properly and fairly dealt with in being assigned positions of a subordinate character. In England there are subordinate offices of Government; and when we remember that, although there are not more at any time than

Mr. FOSTER.

fifteen Cabinet Ministers, there are more than fifty members of the Administration, we can well understand how it is that positions of an inferior character and of inferior responsibility, should be created in the Administration. We understand also how it is that a Minister there, has an opportunity of selecting an assistant, a parliamentary subordinate, who usually represents the department to which the chief belongs in the House of which his chief is not a member. That rule has not been followed here. I observe, further, in the arrangement made, and in the report which you, Mr. Speaker, have laid on the Table of the House, that certain members of the Administration have not upon the acceptance of office vacated their seats. It was stated, Sir, by you, that the two subordinate Ministers of the Crown, in this House had resigned their seats. Whether that resignation took place before their appointment, or whether that resignation accompanied their appointment, I do not know. Your report, Mr. Speaker, does not inform the House. But this much is perfectly clear: under the provisions of the law if they had not previously resigned their seats, their seats became vacant by acceptance of office under the Crown; and so becoming vacant by operation of the law, they were not in a position to tender their resignations. I think we should not allow a report of this sort to pass unnoticed, because if the Minister of Justice and his colleagues are to regard this as a voluntary act on the part of those two hon. gentlemen, then the same offices might be filled at any subsequent time without any resignations. It is perfectly clear to my mind, as I think it will to any hon. gentleman who will carefully read the statute, that those are offices of emolument under the Crown, which, when accepted, like any other office, vacates the seat of any member accepting the same. What the statute does, is to take those two offices out of the class the holders of which are absolutely disqualified and rendered ineligible for election, and to make the parties accepting them, once more eligible for election, and in this respect putting them on the footing of Cabinet Ministers. This will be evident to any one who will look at sections 6 and 7 of the statute. Section 6 says:

Nothing in section 9 and of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, or in this or any other Act shall render the Controller of Customs or the Controller of Inland Revenue ineligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein.

It does not say he shall not vacate his seat. It is clear that is the effect of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. What that section says is, notwithstanding the fact that the seat shall be vacant, the party is not ineligible, but is qualified to offer himself as a candidate to be returned to Parliament, and to sit and vote when so returned if a member of the House of Commons. That is rendered more clear by the section which follows, which says:

Whenever any person who holds the office of Controller of Customs or Controller of Inland Revenue and is at the same time a member of the House of Commons, resigns his office and within one month after his resignation accepts any of the offices mentioned in subsection 3 of section 9 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons and becomes a Minister of the Crown and a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, or having so resigned accepts any office created by this Act or by the Act of the present session intituled an Act to make provision for the appointment of a Solicitor-General other than that then held by him, he shall not thereby vacate his seat.

Here the same provisions that apply to a Cabinet Minister, apply also to the Controller of Inland Revenue and the Controller of Customs. If his seat were not vacated by his acceptance of office in the first place, how can it be supposed that it would be rendered vacant by his acceptance of office other than the one he held within one month. It is plain, therefore, that the intention was to take the two officers out of the class of the eligible for election to the House of Commons, and put them in a class of officers which are eligible, not to put them in a position superior to that held by members of the Cabinet, so as not to render the vacating of their seats unnecessary, because that was the necessary effect of the operation of the statute relating to the Senate and House of Commons. Whether they accepted office in the Government or not, if it was an appointment to an office of emolument by the Crown, then the seat became vacant, and the seat becoming vacant they would have been ineligible for election, if this special provision of section six had not been made applicable to them. I make this statement on account of the report which was laid on the Table of the House, a report which I think requires some explanation, because if there is or could be any doubt as to the effect of the acceptance of office, then I think that that doubt ought to be removed. It seems to me from an examination of the two statutes, that there is not any room for doubt, but if there is, then that doubt ought to be made impossible for the future, and an amendment to the law should be made so as to make it clear that the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue do not stand in a position superior to that occupied by an ordinary minister of the Crown. There is, let me say, this difference between assistant ministers in England—members of the administration, although not members of the Cabinet—and the controllers here. The assistant minister in England is an appointee of his chief, and not an appointee of the Crown. He is not a minister of the Crown in that sense. Being appointed by his chief his seat is not vacated; but that rule does not apply to either of these gentlemen, because the law provides in both cases that the appointment shall be made by the Governor in Council, and being made by the Governor in Council, they hold offices under the Crown to which salaries and emoluments are attached,

and by operation of the law, their seats, upon the agreement to accept office, become vacant. I have said all I propose to say with regard to that matter, and I wish now to make an observation or two in reference to the statement of the Prime Minister, that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is not a constitutional or a proper amendment, inasmuch as it related to the finances of the country, and ought not to be proposed in advance of the actual proposal to alter the tariff. That would indeed be a very extraordinary principle to lay down. Let us suppose for one instance that this resolution were to become an issue in the elections. Let me suppose that we went to the country upon this, and that this side of the House, upon that motion, were to succeed, as I think they would. Is not that a declaration, even before the meeting of Parliament, of what the views of the party are upon an important question of financial policy? Then again let me refer to the case when Mr. Gladstone in 1874, went to the country upon a proposal to make certain alterations in the inland revenue tax. He did not state specifically the character of these alterations, except to say that there was to be a diminution in the rate of taxation, a declaration precisely the same as we are making now. It is true, Mr. Gladstone lost the election, but, if he had succeeded, does not everyone see that the whole country would have known what the policy of the Administration upon that question was? If the objection of the First Minister had any force, it would be as applicable in the case to which I refer as to the motion made by my hon. friend beside me. I felt quite sure that there would be no difficulty in finding a number of instances in which paragraphs similar to that proposed in this amendment would be found in speeches made from the Throne at the opening of Parliament, and I obtained from the Library Mr. Ensor's collection of speeches from 1837 to 1882. I will read extracts from two or three of these speeches to show the Prime Minister that the objection which he takes is one which has not been recognized by the Imperial Parliament, and certainly the principles of Parliamentary Government, are quite as well understood, and quite as carefully observed there, as they are likely to be on this side of the Atlantic. In the Speech in 1844, Her Majesty, in opening Parliament, says:

I feel assured that in considering all matters connected with the financial concerns of the country you will bear in mind the evil consequences of accumulating debt during the time of peace, and that you will firmly resolve to uphold the public credit, the maintenance of which concerns equally the permanent interests and the honour and reputation of a great country.

Here was a proposal to adopt a particular policy with regard to a matter of financial importance. In 1846, Her Majesty says:

I recommend you to take into your early consideration, whether the principles on which you have acted [that is, the principles of reducing the taxes]

may not with advantage be yet more extensively applied, and whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties on many articles the produce or manufactures of other countries, to make such further reductions and remissions as may tend to ensure the continuance of the great benefit to which I have adverted, and by enlarging our commercial intercourse to strengthen the bonds of amity with foreign powers.

Here is a direct recommendation by Her Majesty, in the Speech from the Throne, asking Parliament to consider the propriety of extending further that policy upon which they had entered, to further reduce the taxation on foreign articles, and by that reduction to extend the commerce of the country, and to increase the bond of amity existing between foreign countries and the United Kingdom. This is a declaration in Her Majesty's speech exactly on all fours with the amendment moved by my hon. friend. In the Speech of 1847 Her Majesty says :

It will be your duty to consider what further measures are required to alleviate the existing distress. I recommend to you to take into your serious consideration, whether by increasing for a limited period, the facilities for importing corn from foreign countries, and by the admission of sugar more freely into breweries and distilleries, the supply of food may be beneficially augmented.

Now, this is a specific declaration with regard to two articles, and it is clear from the paragraphs which I have read, and I need not read any others, that what the hon. gentleman says is an objection on principle, is one which is not well founded. I would like to know, if my hon. friend's motion were to carry, or if the Government had accepted it, what would be its effects upon the commerce of this country? In what way could it injuriously affect any particular class of the community? My hon. friend has not specified any articles. He has simply declared that the burdens of taxation ought to be lightened and that they ought to be lightened in the public interest. That is a clear and specific declaration as to a general course of public policy. But, as I have pointed out, in 1847, in the United Kingdom, the Government there went much further than that, declaring in favour of reducing the taxation upon certain articles which were specified. That being so, it is, I think, plain to the House, that the objection which the hon. gentleman has made, has no foundation on any constitutional ground. Now, Sir, having said this much with regard to the propriety of the motion, I wish to say a few words in reply to the observations which have been addressed to the House by the hon. First Minister and by the hon. Minister of Finance. These hon. gentlemen tell us that it is true that the National Policy has not prevented the exodus; it is true that the exodus continues, but it is unreasonable to expect that it would stop as a result of the National Policy. Why, they say, you yourselves admitted, in defending your policy in 1877, that this would not be the effect, and

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

so you are asking us to accomplish, by this line of policy, what you predicted in advance would not flow from its adoption. Well, Sir, the objection would be well founded if the hon. gentlemen had taken the same view. But how came they on the Treasury Benches? How did they succeed in getting there in 1878? It was by a declaration that this would be the effect. They said in 1877 and 1878, that the people were leaving Canada by tens of thousands; that you, sitting on the ministerial benches and drawing your salaries, are flies on the wheel; you are utterly incapable of coping with the situation; give us the opportunity of taking your places, and we will make such alterations in the fiscal policy of this country as will put an end to this state of things. That was the position hon. gentlemen took. Why, Sir, we were told by one hon. member in the House on that occasion, Sir Charles Tupper, that it was not to secure prosperity during the general period of the world's prosperity that was required of the Government, but what was required of them, was to secure prosperity to the country when every other country was anything but prosperous; and he declared that if they were permitted to take charge of the affairs of this country, they would accomplish that result. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance has made a statement which, I think, is not borne out by facts. The hon. gentleman this evening has talked a great deal about facts; but what fact has he produced to show this House or the country that the exodus from Canada was greater in the period from 1874 to 1878 than it has been since? Why, Sir, both the returns of the United States bureau of statistics and those of Canada, prove the contrary. The United States returns show that from 1868 to 1874 the emigration from Canada to the United States was equal to 43,000 a year, while from 1874 to 1878 it averaged 23,000 a year—but little more than one-half of what it was during the previous six years. How has it been since? In 1879 it was 35,000, in 1880 56,000, in 1881 85,000, and so on; you have an accelerated increase in the exodus from Canada, out of all proportion greater than it was during the period a revenue tariff was in operation. The hon. gentleman says that the relation of cause and effect does not exist between the high tariff and the exodus; but, Sir, I think it does exist. It is quite possible that two things may exist together in point of time, and one may not be the cause of the other; but I think there will be no difficulty in proving that the increased exodus is due to the increased burdens imposed on the population of this country. So long as the people of Canada were more lightly taxed than the people of the United States, the emigration was proportionally small. When the people of Canada became more heavily burdened than the people of the United States, as they are to-day, then the effect of the higher taxation was to drive the people from

the country that was less prosperous to the country that was more prosperous. It is true, the rate of customs taxation in the United States is higher than it is in Canada; but the customs duties there relate to articles that form but a very small fraction of the entire consumption of the population, and, in consequence of greater wealth and a more extended market existing in the United States—because you have practically free trade between forty nations—you have greater competition and a lower rate of taxation on the home-produced articles, than you have in Canada. We have here a rate of taxation on the home-produced articles, but little inferior to what is imposed on the articles brought in from abroad. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman said that there was a tendency on the part of the people, both in Canada and the United States, to go from the rural districts into the towns. That is true; but why is it true? Why should the people exhibit a disposition to do this during the past fifteen or twenty years which they did not exhibit during an earlier period? Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada, and the people of the United States alike, have adopted a policy which has tended to drive the rural population into the towns and cities. You have made labour less productive; you have, by the policy you have adopted, made the compensation for labour in the rural districts less than it is in the towns and cities. The result is that you have driven a very large percentage of the rural population into the towns, and these, being unable to find employment in the towns of Canada, have gone across the border into the towns of the United States. That is a necessary consequence of what you have done, and it is because that is the operation of your policy that you will find emigration from Canada into the neighbouring republic to have been larger, since your adoption of that policy, than it was in the previous period. Then the hon. Minister of Finance told us that the people in the New England states were not increasing in numbers any more than they were in Canada. Take that group of states called the North Atlantic Division, and I find that, according to the census of 1880, there were 14,500,000 in round numbers in those states, and according to the census of 1890 there were 17,401,000; and whether these are urban or rural people, the hon. gentleman will see that the percentage of increase is very much greater than in Canada during the same period. Another thing which the hon. gentleman altogether overlooks is the fact that the people who leave the states and go to the west are not lost to the United States, but the people who leave the provinces are, in a great measure, lost to Canada, for they do not go to our western territories, as the people of the United States do to theirs, but by far the greater portion cross the border, and become settlers in the neighbouring republic.

The hon. gentleman overlooks the fact that the fiscal policy which the Government have adopted has tended to bring about that state of things. They have diminished the rural population, they have diminished the profits on labour in the rural districts, they have diminished the cash value of labour, and consequently have driven out of the rural districts a very considerable portion of the population that were otherwise profitably employed. Now, the hon. gentleman has told us that they have failed in part to retain their population because the North-west Territories were not opened earlier. Why, Mr. Speaker, in the most densely populated portion of the province of Ontario, the western counties, there is not one that could not sustain double the rural population it has to-day. The hon. gentleman did not need the North-west to give room for our population. The room exists. There is not a county in the province of Ontario where there is not room for double the rural population it has at this moment, and it is not because the North-west Territories were not open ten years earlier, but because hon. gentlemen opposite have increased the burdens of taxation to such an extent, that people have found it more to their interest to go elsewhere, than to remain within our own borders. I say that the hon. gentleman, instead of undertaking to blindly defend a policy which has proved, after thirteen years' trial, a great failure, ought to admit in all candour that the policy has failed, that it has not produced the results its friends anticipated, and that the Government are prepared to enter upon a more healthy and fairer course in the interests of the people. The hon. gentleman says that we are responsible for the North-west not having been opened sooner. What were the impediments we put in the way of the settlement of the North-west? Does the hon. gentleman mean our opposing the surveying of ten times as much land as was settled, and which surveys have had to be made over again. Is it because we condemned the Government for quarrelling with the half-breed population and producing a civil war? Are the Opposition responsible for that war, the result of the negligence and the incapacity of those who were the former colleagues and associates of the hon. gentleman? Does the hon. gentleman not know that the effect of that rebellion was to seriously retard the settlement of the North-west? Then the hon. gentleman called into existence a large number of colonization societies, and he put into the hands of speculators greedy of gain the settlement of the North-west lands, and those speculators undertook to make fortunes out of the settlers, the strangers whom they desired to take in. They did not succeed, the settlements failed, the speculators made no money, and the lands remained vacant in the hands of the Government. That was the policy of the hon. gentleman. That was his bold, free, liberal, wide, and all other

linear and superficial kinds of policy which he has described to-night. It did not succeed. The hon. gentleman will remember that when his friends first proposed to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which he has alluded this evening, among the declarations of policy which accompanied the resolution to build the road, was the declaration that its construction should not add anything to the burdens of the people. That was the policy with which the friends of the hon. gentleman set out. When they adopted that view, they thought that increased taxation was a burden, and they acted upon that assumption; but the hon. gentleman and his friends soon changed their minds, and looked upon increased taxation as a blessing. They said the tax would prove a benefit, wholly regardless of the use made of the money collected. The mere fact that you took the money out of the pockets of the people would contribute to the general prosperity of those who were thus depleted of a certain portion of their wealth. That was the policy which the hon. gentleman declares was a most wise and liberal policy. The hon. gentleman had control of the Northwest, and has had a majority of this House which enabled him to do just what he pleased with regard to that territory, and he has to-day there, within easy access, hundreds of miles of railway lands, which are still without occupants. The hon. gentleman told us also, what he has told us over and over again, that the manufacturers of Canada were rendered bankrupt by the slaughter of American goods in Canada. Well, that is the old argument, the old fiction, and although the people were for a time deluded by it, I think the hon. gentleman will find it very difficult to impress any portion of them to-day, by a statement of that sort. I can understand how the men who sacrifice their goods may be rendered bankrupt by the sacrifice. I can understand that if an American comes into Canada, and sells his goods for one-half their cost, and persists in the operation, he may lose very seriously by it; but how is the purchaser to be hurt? Will he not be benefited? But the hon. gentleman says that the Canadian manufacturer was hurt. No; I say that is not so. In the first place, the goods were not sacrificed, and in the second place, there was no failure of Canadian manufactures. I took the trouble here in 1876 to make a collection, because we had the means at our disposal at the time, of all the failures for twelve months. It was a year of very serious failures. The bankruptcies amounted to over \$20,000,000. How much of that was represented by manufacturers' capital. Not three quarters of a million. I do not think there was half a million; and those who suffered were the mercantile classes, the classes whose goods had depreciated in value in the market. The men who were unable to sell at the prices they had been in the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

habit of obtaining before, and the result was that they failed; and they were to be subjected to higher taxes to restore property to the country. But there was no class of people of this country that weathered the storm arising from the straitened circumstances of trade throughout the world, better than the manufacturing classes of Canada. You may compare them with the manufacturing classes of the United States, at the same time, and you will find that the percentage of failures of those engaged in manufactures as compared with the failures of those engaged in every other trade was, out of all proportion, less in Canada than in the United States. And so it may be proved to demonstration, that the revenue tariff of Canada did not operate disastrously as far as the manufacturers were concerned. In 1873 there were less than two million pounds of cotton manufactured into cotton goods in Canada, and in 1878 there were nine million pounds. There was an increase of fivefold in the production of cotton goods alone, and I would like to know if the manufacturers would have increased their productions fivefold in five years, if the business was an unprofitable one. Why, the stock on the market in Montreal in 1878 was worth more than it is now or than it has been worth at any period within the last five years. So the hon. gentleman is stating what is altogether beside the fact when he states that the Americans had made Canada a slaughter market, and that the result of that was to bankrupt the manufacturers of Canada. The hon. gentleman cannot point out any class that were driven into bankruptcy in consequence of the competition from abroad. Every one knows, or ought to know, that is not the case. You consume in Canada the tweeds from Scotland and those manufactured here. The same causes that will restrict the market of the one will restrict the market of the other. When you find there is a diminution in the consumption of the one, you will find there is a diminution in the consumption of the other, because there is a diminution in the income of the population which consumes both classes of goods. It is not the case that one class of goods is driving the other out of the market, but it is the case that the same causes which diminish the consumption of the one, operate to diminish the consumption of the other. The hon. gentleman also said that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke of the farmers of Canada as being paupers. My hon. friend did not use any such expression. He said the farmers of Canada were in more straitened circumstances now than they were fifteen years ago. I say so too, and that is shown by the diminished value of real estate. The hon. gentleman says farming lands have diminished in value in England. That is true; but how came it about? It came about by the increased facilities for transportation, which put the products of the farm from almost all christen-

dom on the English market at very little cost ; so that the farmer in the United Kingdom has his products put in competition with the products of cheap lands, with the cost of transportation and the difference of wages and yield as his only advantages. That, however, has not operated to produce the mischievous effect that we find in the value of real estate in Canada. During the last twelve years we have found gentlemen on the treasury benches denying that real estate had depreciated in value. The Minister of Agriculture over and over again, when we pointed out that it was the testimony of every loan company that the value of farm lands had declined in Ontario quoted from the reports of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario for the purpose of showing—though they did not show—that farm lands had not fallen in value. Now, the Minister of Finance says they have fallen in value in Canada, but that we are no worse off than they are in the United States or in the United Kingdom, because the value of real estate has fallen off in those countries. The hon. gentleman has made progress. He has come to see as a fact what he called a fiction not so long ago. So far I congratulate him on the progress he has made. So far he has a more accurate view of the situation, but he has no more accurate view of the causes which have brought about the state of things in this country, than he had two years ago. When the hon. gentleman tells us that the tariff has not produced these results, he also tells us of the burdens that my hon. friend put on the people by a tax on tea and a tax on coffee. The hon. gentleman argued for years that a tax on an article did not increase the price to the consumer, but was a loss to the producer. I think that was argued as to the sugar duties, but now that the sugar duties have been taken off in part, he tells the people that he has relieved them of a portion of the burden under which they suffered.

Mr. FOSTER. You are quite out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I am not.

Mr. FOSTER. It all depends on the article.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose then a tax on sugar would be borne by the consumer. That is the hon. gentleman's contention now, though a few years ago he was of a different opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am of the same opinion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has had new light. I congratulate him on being able to see where before he was blind. The hon. gentleman has told us of the increased commerce of the country. I dare say you remember when we were told we were not to look to increased commerce for increased prosperity. We were to be a self-contained people. We were to have a policy which would bring here the produce of the

whole of christendom. Canada was to become a distributing point for the commerce of all the world. In 1882 we went to the country for what purpose? What was His Excellency the Governor-General advised to tell the House he prematurely dissolved it for? In order that capitalists might know that the people endorsed the policy under which the millions of money awaiting investment in Canada might be safely invested here. As a consequence of that investment, there were to be tens of thousands of skilled labourers come here to engage in the factories thus to be fostered, and then there were to be tens of thousands of farm labourers engaged on the farms which were to supply those people with food, and the prices the farmers now get in Liverpool were to be the prices at which their produce would be sold to these people in the towns and villages. The people were told they were losing so much by the transportation of their produce on the railways and across the Atlantic; that the money ought to be in their own pockets, and would be if the people who consumed their products in Manchester and Birmingham were living here. The hon. gentleman does not say that now. He does not now point to these large factories, and to the numerous employees in these factories. Why, the hon. gentleman and his friends secured a report, giving an account of those who were engaged in manufacturing pursuits in the different provinces, and among those was mentioned the production of saws in the city of St. John. But we were told by a member from that province who knew the city of St. John, that the manufacturing there consisted of what was done by an old man who lived in a small place, and did a little travelling about sharpening buck-saws for wood sawyers. Now, the hon. gentleman has, no doubt, in his census given us a large increase in the number of manufacturers and in the capital of men just of that sort. Then the hon. gentleman told us that we were importing too much and exporting too little. We were to equalize imports and exports; that the balance of trade was against us; and that the country was being ruined thereby. That is not the hon. gentleman's opinion to-day. The hon. gentleman to-day points to the very large imports into this country, and he does not give the slightest indication that he holds the old views that were so persistently proclaimed to the people of this country, that the importations indicated the amount of our indebtedness, and that the difference between imports and exports showed whether we had gained or lost by the transaction. Now, one thing the hon. gentleman said which indicated some distrust in the line of argument he has hitherto adopted in the House, was this: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that the amount of taxation at the present time is not very large, it will only average 17½ per cent on the imports. The hon. gentleman,

then, does not think that very high taxation is a very great benefit, or he would not have been inclined to tell us that it was only 17½ per cent. Well, Sir, when we consider the number of articles that are imported in the interest of those for whom this high tax is imposed, and which are admitted free from duty, we will see how very burdensome this tax is on a very large proportion of the people of this country. The statement made by the Minister of Finance and the statement made by the Prime Minister on this subject, do not lead us to suppose that they are disposed to give the people any degree of relief in the direction in which the resolution of my hon. friend points. What we ask is that the burdens of the people of this country shall be lightened. We say that the whole system of taxation requires revision: that the policy pursued in the imposition of that tax is a pernicious policy; that taxes should be imposed solely with reference to the public interest, and these taxes have not been so imposed; that a very large amount of taxation, equal to several millions, is taken every year out of the pockets of the people of this country that never reaches the public treasury at all. We say that ought to be discontinued; that there ought to be a change in that particular. I do not say that it should be made all at once, but there should be a change in that particular, looking to the total abolition at an early day of every dollar of tax imposed upon the people of this country that does not ultimately find its way into the public treasury. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to a tax on certain articles, and he says that the people are relieved of a certain amount of taxation. Well, Sir, the relief that they get is shown by the amount of taxation that reaches the public treasury. To-day, beside the enormous sum that does not reach the treasury at all, you have a very large amount of taxation collected. The burden of taxation is a serious one. It is falling upon the population unequally. They are not bearing their burden in proportion to their ability to pay. Those that are least able to pay, many of whom are in straitened circumstances, have to pay upon what they consume out of all proportion, a larger rate of taxation, than other portions of the population more favourably circumstanced. I say that ought not to be, that we should follow the policy of taxation laid down by Adam Smith a century ago; that care should be had to impose taxes in such a way that they will fall upon the population in proportion to their ability to pay; that they shall be imposed in such a way that the taxes shall reach the public treasury and not go elsewhere; and that they shall be imposed only to the extent that the interests of the State require. Now, we say that these principles of taxation, under the present tariff, are violated in all these respects, that the taxes are unequal; that they fall unjustly upon the population, that a large portion of them are wasted and never reach the public treasury;

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

and that they are taken in a larger degree from the people of this country than the public interest requires. The Government and the Parliament of this country should inaugurate a system of economy. That has not been done. The hon. gentleman has over and over again boasted, as if it were a matter for congratulation, that he had taken out of the pockets of the people of this country a larger sum than was required for the public necessities. He boasted of his surplus. I say that a Government is not entitled to have a surplus. There is no stimulus to economy where a large surplus remains in the hands of the Government. A large surplus invites extravagance, and has invited extravagance in this country. Everything points in that direction. Why, Sir, look at the necessities of the Government fifteen years ago, when \$23,500,000 were considered a large and unnecessary amount of taxation, and to-day that hon. gentleman expends over \$40,000,000, and there is no indication that there will be any diminution in the burden of taxation. I know the hon. gentleman comes down here with a budget every year, and tells us that the taxation amounts to about \$36,000,000. But, Sir, everybody knows that is an illusory statement; everybody knows that that does not explain all the facts. Every one knows that in connection with the Intercolonial Railway large sums have been charged to capital account that ought to have been charged annually against the ordinary expenditure of the country. And what is true of that, is true, in a hundred other cases, where sums ought to be charged against annual expenditure that are charged to capital account. If there was a prospect of capital account being closed then there might be some foundation for such a distinction, but there is to-day just the same demand for expenditure that there was a quarter of a century ago when this federation was first inaugurated. Sir, the Minister of Railways a few days ago said at a public meeting that it would be time enough to consider a policy of economy when some gentleman on the opposite side would point out in what direction economy might be practised. Well, let me say to the hon. gentleman that I think a very large amount of economy might be practised in connection with the railway he has under his charge. I think that the expenditure might be brought within the income of the road. I think that the Indians of the North-west can be paid \$5 without an expenditure of \$7 to make the payment. I think the Indians of British Columbia can be paid \$1 without an expenditure of \$4.50 for the purpose of making the payment. I think that people in a number of towns and villages, in closely contested counties, can do without some of the public buildings that this Government erects in order to secure constituencies, thereby entailing a permanent increased charge upon the public expenditure. I think I could point out a number of instances in which economy might be practised to a very large extent, and so I think we may

safely ask the representatives of the people in Parliament to force the Government to consider a policy of economy, and to adopt that policy in the public interest. I therefore feel that I can, without any injustice to the administration, without any injury to the public interest, but with great advantage to that interest, support the motion which my hon. friend has moved in amendment to the Address.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Grieve,
Bain (Wentworth),	Guay,
Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchar,	Laurier,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Lowell,
Borden,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowers,	McGregor,
Bowman,	McMillan (Huron),
Brodeur,	McMullen,
Bruneau,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisle,	Rowand,
Devlin,	Sunborn,
Edgar,	Sriver,
Edwards,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Vaillancourt,
Gillmor,	Yeo.—53.
Godbout,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	La Rivière,
Baird,	Leclair,
Baker,	Lépine,
Belley,	Macdonald (Kings),
Bennett,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	Maclean (York),
Bergin,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Bryson,	McDonald (Victoria),
Burns,	McDougall (Pictou),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McIneruey,
Carling,	McKay,
Carpenter,	McLean (Kings),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McLennan,
Carscallen,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Chesley,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Mara,
Cockburn,	Marshall,
Corby,	Miller,
Co-tigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Moneriff,
Curran,	Northrup,
Daly,	O'Brien,
Davis,	Ouimet,
Denison,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dickey,	Paterson (Huron),
Dugas,	Pope,
Dupont,	Pridham,
Dyer,	Prior,
Earle,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Roome,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Fréchette,	Ross (Dundas),
Gillies,	Ross (Lisgar),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Simard,
Grandbois,	Smith (Ontario),
Guillet,	Sproule,

Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Lachapelle.

Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brookville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—103.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the stages of committee and of report upon the Address be henceforth discontinued, and the Address be agreed to, with or without amendment, in the form for presentation to His Excellency the Governor-General.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the Address be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—
THE ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1894, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor-General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 30th January, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the Message with the Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a convenient time to inquire whether the

Finance Minister proposes to proceed with the Estimates, as has been his habit for some time, before he makes his financial statement, or after ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is my intention to proceed with the Estimates almost immediately. The Budget Speech will not be delivered for a little time.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed. Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday last, the 26th instant, to be composed of Sir John Thompson, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messieurs Costigan, Haggart, Laurier and Mills (Bothwell).

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— INTERNAL ECONOMY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

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

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

OTTAWA, 27th January, 1893.

OFFICIAL DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time ; to be composed of Messieurs Beausoleil, Béchard, Cameron, Charlton, Davin, Hazen, Innes, LaRivière, Lépine, Prior, Scriver, Somerville, Taylor, Weldon, and White (Cardwell).

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 31st January, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISFRANCHISEMENT FOR BRIBE TAKING.

Mr. DICKEY (for Mr. Weldon) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise voters who have taken bribes. He said : This Bill provides that, on the petition of twenty-five electors in any constituency, the Government shall be obliged to appoint a commission composed of one member of the Bench of the Superior Court of the province, and that this commissioner shall proceed to the constituency, take evidence with regard to the prevalence of improper practices, and report the persons guilty of such, and these people shall be disfranchised for a period of eight years. That is the general scope of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Wrecks and Salvage Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

AMENDMENT TO THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Franchise Act, chap. 5., R.S.C. He said : The Bill I now introduce is very simple ; it provides that a clause be added after clause 35 of this Act, with respect to appeals from the decisions of the revising officer, so as to fix a time during which these appeals should be decided. I propose by this Bill that these appeals shall be decided within three months, or that they be declared null and that the names remain on the electoral list. That will effectively prevent the recurrence of what occurs now in L'Islet.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the half year ended 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Patterson, Huron.)

SUPPLY—LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the close of the last session of the House, the First Minister, in reply to a question put to him by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, stated that the question of appointing

a Governor of the province of New Brunswick would be taken up immediately after the prorogation. Since that time several months have elapsed, and I understand that no such appointment has yet been made. I would ask the First Minister to now take the House into his confidence and to state what was the cause of the delay, and whether it is the policy of the Government to give third terms to the Provincial Governors or not? During the recess the press has very naturally discussed this matter, and many names have been referred to. The name of the respected Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of that province has been mentioned, and at one time it was thought, and generally believed, that the present Secretary of State had accepted the position, but I suppose we may understand by his accepting his present duties that he is not looking for it, at any rate for the time. We have also heard the name of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) mentioned, and we have heard that his appointment was pressed on the Government, and also, we have understood, that his fitness for that appointment was challenged by others very severely. Then the name of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams) has been mentioned, and favourably mentioned. Other names have also been referred to, one of a gentleman who was formerly a member of this House, who is looked upon as one of the Fathers of Confederation, and who would no doubt make a very popular Governor. No doubt these names are under the consideration of the Government of the day, but I think it is only fair, looking at the promise of the First Minister at the close of the last session, that he should state what reasons there are for the extraordinary delay in making the appointment. The present incumbent of the office has had two terms, and is now two years and some odd months on the third term. It is not right that such a state of things should continue. It would inaugurate a very bad system if it were understood that a third term might be given, and if the hon. gentleman cannot arrange the differences amongst those who support him as to who should be appointed, he might go outside and appoint either the Chief Justice or our old and esteemed fellow-member, Mr. Mitchell. However, whomsoever the Government may appoint is another matter, but the appointment of somebody is, I think, a necessity, and I think the cause of the delay should be explained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman does not expect me to discuss the claims of the different gentlemen whose names have been put forward. The subject was brought to the notice of the House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) towards the close of last session somewhat unexpectedly, and the line which the hon. gentleman's observations took, as I remember, was somewhat thus. The hon. gentle-

man challenged the constitutional propriety of allowing any time to elapse after the expiration of the term of a Lieutenant-Governor without the appointment of his successor. He seemed to think that it was a constitutional obligation on the Government to fill the office at once. The position then taken by the hon. member struck me at the time as being somewhat new, and, having been mentioned on the spur of the moment, I promised the hon. gentleman and the House that the subject would be taken up immediately after the close of the session. It was, and the conclusion which I arrived at was altogether different from the conclusion which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed to have arrived at. I humbly submit to the House, notwithstanding the opinion which he has expressed, that the constitutional position is this, that the Lieutenant-Governors hold office during the pleasure of the Crown, but are irremovable except for cause within the five year period, and that there is no such exigency as the hon. gentleman seemed to suppose in regard to filling the office. It was chiefly for that reason that the office was not filled by another incumbent, it being already occupied by a gentleman who was well able to fulfil the functions of the office. I may state that no decision has been come to in regard to conferring a third term, and I agree with the hon. member that in most cases that should be avoided. The office has remained without a new appointment for the reason that it is well filled now and that no reason for a new appointment has been shown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The opinion I expressed last year I entertain still, that it is an irregular and unconstitutional proceeding to permit a Lieutenant-Governor to continue in the position which the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick occupies at the present time. The hon. gentleman has said that these appointments are made during the pleasure of the Crown. That is true of every Governor appointed in any part of the British Empire, but as a matter of fact they do not hold office longer than five years except for cause. The rule pursued by the Colonial Office is precisely that laid down in the British North America Act as to the Lieutenant-Governors of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that after five years have expired, the Government are under no obligation to immediately appoint a successor. Now, the hon. gentleman should see that the position of Lieutenant-Governor, after five years have expired, is altogether different from what his position was before that period expired. The hon. gentleman knows that after five years have expired, the Lieutenant-Governor can be removed without assigning any cause. Sir Leonard Tilley might be removed at the end of two years, he might be removed at the end of three, at the end of four, at the end of five, at the end of six. After the first period of five years have expired, then he holds office simply as a

tenant at will. That is his position. Now, I say that that position is altogether out of harmony with the constitutional principle which is intended to make the Governor independent of the control or interference of the Government here. The hon. gentleman will see that after the five years has expired the position of the Lieutenant-Governor is not at all the position of Lieutenant-Governor during the period of those five years; and the intention of the law is that Lieutenant-Governors should not be removable in any one of the provinces, although appointed during pleasure, except for cause. Now, that being so, the hon. gentleman will see that the position I took last year is a sound position, is a constitutional position, and every day that he permits Sir Leonard Tilley to remain as Lieutenant-Governor of the province is, in effect, violating the spirit and principle that was intended to govern the office of the Lieutenant-Governor under the British North America Act. It does seem to me that the Government are derelict in duty in allowing Sir Leonard Tilley to continue in the position that he now occupies, instead of appointing, under the great seal of the province, another party to take his place. It is true, as my hon. friend suggests, that the Government might have issued a new commission to Sir Leonard Tilley, and he would have been again holding office during the pleasure of the Crown for a period of five years, subject to removal only for cause; but that commission not having been issued, that is not his position. I do not say that Sir Leonard Tilley is not a proper party to have occupied that position. I admit that his long training in Parliament qualified him well for the office which he held as Lieutenant-Governor; but I do not suppose that the Government intend to introduce the principle of making Lieutenant-Governors for life. That is not the theory or principle that governs appointments by the Colonial Office. The intention was that the same rule should prevail here. What is a matter of simple regulation in the Colonial Office, is a regulation made by law in this country, and when the five years expired, a successor to Sir Leonard Tilley ought to have been appointed. Now, I think it is very desirable that the party who holds the office of Lieutenant-Governor, just as the party who holds the office of Governor-General of Canada, should be a gentleman of parliamentary experience, of parliamentary training, who knows the rules and principles of our system of parliamentary government, and knowing them, he would be qualified to discharge his duties, and would know what were his constitutional relations to his advisers and to the legislature. It does seem to me that the position taken by the Minister of Justice has not been well considered, and that the principle I stated last year is a sound principle, that is to say, that within a reasonable time after the period has expired, a successor should be appointed under the great seal, and holding

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

his office independent of the Government except where he has abused the trust that has been reposed in him.

Mr. LAURIER. The principle which has been laid down by the Minister of Justice is one of great consequence. The hon. gentleman says that Sir Leonard Tilley has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick during the pleasure of the Crown. Well, that means simply that he is appointed for life and can remain there as long as the pleasure of the Crown will leave him there. But, Sir, the pleasure of the Crown never meant, in constitutional government, the caprice of the Crown. The pleasure of the Crown means some reasons whereby things should be done that need to be done. Although Sir Leonard Tilley has been appointed during the pleasure of the Crown, still at the end of five years there is one cause why it should be the pleasure of the Crown that he should be no longer Lieutenant-Governor, and that cause is that he has been holding his office for five years. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware that every day after the expiration of five years that a Lieutenant-Governor remains in office, there is a violation of constitutional government in this country as we have always understood it. If Sir Leonard Tilley is to be continued in office, let him be appointed by a new commission, and then there will be no difficulty. Sir Leonard Tilley is quite competent to fill the office. Personally he is quite acceptable to all parties and to all people. There could be no objection to reappointing him, but there is an objection in allowing him to remain there on sufferance day after day, or during the pleasure of the Crown, as the Minister terms it. Does the hon. gentleman contend, for instance, that the pleasure of the Crown is to be merely the caprice of the Crown? That if the Crown chooses to let Sir Leonard Tilley remain in his position for one year, or ten years, or twenty years, or all his life, they may do so? If that is the interpretation of the law, it should certainly be modified. But that is not the interpretation of the law, and the only conclusion we can come to, after the explanation of the hon. gentleman, is that for reasons better known to themselves, the Government are not prepared to make the appointment in New Brunswick. It may be that they find a difficulty in making an appointment among so many aspirants, but that is not a constitutional reason; and surely the hon. gentleman, if he will discharge the duties which he owes, not only to the people of New Brunswick, but to the people of Canada and to the Crown, he should advise His Excellency at once to make an appointment, whether it is Sir Leonard Tilley or some one else.

MILITIA SUPPLIES.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply, I would call attention to a matter in connection with the

Department of Militia and Defence. These estimates contemplate the House being invited to vote \$1,250,000 for the Department of Militia and Defence. Some years ago complaints were made to the House and to a committee of this House, against the character of the supplies, the uniforms and materials generally dealt out to the militia. I took the responsibility of bringing that matter before a committee of inquiry. A large amount of evidence was taken, and the committee made a report. That report was submitted to this House, and was the subject of discussion. I contended at that time that the evidence showed a most unsound system in the purchase of militia supplies, the result of which was bad material, bad workmanship and consequent loss to the Government. However, the argument and the evidence fell upon deaf ears, the House declaring itself perfectly satisfied with the administration, with the system in force, and the way it was being worked out. Not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House was found prepared openly and publicly to express his disapproval of that condition of affairs, although some military men among them who recorded their votes in approval of the administration, had been almost in open insurrection against the department by reason of the existence of these very grievances. Nevertheless the House told the country that everything was being done that the public interest demanded, that the system in force was all that was needed. What was the system? A member of Parliament through the guise of a corporation contractor for the sale of supplies to the department: no system whereby public competition was invited; but the whole arrangement appeared to be either the result of corruption or negligence, certainly a violation of the true spirit of Parliament in allowing a member of Parliament to be a contractor to these enormous sums each year. There being those relations between the contractors and the Government of which I have spoken, it followed that there was not that proper supervision over the actions of the contractor that otherwise would have obtained, and the result was, whether through political influence or whatever it might be, there were sold to this Government thousands of dollars worth of material and supplies for the use of our militia that were in no sense in compliance with the conditions of the contract, and in no sense were fit supplies. But as I have said, it was idle to talk to the House. The evidence was conclusive, we had the testimony of veterans in the service, whose testimony was certainly not likely to be adverse to the Government, if the facts would not warrant it, everything was ready for a reformation, except sound public opinion in this House and in the Government. Matters went on as before, and last November the officer commanding Her Majesty's forces, I suppose, from a sense of duty, was obliged to put himself on record in regard to this state of affairs; and

before this House resolves itself into Committee of Supply to vote another million and a-quarter to maintain the Department of Militia and Defence it is due that assurances should be given that there has been a change of method in regard to the management of the militia force. Permit me to read to the House from the report to which I have referred, which is dated 30th June last. Under the head of equipment, I find this paragraph in the report of the officer commanding the Department of Militia:

The condition of a large proportion of the equipment in use in the militia, is even worse than I have already represented. Not only is a great part of it worn out with age, but much of that which is issued as new is of the worst possible quality. I have seen saddlery and other equipment, when issued fresh from store, which failed to endure the ordinary usage of a twelve days' camp. I have seen boots that had been issued to soldiers, the leather of which had no more consistency than paper.

Speaking of stores, the commanding officer goes on, in a later paragraph, to say:

The system under which clothing, arms, equipment and military stores are now procured and issued to the militia, appears to me open to very serious objections.

The responsibility for purchasing stores, making contracts, viewing the stores furnished by contractors, as well as for their custody and final issue, is all vested in one office, regardless of the conflict of opposing interests, affected by the performance of duties of such widely different character. It would seem more in accordance with business principles to vest the responsibility for purchase and contracts in the financial or civil branch of the department, and give to the military executive the duties of custody, inspection and issue. This would be more easy since the amount of stores (exclusive of obsolete and condemned articles) in possession of the department amounts to little more than an "expense store" calculated to meet the current requirements of the militia, but not providing for any reserve.

I submit that the House is entitled to guarantees on these certain points. We are entitled to be told, first, is the manufacture of the clothing of the militia of Canada directly or indirectly under the same management as before? In the second place, are those contracts filled by the same contractors? I do not mean by a new deal, because I understand that, in order to get over the criticisms that were very properly directed against the system some years ago, the then contractor with the Government has become a sub-contractor and another person appears as direct contractor, while, I understand, the work of manufacturing the clothing goes on in the same establishment as before. I submit that it is due to the House that it should be informed whether the clothing is manufactured at the same establishments as heretofore. If so, with the record supplied to the Committee on Public Accounts, which this House said was wholly valueless evidence, and with the testimony of the officer commanding, I think the time has come when we should treat those contractors as all persons treat unworthy contractors, men who will not live

up honestly to their contracts, and give them the go by. The fact that this corporation possesses political influence is not sufficient reason that public money should be squandered with them, and that that great public service, the militia should be made to suffer by it. I hold, therefore, that we are entitled to ascertain the facts from the Minister, and in order that he may not misunderstand my points, I ask, first, is or is not the militia clothing now supplied to the Government being manufactured in the same establishments in which it was being made when this report was prepared; second, are any steps being taken by the department to invite tenders by public competition for the manufacture and supply of clothing on business principles? Until the House obtains assurances on these points, it will not be reasonable to ask it to go into Committee of Supply on any item connected with Militia and Defence.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The best answer I can give to my hon. friend is that, with the consent of the Minister in charge of the department and of the Governor in Council, the report of the Major-General commanding has been incorporated in the departmental report of this year. The fact that the report is thus printed will be a sufficient assurance to my hon. friend and this House as to the intentions of the Government in connection with the Department of Militia. As regards the specific questions put by my hon. friend, if he will place them on the Notice Paper, I shall have much pleasure in giving them that attention which their importance demands.

Mr. HAZEN. Referring for one instant to the question raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) with respect to the New Brunswick governorship, I desire to say a word. As there seemed to be a difference of opinion as to what was the proper constitutional course to adopt between the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I sent for a copy of the British North America Act, and it certainly seems to me that under any fair interpretation of section 59 of that Act, the course pursued in regard to the governorship of New Brunswick cannot with any degree of fairness be called unconstitutional or improper. The Act distinctly states that the Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor-General, and in the same paragraph there is a condition that no Lieutenant-Governor can be removed from office during a period of five years from his appointment, except for cause. I take that paragraph to mean, as was stated by the Minister of Justice, that the Lieutenant-Governor cannot be removed from office, except for cause, during a period of five years from his appointment; but that it is not incumbent on the Government after those five years have expired to continue him in office by a new commission or remove him from office

Mr. MULLOCK.

by appointing a successor. It, therefore, seems to me beyond question that the Government acted strictly within the statute in regard to the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick. It is true, undoubtedly, that the course adopted has been an unusual one in this country; but it is also true that the circumstances have been exceptional, for I doubt if there has ever been in any province of Canada a Lieutenant-Governor who has filled the position with such general acceptance, irrespective of party, as has Sir Leonard Tilley in the province of New Brunswick.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I apprehend there is no doubt as to the technical legal right of the Government to act as they have done on this question, and it is not necessary therefore to press the argument as to whether they are a little to the windward of the law. The broad question raised by my hon. friend is, whether, having reference to the position that the Lieutenant-Governor plays in our political economy, it is or is not a proper thing that our Lieutenant-Governors should be mere tenants at will, removable at the pleasure or caprice of the Government without any cause assigned. That is the position Sir Leonard Tilley is in to-day. He may be turned out to-morrow, or he may be left in office for one year or two years or the rest of his natural life. Now, whether Sir Leonard Tilley is or is not a good Governor is not the question. I agree with my hon. friends here that he is a man of very considerable experience and may therefore be fairly supposed to be qualified to discharge his duties, but I also agree with them that it is in the highest degree inexpedient that, except for a short period for matters of temporary convenience, any man should be allowed to remain there as a mere temporary Governor. Why, Sir, we know, and I think my hon. friends from Quebec know that cases may arise in which the position of Lieutenant-Governor may be used or abused in a way that the constitution never contemplated. We have had experience enough that the Lieutenant-Governors of provinces take upon themselves rights and functions which the Governors-General of Canada have never dared to hint at. I think we have proof enough of that, and I say it is in the highest degree inexpedient that for any considerable period a Lieutenant-Governor—I do not care who he may be, I do not care in what province he may be—should be allowed to remain in office as the occupant of the place on sufferance. As I have said, we do not object at all—although there is a good deal to be said against the expediency of giving any man a third term—we do not object at all if the Government in their wisdom see fit to issue a commission to Sir Leonard Tilley and put him in the position in which a Lieutenant-Governor should be, of holding his office as a judge holds it; that is, by holding it removable only for cause. I take it that is the position of a Lieutenant-Governor during the five years' period. It

is nominally at pleasure, but it is really removable only for cause. He holds his office during good behaviour practically as a judge holds his. What would be thought if we went back to the old and evil system under which judges held office at the pleasure of the Crown and could be removed at pleasure? To a very considerable extent the Lieutenant-Governor of a province should be an independent man. He occupies in some respects, between the two parties very much of a judicial position, and I believe, Sir, that the Constitution never contemplated—although there may be, and I suppose is, a loop-hole for this kind of thing to be done—the Constitution, I say, never contemplated that Lieutenant-Governors should be allowed to hold office simply at caprice and pleasure, on the understanding that if they pleased their friends at Ottawa they may keep a comfortable situation, and that if they do not please their masters they shall be bundled out without any formality of assigning a reason or without informing the House that their usefulness was gone, as was the case in a certain well remembered instance here. I wholly agree with the contention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the contention of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), that it is in the last degree inexpedient that except for a very short period, and for purposes of very temporary convenience, that this important office, an office which we have seen and known, may be used for the purpose of interfering very materially with the expressed will of the people, should be held by anybody, I do not care who he may be, on such a tenure as that by which Sir Leonard Tilley now holds the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick. With respect to the domestic quarrels of hon. gentlemen opposite we have very little to do. We do not care whether the party of the Minister of Inland Revenue, or whether the party of the Minister of Finance get the uppermost. We do not care much whether the new member comes from the east or the west or the south or the middle of New Brunswick. Let them settle these matters as they please. All I contend for is that in the interest of the public service, and for the purpose of discharging the duties of Lieutenant-Governor, it is of very great importance indeed that whoever may be chosen can hold his office during good behaviour, removable only for cause.

Mr. OUIMET. I am glad to see that we agree pretty well on the legal aspect of the question, that Lieutenant-Governors ought to hold office during pleasure, but not for a less period than five years. It is within the pleasure and prerogative of His Excellency the Governor in Council to continue beyond the five years his confidence in a gentleman who has been appointed to the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and this exercise of prerogative comes under the supervision of the House and the country, and for that, in this instance as well as in any other, the advisers of His Excellency are ready to

answer for any abuse that can be made of the exercise of His Excellency's prerogative. However, I must candidly say that this case must be looked at as an exceptional case. It is a comfort to see the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition admit that this exception is on behalf of an exceptionally good man. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) that it is very important that the Lieutenant-Governors should enjoy the fullest independence possible while they hold that high office. There is one point, however, on which we have differed in the past from hon. gentlemen, and that is as to the degree of independence with which Lieutenant-Governors should exercise their high powers. As to the late instance to which the hon. gentleman has referred, every one was much surprised that this question was not brought before the House last session, and we have remained under the impression that if the question of the independence with which the prerogative of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec had been exercised recently had not been brought before Parliament, it was because hon. gentlemen opposite did not expect to gain much credit for themselves in doing so.

Mr. FRASER. There is one point in this question which I think hon. gentlemen have forgotten. If the Lieutenant-Governor can be continued for one month after his term expires why not continue him for a year or five years or ten years? But there is another side to the question which I think this House should take some notice of. I hold that of all the unseemly things we can have in this young country, it is for a man to get up a petition for himself and hawk it around asking that he should be made Lieutenant-Governor. I think it is desirable in the extreme that a man holding such a high office should be of such character and position that he would be pointed out at once without any effort on his part as the person who should be selected. But for a member of Parliament, or for anybody else to get up a petition, and to attach his own letter to it making application for the office after the petition was signed by certain members, is derogatory to this Parliament and infamous in this new country. I conceive, Sir, that the Governors-General and the Lieutenant-Governors ought to be men of the highest character and men who should not find it necessary to try and get up a petition for themselves in favour of their appointment. Has it come to such a pass that the man who is to represent Her Majesty in a province, is to be a man who seeks the office like a common scavenger, moving among the members and asking them if they will not sign a petition that he should be Lieutenant-Governor? What a manly thing that is? With what dignity a man like that can fill the position? What honour he would confer upon the province and how well he would represent Her Gracious Majesty? I take it that in this country we should at once stamp out such a

thing as that. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite; I trust that the First Minister, who I believe understands these matters and who has some conscience and some idea of the dignity of the position, will so treat any man who comes to him with a petition of that kind as to make it ever afterwards impossible for any of his servile followers to carry around a petition for signature asking that he should be appointed to an office for which neither honour, nor nature, nor dignity ever designed him to occupy.

Mr. LANGELIER. The instance mentioned by the Minister of Public Works is the very best proof of the wisdom of our constitution in reference to the office of Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman did not seem to have understood the arguments of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He says the Ministers are responsible to Parliament for the maintenance in power of the Lieutenant-Governor after his term has elapsed. We admit that; but it is exactly what the constitution does not want. The constitution has laid down the principle that the Ministers shall not have the Lieutenant-Governor in their hands or under their thumbs. While Lieutenant-Governor he is supposed to be independent of the Federal Ministry, only to be removed by Parliament for cause. There are great objections to his being maintained as Lieutenant-Governor after the five years are over. Then he is entirely in the power of the Government here instead of being independent of them. As to the instance mentioned by the hon. Minister of Public Works he could not have mentioned a worse instance. He says we did not bring up that question before. Well, we could bring it up this year. We have from the very mouth of the gentleman himself a statement of the way in which he acted as Lieutenant-Governor. We have him admitting that when the constitution was in his way he jumped over it; when his oath was in his way he jumped over his oath. He made that admission in the presence of the hon. Minister of Public Works in a speech which he delivered in Montreal.

Mr. OUMET. If the hon. gentleman will allow me; I was there present, and I never understood my hon. colleague to apply the allusion he made to his own conduct in Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER. That is a new construction of his speech, because I have not seen a single ministerial paper which put any other construction upon it than the one I have given. He made the remark that when he found a wall in his way he jumped over it, and everybody understood that he referred to the wall of the constitution and the wall of his oath. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman complains that we did not bring that matter before this House. We had an opportunity lately to bring it before the people of Quebec. There was an election in L'Islet, and the hon. Minister of Public Works has a vivid re-

Mr. FRASER.

collection of that election. The gentleman to whom I am alluding has administered justice in the county of L'Islet and in two neighbouring counties. Yet he had not the courage to show himself in that election. It was claimed that he had saved the province of Quebec in those counties; and yet that saviour had not the courage to show himself in that county which it was claimed he had saved. The hon. Minister of Public Works, though a comparative stranger to that part of the country, went there, as did also the hon. Postmaster-General. Their own papers boasted that Mr. Angers, the gentleman alluded to, would go there also and carry the county before him; but he had not the courage to go there and boast of having jumped over the constitution. It was only in Montreal, at a meeting composed of the Tory party, that he made this great boast. He never ventured to appear anywhere else in the province of Quebec. Now, we are not afraid to discuss his conduct. It was outrageous, and it shows more than anything else the wisdom of our constitution, that it does not contemplate putting the Lieutenant-Governors under the thumb of the Ministers at Ottawa. His papers and his friends boasted that he had to come to Ottawa to sign official documents—that he refused to take the advice of those whom he was bound to follow, but, instead, took the advice of the Ottawa Ministers. In saying this I do not mention secrets revealed by the Ministers, but matters openly stated by his own political friends in the province of Quebec. We have had some most scandalous things in connection with the administration of justice in the province. There was an official magistrate in Rimouski whose administration was a disgrace to the province, and it was openly boasted that he would never be dismissed because he had assisted the hon. Postmaster-General in the election. It is an evidence of the wisdom of the constitution that it does not want to make the Lieutenant-Governors the mere tools of the party in power at Ottawa.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised at the warmth with which the hon. gentleman seems to resent the action of the late Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman has more than one good reason for feeling very much annoyed at the action taken by my hon. colleague who now has a seat in the Senate. But the hon. gentleman, to my surprise, taxes the Hon. Mr. Angers with having been afraid to submit to the people of Canada the question of the manner in which he dealt with an Administration which disgraced the province of Quebec; and that, according to the hon. gentleman, is the reason he did not make his appearance in the county of L'Islet. Sir, the question of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was submitted to the people of the province of Quebec in a constitutional way, and the answer

came from the people of the province of Quebec when they dismissed the Administration of Mr. Mercier by the largest majority that has ever been known in the province of Quebec since Confederation. The Hon. Mr. Angers could well dispense with going before the people in the district of Quebec after the verdict had been rendered by the people of that district and by the people of the whole province. We know that in the largest centres like Montreal, every man who was returned was returned against the Administration of Mr. Mercier, and to support the action of the late Lieutenant-Governor; and Mr. Angers did not require again to go before the people of L'Islet or the people of the province of Quebec when his action had been endorsed in the manner in which it was in the general elections.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I am astonished to hear the hon. Postmaster-General giving vent to feelings of indignation with respect to the Government who were the victims of the ex-Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. We all know that should he, the Postmaster-General, have had to overcome half of the difficulties set up against the Hon. Mr. Mercier, he would have been long since out of this House. If the hon. Minister had had courage enough to allow the investigation which we asked for last year to be carried on, we all know, and he knows more than any one else, that he would have been shown out of it by his own friends. Should the hon. gentleman have allowed a committee of this House to enquire into his conduct, should he have had a petition composed of the most ardent supporters one could find on the bench, he would have disappeared from this House before the day would have been over, he would have taken shelter into a rich cheese. They say the Hon. Mr. Mercier was very faulty. If that is so, how is it that, after having been dragged before the courts, and after a lengthy trial, he was acquitted? How is it that, now that light has been thrown upon his conduct, he is so popular in the province of Quebec? It is because, Mr. Speaker, he was not guilty. Had all the Conservative forces been brought to bear to crush him, they never could have thrown him down. I again state I am surprised when hearing the hon. Postmaster-General talking about virtue. We shall have an opportunity, during the session, to inquire into his conduct, and to know if he ought or not to remain in this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The continuance in this office of Sir Leonard Tilley, is, under the circumstances, very peculiar. We on this side may not be able to understand all the difficulties that lie in the way of appointing a successor to him, but those of us who have known Sir Leonard Tilley in this House are somewhat surprised that he should continue to occupy the position under present conditions. We who have always been loyal to the

Crown and have always desired to preserve the Crown in its purity, do not like to see a high officer such as a Lieutenant-Governor placed in the position in which Sir Leonard Tilley is now placed. It does seem singular that since Confederation this same office has been held by that gentleman more than half that period. It certainly looks as if the province of New Brunswick does not grow Lieutenant-Governors in abundance. There may be difficulties, and we probably should not look too closely into those difficulties, because we know that the Government have members who have held high office in the province of New Brunswick, and have occupied seats in this House as long and longer than did Sir Leonard Tilley. We know of men who have the experience and qualifications for that position, but it does appear there are peculiar influences at work. Some of these hon. gentlemen are Irish, and we understand that no Irish need apply. Some are anti-Irish, and there difficulties arise again. We do not want to increase the difficulties. We know what the hon. gentlemen did last election in the province of New Brunswick. We know that the appointment was made there of an Irishman, and that a cry of horror arose among those gentlemen because Mr. Blair chose to appoint to office in the city of St. John, a gentleman of Irish origin. Where is the Solicitor-General? I want to draw his attention to these matters, and would like to hear him say whether a man is to be excluded from a position because of the accident of his birth. I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister to this. I believe there is a number of candidates willing to sacrifice themselves on the altar of their country, but that Sir Leonard Tilley has to be retained for political reasons, and political reasons alone. Imagine a Lieutenant-Governor being kept in office to satisfy the exigencies of party. Imagine a people who boast of their loyalty to Britain and to British institutions, perpetuating a system which is derogatory to British institutions, and which ought not to be tolerated for a day. Look at the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, acting the part of a political partizan while he was exercising the functions of the Crown—bowing down to the shibboleth of a party, making himself a subservient tool of this Government, and receiving his reward for that subservience. It was disgraceful and should lead this House to consider how much longer this office of Lieutenant-Governor is to be retained, and whether men who disgrace the position by truckling to party interests are worthy of exercising the mandates of royalty any longer. We should teach those who take upon themselves the garb of Her Majesty that they will have to be loyal to the people of the country, that they must keep themselves above political partizanship, and not allow themselves to be made the tools of any party which chances to be in power. The

gentleman I referred to has been rewarded by being appointed Minister of Agriculture. Is the Lieutenant-Governorship of the province of Quebec a training school for Ministers of Agriculture? We know that one Lieutenant-Governor there, a short time ago, established a piggery. Is this to be considered a training school for Ministers of Agriculture in the Dominion Government? Those who will tolerate and condone the state of things now existing in New Brunswick have little idea of British institutions and British fair-play. They are degrading both the office and the officer, and I, as a Canadian Briton, appeal to the Government to stop as soon as possible this crying shame against British institutions which they are allowing to be perpetrated there. It does not appear strange to some of us, who know Sir Leonard Tilley, that he should hang on to office for dear life. Just think of it. The highest office in the province of New Brunswick being peddled round for the purpose of obtaining political support. It is a shame and a scandal and should be stopped.

Mr. HEARN. It is with considerable hesitation that I rise to say a few words upon some of the matters which have been referred to within the last few moments. I feel that I can speak only with much unpleasantness to those who have to hear me, and with considerable inconvenience to myself. Yet, Sir, the occasion is one that satisfies me I would be very remiss in my duty, very remiss in what is due, from my humble point of view, to truth, were I to remain silent in the face of what has fallen from the gentleman who has just taken his seat, and of what has been said by my hon. friend, the member for Quebec East. Both gentlemen, if I understood them correctly, and I did my humble best to do so, have found it convenient, and seem to have deemed it manly and fitting, to attack an absent member of the Government—one who, though he cannot reply to them here, would readily do so in another place. Both gentlemen have deemed it becoming to attack the hon. Minister of Agriculture—with what? With cowardice! Sir, those who know that gentleman best have spoken upon the subject. Sir, the conduct of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, as has been well said by his colleague, the hon. Postmaster-General, has been submitted to the fairest tribunal upon earth. It has been submitted to that tribunal which of all others in the world knew most of the case and was the most competent to judge of it. The people of the province of Quebec heard all that could be said in denunciation of the conduct of the late Lieutenant-Governor of that province. The people of the province, from end to end, were told through the press, were told on the public hustings, were told at every street corner, were told at every church door, Sunday and week-day, that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was infamous. The reasons for pronouncing it

Mr. LANDEKRIN.

infamous were given to the people, the people heard all that could be said against him, all that malice and party spirit could urge, and the people, having duly deliberated, having taking time to consider, and having heard the eloquence and the ability with which the charges were put forth, came to the conclusion, that, notwithstanding the eloquence and ability with which the charges were put before them, those charges were baseless, that they were not deserving of endorsement, and that had it not been for the wise and the courageous action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, that province would have soon reached the abyss of ruin towards which she had been fast speeding, and from which it would have taken long years to retrieve her. Sir, if there be one thing that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is, in his own province, considered entitled to, it is the character of a courageous, an able and an honest man. And, Sir, to show that that is the belief of the people of the province of Quebec, they, with a majority almost unparalleled, have given their verdict, and in vain will it be for the small number of his opponents in that province to persist in repeating, as I regret to find they are disposed to do, the charges they have made. Excuses may be found, and good excuses, for hon. members from other provinces who are deceived by a false press and by mistaken views which may be honestly entertained, and no doubt honestly spoken by many, but reflection and a fair holding of the scales would force those who desire to see truth prevail over falsehood, to admit that the province of Quebec had good reason to thank God that she had a Lieutenant-Governor with the courage, the integrity and the ability of her late Lieutenant-Governor Angers.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would not have thought it my duty to offer any observations to the House on the subject now under discussion, were it not for some remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) as well as from the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Hearn). We have heard a good deal as to the part the constitution has to play in regard to filling the high office of the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. This is all nonsense, as the House and the members of the House well know. The constitution has nothing at all to do with it. The constitution does not require that the present Lieutenant-Governor should fill the office during two full terms and half of another term, but there is another point brought out in discussion by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) in regard to which, perhaps, some remarks may be offered. He said that "he was afraid it was a case of 'no Irish need apply.'" It is with feelings of gratification that I look upon the advent to the Ministry of the present Solicitor-General. I must say that,

if it were true in the past that no Irish need apply in regard to the position of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, we have now our champions in the ministry who will see that that barrier shall be thrown down, and that the fact of an Irishman being an Irishman shall be no reason why he should not occupy the position of Lieutenant-Governor. I am perfectly sure that the hon. the Solicitor-General, as well as the hon. gentleman who has long been recognized as a champion of Irish rights in this country, the present Secretary of State, will see that it shall not be because an Irishman is an Irishman that he shall not have his ambition satisfied if it be in the direction of the post of Lieutenant-Governor—of course, provided he has the other qualifications which are necessary. I hope this little domestic trouble, if it exists, will be soon removed, and that it will not be said in that province more than in any other that a man because he has the accident of Irish birth shall not have the office which his talents, his services to the country, and other qualities which I might enumerate, entitle him to occupy. Then my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Hearn) has shown a great deal of indignation, which no doubt was aroused by a remark of the Postmaster-General, when he said that an Administration existed in the province of Quebec a short time ago which disgraced that province. Assuredly there is not a member in this House who knows better than the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Hearn) the history of the different Administrations which have existed in that province. Did he express indignation in the past when it was established by fact proved, when it was established by the verdict of the people that Administrations composed of men of his own political creed had disgraced the province of Quebec? No. He crossed his arms and bowed his head in approval of all they did, because they were of his own political faith. To-day he is indignant, and says: Why attack this powerful Minister of Agriculture when he is not in this House? Whose is the fault that he is not in this House? I have not far to look to find an hon. member—I think the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette)—who threw out the challenge to the Minister of Agriculture, and said: I will resign my seat if he is willing to contest the seat with me, and to see if the people of that county will approve of his course as Governor of the province of Quebec. Did he accept that challenge? No, he refused to accept the challenge. Sir, the county of L'Islet was opened some time ago, and the Lieutenant-Governor had, as is well known the offer by his party to contest that county. Did he accept it? Sir, we did not keep the hon. Minister of Agriculture out of this House; it is not the hon. gentlemen on this side who closed these doors against him. It was his own knowledge of the feelings of the people of the province of Quebec. He knew that he could not face them, he dared not face them, with the knowledge of what he

had done as Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. That is the reason why the hon. gentleman is not here. Anyway, it was not necessary to bring under the knowledge of the House the facts which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. He says that the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec received the approbation of the people, that when his ministry went before the people they received the sanction of the province. Let me recall another little matter of history to that hon. gentleman. There was another Lieutenant-Governor who some years ago presided over the destinies of the province of Quebec. For an act somewhat similar in nature, his ministry went before the people in the province of Quebec, and by the verdict of the people the Lieutenant-Governor was sustained. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do with him? They dismissed him. But did they dismiss Lieutenant-Governor Angers? Not at all. Sir, the Minister of Public Works threw out the hint a moment ago, when he said: "Why did you not bring his conduct under the notice of the House?" As much as to say: You know what we would have done had you brought it under the notice of the House. We would have voted it down, as we vote down anything and everything that you may bring up in this House. He referred to the gentleman who was dismissed from office. Let me here say that it is not my duty, it is not a part of my office, the circumstances of the case do not require, that I should defend the Hon. Mr. Mercier. But, Sir, these gentlemen attacked him, they dragged him before the court, they constituted the court, they named their own judge, they named their own jurymen, they put the case in every way just as they pleased. But their victim had a warm place in the hearts and in the affections of his countrymen in the province of Quebec. They dragged him into a criminal court. What was the result? Why, Sir, the whole country and the world know that their own judge and jury proclaimed their victim innocent. I can say that there are two names to-day well known in the province of Quebec, Mercier and Angers, and the day will come when the man who to-day has his reward in the Senate will regret the act which he has committed, and the other will be taken up as he was before, the choice of the people, and placed in the position he formerly held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that while I am not going to raise any objection to the very unusual course which he has taken of proceeding into Supply within a few hours after the Estimates have been placed in our hands, I think he must remember in that case that we require a good deal more information than might otherwise be required. It is not at all convenient that the Estimates should be examined and proceeded with the day after they have been intro-

duced. A reasonable time ought to be allowed for the purpose of examining them and the Auditor-General's Report, which has also been but a very short time in our hands. I am glad to see the Estimates down at an early day. I always thought they ought to be presented to Parliament almost immediately after Parliament meets, and I will be particularly glad if it proves in the result that these are the Estimates and not a mere instalment of them, because it has been too much the fashion to bring down a mere instalment of the Estimates, and, at a later date, to introduce three or four million dollars more. I think that plan is a very bad one. For two or three years, if I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman did not adopt it, but I fear he is falling from grace, I am afraid he is going back into the bad old plan of keeping back a large proportion of these items which ought to be discussed fully in the House, until a very late period in the session. I trust that he will be able to assure the House that such is not his intention on the present occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be quite willing to give all information possible as these Estimates are going through. I think I have always shown a disposition to do so so far as I was able. I never supposed that I would be able to satisfy all the cravings for information of hon. gentlemen opposite. However, we will go on with the first Estimates with reference to Civil Government, which do not require so much looking over as the main Estimates, which will come later, and by that time, I have no doubt, that the hon. gentleman will have thoroughly perused the Auditor-General's Report. As to the Supplementary Estimates, my hon. friend must have forgotten the routine. Never, since I have been in Parliament, have we had a session when we had not a fairly large supplementary estimate brought down; and, certainly, if he will look over the records, he will find that that has been the practice at least ever since I have been a member of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know it has.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will find, also, if he goes over the last few years since I have had the honour of bringing the Estimates down, that the supplementaries have been smaller instead of larger. It is almost impossible to avoid bringing down some supplementary estimates. I agree with him entirely that the main body of the Estimates should be in the first lot that is submitted, but there are certain things which it is almost impossible to get into the main Estimates unless these are kept back for a longer time than would suit the convenience of Parliament. However, I will do my best to see that the supplementary estimate is a reasonable one when it is brought down, and is kept within the requirements of the revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware that it is sometimes not altogether within the power of a Finance Minister to keep his colleagues within bounds, and I will reserve criticism until we can see what he can do.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Speaker is still in the Chair, and this is the third speech he has made since the motion for going into Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will only ask one question with reference to the business of the House. I understand that the hon. gentleman will pursue the plan he has heretofore pursued, and that he will take up these Estimates in regular rotation?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that will be the plan pursued. It may happen, through the absence of a minister or some other like cause, that we may have to make a little digression. In that case I will give my hon. friend notice so far as I can do so.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Interest on Public Debt, &c., Commission \$30,350

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that this will be a convenient opportunity for him to inform us of the reasons which led him to make a change in the London agency, and to give us some details as to the arrangement which the public has been given to understand has been made with the Bank of Montreal to transact our London business.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend knows, the agreement which had been entered into in 1880 for the management of our financial affairs in London by the houses which have acted as our agents, since that time, was made consequent upon the long services by those same houses in assisting us in our financial work in London. At that time a considerable reduction was made in the charges which had been before them levied for the various services that they gave, and a period was set at which this was to be terminated upon notice by the Government. That period came to an end last year. The notice was given, and it became incumbent on the Government to see whether or not we could make a better financial arrangement, with equal safety to ourselves and with equal strength to ourselves, than the one which had preceded it. It had always been my opinion since I entered the department that it would be possible for us to make a better arrangement. In consequence of that, I thought it better to go over to London, and, without going into particulars, I may say that I was able, not to make a better arrangement than the preceding one to any large extent with the old agents, although in some respects they were willing to modify their charges, particularly upon the issue of loans, but while

being willing to make the charges on the issue of loans less, they thought, and held a very strong opinion that they were not sufficiently paid for the management of the loan, for the payment of interest and sinking fund and all other business which they had to carry on for us. And so, while being willing, as I have said, to lessen their charges on the issue of loans, their offer contemplated a considerable increase upon the management of the loan, and their reason for that was, so far as they were concerned, a reasonable one, provided the payment as a whole had not been too great before. They were paid a commission on the interest. In 1880 the average interest payable on our loans in London was of course, much larger than it was in 1890 with a tendency to decrease, owing to our placing loans on the market at a less rate of interest, and payment by them of a commission on the interest left the aggregate that came into their hands for that service less in proportion as the rate of interest decreased. Consequently, in their offer they made a proposition by which, instead of one-half per cent, which had formerly been their rate, they would require for their services £250 per million, not a commission, but a rate per million for the loan managed. That would be considerably higher than the one-half per cent commission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much?

Mr. FOSTER. One-half per cent commission would be in the neighbourhood of £200 per million. As the prospects were that the amount of loans required by the Dominion would be less than in preceding decades whilst we would not get as much advantage from the proposed lowering of their commission on the issue of loans, the management of the loan would go on at the higher rate of remuneration to them; and in the end, for a period of ten years, the cost of the charges under that proposition would have been, I think, about on an average with what it had been during the preceding ten years. I then turned my attention to the Bank of Montreal, which had before acquainted me with their desire to obtain the management of our business and take our accounts there, and the result was that I was able to make an arrangement with the Bank of Montreal which was far more favourable to us in all those respects. I cannot do better, possibly, than read the rates and contrast them with the old rates. Our old rate upon the issue of loans was 1 per cent. The Bank of Montreal will issue our loans at one-quarter of 1 per cent, a decrease from 1 to one-quarter per cent for new loans. We now paid one-half per cent commission on interest payments and sinking fund. The arrangement is that this is to be done for £150 per million of the debt, which is considerably lower than the preceding rate. In the case of redemption, there is to be no charge for retiring the loan redeemed, in case the bank

has the issuing of the loan for the redemption of the expiring one; in case it has not, one-eighth per cent is to be paid to them. Our arrangements with our preceding agents was that there was to be no charge if they issued the loan for redemption; but if they did not issue the loan for redemption, then the charge was to be 1 per cent. The Government is to pay the cost of the inscription books, which are to be the property of the Government. That was not the case in the arrangement with our preceding agents, in fact, I think it was overlooked. They paid for the stock books themselves; but I think it is of great importance that they should be the property of the Government and not the property of the agents, and I made a proposition, which will be accepted, of course, that we would take from them the old inscription books so that we may have the records complete from the first, and allow them a reasonable sum to reimburse them the cost of printing. That, however, is not a large matter. The contract in this case will run for a period of ten years, the same as before, and terminate in the same way, by one year's previous notice. On the whole, we have made, I believe, a most excellent arrangement so far as cost to ourselves is concerned, and from a very careful inquiry into the matter, I think with perfect safety so far as the management of our business is concerned, and so far as the issue of new loans is concerned. We have made this arrangement with the Bank of Montreal in this way, and I may state generally that the conditions are better by far than those obtained in the case of any colony having its financial matters managed in London, as all of them have them managed. For instance, I may say that New South Wales pays from £500 to £600 per million for management, that the colony of Victoria pays from £400 to £500, South Australia £250, Queensland from £600 to £500, Cape of Good Hope from £500 to £450, and, as I have said, our rate is £150 per million for management. The higher amount I have read is the amount per million up to a certain amount for loan management, and the lesser sum for amounts above that sum. With respect to the issue of loans, we are lower than New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and New Zealand. The only colony which secures as good terms for the issue of its loans is the Cape of Good Hope; but, on the other hand, it pays from £500 to £450 per million for the management of its loans. I may also state, a further saving will be effected. While we paid half per cent on the sinking fund to our old agents, the sinking funds are included in the management of loans; the charge is £150 per million for the management of the loans, including the sinking fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount does the hon. gentleman expect to save per annum, apart from the question of the issue of loans? How many hundreds

or thousands of pounds does he expect to save ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot expect to save many thousands of pounds in the management, because what we have paid altogether is a comparatively small amount. We paid 1 per cent before, and we shall pay one-quarter of 1 per cent now, on the issue of loans, so that the saving will depend on the amount issued in comparison with the preceding term. On the management, for payment of interest, I find that we paid in 1891-92 about \$43,700, and, under the offer of the Bank of Montreal, we will pay about \$30,000, a saving of \$13,000 per year. I may say that the offer of the Barings and Glyn, Mills & Co., this year contemplated on that sum, \$51,100, so that, as regards that offer, we will save about \$21,000 per year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Bank of Montreal agree to advance any definite sum in case of need ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. We have an understanding with the Bank of Montreal by which it will advance to us for temporary needs something in the neighbourhood of from two to three million dollars per year. Of course that must be on the understanding that we shall not, as it would not be to our interest to, run temporary loans for too long periods. But suppose we take the present instance, having gone for a loan last year, a loan which was simply to arrange for matters to the end of the year and put us on an equal footing, it would not be wise, of course, as my hon. friend knows, to go on the market within two or three, or possibly four years. During that period we have an arrangement with the Bank of Montreal, by which they will advance to us at reasonable and current rates, accommodation to the amount of two or three million dollars per year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you mean by that you can draw on them to the extent of two or three million dollars each year ?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say they will accommodate us to that amount each year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you can get \$2,000,000 out of them, if necessary, during the three years ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the arrangement between us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the other agents make any similar offer ?

Mr. FOSTER. They made an offer ; but it did not contemplate giving us so large an amount ? I do not remember exactly the limit, but it was not so large as that offered by our present agent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt that the figures given by the Minister of Finance, particularly for floating loans,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

are very low indeed. Does that one-quarter per cent include brokerage ?

Mr. FOSTER. Brokerage is always extra.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The whole question is one which would bear a good deal of discussion pro and con. I cannot offer a positive opinion on the subject further than that I trust the Minister of Finance has very well considered the effect which the step he has taken might have upon our credit under certain very possible conditions of the London money market. I always knew myself that we could obtain from the Bank of Montreal, as well as from other Canadian banks, terms for negotiating loans and for managing our interest in London considerably below what was likely to be granted by firms like Glyn, Mills & Company, or the Barings, who are now recovering somewhat of their old standing I am happy to hear. But the ground which was taken by Finance Ministers in former days, and, I think, with a good deal of reason, was this : That it was worth the while of Canada to pay a fair market rate, not too much, for the purpose of obtaining the assistance and support in negotiating their loans in England of two or three London houses of the highest possible standing. There is no doubt that is worth something to us. I have no doubt whatever that the Bank of Montreal will do all the ordinary work connected with floating our loans excellently well, and I dare say that it will not be excessively profitable to them, although no doubt they will make both ends meet. But if a crisis were to arise in this country and it were necessary to borrow money temporarily, the hon. gentleman might find that the arrangements which he has made would be possibly inconvenient. The Bank of Montreal are our agents on this side of the Atlantic as well as on the other, and as a mere matter of ordinary prudence, I am not sure that we are doing a very wise thing in having the same persons as our bankers on both sides of the Atlantic. What was done in the case of Australasia, if I remember aright, was that the Australasian colonies entered into an agreement with a powerful corporation of banks, having their headquarters in London. I can easily see that the hon. gentleman, under certain contingencies, might find that the very small saving in proportion to the magnitude of our transactions was rather dearly purchased. The Bank of Montreal, no doubt, is a very excellent institution, and it has got large sums of money at command ; but I am doing no injustice whatever to it in saying that it is at least a questionable point whether in an emergency they would command the confidence of the London money market to the extent that the late agents of Canada did. Although it is a matter within the purview of the Government, I for my part have considerable doubts as to whether a wise discretion has been exercised in severing the connection which subsisted for at least fifty years between old Canada and the Dominion

of Canada and the houses of Glyn, Mills & Co. and the Barings. The hon. gentleman may come to find, as other Finance Ministers have found, that dealing with a Canadian bank exclusively is a grave inconvenience, when that Canadian bank's resources, large as they are, may be strained by exigencies on this side of the Atlantic, and I am bound to say that, considering the comparatively small amount of the saving effected, I think he would have consulted the dictates of prudence better by abstaining from putting all his eggs into one basket, as he has done in the case of the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that the contingency which he has especially brought to the attention of the House did not escape my own attention. I know it is a vital point, and I know that a failure to regard that point would be poorly compensated by a saving of even thousands of dollars on management. But I took especial pains to inform myself on that point by the best means open to me in London; and, without saying anything against the Barings and Glyn, Mills & Co., who have done our business well, and are reputable and strong concerns, I have no hesitation in saying that we can deal just as safely in these respects with the Bank of Montreal as we have done with the Barings and Glyn, Mills & Co. There are several things to be taken into consideration. Under ordinary circumstances, the amount of money we shall have to raise in England from this time out will be comparatively small until the years of redemption come around. But the redemption of old loans is a very different thing from making new loans for new services in the country. Ordinarily speaking, I do not think there is a shadow of a doubt that all the accommodation necessary and all the loans necessary can be just as well brought out under the auspices of our present agent as under the auspices of the old; I do not say better, but I think equally well. The position of Canada's credit, too, is better than it was ten or fifteen years ago, and naturally so, because we are an older country, and the management of our financial affairs and the regularity with which everything has been done, have raised our credit in London to a higher pitch than was the case ten or fifteen years ago, when our former arrangements were entered into; and, unless there should be something very extraordinary in the state of the market, it would not be difficult for us, even if an emergency on this side should make it necessary for us to raise more than we do in ordinary seasons, to go on the London market through the Bank of Montreal and its affiliations. I may say that we are not bound to negotiate through the Bank of Montreal, and I have taken the precaution, in case something extraordinary should happen, to have the power of associating with the Bank of Montreal other banks in London, if in the opinion of the Government it is bet-

ter that that should be done, in bringing out extraordinary loans. So that, taking all these things into consideration, I think we are fairly certain, whilst contingencies must always be provided for, and whilst we make a saving in the ordinary expenses, that we are not abating anything of the safety and security and prestige which are necessary to have our money matters well cared for in the city of London.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just recall to the hon. gentleman's mind one fact. He knows that the Australian colonies always stand in very good credit in London. Latterly their credit has not been so good, and it has been found that, powerfully associated as the Australian banks were, they were not able to render the same assistance to the Australian colonies, though favourite colonies for investment, that houses of the standing of our late agents could have done. That is a mere matter of fact, well known on the London market, and a fact which the hon. gentleman will do well to bear in mind. I have nothing to say against the Bank of Montreal. In its individual capacity it is likely to do as well as any bank I know, possibly as well as any London bank. But it will be liable, as the hon. gentleman knows, under certain contingencies, to have its resources drawn upon heavily in Canada. There might be some advantage in having the Bank of Montreal as our Canadian banker, and Glyn, Mills & Co. as our London bankers. However, I have discharged my conscience in the matter. I would have hesitated, however great the possible gain, to take the risk, but that is the hon. gentleman's affair. The transfer has actually taken place. I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, on the 1st of January.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before we leave this point, I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether the promise made by Sir John Macdonald, at the time Sir Charles Tupper was appointed High Commissioner, that a very large saving would be effected by utilizing him in the handling of our financial matters in the interest of the Dominion, is likely to be fulfilled? For several years this question has been put to the Finance Minister, and he has stated on several occasions that our contract with our financial agents in London would not expire until the first of the year, and that the Government would then possibly have an opportunity of utilizing Sir Charles Tupper and his staff for the purpose named by the late First Minister. I would like to know from the Finance Minister whether any effort was made by him to reduce the commissions or the expenses in London by using Sir Charles Tupper's staff in that way?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that I always had it in mind, when the ten years expired, to make an investigation into that subject, with the view

of ascertaining if it were feasible to turn over the management of our financial affairs to the High Commissioner's office in London; and I was not long investigating the matter on the spot before coming to the conclusion that it was neither desirable nor feasible, either in the interest of economy or in the interest of that prestige, security and safety which my hon. friend the former Finance Minister has spoken of this afternoon. In the first place, as regards economy, I found, after going into the matter thoroughly, that we would make very little, if any, saving upon the terms we have made with the Bank of Montreal; and, in the second place, I found very quickly that we would lose that prestige which comes from having large monetary influences, such as banks and the associations of banks, back of us, particularly in the issuing of loans. It may have been thought possible, at the same time, for that to be done. I do not think that it is considered possible by any persons who have gone into the matter with the view of bringing it down to a practical issue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was promised by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, and was made one of the grounds for establishing the High Commissionership.

Mr. FOSTER. There may have been something said with reference to that. The Commissioner has been of great advantage to us in London in financial matters, arranging for temporary loans at times and in other respects, but that is a different matter from handing over to him the financial management of our debt.

Mr. McMULLEN. I dare say the hon. gentleman would find very great inconvenience in using Sir Charles Tupper to the extent promised at the time of his appointment, but it is undoubtedly the fact that his appointment was consented to largely under the promise of the First Minister at that time, that we would save considerably by having a resident financial agent in London. In consequence of that promise, we consented to his being over there doing little or nothing, in the hope that the day would arrive at no distant time when we would be able to use him to better advantage. If you will look over the staff the High Commissioner keeps and the amount of work done by his office, you cannot fail to come to the conclusion that his office is one from which Canada receives very little in return for what it costs. I am sorry to find that many things which might be well and profitably performed by his staff are not done. We pay enormous amounts in London for duties performed by immigration agents, in the publishing of pamphlets and work of that kind, which could be done by the High Commissioner's staff or by his staff and our agents combined. When we come to the item in that connection, I will have something more to say upon it, and in the meantime must express my regret that the pro-

Mr. FOSTER.

mise of the First Minister who was in office when Sir Charles Tupper was appointed, has not been carried out. No doubt, the hon. gentleman found it would be expensive to do so, but the House was led to understand that a considerable saving would be effected, when our contract with our financial agents expired. Now, however, we find him making a new contract at a reduced rate, the rate being reduced, not because of Sir Charles Tupper being in London, but for other reasons. We have still the High Commissioner over there at a very high salary and virtually doing nothing in the one matter to which he owes his appointment.

Mr. MULOCK. Have the Government debentures that form part of the sinking fund been all transferred?

Mr. FOSTER. They have been.

Mr. MULOCK. The redeemed debentures have been placed in the custody of the Bank of Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. As I told my hon. friend last year, in the case of guaranteed loans the debentures have always been in the custody of the Bank of England. In the case of the unguaranteed loans, the trusteeship has been transferred to the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. Are they in the Bank of Montreal subject to the order of three trustees?

Mr. FOSTER. They are in the vaults at Ottawa and no transfer can be made without communication with the department at Ottawa, and the certificate which is here of the inscribed stock must be forwarded. When debentures, for instance, are bought and turned into inscribed stock, our cancelled debentures are sent here and burned according to the Audit Act, and the certificates of inscribed stock are kept here, and the Finance Minister is one of the trustees, so that everything is as safe as it can possibly be.

Mr. MULOCK. Then all these Government securities that are payable to bearer, when redeemed, are in due course forwarded to Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. All the debentures when cancelled are sent to Ottawa and burned here.

Mr. MULOCK. Still there is a form of sinking fund maintained by the issue of stock. So far as your books are concerned, it would appear that these debentures are kept in the hands of the creditors. I understand you keep your sinking fund the same as ordinary corporations?

Mr. FOSTER. The sinking fund is in the hands of trustees. The guaranteed loans fund is in the hands of certain trustees different from the unguaranteed loans. They hold both debentures and inscribed stock, and these are in the custody of the Bank of England. For our own sinking fund we buy through our trustees, of whom the Receiver-General is one, inscribed stock, and the trusteeship

has been transferred from Barings and Glyn, Mills & Co. to the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there is a question as to the wisdom of the destruction of the Government debentures. It is not considered, as a rule, the right way to treat redeemed debentures, to destroy them. On the surface it would seem the most convenient way to prevent their getting into circulation, but in the case of forgery the production of the original debenture in its cancelled form would be a complete answer to the claim. The moment you destroy the original, you destroy the strongest evidence against the forgery. It is not the custom, I think, to destroy debentures, but to so effectually cancel them that they can never be utilized again. Who are the trustees of the sinking fund in connection with the funds in the Bank of England, the guaranteed loan?

Mr. FOSTER. They are the two under secretaries, one of the Colonial Office and the other of the Treasury, and Lord Revelstoke, and the High Commissioner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do we pay those gentlemen?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these debentures subject to their order as trustees? Could they remove them from the Bank of England to another place if they so desired?

Mr. FOSTER. That I cannot say. I think, in the case of guaranteed loans, it is stipulated by the home Government that the debentures should be kept in the Bank of England.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose the securities got astray, who would sustain the loss? They are the security to the Imperial Government for their obligations. Supposing they got astray who loses, the Government of England or Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how they can go astray. The trustees are responsible under, I suppose, general Acts which govern them in Great Britain. They deposit the securities in the Bank of England, and that, I should judge, should be a sufficient guarantee that they will be well and properly looked after. As to what are the legal relations governing the responsibility between the Bank of England and the trustees I cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is rather a material question. It appears to me it would be well to have those debentures treated in the same way as the others. I am only alluding to such debentures as are payable to bearer. Of course inscribed stock being payable to order, no risk arises in respect to that class, but there is some risk in the case of debentures payable to bearer. It is, I think, important that the House should know the legal position of those debentures. They are growing in volume.

Mr. FOSTER. The debentures are not increasing in volume. The inscribed stock is increasing and the debentures have been largely transferred into inscribed stock.

Mr. MULOCK. If all the debentures were transferred into inscribed stock my remarks would have no force; but I understand it is the custom to leave in the Bank of England all the debentures which are not converted into inscribed stock, and I understand there is a large portion of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a considerable portion of debentures; but I cannot say how much.

Mr. MULOCK. Payable to bearer?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. That is, they are payable to the order of three officials, of course of unquestionable integrity; but why should not these securities have an additional security and be made payable to order so that no possible accident could happen? Could they be withdrawn on the order of the three gentlemen in question?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is raising a point which may appear of importance to him, though I doubt if any importance is to be attached to it. We have had this arrangement not only since Confederation but under the united provinces as well, and during all that period there has not been a single instance of a miss or a loss or any mismanagement of the funds. I do not think there is any just cause for alarm.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not say there is cause for alarm; but the pitcher went to the well a great many times and at last it got broken. If it is possible to have an additional safeguard it is our duty to have it, and if millions of dollars of securities of Canada are lying at the order of three persons, notwithstanding their undoubted integrity, if it is possible for us to add another check we should do so. I would ask the Minister at an early date to inform the committee whether these securities are payable to bearer, what is the amount now in the Bank of England, and are they withdrawable on the order of those three gentlemen.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask what is the arrangement now made with respect to the transfer of inscribed stock. Is any duty now paid on the transfer from one name to another? That was a matter of some considerable discussion and correspondence between the Government of Canada and the home Government, who, I think, used to put a duty on those transfers.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is a duty of 2s. 6d. on debenture stock, and I think 12s. 6d. per cent on inscribed stock. That is the stamp duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not for the transfer from one man to another?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that is for the issue of the stock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was an attempt made in the English House some time ago to put a duty on all transfers of stock. I do not know if it was carried into effect, or whether it affects all stocks. Of course, if it does, we are in no worse position than any other proprietor. But I think there was a proposal to put a duty on colonial stocks.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure, but I think there is a small duty on the transfer of stocks, but if so it affects all stocks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A great many of those stocks were used as what are technically called "floaters." If there is a duty on the transfer of inscribed stock, it would materially interfere with its free use.

Mr. FOSTER. It would if it were on ours and not on others, but I am sure that there is no discrimination as between colonial stocks and stocks in general.

Inspector. \$1,700

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the present inspector?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. George Crookshank.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long is it since he was appointed?

Mr. FOSTER. I think about two years. Mr. Tims, the former inspector, was superannuated, and the assistant inspector became inspector, so that we saved one officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the salary?

Mr. FOSTER. \$1,700, with travelling expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that Mr. Tims was superannuated at \$1,820 a year, and the assistant now gets the same salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Tims received a high salary—\$2,200, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was \$2,600. How is it he receives over \$1,800 superannuation?

Mr. FOSTER. He was superannuated in the ordinary way and received no additional time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose Mr. Crookshank is the son of the late inspector at St. John?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has he been in the service?

Mr. FOSTER. He was private secretary of Sir Leonard Tilley for some years before that.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister must be mistaken in the date. His name does not appear on the printed list laid before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. It ought to be. We have not estimated for Mr. Tims for, I think, two years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, yes, I now see his name on page B—215. He got it for six months last year. Then he cannot be superannuated two years.

Mr. FOSTER. It is nearly two years. That is for 1891-92.

Assistant Receiver-General's Office,

Halifax. \$8,300

Mr. FOSTER. The decrease here arises from the fact that the Finance Department has, up to the present time, paid rent for the building in which this office is kept. The Public Works Department has now assumed the property, and so this decrease is apparent rather than real.

Assistant Receiver-General's Office,

St. John. \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. The reduction here is caused by a reduction in the official staff since last year. The Assistant Receiver-General in St. John has been superannuated. He was Mr. R. W. Crookshank, and his superannuation amounts to \$1,540 per year. In his place, Mr. H. D. McLeod has been appointed, and the staff has been rearranged. The total amount of pay under the old staff was \$7,150; the total amount of pay, including the superannuation allowance of Mr. Crookshank, under the new arrangement, is \$7,170; so that there has been an increase in total salaries of \$20. Mr. Crookshank was superannuated on the 21st January this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was Mr. H. D. McLeod previously employed in the department, or was he brought in from the outside?

Mr. FOSTER. He was previously employed in the department, but that only partially answers the question. He has been previously employed in it for about a year. He was brought in from the outside and now takes charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that rather calculated to discourage officers in the department? It is customary to make promotions from among officers who do their duty well, and here you have brought a party in from the outside and put him over their heads.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think it would have that effect in this case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that some of these officers were fit to be promoted, and here they are deprived of their promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that in arranging for who shall have charge of the Assistant Receiver-General's office, it is necessary, in the first place, to get a good capable man, to get a man more than ordinarily capable. In respect to this particular case, Mr. McLeod is

a gentleman of whose capabilities I have not the least doubt. He has had long experience in the work of an accountant and in the management of concerns involving large expenditures, and in every way he is thoroughly capable and thoroughly honest. I may say further, as I have been driven to say it, and I am quite willing to say it, that I would not have recommended any other person at present in that office to take charge of the Assistant Receiver-General's office, although that is not saying that we have not faithful and honest and capable clerks in that department. I would be very sorry to have any other impression go abroad.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does pedigree count for anything in these matters?

Mr. FOSTER. It does sometimes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am inclined to think if Mr. McLeod's pedigree could be traced, that it might be found not among the least important of his qualification.

Mr. FOSTER. I think Mr. McLeod would not be at all ashamed if his pedigree were traced. He does happen to be related to the present Finance Minister. That is not detrimental to him, perhaps, nor to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the connection?

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend is so anxious to know—his mother and my mother were sisters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under these circumstances, no doubt, the promotion is to a large extent explained. Have you any more first cousins?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a few more. If my hon. friend will have proper patience, he remaining there and I remaining here, he may become acquainted with some more.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister is following out the course adopted by his predecessor. I made it my duty to ascertain the number of relations that the ex-Finance Minister, Sir Leonard Tilley, had in office a few years ago, and I think there were fifty-seven.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not lived as long as he has.

Salaries in Country Savings Banks:
New Brunswick, Nova Scotia
and Prince Edward Island. . . . \$11,650

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year there was a reduction in the number of savings banks, and the Finance Minister explained that it was his intention to turn over their accounts to the Post Office Department. Now, I am sorry to notice that there is no reduction in number this year. Of course last year, I believe, one of the managers died, and in that case the account was transferred. I notice in looking over the places where those savings banks are located that they are in large trading centres in the Maritime Provinces, as in several large seaport towns; therefore, I

cannot see why they are still to be kept in existence when we have got post office savings banks in those places. I do not see why these accounts should not be transferred to the Post Office Department, and thus save a large amount of money. I should like to know if the Minister of Finance has any hope that this can be done. I observe that there are no less than thirty-three of these institutions in existence. Does the Minister of Finance intend to keep them in existence until the incumbents of the office die?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I explained this matter to the House last year. The policy is to change those savings institutions into post office savings banks, and to let them drop, owing to the death of the officer in charge, or for other sufficient reasons. The fact that there has been no change last year is because no officer has died and no case of inefficiency has been reported. It never was proposed to make a wholesale change, but simply to change as opportunity arose from the two causes I have mentioned.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope the number will not be reduced by placing the officers on the superannuation list.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not eligible for superannuation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad if they do not contribute to that fund, which has been increasing rapidly. As the officers receive salaries of only \$300 or \$400 a year it is evident they are engaged in other business. This is only a sop that might be taken away.

Mr. FOSTER. When transferred to the Post Office Department, the work is still attended with expense, although there is a saving on the whole.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is a considerable reduction on the items for commission for payment of interest on public debt, purchase of sinking funds and transfer of stock. I hope we may expect still further reductions.

Dominion Notes, Issue and Redemption \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. The matter has been very fully explained. As the sum we pay for the management of the debt in London has been decreased, this saving is effected. In regard to the item of \$5,000 for expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, I desire to add the words "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How are you going to use this amount?

Mr. FOSTER. I will explain. This amount is for expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes; it is for counting, signing and cancellation of Dominion notes. The work is done by a staff of women, ten or eleven in number, who are constantly employed at so much per day. Most of them, I think, have not passed the Civil Service examination, and are not eligible for

appointment from length of service. If the Civil Service Act was made to apply to them, as it otherwise would, the Auditor-General, having determined to apply it, in these cases, it would work an injustice to those women, who are thoroughly capable of doing the work and who do it well, by turning them out and replacing them by an equal number of other persons. So I think it is only fair, and the House will no doubt readily assent to the proposition, that we should protect them and continue to employ them at the work, as they have performed it for ten or eleven years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Am I correct in stating that authorization was given for the issue of Dominion notes to the extreme limit, \$20,000,000, which the law permits?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman contemplate asking Parliament for authority to increase that issue?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not altogether determined. At present I do not, but circumstances may arise before this session is over which will make it desirable to apply to Parliament in respect of this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman state what is the actual issue?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state exactly, but it is very close on \$20,000,000; but there are certain causes for that, which probably may not last long.

Dominion Notes, Printing. . . . \$45,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice the item of \$45,000 for printing Dominion notes. No less than \$49,900 were expended last year, and almost \$5,000 must have been overdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will observe that the sum of \$45,000 is for 1892-93, the current year. The year before that is the year when \$49,900 were expended, and that expenditure was under the old contract. It will be remembered that last year a new contract was brought down by which the work will be done for a reduced sum, and although \$49,900 were spent under the old contract, \$45,000 will prove sufficient to do the work under the new one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any other firm besides the Burland Printing Company that prints bank notes for the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. No; our contract is solely with them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any other competing firm?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; there is a firm in Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any other firm capable of tendering for the work?

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders were called for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Tenders were formally called for, I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not a matter of simply going through the form, but bona fide tenders were put in. There is a company in Montreal that does good work, and it is stated they are capable of doing this work in question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did they tender?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was their tender above or below the tender of this company?

Mr. FOSTER. We went over the whole of this matter last year. Tenders were handed in by two parties, one being the Canada Bank Note Company, of Montreal, and the other the Burland Company. It will be recollected that I explained last year that the former contract was with the Burland Company, and it was one of the conditions of the contract that the firm should come to Ottawa and erect a satisfactory building in which to carry on the work. Under that former contract for five years the firm removed to Ottawa and erected a building on Wellington street, a very excellent building in every respect. When the tenders were received last year and examined, it was found that they were on the whole as nearly equal as they could be, and the Government decided to give the contract to the old firm because of the very large expenditure incurred by them in compliance with the request of the Government in erecting a building here, in order that the work might be more under the supervision of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. With respect to the issue of Dominion notes, are they printed and signed, and when ready for use stored in the vaults of the Finance Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are they issued through the several Receivers-General throughout the Dominion, and again issued by them to the banks?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who finally signs the notes?

Mr. FOSTER. These women, for whom this \$5,000 is asked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they really sign them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; for the Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is a stamp used?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is a sign manual. They sign their own names.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe a considerable increase in the item for printing and advertising and like charges.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase, because last year's estimate was insufficient.

Committee rose, and, it being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia and Defence Dept. . . . \$45,462 50

Mr. FOSTER. There are eleven statutory increases of \$50 and an additional second-class clerk to fill the place of one promoted.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with these several departments I notice that there are quite a number of clerks who draw their salary for the year, and who in addition get extra pay for extra services. I have drawn the attention of the House for several sessions to the fact that the system of allowing clerks who draw extra pay for extra work is an absurd one.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that any of the thirty-three clerks in this department are drawing extra pay?

Mr. McMULLEN. I speak of the system generally and I am not prepared to refer to particulars just now.

Mr. FOSTER. None of these are.

Mr. McMULLEN. That may be so, but I say that the custom is becoming more common in the several departments of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the point my friend is aiming at, but I think we had better keep ourselves to the business-like rule of last year and the year before, which was to confine ourselves to the discussion of the item under consideration. There are none of these clerks drawing extra salary, and my hon. friend will have ample opportunity of discussing this matter when the particular item to which he refers comes up.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is utterly impossible for a member to keep track of all the payments of this kind for extra services, because there is an enormous list of these clerks who draw extra pay. The hon. gentleman is evidently anxious to get through supply as rapidly as possible and no one finds fault with him for proceeding with it so early in the session, but it is our duty to have a reasonable and intelligent discussion of the public expenditure. We cannot rush through these items, lest we might find that certain matters have escaped our attention which should be subject to the criticisms of hon. gentlemen. We have a duty to perform in criticising expenditures, and we wish to perform that duty with all courtesy to the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. This subject of extra pay to civil servants is one which deserves attention, because I have come to the conclusion that the first thing a clerk does when he is placed in a position is to look around to see if he can obtain extra pay. The Minister of Finance can find on the first pages of the Auditor-General's Report the names of

hundreds of clerks who have drawn extra pay for extra work. Some of them have positions in which they draw a salary of \$2,000 a year, and yet they are allowed extra pay for some trifling work which they may do in the very office in which they are engaged. This is a growing evil and should be put a stop to now and forever. It is a wrong system and it is one which should be drawn to the attention of the Government and the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that this Department of Militia and Defence appears to be very heavily manned. Thirty-two clerks and messengers ought, in all conscience, to be enough, and there ought to be a very distinct explanation of the reason for the appointment of another officer. You require thirty-three people, independent of the minister himself, to superintend the clerical part of the expenditure of about \$1,250,000 all told. I have known businesses of vastly larger extent conducted by half a dozen people. All these men, too, are very highly paid. Deducting the messengers, there are twenty-nine gentlemen drawing \$43,000, which represents an average salary of about \$1,500 apiece. I think, under the circumstances, we should know who this extra gentleman is, and what is the reason of his employment.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the promotion from the third class to the second class of a gentleman who has been at the top of his class for some time. His place is filled by a third-class clerk coming in at the minimum salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. minister will look at page A-78 of the Auditor-General's Report, he will find several cases of the class I have mentioned. For instance, Lieut.-Col. Irwin, inspector of artillery, who gets a salary of \$2,300, is paid in addition, as commandant of batteries, for 366 days at \$1.25 per day, amounting to \$457.50. On the same page the hon. gentleman will find several cases of the same kind. I do think this whole question of extra pay should receive some action at the hands of the Government. Every year it is getting worse. Every man, the moment he is installed in office, seems to try to get some hook whereon he can hang a claim for extra pay, and very generally he gets it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the Government had expressly stated that they were going to put a complete stop to the system of extra pay.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true. My hon. friend is speaking of a class of officers entirely outside of the departments at Ottawa, and, in nearly every case I believe there is the best of reasons for the double pay, that is, the reason of economy. For instance, on a canal there is a man who acts as lockmaster, but you want some one to collect the tolls, and, instead of appointing another man for that purpose, you allow the lockmaster a slight addition for doing that

work. In the same way, excisemen who have salaries, are engaged in the preventive work of the department, and for this they are allowed a small proportion of the seizures. Then, some of the collectors of customs do the work of arranging for fishery bounties, and receive a small commission for that work, which is more economical than it would be to appoint special officers. But, as regards the officers in Ottawa, my hon. friend's criticisms were not directed to them, because double payment does not occur here.

Mr. McMULLEN. In some cases, I admit it may be an advantage to allow a commission where officials are authorized to collect fees, but in many cases that argument will not apply. If the hon. Minister will look at the beginning of the Auditor-General's Report, he will find the names of a large number of men who are drawing double pay. For instance, I will call his attention to one. L. O. Bourget gets a salary of \$1,170 as accountant of the North-west Government at Regina, and for keeping the books of the Board of Education he gets \$100. Now, I would like to know why we should pay him that extra \$100 when he is well paid for his services otherwise?

Secretary of State's Department.....\$42,285

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here there is also an increase of one officer, as well as apparently several promotions. The hon. Minister will please inform us why this additional appointment was required, and also the names of the gentlemen promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. There are twenty statutory increases of \$50, one of \$37.50 and two of \$30. Then, there is the promotion from the second class to the first class of two gentlemen who have been at the head of the second class for several years, and whom the minister thinks worthy of promotion. Their names are Irwin and Leroy. On the other hand, my hon. friend will see that there is a decrease in the second-class clerks of one. There were eleven last year, and there are ten this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many statutory increases?

Mr. FOSTER. One at \$37.50 and two at \$30.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were there any superannuations during the year?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I think not. I find that Mr. Timms was superannuated on the 1st of January, 1892, at \$1,820. Number of years of service, thirty-three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He received almost the full amount?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; his salary was \$2,600.

Printing and Stationery.....\$25,574 50

Mr. FOSTER. There are ten statutory increases at \$50, one at \$37.50, and one at

Mr. FOSTER.

\$22.50. Then there are two second-class clerks made. These were transferred from the temporary staff where they were getting \$936 each, and the vacancies thus created in the temporary staff will not be filled up. These two men, the Queen's Printer has told me, are excellent men who have been a long time in the temporary service, and he thought it better they should be made permanent and not replaced in the temporary staff, so that although it seems an increase of two second-class clerks there is a decrease of \$1,872 in the temporary staff. Then there is an increase to Mr. McMahon, Superintendent of Printing, of \$300.

North-west Mounted Police—
Comptroller.....\$9,742 50

Mr. FOSTER. In this there are two statutory increases at \$50: one at \$62.50, and one at \$30, making in all \$192.50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the chief comptroller?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. White.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the hon. gentleman inform us whether there have been any additions to the force during the year?

Mr. FOSTER. On the contrary, there was a reduction. When the estimates for the main part of the service come on all the information will be here. There is a decrease of about \$50. It is not intended to fill up their places.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear that, because I think it is about time we should seriously consider the propriety of dispensing with the force altogether. I cannot see any necessity for its continuance, except to prevent smuggling on the border. It is an item of considerable expense. We have been for years drawing the attention of the Government to the enormous expense connected with the force, and were glad to hear last year that the Government intended to reduce it. There has not been a sufficient reduction as yet.

Mr. FOSTER. A reduction of \$50,000 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not enough, and that reduction is not due simply to the decrease in the number of the force, but to the reduced cost of maintaining it compared with the days when the country was unsettled and we had to pay high charges for bringing in supplies. Except to prevent smuggling there is really no necessity for the force at all. The Indians have all settled down, and the Government surely do not anticipate another Indian war, and it is sincerely to be hoped that we will not have another half-breed rebellion, for, if we do, we might dispose of the country for the cost, if it should amount to what we paid for the last rebellion.

Indian Affairs Dept. \$50,952 50

Mr. FOSTER. There were formerly two private secretaries, one for the Interior Department and one for Indian Affairs. The Minister proposes to do with one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the same officials remain who were here last year without any change or superannuation?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Finance and Treasury Board. . . . \$50,500

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$722.10, entirely a statutory increase. There are no changes.

Customs Department. \$35,137 50

Mr. FOSTER. These are statutory increases. Difference between the salary of clerk, transferred from the Post Office Department and estimated salary, \$475; difference in the salary of messenger, \$140; less difference between the salary of second class clerk transferred to Montreal and salary estimates for his successor, \$87.50, difference in commissioner's salary and assistant commissioner's salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose, in future, to dispense with the latter officer?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; under the statute creating the new officer and abolishing the old one.

Agriculture. \$52,350

Mr. FOSTER. There is a decrease here, owing to the transfer of certain clerks to the Interior Department on account of immigration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see here an inspector of quarantine is put down at a salary, which certainly does not seem extravagant, of \$300.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the accountant, Mr. J. B. Lynch, whose salary is voted just above. He was inspector of quarantines and of immigration offices and received a sum of money for that. He is now inspector of quarantines and receives \$300 for that. He is a very efficient officer in his capacity of accountant, as well as in that of inspector of quarantines.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might ask if the Minister has any information to give to the Committee as to the important question which is now agitating the minds of the people as to what steps can be taken for the more rigid enforcement of quarantine during the approaching season. It is hardly necessary to say that there is more than a suspicion abroad that there may be an outbreak of cholera in this country this year, as there was in Europe last year, and if the hon. gentleman has any information to give to the House as to the steps the Government propose to take, if they have made up their

minds to take any, as I presume they have, I think he should give us the information. The question is of very great moment, and I believe that all the precautions we can take will not be too great to prevent the importation of cholera into this country during the approaching season.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have taken all the steps they think necessary to enforce at the beginning of the season, and, in fact, almost immediately an efficient quarantine on all sides of our coasts. The station at Grosse Isle is being fitted up with the most improved and the most modern apparatus, so that there will be no lack as far as that is concerned. Buildings that will be necessary for the care of passengers while they are detained at the quarantine station, those who are not suffering from an attack of cholera, are being erected and will be ready for the opening of navigation and will be fitted up with all the appliances necessary for their comfort. Then there will be also ready for the opening of navigation sufficient houses for the care of those who may be infected with the disease—that, of course, to a certain extent. If a large outbreak of the disease were to take place and a large number of infected people were to be placed on the island, of course extra measures would have to be taken in regard to providing tents and so on in which to house them. However, every step is being taken to place that station in a proper shape. The same thing is being done at Halifax, where a quarantine station is being fitted up, and a building is being erected with all the appliances necessary, and that station will be perfectly equipped and in order in a month or two. In St. John the same preparations are being made, though on a less extensive scale, the number of passengers arriving there by steamer being smaller, but those preparations will be effective as far as that is concerned. On the Pacific coast the Government have purchased a new site for a quarantine station a little further out than the old one, which was found to be unsuitable. One great defect of the old station was that it was difficult to get in and out to and from it, and, when it was agitated that we should build a wharf there to accommodate the passengers landing, it was found that the cost of building a wharf would be very large, and it is rough there as well; so land for a new quarantine station has been purchased, and new quarantine quarters are being fitted up. That, also, with a wharf and proper accommodation, will be ready in a short time. These are the four principal organized points. Besides that, precautions will be taken at Sydney and whatever other exposed ports it is considered necessary to establish quarantine precautions at, so that, on the whole, I think nothing will be found to be complained of at the opening of navigation. The total amount of money to be expended upon these works, which will appear in the Estimates, is quite large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has stated what he is going to do with respect to Canada proper. Can he inform us whether any communication has passed, or any concerted scheme of action has been arranged between the Canadian Government and the United States authorities? This is a subject upon which, I presume, they can act conjointly without any heart-burnings or differences, and, as our boundary is continuous with theirs for about 3,000 miles, I think the hon. gentleman will see that whatever we may do will be of very little use unless there is concerted action with the United States on both the Atlantic and the Pacific sea coasts.

Mr. FOSTER. There is every reason for believing that the quarantine regulations on the coasts of the United States will be very thorough and complete, and I know that our authorities and the quarantine authorities on the other side have been in constant communication, and I have no doubt that the unanimity of action which my hon. friend speaks of as so necessary will exist between the quarantine authorities on both sides.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly we are not disposed to impel the hon. gentleman to any unnecessary expenditure, but, speaking for myself, and, I believe, speaking for my hon. friend here, I may say that we are not going to put any obstacle in the way of any well-considered expenditure with the view to protect the people of Canada from such a visitation as cholera might be. On that point I think the House will agree that the Government is entitled to a free hand.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government are taking a pretty free hand in reference to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have known of cholera visitations in Canada before now, and there is no doubt that a reasonable expenditure is a very wise thing, if in any shape or way it can prevent the spread of it.

Marine and Fisheries.....\$50,005

Mr. FOSTER. There are twenty-eight statutory increases of \$50, that is \$1,400. There is a difference in the estimate for a messenger of \$50, and there is a clerk at \$900, making \$2,350, the total increase. The clerk who is put in at \$900 is a young man, a graduate of Kingston, who was employed upon Commander Boulton's Georgian Bay Staff. He is a young man of good parts, diligent and painstaking, and he has been on that survey up to the present time. Now, that a change is taking place, he is no longer necessary on the survey, and the Minister has taken him into the department, where he needs a clerk, at the same salary he was receiving on the survey.

Mr. MULOCK. You have only one deputy-head there now. Should there not be a greater decrease in the salaries?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not estimate for the current year for the deputy who was dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the House is entitled to some explanation as to what this new clerk in the Marine Department is required for. If I gathered correctly from the hon. gentleman's remarks, the Georgian Bay survey has been terminated.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then is Capt. Boulton proceeding with the Georgian Bay survey?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Capt. Boulton's services terminated at the end of the current year, this spring, but the Georgian Bay survey is not finished. It continues under the management of a gentleman who has been with Commander Boulton from the first inception of the work. He is a graduate of Kingston, and has served his time with Commander Boulton, and has become thoroughly proficient. Last year he made a survey of part of Burrard Inlet under his own management entirely, which survey was accepted by the Admiralty Department as in every way well done, and he was recommended by Commander Boulton as in every way fitted to carry on the survey work as satisfactorily as need be. This young man is now taking charge of the hydrographic survey, and will continue the operations of which Commander Boulton formerly had charge. Commander Boulton's time expires this spring. This young man was on the survey; but under the rearrangement that has been made he is no longer necessary there, and the Minister of Marine requiring his services, has transferred him to his department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to discuss the Georgian Bay survey at the present time, as we will have another opportunity of doing so. Still, I think that concerning the introduction of a new clerk into the Marine Department at a salary of \$900, we are entitled to some further information as to what branch he is to take charge of, and if he is necessary at all. It has been generally considered that that department was pretty well manned; it is almost conceded that it was over-manned, and the superannuation of the deputy head of the Fisheries Department was an acknowledgment of the contention that the place was over-manned. I have never heard any complaint that the Marine Department was shorthanded. I would like to know what are the duties of this new official who starts at a salary of \$900.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot exactly say the duties which he has to perform. I may say, however, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which was formerly divided, is now united, and it takes in the whole of the marine interests of this country, and the whole of the fishery interests of this country. There is

scarcely a nook or corner of Canada in which these two interests do not run and where they do not require supervision. Our large extent of sea coast and our large extent of fishing waters, which have to be protected and cared for, make an amount of detailed work as large, if not larger, than is to be found in any other branch of the Government. I know that from my own experience. If you look at the number of clerks, thirty-nine in all, I do not think, taking into account the work that has to be done and the immense amount of details, that the staff is extravagant. That a deputy head has been taken away is not proof that it was over-manned, but is a proof that it was considered better that the two departments should be merged into one, and that one deputy head should have charge of the whole—over-manned, possibly, in the deputy head's service; that must have been the opinion of the Minister. Not being the Minister of the department, I do not know exactly what work this new clerk is to take charge of; but I have no doubt that the work is there, and that he will do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt that the department is important, and has its officers in every part of the Dominion of Canada; but these men are there discharging public duties, and are paid for it. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman sincerely believes that a new clerk is needed; but the question is, what grounds are there for making the appointment. It looks to me as if the place was being made for the man, and not the man appointed to a place where his services were required. It seems to me that if a young man was required there the hon. gentleman who has now charge of the department should be able to explain to the House what services he is going to perform. Otherwise such explanation as has been given would be a justification for the importation of half a dozen men or more into that or any other department. The House always expects when new men are introduced into the service that a reasonable explanation should be made as to increase of work or other cause justifying the appointment. This case looks very much as if it were one in which the place was made for the man.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ascertain from the department exactly the branch in which this work is required to be done and the character of the work, and I am willing to guarantee that the explanation will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House is entitled to an explanation. This committee sits for the purpose of checking extravagance, and while the hon. gentleman may be convinced that the vote is a proper one, the grounds on which it is asked should be stated to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I will see that an explanation is given.

Mr. McMULLEN. I call the attention of the Minister to the system adopted in the preparation of bounty cheques.

Mr. FOSTER. We shall come to the bounty vote at a subsequent stage, when this question can be fully discussed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the discussion is applicable to the present vote for salaries. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor-General's Report, A-102, he will find a list of clerks to whom were paid \$3,516, and in addition for the preparation of bounty cheques last year, \$1,898. This is part of the system adopted by every department. Why is it considered necessary to employ clerks during extra hours to prepare bounty cheques? Twelve clerks were so employed, who, although they were receiving salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,400 per annum, were paid an additional sum of \$1,898.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will have patience he will get at the items for a similar vote to that taken last year. The Minister in charge will then be able to give him a satisfactory answer this year, as was given last year, or there would not have been a vote of Parliament for the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That statement does not cover the question raised by my hon. friend as to the propriety or impropriety of paying clerks extra amounts when they are now receiving considerable salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. A discussion on this subject took place last year in regard to the change made from that of previous years when extra clerks entirely were employed to do this work, and the Minister showed that it could be done more economically by giving extra pay to clerks in the office. A special sum was voted for that purpose, and a special sum is asked this year for the same. When that vote comes under consideration, the principle can be fully discussed.

Public Works Department. \$50,555

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there are a large number of additional clerks employed, while, I admit, there is very little additional expense.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that for a number of years the Department of Public Works has had a comparatively small establishment at Ottawa as the civil service establishment. It has, however, had a very large number of temporary clerks so-called, but who have been permanent temporaries, such as architects, engineers, draftsmen and the like, who had formerly been paid out of the votes for the different public works. That system was abolished last year, and a vote was taken for the clerks at Ottawa who had formerly been paid out of the different public works for which appropriations were made. The minister last year dispensed with a number

of those temporary clerks. This year he has dispensed with some more of them; but he proposes to fill up his permanent establishment to what he considers the complement from those who have been transferred from the permanent temporary staff to the civil service staff. So there is an addition of one first-class clerk, one second-class, four third-class clerks at small salaries, making up a total of forty instead of thirty-five.

Mr. McMULLEN. The minister says a number of the temporary clerks are permanent temporaries, and he proposes to remove them from that class and make them permanent. Under the superannuation system I presume that these clerks would be entitled on taking advantage of the superannuation, to claim for the entire time that they have been in the service as temporary clerks when they are put on the permanent list.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. In what relation do they stand to the superannuation law?

Mr. FOSTER. None. They are outside of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When they are put on the permanent list they are not outside of it.

Mr. FOSTER. When they are put on the permanent list they pay superannuation abatement from the time they become on the permanent list, and get the advantage of the Superannuation Act in proportion to the time they have served on the permanent list, not on the temporary. Suppose a temporary clerk had been temporary for twenty years, and was, in this vote, made permanent as an engineer, say at a certain salary, his civil service, as far as superannuation goes, commences with the day he is appointed on the permanent list, and his abatement commences at the same time. His advantages for superannuation are in proportion to the time he serves on the permanent list, not upon the temporary list.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there not been a suggestion that these temporary clerks, when they enter on the permanent list, by paying in the sum they would be required to pay had they been permanent clerks, would be allowed to participate in the superannuation from the date of their appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. That was done at the time of the passing of the Superannuation Act with reference to old servants who had been in the employ of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is asking here for practically the same amount as he asked for last year, but in the report of the Auditor-General for the expenditure of the department for the year before, I find that only \$36,082 were expended out of a total of \$50,107, leaving an unexpended balance of \$14,000. Would the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because there were several vacancies which were not filled up; Those of Perley, Arnoldi and some others. These vacancies were not filled, and the work was done by the permanent temporary engineers. This year Mr. Coste is chief engineer at \$3,200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all of that unexpended \$14,000 is accounted for in that way? It is more than one-third of the whole expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; by these suspensions and other vacancies. The reason for the large number of clerks and the decrease in the total amount voted arises from the fact that several of the large salaried offices were vacant during the year preceding, because my hon. friend refers to the appropriation in the Auditor-General's Report for 1891-92. They have, however, been in part filled during the current year. Amongst those I remember there would be the position of chief engineer, formerly occupied by Mr. Perley, which has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Coste. The chief clerkship has been dropped, which accounts for \$2,400 of the reduction. Mr. Arnoldi's place has also been filled. Then there were several vacancies among the second and third class clerks which have not been filled, but the higher class of clerkships have been divided into lower class clerkships, enabling a larger number of clerks to be taken on at a diminution of cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. When I raised the question whether the temporary clerks, when placed on the permanent list and allowed to participate in the superannuation fund, were credited with their entire period of service, my attention had been called to that point by correspondence that passed between the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Clerk of the Privy Council, to be found on page A-9 of the Auditor-General's Report. In an Order in Council there given, it is stated:

The Board, in compliance with the law, have recommended favourably on the cases submitted to them, but at the same time the Board have to direct the notice of Council to the fact that placing these officers on the permanent list has the effect of bringing them under the operation of the Superannuation Act, and that hitherto no provision has been made for payment of abatements on the pay of these officers while temporarily employed, although their temporary service counts on retirement.

The Board now recommend to Council that from and after the 1st inst., it shall be optional with temporary officers, on receiving permanent appointments, to place themselves, as far as regards their temporary services, under the operations of the Superannuation Act; but that in the cases where officers desire to avail themselves of this privilege, the Board are of opinion that abatements should be paid on their past temporary salaries since the Superannuation Act came into force, when the officers have served for so long back; otherwise, from the commencement of their temporary services.

This is dated the 7th of January, 1884. So that it looks as if the temporary clerks were entitled to participate in the superannuation fund from the date of their first service.

Mr. FOSTER. It looks as if it were contemplated by that order. I am speaking simply from experience. I know that the rule followed since I have been a member of the Treasury Board has been to count from the time they became permanent officers. The only condition on which their temporary time can be included is that they pay the superannuation abatement for that time. That is simply an Order in Council which may have been changed since, although if it were, I suppose it would not be here.

Railways and Canals \$49,662 50

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the Minister of Finance would inform us what position if any, Mr. Bradley, who was suspended, while secretary of this department, now occupies in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. He occupies no position in the Civil Service.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has he been superannuated?

Mr. FOSTER. He has not been superannuated. In this department there have been eight statutory increases of \$50, one of 37.50, and one of \$25. There is also \$300 more for messengers, making \$800 in all. The decreases include the chief engineer, \$6,000, and the difference in salaries, \$1,150, making a total decrease of \$7,150, the net decrease being \$6,350.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is an opportune time, I think, for the Minister of Railways to explain to the House the different changes which have taken place in his department during the past year. From what we have seen in the press, we have understood that a change had been made in the position and powers and duties and salary of the late chief engineer. I do not know exactly what his title is now or what duties he discharges or what pay he receives or what power he possesses, and I would like a full explanation from the Minister on that point. It is understood that Mr. Pottinger's power as local manager has been changed. I do not know whether matters have to be referred by him to Ottawa, as before, or what are the relative positions which he and Mr. Schreiber hold. I would like to know also what salaries they are to receive and what increases have been made to each.

Mr. HAGGART. I was prepared to give a full explanation, but did not think this matter would come up on this item. The management of the Intercolonial Railway has been considerably changed. The duties of Mr. Pottinger are prescribed by a set of instructions which I will lay on the Table of the House when the item for the Intercolonial

ial Railway comes up. The duties of Deputy Minister and chief engineer of railways are all those which were performed before by the Deputy who had charge of the Department of Railways and Canals. I will give a full explanation, when the item of the Intercolonial Railway comes up, of the duties imposed on Mr. Pottinger and the powers given him, and will lay on the Table of the House a copy of the instructions. They are very long, and I have not got a copy here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We will only have to wait, but I was in hopes the hon. gentleman would on this occasion have given the explanation, as it is anxiously looked for by a great many persons. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what salaries these gentlemen receive?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Schreiber gets \$6,000, as before. The increase of salary to Mr. Pottinger is \$2,000 per year, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the hon. gentleman to lay the papers on the Table a day before the item comes up for discussion.

Mr. HAGGART. I will do so. I could give generally what powers are retained in the department here. One is that they are not to put on more trains than at present without consulting the department, and another is that two or three of the principal officers are to be appointed by the Governor in Council. I will lay the papers on the Table the day before the discussion.

Mr. DICKEY. With regard to the increase of a chief clerk in the office of the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals and another in charge of the record staff, I would like to ask what the duties of the two chief clerks are and the changes made in the department in that regard?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will look, he will see that one of them has been done away with. The office is divided into two branches. In one of them is the chief officer of Railways and Canals, and in the other is the chief clerk in charge of the record staff. It is the intention of the department to give those two appointments to two first-class clerks at present in the department. The name of one is Maynard and the other Jones.

Geological Survey Department . . . \$50,732 50

Mr. FOSTER. There are nineteen technical officers who are not on the same basis as civil servants and are not eligible for statutory increases, and while I will leave the total of this item as it is, I propose to take \$950, included in the item as statutory increases, from the item, and replace the amount in the shape of a bonus to these officers, which will make no difference in the aggregate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That practically means we will have to do that every year.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they did not get it last year.

Trade and Commerce Department. \$6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we should have a very full explanation indeed of this. It appears to me as if we were doing nothing but creating deputy-heads, for I must confess that providing a deputy-head to look after a second and a third-class clerk and a messenger does appear to me to be running the thing into the ground. *Prima facie* this official will have no department of any importance to attend to. Both the Inland Revenue and the Department of Customs have similar officers. In the Department of Customs you ask for a vote for a commissioner of \$3,200.

Mr. FOSTER. The commissioner having been there before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is also a commissioner at \$3,200 in the Inland Revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. He was there before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. True, but they are equivalent in all respects to deputy-heads. They have salaries equal to deputy-heads and they answer to deputy-heads. Now, I do not see on what possible ground the appointment of a Deputy-Minister at \$3,200 can be defended for the Department of Trade and Commerce. Of course, we know very little of how that is going to be worked. Perhaps the member from Brockville, now the Controller of the department, has by this time got some insight into the working of it, and can tell us something about it. It does appear a very extraordinary step indeed to create a Deputy-Minister for the purpose of looking after a department with such a staff as this. The usual result of doing a thing of that kind is that the department grows up to the deputy-minister. The usual result is that so important an officer as the deputy-head is supplied with a staff proportionate to his dignity, and the general result is that the amount swells from \$6,000 to \$16,000, and then to \$26,000 and even to \$36,000, as we have seen examples of before this. I think if we must have fifteen gentlemen here to do the work which is done in other countries by half a dozen, and a much smaller proportion having reference to the numbers of the officials, we should not also be inflicted with fifteen deputy-heads, or whatever the number may be. This matter was discussed before as to the number of deputy-heads we were creating, and I think a strong case ought to be made out before adding another deputy-head as is now proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. It is hardly fair to say that we are adding another deputy-head. The Department of Customs had a deputy head, Mr. Parmalee, and an assistant commissioner, and the Inland Revenue Department had a commissioner and an assistant commissioner, the commissioner not being named as Deputy-

Mr. DAVIES.

Minister, but being to all intents and purposes a deputy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And he is still.

Mr. FOSTER. And he is still. The new Department of Trade and Commerce has been created under the Act, and one of the deputies, Mr. Parmalee, has been transferred from the Department of Customs to the Department of Trade and Commerce, so that there is not a creation of a new deputy-minister. The Act contemplated that these gentlemen should continue to hold their offices during their life time if no other arrangements were made, so that when the Commissioner of Inland Revenue ceases to occupy his present position, there will be only one deputy-head and two commissioners instead of two deputy-heads and two assistant commissioners. That will be on the whole a saving, and at present there is no increase, because we have the same three men as before, Mr. Parmalee being transferred from one department to the other. I am sorry to find that my hon. friend has no higher opinion of a deputy-minister than to think he has simply to take charge of clerks. He is a very important officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know he always considers himself so.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt Mr. Parmalee will have a great deal to do with organizing the new department. The hon. gentleman will observe by the foot note that it is provided "That in case of the transfer to the department of any officers or clerks whose salaries have been provided for in the estimates of any other department—whether inside or outside service—the amount so provided shall be available for the payment of their said salaries by this department." So that, if transfers are made of duties or otherwise, and clerks are transferred in consequence, they become a part of the Department of Trade and Commerce, but they diminish by so much the department from which they are transferred. Of course the Department of Trade and Commerce is at present in an embryonic state and is to be developed or not as circumstances require, but it cannot be stated that the staff is increased as the hon. gentleman said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I want to know is what on earth is the Deputy-Minister to do. The hon. gentleman has not thrown much light on that branch of the subject. He has told us that the Deputy-Minister and the two commissioners replace one commissioner and two assistant commissioners, but what functions are you going to assign to the Deputy-Minister? This is a new experiment. It has involved the removal from this House of an hon. gentleman to another House, where I am told he is at present struggling with all the difficulties of engineering Government measures in a place where he has a majority of only ten or twelve to one.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all the more difficult.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt that is so. In fact, I am told that he already regrets his docile majority here. The hon. gentleman, however, has given no explanation of the duties of the new Deputy-Minister. I have heard that there was a venerable Dean who was summoned to give evidence before a committee of the House of Commons in England and he was asked what his duties were. He replied that his duties were the usual duties of a dean in a Cathedral establishment. Then they sent for a sub-dean and asked him what his duties were and he said they were the usual duties of a sub-dean in a Cathedral establishment. What I want to know is what are the duties of a Deputy-Minister of Trade and Commerce? Perhaps my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) knows, as he is now actively concerned in the department. Really I do not see the object of retaining a Deputy-Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not know what position Mr. Bowell is to assume to the two gentlemen we have here. Perhaps they do not know, and perhaps he does not know, but I took it for granted that the Department of Trade and Commerce, if it had any purpose except the duplication of the number of members of the Government in this House, had for its purpose that the Minister should exercise a wise supervision over the trade policy of the country apart from the administration of that policy; and while he might require two or three clerks, a stenographer, a private secretary, a messenger and so forth, I do not understand for what he can require a Deputy-Minister. Before we vote this amount for what is practically—with all respect to the Minister of Finance—a new office, we ought to know what duties the Deputy-Minister can have to perform. I cannot see what he can have to do, and I know enough to the habits of Deputy-Ministers to be aware that they will, if possible, live up to the dignity of their office, and the idea of dignity which they convey to the public is by means of having a numerous staff around them.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not provided for that numerous staff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to come. You have sown the seed and you will have the fruit.

Mr. FOSTER. That cannot be unless Parliament votes the money, and I do not suppose that my hon. friend would begrudge a larger vote if it were shown, in the development of the branch of Trade and Commerce, that good would result to the country from the work of that department. The story which my hon. friend has told about the dean and the sub-dean ought to be applied to himself. Any man in holy orders would be satisfied with the answers that were given. Now, a gentleman who has had charge of a department, who has had a deputy to help him to administer his department, knows what the duties of a Deputy-Minister are.

Consequently, no explanation is necessary for my hon. friend. I may say, as I said before, that the Department of Trade and Commerce is but commenced, the development and organization of it are largely to come, and the work will be taken up and the sphere of its duties increased in ways which will be, I have no doubt, beneficial to the country. For instance, at the present time, my hon. friend the Minister of Commerce has the administration of the steamship subsidies, these having heretofore belonged to my own department, but now, as appertaining more especially to trade and commerce, they have been transferred to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That of itself is a large and important field. I have been instituting, the last two or three years, a system of consular officers or commercial correspondents in different countries. These are now under the management of the Minister of Trade and Commerce; and as the main body of the Estimates will show, it is proposed to carry out that policy gradually towards a larger development of what my hon. friend from Brant thinks to be a wise and good policy for this country to adopt in the extension of trade. These are two important things. Then, the whole question of the development of trade between our country and foreign countries comes directly under the sphere of the Department of Trade and Commerce, which will also take advantage of whatever opportunities may present themselves for promoting that object, and the executive in all these matters will be the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If my hon. friend were to be made Minister of Trade and Commerce, the very first thing he would do would be to get one of the most efficient men he could find, as far as knowledge of trade and commerce go, to assist him in carrying out the work which pertained to his department. It would not do at all for him to be tied down to his work with a second-class clerk, a stenographer and a messenger; that would not at all fulfil the necessities for the working of his department. Not being myself the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I have not thought so deeply over this as my hon. friend in the other House has done. I am a little sorry that he is not here to explain his views and the methods by which he proposes to carry out those views. I do not know whether I have satisfied my hon. friend; if he requires more information I shall have to consult with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and then give the information to the House more in extenso.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, before he took the responsibility of advising the establishment of this new department of Government, surely satisfied himself that it was a necessity, and he was asked to give to the House the grounds upon which he came to that conclusion. He has fairly explained the matter by

telling us that to-day he is only giving the outlines of the arrangement, and that hereafter they will be filled up. It will be just as he says. You will have a complete staff. They will never be satisfied till their staff equals the staff of the other departments. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is to be at the head of two great branches, the Inland Revenue and Customs. Very well, the hon. gentleman retains the two deputy-heads of those departments, called Commissioners. He calls in two estimable gentlemen from this House and he calls them Controllers, new officers altogether, and we ask him to explain what their duties were, and what relative positions these gentlemen are to hold towards the new Minister of Trade and Commerce. Now, in the name of all that is holy, if the Controllers are necessary for the administration of the departments over which they are placed, in addition to the Deputy-Ministers, or Commissioners, what do you require another deputy for? Here we have a Minister of Trade and Commerce with a deputy, and a staff which is detailed here, with clerks, stenographers, messengers, etc. That is the outline to be filled up hereafter at an enormous cost, no doubt. Before very long we shall be called upon to vote money for extra clerks, etc. We know from experience that when the Marine and Fisheries Department was divided some time ago the same thing took place, and the same thing will take place now. It is just an excuse for a large expenditure of public money for providing places for new officers. We have a Minister of Trade and Commerce, we have a Controller of Inland Revenue, we have a Controller of Customs, we have two Deputy-Commissioners of Customs, and Deputy-Minister or Commissioner of Inland Revenue—these six gentlemen at the head of a department, practically one department. My hon. friend says he has a scheme on foot for the appointment of consular agencies in the different parts of the world, and that may develop a certain amount of work. Possibly it may, but I think he will hardly say that the present staff could not be utilized to discharge such duties as may arise in connection with these agencies. That surely will never justify the creation of a new department and the appointment of a Deputy Minister. The whole thing savours very much of what might be called, without offence, a political job. The fact of the matter is, some gentlemen had to be provided for, and they are provided for in this way, and I do not think the country will be satisfied with it. The hon. gentleman knows it will cost a large amount of public money extra, and he confessed himself to be unable, in the absence of the Minister, to explain to the House what the duties of these new officers are. I have no doubt we will have a full explanation from my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), the Controller of Inland Revenue, and he will explain very lucidly, as

he generally does when he makes an explanation to the House, what his relative duties are compared with the Commissioner, and as compared with the Minister who is over him. I think it will be satisfactory to this committee and the country to understand what the hon. gentleman's duties are.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I did not suppose when I came into the House to-night that I would be called upon to explain why it was that the late Minister of Customs, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, had seen fit to appoint a deputy minister to his department. If the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had read the Act creating the portfolio of Trade and Commerce, and the Act relating to the Controller of Inland Revenue and Customs respectively, I think he would have gained a good deal of light on the subject which he seems to stand in need of. If he had read the debates which took place when the late Sir John A. Macdonald introduced those Acts he would have been further enlightened, much to his advantage. Now, I am glad of the opportunity of giving that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) all the information in my power. One of the objects in view in introducing this Act was to do away, in a good many cases, with the duplication of officers. There are some inspectors of Inland Revenue and some inspectors of Customs who can do work which both sets of officers are doing now, and economy was one of the objects upon which the late Sir John A. Macdonald based the Acts in question, as will be found on reading the discussion that took place when the Bills were introduced. So far as the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce is concerned, the portfolio, as the Minister of Finance has said, is necessarily a growing and expansive one. It must necessarily in the nature of things be such, especially in a country like this. It is quite true the Minister of Trade and Commerce exercises a general supervision over the work of the two departments, Inland Revenue and Customs. I do not wish to exaggerate for one moment the importance of the office I hold. I am Controller of Inland Revenue, and am under the general supervision of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If he exercise that jurisdiction, as no doubt he will, on matters of policy affecting the department itself, he will have his hands full and will need a deputy. For instance, I propose, with the sanction of my colleagues, to introduce this session an Act to bring the electric light under a system of inspection similar to the inspection system of gas. I would not undertake to introduce that measure without consulting the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I might mention some other matters by way of illustration. I allude to these points simply, in the best of good faith, to enlighten my hon. friend on one detail, and give him some little insight as to what the Minister has to do; but

apart from all that, so far as departmental matters are concerned, the Minister himself I have no doubt, although I have no right to speak for him, possesses sufficient capacity, as we know from our experience of that gentleman, as the head of one of the most important revenue producing branches of the Government, and is broad-minded enough and had experience enough in connection with the its expansion can take place with profit to this Dominion, and I think we can safely leave with him the duty of selecting his own deputy and deciding the necessity of his appointment. In the discussion that took place in this House on the introduction of these measures, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—I am not sure of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—and several hon. gentlemen opposite took part, and it was then expressly stated that there would be a deputy of Trade and Commerce, and not one word was said against that proposition. Why should objection now be taken to filling a position provided for in the Act which passed this House, when, in the discussion which took place, not one word was said against it. I think we can very safely leave to the good judgment of the Minister of Trade and Commerce not only the question of deciding as to the necessity for the office, but the selection of the deputy himself.

Mr. FRASER. It would perhaps have been desirable if the Controller had left the task of explaining the duties of the office of deputy to the Minister of Finance. If the additional information as regards the duties of the new department cannot go further than that furnished by the Controller in regard to the preparation of a measure respecting the electric light, it was hardly worth while that he should offer it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I only gave you that as an illustration,—and you know it.

Mr. FRASER. I suppose the hon. gentleman wanted to throw some light on the subject.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If you will call over I will give you all the light you wish.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman does not inaugurate his position well by showing temper. The Controller should control himself; and I must notice that the Government have adopted the American method of spelling the word. My impression is that when the Act to which the hon. gentleman has referred was under discussion in this House, there was considerable objection offered to the creation of the office. I observe the hon. gentleman has been reading up the debate with the intention of having some little defence for himself. I have not done so. I suggest, however, that it appears somewhat strange that the Act should have remained in abeyance six years and should only now be brought into operation. Have we not been passing through such an experience in regard to the commerce

of this country during those years as to require the able services of these Controllers? Is the Minister himself so old that he cannot perform the duties? Must we now, without evidence being adduced to show that our trade and commerce has increased, vote money for the salary of a deputy? That is the question before this Committee. It is not a matter of any personal experience. The hon. gentleman, moreover, has not shown that the commerce of the country is advancing and that such an appointment was necessary at this particular time. I fancy the difficulty experienced by the Minister of Finance, who is always ready to give an explanation of some kind, in explaining this item may be taken as evidence that no explanation can be given satisfactory to this House as to why, although this country is feeling the burdens of taxation, three new offices have been created. I do not for a moment say that the hon. gentleman who has addressed this Committee and who received the appointment of Controller is not as good a man as the Government could obtain on that side of the House. I think he will agree with me that he is—he will be the first man to do so. But that is not the question. The real issue is whether these appointments were necessary. I submit that neither the hon. Minister of Finance, nor the Controller of Inland Revenue has shown there was any necessity for this change. A good business man does not employ a clerk until he knows the work on which he will place him. He does not say: I will get a clerk, it is true my business is not sufficient to warrant his employment, but perhaps I may be able to find some work for him to do. True, the country supplies the salary in this case, for in a like case a business man could not afford to do so. All these salaries are paid out of the pockets of the people. I am glad to see an hon. gentleman in his seat who has raised his voice against the present taxation. I refer to the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn), who has declared that we were burdened with taxation, that the National Policy, while it might be all right up to a certain point, might be carried a little too far, and that something should be done. I am sure he will deem it imprudent to expend \$15,000 more in appointing these new deputies. I never heard the Minister of Customs when in this House complain that he was overworked; on the contrary, no hon. gentleman showed more vigour. I am sorry we have lost him, and I must say he could rise at any time and show as much energy and endurance as any hon. gentleman. I regret that his deputy is learning a little of his acidity in speech, and is commencing his work in this House by copying somewhat the sharp methods that our good friend, of whom we all thought so much, displayed in this House. That, however, is not here or there; but the question is, were these changes necessary in the existing state of public affairs and in the best interests of the country. Now, it may have been, but I submit that

that has not been shown, and, until that is shown, I say that the hon. gentleman should not ask that this should be voted until they make it appear to this Parliament and to the country that there was absolute necessity for the appointment. It seems to me that further explanations are necessary in order to justify this large increase in expenditure with reference to the appointment of my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood). I congratulate him and I congratulate the country upon any position which he may fill. I know no one in public life on that side of the House better qualified to receive preferment than the hon. gentleman. I have the utmost confidence in him personally, and, therefore, any allusion I make to the appointment is wholly in the public interest without regard to him personally. I say that the country is entitled to explanations as to why it is put to this greatly increased expenditure. Of all times you have selected the worst, probably, for increasing the burdens of the people. There is certainly nothing in the trade of the country to warrant this large addition to the Civil Service. Since I have been in public life I have observed that come what might, let there be deficits or not, there was always an increase going on in the staff of the Civil Service. The only thing which the National Policy has really developed in the country has been hard times and increased parasites on the country. In the end the whole of this expenditure comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country, the tillers of the soil. You have now a Cabinet of seventeen members, three of whom have no portfolios, I believe, and fourteen of whom are under full pay, drawing about \$100,000 a year from the public treasury, a cabinet three times as large as that of the United States, with a population thirteen times that of the Dominion of Canada. There is not the first shadow of an explanation offered to the public to justify what has taken place, and if we are left to our imagination—which is about the only thing which seems to be left us here, as you will not give us facts—I presume that we can only assume that the situation demanded the providing of offices. We know last year that there was lots of kicking. It was not the first time we heard of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) having knocked at the door of the Cabinet and asked permission to enter. However, he has not gone in there yet, and has, so to speak, only attained the position of outside guard.

An hon. MEMBER. He got his shoulders in.

Mr. MULOCK. He has not got even that far yet. For some years we have heard that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) conceived himself a heaven-born statesman anxious in the country's good to sacrifice himself on the altar

Mr. FRASER.

of his country, but for some reason or other his merits were unrecognized and Canada was without his services for all these years. The law had been there and he had been there always willing, but yet the country never availed itself of his vast services until lately. There is a general opinion that he was selected as a life preserver for the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A set-off.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that he was put there as a set-off. The life preserver floated the Cabinet ship too high and it could not navigate, and so to even matters up they had to go to Montreal to get a Solicitor-General to weigh down and make it float properly. So in order to serve party exigencies the Government disregards the welfare of the people and increases their burdens. I am not the only person objecting to this work of the Government. There is dissatisfaction all through the land about it. On several occasions, Brother Wallace—I beg pardon the member for West York—has no doubt seen allusions to his appointment, and he must see there is some dissatisfaction in regard to it. It is becoming a very serious matter, because only this evening I see published a despatch from Halifax, which says:

Central Star, Loyal Orange Lodge, New Glasgow has passed a formal resolution denouncing the action of Mr. N. C. Wallace in the strongest terms for accepting an inferior position in the cabinet of Sir John Thompson, being convinced that Brother Wallace violated his obligation and sacrificed his Orangeism for political advancement.

I do not quite understand whether that resolution objected to the general proposition or simply to his having taken a position on the outside. However that may be, the job has not given satisfaction in certain quarters, and as regards the whole country it has produced the impression that offices have been created to serve political exigencies. Hon. gentlemen opposite have disregarded the interests of the country and have been merciless towards the taxpayers, and I trust that when the time arrives the taxpayers will have their innings and will call to account those unfaithful stewards who are now squandering the public money in the interests of the office holders, and have so long remained in office as to be out of touch with the people, and come to think there never will be a day of retribution.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we might fairly ask that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) would state his facts, or his supposed facts, a little more correctly. He has stated to the House that there are seventeen Cabinet Ministers, when, as a matter of fact, there are only fourteen.

Mr. MULOCK. I gave you credit in that.

Mr. WALLACE. He is only mistaken by three in that statement. He has also stated that three have no portfolios, whereas two is the correct number. The hon. gentleman

alludes to the fact, or rather what he states to be a fact, that I have been looking after office. I can assure the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) that I have never looked for any office, except that when I was nominated for West York, I looked to the electors to return me to Parliament. More than that, I may say to the hon. gentleman that I did not require to spend thousands of dollars to be elected, as the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) required to do in his constituency. It is a well known fact, Mr. Chairman, that only for the hon. member for North York's money bags his talents would never have brought him into the House of Commons. He read a supposed resolution from some lodge down in New Brunswick—

An hon. MEMBER. Not New Brunswick.

Mr. MULOCK. New Glasgow—Central Star Loyal Orange Lodge, New Glasgow.

Mr. WALLACE.—In Nova Scotia. I presume that resolution was like another that was passed by a solitary lodge in the province of Ontario, and the fact remains that hon. gentlemen opposite, with all their efforts, have only been able to induce two lodges out of 2,000 to pass such a resolution.

Mr. LISTER. We have no influence over the lodges.

Mr. WALLACE. They are all good loyal men, loyal to the institutions of this country, and they are not looking to their friends across the border; they are not sending emissaries to the United States to stab Canada in her vital parts. They are members of a loyal and patriotic institution, and I wish we could say the same of the hon. members on the other side of the House and their colleagues, some of whom are in Washington to-day, working, not in the interests of Canada, but working to destroy Canadian nationality.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think it is due to the House that I should make ample restitution for the observations I directed to it a moment ago. I had no idea that the country had secured such a prize in the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I had no idea that he was possessed of such talent and such dignity, and that he would be so well qualified to discharge the official functions of the position he holds. I congratulate him on being "facile princeps" a master of decorum, a master of good taste, and a master of the French language.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is well that we should fully and freely criticize the increase that has taken place in the Cabinet. Under the present circumstances, when the people of this country are feeling the burden of taxation, when men on that side of the House are willing to admit on public platforms that the people of this country are overtaxed, and that the National Policy has gone to the extreme in extorting money un-

necessarily from the people of this country, and when our population is virtually decreasing while the annual expenditure is increasing, I think an increase of three to the number of the Ministry, who were looked upon as amply sufficient in number if not in ability before, is a gross piece of injustice to the taxpayers of this country. I can easily understand that the Government had some little difficulty in dealing with their friends outside of the Cabinet. By the public prints we all know how frequently men who thought they were born statesmen were in Ottawa, no doubt seeking for positions. The hon. Controller of Customs says he did not seek a position in the Cabinet. He may not have done so, but he was very willing to grab at and take the humblest position of the whole. We were informed in the public press of one man who had been offered one of those positions and indignantly declined it. Although my hon. friend says he was not at all anxious to get a position, he has only a very humble one, and it is not in the Cabinet. He merely occupies the position of an outside tyler to the Cabinet; he has to stand outside and keep the door, and allow the deliberations to be carried on inside and whenever the Cabinet decides, he has to whistle the tune that he is told. He has nothing to say as to what is done inside; he has no advice to give, he is not supposed to give any advice, but he is supposed to fall into line and do his part to carry out the decisions of the Cabinet of which he is not a member, but merely an outside guard. It looks as if he was very anxious to get some position when he is willing to take such a humble one as that, although he has been for many years in this country the recognized chief of the order to which he belongs. I understand that there has been some trouble in finding places for men like the hon. member for West York. We know very well, if we can believe the public prints of the day, that a great many men were pressing their services on the Government, and I suppose, considering the ability of the old cabinet, that it was absolutely necessary to get into it better blood, for they could not get rid of what they had. The only one they did get rid of was the Minister of Agriculture; and after all the fight he passed through to hold the seat that was not his, it seems to be a cruel thing to thrust him out so ruthlessly, so that he does not now occupy a position at all.

Mr. LISTER. He sits on the front benches.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, he sits on the front benches, but so far as the Cabinet is concerned he has to take a back seat, for he is no longer a member of the Cabinet. We on this side of the House can only say that he has received his just deserts, and we do not sympathise with him in the least. With regard to the other members of the Cabinet, I have no doubt, and I honestly admit, that there was a necessity for new blood being

taken in, because the ability that characterized the heads of several of the departments was so limited that it was absolutely necessary that some effort should be made to improve the Cabinet. Whether the additions made will be improvements or not I am not prepared to say. I am quite ready to endorse the statements made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). Ever since I have sat in this House I have respected the hon. gentleman as a man of ability, who endeavoured to discharge his duties in this House with credit to himself. With regard to the others I am not prepared to say much. I certainly cannot give them the certificate that I have given to the hon. member for Brockville. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) I recognize as a man of some ability. I know that he is a capital hand to sing "Old King Cole"; that is the only thing that I have known him to do efficiently in this House, and he has done that very well. The Controller of Inland Revenue I have never heard sing a song to the House; but I remember that he has been prepared to trip up in a very discourteous way some men on this side who differed from him on points that arose in our discussions. However, we shall see how these gentlemen develop, and I suppose that if they develop a sufficient amount of ability, the First Minister will let them have inside seats in his Cabinet coach. But, in the meantime, the hon. member for Montreal Centre will act as outside tyler at one end and the hon. member for West York as outside tyler at the other end, and they will have to show how they occupy those positions to enable the First Minister to judge whether they are entitled to inside seats.

Mr. FRASER. One or two remarks have been made which I think deserve a little notice. The hon. member who has just spoken is perhaps a little severe. I can very well understand how the Controllers are chafing under the feeling that they cannot be called honourable, and a considerable amount of leniency ought to be shown to them on that account. I regret that the hon. Premier is not here—we always like to have him here—for I would like to point out to him some incongruities about the Government as at present formed, that is as to the character of the elements of which it is composed. But I must congratulate the First Minister on so nicely balancing matters and on having, even down to the arrangement of the seats, perfected the appearance of that ministry in this House. I can very well understand the difficulty he had in forming a Cabinet. I think I see the Premier starting out on that great work of building that grand cabinet cathedral; and of course as the last one was strong in knaves, a change had to be made, and he had to start in with an eye to the moral sense of the country in order to avoid extravagance in that particular. I think I see him building

MR. McMULLEN.

the cathedral until at last the keystone alone was wanted; and then I can fancy him walking up and down the edifice, in the cold, frosty air, hearing the noise of contending elements outside, the wind and snow beating in upon him, not knowing what was to be done, and looking up and wondering how he was going to complete the structure. Outside were the contending elements. West York and several other counties were in full blast of contention. One of the Norfolks was lashing itself into fury and the noise outside was increasing. But West York howled more vigorously than all the rest and got the keystone, and I can fancy him the First Minister, after that feat was accomplished, saying in Shakespearian phrase: "Now is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer by this son of York." The Cabinet was completed, but he did not end there. He had to balance the different elements in this House. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) he placed just beside the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan) in order that the one may keep close watch upon the other, and that they might cultivate each other's friendly feelings as they never did before, so that perhaps they may come to the conclusion that there may be some good in men differing ever so widely. Then the First Minister placed the deposed Minister (Mr. Carling) alongside the Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron). I looked over at the deposed Minister, as he sat there, and felt sorry. He reminded me of the epitaph placed by a wife over her husband who had died before he was expected to. His wife loved him very much, and she had this epitaph inscribed on his tombstone: "I expected it, but not so soon." Near the deposed Minister was the Minister of Militia. In ancient times a criminal who had taken life was compelled to walk around the whole country side attached to the man he had murdered, in order that he might ever be kept mindful of his crime. The First Minister must have had this custom in view when he thus placed beside the Postmaster-General, who has certain things to answer for before this country and this House, even before his own friends, this reminder of the desposed Minister: Just look beyond you; you may some day meet the same fate. All these arrangements are not without design, and they are well designed. But I submit that even the beautiful front they present, the nice arrangement of colours and shades, is not sufficient to satisfy this country and justify the expenditure. The lavish expenditure of more money on officials is a matter this country is not going to reap the benefit from that even this beautiful appearance indicates. I have nothing against those hon. gentlemen. I join the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in his remarks concerning the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), and I have no doubt that all these gentlemen will, to the best of their ability, perform their duties; but the question is, is the country going to receive any return for the amount expended—any work which will repay it?

It was well said that this is only the beginning of it. Everybody knows how men will surround themselves with messengers and clerks and all the rest of it. There is the Deputy and a second-class clerk and a stenographer and a messenger at \$500. I venture to say that there will not be sufficient messages to enable this messenger to earn his salary, even if he get paid at the rate of a dollar each. Messages from whom? From the Deputy to the Controller, and from the Controller to the Minister. Are the Minister and the Controller to live together and the Deputy to be in a separate place? Every business man knows that the simpler the arrangements are for conducting an office, the more effective they are, and that as you increase positions unnecessarily, you impair the performance of the work. The responsibility will be shifted from one official to the other. As the work is to be done by the Deputy, the Minister will not look to it, and vice versa, whereas, when the whole responsibility is thrown on the one head, he will make it his business to attend to the work and see that it is performed. I am not making any personal objections to these gentlemen, but I object to this sacrifice of the country's interests for the sake of propitiating individual ones. The only interests the people care for are their own. What care they whether this body or this race wants a man in office? What they want is that the country shall be economically governed, and it has not been shown that the appointment of these parties is in the best interests of the country. This is the time of all others when we ought to be cutting off any rotten branches of the protective tree and the suckers that are gathered around the body politic; and in place of putting it in the power of any man to bleed this country to a greater extent, we should endeavour to make the lot of those whose toil is barely sufficient to earn them a livelihood easier by reducing our expenses. It has not been shown that these changes are in the best interests of the country, and for that reason I oppose them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I must confess that when I invited the Finance Minister a few moments ago to give an explanation of the reasons which prompted the Government to incur this very great expense in the creation of this new department and the appointment of two new Controllers, and the other officials to whom reference has been made, I did expect, if not from the hon. gentleman himself, at least from the two gentlemen to whom reference has frequently been made, such explanations as would satisfy the Opposition that the step had not been taken without cause, and could be justified by sound reasons. As far as the Minister is concerned, I congratulate him on his frankness. He plainly said that he did not know the reasons, but that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce were here we might obtain them from him. I addressed myself to the hon. member for Brockville, knowing that

if he had a case at all, he would be able to present it in its best aspect to the House. After the explanation he has given, and knowing the position he has held in this House for many years, I can only exclaim: "How are the mighty fallen." According to him it is necessary that there should be a Minister of Trade and Commerce and a deputy-minister and a controller of Revenue and Customs and a deputy-minister of Customs—and a commissioner of Inland Revenue—all for the purpose of introducing a Bill to regulate the inspection of electric light. The hon. gentleman, after consideration, gave the reasons for his appointment, and, knowing his ability, I know he must have exhausted these reasons, and he exhausted them in the statement that he hopes to bring in a Bill for the inspection of electric light. Does he not see what a serious charge he brings against the Secretary of State, formerly Minister of Inland Revenue, when he intimates that the Secretary of State was not capable of introducing such a law? Does he not think he was capable of introducing an important measure of that kind and guiding it through this House? I think he was, and I think the House will come to the conclusion that, with all the hon. gentleman's ability, legal and parliamentary, he has failed to justify his existence as a controller. But what shall I say as to the other hon. gentleman who came forward and made his maiden speech as a controller? I expected that he would have made some attempt to justify his position. What are his duties? It appears that there are some emissaries, some enemies of this country who are going about in order to stab her vital parts, and the hon. gentleman has been elevated from the position of an ordinary member to that of a Controller in order that he may wrestle with these enemies of his country. Knowing his past history, and knowing how jealously he watched the machinations of the present members of the Cabinet, I would not have been surprised, if he had succeeded in getting himself placed inside the Cabinet, to hear him say that he occupied a position where he could countermine the machinations of those enemies of his country who were endeavouring to stab her in her vital parts, but he is not there. There are some people who go through the world imagining that their friends and neighbours are going to commit assaults upon their persons or upon their religion. But see how useless he is. He tells us the duty he has to perform, and yet he is not in a position which would enable him to countermine these machinations. I am afraid he will be as useless as a Controller as he has been as a member of this House.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 5) to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 6) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Governor-General has issued his proclamation to bring into force the provisions of the "Copyright Amendment Act" of 1889? Whether the British Government has given notice of the withdrawal of Canada from the Berne Convention, as requested in the Address passed by the Parliament of Canada in 1891? If such proclamation has not been issued, and if such notice of withdrawal has not been given, is the Government prepared at once to lay before this House papers and correspondence to explain the delay or neglect that has taken place in these matters?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proclamation has not been issued and the notice has not been given. The subject has caused some correspondence during the last few months, and a long despatch has been received from Her Majesty's Government which is to be answered in a few days. I propose to let the hon. gentleman know when the answer is given, so that he can move for the papers if he chooses, or can let us submit them, as he prefers.

CLAIM OF MESSRS. C. AND Z. ROY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government have come to any decision in relation to the claim of Messrs. C. and Z. Roy, of Isle aux Grues in the county of Montmagny? If so, what is the decision? and if not, what do they propose doing in the matter?

Mr. OUIMET (Translation). The claim of the Messrs. Roy was referred to the Department of Justice, and the necessary information is being sought for so as to come to a decision in the matter.

MR. THOMAS F. X. BERLINGUET.

Mr. DESAULNIERS asked, On whose recommendation was Thomas F. X. Berlinguet, Esq., appointed resident engineer at Three Rivers? What work is he intrusted with? What are his instructions? What amount did he draw, whether as engineer or otherwise, out of the public chest, between 29th June, 1891, and 31st December, 1892?

Mr. OUIMET (Translation). Mr. Berlinguet was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Baillairege, who was then Deputy Minister of Public Works. He is intrusted with the St. Maurice, from its mouth up to superintendence of the works on the La Tuque. He is also in charge of the public works in the district of Three Rivers, such as the wharf in Yamachiche, the Nicolet pier and the works on the river Yamaska. Instructions are sent occasionally to Mr. Berlinguet, when deemed necessary; but his general duties are to superintend all public works in his district, and to report to the department whenever there are repairs or improvements to make. He is also bound by his duties to see that all the public works that are given out, either by contract or by specification, be carried out as well as possible. The following sums were paid to Mr. Berlinguet, between the 29th June, 1891, and the 30th June, 1892: As salary, \$1,875; for his maintenance, \$769.25; for disbursements, \$76.41; for travelling expenses, \$370.93. From the 1st July to the 31st December, 1892, his salary was \$1,012; maintenance, \$373; disbursements, \$10.91; travelling expenses, \$145.

SLAUGHTERING SWINE IN BOND.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend or relax the quarantine regulations now in force governing the importation and slaughtering of swine in bond?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been a deputation upon the subject lately, and so lately that the subject has not yet been fully considered by the Government.

THE SAUGEEN INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Landerkin) asked, Was an investigation held during the past year in reference to ties and posts cut on the Saugeen Indian Reserve in the county of Bruce? If so, who conducted it? Was a seizure made of any ties and posts from said reserve, and if so, by whom made and from whom seized? What was the value of said ties and posts, and what was the total cost incurred in the seizure, and to whom was it paid?

Mr. DALY. No official investigation was held during the past year in reference to ties and posts cut on the Saugeen Indian Reserve in the county of Bruce, but inquiry into the matter was made by the Department of Indian Affairs through its agent, Mr. James Allen, of Chippewa Hill, Ontario. A seizure of ties and posts was made by Mr. James Allen, Indian agent, from Mr. J. J. Creighton. The value of said ties and posts was about \$30; and the total cost incurred in the seizure was \$101.75, of which \$91.50 was paid to Thomas Shular, constable, and \$10.25 to cover expenses of parties who were called upon by the agent to make statutory declarations in the matter.

HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Whether the household effects referred to in the item intituled "Household Effects," which appears on page 458 of the Trade and Navigation Report for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892, were any of these the household effects of persons removing from Canada? If so, what was the value of said portion?

Mr. WALLACE. Without communicating with all the ports, it is impossible to say definitely just what goods are classified under this heading. The effects of emigrants are included in the heading, and no doubt a large proportion of articles classified thereunder are made up of such goods, but what the proportion is it is impossible to say.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What were the receipts and expenditure of the Prince Edward Island Railway for the six months ending 31st December, 1892? Was there any expenditure during that period on capital account? If so, what?

Mr. HAGGART. The receipts for six months on the Prince Edward Island Railway, to the 31st December, 1892, were \$92,073.90; and the expenses, \$130,391.43, or a loss of \$38,317.53. There has been no expenditure on capital account during the above period.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What were the receipts and expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway and its several branches for the six months ending 31st December, 1892? What, if any, was the expenditure during that period on capital account of such road and its branches?

Mr. HAGGART. The receipts for six months ending 31st December, 1892, were \$1,595,047.13; and the expenditure, \$1,597,757.72; leaving a loss of \$2,710.59. The expenditure on capital account for the above period was \$170,828.17.

WHARFINGER AT TIGNISH.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a wharfinger has been appointed at Tignish? If so, who is he, when was the appointment made, and what was the amount of wharfage paid during the year 1892?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes. Mr. George Conroy was, on 2nd October, 1891, appointed to succeed Mr. Benjamin Gaudet, superseded in February, 1892. Mr. Conroy remitted \$8.30 wharfage collections for 1891, but nothing has as yet been received from him for 1892. He has been directed to forward his returns for the calendar year ending 31st ultimo, without delay.

DUTY ON BINDING TWINE.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That it is expedient to place binding twine on the free list.

He said: This is not the first time that I have pressed this motion upon the attention of the House, and although unsuccessful up to this moment, I hope that in due time the Government will see the wisdom of yielding to the request. If they do not agree with the spirit of my motion, perhaps they will, like the unjust judge, at least yield to it on account of frequent importunities. However that may be, and whatever may be their motive for yielding, assuming that they will yield, I shall be content. I think that already, since this matter has been brought to the attention of the House, there is an accumulation of evidence that it is not one altogether without interest outside of this House. From all sources, from the agriculturist from one end of Canada to the other, the House has been invited by petition and otherwise to give relief to the agricultural classes in many ways; but up to this moment they appear to have found no friends at court in the Government circles. Whether at last they may, becomes a question for the Government to decide. Now, what are the merits of the question? The merits of the question are simply these: the agriculturists, in carrying on their calling, are obliged to supply themselves with this twine in order to be able to conduct their industry according to modern methods, and it is to their interest to acquire it at the cheapest possible price. I am sorry that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) sees nothing in my motion entitling it to his consideration, but perhaps when the discussion has continued some time, and when his own peculiar interests are brought more particularly into view, he, and the friends around him who now seek to disturb the discussion, may feel it incumbent upon them to give some little attention to the matter. Now, Sir, I say that the result of the tariff upon binding twine is to place the farmer at the present time at the mercy of a syndicate. In 1891 I brought to the attention of the House the condition of the manufacturing trade in connection with binding twine. I was able to show, and hon. gentlemen have only to refer to the records of Parliament at that time to find, that in 1891 an American company, known as the National Cordage Company, had, with the assistance of its enormous American capital, formed a syndicate and leased all the twine factories of Canada. That fact was established beyond controversy, and was admitted by the chairman of the Canadian combine, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who now sits in his place in this House. It was further established on that occasion that the combine was operating in Canada, supplying the Canadian manufacturer to the exclusion of all competition from without, and also engaging in an export trade; in other words, it was

selling its product to the Canadian manufacturer at combination prices and was supplying the free trade market of the world at free trade prices, was using Canada as the basis of operations, taking advantage of the imprisoned farmer of Canada and making use of him as a machine wherewith to carry on this gigantic concern, the benefits of which accrued, in the first place, to the combine itself, and, perhaps, to some extent to the outside world, which thereby acquired twine at cheaper prices. On that occasion those who agreed with me on this measure addressed their arguments to deaf ears. I introduced my motion on 1st May, 1891. The Minister had not at that time announced what tariff changes he contemplated, and, at his request, I allowed the motion to stand without comment until he had decided as to his course. It was therefore a great disappointment to those hon. gentlemen who agreed with my view and to the agricultural section of Canada that on this, as on many other occasions, the interests of the farmer were entirely ignored by the Administration. The Government on that occasion said they proposed not to deal with the matter, they refused to deal with it, and allowed the years from then to now to pass by, the farmer being compelled to pay, as he has since been compelled to pay, on an average, 25 per cent more for twine than it was worth. The tariff is 25 per cent. There is but one manufactory in Canada, the manufactory presided over by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). That is the only firm selling twine in Canada, and the farmers have been obliged to purchase at the price of the seller. Every purchaser is entitled to buy in the cheapest market, but owing to the restricted character of the tariff the purchaser of binding twine has been obliged to purchase at prices named by the seller, wholly uncontrolled by the purchaser or the question of supply and demand. On the occasion referred to we were told by the Minister of Finance, and we were appealed to almost with tears in his eyes by the junior member for Halifax, that if we reduced the duty on binding twine we would close one of Canada's infant industries. This Canadian infant industry has had a couple more years of existence, and if an advertisement which I find in the papers is authentic, it will give the House and the country to understand the kind of infant industry now receiving pap through the agency of the Government from a suffering public. Let us look at what the infant industry is, for it is typical of its class, which receives protection from the Government, a product of the National Policy, a sucking infant which has to be propped up by the mass of the people, or otherwise it would go to ruin, and the glory of Canada and the British flag would depart. As an infant industry it had to be protected by a tariff of 25 per cent at the expense of the toiling farmers of Canada, under the name of the Consumers' Cordage Co., and this company has

MR. MULLOCK.

given the Canadian world this much information, at all events, as regards their affairs. I read from an advertisement which appears to-day in the Montreal "Herald," and I think a similar advertisement has appeared in authentic papers from the Government standpoint, and we may assume that this advertisement comes from headquarters, from the company itself. If not, the president of the company, who is sitting in this House, will of course repudiate the advertisement at once, and thereupon I will abstain from making any comment. If, however, he admits, as I assume he now does, this advertisement, as issued by the company in question, I will proceed to analyse to some extent the feeble condition of this industry, and show how most necessary it is that it may still be allowed further to operate, or, to quote an expression, to stab Canada in her vital parts. This infant industry has been described by itself as follows—I read from the advertisement :

Capital \$3,000,000.

Surely, an infant industry with a capital of \$3,000,000 is entitled to its contribution of taxes from the suffering farmers, the average of whom may be described as not possessing \$3,000,000. This company, it goes on to say, has the following gentlemen as directors :—

John F. Stairs, M.P., Halifax, president ; A. W. Morris, M.P.P., Montreal, vice-president ; Edward Fulton, Montreal, treasurer ; George Stairs, James M. Waterbury, New York ; Chauncey Marshall, New York ; Willard P. Whitlock, Elizabeth.

I presume the Elizabeth is Elizabeth, N.J. Thus we have in the directorate seven gentlemen, three of them admittedly American capitalists, two of them members of this House and the Quebec Legislature, and another a collateral relative of the president of the company. The advertisement goes on to say :

The directors who are now the owners of the entire capital stock have decided at the request of numerous friends of the company throughout Canada, to enlarge the proprietorship of its stock, and to offer for sale at par 10,000 shares of \$100 each, fully paid and non-assessable.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that this infant industry with \$3,000,000 of capital is not in that weak condition the Government suggest, but the stock is so valuable that numerous friends of the company throughout Canada are exceedingly anxious to get in on the ground floor and become joint proprietors ; and their pressure to secure some of the good things has been so great that those seven philanthropists have at last determined to make such sacrifice and to increase their capital by another million dollars, and thus further prop up this infant industry. It goes on to say as to whether this enterprise may or may not be profitable :

As the dividends of the company are payable quarterly, beginning with the first day of March next, allottees of stock will be entitled to receive a proportion of the quarterly dividend as declared, corresponding to the amount paid upon their subscription.

It would seem from this, inasmuch as they are sure they are going to be able to pay their quarterly dividends, that the infant industry is scarcely in that state which would entitle it to tax the farmers just now to contribute these dividends, because I extremely doubt if the farmers are able to rely upon quarterly dividends to themselves from their own special industry. I again quote from the advertisement :

The Consumers Cordage Company was organized in June, 1890, with a capital of \$1,000,000, to operate several of the largest cordage and binder twine factories in Canada. It at first operated these under leases, but its operations having been successful, the capital stock was subsequently increased to \$3,000,000, and the leased properties were purchased.

It might also have gone on to say that it was organized to take advantage of the National Policy and to buy up all the cordage factories of Canada, so as to get the farmers of Canada at their own mercy, and through the beautiful agency of the National Policy to extract from the pockets of the farmers and put into the pockets of this American combine a large sum of money. However, it does not give us the details of the operation, but it simply says that this company was organized in June, 1890, not three years ago, remember, for the purpose of operating several of the largest cordage factories in Canada. It goes on to tell us some of its history, and it states that :

It at first operated these under leases, but its operations having been successful, the capital stock was subsequently increased to \$3,000,000, and the leased properties were purchased.

In June, 1890, this company only managed to lease the properties throughout Canada, but its operations were so successful that it purchased them out and in fee simple and now owns them. It was so successful in the course of less than three years that it increased its capital to \$3,000,000, and yet it is held out as an infant industry. But somebody may say : It has accomplished all these things, but yet it is loaded down with encumbrances. That is not so. Lest there should be any doubt on that point, the advertisement proceeds to say :

The company has no mortgage indebtedness.

Here is an infant industry with \$3,000,000 capital, owning every cordage mill in Canada, and yet propped up by the Government as an infant industry and still maintained in a position to exact tribute for its own advantage from every farmer in Canada. In order that no person may have any doubt about the accuracy of these statements, auditors have investigated the matter and lawyers have given their opinions, and I read further on in the advertisement the following document :—

MONTREAL, January 5, 1893.

Consumers Cordage Co., Ltd., Montreal.

GENTLEMEN,—We have examined the books and documents connected with the organization of the Consumers Cordage Company, Limited, and are of opinion that it has been properly incorporated, and that its capital stock of \$3,000,000, as issued, is fully

paid up and non-assessable, according to the provisions of the "Companies Act."

We are, yours truly,
(Signed) ABBOTTS, CAMPBELL & MEREDITH.

There we have it beyond all controversy that this company has \$3,000,000 of paid-up capital. We have it on its own statement that it has not a mortgage against any of its property. It has purchased every cordage mill in Canada, and yet it is claiming to be a ward of the Government and demanding that the Government shall still allow it to roam through the land and tax the people of Canada. The advertisement proceeds :

The Consumers Cordage Company is probably the second largest manufacturer of cordage and binder twine in the world, and claims the following very material advantages over its competitors.

If the second largest manufactory in the world is not able to stand alone when it occupies that position, let me ask when will it be able to stand alone ? We are told that the National Policy is in force in order to maintain weaklings, and that, only for it, the weaklings would be crushed out by their more powerful rivals or competitors. Do you call this a weakling that proclaims to the world that it is the second largest manufacturer of the kind, not in Canada, but in the whole world ? Which is the largest ? Probably the parent institution—the National Cordage Company of the United States. I ask again : If the second largest manufacturing industry in the world is not able to stand alone in Canada under the National Policy, how long is it to continue to be entitled to draw upon the resources of the farmers of Canada in order to give it stability ? It proclaims the following advantages over competitors :

1st. Ample capital to conduct its business which enables it :—

(a.) To buy its raw material in larger quantities, and at lower prices.

(b.) To use only the latest and most improved machinery, thus keeping its mills in the highest state of efficiency.

2nd. Economy in selling and distributing its manufactured product.

3rd. The business covers so wide a territory (its manufactured goods go to almost every civilized country in the world) that it cannot be seriously injured by local troubles ; and its manufacturing establishments are so scattered that the danger of severe loss by fire is very slight.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the statement made in the paragraph which I have just read. It is here stated that its business covers so wide a territory that its manufactured goods go to almost every civilized country in the world. I ask why is it necessary to tax the farmers of Canada to maintain this twine combine, when it is obliged, as it necessarily must, to sell its stuff in the free trade markets of the world at lower prices than are exacted from the people of Canada ? How could it compete in the free trade markets of the world except at the expense of the Canadian farmer, and how comes it to be necessary,

as a matter of maintenance and legitimate business, that it should have the right to exact an extra profit from the Canadian farmer? The paper goes on to say that another advantage is:

4th. Lower cost of production.

(a.) By maintaining the sharpest competition between its several mills, it is enabled to introduce in all the best methods found in each.

(b.) By spreading its commercial expenses over a larger output.

(c.) By placing in one hand the purchasing of the raw materials and manufacturing supplies for the several mills, thus securing lowest prices.

(d.) By manufacturing for themselves many of their supplies.

One would think that all these advantages which it claims for itself were quite sufficient to take it out of the category of infant industries, and to entitle the best friends of Canada to say to it: The time has arrive when you must cease to prey upon the public.

The company does not claim to have any monopoly or to earn monopoly profits.

It would be a most unwise thing for the company to make any such claim in the press, but it goes on to say:

Since its organization it has been able, owing to the advantages above referred to, to earn a net return on its present capital of not less than 10 per cent per annum (as statements in their bankers' hands will show), and the directors believe that these profits will be maintained in the future, as the cost of production and distribution shows each year a marked decrease.

This company says that it has been able up to the present time to earn a net profit of at least 10 per cent per annum, and it believes that it will be able to maintain that profit for the future. If we are going to put industry by industry I would like to ask how comes it that this great industry is able to earn such a profit, and out of whom does it earn that profit? Its industry is selling twine and rope. The twine goes into the hands of the agriculturists of Canada. Have the farmers of Canada made at least 10 per cent per annum? On what principle of justice do the Government insist on transferring from the pockets of the farmers of Canada to the coffers of a \$3,000,000 infant industry this enormous sum of money, enriching a single corporation which has its ramifications extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and is levying taxes every year upon the farmers of Canada?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Blackmail.

Mr. MULOCK. Blackmail! It is legalized robbery, nothing else, and it is sanctioned by the Administration now sitting opposite to us. Two years ago hon. gentlemen promised that they would allow no such wrong as this to exist, yet for two years at least they have allowed this iniquitous system to remain. I say, and I say with regret, that it is a scandal to Canada that an institution like this should have the privilege, under the aegis of the Government of Canada, of taxing four-fifths of the

Mr. MULOCK.

people of Canada for its own enrichment; this institution, himself an estimable man, is in this House abusing the privileges of Parliament by managing, through the machinery of and I especially regret that the president of the Government he supports, to turn indirectly into his own pocket that share of the profits of this company which he, as one of its proprietors, has been able up to this moment to win. How long is this condition of affairs to last? I pointed out in this House two years ago, and nobody dared to contradict me, or has dared to contradict me up to this time, that the effect of this tariff was to levy upon the farmers of the county, a portion of which I represent, a charge of \$10,500 in the single year 1889, in respect of the crop they gathered and bound that year. The price of the twine they used exceeded the legitimate price of that year by the amount of the duty, 25 per cent, or between 2 and 3 cents a pound; and, according to the computations I laid before the House, the farmers of my county contributed, in that year, to this illegitimate institution, \$10,500, which they would not have had to pay if there had been free competition in the supply of this raw material to them. I ask, where is this thing to stop? The farmers of my county cannot afford to bear this burden. They toil hard and long for everything they earn; they find it hard enough to make ends meet, and some of them, I am sorry to say, are not able to reach even that point. On what principle, then, are we to take from him who has none and give to those who have much? There may have been some authority for that of old, but I do not want that authority extended to the practical affairs of to-day. We were told last year that it was a trifling tax, that it only amounted to a few cents an acre. I grant that. Suppose it only amounts to two or three dollars a year to each farmer, if you take even two or three dollars a year from each farmer and give it to the Cordage Company of Halifax, where can you fix a limit? If you once concede the principle that you can, by legislation, establish in Canada any institution which is permitted to levy taxes on one class of the people, for the special advantage of that corporation, where is the limit to be fixed? Compared with the other necessities of life, the item of binder twine is but a trifle; and this system unfortunately is not limited to that one item, but is found running through the whole gamut of articles which the farmer has to purchase. Take from him a few dollars illegitimately on his binder twine, a few more dollars on his agricultural implements, a few more on his household supplies, a few more on his iron goods, his cotton goods, and his groceries, and you have an explanation how it is that, by this iniquitous system of petty larceny, the farmers are being ground down under the tyranny of huge corporations. And yet we have the Administration telling the people of Canada, as they did a few weeks ago, and as they told this House

three days ago, that this country is entirely prosperous, and that the great National Policy ought to be maintained in its integrity.

Mr. LISTER. Except the mouldering branches.

Mr. MULOCK. Mouldering branches! We have not heard that there were any mouldering branches. We were told that if any were discovered, they would be lopped off; and if any had been discovered, there was an opportunity to mention them in the Speech from the Throne; but they have not told us that there was even a diseased twig. I bring this matter up in advance of the Budget speech, and I tell the hon. Finance Minister that the people of Canada demand at his hands immediate redress. Let him not say, when he brings down his budget, that he has not heard from the country on this subject. No matter what deceiving voices may be heard from the back benches, no matter how any members from farming districts may try to persuade him that this is only a trifle—for the dogs have been known to howl with the wolves—I venture to say that I am voicing the sentiments of the agriculturists of Canada, regardless of party, when I say that they are determined that, come what may, party must go to the winds in defence of their own homes; they are bound to take their stand on this item, and demand a fair consideration of their interests, which means freedom, fair-play and equal rights to all, and nothing more.

Mr. SEMPLE. I desire to say a few words in favour of the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and to voice the opinions of my constituents, both Liberals and Conservatives. The question before us is whether the interests of thousands of farmers, who have nearly a thousand millions of dollars invested in the country, are to be considered, or whether the Government are to consider alone the interests of a few manufacturers. It will shortly be seen which weighs the heaviest in the scale and which interest is most respected. This is a duty that taxes exclusively the farmers. Binder twine, though the finished product of the manufacturer, is the raw material of the farmer, because he cannot have his grain put in a position for the market until the binder twine is used; and in many sections of the country the cost has been so great that some have refrained from buying the most improved machinery on account of the cost of the twine. And, after all, but a small amount of the tax goes into the treasury. I took the trouble of consulting the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that from Great Britain we imported 30,649 lbs., value, \$3,548, duty, \$887. From China we imported 90 lbs., value, \$1, duty, 25 cents, and from the United States, 2,195,793 lbs., value, \$167,418, duty, \$41,824.25, making in all \$42,711. That is only a small amount to go into the treasury, but the tax is nevertheless a very serious tax on the farmers. Every farmer

can tell at a glance how much he has to pay; 25 per cent just means to a man who pays \$10, that without that tax he could purchase at \$8, and that a man who has to pay \$20 could purchase, were it not for the duty, at \$16, and so on. The calculation is easily made. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this cordage company sell at the lowest possible prices, that they are very generous and do not extort all they can, but just sell as low as the imported article is sold at. Well, I have been shown binder twine imported from Dundee, which was sold at 10 cents per pound. On that twine there was a duty of 25 per cent, and were it not for that duty the seller would have disposed of it at eight cents just as easily and made as much profit. The manufacturers generally manage to make a scale of their own, so that they will be just able to sell at the same price as the imported article sells at with the duty added. So that, when only \$42,000 goes into the treasury, it is very evident, considering the large amount of binder twine used in Ontario, Manitoba and the North-west, a large amount must go into the pockets of the manufacturer. And this is taken from the farmers at a time when, above all others, the Government should seek to lighten, or, at any rate, not increase their burdens. Good farmers have told me that they could not realize more than \$6 an acre from fields of wheat after taking it to market. When wheat is at 56 cents, oats at 25 cents, and peas at 50 cents per bushel, any tax unnecessarily imposed is a serious burden. This is not a question of politics. At a meeting of the county council of Wellington, which was held in Guelph recently, a motion was moved by Mr. McGowan that this Government be petitioned to take the duty off binder twine imported from Great Britain. Mr. McGowan is a life-long Conservative, and a farmer of wealth and influence, who formerly occupied a seat in the Local Legislature, and many thought he would be the nominee of the Conservative convention at the last general election. This is only one instance I have given to voice the opinions of the farmers of different shades of politics. All the farmers' organizations, such as the Farmer's Institute, the Grange Association, and the Patrons of Industry, are unanimous in holding that this iniquitous tax should be taken off, and the farmers be given fair-play. We give the Government credit for trying to help the farmers by means of the experimental farm, but, if you put all the good in that institution into one scale, and the amount taken from the farmers by the tax on binding twine in the other, the latter would more than balance the former, and the farmers would be losers, and the sooner the Government comes to the conclusion to act with justice in this particular, the better. This is a good opportunity to lop off one of the rotten branches by taking off the tax that exclusively falls on the farmer.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to enforce with whatever little weight remarks of mine may have, the contention of the hon. gentleman who has put this motion on the Paper, that the tax on binder twine should disappear. The hon. gentleman gave us an account of the cordage company, and the account he gave us puts us in a position which, in my opinion from the stand-point of scientific protection demands at once that a Government founded on protection should sweep away the tax. But the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I hardly think, knows the history of this company. I think I know even a little more than he does. He read to us an advertisement, and he told us of the National Cordage Company coming over and buying up the mills in Canada, but he did not tell us of that \$3,000,000 capital placed there, and supposed to be invested in this company, only \$1,500,000 exists. What the National Cordage Company did, was to say to the Canadian companies: Here, let us go into a pool. We will take half interest in your company, and, having taken that half interest, we will allow you the whole Canadian field to yourselves. Now, that is exactly what they have done. And the National Cordage Company of the United States are to-day the masters of the Consumers Company here. We find that Mr. A. W. Morris, M.P.P., Montreal, vice-president, before he could run for the Local House had to go to New York to ask permission, and I do not know what inference we may draw from that as to whether anybody else connected with that company, before he entered the Dominion House, would have to go to New York to ask a similar permission. I say that a priori the bare fact that a combine exists is sufficient reason for the Conservative Government of Canada, that came into power on the cry of protection, to sweep the combine away. When the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, and some others, and myself went about from platform to platform, of course, compared with the eloquent voices of my late leader and Sir Charles Tupper, and of Mr. Plumb, my voice was quite feeble, but, such as it was, it was the first in that campaign that uttered a word in favour of protection on a public platform. An hon. member says I ought to be ashamed of myself. I am not. I stand here now as strong a protectionist as ever and I speak from a protectionist stand-point. What was one of the arguments that we used in 1877 and 1878? We told the people that, instead of combines coming into existence, we would enlarge the sphere of competition, that we would put on a tariff which would be a just and fair protection but not an exclusive wall, and that we would have protection within the bounds of Canada and also competition in Canada, as we find that, even with the tariff of 25 per cent, you have still, as an hon. gentleman has stated, a feeble competition coming from Dundee, and from China, and a little, if it can be called compe-

Mr. SEMPLE.

tion, coming from below the line. What we said was that we did not intend to place a tariff which would be altogether a wall to exclude the goods from outside, but that what we wanted was to give a protection to enable young industries to come into existence and to foster them in their infancy. I think, if you look at the speeches of the right hon. gentleman who once led this House and the Conservative party with such distinction, you will find that he used the metaphor of rearing a child as long as it requires fostering care until it comes to adolescence, and then giving it less and less care until it comes to maturity, and when it comes to maturity allowing it to stand alone. I happen to have had the great honour of meeting in London, when I was a very young man, the late John Stuart Mill. As you know, he was an apostle of free trade, but he has stated in my presence, as I think he has stated in the eleventh edition of his Political Economy, that for a young country it was right to resort to protection; but he said, as he was opposed to exclusion, that the true way to inaugurate protection was by bonus, because, he said, the moment you protect by tariff there is great danger of large interests being created and intrenching themselves in such a way as to prevent a country from getting rid of them. We have the history of the United States before us, and we have also our knowledge of human nature, and we are aware that if we give anything to a man or a class he or they will get more if they can. That has been the result in the United States, and, instead of their system being a scientific protection, they have adopted a tariff which is unconsciously and unreasonably high, and which, instead of being protection, is frequently exclusion. Take this Consumers Company. In 1877 and 1878 we said: We will bring industries into existence here and there; you will have your tall chimneys rising up and vomiting their smoke to the sky. That is what I said in Haldimand, and it has been quoted over and over again by the Toronto "Globe." What we prophesied has been in the main fulfilled. I say the National Policy has justified itself, and it is because it has justified itself that I do not want the National Policy to stultify itself now. I do not want now, when gentlemen who have got rich and prosperous under the protection we gave them, have broken their implicit contract with Canada and have sold themselves and Canada to the foreigner, to come here and say: We have still the right to the shield and the shade you gave us in 1877 and 1878. I shrink from characterizing those gentlemen as I might. Like Scrub in the comedy, who commenced by denouncing the burglars as thieves and robbers, but under the influence of fear finished by referring to them as the honest gentlemen who were robbing the house; so, under the influence of politeness, I can only refer to these gentlemen of the cordage company as the honest and attractive gentlemen, as they are, who have been unconsciously led into a position of treason to Canada. The position they occupy

is just as bad as that with which Charles II. has been branded by historians of being pensioners on a foreign power. Charles II. became a pensioner of Louis XIV. These gentlemen who had been crowned with wealth by the Government of Canada, have been false to their agreement, and have sold themselves to the foreigner.

Mr. LISTER. No Cassius about that.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. LISTER. I said there was no Cassius about that.

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing lean and hungry.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman should know that I have been somewhat select in my society, and he should use the language of the class to which I belong. Mr. Speaker, I was about to point out to you that one of the things we promised in 1877-78, as any man can prove by going back to our picnic assemblies, was that in one part and another of the country, industries would crop up as a result of the National Policy. What do these gentlemen do? They crush down industry after industry all over this country. There was an industry at Lachute, to mention only one. "Ex uno disce omnes." There was a mill there in which some \$15,000 was invested, and which employed sixty workingmen. Now, one of the things we promised the people of Canada as a result of the National Policy, was that we should have mills here and there, and the workman would afford a market for the farmer. Well, Sir, the National Cordage Company and the Consumers' Cordage Company shut up the mill at Lachute, and they gave the gentlemen who were interested in that mill \$6,000 a year. For what? For dismissing these sixty men and taking the bread out of the mouths of their families. And, mind, Mr. Speaker, I can prove to you that they did not buy the mill. No hon. gentleman can get up here and say to me: Oh, well, a mill is a marketable commodity, and these men probably sold their mill, and men cannot always know to whom they sell. Now, that was not the case at all. On the contrary, their object was to shut down the manufacture of binder twine at Lachute. After they had agreed to pay the gentlemen who owned that mill \$6,000 a year, some persons connected with the Consumers' Cordage Company thought they owned the mill, and they removed part of the machinery to Montreal for some purpose; but the men to whom they are paying the \$6,000 made them take that back, and they took the machinery back, showing that this \$6,000 was a rental for not working. And the same thing happened at Quebec, and is happening all over the country. Now, let me point out to the Minister of Finance—because I thought I convinced him last year on this

subject—in fact I think I helped him to win two elections by false pretenses—

Mr. MULOCK. But you voted against us last year on this question.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, my hon. friend says I voted against him. I may vote with him now, but it will go against my grain, because, when he makes a proposal, he makes it in such a rough, aggressive and unwinning manner that it is a very difficult thing to vote with him. But I thought I had convinced my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, last year, in a private conversation I had with him, that it was necessary to take off the duty on this binder twine. He asked me: How can it help to take off the duty when it is the same company? I said to him just what I say here: first, my argument is that a priori, a combine has no right to protection. As a protectionist you have no right to give a combine protection. I said to him further: In the United States, with a market of 65,000,000, they are selling binder twine cheaper than they are in Canada. I took one large square and put a small square in the corner of it, and I showed him that as the size of the remainder of the large square exceeded the small square, and the wealth of what remained of the large square exceeded the wealth of the small square, so was the probability that if they raised the price of binder twine in the United States to anything like an exorbitant or irrational price, competition would come into existence to the probability of the same competition arising in Canada. Throw down the protection and the probability of competition is increased throughout the entire square. I thought that argument weighed with the Finance Minister. He did not say that he would do it, but I thought he would, and the consequence was that I went up to South Perth and I went into Northumberland and told the farmers, first, I disapproved altogether of this tax on binder twine, and in the next place, I said my own opinion is that you will find that the Government will take off the tax. Although they did not do it then, I hope they will do it next year; and in fact, although I have had no conversation whatever with any member of the Government on the subject, I am pretty well convinced that the tax will come off this year. Now, I want to speak for the North-west and Manitoba. We have had a good crop this year all over the country; in some parts we have had as large a crop as in 1891. And what has been the price of wheat? 43 and 46 cents a bushel; and yet in regard to this one item, a great company like this Consumers' Cordage Company are so protected that they can take a considerable sum above what they ought to take out of every large farmer's pocket in the North-west and in Manitoba. Why, Sir, our farmers are a struggling, and energetic, and on the whole, a prosperous race of men, but this year I may tell you that they feel the pres-

sure of high prices for what they buy and low prices for what they sell. Hon. gentlemen around me and opposite me who are farmers, know what it must be for the farmers up there when they are only getting 43 and 46 cents a bushel for wheat. In regard to this and to many other things in which the farmer of the North-west is deeply interested what was once a protective tariff has become an oppressive tariff, and I say that from the point of view of scientific protection, these things will have to be lowered or swept away. This protection to the Consumers' Cordage Company must go, for this company deserves no mercy whatever. To begin with, the stock is watered. In order to see what the farmer has to pay, you have to take into account what the excessive protection enables the seller in Canada to charge; and you have to take into account the fact that he pays interest on \$1,500,000 of stock watered to the foreigner. I will go further. I have been informed by a person who can speak by the book in regard to this company, that literally this National Cordage Company has not put a cent into the concern. All they did was to come over here and get hold of the Consumers' Company and tell them what they would do if they did not take such and such a course. But they said: We want our share of the dividend on a million and a half. That is what I have been told by a person who can speak by the book, and if it should be thought necessary to give us a committee on this or any other combine, or on combines collectively, I will put that gentleman into the witness box, because he is one of the first men in Canada in commerce, and I have no doubt that he will prove what he alleged to me. Anyway, in the interest of protection, in the interest of consistency on the part of a protective Government, in the interest of the constituency I represent, and the farmers of the North-west and Manitoba, and in the interest of the country at large, I hope that my hon. friends who sit on the Treasury benches will remove this onerous, and oppressive, and unjust impost.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was much pleased to hear the statement of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) on this subject, and also to hear from him that one of the reasons why he won two elections was because he promised the farmers of his constituency that the duty on binding twine would be removed. I was in North Perth with the hon. gentleman, but he neglected to make the statement there, and therefore the Government lost the election. This is one of the most oppressive taxes levied on the farmer, and this fact must have forced itself on the attention of the Government because last year they determined to establish a factory at Kingston Penitentiary for the manufacture of binding twine. I should like to ask the Government whether the vote taken last year is going to result in twine being manufactured there in time for next harvest. I hope the Government

Mr. DAVIN.

will not continue this protection of binding twine and compel the farmers to pay duty to the manufacturer. I repeat that this is one of the most grievous taxes that the farmer is called upon to bear. The returns show that Ontario imported 512,702 lbs. of binding twine. That was the whole quantity that came into the province; but from an advanced report of the Bureau of Industries I find that during last harvest there were 4,053,749 acres of fall and spring wheat, barley, oats and rye to be tied in that province. Taking two and a half pounds of twine per acre, there were required 10,134,372 lbs. The duty is 25 per cent, and admitting that the price of twine coming into the country was only 8 cents a pound, a rate which the Trade and Navigation Returns will bear me out as being correct, out of the duty on twine required in Ontario of \$202,687, only the sum of \$7,932 went into the public treasury, while \$194,755 went into the pockets of the combine, or, in other words, only \$1 went into the treasury for every \$22 that passed into the pockets of the combine manufacturing twine in Canada. I desire to state to this House what effect this duty has on the people of the county I represent. In Huron there are 175,472 acres that required binding twine during last harvest. Take the rate of two and a half pounds per acre, there would be required 433,680 lbs., which at two cents per pound duty would give a tax of \$8,673 as the sum which the farmers paid, while only \$395, went into the Treasury. The time has certainly arrived when this grievous duty should be removed, and I had hoped that when the Government in their wisdom found that it was in the interests of the farmers of the Dominion and of the whole people to establish a factory at Kingston and to take a vote to that purpose last year, they would consider that as the first step in the direction of removing the binding twine duty. This duty imposes on each farmer in Ontario a tax of \$2 for every forty acres of grain. It may be said that this is a small amount for each farmer to pay, but when we take that tax and the other taxes, such a large amount is taken out of their pockets that he has been reduced to a worse condition than he has occupied during the forty-nine years I have been in this country. I will not now enter fully into this question, but when the Budget is brought down, I shall be able to show that the reported increased exports, which to a large extent represent farm products, have been really the means of impoverishing the farmers, because if it cost more to raise the products exported than they realize, certainly they cannot prove profitable to the farmers and the country cannot be in a prosperous condition. I hope, therefore, the Government will take this question into their consideration, and as they took the first step last year, they will grant that relief which the farmers seek from the Government during the present session. I consider this is not a mouldering branch, but one rotten to the core, and it should therefore be lopped off without hesitation.

Mr. McMULLEN. It has been the duty of the Opposition to bring forward the question of this duty on binding twine for several sessions, and we have frequently drawn the attention of the Government and of the House to the injustice done the farmers of the Dominion by the imposition of this heavy duty. I think the evidence submitted to the House by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) clearly and distinctly proves that a gross injustice is done the farmers by continuing this tariff, and if there is one item of the National Policy which should be dispensed with, it is the duty on binding twine. I earnestly hope the representatives from the Maritime Provinces will not vote to-day for the continuation of this unjust duty. Halifax appears to be the principal point in Nova Scotia at which binding twine is produced. We know perfectly well there is not 5 per cent of the entire binding twine manufactured in the Dominion used in that province, in fact there is not 5 per cent of the quantity used in the Dominion consumed east of Montreal. The hon. gentleman who is most largely interested in the financial well-being, prosperity and future of that binding twine combination, and who has a seat in this House, knows perfectly well that his own province is not subjected seriously to the tax imposed upon binding twine, simply because the people there do not use it. The two provinces that suffer most from this unjust tax are Ontario and Manitoba. I was exceedingly pleased to hear the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) pronounce so distinctly and clearly his personal objections to the continuation of this tax. I look upon it as indicating the dawn of a better day for the people of this country when we find an hon. member of such pronounced Conservative views as the hon. member for West Assiniboia deeming it necessary in his own interests and in the interests of his constituents to cut himself loose from his party on this important question. He claims he is the father of the National Policy of protection. I was not aware of the fact before, although I have sat in this House during ten sessions.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not profess to be the father of that or anything else.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was not charging my hon. friend with being the father of that or anything else, for I never thought he was. As he claimed to be the father of the National Policy, I gave him credit for being its father, but if he thought that I attempted to insinuate that he was the father of anything else, I withdraw the insinuation. I believe that it was an evidence of a better day for this Dominion when we found a man of such pronounced views willing to stand up and boldly denounce the extortionate combine that has been formed in the matter of binder twine. I believe that there are other things in connection with the National Policy that are just as bad as this tax, and I dare say that when

the hon. First Minister made the announcement before the Board of Trade in the city of Toronto, that he intended to lop off the mouldering branches, will find when he comes to examine the tree that the branches are not only mouldering, but that actually the entire tree is rotten from root to top. The proper way, therefore, to get rid of the whole trouble is to dig the tree up by the roots. Let me point out an important consideration in connection with this question, viz., that in the Maritime Provinces binding twine is hardly used at all, and that the provinces which suffer most severely from the result of this imposition are Ontario and Manitoba. What hope have we that relief will be granted to the farmers of these two provinces when we look at the composition of the present Cabinet. The First Minister comes from Nova Scotia, and no serious loss from this tax results to the farmers of that province. The Minister of Finance, under whose department this question comes more directly than that of any other member of the Cabinet, also comes from the Maritime Provinces. The Postmaster-General comes from the province of Quebec, and there is very little binder twine used there. We find that all the prominent and influential members of the Cabinet represent provinces which are not directly interested in the question of lowering this duty. To whose tender mercy and personal care is the interest of the farmers of Ontario committed in this matter? It is committed to the Controller of Inland Revenue and the Controller of Customs. These two gentlemen are not inside Cabinet members, but are supposed to remain on the outside. The hon. Controller of Customs, to whom more particularly, I presume, the people of Ontario should look for relief, occupies such a position that, while the Cabinet is deliberating on the question of removing the binder twine duty, he is allowed only to mount his goat and ride along the corridors of the Privy Council Chamber and wait for the decision. He is the man above all others whom the farmers of Ontario must expect to attend to their interests. The other Ontario member of the Cabinet who is supposed to exercise an influence is the hon. Minister of Railways, but his ideas and his actions are largely wrapped up in the Intercolonial Railway. He does not go west; we see very little of him west, and I do not know that he is very much wanted or that he has been much sought after. His interest brings him east, and there is no regret I believe in that fact. I may say that the province of Ontario stands very much in need of a master hand, of an eloquent and clever man of good influence amongst his confreres, and of a patriotic Canadian who will stand up before the Cabinet both in Council and out of Council to advocate the interest of that great province in the matter of binding twine and coal oil duty and all these other things. While the people of the province of Ontario are suffering from those

severe and unjust duties on binding twine, the people of the Maritime Provinces, as I have said, are not feeling the serious drain upon their resources, because they do not use very much binder twine. Let us make a comparison. The great fishing industry of the Maritime Provinces has been considered in this matter, and twine for fishing tackle and for making and mending nets is allowed to be brought in free of duty. This is done to encourage the fishing industry of the Maritime Provinces. I appeal to every member of this House. I ask every honest man who will be called upon to record his vote upon this question to-day: is it not as honest and as just, that the farmers of Ontario and Manitoba who are obliged to use a very large quantity of twine as a raw material in their industry: is it not as just, I ask, that they should be relieved from the vexatious tax of 25 per cent on twine to encourage their industry as that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces should be relieved? If one is just is not the other just? Where is the principle of justice in allowing the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces to import their twine free of duty for fishing purposes, and at the same time in placing a tax of 25 per cent on the farmers of Ontario when they use twine in their industry? It is a gross injustice that such a law should be kept in force. If it should come to pass that we imposed a duty on twine brought in for fishing purposes, we would then see the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces standing up man for man and demanding that that duty should be taken off in the interest of their business; and if we had united the two influences, that of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces and that of the farmers of the west, we should very soon find that the farmers of the west would get that relief which they are now claiming. I was surprised at the statement made by the Minister of Finance the other night when he declared that the farmers of this country were in a prosperous condition. That statement is not founded upon facts. I quite endorse the statement made just now by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) that the farmers are not in such a condition as described. I am personally acquainted with a very large circle of the farmers in the section of the country from which I come. I know their struggling efforts; I know their pinched condition financially; I know that they are suffering, and I declare that there has not been a period in the history of this Dominion when the farmers of western Ontario suffered so much, and are so pinched by low prices and hard times and mortgaged farms as at the present day. That has been largely brought about by the operation of the National Policy, which has been imposed upon them year after year. They have to pay heavy prices for these things that they have to buy and consume, and these high prices have prevented them, to some extent at least, from paying off the mortgages that they were

R. McMULLEN.

obliged to contract in years gone by. My hon. friend opposite pointed to the condition of the farmers of the United States, and I am sorry to say that it is true, that in some cases the farmers of the United States are in a very deplorable condition. But why is that? It is because they have been ground down under the heel of monopoly, brought about by twenty-five years of protection and high tariff. We have had the same system in Canada for fifteen years, and if the farmers of this country are subjected to it for ten years more their condition will be worse than that of the farmers of the United States. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what relief he is going to extend to the farmers of this country to enable them to dispose of the surplus stock of horses for which there is now no market? The market opened to us for horses is shut out by the McKinley Bill; the price of horses is seriously depreciated; they are not bringing within thirty per cent of the prices they brought a few years ago, and I would like to ask the Government what relief is going to be afforded to the farmers in this respect. I would suggest that the Government should grant a bounty for the export of horses, to try if we cannot relieve the farmers and enable them to get rid of the enormous stock of animals now in Canada. I dare say there are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House who uphold the proposition to grant a bounty on the export of horses. I would like to know if it is not a matter of as vital interest to the well-being and prosperity of this country that the farmers should be helped out of their difficulties and made more prosperous, as that we should develop our iron mines alone. We are paying every year to the producers of pig iron a bounty of \$4 a ton. If it is thought wise and prudent to develop the production of pig iron by a bounty, I would ask would it not be equally desirable to relieve the farmers of this country from the embarrassed condition they are now in, by granting a bounty on the exportation of horses? I say it would be a wise and good thing; but I believe, from my past experience in this House, that it will take us on this side a very long time to induce hon. gentlemen opposite to meet the views of the people of this country. As long as they can fool and humbug the people, as they have done in the past, they will maintain the present condition of affairs. Every time they have appealed to the people, they have fooled and humbugged them. What was the case at the last election? They said to the people: Gentlemen, we want your mandate to authorize us to go to Washington to make a treaty; we have been invited to go to Washington on the 4th of March; we do not want to go there as the representatives of a Parliament in its dying hours; we want you to authorize us to go there to get such a treaty as you desire. The people of this country very foolishly took them at their word and voted in favour of giving them that mandate. What was the result? They said they

could not get a treaty. The Minister of Finance came back and reported that unless we abnegated every independent right, unless we cut ourselves off from Great Britain and threw ourselves into the lap of the United States, we could get no treaty. Well, Sir, the hon. First Minister, at the meeting he addressed in Toronto a short time ago, stated that they were offered a treaty on the very lines on which they said they could not get one. He said they could have got it, if they had been willing to take it, but they would not take it. That is the position they occupy to-day. I remember the First Minister leaving this city to go to Washington in order to give birth to this expected bantling of reciprocity. Why, Sir, the whole front of the Conservative party was swollen, pregnant with the desire to get a reciprocity treaty, and the First Minister took Sir Charles Tupper with him to act, I presume, as his attendant physician, at the expected accouchement, and he also took with him the Finance Minister to discharge the duties of midwife on that particular occasion. They went to Washington, but the people were disappointed; they were amazed to find that the whole thing passed off in a hurricane of wind on the political stump. There was nothing accomplished. Everything was done for the purpose of deceiving the people of this country, and the whole thing collapsed. It had no existence in any shape or form: it was not even still-born: it had neither bone nor flesh; there was nothing in it; and they came back and said to us: We could not get a reciprocity treaty. They misled the people of this country, for they had told them that they could get a treaty and were going to get it. Well, I wonder if the farmers of this country are going to permit themselves to be fooled and humbugged another time. I do not know whether the Government intend next time to go to the country on the same line of humbug. It looks like it. They may go on the promise that they are going to lop off the mouldering branches, but they have not told us what these mouldering branches are. I say it is time that we should show some anxiety to secure to the people of this Dominion the best things we can get. We should come together, and unite in a struggle to relieve the people from the shackles and the restrictions which bind them, to set them free, and give them every opportunity to make the best of their earnings—to buy in the cheapest market what they have to buy, and to sell what they have to sell in the dearest market. The Finance Minister tells us that the farmers of Canada have increased their shipments to Great Britain during the last year. Why is it? Simply because the ports of a more desirable market are closed against them, and they are driven to the necessity of sending their products to Great Britain, which is known as the slaughter market of creation, the market in which in a great many cases you have to take the lowest price. It is time that we stop fighting in the interests of party

alone. Let us lay party aside and look after the interests of the masses of the people of this country. Let us wipe out the duty on corn; let us wipe out the duty on binding twine so that the farmer can get it free as well as the fisherman; let us wipe out the duties on iron and on other articles. Everybody who sat in this House in 1887, heard Sir Charles Tupper depicting the advantages which this country would derive from the duties on iron. We were to have blast furnaces studding the whole country—at Kingston, at Fuller's Bay, at Toronto, at Hamilton, at Galt, at Fort William—a row of blast furnaces right across the country from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver. Yet there has not to this day been a single ton more of pig iron produced in Canada than there was before the duty was imposed. I ask, what is the use of imposing on the farmers of this country a tax of from \$300,000 to \$400,000 a year for the purpose of encouraging the production of pig iron, when for five years it has been a signal failure? There have been no blast furnaces built, or mines opened, as the result of that duty. That picture was just about on a par with many other pictures which we have had painted in this House for the purpose of leading men to support many things that turned out to be bogus afterwards. It is on a par with the picture we had painted to this House by Sir Charles Tupper with regard to the output of wheat in the North-west. He went into a calculation, and he calculated that if 640,000 farmers went in, as he thought they would in ten years, and if each man cultivated a hundred acres, and if each acre produced so many bushels, our receipts from lands in the North-west alone would more than pay, by the year 1891, every dollar spent in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. 640,000,000 bushels of wheat were to be produced in that country. Well, Sir Charles Tupper is away beyond the sound of my voice, and enjoying in the city of London all the gaities and the grandeur and the comforts of a lordly life at the expense of the people of this country, whose representatives he fooled and humbugged and mislead on the floor of this House for ten years. That is his reward. He is kept there virtually doing nothing at the expense of the people of this country. He is not here to listen to the wail of the people under the burdens imposed upon them chiefly by means of his false pretenses and deceptive pictures. After twenty years of Confederation, we find ourselves with a burden of debt unequalled by any portion of Her Majesty's empire, and unequalled by the people south of us, although they had to wage an internal war which cost them hundreds of millions. To-day we have a per capita debt quadruple of what they have across the border, and here we are struggling and agonizing under the burdens of indebtedness on which we are paying each year very nearly ten millions of dollars into the London money lenders' pock-

cts, one dollar of which never comes back to us except in the shape of a fresh loan. This is the result of fifteen years of extravagance. It is time we should begin to make a change. I should like to see the First Minister rise and announce to the House that the duty on binder twine is a mouldering branch which he intends to lop off. I am satisfied he may possibly call his supporters into line when this motion comes before the House in order to sustain the Government, but I believe the convictions of the people are so strong and pronounced that he will be compelled, before this Parliament rises, to give way and announce to the country that he will withdraw the duty on binder twine. In every farmers' institute, in every meeting of the patrons of industry, the people have declared most unanimously that the duty should be taken off this article. The Government cannot afford to close their ears to these utterances and appeals, and I venture to predict that if the Government persist in their present course, the measure of retribution will be meted out to them, when the proper time comes, which they justly deserve. That retribution may be a little delayed, but I have not the slightest doubt it will come like a torrent, as it did in the United States, and the political tornado which will pass over this country will sweep from their present position the men who persist in drawing from the resources of the people increased taxes and subjecting them to continued extortions. I felt it my duty to offer these few remarks to the House on this question, and I hope this is the last occasion in this Parliament when we will require to bring forward a motion to abolish the duty on binder twine. I hope that this discussion will make such an impression upon the Government that they will unanimously agree that binder twine is one of those things which should be placed on the free list, and thus give the farmers some instalment of the relief they are justly entitled to.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House comes to a vote upon this question, it is only right that I should say a word or two with reference to the subject under discussion. I may say, in the first place, that the Government is thankful for any fair discussion of a question pertinent to tariff matters as to other matters relating to the administration of affairs, and thankful for any information in the course of that discussion which the House may have at its command. The Government depends upon the information which it possesses, and which it acquires, and upon that information it draws its conclusions and bases its action. There may be many motives which have made themselves plain during the debate. Hon. gentlemen may have discussed this matter simply from the stand-point of a public good, and as discussing it from that stand-point, have laid aside partisan references or ad-

Mr. McMULLEN.

vantage and gone into a study of the question upon its merits, showing how and why this duty upon binder twine is particularly oppressive, and in what way matters would be made better if that duty were reduced or removed. That would be a line of argument which would be followed, I am sure, by gentlemen who undertook the discussion solely from the stand-point of public good. It may be also, that the discussion may have advanced somewhat upon the line of a desire to hit an individual or a party. That may have been a motive in some of the speeches which we have heard. I suppose hon. gentlemen have a perfect right—I am not finding fault with them—to take advantage, in this respect, of any line of discussion which is opened. Others have drawn the attention of the House chiefly to the manner in which the industry has been carried on, and have directed their animadversions in this respect to the combines and their effect upon the country, and given their view of the treatment which should be meted out to them by this Parliament or the Government in introducing its measures. I have, for my part, listened very carefully to the arguments and information, and hits as well, which have been made by the hon. gentlemen who took part in this debate, and I want to say, in the first place, speaking to hon. gentlemen who are in Opposition, that the Government does not take, in any respect, a backward position as regards their care and solicitude for the public good. Neither have they lost sight, nor do they intend to lose sight, of any subject of particular interest. It is one of their first duties to keep themselves in touch with the trend of events, with the circumstances and conditions of the country as a whole, and the particular interests of the country, and it is their duty, as it is their care and solicitude, to do everything, after having gathered such information as they may get, which shall tend towards the public good, and, so far as possible, in conjunction with that, towards the good and advantage of the particular interests which may, from time to time, be considered. Now, I am not at this time going to enter into a discussion of this question on its merits. Within a very few weeks the Government will be prepared to put before this House the exposition of their tariff and their commercial policy. They are considering it. They are not losing sight of this interest or of any other interests. Whatever may be done will be done and ought to be done on the broadest information and after the most careful consideration, and when the Government states its policy it will do so with confidence that it will be approved by the reasonable minds in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A new policy.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says "a new policy." If it be so, it will be something which hon. gentlemen opposite have not been

able to find for some years. They taunt us with sticking to the "old flag" and the "old policy." They have an old policy—and a mighty bad one it is—and with it only a foreign flag. At the present time I am sure it is not supposed that I should announce, as Finance Minister, what will be the Government's treatment of this matter. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), with that confidence in his own powers of persuasion which he rightly possesses, though he did not get a positive answer from me, thought he had converted me. Well, time is young yet, and in the course of time my hon. friend's prognostications may be found to be correct, or partially correct. There is something in standing up and saying we must let every industry stand on its own footing. One may state that and still may be arguing for something which will not allow an industry to stand on its own footing at all. We have to take into consideration the circumstances of countries with which we trade, and the tariffs that affect us as well, and see whether an industry which is heavily borne upon and has not a broad opening into all the markets of the world is standing on a fair footing and getting fair-play if we put it in a position of disadvantage. A position of fair advantage is what I consider properly allowing an industry to stand alone; but it is not fair if you take away all the ramparts and bulwarks from one army and ask them to fight against an army intrenched behind bulwarks and ramparts and well munitioned. I throw that out not so much in regard to this question but in reference to the general state of mind we must entertain in dealing with the position of our own industries. One other point. A member of our own party may get up and say: I am a strong protectionist, and believe in the policy and principle of protection, and yet I think in some particular details that policy and principle which is good may be amended. And here, and now, it may be well to state, not for those who possess information as to the progress of events in this House, but for others, that, whenever you hear a gentleman on the opposite side state that the Tory or Conservative party have declared that protection and their system of tariffs was a perfect one and needed no amendment, and that, as it came forth from its birth in 1879, it is what they have sworn to live and die by, he is misstating the proposition; he is making a proposition which hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have demolished time and time again, because, whenever changes have been proposed in the tariff—and they have often been proposed since 1879—they have taunted us with tinkering with the tariff. You may have an absolutely correct principle, but you may be called upon to vary the details from time to time as circumstances change. So much for the general question. Perhaps, now, after my hon. friend has argued this matter and has put his views before the country, he may be willing to post-

pone the vote until the Government has announced its intentions and its policy, which it will announce in a very little time. If not and if hon. gentlemen choose to do what is perfectly within their right to do, and to bring the matter to a vote, I have only to ask our own friends to wait until that time arrives before giving a decision on the question.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is very unfortunate, perhaps, that a subject of this kind cannot be fairly discussed without bringing in issues which do not properly belong to it. We cannot discuss this question of binder twine without bringing in the general principles of the National Policy. Now, I think that the principles of the National Policy were fully and fairly laid down by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). That hon. gentleman, I think, expressed them in terms with which I am, at any rate, in perfect accord. With regard to this particular subject I think he was right in saying that the moment any industry of this country which we have fostered by the National Policy, becomes the subject of combination, from that moment it ceases to deserve any consideration from this House in the shape of a protective duty. There are many other matters of a similar character which will probably be discussed when they come before this House at a later period. Now, with regard to this particular subject, I will simply say that I for one accept the declaration of the Finance Minister as far as it goes, that they are prepared to deal with the National Policy as a whole. I for one do not desire to attack it piecemeal, but I must say that if there is any doubt in the country, or any doubt in this House, the Government themselves are to blame for it, because in the Speech from the Throne, although nobody could have expected that they would have said they were going to reduce this or that particular duty, yet at any rate they might have given us some general declaration as to what their policy would be. Sir, their position is a very extraordinary one. They have read one hon. member out of the party because he was supposed to intend to say something against the National Policy; and here they have, from front and rear, from flank and centre, shot coming in from their own supporters, attacking this National Policy in terms which admit of no possible question or dispute. They remind me somewhat of the Spanish galleon at the great fight of the Armada. They are apparently unable to fight and they are unwilling to flee, and so they are submitting to attacks from various quarters in a manner which is certainly not very complimentary to the financial position of the Government. However, I do not propose to discuss the subject any further at the present moment, but in order to meet the views of the hon. Finance Minister, and while in the event of the failure of the Government to give us any distinct declaration of their policy I shall certainly vote for the motion of the hon. member for

North York (Mr. Mulock). I now beg to propose that the debate be adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the motion is put I will take the occasion to say a word or two. There would be a good deal, perhaps, to be said for the contention of the Minister of Finance that the Government should not be pressed on this occasion to make a declaration of their policy, were this a new question which was brought to their notice for the first time, were it a question on which there was any reasonable room for doubt. If it were a question as to which they had not had the most ample means for obtaining information in the fullest detail, if it were not a question which has been thrashed out time and again on the floor of this House, then I would say that there might be some reasons in asking my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) to abstain, until the Government policy was announced, from pressing his motion to a vote. But, as the matter stands, my hon. friend would be very ill-advised indeed if he refrained from taking the earliest opportunity in his power to test the sense of this House on the question of this most unjust and oppressive tax. Now, Sir, I doubt if, in the whole list of iniquities contained in the tariff of abominations which we now live under—I have no doubt the reading of the Finance Minister is sufficiently extensive to enable him to know that this is a classical and parliamentary phrase which has been applied to tariffs of this kind more than once, or twice, or twenty times, within the last fifty years, though rarely with as good a ground as I apply it on the present occasion. But I say that, of all the iniquities which this tariff contains, I can conceive of none that is so contrary—not alone to every canon of political economy, pretty nearly all the hon. gentleman's tariff resolutions are that—but against the plainest dictates of reason and common sense in a great agricultural country like Canada, which depends, to a great extent, on the prosperity of the agriculturists, on the prosperity of whom depends that of those identical classes whom the tariff is specially created to favour. Now, let us look at this duty. First of all, this gives almost no revenue. Here is a huge tax, computed by a very eminent agricultural authority at the rate of about \$8,000 per county in Ontario and Manitoba at any rate, and this tax, I believe, puts scarcely one dollar in the public treasury for \$20 which go into the pockets of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and his American friends. My hon. friend beside me, I dare say, has got the exact figures of the revenue last year.

Mr. LAURIER. About \$42,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we have raised a little revenue out of it, more than I supposed, and the burthens of the people have been increased in proportion.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

But there is no doubt whatever that in this, as in many other cases, four and fivefold as much is taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the pockets of a few monopolists like the hon. member for Halifax and his friends, as go into the public treasury. Now, that alone is a thing which ought, in all cases, at once to challenge the attention and command the instant action of the Government. It requires an overwhelming case, in my judgment, to justify the Government of a country in using their power to take four or five times as much out of the pockets of the people as they put into the treasury. There is another consideration. This tax imposes a very heavy burthen, not on all the people at large, not on the whole community, but on one single class of the community, and on a single portion of that class. It was contended with great force and truth that this is not a tax that falls on the people of the Maritime Provinces at all, it is not a tax which falls on a great part of the people of Quebec at all, but it falls on the province of Ontario, and chiefly on the province of Manitoba and on the North-west Territories, that part of Canada which at this present moment it is the duty of a wise Government to foster and protect, that part of Canada where, more than any other, it is extremely desirable that no impediment should be thrown in the way of colonization, that no impediment should be put in the way of the farmers of that region obtaining a just reward for their labours. Now, what is their position? Why, their position, for the past seven or eight years, has been this: That in consequence of what I may call world-wide causes over which the Government, I admit, had no control, steadily from month to month and from year to year the prices of agricultural products have been falling to an extremely low point, so that to-day, unless I am misinformed, the prices of wheat and other products of the soil similar to wheat are lower in the markets of the world than they have been for forty years. If the hon. gentleman has any other information, let him give it; but that is the statement I have extracted from the "Mark Lane Express," which has been confirmed by the authority of many eminent agriculturists, and which I believe to be approximately correct. Now, this is the time, those are the conditions, that is the identical moment which the Government chose to refuse to mitigate in any degree the position of the farmers. If you had a real and honest desire to promote immigration into the North-west, I can conceive of no one thing which you could do that is more likely to retard immigration into that country than to allow it to be generally known that our farmers in that region are subject to special and oppressive taxes which do not exist on the other side of the border—at any rate, to anything like the same extent. Then there is another consideration. My objection, first to last, since the National Policy was hatched here, from the very moment when a number

of mischievous charlatans undertook to persuade the people of Canada that they might get rich by doubling their taxes, my objection was, not merely that their policy was false on all possible grounds of sound economy, but the course of affairs in the United States had shown me what was the chief motive underlying the action of those men who were clamouring for protection in Canada. I was perfectly well aware then, as I am to-day, that the moment you introduce a protective system into any country under Heaven, that moment you provide a fund for organized political corruption; that moment you make it the interest of certain men to contribute for the purpose, not merely of obtaining a portion of the plunder of the people, but for the purpose of enslaving and debauching them. And here we have an admirable proof of how these things work. Now, I do not want to say anything personally offensive to the member for Halifax, but I ask the House and I ask the country under what possible conditions can that hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman occupying a similar position, give an honest, unbiassed vote on a proposition to reduce the burdens of the people of the country? He is largely interested in maintaining this duty on binder twine—personally interested through himself and his friends, and it is utterly impossible to maintain that duty without maintaining that particular policy of oppressive and unjust taxation on other articles as well. He must, of necessity—it is human nature that it should be so—come to a decision of this important question with a biased mind. It is not possible for him to look at this question on its merits; he must look at it, not as the member for Halifax, but as president of the Binder Twine Association. Now, I will not say whether he, as a great many other gentlemen in the same position, has been assessed for the purpose of contributing to the corruption fund whereby the Government carried their elections. If he and his friends have not been assessed they form a very remarkable exception to the general rule of conduct which has actuated the Government and their friends in this matter. Lastly, as was pointed out with force by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), even on the doctrine that is commonly laid down by protectionists themselves, this thing is an outrage, it is outside the pale of scientific protection, this thing has no claim on the Government, for the very excellent reason that this is a combination which is another name for an absolute monopoly that has shut up a large number of manufactories in Canada, that has driven a large number of workmen out of Canada or out of employment for the benefit of half a dozen gentlemen, most of them, I am informed, capitalists and inhabitants of another state, capitalists who do not reside in Canada, who do not even spend in Canada the plunder wrung from the agri-

culturists in Manitoba, Ontario and the North-west Territories, who lay us under tribute, who have used a portion of their money to shut up Canadian factories and who are now drawing a revenue so large that those benevolent individuals are publicly advertising their willingness to share it for a consideration. That is the kind of infant industry which I think an honest Hercules like the Minister of Finance could feel an honest pride in strangling in its cradle. But possibly in this case the serpent is too strong for our Hercules. I know something of the way in which tariffs were framed, that is to say, the tariffs prepared under the guidance of the hon. gentleman's predecessors. I can recollect the time when the Manufacturers' Association sent down a paid agent to draw the tariff for the then Minister of Finance, and it is within my knowledge that while that gentleman was drawing pay from the Government for assisting in the preparation of the tariff, he was under the pay of the manufacturers too. But, Mr. Speaker, what it is most important to the people of Ontario and the North-west to mark is what I must call the stolid indifference to their situation displayed by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Unhappily the agriculturists of Ontario and the North-west do not seem to have very weighty influence in this Cabinet. Were they maritime fishermen they would have got their binding twine duty free, but, being only agriculturists of Ontario and of the North-west, their humblest petition is whistled down the wind. It is not the first time, nor the second time, nor the third time, nor the fourth time that their wrongs have been brought before this Parliament, and before this Government. It is not the first nor the second nor third time they have been put off with the assurance that it is under consideration. Why, Sir, it has been under consideration ever since 1888, and the hon. gentleman has got no further with it yet. I agree with some of my hon. friends in saying that the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, notably by the First Minister, notably by his Finance Minister and by most of his colleagues touching the present condition of the agricultural community, are, to say the least of them, statements which are wholly destitute of foundation in fact. I do not pretend to say there are not in Canada, there are not in Ontario, a large number of agriculturists who, in spite of all the acts those hon. gentlemen have done, are able to keep their heads above water, thanks to the industry and frugality which made them pretty wealthy men before the hon. gentlemen got into power; but I say this, there are very few indeed at this present moment who at the outside do more than make both ends meet. I affirm that an enormous number of agriculturists in Canada are daily and yearly sinking from the position of freeholders into that of mere tenants at will, or into a position which is worse still, who have no chance,

humanly speaking, of extricating themselves from a position which makes them, although not tenants at will, in form tenants at will, in fact, and that is a most unfortunate condition for that large and important class to find themselves reduced to. The First Minister, either at a dinner at Sherbrooke or elsewhere, asserted, if my memory serves me, that the people of Canada were the most prosperous in the world, and I think he mentioned the farmers particularly. I should like to have that assertion placed in the hands of one of the unfortunate 10,000 Ontario farmers, who, according to the latest statistical returns supplied by the Ontario Government, were proved to be under chattel mortgage. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and a lawyer of repute. He knows what a chattel mortgage is; but perhaps he does not know what that means to the agriculturist. The giving of a chattel mortgage is the last sign of extreme distress, and if you find in Ontario that its farming population of perhaps 150,000 or 160,000 farmers, that is using the term as applicable to farmers who have a reasonable quantity of land, in the proportion of one man in fifteen or sixteen is hoisting that signal of uttermost distress, you may rest assured that a vastly greater proportion, an enormously greater proportion, are in very bad condition. I repeat that I know there are sections of Ontario where the original wealth of the farmers was so great they have not been reduced to anything like the extremity that has prevailed in other quarters; but I tell the hon. gentleman, if he disputes the assertion that he knows more about this than he does about the facts of the census; that if he dares to issue a commission and cause any inquiry to be made, first, into the depreciation in the actual selling value of land in the old provinces of this Dominion, at all events, he will find every statement made by me in this House is well within the mark, as well as every statement made by me in this House with respect to the exodus during the last ten years. Mr. Speaker, at this present moment there is no sort of doubt in the minds of those who have examined the question, as I have done, who have taken the means of ascertaining what the depreciation is, that, take the province of Ontario, for which alone I profess to speak—let the Maritime Provinces members speak for their own provinces—there is no doubt that from one end of Ontario to another there has been an average depreciation of at least \$10 per acre. Does the Minister want to know what that means? That is an item of statistics I recommend to the attention of himself and his colleagues. In Ontario alone there has been a depreciation within the last ten or twelve years of not less, it may be very much more than \$200,000,000 in the selling value of farm property alone. We have over 20,000,000 acres of land in Ontario, and taking it on an average I do not believe five per cent of that land could be sold within \$10 per acre as much as was received for it, or could have been received for it ten or

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT: HT.

twelve years ago. If the hon. gentleman wants to ascertain these facts, the course is easily followed. Do not let him go to idle and vague reports, but let him make inquiry from those conversant with the actual selling value of those lands. Let the details as given in the various registries be examined; let the dates of sale made by the officers of justice, and there are only too many of them made at the present moment in Ontario, be noted, and these, I regret to say, will go to prove the absolute truth of all I have to say. Sir, I had an opportunity not long ago of examining confidential reports made by the agents of some very large loan societies doing business from one end of Ontario to the other, and I speak of my own personal knowledge, of course, of the province of Ontario alone. As to the other provinces, I repeat that hon. gentlemen who come from them can speak as to their experience. There was one fact which every one of these reports confirm, namely, that taking Ontario throughout, there had been during the last few years an enormous depreciation in the selling values of the land. In many places that was put at 40 per cent, in others at 30 per cent, in others at 25 per cent, but in none, that my memory recollects, was the average depreciation put at one penny less than 20 per cent of the former selling value. Does the hon. gentleman desire to ascertain how heavy our mortgage indebtedness is? They would not do it when they were taking the census returns, although it was suggested to them, but they can do it now, if they like, and a small expenditure of money would obtain all the information required. Some years ago I myself took samples from seven different counties, and the result of that investigation went to show that in these seven counties, covering fairly enough the various sections of the province of Ontario, you would not find a concession in a township in which, on an average, more than each alternate farm was free from mortgages, and I grieve to say that in a great many cases it was much more difficult to find a farm that had no mortgage on it than to find those that were so encumbered. Mr. Speaker, I have not alleged, as the hon. Finance Minister appeared to think, that the present condition of the farmers of Ontario was wholly due to this mischievous National Policy. I repeatedly and emphatically stated that while that was one important factor in destroying the value of property and causing the exodus, it was not the sole factor. But my complaint against hon. gentlemen opposite is this: That at a time in the history of our agriculturists when a variety of adverse circumstances had conspired together to reduce the value of their crops, when they conspired together to depreciate the value of their lands, at that time under the guise of the National Policy the Government of Canada saw fit to inflict enormous burdens upon the people, burdens which in the last resort rest more heavily upon the farmers than upon

any other class of the community. It is a fact, whether the Finance Minister or the Minister of Justice knows it or not, that it is of the essence of the protective system that while almost every other class can to a greater or lesser degree shift the burden from themselves on the consumer, that burden in the last resort comes to rest upon the land, and upon those who derive their subsistence from it. More than that, Sir, there are circumstances which ought to have led the Government under existing conditions of things to have taken special care to relieve the farmer in every possible shape and way. Largely, I believe, due to the improvidence of the Government, largely due to the petulant and foolish manner in which they carried on relations with the neighbouring States, the farmer of Canada, in addition to the Foster tariff has been lately afflicted with the McKinley tariff. He has been ground between the upper and the nether millstone. Not merely has he had to pay many millions of duty into the treasury,—which he would not complain of so much,—but he has also been compelled to pay into the pockets of monopolists like the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), like the hon. Senator Drummond with his sugar tax, and a variety of other gentlemen whom I could name. Not only has he been compelled to pay these huge sums, partly to the revenue, and chiefly to the monopolists, but over and above all that he has been obliged to pay huge sums of money into the American treasury as well. There is no shadow of doubt, knowing the facts we know, that the imposition of the McKinley tariff was largely due to the unfortunate relations, which in consequence of the ill-considered conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, had subsisted between them and the Government at Washington, and which had a reflex, and a very unfavourable action on the American people. Under those conditions, they being responsible to a great degree not merely for their own tax, but for the imposition of the United States duties, it was their bounden and special duty to have taken every possible opportunity that came in their way to relieve these burdens on the agriculturists. What have they done? They have not lightened those burdens by one single solitary cent—because I give them no credit for what the hon. Finance Minister took credit to himself not long ago—I give them no credit for their reduction of the sugar duty. They did not reduce the sugar duty until the Americans had set them the example, and then they simply reduced it because as they right well knew it was impossible for them to maintain it. When they did reduce it they did it in such a way as to cost the people of Canada as much revenue as possible and to leave as much plunder as possible to the monopolist. To-day they claim credit for taking off three millions of duty on sugar which they could not help taking off. But, Sir, they do not take credit—or rather, perhaps, they do in certain quarters

but not in this House—for having left two millions of dollars of duty on for the benefit of some half score monopolists and sugar refiners. That is the reason, that is the ground on which I say that the Government of Canada, when a special case like this is made out, and when it is shown clearly and unmistakably that this tax has pressed most unfairly and unreasonably on a large section of the agricultural population of Canada, ought, tariff or no tariff, take steps at once to relieve it. Out of their own mouths, as was pointed out by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), they stand condemned. Out of their own mouths they ought to be judged. I say that the Government are not justified by any argument that has as yet been advanced from the Treasury benches. Certainly they are not justified by the argument of the Minister of Finance for refusing to consider this proposition, and to consider it favourably. We will be glad if there are reasons—better reasons than the Minister of Finance has given—to hear these reasons, and I trust this debate will not close without some attempt at least being made by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to justify the conduct of which they have been guilty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I need not say to the House that the reasons which would be sufficient in the mind of the hon. member who has just spoken (Sir Richard Cartwright) for asking the House to pursue the ordinary course of leaving this matter to be dealt with until the tariff policy is brought down, would be very extraordinary indeed. The hon. member did not need to address the House this afternoon for the purpose of convincing us as to what his position is upon this question, or upon any other question in relation to which he might hope the Government could be embarrassed for a single moment. We knew very well, that however reasonable and fair and proper in the judgment of ordinary members of the House, was the appeal of the Minister of Finance, that the House should not come to a vote upon this question until the tariff arrangements which are proposed to be made were brought before it; no reason of that kind would meet with a proper reception from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We knew that he would avail himself of any opportunity,—or of anything that he considered an opportunity, whether it might be really opportune or not,—of working into the debate the language with which he is accustomed to disfigure "Hansard" on every occasion. We knew he would have the old stock arguments, the old cry about the "Red Chamber," the old talk of assessment for the purposes of corruption, the old bogus theories about taxation for the benefit of the sugar refiners, and every stale adjective which he has been flashing backwards and forwards through the pages of "Hansard" for twenty years. We were pre-

pared for that. We were prepared for the hon. gentleman's wild assertion that I stated somewhere—the hon. member was not bound by the ordinary rules of debate, nor one would suppose by the ordinary rules of propriety to state where—but at all events we were prepared for his assertion that I had said somewhere that the farmers of Canada were the most prosperous people in the world; an assertion which I need not say is wholly without saying. The hon. gentleman, there-without truth, because that almost goes fore, has not made any fresh contribution to the debate in stating that the Government ought to be forced to a vote upon this question, or in asserting even that we were not disposed to action with regard to this or any other feature of the tariff, that we were refusing to mitigate the burdens that were said to fall upon the farmers of this country; and that we were refusing to extend any relief at all to people labouring under the depressing circumstances which he was obliged to admit—although it falsified, to a great extent, his argument—existed with regard to the condition of the agricultural classes in every part of the world. But, Sir, irrespective of those vituperative expressions which the hon. gentleman has delighted himself with, although he delighted nobody else this evening, I desire to call the grave attention of the House to the position in which this question comes before us now. We are within the first week of the session; we are still a month at least distant from the period of the session when the tariff policy of the Government is usually announced. We do not by any means dispute the constitutional right of any member of this House to move a resolution with regard to the tariff; that is as much the right of any private member of the House as it is of the Finance Minister. But in ordinary cases—and I think the same rule will be followed in this case—the House does recognize that, the Finance Minister being charged with the duty of making presently a declaration to the House and the country of the changes which the Government desire the House to enact in the tariff, it is more seeming and more becoming that the whole policy of the Government on that subject should be laid before the House before it is asked to express an opinion by its vote. We admit, I say again, the right of a member to raise these questions and to discuss them; but I submit to the judgment of the House whether it will pass a resolution dictating a policy to us, or whether the course most convenient, according to parliamentary practice, is not that this and every other question relating to the tariff, shall be delayed for decision, if not for discussion, until the whole tariff is before the House. The reason for that is obvious to any man who considers the way in which trade would be affected if the House should come to the conclusion that the duty on binding twine or on any other article must be reduced. In what position would we find the business interests of this country if, two

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

months in advance of the time when any such changes could come into effect, the business community should be notified that this or that duty would be taken off? Trade would be completely demoralized; and if this could be done in the case of binding twine, it could be done in the case of every business interest which our tariff affects. In times past every member has conceded the reasonableness of this practice. Every member has recognized that when the tariff policy of the Government is brought down to the House, the whole tariff is open to amendment at the instance even of a private member, and every member has recognized that that is the convenient time to discuss and consider every question relating to the tariff. I could not expect the hon. member for South Oxford to agree to this proposition. The hon. member said that if this were a new question, he would agree to this proposition. The hon. member would not agree to a proposition to postpone the consideration of the question even if it had not been brought up before. But we do expect, in regard to all matters of this character, that the House will reserve its judgment until Parliament comes to deal with the tariff as a whole, both in view of the ordinary convenience of Parliament and as a matter of prudence with regard to possible disturbance in the trade of the country. Notwithstanding the observations which the hon. gentleman has made, and which are very inviting indeed, as to the condition of the farmers of this country—inviting because they offer an opportunity of comparing the state of affairs in this country with that of the country to which he desires to annex us commercially if not politically, and because the hon. member has challenged an investigation into his arguments of the past, as regards the ridiculous samples he brought before the House of mortgages in certain counties, forgetting altogether in his calculations the amounts of money that had been paid on those mortgages, until reminded of his omission, presenting to this House an extraordinary spectacle for a man who had figured as the Finance Minister of this country for a number of years. And that hon. gentleman, I may mention parenthetically, is the gentleman who undertakes to pass a criticism of my figures of the census, which he observed evinced ignorance on my part—a remark, however, which only evinced ignorance on his own part.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a pity your own Finance Minister did not see that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can answer for myself, Mr. Speaker. But I would not have risen, notwithstanding the tempting opportunity which the hon. member for South Oxford afforded, had it not been for one observation which was made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). Although the hon. member for Muskoka was critical in what he said as to the course pursued by the Govern-

ment, he recognized with perfect fairness the impropriety of pressing this question to a vote just now. But that hon. member made the observation, that while the Motion Paper was bristling with demands for changes in the tariff, the Government had read a gentleman out of the party for no other reason than that he had criticised the tariff. I credit the hon. member with the utmost sincerity in making that observation; but whatever it was based upon, whether upon speeches made or articles written elsewhere, I have simply one remark to make with reference to it, that is, that this Government has read no man out of this party. If any man who has given us support in the past is unable to continue that support, either to the general policy of the Government or to its particular measures, we regret it; but it is reserved for such a gentleman alone to read himself out of the party. The Government has never done it in the past, nor will it do it in the future.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Government to the state of affairs in the Sandwich Islands, and to take this opportunity of asking whether the Government have impressed on the home authorities the vital interest Canada has in the maintenance of the political independence of the Sandwich Islands. These islands are well situated for trade between Canada and Australia, and are also intended to be a resting place for the Pacific cable. Their annexation to the United States, which is now before the Senate of that country, is a matter, therefore, which deeply concerns us.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to postpone that question until the leader of the Government comes in, when, no doubt, that hon. gentleman will reply.

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

(In the Committee.)

Interior Department.... \$101,146 50

Mr FOSTER. There are fifty-four statutory increases at \$50, one at \$37.50, one at \$25, and one at \$30. There are also some transfers, and there is a deduction of the salary of the chief clerk, \$2,800.

Mr. McMULLEN. Amongst a number of the departments with which we have to deal in the matter of salaries, it appears to me that the Department of the Interior is one to which the pruning-knife should be most

vigorously applied. That department has for years been costing this country more than it really ought. We have in it what might properly be called a double-headed institution, one head of which is here and the other in Winnipeg. I refer to the Land Board. We have a Land Board at Winnipeg to which it was supposed appeals could be made in disputed cases. No doubt appeals were made, and then after that board had deliberated and reached what they considered a just decision, the matters were referred to Ottawa and the work done over again. Having realized but a very little sum from the sales of land in the North-west, and from other sources, which were expected to yield large annual returns, it behooves this House and committee to vigorously investigate every item connected with the Interior Department. In the matter of civil servants, its expenditure has been growing more rapidly than any other department. In the North-west there is room to hide away a great number of virtually useless and unnecessary servants. They spend their time hunting around there generally, enjoying a never-ending holiday, a great many of them, and this country is called upon yearly to vote very large sums in order to defray the very liberal salaries allowed to these gentlemen. We have instances of this in the case of homestead inspectors, colonization inspectors, timber inspectors, and there is no end of officers which have been created, not because there was any necessity for them, but because there were persons pressing their services upon the country, wanting positions to fill, and the Interior Department has been utilized to furnish these people with appointments. I earnestly hope that the Minister now in charge will very vigorously apply the pruning-knife to all unnecessary officials employed in the North-west in connection with that department. I was through that country, and had some little ocular demonstration myself of the number of fellows who are virtually almost tramping on each other in Government offices. About Winnipeg they are as thick as bees around a sugar cask, dancing about in all directions, drawing large salaries, and doing next to nothing. I found I could trace the relations of a good many people who used to be prominent in this province, and to whom were given very lucrative positions in the North-west, or if not to them to their sons and grandsons. We have any number of Stephensons out there drawing Government pay—and that name has been before this House on several occasions in connection with the Department of Interior—as timber inspectors, colonization inspectors and homestead inspectors. I believe it is a wonderful country for rapid growth, but I do not know whether these people are the natural increase of that country or not. I dare say a good many have gone from here because they could not get very much to do here in a lucrative way, and so they transferred themselves to the North-west and were pitchforked on the country,

for the purpose of drawing salary. This thing has gone too far. I would like to know how many homestead inspectors we have, and whether we are still to have this double-headed institution of the Land Board continued. What is the intention of the hon. minister with regard to that board? It has been a very costly institution. We have a man drawing the magnificent salary of \$5,000 a year as head of that board at Winnipeg, and then we have any number of others dancing attendance for all purposes.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that of course we are not discussing the estimates relating to the office in Winnipeg, and when we reach that item I will give him the fullest explanation with reference to the salaries and duties of the commissioner and of the officers under him in Winnipeg. If the hon. gentleman will be content with that, I will give him the fullest information I possibly can and any other information in regard to the other officers under the commissioner, such as the land agents and inspectors and timber inspectors, when the matter comes up.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will willingly defer my request to the minister to grant the information which I asked, but I thought it necessary to prepare his mind for answering the questions which will be put to him at a future stage, and because it is well that he should prepare himself for a determined and vigorous investigation when the item is reached and should not be caught napping when it comes up. As he has been only recently installed in his office and no doubt has a very limited knowledge of the details of that important department, we will give him the space and the time to study up so as to be intelligently able to answer the questions when we reach that point. We have had some information from the Minister of Finance as to the increases in his department, but I would ask if any superannuations have taken place out of the department here?

Mr. DALY. No, there have not been any.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada—Salaries.. \$8,200

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should have some explanation from the Minister with regard to the High Commissioner. I pointed out last night that the House and the country were disappointed that his services had not been utilized in matters of finance. The Finance Minister told us that he was in England and was entirely independent of him, that he was not able to implement the promise made by the First Minister years ago that he would be very valuable in handling our finances in England, but he has been unable to utilize Sir Charles Tupper and his staff in that direction. The House consented to the appointment very reluctantly, the First Minister then giving his positive assurance that Sir Charles Tupper would be a most valuable assistant in manag-

Mr. McMULLEN.

ing our finances in England, and he has been having what we are disposed to call, and very properly, a holiday, from his appointment to the present time, and has been drawing his salary all that time, and dancing around and enjoying all the gaieties and pleasures of London life. No doubt the Finance Minister was highly entertained by the High Commissioner when he was in London recently. No doubt that, with a view to keep his office, he endeavoured to entertain the Finance Minister and show him the dignity and the grandeur and the importance of the High Commissioner in London. After his investigation, no doubt the hon. gentleman will be able to say what particular duties that officer is supposed to perform. This is not a matter we can afford to jest upon. The High Commissioner and his family have been very expensive to this country. Last year I drew attention to the fact that they were drawing large sums of money from this country. In 1888 they received \$33,783.26, in 1889 \$31,623.11, in 1890 \$42,044.83, and in 1891 the amounts the High Commissioner and his sons, sons-in-law and others have drawn will amount to about \$44,000. If that is to go on, we must say it is God's blessing that we have only one Tupper family. I daresay we get some service for this, but as we are not to use the High Commissioner as a financial agent in London, I should like to know what use we are to make of him. We know that we pay \$17,000 for immigration purposes in London. If he is to discharge the duties of immigration agent there, we had better abolish the other office, because the total amount is very large. I see that last year we paid out in London alone \$17,721.73, apart from Sir Charles Tupper's office altogether. If any person will look over the items of charges made in connection with the High Commissioner, he will see that we have evidently in London another double-headed institution in the shape of immigration agents. We have the High Commissioner, who is supposed to perform some of these duties, and his office costs \$27,526.38, and then we have the other office which costs \$17,721.73, or, in all, \$45,248.11 for immigration purposes. If Sir Charles Tupper is performing the duty of immigration agent, should we not abandon the other office, or if the other office is doing, as I believe it is, the most efficient work, should we not abandon the High Commissioner? I do not mean that we should turn him out on the streets in London. I would bring him back here, and he might be sent to the North-west and might implement his promise that we would export 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from that province. If, with his eloquent tongue, he could persuade the people there to do that it might be of some use, but it seems to me he is doing nothing in London. I think we ought seriously to consider the necessity of keeping the High Commissioner in London, and I would like to know from the Finance Min-

ister what he and his staff are supposed to do.

Mr. FOSTER. I will first give the hon. gentleman the information as to the item under consideration, leaving the North-west and former prophecies out of the question for the present. There have been three statutory increases at \$50, amounting to \$150. The promotion of Mr. Chase from second to first class, \$100; and Mr. Howard from third class to second, \$116, making \$366 increase in all.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would the Minister tell us what that staff has to do?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who particularly assumes the role of criticising the High Commissioner's expenses in this Parliament, and has done it for several years, in performance of his duty, of course, has always sought to give the impression to the House, and to the country, that this was an office which did nothing and which ought to be abolished in the interest of economy and the efficiency of Government. Hitherto he has had his way, and it was thought that the House was so well acquainted with the duties which would necessarily belong to a High Commissioner, representing a country having so many interests in London as Canada, that it did not need any lengthy explanation to set the matter right. But the hon. gentleman has to-night called for details, and he has challenged the wisdom of keeping an office there at all for a High Commissioner. He has mentioned that we have two offices there, one an immigration department and the other for the High Commissioner. My hon. friend is wrong in that. We have no emigration department proper in London. We have the High Commissioner's office, and a part of the duties of his staff are intimately connected with emigration, of course. The payments that are made on account of the High Commissioner's residence in London, and his work in London, and for his official residence, will come up on an item later. Now, my hon. friend says that he does not think the High Commissioner's staff does anything to justify its existence. I happen to have been there last autumn myself, and to have visited the High Commissioner's office many times, and to have seen something of the place itself, and of the work that was carried on. I came to know somewhat intimately the clerks who are there, and I made myself acquainted with the work which they are doing. In the first place, I may say that there is nothing to reproach Canada with as regards the palatial character and luxurious surroundings of the High Commissioner's office in London. It is a model of plainness, if not of neatness, and while it occupies, as it ought to occupy, a very good position amongst all the offices of the agents-general of the different colonies, there is not, in its appearance outside, or in its arrangement inside, anything that would lead one

to the conclusion that the office of High Commissioner is unduly splendid or luxuriously furnished. It is a working office from top to bottom, and is designed to carry out, and does carry out, the purpose of its work. Now, as regards the staff, there are five clerks and two messengers, as my hon. friend can see, who are estimated for here, and who do the work. The five clerks and two messengers do a great deal more work than could otherwise be done from the fact that they have taken as messengers persons who are expert type-writers, and, although they do the work of messengers, they are also doing the work of expert type-writers in all the hours when they are not required for messengers' duty; so that they are in reality messenger clerks, and efficient clerks at that. I found that every clerk in the establishment was a type-writer, so that the staff is, besides being small, equipped to the very best advantage for work. Now, the point is as to what work they have to do, and I came to the conclusion from my investigations into the matter while I was there that the office clerks are not only worked but are hardly worked from the beginning to the end of the year. Before looking into it I had no idea of the amount of work that was forced upon them. In the first place the commissioner himself being a representative of Canada, has affiliations with all the other colonies and with the official world in London, and with the Government offices in London, which requires a great deal of his personal attention, and which he gives, of course, as any one who knows Sir Charles Tupper knows that he would give, and this requires a great deal of correspondence, official and semi-official in its nature, which requires a competent clerical force and diligent work as well. That, however, is a small portion of the work which is done in the High Commissioner's office. The work is divided amongst the staff in four divisions. The first is the accountant's division, and last year the amount of money which passed through the accountant's hands in the shape of cheques in the High Commissioner's office was over half a million dollars, 944 cheques having been issued. These take in the pay for the expenses for the High Commissioner's office, and also expenditures for almost every one of the departments in Ottawa, which order through the High Commissioner's office certain stores and things that are necessary, and which are paid for through the High Commissioner's office, the cheques being issued and the record of the transaction being kept and closed upon the spot. That of itself necessitates the keeping of books, and the accountant's time is very fully taken up with that matter and with the other items I have mentioned. Then, again, there is the correspondence on account of emigration, and the emigration officials in England are paid through the High Commissioner's office in London, where the accounts are checked and the vouchers are supervised, and the salaries

and expenses are paid through the High Commissioner's office. That makes necessary the supervision of the expenditure in the emigration offices throughout the United Kingdom, both those that are stationary and the emigration agents who are travelling. Then, again, there are the bonuses which are paid to steamship companies for passengers who are booked through to Canada. All these payments are made through the High Commissioner's office, necessitating a complex and thorough system of checking accounts and keeping books, so that if I went into the accountant's office and asked for any single account of any steamship agent, the whole matter is laid before me in a practical and business-like shape, so that I can trace every payment that is made. Then, under the system of giving bonuses to persons who settle on lands in the North-west, the bonus cannot be given to a steamship agent who books the passenger, until the certificate has been forwarded that the passenger has taken out his land in the North-west. That certificate is given at the Land Office in Winnipeg, and is sent to the High Commissioner. The High Commissioner's office then traces out the agent and makes the payment, gets a receipt, and has the vouchers and all kinds of things. Then the coinage which we require for the Dominion each year, both silver and gold, is negotiated through the High Commissioner's office. If we had that done by means of an agent, we should have to pay for it. Supplies are ordered, as I have said, by almost every department in Ottawa, and these are more easily arranged for by some one who is upon the spot and can be in personal correspondence with the parties from whom the supplies are got. Then the accounts with regard to quarantine, and the archives branch in London and Paris are under the High Commissioner's office as well. There they are checked and paid. All this simply goes to show the multitude of duties and the large amount of work done by the accountant in the High Commissioner's office. Then, again, there is immigration work and library work. All the immigration correspondence of the United Kingdom, and of Europe, comes to the High Commissioner's office; 9,000 letters were received last year upon immigration alone. They have to be answered; all those contain inquiries, and information has to be given in answer to each one of the letters, requiring, in some cases, quite an amount of research in order to procure it and forward it to the person who asks for it. That itself is a great labour and involves a great deal of work. One and a half millions of pamphlets on immigration were distributed from the High Commissioner's office, and by the clerks last year alone. Those were not distributed helter-skelter or pell-mell, but were sent on an approved plan, so that they would actually get into the hands, as far as possible, of persons who were interested,

Mr. FOSTER.

and they were not distributed as waste paper. On request, a large number of those pamphlets were distributed. There are advertisements in the newspapers as to immigration to Canada. This year, in almost every principal paper in the United Kingdom, an advertisement appears in a few issues, drawing attention to this country as a field for immigrants, and asking all who have an interest in the subject, or who think of coming to this country, to correspond with the High Commissioner's office. That brings in a multitude of inquiries, and these, as I have said, have to be carefully answered. Besides this, the office took up last year a most important work. The tenant farmers' report on the North-west, made two years ago, which was so favourable, has actually been made a school book in the schools of Great Britain, and 50,000 copies of it are to-day being used as text books for reading in the schools, furnishing not only information to the children, but giving the teachers of those schools a text book out of which to teach the children growing up the advantages of Canada, our lands, our climate, our Government and institutions and everything of that kind. Besides, the department took up last year another very good work, which was the distribution of a large map of the Dominion to the schools, but only to those school teachers who applied for it. When I was in London, there were over 600 of these maps of Canada hanging on the walls of schools in Great Britain, from which the children were being taught the geography of Canada and from which they were instructed that there was such a country, and the advantages were pointed out. Personal inquiry was constant at the office, not only by means of letters, but by means of persons visiting there. Go to the High Commissioner's office any hour of the day and you will find in the library half a dozen or a dozen or more strangers who are there to get information. They are referred to the library, where all documents relating to Canada are kept and where they are able to obtain information from books placed at their disposal, these being supplemented by the clerks, who see that the people get the information they require. Then there is the division of official correspondence. Much correspondence between the departments in Ottawa and the Government in London passes through the office of the High Commissioner. The High Commissioner personally attends to these, so that when requests are preferred or matters have to be explained the High Commissioner can, if necessary, and as he so often does, make personal application after the official correspondence is sent and give personal explanation, and by hurrying the matter up secure urgency in having the demands complied with, and answers are thus obtained more quickly than otherwise would be the case. Nine hundred and thirty-six letters were received in this official correspondence alone, and 1,386 letters were

forwarded. That work has to be very carefully done and it involves in many cases copying of inclosures which go backwards and forwards between Canada and the British Government. Then there is the division of general correspondence, which takes in all correspondence not coming under the heads I have mentioned. Under this head 2,810 letters were received and 3,613 were sent. The inquiries cover every conceivable subject with respect to Canada, some asking information regarding the Customs duties, others asking in regard to the internal revenue statistics, and others as to trade, and that is now claiming every day a much larger share of attention of the commissioner and his officers. One would be surprised to know the number and variety of the inquiries made as regards trade with this country. These inquiries have to be very carefully answered, for the information must be reliable, as it is required by responsible parties who must not be misled, but must receive correct information. I have gone over these matters merely to show my hon. friend that it is not fair to say that five clerks and two messengers in the High Commissioner's office are doing unproductive work or doing no work at all in comparison with the salaries they receive. No clerks in our offices here are so hard worked on the average as those in the High Commissioner's office, and to none are more responsible and discriminating duties given. They have to answer inquiries, see visitors, and in every way to be careful and prudent in their answers, because the information they give must be reliable. I think this is a satisfactory answer to the House, and I know it will be a satisfactory answer to the country as to the necessity for them. I am firmly convinced that Canada cannot do without the representation which she has in the United Kingdom, and every year that Canada becomes better known more inquiries will be made at some central point, and that central point is London, towards which all eyes turn and where information is sought. It would be a great disadvantage to this country if she did not have in London a well known representative officer and a well known office, where every kind of inquiry can be made and information sought by the large and increasing class of people who are turning their eyes towards Canada either for trade, immigration or other purposes. I have no hesitation in saying that no money we spend is better spent to-day for the general good of Canada than the money which is spent in the High Commissioner's office, and no work tells better for Canada as a whole than the work done by the High Commissioner and by his staff of conscientious, hard-working and able clerks, and I bear testimony to them and to their work from personal knowledge and investigation, and I am only too glad to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it require the personal supervision of the High Commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and he is at his office every day when he is in London. He has office hours and is there; and when he is not in London at his office the High Commissioner is engaged on missions on which he is sent to one place or another. His life is not an easy one. He does not go dancing on the air with no responsibility and no work, as hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of representing him. His work is as hard there as his work was when in Ottawa at the head of a department, and every one who knows his work here will have an idea of what he does there by that comparison. I think we ought to be fair. For a party advantage, or any other advantage, what is the use of decrying an agency which is of the utmost benefit to us, and without which I believe Canada would be at a very great disadvantage. What is the use of decrying a man who gives his best time and energy to advance the interests of Canada in England, whether he be of one political persuasion or another, and what is the use of giving a wrong impression of hard-working, honest, painstaking clerks, who are doing as good service to the Dominion of Canada as any clerks in the service of the Government. Let us be fair and honest in this matter. If there are expenditures which are extravagant, let us prune them off. Let us come to the conclusion as a whole, and I believe we all ought to agree on that, that we must have representation there, that the representation there is sufficient, and that it should be the object and aim of this Parliament, and of every Government, whatever Government may be in power, to make that representation just as effective and as wide-reaching as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is rather remarkable that the High Commissioner finds it possible to absent himself from London for months at a time. His personal inspection and presence, which are of so great value, were not found incompatible with appearances on this side of the Atlantic for protracted periods. Possibly it was not the High Commissioner, but it was his astral body that was doing duty at Windsor and elsewhere.

Mr. PERRY. I do not think that the services rendered by the High Commissioner are worth \$30,000 a year to the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PERRY. Perhaps you gentlemen over there do not pay it, but the farmers of this country, who are the taxpayers, have to pay it. You should remember that the gentlemen on the Treasury benches get their money very easily, but that the farmers have to earn it by the sweat of their brow. I say the people of Canada have a right to know what value they are getting for their money, or if they are getting any value at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has, of course, tried to make it appear that the High

Commissioner is worth his money, and has a big lot of work to do, and that he has eleven clerks around him. No wonder they can answer 900 letters a year. Why, I could answer that many myself and not be over-worked. The hon. gentleman says that over half a million dollars, yearly, passes through that department in London, but I can tell him that I, myself, have firms in Canada doing more business than that with less than half the clerical assistance. The hon. gentleman says that these officials are there from sunrise in the morning until sunset in the afternoon, but he did not tell us what they were doing all that time. It may be that they are warming their feet at the fire, or smoking cigars, or it may be that they are busy reading these periodicals which I find charged in the Public Accounts. Perhaps they are winding the clocks for Sir Charles Tupper, for which I also find a charge in the Estimates. The Minister of Finance was over in London lately, and I suppose he knows all about that department. If the office in London be of such importance as he thinks, why does Sir Charles not arrange about our loan, and why had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go to London three times to try and settle some dispute between England and the United States. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has gone over again lately, and I suppose Canada will have to pay his expenses, which would be saved if the High Commissioner looked after the work. When the Minister of Finance goes to London, it is no doubt very fine for him to walk into Victoria Chambers to see the High Commissioner, who no doubt squeezes his hand warmly and asks, "What is the news from Canada." It is also, no doubt, very pleasant for the Minister of Finance to be able to say: "Oh, things are all right, the Tory Government is in power, and we will not be put out for some time, but if we find that we are in danger we will telegraph to you to come across the Atlantic and help us." That may be very nice, but it is not worth \$30,000 a year. I can tell my hon. friend that I never saw the High Commissioner in his department, and that there are a great many poor farmers in the country who never saw him there either, but nevertheless they have to pay him all the same. We were told a year or two ago that Sir Charles Tupper was wanted in England to open up an egg trade with Canada. When the United States shut their door against us, we were told by the Finance Minister: "Don't fret; the hens will lay all the same, we will find a market for the eggs, and the High Commissioner is there in London to open up an egg trade." I got a little message from a bird some time ago, which was to the effect that a gentleman from Montreal shipped a lot of eggs, which were reckoned to be stale when they got to London, and the High Commissioner took them off the hands of this exporter and said he would send them to his kitchen so as to open

Mr. PERRY.

up an egg trade in England. I do not know whether he had to pay for them or not. Last fall our cattle were scheduled in England, and where was this Great Mogul High Commissioner then? Why did he not use his influence with the Board of Trade to get our cattle free entrance to the British markets? It is all very well for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance who gets \$9,000 or \$10,000 a year and who takes a couple of trips to London each year, to talk about the utility of the High Commissioner, but the people of Canada do not see it in the same light when they have to foot the bill. I repeat here that if the High Commissioner is in London for no other purpose than to encourage immigration to this country it is time we should do without him. I contend that he induces the Canadian Government to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to encourage immigrants to come here, who as soon as they arrive go across the border to the United States. Can the Minister of Finance tell me how many hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars, this country has paid to bring out immigrants from Europe who are now American citizens? I would like the hon. gentleman with all his ability at figures, to tell me how many millions of money have been spent in that direction; and the High Commissioner has been the means of squandering a great deal of money in this way. Let him come back here and fight his battles in this country, let him run an election here and take his chances; but we have no right to vote this large sum to keep him in luxury in London, and I for one protest against it.

Mr. MULOCK. Whilst I would not suggest that the minor clerks should be taken from this side of the water, I submit that in the appointment of clerks to this office some consideration should be given to Canadians. I would like to know whether these clerks come within the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Who makes the appointments?

Mr. FOSTER. The appointments are made here, and they come within the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, have these gentlemen passed the examinations required by the Act?

Mr. FOSTER. The staff formerly was not under the Civil Service Act. In 1888 it was brought under that Act, and the clerks who were at that time in the office became the clerks under the establishment that was made. From that time I do not think there have been any new appointments. There was one transfer, that of a young man named Reynolds, from the service in the North-west to the High Commissioner's office, where he is now the accountant.

Mr. MULOCK. Did the Act bringing the High Commissioner's office under the Civil Service Act expressly exempt those in the office from the provisions of that Act? If not, I presume those gentlemen would have to comply with those provisions.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt they did. They were established at that time as officers without the necessity of passing an examination.

Mr. MULOCK. I see there is a Mr. Just here in receipt of a salary of \$1,250 a year. May I ask if he is a Canadian?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell you whether he is a Canadian or not. He has been in the office, I know, for a long time.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not believe in any extreme nativism, but I believe there are almost as many young men in Canada willing to take positions as there are vacancies. In fact, I think I saw a statement some time ago that there were 1,200 odd who had passed the Civil Service examinations, and who were waiting for something to turn up. If so, it is strange that you should appoint people in England when there are so many people waiting in Canada to be employed. Surely the Canadian-born have the first claim upon whatever good things are going at the hands of the Government of Canada. Is Mr. C. J. Taylor a Canadian?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say whether he is or not. This is a criticism which has not been offered before. It is quite new, and we are not prepared for it.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it is a matter to which the attention of the Government should be called. We know that they have appointed new arrivals here to positions for which many Canadians have been waiting. I have been written to on that subject, and have been asked if it was the custom of the Government to appoint people here who were not Canadians. I have replied that I did not believe it was a custom, but that I had known it to have been done in isolated cases. Now, the High Commissioner's office is becoming practically a department. He is practically a Minister of the Crown, with none of the responsibilities of a Minister, and probably every year we shall be called upon to increase his staff. The Finance Minister says he has not had time to think out the matter, and apparently thinks it unworthy of consideration; but, subject to his views, I put in a claim, on behalf of the Canadian people, to places in the gift of the Government of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister states that this is a new criticism, and I am sorry that he seems to think it an unworthy one. I was about to rise when my hon. friend did, in order to ask the same question that he asked. I do not think he asked the question, as I do not ask it, from any sectional stand-point, or to make a complaint against the Government for not employing our own people; but it is obvious that a great many inquiries are made at the High Commissioner's office with regard to Canada as a desirable place for emigrants to come to. The minister informs us that dozens of people may be found there at one time asking for information, consulting books in the library,

and asking clerks to explain the information given in those books. The matter has weight in my mind, not from the fact alone that I think it desirable that our people should receive consideration at the hands of the Government when there are places open which they are competent to fill; but every hon. gentleman knows that it must be a very great advantage to anyone in that office who is called upon to give information to have a knowledge of the country, derived from actual experience in it. Anyone knows that you may be very conversant with a country through the medium of books; but even if you have no more than seen it, what an addition that makes to all the knowledge of the country which you may have derived from books; and to have lived in the country and known it is a much greater advantage to any one called upon to impart information about it. And so, not knowing the gentleman who is transferred from the North-west, as one of those gentlemen had been apparently, from what the Minister of Interior says, I should think that that was a wise regulation. That gentleman having lived in the North-west and being transferred to London, if inquiries are made with reference to Manitoba and the North-west, must inevitably be in a better position to give the information required. And so with the older provinces. Anyone having lived in any of our provinces must be in a better position to give intelligent information to those seeking it than can others, no matter how attentive they may be to their duties in the way of storing their minds with information through studying the literature that may be provided for them. I think this is a matter of importance. I do not urge it with any view to race, or on the ground that our own people are not sufficiently cared for by the Government in the filling of appointments; but it does seem to me that if the Minister gives the matter a moment's consideration, he will see that in the discharge of the duties which he himself has told us devolve upon these gentlemen, it must be a very great advantage to them indeed if they have had a practical experience of the country by having lived in different portions of it and thus know its capabilities and what is required of those who come out to settle. I think the Minister, if he ponders on this for a moment, will not be disposed to dismiss the subject, as I thought, by the rather vexed look on his countenance, he was prepared to do a short time ago. Of course there are other duties besides imparting information, but it is not to be supposed that our own people, who have experience of this country, have not also the other qualifications of keeping accounts, passing cheques, and doing the other duties pertaining to the office.

Mr. FOSTER. The Act was passed in 1888, and it expressly states that such officers and clerks shall not be subject to examination under the Civil Service Act. The other provisions of the Civil Service Act and the Superannuation Act apply to them.

Mr. MULOCK. Do the words "such clerks" mean those then in the office?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the Governor in Council may appoint such officers and clerks in the office of the High Commissioner as he may deem necessary. The said officers and clerks shall not be subject to examination. And then the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the Superannuation Act, apply. They were, I suppose, not subject to the Civil Service examination here, because if a clerk is needed there,—and some might be taken with very great advantage over there—it would be inconvenient to send him here to Ottawa, or to have him examined or to conduct an examination over there. With regard to the other question, I would have been taken just as much aback if the hon. gentleman had asked me the birthplace or the religion of the officers in my own department. We give neither the birthplace nor religion, and the only point in the criticism is that made by my hon. friend who has just sat down, that if gentlemen are there to give information of Canada, they would have a warmer interest in Canada and probably be in some respects better fitted to give a sympathetic description or information, if they had lived in this country, than they would otherwise. That view has been followed, but all clerks are not there to give information. Some are simply clerks to do the work of the office, and they do it efficiently. In the first place, we have the High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, and it will not be said that he has not that intimate knowledge of Canada, which is required. He is the person who supervises the whole, and any inquiries which could not be answered by the others would be referred to him, so that information on all those points beyond the ken of the other clerks would be fully given by the High Commissioner. Then, the first officer under him is Mr. Colmer, who has spent the greater part of his life in Canada and was taken over to the High Commissioner's office by Sir Alexander Galt. He knows Canada thoroughly and is thoroughly in sympathy with it. Mr. Reynolds was transferred from the North-west to the office there, particularly under the idea that my hon. friend has mentioned, that the office might have a man who not only had a knowledge of Canada, but was specially versed in matters concerning the North-west and Manitoba, where Mr. Reynolds had passed his time of service. He is an excellent officer and has those advantages in point of knowledge that my hon. friend requires. With reference to Mr. Just, I cannot say certainly, but I think I understood from him that he is a French Canadian. He speaks French and English equally well, and from what experience I had of him when there, and I saw a good deal of him in London and Paris, I consider him a very able young man indeed and thoroughly fitted for his work. Mr. Taylor, if I mistake not, is also a Canadian, but I would not speak

Mr. FOSTER:

positively. However, we have the High Commissioner, Mr. Colmer, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Just, all of whom are Canadians.

Mr. AMYOT. I saw by the newspapers recently that the High Commissioner had gone to Paris to obtain a commercial treaty with France. Has he succeeded in so doing?

Mr. FOSTER. The High Commissioner has, under instructions from the Government here, been in communication with the French authorities for some time. These negotiations were being carried on when the late Prime Minister and myself were in London, and we were both with Sir Charles Tupper for a while in Paris, while he was conducting this matter. The negotiations had been brought nearly to a termination, and I should judge, from the present situation, that there is a probable prospect of some arrangement being come to. As those negotiations are not completely ended, we cannot bring down full information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not press for further information, but would ask if there is any prospect of our getting better liquor in consequence.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not much of importance to myself, but as my hon. friend seems to be so much interested in it, I will make inquiries.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very happy to hear what has been said by the Minister of Finance. We have been desiring to extend our commercial relations not only with France, but with all countries possible, and I am glad to hear that there is a possibility of succeeding with France. I believe that if we had a commerce of light wines with that country, unhampered, we might exchange many products; and this is one of the instances where our being represented in England by an intelligent, devoted man, such as Sir Charles Tupper, is a great advantage, and I do not believe that anyone should have the courage to stand up here and carp at the few dollars expense which the High Commissioner may cost the country. Surely, Canada is able to pay her representative and give him sufficient means to represent us with dignity. I knew Sir Charles Tupper was desirous for a long time to open that new market to Canada, and I know he has been powerfully aided by Mr. Fabre in Paris; and I believe the more Canada will be represented, not only in England and France, but in all commercial countries, the greater advantage we will derive. For my part, therefore, I will not grudge this expense, and if it were found necessary to add to that expense in order to make the service more efficient, I would not begrudge the addition. I believe we are interested in every possible way, commercially and financially, in being well represented, and may be more interested, too, at any moment. When there was some difficulty about our cattle, we were very glad to have a man there so

active and well informed as Sir Charles Tupper. And who knows that at any moment we will not be in great want of having representation next the throne in England, who knows what circumstance will offer itself in that sense? For my part, I am thankful to the Government for having given these instructions to Sir Charles Tupper, and I hope they will result in complete success.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For my part I hope that Sir Charles Tupper's statements may be always characterized by the painstaking accuracy that distinguished those which he made from his place in this House. We have some painful recollections of the statements he made here and it is possible that they may be equalled by those which he has made now. I rose, however, to ask if a report has been presented from the High Commissioner's office, and, if so, where is it?

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper's report, as far as regards trade matters, is now on its way. I had a cablegram from Sir Charles Tupper a couple of days ago, stating that he had despatched it, and when it arrives it will be submitted to the House. His report on immigration will go to the Immigration Department, and he also makes a general report which goes to the Secretary of State.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what date is his report brought?

Mr. FOSTER. To the 31st December.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it would be more convenient that these items should be discussed with the report in hand, which would give a better opportunity of judging of the value, be it much or be it little, of this particular establishment, but if the report goes to so late a period, of course at this early stage we could hardly expect to have it here and printed, but I trust it will be put on the Table and put in type as soon as possible. I should also like to see the report of Mr. Fabre.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of Mr. Fabre accompanies it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Last year when we were taking the vote of \$10,000 for commercial agencies, I think the hon. gentleman stated that there were to be consular agencies and that the different agents would be utilised in such a way as to obtain information and give facilities to those who were desirous of opening up foreign trade. Is this correspondence carried on through Sir Charles Tupper's office and are the reports made through him to some department of the Government here, or is the correspondence direct with one of the departments here, if it has been inaugurated at all, and, if so, with what department?

Mr. FOSTER. That has been under the charge of the Minister of Finance up to the

end of the year, when it was transferred to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who will have it under his charge in future. However, having had it for the first year, and having appointed a number of these agents, I propose to bring down the first report of the commercial agents myself. It is now being printed, and will be laid before the House as soon as I get Sir Charles Tupper's report from England and can bring that down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then this correspondence comes directly to your department?

Mr. FOSTER. The correspondence from the agents outside of Great Britain has come direct to my department; but I have directed those in Great Britain to report to the High Commissioner, who reports to me.

Mr. FRASER. I did not hear the answer to a question by an hon. gentleman in front of me as to whether the Finance Minister has assented to any terms with France in regard to the importation of light wines.

Mr. FOSTER. I have assented to nothing. I said that negotiations were going on and were not finished.

Mr. FRASER. I asked the question, because I thought it would be an important piece of testimony to send before the Prohibition Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite welcome to make anything he likes out of it. If I can make arrangements which are in favour of Canada as a whole, I am quite willing to sacrifice myself to that extent, and to afford my hon. friend any gratification he can draw from the circumstance.

Mr. FRASER. I had no personal reference whatever, and the hon. gentleman need not be so thin-skinned. I never thought of the hon. gentleman; but I said it was an important statement to go before that commission if it were correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to state why I was led to suppose that there were two offices in London carrying on this immigration business. At page B-9 of the Auditor-General's report, under the expense of the High Commissioner's Office, I find an amount of \$1,157 paid for postage. Then, on page B-184, I find \$2,083.89 paid for postage. I would like to know how a separate and distinct postage account is kept, first for Sir Charles Tupper's office and then in connection with the item on page 184. I think it would appear to anybody who examined the report that there must be two separate and distinct offices. We find on page B-184 an expense on immigration in London, amounting to \$18,022.39, and then under the High Commissioner's office we find the amount I have referred to before. Consequently, I was led to suppose that there were two distinct offices. I am sure that we are all glad to get the extended explanation we have had from the

Finance Minister. We have been worrying at him for the last four years in order to get some distinct idea of the duties performed by the High Commissioner in London; but we have never been able to get it. The Minister of Finance had to go to London and to the High Commissioner's office and examine for himself before he could give the House an idea of the duties which are performed there. Of course, when the report of the High Commissioner comes before the House we will have some idea of the duties he performs. Last year we carefully investigated the High Commissioner's report, and after that investigation we could not see that there was enough service rendered for the money which was expended. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) seems to think that we should feel proud of the High Commissioner in London, and the services he renders to the country. Well, my hon. friend has got new light with regard to the High Commissioner. He has changed his views with regard to him as well as with regard to other things. However, we are glad to receive the information which has been given, and from time to time we will seek further information with regard to the duties the High Commissioner performs. The whole thing costs this country from \$43,000 to \$45,000 a year. That is a very important item and justifies us in devoting some considerable time to its discussion.

Contingencies, rent and insurance on office, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, &c., and amount -- \$2,000 -- required towards the contingent expenses (water, light, fuel, carriage-hire, cabs and railway fare) of the High Commissioner, and \$1,200, for contingencies, rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c., of the official residence, including income tax. \$10,700 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. FOSTER. The increase of \$500 is due to some little improvements which have to be made in the High Commissioner's office. It requires new matting and some additional furniture. One of the rooms that is used is a sort of annex to the library, and needs some fitting up.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if this is the first season we have had to pay an income tax upon the official's salaries?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it has always been paid.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call again the attention of the House to a matter which we discussed last year, and that is, that in reality that amount for contingencies is put down under a false pretense. If we look at the Auditor-General's Report, we find that out of the amount voted for contingencies there is an allowance to Sir Charles Tupper of \$2,000. This is simply given to him in addition to his

Mr McMULLEN.

salary to make it \$12,000 instead of \$10,000. Now, if it be convenient—and I do not say it is not—to pay to Sir Charles Tupper \$12,000 instead of \$10,000, let the money be so voted. But it is an absolute dereliction of duty to vote money for one purpose and appropriate it for another. I do not complain for my part of the office of Sir Charles Tupper; I think in his capacity as High Commissioner he can render very efficient service to the country, and I do not grudge the money we pay him. The only fault I find with Sir Charles Tupper is, that on certain occasions he assumes duties which are altogether at variance and incompatible with his office as High Commissioner. He is paid as Commissioner a salary of \$10,000. We vote in all for his office about \$18,000. Out of that the only amount which he spends for his office proper is \$15,000, and \$2,000 more is paid him directly under the name of an allowance, that is to say, it is an increase of his salary. I do not object to it if it is to be an addition to his salary, but it is a false pretense to have this money voted for contingencies when in reality it is a part of his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt something in what the hon. gentleman says. The \$2,000 allowance is paid to Sir Charles Tupper quarterly, just the same as his salary. It was, however, given at first in the nature of an allowance. There are numerous expenses which the Commissioner must necessarily incur outside his personal expenses, by the very fact that he is High Commissioner, and has to mingle with his confreres in various ways, which necessitates extraordinary expenses to a man in his position. There is no doubt about that, and so it was at first voted as an allowance to cover all these things, without particularizing. But it is entirely immaterial whether it is voted as salary or voted as an allowance so far as the expenditure of the money is concerned, and I have no objection at all after this to have it put on the ground of salary and taken out from the list of contingencies, if my hon. friend will be better pleased with it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not satisfied to increase the salary of the High Commissioner by \$2,000, with all respect to the views of others. I think \$10,000 a year, considering that we pay all the running expenses of the establishment, is a good deal. Remember that this \$10,000 a year is free of rent and of taxes, and a great many services which a man has to pay out of his salary under ordinary circumstances. If it is proposed to increase the salary to \$12,000, then you should make him pay all these expenses. We are continually appointing men to office here at remunerative rates and afterwards supplementing their salaries in these indirect ways. For example we appointed a commandant at Kingston at the head of the school at a reasonable salary to begin with, and then we purchased a house for him, just as we did for the High Commissioner, and at a cost wholly

incompatible with the salary ; and, just as in the High Commissioner's case, this house is a standing bill of expense to us every year. I think it is a mistake to proceed in this way. The High Commissioner is not likely to be changing his office very often. I was opposed to the investment of nearly \$50,000 for a leasehold for the High Commissioner. Now that we have purchased a property, we are called upon to bear an annual expense in maintaining it. Although originally Parliament was informed by the High Commissioner himself when his office was created that \$3,500 annually would pay the rent, taxes and maintenance of the house, yet no sooner was the office created than an enormous outlay was entered upon on capital account, and still a larger annual sum is required to maintain these services. I think the proper way for dealing with this matter is to strike out the item of \$2,000. I entirely agree with the leader of the Opposition that we have no right to vote \$2,000 for any part of the public service and not be able to give a voucher to the public explaining the manner in which it was expended. When the Public Accounts Committee asked a voucher for that sum, and that a statement should be made as to how it was expended, because it was not supposed to be given as an increase of salary, but it was to be expended as any person in the service would expend petty cash, the High Commissioner sent one to this effect: "Received from the Government \$2,000." This shows that the money has not been paid out in the proper way, or at all events that the original intention was being departed from, by the manner in which the High Commissioner has treated Parliament. I maintain that if that money is paid to the High Commissioner for services, the details should be furnished; if it was paid for salary, it should be so stated; at the same time I cannot give my assent to an increase of salary to that extent. All evidence goes to show that the High Commissioner in London has, to use a common expression, a very soft thing. There is no supervision over him. The description that he is sacrificing himself, that he spends long hours daily in his office, is a very good statement to make on the floor of Parliament, but the High Commissioner appears to be able to take his jaunt all over the continent when he likes. Every little while we have a cable message that Sir Charles Tupper has just gone to Spain to conclude an important commercial treaty between that country and Canada. But we do not hear any more about it until attention is called to the fact that his expenses are increasing. Then we have a cablegram stating that Sir Charles Tupper has just left for Germany, that he has gone with some great iron men to lay the foundation for a commercial treaty between Germany and Canada ; and so we have cables telling us constantly that Sir Charles Tupper is earnestly devoting himself to the interests of Canada in those many pleasant ways. But nothing has come

from those labours for several years. Those jaunts over Europe and occasional trips to see this Government about election times are all said to be made in order to promote Canadian commerce ; yet I should like to know what the High Commissioner has done for Canadian commerce from the time of his appointment until this moment. I have been told, and I will give him credit for it, assuming it to be correct, that he rendered important service in preventing Canadian cattle being scheduled. I will set against that service the fact that on another important occasion he did not prevent our cattle being scheduled and at this particular moment our cattle are scheduled. The danger which he is said to have averted on one occasion has at last overtaken us ; but that may not have been his fault. I should like to know in what way the High Commissioner has enlarged the commerce of Canada with other nations. It has simply been a march up and down the country. I should like to know who discharges his duties when he comes here on election trips, and whether he draws his salary during the week, or month, he remains in this country. Has he been paid at the rate of \$10,000 per annum to stump this country on behalf of the Government ? I ask the Minister of Finance whether the High Commissioner's salary was paid during the time he stumped in Canada, fighting the cause of the Government in the election of 1887.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw him on the stump.

Mr. MULOCK. The papers told us that such was the case, and there was evidence that he was here. It was highly improper for an officer in his position to take the course he adopted. He is not entitled to any special consideration until he recognizes the proper position he should occupy. There must be due discipline in all branches of the service, and it is indecent on the part of the High Commissioner of Canada to engage in party warfare so long as he occupies his present position. The theory is that whoever enters the Civil Service should keep aloof from party politics. They are not compelled to serve any party and are not compelled to abandon their party allegiance ; but they have no right to abandon their duties in order to take part in the elections. The Minister of Finance very properly feels that this is an indefensible transaction, and he has nothing to say about it ; at the same time I think it is due to the House and the country that it should be made known whether the High Commissioner was paid for the time he absented himself from his duties to take part in elections for the benefit of a political party in Canada.

Mr. AMYOT. I altogether differ from my hon. friend. I do not consider the High Commissioner as belonging to the Civil Service. If the Liberal party should come into power, would it not feel at liberty to depose Sir Charles Tupper and replace him by some gentleman of their own political allegiance ?

What guarantee would Sir Charles Tupper or any High Commissioner possess that a change of Government would not involve a change of person as High Commissioner. The High Commissioner does not belong to the Civil Service. It is true he visited Canada during the last election. He came to Quebec, and when there he stated that there would be a splendid hotel erected which would attract strangers of the travelling public. He further stated that there would be elevators provided, and deep navigation. These statements have turned out to be true. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now building a splendid hotel in Quebec. If Sir Charles Tupper came to Canada to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to undertake these works he has rendered great service to Quebec, because that city is now getting out of the state of poverty in which it has been kept for many years, and if Sir Charles Tupper left England and came here in order to secure those results, I am grateful to him. But I understand it is charged that he occupies a political position. It is true he belongs to a certain party, and I am not surprised that at election times he works for that party. I look upon him as one of the Ministers of the Crown, one who is not responsible directly to Parliament, but to the Government, and the Government are responsible directly to Parliament; but to assign him to the position of a humble public servant, attached to the Civil Service, is not stating correctly his position.

Mr. LAURIER. Sir Charles Tupper is certainly not to be mistaken for a civil servant. He is more than that: he is the Ambassador of Canada in London, if he is anything at all. Are we to be told that our Ambassador has the right to leave his office, come to this country and take part in the elections? It is a most indecent act. Sir Charles Tupper has done so, and in doing so has simply prostituted the dignity of his office, there is no other term for it. As Ambassador of Canada, he does not represent any party, but all parties. He is paid with the money of the whole people of Canada, and it is simply lowering the dignity of his office for Sir Charles to come here in such a capacity. I repeat, it lowers the dignity of the office when we are told that he has a right to step from the position which he occupies, to come here to take part in election meetings, and to do the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the city of Quebec. The city of Quebec is entitled to justice, and it wants no favour from the hands of anybody. It wants justice and nothing else. With regard to the question immediately before us, I may say that the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was not satisfactory. The hon. gentleman says the point is well taken, that the money is voted for one object, and it is not applied to that object at all. The money is voted for contingencies

Mr. AMYOT.

but a part of it is taken from that object and paid as salary. I again repeat, that if it is to be paid as a salary, let it be paid as a salary, but it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is altogether wrong when he says that it is immaterial to the people of Canada when money is voted for one purpose that it should be applied to another. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, what did the hon. gentleman say? Was it not the purport of his answer? The sum we vote as contingencies for the office of Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Finance himself admits, is really paid to Sir Charles Tupper as a part of his salary. As I understood the hon. gentleman, he gave as a reason for that: that the salary of Sir Charles Tupper would be insufficient without it, because Sir Charles Tupper paid the cost of receptions and so on. I do not dispute anything of that kind, but, Sir, I altogether repudiate the doctrine that money which is voted for one purpose should be applied to another. That is what I object to, and I trust the Minister of Finance will pardon me for saying that I am surprised at the looseness of his morals in matters of finance. The hon. gentleman said it was immaterial that we should vote money for one purpose and that it should be applied to another.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said so. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting what I said, and misrepresenting it after I stated to him twice that I did not say so.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman state what he said?

Mr. FOSTER. I will. I interrupted the hon. gentleman when he misrepresented me at the time he was on his feet, and I asked him if he would be kind enough to allow me to finish my sentence before he interrupted me, as he seemed to consider I was doing wrong in offering the explanation. What I stated was: It was immaterial whether the \$2,000 a year, paid as a matter of salary, is voted for salary or voted for allowance, so far as the expenditure itself was concerned. The hon. gentleman interrupted me before I got the latter part of my sentence out. I did not say it was immaterial in the sense which he attributed to me, and neither did I advocate the doctrine that it was proper to vote money for one purpose and apply it to another.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that all the explanation?

Mr. FOSTER. That is sufficient, I think.

Mr. LAURIER. Then it amounts to this, that it is immaterial whether money is voted to be paid to Sir Charles Tupper as salary or allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me again.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the hon. gentleman is not happy in the manner of expressing himself.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I was both happy and plain in the manner of my expression. I think the fault is not with me but with the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. LAURIER. The fault is with the hon. gentleman. I do not understand what he means, and I do not think he has explained it to the House. What I complain of is that the money is voted to be paid as contingencies for the office of Sir Charles Tupper, and here is the explanation of it given in the item :

\$2,000 required towards contingencies, expenses-water, light, fuel, carriage-hire, cabs and railway fares.

That is what the money is voted for, and \$2,000 of that money goes, not for light, not for fuel, not for cab-hire, not for railway fares, but simply into the pocket of Sir Charles Tupper for his own personal expenses. That is voting money under false pretences, and that is what I object to. I say that the hon. gentleman has not given us any explanation as to that. The only explanation he gives is, that he shall not do it any more in the future, but, Sir, I object to it at this moment. I repeat what I said a moment ago : if it be proper to give Sir Charles Tupper an extra \$2,000 a year, let it be given to him, but let not the money be voted for cab-hire and fuel and so on, and then be given to Sir Charles Tupper himself personally. That is what I object to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, after what the hon. Minister has admitted, he must see that this vote ought, in all conscience, be reduced by \$2,000, and a vote taken elsewhere. If he and the Government choose to take the responsibility of raising Sir Charles Tupper's salary to \$12,000 a year, then, on their shoulders be it. We on our side of the House may have our own opinion of the matter. We may divide or we may not, but we certainly have the right to object, and the House ought not to sanction a proposal to smuggle an additional salary of \$2,000 a year through in this way. The hon. gentleman had ample warning. Last year the thing was allowed to go through after an expression of penitence on his part, as well as I recollect, but his penitence is not of a fruitful kind. We have now repeated precisely the same offence against the customs and rules which ought to govern the expenditure of public money. I think the hon. gentleman, in his position of Minister of Finance, after what he has stated, owes it to himself to reduce this vote by \$2,000. It is a very bad example to set.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It should be understood that when this House votes money for a certain purpose, that money should be applied to the purpose for which it is

voted, and it does not come well from the Government to say that it does not make much difference after it is voted whether it is expended for its special purpose or not. It is desirable that we should not have that sort of financial morality introduced into any estimates passed by this House. It is a course which should be studiously avoided by the Government, and reprobated by every member of Parliament. It is well known that Sir Charles Tupper left his duties in England during the time of an election, and remained here for a considerable time. The Minister of Finance indicates that he is a hard-working man in London, that he has not a moment to be away from his duties, except when he is making treaties or doing something of that kind. Well, if the business, and the duties, and if the honours of the office demand his whole attention, how is it possible for him to come to Canada and remain a month or two months and to take part in elections. I understand, if my memory serves me correctly, that Sir Charles Tupper was paid something in the neighbourhood of \$4,000 on the occasion of that remarkable trip. He gave up his functions as ambassador in London, he came out here as an election agent, he did nothing except what was in the interest of the political party with which he was allied, and he left his high office to advocate party ends, and party interest. He had forgotten his duties, he had forgotten the dignity that appertains to that office as ambassador of Canada, living in the city of London, and when he did that, he was guilty of conduct which an ambassador should not be guilty of. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) stated that Sir Charles Tupper rendered some services, because through his influence at the time he got an hotel built at Quebec, and the hon. member seems to regard that as a satisfactory excuse for his absenting himself from the duties of his office. If hotels are an indication of prosperity, you generally find that there are enough of them throughout the country, and if an ambassador has to come all the way from London for the purpose of endeavouring to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to build an hotel at Quebec, what becomes of the influence and the power of the Government here? If it is desirable in the interest of the trade and commerce of the city of Quebec that an hotel should be erected there, why have the Government to send for their ambassador to London to urge upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the propriety of building that hotel? Have the Government not the power themselves to do it? Have the Government not as much power as Sir Charles Tupper, or does he run the Government, and does he run the Canadian Pacific Railway, and does he run the whole Dominion from his office in London? Is it possible that they make that admission? Is it possible that that is the justification for his coming here at that time? Now, Sir Charles

Tupper did other things on that occasion which were not judicious in one occupying his position. He attacked the Grand Trunk Railway and did everything he possibly could to destroy its credit at home and abroad. That was foreign to the duty of an ambassador of this Government to England. It is well known that this office is a very extravagant one; but all the time we are told that Sir Charles Tupper is about to make a treaty with Spain or with some other country, and we have heard in this House again and again that, through the powerful influence he wielded in the British Empire, he was enabled to prevent the Board of Trade scheduling our cattle at a very important time. Sir Charles Tupper has been in England ever since, and our cattle are now scheduled there. If he had the power and the influence to prevent the Government doing it before, his influence must be waning, if he is not able to do it now. His usefulness must be gone, and he should be recalled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. There is a Grit Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a great pity for this country that there is not a Grit Government here now. If there were, it would not be necessary to have such a man there in that capacity. We remember how the ambassador appointed by Mr. Mackenzie, when he was in power, was criticised. The Minister of Finance asks us not to criticise now. He says we should have some regard to the position and to the services that Sir Charles Tupper has rendered, and should forbear to say a word against him. He does not remember, because he was not in the House at the time—and very few members of the Government were in the House, because most of them are young men in statesmanship—how fault was found with everything done in the High Commissioner's office in Mr. Mackenzie's time. I remember how Senator Bowell, one of the rats that has left the sinking ship and has got a comfortable seat for himself in the Senate, almost fell down with paralysis because one of the attendants at the door of the High Commissioner's office had brass buttons on his coat. Yet the Minister of Finance now asks us not to say anything in the way of criticism of Sir Charles Tupper. We are going to vote the money to him, not in the way of salary, but as an allowance. It makes no difference in which way it is voted they say. When I consider the composition of the Government I am not surprised at the position they take. I am not surprised, because matters of commerce and matters of state are very new to the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches to-day. Most of them have not been in the House for more than a few years, and have not had a due training in statesmanship. That is why they think that to vote money for one purpose and devote it to another is a high form of statesmanship. I say it is trifling, not only with the House, but with their

Mr. LANDERKIN.

own supporters and with the country, and I hope we shall not have any more of this kind of financial morality from the Finance Minister.

Mr. AMYOT. I am not ashamed of my opinion, and it does not bind any body but myself. I believe Sir Charles Tupper, while acting as the ambassador of Canada in England, should be well paid, so that he will be able to maintain the position due to his rank. Nor do I see any prostitution or anything improper in his crossing the Atlantic to take part in an election in his own country. When he did that, he was no longer ambassador, but was simply Sir Charles Tupper, doing what any other Canadian could do. And to the city of Quebec and that part of the country Sir Charles Tupper was of great service, because he inaugurated a new state of activity and prosperity there. For over thirty years the city of Quebec had been going backwards instead of keeping pace with the prosperity of the other cities of the Dominion; but to-day we are glad that Sir Charles Tupper left his high functions in London for a few weeks to come to Quebec on that occasion. That is my humble opinion, and I protest against the word prostitution being used with regard to that visit. My hon. friend does not admit the propriety of Sir Charles Tupper leaving his office in England to come here and take part in the election; but his argument would have been stronger if he could have told us what interest of Canada had suffered during Sir Charles Tupper's absence. If I am shown that Sir Charles Tupper abandoned some actual interest that required his presence in London, I would be ready to blame him; but so long as that has not been shown, I contend that not only Sir Charles Tupper, but any other High Commissioner, Liberal or Conservative, may leave England and come back to Canada during an election to help the party that sustains him there, and that represents the policy which he supports. I claim that Sir Charles Tupper came and did a good service for Quebec, not only for the hotel, but for the good of Canada. He inaugurated a new era of prosperity for Quebec, and personally I am thankful to him for having done that.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is entirely mistaken as to what Sir Charles Tupper did when he came to Quebec. He never thought of building the hotel, but spoke of building quite another thing, and that is the bridge across the St. Lawrence. At a meeting Sir Charles Tupper held in Quebec, he told the citizens they might consider the bridge as almost an accomplished fact. He stated that with as much emphasis and confidence as some years before he stated that there would be 740,000,000 bushels of wheat produce before this in the North-west. The new hotel however never entered into his calculations.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This item has been under discussion yearly for a number of years, and I think I am correct in saying that two years ago the Finance Minister promised to take into serious consideration the advisability of taking this vote out of contingencies and adding it to Sir Charles Tupper's salary, making his salary \$12,000, which is really what he obtains. Last year he again made the same promise, on the same arguments being brought forward, that every expenditure should be made in accordance with its vote. I do not think it would be any great condescension on his part to supplement the promise he made some two or three years ago by performance. If Sir Charles Tupper is to receive a salary of \$12,000, and that is the salary he really receives, it ought to appear at that figure in the estimates, and I cannot see that we are doing any injustice to him, or that we are asking the Government to do anything they ought not to do, when we ask them simply as a matter of business to vote Sir Charles Tupper a salary of \$12,000, when that is what he really receives. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), that the city of Quebec has been drawn out of the mud and the mire, in which he describes it as having been for so many years, by the building of a tavern, it is something new for the members of this House to learn that the oldest city in the Dominion of Canada is to be elevated to a point which it never attained before, because Sir Charles Tupper came out to this country and got an additional hotel or tavern built in that city, so that the citizens there might have the opportunity of getting a good meal and a glass of French wine when they required them. If I am correctly informed by gentlemen conversant with the course pursued by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), during the time Sir Charles Tupper was out in this country, the hon. member opposed him through thick and thin, and denounced him not only on the stump but in the newspaper he was publishing at the time. We ought to have some explanation with regard to this change of sentiment. Was it because there is another hotel being built in Quebec that the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion that Sir Charles Tupper has done so much for this country? Is it because Sir Charles Tupper exercised his influence as Ambassador in England to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway to build an additional tavern or hotel in Quebec that the hon. member for Bellechasse now lauds him to the skies as a benefactor of his country? As I understand it, Quebec has heretofore been furnished with very good hotels. I visited that city and stopped at some of the hotels, and I think they can be said to be very good ones; but they were evidently not up to the standard of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and he therefore has come to the conclusion that Sir Charles Tupper did a great thing for the people when he used his influence to get this addition made. The hon. gentleman, however, is not consistent, for when Sir Charles

was here arranging for the erection of that hotel the hon. gentleman kept continually fighting him, and declared that, being our ambassador in the mother country, he had no right to come out to this country and exercise his influence in favour of the Government. The hon. gentleman ought to rise and explain this sudden change of sentiment.

Mr. AMYOT. I am ready to oblige the hon. gentleman by standing up and telling him all about my humble self. He accuses me of having spoken and written against Sir Charles Tupper because of his trip to Canada. The hon. gentleman had better be prudent. Where are his witnesses? He says he has been so informed. Let him take care lest he might have been informed by some heads very light, who do not know what they are about and cannot prove what they say. I will tell him this: that I have never written one word against Sir Charles Tupper in my life, and have never uttered one word against him, and I will recall to the hon. gentleman some six or seven years ago, when I was in Opposition, I made a speech in this House praising Sir Charles Tupper for his efforts to obtain a commercial treaty with France. Now, the hon. gentleman tries to sneer at me because of the new hotel in the city of Quebec, which he compares to a tavern. I am sorry that at his age he is not able to distinguish between what will be one of the finest hotels in the world and a poor tavern. The Canadian Pacific Railway is building an hotel which is to be one of the finest structures and which will be advertised all over the world, and we expect that many thousands of strangers from the old country will come every year to Canada to visit that hotel and the splendid places around it. We see in the future a great amelioration. We see not only a hotel but an elevator that will bring the people of the lower town to the hotel. We see the elevator for grain which the Canadian Pacific Railway is now building, and we see commerce coming back to Quebec, and then when we will have people and commerce we will have a bridge, because it will be a necessity. To-day we cannot have it, because there would be nobody to cross on it. Bring manufactures to Quebec, bring people there from all over the world; and when there will be activity and people, the bridge will come. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has generally a very good memory, but he has forgotten Sir Charles Tupper's pledges, for in speaking of the bridge, Sir Charles Tupper said it would be one of the consequences. He spoke also of the hotel and the elevator and the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for my part, I said that I not only admitted the implicit right of the High Commissioner to come to Canada and take part in the political fight, but I felt thankful to him, personally, for having inaugurated a new era for the city of Quebec. I would beg my hon. friend to be more prudent when receiving information second-

hand about me. He is badly surrounded. He wants to know not the reasons of my changing in reference to Sir Charles Tupper but in reference to my going back to the Conservative party. If he presses me too much I will let him know, but I will not bring that in on the question of Sir Charles Tupper and his status, but if it is for his happiness to know all about it he shall have the information at the proper time.

Mr. DEVLIN. I merely wish to say one word in regard to what has fallen from the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). I certainly will not charge him with attacking Sir Charles Tupper directly in this House or out of it, but I find in "Hansard" that, if he did not make a direct charge against him, he watched Sir Charles Tupper pretty closely when in 1891 he asked the Government "Whether the High Commissioner for Canada in London is authorized by the Government to support Imperial Federation and to afford to that scheme his active, officious and official concurrence." I suppose he wanted to know if Sir Charles Tupper could actively take part in a question "belonging to party politics." He referred in his speech to the prosperous condition of the city of Quebec, due largely, he said, to the efforts of Sir Charles Tupper. I was reading a Conservative newspaper the other day in which I saw that a petition from the labourers of Quebec was to be presented to the Government, signed, I think, by 400 labourers, who state that they are without employment in this prosperous city of Quebec, and they ask the Government to attend to work which they claim is now neglected, public buildings belonging to the Government which are neglected in the city of Quebec. I only desire to bring this to the attention of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot).

Mr. LAURIER. I hoped that the Minister of Finance would have reduced this item by \$2,000. If he does not, I will move that it be reduced by \$2,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister intend to reduce the item as we understood?

Mr. FOSTER. The leader of the Opposition has made a motion.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not know whether it was acquiesced in or not. I think the committee has received one important piece of information in this discussion which the country will be glad to know. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who, I suppose, is most familiar with the needs, the possibilities and the requirements of the city of Quebec, has relieved me of much anxiety, because he has now stated that there is no necessity for this bridge being built in Quebec, that there is no one to walk over it now, though, when this hotel is built, there may be somebody to walk over it. It is gratifying to have that statement on record, because on

Mr. Amyot.

other occasions the hon. gentleman was one of a number who pressed this matter on the attention of the public.

Mr. AMYOT. No. I only required a ferry service as an introduction to it.

Mr. MULOCK. Now the hon. gentleman takes the hotel service as an introduction to the bridge service. At all events, we have it from him that we need not give ourselves any further anxiety about that \$7,000,000 bridge.

Mr. AMYOT. You never had any anxiety about it.

Mr. MULOCK. I think No. 8 was historic in regard to it and in regard to another matter which passed into the history of Quebec at that time. It is satisfactory to learn that the hon. gentleman was mistaken when he was inveigled into No. 8 some nine years ago and was induced to support the construction of that bridge.

Amendment (Mr. Laurier) negatived on division.

Post Office Department, to pay officers of the Savings Bank Branch engaged in the balancing of and computing interest on depositors' accounts, to 30th June, 1893. . . . \$2,600

Mr. FLINT. I rise, not to make any objection to the item under discussion, but it seems to me that this is a very good opportunity to put in a plea for a more careful statement of statistics with reference to savings banks. In my efforts as a member of this House to look into the statistics as to the Government savings banks and the Post Office savings banks I have found considerable difficulty in ascertaining what I required. Turning to the Statistical Abstract furnished to members, and which in the main is of considerable utility, I find that, while the compiler has given a very careful statement as to the number of officers, the number of depositors, the amount on deposit, the average amount per head of the population and so on, in the Post Office savings banks those items were not given in regard to the Government savings banks. It is possible that those items may be given in some other blue book, but I have not been able to lay my hand upon it, and I would ask the Minister to make a note of it and to see whether we cannot have all the statistics as to the savings bank deposits of the people tabulated in one place so that we may have an idea of our progress. We are aware that scarcely a speech is made by any Minister that does not touch upon the deposits in the savings banks, and it is important to know the changes that take place from time to time in regard to these particulars. I am astonished to find that the compiler of the Statistical Abstract, while giving a great many of these figures as to the Post Office savings banks, has omitted them in regard to the Government savings banks. This a subject I have had in my mind for

some time, and as the estimates under consideration deals indirectly with it. I would ask the minister's attention to it in order that these matters may be laid more completely before those who are interested in their study.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the House to a point that I have already raised on several occasions, that is, paying clerks for extra time in connection with this item. This is a repetition of the evil that is creeping into every department. Here, it appears, that quarterly, or half yearly, it is necessary to make up the books in the Post Office Department, so as to permit those who wish to draw their accumulated interest, or have it added to the principal, may do so, so that the returns can be made up to a certain date, and a little extra work has got to be done. The clerks in the department are supposed to be there from half-past nine in the morning to four o'clock in the afternoon, with an hour for recess, and they are asked to put in a few extra hours for the purpose of calculating interest and getting the pass-books of the depositors in such a position that the sums can be added to their accounts. I understand that this is what this charge is for. Now, take wholesale firms in this country; when they take stock and their clerks are asked to work for two, or three, or four weeks in the evening, perhaps till ten or twelve o'clock at night, do they get extra pay? I think not. I do not know a single institution, either incorporated, or a joint stock company, or an individual, that pay extra to their clerks when it becomes necessary, owing to the pressure of work, that they should do a little extra service. I know the Postmaster-General last year explained that these men were in a better position to do this kind of work, and that it could be done better by them than by securing extra clerks. I contend it should be done even if they have to put in extra time, but without extra pay. There is a staff in the several departments whose salaries are equal to, if not in excess of, the salaries of any other class in this Dominion. School teachers, ministers, bank clerks, wholesale clerks, all these classes are not paid on an average as much per head as we pay to our civil servants, and not in one single case is an allowance made for extra services. Now, I ask why it is that this system of paying civil servants for extra work has been inaugurated, and enlarged, and extended in connection with every department of the Government? I say it is wrong, it is unjust to the people of this country, it is a great evil, and it is increasing every year. If you look in the Auditor-General's Report from page A-15 to A-16 you will find a whole list of people that are drawing extra pay for extra hours. Now, I contend that the present Postmaster should immediately make a rule in his department that these people shall be required, when it becomes necessary in the case of adding interest, to do a few hours of extra work without getting extra pay. Why, Sir, it seems that in every department now, as

soon as a man gets a position in the service, he begins to look around and see how he can possibly make a charge for extra services. I have been in the Post Office Department and some others, and I do not think these people are worked very hard, and they could well afford to do a little extra work when necessary. I say that when work accumulates on their hands and it is necessary to do a little extra work, it is not right that they should ask or be permitted to draw extra pay for it. Civil servants in this country are paid on an average very nearly \$1,000 a head, and I would like you to point out any other class in this Dominion that is as well paid. Bank clerks are not as well paid, school teachers are not as well paid, ministers are not as well paid; there is no other class that draw an average allowance of a thousand dollars a year. They are subject to no tax on income, they are not subject to many charges that others have to meet. I see that some of them by charging for an hour, an hour and a-half, each day, go as high as 540 hours of extra work, for which they charge 50 cents an hour, and they are allowed to draw pay for it. I would like to know from the Postmaster-General whether it is his intention to keep on encouraging clerks in the direction of drawing extra pay. The first time that this item of counting interest in the savings banks of the post office was brought before the House, the sum was only about \$75, but now we are asked to pay \$2,500 for that purpose. It is increasing every year. I suppose the Postmaster-General will say that the deposits are increasing, and consequently this work will increase. That may be true, but the system should never have been initiated. A mistake was made in the beginning, and now it ought to be corrected.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has criticised the practice that is followed not only in Canada but in almost every country, so far as my limited experience goes, and I admit that my experience is limited in the department over which I preside at present. The hon. gentleman knows that in England and in the United States this practice has been adopted and successfully followed, for the reason that the permanent employees of the department in that special branch are more capable, and in fact are the only men who can successfully handle the books of the department. Now, I can tell my hon. friend that it is really in the interest of the public that this extra pay is granted for extra work. The hon. gentleman, with his practical mind, has already answered his objection by stating that the reason of the increase is the increasing wealth of the country and the increasing number and amount of the deposits in the savings banks of the Post Office Department; and the men who have the supervision of the books are the only men who, at a given date, are able rapidly to bring down the accounts to the dates when they should be brought down. Now, Sir, I wish to say that I have given more than ordinary attention to the department since I took charge of it, and I can

say that the work of the Post Office Department is every day increasing in accordance with the requirements of the country, because it is well known that post offices are being constantly opened up in new sections which are being populated by our own people or those from other countries. I have no doubt that my predecessor in the department will bear testimony to the fact that we have a staff which, with very few exceptions, would be a credit to any department in any country. When my hon. friend considers the reason why that expenditure of \$2,500 was made, he will arrive at the conclusion to which I have arrived, that it is an indication of the prosperity of Canada and is the cheapest way of doing the work, and at the same time the most successful way.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, is stating what he conceives to be a fact, that granting the services have to be performed, they can be more cheaply performed by allowing the clerks to work extra hours rather than by employing outside men. I am not, however, prepared to accept the example of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not generally willing to take the United States as an example in any way, and in this case I do not think they should adopt it. I am not prepared to adopt the system followed in England. The salaries there for civil servants are not so high as are paid here. The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that increased deposits in the savings bank furnish evidence of increased wealth. That is the contention tenaciously held by hon. gentlemen opposite. If that principle is correct it is a reasonable conclusion that when the deposits decrease the people are getting poor. Is it not a fact that the deposits have decreased for some years past, and will the hon. gentleman admit that the country is getting poor? I do not approve of the system adopted and that is being carried out from year to year, of granting payment for extra hours to employees. There is no bank where the clerks have not to put in extra hours to get out their monthly and quarterly returns, and yet they receive no extra pay. There is not a wholesale house in Montreal or Toronto where the clerks do not work until 10 or 12 at night in the spring and at stock taking, without receiving extra pay. When this practice is followed by bankers and wholesale merchants, it should be adopted in the Civil Service.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

ADJOURNMENT—THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Before the House adjourns I desire to repeat the question I asked the Government earlier in the day.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has given me an intimation of what the question was which he brought to the notice of the House on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply; and I regret I was not here at the moment. I beg to say in reply to the hon. gentleman, that communication has been had with Her Majesty's Government in recent years past with respect to the importance of the Hawaiian Islands as a possible station in connection with telegraphy, and in connection with other Canadian interests which are involved in the independence of that country. As regards recent movements, no communication has passed between the Canadian Government and Her Majesty's Government, partly on account of our being aware from what transpired before, that Her Majesty's Government was well aware of the interests involved, and partly because we had other reasons to believe that Her Majesty's Government was fully alive to the importance, as regards Canadian interests and other interests of the Empire as to those islands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance one question. The First Minister intimated that the Budget was not likely to be brought down for some weeks. I take it for granted that the Minister of Finance is not in a position to bring it down next week.

Mr. FOSTER. Not next week.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 7) to provide for the repeal of the Electoral Franchise Act; and making certain provisions in place of the same.—(Mr. Charlton.)

COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. AMYOT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to make voting compulsory. He said: This is the Bill as reported last year by the select committee, after many sittings. The committee reported the Bill unanimously, but it was then too late in the session to proceed with it. This year, however, I intend to ask the House to pass the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, being chapter 17, R.S.C. He said: The amendment proposes that no person shall be appointed to the Civil Service of Canada unless he can read, write and speak both the English and French languages, and unless he has been a resident in the Dominion of Canada during the three previous years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to make further provisions as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: There need not be much said at this stage in explanation of the Bill. Chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada makes provision for offences relating to cruelty to animals, and the Bill which I introduce is to extend the scope of that Act. It has been found in the practical operation of the Act that there are omissions from it which render it, to a certain extent, inoperative. I might mention a great many cases. For instance, I have before me some statements as to the carriage of animals in the cars. I propose a new section to the Act providing that the cars shall be properly fitted for the carriage of animals. To show the necessity for that, I will mention one or two cases that have occurred for which there is no remedy, and for which no person could be punished. On 3rd October, 1892, there was a cargo shipped in the cars from Pontypool to Toronto, of sixty sheep and forty hogs, in car No. 60982. When they arrived at the cattle market in the city of Toronto, twenty-three lambs and two hogs had been trampled to death; and at the same time and place a car of larger cattle came in and two of the cattle had each a leg broken. Prosecutions were instituted, and it was found that no person was responsible for the injury and death of these animals. In another case, just a few days ago, on 25th of January, the police constable, whose duty it is to enforce this Act in Toronto, reports that there were nineteen cattle, twelve hogs and nine lambs shipped in a Grand Trunk car from Listowel, and two of the lambs were trampled to death by the breaking down of the deck or partition, and no person could be held responsible for it. That is one of the amendments introduced in this Bill. Another amendment is this: It has been found, in many cases, that the owners of animals which become disabled and unfit for use, have turned them adrift, and there is no proper provision in the present Act for the punishment of persons who commit that offence. That is particularly the case where animals are

found on private property, and there is no provision in the law to allow the police to enter private property or destroy the animals. This Bill provides that under the authority of two justices of the peace, a police officer may enter such premises and take and destroy such animals. There is one other clause to which I desire to refer as it was contained in the Bill previously before the House, but it is now brought before the House modified in its provisions, and that is the clause regarding pigeon shooting matches. Most of the members will recollect that the object of the former Bill was to prevent pigeon shooting matches. Evidence was read at that time showing there was cruelty practised both before and after the shooting at the pigeons; before the shooting by maiming the birds and in other ways treating them so as to excite them to fly in an erratic manner, making it more difficult to shoot them, and after the shooting by allowing maimed birds to escape and die a lingering death. The object of the Bill is not to prevent shooting matches, but to provide that birds shall not be maimed before the shooting takes place, and that after they must be retrieved and put to death after being wounded and not allowed to escape. These are, in general terms, the provisions of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BREAKWATER AT WEST POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a survey has been made at West Point, P.E.I. during the season of 1892, for a breakwater at that place?

Mr. OUMET. A survey was made at West Point or West Cape in 1892, not for a breakwater, but to ascertain what would be the cost of reconstructing the pier at this point. Under date 20th June, 1892, a report thereon was received, estimating the cost of rebuilding the destroyed work in a substantial manner at \$8,000.

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the contract for a breakwater at Miminigash, P.E.I., has been let? If so, to whom, for what sum, when is the work to be completed, and who is the inspector?

Mr. OUMET. A contract has been given to J. Barclay for the sum of \$2,447, the work to be completed on or before 18th July, 1893. The inspector is J. Blanchard.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether Mr. Davy, C.E., has made a report of his survey of Cascumpeque Harbour, during the year 1892?

Mr. OUMET. An examination has been made of Cascumpeque, and the report will, it is expected, be in the possession of the department next week.

BRITISH CATTLE REGULATIONS.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN asked, Whether the Government has reason to believe that the order of the British Board of Agriculture, requiring the slaughtering of cattle at the point of debarkation in the United Kingdom, will be shortly rescinded?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That has been the subject of very strong communications between the two Governments, which will be presented to the House if desired. I think we are unable to give any assurance on the subject at present.

BRIDGING THE LACHINE CANAL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN asked, Whether a contract has been given for building an iron bridge over the Lachine Canal within the limits of the city of Montreal? If so, who is the contractor? What is the amount of his tender? How many tenders were received? Was his tender the lowest, and when is the work to be completed?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; a contract has been given for building an iron swing highway bridge over the Lachine Canal at Wellington street, Montreal. The Dominion Bridge Company, at Montreal, are the contractors. The amount of their tender is \$34,400. There were two tenders received. The Dominion Bridge Company's tender was not the lowest. The tenderers were, Dominion Bridge Company, \$34,000. Hamilton Bridge Company, \$32,000. The plans of the Hamilton Bridge Company did not give a structure of the strength called for by the specification, the bridge engineer of the department reporting that it would take an addition of 80,000 lbs. of steel to bring it up to the required standard of strength. His calculations were verified by Mr. Douglas, the hydraulic engineer of the department. The tender was accepted by an Order in Council dated 16th December, 1892. Hamilton Bridge Company's tender, \$32,000. 80,000 lbs. of steel on bridge, \$3,200, total \$35,200. To be completed on or before 1st May, 1893.

VOLUNTEER RIFLE PRACTICE.

Mr. HUGHES asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant Canadian volunteers and rifle associations organized under Militia Regulations and Orders, Snider ammunition at 5 cents or less per package, and Martini at 10 cents or less per package of ten rounds, such sums being a fair representation of the cost thereof, in order to encourage bona fide rifle practice by reducing the present almost prohibitive personal cost, thus enabling many now debarred on account of the great expense, to practice rifle shooting?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The Government are anxious to encourage bona fide
Mr. QUIMET.

rifle practice on the part of our volunteers, and rifle associations in general. The subject-matter of the hon. gentleman's question is now under serious consideration.

MACKEREL NETS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Do the Government propose to repeal the Order in Council passed on the 21st day of March, 1892, relating to "mackerel nets"?

Mr. COSTIGAN. An officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department is now examining the reports of the several inspectors on the regulations in connection with mackerel fishing, and is to report fully on the subject.

Mr. FRASER. How soon will the report be brought down?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) (for Sir Richard Cartwright), asked, What is the total amount now borrowed by the Government for periods of less than three years? And from whom have the said amounts been borrowed, for what time and upon what terms?

Mr. FOSTER. \$1,460,000, or £300,000, from the Bank of Montreal; six months from 1st January, 1893; 4 per cent, paid quarterly.

MILITIA—CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. Who are the present contractors for furnishing the Government with militia clothing and boots? 2. Have any steps been taken to recover damages or other compensation from the contractors for loss sustained by reason of the inferior quality of the militia clothing and boots supplied the Government, as mentioned in the report of the officer commanding, dated 30th November, 1892? 3. Is there any contract now in force between said contractors and the Government for the supply of militia clothing or boots? 4. Is any portion of such supply now being manufactured at any of the establishments where the said defective clothing and boots were manufactured?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The contractors for clothing are James O'Brien & Company, of Montreal; Doull & Gibson, Halifax; H. Shorey & Company, Montreal, and the Almonte Woollen Manufacturing Company, of Almonte, Ont. Boots are not contracted for. An allowance is made to the officer in command of the several military schools of so much for boots, \$4.87 for winter boots and \$2.10 for summer boots, and they are purchased in the several localities where required, with the exception of the boots for the cavalry school at Winnipeg, which are supplied from the stores of the North-west Mounted Police at \$3.50 for winter boots and \$1.99 for summer boots. No other boots are issued to the militia corps. All contracts for clothing will expire on the

30th June next. As regards complaints in reference to clothing, formal complaints have not been sent in to the civil branch of the Militia Department with very slight exceptions, and when complaints are sent in it is difficult to trace to which contractor the defective article can be assigned, so that up to to-day no action has been taken for damages against any of the contractors who have been supplying the clothing for the militia and volunteer forces. The complaints as to boots were remedied by the local contractors supplying to the local commandant a new issue of boots in lieu of those condemned.

DUTY ON BINDING TWINE.

The House proceeded to further consider the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock: "That it is expedient to place binding twine on the free list;" and the motion of Mr. O'Brien: "That the debate be adjourned."

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps under ordinary circumstances the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) might be considered a reasonable one. Were this question coming up before Parliament for the first time I would not complain if the Government, or some one on behalf of the Government, had asked for a postponement of the motion. But I think there are special circumstances connected with this matter now that would not warrant the House in accepting the amendment of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). Permit me to mention some of these special circumstances. The grievance is not a new one; neither new to the country nor to this House. I had the honour of bringing it to the attention of Parliament in the month of May, 1891. On that occasion I moved a motion similar to that which is now before the House, and at the request of the Government I allowed that motion to stand—acting upon the line of the amendment of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien)—until the month of July. I allowed it to stand at the request of the Government. The request of the Government then advanced was the same as that proposed by the Minister of Finance yesterday, in order to enable the Government to come to a conclusion as to its action upon the proposition. Nevertheless, although two months elapsed between the adjournment of the motion in 1891 and its coming up again, and although the Government tariff policy had been announced in the meantime, it turned out that the postponement of the question simply resulted in this: that we did not get the relief, that the Government having had two months in which to consider the proposition, came to an adverse decision, and as the farmers then in the middle of their harvest, were compelled to buy their supplies of this necessary appliance in connection with their industry. I may say that, after the House had voted down the motion—which it manfully did on the part of the Government supporters in 1891—the mat-

ter came before the attention of the farmers of the country, and there was a strong feeling manifested by them that this motion had been unwisely disposed of, and petitions came into Parliament last session asking Parliament to reverse the decision of 1891, and to place binding twine on the free list. A motion similar in effect was made in 1892, and in the month of April of that year, the motion was voted down. The Government, in July, 1891, brought in their tariff changes, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means, and I supposed that from the attention which had been directed towards this matter in the country, we might have expected relief last session. It was not granted, but on the contrary, the Minister of Finance wholly ignored the matter, not even, I think, venturing to refer to it in the course of his tariff speech. Now, we have tried the Government in various ways. In 1891 the House did exactly what my friend from Muskoka asked to-day and postponed coming to a conclusion on the question until the Government had an opportunity of considering it. In 1892 they adopted another course and came to a decision, and thereafter the Government came to a decision as well, both of which were adverse to the farmers in this matter. The Government now evidently desire to be told what is the opinion of the House upon this question. The decision given by the House in 1892, prior to the Government announcing its decision, was adverse to the granting of the relief, and the House having decided in this way, the Government simply followed that decision a couple of months later and refused to interfere with the high duty levied on binding twine. It therefore appears to me, that if there is to be any relief granted, it will only be given on the mandate of the House, and that that mandate must precede the announcement of tariff changes, if there are to be any. I believe, therefore, that it is unreasonable that the Government should now ask that the matter be postponed. It is idle for the First Minister to say that a resolution such as is here formulated would, if adopted, disturb trade. The Government themselves have disturbed trade because they have announced that the mouldering branches of the National Policy would be lopped off. Is this high duty on binding twine a mouldering branch, or is it not? I believe that it is a mouldering branch, and I am not alone in this opinion, because on the other side of the House as well as on this, the opinion is very general that this is a rotten branch which should have been long ago lopped off. I therefore submit that it is of vital importance that this House should now pass a resolution instructing the Government as to the wish of the House upon this matter. Under these circumstances, I think it reasonable that the House should come to a conclusion to-day, and if it comes to a favourable conclusion, you may be sure that the Government will

give effect to the voice of this House, which in that case will, I think, be the voice of the country. Therefore, whilst desirous of meeting any Government request with all courtesy, I think the public interest demands that the House should now give an expression of its opinion upon this matter, declaring whether it is in favour of or against the proposition. The motion of adjournment appears to be a dilatory one to defeat it in the long run. That was the effect of the postponement of the question in 1891, and we have no evidence of any repentance on the part of the Minister of Finance since. If I had seen the slightest indication of such, I might have been willing to yield to his request; but I fear that the only way in which we can influence the Minister of Finance on this question is by the strong arm of the House. We must manifest to him the will of the House on the matter; in that way only shall we secure relief to the country from this burdensome tax. It is a question between the farmers on the one side and the combine on the other—it is a question whether the Government are going to fall in with the farmers or aid the combine against the farmers; and, with such an issue before the House, the hon. gentleman should consent to dispose of it at once. There is another circumstance to be considered. It is important that a question of this kind should be determined at an early stage, so that the farmers may know where they are. It should not be adjourned from time to time until the season is far advanced. From now on the farmers will be preparing for their summer's operations, and they ought to know as soon as possible whether they are going to get relief, or whether they are going to have to pay the old-fashioned prices. It is idle for hon. gentlemen to say that the abolition or reduction of the import duty will not reduce the price. We were told the same thing with regard to sugar; but the moment the duty on sugar was reduced, the price of sugar fell by the amount of the duty, and the minister himself loudly boasting in the House, how by the reduction of that duty he had relieved the people of burdens amounting to \$3,000,000. By what process of reasoning, then, can he claim that the abolition of the duty on binder twine would not have a similar result? I think the country is becoming convinced that the tariff is a tax and nothing else, and this item in it being a tax resting on the great farming industry of Canada, I think the House cannot too soon relieve that struggling industry of such a burdensome and unjust imposition. I hope, therefore, that the minister will agree to this question being decided on its merits now, and that he will not attempt to escape from a fair issue by a dilatory motion in the shape of one to postpone the decision to a later day.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want to add anything to the arguments which have been addressed to the House upon both sides in favour of the abolition of this tax—because

Mr. MULOCK.

we have not yet heard anything on the other side of the question. But I would like to say one or two words against the postponement of the consideration of the question as it has been brought before the House by my hon. friend who has just spoken. Now, it occurs to me that this is not in any sense, a want of confidence motion. Therefore, I and ought not to be considered in any sense, cannot understand why the Government should oppose a vote of the House being freely taken upon it. In fact, it is not even a censure upon the past conduct of the Government, though perhaps there was room for such a course being taken. It is simply a proposal to express the opinion of the House as a whole upon a certain tax imposed upon the people, and surely on such a subject the House is entitled to give an expression of its opinion for the guidance of the Government. The Government can only be considered to be, after all, a committee of this House, bound to try to carry out the wishes of the House. Is not the House, outside the Cabinet, entitled to advise upon the reduction or abolition of an important tax? I surely think it can do so; in fact, it is its duty to do so. We are not here, on either side, simply to register the decrees of the Cabinet, who may come to a conclusion in secret conclave as to whether a tax shall be reduced or not. I wonder whether it is the only function of the members who usually support the Government to follow their lead, or to give them independent advice upon questions of that kind. While of course it has been settled as the practice of Parliament that private members of the House cannot create a tax, they have the absolute right to propose a reduction in the tariff; and when the Government intervene between the action of the members of the House in making such a proposition, I think they are going a little beyond their constitutional right. Now, if the Government again disappoint the House, as they did last session, and if, when they come to propose their changes in the tariff, if they have any, they omit to propose a reduction or the abolition of this duty, what sort of position will they place their supporters in? At that stage of the proceedings it will be impossible for their supporters to vote, as we know many of them believe, in favour of the abolition of this tax, without voting a direct censure upon the Government. Now, I think that would be a very awkward position in which to place even those members of this House who support the Government; and it would place the members upon this side of the House in a rather awkward position also, because if we should condemn the neglect of the Government to abolish this tax after they had decided that as their policy, then we would be accused of simply acting from factious and partizan motives. Now, surely it is a mistake for the Government or for the House to propose the postponement of a vote upon this question. If the Government have decided,

either in their own conclave or the larger conclave of their supporters which was held this morning, to abolish this tax, I think we should be informed of it; and at any rate I think it will be a great mistake if this House is not allowed free and untrammelled opportunity of expressing its opinion by voting on this question

Mr. CAMPBELL. So far as the main motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is concerned, there does not appear to be any direct objection on the part of the Government to its passage. At least we have not heard anything from that side to that effect. It has been shown clearly that the tax levied upon the farmers in the shape of a duty upon binder twine is very oppressive. That has not been denied by anybody. It can be clearly proven that the tax on the farmers alone would amount to \$225,000 a year. If this duty were a source of large revenue to the Government, we might not wonder at their hesitancy; but when it is shown that the amount derived by the Government last year from it only amounted to a little over \$40,000, there can be no reason why this tax should not be removed, especially when it bears so heavily on the farming interests. As has been said, the farmers of this country are almost unanimous in favour of the removal of this duty. There is not a single farmer's institute in Ontario or Manitoba, there is not a branch of the Patrons of Industry, which has not over and over again petitioned the Government to remove the duty. Two years ago, I think it was, the hon. member for West Lambton submitted the largest petition ever presented to this House, containing the signature of over thirty thousand farmers of Ontario, asking the Government to remove this oppressive tax. In the face of the petitions presented over and over again, there ought to be some good reason advanced before the Government should call on us to reject this motion. I have failed yet to hear one reason assigned why this vote should not be taken and the duty removed. It is true, both the Minister of Finance and the First Minister have appealed to the House to postpone action. I do not think they should have taken such a course. I do not think it is the duty of the Government to ask this House to postpone action on any question we may wish to bring forward. If this question were now being brought forward for the first time, the Government might reasonably ask the House to postpone the vote until they had considered the matter and made up their minds, but for the last three years this question has been brought forward over and over again, the iniquities of the tax have been pointed out, and the Government asked to remove it. Their invariable reply is that they will consider the matter; but we find, after they have considered it, and made up their minds, they always fail to remove the duty. It seems to

me that the Government ought to consult the wishes of the House. We are sent here, as independent members, to decide what course we think is best for the country, and the Government ought to act on our advice. I do not take it that they are masters of the whole situation. They are simply intrusted with the control of the affairs of the country in order that they may carry out the wishes of Parliament; and therefore I think it is begging the question for the Minister of Finance, or any member of the Government, to ask the House to postpone action upon this or any other question. It seems to me the question is simply this, that, in the opinion of this House, the duty should be removed; and if that be our opinion, it is the bounden duty of the House to give expression to it in supporting this motion. For my part, I am quite satisfied that this tax is, of all those levied on our imports, one of the first that should go, and for that reason I shall vote against any postponement of the question.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In so far as I am personally concerned, I am decidedly in accord with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in his desire to have binder twine placed on the free list, and, when the opportunity occurs, I shall be found recording my vote in support of that view, as I have done already. Yesterday afternoon the Minister of Finance invited members of the House to give their views upon the general effect the remission of this duty might have on our tariff, and I want to bring under the notice of the head of the Government, for a few moments, one of the relative circumstances involved in the establishment and continuance of this and similar combines. In the discourse of this discussion, it came out that one of the results of the operation of this combine was to close a number of establishments that heretofore had manufactured binder twine in various districts, notably the establishments at Lachute, Quebec, and St. John's. Of these, the machinery is standing idle and the operatives were turned adrift to secure for themselves a livelihood as best they could. It seems to me, from the standpoint of the friends of the National Policy, this is entirely an undesirable result. In common with other towns in my early election campaigns, we had, in discussing this question, presented to our attention as one of the reasons why the electorate should support the National Policy, the predictions as the hon. member for Assiniboia West (Mr. Davin) remarked, were, that tall chimneys would spring up in these various districts, that employment would be secured for the resident population, and a great market for the agricultural population adjoining. These were the promises openly and freely made. I think the present results of the National Policy are not just such as justify those promises. Let me give an example of the

position of matters in my own town. When the cotton combine was established, a couple of years ago, the cotton mill in my town, although it had paid dividends in the old days of moderate tariff, found itself, under the operation of the National Policy, unable to pay any dividends, and the directors had to carry a heavy burden of liability on their personal responsibility. Naturally, they became tired of doing so, and the mill was closed and threw a large number of operators out of employment. It was put up at auction to satisfy the floating debt, and was sold for some \$27,000, more than sufficient to pay those debts. The whole of the original capital, as I was informed—for I was not one of the victims—was over \$400,000, and that was swept at one operation out of existence. The operatives accepted the statement in good faith that with the varied development of machinery in other parts of the country there was not sufficient demand for the combination to keep their mill open. They went to one or two other mills operated by the combination, leaving their families in town, and they came back saying that the combination controlled all the sources of employment in the class of labour they were accustomed to, and they had no alternative but to accept the reduced scale of wages which left them nothing to support their families, after paying their board away from home, and after trying that for a few months, many of them drifted away to the United States to find employment which was denied them at home. These had invested their little savings, more or less as the case might be, in their homes in the town. Some of them had been fortunate enough to realize a little more than sufficient for that purpose, and, having faith in the statements of the friends of the National Policy, they had invested money in other properties in the town. To-day, almost in sight of this town, they see that this combination has watered their capital so as to almost double the amount invested and they see the machinery taken out of their mill and the capacity of another mill only a few miles distant doubled while they are left with their homesteads and their investments which they made on the faith of the statements of the friends of the National Policy with their value reduced and themselves placed in a position of embarrassment. In speaking of these parties, I am not speaking of political friends of my own, for these men honestly fought me through every campaign since the advent of the National Policy, and they stuck honestly to that National Policy and to that political party, but I call the attention of the Government to the position that these working people are in to-day. These men are not members of a combination, they are not—shall I use the phrase—interested in the Red Parlour, they are not in a position to enforce their views on the Government because they are only ordinary citizens and mechanics, but it is a cruel hardship that the Government

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

should maintain heavy duties on cotton goods or binder twine for the benefit of a monopoly and that these people should be left in this position. What has been the result of the operation of the National Policy in the smaller towns and districts? I venture to say that neither the operatives nor the capital nor the output which are credited to the various towns can be found to exist except in the last census taken in the Dominion. In all my wanderings I have never seen a man who has been able to find anything like a decent proportion of the industries and the operatives and the capital in western Ontario that are said in these returns to be in existence in these towns. But these parties find themselves with their small capital invested where they are not able to get anything from it, and they see themselves helpless in the face of these combinations. If the pressure of these combinations is kept up much longer, these parties who have stood honestly by the National Policy, will have to leave the province, as hundreds in my town have been compelled to do when they finished their apprenticeship and came out finished mechanics, and had to go away to better their condition, and to advance the interest of the country to the south of us; and there is this further difficulty, that, when one or two boys do well there, they draw their acquaintances after them, but those who are left with their little property have either to sacrifice or to be content with obtaining a little work in other occupations. I say, in good faith, without regard to political relations, whether these parties are right or wrong, they say it is not fair for the Government to allow these combinations thus to treat them, and that they should be treated at least as fairly as the parties who have inaugurated these combinations. I say, without prejudice, in looking over the field of manufactures in our Dominion to-day, that, the trend is in the direction of combination and centralization, and it behoves the Government to ascertain, when they are readjusting the tariff, whether they cannot in some way, extend some meed of justice to the parties who are now suffering. They ask why the Government should allow these combinations to act as they do, and I should be false to my duties if I failed to draw the attention of the Government to the difficulties in which their own friends are placed, because I am not now speaking on behalf of my own political friends at all.

Mr. STAIRS. I think it but fair, though I am interested in this question, and what I may say will be taken with some grain of allowance, that I should make some observations before this comes to a vote. I feel sure that hon. gentlemen who are supporting this motion have no desire to misrepresent the facts as they exist, and, as it happens that a great deal of the question seems in

the minds of hon. gentlemen who have spoken to turn upon the point of monopoly, I desire briefly to state the history of the manufacture of this article in Canada. It was started about ten or twelve years ago, about the same time as it was in the United States. I think the duty at that time was 20 per cent. the article coming in under unenumerated articles. For some years down to the present time, the manufacture has been continued. Those engaged in the manufacture, so far as I am aware, have not at any time asked for an increase of duty upon this article. I believe the duty was increased to 25 per cent some years ago, though I was not in the House at the time, and I know that those who are associated with me at the present time had nothing whatever to do with asking for that increase. Now the present position of the manufacture of this article in Canada is simply the outcome of business arrangements into which, I feel sure, I need not go. It is a little unfortunate for me that sometimes I have to speak upon items in the tariff in which I am to some extent directly interested, and on that account I feel very diffident in speaking at all; but still, feeling that I am better acquainted with the facts than hon. gentlemen opposite, it is but fair that I should make them known. Upon the question of monopoly, I desire to say that at the present time there are less grounds for attacking the duty upon binder twine than have existed for some years past. There is at present in Canada no monopoly in the manufacture of binder twine, if by monopoly we are to understand one concern controlling the whole manufacture. There is another concern starting in Canada to-day to manufacture binder twine, and I think if they are not already in operation, they will be very soon. The Government of Ontario have gone into the manufacture of binder twine, and I presume they will prove very severe competitors; so that the members of this House will see that there is at the present time competition in binder twine, a competition which, I believe, will be amply sufficient to keep down the price. In regard to the price of binder twine, while I am upon my feet, it is, perhaps, only right that I should point out that there has always been in this House some measures of unfairness in the way this question has been treated by those who mention prices. It has been the custom for hon. gentlemen opposite, in comparing the price of this article in Canada with the price in the United States, to quote the wholesale price in the United States and compare it with the retail price in Canada, manifestly to the prejudice of the Canadian industry. I feel confident, Mr. Speaker, that it has been established in the debates for the last two years, that the prices of twine in Canada, to the farmers, have been as low on an average, during the past five years, as they have been in the United States. Last year the hon. gentleman who then represented Marquette in this

House quoted prices at which English binder twine was offered in the United States, which were so high that it would not have been any lower if sold in Canada without any duty upon it whatever. Now, as to the position of the company which was very largely dealt with by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) yesterday, I do not want to say anything on that point further than that the arrangement to which that hon. gentleman referred was simply the outcome of a wish on the part of some of the owners to put the stock upon the Canadian market and make it a public company. There was no increased issue of stock at all; it was only an offer of stock by the present shareholders. It is also the case that the old proprietors of the company in Canada are buying stock, and it is the intention of the controllers of the company that a majority of the stock shall be held in Canada. That will be the case as soon as the arrangements are completed. Upon the general question of this attack upon the binder twine duty, if it is treated as a part of the National Policy, and is considered by the Government and by the members of the House in the same way as the duty upon any other article, those who are interested in the manufacture will just have to put up with any action that may be taken by the Government. They are quite prepared to let the whole matter rest in the hands of this House, and whatever the decision may be we will have to put up with it. I feel sure, however, that the House will agree with me that the grounds upon which the House arrives at a decision should be clearly made known, and that the decision should be based upon the facts of the case, and I am confident that when these facts are known the question will be fairly treated, and that the decision will be in the interest of the whole country.

House divided on amendment (Mr. O'Brien):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams.	Lippé.
Bain (Soulanges).	Macdonald (King's).
Baird.	Mackintosh.
Bellefleur.	Maclean (York).
Bennett.	McDonald (Victoria).
Bergeron.	McDougald (Pictou).
Bergin.	McDougall (Cape Breton).
Boyle.	McInerney.
Burns.	McKay.
Cameron.	McLean (King's).
Cargill.	McLennan.
Carpenter.	McMillan (Vaudreuil).
Caron (Sir Adolphe).	Madill.
Carscallen.	Mara.
Chesley.	Marshall.
Coatsworth.	Masson.
Cochrane.	Metcalfe.
Cockburn.	Miller.
Corbould.	Mills (Annapolis).
Corby.	Moncrieff.
Costigan.	Northrup.
Curran.	Ouimet.
Daly.	Patterson (Colchester).
Davin.	Patterson (Huron).
Davis.	Pelletier.
Denison.	Pridham.
Desaulniers.	Prior.
Dickey.	Putman.
Dugas.	Reid.

Dupont,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Ingram,
Ives,
Joncas,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Leclair,

Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—99.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),
Béchar, d,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brown,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Charlton,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies,
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,

Laurier,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt,
Welsh,
Yeo.—58.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Amyot,
McAllister,
Lépine,
Grandbois.

Opposition.

Choquette,
Allan,
Brodeur,
Bruneau.

Amendment agreed to and debate adjourned.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, memorials, departmental orders and Orders in Council, not already laid before the House, respecting the north-western, northern and eastern boundaries of the province of Quebec, together with all reports of surveys or explorations ordered thereon or in connection therewith, by the Government of Canada, since last session of Parliament, including the instructions for said surveys or explorations.

He said : Last year I made a motion to the same effect as that which I am now making, to have all the papers up to that time connected with the proposed boundaries of the province of Quebec on its north-west, northern and eastern sides laid before the House. Those papers were brought down, and, so far as they went, they were satisfactory. How-

Mr. STAIRS.

ever, the late Minister of the Interior, Hon. Mr. Dewdney, in the course of his speech, stated that the whole work had not been completed, and he told me afterwards that, during the recess, the engineer, Mr. Ogilvie, who was going to visit James Bay, would be instructed to continue the survey, or, in fact, to make the examination that he was not able to make when he visited the district previously. Mr. Ogilvie could not reach that point on account of the bad weather, and he was only able, of course, to submit information regarding the country as far as he travelled. At page 23 of his report laid before the House, he says :

East Main River, called by the natives as this Indian informed me, Kis-ta-ciwan Sipi, or chief river, is, at the post 76.50 chains or 1,683 yards wide. The tide runs up it to the first rapids about 15 miles above the post, and the white porpoises which come into the river go up as far as that, showing that there is a good depth of water all the way up. It appears this river was ascended in 1824 by a Mr. Clouston, under orders from the Hudson's Bay Co. He made a map of it, a copy of which Mr. A. P. Low, of the Geological Survey, obtained at Little Whale River. This is now in the office of the Geological Survey, but I have not yet seen it.

That map will certainly be very interesting, and might be brought down with the papers in connection with this motion. He further says :

The journals of this post were removed many years ago to Whale River, and the greater portion of them burned, so that source of information (a very valuable one) was not available. It appears that this was quite an important place at once time, and the ships from England called there.

Continuing, Mr. Ogilvie states what he knows about the survey, and continues :

Of the other rivers north of this I got a little information from the gentleman in charge of East Main (Mr. Corston), who has been in the country since 1836, and has travelled much around the Bay since that time; but as Mr. A. P. Low, of the Geological Survey, has examined several of these rivers, and his account is already published in the report of that survey for the years 1887-88, I will not further refer to them.

Then he adds the following information :

While at East Main I was told that the Rev. Mr. Peck, a missionary at Fort George, had ascended Fort George River, as it is called by the people there, but which Mr. Low calls Big River, and crossed from it to the head of the Ungava, which he descended to Ungava Bay. My informants were not very well acquainted with his account of these journeys, but gave me the following items : The journey from James Bay to Ungava Bay occupied only 26 days. There was nothing specially difficult about it, the portage from one water system to the other being estimated to be about 10 miles, partly over a rough rocky ridge. The descent of the Ungava River was easy, requiring no portaging at all. The country around the head of the Ungava is treeless, and covered with furze and moss, over which numberless cariboo wander apparently heedless of the presence of man. I tried to get from Mr. Peck himself a few notes of his journey, but failed to communicate with him in time to get them before I left East Main. I hope to get his reply by the next mail from that district.

The House will remember that the reason why I moved for the papers last year, and

why I now ask for further information, which no doubt the Government have at hand, is this : From the papers brought down last year it appears that the difficulty, if difficulty there is, existing between the Government and the province of Quebec, is that the province would prefer to have as its northern boundary the river called East Main. The contention is that East Main River is hardly more than sixteen or eighteen miles north of the 52nd parallel of latitude. If so, it may be very important for the province of Quebec and for the Dominion that the boundary should be a river instead of being a purely imaginary line over that portion of the country. The river is wide enough, at all events for the first fifteen or sixteen miles, and, therefore, if the boundary of the province were limited to East Main River the boundary would be a fixed one, always easy to be discovered, and this would prevent the difficulty that must occur if we have a line that is purely imaginary, on which monuments are placed. That boundary would always be a costly one and not be a satisfactory one. The boundary selected for the province of Ontario is Albany River. When the matter was brought before the Government, we thought at the time that the river was the proper boundary for Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. The hon. gentleman said the proper boundary was the height of land.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman has his own views on this subject, and I remember what he said last year ; indeed, I read his remarks ever since that time in order to refresh my memory in regard to them. The contention at the time was that the boundary of those provinces should be the height of land ; but when the matter came finally before us, it was settled that the boundary should be the Albany River. Albany River is the boundary that has been settled by Parliament, and is the boundary of Ontario to-day ; and I am glad that boundary was selected, because it is one that is easily pointed out and is the proper one for all time to come. The same principle should apply to the province of Quebec. It was very important that the northern boundary of that province should be East Main River, so far as we can have it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about Rupert River ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is very much below the 52nd degree. By adopting that as a boundary, you would be curtailing the limits of the province of Quebec in that direction, while the 52nd degree was supposed to mark the boundary of the province. After looking over the matter, we thought—when I say we, I do not speak of the Government—we thought, in the province of Quebec, that the boundary should be the East Main River. The objection that some made to that boundary was, that if the East Main

River were followed from one end to the other, it would be going too far north and would give to the province of Quebec a larger territory than it was thought that province should have. The answer to that is : Let us follow the East Main River as far as it is reasonable to do so, and then follow other rivers and lakes that are in the interior, to this 52nd degree ; and then follow the 52nd degree, if there are no rivers or lakes to form the boundary, towards the parallel of Blanc-Sablon, which is now the eastern boundary of the province of Quebec. The hon. Mr. Dewdney told me that he would give instructions to Mr. Ogilvie, who was going to James' Bay, to follow that river, so as to give us an idea of its course and to obtain information as to whether it really goes far north, or as to whether, after going fifteen or twenty or fifty miles, we could not deflect it towards the 52nd degree of latitude and bring it down there in a direct line, as far as possible, to the line of Blanc-Sablon extended. I understand that Mr. Ogilvie went up there, and I therefore wish to have the papers that were not laid before the House last session. This matter, I think, should be settled as soon as possible. The boundary of the province of Quebec would have been fixed at the time I refer to, if there had not been this difficulty or contention in reference to the boundary by the East Main River. Under these circumstances, I hope the Government will be in a position to grant the motion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sure hon. members will agree with me that the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has given us very interesting information with regard to a question which is certainly of great importance to the province of Quebec. The papers, of course, will be brought down. I am disposed to agree with the hon. gentleman, in so far as the East Main River frontier is concerned. I think it is a very convenient one, and for a long portion of the extent of that river there can be no trouble, because, as far as my recollection goes, the East Main for a considerable portion of its course runs across country from east to west. It is supposed from the fact of this river deflecting from its course, that it would be giving too much territory to the province of Quebec, and if that be the case, it occurs to me that it would be easy, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, to draw a line that would meet the 52nd degree, which would be the delimitation upon which most people agree. I think that when the papers have been brought down it will be seen that the commission appointed by the Dominion Government, which commission is now defunct, studied the question very thoroughly and made a report ; but the Government of the province of Quebec has not acted upon that report, and until the Local Government take the matter up I do not see what more we can do. However, it is a very interesting question, and I have no doubt that the present Government of the

province of Quebec, as soon as they find it convenient, will give the matter attention, and then the question can be gone into and the frontier decided.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) can be congratulated on the perfect accuracy of his statement of the facts connected with the establishment of the northern boundary of the province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman will remember that that boundary was the subject of arbitration, in consequence of the contention of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a prominent member, that the boundary of Ontario was the height of land on the north; and that it was bounded on the west by a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. If the contention of the hon. gentleman had been carried out, Ontario would have had just about one-half the area that she has received under the determination of the Queen in Council. The hon. gentleman refers to the establishment of the Albany River as the boundary for Ontario on the north, and he says that Parliament agreed to the boundary so established. The hon. gentleman, and those associated with him, agreed to that, after the determination of Her Majesty in Council. It was a legal decision or an Act of the State which determined the boundary on the north to be the Albany River. That the boundary of Ontario extended further to the westward, I have no doubt, but the Lords of the Council refused to entertain a proposition that would embrace territory that had for a long period been under a government organized by the Hudson Bay Company, and in which the province of Ontario had, by its neglect to assert the right to dominion over that western territory, lost by acquiescence. The hon. gentleman referred to the boundary on the north of Quebec as if that were a matter of doubt, as if it depended altogether upon convention as to where the boundary of Quebec was determined to be. I think Quebec has a legal boundary on the north, and the question this House has to consider is whether it will disturb that boundary: whether it will, by mutual legislation here and in the province of Quebec, undertake to establish another boundary for reasons which may be justified in the public interest, both in the province of Quebec and in the Dominion at large. Those who have looked into the history of this question, as to the northern boundary of the province of Quebec, know that it was a matter of dispute between the Government of England and the Government of France before the cession of the province of Quebec to British dominion—that it was settled by the treaty of Ryswick that the territories of the province of New France should extend to Hudson's Bay—whether to the Rupert River or to the Main River was an unsettled question; be-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

cause the two Governments could not agree where that boundary should be located, either on the west or on the east of Hudson's Bay, and no settlement of that question took place. War broke out very soon afterwards—a war which was terminated by the Treaty of Utrecht—and under that treaty the French were excluded from Hudson's Bay altogether, it being agreed that the boundary between the English possessions on Hudson's Bay and the French possessions to the south should be determined by commissioners. These commissioners were not appointed until 1750 or 1751, and it was not until 1755 that the commissioners met at Paris. Col. Bladen was sent over from England with instructions; but those instructions were disregarded by the English commissioners. They submitted to the commissioners who represented France a different boundary, as the northern boundary of Quebec, from what had been suggested in their instructions. The House will bear in mind that during the negotiations upon the Treaty of Utrecht the Government of England applied to the Hudson's Bay Company to state where they desired the boundary to be established, and the Hudson's Bay Company proposed to begin at a point on the Labrador coast near the Straits of Hudson, in latitude, I think, 58 1-2, at a place called Grimington or Partridge Island; and they proposed that a line should be drawn also south-west to Lake Mistassin, which was also called in the same paper Miskosinke, and that line extended the boundary to the south-west shore of that lake. It does not extend the boundary any further, but it is assumed that the parallel of the south-western shore of that lake would be a parallel midway between the English posts on the Hudson's Bay and the French posts farther up the rivers emptying into that bay. The French had a post at Lake Abbittibi, as well as Lake Mistassin; and it was proposed that a line midway between those lakes should be drawn. Now, in the correspondence which took place between the English ambassadors at Utrecht and at Paris and the English ministers, it is pointed out that a map was prepared, and that lines were drawn upon that map, both by the English and the French, and that the difference between those two lines was not very great, and there would be no difficulty in settling the matter by means of commissioners. The terms of the treaty, the correspondence which took place, and the map upon which those lines were drawn, show that the commissioners were to find a boundary not nearer to Hudson's Bay than the line drawn by the French, and not farther away from the bay than the line drawn by the English. The commissioners' discretion in finding a boundary was to be exercised between the lines so drawn on this map. Now, the French proposition was to commence at the entrance to Hudson's Straits, at a point which is at

latitude 61, and to go in a south-westerly direction midway between the English post on Rupert River, near the mouth of that river, to the French post on Lake Mistassin. There they drew the line. They extended it south of the river, and they carried it midway between the bay and Lake Abbitibi. There is not much difference, as to the line south of the bay, between the line drawn by the English and the line drawn by the French. There is a considerable difference as to the line to the east of the bay. There is a difference of a degree and a half at the starting point between the lines drawn by the two parties, and those lines approach very little in their extension until they reach what may be regarded as a common line extending westward on the south. Now, under an act passed early in this century a considerable proportion of the territory lying east of either of those dividing lines is taken from the province of Quebec and attached to the province of Newfoundland. With that, therefore, we have nothing to do. That was a part of the Imperial policy, and you have but to draw those lines that were drawn by the English and the French in the discussion of the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, and you will see precisely what territories the province of Quebec has on the north of Rupert River. She does not touch Hudson's Bay at any point under that legal boundary, and the northern boundary would be midway between Lake Abbitibi and Hudson's Bay. The Government of the Hudson's Bay Company, under the Treaty of Utrecht and before the commissioners met at Paris, were asked again to state where the boundary was, and they followed the very lines on the east from Grimington Island, and ran south of the shore of Lake Mistassin to the southerly shore of that lake; but they extended it on to the 49th parallel, and they proposed that the boundary should follow the 49th parallel westward. Well, I do not think any importance can be attached to that document in a legal point of view, because the terms of the treaty and the boundaries contended for by the two sovereignties were marked upon the map, and it would not be possible for the commissioners to concede to either party a larger area of territory than it claimed. The most the commissioners could do in favour of either would be to adopt the boundary so marked out. Now, the question which the Government have to consider, and which Parliament ultimately must consider, is that, if that boundary—which, I admit, is not a convenient boundary, looking at the extent of territory taken off the eastern portion of Quebec and attached to Newfoundland—if that boundary is to be abandoned and a conventional boundary established, where should that conventional boundary be drawn? If a line is drawn upon the map, it seems to me that the territories lying south of Rupert River, which undoubtedly belong to Canada, and can be transferred to the province of Quebec, would be equal in extent, it may be

presumed, superior in value and importance to the territory which the province of Quebec would yield to Canada north of that river. If the House is desirous of exercising that supervision which is necessary over an act of this sort, I think it is important that a map of that section of the country should be laid on the Table, and with the lines which were drawn by the Marquis de Torcy, the representative of France, and Mr. Prior, the English poet, who represented England. The correspondence that took place was between the Marquis de Torcy and Mr. Prior, and it was sent by Mr. Prior to Lord Bolingbroke, who was the Prime Minister, practically, of England at that time. It does not at all follow that because the province of Ontario extended to Hudson's Bay, the province of Quebec did extend to that bay also. On the contrary, it is impossible to read all the papers relating to this subject without seeing that the province of Ontario was extended to Hudson's Bay by proclamation and by Order in Council in 1791. Before that, the middle distance between Lake Abbitibi and Hudson's Bay was the northern boundary, in that vicinity at all events, of both the north-eastern portion of what is now the province of Ontario, and the north-western portion of what was then the province of Quebec. There were two papers which the Government of England caused to be laid before Parliament when the Act of 1791 was submitted for enactment. The one divided the province of Quebec by a line extending northward to the northern extremity of that province. The other followed exactly the same line, but extended to the shores or coast of Hudson's Bay, and declared that all the territory to the westward and southward of that line, to the utmost extent of what had been known or commonly called, not Quebec, but Canada, should be embraced in the province of Upper Canada. But the boundaries of the province of Quebec on the north, as they existed prior to the surrender of Quebec to Great Britain, remain just as they were. I said last year, and I repeat it now, that it seems to me a conventional boundary could be established which would be to the advantage of the province of Quebec, and not to the disadvantage of Canada. I would not propose to follow the illiberal and unfair course which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), and those associated with him, followed in dealing with the province of Ontario, but I say that it is important to determine, and it ought to be determined with care, if a natural boundary is selected, whether the Rupert River—which would give Quebec access to Hudson's Bay, and would give her all the territories belonging to Canada that are clearly without the boundaries of the province of Quebec up to that river—whether that would not be an adequate exchange for the territories that she would surrender north of that river. The hon. gentleman has referred to Slave River. I do not think

any man living knows where Slave River rises. I do not believe that river has ever been marked out by any party. It is a mere conjecture as to whether it runs westward or south-westward. Where the river empties is known, the direction from which it flows for some miles away from the bay is known; but what is the source of that river, whether it is in the 55th or 56th parallel, north latitude, or whether it is in the 52nd, no one knows, and it seems to me that if the Government were to propose to agree to the Slave River as a boundary, they would simply be taking a leap in the dark, and might be transferring a very large extent of territory to the province of Quebec that, on no ground of exchange, and no ground of mutual convenience, could be upheld.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the query of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), I may say that the Government are not in possession of very much more information than they had when this subject was under discussion last year. The hon. gentleman labours under a misapprehension if he understands that Mr. Ogilvie was in that neighbourhood this year. It was Mr. Low, of the Geological Survey, who was in the neighbourhood, and all the information I can give on the subject is contained in the report of Mr. Low. I understand that we are as much in the dark as ever, from the information I get from my department as to the true sources of the Main and Hamilton rivers. Mr. Ogilvie, it appears, carried his traverse survey from the point at which he reached James Bay to the mouth of the East Main River; and during this past season, Mr. Low, of the Geological Survey, has connected by a micrometer survey, Ogilvie's station, at the mouth of the East Main River, with Lake Mistassini, which took him 308 miles up the East Main River. Mr. Low informs me that about twenty miles from the Hudson's Bay coast, the East Main separates into two branches, one running about due east, and the other about north-east. The most careful examination he was able to give to these two branches did not permit of his deciding which was the main branch. He further informs me:

You will observe that at a point much nearer the Hudson Bay coast than I had supposed, the difficulty as to which is the main branch arises.

Again, he says that 300 miles from the coast it divides again, and the two divisions are so nearly alike that it was impossible for him to form any opinion as to which was the larger. He says the probabilities are that the east branch is the larger, because the Indians say so. So that leaves the whole question open, and from the information so far obtained, it would be impossible either for the Dominion or Provincial Government to arrive at any conclusion as to whether the East Main River would be the true line or not. I will bring down, for the information of the hon. gentleman, a full report of Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

what Mr. Low is able to give us upon the subject. I may state for his information that it is the intention of the survey to send Mr. Low back to the region again next year, and possibly we may have further information on the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am satisfied with the statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, as far as it goes. At all events, we have this information, that the river at a certain point separates into two, and one branch goes east and the other goes north-east. In that case the contention that that river might be the boundary of the province of Quebec is strengthened. If the river goes east, that is the direction in which the boundary should be determined in order to reach the extended line of Blanc-Sablon at the eastern end of the province of Quebec. I am sorry that the information that Mr. Low—I understood at the time it would be Mr. Ogilvie, but that may have been changed afterwards—can give is not fuller and that another year has to pass away before we can come to any settled boundary. I hope, however, that as this is a difficult line to determine, being so far north and being so far away from civilization that the difficulties in the way of the settlement of that question are great, the Minister of the Interior will be able, in his instructions to Mr. Low or anyone else he sends there, to obtain as full a statement about the direction of the two branches of that river as can be obtained, because, after all, we must come to some determination about it; and when the boundary of Ontario was fixed, the boundary of Quebec might have been fixed, but it was understood that we could not settle it until we had the information for which I am now asking. Perhaps also the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to bring the map mentioned in the report of last year, but which was not sent down. Then, as suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), we might also have a map, giving as far as possible the direction of those rivers. Of course, we do not require, and I am sure it is not the intention of the hon. gentleman to ask, all the details, but we might be given the direction of these rivers and the parallels and the eastern boundary of the province of Quebec, and also the western boundary as settled in the Act by which the boundary of Ontario was settled, that is, the line which starts from the northern end of Lake Temiscamingue and goes due north to James Bay. If we could have these things before us for next session, it would be important, and in the meantime, perhaps, we might have the papers asked for and the map I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF LARD.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That in the opinion of the House, it is expedient that legislation be enacted during the present session of

Parliament to prohibit the importation into Canada, or the manufacture therein, of lard adulterated with cotton-seed oil or other injurious ingredients.

He said: During the session of 1888, I moved a resolution somewhat similar to the one I have now placed in your hands. It read:

That the House resolve itself into committee to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to introduce a Bill providing for the regulation of the manufacture and sale of rendered lard.

After some debate, that was carried, but a Bill was not introduced, because the Trade and Navigation Returns then showed that we had to import lard into the country largely to supply the consumption; but now things have changed to a great extent, because our farmers are going a great deal into the raising of pork, and the lard manufactured at home and that imported from the United States, as I shall show by the Trade and Navigation Returns, is so adulterated that it is almost unfit for food. In speaking to the resolution that I moved in 1888, I quoted the following statistics and made the following remarks:—

I wish now to draw the attention of the House and the country to the effect of the legislation then passed on this article of oleomargarine. In 1884-85 we imported 1,162,337 lbs. butter; in 1885-86 we imported 1,249,000, while this year, 1886-87, we have imported but a total of 264,272 lbs. We imported into Ontario 6,155 lbs., Quebec 542 lbs., Nova Scotia 189 lbs., New Brunswick 1,881 lbs., Manitoba 9 lbs., and in British Columbia the large quantity of 237,496 lbs., or within 9,000 lbs. of the total import. Nearly 1,000,000 lbs. less have been imported into Canada since legislation was passed affecting the article, compared with what was imported in the ten months of the preceding year, the legislation having been passed two months previous to the end of the fiscal year. We exported in 1886 5,455,809 lbs. of butter. I am of the impression that the 237,000 lbs. imported into British Columbia, and paying 4 cents a pound duty might profitably have been exported from Ontario. I am strongly of opinion that a large quantity of this 237,000 lbs. was a spurious article of butter. It think it would be well if the Customs authorities would instruct their officers to place in bond any butter imported into this country, so that it might be properly analysed, for I am strongly of opinion that there is yet spurious butter brought into the country.

The remarks I made at that time are applicable to the state of affairs to-day, for I see by the Trade and Navigation Returns that last year we imported into Canada of butter for home consumption, only 246,000 lbs. less than a quarter of a million, where previous to the passing of the oleomargarine prohibition Act, we imported a million and a half. I find that of this total amount, 236,000 lbs. went to British Columbia, and I wish to call the attention of the Controller of Customs to the statement I made at that time, that I think the importation of butter into British Columbia is an importation of that spurious article of oleomargarine. While we exported 7,000,000 lbs. of butter from Ontario last year, we should be able to supply British Columbia with that article, instead of their importing and paying 4

cents a pound upon it. I would like the Customs authorities to instruct their officials to collect samples and send them down here and have them analysed, and if the article of oleomargarine is found, that it should be prohibited, because it interferes just that much with the consumption of our home product. Before I take up the larger question, I want to refer to a gentleman who has done great service in England to the farmers of Canada—I refer to Professor Robertson. I have before me copies of two papers which he was kind enough to send me from England, one, the "Grocers' Gazette," and another the "Canadian Gazette." Speaking in reference to Canada, he makes use of these words:

Canada was ambitious to have a good name in this respect. They were not an old people. Was there ever a boy of twenty (men they were called now)—(laughter)—who had not pretty high ideals and would keep trying every Monday morning to act up to them, but by the time he was 40 he would be quite willing to relinquish his ideals in deference to other people, and to do things he would have scorned to do when young. So Canada, which was still young, had its ideals like the young man, and the Government had prohibited the making of anything that was adulterated."

He is laying down the fact over in England that we in Canada have prohibited this article. He made the statement in one of his speeches that the Government of Canada had prohibited the manufacture or importation into Canada of oleomargarine, and he recommended the English people to adopt the same course. He sent me a copy of the "Grocers' Gazette and Provision Trade Review" in which I find that at one session of the police court seven grocers were summoned and fined for having sold adulterated butter or oleomargarine. Professor Robertson, in all his speeches, has referred to this fact, and advised the English people to do as we have done here in Canada. These seven cases were tried under the Margarine Act, as they have one in force in England, not prohibiting the importation, but preventing retailers from selling oleomargarine unless they have it labelled and called by its proper name. But in each of these cases they were all selling it for butter, and it took the place of butter. I will read one or two of these cases:

At the Greenwich Police Court on Tuesday, before Mr. Kennedy, Elou Smith, trading as E. & E. H. Smith, provision merchants, of 165, Brockley-road, Brockley, was summoned by the Greenwich District Board of Works for selling butter admixed with about 70 per cent of foreign fat (margarine).—Mr. Kennedy fined the defendant 40s. and 2s. costs.—Daniel Edwin Walden, grocer, of 77, Foxberry-road, Brockley, was summoned for selling butter admixed with about 80 per cent. of foreign fat (margarine).—Mr. Kennedy said he would give the defendant the benefit of a possible mistake and fine him only 20s. and 2s. costs.

That is how they deal with this margarine in England. They allow merchants to sell it, but on each package there must be a label showing that it is oleomargarine, but these

seven grocers simply had it on their counters, and did not have the sign on it, and they were fined for so doing. Now, we imported last year from Great Britain and entered for home consumption, 2,000 lbs., and from the United States 690,766 lbs. of lard for home consumption, besides what has been manufactured of the adulterated article in Canada. Now, I am of the opinion that we can produce, and are producing, a sufficient quantity of lard in this country to supply our home demand; if we have not been doing so in the past, I am satisfied we will do so in the future, from the fact that farmers are learning throughout this country that hog growing in connection with dairying is one of the most profitable investments that the farmer can go into. I might refer to one case in my own county. A gentleman there had held over from the year before last a large quantity of barley that he would not sell at the then going prices; he held it over until spring. He then purchased a number of pigs and he charged the pig account with the cost of the pig, and with the barley fed to the pig, with his whey from the factory. He had in his pen one pig for each cow in his dairy; so that he gave the product of that cow, the whey from the factory, to the pig, with an admixture of barley meal, pea meal, and oat meal; and he told me that his coarse grains, barley, peas and oats that he fed to those pigs, realized 75 cents per bushel. Now, farmers throughout the country, instead of selling their grain and raising three or four pigs, as they have been doing, on the product of the whey from twenty or thirty cows, they are raising a pig for each cow and feeding the coarse grains with whey, thereby producing a large amount of pork; and they will find in this way that their coarse grains will bring them much larger returns than they will if sold at the low prices that have been prevailing this last year or two. Let me refer to the fact that I see on the Notice Paper one or two motions asking that corn be admitted into this country free of duty. Representing, as I do, one of the largest agricultural constituencies in the province of Ontario, one of the largest dairying districts in that province, where cattle feeding and pork feeding is largely carried on, and representing, as I do, the agricultural classes, I wish to say to the Government that I would be strongly opposed to any reduction in the duty of corn. If they reduce that duty, it will materially reduce the price of our own coarse grains. I will read an extract from a speech which Prof. Robertson delivered, as reported in the "Canadian Gazette" of London, England, of December 15th, I think it well worth going to the country:

In all markets a threefold competition exists—a competition between buyers which tends to raise prices, a competition between sellers which tends to lower prices, and a third competition, which is too often forgotten, between products for preference in the markets. It should not be hard for an excellent quality of anything to displace a poor quality of the same kind of goods; but the producer in Canada has to meet in the markets of England with a most unfair competition, which has

Mr. TAYLOR.

wrought also the greatest injury to the live-stock interests of Great Britain. The vital organs of these corn-fed animals are also much smaller and their health less robust. Can the flesh from their carcasses be as nutritious or wholesome? Would it not be a wise measure, in the interests of the health of the toiling masses of Great Britain, to insist upon a clear and unmistakable means of designating to the ultimate consumer the source whence all the animal products which are offered for sale have originally come? Any legislation looking towards the regulation of diet is called offensive to the English-speaking people; but that class of legislation which would protect the poor man from buying a pound of lardy bacon, a pound of oleomargarine, or a pound of "filled cheese," under the supposition that he was getting in these things real value and food which was adequate for the nourishment of his muscles, nerves, and bones, would be a boon to him which he would not long suspect or complain of as being arbitrary. The effect of the quality of the foods which are produced in these northern climes upon the constitution, vitality, and vigour of the race is one which should not be ignored in any fiscal policy which has in it the elements of directing, modifying, or regulating the source of a nation's supply of food.

This is another argument in favour of keeping American corn out of this country for the purpose of fattening pork, for, as Prof. Robertson says further on, it makes an inferior grade of pork, and, as our pork stands high in the English and German market today, we do not want to bring our pork down to the level of American pork. Prof. Robertson goes on to say:

The English, the Irish, the Scottish, and the Canadian farmer have all had to meet the unfair competition of counterfeits, in substance and in name, which by their low price per pound have turned the consumption from more wholesome, more nourishing, and, on the whole, cheaper, honest animal products. Many instances might be given. The most familiar are, perhaps, the subterfuges by which tallow, lard and cotton-seed oil are sold in enormous quantities in England in the place of English, Irish, Canadian, or Australian butter. Of course, the imitation is sold wholesale, and probably sold retail, under a distinctive name; but the distinction extends only to the label of the package, the shop-window ticket, or the wrapper of the piece of coloured fat. Neither the Imperial nor the Colonial Parliaments can, by their fiat, legislate good times; but it seems to me that both can and should legislate in the direction of good times by prohibiting further competition with imitations and counterfeits which prevent the remuneration of honest British toil, applied to the production of honest British products, for the nourishment of honest British men. A simple remedy for this might be indicated, and it points to a method which may be applied with advantage to several other lines of farm products. Let the colouring of any fatty substance into an imitation of butter be prohibited.

Experiments conducted at the Government experiment station in the United States of America have shown that the bones from swine which are fed upon corn, exclusively or mainly, will break with the application of less than half of the pressure which is required to break the bones of animals of similar breeding which have been fed upon grains or dairy by-products.

Prof. Robertson proves conclusively that the meat of corn-fed swine is not so healthy as that fed on the products of the dairy and our coarse grains. It is not nearly so valuable in the English market, and Canadian bacon brings from 2 to 3 cents per

pound more than American bacon, owing to the fact that the hogs are fed largely on our coarse grains, and very little on corn. In regard to the statements of Prof. Robertson respecting "filled cheese," I desire to draw the attention of the Controller of Customs to this fact: A regulation is now in force—I having moved in the matter some two or three years ago—in regard to American cheese passing through our country in bond and being shipped to England. A regulation was put into force that any American cheese shipped from Montreal should be branded as the product of the United States. I am credibly informed by a large cheese dealer in Ontario, a seller, not a buyer, that he visited Montreal this year and while spending two or three days at that port of shipment examining the cheese which was being shipped, he found that, notwithstanding the instructions of the Customs authorities here to their officers in Montreal, cheese coming in bond from the United States was shipped on board vessels without being branded. How this is brought about, whether it is negligence on the part of the officer of the department or not I do not know, but I was assured such was the fact and that my informant saw cheese received from the United States shipped without being branded. Every day American cheese is being brought over. Last year it was brought over to Gananoque, boat load after boat load, and placed on the Grand Trunk Railway cars, shipped to Montreal and exported to England. I do not know why it should be brought through by this route, except for the possibility that on arriving in England, it should be known as a Canadian product; but I trust the Controller of Customs, in the interests of the dairying industry, which is one of the largest in this country, will see to it that next season not a pound of American cheese passing through Canada in bond is shipped without being branded both on the package and on the cheese itself as the product of the United States. In England we have the reputation of making the best cheese that goes there, and we desire to retain that reputation, and do not desire the name of our cheese to be injured by being mixed up with the American product that is adulterated with cotton-seed oil and other substances. Coming back to the lard question, I may say that I have visited grocery stores at home and have seen the lard they offered for sale. They call it lard, it is branded lard; there are no marks of adulteration discoverable on the package, but if you take a few pounds home and melt it, you will very soon discover there is very little lard in it. It is so all along the line. We are paying high prices for goods, and they are being adulterated. I am aware that we have on the Statute-book a law to punish persons for selling adulterated food, and my hon. friend the member for Colchester (Mr. Patterson) informs me that within a short time three merchants in his constituency have been summoned and fined for having sold

adulterated lard. I stated to him, when he mentioned the matter to me, that I did not think action should have been brought against the retail merchant who perhaps purchased the article from the manufacturer, either in Montreal or Toronto, as a pure article. The party who should be dealt with is the manufacturer. We have on the Statute-book to-day an Act to prevent the adulteration of food, but the fact is patent to any hon. gentleman who will visit a retail store in town and purchase a pound of lard and have it analysed, that it will contain from 50 to 75 per cent of cotton-seed oil. As I stated at the outset, our farmers can produce sufficient quantity of pure lard from home-grown hogs to supply the demand of this country, and they should not be called upon to place their products in competition with an inferior and spurious article. I hope, therefore, that this motion will meet with the approval of the House, and that the Government will this session act as they acted in the case of oleomargarine—bring in a Bill to prevent the importation into Canada of American lard which has been adulterated. I think it is due to the farmers of this country to grant them the protection this resolution calls for, and I hope it will meet the approval of a majority of the members of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add but few words to what has been already said upon this subject, because the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has gone over the matter very thoroughly and very fairly. It is a fact which cannot be denied, that last year we imported into Canada 692,789 lbs. of lard. It is also a fact patent to those who have taken the trouble to investigate it, that a great deal of the lard which is sold here is spurious and impure, and when we know that to be the case, it is time that Parliament should interfere and by the enactment of a law, or such other means as are possible, prevent the sale of this adulterated article. It is universally acknowledged that it is injurious to take into the human system that which is not wholesome, and not only is this lard not what it is represented to be, but it is also composed of deleterious substances. Not only do we believe that the lard which is imported into the country is spurious, but it is also known that some lard manufactured in Canada is equally bad. I have been told by a person who I have reason to believe is an excellent authority on the subject, that some of the lard manufactured in Ontario to-day is adulterated with the same ingredients as have been found in the imported article. This should not be permitted. This lard is used by our own people, believing that, as it is the product of the country, it is wholesome, but in this they are deceived. The lard which is adulterated with cotton-seed oil and other fats of less value than the lard itself, may not be wholesome, and I regret to say that it is extensively used. Whether or not the department is doing its duty in regard

to the investigation which should be held, or the analysis that should be made of the product that is sold in the country, I am not prepared to say. Perhaps it has not been brought to the attention of the Government, but it is a fact which cannot be denied, that you can find this spurious lard for sale in grocers' stores in every village in the province of Ontario. When we know this to be the case, it is high time that we should interfere and pass a law to prevent this abuse.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the debate be adjourned, in order that the House may not be required to meet this evening. I make that suggestion because I see that some of the members desire to speak on the question. If the debate is now adjourned, we can easily reach the subject again.

Mr. WALLACE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented the first report of the committee appointed to supervise the Debates.

Report concurred in.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be extended until Tuesday, 14th instant, and for presenting private Bills until Friday, 17th instant.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CIVIL SERVICE INSURANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) respecting Government Civil Service insurance. He said : This Bill is introduced and is to be considered in connection with another Bill of which I gave notice, to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, the design being to secure for civil servants the advantages of superannuation, that is, an allowance to servants who have spent their term of service in the em-

Mr. SPROULE.

ployment of the Government and who have reached an age when it is proper they should be retired for the remainder of the term they may have to live ; and, in conjunction with that, the Civil Service Insurance Bill, which I am now introducing, is to make provision, for which there has always been felt a lack, for the surviving members of the family of a civil servant. A civil servant comes into the department, pays his superannuation for a term of twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years, and it may happen that about the time he is to be retired, or very shortly after he has retired, he is taken away by death. His family receives nothing. This is, as I have said, to prevent that hardship, and to provide for civil servants an inexpensive method by which they may have, under Government auspices, a provision, not very large, it is true, but yet something substantial, for the members of the family when they are taken away by death. The existing Superannuation Act, under which we are now governed, has proved itself to be an expensive one, due largely to two circumstances ; one, the overloading of the Civil Service superannuation list—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon gentleman will wait a moment he will find he was a little too previous. One circumstance, as I have said, was the overloading of the superannuation list by old servants in the employ of the Government at the time the Civil Service Superannuation Bill was enacted into law, numbers of whom having served for long periods of years, were by that Act placed upon the Civil Service superannuation list, entitled to all the benefits of superannuation, although they had paid in all cases not very much, in some cases actually nothing, into the Civil Service superannuation fund. It was overloaded, therefore, by its own provisions at its very start and commencement. Another reason why it has proved burdensome arose from the fact that the abatement made at the time the Act went into force, none too high and probably not high enough to carry the system, was afterwards lowered, so that the rate of abatement at the present time, and since that lowering, has been altogether inadequate to any fair support of the Act. The amendment to the Civil Service Superannuation Bill, which will be introduced directly, provides that for civil servants entering the service after the date of the passing of the Act, a larger rate of abatement shall be made for superannuation purposes, and in connection with those servants the provisions of this Civil Service Insurance Bill are to be applied. One objection which has been felt very strongly by the House to the present system of providing for civil servants is, that we never knew the end of it ; that there seemed to be no definiteness as to what would be the working out, and as year after year has passed we

have found that the receipts and expenditures on superannuation have been growing wider and wider apart, until to-day it has become burdensome on the Consolidated Revenue fund. The two Acts which are to be introduced, one of which I am introducing now, will have this advantage: that from the very start Parliament will be able to see just about the limit of its liabilities. The two put together will not be quite self-sustaining; but the limit in each, of what will be the Government's contribution towards its sustenance, will be a very moderate limit, and one the maximum of which can be fairly estimated, and may be known from the beginning.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you increase the abatement payment on those who are paying to the superannuation fund now?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you extend to them the benefits under this?

Mr. FOSTER. No; except that there is this provision that any person who belongs to the Civil Service at present, and who contributes to the present abatement, may take advantage of the Government Civil Service insurance, provided he pays an increased abatement. That is merely to leave it open for present members, if they choose, to avail themselves of it in that respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What class would be required to pay the higher abatement from this date?

Mr. FOSTER. All who enter the Civil Service from this date. The benefit of the insurance will, of course, be felt in this way: it is given on a very much reduced rate to that the standard companies can offer, and for two reasons; one is that the Government proposes to pay all of the expenses of the administration, and the other reason is that the Government proposes to give a small contribution towards the fund in the way of interest upon the investment of the moneys that come in as premiums upon the policies. It is calculated that when under this Act the new Civil Service, as far as superannuation is concerned, shall have reached the maximum of the present Civil Service in number of employees and salaries given; the amount of insurance will probably run at the maximum of about \$4,000,000. When that time is reached the contribution by the Government each year will attain its maximum amount of about \$13,000 per year. Of course for a number of years, that amount will not be reached, and consequently the contribution of the Government will commence at a minimum sum and will go gradually up until in about 20 or 25 years, it will reach the maximum contribution of \$13,000 a year. I may say that when the new superannuation scheme has got fully into force in about 20 or 25 years, and comes up to the maximum of the service as it at present exists; the contribution from the Government towards its sus-

tenance will be in the vicinity of about \$8,000. If I remember right, making for both systems a maximum contribution by the Government each year of not more than \$20,000 or \$21,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—COUNTY OF PONTIAC'S BONDED INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would like to inquire of the Government what action they have taken with reference to the bonded indebtedness of the county of Pontiac. I understand that the present member for that county, during the election which occurred when the House was in session last year, gave to his constituents the assurance that if a supporter of the Administration were returned to Parliament, the Government would be prepared to seriously consider, and to relieve in part, if not altogether, the county from the indebtedness which it had incurred for railway construction, or for other purposes, within the limits of the county. I understand that that indebtedness amounts to a very large sum at the present time, and that it is a considerable burden upon the people of the constituency; a burden, however, that the constituency, in the exercise of its undoubted legal right, voluntarily incurred. I think, Sir, that this is a suitable opportunity to inquire how far the revenues of this country are pledged to the relief of that county from the indebtedness which the inhabitants of the county have incurred in the interests of the county; and whether it is the intention of the Government, from time to time, to hold out inducements to constituencies that the burdens which they have assumed, and over the assumption of which the country at large had no control whatever, can be thus lightly assumed, because the country at large, if a county finds it inconvenient to meet its obligations, may be saddled with the liabilities that they themselves have incurred. I think, Sir, if the Government held out to the present member for the constituency, any such hope, or gave him any assurance that they would be prepared to favourably consider that proposition, it is important that the House should know it, because I would regard in the first place any such statement as that, and I think the country would regard it as a very gross interference with the freedom of the election in any constituency, if such statement was made with the authority of any member of the Government, or the authority of the Government collectively. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I think that it is important that we should know precisely whether any such assurance was given or any such promise made, or whether the hon. member who represents the constituency had any authority from the Government to give such an

assurance to his constituents with a view of influencing the election.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has not given the House a statement of what the assurance was.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was to this effect : that the county is indebted to the amount of about \$200,000, that debentures of the county are outstanding to that amount, and that the assurance was that the Government would relieve the constituency of that burden if a supporter of the Government were returned to this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Speaking for myself, and for my colleagues as well, I may say that I have heard to-day, for the first time of such an assurance having been given, and that the Government has not taken any action in the matter or authorized any such assurance to be made.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the memory of my hon. friend is at fault when he says that he has heard this statement for the first time, for I recollect distinctly that during last session, on the evening of the election, when the news was brought to this House that the hon. gentleman who now represents the county of Pontiac had been elected, I myself alluded to this fact. I am bound to say that at that time the then Minister of Militia, the present Senator Bowell, distinctly denied that any such promise had been made by the Government. I have nothing more than that to say at present. But, at all events, I am credibly informed, and I have every reason to believe, that the present member for Pontiac, on more than one occasion, especially on one occasion, I think on nomination day, distinctly stated that he had the promise of the Government that if he were returned relief would be given to the people of Pontiac from the debentures, amounting, I think, to over \$200,000, given in aid, I think, of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway. I do not know the fact personally, but I have heard it on good authority, and I have not yet heard any denial of it on the part of the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Pontiac.

Mr. BRYSON. The hon. leader of the Opposition is quite correct when he states that on the evening of the election on the 28th of June last, there was a discussion in this House on this subject. On that occasion he made a statement which hardly bears out what he says now. He stated, if I remember rightly, that I had in my possession a letter from the Government containing such a promise. The hon. leader of the Government denied the statement, and I am here to-day to say that I never stated on any platform in the presence of the Liberal candidate that I had such a letter from the Government, or that any promise had been made to relieve the county from the railway bonus.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

The Liberal candidate on every occasion, however, endeavoured to make that the issue, while we on our side were ready to discuss the political issues before the electors, and he assured me on the 3rd of June, that if I would state that I had a letter, or got an assurance or promise, from the Government of relief for the county, he would withdraw from the contest. I stated on that occasion, before the electors, that I had no such letter promising that the county would be relieved of the bonus, even if I were returned. In making this statement, I state as nearly as I recollect what passed, and whatever may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite, I can assure the House and the country that no promise was made by me to the electors that the Government would come to the relief of the county with regard to the bonus, neither did I state on any platform that I had any such letter from the Government.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am glad to have this opportunity of answering the hon. gentleman, especially the statement he has just made, in which he claims that he never held out any promise to the electors of the county of Pontiac of relief from the bonus. This question, it is true, came before the House last session, and was discussed at considerable length. I will not now go into the details which were then brought out, but I will try to establish that the hon. member for Pontiac did hold out to the electors of the county that such relief would be given. I will try to show it by his address to the electors of the county of Pontiac, by literature appearing in the form of editorial articles in a paper published in the county and called the "Equity," which was the hon. gentleman's organ during that campaign—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. Hon. gentlemen will not dispute that that newspaper was the hon. gentleman's organ,—and from speeches delivered in the county by the hon. member for the county of Pontiac. The hon. gentleman, during the course of the campaign, which was held in the month of June last, addressed a card to the electors of the county of Pontiac, in which he said :

Mr. Thomas Murray has kept Pontiac without its proper representation since March, 1891, a fact which I believe every candid man in the county will readily admit. He cannot do anything to advance your interests or increase your prosperity, or benefit you in any way.

I am a supporter of the present Government, because the policy of that Government is such as cannot fail to recommend itself to any unbiassed Canadian as a policy that increases the prosperity of the people and hastens the development of the almost inexhaustible resources of this Dominion. I am in sympathy with the Canadian Government because that Government, by its wisdom, has built up on the northern half of this continent, a young nation whose giant areas stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and whose future, under judicious administration, is full of brightness and hope. I ask your support as one who honestly desires to serve you faithfully, and

guard your interests with every faculty of heart and head.

I realize that as sensible men you must know that the interests of Pontiac can be better advanced by giving a loyal support to the present Government than by a factious and senseless opposition such as Mr. Murray has given since March, 1891, and which course he purposes to pursue should he again be returned to Parliament.

The county of Pontiac cannot reasonably expect favours from a Government if it arrays itself in opposition.

What were those favours if not the very relief which has just been mentioned? The hon. gentleman made a speech on the day of nomination in the town of Bryson, in the course of which he said:

He then referred to the futility of Mr. Murray's efforts to do anything for the county's benefit. He challenged anyone to show in the public accounts where he had procured for the county one dollar in addition to his sessional indemnity.

During the course of the same afternoon Mr. Hector McLean, who was one of the candidates in the election in 1891, who during the last election actively supported Mr. Bryson, and who is a gentleman very much esteemed in the county, and one whose word counts for a great deal there, said in the course of his speech:

He would confine himself to the local question which he considered of much greater importance to the people than any other question. In 1890 he had felt it his duty to oppose Mr. Bryson, because that gentleman had failed to carry out certain promises that he had made regarding the bonus. At that time he (Mr. McLean) held certain letters from Mr. Ross, the holder of the bonds, offering a settlement of the matter to him, which would not be given to either the other candidates. It was a question which should have been left to himself and Mr. Bryson to settle at the polls, but Mr. Murray had to come over and interfere, and taking advantage of the situation had succeeded in being elected. And after he was elected he went to Quebec to try to induce Mr. Ross to treat with him regarding bonds, but Mr. Ross would have nothing to do with Mr. Murray, and subsequently in Ottawa Mr. Murray had the cheek to approach him (McLean) and try to get him to assist in making an arrangement with Ross. Mr. Murray had accused him of canvassing for the bonus by-law, but he could say that Mr. Murray had canvassed as much and more than he had in favour of the by-law.

Passing on to the present contest, he said he had declined to give his support to Mr. Bryson until Mr. Bryson had satisfied him that he was in a position to do something towards getting relief for the county. His whole ambition was to see that relief obtained, and up to the 8th of June he had declined to take any interest in this contest.

You know, Mr. Speaker, perfectly well that, in the county of Pontiac, Mr. McLean is a gentleman who possesses the confidence, very largely, of the Conservative party. You know, Sir, that he supported Mr. Bryson, and that the reason he did so was because he believed, from his conversations with this hon. gentleman, that the promised relief would be obtained by him. Mr. McLean, in the course of that same speech, said:

He had then met Mr. Bryson in Ottawa on the return of that gentleman from interviewing the ministers at Quebec, and after an arrangement had been

arrived at, which he considered satisfactory, Mr. Bryson had very generously offered to retire in his favour and allow him to take the field. But he (McLean) concluded he could not very well do this; and he believed, too, that Mr. Bryson was in the best position to do the most in the county's interest. He (McLean) was quite satisfied that if Mr. Bryson was returned at this election we had a good chance of a fair measure of relief for the county. And it was his intention to do all in his power to assist Mr. Bryson in his efforts to secure the county relief, and to work to secure his election which he felt sure of.

I think there was a promise anyway. We are told here to-day there was no promise held out. However, if we take up the same paper—

But the bonus is not yet wiped out, and the people of the upper end realize that Mr. Murray cannot do any wiping out. Their confidence in his powers for good is not of the enthusiastic kind. They know that the Government only grant favours to those that support the Government, not to people who support Thomas Murray.

Further on:

No real friend of the county who calmly views the situation can help but come to the conclusion that the right thing for the people of Pontiac to do in the present crisis—

And bear in mind the crisis was the bonus crisis—

is to give a loyal support to the present Government. That is the wise and safe course to pursue. Is there a man in the county of Pontiac to-day who would not consider it a favour to be relieved of the bonus? If taking the bonus off relieved a man from paying a bonus tax on his farm of, say \$50, would not that be a favour?

I could go on quoting this kind of literature which is to be found in the editorial articles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would go on to give you one point more, taken from Mr. Bryson's speech on the day he was selected to be the candidate. He closed that speech by stating he would not just then announce his decision, but would wire that decision to the telegraph offices in the county, and, in the meantime, would ascertain what assurances he could obtain from the Federal and Provincial Governments in behalf of the county's interests. I do not think it is at all necessary to read further from those speeches, but I can tell this House that I was present at a meeting at which he spoke, I think it was at Black River, and there he dwelt at great length upon this same question, the bonus question, and he gave it out in insinuations, if not in direct words, that he was in a position to do something for the county. Now he comes here to-day, and he says that nothing has been done, and, despite the articles which I have read, despite his own speeches, he says he never held out that promise. The promise was held out, it was not only held out, but it was the main battle cry during the whole campaign.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. On every platform, in every village and township, it was stated that Mr. Bryson would secure from the Govern-

ment of Canada the desired relief. The cry was: Do not elect an opponent who will not secure this relief. Yet to-day, after the people have placed their confidence in this hon. gentleman, mainly in the hope that he would obtain this relief, he now stands up in Parliament and says he never gave that promise. It is for the House to decide whether that promise was held out. No doubt it was. The hon. gentleman thought the end would justify the means, and he did not care what means he took to secure a seat in Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I would point out, for the information of the hon. member for Ottawa, that he has laid down a very false doctrine with regard to the relation between politicians and the public press. Within the last few days, we have had that erroneous doctrine illustrated in the case of the hon. member for North Simcoe, who undertook to show that the Conservative party is responsible for the utterances of the Toronto "Empire." The position of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is entirely erroneous, because if the politicians are to be occupied all their time in repudiating the press, they would have a great deal to do, and I take it the true doctrine is that which was laid down by the "Globe" of Toronto just a few days ago:

The same remark may be made regarding Mr. McCarthy's complaint that he was not consulted in the formation of the new Ministry, but what we chiefly regret is that Mr. McCarthy, by his utterances in regard to the "Empire," seemed to give countenance to a very unsound idea of the relations between public journals and party men. Those relations ought not to be so close as to require one to repudiate the other in case of a disagreement. The general support given by public men and journals to a party ought to be such as to admit of the free expression of the opinion of all, even where that free expression shows divergence.

That is the true policy. Members of Parliament ought not to be held answerable for what the newspapers say, and it is, thank God, a still better thing for the newspapers that they are not responsible for the politicians.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I had the honour of attending a few meetings in Pontiac during the last contest, and I must confess I was a little surprised to hear the statement of the hon. member for Pontiac to-day. The great question of all others then before the county was the question of relief from that bonus. It was originally \$100,000, and with accrued interest and legal expenses it amounted to \$190,000, and the burning question in that county was to get rid of that incubus. It is useless for the hon. member for Pontiac to say that he did not make any promise. I myself was present at Shawville and Campbell's Bay and heard him state distinctly to the electors: If I am elected, you do not pay the bonus. If Murray is elected, you pay the bonus. If that is not as straight a promise as any man could make, I do not know what a promise is. It is only right,

Mr. DEVLIN.

having heard the hon. gentleman make this promise and now hearing him deny it, that I should state that I remember distinctly his making it in those two places, and, I think, in another place, the name of which I forget just now. Those were the only three occasions I had the honour of attending meetings addressed by the hon. member for Pontiac. In each the same statement was made. The question put before the electors of Pontiac was: Elect Mr. Bryson and do not pay the bonus, or elect Mr. Murray and pay the bonus.

Mr. BRYSON. Does the hon. gentleman wish to convey to the House that I made that statement? If he does, I wish to say that the statement is fully unfair, and it never was made by me. That statement was made on a public platform; but it was not made by me.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was made by you at Campbell's Bay.

Mr. COCHRANE. I had the honour to be up in that riding at some of the meetings. The first meeting that was held in that riding was at Shawville, and the Liberal candidate, Mr. Murray, told me going up there that it was no use for me to go into that county to talk politics; that the railroad question was the burning question. I listened to Mr. Murray speaking for about half an hour, and he never spoke of any other question than the railroad bonus. His whole effort was to prove to the electors that if he was sent to Ottawa he would be in a better position to do something for that bonus than Mr. Bryson. In reply to that I told Mr. Murray that I did not go up there to discuss that question. Mr. Bryson opened the meeting, and he said just what he has informed the House that he said; he told the electors that I was not there to discuss the railroad bonus, but that I was there to discuss a more important matter—the financial policies of the two parties. I drew their attention to the fact that although Mr. Murray was seeking for their support he had failed to mention the policy of the two parties, the facts that the Liberals had introduced; and to allow him a chance I sat down and asked him to explain, but he was not man enough to get up. He found before I got through with the meeting that the electors of that riding took very kindly to the National Policy and the fiscal policy of this Government, and therefore Mr. Bryson was returned by about 800 of a majority.

Mr. FRASER. As there is evidently an issue of fact raised in that matter I think it should be set at rest by my testimony. I was there too, and if there was any evidence required to prove that the bonus was the all-absorbing question the evidence comes from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). He says that Mr. Murray spoke of nothing else. That is very true. I want to say here and now that the whole question discussed was on the question of the bonus. The whole burden of the speeches was: "If you expect anything, support the Govern-

ment." They were after that and nothing else. We are in the unfortunate position to not have our hands on the public treasury, and so, Sir, we are not able to show, as any person would wish to show, who had the best interests of the country at heart, that the public treasury is for the public good, not for the county of Pontiac. The whole cry was simply this: Vote for Bryson, and get clear of the bonus. I, myself, was there on nomination day, when the proceedings took place that were mentioned in the report—not the editorial, as the hon. member for West York would seem to imply. I want to call attention to another fact. Why was it that the hon. member for Pontiac wanted time to consult with both Governments before he would agree to run? I am perfectly satisfied that there was no promise made, but I do know that when the hon. member spoke, he went so far as to lead the electors to believe that he had the power to secure them relief; and then, to use the vulgar expression, "he winked the other eye." Now, the statement made was simply this: that there was no relief for the county unless Mr. Bryson was returned; and I remember distinctly saying to the electors that that was dishonest politics, and I distinctly told them: You are not going to get any relief. I called their attention to the fact that there were other counties besides Pontiac in this country, that millions of dollars had been voted by municipalities, and I pointed out the dishonest character of the canvass on behalf of the Government candidate, that he should attempt to lead these people astray by saying that \$150,000 was to be paid on behalf of Pontiac. I instanced the cases of a number of members of Parliament; I instanced the case of the hon. Premier and the railway in his county; and I mentioned the county I have the honour to represent myself, and I said it would be impossible for Pontiac to get relief unless the amount paid for railways in that province was refunded, because the Government in the two cases, namely, in the case of the road that passes through the county of Antigonish, and the road that passes through my county, the amounts paid by the counties in those cases went into the railways which the Government themselves had taken over for the general advantage of the country, and now own it. I tried to point out to the electors of Pontiac that that was not the kind of politics that would commend itself to them, or else I misunderstood their disposition; I believed they were not of the character to be bribed in platoons. Now, I think the hon. member for Pontiac himself will remember that I made the statement that they were not going to get clear of the bonus, even if they did return Mr. Bryson. I said it was dishonest, and the cheers that went up after I made that statement were cheers of derision, and the shouts of the crowd were: "Vote for Bryson, and get clear of the bonus." They believed the

under-current talk that Mr. Bryson would get them relieved of the bonus, because they had heard the assurance from the hon. gentleman himself, and knew he had declined the nomination until he had seen what was going to be done, and surely after he went down, and returned, and accepted the nomination, they had a right to expect that the Government had made the promise. Now, I do not say at all that that promise was made; that is not the point at issue just now, but I think it is only right that we should call attention to this scandalous method of politics. Just fancy an English statesman going before the country and appealing to the electors for support, because he was supporting the Government, and they would be more likely to get something. One man tried it some time ago, a supporter of Lord Salisbury's Government, and quickly came a telegram from Lord Salisbury that unless the candidate took back that promise at once and stood upon his own merits in running for that election, he would have no place amongst his friends. It is time that we treated politics on issues broader than those which decided the election in Pontiac. I regret the degradation of our politics, and I regretted very much to hear the cheers that went up at that meeting as indicating the considerations which appeal most strongly to the electors. So far as my observation went upon that occasion, the question of the railway bonus was the sole question that decided the election. I know Mr. Murray spoke about it, and his speech was in this direction, that so far as matters relating to the bonus were concerned, he would be in just as good a position to get relief for the county as Mr. Bryson would be, because he said: If it is a right thing that the county of Pontiac should receive relief from the Government in this matter, you will get it if I am your member just as well as if Mr. Bryson is elected. I trust, therefore, that whatever may be said, on the other side, at least we will agree on this point, that it was the under-current. With the exception I have mentioned, I did not on any occasion meet the hon. gentleman myself. The statement in question was made, however, on nomination day, for I personally heard it. The address by Mr. McLean was even stronger than it was reported, and I had a very pleasant chat with the hon. gentleman himself while it was going on. The statement was made by Mr. McLean in the hon. gentleman's presence, and as the hon. gentleman did not then and there repudiate it, it must be taken as having been made with his approval.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to ask the First Minister when the House may expect to have laid on the Table the report of the commission to inquire into the charges made last session against the present Postmaster-General. I do this on this ground, that certain charges were brought against an important and influential member of the Government and those charges were considered by

his colleagues of sufficient importance to warrant an investigation by a Royal Commission. The House has been in session for some little time. The Government are asking the House to vote confidence in them by granting the supplies and proceeding with the business of the country. It seems to me to be the true constitutional doctrine that where a charge exists against a member of the Government, be that charge well founded or otherwise, the House has a right at least to have the earliest information as to the result of the inquiry that the hon. gentleman's own colleagues set on foot. I ask the First Minister, therefore, when this House may expect to have the report laid before it, because I think it would be perfectly justifiable for any member of the House to object to proceeding with the business of the country so long as a matter of that kind remains in abeyance. Of course, there may be some very good reason why the report has not yet been laid before the House, but I say that on sound constitutional doctrine, I as one of those who voted for referring the matter to a commission, have the right to ask that the report of the commission may be laid on the Table of the House at the earliest moment in order that the House may know what ground there is for those charges, how far they have been sustained, or how far not sustained. I, therefore, ask the First Minister this question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in asking the question, and it did not need, I am sure, that he should give reason for it connected with Supply. The matter was referred to in the debate on the Address, and I then observed that the commission was simply waiting the meeting of the House in order that the report might be laid on the Table. I supposed then that next day or the day after the Address was disposed of, I would be in a position to bring it down. The copying of the report, I am told by the officer in charge, has taken longer than was expected, but on Monday or Tuesday the report will be laid on the Table. The officer states the report will be ready on Monday, but I may say Monday or Tuesday. This, of course, is only the fourth day after the passage of the Address.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Contingencies—Governor-General's
Secretary's Office..... \$13,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This item shows a considerable increase, more than 10 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The increase is on account of the large correspondence, a great deal of it being telegraphic, between the Governor-General's secretary's office and the Home Government in connection with the Behring

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Sea arbitration and other matters. Many communications have taken place, and they will continue probably during the greater part of this year. The increased expenditure is chiefly for telegrams.

Mr. McMULLEN. A grant is made of \$5,000 to the Governor-General for travelling expenses. Is not that sum supposed to include the travelling expenses of his staff and servants?

Mr. FOSTER. Five thousand dollars have been paid for a number of years to the Governor-General for travelling expenses. That covers his own travelling expenses and those of his suite.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to know the statute or Order in Council under which that grant is made. It must have been intended to cover the travelling expenses of the Governor-General and his staff. The additional amount paid is increasing every year, and it should not be permitted. We pay the Governor-General \$50,000 salary, \$8,000 for fire and light, and \$5,000 for travelling expenses, and that sum should include the travelling expenses of his private secretary and other officers or servants accompanying him. If the country is going to pay the travelling expenses of all the officials whom he chooses to take with him on his tours, it will amount to a large item. I desire to learn the wording of the statute or the Order in Council under which this \$5,000 is set apart.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the Order in Council—if the arrangement was made by Order in Council, as it probably was—but I know it has been the usual vote for a number of years. I find this sum does virtually cover all travelling expenses incurred by the Governor-General and his suite. The amount was intended to cover the travelling expenses of the Governor-General and his suite, and it does so. There are a number of officers connected with the Governor-General's office, and the small sum of \$500 has been incurred by them in travelling on public business.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that last year the amount was \$473.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very little. The \$5,000 are granted to the Governor-General for his travelling expenses, and the sum of \$500 is not much to cover the travelling of the officers of the department, consisting of quite a number of employees, who have their work to do, and incur expenses when travelling on public business.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will look up the details he will find that these officers accompanied the Governor-General on his tour, and that the expense is for that. It is not altogether the amount that is to be complained of, but there is a principle involved. If we continue the principle that the officers in attendance on the Governor-General are to be paid their expenses in addition to the \$5,000, the sum will run up to

\$6,000 or \$7,000 or more, and if these people find that the Parliament of Canada is willing to pass over these items, we will have a continued increase in expenditure every year. That is the reason why I should like to know what is the wording of the statute or the Order in Council making a provision of \$5,000 for travelling expenses; or if it is for personal expenses of the Governor-General himself?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can easily settle that. If he will turn to page A-109 of the Auditor-General's report he will find what is in the Order in Council, not in extenso, but the effect of it. "Travelling expenses for self and suite, by Order in Council of March 3rd, 1879, \$5,000." The other travelling expenses are for the orderly, and for the Governor-General's secretary, and for the clerks of the Governor-General's office—all of them small amounts. For instance, there are the expenses of Mr. Clarke, sergeant orderly, from Ottawa to Quebec and return; the Governor-General's secretary from Ottawa to Richmond, while the Governor was there in the summer of 1891, and the expenses for Orderly-Sergeant Rogers, a trip in the same way; so that the Order in Council covers that for which the money is issued; that is the travelling allowance for himself and suite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman. I do not want to criticise minutely His Excellency's expenditure, and it was for that reason that no great objection was raised to taking a lump sum. I do not remember what the terms of the Order in Council were, and the hon. gentleman had better bring them down and lay them on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I remember distinctly we were told at the time that a lump sum would be given in order to avoid any petty minute examination into the items for the Governor-General's attendants and refreshments, which probably are just as well not discussed too minutely. I think my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has been perfectly well advised in calling attention to the fact that this \$5,000 ought to cover all expenses. We know quite well there are a good many years in which the Governor-General does not require \$5,000 for his expenditure in travelling, and the whole allowances that are made here—although I think that the Governor-General is not at all to blame for a great deal of the expenditure that goes on at Rideau Hall, as I think various Governments have been careless in regard to that, and that it should not be properly charged against His Excellency—the whole expenditure is on much too large a scale for the resources of this country. What is more than that, before his present Excellency came here, attention was called to the expediency, in the public interest, of making an arrangement where-

by some moderate fixed sum should be placed at his disposal, so that these exorbitant charges should not appear. The then Premier, Sir John Macdonald, agreed, I believe, to make that arrangement, but never did so, and the consequence has been that there occurs in the press and in the House a certain amount of reflection on these charges, which, I think, is very inexpedient. I believe, however, that this allowance of \$5,000 was intended to cover the expenses and should have done so.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman. I think that the allowance of \$5,000 a year to His Excellency the Governor-General for travelling expenses is entirely too large, and is, I believe, unreasonable. Everybody knows perfectly well that His Excellency the Governor-General—in my remarks I do not refer to any particular Governor-General, nor do I intend that my observations should be personal at all—I say everybody knows that the Governor-General of Canada is necessarily obliged to spend a large portion of the year at the capital. I am not now in a position, nor do I believe is anybody in a position, to form an estimate as to what the expenses are when he does travel; but just think for a moment what \$5,000 will buy in the way of railway traffic. At the ordinary railway rates of 3 cents per mile—I do not know what the rate is from one end of the continent to the other—with the ordinary railway rates at 3 cents a mile, \$5,000 would buy railway tickets covering 166,000 miles, and a man could cross this continent fifty times a year and more on that allowance. Even though the Governor were accompanied by two of his staff, travelling every day for 100 days in the year, \$5,000 would cover the expenses at the rate of 3 cents a mile, not including Pullman fare. This \$5,000 is given simply in addition to what I consider an unnecessarily high salary. It is my intention, before Parliament prorogues, to invite the attention of the House to the salary paid to the Governor-General. We are now, in all probability, about to lose the services of the present Governor-General, and it is a very proper time, I think, before we have a new Governor in office, that the whole of the expenses of the management of this branch of the service should be looked into. The expenditure has grown, so that, since Confederation, this one office alone has cost us. I venture to say, some millions of dollars. It is in excess of the resources of Canada, and in this and other respects there is a degree of extravagance wholly beyond the means of the people. I intend, before Parliament is prorogued, to submit to the consideration of the House a proposition in favour of the modification of the Imperial Act, so that we shall not be saddled with the enormous salary of \$48,000 a year for the Governor-General of Canada. If there were no extras in addition to the salary, perhaps it would not be so bad; but, as my hon. friend from

Wellington (Mr. McMullen) reminded us, in addition to that, we pay annually some \$8,000 to heat and light the Governor-General's establishment, a sum which would be enough to heat and light the entire houses of a good country town. I warrant you, that there is many a town of a couple of thousand inhabitants in this country which will not spend more than \$8,000 in supplying heat and light for the whole population. That these people should be compelled to contribute \$8,000 a year for the heating and lighting of one establishment for an officer who is paid \$50,000 a year, is simply a piece of cruelty towards the taxpayers of the country. Then, in addition to that, this \$5,000 is allowed for travelling expenses, when everybody must know that a large portion of it cannot be required for that service. I say that we are unfaithful stewards if we allow such items to appear in the Estimates any longer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that this vote is somewhat similar to the vote made the other night to Sir Charles Tupper, and that it is in reality an addition to the salary of the Governor-General. It is generally supposed, and I believe correctly, that when the Governor-General travels he travels in his private car, which is conveyed over any of the railway tracks in the Dominion free of expense, so that in reality he pays no railway fare. That being the case, it is fair to presume that this \$5,000 is not expended in railway fare at all. Looking back a few years, we find that the Governor-General of Canada has not been addicted to a great amount of travelling. It is true, the present incumbent of the office has seen fit, during the last month or six weeks, to take a trip into the western part of Ontario, but nearly all the travelling done by him has been from here to his sporting place in the lower provinces, where he fishes. We may as well speak plainly on this question. I have no reflection to cast upon this Governor-General any more than upon any other; but we are here to discharge a public duty, and I say that this vote of \$5,000, like the sum of \$2,000 voted the other night to Sir Charles Tupper, is simply an addition to the salary of the Governor-General, which is sufficiently large already.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The committee is somewhat helpless in this matter, from the fact that individuals are not in a position to form a fair judgment as to what ought to be a reasonable allowance. I remember that in 1879, when this matter was brought to the notice of the House on two or three occasions consecutively, it was felt on both sides that, being such a question as could not be discussed with the same freedom as other questions, some understanding should be come to as to a fixed sum for His Excellency's travelling expenses. The Government came down with a vote of \$5,000, and the same sum has been taken since. Whether that sum

Mr. MULLOCK.

ought to be revised at present, whether it is too large or too small, we are not in a position to judge; but whether too large or too small, by adding to it a number of items you are reversing the system which was established in 1879. There are two questions before the House. One is whether the \$5,000 is a reasonable sum to allow for this purpose. As to that, the House has not the information necessary to enable it to judge. But neither the House nor the Governor-General want to have another sum smuggled in in addition. If we determine that \$5,000 is sufficient, let us vote it, and let it suffice. But what I object to is, that after a fixed sum has been determined upon, we should be asked to condemn the system which was agreed to by both sides in 1879 by voting \$473.74 extra. This is a small sum, I admit, but it is likely to grow larger from year to year. With respect to extravagant expenditure at Rideau Hall, there are two sides to that question. I was on the Committee of Public Accounts for some years when this matter was inquired into, and it was thoroughly demonstrated to me, and, I think, to every other member of the committee, that the extravagance which took place, which was published and known to all parties, was caused by the Department of Public Works for political purposes, and that neither the Governor-General nor any of his aides or servants were in any degree responsible for it. It was proved in that committee that carpenters, painters and others were sent down to Rideau Hall against the wish of the Governor-General and his aides, and odium was unjustly and dishonestly attempted to be cast upon the occupants of Rideau Hall for this extravagance, when it was indulged in wholly for political purposes. That was proved, and I think it ought to be stated.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to this fact. He spoke as if a charge of \$473 extra was smuggled in—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke from the Public Accounts of 1891-92.

Mr. FOSTER. He spoke of that sum as having been smuggled in over and above what was usual. It is over and above the \$5,000, but if he looks at the Auditor-General's Reports of the previous years, he will find that it was never supposed that the \$5,000 was to cover more than the Order in Council contemplated, namely, the expenses of the Governor-General and his suite, and that the travelling expenses, which were not large, of officials in the Governor-General's secretary's office were not included in that amount and were not meant to be included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was it not understood that it would cover the travelling expenses of the Governor-General and all his officers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These expenses are really those of officers who are occasion-

ally sent by the Government to His Excellency on important public business, when His Excellency is absent from Ottawa. The vote of \$5,000 is clearly intended to cover only the personal travelling expenses of His Excellency and those who accompany him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On page A—109 of the Auditor-General's Report the hon. gentleman will find some items which do not bear out his statement that the expenses were incurred in connection with public business. For instance, Major Colville, the Governor-General's secretary, charges for travelling from Ottawa to New Richmond, which, I understand, is a fishing place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is one of the summer residences of the Governor-General for the time being. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that these journeys are not upon important public duties. While His Excellency is at Richmond or anywhere else, these officers are in attendance. Not only the Governor-General's secretary, but orderlies and others have sometimes to be despatched to him, bearing with them important papers on public business.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. First Minister informs us that these expenses, amounting to \$473.74, are incurred by the Government sending officials to consult with His Excellency on public business. If that is the case, how would you explain the last item :

Walker, W. H., clerk, Gov.-Gen.'s office—balance of \$342.79 for trip to New Richmond and Quebec, 2nd July to 22nd September, 1891, \$242.79.

That makes nearly three months, rather a long trip for the purpose of transacting business between the Government at Ottawa and His Excellency, and it hardly bears out the supposition that these expenses were incurred for the purpose of sending down a messenger.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that was the only cause, but I did state that these expenses were all incurred by officers who were sent on public business. That gentleman is not one of His Excellency's suite, and did not incur that expense in attendance on His Excellency, but as a clerk in the Governor-General's office, and these are the expenses between the two places on public business. There is also clerical work, at the instance of the Government in connection with Government business.

Mr. FOSTER. I find, in 1889, the travelling expenses, besides Lord Stanley's allowances, amounted to about \$800, and similar travelling expenses were voted during Lord Lansdowne's term, so that every year I find, and it is borne out by the substance of the Order in Council, that this takes in simply the travelling expenses of the Governor-General and his suite. It arose in this way : Previous to the Order in Council, each year the travelling expenses of the Governor-General, in making these trips through Can-

ada, trips which we all understand are in the interests of the country, were not met by any stated allowance, and you have only to look back over those preceding years to find out that the amount generally far exceeded the sum of \$5,000, running away above that amount in certain years ; and, as the result of those years' experience, it was thought better to fix a certain amount, and then we would get rid, each year, of criticising the varying items of travelling expenses of the Governor-General and his suite. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) expressed his belief strongly that this \$5,000 was not spent in travelling, but was really an addition to the salary of the Governor-General. He did not give any evidence to support that belief, and said he has not certain information on which to base it. My own expression of opinion will perhaps be worth about as much as that of the hon. gentleman, when neither of us has positive evidence, but I think I have some things to go upon which make me believe exactly the contrary. During Lord Lansdowne's incumbency of office, I am certain that the \$5,000 per year did not pay the expenses of the public travel of the Governor-General, nor do I believe it does in this case ; but before my hon. friend states with so much certainty that Lord Stanley's car is carried everywhere free, he had better inform himself as to the facts lest he may be doing great injustice to the Governor-General in making that statement.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can you tell us ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not his secretary and do not pay the bills, but I would not make an assertion of that kind unless I had proof positive.

Mr. MULOCK. How are the facts ? Does the hon. gentleman know ?

Mr. FOSTER. As regards the \$8,000 which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) seems under the impression is too large an amount to have been really spent in fuel and heating of the Governor-General's house, I know positively that in Lord Lansdowne's time the allowance for that was exceeded by hundreds of dollars every year. I happen to have been on a committee which went into that matter rather thoroughly, a committee of the Executive Council, and I became aware of those facts at that time. The building is disconnected, it has many ramifications, and everybody connected with it knows that the heating and lighting of it is a very expensive matter, and that \$8,000 is spent and more every year in that respect.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is rather a delicate matter to discuss, but we owe a duty to the public, and ought to get at the facts if possible. As I have stated, I do not know of my own knowledge that the Governor-General's car is drawn free of charge over the railways, but I not only think so, but it is the

general opinion of the public and the members of this House as well. If it is a fact that His Excellency's car is drawn free of expense all over the Dominion, there ought to be some means of ascertaining it by the committee, and I think I am right in saying that possibly we ought to appeal to the Government to tell us the truth in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. gentleman suppose the Government could inquire into a matter of that kind, after an Order in Council has settled it once and so long as the Order remained unrepealed. That Order in Council was passed in order that this vote should not be canvassed from year to year, as it was not a pleasant matter either for the Governor-General or the House itself. In order to get rid of that unpleasant matter, we agreed that \$5,000 a year should be given, and that having been settled, there ought to be no further discussion except as to whether or not it is wise to continue the Order in Council longer. But to go into the other details I do not think is our right, and the Governor-General, if he were so disposed, might very well say to us: You have made a compact and I have carried it out, and I do not think you ought to inquire into these details.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This House is not responsible for the Orders passed in Council but the Government are to this House and the country, and I think this is a very proper time and place to discuss the matter. If it were wise and judicious that an Order in Council should be rescinded and that we should make some new arrangement, then it is for this committee to say so, and we ought to discuss the question fairly in order to arrive at a proper conclusion. If the \$5,375.74 is too much to pay for these travelling expenses, we, as a committee, looking after the financial interests of the country, have a right to ascertain whether it is really the fact that the Governor-General spends this \$5,374 in travelling. If he does not, then I say the item should not be voted. I have as much respect for the Governor-General as any other man, but I believe in the business of the country being conducted on business principles, and if we are to vote \$5,374 for the travelling of the Governor-General and his staff we ought to know that the money has been expended for that purpose, and we ought not to vote a sum like this and trust to the honesty of public officials to see that it is expended. If we are going to vote public money we ought to have the vouchers to show that it has been judiciously expended. It is very proper that we should inquire into this, because, as I have said before, although I have not positive evidence of the statement I make, that the Governor-General's car is drawn all over the country by the railway companies free of expense, I believe that to be the case, and if it is, then this vote of \$5,000 is not a vote for travelling expenses but a vote in addition to his salary of \$50,000 or thereabouts, just as the vote we passed the other day in contingen-

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

cies was an addition of \$2,000 to Sir Charles Tupper's salary. If the Finance Minister or any other member of the Government has information on this point it is due to the committee and the country we should have that information, and I do not think that we should be afraid to discuss this question because it pertains to the Governor-General's department. We are here as business men to look after the finances of Canada, and we ought to have no delicate feelings in dealing with the Governor-General or any other man. We are spending public money, and we are responsible to the people for its proper expenditure; and I say that whether it be the Governor-General or the door-keeper of the House of Commons, we have a right to inquire into all such expenses and ascertain that they are in the interest of the public at large.

Mr. DENISON. We must not forget that in travelling the railway fare is sometimes a very small proportion of the expenses. It might be very easy for a Governor-General, in going to Montreal or Toronto, to spend a thousand dollars a week in hotel bills. They generally have to pay pretty freely. It is my own experience, and doubtless the experience of others, that the amount paid in railway fares is but a small proportion of the total expenses.

Mr. M'LOCK. I have handed in a motion to the Chair to reduce this item by \$5,000. I think the proper way to deal with the matter is this: Let the Government ask for an appropriation, a contingent account—call it \$5,000 if you like—to cover the Governor-General's travelling expenses. The Minister of Finance says that sometimes they cost the country more than \$5,000 for travelling expenses. Now, the effect of giving a fixed sum of \$5,000 to the Governor-General for travelling expenses is simply this, that all he saves out of it is so much money found; therefore, if it is an advantage to have a Governor-General travel over the country, he will be induced to deny Canada that advantage in order to save money. If it is to the interest of the country that he should travel over Canada, let him do so and let his bills be presented and audited—not too nicely, but in a proper spirit; and if it is not in the interest of Canada that he should travel, let us save the money instead of paying \$5,000 a year for that purpose. It must be manifest to any person that no Governor-General has spent \$5,000 a year of late in travelling expenses. Even if there has been that much spent, it is to be borne in mind that the \$50,000 a year we pay the Governor-General is running on all the time, and whether he is in a car or in bed, whether he is at Ottawa or Toronto, whether he is awake or asleep, his \$50,000 is going on all the time, and it helps him defray his expenses wherever he is. If you distribute \$50,000 over 365 days, you will find he has a very handsome allowance for hotel ex-

penses every day. I do not know when the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) was travelling as a Governor-General and incurred these large expenses of a thousand dollars a week. We are now dealing with the public funds, and I submit that there is only one way to proceed. It is extremely important that every change in connection with the office of Governor-General should be so conducted that the office itself will be a popular one in the eyes of the people of Canada. I desire to see it popular; I desire to see the people of Canada appreciate and be anxious to maintain the office of Governor-General, and for that reason, I would lop off any mouldering branch in connection with that office; and if any abuses creep into the expenditure, let us destroy them whenever and wherever discovered. I think we would be doing wisely to look to the future, as we are now about to have a new Governor-General, and to see that we start well. It would be embarrassing to the Government of the day to change an existing Order in Council when a new Governor comes; the best plan is to have everything in order before he comes, and before there can be any such embarrassment. Therefore, I think the proper plan would be to reduce this vote by the amount of \$5,000 for the future, as it will not apply to the present incumbent.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am sure we must have been greatly pleased with the zeal manifested by the last two speakers to secure public economy in all the departments of this Dominion, but I think the zeal of the last speaker has led him beyond discretion. He has proposed to limit the amount of travelling expenses to the sum of \$473.74, to be strictly accurate.

Mr. MULLOCK. No; I do not.

Mr. COCKBURN. The proposal is to reduce the present amount by \$5,000. The amount, as made up by the gentleman who preceded, was \$5,473.74, so that the proposal of the last speaker is to vote the Governor-General the sum of \$473.74, a munificent sum. I am sure the Governor-General is not a person who is accustomed to sit up all night to save the fare of a sleeper, but, when he travels he does so in a manner befitting the dignity of the great country which he represents. It is perfectly absurd for us, in this catch-penny manner, to try to appeal to the country, as if the country was so poor and destitute that it was unable to afford the sum of \$5,000 to the Governor-General and suite for travelling expenses, to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the wants of the country he is called upon to rule. The gentleman who has preceded him has taken high grounds; he tells us that he thoroughly believes that the car, the carriage on which the Governor-General travels, is carried free over the road. Well, I think, in the interest of the country and the interest of this House, it is his duty now to explain the grounds on which he bases that belief.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you know his car is not carried free?

Mr. COCKBURN. I know nothing whatever of the matter, but here is an hon. member who has publicly told us that he strongly believes the car in which the Governor-General travels is carried over every railway in the Dominion free of charge.

Mr. LISTER. Move for a committee.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think, under the circumstances, possessed as he is, of this valuable information, he ought to make the facts known to us; and I call upon him to get up and enlighten us, and tell us by what means he has arrived at this knowledge, putting us in the same position as he is himself, and then, perhaps, we will be able to dispense even with this sum of \$473.74. That hon. gentleman is in a peculiar position, he is in the possession of information which no one else has; and as he is a man of great experience, and does not form his opinion without sufficient grounds, let us know also the grounds on which this firm belief of his is founded. We will then be in a position to know whether the sum of \$5,000 is too little or too much, or whether the sum recommended by the last speaker of \$473.74, is sufficient to carry the Governor-General from Gaspé to Vancouver and back, and enable him to become acquainted with the resources of the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for. I gave the information before, when I had the honour of addressing the committee on this subject. I said I believed that that was the case. My belief was founded, not on evidence, because, as I said before, I was not positively sure. We remember the discussions that have taken place in this House with regard to conveyance of Government cars. We remember the history of the car "Jamaica," which was burnt, and which was at the disposal of the Government, not only for official business, but for election purposes, which car travelled all over the Dominion of Canada. I remember the celebrated car, the pay car "Jamaica" travelled from one end of the country to the other during the elections, containing Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues and friends. No hon. member on the Treasury benches will deny that that car was drawn over the railways free of expense.

Mr. McNEILL. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not want to hear about this matter.

Mr. McNEILL. We want to hear about the Governor-General's car.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The car "Jamaica" was drawn over the roads free of charge, and when it was burned the Government built another. I venture to say that the special car containing the First Minister or any of

his colleagues is taken over the roads free of expense, either to Toronto, Chatham or elsewhere. When Sir Charles Tupper came out to this country and took part in the elections, at the solicitation of Sir John Macdonald, he was toted over the railways in a Government car free of expense. I have good reason to know this to be the case, and therefore I believe that in the case of the Governor-General he is treated with the same courtesy by the railway companies as Ministers of the Crown are treated. I desire to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if it is not the fact that the Government car is drawn over the railways free of expense?

Mr. HAGGART. When this debate commenced I had the idea that the Governor-General had refused free transportation, and insisted on the payment of his travelling expenses over the country. I telephoned over to the office, asking whether any arrangement was made for the transportation of any Governor-General or not. The reply I received was that the only arrangement for transportation ever made was when Lord Lorne and Lord Lansdowne came to the country. No arrangement for transportation had been made for the present Governor-General, and my impression is, and that impression will be confirmed in a short time, that the Governor-General pays his own transportation.

Mr. LAURIER. Then he has given the Ministers an example which his Ministers have not followed hitherto.

Mr. COCKBURN. I thank the hon. gentleman for the lucid argument and proof he has given of the sincerity of his statement. It is a peculiar syllogism: Government car "Jamaica"; car burnt; Sir John Macdonald once travelled in it, and therefore the Governor-General has transportation free.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Centre Toronto stated that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) had proposed a resolution reducing the Governor-General's allowance for travelling expenses to \$473.

Mr. COCKBURN. And 74 cents.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman was as conversant with the public accounts and with the Auditor-General's report, and the manner in which items are voted by this House, he would not have risked his reputation by making that statement. He knows perfectly well that the item of \$5,000 is fixed by statute, and that the amount of \$473 and odd cents is paid under Supply voted each year. If it was not voted this year, the Governor-General would not have a claim to it, so the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in saying that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) desires to reduce the Governor-General's travelling allowance to \$473. I hope the hon. gentleman will have the manliness to rise and acknowledge his error, because the hon. member for

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

North York made no such proposal. It is an unpleasant duty for the Opposition to criticise items of this kind, particularly items connected with the Governor-General. But we have a duty to perform. We are here to criticise public expenditure, and, if we fail to do so, the country undoubtedly will find fault with us, and will deem that we are failing in our duty if we neglect to criticise, no matter whether the expenditures are connected with the Governor-General's department or not. With respect to the statement made by the First Minister, I wish to draw his attention to this point. He has stated that officials belonging to the Governor-General's office went down to Richmond to do business with the Governor-General. The Governor-General is sent here as the representative of Her Majesty in Canada. His residence is supposed to be in Ottawa. If he chooses to live at Victoria during the hot months of the year, will the First Minister be prepared to say that the country should be called upon to pay the travelling expenses and living allowance of each official who would have to travel backwards and forwards on business connected with the Government? Suppose the Governor-General chooses to live at Halifax or at the most eastern point of the Dominion, or at some fishing resort, would the country be expected to pay the expenses necessary of officials travelling between there and Ottawa? I quite admit that if the Governor-General goes to Halifax or Victoria, on an official tour, in the interests of the country, the Government should bear any little incidental expenses connected with the necessary staff. But in the case of the Governor visiting a fishing resort, the Government should not be expected to pay the additional expenses involved. The items to which we have drawn attention cover expenses of this kind, and the country cannot be expected to meet them, because, if it gave permission to the Governor-General to live at an extreme point in this Dominion an enormous expense would be incurred. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has truly said that we are not now trying in any way to hurt the feelings of or deal ungenerously with the incumbent of the office at this moment; but the time of his service is drawing near a close, and we should have it distinctly understood for the future, whoever the Governor-General may be, that incidental expenses of this kind should be a fixed amount, and Parliament should not be called every year to enter into these unpleasant controversies. It is the duty of the Opposition to discuss these matters however unpleasant they may be, and it is our duty to bring irregularities of this kind to public notice. This matter should be settled either by statutory enactment or by Order in Council fixing a certain sum which would include the Governor-General's travelling expenses and those of his suite, particularly when His Excellency is on a

pleasure tour in which the country is not directly interested.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has asked one or two questions which I am bound to answer. The hon. gentleman has asked whether we do not consider it would be proper that a fixed arrangement should be come to on this subject, and a fixed amount given for the travelling expenses of His Excellency and suite. I reply to the hon. gentleman that I am of that opinion, that I think both parties were of that opinion in 1879, that what he advises we should do now was done then, and that the discussion which has taken place this afternoon in the House ignores that arrangement to a very great extent. Previous to that time, as my colleague has mentioned, the expenses of the travel of His Excellency and suite—I shall not discuss whether on official business or not—very much exceeded that sum. It was considered desirable that a fixed sum should be voted from year to year for that purpose, and that any excess over that sum should be borne by His Excellency himself. That has been exceeded in no case that I am aware of, and I repeat the explanation to the hon. gentleman which I gave to the committee before: that these casual expenses of the Governor-General's office for the travel of officials, are not for the service and attendance on His Excellency, and that, therefore, the hon. gentleman need not expect me to answer his question as to whether we should pay the expenses of His Excellency's servants and attendants if His Excellency should be living in a remote part of the country. I repeat that the sums which have been paid out during the year, and for which a return is before us, are for civil servants; the employees of the Government doing the work of the Government in the Governor-General's office, and that when they went and came on these trips, they went and came on the business of the Government. It is immaterial for that purpose whether they are charged to the Governor-General's office or charged to any particular department from which the request that they should go was made. I venture to say that in almost every case the request came from the Privy Council office, and that the expenses might have been charged to that office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that apply to Walker?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I find from the Auditor-General's Report that not only did Walker, a clerk in the Governor-General's office, travel in the way referred to, but that Sergeant Rogers, orderly, travelled from Ottawa to Richmond and return, between the dates of July 8th and 30th. He could not have been carrying despatches all that time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Although he is

described there as an orderly, he is a messenger in the office of the Governor-General.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As the First Minister will see he was away from 8th July to the 30th, from the 8th August to the 13th, from the 19th of August to the 27th, and from 10th of June to the 29th of June; rather long periods for the carrying of despatches.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps he had to go by canoe.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) was hardly fair to me after I had given him credit for that amount of intelligence which he really possesses. I am sure that no one in the House understood my remarks as he did. My suggestion was simply to depart from the old system, which the Minister of Justice seems to think has become sanctified with age, and to do away with the vote of \$5,000 as a fixed sum. I suggested that the House should be asked meanwhile to vote to the Government a sum to cover travelling expenses—such sum as they deem proper—and that they should duly and properly account for it the same as any other sum placed at their disposal. It would not, I presume, be in order for me to add that suggestion to the resolution, and, therefore, all I can do here, as a private member, is to move to reduce or strike out the item. I accompanied my proposition with another one which, I think, was understood by everybody, perhaps including the member from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). I may say that I yield to no person in my respect for men in office faithfully discharging the duties of their position, whether of high or low degree, but when it comes to dealing with the public funds, I maintain that there is no man in the service, no matter how exalted his position, who is so hedged in as a divinity, that his public administration should not be subject to proper and respectful inquiry.

Motion negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to inquire about the item of \$3,000 for telegrams. It seems rather a large sum.

Mr. FOSTER. The affairs which have been going on for the last year or more have necessitated a great deal of cable work between the Governor-General and the home authorities.

Contingencies — Queen's Privy
Council of Canada..... \$10,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that there is a charge of \$8,148 for extra clerks, which really does seem very heavy, for the Privy Council office. We know that what is expended one year is generally expended another, no matter how much is asked for in the Estimates, and the hon. gentleman does not, I fear, consider himself bound by the fact that he is only demanding \$2,500. What guarantee is there that the

sum spent on extra clerks will not reach \$8,000 next year?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see that a change has taken place in the way in which details are put down. Heretofore we have simply had one sum for the whole contingencies, and out of that sum the extra servants were paid. Under that arrangement it was quite possible for the department to have expended the whole of it, if they pleased, on extra clerks, or upon printing if necessary. As my hon. friend will see, I have divided the expenditure into four heads so as to have the effect of restricting the departments to at least this classification in their expenditure. For clerical assistance, or for printing, or stationery, only the maximum of certain sums can be expended. The stationery and printing vary somewhat from year to year, but not very much, and they can be fairly well estimated for as I have estimated them in this estimate. The expenditure of so much money in the Privy Council office is explained by the fact that quite a large number of the regular staff were not replaced, the work being done by temporary clerks. I think there were about five vacancies in the second class that were not filled up last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The arrangement for sub-dividing in this way is an excellent one, but I have some doubts as to whether the Auditor-General can govern himself by the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. He holds that he is governed by the details as given in the sub-items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Treasury Board, I know, often override his little objections. Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman means to be bound by his own subdivisions?

Mr. FOSTER. We do sometimes override his decisions, because the Auditor-General occasionally shows himself to be human like others. If you look at the items, you will find that for two years he has been guided by the sub-items, and during that time his decisions have never been overridden.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the Supply Bill makes no reference to these subdivisions, it is a question how far the Government are legally bound to regard them. What does the hon. Minister of Justice say as to that?

Mr. FOSTER. The contention is that these subdivisions show the express wish of Parliament, and that it is reasonable that the amounts there voted should not be exceeded.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. Finance Minister will recollect that during the last two or three sessions we have had discussions with regard to the expenditure incurred for newspapers in the several departments of the Government, and I think he made a kind of half promise last year that he would look into this matter with the view of reducing that

expenditure. I think there has been some reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. A very considerable reduction.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the suggestion then made to do away with all these different reading-rooms in the departments, ought to be carried into effect. We have, in this building, a reading-room in which all the newspapers of the Dominion can be found. It is supposed that the clerks of the various departments, when they enter on their duties in the morning, go to their offices for the purpose of discharging their duties, not for the purpose of reading the newspapers. If the hon. Finance Minister will turn to pages B-10 and 11 of the Auditor-General's Report, he will see that the sum of \$6,215.47 was expended last year for newspaper subscriptions. That sum was divided among the various departments as follows:—Governor-General's Office, \$583.83; Privy Council, \$402.29; Justice Department, \$379.10; Militia Department, \$317.01; Secretary of State, \$734.65; Public Printing and Stationery, \$25; Interior Department, \$255.89; Indian Affairs, \$120.77; Audit Office, \$6.50; Finance Department, \$386.71; Customs Department, \$443.45; Inland Revenue Department, \$356.28; Post Office Department, \$594.12; Agricultural Department, \$437.52; Marine Department, \$297.90; Fisheries Department, \$107.80; Public Works Department, \$355.85; and Railways and Canals, \$410.80. Now, I contend that nearly all of this money might be saved to the country if the Government would do away with these reading rooms in the different departments. It will do the clerks of the departments, and the Ministers themselves, good to take a walk up to the House of Commons and read the news of the day in the reading-room here if they wish to do so. Besides, I am satisfied if these departmental reading-room were abolished, the clerks would give more attention than they do to the public business. I say this is a useless expenditure, as the Finance Minister seems to admit himself, for he says that he went a certain distance in reducing this expenditure. That shows that he could abolish it altogether, and I would urge upon him this view of the matter. It was the opinion generally expressed last year, and there was no opposition to it. Not a single man contended that these reading-rooms should be kept in existence, and I trust that the minister will do something further towards abolishing them.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must not be too voracious. He may recollect that two or three years ago the expenditure for these newspapers and books was very, very much larger than it is now. The average expenditure for each department then ran from about \$500 to \$1,100. It has been reduced until to-day the average for each of the departments named is about \$340, and the Order in Council which was passed on the subject limits each department to a certain maxi-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

num, which is very nearly half what it was some years ago. There are not separate reading-rooms in the different departments. A great many of these newspapers are necessary, however, and, considering the progress that has been made, the hon. gentleman ought to have hopes for the future, without too much criticism.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to inquire of the Finance Minister what necessity exists for a long list of newspapers in a department, costing \$500 or \$600, which is sufficient to pay the subscriptions of 100 or 125 daily newspapers. What reason is there for a department having a supply of papers beyond the leading daily newspapers of the day—one or two Toronto papers, one or two Montreal papers, and the Ottawa papers. What is the necessity even for them? But if the departments are allowed to have papers at all, I do not see that more than \$30 or \$40 to each is necessary. There is a great deal of waste and extravagance in this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can understand that it may be absolutely essential for the Finance Department and some other departments to have a few papers; but the hon. Minister has not stated that, in his judgment, he has reached low-water mark or even approached it. It is impossible for anyone not in a department to fix any figure; but it does seem absurd that so many newspapers should be taken in the various departments. So far as the departments require information, I can understand it to be necessary and desirable that they should take the newspapers; but apart from that the deputy heads, who have grown to think that they own the departments and are not the servants of the departments, and the other clerks who want to read the news of the day, ought to pay for them out of their own pockets. It does seem to me that \$6,000 is an extravagant sum for that purpose. I would not object to any reasonable sum the Minister would say is necessary for his department.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is desirable the head of a department should be familiar with the expressions of opinion on public matters to be found in the country newspapers. I do not know of any better way to watch the trend of public sentiment than by reading the country newspapers. If you go into one of the departments and examine the files you will find that three-fourths, and probably more, consist of country newspapers published all over Canada. I do not know how it is with the heads of the other departments; possibly they may not read them to the same extent that I do because they may not have time; but I make it a point to scan all the papers which come to the department, and I find it exceedingly useful. It is a mistake to suppose that the papers are only for the accommodation of the clerks or even the deputy heads. We may become too economical altogether if we discontinue the country news-

papers. Of course, the duties of the heads of departments to a great extent confine them to the capital, and they have not the opportunities of keeping in touch with the people which members of Parliament have, and it would not be wise to prevent their seeing country weeklies and learning from them the feeling of the country. Another class of newspaper I find to be very useful—I refer to the commercial papers. They are almost an absolute necessity, if the head of a department is to keep himself informed of the trend of opinion on matters of finance and general interest.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is desirable that members of the Government should be posted on the opinion of newspapers all over the country; but they can do that by coming up to the public reading-room here or by sending their officials here, much more thoroughly than by scanning through the papers taken in the departments. I venture to say, and the hon. Finance Minister will not contradict me, that the mass of papers taken in the departments are Conservative. You will not find many Liberal papers on the file. In the reading-room of this House and the Senate, of course, you will find them, and if the President of the Privy Council wants to keep in touch with public sentiment he will have to read newspapers on the Liberal as well as on the Conservative side.

Mr. IVES. I have nearly all the leading Liberal papers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But the President of the Council spoke of keeping in touch with the country press. No doubt the departments take the leading Liberal papers, the Toronto "Globe," the Ottawa "Free Press," the London "Advertiser" and the Hamilton "Times," but they do not take any of the Liberal papers published in the country. So that the hon. gentleman is wide of the mark altogether. He may scan over the Conservative country papers, and learn from them that this is the best Government on the face of the earth, and these papers have good reason for saying so, because they live on Government pap. In the Auditor-General's Report you will see thousands of dollars expended on these Government papers, and it is these papers which the President of the Council will find on file in the departments. Where the public service requires that a department should be in possession of certain newspapers, the public should pay for them; but if the members of the Government and the public servants in the department wish to read the papers for their own benefit they should pay for them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. President of the Council seems to forget the excellent source of information with reference to the state of the country and its requirements which he has in the gentlemen on this side, who, during three or four months every year, impart that information to him without charge. If he would be guided more

by them, he would find himself acting more in the interests of the country than he can by spending money unnecessarily on these newspapers, the sole object of many of which is to support themselves and the Government at the expense of the country.

Mr. DICKEY. The Finance Minister deserves some credit for the care he has given to this subject of newspaper subscriptions. This item should be kept as low as possible, and hon. gentlemen opposite should be a little more generous to the Minister than they are. I think they will admit, at any rate, that the finances of the country were managed most economically under the direction of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and if they will look at his record, they will find that during the last year he was in office, instead of spending less than \$7,000 in newspapers and advertising, the various departments of this country spent \$13,588. I think if this Finance Minister, during the time he has been in office, has reduced that expenditure to one-half what it was under the economical management of the hon. member for South Oxford, we ought to allow him to go on in the same line. I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that reductions should be made as fast as the real needs of the department will allow, but I think they should give the present incumbent in office the credit to which he is entitled.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. the President of the Privy Council informs us that it is necessary for the heads of departments to take the country newspapers, in order to keep in touch with public sentiment in the rural districts. Now, I find that the office of Secretary of State has the sum of \$734.65 for newspapers. That should pay the subscription price of a good many more than all the weekly newspapers published in Canada. It would cover a list of over 500 weekly newspapers. I find that the total expenses of the reading-room of the House of Commons, in which all the newspapers published in this Dominion are taken, with many others published in the United States and Great Britain, are \$1,800, while these various departments of the Government expend \$6,215. This, I hold, is a useless expenditure of public money. It is not necessary to have a list of papers so extensive in the various departments of the Government. If it is necessary to have the newspapers accessible to those departments, why not have a reading-room in each one of the blocks, a reading-room in the Eastern Block, one in the Western Block and one in the Langevin Block, and by that means we could reduce the expenditure to nearly one-quarter of the present sum, and we would be affording the same facilities to the officials to consult the newspapers that they have now? I agree with the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville) that the expenditure is entirely unnecessary. It is unnecessary to pro-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

vide these clerks with a reading-room. If they have not anything else to do than to read newspapers, there had better be discharges made. I have always contended that the hours for working in the Civil Service were altogether too short—going to their offices at ten and leaving at four o'clock; and I do not think that it is necessary to spend \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year to furnish them with the means of passing away their idle time pleasantly. If they go there to work during office hours, they do not require those newspapers, and we are not only guilty of spending money uselessly for newspapers, but employing the men and paying them for the purpose of reading these newspapers. Of course, I would not say that the heads of the departments should have no expense of this kind at all; it might be necessary to take a few newspapers if the suggestion I made with regard to reading-rooms in each one of the blocks is not adopted; but surely it is not necessary to expend over \$700 for the Department of Secretary of State, nor \$402 for the office of the Privy Council. If the reading-room for the House of Commons is run for \$1,800 a year, it is an absurdity to spend the sums we are now asked to furnish newspapers for the various scattered departments of this Government. It is a thing I commend to the attention of my hon. friend the Finance Minister; it is one of those directions in which he can use the pruning-knife, and exercise his well-known spirit of economy very effectively.

Mr. FOSTER. It is scarcely fair to take that exposition of the account as the actual state of matters in 1891-92. For instance, he has read in some cases where the expenses were \$600 or \$700. When we commenced to get this thing into a little better shape we found arrearages, and a large proportion of the amounts there are not for actual uses of that year, but are for arrearages which had accumulated and that were paid off in that year. Next year's report will show a much more favourable exposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) to the fact that I have before me the Public Accounts for 1878. In the Customs, I think he said the subscriptions were \$13,000.

Mr. DICKEY. And advertisements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that makes a material difference. In 1878, the subscriptions and advertising in newspapers amounted to \$7,269. Your advertising account, I see, is \$46,000, according to the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. The advertising is \$525.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will find that the Auditor-General reports an item of \$46,000 for advertising, and these subscriptions to boot. I want to call attention to the fact that although there are some cases in

which it is for subscriptions alone, in the great majority of cases I notice that it is subscriptions to, and advertising in, newspapers, which is totally a different thing, as he knows, from mere subscriptions alone. For instance, in the Governor-General's secretary's office for that year, subscriptions to, and advertising in, were \$1,299. So in the case of the Department of Interior, subscriptions to, and advertising in, \$444. Then, subscriptions to, and advertising in for the Department of Finance, over which I presided, \$771. In the Department of Public Works, subscriptions to, and advertising in, \$1,337, and, as I said, in Customs, subscriptions to, and advertising in newspapers, amounted to \$7,269. The comparison does not hold. The comparison, as he had made it, is certainly not correct as compared with this, because then we had no Auditor-General. Now the items are separated by the Auditor-General, and then they were put together.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not wish to take from the member for South Oxford the claim which he has to fame of being an economical Finance Minister, but I have simply quoted from the Public Accounts of 1878, the Contingencies Account for advertising and subscriptions to newspapers. As compared with that, I quoted from the Auditor-General's Report of the present Contingencies Account of the various departments for subscriptions to newspapers and advertising. I made a comparison of these two items, and I found that the hon. member for South Oxford spent twice as much for these two purposes as the present Finance Minister during the last year. I think the year 1878 is the most favourable for the hon. member for South Oxford; the other years will show a worse record. I am sorry if I misrepresented him, I am sorry if any change in keeping accounts makes the comparison unfair to him, but I do not think the hon. gentleman has shown it yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If he will look at the Auditor-General's Report, page A-23, he will find the item of \$46,226.19 put down under the head of advertising for the year 1892.

Mr. McMULLEN. This question has been before the House every session for the last ten years. I am glad to notice there has been a reduction made in the Finance Department, and I earnestly hope reductions will take place in other departments, until the expenditure is entirely wiped out. I endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). If any information is required with respect to any particular matter, the general reading-rooms are quite convenient and any Minister or clerk can visit them. The President of the Council has referred to the desirability of the Government being in touch with public feeling, and that this can be acquired by perusing the newspapers. I frankly admit that the Government stand in need of such information. The Opposition have endeavoured

to impress on them the necessity of obtaining accurate knowledge as to the general condition of the country, but although we have pointed this out clearly and distinctly, they have declined to listen to it. If they would consult the independent journals they would find from day to day similar sentiments expressed to those uttered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and they would obtain evidence as to the unfortunate financial position of the farming community. If these newspapers were the means of educating the Government on this important question, including the President of the Council, who stands as much in need of education on this point as any member of the House, I would be willing to continue the expenditure of \$6,000. Great advantage would be gained by the country if we could educate the Government in this direction. But they have had the use of these newspapers during eight or ten years, and they do not appear to benefit by them, and under all the circumstances and in the light of past experience, it is necessary to cut down the items of expense, and the expenditure on newspapers for the several departments should be dropped. I hope next year that the Minister of Finance, with that courage which he has displayed in making reduction in the Finance Department, will reduce the expenditure in every department until there is not a paper left except in the reading-rooms.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood the Minister of Finance last year said he would take the matter into his consideration and endeavour to make some arrangement by which the reading-rooms of the House and the Senate would be utilized for the departments. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) went a little too far in attempting to insinuate that we were finding fault with the Minister of Finance. Every hon. member has given credit to the Minister of Finance for having reduced the expenditure, and he does not require any assistance from the member from Cumberland to keep up his end of the stick. The Minister of Finance should adopt the course of discontinuing the expenditure under this head entirely and have the officials of the departments visit the reading-rooms of the House of Commons and Senate to get the news of the day. I understand the Minister of Finance last session undertook to work out some scheme of this kind by which the expenditure would not only be reduced but wiped out.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave no such undertaking, because the scheme is not feasible to have two or three different reading-rooms to which officers should come who wanted information. Every hon. gentleman knows how the expense has grown and how difficult it is to bring matters to a normal condition. Every department must take a certain number of newspapers. So long as I am in charge of the Finance Department I intend to take

what newspapers are necessary and not to go to the reading-rooms for them. I take those that are necessary for my information and for the work of the office, not for my personal use but for use in connection with my official position. Take the Marine and Fisheries Department, of which I have some knowledge. That department must necessarily take a large number of papers. There is a record kept of wrecks and casualties, and also a record of fishing matters, so far as they are reported in the different local papers, as regards the coast and inland waters. The newspapers are useful and are necessary for the working of the department, and of course they entail considerable expense. In that department I think the expense has been brought down to a normal position. I think in my department the same result has been brought about, and all the departments are working on the same line. In regard to the expense for the Secretary of State's Department some newspapers did not send in accounts for three years. Now the rule is to pay for newspapers in advance, and if newspapers are sent to the departments without being paid for the publishers do so at their own risk.

Contingencies—Department of
Militia and Defence..... \$8,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice an expense for extra clerks. With thirty-three gentlemen in the department extra clerks should not have been required. There was no war imminent, so far as I remember, in 1892, and there was merely the routine work to do.

Mr. FOSTER. The expense was the small amount of \$560.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the work of 1891-92 was the normal work of the department the regular staff should have been able to do it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I notice an item for postage in connection with the department. Is that for foreign postage?

Mr. FOSTER. Each department pays its own foreign postage. This expense is for foreign postage.

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the report of expense connected with the Department of the Secretary of State I find item for expenses of private secretary and messenger to New York. It appears that the late Secretary of State made two trips to New York in December and January, and there is a charge for travelling expenses of \$87.50. What was the Secretary of State doing in New York at that time?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no means of giving the information at present, but I will get it as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the explanation is, that the Secretary of State at that time went away from this country very ill indeed on his way to the south, and he

Mr. FOSTER.

took his secretary with him for the purpose of completing unfinished business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very ingenious explanation, I must say.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is ingenious.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt that what the First Minister stated is true, and perhaps it was necessary that the Secretary of State should bring his private secretary along with him to transact his business, but I do not believe that the country should have to pay for the expenses of a messenger whom the Secretary of State brings along to take care of him. I want the present Secretary of State to tell us why the country should be called upon to pay \$87.50 for the trips of John Courtman to New York. I think that is saddling too much expense altogether on the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before this item is passed, we should be informed why the Secretary of State has to carry a man around with him in addition to his private secretary at the expense of the country. If the chief men in the Government are permitted to pursue such extravagant habits as this, we may very soon find that the Controllers and the Solicitor-General will be doing the same thing. It would be nothing but equal rights that they should have the same privilege, and that is what the members of the Government are contending for all the time. I do not think we should sanction this expenditure so as to make it a precedent, because precedents are very often brought before the House as excuses for a good deal of wrong-doing. I, therefore, contend that this item should be allowed to stand over until we can get an explanation from the present Secretary of State after dinner.

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible for the Secretary of State to give this information after dinner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say that, as his office is closed, it would be impossible for him to get the information in such short time. Besides, the expenditure occurred under the preceding Secretary of State, and it was on account of Mr. Chapleau's serious illness. I do not think my hon. friend is so cruel-hearted as to make a very strong criticism on that point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chapleau must be sick very often, because I find there are two trips to New York and three to Montreal charged here.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite within the memory of us all that he was very ill at that time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I suppose he strained himself when he was kicking.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is understood that if this vote passes now, it will not be considered as a precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be considered as a precedent, it is now a year behind.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should hear from the Minister of Militia on this subject, who, on a recent occasion, accused his colleague of petty larceny. If I remember aright, he accused the Minister of Finance of having been a party to stealing some of his notes, not promissory notes, but notes of an address.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am perfectly satisfied, when a minister gets sick and has to go to a warmer climate for the benefit of his health, that his pay should go on, if this House determines it. However, I think it is a very serious proposition to ask the country to pay the travelling expenses of a private secretary and a messenger when their salary is going on all the time. I do not think we can justify this expenditure on any ground. If the hon. gentleman says that it was some little extravagance on the part of the late Secretary of State, the House will have to accept that explanation, but I do not think the House should accept it. It is an outrage that the country should have to pay the expenses of a private secretary and a messenger on a trip of this kind. It is not a proposition that I can endorse.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not make that proposition. What I said was: That the minister at that time went away for the purpose of remaining for a considerable period, and he took his secretary and messenger with him for a part of the journey. The hon. gentleman will remember that the inquiry at that time was principally about Mr. Tache, and while the Secretary of State was absent for a considerable time, his secretary was also absent eight days altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had reference more to the explanation of the Minister of Finance, in justification of the charge, namely, that the Secretary of State was ill and went away, and that, therefore, we should be satisfied with that explanation. I suppose a few hundred dollars more or less does not amount to a great deal, but to have such an expenditure justified on that ground gives a very bad precedent, and ought not to be sanctioned or approved of by the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I merely stated the circumstance as a means of disarming the severe criticism of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). That is all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It appears that the Secretary of State went down to the Wet Basin at Quebec and got cold, and that is the cause of the outlay. He had to take a messenger with him at the time he was down there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think this estimate should be allowed to pass in its present shape. I do not see why the country should be saddled with the expenses of a messenger and a private secretary, travelling around with gentlemen who get very large salaries outside their expenses altogether. Unless the Government give a promise that it will not occur again, the item should be struck out.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Contingencies - Post Office Department..... \$45,500

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the minister explain the cause of the increase of \$8,300 in this item?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contingencies of the department are explained in detail on page B-5 of the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the Postmaster-General expends \$471.82 for Canadian, \$55.75 for American and \$66.55 for European newspapers. Are these papers found to be necessary in that department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, they are.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who requires them, and for what purpose are they required?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. These papers come to the department just as they come to the other departments, and they are necessary for the purpose of the department. It is necessary for the department to have foreign exchanges, so as to keep informed as to what is going on in regard to postal affairs.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the department no more authoritative source of information respecting postal matters? I am unable to see why the Post Office Department requires papers unless to furnish reading matter to the clerks. How many does the Postmaster-General himself read?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Personally I get very few of these papers. But I think the hon. gentleman will find, on referring to the Public Accounts of former years, that the number has been very considerably reduced. They would not be taken unless they were considered to be necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. Could the number not be reduced still further without crippling the department or depriving it of information?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may be possible to cut down the number. The matter

will be looked into, and next year I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to congratulate me on a further saving.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not been able to appreciate the explanation given by the hon. minister. The vote which the hon. gentleman asks for this year is \$8,300 in excess of last year. The expenditure for last year was \$36,000, which was slightly below the estimates, so that his explanation was really no explanation at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The estimates are made up by Colonel White, who is, I think, every hon. gentleman will admit, very economical in his views. The vote for contingencies is increased by \$8,300, because that amount was expended over the amount of the previous year, and it was considered better to put in the estimates what would be required than to allow the appropriation to be overdrawn as it was last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The mere statement that the expense exceeded that of the previous year does not explain the reason for the increase. Has it been for extra clerks, or for cab-hire, or for what? We have ten or twelve departments. In five there have been decreases; four show an increase; but in none does the increase come near that of the Post Office Department contingencies, in which there is the abnormally large increase of \$8,300. It may be perfectly justifiable; but we ought to have some reasonable explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that the Post Office Department is every year increasing with the development of the country. This involves the continual opening of new offices and money branches and additional clerks, and I have already stated that the increase upon the expenditure of last year is caused by the increase in the number of clerks who had to be added to the ordinary staff, because as the work in the department was increasing abnormally, additional clerks were required to carry it on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman cannot really mean that, because he will see that the total amount expended in the year 1892 for extra clerks in the department was only \$16,800, and here is an increase of \$8,300, which would be 50 per cent. The hon. gentleman does not desire the House to understand that he has increased the number of extra clerks by 50 per cent. If the hon. gentleman will look at page B-5, he will see that the expenditure for the year in the four large items was: telegrams, \$1,242, the increase in which must have been nominal; extra clerks and messengers, \$16,711; stationery office, \$2,311; printing, binding and paper, \$10,743. On which of these has the increase taken place? If there has been an increase of 50 per cent in the extra clerks, it is time this committee took the matter into very serious consideration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will find, when I bring down the information, that I am quite correct, and that the increase was caused by the fact that we have had to open new post offices all through the country, owing to the building of new railways, and this necessitated additional help. I will bring down in detail all the items; but I still hold to what I have said, and the hon. gentleman will find that I am quite correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's report is not before the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It will be placed on the Table to-night.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not going to prejudge the matter; but I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask the House to vote a sum for contingencies so largely in excess of what has been voted for years, especially at a time when the pruning-knife is being applied to other departments, without giving us some better explanation than he has. He knows that although there may be an increase in the number of post offices from year to year it does not follow that the contingencies of the department at Ottawa should be increased except to a very inappreciable extent. Has the hon. gentleman appointed any new extra clerks, and how many?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have not got the information here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The increase of half a dozen post offices in Manitoba, or a dozen in Ontario and a couple of dozen in Quebec, as the case may be, does not add to the increase in the contingencies of the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, to a great extent, because we have to employ additional hands. In the Post Office Department additional help is required, who are taken on for a certain period of time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot congratulate the head of any department when he asks an increase of 50 per cent on one item, while the other departments are decreasing, and gives such an explanation as the hon. gentleman has given to-night. With all due respect to him, I do not think it is proper that he should ask the House to pass the vote in the face of the explanation he has given.

Mr. HAGGART. As the business of the department increases, so does the expenditure, and among the large expenditures many would be stationery. The employment of extra clerks also requires to be increased. The hon. gentleman seems to think there was 50 per cent increased expenditure on extra clerks. The extra clerks made but a very small proportion of the total amount. When the details come down, it will be shown that necessity required this expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. The explanation is not satisfactory. Here is an increase in the total of contingencies for last year of almost 23 per cent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will allow this item to stand until I bring down the details.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that this increase of 23 per cent cannot bear any proportion to the increase in the business of the department or the increase of the population or wealth of the country. While the population of Canada was increasing less than 12 per cent in ten years, here is an increase of 23 per cent in one year in the amount of contingencies. Now, I hold that some explanation more satisfactory should be given by the Postmaster-General before we pass this item. It may be susceptible of satisfactory explanation, but an increase upon the total list of contingencies of almost 25 per cent is certainly a rather startling increase. There can be no increase in the business of the Post Office Department and in the amount of railway mileage open, or anything in connection with the business of the department, commensurate with this increase of 25 per cent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to let the item stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Railways throws the Postmaster-General over, and intimates that the explanation he made to the House may not be the correct one. But I made my statement with reference to the explanation made by the Postmaster-General, and that was that the increase occurred in the extra clerks of \$16,741 last year, and the increase of \$8,300 would be about 50 per cent. I therefore assumed that the Postmaster-General knew what he was talking about, and my observation was strictly correct.

Contingencies—Department of
Agriculture, including \$912.50
to Messrs. Skead and Dew-
hurst..... \$21,725

Mr. FOSTER. Make that sum \$21,100. This decrease arises from the fact that a clerk who was last year paid out of the contingencies, has been appointed to the regular staff to fill a vacancy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand the Department of Immigration has been taken over to the Department of Interior. How is it that the same amount of contingencies are asked for under these circumstances as before that time?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a list of extra clerks from the Agriculture Department who are employed in the Patent Branch, the Archives and in the main branch, the most being in the Patent Branch, the salaries amounting to \$8,766. In the Archives Branch are two that I have struck out, one at \$730, leaving \$456. In the Main Branch there are six extra clerks at \$4,158, making up the total sum asked for. The Patent Branch, of course, is increasing every year, and these clerks are mainly in the Patent Branch. I suppose an addition is necessary there each year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not understand the explanation very clearly. The Immigration Branch is removed from this department, the contingencies of the Immigration Branch is increased this year, and this remains almost the same. The Patent Branch was in force in this department last year. How is it that you have almost the same as you had before the removal of this branch to the Department of Interior?

Mr. FOSTER. The Immigration Branch was removed, as my hon. friend states, but I think not more than three extra clerks were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Interior Department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That would reduce it, would it not?

Mr. FOSTER. That would reduce it by three, yet the increased work in the Patent Branch has overbalanced that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister explain the note on page 17, which reads: "Including \$912.50 to Messrs. Skead and Dewhurst, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." Why were these payments made to these two clerks?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Dewhurst and Mr. Skead were extra clerks in the main branch. That foot-note was put in because they have not passed the Civil Service examination, and they have not been in the office continuously since 1882, and so are not eligible to continuous temporary employment unless this is put in. Mr. Dewhurst and Mr. Skead are both of them excellent clerks, and have a special work to do, and, consequently, ought to be kept on in the interest of the department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, that is intended to override the rule laid down by the Auditor-General that these extra clerks, unless they pass the Civil Service examination—

Mr. FOSTER. Or had been on before 1882.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You will perceive that possibly an injustice is done to a number of clerks who were discharged here a year ago from the Department of Interior, who had been long in the service of that department, and were dismissed summarily because they were not able to comply with the Civil Service Act. Now, why should that rule apply to the Department of Interior and not apply to all the other departments? If we pass an Act of Parliament for the guidance of the Government in these matters, I think that rule ought to be applied to all the departments alike.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true, and the rule has been applied, but there have been exceptions made as required by the exceptional ability or utility of the clerks themselves. If I mistake not, there was an ex-

ception made in one or two instances in the Interior, in the same way as in the case of these clerks. Of course it is immaterial in one way whether those two clerks are retained or two others brought in to do the work, but the two clerks who are there possess a knowledge of the work and are reported as being experienced and efficient clerks, and it is against the best interests of the department that they should be removed simply on this technicality and two others put in who would not understand the work. It comes to this, whether in special instances we should make special exceptions, not, however, so many exceptions as to avoid the rule. The rule is that the clerks must pass the Civil Service examination or have been continuously employed since 1882.

Mr. FLINT. What compensation do these clerks receive?

Mr. FOSTER. \$912 per annum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The rule generally has been to explain the retention of clerks in violation of the Civil Service Act, that is, men not entitled to be in the service because they have not passed the examination, on the ground that they possessed some special technical qualification which induced the department to retain them. I do not understand that any special qualification is possessed by these two gentlemen, but simply the department wishes to retain them because generally they are good men. If that rule is adopted, you strike a blow at the Civil Service. There is no benefit in passing the examination. There are lots of good men in the service, but the law has laid down the rule that the clerks must pass the Civil Service examination or they cannot be retained. I understand that occasionally, where very special qualifications are possessed by clerks, the House is asked to override the rule by voting a special grant. I do not understand, however, that special qualifications are claimed in these cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say whether the claim is made on the ground of special technical knowledge or not. They have not been kept on during preceding years in violation of the law, because the same provision was made two years ago, and this will make the third year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Unless these clerks possess special qualifications, why did they not, during those years, qualify themselves to pass the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine they are beyond the age.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the minister state the amount of receipts last year?

Mr. FOSTER. About \$80,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What were the receipts for the previous year?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say from memory, but if the hon. gentleman will send out for the Public Accounts for any year, he will find the receipts in the revenue returns.

Mr. McMULLEN. The committee must regret the absence of the Minister of Agriculture. If he, with his intimate knowledge of the department, was present, he would be able to give us information. Unfortunately the hon. gentleman who occupies that position is not even here, and his successor is placed in a position beyond the hearing of our voices. He has not allowed himself to be tortured by being questioned across the floor of this House. In regard to the most important department, the Department of Agriculture, hon. members will be called upon to look across the floor for some one to answer questions in the interest of that department, and I suppose the Government will refer us to the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. What is our loss is gain for the other party. The hon. gentleman will find plenty of ministers to torture.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It appears there are no farmers in this country who understand agriculture, and they have to be taught by a lawyer who has not devoted very much attention to this subject. The hon. gentleman who occupied the position of minister before had an idea regarding some products. He understood two-rowed barley, but I do not believe that the present incumbent understands the nature of that product. It does appear singular that among the farmers in the House who sit behind the Treasury benches, the Government were unable to find any gentleman in the House who was able to fill the position, and were obliged to go out of the House and obtain the services of a gentleman who has no special claim, no technical knowledge, to preside over the most important department of Government. Every hon. member must understand that the welfare and prosperity of this country largely depend on agriculture, and yet the Government have placed a lawyer in charge of that important department, one who has had no special training even on any of the experimental farms, who has not even been a disciple of the late Minister of Agriculture, who does not possess special training, and then in order to prevent troublesome questions being asked in this House and discussed by those who have practical knowledge in regard to the solution of agricultural problems, he is placed in the Senate. It is strange indeed that in the formation of the new Government no consideration was given to that large and important class of the community. I would not object to the hon. gentleman because he is a lawyer. The Government are very partial to lawyers, and all the new ministers and all the accessories to the Government, those who are only allowed to peep into their deliberations, who are like Peri peering into Paradise, are all lawyers. There

is an hon. gentleman, who has no technical knowledge of farming, except that he is connected with a colonization company, who sits there and waits at the door of the Privy Council for the results of the deliberations of the Privy Council, and then has a voice outside, in the outside service. Another hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and still another of these hon. gentlemen is a lawyer, and the Minister of Agriculture is a lawyer, and he is put in the Senate. I presume if the farmers in this House were to investigate the claims and ascertain the knowledge possessed by that minister it might embarrass the Government, so they put him in the mausoleum of departed political souls, the Senate. The great agricultural interests of this country are intrusted to a minister who has no practical knowledge of farming, who understands it not, and the Government have hidden him away in that retreat, that charnel-house, the Senate. That is where the people of this country have to go for information on agricultural questions. It is singular indeed to notice the way in which the Government has been formed as regards the Department of Agriculture. The Government seem to have been unable to get what were formerly called brains, except by bringing them in from outside. Even when they went outside this House they brought in a minister who did not possess any special knowledge of the subject. The greatest interest in the country, the agricultural interest, has been entirely neglected, and there is not much wonder that we find the country in its present depressed condition when it is governed by men who, it is true, possess some qualifications, who are able to split hairs, who are able to show that wrong is right, and who are able to give excuses, and they are good at giving excuses, although they are not very efficient or willing to give information in regard to estimates presented to the House. I do protest on behalf of the agriculturists of this country that their interests should be passed over, and that the gentleman who presides over them should be shelved away in the Senate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know that this debate is pertinent to the subject of "Contingencies, Department of Agriculture," but I really do not think the case is quite so hopeless as my hon. friend seems to regard it. Considering how much he knows upon every subject that comes before the House. It must be remembered that the hon. gentleman is not a farmer at all, and is not even a lawyer. He is a physician. If the hon. gentleman will turn his memory back to the time when he thinks this country was governed under better conditions than it is now, he will find that the Department of Agriculture had two heads at various times and that they were both lawyers and both Senators.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I may say for the information of the First Minister that I had the advantage of being a farmer, and was trained and brought up on the farm, so that I

do not think the hon. gentleman should misrepresent me.

Contingencies—Department of
Marine and Fisheries..... \$10,000

Mr. FLINT. There are some inquiries which I should like to make in regard to this item. It seems to me that there is altogether a disproportionate amount of money expended by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the matter of distributing the fishing bounty annually. It is difficult, in the short time I have at my disposal, to separate the accounts and to ascertain what it does cost to distribute this \$150,000 a year. When you look at some of these charges you will find that either they require some explanation or that there ought to be some reform in the department in the matter of the cost of distributing this comparatively small amount of money. If I have made the additions correctly I find that it cost the Government last year \$12,500 simply to make out the bounty cheques. A large number of extra clerks were employed; but I am not quite certain whether that comes under this item or not.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not come under this item.

Mr. FLINT. As I broached the subject I will conclude my remarks now; but I will probably dwell more at length on this point at some future time. In the meantime the minister might look over the subject and make such explanations as he considers necessary. It does seem to me that a large amount of money must be—I will not say unnecessarily expended—and there ought to be some change in the system which costs from \$12,000 to \$13,000 a year for simply making out and signing these cheques. There are in addition the cost of inspectors and wardens, the expenses in connection with magistrates taking informations, the expenses for gathering information, and the necessary expense of verifying all these charges. I call the attention of the acting minister to the matter now, as it appears to me that this charge is excessive, and I trust that he will be able to give an explanation later on.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Flint) has referred briefly to the fact that the fishermen of the lower provinces receive from this Government yearly a very large sum of money in the shape of bounty. I do not know but perhaps this would be a proper time in which to call the attention of the House to the grievances of the fishermen of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. It is scarcely the time. This vote is for contingencies here at Ottawa.

Mr. LISTER. Of course I suppose I would have the right to bring up the subject, but I do not propose just now to go at length into the grievances of the fishermen of Ontario. I will call the attention of the gentleman in charge of that department to

the fact that before the close of the session I shall take occasion to bring to the attention of the House the grievances of the fishermen of the province of Ontario, grievances which they complain they suffer from the large number of inspectors who are constantly interfering with them. I will also draw the attention of the minister to the very large expenditure involved in the so-called protection of fisheries in Ontario, the very large amount of money received from these fisheries as compared with the fisheries of the lower provinces, and to the fact that they receive no attention and no support from the Government, in the way of bounties or otherwise. I believe that I am correct in saying that petitions have been forwarded to the department setting forth a number of the grievances which these men complain of, and that if these complaints are at all well founded, the Government should investigate them and if possible offer redress.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that he is, perhaps, improperly stopping a discussion which my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) intended taking up.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are in reality, now voting money to pay clerks for this fishery bounty work. If he turns to the Auditor-General's Report, he will find that of this \$5,000, over \$3,000 are charged to expenses in paying the fishing bounty, so that if any hon. gentleman wishes to discuss this matter now is the proper time, lest he might be told later that he had missed his opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not do that.

Mr. FLINT. I may say that for the present I am satisfied with calling the attention of the minister to the matter.

Contingencies, Department of
Trade and Commerce \$5,000

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the minister if there has been laid before the House, or if there is accessible to members, any statement as to the constitution of the new departments and the distribution of duties among the new ministers and assistant ministers? I think it would be of great advantage to the members of the House to have either the Order in Council or any regulation that has been made by the Privy Council in regard to this subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no information such as the hon. gentleman asks for laid on the Table of the House. The only Order in Council on the subject is the Order in Council which places these departments under the supervision of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The distribution of the work between the Department of Trade and Commerce itself and the two Departments of Inland Revenue and Customs, will need to be worked out by a

Mr. LISTER.

little experience: we found it impossible to outline their respective duties in advance of that experience. At the same time, we think it very likely that some legislation will be necessary to transfer to the Department of Trade and Commerce some subjects which are now in charge of other departments.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it considered that there was any real necessity for this change, which gives us practically fifteen ministers, when a country to the south of us, with a population of 65,000,000, manages to get along with seven? I have never heard any statement showing any necessity for the creation of these new offices. It strikes me, in fact, that it is likely to complicate matters and increase the difficulty of managing the affairs of the country. If the hon. gentleman had consolidated the two Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue, instead of dividing them and putting the business under three heads, it is my opinion that he would have done better.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the principle was pretty well recognized in the debate that took place in the House in 1887, on the Acts respecting these departments, that the establishment of a Department of Trade and Commerce might be attended with great benefit, and we are of that opinion. As regards the placing of the other two departments under controllers, we think that will be attended with great benefit, inasmuch as it will enable the gentlemen at the head of these branches to attend exclusively to matters of administration. I think everybody who has had any acquaintance at all with those departments will, on the whole, realize that their work has grown to vast proportions, that of the Department of Customs especially being more than a Minister could attend to while having Cabinet and political duties to discharge. As regards the Solicitor-Generalship, hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1877 a Bill was introduced into this House for the purpose of creating the office of Attorney-General, with the view of sharing between two persons the work of the Department of Justice, and I am sure that since that time, with the growth of public business, the work of that department was doubled. The hon. gentleman has referred to the disparity in the number of Ministers in this country and in the United States, where population is so very much greater. But while the hon. gentleman's observation was verbally correct, he must remember that the work of departments there is divided into branches of great importance, each of which is presided over by an officer of high salary and of high rank, although not of Cabinet rank; and, besides, everyone must remember that in this country we have still the system of provincial representation in the Cabinet. That system was founded in 1867, at the time of the Union, and it is an outgrowth of the provincial system, which is almost as strong to-day as it was then. I doubt very much, indeed, if any of the provinces will be willing

to give up the share of representation which it had at the time of the union. While that provincialism exists as regards the Federal Government, we must necessarily have a larger number of ministers than we would have if the country were more compactly united, as it is on the other side of the border, and as we hope it may be some time here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While I doubted extremely at the time the hon. gentleman alludes to, the expediency of adding to the number of ministers, I did think years ago that we should aim to reduce the number of ministers in the Cabinet to seven, adding to them a moderate number, some four or five, of junior officers. I must say that the idea that it is requisite, in a country of four or five million people, to have twelve paid, and, I think, two unpaid ministers, and three gentlemen in a sort of incipient or probationary stage, is very like running this thing into the ground. We have fifteen paid officials at least, besides the Speaker and Deputy Speaker, making, practically, seventeen members of the Government. For a country of our population and resources, I must say it strikes me as pretty extravagant. The plain fact of the matter is we possessed a legislative and civil service machinery adequate to a population of twenty or thirty millions of people instead of four or five millions. The pattern of our Government was cut a little large at Confederation, because the men who founded Confederation did not dream that at the end of a quarter of a century the population of Canada would be only four or five millions. They thought we would by this time have at least eight or nine millions, and that we would be on the high road to acquiring fourteen or fifteen millions, which was their excuse for starting with a greater number of ministers than was really required. Now, I believe that the services of this country would be infinitely better conducted if we had seven Cabinet ministers and a moderate number of junior officials to assist them. That is the theory I always advocated. I may tell the hon. gentleman that is the theory I advocated then. I never approved of the creation in this country of such an enormous number of ministers, and I believe that, to a very great extent, the present system results in this, that you have two Cabinets. You have the anomaly of thirteen or fourteen officers to do the work which only requires four or five. That is about the practical result of this arrangement. I know of no other country similarly encumbered. Certainly not Great Britain, for there the members of the Cabinet hardly exceed eleven, besides a number of gentlemen who are sometimes admitted into the Cabinet and sometimes not—officers of what are called Cabinet rank, that is, who have a right to a seat in the Cabinet. In Great Britain, with a population of nearly forty millions and without, at present at least, the assistance of any subsidiary assemblies, they can get along

with eleven ministers; and it does appear to me to be a monstrous piece of folly and extravagance that we should find it necessary to augment our number to seventeen, for whether it be twelve or fourteen who are in the Cabinet, the total number amounts to seventeen. That is far too many, and has the evil effect of filling this House with placemen or expected placemen to a very injurious degree. The average number of supporters of the Government in this House may be any number from 115 to 125; and you find now, supposing we count Mr. Speaker and his deputy and allow a couple for the service of the Upper House, that one man in seven or eight is practically provided for by a seat in the Cabinet, either inside or outside the door. The number is far too many, and causes dissatisfaction in the country. We have about ten or twelve million dollars of revenue to spend every year. We take, I see by these returns, about \$1,400,000 to pay for our civil government and some \$700,000 or \$800,000 for our legislative proceedings, and there are extras besides; so that it costs us roughly for the mere machinery of spending this \$10,000,000 revenue a sum of about \$2,000,000 a year, which is out of all proportion to the real wants of the country. The whole thing is an unfortunate business and a great mistake, and had the calmer judgment of the First Minister been consulted, he would hardly have ventured to do it, even under the necessity of meeting political exigencies and supplying his political menagery, even with the temptation, which I admit to be great, of seeing the Protestant lion munch his provender contentedly as the very last joint in the tail of the Catholic lamb.

Mr. LISTER. The First Minister, down to the last few words of his explanation, made what appeared to be a very satisfactory explanation indeed for adding to the number of the Cabinet, but when he told this House that it was necessary to add to the number in order that the different provinces of the Dominion might be there represented, he at once admitted that the addition was not at all necessary. If we look at the Cabinet for a few minutes, we find in it what is called the President of the Council. That gentleman has absolutely nothing to do except preside at the Council Board—which the First Minister himself could do—and draws his salary of \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year. We find that gentleman's office is to be paid the same as the other departments of the Government, and we find three other gentlemen appointed. Now, there is no doubt at all that the First Minister discharged all the duties of Minister of Justice with satisfaction to the country at large, and if he found that the duties of that office were too much, it would have been competent for him to have taken some other office instead. But instead of that, he adds to the expenditure of this country \$15,000 a year by taking in three additional gentlemen, and he promotes one gentleman, who presides over the

Customs Department, to the office bearing the high-sounding name of Minister of Trade and Commerce. What the hon. gentleman will have to do it is difficult to understand, except to direct the deliberations of the Senate. We find that that hon. gentleman draws his salary. He is long in the public service, and if the Superannuation Act applied to him, I submit that he would be a fit subject to retire, instead of bringing in two other gentlemen at \$10,000 a year into the public service. I have no word of complaint to make against the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) or the others. No doubt, they will fill whatever office they may be appointed to with satisfaction to the country and credit to themselves, but what I do complain of is, that situated as we are in the country to-day, barded as the people are, we should impose a Cabinet of seventeen members on a population of four or five millions. That times are hard throughout the country, notwithstanding the speeches of the First Minister and the Finance Minister at Toronto, there can be no question; and in the face of this, the Government have thought, at this particular juncture, to bring in without necessity three other members into the Cabinet at an expense of \$15,000. It is all very well for the Minister of Justice to say that the duties of the office have increased. I can name Cabinet ministers who can do all their work in half an hour per day. As a matter of fact, the work of the departments is done by the deputy ministers and the other clerks in these departments, and the chiefs, many of them, do not even supervise or attempt to supervise the work. We have here a Minister of Trade and Commerce, we have a new deputy created for that office, we have a Controller of Inland Revenue, and we have a deputy under him and an army of civil servants; we have a Controller of Customs and a Deputy Controller and all the officers in that department; we have a Secretary of State, and I ask the hon. gentleman what work there is to be done by him except to sign his name occasionally to a patent or proclamation issued by the Governor-General, which work could be well done by some other member of the Government? The President of the Council is a supernumerary, other officers in the department are mere figure-heads, and the consequence is that hon. members of this House are looking for positions in the Cabinet and places of emolument. This thing, which is going on from session to session, is destructive of the interests of parliamentary government. In England there are but eleven Cabinet ministers. In Mexico, with a population of 10,000,000, there are only seven with deputies; in the United States, with a population of 64,000,000, notwithstanding what the Prime Minister says, there are seven Cabinet ministers with deputies in the different departments, to discharge the same duties as the deputies in the departments here called Controllers. Sir, it cannot be justified

Mr. LISTER.

by any process of reasoning. Instead of increasing the number of Cabinet officers, in the interest of the country and in the interest of economy, the number of those officers ought to be decreased.

Departmental Buildings, including \$100 required to pay for firing the noon gun. \$29,000

Mr. LISTER. What is the object of firing the noon gun?

Mr. COCHRANE. To make it sound like your speech.

Mr. LISTER. I ask the hon. gentleman why the country should be put to that expense, notwithstanding the interruption of the hon. gentleman who has been charged with the skim milk business.

Contingencies in connection with the Department of Interior. . . \$18,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the House and the country at large are entitled to a very full explanation of the reasons which induced the Minister of Interior to reappoint to office the gentleman who was suspended last year. His suspension took place for causes which seemed at the time *prima facie* to justify it—at any rate, the Government took the responsibility and the House did not complain of it. After a time, while he was discharging temporarily, I believe, under suspension, the duties of the office, he has been reappointed. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take the House into his confidence and explain what reasons induced him to make that reappointment?

Mr. DALY. I can only say that my reasons for reappointing Mr. Burgess are, briefly, that I have known him as former deputy head of that department for a number of years, having had a great deal of business to do with the department. I always found him to be a very courteous and obliging officer, and one who seemed to have the work of the department, so to speak, at his fingers' ends. Since I became the head of the department I have had better reasons to judge of his qualifications for the position he fills, and I am satisfied, from my own experience, that no better officer, or no better head of a department, exists in the service. Mr. Burgess has been connected with the department for some sixteen years, and during a part of that time he has been at the head of that department. He has a peculiar knowledge of all affairs pertaining to the Department of the Interior, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is one of the largest departments in the service; and I think it would have been a great misfortune to the department and to the Government to have lost the services of an officer who had the requirements that I speak of. Now, as to what the hon. gentleman said in reference to the suspension of Mr. Burgess, of course, he is aware of the debate that took place in the House last year, and I do not know that I could add much

information to that which was given by my predecessor then. Mr. Burgess was reappointed entirely upon his merits, from the fact that he was a good officer, that he had the qualifications of which I have spoken, and that he would make, in my opinion, one of the most efficient deputy heads in the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very sorry to hear a minister of the Crown state that Mr. Burgess, after what has happened, is as good as any deputy minister in the service of the Crown. That is not a compliment to the other deputy ministers. The House will recollect that Mr. Burgess appeared before the Public Accounts Committee, and that very grave irregularities were found to have occurred in his department; many grave improprieties were discovered in that department; they were so grave that he had to be suspended, and the head of the department, although very anxious to protect Mr. Burgess, was utterly unable last year, in my judgment, to give any justification or any reasonable ground for his practical reinstatement. The Government, bearing in mind the results to Canada of the exposures which then took place, ought to have been excessively careful before they restored any man who had been implicated in them. What they are now doing is to make public proclamation to the other heads of departments, that conduct like that of Mr. Burgess, which involved, to say the least of it, the disapprobation of his chief, and which involved a very grave irregularity, is not to be considered a bar to his advancement to the very highest post in the service, and perhaps the most responsible post. It is impossible to suppose that it was not in the power of the department to obtain other gentlemen with as much information and as much knowledge of the affairs of the Interior as that gentleman possessed. I must say that if they wished to demoralize the Civil Service worse than the evidence laid before us showed that it was demoralized, the reinstatement of Mr. Burgess, in my opinion, is the best way to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is one other remark to make, and that is the reinstatement of Mr. Burgess in his place in the department would seem to be an act of injustice towards those who were dismissed for similar irregularities. Now, I have personally no word to say against Mr. Burgess. I never had any work in the Interior Department; but I have always heard him spoken of as an obliging deputy and thoroughly well acquainted with his duties. But you must remember the relation in which he stood to the public and to the department. He had been guilty in conniving at irregularities, or committing irregularities. He was the deputy head of the department, to whom the staff looked up; and it is well known that if in an army officers find their chief guilty of want of discipline that will spread to the rank and file. So in his case, that which

might have been a venial offence on the part of a subordinate, becomes a much more serious offence when committed by a gentleman occupying his position. I am not going to discuss now, as we discussed at great length last year, the character of that offence. The House is sufficiently well aware of it. It was sufficiently grave, in the opinion of the Government, to cause them to suspend Mr. Burgess from his duties for many months, and it is well known, as remarked by my hon. friend, that although the then Minister of the Interior was anxious, nay, determined—and he evinced his determination on more than one occasion in this House—to reinstate his deputy, the other ministers of the Crown would not consent to any such reinstatement taking place last year. May I ask upon what grounds, if there is to be an act of oblivion passed for these offences, that gentleman is to be restored and others are to be ruined? Why, there was a gentleman in the Department of Railways, a Mr. Bradley, who was suspended from his office because he permitted one person to do work for which another person drew the salary. That was a departmental offence; I understand that the work which a son of his was paid for doing was done by that son's aunt or some other relation; and Mr. Bradley was suspended from his duties, properly enough, I dare say. He had broken the departmental rules; he had set a very bad example; he was guilty of drawing public money improperly and contrary to law, and therefore he was suspended, and has been out in the cold ever since; he has been disgraced and lost his office. His name comes to me as one. There seems to be fish made of one and flesh of another. The gentleman who is just as guilty of breach of departmental rules, of an offence which can only demoralize the whole department, is reinstated at the head of it, while the other gentleman remains in disgrace to-day. I say that is not fair-play. I say if there is to be an act of oblivion passed, that these gentlemen who stand upon the same footing, ought to be treated alike. It can only demoralize the whole public service if they find that a deputy minister, having been suspended for a serious breach of the departmental regulations and rules, is afterwards reinstated because he is sufficiently powerful, apparently, to force his reinstatement upon the minister. What does the hon. gentleman say with regard to this distinction? At first blush it appears to be unjust and unfair. I repeat, if one is to be restored, let them all be placed in the same position. Canada gained an unenviable notoriety from the disclosures made with reference to the Interior Department, and the Railway Department and others, owing to the irregularities and looseness with which the public business, to say the least of it, was conducted. The Government were applauded, they claimed to be applauded for their prompt and energetic measures to oust those from the Civil Service who had done these things. Here we are to-day calmly

endorsing the action of the Government in reversing their action last year, and reinstating a gentleman who was suspended for these departmental offences. Much as I would desire to see this gentleman, whose matter is before the House, reinstated, I cannot see that sufficient reasons have been given to justify the House in assenting to it.

Administration of Justice—Miscellaneous Expenditure, including N.W.T.	\$37,000
Circuit Allowances, B.C.	\$7,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On what principle are these circuit allowances made up? They seem to be much larger than formerly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They depend on the distances travelled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the distances in British Columbia very much greater than in the North-west?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. In the North-west there are districts, and while there is some travelling in the districts, it is not very much compared with British Columbia. In British Columbia the actual expenditure on a circuit will sometimes go up to \$1,000. The distances are very long and travelling very expensive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought this had been provided for by giving county judges to a large extent to the province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have some county judges there, but their jurisdiction is limited, and the Queen's Bench judges have to go on circuit.

Official Arbitrators	\$2,000
----------------------------	---------

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are official arbitrators still retained?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only those in office. The salaries are paid during their lives, and vacancies are not to be filled. Two have dropped off.

Travelling Expenses of Official Arbitrators	\$500
---	-------

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While I can understand the salaries of the official arbitrators being continued as a sort of pension, I cannot understand why travelling expenses should be paid them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The arbitrators are used as referees in connection with the Exchequer Court, and they make reports to the departments on claims made. According to the Act, as they drop out, the court will appoint its own referees, without salary, and as required from time to time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How many of the arbitrators are now living?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only Messrs. Muma and Compton.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I notice that Mr. Cowan is still drawing a salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was superannuated last year at his regular salary of \$1,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I saw that \$1,000 was paid to him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That very likely was up to 30th June.

Expenditure under Cap. 181 R.S.C.	\$700
-----------------------------------	-------

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the purpose of this expenditure?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is an allowance made to an executioner.

Printing and Distributing Supreme Court Reports	\$2,750
---	---------

Mr. LISTER. On what system are the reports distributed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a small list for distribution, but the reports are sold, and the revenue is devoted to the purchase of books for the library.

Exchequer Court—To pay increased salary to A. A. Audette	\$100
--	-------

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was that increase of salary given to the registrar?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Last year, Mr. Audette was appointed under the Statute, practically at the rank of chief clerk, at a salary of \$2,000. I proposed last year to Parliament that he should be paid the regular salary of a chief clerk and allowed the statutory increase until his salary reached \$2,400. He received \$300 as editor of the reports, and he at present receives \$2,400.

Salary of Registrar in Admiralty, Quebec	\$666
--	-------

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot understand why salaries should be paid to the registrar and marshal of the Admiralty Court in Quebec, when this is not done to the officers of any other Admiralty Court in the Dominion. I thought when the new Act was introduced and the new code established, all the officials would be placed on the same footing. Although the registrar at Halifax does three or four times as much work as the Quebec registrar, he is paid no salary, but only fees.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The explanation which I gave last year I must repeat now. The judge, registrar and marshal at Quebec were appointed at their present salaries, which differ from those paid to similar officers in the Maritime provinces. For my part, I would not think of proposing to Parliament, if the offices were vacant, to reappoint officers at rates different from those that prevail in the Maritime provinces; but we cannot make reductions while the incumbents hold their positions, more especially as the Imperial Act provided that, in assuming jurisdiction and power to legislate on the subject, we should not interfere with the salaries of the incumbents.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That applied to the judges. I do not think that it extended to the subordinate officials.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so, but I would not be positive on that point. At all events, it would hardly be fair to interfere with them.

Mr. HAZEN. In New Brunswick, as in other provinces, except Quebec, the registrar has been paid by fees. The system is a very unsatisfactory one and, I think, a very unfair one to the registrar of the court, because there is always difficulty in a practitioner collecting fees which go simply to himself. Any man who has been in a position of that sort knows that there is that difficulty. The consequence is that the registrars of these courts are placed at a very considerable disadvantage, as compared with a registrar who has a fixed salary. The position of the registrar in Quebec is, for that reason, a better one than the position of the Admiralty Court in the other provinces. It seems to me that a system should be adopted by which stamps should be attached to documents, as is done on the law side of the court in nearly all the provinces of the Dominion. If it were required that the fees should be paid by stamping the documents, then these fees could go to the Government, and a salary equivalent to the amount of the stamps paid to the registrar. That would be a more satisfactory system all round than the present one. I would ask the Minister of Justice to give his consideration to this matter before the next session of Parliament.

Mr. LISTER. I would take the opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the Admiralty Act as passed last session is not at all workable in Ontario, outside the city of Toronto. The judge in admiralty is appointed in Toronto, while under the Maritime Act, before it was repealed, there were surrogate judges at the different points throughout the province, such as Windsor and Goderich and other places. There was no difficulty at that time in getting a warrant for the seizure of a vessel for debt, but as the law now stands an affidavit has to be made and forwarded to Toronto, and a writ issued in Toronto and sent back again to the sheriff of the place where a vessel may be. During the time these proceedings are being taken the vessel gets away. The First Minister will understand how important it is in making an arrest of a vessel, that no time should be lost. As I have said, the Act is of no use to-day outside the city of Toronto. I do not see that there could be any difficulty in appointing surrogate or associate judges, or whatever you may please to call them, in the different seaport towns, and empowering them to issue warrants upon a proper affidavit being presented.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will take up that subject and see what can be done about it. I may say that under the Act we have passed, we have power to deal with the subject.

Mr. LISTER. I think you have. I may say that in one case in which I was interested, I wrote to the registrar of the court at Toronto, and he told me that if I telegraphed to him he would send authority to the sheriff, by telegraph, to arrest the boat; but of course he had no right to do that without an affidavit showing grounds to justify the arrest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman state how many cases were tried in Quebec during the last year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot just now, but I have looked into the matter, and I found that the volume of business is about the same in Quebec as in Halifax, and about the same as in St. John.

Mr. FRASER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that a very large amount of extra work is given by the Speedy Trials Act to the county court judges in Nova Scotia, and that the amount allowed them for travelling expenses is insufficient. I know, for example, that the judge of county court No. 5 comes over once a month—it is a great saving, of course, to the county to have criminals tried speedily under this excellent law—but the amount allowed him for travelling expenses is not at all sufficient to cover the outlay.

Mr. LISTER. How much do they get?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. \$200 a year.

Mr. FRASER. The county court judges in my province have a great deal of travelling to do, and it is only fair that a reasonable amount should be allowed them for expenses. I would suggest that they should be allowed \$20 or \$30 a trip, and then, of course, if he does not travel the amount would be saved. At all events, the judges should not be at a loss, out of pocket, by having to travel to discharge that duty.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend speaks about judges in Nova Scotia having to travel to hold two or three courts during the year in certain towns; but in the province of Ontario the judges have to hold fourteen, or fifteen, or sixteen courts every two months, and the amount allowed them is \$200 a year. They have to travel all over the county by rail, or by hiring horses, or whatever way it may be necessary for them to get to where the court is held. I do not know that I have heard any complaints from the judges so far as that allowance is concerned; but I will take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that in the province of Ontario there are twelve or fourteen junior judges who were appointed on a salary of \$2,000 a year, with \$200 a year

travelling expenses. They have all the duties to perform that the senior judges have ; they have to hold the division courts in nearly all cases, they hold the county judges' criminal courts, and they take their share of county court work twice a year. I think myself as a member of the bar, and as one knowing something about what some of these gentlemen have to do, that they ought to be placed on a footing of equality with county court judges. I cannot see upon what principle a junior judge who has the same responsibility as a senior judge, should have his salary fixed at \$2,000, and without any chance of getting any increased pay, while the salary of the senior judges increases up to \$2,600 besides the fees of the surrogate court, which I venture to say make their income on an average of \$3,000. The junior judges have equal duties to perform with the senior judges and I cannot see why there should be a distinction made between them. At all events I think the Government should allow these judges sufficient to enable them to live respectably. Any person who has lived in the country and understands what the cost of living there is, must know that a judge cannot live on a salary of \$2,000 a year in a way compatible with the position he is expected to occupy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am aware that the Speedy Trials Act has very much increased the travel and labour. Still, I do not remember having been shown that the allowance of \$200 did not cover the actual travelling expenses of any of the judges. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell me.

Mr. FRASER. I was speaking particularly in reference to the county court judge of the District of Cumberland and Pictou, and I think the same will be found true of the judge of the District of Antigonish, Inverness and Guysborough, who has a very great distance to travel. Instead of establishing a fixed sum, I think it would be preferable to allow the judges a certain amount for each visit. I believe that it would be more satisfactory to the judges themselves, and that \$200 would be found sufficient to cover the average expenses. It would be more equitable than allowing to each judge \$200, which in one case may be more than the actual outlay, and in another case less.

Kingston Penitentiary. . . . \$190,443 66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Justice will deem this a fitting time to make a full explanation to the House as to certain disagreeable statements which have appeared in the public prints from time to time touching irregularities in this penitentiary. I may also call the attention of the House to a passage in the report of the Inspector of Penitentiaries in regard to a matter which requires considerable attention at the hands of this House, and from the Department of Agri-

Mr. LISTER.

culture and Immigration in particular. That gentleman says :

Of late years, our penitentiaries have had a most undesirable, because a most hardened and irreclaimable class of criminals added to their numbers. This is particularly the case at Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul, where those cockney sneak thieves and pickpockets, referred to, are numerous. These pests, gathered from the slums of St. Giles and East London, after short terms of so-called probation, in a certain notoriously mismanaged refuge, are periodically shipped out to Canada, as immigrants deserving of encouragement and support. With very few exceptions—as the police of our cities and towns know—these street Arabs from Whitechapel and Rotherhithe and Ratchiff and other like haunts of vice, speedily return to their old habits, on arriving in Canada, and, as a consequence, become a burden and an expense upon the taxpayers of the Dominion, in our reformatories, jails and penitentiaries. Steeped as they have been in crime, from infancy, because inherited, they are found to be the most troublesome and worst conducted convicts that reach our penitentiaries. Their evil influence in corrupting others is potent and pernicious. The general verdict of the chaplains and the other prison officers, regarding those youthful imitators of Fagin and Bill Sykes, is most unfavourable. They consider them dead to all good influences and that their reformation is hopeless. In order to protect the community, against the depredations of such thoroughly trained malefactors, and our youth, especially, against the evil effects of their example and influence, it were advisable that effectual means be adopted to prevent mistaken philanthropists, abroad and at home, aiding and encouraging the transplanting to Canada of exotics so upas-like and so unsuited to the soil and moral atmosphere of the country.

Now, that is a somewhat grave indictment of a certain percentage of the immigrants who have come to this country of late years, and if the Inspector of Penitentiaries finds the number of this class sufficiently large to call for so very formidable a notice, there is no doubt that the Government will be well advised to take energetic steps to prevent the scum of London being dumped upon us. We have, in my judgment, quite enough to do in looking after Canadian criminals, convicted and unconvicted, and I think the greatest care must be taken not to augment the number of that description of importation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The inspector has not been accessible to me since this report was laid on the Table a few days ago ; but the information in my hands did not justify me in asking him to moderate or withhold the opinions he desired to express on that subject. Very careful inquiry will be made, however, as to whether the inspector's views are correct, or whether the contentions of the managers of the institutions from which these immigrants come are correct. As regards affairs at Kingston Penitentiary, I will speak in general terms, and if my explanation does not meet the hon. gentleman's wish, and he calls my attention to any particulars, I will answer further. An investigation took place into the management of the affairs of that institution during last summer. The attention of the department was

called to what were claimed to be irregularities connected with the stores, the supplies and the farm there, and a set of questions were suggested to the department as likely to elicit information if pressed upon the officers of the penitentiary. I felt bound to press those questions in the way in which they were suggested to me. The result was that the answers were not clear and satisfactory, and an investigation extending over some weeks was held by the inspector, with officers to assist him. As a result of that inquiry, I had to call upon the accountant to resign his position. I came to the conclusion likewise that the farmer was not so efficient a farmer as we required for the institution. I did not come to the conclusion that he had been guilty of dishonesty, but I came to the conclusion that supplies were lost to the prison in consequence of his want of skill, and that his general conduct of the business of the farm was not satisfactory. I, therefore, instructed the warden to make inquiry as to where he could get a thoroughly skilled, and, if possible, scientific farmer, so that the work of the farm could be properly carried on, and loss, if possible, prevented. I have left the investigation as to the fitness of any of the applicants to the warden himself, and I expect in a few days to receive his report as to the person whom he thinks should be selected to fill the position.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume that a detailed report has been placed in the hands of the hon. gentleman in reference to all these matters to which he has referred.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An immense mass of evidence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But no general report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not. I think the evidence was just laid before me by the inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without any comments?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so; I may be mistaken as to that, and if so I will bring it down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is a report it should be placed on the Table.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What officers did the hon. gentleman dismiss?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I dispensed with the services of the accountant and filled his place by the appointment of young Mr. Creighton, who has been a great many years the warden's clerk there. I also dispensed with the farmer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was \$137,000 spent in 1891-92 on Kingston Penitentiary; the grant this year is \$190,000. How is that accounted for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A considerable sum was voted last year for the equipment and organization of a new prison, but the staff has not yet been appointed because the prison is not completed, and that accounts for the discrepancy between the actual and the estimated expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that account for the whole \$50,000 difference?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not for the whole, there is also \$30,000 for the machinery, which has not yet been bought because the prison is not yet ready, but that and the additional staff will about account for the whole. The cost of supplies is only conjectural.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are many large increases of working expenses, nearly \$10,000, although the number of convicts is less.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expenses of maintenance, as I have just explained, is altogether based on conjecture. We have to conjecture the number we will require, and the price of supplies is estimated for twenty more.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to submit any comparative statement of the cost of keeping the inmates of this and other penitentiaries, say in the United States? The cost of clothing and rations alone is \$245 per head, which seems a very large sum. Of course, if the supplies are tendered for, it must be supposed that the competition would secure the lowest prices, but I notice some articles charged at very high rates. For instance, 90 cents a bushel for peas is a very high price. Could the hon. gentleman give any information with regard to the cost of similar establishments in the state of New York?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very confident that from what I know of the penitentiaries in the state of New York that the cost per capita must be greatly over ours. They manage their prisons on different principles, and on principles, which compared with ours, are very much advanced as regards methods. I do not think that the cost of maintenance has been materially increased, though it may have been slightly. It has been increased if we take into consideration the organization of the staff and salaries of the staff, because we have provided for the organization of a new prison, for the purpose of separating those classes of convicts which the House consider ought to be separated, and the organization of the staff for a separate system of that kind will increase the expense as compared with the old system of simply working them together in a gang. I do not think that as regards the actual maintenance of the convicts there can be much increase. The regulations as to clothing have been changed somewhat, a better class of clothing has been provided, but there is no increase otherwise. Instead of the old

system of clothing the prisoners in two colours, we have provided three grades of tweed clothing. The system of red and white legs, or red and grey, has been abolished, and now when the prisoner comes in we put him into a suit of checked tweed of one colour; and accordingly, as he serves his time well and merits promotion, we change the clothing and give him a higher grade; so that any person going through the prison can see who are the better behaved, who are the worse behaved, and those who have just come in. We have found that a good thing, and in fact our old system of parti-coloured clothing has been abolished as morally degrading to the self-respect of the convicts themselves. We find this new system has a very good tendency in promoting good behaviour.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the Minister had any estimate as to the probable revenue to be derived from the manufacture of twine, and as to the cost of the machinery they are putting in? I see the revenue from the penitentiary is only \$3,600 altogether. It is very desirable that these convicts should be made to serve the country in some way when they are consuming such a large amount annually. It is to be hoped that when this machinery is put in and they are set to work to make that article, the revenue of the penitentiary may be considerably increased. It is really too bad that we have to support 532 convicts and the entire revenue is only \$3,600 a year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would not like to give an estimate of the probable prices at which we can sell this twine, but it is the intention to put in machinery that will turn out about 500 tons a year.

Mr. FRASER. How soon do you expect that work will begin?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think by the 1st of July we will have everything ready.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to know what investigation has been made before the Government committed themselves to the manufacture of binding twine, and as to that being the best method of employing convict labour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are almost puzzled to find employment for those who will be in the prison of isolation. It is not easy at all times to find out-door work for them. We have had a great deal to do within the last two years in completing prison structures, and there are yet prison institutions that I want to erect by convict labour, a separate prison for women, another for the insane, who now occupy one large ward, yet having no out-door exercise and employment such as persons of this class should have. The industries that can be availed of for prisoners separated, are but few. We have had reports made by the warden, and investigations made in other prisons in various parts of the country, to ascertain what

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

industries could be made available for them in that way, and at the same time fairly profitable. There are very few, as I have said, and we have thought that binding twine could be manufactured there with advantage without interfering very seriously with other industries of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain exactly to us what he proposes to do with these prisons of isolation? Is it the intention to introduce long periods of absolutely solitary confinement?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, not long periods of solitary confinement; but we desire to separate the incorrigible persons for one class, and the youthful prisoners for another, but we do not desire to prevent association among these themselves. The absolute separate system is one that we have never adopted in this country, and of which I have not sufficient knowledge to recommend. We desire to separate them and put first offenders at industries of that kind, so that they may not be obliged to associate with a worse class of convicts. They may be a class by themselves and profitably employed. Eventually, I am going to ask Parliament to consider a scheme for a separate prison for first offenders, especially first offenders under the age of 30 should undergo methods of treatment entirely different from that to which others are subjected. But in the meantime we propose to use prison isolation for them as well as for the worst class.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister at what season of the year these contracts are called for by advertisement?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1st of July.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice in looking over the Auditor-General's Report that a large quantity of wheat was bought at a price as high as \$1.17 a bushel, and a large quantity at \$1.12. I notice, also, that flour has been bought at \$2.50 and \$2.60 a bag. I think it would be in the interest of economy to buy flour instead of buying wheat at that price.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have dispensed with the mill altogether; and we intend to buy flour. The mill required very extensive repairs, and we thought it was better to abolish it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the object of putting that in?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was a theory of the late Mr. Creighton that he could grind flour for all the penitentiaries and reduce the cost. But the mill became old-fashioned and altogether unsuitable. One of the disadvantages was that it did not employ convict labour. We had to employ a miller to run the mill, and in that way we were interfering with other industries and still not finding work for the convicts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would the Minister give me the price at which the contracts for flour are given out?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not taken any contracts for flour for Kingston, because we have been using the mill all along down to the present time. I have asked tenders for the purchase of the mill, but I have not had any offer yet for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. In examining into the question of finding employment for convict labour, which I presume is one that has given the Minister a good deal of thought, has he ever examined into the question of employing such labour by contract upon public works outside the prison, of course. The system is pursued, I understand, in a number of American states, with what success I am not aware.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We were cut off from that source of finding employment, because a statute was passed before I came into office, forbidding it being done—I suppose in deference to the wishes of the labour population.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the repeal of that statute could have been secured if the minister had desired it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt. I have no inclination to ask Parliament to reverse that policy. Down to four years ago about eighty convicts were employed at lock-making, but when that contract expired it was not renewed in consequence of the Act I have mentioned.

Mr. FRASER. Does the statute prevent those convicts being employed on Government works? An excellent opportunity has been offered to employ them on the Kingston works. That appears to me to be the best method of employing convicts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had no great quantity of surplus labour as yet, but when we find it necessary to shut up the men we furnish inside work for them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This question of employing prison labour is a very difficult one, because every hundred men employed displaces so much labour outside.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A vote of \$20,000 was taken for machinery in 1892-93, and none of this has been spent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nothing has been spent yet, because the prison in which we propose to place the machinery is not yet ready for occupation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose will the machinery be used?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The whole sum will be required for machinery for binding twine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from the facts brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), there might be a profit derived from that industry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope it will turn out to be the case.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary \$102,331 29

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no substantial increase in this item, except an item for an instructor, called a "carriage-maker instructor," who is to be employed for the purpose of instructing convicts in carriage-making and repairing. A good deal of repairing work is done outside, and the department is going to try the experiment of employing an instructor in this trade.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe by the report of the Minister of Justice that the average number of inmates of this institution is 353, the average cost per capita is \$248, and the revenue per capita \$3.48. Is it the intention to utilize convict labour in that institution, as at Kingston?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. A great deal of work is required for the completion of the penitentiary. We are now constructing a boundary wall, and there will be abundance of work for some years on the institution itself. Moreover, guards are required. Kingston is a much more complete institution, its boundary walls have been finished, and it is almost perfect, excepting that it is old-fashioned; but St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary is an old reformatory, and not suitable for a penitentiary without extensive changes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I take it that no work is done inside the institution.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no inside work done, and the products of the farm are not credited; only cash received is credited.

Mr. FRASER. The staff includes one surgeon, one schoolmaster and two chaplains. \$2,400 is a somewhat large amount to pay for chaplains.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They give their whole time.

Mr. FRASER. I doubt whether that is necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is one Protestant and another Catholic?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We cannot get along without two chaplains. \$1,200 is not too much to pay a clergyman who gives his whole time to the work. One chaplain is Protestant and the other is Catholic.

Mr. FRASER. There are 200 convicts at Dorchester and two chaplains are employed, but they only receive half as much salary as the chaplains at St. Vincent de Paul.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are not required to give their whole time to the work.

Mr. FRASER. I can scarcely see how 100 more convicts can make much difference, and that the whole time of two chaplains is needed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there are about 60 Protestants at St. Vincent de Paul, and the balance are Roman Catholics, who form a very considerable congregation. I cannot give the Protestant chaplain less salary than the other, especially as he has a family to support.

British Columbia Penitentiary \$49,449 15

Mr. FRASER. I notice that in Dorchester Penitentiary there are 200 convicts, and that the total sum asked is \$46,000; whereas in British Columbia Penitentiary, with 100 convicts, the amount asked is \$49,000. It requires more to keep 100 in British Columbia than 200 in Dorchester.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You have to keep the same staff for 600 convicts as you have for 500. Of course you require more guards, but the staff is just the same.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Postmaster-General for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PONTIAC ELECTION PETITION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Honourable Mr. Justice Loranger and the Honourable Mr. Justice Malhiot, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, and amendments thereto, a report and judgment relating to the election for the electoral District of Pontiac, by which the election petition was dismissed and the sitting member declared duly elected.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented the report of the special committee appointed to report Lists of Members of Select Standing Committees of this House, as follows:—

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Adams,
Amyot,
Baker,

Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leclair,

Beausoleil,
Bruneau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Choquette,
Coatsworth,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier),
Ives,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),

Lister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McLeod,
Masson,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Préfontaine,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Weldon, and
Wood (Brockville).—41.

ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs:

Bain (Soulanges),
Belley,
Bennett,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carroll,
Corbould,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Dugas,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Flint,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grieve,

Henderson,
Hutchins,
Legris,
McDonald (Victoria),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Pridham,
Pope,
Reid,
Robillard,
Ryckman,
Simard,
Somerville,
Temple, and
Tyrwhitt.—29.

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

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Adams,
Allan,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Bernard,
Beausoleil,
Béchar, d,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Burns,
Calvin,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Carignan,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,

Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leclair,
Leduc,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McImmerney,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McMullen,
Madill,

Choquette,	Mara,
Christie,	Masson,
Cleveland,	Metcalfe,
Coatsworth,	Mignault,
Cochrane,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cockburn,	Mills (Bothwell),
Corbould,	Montague,
Corby,	Mulock,
Costigan,	Northrup,
Craig,	Quimet,
Curran,	Paterson (Brant),
Daly,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davies,	Perry,
Davin,	Pope,
Davis,	Prefontaine,
Delisle,	Prior,
Denison,	Proulx,
Desaulniers,	Putnam,
Devlin,	Reid,
Dickey,	Rider,
Dupont,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Roome,
Fauvel,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Fraser,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Sanborn,
Geoffrion,	Scriver,
Gibson,	Simard,
Gillies,	Smith (Ontario),
Girouard (Jacq.-Cartier),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Sproule,
Godbout,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Temple,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hazen,	Turotte,
Hearn,	Tyrwhitt,
Henderson,	Vaillancourt,
Hodgins,	Wallace,
Hughes,	Weldon,
Ingram,	White (Cardwell),
Innes,	White (Shelburne),
Ives,	Wilmot,
Jeamotte,	Wood (Brockville),
Joncas,	Wood (Westmoreland), and
Kaulbach,	Yeo.—166.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs :

Allan,	Hodgins,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ives,
Baker,	Joncas,
Barnard,	Kenny,
Beith,	LaRivière,
Belley,	Lavergne,
Bennett,	Leduc,
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lépine,
Boyd,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Campbell,	McAllister,
Carpenter,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McInerney,
Carroll,	McKay,
Casey,	McKeen,
Chesley,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Choquette,	Madill,
Cleveland,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Mignault,
Corbould,	Miller,
Corby,	Moncrief,
Craig,	Monet,
Davies,	Northrup,
Delisle,	Quimet,

Denison,	Pelletier,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Edwards,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Rosamond,
Featherston,	Ross (Dundas),
Frémont,	Smith (Ontario),
Geoffrion,	Stairs,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt,
Girouard (Jacq.-Cartier),	Weldon,
Guillet,	White (Shelburne), and
Hazen,	Yeo.—74.

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

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

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

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

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs :

Amyot,	Mackintosh,
Bergin,	Maclean (York),
Bourassa,	McLean (King's),
Charlton,	McMullen,
Costigan,	Putnam,
Davin,	Rider,
Grandbois,	Somerville,
Innes,	Stevenson,
Kaulbach,	Sutherland,
Landerkin,	Taylor, and
LaRivière,	Tisdale.—23.
Lépine,	

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Adams,	Joncas,
Baker,	Landerkin,
Bécharé,	Langelier,
Bergeron,	Lister,
Bergin,	Lowell,
Boyle,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bryson,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cameron,	McDonald (Pictou),
Campbell,	McGregor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Carscallen,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Madill,
Charlton,	Mills (Annapolis),
Chesley,	Mills (Bothwell),
Coatsworth,	Moncrieff,

Cochrane,	Montague.
Corby,	Mulock.
Costigan,	Quimet.
Daly,	Paterson (Brant).
Davies,	Rinfret.
Devlin,	Scriven.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Somerville.
Forbes,	Sproule.
Foster,	Taylor.
Fraser,	Tisdale.
Gordon,	Tupper.
Haggart,	Wallace.
Hearn,	White (Cardwell).
Hughes,	Wood (Brockville), and
Jeannotte,	Wood (Westmoreland).-- 60.

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

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Allan.	Ives.
Amyot.	Joncas.
Bain (Wentworth).	Kaulbach.
Baird.	Kenny.
Barnard.	Lachapelle.
Beausoleil.	Langelier.
Béchar.	Langevin (Sir Hector).
Beith.	Laurier.
Bernier.	Lister.
Borden.	Livingston.
Bowers.	Lowell.
Bowman.	Macdonald (King's).
Boyd.	Macdonald (Winnipeg).
Boyle.	McDowall.
Bruneau.	McAlister.
Burnham.	McCarthy.
Burns.	McDonald (Victoria).
Calvin.	McDougald (Pictou).
Cargill.	McDougall, (Cape Breton).
Carignan.	McKay.
Carling.	McLennan.
Caron (Sir Adolphe).	McLeod.
Carscallen.	McNeill.
Cartwright (Sir Richard).	Mara.
Charlton.	Masson.
Chesley.	Metcalfe.
Cleaveland.	Mills (Bothwell).
Coatsworth.	Moncrieff.
Cochrane.	Mulock.
Cockburn.	Northrup.
Colter.	O'Brien.
Corby.	Quimet.
Craig.	Paterson (Brant).
Curran.	Patterson (Huron).
Daly.	Pelletier.
Davies.	Pope.
Devlin.	Préfontaine.
Dickey.	Prior.
Dugas.	Putnam.
Dyer.	Rider.
Earle.	Rowand.
Edgar.	Ryckman.
Edwards.	Sanborn.
Featherston.	Scriven.
Flint.	Semple.
Forbes.	Smith (Sir Donald).
Foster.	Stairs.
Fraser.	Sutherland.
Fréchette.	Temple.
Geoffrion.	Thompson (Sir John).
Gibson.	Tisdale.
Gillies.	Turcotte.
Girouard (Jacq.-Cartier)	Wallace.
Guay.	Welsh.
Guillet.	White (Cardwell).
Haggart.	White (Shelburne).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Hazen.	Wilson.
Hearn.	Wood (Westmoreland) and
Henderson.	Yeo.—118.

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

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Bain (Soulanges).	Ingram.
Bain (Wentworth).	Innes.
Beith.	Jeannotte.
Bergeron.	Joncas.
Bernier.	LaRivière.
Bowers.	Leduc.
Bowman.	Lagris.
Boyd.	Lepine.
Brodeur.	Lippé.
Burnham.	Livingston.
Burns.	Macdonald (Huron).
Calvin.	Macdonald (King's).
Cameron.	Macdowall.
Carignan.	Mackintosh.
Carling.	McDonald (Assiniboia).
Carpenter.	McGregor.
Casey.	McLean (King's).
Choquette.	McLennan.
Christie.	McMillan (Huron).
Cleaveland.	McNeill.
Cochrane.	Mara.
Corbould.	Marshall.
Daly.	Metcalfe.
Davin.	Mignault.
Davis.	Miller.
Dawson.	Montague.
Desaulniers.	O'Brien.
Dugas.	Paterson (Brant).
Dupont.	Patterson (Colechester).
Dyer.	Perry.
Earle.	Pope.
Edwards.	Pridham.
Fairbairn.	Putnam.
Fauvel.	Reid.
Featherston.	Robillard.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.).	Roome.
Ferguson (Renfrew).	Rosamond.
Forbes.	Ross (Dundas).
Fréchette.	Ross (Lisgar).
Frémont.	Rowand.
Gibson.	Sanborn.
Gillies.	Semple.
Gillmor.	Smith (Ontario).
Girouard (Two Mount'ns).	Sproule.
Godbout.	Sutherland.
Gordon.	Taylor.
Grieve.	Turcotte.
Guay.	Tyrwhitt.
Henderson.	Wilmot.
Hodgins.	Wilson, and
Hutchins.	Wood (Westmoreland).-- 102.

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

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 12) to determine the hours of the daily labour of workmen and others in the employ of the Government or of Government contractors.—(Mr. Lepine.)

**MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—
ROYAL COMMISSION ON CHARGES
AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.**

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of the report of the Commissioners appointed by Royal Commission to take evidence as to the truth or falsity of certain charges made against Sir Adolphe P. Caron, member of the House of Commons and of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, with copies of the evidence and exhibits thereto pertaining.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

OTTAWA, 6th February, 1893.

POSTMASTER AT GUILDS, ONT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, Whether the postmaster at Guilds, in the county of Kent, Ont., has resigned his position as postmaster? If so, when? Has any person been appointed in his place as postmaster at that place, and is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy at an early date?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The postmaster at this place resigned in August last. His son was appointed in his place.

**MANITOBA SEPARATE SCHOOLS—
LEGAL EXPENSES.**

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, How much has been paid by the Government as costs in the legal contestation over the question of the right of the Manitoba Legislature to abolish the system of Separate or Denominational Schools formerly in existence in that province? Is any amount still due or payable by Government as costs in connection with the matter in question? If so, how much? Is it the intention of the Government to bear the expenses connected with the hearing of the appeal of the Manitoba minority by the Governor-General in Council?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The sum paid is about \$13,000. Something is still due; but the amount is not yet determined. To the third part of the question the answer is, No.

COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. SCRIVER asked, At or about what date does the Government expect that the report of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic will be made?

Mr. FOSTER. Before the next session of Parliament.

Mr. SCRIVER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sum of money to provide for the printing of the evidence taken by the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

Mr. DICKEY asked, If the report of the Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic is received at date sufficiently early for that purpose, is it the intention of the Government to cause the evidence taken by that commission to be printed and distributed to the members of Parliament before the next session?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

RUSTICO BREAKWATER.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Was any survey made during the year 1892, by any engineer of the Public Works Department, of the breakwater at Rustico? Has the department any report of the condition of that work during the summer and autumn of 1892? What is the latest official report in the possession of the department on this breakwater?

Mr. OUMET. During the year 1892 a careful survey was made by an engineer of the Public Works Department of the breakwater at Rustico. The latest report in the department was received on the 24th of November last.

SANDFORD, N.S., BREAKWATER.

Mr. FLINT asked, Does the Government propose to ask for an appropriation, at the present session of Parliament, for the purpose of repairing the breakwater at Sandford, in the county of Yarmouth, N.S.?

Mr. OUMET. I cannot say until the Supplementary Estimates are before the House.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS FOR COAL.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Who has the contract or contracts for supplying the Government buildings at Ottawa with coal? How many tons do the contracts provide for, and what are the prices for bituminous and anthracite coal? Is it stated in the contracts for bituminous coal that Canadian coal should be supplied? Has the Government any knowledge that Nova Scotia coal was used at any time in the buildings; and if so, why was its use not continued?

Mr. OUMET. The contract was awarded last summer to the lowest tenderer, Messrs. C. C. Ray & Company, for anthracite coal, the number of tons and price per ton being: smith's size, five tons of 2,220 lbs. each, \$7 per ton; furnace size, 2,400 tons, at \$5.73 per ton; stove size, fifty tons, \$5.73 per ton; egg size, twenty-five tons, \$5.73 per ton. No tenders were called for bituminous coal, our supply being drawn by our means of transport from our shipyard at Sorel during the past summer. Some years previous, when tenders were called for, Nova Scotia coal was specified and obtained. Nova Scotia coal is now used when soft coal is required.

MONTREAL MEDICAL INSPECTOR.

Mr. LEPINE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a medical inspector for the port of Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. The duties pertaining to maritime sanitation belong to the Dominion Government, those pertaining to public health are matters belonging to the Provincial Governments. The maintenance of a medical inspector at Montreal belongs to the latter category. The whole subject is under consideration, on a report made at a recent conference, by representatives of the provinces.

SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. MULLOCK asked, 1. What is the total number of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada? What is the total annual amount of their salaries? 2. If members of the North-west Police are not included in such number, then what is the total number of persons in such last-mentioned service, and what is the total amount of their salaries, and allowances and payments on account of the police.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should make a motion for a return on this subject. The question will require some examination from the different departments and some reports from the outside service. I take it for granted, from the lower portion of the question, that the object of the hon. gentleman is to ascertain the salaries of the outside Civil Service as well as the inside, and I understand this question to be confined to the members of the service who come under the Civil Service Act.

RICHMOND AND WOLFE REVISING OFFICER.

Mr. RINFRET asked, 1. Who is the revising officer for the electoral division of Richmond and Wolfe, in the province of Quebec? 2. Has there been a revision of the lists made by the returning officer in 1891?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The electoral district of Richmond and Wolfe is, for the purposes of the revision, divided into two parts, and there are two revising officers, namely: F. A. Brien, notary, of Danville, is the revising officer for Wolfe, and has completed his work for the last revision. G. H. A. Brooke, advocate, of Richmond, is the reviser for Richmond, and has not yet reported any work done for 1891, though the department has called his attention to the fact.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the report of the Royal Commission intrusted with the investigation of charges against Sir Adolphe Caron. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to have those papers printed at once?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is. I beg to move:

Mr. LEPINE.

That the Message, Report, evidence, etc., be printed forthwith, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. LAURIER. I would now ask whether the correspondence with Newfoundland will be brought down at an early day?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In a day or two.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the report of the sub-committee of the Privy Council on this question be brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved for:

Copy of all petitions, memorials, appeals and of any other documents addressed to His Excellency in Council, since the 15th March, 1892, relating to the Manitoba School Acts of 1890 and to section 22 of the "Manitoba Act" and section 93 of the "British North America Act." Also, copy of all reports to and of all Orders in Council in reference to the same. Also, copies of all correspondence in connection therewith.

He said: In making this motion, I wish to explain to the House that my intention is not to discuss the merits of the question to which it refers. I consider that question as now sub judice, the appeal from the position in which the minority have been placed in Manitoba being now before His Excellency in Council, and, until a decision is arrived at, I do not believe it rests with either the minority or their representatives, or even with this House, to express any opinion on the merits of the case. But, at the same time, while we might not perhaps be in a position to discuss this with proper convenience, it is my duty to take all the necessary steps to have all the papers and documents, in fact, the whole history of that question, put before the members of this House, so that if at a later stage this question comes before us, we shall be in a position to master its details. We shall then have all the documents necessary to the study of its history, and shall be in a better position to make up our minds as to what we shall do in the matter. If I were to consult my own feelings and convictions, I might tell you what they are, but I believe it would be inopportune for me to express my views in the matter before the other members of the House have made themselves fully acquainted with it by perusing all the documents.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved for:

Copy of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council in the appealed case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, commonly known

as the "Manitoba School Case." Also, copy of factums, reports and other documents in connection therewith.

He said: This, the second notice of motion on the Order Paper, should have been made first, and it was my intention to make it first, because the facts to which it relates are anterior to those mentioned in the former notice. However, I hope the whole will be put together in bringing down the papers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the motion include the arguments of counsel before the Judicial Committee.

Motion agreed to.

THE TELEGRAPH SYSTEM OF THE EMPIRE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for:

Correspondence, documents, reports and Orders in Council about a special commission to inquire into the most feasible means of completing the telegraphic system of the Empire.

He said: Some time ago I saw a statement outside of the House, that a special commission had been, or was to be, appointed to inquire into the most feasible means of completing the telegraphic system of the Empire, and that Canada was to have a voice on that commission by some one being appointed to represent her. As this country and Government are very much interested by reason of the telegraph lines belonging to the state, and as our railway companies are also much interested in that system, it is very important that we should have a voice on that commission. A large scheme has been propounded for extending our telegraphic system from the Pacific coast of Canada to Australasia, and some information has been obtained on that subject. When that scheme was first proposed there was no question of the islands of Hawaii being annexed to the United States; but just now that question is before the world, and if reports are to be credited, it is now under the consideration of the Government of the United States. I hope that the representatives of Canada on that commission may have sufficient authority to induce the commission to bring this matter specially before the British Government, in order that our interests in the line or lines of telegraph between the Pacific coast of Canada and the Australian colonies may be properly looked after. It would probably be very difficult for us and for the Empire to have a line of telegraph between Canada and the Australian colonies, if we had not a footing on the island of Hawaii. When this subject was broached I understood that the government of those islands was well disposed towards a line of that kind, but at that time certain persons in the United States were promoting a bill before Congress providing for the construction of a line of telegraph between San Francisco and those islands. We thought, some of us, that we should try to have our line run from Victoria, or from some other

point on our coast, and that we should first construct that portion of the line between our own coast and the islands, leaving the second and longest portion between the islands and Australasia, to be constructed afterwards. However, it was an enterprise of such magnitude that it was not to be expected that Canada should complete it alone. Our interest in the line at present is purely and simply a Canadian interest, although in some respects there may be an Imperial interest as well. The British Government now sees a great advantage in having a railway across the continent on Canadian soil, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, in having a fast line of steamers between Great Britain and Canada, which line, I hope, will be in operation before very long; therefore, that line of telegraph should be added from the Pacific coast in order that we may communicate more readily with our co-subjects in the Australian colonies—we for trade purposes, and Great Britain both for purposes of trade and purposes of defence, and for Imperial interests generally. Under these circumstances, I thought I might be allowed to make a motion of this kind, and, perhaps, a little later on, the Government may give us information as to how our interests can be safe-guarded in connection with this question that has arisen in Hawaii.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman no doubt has a recollection of the measures which were taken during some years past in this connection, because the hon. gentleman himself took a leading part in preparing those measures and in causing the public officers to make the investigations which were necessary to lay before both the Dominion Government and the Government of Her Majesty the fullest information on those subjects, and to bring likewise to the attention of Her Majesty's Government the views we held as to the great importance of completing the telegraphic communication of the Empire in the way in which the hon. gentleman has described. Of late there has been correspondence on the same subject, initiated by the Board of Trade of this city and looking towards the appointment of a commission, as stated in the motion, for the purpose of investigating this whole subject and ascertaining what steps should be taken in order to complete the system. I may say that the object contemplated by the resolutions of the Board of Trade was the appointment of a commission by Her Majesty's Government, and that Canada should have a representative on that commission. The papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

SCHEDULING CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. SPROULE moved for:

Return of all letters, correspondence, reports and all other matter on record, passed between the Department of Agriculture and the High Commissioner

of Canada in London, the Imperial Board of Trade or any other officials of an authoritative body in reference to the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the ports of Great Britain and Ireland, on and after 20th October last.

He said: I move for this return for the purpose of placing in the possession of members of this House all information that is on record regarding this important subject. The privilege we enjoyed in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, up to last October, with respect to sending our cattle to that country was one that was of great importance to the Canadian farmer. It enabled him to send away a class of animals that was scarcely fit for the market, if it was intended for beef, and he could send it at a time when it realized the largest return with the least possible outlay and with the least possible trouble. In order to understand the importance of this question to the Canadian farmer, today, I will give, with the permission of the House, a few figures to show its development during past years. In 1864 we only exported to Great Britain 64 head of cattle. In 1879 the number had increased to 20,588; but those, I believe, were all beef cattle, fully finished for the market. In 1884 the number had reached 53,962; in 1888 it was 60,000; in 1890 it had reached the large total of 123,136. Last year, I believe, there were 117,000 sent, in round numbers. Hon. members will notice in those figures that up to the time the English and Scotch farmers began to take our stockers, or half-fattened cattle, and finish them as beef for the English market, the development was not nearly so rapid; but when it became known by those farmers that they could make use of our grass-fed cattle and finish them with profit to themselves, they took them in very large numbers and the trade with Canada very rapidly developed. As a result, we have been sending over from 117,000 to 123,000 each year. In order to enable the House to see how much profit was realized from that cattle exportation, owing to the privilege we enjoy of sending our cattle to the British market without being scheduled, we must know about how many were prime beef cattle and how many were stockers or cattle taken from the grass. I find that of the large number sent in 1890, 123,136, about 90,000 were grass-fed cattle or stockers, cattle that were not fit to be slaughtered on landing, but which were suitable for feeding and being finished by English and Scotch farmers. In supplying that large number of cattle, the Canadian farmer benefited very materially, because up to that time the cost of raising the cattle was comparatively trifling, for they were fed on straw, coarse grains and pasturage around the farm, that cost very little, and if not fed to those cattle, would have been largely wasted, and so up to that time there was comparatively little expense in fattening them. If the farmer intended to prepare cattle as prime beef for the English market, he is compelled to go

Mr. SPROULE.

further and provide suitable buildings for housing the cattle and prepare fodder for them. All our farmers were not able to do this, but owing to the regulations by which Canadian cattle were admitted into England, while American cattle were scheduled, they were able to send over stockers and sell them at good prices. It is held by some persons that it is unprofitable for Canadian farmers to send over cattle at that stage; but it cannot be denied by those who have paid any attention to agriculture in Canada, that a large number of our farmers are not prepared to expend a large sum to finish cattle for the English market. So long as they are stockers, a very small cost is involved, but if the farmer is obliged to fatten the cattle, he is compelled to erect suitable buildings and house them and provide suitable food for them, and then have to wait for his return. I believe that not more than two out of every ten farmers in the Dominion are to-day prepared to feed cattle and put them in proper condition for shipment to the English market. At the time these cattle were scheduled we enjoyed the important advantage of being able to send them into the old country, where they could be retained until they were prepared for the market. It unfortunately happened that a report was made by the veterinary surgeon of the London Board of Agriculture that some cattle coming from Canada were infected by what is known as pleuropneumonia, or some other contagious disease. I think the cattle on three vessels were reported to be so infected, two of these being the "Monkseton" and the "Huronian." The result was that this report having been made by an expert veterinarian to the British Agricultural Department, it seems that there was no other option but to bring into operation a law which provided that when the cattle from any foreign country were found to be affected with contagious disease, they should be scheduled, and that cattle coming from that country should be killed at the port of landing. Now, so far as our knowledge goes, the people of Canada have never been aware of any contagious disease here. In no part of Canada, as far as the people of the country know, has the disease ever had a footing. In addition to that, the quarantine regulations are such that it would be practically impossible for the disease to get a foothold in this country, because cattle coming from the portions of the United States where disease has been prevalent in the past, as well as cattle coming from the old country, are quarantined for ninety days, and during that time, if disease existed, it would have developed to such an extent that it would be apparent to the veterinary surgeon, whose duty it is to look after the quarantine station. I say again that up to the present we have never known pleuro-pneumonia to exist in this country. I understand that every effort was immediately made by the Minister of Agriculture, and by the Government, through him, to induce the British

Government to raise that schedule, but up to the present it has not been successful. I am also reliably informed that every effort is being made at the present time to satisfy, not only the London Board of Agriculture, but the Imperial Government as well, that there is no just reason for continuing that schedule and that it ought to be raised. It is for the purpose of getting all these papers and this information that I make this motion. The question is a very important one to the farmers of this country; so important that we should at once endeavour to provide such information as will, if possible, convince the English people that there was no just ground for the scheduling of our cattle. The sooner we can do that the better it will be for the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in order to outline what I have in view, in moving for these papers, that I propose that when they are brought down they should be forwarded by order of this House to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, so as to enable that committee to make a more extended inquiry regarding the condition of the cattle in various parts of the Dominion. If it is thought advisable, there can then be brought before that committee veterinarians from different parts of the country to show by their evidence that pleuro-pneumonia has never been known to exist here. In addition to that, our cattle exporters could also be brought before the committee to show that pleuro-pneumonia had never existed in Canada, or in any cattle that had been exported. If found necessary, the committee could go further and bring those in charge of the quarantine stations to prove that the regulations are such regarding imported cattle at quarantine, as to show that it is impossible that disease can be introduced into Canada. After this evidence is obtained by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, a special report on the matter could be made to this House. If, as we anticipate, it will be found that there was no just ground for scheduling our cattle in the British market, then the House could proceed to express its opinion on the matter in the form of the resolution which I have lower down on the Order Paper, and which is to the effect:

That, in the opinion of this House, the recent scheduling of Canadian cattle in the ports of Great Britain and Ireland was not justified by the facts, so far as they have been elicited by the evidence of competent authority, that neither pleuro-pneumonia nor other contagious diseases of similar character has heretofore existed, or does now exist in the Dominion of Canada.

These were my objects in making the motion, and I trust that the Government will see the importance of bringing down this information at the earliest possible date, so that Parliament may be able to deal with the matter in such a way as will convince the English Government that the scheduling of Canadian cattle was not justified.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for discussing the matter at the present time, as my hon. friend states that his object in having this correspondence brought down, is to obtain information upon which his second resolution is to be based. All these papers will be brought down in a very short while, as I think they are in reality prepared, and my hon. friend will see when they are laid before the House that the Government, and all concerned in the matter, have been as careful, and as prompt, and as thorough as possible in putting the information with reference to Canadian cattle before the British Government, and in urging what we all believe to be the fact: the entire freedom of Canadian cattle from pleuro-pneumonia.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for:

Statement showing the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway for the years 1890-91 and 1891-92, and from the 1st July, 1892, to the 31st December, inclusive, under the following headings, viz.:—Passengers, freight, mails and sundries, giving also the number of passengers and the number of tons of freight carried in each of the above named years.

Statement of the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1890-91, and also for the year 1891-92, and from the 1st July, 1892, to the 31st December, inclusive, under the following headings, viz.:—Locomotive power, car expenses, maintenance of way and works, station expenses, general charges, car mileage.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I know that this statement in so far as the previous year is concerned, is in the report of the department, and that the other will be in the departmental reports this year, but it is more convenient to have them together so that we may see the difference between the two years. I ask in the second, as well as in this motion, with the consent of the Minister of Railways, a similar statement to the 31st December last so that we may have the full statement of the facts.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENSES OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL AND RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

Statement showing total amount of money paid since Confederation on each of the following accounts:—(a.) Salary of Governor-General. (b.) Travelling expenses of Governor-General. (c.) Expenditure on Rideau Hall on capital account. Expenditure on Rideau Hall maintenance. Expenditure on Rideau Hall grounds on capital account. Expenditure on Rideau Hall grounds maintenance. (d.) Expenditure on furnishings of all kinds for Rideau Hall. (e.) Allowance to Governor-General for coal and light. (f.) Expenditure on any other account in connection with the office of Governor-General. (g.) Expenditure on any other account in connection with Rideau Hall and grounds. (h.) Total expenditure of every kind since Confederation in connection with the office of Governor-General. (i.) Total expenditure

of every kind in connection with Rideau Hall and grounds.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask that this motion be amended in one particular. Make it read "the total amount of money paid each year since Confederation."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE QUEBEC EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents, whatsoever, respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Quebec Eastern Railway.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in 1891 I moved a motion similar to this, and was told by the then Minister of Railways that he had but a single document in his department respecting the road. The ex-Minister of Public Works then congratulated me and encouraged me to ventilate the question, by saying to me that London was not built in a day. The hon. gentleman can now see that I benefited by his advice, and that I bring the matter up again. If I am well informed, the documents relating to that railway must now be more numerous. An extended correspondence must have taken place between the company and the Government. I need not show once more the advantages of the Quebec Eastern. The company, which was formed in 1888 with the object in view of building this railway which is intended to run from a certain point in the parish of St. Anselme, along the Quebec Central, will run through the counties of Dorchester, Bellechasse, L'Islet and Montmagny and will overtake the lower provinces ; that is to say, a country rich in splendid woods and fertile lands which, should they be opened to settlement, would form from 60 to 75 parishes. The country also includes numerous mineral lands, amongst others asbestos mines, hardly worked now, but the results of which will be very important later on. Should, as the thing seems very likely, the Quebec bridge be built, this Quebec Eastern Railway which will join the Canadian Pacific, will in fact be the actual short line to the Atlantic, running wholly on Canadian soil, without running through American territory. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I was stating a moment ago, if I am well informed, large correspondence relating to this railway must now be in the hands of the Government, and I think the Government will admit that what I ask for is in the right course, and that they will grant to this railway the same subsidy that they grant to other railways of the Dominion. That railway, when built, will be useful not only to the province of Quebec, but to the whole Dominion, and I cannot see how the Government could decline to grant to it the same subsidies they grant to other railways. I trust, therefore, that the Government will earnestly entertain my claim, and that I will be later on in a position to congratulate them on their fair-play.

Mr. MURLOCK.

Mr. HAGGART. There are two petitions from parishes in the county of Bellechasse and a petition from Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice, the vice-president of the Oriental Railway. These parishes ask assistance to the railway, and one of the grounds was that it would be a means of repatriating Canadians gone to the United States, and would also be the means of opening up a fertile section of country. It was also urged in favour of this railway that it would open up a short route from New Brunswick to Quebec. If any subsidies are to be brought down, I will, when the question of subsidies is to be considered, bring this road to the notice of my colleagues, and will have the petitions the hon. gentleman mentions brought down to the House.

Motion agreed to.

WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER.

Mr. WELSH asked for :

Copy of the report of Government surveys on Wood Island breakwater, Prince Edward Island.

He said : This matter has been brought up almost annually since I have had a seat in this House. This breakwater has been for some years past a disgrace to any civilized Government. I brought forward, during the rule of the late Minister of Public Works, the necessity of doing something there, but without effect. I have some hopes, however, now, as since the present hon. minister has taken charge of the department, he has done everything possible to meet my views, by sending and ascertaining for himself the condition of this work. The more the necessary expenditure to improve its present wretched state is delayed, the greater will be the cost in the end. The hon. minister will see, by looking over the report and surveys, that it is absolutely necessary this matter should be attended to. One of the causes of the exodus from Prince Edward Island is the neglect of our public works. This work was commenced by the Local Government twenty years ago. Before we entered Confederation, it was attended to and improved every year. After that the Dominion Government laid out during one year something and put it in pretty good repair, but never completed the harbour by dredging or levelling. The effect is now that all the young men are going away to the States and send home money to support their parents. I am not exaggerating and call upon the Minister of Public Works, who, I know, is inclined to do it, to see that this matter is properly attended to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to add to what my hon. colleague has said my own testimony of the necessity that exists for the expenditure of money to put that work in proper order. The people who would use that breakwater for the purpose of shipping their produce are peculiarly situated. They are at a distance

of twenty or thirty miles from a railway, and have no other harbour than this artificial one whence to ship their produce, and that is of no use to them. I only speak upon this subject because I want to ask the hon. gentleman not to throw away any more money in that place. For the last eight or ten years there has been a practice introduced by the Department of Public Works to spend from a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars on that work. I told him last year that it was useless, that he might just as well throw the money into the sea; it does no good to anybody at all; it is a reckless waste of public money. If the hon. gentleman, having had a report of the surveyor of his department, can see his way clear to appropriate sufficient money to make the work efficient, to reconstruct it so that it will be useful for the purpose of shipping produce from it, well and good. If he cannot see his way clear to do that, let it go down and disappear; but do not, for Heaven's sake, let us have the spectacle we have witnessed for the last ten or twelve years, of throwing away a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars every year. From what I can gather from the report of those who are acquainted with the cost of constructing similar works, I think that it will cost from five to six thousand dollars.

Mr. WELSH. At least.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If it is to be touched at all, it ought to be taken in hand and thoroughly done. Now, that work never was at any one time in thorough repair or condition to do what was expected it would do. I hope the hon. gentleman will do one thing or the other—either let the work go down and the enormous amount of money that has been spent there, be wasted; or put enough money in the estimates to reconstruct it and put it in good repair. But do not potter with it and pretend to repair it, as has been done in the past, when the money spent upon it is utterly wasted.

Mr. OUMET. At the request of the hon. gentleman a careful survey was made of this work during the summer, and an elaborate report has been received by the department, which will be brought down in a very few days. This report shows that in order to put the work in that thorough condition the hon. gentleman has mentioned, will cost \$12,500 for repairs to the eastern part of the breakwater itself. The western part will cost \$850, and in order to make the breakwater useful as a harbour, we shall have to do dredging which will cost \$9,000, or altogether, \$22,350. That is the statement of our engineer.

Mr. WELSH. A correct report, too.

Mr. OUMET. This report will be laid before the Government, and if we can spare the money I will be very glad to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Motion agreed to.

THE BRISTOL BOARD OF TRADE AND THE FRENCH CHEESE.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Robertson, Dairy Commissioner for Canada, and the Department of Agriculture, in relation to a certain Resolution adopted by a Committee of the Board of Trade of Bristol, England, against accepting as Canadian cheese, cheese designated by the said Committee under the name of "French Cheese" and manufactured in the province of Québec;

Copies of all speeches, letters and reports made by the said Dairy Commissioner, Mr. Robertson, on the value of cheese manufactured in the provinces of Québec and Ontario.

He said: Mr. Speaker, by moving in this matter, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to the resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Bristol, England, with respect to the Canadian cheese. At the meeting held in Ste. Therese in November last, a resolution was moved and passed in order to protest against this resolution of the Board of Trade of Bristol. These resolutions were sent to England, where they answered that the discrimination made as to cheese imported from the Dominion was due to the Montreal exports. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Agriculture would do well to inquire into this matter, and through their commissioner, Mr. Robertson, to have this discrimination abolished. The cheese manufactured in the province of Québec is worth that made in the province of Ontario, except in certain places where this industry is just in its infancy. I went to the trouble of inquiring into this matter and I am in a position to state without the least doubt that nine-tenths at least of the cheese made in the province of Québec is worth that of the province of Ontario. I hope that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture will give his earnest consideration to this matter and that with all his might he will protect the interests of the manufacturers from the province of Québec who suffer by this unfair discrimination.

Motion agreed to.

SLAUGHTERING SWINE FOR EXPORTATION.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council now in force regulating the slaughtering of swine for exportation in bond, passed under authority of an Act respecting Customs, cap. 32, Revised Statutes, sec. 93; and for a copy of the quarantine regulations governing the importation of such swine into Canada for the purpose of slaughtering in bond.

He said: In 1890, in this House, I pointed out that the duty which had been placed upon hogs had been of great benefit to the farmers of Canada. I also expressed the belief that the changes the Government proposed to make in the way of increased duties would be of still greater benefit to the farmers. It is true that, perhaps, we have not gained as much by that increased duty as

we hoped, but it may be that the farmers have themselves to blame for that, from their own want of knowledge and their inexperience. But we have improved upon that, and I notice that the other day a deputation waited upon certain members of the Government, asking that swine might be imported into Canada free in bond, to be slaughtered, with the view of sending a certain quantity of the pork out of the country. Now, it appears to me that, looking at it from the farmers' stand-point, that might be very dangerous to their interests. If Canadians were not in a position to place their hogs upon the market large numbers might be purchased from the other side and brought into Canada in bond and slaughtered. The result would be that when we were able to place our hogs upon the market our packers might be quite indifferent. We would then be in the position that whilst we were forced to place our hogs upon the market, the packers would be so indifferent that they would have them at their own prices. This might happen late as well as early in the season; so that I think it would be to our interest if the Government could see their way clear to refuse the application of the pork packers of Canada. We have a great deal of sympathy for them, and for their employees who ought to be occupied at all seasons of the year; but on the other hand, we have also to look after the interests of the farmers of Canada, which I think would be better served by refusing the application of the packers.

Motion agreed to.

RECIPROcity IN CANAL TOLLS— CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Tisdale) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, papers and documents, not already laid before the House, in reference to negotiations and communications between the Government and the United States, in reference to reciprocity, canal tolls, and wrecking and towing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the papers here moved for will include a report of the interview or conference that took place between the hon. gentleman and his colleagues on the one side, and the American commissioners on the other?

Mr. FOSTER. There were two conferences. At the first conference the subject of reciprocity was mentioned. Subsequently, Hon. Mr. Bowell and myself went to Washington on the subject of canal tolls.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was a reference to the subject of reciprocity, which was under discussion, and if the ordinary rules observed in all countries were followed there would be a memorandum of that conference, and I ask the hon. gentleman whether that memorandum or report of the interviews that took place between the ministers on both sides will be included in the correspondence asked to be brought down?

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that we had some conversation on two other occasions about that matter. I simply ask whether that was the one he meant or whether he referred to the last conference alone? If he referred to the last conference alone, I would say that it would be included; but if he referred to the first conference, I would postpone answering the question until the Premier was in his seat. If it can be brought down it will be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there no document in the department with respect to that interview, or is it simply a question as to whether the Government are prepared to bring down the document or not?

Mr. FOSTER. All documents will be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot see, if all documents are to be brought down, why the hon. gentleman should desire to wait until the First Minister is in his seat.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite clear. A protocol might be called a document; and yet I would not call it a document under the general term applied to documents. If the hon. gentleman thinks a protocol is included in such a designation I will make the same reservation as I did to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. LAURIER. Then you say everything will be brought down except a statement of that which actually took place.

Mr. TISDALE. My intention in making the motion is to have everything brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be done.

Mr. LAURIER. But I am afraid as to that being done.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a great deal of curiosity to know what took place between the Canadian commissioners and the Secretary of State of the United States at that time, and his successor General Foster. There are a great many stories in circulation with respect to those interviews, and it is felt that the ministers have not taken the country into their confidence in regard to this matter. There were charges made at the time that the course of the Canadian commissioners was not as open and truthful as it might have been, that there was an under-current, and that their purpose in going to Washington was not that which appeared ostensibly to be their purpose. If there were communications and discussions between the Canadian commissioners and the Secretary of State of the United States, I think the people are entitled under this order of the House to know what they were, to know what position was taken by the Canadian commissioners with respect to reciprocity, what propositions were made, what overtures were made, what they asked for, what the United States Government were willing to grant, what the commissioners were ready to

concede. The Government should take the country into their confidence and let the people know full particulars in regard to all conferences, not regarding any special or particular conference, but in regard to all the communications that have taken place from time to time during the different visits of the Canadian commissioners to Washington. That is what the country wants, and what it is entitled to know. If the ministers find it necessary to withhold, in answering this motion made by one of their supporters, any material information from the country bearing on the question as to whether they used their utmost efforts to obtain reciprocity, as to whether any proposition made by the American Government naturally led them to suppose that reciprocity could be obtained, whether they placed themselves in the position which they must have known made it impossible for them to obtain reciprocity, we are entitled to know these matters and to secure all information the Government can furnish, including notes of stenographers with respect to conversations and propositions made by the Canadian commissioners and the discussions that took place respecting this important question of reciprocity, which is one of the greatest interest to this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is another reason why I think the hon. the Minister of Finance should not hesitate to lay these papers before the House, and that is because he has already to a great extent taken the press into his confidence, and given the press a report, from his stand-point, of what he understood took place. The people who are desirous of forming a judgment on this matter stand in this position: They have, in the first place, a report made by Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State, to the Senate, transmitted by the President in his Message to the Senate, in which the Secretary gave his version of what took place. We have the formal statement made by General Foster to the newspapers, in which he gave his understanding of what occurred. Then we have the statement made in this House by the Minister of Finance last year, in which he gave his understanding of what took place at the time, and that statement has been supplemented by a statement, which the hon. gentleman is reported to have authorized the press to make, which is in direct contradiction to General Foster's statement. It is impossible, in view of these conflicting statements, for outsiders to know which statement is right and accurate, and it is of vital importance to the country at large, to the electors and to everyone who desires to form a true and honest judgment in the matter, that Parliament should be furnished with an exact report of what took place, so that the people will be able to judge for themselves whether our ministers or the ministers of the United States are misrepresenting what took place at the conferences. There is no doubt, a most extraordinary misunderstanding between

them. They give versions diametrically opposite as to what was said and what was understood. It is said, and I believe it to be true, that the hon. gentleman is in possession of a stenographic report of the conversation which took place on that occasion. That report is accessible to the hon. gentleman and it can be laid before the House. If the House is placed in possession of that document, then everybody will be able to read and judge for himself as to whether Mr. Blaine or General Foster, on the one side, or the Minister of Finance of Canada on the other, is to be relied upon. There is no question at present more generally talked about and discussed by the people of Canada than this one as to the possibility of obtaining better trade relations with the United States. We want to know exactly on what grounds we may reasonably hope a treaty will be negotiated. We have our views in regard to it, and the Minister of Finance has stated his views very strongly. It is essential in the public interest, especially as the press has had information given to it in a semi-official way, that this House should be taken into the confidence of the Government to that extent, and the stenographic report of the conversation, the different propositions made and the objections raised should be placed in the hands of hon. members, so that they may be able to form a true judgment in regard to the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Upon this subject I do not wish to be bound by the hon. gentleman's statement, that there is a stenographic report. There is a full report on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not deny that there is a stenographic report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will neither affirm nor deny it; but a very full and explicit report was sent to Her Majesty's Government, as no doubt the hon. gentleman surmised from some other documents in which reference was made to it. We have already applied for permission to lay this before the House during the present session, and we expect an answer in a day or two.

Mr. LAURIER. But, if the hon. gentleman will pardon me, we understood a moment ago, from a statement made by the Minister of Finance, that there were what he called protocols.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These were laid before the House last year.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Propositions.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, propositions; but protocols are the proces-verbal, the journal of what takes place. In this matter I would quarrel to some extent with the expression, "protocols." I do not think it would apply. But, at all events, I refer to the offers and counter-offers and negotiations. I understand

that there is a stenographic report, and that is what we particularly want to have, and that is what, so far, has not been promised. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us the day on which he could lay that process-verbal before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I may say that, so far as that is concerned, and so far as any interchange of protocols, properly so-called, is concerned, the conference was to be informal, and unofficial, and it was only at the conclusion of the conference that we obtained the consent of the other side to have any communication made as to what had transpired. Down to that moment, there could be no interchange of the usual protocols. Proposals were interchanged; first discussed, but then, when there was a prospect of their being agreed upon, they were interchanged in writing, and a record was kept of the conversation from day to day. That is what I refer to, and probably what the hon. gentleman refers to as a stenographic report. I cannot say that it is a stenographic report at all, but such as it is, we regard it as a full and faithful record of what transpired. That is the record I refer to as having asked leave to bring down.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that this will be brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what I refer to as to having asked for leave to bring down.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the other side object to the proceedings being made public?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At the conclusion of the conference, as I stated, it was agreed, as far as the delegates were concerned, and as far as their respective Governments were concerned, that there was no objection to what had transpired being communicated by either side. We have not, therefore, to ask permission from the United States authorities.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government have been in that position ever since the close of the conference, so far as the United States Government is concerned?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. So that the privilege is the result of, perhaps, the imagination of the Government, as regards its duty towards the Imperial Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not in any sense.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the Government of Canada were willing to take the people into their confidence; if the Imperial Government had no objection, and if the United States Government gave consent at the close of the conference, why was not Parliament informed of it last session?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Why, indeed? Why should the hon. gentleman assume that there was no objection on the part of the Imperial Government?

Mr. LAURIER

Mr. MULOCK. I thought there was consent from the other side.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has utterly misunderstood me, if he thought I said that there was consent on the part of the Imperial authorities, that we should produce the record down to this time.

Mr. MULOCK. I must have misunderstood you, then.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps I did not express myself plainly. What I did say was: that matters have been in that state since the close of last session. That is, in the state of not having yet obtained permission that they should be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. Are not the ministers rapping the Imperial Government on the head, because they have referred more than once, in their speeches, to what took place there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not at all. We have perfect free speech on any such question as that dealt with in the record which we were obliged, by our duty, to communicate to Her Majesty's Government. That record is now their property, and that is another matter. We are not bound, in any sense, to refrain from speaking in the House as to what has transpired, and we have spoken. We have not violated any obligation to Her Majesty's Government in that. The record is there.

Mr. MULOCK. This was not a commission sent by the Imperial Government to the United States.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has not the hon. gentleman spoken before?

Mr. MULOCK. I only put an interlocutory question, Mr. Speaker. I would remind the minister how this commission was formed. As far as Parliament and the public know, when Parliament was dissolved in 1891, the Government announced to the people through, I think, the Speech of the Governor-General at the dissolution of Parliament—at all events, I know that the First Minister in his address to the people stated it—that as soon as the Government received a mandate from the people, they intended, on the 6th of March, 1891, to send three commissioners to Washington to see if they could not arrange a reciprocity basis. It was never stated on that occasion, nor up to this moment, so far as I know, that the declaration by the First Minister of that day was made on the authority of the Imperial Government. So far as was made manifest then, it was a decision arrived at by the Canadian Prime Minister of that date, and so far as Parliament up to this moment knows, it was carried out by this Government of its own motion. It is the first time I have ever heard of the Government taking shelter behind the Imperial Government and saying that the Parliament of Canada and the people of Canada can only be advised of

the proceedings on the consent of the Imperial Government. It is a new doctrine, that anything affecting the trade of Canada, the very existence of Canada, is not to be made known to the people of Canada and that they are to know nothing of matters deeply concerning themselves. It is now the second year since this commission visited the United States, and the trade of Canada has been suffering in the meantime. Does the First Minister say that the people of Canada have been kept in the dark for two years by order of the Imperial Government? Last session the Minister of Finance, in addressing Parliament, stated what? If I remember rightly, the impression which he or some of his colleagues gave to Parliament was, that efforts to promote a reciprocity treaty with the United States had absolutely failed. That was the impression made to Parliament, and I am satisfied that an examination of "Hansard" will show that in one of his leading speeches the Minister of Finance made that declaration to Parliament and to the country, and announced it further through the press, that it was idle to look to the United States people for freer trade relations with them. The country has been under that impression, until the Minister addressed the public at the Auditorium in the city of Toronto, just before the present meeting of Parliament. It was with amazement that I then read the utterance of the First Minister, that he could have procured a market in the United States for the product of the forests of Canada, had he been willing to give certain considerations in return. Whether the consideration was or was not a proper one, it seems to me that if there was that basis of negotiation, it was due to the people of Canada that it should have been made known to them at the earliest possible moment. The Minister told the public the other day that he could offer certain considerations for procuring a market for the farmers of Canada, which they certainly are most desirous of procuring. Perhaps he made that declaration in a loose way, and perhaps it is not fair to bind him to it altogether, but it did seem an official declaration in a loose way. He said that for two or three years he had the knowledge of a proposition like that in his breast and, in fact, had not made it public. I am willing to concede to the Imperial Government the fullest control over our fiscal policy that is compatible with our dignity and our interests, but I appeal to everyone who has a sense of right, whether it is fair that the Government should proceed, as they seem to have done on this occasion, and to have retained in their own breasts for two years important information such as they now admit they have, without for one moment taking the people of Canada into their confidence? I say it is not fair for them now to say that they had assumed this position in consequence of the attitude of the Imperial Government. It may be that it was decided wise to defer to

the Imperial Government at a certain time, and I would not blame them for showing that proper respect to the Imperial Government. But it is most important now, I think, for the Government to show that they have been making active efforts during these two years to get that permission; they cannot otherwise. I think, shelter themselves behind the mere inaction of the Imperial Government to give them an answer. I am amazed to find that it is now charged for the first time that the Imperial Government have been refusing to take the people of Canada into their confidence. Surely the people of Canada can be trusted in matters affecting the Empire as well as in matters affecting the colony of Canada. Do you mean to say that the Imperial Government for two years have refused to let the people of Canada know that there was a possible bargain which they might have obtained? The people of Canada are loyal to the Empire, and I am satisfied that they could be trusted. I withhold any further observations on the matter until it is shown whether or not the delay is attributable to the Government of Canada. Unless the Government of Canada can show that they have been actively pressing for permission to place this information before the people of Canada, they will stand guilty of gross deception towards the people of Canada and responsible for all the delay that has taken place.

Mr. TISDALE. It will be observed that in the motion I not only ask for documents, but for all communications. Now, I do not know exactly what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is getting excited about. I understand the Prime Minister to promise that everything shall be brought down; but, owing to the manner in which a certain portion of these negotiations were conducted, he feels it his duty to ask the permission of the Imperial Government to bring down a certain portion of the papers. That is quite proper; and when the papers come down, if it is then found, in the opinion of the House, that the minister did not require to get that permission, it will be quite time enough, I think, to lecture him. We are all, I think, very anxious on both sides of the House, whatever party may be in control of the affairs of this country, that no breaches of diplomatic usage should occur in connection with our international relations. The Prime Minister has said that he hopes, in a day or two, at all events within a week, to have the permission which he expects to get. That is quite satisfactory to me. If he does not bring down the papers, if for any reason the Imperial Government should object, nobody will be more anxious or more willing than myself to discuss the question, and to put the blame, if there is any, where it should rest. I have no doubt that under the circumstances the Imperial Government will consent.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not see what the Imperial Government has to do with this

matter. Since a part of the negotiations have been already placed before this House, I do not know why we should not have the whole of them.

Mr. TISDALE. I think parliamentary usage is to accept the statements of those in control of the affairs of the country, when they stand in their places and state, on their responsibility, what they have done, as I understand the Prime Minister does. When the papers are brought down, or when the Government state that the permission of the Imperial Government has been refused, then, I think, would be the proper time to discuss the matter. But I think it is not adding to the dignity of this House, and it is rather uncalled-for and unfair, to condemn what was done until we know whether or not it was justified by all the circumstances. So far as I am concerned, if reasonable despatch is exercised in obtaining the permission of the Imperial Government, my purpose in making the motion will be served. This is the first request that the House has made for this information, and notice of the motion was given in the first week of the session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Allow me to make an observation. Although I spoke before in answer to a question, the hon. gentleman who has made an attack has spoken three times.

Mr. MULOCK. No, I asked a question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, the hon. gentleman made a long statement, and wound up with a note of interrogation. I shall be very brief, and I will simply say at the outset that the use of these expressions in regard to taking shelter behind the Imperial Government and keeping the people of Canada in the dark, and all that kind of thing, may add vigour to the debate, but they certainly can have only one other effect, that is, to mislead the House and the public as to what the true aspect of the case is. I am sure that when the hon. gentleman made these observations, especially when he made the observation that the Imperial Government had nothing to do with this matter, that they did not initiate it, and that the conference was entirely one sought for and obtained at the instance of the Canadian Government, he forgot what the actual proceedings were. He forgot that it was by conference between the British Minister at Washington and the Secretary of State for the United States that the conference was initiated, and that it grew out of the negotiations which had taken place with reference to the Newfoundland Convention, and that before it was agreed by the Secretary of State of the United States that a conference should take place, and that a date should be appointed on which commissioners from Canada should be invited to attend, the programme of subjects was communicated by the British Minister at Washington and accepted by the Secretary of State of the United States, and was then published.

Mr. LAURIER.

to give it authenticity and prominence, in the "Canada Gazette." So that the conference was initiated in the way I have said, through the diplomatic officer of Her Majesty's Government, and, like all negotiations between the two countries, was conducted in his presence and by his authority. Therefore, Her Majesty's Government certainly had something to say as to the proceedings. Now, the hon. gentleman thinks it an unheard-of proceeding that any part of the transactions of that conference should fail to be made public. The hon. gentleman will remember, when I remind him of it, that in any conference of a diplomatic character, not one word transpires until the consent of both parties is obtained at the conclusion of the conference, when it is agreed what shall be made public and what shall not be made public. The protocols, properly so called, that is, the propositions which were interchanged at that conference and which resulted in an agreement, after having been made public, were laid on the Table of this House;—everything that was agreed upon, everything upon which the action of this Parliament was required, was submitted here. But the hon. gentleman's request is that conferences, consultations and conversations which took place, as to which no agreement was arrived at, shall be laid before this Parliament. As to that, not only had the United States Government something to say—and that Government gave their consent—but Her Majesty's Government were certainly interested and had something to say. As regards the obligations we are under to press the Imperial authorities for permission to lay this information before the House, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that any such obligation lies upon us. The statement I made in Toronto was substantially the same as the statement made by the Finance Minister last session, which was debated on every platform in this country where a discussion of the subject took place, and will not strike the House as being in any degree novel. But when the hon. gentleman desires us to explain that we were persistent in our efforts to get permission from the Imperial Government to bring down the portions of the record which was not brought down, the hon. gentleman must remember that down to this moment no address or order of the House was made with regard to it. The only application from hon. gentlemen of the Opposition which was made upon the subject—I am speaking from memory, but I think my memory is accurate—was this: There was first of all, an interruption to the speech of the Finance Minister when he was undertaking to inform the House of the only grounds upon which reciprocity arrangements with regard to trade could be made with the United States. The objection was taken that the hon. gentleman was not at liberty to speak to the House upon that subject because the record was not here. At a subsequent stage a vote of censure was moved by the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) upon the Government for not having laid the papers upon the Table of the House. We made our defence to that motion as best we could, and we were sustained by the House. But down to this time there has been no formal request by the House to lay those papers upon the Table. I desire to add that I am not making this statement as a reason why the papers should not be brought down, or why permission from the Imperial authorities should not be sought; but I am giving it in answer to the hon. gentleman who seems to think that we are under obligation to the House to excuse ourselves for not making a persistent effort to induce consent that these papers should be brought down. When we are fortunate enough to get them here, I think it will be quite apparent why the Imperial authorities had a right to be consulted, and should be consulted, on the subject of giving the record publicity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman that that statement is accurate so far as my objection to the speech of the Finance Minister was concerned. I did object to the hon. gentleman going on and making his statement as to what transpired at Washington with reference to these negotiations, and at the same time refraining from communicating to the House any of the correspondence or proposals that had been made by the one Government or the other. Subsequently, when I formally brought the matter before the House, after you, Mr. Speaker, had ruled that the hon. gentleman was at liberty to proceed, I called the attention of the House to the practice that had prevailed in England for a long period of years with reference to matters of this sort; and I asked the hon. gentleman to lay upon the Table of the House the notes or memoranda of the interview that had taken place between the representatives of the Government at Washington and the representatives of this Government. The then Minister of Justice, the present Prime Minister, told me, I think, that those papers would be laid on the Table of the House, if there were any; the hon. gentleman informed the House that he could not say whether there was any such memoranda or not. I think the hon. gentleman will find that report in the Debates. Now, Sir, I do not at all withdraw from the position I took last year. I think it is a most unusual proceeding in Great Britain, and ought to be an unusual proceeding here, to undertake to discuss the policy of the Government with reference to any negotiations that may have taken place with a foreign country, while the papers which were necessary to enable Parliament to form an opinion upon the subject, are withheld from the House. The rule has been laid down over and over again by one of the most distinguished parliamentarians that ever sat in the British House of Commons, Lord Palmerston, that it was highly inexpedient

for the House of Commons to enter upon the discussion of negotiations that had passed between the Imperial Government and any foreign Government, so long as proceedings had not reached that stage when it was possible to lay the communications that had taken place before Parliament. Sir, what is the object of bringing these matters before the attention of Parliament? Why, it is to enable Parliament to discharge its duties. The superintending control over every department of Government is with this House, is with this Parliament, and in order that this House may be in a position to discharge that duty, all the papers necessary to enable it to form a judgment upon any matter, ought to be before it. Now, when the hon. gentleman asked us last year to form a judgment upon the conduct of the members of the Government who undertook to negotiate with parties at Washington, he withheld from us those communications which were necessary to enable us to decide, not whether his statement was accurate, but to decide that the decision to which they had come was a wise one in the public interest. Now, those papers were withheld by the Government. Subsequently, on a formal discussion of the principle that I thought was involved, I made further inquiry of the leader of the House, the present Prime Minister, whether such information would be communicated to the House; under the circumstances, if the hon. gentleman has not, up to this time, communicated with Her Majesty's Government, it seems to me there has been a dereliction of duty on the part of members of the Administration. The Government are subordinate to Parliament, they are responsible to Parliament as well as to the Crown, and it was their bounden duty to take immediate steps to lay those papers before Parliament; and until they were prepared to do that, they ought to have refrained from discussing the subject and asking any action from Parliament with regard to their conduct. I think, Sir, that my hon. friend, the First Minister, if he has not communicated with the Imperial Government to have those papers laid before Parliament, has certainly failed in his duty. He has forgotten what transpired last session upon the subject. It does seem to me that where the subject has reached a conclusion as this one has—because the Government refusing to accept the proposition of the United States the negotiations came to an end—there was no further communication to be had, and there was no motive, public or official, which should have prevented the ministers from laying those papers on the Table of the House. That being the case, I think the hon. gentleman ought to have been prepared at the very opening of this session to communicate the refusal of the Imperial Government—if they were disposed to refuse—to consent to their being made public. I say that the Government ought not to have made that discussion on the floor of Parliament without the consent of the other party to lay the papers

on the Table, and having that consent, the whole papers ought to have been laid at that time before us.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). While I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who sits alongside the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in his desire to get all these papers brought down, I would also like to say that it is the desire of this House, and of the people of the country, to have a copy of the protocols, and the proces-verbal, and the stenographic reports, that passed between the delegations and missions from this country and the officials at Washington with regard to this question. This country would also like to know to-day, and members of this House would like to know, who commissioned the present delegate academic, who is now wandering through the United States, to try to settle this great question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to say that I will make to this House, on the first occasion when it goes into Supply, a personal statement regarding the charges made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

Motion agreed to.

DEPUTY ADJUTANT-GENERAL VILLIERS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for :

Return of all correspondence, telegrams and documents in reference to the suspension of Deputy Adjutant-General Villiers, and also as to his restoration to office.

He said : In moving for these papers in connection with the suspension of Deputy Adjutant-General Villiers, I may say that when, some time last October, it became known that this distinguished militia officer had been suspended, the news created some considerable surprise wherever he was known. I understand he has been in the service since before Confederation, and has rendered good service to the militia. I understand further that he was suspended by telegram, and a junior officer was appointed in his stead. I think the offence was absence from the district. It turned out, upon inquiry afterwards, that he was not absent. He was afterwards reinstated, and another and totally different excuse was given why he had been suspended ; and it is in order to see just the position which was taken at the time as to the causes of the suspension and the reasons for reinstating him, so that we may arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, that I think it my duty, in the public interest, to move for those papers.

Motion agreed to.

SANDFORD BREAKWATER, N. S.

Mr. FLINT moved for :

Copies of all letters, petitions, surveys and reports in the possession of the Government, relating to the threatened destruction of, and claims for, repairs on the breakwater at Sandford, in the county of Yarmouth, N. S.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

He said : My object is to impress upon the Minister of Public Works the great local importance of this work which, I fear, must, in the press of business, have escaped his attention. I have had numerous letters and petitions from my constituents drawing attention to this matter, and I desire to see what the Government officers say with regard to the present position of the work and the probable expenses which the repairs that may be required will cost. As far as the constituency I have the honour to represent is concerned, we have not pressed on the minister any very large expenditure, and the expenditures we have urged were absolutely necessary. This work, when I first had the honour of a seat in Parliament, was threatened with destruction. I called the attention of the then acting minister to the danger, and he kindly promised to make official inquiries. Since that time I have frequently, and some of my constituents also have frequently, placed upon record the urgency of repairing this important public work. Shortly before I came to Ottawa I personally visited the scene, and was surprised to find what great inroads the storms of autumn and the early part of spring had made upon the work. I fear now we will have to urge a larger appropriation than would have been necessary had the repairs been made in the first instance. However, I will have the opportunity of seeing what the Government surveyors and others have said on this matter, and I hope the minister will kindly read over their reports again for his own information. In the face of the fact, which is repeated to us very frequently, of the buoyancy of the public revenue, I would urge upon the attention of the minister the very great importance and desirability of having this work repaired. Unless it is I may say that a large industry and the interests and progress of a large number of most honest, industrious and loyal people of this Dominion will be imperilled. Their industry will be destroyed ; the value of property will be decreased, and the industry will have to be removed to some other portion of the county, where a breakwater still remains in existence. I do sincerely trust the hon. minister will give us some assurance, before the close of the session, that this work will be reconstructed in as substantial a manner as before the storms of 1890 began to undermine it.

Motion agreed to.

PICKETS PIER, N. S.

Mr. BORDEN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, reports of engineers and commissions authorizing the expenditure of money since the year 1890, relating to Pickets Pier, N. S., together with a statement of the wharfage collected thereat, during said period.

He said : Before this motion is moved, I desire to say a few words in reference to this matter. As I live quite near this public work I am acquainted with almost everything that has been going on in connection with it. Still I think there are pro-

bably some surveyors' reports which I have not seen. That is the reason more particularly of my moving this motion; but I also move it in this public manner for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government to the condition of this work. It is an important work, one upon which the Dominion has spent considerable sums of money during the last twelve or fifteen years, and which was taken over some years ago by the Public Works Department. It is in charge of a Dominion official known as a wharfinger and harbour master, and considerable sums of money are collected annually, which go to swell the annual revenue. About a year ago this work was discovered to be in great danger of being carried away. At that time there happened to be a by-election in my county, and just before it took place, the Government sent down an engineer from the Public Works Department to examine that wharf, no doubt with a view to assist me in winning that election. That gentleman, Mr. Dodwell, visited this public work in the latter part of January, and he found it was in a very bad condition indeed, so bad that on returning to his office he immediately sent out a commission, which I have in my possession, in which he authorized a party living near the breakwater to expend a certain sum of money out of the contingencies fund, several hundred dollars—I do not remember the exact amount, as I did not expect this motion to be reached to-day. That officer discovered that the work was liable to be carried away at any moment. He, no doubt, advised his superior that an expenditure was necessary, and he wrote a commission authorizing an expenditure of several hundred dollars and sent it to the commissioner I have named, informing him that he was appointed at the suggestion of Mr. C. B. Bill, a gentleman who happened to be contesting the county against me. But for some reason or other, this sum of money was not expended. The election came off early in February. We heard nothing about the expenditure then, and we have not heard a word about it since. When I came here to attend to my parliamentary duties last session, I spoke to the Minister of Public Works in regard to the matter, and I asked him to place a sum in the Estimates for the repair of that breakwater. He said he would consider the matter. Finding there was no sum in the Estimates, I wrote to the Minister of Justice, the present Premier, and also the Minister of Public Works, setting out the facts I have stated, that several months before a public officer of the Department of Public Works had considered the work in such danger that immediate steps must be taken to ensure its safety, and asking the Government to be good enough to provide for the expenditure out of the grant for ordinary repairs. I received very polite answers to my letters. I also received a letter from the Minister of Public Works later, informing me that his chief engineer would be in Halifax, I think,

in August, and he would certainly visit the work. I have not heard whether he did so or not. If this motion is agreed to, I presume his report, if he made one, will be laid on the Table of the House. I am not going to animadvert on the circumstances I have related, but I think the Government and the House will agree with me, that if repairs on this work were so urgent in January, in the middle of winter, and yet in some unaccountable way the money was never expended, surely it is reasonable to suppose that one year after that date the necessity of repairs is still greater. I am sure the minister will agree that unless there is some expenditure made on the work during the present season, the wharf will be entirely destroyed, and all the money expended on it hitherto will be wasted. When the returns are brought down showing the annual amount collected for wharfage dues, it will appear that the collections from this wharf were in excess of many other wharfs of the same character in Nova Scotia, and that, therefore, this work is a valuable asset to the Government. It affords an outlet for the agricultural produce of a large farming community occupying the best part of King's county, who desire to ship their products. This wharf could be placed in an efficient state of repair for a sum, probably not exceeding \$1,000, and I, therefore, hope the Minister of Public Works will place that amount in the Supplementary Estimates in order that the work may be saved from utter destruction.

Motion agreed to.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the birthplace, national origin, creed or church to which belonging, and the date of appointment of each person employed in the Civil Service of Canada, both in the inside and outside service, also the salary paid the last year and the department under which they are serving.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider his motion. Part of the information requested is already given in the Civil Service list, namely, the date of the appointment of each person employed, the salary paid last year and the department under which the officer is serving. As regards some of the other particulars, I think the Government, some time ago, with the approval of the House, decided not to inquire into and record those particulars, and during last session a motion of like character was amended in that respect. The hon. gentleman asks for a statement of the birthplace, national origin, creed or church, to which each civil servant belongs. I have no objection to the birthplace or national origin being given, but I do not think it is proper to inquire as to the creed or church to which our civil servants belong, or to ask those gentlemen, who number many hundreds, to reveal that fact in order to put it on record. It does not seem to be material, in any respect, to the Civil Service. Perhaps the hon.

gentleman will reconsider the propriety of pressing his inquiry on that point.

Mr. LAURIER. I certainly do not see that any inconvenience would arise from these particulars being given. If they are accessible to the Government, I certainly see no objection to furnishing them to the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not understand why the information is refused, unless there is some purpose in refusing it, something which the Government do not desire to reveal. There is some curiosity in the public mind in regard to this matter, and a great many people desire to know how favours are distributed; how appointments are made; whether there is any ground for suspicion that the religion of the individual has anything to do with his chances for success; and I do not think that it is a proper request for the First Minister to ask my hon. friend to drop that portion of his inquiry. It is perfectly proper that we should know what the nationality, origin, and religion of the various incumbents of the Civil Service in this country are.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to drop the latter part of the motion which is objected to by the First Minister, but as to the first three clauses, I think the House should grant all of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say with regard to the first requests, that I think that under the circumstances they are not unreasonable. I know there is a great deal to be said for the view expressed by the First Minister, that we have nothing to do with a man's creed, and that his creed or nationality ought not to help or hurt him with regard to official appointments. But, when the notion gets abroad that they do influence the Government in giving the appointment, I think that there is an advantage in having correct information, for the very purpose of correcting any misapprehension in the public mind in that particular. It would be upon that ground that I think the information might be of importance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps I might be allowed to ask the hon. gentleman whether his motion is confined to any particular period; at present it relates to the whole 27 years since Confederation?

Mr. LAURIER. It refers to all those engaged in the existing service without reference to the time of their appointment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Persons now holding office?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Now employed.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Motion amended and agreed to.

FISHING BOUNTIES—VICTORIA, N.S.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

Correspondence, telegrams or other papers relating to irregularities and frauds in payment of fishing

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

bounties in the county of Victoria, N.S., with the report of the commissioner or commissioners appointed to make the investigation.

He said: I do not propose to address myself to the House on this question, but simply to ask that this correspondence and all papers relating to it should be brought down at the very earliest moment. I do so in the interest of the bounty so far as the fishermen of Nova Scotia are concerned, in order that this House may have such information before it as will strengthen the Government in ensuring that such a state of things cannot occur in the future, as has existed in the past in that county and other places. I trust the Government will bring down all these papers at once, so that the House shall have an opportunity of seeing them, and remedying the defects. I do not by any means make this motion for the purpose of insinuating that this matter took place under circumstances which were peculiarly understood by the Government, but I do so in the interest of the bounty, and in the interest of the honest fishermen, from whom every dollar taken from them wrongfully, as was done in this case, is so much reduction on what they were entitled to.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of all petitions, documents and letters in relation to a request made for increased mail service at the Harkaway Post Office, during the past six years.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Return showing the quantity of pig iron produced in Canada in the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892; and the bounty paid for the production in each of those years.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of the receipts and expenditures in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the first day of July, 1892, to the thirty-first day of January, 1893, and comparative statements from the first day of July, 1891, to the thirty-first day of January, 1892.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copy of any Order in Council or other document which gave power to the "Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Co." or their successors "The Vermont Central Railway Company," to build a bridge across the Richelieu River at St. John's, P.Q.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Return, in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the exports and imports from the first day of July, 1892, to the first day of January, 1893, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries; and comparative statements from the first day of July, 1891, to the first day of January, 1892.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

List of the names of all tenderers for section eight of the Soulanges Canal, also of the residence of each such tenderers, and of the amount of each tender.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Copies of all letters and petitions forwarded to the Post Office Department by certain inhabitants of the parish of St. Etienne de Lauzon, in the county of Lévis, complaining of maladministration in relation to the Bailargeon Post Office in the said parish.—(Mr. Guay.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

NATHANIEL BOYD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Marquette, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Macdonald (Winnipeg).

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) to give effect to an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Corporation of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 14) to wind up the Montreal Mining Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 16) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

GRINDING WHEAT IN BOND.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Customs Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to do away with the privilege that the millers of Ontario at present have of importing wheat and grinding it in bond and paying no duty thereon. That privilege was given originally something over eleven years ago, in consequence of a representation made by the millers to the then Prime Minister. They represented that we did not produce a sufficient quantity of hard wheat in Canada to enable them to supply the flour which was necessary for the English market. They therefore urged that they should be allowed to import wheat No. 1 hard, or something like it, from the western states. There is no longer any reason of that kind. We produce in the North-west all the No. 1 hard that the millers can use, and it will be consonant with the National Policy that we should do our best to keep the home market for the farmer. I therefore move for leave to introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following proposed resolution:—

12½

“That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and to provide that the deduction or contribution, to the superannuation fund, from the salary of every person who enters the Civil Service after the date of the coming into force of such amendment, shall be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum on such salary if it is six hundred dollars or upwards, and of three per cent per annum if it is less than six hundred dollars.”

SUPPLY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some explanations, of which I gave notice last night, relating to my visit to Washington, and the strictures with reference to that visit made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). The reference was not in complimentary terms, and implied that the object of my mission was a disloyal one. The same insinuation or assertion has been made upon the floor of this House, but not in my hearing, by ministers of the Crown and by others, and I take the opportunity to meet and refute it. The policy of the Government press and of Government speakers, both in and outside this Chamber, seems to be one of detraction, calumny and misrepresentation, as regards the members of the Liberal party and their policy. I might read, in proof of this assertion, extracts from the leading journals of the party—from the “Empire,” the Hamilton “Spectator,” and various others—but I do not deem it necessary to take up the time of the House or disfigure the pages of “Hansard” with these quotations. I presume that there is not a member of this House who is ignorant of the fact that misrepresentations and charges and assertions, more or less malignant in their character, regarding leading members of the Liberal party, have been made in the public press. It seems to be the settled policy of the Government party, from the First Minister down, to misrepresent the motives and distort the position of the Liberal party. The loyalty cry is made to do service in place of argument, no doubt, by this means, by the Government and their followers, expecting to withdraw attention from their own misdeeds and divert public attention from the issues placed before the country. The application of these epithets and charges to my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright), to the leader of the party (Hon. Mr. Laurier) and to all the prominent men in the party, is a matter of daily occurrence, and I, for one, believe that in making these charges, gross injustice and prevarication of truth is indulged in by those who make them. The effect of this in the United States, we can readily see, is to induce the American people to believe that this country is ripe for annexation. Of course, when Government members, leaders and organs, all charge the Liberal party with being annexationists, the impression is circulated that one-half the people

are committed to that policy. And in fact, Mr. Cummings introduced a Bill a few days ago to facilitate our coming into the American union, under the impression, industrially circulated by Tory leaders and orators, that one-half the population are in favour of that movement. The result naturally is to strengthen the hands of those who desire to see retaliatory measures applied to Canada in order to force her into the Union; and the First Minister, the Finance Minister and every other minister in the Government are acting in concert with Mr. Farrer and other advocates of annexation in inducing the American Government to apply the screws, under the belief that this country is ready to drop like a ripe pear from the tree, and all that is necessary is to strengthen the hands of the disloyalists, who are said, by Government supporters, to swarm on every side.

It is true a certain degree of dissatisfaction exists in the country, and a certain degree of unrest among the people. But the party now in power are responsible for that state of things. If there does exist annexation sentiments, in nine cases out of ten it is due to a sense of the injustice of the Government course and its impolitic character. If such a feeling does exist, it is due, not to the attractions presented by the movement itself, but to the policy of the Government in placing undue burdens on the shoulders of the people. It is this which makes people look around in various directions for some source of relief. If there is an annexation sentiment, upon the hon. gentlemen opposite rests the responsibility for its existence. As the chairman of the Young Liberal Club in Toronto very truthfully said, the policy of the Government was to annex the population of Canada to the United States in job lots. It has annexed over a million of them, and it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite, to talk about annexation sentiments and proclivities and tendencies. Whatever sentiments of that kind exist are due, in a very large measure, to their own misdeeds. What has been the attitude of the Liberal party? Has the Liberal party advocated annexation to the United States? Is there a Liberal in the House of Commons who has given utterance to sentiments of this kind? No; the attitude of the Liberal party is to advocate the adoption of a policy which will secure better trade relations with the United States, which will remedy the evils under which we labour, which will give us tariff reform, which will give us reform in various matters, such as the franchise, which will give this country a Government that we can appreciate and respect. It is not a policy revolutionary in its tendency; it is not a disloyal policy. It is a policy, Sir, calculated to remedy the evils that now exist with reference to the public affairs of this country. Such is the policy of the Liberal party; and these allegations, these assertions, these charges made with

Mr. CHARLTON.

reference to the Liberal party, are malignant, are untruthful, are slanderous in every case and in every respect.

Now, I should not, of course, have stood upon my feet with reference to this matter but for the attacks made upon myself. I repudiate those attacks. It is asserted that I am a Yankee. Well, Sir, if I happen to have been born in the United States, and if there is anything criminal about that, I do not know that I had very much to do with the circumstances. I think my personal responsibility with reference to that matter is small indeed. It is true, I was born in the United States. My parentage is Scotch-English. The name of my family is an old Northumberland name, whose records go back for many centuries. I have very much pride in the history of that family; I have pride in my origin. I have lived in Canada since my boyhood. I have spent forty-four years in this Dominion; but in the estimation of my Tory friends opposite that hardly seems a sufficient length of time to have naturalized me. Sir, I repudiate the charge that the fact that I am an American by birth prevents me from being a loyal and true British subject. I am, in fact, a British subject by birth, a British subject under the law of the realm, a law which provides that every person born of British parents, born in a foreign country, not, at the time of his birth, at war with England, is by birth a British subject; and I have a right to all the privileges of a natural-born British subject to as full an extent as any other British subject born in any part of Her Majesty's wide Dominion. Now, with regard to my being a raitor. What evidence exists of that? What right has any rib-stabber in any Tory newspaper to-day to make that assertion with regard to myself, or with regard to any Liberal on this side of the House? Sir, I repudiate the charge. I have never in any way used my influence, by word or act, to do anything that was not, in my opinion, conducive to the best interests of Canada—of Canada, not as a portion of some foreign power, but to benefit this country under its present condition and under its present Government—I do not mean the Government sitting opposite, but a Government that would rule here constitutionally in the interests of the people.

It is said that I have been in Washington betraying Canada. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) can go to Washington with his family, and there is no notice taken of it. If anything is said about it it is rather complimentary to the hon. gentleman, and to his advantage. Any gentleman from the opposite side of this Chamber can go to Washington, and there is nothing wrong in it at all. Any member of the British Parliament can go to Washington. Mr. Bryce went there, and spent a length of time in accumulating the information that was available for his book, *The American Commonwealth*. Hundreds of prominent Englishmen go to Washington; but I cannot go there. Canadian

commissioners can go there. They go there once, twice and three times. They go there for the purpose of exhibiting to the country a magnificent spectacle of how not to do it—go there for the purpose of playing the game of political deception, and they did so, and it is all right. But if a Liberal goes to Washington, there is something criminal about it. Now, if it is wrong for me to go to Washington, if it is wrong for any Liberal to go to Washington, let the Government put a law upon the Statute-book prohibiting Liberals from going to Washington, enacting that, in order to be permitted to go to Washington, it will be necessary for a man to be a Tory; then we should have the thing in a proper position, I presume. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was in Washington. I was in Washington on Sunday, the 15th January; on Monday, the 16th January; and on Tuesday, the 17th January, in the year of our Lord, 1893. I had business in Washington, not of a public character but of a private character, business of a not very agreeable character. I suppose, perhaps, it may be necessary for me to disclose that private business fully in order to answer the charge that I was there with a felonious intent and purpose. If hon. gentlemen think so, I can do so. I was unfortunate enough to have a vessel that had got into difficulty in connection with the American navigation laws. She was under fine, and the case was appealed to the Secretary of the Treasury, and I went to Washington to attend to the presentation of that case, and to secure, if possible, a mitigation or an abrogation of that fine. That was my business at Washington, the business that has procured for me the title of a traitor, going to that city to sell the rights and interests of Canada. Yes, I went there on business. I have been there before on business, on two occasions. I shall go there again on business; and I now inform hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that I shall go there as often as I please, business or no business. I have a perfect right to go there, and I shall exercise that right at all times that I choose to do so, which probably will not be very often, for it is something of a journey, and entails a little expense, and I have nothing in particular to draw me there. I will say, further, Mr. Speaker, that when I have been in Washington I have used every effort in my power, and sought to the best of my ability, to promote the interests of Canada. I have thought it my duty to do so, it has been a pleasure to do so. I have not gone down there for the purpose of misleading the American people. I have not gone down there for the purpose of palming off a sham and a fraud upon the Canadian people. I have been there in due course of my business, and whenever I have come into contact with American public men, I have urged upon them, as far as my feeble abilities would permit, the propriety and the desirability of having broad, fraternal and liberal relations between these two countries, of having an

end of this bickering and jealousy, and friction that are disadvantageous to the people of both countries. I have been actuated, in my humble efforts, by a patriotic desire to promote a better state of feeling and better relations between the two peoples than now exist.

Now, Sir, about my last visit. It differs in character from the visit of hon. gentlemen opposite, for I have nothing to conceal. They had something to conceal, and they concealed it. We have not even yet learned all about the true inwardness of their visit. They have kept the country in ignorance of it for two years. As to my visit, I am ready to disclose to this House now, anything and everything that transpired. After despatching my business, as a very natural thing, I imagine, I decided to go up to the Capitol and see Congress in session. I presume almost anybody in this House would have done so. There may possibly be some Tory here so loyal that he would not have done so. There may be some person here of the character of an old Tory gentleman in South Norfolk some years ago, who started to go up to Detroit on an excursion, but when he got to Windsor he would not cross the river and set his feet upon the accursed American soil. He was thoroughly loyal. He has had a son since then representing that riding in this House. I imagine there is scarcely a member of this House who would not have gone up to see the House of Congress in session. I went up there, and when there I fell in with a number of members, by whom I was treated very courteously. Any member of this House will be treated courteously if he goes to Washington. He will find the utmost desire evinced by members of Congress to make his stay a pleasant one. I was introduced to a number of congressmen. I should not like to undertake to recall the names of one-half of them. But I got into the papers. I did not ask to be put in the papers, but I found myself there; and the reports as to the object of my visit to Washington were more or less wide of the truth, and I could not vouch for the accuracy of any of them. Well, Sir, I had a talk with members, I had a talk with quite a number of members about various matters. They wanted to talk, in fact, and I will frankly confess so did I. They wanted to know about us. I felt complimented by this, for in the United States there is generally manifested ignorance by the people of that country about Canadian matters, and an utter indifference as to what we are, who we are and where we are. I venture to say that in the United States not one person in a dozen knows anything substantial about Canada, or cares as much as he knows about it. I felt glad to see in Washington among public men a desire to know about Canada, and that they were quite willing to talk about it. They inquire about our political issues. As well as I could, I told what the leading

issues between the two parties were, and the Democrats were kind enough to say that the Liberals were all right, that they were bone of their bone as regards the fiscal policy. Then they wanted to know about something they had heard about us. They wanted to know, for instance, about the gerrymander, about the Franchise Act, if it was possible that we had a franchise law in Canada which permitted the Government to appoint during its pleasure officers who made the lists, and which permitted the Government, after their own creatures had made the lists, to print them in their own office, where they had power, if they chose to exercise it, to carry on any game of manipulating lists they pleased. I said, that, unfortunately, it was true. Then they wanted to know about boodling. They wanted to know if we had really reached that stage of perfection in that line which they had attained in the United States. I said I hardly knew, but I thought in some respects perhaps we had; but the Government had discovered a way of getting rid of the taint by vicarious sacrifice, by selecting a scapegoat (Sir Hector Langevin) and laying on him the sins of the Government and banishing him over to the wilderness and anchoring him beside two of the most rabid and bloodthirsty Grits in the House (Mulock and Charlton). They wanted to know something with respect to the question of annexation, of course. They wanted to know if really there was that feeling in favour of annexation in Canada that was represented, and I informed them there was not, that there might be a few localities along the frontier where the annexation sentiment was a pronounced and prevalent one, but in the interior we scarcely heard of the question, and it was not a political force in Canada at all. Then they gave their views about annexation, and I found a great divergence of opinion among members of Congress as to its desirability. Some thought it would be a good thing, some thought it would not, a great many feared the result. They thought the United States already possessed incongruous elements in the body politic of sufficient extent, and that it would be better to go slow; and they by no means endorsed the desirability of effecting a change, even if it were practicable to effect it. I thought that would be a good time to come down to a point which I conceive to be of great importance, and so I urged on almost every member I met, certainly on every member when I obtained an opportunity to do so, the impropriety of attempting to force Canada into annexation by adopting a policy of restriction. I assured them that to continue a policy of retaliation and restriction would fail to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended, that such a policy would beget resentment, and that it would serve no good purpose, but that it would in itself be detrimental and prejudicial to the interests of both countries, and if any

Mr. CHARLTON.

person favouring annexation thought it would contribute to securing that result, he was utterly and entirely mistaken. I urged this view of the case for the reason that I did not desire to see that policy adopted, that I deprecated the consequences of that policy, and I sought, so far as my influence might go, to convince the members of Congress that it was a fallacious policy to adopt, and one they had better abandon. It may be asked, what did I urge? In talking with members of Congress I urged my views. I urged forbearance. I urged generous treatment on the part of the strong towards the weak. I urged peaceful relations. I urged a policy of refraining from adopting retaliation. I urged favourable consideration of a fair proposal for reciprocity. I deprecated unfriendly legislation, and as I have said before, I argued especially, and with all the force I could command, that they should not think of adopting a retaliatory policy for the special purpose of playing into the hands of the annexation party and hastening the consummation of that event. I ask, was this treason? I have outlined fully and fairly the course I took. Was it treason? Was it even stabbing Canada, à la Wallace, in a vital part? I submit the case to my peers in this House.

I have something further to say about what I learned in Washington. There were a great many things I wanted to learn, and although my stay was brief, I learned what I could while I was there. I learned something about the feeling that exists among public men in Washington towards Canada. I learned that it was in the great majority of cases a friendly feeling, that the feeling was all that could be desired, that we have nothing to fear from that kind of Jingo feeling in Washington that exists in this House, that we may look to them when the proper time comes and feel satisfied that when we approach them in a fair spirit we will be treated with the essence of fair-play, that they will meet us in the middle of the stream in any offer we may make for friendly relations and wider commercial relations between the two peoples. What I learned about reciprocity was that under the Cleveland Administration we can get reciprocity. I affirm unhesitatingly and without reservation that we can get reciprocity from that Administration, and get it on fair and equitable terms. In connection with this, I will read a resolution introduced into the Senate by a gentleman who, it is reported, will be Secretary of the Treasury in the Cleveland Administration, by a gentleman who is next to the President of the United States, the foremost figure in the political life of that country at the present time. I refer to the Hon. J. G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, who is in direct line of succession to the next nomination for the presidency, and who is one of the most broad, liberal-minded and patriotic men in that country. Mr. Carlisle introduced this resolution some two years ago. I read it as indicative of the feeling Mr. Carlisle

will entertain with respect to this matter. It is as follows:—

Whereas there are existing between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada certain controversies with respect to their trade and commerce and concerning the interpretations of treaty stipulations; and whereas it is desirable that the most friendly relations should obtain between the peoples of the two countries, and that more extended trade and commerce be established, promoted by such friendly legislation by both countries as will remove all causes of irritation and every obstacle to healthy growth and development of such trade and commerce between them: now therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that, for the purpose of carrying out the spirit and intent embodied in the foregoing preamble, the President of the United States be and is hereby authorized and directed to invite the Government of the Dominion of Canada to appoint three commissioners to meet a like number of commissioners to be appointed by him on behalf of the United States.

Such joint commission shall consider all questions relating to the commercial relations of the two countries under existing treaties, concurrent legislation or otherwise, and agree upon and recommend to their respective Governments such legislation as will settle all disputes and controversies between the two countries, and which will, in the judgment of the said commission, best tend to promote the growth of trade and commerce between the United States and the said Dominion of Canada.

That was the resolution introduced in the Senate by the Hon. J. G. Carlisle, and that resolution is the key-note of the policy of the Democratic party, which assumes power in the United States on the fourth day of next March. I may, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, without violating confidence, say that the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington, a man whose voice with regard to tariff changes is more potent than that of any other man in America, the Hon. Wm. M. Springer, of Illinois: one of the most thorough men in the United States in the grasp of his knowledge of economic questions, one of the greatest minds in the United States.—I may say that Wm. M. Springer is understood, on what I believe to be good authority, to favour a policy of making a statutory offer of reciprocity by the United States to all contiguous states; reciprocity in all the natural products of all these states, reciprocity in all things manufactured from the raw material produced by every one of these states, reciprocity in all goods produced from raw material admitted free of duty by both of the contracting countries. In all probability that offer, briefly outlined in these words, will be made a statutory offer, and the overture held out Canada, to Mexico, and to the states of Central America. The assertion that we cannot get reciprocity, the assertion that such a treaty is unattainable has no foundation in fact, because such a treaty can be obtained. No such treaty as the Canadian commissioners went to Washington to obtain, a treaty with the advantages entirely on the side of Canada, a treaty admitting raw materials free of

duty only, a treaty giving us the privilege of selling all we want to sell, and debarring the Americans from the privilege of selling to us what they want to sell—no such treaty as that can be negotiated. But a fair reciprocity treaty that gives to us the privilege to sell in the markets of the United States, everything we produce in mines, in fisheries, in forests and on the farm, and everything that we produce in our workshops, in return for privileges granted to the Americans of selling to us the production of their own labour,—such a treaty, I affirm, can be negotiated with the utmost facility and without any obstacles standing in the way. I have said that the feeling in Washington with regard to Canada was all that could be desired.

I found out something, also, with regard to the feeling towards the present Government in political circles in Washington, and I found that it was not so favourable or so friendly as the feeling towards the country at large. I was sorry to see it, but the fact remains that there is not so cordial a feeling towards the Canadian Government as there is towards the people which this Government presides over. That arises from various causes. The canal toll question has had something to do with it, the refusal of the privilege of bonding fish from the Maritime Provinces to be shipped by rail to American cities, has had something to do with it; but more than anything else, there is the alleged breach of confidence and chicanery practised by the Canadian commission, and by which the United States Government was made a catspaw to pull Tory chestnuts out of the fire in an election contest in this country. The deep feeling of resentment in reference to this matter has, it is stated, been such as to lead the President of the United States to provide that we shall have reciprocity in refusing the bonding privilege, and reciprocity in quarantining cattle, a policy which we have adhered to for many years, and which I fear is to be now introduced by the United States. Now, Sir, this is a brief statement of what I saw, and what I did, and what I learned in Washington. I obtrude it upon the House—if I may use the term obtrude—because I feel forced to do so. I have been charged in the newspapers of the Conservative party in the grossest manner, with malignity and untruthfulness and treason and selling my country, and with every degree of baseness that Judas Iscariot could be guilty of. I repudiate and deny these charges, and so far as they relate to my visit to Washington I have met them fully, minutely, fairly and truthfully, and I have placed the whole state of the case before this House and before the country. I repeat, Sir, that we can get reciprocity with the United States, and that the allegation that we cannot get it has no foundation in fact. I would not say that we will have, under the democratic policy, a mitigation of the tariff restrictions that exist in that country, before we apply for reciprocity. I think it is doubt-

ful if we have, I think the American Government will leave that question to be settled, and these mitigations to be secured through treaty arrangements which they are ready and anxious to make; but whether they do or not, I reiterate that we can get reciprocity. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot coerce us. I took the utmost pains to impress that view of the case upon public men at Washington; but neither can we coerce the United States, and both parties have been engaged in that unprofitable and foolish business long enough. I have here words spoken by Lord Salisbury—

Mr. WELDON. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman; but a number of members on this side of the House did not quite understand his statement with reference to the hon. gentleman's interview with Mr. Springer, Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in Washington. We would like to ask the hon. gentleman, before he leaves that part of his subject, whether, seeing he had so full a discussion with that distinguished American statesman, he had brought things to any other conclusion than this: that there was to be a common tariff, a perfect free trade between the two countries, and a common tariff against all the outside world—the McKinley tariff, if you will—but at all events, a high tariff against goods from the British islands?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has interrupted me and asked for a fuller and more explicit statement in regard to the point he has raised. What I stated with regard to Chairman Springer was this: That I had reason to believe that he, as Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, was in favour of a reciprocity arrangement, not only with Canada, but with all states contiguous to the United States; an arrangement that will permit the free interchange of all the natural productions of the soil, the forest and the mines; an arrangement that will also permit the free interchange of all the finished products of the raw materials of either countries, and that will also permit the free interchange of all the products of raw materials imported into both countries entering into the arrangement, free of duty. I may also state, as the hon. gentleman's question suggests, that Mr. Springer is understood to be opposed to any arrangement such as a Zollverein or customs union; that he does not think it practicable, that he does not think it in the interests of the United States, and he believes that each party should control its own tariff, except so far as such control is surrendered by the common arrangement rendered necessary, by the negotiations that will be required to secure a reciprocity treaty between each. Have I made myself sufficiently clear upon the point? I was about to quote, Sir, the language used by Lord Salisbury a few days ago bearing upon this question of tariff reprisals, tariff war, and tariff retaliation.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Lord Salisbury, in his speech to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, which is reported on the fourth day of this month, says:

He questioned both the morality and expediency of the use of tariffs as a weapon against other nations, and he mentioned as an instance and illustration of his argument the fiscal wars between France and Italy, and France and Switzerland, as producing disaster to all concerned.

Lord Salisbury, with equal propriety, might have instanced the fiscal war between Canada and the United States as furnishing an illustration of the same kind, and as producing disaster, and nothing but disaster to all concerned.

In the year 1886, on the expiration of the reciprocity treaty, we had as large an export trade with the United States in the natural products of our soil as we had last year; under the influences of repression, the trade of the two countries has been dwarfed, and while the population of the United States has doubled, while their wealth is three times greater than it was then, while their demand for productions has increased, we in Canada have remained almost stationary in our exports during the whole of this period. In no year since 1866 have our exports to the United States equalled the exports of 1866, taking the United States statistics of the trade of that year as the basis of calculation, and the result of this war of discrimination and retaliation has been entirely and wholly disastrous to both countries, producing mutual disadvantages, mutual difficulties and mutual losses.

Now Sir, I may conclude my remarks by saying, as I said before, that the charge of treason, the charge of disloyalty, as applied to the Liberal party of Canada, is false—utterly false—that party is the truly loyal party that strives to promote the interests and the prosperity of the people of this country, the party that will stand by the interests of this country, the party that has no object in view beyond making Canada a prosperous country, a growing country, a wealthy country, a better country to live in, and a more successful experiment as a colony under the British flag, pending the settlement of its ultimate position. We go Sir, for free trade with the United States, because we believe it would be mutually advantageous. We go for tariff reform—for tariff reform all along the line. We go for economy; we go for honesty; we go for the prosperity of Canada. In all these things, Sir, we are the antipodes of the party opposite; and if these things constitute disloyalty, if they constitute treason, then we are disloyal, we are traitors, and there sits the party that is loyal to the destinies and the interests of the country. And what I say with regard to the party, I repeat with regard to myself. I say that the same charge applied to me is malignant and utterly false; it has not a scintilla of truth in it. I have battled here, Mr. Speaker, on the opposite side of this House for nearly fifteen years.

It has not been a very lucrative or satisfactory occupation; but I may say to-day what I have never before said in this House, that I might have had a position on the other side of the House in 1878—that I might have had a position since then; but I have declined anything in the shape of the flesh-pots of Egypt, and have held to the trust which I believed properly rested upon me, to fight for what I thought to be right, and what we on this side of the House think to be right. Political life has been to me, as to many others, one of pecuniary sacrifice. I have never been very anxious for popularity. My wish has been rather to leave a good name behind me. I do not want to leave behind me the name of traitor or the name of one guilty of chicanery or fraud. If, when I die, I can leave it to be said by some poor woman that my efforts as a promoter of legislation have protected her against the wiles of those who lure to ruin, if I can leave it to be said that the truth of the intimate connection which exists between the laws of God and the welfare of the state, has been illustrated by anything that I have accomplished in this country, I shall be rewarded for all these years of battle and strife. I have not been governed in my course here by any desire to do anything that would not meet with the approval of my own conscience and with the approbation of my disinterested fellow-countrymen. Canada, Sir, is my home; it has been my home for forty-four years; it commands my services, and I will do anything that lies in my power to promote the interest and welfare of this land which has been mine since my boyhood. I will labour for its peace and prosperity. I will do that here and elsewhere. I will do that when I address my fellow-countrymen; I will do it when I address, as I have too seldom the opportunity of doing, meetings in the United States, and when I meet public men in the United States, whether at Washington or elsewhere. In all this I shall be governed by the single desire to promote the interests of Canada. That is what I have sought to do; that is the motive that has governed my actions, and I feel stung by these unjust reproaches and these lying epithets that have been applied to me by the base party press of this country. I believe, honestly, Mr. Speaker, that admission to the markets of this continent is essential to the prosperity of Canada. I act on that belief; I advocate that policy; I do it without asking any man's permission, and without apologising to any man for what he believes may be the ultimate result of that policy. I labour for this, and, at the same time, I am in favour of internal reforms. I look, of course, to the future, and I realize that the day is coming when the process of evolution, as it is applied to nations and colonies, will require us to face the momentous question as to what the next step in our national progress shall be. I realize that the condition of colonial dependence is not a permanen-

one, and that we must expect to meet the question as to what action—momentous in its consequences and likely to settle permanently our political status, we shall take when the proper time comes—whether it shall be the blending of our institutions with those of the Empire, on the one hand, independence on the other, or a consolidation of the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths on this continent, as the best of the three plans, cannot with absolute certainty be predicted. These will be the questions for the people of Canada to consider and to decide at the proper time. But they are not questions of the hour. They are not to be settled now; they are not to be passed upon now; and if we can adopt the policy that will secure the prosperity of this country, the development of its resources, the increase of its population, the promotion of its well-being, the happiness of its people, and peaceful relations among all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths of this continent we can leave these questions of the future to be settled when the fulness of time has come, trusting and believing that He who governs nations will direct the course of this country aright.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I must congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) upon his intimate acquaintance with the secrets of politics on the other side. He is able to tell us who is to be the Secretary of the Treasury in the incoming Administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not say he was to be so; I said he was reported to be slated for that position, and the hon. gentleman, if he is familiar with the American newspapers, has the same sources of information that I have.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The hon. gentleman left the impression on my mind that he was thoroughly familiar with the political parties of the United States, and knew nearly all their secrets, and was able to tell this House that this country could get reciprocity, if it so desired. To show that the hon. gentleman is generally believed to be intimate with American politics, let me read what was said by a gentleman at a meeting of the Ministerial Association of Toronto yesterday:

Rev. Mr. Blackstock dissented. He objected to lending any influence whatever, either directly or indirectly, to politicians. In a matter like this they should act in their individual capacities. Mr. Charlton had been in Washington doing what he could to promote annexation, and the association should remember him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is that the "World?"

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). It is the Ottawa "Citizen"—a press despatch from Toronto. The hon. gentleman's acquaintance with American politics is such that this reverend gentleman considered it improper that he should address a meeting in Toronto. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk, without

any special instigation on my part, has seen fit to explain his relation, or rather his want of relation, to those various missions which have been sent to Washington by certain politicians in this country. I myself happened three years ago to be in Washington—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN—in the pursuit of health. I was stopping at the Willard Hotel—a very good hotel, though a very old one. I was sitting at a table in the dining-room, enjoying a meal, on the opposite side of which was sitting a gentleman whom I did not know. I went to the head waiter and asked him if Guy Fawkes was in town? He replied no and I then asked him who that gentleman might be? He said that was Mr. Charlton, from Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Anything further in that line?

Mr. MACLEAN. The other day when addressing the House, I referred to the responsibility of politicians for what newspapers said and the responsibility of newspapers for what the politicians said, but did not say anything to preclude me from holding the Liberal party responsible for the acts of certain men who are identified with that party. The Liberal party is responsible for men like Mr. Bunting, who is associated with them in their efforts to get reciprocity. They are responsible for men like Farrer, who has been in Washington time and again, and Goldwin Smith who upholds them in their policy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was Goldwin Smith who put the other party in power.

Mr. MACLEAN. They are responsible for the utterances of Mr. Farrer and his articles, and we know what those are; they are responsible for the articles in "La Patrie," of Montreal, and we know what those articles favour; they are responsible for Mr. Longley, of Nova Scotia, who is an annexationist—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN—and who is responsible for the sale of a mine in this country to an American combine; and they are responsible for all those recriminations against Canada and instigations to coercion and the like. Can they deny that? They must answer to the country and the people for the action they have taken in these various missions to Washington; and it is their duty now, if they are honourable men, when calling for all the papers in connection with the efforts of the Government regarding reciprocity, to tell us all they did and said in connection with that matter. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said he was at Washington and told the politicians a great deal, but I take it he did not tell them, for instance, that in Canada the Liberal party had a French Canadian Catholic as its leader and was manipulated by a machine politician, J. D. Edgar. He told them nothing of that. I just wish to point out the difference between the two parties in this country with

Mr. MACLEAN (East York).

regard to this question. The Conservative party has, as its fundamental principle, that we are a Canadian people, that we are on this continent as Canadians, and intend to realize our destiny as such, and the second article in our creed is that we are British subjects; and in the light of these two facts, namely, that we are Canadians bound to establish a Canadian nationality on this continent and are British subjects, we purpose to regulate all our trade relations and tariff reform measures and diplomatic relations with other countries. But hon. gentlemen opposite, first of all, lay down a trade policy, and then they let our future as a nation and our relations to the mother country sink or swim, as they may be affected by that trade policy. I have nothing further to say on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I will oblige hon. gentlemen. Let them just remember this, that they have taken an unpatriotic stand, that they are fast going to the political graveyard, where they will be interred; and the man who drives the annexation hearse containing the corpse is Mr. Goldwin Smith, and the undertaker is Erastus Wiman, and the chief gravedigger, Farrer, and over one grave will be a little board bearing the inscription: "Here lies the man who tried to sell his country," and over another "Here lies the man who tried to sell his adopted country."

Mr. FRASER. I think that perhaps the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), if he took into consideration the character of the attempted little bit of wit on the part of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) last night, would not have paid so much attention to it. We really, by paying any attention to that hon. gentleman's remarks, appear to give them some value, but as he said something relating to the province of Nova Scotia, and as the hon. member for Cape Breton right behind him, who is hand in glove with Mr. Longley, did not rise to refute the statement, I felt bound to answer it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He had good reasons probably.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and substantial reasons. But so far as Mr. Longley, the Attorney-General, is concerned, he is not an annexationist, and the statement of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is not true. It is an easy matter to make a little capital by saying this man and the other is an annexationist. Does any man in Canada believe there is any more loyalty to the British Crown in the breast of the man who spoke than in the hearts of the men on this side. Look at him. Loyalty to what? Fancy him posing as the sole custodian of the loyalty of Canada. What a manly man to stand by Her Majesty in peril. There are a number of people in this country who go around talking as if they possessed the whole loyalty of Canada, men who in their

hearts do not believe a word of what they profess, and who show they do not by their actions. What is loyalty? Does it consist of the loud-mouthed utterances of men who say they are the only loyal people in the world? Does any man believe that if the hon. gentleman came in here and went about boasting how loyal he was to his wife we would believe he was any more loyal than he should be? Not a bit of it. If he is loyal to his wife he will say nothing about it; but down in the depths of his heart he will cherish that sentiment and do the best he can to make her happy. That is true loyalty. Whenever I hear a man talking loyalty I suspect that if you look deep down into him you will find a selfish disposition which he wants to cover with the cloak of loyalty. What is loyalty? It is the desire to make this country the best heritage in which to live. If an hon. gentleman who thinks that free trade is a better principle than protection, stands by it and strikes hard at the party opposite, is he disloyal? These gentlemen think that if a word is said against the Government, that is disloyal. Surely Governments are constituted for the well-being of the country, and surely a fair criticism of their policy is consonant with the highest degree of loyalty to the best interests of the country. I agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that these men going up and down the country, speaking as if they only were loyal, are doing more to make outsiders believe there are disloyal people here than anything else; and I have no doubt that if it came to an issue the men who shout loyalty would be the first to show their backs and their heels. Here is our country to live in and die in, and to make as good as or better than any other country. Shall we do this by diverse methods or by all thinking alike? Shall we not think our thoughts and speak our thoughts as to the best methods of governing the country, and if we do so shall we be called disloyal? So far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned there are no annexationists there. The thing is never heard of, and why? Because our Conservative friends know that the country is equally divided between both parties, and they see the farmer and the fisherman on both sides; the one as ready to imperil his life for the safety of the country as the other, and they know a cry of disloyalty would be ridiculed. But there has grown up a set of men who think they are doing nothing for their country unless they shout their loyalty. Wherever there is liberty, that is my country, and my country is best when there is liberty, not only in thought but in action. Let us join together, without thinking that this man is disloyal or that man is disloyal in this House because he belongs to the opposite party. Why, look at Mr. Sol. White, who, I notice, is in the Ontario Legislature, and against him not a single Conservative paper has raised its voice. He went down the other day to one of the Norfolks; I am not well acquainted with the geography of Ontario,

and I do not know whether it was the constituency of the hon. gentleman for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) or of my hon. friend who has just spoken; but this man is going up and down the country talking disloyalty. Why not strike at him?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I ask the hon. gentleman to whom he refers?

Mr. FRASER. I refer to Mr. White.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong with regard to the facts.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman say he is not a pronounced annexationist?

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman says that Mr. White is going up and down the country preaching annexation, he is saying what is not true.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is true; I have heard Mr. White several times myself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As the hon. gentleman from Essex (Mr. McGregor) has denied what I have said with regard to Mr. White, I wish to say this: although I am not the special keeper of Mr. White's conscience, I wish to say with regard to the meeting in Norfolk—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a speech.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I only wish to say that I understand Mr. White was not in the county of Norfolk. Mr. White held no meetings in the county of Norfolk; and more than that, Mr. White has recently declared that he never was an annexationist.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentlemen will wait a moment: Mr. White has said that he has preferred annexation to the miserable policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and further, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) ought to know that the Continental Union Association has expelled Mr. White recently because of his expression of those views.

Mr. FRASER. I may have been mistaken about the county. As I say, I am not very well up in the geography of the numerous counties in Ontario; but I do know that Mr. White attended a meeting somewhere in that section—it may have been at Woodstock. The hon. gentleman says that he preferred annexation to the "miserable policy of gentlemen opposite," and, therefore, he became an annexationist. What was the glorious policy of hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House that he could not stick to it? Was not that a bright idea of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague)? He had not resting place among the Conservatives, and so he detached himself completely from the policy of his whilom friends, for he was rather more of an annexationist than they were. All I do know is that Mr. White has again and again held meetings, and I have read in the newspapers that he said he was in favour of annexation, but by methods that are thoroughly constitutional, namely, with the consent of the

mother country. Now, why should not he be spoken against? I suppose if he has recanted and gone back, there will be a great deal of joy in the camp. He will find a resting place there among others who have heretofore declared for annexation, and now find a congenial place in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. He will, no doubt, be taken back as a man entitled to more than usual honour, because he had given utterance to those views at one time. But I only rose to say that so far as the statement is concerned with regard to Nova Scotia, that the coal deal was the outgrowth of the annexation views of Mr. Longley, the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) might have got more correct information if he had consulted the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) and some other Conservative members. Why, the chief man in that deal is Mr. White, of Halifax, one of the best Conservatives in Nova Scotia; and my hon. friend Mr. McKeen was a willing party. Now, is it to be said that if American capital comes into this country, the men who accepted it are disloyal? I thought that we invited capital from all parts of the world. How disloyal the Englishmen must be who are buying up millions of property in the United States. Is it disloyal for a man to further his fortunes by making investments in another country? If so, I suspect that there are a number of gentlemen opposite who, I understand, are largely interested in the United States, who are more disloyal than many other parties. That is not disloyalty, it is the widening of commerce, it is the breadth of commerce, that leads men to make investments where they can do so at the best advantage. Let us stop this kind of talk. I thought it was small work when the hon. member rose last night to make the statement he did. Let us in this House take a broader view. Let us acknowledge that, whatever our political differences may be, we are true to Canada, that we have no other interests than the interests of Canada, which have been confided to us by our constituents. We are here to better her condition, to give her freer institutions, to make her people happier than they have been in the past, by trusting her, honouring her institutions, make her better by trusting her sons, although we differ from them. Let us acknowledge that, although their views are in opposition to ours, they are as honest as ourselves. Let us make this Canada better, in fine, by putting out of position those men who cloak themselves round with a miserable loyal cry to cover up their shams and their frauds. Then, alone, will Canada feel that we have men who are loyal because they love Canada, not because they pronounce the shibboleths of party, and who think thereby that they have a peculiar claim to call themselves the only loyal men in the country.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) commenced his remarks by asking this House to look upon

Mr. FRASER.

the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean). This was evidently regarded by the other side of the House as a very refined piece of wit, judging by the applause with which the remark was treated. I looked at the hon. member from York and was unable to see anything ridiculous or amusing in his appearance. Sir, following the example of the hon. member for Guysborough, let me ask this House to look upon that hon. gentleman himself. Whenever he rises to address this House, I look upon him with feelings of pride. In his portly form and manly bearing I see something that the Maritime Provinces should be proud of. Sir, as I gaze upon him, another thought always occurs to my mind, and as I observe the impressive manner in which he addresses this House, and the way in which he looks upon the members about him, whom he seems to regard as pigmies, not only physically, but mentally, I cannot help thinking of the language of Shakespeare, in Julius Caesar:

Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
Like a Colossus; and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves.

From his exalted physical and intellectual position, the hon. member for Guysborough should have compassion upon those who surround him, and who do not possess the same advantages that he does. The hon. gentleman, at the outset of his speech, referring to the hon. member for York, said that he always suspected a man who boasted loudly of his loyalty. He does not believe in the loyalty of any man who makes too many professions. I suppose the same thing might be said of a man who boasted too much of his virtue, and of his honesty. I think it was a harsh thing, it was indeed a cruel thing for the hon. member for Guysborough so deeply to wound the feelings of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the greater part of whose speech was taken up with an assertion of his honesty of purpose, of his own goodness, and of the sincerity of the motives that actuated him. So if it is open for the hon. member for Guysborough to say that he suspects my hon. friend from York, that he doubts his loyalty because of his profession of it, although I did not hear him make any very loud profession of loyalty, it is equally open to us to suspect the honesty and sincerity and general goodness of the hon. member for North Norfolk, after having made such loud professions of the same in this House. I thought it was very unfair for the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who sits behind the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and is supposed to regard him as one of his leaders, to stab him in the back, as it were, in this matter. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is aiming to secure the hon. gentleman's position in the front rank, and he is, therefore, posing as the embodiment of all that is good, pure and virtuous in this country, a position which, up to the present time, has been contended for by the hon. mem-

ber for North Norfolk, although that hon. gentleman, as was shown by the short extract from a letter which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) read, is not that broad-minded man he would have this House to believe he was, because he himself took exception to having, as the leader of his party, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), and he told the country he had little hope for the future of the party so long as that hon. gentleman continued to be its leader. That, certainly, was not a broad-minded and elevated position for a liberal-minded and honest statesman to take. It seems to me that the members on this side of the House would resent a charge of that kind brought against the leader of the Opposition as quickly as his followers on the Opposition side of the House. No such narrow feeling should have a place in his breast, and it ill-becomes a man who would put forward that idea and also put forward the idea respecting the machinations of the poetical gentleman, or, as he calls him, the machine politician from Ontario, to stand before this House, and before the country, and flaunt his superior honesty and virtue in the face of the House and the country. Coming down, for a few moments, to the question more especially before this House, I desire to say that I do not now charge, and never have charged, the Liberal party of this country with being a party that were disloyal to British connection. I desire to say, as one who is loyal to British connection, that I cannot bring myself to believe that such a large body of men in this country as are to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party are disloyal to British connection, because I firmly believe that the people of this country are loyal to the core, and any man who openly advocated annexation would take his political life in his hands and virtually sign his political death-roll. But while that is the case, while I am willing to state, and have always stated on every platform, that I believe the great bulk of the Liberal party and of Liberals in this country are loyal to British connection, and that if the party openly urged annexation the people would resent that policy and not support it, yet, at the same time, it seems to me that the party itself are to blame, to a great extent, for having nursed on their breast many men who openly advocate annexation between this country and the United States.

Mr. GILLMOR. Name them.

Mr. HAZEN. I will name one, as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) asks me to name one. I will name a hon. gentleman who, during the last election campaign in this country, was the leading writer on the principal Liberal paper, a man who, during that campaign, edited the great party organ of the Liberals, a man who furnished the campaign ammunition and the material which the Liberals relied on in order to win

the election. I refer to Edward Farrer. The hon. member for Charlotte nods his head. The hon. gentleman may possibly say that Mr. Farrer at one time was a writer on Conservative papers. That is true. But the moment Mr. Farrer put forward views of that sort, he was unable to express them in Conservative papers, but he got his opportunity as editor of the leading Liberal organ, the Toronto "Globe." And so I name that one man, in response to the request of the hon. member for Charlotte. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who addressed the House, stood up in defence of the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, Mr. Longley. The hon. gentleman repudiated the idea that Mr. Longley is an annexationist. Well, if Mr. Longley is not an annexationist, then all I have to say is, that I never before so forcibly felt the truth of the remark that language was given to conceal our thoughts as I do at present, because I have read speeches made by that gentleman which seem to bear very closely indeed on the question of annexation to the United States. But further than that, I say that hon. gentlemen opposite, at the last election, unwittingly it may be, advocated a line of policy which to my mind could have had but one result if carried into effect, and that would have been to hand over the control of our tariff to Washington, which in the end must have resulted in political union between Canada and the United States. I do not make this statement in consequence of what any Conservative has said. In support of that contention I will quote, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, an authority which I do not think they will dispute, and that is the gentleman who for years was the standard-bearer, the pride, the ornament of the Liberal party of this country, a gentleman who sat year after year in this House, who was a member of the Government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who was leader of the Liberal party in Opposition,—I mean Edward Blake. In that letter which Mr. Blake published to his constituents of West Durham declining renomination, and which was not published until after the elections, he took the same view concerning the question of reciprocity as was put forward by the most ultra-Conservative in the land. Surely that is an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute. Then we have Goldwin Smith. I do not wish to hold the Liberal party responsible for the utterances of Mr. Smith; but in Toronto he was the intimate friend of Mr. Farrer while editor of the "Globe," and he is the intimate personal friend of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Therefore, while I do not think it is the intention of the Conservative party to charge the hon. gentlemen opposite with being disloyal, yet it seems to me they should be careful of their associates and careful of the policy they put before this country. I do not wish that a charge of

dishonesty should be made against them. A great deal has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) concerning what Mr. Springer, the American Democratic statesman, has said. But we have before this House the plain statement made by the Minister of Finance last session, in which he told us plainly that in the conference which took place at Washington between the representatives of this Government and Secretary Blaine and General Foster, now Secretary of State for the United States. Mr. Blaine laid it down as a positive fact, that we need not hope to have reciprocity with the United States, unless we were prepared to give the manufacturers of the United States an advantage in the markets of Canada over the manufacturers of Great Britain, who were their principal competitors there. That was a sine qua non, that was essential to an agreement of that sort, as stated by Mr. Blaine to our delegates to Washington. Further, he told our delegates that the people of the United States were committed to the policy of high protection, and if a joint tariff was adopted, it must be the tariff of the United States. I, therefore, say it is utterly impossible in that position of affairs to obtain reciprocity with the United States. It is the hope of every Canadian, I care not to what party he belongs, that, in view of the change that has taken place in the United States since last election, that with the tidal wave which has swept the Democrats into power, the Democrats running on a platform of freer trade and a tariff for revenue only, when the Democrats come into power, a treaty may be arranged with that country that will give us freer intercourse with them, than we now enjoy, and yet be framed on terms fair and honourable to Canada and that will not endanger her British connection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is somewhat lowering the dignity of this House to be compelled to listen to the discussion that has taken place on this subject, and I regret very much the occasion which has caused the subject to be brought up in the House. Had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), I, for my part, would not have joined in this debate. I have never been accused on the floor of Parliament, nor in the press, nor by any person, so far as I know, of being an annexationist, but owing to the many references made in some of the ultra-loyal papers of the Conservative party, in regard to the riding which I have the honour to represent, I desire to take this occasion to explain, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, if they are not aware of it already, the serious trend that their action in regard to this matter is taking in the country. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) undertook to deny that a leading and prominent Conservative member of Parliament had announced himself as an annexationist. In

Mr. HAZEN.

answer to that, I have this to say: Mr. Sol. White, a member of Parliament and a prominent member of the Conservative party, called a meeting in the town of Woodstock, in the county of Oxford, and he there delivered a speech of over an hour's duration in favour of the annexation of Canada to the United States. It is dishonest for the Conservative press and the Conservative members of this House to try to slander and misrepresent the leaders of the Liberal party by calling them annexationists because there may be some members of that party who expressed such views, and it would be just as dishonest for me, if I were to say for one moment that the Conservatives of the town of Woodstock, and of the riding which I represent, are annexationists, because Mr. Sol. White, a Conservative annexationist, preached his doctrine amongst them. However, I can say that it was this Conservative member of Parliament, this prominent member of the Conservative party, who called a meeting in Woodstock, delivered a speech in favour of annexation, and tried to initiate, and to raise money to support, an organization to propagate these views in that county. I will say further, that although there was a large number of Conservatives present at that meeting, not one of them got up on that platform and attempted to answer Mr. White, but it was left for the Liberals of that county to speak in opposition of the views of the leading Conservative annexationist. I do not for one moment say that because the Conservatives present did not undertake to refute the opinions of Mr. White, that they were in favour of annexation. I do not believe it to be so, but I do say, that if he did not carry a resolution in favour of annexation, it was owing to the number of Liberals who were present, and I myself took the platform there in opposition to Mr. White. I regret to find, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian politics have degraded so low, that we find men getting up in this House, endeavouring to slander the Liberal members and the leaders of the Liberal party, by saying that because Goldwin Smith advocates annexation, that we, as a party, are responsible for it. I remember the first time that I ever saw or heard that gentleman, and it was on an occasion when he was on a public platform, in company with the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald and many prominent Conservatives. It is to his pen and voice, more, perhaps, than to any other man in Canada, that we owe to-day the fact that we have the National Policy in this country. Will any person deny that? I am informed that that was long after he had given his opinions as a pronounced annexationist. Be that as it may, I say that it would be dishonest for me to insinuate that the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, and his colleagues, and his friends at that time, were disloyal to the country, because they had Goldwin Smith associated with them on the platform. I may say further, that within

the last few weeks I met, in the town of Woodstock, a well-known prominent Conservative, a gentleman who, I believe, contested at the convention the nomination from the riding of the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean), who has just spoken; I met that gentleman in the town going around amongst all classes of the people, trying to raise money to maintain an annexation organ in the city of Toronto. Would it be honest for me to state here that, because that gentleman supported the hon. member for East York so strongly in his last election, that the hon. member for York is, therefore, an annexationist, and in favour of these views? I regret, Sir, exceedingly, the occasion for this discussion, and, as a Canadian, and one who desires the best interests of his country, I do hope that one result of this discussion will be to stop this slandering of the Liberal party. I do hope that we shall no more hear such remarks as those used by a member of the Government the other day, with regard to the leaders of our party. If gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House supporting the Government, are honest in their desires for the interests of the country, and wish that we should maintain the position we now hold, they will cease their speeches in the House and on the platform, and stop the articles which are being continually printed in the Toronto papers, accusing the Liberal party of favouring annexation. I trust that they will also realize that, if there is a growing sentiment, and a growing party in this country in favour of annexation, it is they who are creating that party. I speak now for my own riding, and I repudiate altogether, on the part of any prominent Liberal, the action that has been taken in forming a political union club there. I have shown to the House beyond question that the Liberal party has nothing to do with the spreading of these sentiments in the House or out of it, and no man dare contradict a word I say. I wait for an answer. I want to know if every word I have stated is not known to every one of the gentlemen opposite as being actually true. I want to know if it is not a fact that the men who came to my county and formed this organization, and who are trying at the present time to support this annexation party, are not all prominent Conservatives? As a Canadian I regret this state of affairs. It would be dishonest on my part, or on the part of any Liberal in this House or out of it, to accuse the Government or their followers of being annexationists because their political friends hold those opinions. It is equally dishonest for members of the Conservative party to accuse the Liberal party of annexationist tendencies because some individual follower of the Liberal party undertakes to express such views. I do trust that in future we will hear gentlemen opposite discussing public questions on their merits, giving people the right to express their views honestly and sincerely, and fairly, and without accusing

them or the Liberal party of disloyalty, or of being traitors.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, I have a very few words to say in reference to this matter, and they will be largely of a local nature. I quite agree with a great deal that has been said by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), but I think that he misunderstood largely the discussion here, or that he hardly put it fairly before the House, if he understood it as I did. I do not understand that a single member on this side of the House has charged the Liberal party with being disloyal. It is true that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and some hon. gentlemen criticised the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and when I come to deal with him, I will give some reasons why I think that he himself may have in the past afforded good grounds for criticism in this respect. I wish to say here, as I have had occasion to say in my own riding, and as I have always said, that I believe the Liberals in this country as a body are as loyal in every respect as the Conservatives. My experience as a volunteer has extended over many years, and it is but justice to state, that I have found the Liberals on all occasions ready to do military duty for the country in times of peace and ready to take their share in the defence of our country when serious danger threatened us. I say further, that lately, in my own county, I have taken the responsibility on myself in meetings which I have held throughout the riding, to repudiate on behalf of the Liberal party there, certain transactions which have occurred, and in connection with which I have proposed to give an explanation which will afford my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), an opportunity of showing whether he is as sincere, as he states he is, in the professions which he has made to-day. In my riding an attempt was made to make it appear that the Liberal association was in favour of annexation. I have explained it in my riding and I wish to explain it here. In my opinion it was a deliberate fraud on the Liberal association of the south riding of Norfolk. What happened was this. We have in Ontario, as you know, both Conservative associations and Liberal associations for party purposes, largely for the purposes of organization. In the town of Simcoe for some months past, the Reform organ, called the Norfolk "Reformer," has been openly advocating annexation, or what it calls continental union, which is the same thing. It means the destruction of this country as a separate entity, whatever else it may mean. The editor of this paper and his sympathizers packed a local meeting of the Reform association in Simcoe, and got a resolution passed there in favour of annexation. A few days later the Liberal association of the riding was called to meet, and without notifying the association that such a resolution was to be brought up at the meet-

ing, they got it passed there also; and immediately afterwards it was telegraphed all over this country and all over the United States that a Liberal association of this Dominion had pledged itself as a party association in favour of annexation. It was a fraud, because it would have been voted down ten to one if the Liberals of that riding had known that the question was going to come before the meeting and had an opportunity to vote upon it. Now, I make that explanation, and I accept the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk to-day in reference to his loyalty. It is the first time he has made such an affirmation. I agree with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that this is not a matter to be trifled with at all. It is becoming a serious question, and I am glad to proclaim, unless I see greater evidences to the contrary than at present exist, that the Liberal party of this country are loyal; and I am prepared to maintain it. The hon. member for North Norfolk, however, has allowed himself to be left open to suspicion, because of the speeches he has made in Buffalo, in Chicago and in Washington, as reported in the American press—I will not say whether correctly reported or not. But he has left himself open to suspicion and to criticism by those reports, and until to-day has never taken the opportunity of proclaiming his devotion to this country and to the British Crown; and I am very glad to have heard him say what he has. Now, the Norfolk "Reformer," the organ of the hon. gentleman's party in his county, notwithstanding the protest of Mr. Mowat—probably the greatest Liberal local prime minister we ever had—has been for a year past not only promulgating annexation, but the other day the editor of this paper was foremost in forming what they called a continental association there, and also had Mr. Meyers, whom Mr. Mowat very properly dismissed, and Mr. Jury, from Toronto, brought over to Simcoe, to address a public meeting in favour of annexation; and they telegraphed, as they always do, false statements of what occurred in that town on that occasion. And who do you think the editor of this paper is—the prime mover who has been publishing articles week after week in favour of annexation? I will tell you who he is, and then I will call upon the hon. member for North Norfolk to disavow him and his sentiments. I will read from the paper:

NORTH NORFOLK REFORMERS.—The annual meeting of the North Norfolk Reform Association will be held in the Opera House, Simcoe, on Monday, 13th February, commencing at 2 o'clock. A full attendance is requested. John Kitchen, President; Hal. B. Donly, Secretary.

Mr. Hal. B. Donly is the gentleman who runs the paper, and is the right-hand man of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and as yet we have not heard one word of protest against him from that hon. gentleman. I do not know

Mr. TISDALE.

as much about newspaper etiquette as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean); but I do know this: that if the organ of my party in my riding, in the town where I live, came out in advocacy of annexation—and I, the same as the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk avowed to-day, claim to be loyal and proud of my ancestors and my connection with the past history of this country and of Great Britain—I would not for one day let his articles go unanswered over my own signature in his paper. Until to-day I did not know whether I had a right to call on the hon. member for North Norfolk or not to repudiate the articles in this paper and the man who writes them; but now, after his statements of loyalty made here to-day, in his place in Parliament, I call upon him, in his duty to his county and to his party, to show his sincerity by repudiating this man and his articles, and turning him out of the position he holds as secretary of the Reform association. I have heard that some of the best Reformers in that county say that no longer should this man disgrace the Reform association of Norfolk by being its secretary. I hope it is so; and I call upon the hon. gentleman to now give voice to his own sentiments on this subject. I do not wish to make any further remarks. This is a practical test of sincerity. I maintain, and I shall be always happy to bear my testimony, that the great Liberal party of this country, with the exception of certain disaffected elements, is thoroughly loyal. But I call upon the members of that party in this House to help us on this side of the House in maintaining the integrity of Canada by disclaiming and repudiating proceedings of this sort wherever they have the power or opportunity.

MR. LANDERKIN. It is very nice to hear the declarations of loyalty that are made on the other side of the House. I highly approve of those sentiments. I am very glad to see that we are bringing these hon. gentlemen into line. I do not hear any of them say anything about their colleague Solomon White, nor have I seen any of their papers say anything about him. He is the father of this movement. I do not know whether he was secretly aided and abetted by the Government of Canada; but I have never heard them nor their organs find fault with Solomon White. I like the loyalist party; I like those who have faith in their country and are prepared to stand up in defence of it. I like that kind of loyalty; but I must say that I do not like the boiler-plate kind of loyalty or the thirty-five per cent loyalists—I have not much admiration for them. I like the loyalty that gives to every man in Canada a fair chance and fair-play; any other kind I regard as boiler-plate loyalty, which is one of the industries that this House should not encourage. Now, in reference to Mr. Farrer and Goldwin Smith, every hon. gentleman on that side of the House knows very well that Goldwin Smith, Mr. Farrer, Sir John Macdonald and Nicholas Flood Davin were

the fathers of the National Policy. That is no new thing—it is known throughout the land. I will not say that they were all branded with annexation sentiments at that time; but if my hon. friend from St. John, who quotes Mr. Blake, will only read Mr. Blake's letter, he will find that they must have been, because Mr. Blake's view was that the high protective tariff was one of the means of driving this country into annexation. He certainly only read that portion of Mr. Blake's letter which suited his purpose.

An hon. MEMBER. He read all of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He only quoted a very small portion. The most vital part he omitted to quote. It is well known that the late Sir John Macdonald thought it an honour to have this distinguished Oxford professor, Mr. Goldwin Smith, on the same platform with him, advocating a protective policy.

An hon. MEMBER. A National Policy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who calls it a National Policy? It is a destructive policy and a policy that leads to annexation. Let any hon. gentleman quote Mr. Blake on this point. His views are that it is a policy leading to disintegration and annexation. Mr. Farrer was the leading writer on the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. He prepared their campaign sheet for them, and he prepared it in 1882. He is now writing for American journals, and, the hon. gentleman thinks that, as a journalist, Mr. Farrer has no right to do that. I did not think the hon. gentleman would stab the Prime Minister in the back in that way. Our First Minister argued on the American side in a very important suit. Did any one bring against him the charge that he was disloyal because he did so? Why, then, did the hon. gentleman try to stab his leader, as it were, in his vital parts, on this occasion? His leader is not a traitor nor an annexationist because he pleaded the American side; and if Mr. Farrer is writing for American newspapers, we do not know but that he may be only doing so in the discharge of his duty as a journalist. We do not know whether the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), if he got the chance, would not do the same thing, provided he was paid for it. That hon. gentleman does not rise any higher than his leader, who was, on one occasion, in the employ of the American Government. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) thought he was making a great point when he spoke of something which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had said of our leader, with reference to his being a French Catholic leader; and the hon. gentleman wondered the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would follow our leader. Sir, we are proud of our leader. We honour our leader, we allow our leader to worship at the shrine he desires. We find no fault with him for that, nor do we find fault with him

because he is of French origin. How is it with the hon. gentlemen on the other side? I met one of them when coming down to Toronto, and what did he say? He said they liked their leader very well, but they did object to a Methodist Catholic as a leader. That is what he said, and my hon. friend, before he tells his story again, should not forget the observation made by one of his party to me on that occasion.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Name the gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not here to be catechised by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), a short time ago, it is reported, was so sure of Mr. Costigan being appointed Lieutenant-Governor that he announced to the people of his county that he would soon be in the field again. That may be one reason why now, seeing he did not get that appointment, he seeks to stab the Premier in the back. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says that we are as loyal as they. I wish I could say in return that they are as loyal as we. But I cannot say that, for nobody who keeps up a policy which does so much injury to the country can be as loyal as we are, who desire to get rid of that policy. And until the party opposite shake themselves free of that policy, which is driving the people into annexation, as Mr. Blake said it would—and he is the authority which the hon. member for St. John now follows—they cannot be called loyal. If they will come and assist us to build up the great industries of the country, for this is a great country with great possibilities, I could then say that they are as loyal as we. How unseemly it does appear to bring up discussions of this character in the House and have these recriminations. Possibly there may be some who think that annexation might be the best thing for Canada. But this is a free country and they should be allowed to discuss the question. At all events, what are we going to do with them? Does the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) propose to shoot them in their tracks if they speak of it? Does the Minister of War propose to shoot his colleague down in his tracks when he advocates annexation? How are they going to prevent it?

An hon. MEMBER. Expel them from the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you would have to get the Minister of War to expel his late colleague, Mr. White. Mr. White has been advocating annexation for many years, and the Minister of War, who has a few valiant warriors in the service, might get them to expel him; but that gentleman has been taken into the councils of the Government, and when Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper went to Windsor, Solomon White was one of the first men on the plat-

form who shook them by the hand. That is the way they expel annexationists. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) is a broad-minded, liberal man. He spoke of his liberality to-day, but when Mr. Blair appointed an Irishman to an office in St. John, I believe he opposed the appointment.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that not only the hon. gentleman but all his party did that.

Mr. HAZEN. If the hon. gentleman understood so, I simply have to say that he understood what was not true and what is not the case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will you state what was the case, then ?

Mr. HAZEN. A few moments ago the hon. gentleman said that he was not going to be catechised by the hon. member for East York. I can equally say that I am not here to be catechised by the hon. gentleman. But I desire to tell him that his statement that I opposed Mr. Blair or his Government because Mr. Blair appointed R. G. Ritchie police magistrate of the city of St. John, is entirely unfounded. Whoever informed him of that informed him of what is contrary to the facts. It is not true, and does not contain a single element of truth.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you oppose Mr. Blair ? I will just read, for the benefit of the hon. member for St. John, what Mr. Blake said in his letter with reference to the National Policy :

The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters.

Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians.

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-west empty still ; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and oppressive tariff ; with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special condition) thence arising ; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, ever more and more estranging us from the mighty English-speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised that we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse.

Worse ; far worse ! It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and a deathlike apathy in public opinion ; with racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed ; with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic Executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes ; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids, and possessed withal by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly pro-

Mr. LANDERKIN,

claiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed.

That is as true history as was ever written of the National Policy. I allow my hon. friend opposite to extract all the comfort he can from the letter written by Mr. Blake on that occasion. I hope that he will get his friends to unite with us in standing up loyally for our country, and in securing a policy which will give this country an opportunity in the race of life, and in the great future which is before it, and which we have a right to expect from the great resources we possess in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was asked by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to define my position. I merely wish to say that I have done so at considerable length, and I have nothing to add to it.

Motion agreed to ; and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Penitentiaries—Kingston . . . \$190,443.36

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to inquire of the First Minister whether the evidence in that penitentiary case has yet been laid on the Table ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman asked me to lay the report on the Table if I had one, but he did not express any wish to have the evidence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I sent for the report to-day when I came to the House, and was told there was none ; but the evidence has been brought to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, it would be impossible to go over it at our desks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I went over it myself and extracted certain particulars, as to which I called for further investigation and observations of the inspector. But I can have the evidence here this evening. I was going to explain the causes of the increased cost of maintenance. My attention was called to the fact that we were estimating for, I think, twenty prisoners fewer than we had last year, and that we are asking a larger sum for them. I find the explanation to be this : The clothing for all the convicts is provided at one time, and three years afterwards a complete refit of clothing is called for, repairs being made in the meantime to keep the supply going, and the coming year happens to be the year when the new outfit of clothing will be required. In addition to that, the bedding is replenished, generally speaking, once in two years, and a large supply of that is called for. For clothing and bedding, the additional amount required is \$3,580.65.

This includes gray and black cloth, flannel, bedding, blankets, rugs, sheets, night-shirts and towelling. Then, there was a question as to the increased cost of working expenses. The memorandum of the warden explains that in salaries there is a decrease of \$1,220, due to the absence of the miller, and changes in the office of accountant and clerk. In the officials' uniforms there is a slight decrease; rations, a decrease of \$230; discharge clothing, an increase of \$63.25. Convict clothing, much of which was new two or three years ago, is worn out and will require to be renewed. There is a slight increase in the officers' mess. In heating there is a decrease of \$820; repairs to building, an increase of \$1,106.65. This amount varies from year to year, and is due this year to contemplated roofing and pointing. In maintenance of machinery there is an increase of \$9,959.85, being the engineer's estimate for purchasing new pumping-engine and pipe for new water-works system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that a different description of clothing is now used for the convicts than heretofore. Formerly they were clothed in a parti-coloured garb, but now in a more uniform garb. What quantity of clothing is required in this vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 13,500 yards. It is procured at the Oxford Mills, in Cumberland county, N.S. It was advertised for, and the lowest tender was accepted and the samples certified to be the best by those who were appointed to examine them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you remember the cost per yard?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 45 to 50 cents a yard, according to the quality.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were any tenders given in?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some five or six, I think.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has not an alteration been made in the rations at Kingston Penitentiary, in the shape of giving an additional meal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no change in the rations of convicts. About a year ago the Government adopted a system of giving the officers on duty a mid-day meal. That is the only change in respect to rations.

Mr. McMULLEN. The minister stated the last time this item was before the committee that the Government had adopted the system of buying flour and had abandoned the mill. What is the value of the mill, when was it built, and how long was it operated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mill was in operation about ten years. I cannot state its present value. Considerable repairs and alteration would be required to place it in

working order. We invited tenders for the mill, but we have received no offers. The mill is one worked by the old process.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was its capacity when first built?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot tell.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can you state its cost?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is highly desirable we should ascertain the amount the mill cost. It has been built ten years. It unquestionably cost a great deal of money, and I should like to know who was responsible for it, and the amount of service the country received while it was in operation. This should prove a lesson to ministers not to launch into expenditure on works that, in the course of a few years, may prove totally worthless. Probably the mill was built with a good intention, but I should like to know the amount of money the country will lose. In view of the very low rate at which flour can now be secured, it is questionable whether the Government should expend money to renovate the structure in order to meet the necessities of the penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The mill was not a very costly one, but rather a small affair, and it was put up in the second story of one of the workshops. It was a project of the late warden, who was very zealous, efficient and ingenious in regard to industries carried on in the penitentiary. I will not venture to say that, at the time it was constructed, it was not a wise course to pursue. For the last ten years it has ground all the flour for the penitentiary, and has occasionally supplied flour to some of the other penitentiaries. During one season, when we were under pressure from a combination of persons tendering, we sent some of the flour to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. It did good work in its time, but it was a question of expending \$1,000 or \$2,000 to place the mill in order. Considering the old-fashioned nature of the mill, and the fact that it did not give any employment to convict labour, I thought it was better to abandon it and purchase the flour.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the minister has adopted a wise course. As it is an old-class mill, \$1,000 or \$2,000 would not go far in repairs. If the minister is aware of the expensive machinery placed in roller mills, he will be satisfied that it is a very questionable expenditure to make over an old mill in order to renovate it, so as to turn out good flour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the minister propose to employ the convicts? I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has definitely arranged to relieve the farmer by establishing the binding twine industry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have ascertained from the warden that there is plenty of work

in the way of building and quarrying for the men for some time to come. I still contemplate establishing the binding twine industry there. I find from a letter received since I last spoke in committee on this subject, that the machinery will cost about \$20,000. It is expected to give an output of about 5,000 lbs. of binding twine per day of ten hours, and give employment to about forty men. The warden tells me that, excepting among the more feeble class, he cannot spare that much labour at present, because the buildings are not completed. If I go on with the other two structures I mentioned in committee the other night, in all probability we shall have all the employment we need for convicts able to work out of doors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many men does the farm employ ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About sixty men. Then we have the quarries, the stone cutting, tailoring, shoemaking and carpentering industries, and then a large staff is required to do prison duty, cooking, and attending to the wants of the prison.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the minister state what material he expects to use in twine making ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know. If the machinery is put up, I must obtain a skilled foreman to superintend it.

Mr. MULOCK. During the last year or two I have received communications from a convict in one of the penitentiaries. He does not happen to be a personal friend of mine, nor even an acquaintance, but he writes me in my capacity as a member of this House. I understand the Penitentiary Act grants any member of the House free access to a penitentiary at all reasonable hours for inspection purposes. I presume the theory of that is to furnish a check on the warden and officers in charge. I judge from the letter I received from this convict, though he did not say so exactly, that he was under restraint in his communications even with members of this House. During last summer I received a second letter from him, saying he had asked permission to write a series of grievances and that he hoped to be able to send that communication in order that I might bring them to the knowledge of the Government. I never received any subsequent communication from him, and I have thought whether he was under any restraint at the hands of the warden. I think every convict ought to be free to communicate with the representatives of the people respecting any alleged grievance. Whilst they are under restraint, they are entitled to consideration, especially those who are almost without hope, being condemned to the penitentiary for a long term of years. If there are restrictions that prevent a convict communicating unrestrained with a member of the House, I think such restrictions should be removed. Has the minister any opinion on the subject ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have perfect freedom, and they ought to have, not only as to members of the House, but as to any person in authority, or any person to whom they apply for redress. Of course their communications are read before they leave the prison.

Mr. MULOCK. That is what I object to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have always thought that should be done, but they are not hindered in any way.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree with the minister that communications from prisoners to the ordinary public ought to be the subject of supervision at the hands of the authorities, but I think that this rule ought not to apply to communications addressed to the representatives of the people. The members of this House are indirectly bound to see that justice is done to every person in the country, and the fact that the warden has a right to look at the letter of a convict directed to a member of Parliament must have the effect, as a rule, of preventing a complaint being made. We know that those who guard prisoners are inclined to be autocratic and tyrannical at times, and surely a convict ought to have an opportunity of making unjust treatment known without having to submit it to the knowledge of the warden. Fancy the helpless condition of a prisoner making complaint against a warden when the warden knows of it. Let me ask the minister this : Suppose a prisoner had a charge to make against the warden, would he have to show that charge to the warden before he can forward it to the Minister of Justice ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know how that is. I know that I insist on the convicts having perfect freedom of communication with me ; and, besides that, every year, unless it is an exceptional year, I visit each of the prisons myself, and have notice given that I will see any person in private who wishes to see me. They avail themselves very fully of that privilege, and the same rule prevails as to the visit of the inspector. Notices are also posted up in the corridors of the prison that no officer is to put the slightest obstruction in the way of the prisoners communicating freely anything they have to say to the officials who visit the prison, from time to time, to inspect.

Mr. MULOCK. So far so good ; but so long as the accused has the right to read the letter of the accuser, so long will these regulations for the protection of the prisoner be valueless. Surely a prisoner should have the right to communicate directly with the Government without the warden inspecting the letter. Any one who has read the history of those who stand guard over prisoners knows that it is the constant tendency of frail human nature to oppress the unfortunates under their control, and in the interest of humanity I

raise the point that the minister ought to see that under safeguards prisoners ought to be allowed to communicate with the authorities without inspection. Of course I would not sanction prisoners having the right to communicate freely with the outside world, because that privilege might be abused for the purpose of defeating the ends of justice. I bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice, as I believe that one of the communications from a prisoner, who brought this to my notice, was not forwarded to me. I would ask the minister if that communication could be intercepted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They had no right to intercept any letter whatever.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Justice if there is any reason why the warden should examine letters sent to him, or to his department?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no particular reason. I think, as a general rule, the warden should read the letters that go out. Sometimes these letters contain very offensive matter. For instance, prisoners think that they are at liberty to write letters to the judges and the members of the jury who tried them, addressed in very offensive terms. A prisoner ought in that case be remonstrated with, and not permitted to send the communication. Every prison officer knows that it would be a serious breach of his duty to put the slightest restriction on a prisoner making any complaint.

Mr. MULOCK. The fact that the communication has to be submitted to the warden is a restriction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The warden knows that the prisoner could have abundant opportunities to complain on the visit of the authorities to the prison, and also when a convict has served his term he can complain to the authorities, if his communications were in any way interfered with, so far as complaints to the minister are concerned. It would be treated as a very serious complaint indeed against the officers.

Mr. MULOCK. When there is a contest between the officers and a prisoner, the leaning is towards accepting the version of those in authority, and perhaps rightly so. There are many grievances that prisoners are subjected to, and many cruelties inflicted by guards, which should be put an end to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have had communication of such from the prisoners themselves.

Mr. MULOCK. The minister will see the risk a prisoner has to undergo in order to do that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think he had to undergo any risk.

Mr. MULOCK. He would incur the active hostility of those over him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot see that he would. He would, of course, if the warden

were a very unjust man, a man who is willing to take the risk of his office, by tyrannizing, in the first place, and preventing a complaint being made known in the second place. In the case I refer to, the warden forwarded the communication making complaint against his own treatment, or that of one of the guards, and redress was given the prisoner.

Mr. MULOCK. That shows that while one man may have had courage enough to make this charge, sending it through the warden, perhaps a hundred or more hesitated to do so, knowing that it would simply be making their life less endurable than it had been up to that time. At all events, I suggest to the minister that there should be a regulation enabling prisoners to write to some person in authority outside of the prison, without their letters being inspected by the warden.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the point raised by my hon. friend is one of some importance. I can appreciate the objection made by the minister that convicts have been accustomed to write to the judges and jurymen by whom they were tried, very offensive letters which should not be allowed to issue from the penitentiary; but the point raised by my hon. friend strikes me as being a very good one. It also strikes me that senators and members of the House of Commons should have the right to receive letters from convicts without those letters being subject to any revision whatever. I think the indiscriminate enjoyment of such a right might give rise to a good deal of trouble; but I know of no other body to whom a letter could be sent except to the Minister of Justice himself, or his department; and the argument seems to point in this direction, that a man who is labouring, or imagines he is labouring under a serious grievance, should have a right to send a letter to an outside, independent party, who could communicate with a member of the House or otherwise, as his duty prompted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad that the minister has adopted the principle of manufacturing binding twine in the penitentiary. I find that we only receive some \$9,000 of revenue, all told, from the penitentiaries. In the case of the Kingston Penitentiary, we have only received \$6.67 per capita. We must have something between 1,200 and 1,300 convicts in this Dominion, and I think their labour might be utilized to produce a larger revenue. I know that they do a great deal of labour for which they receive no credit; but I think some value should be placed on such labour, so as to give the committee some idea of the amount of labour they perform, compared with the amount of revenue that we receive as a result of their labour.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and Contingent Expenses
of the Senate \$61,488

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that there is an increase in this item. Will the hon. Finance Minister explain what it is ?

Mr. FOSTER. The increase consists of additions of \$50 each to the salaries of five clerks, making \$250. These additions are made in accordance with a resolution passed by the Senate.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think any person who reads the items of expenditure in connection with the Senate, as detailed on page B-78 of the Auditor-General's Report, will come to the conclusion that there are great extravagances connected with the management of that department. I think some effort should be made to place its expenditures under the control of some committee, either of this House or of the Senate, so that they will be limited to a certain amount. For instance, last year there is a charge of \$169.24 for 1,662 boxes of pens. Now, I do not think any person will say that it was necessary to get such an enormous quantity of pens for the use of the Senate. We have some eighty or eighty-two senators, all told, and, in the name of common sense, what was done with 1,662 boxes of pens ? I would like to ask the minister, under whose supervision all these supplies are bought ? Who is responsible for them ?

Mr. FOSTER. The supplies and expenditures of the Senate are under the control of the Senate Contingent Committee, which, about two years ago, when the late Prime Minister was in charge there, was considerably revised, reduced in number and put into a more workable condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do think that if this House is to continue criticising the expenditure of the Senate, some of our members ought to be associated with members of that body in the matter of contingencies, so that we may have some thorough explanation of the different items. What particular necessity is there for 1,662 boxes of pens for the use of Senators ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say from personal knowledge. My hon. friend will have an opportunity by and by of criticising similar items for this House, and he will find that there is not exactly the same careful use of these items of stationery which there would be in a man's private house or business establishment. These 1,662 boxes of pens were not only for the Senators but for the use of the officers of the Senate, so that you have to add quite a number of officials to the list besides the Senators. Pens are like

Mr. McMULLEN.

pens, very easily destroyed, and whether it be due to the bad quality of the ink or of the pens, I know that I cannot use one here more than half an hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. If it is really the fault of the ink, I would recommend the Finance Minister advising where better ink should be procured. With regard to our contingencies, I intend dealing with them when the item comes up. But we are dealing now with the Senate, and I think there should be some effort to cut down the expenses of that Chamber. We all know that it is not overtly popular in the country, and I would like to do it justice. The answer of the hon. Minister of Finance is that these pens are not only for the use of Senators but of officials. In that case, it is unjust to charge them all to the Senate contingencies, because any one reading through the list must come to the conclusion that the Senators are very extravagant. It is not right to throw the responsibility on them when the officials are treating themselves very generously with items charged to the Senate. Some arrangement should be made to adjust matters between the Senate and its officials. I notice that the committee of the restaurant in the Senate get \$100. Why is this ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say. I suppose it must be for some expenditure the committee were under with reference to the restaurant. No doubt the Auditor-General finds it difficult, in these short clauses, to dominate entirely the character of the expenditure. I have found instances of that often. This may not at all mean, and I do not think it does, an allowance paid to the committee, but some expenditure in connection with the restaurant which is thus charged.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are forty-eight bottles of champagne only costing \$17.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think they would use such cheap champagne as that. Probably it means glasses.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the pages in the Senate paid \$50 a session more than the pages in the Commons ? It was so a year ago, and I would like to know if it were so still.

Mr. FOSTER. I will find out for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any right on the part of the Senate Contingent Committee to expend more than the amount we vote ? I find in 1891-92 a total paid of \$66,586. I do not think we voted that amount. If they can spend \$5,000 or \$6,000 more than we have voted, they can spend \$10,000 or \$12,000 more. The main thing is to know if we have an absolute guarantee that the amount we vote will not be exceeded.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not altogether an absolute check in that, as you have not in any department. By our system, the departments are given credit and they draw against

those credits, and pay the different items of expenditure; but you cannot find a department, if you search back all the history of the Public Accounts, which does not, in some item or other, overexpend. That will be for various reasons, because in the multiplicity of accounts it may be difficult for the accountant, or the issuer of the cheque, at any moment to say whether his credit is sufficient to pay all the items. He ought to know that, and he thinks that he does, but in some cases there will be some over expenditures. That over-expenditure three years ago amounted to a very large sum. The hon. the Speaker tells me that the amount voted in that year was more than was expended. It happens very often that the expenditure will in some items overrun the amount voted. That will be done under the most careful management, to a limited extent. The extent to which that is done in the different departments, is diminishing every year, because very careful attention is given to it. Looking over the accounts for the last four years it will be found that the overexpenditure has decreased very materially indeed, so that this last year it has been drawn pretty closely down to a minimum. But in this case it appears that the amount voted was greater than the amount expended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think myself that we vote the amount in a very improper way, because we put salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate in one lump sum; and if half a dozen officials were from any cause not acting, and their salaries were saved, they would be allowed to expend the money in contingencies, because you do not divide it. The Minister of Finance intimates that in almost every department the votes are exceeded from time to time. I was not aware that was the case, because I thought the Auditor exercised such a controlling supervision over the expenditure that he would not permit moneys to be spent which had not been voted for the particular object by the House. I thought he had absolute and arbitrary control, which the House relied upon as being perfectly sufficient to prevent any departmental head or deputy from spending more money on any branch of the public service than the House of Commons had voted. In this particular vote under discussion, the Contingencies of the Senate, I was not aware that the Auditor has the same power with regard to expenditure that he has with regard to the expenditure in the different departments.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Audit Act has been made applicable both to the Senate and the House of Commons, for the purpose of auditing the accounts and keeping the expenditure within the appropriation. It applies just in the same way as it does with regard to other departments of the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That being the case, we have some guarantee that the Auditor's

supervision will extend over the Senate contingencies as it will here; therefore, I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the form in which he asks the vote. I think the form of the vote is such as to remove any proper control over this expenditure which the House should have. Now, my hon. friend behind me, in the exercise of his rights, and, I think, with the general approval, at any rate, of those who sit near him, subjects the expenditure, not only of the Senate, but of the House of Commons and other departments, to his criticism. He is not only within his right, but I am perfectly satisfied he is discharging a public duty, and he is discharging it satisfactorily and doing good work. But I would submit to the hon. gentleman that if he wants to retain that proper control which the people's representatives should have over such a matter as the contingencies of the Senate, the vote should be divided and the salaries should go for that purpose, and the contingencies by themselves. Then we would be able to see, at the end of the year, whether they kept within the amount or not. I think the great principle should always be kept in view that this House should determine, absolutely and arbitrarily, the maximum limit of the amount spent in any one service; and, when they have so determined, no official or body, whether a Senate committee or a House of Commons committee, should be permitted to exceed that arbitrary sum. But, where you vote a sum in a lump, partly for salaries and partly for contingencies, you remove practically from the supervision and control of the House the very subject-matter on which they are voting.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that what he contends for is practically done of late years. We consider ourselves bound, and the Auditor-General considers himself bound, by the expression of the House, as it is given upon the details of an estimate. There may be just one line which takes in the whole of a vote. For instance, as to the Senate, it may be that the details of that vote are given under different items, as in this case. He will see, on page 29 of the Estimates, that this total vote of \$61,000 odd is detailed at length, and that is recognized by the Auditor-General, and is recognized by the Government and also by the spending department. So that, under A, you will find the salaries and contingencies for these officers generally, and the amount that is paid for each. That takes the whole of that first part down to the messengers. Then there is the miscellaneous, which takes in what more properly belongs to contingencies. You have the pages, the number is designated; you have sessional messengers, the number is designated; you have a lump sum for charwomen, who may be employed up to the amount of \$1,600, the number is not given.

Stationery is limited ; newspapers are limited. Then sundry tradesmen's accounts. Sometimes the amount may come up to that ; sometimes it may not. Senate Debates, also limited. There is an item of \$3,000 to meet unforeseen charges ; so that really the only contingencies there which are not named are found in the last line—\$3,000 to meet unforeseen charges. That prevents the necessity of detailing the whole in the amount voted, and at the same time binds the expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The explanation of the hon. gentleman may be all right ; but I want to call attention to the fact that in the Auditor-General's Report, where the expenditure is published, the items are not grouped in this way at all. The expenditure is put under one total column, and it is impossible for any member of the House to see whether the Senate, in its expenditure, has kept within the limit of the several items we voted, or whether it has not.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the arrangement of the Auditor-General's account.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly. What I want to point out is this : that if the Auditor-General takes care to see that no excess is allowed in the expenditure of the several items, beyond that which we have voted, well and good.

Mr. FOSTER. He most certainly does.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fear that as long as it is kept within the \$61,000, voted generally, he does not trouble his head about the manner in which it is subdivided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should not the amount be divided so as to show salaries and contingent expenses ?

Mr. FOSTER. This could easily be done, but of course the question might arise as to what were contingent expenses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman adopts different modes with respect to the Senate and the House of Commons. He does not vote a lump sum for the Commons as for the Senate. Moreover, there are, in addition to the 215 or 220 members of this House, a large number of gentlemen connected with the press, who practically share in the expenditure for contingencies. In the Senate there are 83 gentlemen, a very small staff of officials and no press representatives.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there a stationery office in the Senate ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could not the stationery offices of the Houses be combined ?

Mr. FOSTER. We had a conference some years ago in regard to combining some of these offices, and we did not succeed.

House of Commons—Salaries... \$70,666

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How has the decrease been brought about ?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will remember there have been several changes in the staff. Some of the old servants have died, and they have been replaced by other officers at lower rates of salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope it does not mean the superannuation of half a dozen officials.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, we have not superannuated any of the officials, but they have died in the service of the House. There is the case of Mr. Hartney, but that may not have a bearing on the question. Mr. Rivet was an old servant of the House, and reached the maximum—a clerk of French Journals of the first class. He died during the last session of Parliament. In his place Mr. Ouimet was appointed at a salary of \$1,450, almost at the minimum of the first class, while Mr. Rivet had been receiving \$1,800. Then Mr. Ouimet was replaced by an officer who was in the service of the House, Mr. Tasse, who had a salary of \$600, and whom we promoted to the position of assistant clerk of French Journals at \$1,000, instead of \$1,400 salary, to which Mr. Ouimet had attained prior to his promotion to the position of clerk of French Journals. I may say, however, with regard to this matter, that I cannot promise the House that the whole of this amount will prove a saving. I think it is quite possible we may have to ask the House at a future time to grant a sum for a clerk in the Stationery office, so that the whole of this reduction that appears in the Estimates, nearly \$2,000, will not be effected. But we have secured considerable reductions by the changes made in the staff. We have not filled Mr. Tasse's place, to which a salary of \$600 was attached, and who was promoted to the position of assistant clerk of French Journals at a salary of \$1,000. So in two cases, in the case of the French Journals office, there has been a saving of \$350 in the salary of the clerk of Journals, and a further saving of the difference between \$600 and \$1,400 in another branch of the service ; that is to say, we have promoted Mr. Tasse to the position of assistant clerk of Journals and have not filled his place. There are several statutory increments in the salaries of the different officers. The whole of the statutory increases amount to \$1,012.50. Then, there was an addition made to the salary of the deputy-serjeant-at-arms. He was appointed a permanent clerk at \$800, instead of \$300, as before. Mr. Tasse received an increase of \$400, Mr. Clarke, an increase of \$150, he occupying the position rendered vacant by the death of Mr. Romaine. The whole of the increases amounted to \$2,062.50. The reductions are : Mr. Rivet, \$1,800, a reduction in the salary of the accountant of \$200, the new officer having been appointed at \$1,800, instead of \$2,000, and Mr. Romaine's salary of \$1,800, giving a total of \$3,800, the net reduction being

\$1,757.50. But, as I have already said, I am afraid we shall have to ask the House to provide for a third class clerk to place in the Stationery office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many officers are in the Stationery office now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There were three, prior to Mr. Romaine's death.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While Mr. Romaine was not pensioned, it was well known that he did not work for some time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to point out, in regard to the Stationery office, that the duties of the superintendent of stationery and his assistant are not confined simply to the care of the stationery. They have proof-reading to do, which is a very important part of their work, and the information I have received with respect to that office is, that it would be wise to strengthen the staff, which at present consists of Mr. Clarke and an assistant, who is practically a packer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Since last session, the accountant and assistant-accountant of the House have apparently been discharged. Will Mr. Speaker kindly state to the committee the reasons why they were discharged ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not the slightest objection to give the committee the reasons why they were discharged. When the accounts of the accountant's office went to the Auditor-General he informed me at once that there was a shortage of over \$2,000. I came here immediately. On making an investigation I found that the accountant and the assistant accountant had both taken moneys belonging to the public. I suspended them at once. On further investigation I found that in the public interest they ought to be discharged, and they were discharged, the shortage in their accounts amounting, as the Auditor-General shows in his report, to \$2,256.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was stated in the newspapers that they had overdrawn their account by accommodating members of the House. Is there any truth in that statement ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement I saw in a newspaper was that the shortage in the accountant's office had arisen from the fact that members had overdrawn their indemnity; that they had been paid larger sums than the amounts to which they were entitled, and the implication was that they had exercised influence over the accountant for the purpose of obtaining from him money to which they were not entitled. I think the hon. member will recollect that immediately thereafter a contradiction, authorized by me, appeared in the newspaper in which I first saw that statement. So far as the investigation goes, I have no reason to believe that members of Parliament are implicated in any way in the shortage that has occurred in the accountant's office. There is only one case where there is any possible chance of any such allegation as that to which the hon. gentleman has made

reference, being true, and in that case the investigation we made led us to believe that the hon. gentleman whose case I refer to was not implicated in any way, and did not receive any more money than that he was entitled to receive.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the amount been made good ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amount has been made good. These gentlemen in the accountant's office gave guarantee bonds for the amount of \$5,000 each, and the Guarantee Company has paid the full amount of the loss, \$2,256, which has been placed to the credit of the Receiver-General.

Expenses of Committees, Sessional
and Extra Clerks \$13,600

Mr. HAZEN. I would like to ask while this matter is under consideration, who has the appointment of the officials of the House, such as clerks, accountants, and officers of that sort. The reason why I make the inquiry is, that in the part of the country from which I come, there is an impression that no persons are appointed to the offices in the House of Commons except those who live, as it were, right beneath the shadow of the Parliament Buildings; and that there is not a fair distribution of these offices among the people of the rest of the Dominion. I know there are few officials of the House at the present time who come from the Maritime Provinces; at least there are very few who come from the province of New Brunswick. I would like to know who takes the responsibility of these appointments, and I would like to urge that in the distribution of these favours, other parts of the country ought to be considered as well as the immediate vicinity of the Parliament Buildings.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not quite understand whether the question of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) relates simply to sessional appointments, or to the whole of the appointments. In regard to the sessional appointments, I would state for the information of the House, that I understand the rule to be, that sessional employees are divided among the different provinces in proportion to population. The Maritime Provinces are entitled to a certain number and each of the other provinces similarly. The appointments of sessional clerks were all made when I took the office of Speaker. The impression which is very general, or at least prevails to some extent, that those employees are changed at each session, is a mistaken one. Although they are nominally sessional, they are practically permanent. That is to say, if they have behaved themselves and performed their work properly, they are allowed to resume their duties at the beginning of each session. As a matter of fact, the patronage in connection with sessional clerks, and sessional messengers has been exceedingly limited; there has been none practi-

cally since I have become Speaker. I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) will find, if he examines the record in reference to sessional appointments, that they have been fairly distributed among the provinces.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not intend any reflection upon the hon. Speaker in connection with this matter, as I feel sure he is disposed to do what is fair. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he says these appointments are made in proportion to the population of the different provinces, because with regard to the sessional appointments about this House, I only know of one that is occupied by a gentleman from my province; and that is the office of door-keeper. I know of no higher position, in connection with the sessional appointments, occupied by a New Brunswicker at the present time. I trust that in the future the rule which the hon. gentleman refers to will be observed, because at the present time I do not think it is observed at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. The list I hold in my hand shows that three of the sessional clerks come from New Brunswick, three from Nova Scotia, and one from Prince Edward Island. That makes seven out of twenty-five who come from the Maritime Provinces. I venture to say that is a fair distribution.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker is simply referring to sessional clerks, while I am referring to the employees of this House generally. I think if he looks over the list, he will find that in addition to the three sessional clerks, there is one door-keeper and nobody else from the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman will see that the Speaker is governed by the last census.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that there are two of the permanent clerks from New Brunswick, and one night watchman in addition to the gentleman already referred to.

Contingencies.....\$23,100

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice some items in connection with this vote which require explanation. The cab-hire, in 1887, for Mr. Speaker Kirkpatrick was \$173.25. I see that in 1888, Mr. Ouimet drew \$65.10, in 1889 \$56.02, and in 1890 \$208. I see that in 1891, Mr. White drew \$199.70 and in 1892 \$524. I think we ought to have an explanation with regard to the increased amount.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am quite free to confess that the amount for cab-hire does seem somewhat high. The committee will remember, however, that the item of \$524 which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has just referred to, practically covers two sessions; that is, the session of three months from the 1st of July, 1891.

Mr. SPEAKER.

to the 30th September, 1891, and four and a-half months for the session of 1892. That makes seven and a-half months, which is really nearly as long as three sessions of some of the previous Parliaments.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the session of 1890, which was a very long session, Mr. Ouimet's cab-hire was divided in the same way, and amounted only to \$208. It is singular that the amount has run so high as it did last year. I believe it to be quite right that we should draw attention to these items. It is not very pleasant, but we have a duty to perform in this matter and we shall not shrink from it. I do not care whether it is a minister, or a speaker, or anybody else, these are items which we have a right to criticise. I dare say the speaker can offer a proper explanation, and we are entitled to it. There is another matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the House. During last session, it was intimated by the Government that twelve days' absence would be allowed a member who was obliged, by necessity, to leave the city of Ottawa, and that no deduction would be made from his sessional indemnity for that period. In looking over the list I am surprised to find some names of members who have drawn a considerable amount of money more than, in my belief, they were justly entitled to. I see, for instance, that Mr. Bryson, who was elected within three days of the close of Parliament, and who sat three days in the House, drew \$120 sessional allowance. I would like to understand how that happened. I notice, also, that Mr. Guillet drew his full sessional indemnity. I notice by the Votes and Proceedings that it was not until the House was in session twenty days that the Speaker announced his election, and yet he draws his whole sessional allowance. There were other members who, in my opinion, also drew more than was right.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member does not contend, for a moment, that it is any part of my duty to examine each of the declarations and compare them with the accounts. I am afraid that if the House expects me to do that, it will be somewhat disappointed. The hon. member will recollect that the Act of last session provided for an allowance of twelve days' absence without any deduction being made. The Act reads as follows:—

For the present session of Parliament the deduction of \$8 per day mentioned in section 26 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, being chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for 12 days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days; but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the said Act, nor in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present session, or shall it apply to days prior to his election.

My first impression of this provision was that, inasmuch as it provides that the deduc-

tion shall not be made for twelve days in the case of a member who has been absent from the sitting of the House of which he is a member, those members who were elected during the session of Parliament only became members when they took their seats. As to that, the lawyers of the House and the gentlemen in control of the legislation differed from me, and the decision arrived at was that the allowance should be made for the period from the time the member was elected to the time he took his seat, and I presumed that that rule, which I communicated to the accountant, had been applied to all cases of members elected during the session of Parliament. That was the instruction given to the accountant.

Estimate of Serjeant-at-Arms...\$33,732 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to see that there is a reduction. How is it effected, and is it likely to be permanent?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly say that it will be permanent. The larger sum was provided to meet the expenses of the longer session of last year. The reduction will be permanent, of course, if the sessions do not extend beyond the limit which has been taken as the basis for these estimates, that is, 100 days. When the session extends beyond that time, we have to ask for an additional sum.

Salaries of the Officers of the
Library \$17,042 50

Mr. FOSTER. The increases are statutory.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many officers are in the library at present?

Mr. FOSTER. Fourteen.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there are more officers there than are required. Have the Library Committee recommended that this number should be kept there permanently?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Library Committee have nothing to do with the appointments. Under the statute they are made by the Governor in Council. From my own observation I think all the officers in the library at present are necessary, and in addition we have to provide for two messengers to supplement the regular staff during the session.

Printing, Binding and Distribut-
ing the Laws.....\$ 12,000

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the distribution of parliamentary documents is very, very slow. This year we did not get the printed sessional papers until the month of January, six months after the close of the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. The distribution began in November. They were distributed direct from the Printing Bureau. I presume no great inconvenience arose from the two or

three months' delay in their getting through the bureau without employing extra labour, because we all have our sessional papers with us, although not bound.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who has the contract now for supplying the paper?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Printing Bureau provides all the paper. The accounts are sent to the accountant here at regular intervals and certified. We have no contract. The House makes no contract for the paper.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the contract let by the Printing Bureau without tender?

Mr. FOSTER. No; tenders are always called.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can the hon. gentleman inform the House who holds the contract now?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot.

Printing, Printing Paper and
Binding.....\$70,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What became of the suit entered by the Barber Company for paper supplied outside their contract? They had a suit against the Government for damages.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The matter is under appeal to the Supreme Court from the Exchequer Court.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year this vote was utterly insufficient, and we appear to have spent \$102,000. What has the Finance Minister to say on the subject of that large excess? Is it likely to recur?

Mr. FOSTER. The session was no longer than usual, and the paper required for "Hansard" for printing generally was, of course, more. B-84 of the Auditor-General's Report gives the various items. The item Queen's Printer, printing, paper and binding, amounts alone to \$91,529.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are those chiefly for expenses in this House?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask, in connection with this item of \$7,000 for printing, whether it covers the printing and publishing of agricultural reports?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; part of them. The reports proper are covered by this. The bulletins which are issued monthly are printed out of the sums voted for the farm itself; but the agricultural report comes under the reports of the House and the department.

Mr. DEVLIN. Reports coming under this head are both French and English. I understood the English reports have already been distributed several months, but the French reports have not yet appeared.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know that until the hon. gentleman mentioned it.

Mr. DEVLIN. Last session I called the attention of the Government to this point. Considerable inconvenience arises from this delay in the issue of the French report, and the literature does not reach the end it should. The French and English reports should be printed and distributed at the same time, as the French-speaking people are certainly entitled to receive their reports as soon as the English.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There must have been some mistake this year in the distribution, because I have not received a single report, either of the dairy or of the experimental farm. The hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who lives in the same town as I do, received quite a number of bags of reports and kindly gave me some. I have never received a report, so that, so far as the English and French are concerned, we are about equal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are two or three items here which might bear a little explanation. I notice, among other things, "Engraving map, Manchester Ship Canal, four colours, \$195. Printing 14,500 copies for the same, \$80." If that be correct, I should like to know what, in the name of wonder, we want with 14,500 copies of the Manchester Ship Canal? It appears to me we might find a better use for our money than spending \$300, or thereabouts, for copies of the map of the Manchester Ship Canal.

Mr. FOSTER. If there were 14,500 copies, they seem to have cost but a very small amount, only \$80, for printing. There may be some mistake in the number of copies mentioned here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did we want of the thing at all?

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to ask some members of the Printing Committee. The member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is on the Printing Committee, and will probably know why it was ordered.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think I attended every meeting of the Printing Committee last session, but I do not remember anything being brought up about making an engraving of the Manchester Ship Canal. It is new to me.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has been absent.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No, I have not been absent. I think it will be found that I have attended every meeting of every committee of which I have been a member in this House, for the last ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. They could not have been printed unless they had passed through the ordinary channel, coming from the Printing Committee and ordered by the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not altogether a satisfactory explanation. If the minister does not know, probably some-

Mr. FOSTER.

body else can enlighten us. I do not myself see that there is much excuse for this business at all. I can understand that the Minister of Railways and Canals might require to have obtained certain copies of that great work, as a part of the contingencies of his department, and I do not suppose that anybody would raise objections to it. But what do we want, in our capacity as a House of Commons, with copies of an engraving of the Manchester Ship Canal? I hope some hon. gentleman who is on that Printing Committee will be good enough to explain what he wanted with the 14,500 copies of that engraving.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is on that committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no recollection whatever of this matter coming before the Printing Committee. It may have come in when I was not there: I cannot say that I was at every meeting. While the Minister of Finance is hunting up that matter, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. There was a number of actions commenced against parties, after the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee last year, with regard to irregularities in the Printing Bureau. I think it might be well to find out what became of those actions. They were brought for the purpose of recovering the percentages of which the country was improperly deprived.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The evidence is being taken in them, preparatory to a hearing before the Exchequer Court. Several witnesses have been examined, two of them a few weeks ago. The cases will be ready for hearing, I fancy, within a few weeks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if all possible speed has been made to bring to justice those people that were supposed to be guilty of improprieties. It seems to me that a long time has elapsed since those irregularities occurred. It is singular they should be retarded and carried on so very slowly. I do not insinuate that the Department of Justice is responsible, but I would like to know how it is that they have not come to a head before now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not done anything whatever to retard them; on the contrary, I am very anxious they should be concluded. I will ascertain at once when they will be ready for hearing.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no information that I can give my hon. friend about the Manchester Ship Canal. I will take means to find out how this item came about. The Clerk now is diligently searching the pages of the Journal to see if he can get trace of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In addition to the suit brought by Barber & Co., for indemnity for paper bought from other parties than the contractors, there was a suit entered by

MacLean, Roger & Co., who were the Government printers here, for work given out to other printers which should have been given to them under their contract. I would like to know if that matter has been settled yet. I think it was before the Exchequer Court, too.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are three cases, the MacLean & Roger case, the Barber case, and another which stands in the same position. We propose to test the liability of the Crown in those cases, and to test the soundness of the decision of the Supreme Court in the old case of MacLean & Roger and the Queen. In order to do that it will be necessary to carry one of them, at least, to the Privy Council. They must, in the meantime, go through the Supreme Court, and they stand on the docket for hearing next month.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Exchequer Court, I understand, made an award in both cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, the Exchequer Judge was bound, by the outstanding judgment in the case of MacLean, Roger & Co., and his decision is in favour of the plaintiffs in accordance with the judging of the Supreme Court. The judgment must necessarily be the same, because they are bound by their own decision. We want to review that before the Privy Council.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the matter of the Manchester Ship Canal, I find that, on the 1st July, 1891, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) obtained an Order of the House for a copy of the report of Thomas Munro, engineer of the Manchester Ship Canal. The Printing Committee, I presume reported in favour of printing the number of copies that were charged for in the Auditor-General's Report.

Archives \$ 6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see a considerable amount of money was spent in the Record Office, London. Does any hon. gentleman know what work was done, how that money was expended, and what particular branch of the English Archives we are getting?

Mr. FOSTER. Historical documents are being copied in London and in Paris.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what particular section of our history is attention being given?

Mr. FOSTER. That will be found in the report of the Archivist. Mr. Brymner is now in London, and is directing the work personally.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to a reasonable sum being expended in securing copies of valuable documents either at Paris or London; but at the same time I should like to know how it is being used. There is a huge mass of documents of all sorts in London and Paris, and much dis-

cretion is needed in using the money to obtain the valuable portions.

Mr. FOSTER. The documents copied so far are connected with the history of Upper and Lower Canada. The Archivist is at present making investigations in London into documents respecting the history of the Maritime Provinces, of which he will make a selection.

Mr. FRASER. I suggest the investigation be carried to Boston, where valuable documents relating particularly to the earlier history of Nova Scotia may be found. There is a large collection of original documents relating to the early history of Nova Scotia to be found there. I know there is quite a number in England and in France, but I understand there is a good collection in Boston.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How many employees are engaged in the Archivist's office in Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. There are four employed at the present time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It appears there is a reading-room in that branch of the service, as well as in the department itself, for the Auditor-General's Report show an expenditure of \$88 for subscriptions to newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. These papers are, no doubt, necessary to the work, and are not common newspapers.

Mr. SCRIVER. Has any better provision been made for the custody of the documents under the charge of the Archivist than was made a year or two ago? The rooms devoted to the purpose at that time were very inadequate; they were too small, not well lighted and in every respect wanting in the advantages which such rooms should possess. Mr. Brymner spoke to me on the subject, and said he made frequent representations, but as yet without result.

Mr. FOSTER. The Archives are kept in the same place as formerly, but consideration is now being given to the matter with a view to having them housed more appropriately, and therefore better kept. In the Archivist's Report of 1891, he details very fully the documents that were being copied, which were documents of the 17th and part of the 18th century.

Mr. McMULLEN. A large amount of money has been spent for copying in London. Was this done under the High Commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. Clerks are paid so much per folio, and their work is checked at the High Commissioner's office.

"Patent Record" \$8,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it still considered advisable to continue the "Patent Record?" It may be useful to some persons, but I do not think it is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. The "Patent Record" must be published. It contains the cuts of all devices that are patented, and it is necessary to have those published.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the revenue from the "Record?"

Mr. FOSTER. The revenue of the Patent office is \$77,000 annually.

Statistics \$ 2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that take in the Year-book?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no census expenditure this year?

Mr. FOSTER. The statistics are collected and very nearly all compiled, but there is some little trimming to be done yet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Lately I have seen some severe criticisms in the newspapers of the country in regard to this Year-book. I have not had an opportunity of examining it yet, but I see that in some of the Toronto papers it was asserted that this book was published now, more as a justification of the policy of the Government than as a simple record of facts and figures. If that is the kind of publication it is degenerating into, I do not think it would be advisable for the House to vote the item. It was generally supposed heretofore, that this book was an authority that could be relied upon by both parties, and by the public at large; but if it is hereafter to be made a campaign sheet for the benefit of the Government to justify their National Policy, and their general policy, I do not think we ought to be asked to publish a book of that character. I do not say of my own knowledge that this is a fact, but I have seen several lengthy and severe criticisms in the Toronto journals with regard to this publication.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that there have been some criticisms in one or two journals about it. What I know of the book, I only know from my looking at it each year. I consider it a very valuable book, and I do not think it has a political bias at all. It is a compilation of statistics, and any of the figures which I have had reason to verify I have found to be very correct. The only political bias that there could possibly be, would be in the reading matter, in explanation of the statistics, but I never noticed that. My hon. friend has no doubt read it and will be able to base his own judgment upon it. I do not think the criticism is fair.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It only requires a cursory examination of the book to see that it is written by a man whose object it is to uphold one particular system of Government at the expense of the other, I examined the book with some little care on one branch of statistics I was engaged in collecting, and as the hon. gentleman says, so far as the figures

Mr. McMULLEN.

were calculated in the columns, they were correct; but where they told against the policy of the Government, which the compiler of the book was endeavouring to support, he took care to give what he thought to be an explanation of that. The shipping statistics in that book are lamentably short. There are a great many figures, which are right enough so far as they go, but almost always, in the few subjects I had occasion to examine, when the figures told against the policy which the compiler evidently wanted to support, he put in a paragraph trying to explain it away. The other day, while in the library, I called the attention of an hon. friend to the matter, and I do not think that such a proceeding is proper or right on the part of a public official. He ought to be satisfied with giving the figures and letting us draw our own conclusion. In a matter of a controversial nature, which affects the two great parties in the state, where he publishes the figures which tell against his party, he ought not to add a postscript or explanation for the purpose of doing away, as far as possible, with the effect of these figures. People outside take this book to be a strictly official compilation and something that they can rely upon. I say that it is not. He does not give all the figures which, on many occasions, are moved for in this House year after year, and in cases where, he ought to know, the figures are necessary for public men. Take the sample question of pig iron, which is being discussed throughout the length and breadth of this land. You cannot find out from that book how much pig iron was manufactured in Canada since we commenced to give a bounty, nor can you find how much bounty is paid year by year on pig iron. You will find one year given, and its figures do not correspond, in the year he gave, to the annual estimate. He does not give any figures at all, which can be used by those who are opposed to what is called the National Policy, in order to show that it is not beneficial but detrimental to the country. I consider it, in many respects, a useful book. There is no doubt whatever that it collects a large amount of valuable information, but I consider it an exceedingly partial book. It is an excellent book, if it is compiled as a party book, but as an official publication in which the public ought to feel satisfied they would get all the facts, it is a failure.

Mr. FLINT. I think there is considerable justification for the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies). It has been a matter clear to those who wish to study up the history of the Dominion, that the book is partial and biased. I beg to say, with all deference to the greater experience of those who are at work on this book, that a great deal which they have published in it might very well be omitted, and a great deal they have omitted might be inserted in the book with advantage to the public.

I think many of the interjected remarks might very well be omitted. For instance, I notice throughout the book, after a page or two of very excellent statistics, carefully gathered and well stated, the compiler proceeds to draw comparisons and to make statements which simply fill so much space, and are not necessary to make the statistics any plainer or more obvious than they are, such remarks as this: It will be observed that in such and such a year a large number of certain transactions were recorded, and that a certain other year represents the smallest value," and so on—a mere rehash of the facts which were accurately stated on the previous pages. Now, in attempting from this book to study the records of the Dominion and to compare them with the records of other countries, the very fact you are searching for is apt to be omitted. As an illustration of the want of care apparent in various portions of the book, I will refer again to the statements regarding the savings banks. If there is any one subject of more wide and general interest than another in the Dominion, it is to trace the growth and progress of our savings institutions and to note, if possible, the savings of our labouring people in connection with our fiscal and economical legislation. I do not, of course, hold to the view which is sometimes urged that the savings bank deposits are always an index of the progress and prosperity of the labouring people of the country; at the same time, they may be found useful in connection with other information. Now, we cannot find from this book what the proportional savings of our people are. The compiler gives us the number of offices, the number of depositors, the amount on deposit, the average amount to each depositor, and the average amount per head of the population in the post office savings banks; but in the case of the Government savings banks, which represent about the same amount of money, these very important particulars are omitted, and consequently the inquirer is completely at sea, and I do not know where he could lay his hands on such information. There is no information given as to the amounts of the various deposits or the difference between the smaller and the larger deposits. This is an instance that I cite by way of illustration, because it came more forcibly to my own mind than other cases, and I hope that in future issues the compiler will devote a page or two more to that very broad and important subject, so that the student of our progress may see in this financial barometer how the country is moving in that regard.

Mr. HAGGART. Where would the compiler get the information you speak of?

Mr. FLINT. I do not know. I think he should apply to the proper department of the Government. I think we are entitled to that information.

Mr. HAGGART. He can get the information as to the post office savings bank, but the other is not published.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is brought down to the House time and again.

Mr. HAGGART. Not the details which the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. FLINT. This may be, to a certain extent, the reason it is not included, so far as the compiler is concerned, but it is no reason to give to this House. I think those figures should be given. I think the Government should place them in the hands of the representatives of the people. There is not a gentleman on that side of the House who would not gladly have that information to throw light on the questions which are discussed before the country. Take another item as an illustration of the point I make. The compiler, having referred to these savings, in this inadequate and partial way, proceeds to refer to the savings of other countries, and to draw comparisons between them and the Dominion. So far as he goes he is probably correct; but with the vast mass of information at his hands, and with the staff of officials cognizant with this subject under his control to codify the information, I very much regret that he has not given us the information on this subject from other countries. The only countries whose savings he gives are the United Kingdom, New South Wales, Tasmania and Victoria. This is very inadequate information to give to the public on this important subject, when he has at his disposal the fiscal returns of all the states of the Union, the British Islands and the various countries of Europe; and this information could have been tabulated on one or two pages of this book, and it would have been of great value, importance and interest. I call attention to these particulars because they impressed themselves on my mind more than others. I think the book could be greatly improved by making more attractive and complete and elaborate the statements which it professes to give as to the Dominion of Canada, and by making the statistics with reference to other countries as full and complete as the information at the disposal of the compilers would enable them to make them. Then, we should have a book of almost inestimable value—one which every member of Parliament would prize, every journalist would have at his elbow, and those students throughout the country who are endeavouring to qualify themselves to follow public affairs intelligently, would appreciate and admire, and one which members on this side of the House would have no occasion to condemn in the slightest degree as being partisan or partial in its complexion, which I fear is too much the case with the volume which I hold in my hands. I fear that, to a large extent, its remarks have been, not so much designedly as accidentally, of a partisan character. Whenever figures present a view

apparently hostile to the position of the present Administration, there are explanations made which we on this side do not admit, and which have been combatted, and successfully combatted on this side of the House as being unfair explanations of these various phenomena. I hope that in a year or two, this book will be improved, as I think it can be, in a way to make it one of the most useful works that can be placed in the hands of the people of the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Let me quote one sentence to show that the compiler was blassed in the preparation of this book. As the last speaker has said, this is a work which not only should be made valuable for reference here but for information abroad, and ought to be a work reliable in every sense. I will read just one paragraph, on page 415, with reference to savings banks deposits :

The decrease in the number of depositors, together with a decrease in the average amount to the credit of each account, would seem to imply that the withdrawals have been made by the wealthier depositors, leaving the savings more particularly of the working classes, for whose benefit these banks were specially intended. In that case it is fair to assume that the condition of the working classes has been materially improved of late years.

I contend that the compiler had no right to make any such statement. A large proportion of the people of this country are convinced that the condition of the working classes has not been improved of late years, and that is the question which divides the two political parties in this House and the country. The compiler of this work had therefore no right to abuse his position in order to display his political bias in a work which ought to be free from political discussion, either on the one side or the other. There are many other paragraphs in the book of a similar character, and evidently the compiler thought that one of the main objects of the work was to sustain the Government in its policy. It is not a purely statistical record at all, and I am astonished that an official, with these duties to discharge, should indulge in such remarks.

Mr. McMULLEN. On page 134, the gentleman who compiled this work undertakes to prove that the condition of the people of Canada is very much better than what it was years ago. He endeavours to do this by stating that the quantity of sugar now used per head is in excess of what it was in former years, and likewise the quantity of tea. He says :

The consumption of tea and sugar per inhabitant has been generally considered one of the best standards by which to judge the condition of the people, it having been found that the consumption of these two articles indicates more clearly than almost anything else their well-being or otherwise ; and judging the condition of the inhabitants of Canada by this test, it will be found that there has been a steady and satisfactory improvement. In 1868 the consumption of sugar was 15 lbs. per head.

That was when sugar was at its highest.

Mr. FLINT.

In 1877, it was 23 lbs. per head, and it is now no less than 45 lbs., an increase of 22 lbs. per head in the last fourteen years and more than double the quantity consumed in 1877.

We know that sugar has decreased in value very considerably in those years, more than one-half.

As far as information is available it would appear that the per capita consumption of sugar in Canada is larger than that of almost any other country with the exception of the United Kingdom and the United States, a fact that speaks well for the condition of the working classes in this country. In the United Kingdom the amount averages about 75 lbs. per head, having increased from 15 lbs. per head in 1840; in the United States the consumption is about the same as in this country. The consumption of tea in Canada has also very largely increased, in 1868 it was 2 lbs. per head, in 1877 it was 3½ lbs. per head, and is now something over 4 lbs. per head. In England the consumption averages 5 lbs. per head.

This is not at all a fair conclusion, because four pounds of tea in use now would not cost anything like what two pounds would cost in 1878. The compiler is therefore leading his readers astray, by trying to prove by the increased consumption of tea, that the people are better off. Tea is now selling at 20 cents to 30 cents per pound, and in 1866 it sold at \$1.05 to \$1.10 per pound, so that two pounds then cost a great deal more than four pounds would now. This shows the one-sided character of the production, and, as has already been stated, this jug-handled production for the purpose of bolstering up the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is unworthy to be called a statistical report. If we desire to prepare something similar to the publications in England and the United States and the Australian colonies, we had better get up something that cannot be assailed, as this one has been by the public press, and is now on the floor of this House. It is a record of no credit to the gentleman who undertook to get it up as an accurate statistical record of facts and figures connected with the business of the country. It has been compiled with the one-sided view of bolstering up the policy now in existence. I have read over very carefully like charges made in the newspapers in the city of Toronto with regard to the irregularities and imperfections and political bias of this work, and I have noticed that the journals favouring the Government have not at all attempted to deal with those criticisms, as they would have done had it been possible to refute them. In a work of this nature, every single item published should be literally true and be able to stand the severest criticism, and every item which cannot stand such criticism ought to be carefully eliminated before the work is put in the hands of the printer. Such a work would be a credit to us, but a one-sided production, such as this, got up with the evident purpose of vindicating the policy of the Government, is simply disgraceful.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In order to justify a remark I made a moment ago, that from

a very cursory examination of the book, I thought the compilation was one-sided, I would call attention to paragraph 544 :

Iron and steel have so completely superseded the use of wood in the construction of ships that the demand for wooden ships is reduced to an extreme limit, in consequence of which the ship building industry in the Maritime Provinces, which used to be a flourishing one, has almost died away, and it does not seem probable that it can ever be revived, the decline having been caused by a cessation of demand owing to a change of material, and not through depression of trade or any causes consequent upon the policy of the Government of the day or within their control.

Why, the idea of an official compiler going into an argument to show that an industry which was once flourishing and has now become nearly extinct, has declined, and then going on to show, that although it has declined, it is not owing to the policy of the Government or to any cause over which they have control. A stronger speech could not be made by the most violent partisan in the House. That is a paragraph which struck me, as I glanced over the book. Then, hon. gentlemen here are alwas anxious to know what bounty we pay, for instance, on beet-root sugar. There are no statistics accessible, that I am aware of, which will enable you to find out what bounty we pay. Of course, you can go to the Public Accounts, and if you are pretty well conversant with them, you will find the sum deducted from the amount of customs returns, a lump sum. In the same way, you will find that the bounty on pig iron is \$30,000. In that way a man can figure it out, I suppose, how many tons of pig iron were produced. One would imagine that in a matter of that kind, the compiler, in order to give the country information, would have put down from year to year a comparative statement since this pig-iron duty and this beet-sugar bounty had been paid, showing how much was paid in each year, in order that we may know whether the bounty paid for the production of beet-root sugar has had the desired effect, and in order that we may know whether the bounty paid on pig iron has been productive of the results predicted when that bounty was first voted. Nothing of the kind is done here, and the reason, in my humble judgment, is because the payment of that bounty had lamentably failed to produce any of the results that were predicted, because, as a matter of fact, instead of increasing the product, that product has gradually but surely declined from year to year. And that is the gentleman who pretends that he is giving an outside and fair statistical abstract of the condition of Canada. I say that in these regards, at least, and in others that I have not studied closely, he fails to give any fair or square statement at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It is more easy, I suppose, to criticise a book than it is to make one. I have no doubt that in taking up a statistical record of any country under the sun, we

would find some points in which we might think it could have been improved, and we might find some statements with which we would not agree. I do not agree, for instance, with the hon. gentleman in the view that all we should have in that would be simple statistics. I think it is important that besides having simply the dull columns of statistics, there ought to be a fair explanation of those statistics, because they help one to understand them, and make the book more readable, as otherwise, not one person in fifty would ever take it up at all. I agree with my hon. friend, too, that it ought not to have a political bias. I am fair enough to say that that one item which he read looks to me as if the compiler went just a shade too far. But I cannot find any fault with the other items which have been read. Now, as regards the pig-iron duty, I noticed myself that it was not in. In going over it, I had actually been looking for the returns of the pig-iron production, and I remember thinking at the time that I wished it had been in. I will take care that the matter is mentioned to the Minister of Agriculture and see that it does get it in. With reference to the bounty on beet-root sugar, I imagine that is one of the things that the statistician has not caught up to, because it has only been two years in operation. But I am quite sure that in neither of these cases were these figures kept out of the book because it was supposed they would militate against the policy which had been adopted by the Government. I think it is impossible for a statistician to get everything in the book, and every individual reader will find some omission that he may wish had not been made. I will call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to these two points: I think they ought to be included. Mr. Roper, who compiles that book, is a very diligent and painstaking man, and, I am sure, only wishes to procure the most reliable statistics and to have the book generally made so that it will carry its own warrant on its face. The discussion which has been had to-night will, no doubt, be read by the minister. I will call his attention to it personally, and, if any improvements can be made in the book, it will be done. For myself, I have found it very valuable. Whereas one would otherwise have to go over dozens of documents, and go to a great trouble and expense to get the information he wants, he finds it here in a compact and readable form.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Just to emphasise this matter, I will read another extract, which will be found on page 297. Now, if the Finance Minister will just follow me, he will see that this page would make very good campaign literature for his party :

As regards exports, the United States took \$10,917,357 worth, of which \$6,616,630, or 61 per cent, comprised exports of horses, eggs, barley and potatoes. The trade in horses with that country is falling off very much, owing to an increase in the

home supply as well as to the great reduction in the demand. It is very probable that this will result greatly to the advantage of the Canadian breeder, for while buyers in the States will always give a good price for a good animal, there was a ready market, principally for horse-car service, for all kinds of animals, without reference to soundness or quality, which has induced a large amount of careless breeding among farmers, in Canada, and the country is now filled with a lot of unsound animals that are practically unsaleable.

This man ought to be appointed Minister of Agriculture. I think if we had him in this House probably he could make some speeches that would tell in favour of the Conservative party. Then he goes on to say :

The trade with Great Britain has increased rapidly during the last 18 months, and if farmers will only pay more attention to quality, and breed only from sound stock, they will soon find in England an infinitely more profitable market than the United States could ever offer them.

That is just what the Conservative party have been contending for, and the Liberal party have been contending that the English market is not as good a market for horses, barley and eggs as the United States market, which is contiguous. He goes on to say :

The total number of horses that have been exported from this country since Confederation, is 328,122 ; 315,463 have gone to the United States, 6,700 to Great Britain, and 5,986 to other countries. The total number imported during the same period, principally for the improvement of stock, is 42,255. Horse-breeding prevails more or less generally in Canada, but it is made a special industry in Alberta, Northwest Territories, where it is rapidly becoming of importance, and it is expected that in a few years a large number of serviceable horses will be available. Though, owing to the jealousy of British agriculturists, the Imperial Government has discontinued, for the present, the purchase of horses in Canada for the army, there is not much doubt that the demand will be ultimately revived, and it is to be hoped that Canadian farmers will enjoy the interval in profiting by the advice and remarks of the officers sent out to purchase, with reference to the style of animal required, so that when the time does come again, as it inevitably will, a far larger supply will be found available than was the case in the first instance : and even if the animals thus produced are not required for the army, they will be found greatly improved for general purposes. The market is sure to come, and there is likely to be much money made out of the trade.

That is campaign literature in the true sense of the term. Then he goes on :

The export of eggs and barley to the States are falling off, and, as already mentioned, the trade in these articles is being gradually transferred to Great Britain. The export of potatoes during 1890-91 were very large, owing to the failure of the crop on the other side, but there is no permanent demand for this vegetable, the imports of potatoes into the States having ranged during the last five years from 8,200,000 bushels to 880,000 bushels. The duty would appear to have checked the export of hay, which is a matter for congratulation, as the export of hay is as injudicious and harmful as the export of store cattle. There was an increase of \$3,988,343 in the value of exports of farm produce to Great Britain.

Now, I think any unprejudiced man will conclude, after reading these extracts, that as

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

a statistical record of Canada, the book has not been confined to the proper limits. I trust that the minister will put a curb upon the compiler of this book in future, and that he will turn out a statistical record in reality, and not a campaign sheet in favour of the policy of the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). We have been told that it is more profitable to ship horses to the old country than to the United States. At the present time, however, there is a larger number of horses exported to the United States from Canada than to Great Britain. I was told by a gentleman who has exported a large number of horses from Canada, and who has been here during three summers, that he will not ship any to England the coming summer as the market was low. Let me say that from my experience the United States offers the best market for our good horses. American buyers purchase our best horses in Huron county and are at the present time sending them to Chicago. We obtain better prices for our horses when purchased for that market. It is all nonsense to tell a Canadian farmer that it is not injurious to impose high duties on horses entering the United States. Let any one go through the country and hear the complaints of the farmers with regard to the fraud perpetrated on them in respect to two-rowed barley and they will learn something of the condition of our agriculture. Many of our farmers have been utterly ruined by the advice they received to grow as much two-rowed barley as possible for shipment to the English market. I asked the Government to complete the experiment and secure one or two buyers to take this barley and place it on the market. I knew it would prove a failure, for this was not the first time it had been attempted. Let me say, as a farmer, that while the English market is a good market, one we cannot afford to do without, yet for barley, horses, eggs and sheep, the United States is our best market, it is the market we have used in the past, and if we could return to the old conditions, it would pay well. I hope the statistician will not attempt to guide the people, for he will in all likelihood lead them astray, but I trust the Government will exercise control over that officer, and instruct him to publish the facts and allow the people to draw their conclusions for themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised at the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the United States is the best market for the eggs and cheese of Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I did not say cheese ; I said sheep.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does not the hon. gentleman know the difference between cheese and sheep ?

Mr. SPROULE. The witticism of the hon. gentleman is only equalled by his logic—neither is very acute. I understood the hon.

gentleman to mention cheese. I think the information we have received of late affords very strong evidence to the contrary with respect to eggs, because we are sending a large quantity of eggs to the old country and finding a valuable market there. No longer ago than the past season I was told by one of the largest exporters of Canadian eggs that the prices realized during the past year and the year before in the old country, made it profitable to buy eggs here and ship them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman's statements, in view of the fact that men in Ontario have lost fortunes in shipping eggs to England. While there is abundant evidence of the failure of these shipments, hon. gentlemen opposite persist that the exporters are making money out of the shipments. A number of men made honest experiments in that direction, being anxious, if possible, to evade the 5 cents per dozen duty charged on Canadian eggs entering the American market, and every one, not even the most pronounced Tory, will dare to say that it has been profitable to ship eggs to England.

Mr. SPROULE. Name the party referred to.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will name Mr. Wilson, of Seaforth.

Mr. SPROULE. Is he not still shipping?

Mr. McMULLEN. That gentleman will tell the hon. member that it has been a most unfortunate speculation on his part. Then there is a man at Orangeville who has shipped to the old country, and he has pretty much lost all he ever owned. Hon. gentlemen opposite, like the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), will persist in speaking of the advantages which these men possess in being able to ship to England. It is a pity that the hon. gentleman had not invested himself, for now he would have nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not well informed. I have it from Mr. Richardson, brother-in-law of Mr. Wilson, that the eggs he shipped to England realized a fair profit, that he was satisfied with the shipment, and he intended to continue the trade in the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had a letter not long ago from Mr. Wilson, whose transactions in this line of business amount annually to nearly \$300,000. At that time his views were not those expressed by the hon. gentleman opposite. Up to that time he had not made a profit. If any shipper deserves to make a profit, he does, as he has shown great enterprise and energy in trying the experiment.

Mr. SPROULE. He has not been bankrupt as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He had not made any money until within a very re-

cent date. There are strong reasons why under no conceivable circumstances can we ship eggs 3,000 miles as profitably as we can to a neighbouring country. That fact the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may see for himself. It may be possible. I hope it will prove possible, to be able to sell a specially selected quality of eggs, sent under very special conditions, but I do not believe it will ever be possible to replace the trade we formerly enjoyed with the United States to any extent and to any advantage.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) thought I said that Mr. Wilson was bankrupt, he is utterly in error, for I said nothing of the kind. He is a decent, respectable and responsible man. He has, however, lost by the speculation of shipping eggs to England.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I desire to refer to a fact or two with respect to the exportation of eggs from my county. Mr. Wilson is the largest exporter of eggs in the country, a man who ships one and a half million dozen eggs every year. He told me during the last few weeks that he could afford to pay the duty to New York, Boston or Buffalo, sell his eggs there, and realize as much as he receives on the English market. Some time ago he shipped a car load of eggs to New York, and also one to Great Britain. The eggs he sent to the British market were specially collected and packed. Those sent to New York were gathered from the farmers, and yet he realized in the American market four cents a dozen more than in the English market, although for that market the eggs were chosen. He told me, and he is a man who knows what he is talking about when he is speaking about eggs, that although the English market is an unlimited one for Canadian eggs, it is not the market that pays the highest price, because the Canadian eggs are not fresh when they arrive there. They are sold to sell again, and any person will understand that from the time they are laid to their arrival on the English market no less than five weeks elapse, and therefore, when they come into competition with eggs from the continent they are regarded as stale eggs, and realize a price accordingly. We send Canadian eggs to the United States market, and they get there in a few days and realized the highest price as fresh eggs. Any person who understands the egg trade knows that you cannot send eggs three or four thousand miles and realize upon them as much as you could by sending them within a few days after they are laid, to the large cities of the United States, where there is a large demand for fresh eggs. It is just as well for hon. gentlemen opposite to understand and acknowledge this at once, instead of trying to thrust it down our throats that you will get as profitable a market in England as in the United States. Mr. Wilson says that if the McKinley tariff were removed, he could pay the farmers at least 3 cents a dozen more

for their eggs, which on one and a-half million, the collection of which only covers two or three counties, would mean \$45,000 more than he could under the operation of the McKinley Tariff. That would be so much benefit to them if he had the freedom of the United States market, rather than being compelled to send to the English market.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) one question: What induced Mr. Wilson and his partner to put cold storage in three vessels, and to engage space for the whole shipping season if they did not find the English market profitable? The hon. gentleman has told us that it is not a profitable market, and that Mr. Wilson admitted he could pay 3 cents a dozen more for eggs if it were not for the McKinley tariff. Why did not Mr. Wilson pay that much more for the eggs when the McKinley Bill was not in existence, when we see that the prices are, comparatively speaking, the same in the two markets? If you compare the prices in England and New York and here, you will find that they are very much the same as they were here before the McKinley Bill was put on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend evidently does not understand the first principles of political economy. When he states that we are getting as much this year as last year, he is simply begging the question, because the conditions of the market this year and last year are not the same, and, therefore, you cannot compare two incomparable things. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know whether we are getting as much under the McKinley Bill as before, let him take this rule, which is the only one by which he can judge whether the duty affects the Canadian prices or not. If the hon. gentleman turns up the market reports previous to the passage of the McKinley Bill, he will find that the margin of difference between the price of eggs, in the cities of Toronto and Buffalo, was two or two and a half cents a dozen. That two and a-half cents a dozen covers freight, commission or insurance; but if the hon. gentleman now looks at the margin of difference between the price of eggs in the cities of Toronto and Buffalo, he will find it to be from four and a-half to six cents per dozen. The same elements are in to-day as before, namely, freight, commission and insurance, and what makes the difference of 3 cents a dozen more of a margin than previous to the passage of the McKinley Bill? No person can answer that question, only in one way, and that is the other element which comes in, namely, the duty which we pay to enter the United States market. To compare the prices in one year, with the prices in the other, is only begging the question because many circumstances arise which alter the price on either side of the line. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked why did Mr. Wilson put in refrigerators at his own expense in the

Mr. McDONALD (Huron).

steam-boats? It was because he was shut out from the American market by the McKinley Bill and was forced to find another market, even if that other market was not so lucrative to him. He, therefore, went to the expense of getting refrigerators to send the eggs to England, in order to overcome the duty. You must bear in mind also, that nearly all the small eggs have to be taken out from consignments to the English market, or you cannot sell them; but you can sell the mixed eggs in the United States market for as much, if not for more, than you can sell the large eggs in the English market. These are facts which should be patent to every man who professes to understand the question.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to make a remark in answer to what was said by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who stated that the eggs sent from Canada to the English market cannot compare favourably with eggs imported into England from the continent. I may say that when I was in London a short time ago, I happened to go into one of the very largest and best known retail establishments in the West End, where they are very particular as to the quality of the goods which they sell. I had some conversation with reference to cheese, as I found that while I was in Belfast, there was a curious ignorance as to the difference between Canadian and Yankee cheese, and I had some conversation in this establishment in London in reference to the difference between Canadian and Yankee cheese.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman means what is called American cheese. I presume?

Mr. McNEILL. I had made use of that word to avoid confusion. We will say American cheese. I found confusion over there, when we used the word American cheese, because Canadian is American cheese also. I had some conversation with regard to Canadian and American cheese, and I found that this establishment recognized distinctly the difference between the Canadian and American product, and I was told that they only purchased Canadian cheese, which was vastly superior to the other, and that they did not purchase the American cheese at all. In fact, he said: it had only a nominal value on the London market. As I was coming away the gentleman with whom I was speaking, said: As you seem to be interested in Canada, I dare say you would like to know that we have been handling Canadian eggs. I said I would like to know very much about that, and he said that they had given very great satisfaction, and that they were of the very best quality. I asked him if Canadian eggs compared favourably with the continental eggs, and he said: very favourably indeed. I think that disposes of the theory of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald), in so far as his contention is concerned in reference to the inferior quality of Canadian eggs in the

English market. As to the duty, I was rather surprised to hear him demonstrate in the most positive way that we did not pay the duty of three cents of which he spoke, because, he said, the difference between the price in Toronto and Buffalo had been, before the passing of the McKinley Bill, three cents, which was the cost of freight and commission, and he also stated that the difference now was six cents, and that this difference of three cents was the duty. That is to say, that the people of the United States now pay three cents more per dozen than before the McKinley Bill, and he went on to say that this additional three cents was the duty paid by the Canadian farmer. But if that is the case, then the people of the United States are paying the duty. If the people of Canada were paying the duty on the eggs they sell, there would not be that difference in price, because the duty would be taken off the price paid to the person who sold the eggs here. The hon. gentleman has proven that the duty, to the extent of three cents, is added to the price of the eggs to the consumer in the United States.

World's Columbian Exhibition. \$25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume the hon. gentleman is in a position to give us some reasonable amount of information as to what he has done with the vote of \$100,000 last year, and also what he proposes to do with the present sum?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that there was a vote of \$5,000 or thereabouts for 1891-92, and that the amount was expended in that year. For 1892-93, from the 1st of July to the 31st of January, \$42,963.40 were expended, making a total expenditure up to the 31st of January of \$47,972.54. The amount voted in the main estimates for the current year was \$100,000; the amount asked for here is \$25,000, making the total \$125,000. But I think the exhibition as a whole, will cost something more than that; how much I do not know.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would like to ask if a commissioner has been appointed in place of Professor Saunders, who, I understood, had resigned on account of ill health.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no one appointed commissioner in place of Professor Saunders.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say to the Government, that, along with a number of other Canadians, at the invitation of the Columbia commissioners, I visited the inauguration of the World's Fair. Naturally we made inquiries as to where our Canadian commissioner was and where his office was, and I then learned for the first time, with very much regret, that Mr. Saunders had no office in Chicago, and that if Canadians wanted to meet that gentleman they might meet him at some of the corners of the streets. I was given to understand that instead of stopping at a hotel he was living at

some boarding-house, and it was impossible to find him. I very much regretted that while all other nationalities were represented in the procession and had a place in the programme, Canada was not represented at all. It would have been an excellent thing for our Canadian Government, even if the visitors had paid the cost themselves, to have had some carriages placed at their disposal, so that they could have taken part in that procession. I think that the Government, in making an appointment of this kind, should appoint a gentleman who would have the power and position of a Minister, because this is an exhibition at which Canada will be competing, not merely with the United States, but with the world. At the Philadelphia exhibition the exhibit of the educational system of the Province of Ontario was the finest in the world, and I have no doubt it will occupy the same position at the forthcoming exhibition. Therefore, I hope and trust, for the sake of Canada, that a gentleman will be sent there as commissioner who will have power and ability to meet not only Canadian visitors, but people from all parts of the world, and give them all the information they require regarding Canada. We are proposing to spend \$125,000, and I do not begrudge that amount. I think, not only as to our educational system, but as to our minerals, fruits and other products, that our Canadian exhibition will on the whole be as good, if not better, than that of any other country in the world, and I hope that for the sake of this Canada of ours, a gentleman will be appointed commissioner who will do credit to Canada as well as to the exhibition.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask if Prof. Saunders is there now?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not. Mr. Larke is acting and doing the work of supervising at present.

Mr. FRASER. But Mr. Larke is here.

Mr. FOSTER. He is here and there, backwards and forwards. He is doing whatever work is necessary to be done.

Mr. FRASER. I think I can congratulate the Government that, on matters that will not be on exhibition at any rate, they will have in Mr. Larke, a man who will be able to talk against the best Yankee. This is a large vote, but if it is not enough, I, for one, would be willing to vote any sum consistent with our ability that would be necessary to enable us to show our neighbours just what we can do. If there is work there to be done, Mr. Larke ought to be there so that Canadians visiting the exhibition would know where they might go, and where information about Canada would be disseminated. This exhibition will afford an excellent opportunity for Canadians in the United States to learn, after a few years' absence from Canada, just where we are. Our nearness to that country should put us in the first place, I believe in a

place superior to that of any nation in Europe except Great Britain. So I hope the Government will see that the man appointed as commissioner shall be a suitable man, that he shall be there all the time, and that no expense shall be spared that we can afford to make the best possible show.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that Mr. Larke found great difficulty in many places in inducing the manufacturers of Canada to send exhibits to the Chicago World's Fair? Some of the manufacturers with whom I am acquainted signified to me, and to Mr. Larke also, that they did not care to send their exhibits there at all. In fact, I think some of them refused altogether. Judging from what I have heard, I think there are great doubts as to whether Canada will make a good exhibit in that line.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is something in what the hon. gentleman has said. That feeling was encountered in the initial stages of the work of procuring exhibits: but there is no doubt now that there will be a good exhibit made by the manufacturing industries of Canada. We have had more applications for space than we have had space to give. So that, although naturally arising and existing to a certain extent, I think that feeling has passed away, and nothing now stands in the way of an excellent exhibit of our manufacturing industries. The same is true as regards the general exhibit. I am sure, from conversations with Mr. Saunders and afterwards with Mr. Larke, that Canada will not be ashamed of her exhibit. Every care will be taken by the minister in charge and by the Government that a suitable commissioner shall be appointed. A building is being erected commensurate with our position—not a very expensive one, but still a very good building—as the headquarters of the Canadian delegation, the Canadian officers and the Canadian exhibitors, although not a house in which to exhibit our products, which will be divided amongst the exhibition buildings and will take their places with exhibits of like kinds from other countries. Every care will be taken that proper officers are there, and everything will be done to make the exhibition a success. I am glad to hear from my hon. friend opposite that he would not object to a vote of almost any amount. I think we ought to make a good exhibit, but not an extravagant one, one which would be representative both in quality and size, and I am sure that is what the Minister of Agriculture is aiming at.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the Government will be held responsible by the people and the House for the exhibit which Canada will make. The people expect that the display shall be as creditable a one as a reasonable expenditure of public money can make it. It is desirable from all points of view that Canada should put her best foot forward. I would like to know whether an

Mr. FRASER.

office is open at the grounds now, where Canadians can obtain official information with regard to the exhibits and the exhibition?

Mr. FOSTER. It is just about finished.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no office where any intending exhibitor, or other person, can apply for information at present.

Mr. FOSTER. They will apply to the department here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think there ought to be one there. It is a matter of serious regret on both sides that Mr. Saunders' health should have broken down. He was generally appreciated as a man fit for the position. I quite agree with my hon. friend behind me, that a suitable man should be appointed in his place, but I do not wish to see that place filled by a mere political nominee, as a reward for past political services. It is an office which should be filled by just such a man as Mr. Saunders, a thoroughly practical man, who can do thoroughly practical work. The people are prepared to approve of the expenditure of any reasonable sum to make our exhibit a thorough success, but they desire certainly the appointment of the head of the department and his subordinates to be, as far as possible, free from political favouritism and that only practical men should be named. Unless that be done, we run the serious risk of not having our exhibit properly attended to and of, perhaps, being made a laughing-stock.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the chief burden of the commissionership now rest on Mr. Larke's shoulders?

Mr. FOSTER. He is acting.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose his time is paid for and it is all occupied?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. EDGAR. I am a little surprised at that, because I rather think Mr. Larke is engaged in stumping the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. EDGAR. It is only a short time ago when I met him on the platform myself in North Hastings at the nomination. He was there with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the member for North Hastings. He made a very strong speech on the platform, to which I replied, and he was a most strenuous partisan, as it was very proper a stump speaker should be. It surprises me a little to hear that his whole time is paid for, and that the whole responsibility of this important matter of the exhibition is resting upon his shoulders while he is going around stumping the country. I suppose, with the precedent of Sir Charles Tupper before him, who came out here on the stump while he was in the employ of the Government, Mr. Larke felt he could neglect his duties in connection with the fair.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite in error in supposing that Mr. Larke was stumping the country since his appointment as acting commissioner. He has not been, I am sure.

Mr. EDGAR. When was he appointed?

Mr. FOSTER. I think he was appointed to act in Mr. Saunders's place probably three or four weeks ago.

Mr. EDGAR. The nomination I refer to was probably three or four weeks ago. Was not Mr. Larke engaged on that commission before that?

Mr. FOSTER. No; he was engaged on no commission; but he had been engaged visiting the manufactories and different industries and soliciting exhibits. He had been employed in the early part of the year at that work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At his own cost and charges?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that the result is, he was to all intents and purposes a paid agent of the Government, stumping North Hastings. We all know something of Mr. Larke, at least all of us who have taken any share in political contests. He is an ordinary political heeler, and a very unscrupulous one, and his appointment is about as unfit a one as could be made for this important position. I have no desire to grudge any reasonable amount the Government may require to make our exhibit a success. It is emphatically one of those things, which, if done at all, ought to be done well; but I must say there is no man on this side of the House and no person we represent who has any confidence whatever in the fitness of Mr. Larke for this important appointment. It is to be regretted that the Government could find nobody but an unscrupulous political hack to discharge a duty, the proper discharge of which will involve a great deal to the people. Most undoubtedly if our exhibit is not in all respects what it should be, the Government will decidedly have to bear the blame of having put this very important work in the hands of such a person.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to impress on the Government the necessity of having a proper individual to see that our stock is properly handled at the fair. Stockmen in Canada labour under great disadvantages at present. For instance, the Americans will not accept a single animal from Canada from any of our registers, but require them all to be registered in the books of the United States, and I am not aware it is yet settled whether they will accept cattle from our registers in Canada. It is most important that we should have an individual, well posted with respect to the registration and bringing out of the best class of animals. On the effect that the stock of Canada will make at this exhibition, the posi-

tion of our farmers will depend in a great measure, as regards their making as good sales in the future for breeding purposes as they have in the past. I hope the Government will employ an individual thoroughly posted with respect to stock of all descriptions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Canada having decided to take part in this exhibition, it is of the greatest importance that our display should reflect credit on us, and with this object it will be necessary to spend a considerable sum of money. The House is willing to vote a generous amount but would like to have the assurance that the expenditure of that money will be so managed that Canada will receive the credit she is entitled to. We are not exhibiting there with the view of magnifying any other country but our own. We look upon it as an advertisement of what Canada is able to do; we are voting this sum of money in the expectation that it will come back in an indirect way to Canada, and that it will promote its trade and commerce. I think it is absolutely necessary that, having gone into it, we should lose no legitimate means within reasonable bounds, of making an exhibit that will be a credit to us, a credit to us as a people engaged in different lines of manufacture, as a people possessed of a rich agricultural country, and as a nation possessed of great, and I may say, almost inexhaustible fisheries. While I wish to make no charges against any one because of their political views—because I do not hold that the Government shall not employ any one who has been known in political life at all—but that they should base an appointment upon the fact of a person taking part in political matters upon their side, viewing his merits from that standpoint alone, would be a very serious mistake, and I trust they will do nothing of that kind at all. It would be a very great mistake indeed in a matter of such supreme moment to Canada, if politics had anything to do with the appointment. Mr. Larke, who has some knowledge of manufactures, I believe, who is a fair speaker—if it be a fact that he is occupying that position, as a member has pointed out, and is engaged in doing political work, it does seem to me that it is something that ought not to be countenanced by the Minister. It has been likened to Sir Charles Tupper taking part in the campaign here. It does seem to me that the whole time and attention of the individual should be given to that matter, that he should be supported by an efficient staff, and that the money that Parliament is ready and willing to vote should be expended to the best advantage. For my own part I believe that Canadians, if they are led to take an interest in it, as I believe they are, if they bring out, as I trust they will bring out, their full strength, we will have an exhibition there that we may well feel proud of as Canadians. But it will be a thing to be deprecated, a thing to be deplored, if anything should happen to mar that in any way at all. I have

ventured these remarks in order to impress upon the Ministry the importance of the point that is brought under their observation. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if himself or any of his colleagues found it convenient for them to accept the invitation to be present at the opening, and to manifest by their presence their interest in this exhibition.

Mr. FOSTER. I was absent myself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was any of the hon. gentleman's colleagues present at the opening?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think any members of the Government were there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any interim report been brought down of the expenditure of money, or of the steps taken?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a small report; I received a copy of it two or three days ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is important that an interim report should be made to the department and communicated to the House, because I agree with my hon. friend behind me in thinking that it is a matter of first rate importance to us, and that it will be an extremely deplorable thing if our exhibition on this occasion is not a good one.

Mr. FOSTER. A report has been made; I do not know whether it has been distributed to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a matter of regret to many Canadians who visited the opening of the exposition at Chicago, that Canada received no official recognition there. In the procession, in which representatives of all nations were present, Canada had no place.

An hon. MEMBER. Were you there?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was there, but I was not in the procession. I was not an official. It was a matter of surprise and a matter of pain to those of us who believe that Canada is the best country in the universe, to find that Canada did not occupy her proper status, the status to which she was entitled by reason of her wealth, and her population, and her intelligence, alongside the other nations of the earth. Her commissioners were not to be found. There was no member of the Government, and no official there to represent them. But I understand that Mr. Saunders was not well. I have nothing to say against Mr. Saunders. I believe him to be a splendid man for the position, and would give more satisfaction than, perhaps, any political supporter or active politician is likely to do. I think that if we are going to make this exhibition worthy of Canada, if we are going to

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

appear there to compete in the eyes of the world, we ought to make Canada show to a good advantage. If we do not, if it is the intention of the Government to minimize the exhibits, if it is the intention of the Government to belittle Canada in the eyes of the world, if they do not want her to take any place or to occupy any status among the people of the earth, why, then, let them act on that position; but if they intend that Canada shall occupy her proper place, they should have a gentleman there who will command the respect of our people, irrespective of party, and who will secure the support of the business men of Canada. If we are going to do it, let us do it right, and not pack the office there with political heelers. Let it be packed and managed by business men. Let our Government follow the example of Mr. Cleveland, who has said that, in the formation of his cabinet he was going to appoint business men. So in reference to the management of our exhibition, let business men go to Chicago, let business men represent us at Chicago, and then our exhibit will be a success. But if it is to be entrusted to heelers, to those who support the Government, and who are paid electioneering agents, you are going to dis-affect the largest manufacturers and the largest producers, probably, that we have in this country. It was expected that Canada would have some place where Canadians could rally, that some office would be opened by the Canadian commissioners where Canadians could go and make enquiries and receive directions in reference to the opening. Nothing of that kind was done. I am not complaining for the sake of complaining. I was kindly treated while there, receiving an invitation, though not through the Commissioner, receiving a ticket to go to the opening though not through the Commissioner. I was unable to find, during the time I was there, where the commissioner's headquarters were, and of the Canadians who went with me, and a large number went with me, not one of them, I believe, had an interview with the commissioner. One of them, a gentleman from Toronto in connection with the Industrial Exhibition, told me he had written for an appointment with Mr. Saunders. I think it was, and he said he had received a reply that Mr. Saunders would meet him at the corner of 14th Street and Michigan Avenue. Now that is a position that I, as a Canadian, did not like—that the representatives of the Industrial Exhibition in Toronto should be accorded an interview with the commissioner on a corner of a street. I did not think that Canada had got so poor as that. Has the National Policy brought us to this? If so, we had better withdraw this \$100,000 and not appear there at all. If we are not going to make it worthy of Canada, let us drop the item altogether. But if we intend to make it an exhibit worthy of Canada, so that our products will compete with those of the whole world, in the various industrial

branches, let us make it a success; otherwise strike out the item and let it go. Do not have our commissioner making an appointment with gentlemen engaged in the Industrial Exhibition, on the corner of an avenue and another street, when we should have an office and a place where they can go. I do not know but that the Controller of Customs had this in his mind the other night when he was speaking about giving a vital blow to Canada in the back, because I do not think it is anything else. I won't say a word about Mr. Saunders, because he was ill, but the management of our affairs in Chicago, at the time of the opening, was something that struck Canadians as humiliating. I say this with more pain than pleasure. I declare that it was to many Canadians a source of deep regret to see the way the thing was managed at the opening.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the Minister state what the various provinces are doing? Are they all working harmoniously? Are they working separately, or are they working in conjunction with the Dominion commissioner in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. They are working in conjunction with the Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). All the provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman know how the expense is divided, or what particular share of work is assumed by each province?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot quite state the *modus operandi*. The expense of the exhibition so far as collecting and selecting exhibits by the Dominion authorities are concerned, will be borne by the Dominion Government. Some of the provinces, however, have resolved to make special exhibits of their own, and the expense of collecting and selecting those exhibits will be borne by the province itself. I was not quite accurate in saying that all the provinces are working in unison. Manitoba is making a special exhibit of its own. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia,—New Brunswick at least, are not doing very much in the way of making distinct displays, although exhibits from those provinces will form part of the general exhibit of the Dominion at Chicago.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it the intention of the Government to retain Mr. Larke in the position of commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not commissioner. There is no commissioner at present. Mr. Larke is doing the work that is necessary for the time being.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What salary is Mr. Larke receiving at present?

Mr. FOSTER. He is paid so much a day, \$5 a day, I think.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I find in the Auditor-General's report that he is acting as assistant commissioner, at a salary of \$5 a day, and \$3 a day living allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will not be safe to appoint Mr. Larke except by the day, for we will, no doubt, expect to get through the work in time to take an active part in the elections.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it only fair to tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that I expect to deliver the Budget speech next week, and I shall be able to state the time definitely in the latter part of the week.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIERE, from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, presented the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:—

The committee have had under consideration a communication from the Chief Reporter of the Official Report of the Debates requesting the temporary appointment of a stenographer to replace Mr. Thos. J. Richardson, one of the members of the reporting staff, who, owing to injuries received, has become incapacitated for the present from performing his official duties.

The committee, with a view of keeping up the efficiency of the staff, recommend that Mr. A. C. Campbell be appointed to perform the work until such time as Mr. Richardson is able to resume his duties.

The amount of the remuneration to be paid Mr. Campbell for his services to be subsequently determined by the committee and reported for the approval of the House.

Report concurred in.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) intituled an Act respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 21) to confer certain powers on the corporation of the municipality of the town of Calgary.—(Mr. Davis, N.W.T.)

SEDITIONOUS AND UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 22) further to amend the 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths. He said: This Bill is one which was introduced last session by the former member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). In the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada there is a general Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths, the last clause of which provides that the said Act shall not extend to the meetings of any society or lodge held in conformity with the rules prevailing among the societies of Freemasons, "provided such society or lodge has been constituted by or under the authority of warrants in that behalf, granted by or derived from any Grand Master or Grand Lodge in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." The masonic lodges in the province of Quebec were, therefore, exempt from any penalty under the Act. Subsequently, however, the Grand Lodge of Masons of Canada was formed, and in 1865 the Legislature of the old province of Lower Canada enacted as follows:—

The words "or Grand Master or Grand Lodge of Canada" are hereby added to, and shall follow the words "Great Britain and Ireland" in the 9th section of the 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, intituled: An Act respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.

That is to say, the Legislature of the old province of Canada exempted not only the masonic lodges acting under the jurisdiction of Great Britain and Ireland, but also the masonic lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Canada. Then after Confederation the Grand Lodge of Quebec was formed, and the intent of the present Bill is to extend the same exemption to the lodges in the province of Quebec, which are now acting under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) respecting witnesses and evidence. He said: This is the Bill which was under the consideration of a joint committee of both Houses at the last session of Parliament. The report of the committee was in favour of the Bill somewhat modified from the present Bill. I have thought proper to introduce the Bill this session in a larger form, in order that the whole subject may be submitted to investigation and consideration of members.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES.

Mr. LEPINE asked, 1. What has been the cost of the type-setting machines in use in the Government printing office? 2. What has been the quantity and price of the lead and antimony used during the year 1892? 3. What has been the amount of wages paid to operators of the said machines, engineers and others employed, in 1892? 4. What has been the cost of repairs, and the outlay for oil and other articles needed in the operating of the said machines, in 1892? 5. What work has been done and what has been the approximate value of such work, in 1892?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The cost of the type-setting machines has been \$27,036.26. 2. The quantity of lead used was 1,700 lbs. at 3 cents, \$51. The quantity of antimony was 205 lbs. at 14½ cents, \$29.73. 3. Wages paid to operators, engineers and others, \$3,039.21. 4. Cost of repairs, &c., \$140. 5. Work done up to 31st December, 1892: Members' speeches, Civil Service examination papers, several lots of mail lists, library catalogues for Kingston Penitentiary, Mohawk Hymn Book, promotion examination papers, Military College examination papers, three emigration pamphlets, meteorological report, World's Fair pamphlet, Senate "Hansard," book of tables of wages, collection of Orders in Council. Value, \$2,331.07.

CANADIAN SHIPPING.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What was the total registered shipping on the 31st December, 1892?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Complete returns are not yet in. I expect to have the answer in a week or ten days.

EMPLOYEES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. What is the total number of persons employed in the permanent Civil Service of Canada? What is the total annual amount of their salaries? 2. If members of the North-west Police are not included in such number, then what is the total number of persons in such last-mentioned service, and what is the total annual amount of their salaries, and allowances and payments on account of the police.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With regard to the number of employees and salaries, that will be found in the list now being made by the Queen's Printer, which I hope to lay on the Table in the course of a day or two.

Mr. IVES. With regard to the second clause of the question, the total number of persons, of all ranks, in the North-west Mounted Police service, is 923. The annual

amount of their salaries, including scouts, guides and interpreters, is, approximately, \$310,000. The total expenditure for Mounted Police service for the current fiscal year will be, approximately, \$675,000.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN CAMPBELLTON AND GASPE BASIN.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates this session a sum sufficient to improve the mail service between Campbellton and Gaspé Basin?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we must give the usual reply, that we cannot anticipate anything in regard to the Estimates until they are prepared.

FISHERY OFFICER FOR BONNE ESPERANCE DIVISION.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint another person in the place of Mr. W. H. Whitely, as fishery officer for Bonne Esperance division, from Checatica to Blanc Sablons?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The question is now under consideration of the Government, who are awaiting a further report from our officer on that subject.

LIGHTHOUSE AT POINTE AUX ANGLAIS.

Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains) asked, To whom has been awarded the contract for the building of the lighthouse at Pointe aux Anglais? What was the amount of the tender? What are the names of the sureties furnished by the contractors? When must the work be completed? How many visits were made to the works by the inspector of the Department of Marine? What was the date of his last visit? In what condition did he find the works?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The contract for the building of the lighthouse at Pointe aux Anglais was awarded to Richard Abbott, of Ottawa. 2. The amount of his tender was \$1,775. 3. His sureties were Mr. Edward VanCourtland Wright, mine owner, of the city of Ottawa, and Mr. William Henry Maguire, farmer and contractor, of Stittsville. 4. The work, according to contract, should be completed on the 15th March, 1893. 5. Inspector made four visits, but he remained a fortnight at one time at the works, and at other times two or three days. 6. The date of his last visit was the 4th November, 1892, and he returned to Ottawa on the 8th. 7. After the inspector's arrival at Pointe aux Anglais, on the 4th of November, he found that the contractor had stopped work. Seven complete courses on the pier were down, and the eighth was down on the nose. The

height of the sides of the pier is 10 feet 7½ inches, and of the nose, 11 feet 5 inches. The ballast floor had not been put in at the height specified. The stone had not been placed in the pier. The inspector had the timber piled and made arrangements to have any stone left by the contractor placed in the pier before the water should rise. The contractor was notified that steps would be taken to insure completion of work in a reasonable time.

SALARIES OF COUNTRY POSTMASTERS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Colchester) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in view of the small salaries now paid to country postmasters, for the duties performed by them, to take into consideration the advisability of adopting a different system from that by which these salaries are at present determined?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to adopt a different system from that at present in force for the payment of salaries to the various postmasters.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE BY UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether the Government has any official information as to the action taken by the United States Government in providing that Canadian cattle imported into the United States shall be subject to quarantine for ninety days; and if so, at what time the regulation will go into effect, and at what points on the American frontier quarantine stations will be established?

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Government have not been officially informed respecting the action of the Washington Government in relation to quarantining Canadian cattle on entering the United States. It appears, from the terms of the public proclamation, that the embargo has been imposed on account of the fact that Canadian cattle have been scheduled in England. Buffalo is the only point named where Canadian cattle can enter the United States.

CAPE TRAVERSE HARBOUR.

Mr. YEO asked, Has a petition been received by the Department of Public Works from the inhabitants of Cape Traverse and vicinity, Prince Edward Island, asking for improvement of the harbour at that place?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. On 4th January last, a petition was received at the Department of Public Works from the inhabitants of Cape Traverse and vicinity, praying for a grant to make as good harbour accommodation at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, as now exists at Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick.

DUTY ON CORN.

Mr. POPE moved :

That it is expedient to place corn on the free list.

He said: This subject has been so often discussed in this House that there is little to add to the remarks that have been made on former occasions. But since the time it was last discussed, those who are interested more particularly in securing free corn in Canada have been placed in a much worse and more difficult position than they occupied when the subject was before the House in 1890. Since that time an embargo has been placed on our cattle by Great Britain, and also at a more recent date a quarantine has been placed on our cattle by the United States. I do not think that it is a matter of so much consequence as the English embargo, in view of the fact that our shipments to the United States are small, compared with those to the British market. I do not make this motion as a vote of want of confidence in the Government. I move it simply because I believe it is in the interests of the farmers of Canada, especially those of the eastern provinces. Possibly, from having spoken on the question on the other side in 1890, some hon. members may fancy that I should offer some apology for my present position. If such an idea prevails in any quarter, I am not going to satisfy any hon. gentleman's curiosity in that regard. All practical men agree that if we intend to hold our own as farmers in the old sections of Canada, where the land is becoming exhausted by continuous cropping, we must adopt a higher system of agriculture and become, not only producers of raw material, but producers of manufactured articles, beef and mutton, and leave behind the manureal value of the crop, in order to maintain the fertility of the soil. This fact should impress itself favourably on our minds, when we remember that we are developing in the North-west a vast country with a fertile soil, where it is possible to produce grain crops at a very cheap rate compared with the old sections of the Dominion. If we are going to continue to raise grain to any extent in the eastern provinces in competition with the western country, it can only be done by maintaining the fertility of the soil, and that fertility can only be maintained by feeding on the farm all the products, and if the market warrants it, by bringing in other food from other sections of the country and keeping a larger number of cattle, if possible, on the same number of acres. By adopting these measures, we anticipate that it is possible for us to farm and still compete with those western farmers who are raising grain, for the simple reason that it will be some time before they are able to perfect cheese, pigs and beef, while we are able to perfect them in a very short time in this section. Consequently, if we have the cheapest possible food, we can produce beef, butter and cheese, all meats and products of the cow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

more cheaply and advantageously than in the west, and possibly be able to make our farms pay in the eastern sections. Before the embargo was placed on our stock entering England, it was possible for us to send there cattle of any character we saw fit. Not that I believe it was wise in the agricultural interest that we should send very small and exceedingly lean cattle to that country, but I think it was advisable that our farmers should feed our coars- grains to their cattle for export, and send them over to be finished off as beef, as the English market might require. But now every animal exported to that country must be killed at the port of landing, and our shippers must come into competition with the exporters of the corn-fed cattle from Iowa and Illinois. Taking the eastern townships, we have for a long time exported stockers and to a certain extent beef cattle, but a large proportion of the cattle from the townships were sold on the other side to be finished off there into a better article than it was when it left here. In the townships we purchase a large portion of the food with which our cattle are fed. We find that we must now change our position, and I may say here that the embargo was placed on our cattle at a time when it would do our farmers the greatest possible injury. Our cattle were all in the barns, and our lean cattle were being prepared for shipment next season. By this embargo the position was entirely changed, and we now find that we shall be obliged to feed our cattle and fatten them to be killed on landing in competition with the cattle I mentioned a few moments ago. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that these are young, growing cattle, and in my opinion the only food that will really fatten them for the British market is corn, at whatever price we may have to purchase it. Corn and a mixture of barley will properly fatten those cattle for that market. Knowing that our cattle will have to be fattened for that market and that our farmers will be obliged to purchase corn, I submit this motion to the House, in order that our farmers may know what to do, and whether they will have to continue to pay 7½ cents per bushel duty. In 1878 the conditions were entirely different, when the Government of that day thought it was necessary to protect our coarse grains by imposing a duty on corn. In the first place, Ontario and Quebec were practically the only grain-growing sections of the Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island. They were selling that grain very largely in this country to city corporations, such as street railway companies, and to lumbermen and that sort of consumers who could purchase and use wesa corn as well as they could use either barley or oats. Hence, at that date, when our export trade to Great Britain was a small one and when it was not anticipated that it would ever reach its present importance, it was considered necessary that we should protect the

grain-growing sections of this country, and the farmers of the section of the country from which I come, readily admitted that fact, and were prepared, for the sake of the farmers in Ontario and the lower valley of the St. Lawrence, to bear their portion of that burden. I find that in 1878 the export of horned cattle to England amounted only to 29,925 head, valued at \$1,152,234, but in 1892 the number of horned cattle exported to England reached 107,179 head, valued at \$7,748,949. Surely this return proves that there is a changed condition with respect to the articles produced by the Canadian farmers. I also find that in 1878, the total exports of cheese, butter, meats, swine and sheep, under the head of animals and their products, amounted to \$9,249,257, while in the year 1892, we find that the total amount of that export has increased to \$23,673,700. These figures show the tendency of our farming, although, I have no doubt, that there was a greater profit accruing, possibly, in the earlier days of this export trade than the profit realized at present. However, the general tendency of the farmer has been to feed more cattle and to sell less grain. While we have increased our exports of animals and their products from \$9,000,000 to \$23,000,000, during these years, we find that in the grain exports of this country, we have only exported \$8,495,658 in 1892, as against \$7,511,494 in 1878; only a million dollars increase during that long period of time. This proves conclusively that the farmers are giving their attention to producing animals and their products, rather than grain. The cattle question is of vital importance to this country, and especially in the face of the embargo now placed upon us in this matter, we feel that we should be at liberty to buy corn wherever we see fit at the lowest possible price. It has been said to me by the barley growers of Ontario that they would be able to furnish us barley at as cheap a price as it would be necessary for us to secure feed. There is some good reason for that statement, especially at the present time, because we are to-day undoubtedly getting barley from Ontario and the west at a very low price. There is no question about that; but whether we get it at a low price or not, the class of cattle which we have to furnish in our section of the country cannot be finished on barley alone. They are lean, thin cattle and require corn in order to fatten them.

An hon. MEMBER. You can fatten them on barley.

Mr. POPE. An hon. member says that we can fatten our cattle on barley alone. I recognize the voice, and, no doubt, owing to the gentleman's seniority as a farmer and as a member of this House, I ought, perhaps, to give way to him, but I have experience whereof I speak, and I am bound to stand by my own judgment all the same. The grain growers in Ontario never would think of con-

tinuing the production of barley at the price they are selling it for to-day, because, when we consider the exhaustion of the soil in growing barley, we must see that the Ontario farmer cannot afford to raise it for 33 cents a bushel, which is about its present price. Again, the Ontario farmer ought not to sell his barley for 30 odd cents, because, if he feeds it to swine, he will be able to obtain a return of nearly 90 cents a bushel. Therefore, by selling to us at 33 cents, he is not only exhausting the soil, but he is losing 100 per cent more profit, which he might obtain by disposing of it in the way I have indicated. There is another view of the question, and that is: Can the cattle-raiser and the cheese-maker, and the producer of swine, etc., afford, in the future, to pay a much greater price for his barley than he is now paying to the Ontario farmer? I say that he cannot afford it. Our barley costs us in Quebec about 50 cents a bushel, which is a little over a cent a pound. Let us take the price for which cattle have been selling for the last two or three years, and especially during the last twelve months. There have been, and there probably will be in the future, a few sales of choice cattle at 5 cents a pound, but the large bulk of cattle which have left our section of the country during the last year and a half, have been sold at 3½ cents a pound, to be exported to the old country. I claim that cattle at 3½ cents per pound must be fattened on cheaper barley than that purchased at 50 cents per bushel, to make the business pay. A man will find it difficult to get his money back if he pays 50 cents a bushel for barley, and sells his cattle at 3½ cents a pound. Under these circumstances, the farmer of Ontario must feel that if he wishes to get a higher price for his barley than he is getting to-day, he can only get it by taxing the farmers in the other sections of the country. It must be remembered that the Ontario farmer exports his choice barley, and that he has the same opportunity of exporting his choice meats, the same opportunity of exporting his cheese, the same opportunity of exporting his butter, and by what rule of common sense he can expect that because he wishes to get a high price for his inferior barley, he should have the privilege of taxing other farmers in other sections of the country? If this barley was largely consumed by others than farmers, there might possibly be some argument in favour of the duty; but, Sir, I am asking that this duty be removed in order that the feeders in our section and other sections of the country may be enabled to get feeding stuffs at as cheap a price as it is possible on this continent, and pay freight. I ask it in the interest of an export trade of \$23,000,000, which was the cattle export trade of last year, as against an export trade in grains and pease of only \$8,000,000. I ask it because our cattle have been scheduled in England and because we are forced, whether we like it or not, or whether we reside in a

grain-growing section or not, to sell our cattle in such a finished condition that they can enter into competition with the fattest cattle exported to Great Britain, which come from Illinois and Iowa. I ask it, Sir, because the removal of that duty on corn tends in the direction of better farming. The grain-growing farmers may say: You are forcing us to feed. Well, if we do force them to feed, we are forcing them into a line of farming which is pointed out by the most practical and scientific men in the old and the new world as the best system. We are forcing them to maintain the fertility of their soil, and according to the present prices of pork, we are forcing them to feed barley which they now sell for 33 cents, so as to utilize it and get 90 cents a bushel. I think that such a forcing would be for their benefit all round and would be of great advantage to them. There is one reason in favour of the motion which I make, which I might have mentioned, but which is, perhaps, not quite pertinent to this question. It is a reason which was very satisfactory to me when I spoke upon the other side of this question two or three years ago. On that occasion I had the pleasure of replying to a gentleman whom it gives me extreme pleasure, inside or outside of this House, to always oppose, and I find that that gentleman has not altogether forgotten the occasion. He is now one of the editors of the Montreal "Herald," and in a recent article he singles out my remarks in the debate in this House in 1890. I find that, behind the editor's chair, he says, with reference to this debate:

In the last Parliament Mr. Sidney Fisher, then member for Bromes, moved, session after session, a resolution of this tenor: That in the opinion of the House, corn should be put on the free list. The arguments by which [according to Mr. Fisher's authority] Mr. Fisher supported this motion, as they appear in the official report in "Hansard," were conclusive in their character [so Mr. Fisher says], and were couched in moderate and courteous phrases.

So Mr. Fisher says himself of the speech he made on that occasion. Going further down, I find that Mr. Fisher must have a good knowledge of some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, having been an old member, and having had an acquaintance with those gentlemen extending over many years, for he says:

Therefore Mr. Pope assumes a disguise as a tariff reformer, in order that he may delay and temporize, and finally prevent the passage of this measure of relief to the stock-growers of Canada. But a straight motion by an honest Liberal will, ere the session is half over, drive him from his ambush.

Now I am crawling from the ambush on my own account. But there must be two classes of Liberals in this House. I had supposed that after the purging the party received in the courts, those left in this House were pure, honest and upright; but it seems that this gentleman, who has a more intimate knowledge of them than I have, still feels doubtful of them, for he believes that some of the

Mr. POPE.

hon. gentlemen opposite are perhaps not politically honest. But he thinks that the resolution that will be moved by an honest Liberal will be a straight motion, and not a crooked one. Now, I have not yet found the honest Liberal who is to drive me from my ambush, as this man has stated in the Montreal "Herald," and I beg to move this motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I regret to be obliged to disagree with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) in the conclusion at which he has arrived on this important subject. His motion deals with one of the old questions as to the effect of the National Policy which was adopted by this country in 1878 by such an overwhelming majority, and which from that time to the present the people have believed, at least in our section of the country, has been of special benefit to the farmers. The hon. gentleman has given some reasons why corn should be placed on the free list, and I will refer very briefly to a few of them before making the remarks I wish to make on the general subject. Almost the last argument he used was this, that he asked for this change in the interest of \$23,000,000 worth of exports of the products of the farm at the present time against \$10,000,000 worth in the year 1878. I presume that by that statement he means to lead the House to believe that because the development of the agricultural industry of the country in the lines which we export, such as cheese, butter and beef, has reached such a high pitch to-day, that is an argument in favour of placing corn on the free list. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman if he has even thought for a moment that our small exportation in the year 1878 was at a time when we enjoyed the very privilege which he now asks the House to grant, of free corn. If that advantage had brought about a development of those lines to the extent to which they are developed to-day, then his argument would be a strong one; but we find that in spite of free corn the development of the export trade in cattle, butter and cheese up to 1878 was not very rapid. At that time, in the judgment of the men who are now endeavouring to control the destinies of this country, it was desirable for us to adopt a National Policy, in other words, to impose a duty on those classes of grains that were coming into Canada from the western States, largely to the detriment of our farmers. The country saw fit to stand by the principles on which that policy was propounded, and returned to power the men who were advocating it; and then Canada commenced the development of that large industry which has attained to such large proportions to-day as the hon. gentleman has told us, and which has attained this position notwithstanding the duty on corn which has existed from that day to this, and notwithstanding that the imports of corn into this country have been steadily decreasing

year after year. The hon. gentleman thinks it will do us no harm to remove the duty on corn; but if he turns his attention back to 1878, he will find that the unfortunate condition of the farmers of Canada at that time was such that we imported 7,387,000 bushels of corn for the use of Canadians. Some may say that it was for the purpose of being used in the distilleries; but I find that only about 1,000,000 bushels were used in the distilleries, and that the balance was used for feeding purposes, either for man or beast. We also imported at that time 2,162,000 bushels of oats and 5,635,000 bushels of wheat; and all these imports were coming directly into competition with the products of the Canadian farmer, and reducing the value of those lines of grain in this country. I may give one illustration of the effects of these importations on our farmers in the district where I reside. I remember one year, I think 1877, when the price of oats was very high in that part of the country, and the farmers were reaping the advantage of that enhanced price. As soon as navigation opened in the spring, two boat-loads of oats came from Chicago, one of which landed at Collingwood, and the other at Owen Sound, and, inside of twenty-four hours, the price of oats had fallen 20 cents a bushel. Will any one tell me that it was not injurious to the farmers that prices should be so liable to reduction at any moment, through the unfavourable competition of American farmers? Corn was also imported in large quantities. It was brought into the village in which I lived, and used for food for animals; and, in proportion as it was brought in, it became a competitor in these lines of coarse grains out of which our farmers make their money. If our farmers were not raising grain to feed our cattle, it might be an argument in favour of the importation of corn; but so long as the present condition of things exist, under which eight or ten out of every twelve farmers have to rely on making their greatest profits out of the sale of these coarse grains, and so long as the importation of free corn would create competition with our coarse grains and reduce their value, so long will that importation be a detriment to the Canadian farmer. The National Policy imposed a duty on corn of 10 cents and on oats of 7 cents a bushel. What were the results? We find that the very next year the large quantities of oats and corn, which had hitherto been imported, were shut out, and the Canadian farmers reaped the profit. Take the returns of last year, and see to what extent the western farmers have been competitors with the Canadian farmers. In 1891, instead of bringing in 7,250,000 bushels of corn as we did in 1878, we only brought in 2,788,000, and nearly every bushel imported was used by the distillers, and not used in feeding cattle at all. Last year only 79,000 bushels of oats were imported, whereas, in 1878, we imported 2,162,000 bushels. Instead of bringing in 5,635,000 bushels of wheat, we only brought in 147,000 bushels.

Take these three lines of grain, corn, oats and wheat—without saying anything as to the advantages or the enhanced value of pease, raised in our country, because that is one of the prime crops we raise—in those three grains, the Canadian farmer benefits to the extent of a market of 12,067,000 bushels, by virtue of that very policy which put a duty upon the corn, oats and wheat of the American farmer. Now, the hon. gentleman wishes us to go back to the condition of things which was so injurious in the past, and allow corn in free. In my section of the country the feeling of the farmers is as strong against free corn, oats and wheat into our country as it was in 1878. Now, there is another reason which the hon. gentleman has given here in favour of the free admission of corn, and that is that we require it for feeding purposes. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) endeavoured, two years ago, to convince this House it was for the purpose of feeding cattle that we required free corn, because the object was to get the feed at the lowest possible price, so as to provide beef at the smallest cost to export to England. I said then, and I repeat to-day, that if every man were a cattle-feeder, it would be to his advantage to bring in free corn to feed his cattle, because, if he could not raise the quantity of food requisite for the purpose of fattening cattle, it would be very important he should get it at the lowest possible price. But it is unfortunately the fact that a very small percentage of our farmers are cattle-feeders to-day. In the first place, a large percentage of them have not the money to build suitable barns and stables in which to keep their cattle during the winter, and feed them so to make them prime beef. In the second place, they cannot afford to be out of their money the length of time involved if they raise cattle. Not only through the summer would they have to wait, but through the fall and winter, some six months, and, in the meantime, feed their cattle a very large amount of what means money before they could get a return. I believe that eighteen out of every twenty farmers to-day are obliged to depend upon the sale of their coarse grains, and anything coming into competition with these coarse grains in our market must be detrimental to the Canadian farmers. Just in proportion as a man becomes a feeder of cattle, like the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who feeds a hundred head of cattle per year, he becomes antagonistic to the interests of the great majority of Canadian farmers. This is a fact which cannot be denied. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) said that our cattle trade had developed to such an extent that we sent, the year before last, 123,000 head to Great Britain, and that free corn was required to help that development. He said our object is to make the prime product ready to be sent to the English market to be slaughtered, because our cattle are scheduled to-day. It is not on account of

the beef we send to Great Britain that that trade became so much developed, but on account of the advantages we previously enjoyed of sending stockers, or half-fed cattle, to that market. The year we sent the largest number, 123,000, 90,000 were stockers, or cattle not fit for prime beef. They were fattened on the class of food which the Canadian farmer raised on his farm, straw, turnips, ordinary coarse grains and grasses, so that the cattle which brought back such high profits were raised on comparatively small outlay up to the time they were ready for the market. There is another point in connection with this, that if there is any argument which can be used in favour of fostering the trade, we know that the trade has been fostered and developed under the conditions existing to-day in Canada. Our farmers are able to raise the classes of grain and foods they require, not only for developing the dairy products of the country, but also for fattening their cattle. It will not be denied by any farmer here that we are able to raise corn for ensilage in any part of the Dominion. We are able to make ensilage, which is one of the cheapest foods that can be fed to cattle to-day. We want the attention of the farmers directed in that line, and the work done by the experimental farm, the lectures given by the dairy commissioners and other gentlemen from the farm, teaching the farmers to turn attention to other lines in which they can raise cheap food for the feeding of cattle, and developing the trade in that line, must have good effect. We have a climate and soil suitable for raising feed and developing our present lines, so that there is no good reason why we should change the National Policy and bring corn into the country free. I will oppose this motion, not only here but in every other part of the country where the opinion prevails that free admission of corn should be granted. I believe that would be a great disadvantage to the country. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) said last year it would be better for us to sell our coarse grains, and buy corn, because we can buy a class of feed more valuable than what we sell. Well, when our farmers sell grain, they will not buy other grains. They have always urgent demand for their money, and will not buy grains, and if they did, I believe it would be against their interests. They would not change the one for the other, but if they did, I believe it would be against their interests. There is another argument the hon. gentleman used which, I think, is a rather fallacious one. He said we have been cultivating a market in England that has been a valuable one to us, for pork, cured hams and bacon which have been sent to that country in large quantities. He says we want to increase that trade, and therefore want free corn. I wonder if the hon. gentleman noticed that during the past season very eminent men on the other side of the line, as well as in Canada, have been investigating

Mr. SPROULE.

the difference between pork fed upon pease, oats, barley and a certain grade of wheat, and that fed upon corn. Now, corn is thought to be the cheapest feed we have for pigs. I notice that Prof. Robertson has made an investigation into this question, and has come to the conclusion that pork which is fed upon corn is of an inferior quality. In the first place, it rather deteriorates the vital powers of the animal; it makes the bones more brittle, it makes the meat less valuable than pork fed upon pease, oats and barley, or the lines of wheat we use here. Now, the Americans, who have been turning their attention to the same subject, I notice by the agricultural papers of late, have come to the same conclusion. There is but one opinion with regard to that question amongst those who have given attention to it, and that is, that the class of grains that we feed here gives a better and a more valuable kind of pork, one that will realize more in the British market than that which is fed upon corn. If that is the case I wish to know the reason why we should endeavour to bring corn in free. We know that the most valuable feed we can use for fattening hogs is the ordinary coarse grains. Pease, oats and barley make very good feed and are very largely used. These grains are said to be so cheap that they are sent down to the locality of my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope). He says barley may be bought for 23 cents a bushel, although I never heard of its being sold so low. There are farmers in my section of the country to-day who would not sell barley at such a figure, because they prefer to mix and grind it with a small portion of pease and oats for hog feed. They find that the pork raised from that class of feed is of a better quality than that raised from other lines of feed upon which pigs are fed in the United States, such as corn. Now, why is it to-day that we enjoy a reputation in the English market for sending very good pork there? I noticed, in looking up the question this summer from some of the papers that were sent by Prof. Robertson from the old country, that the Canadian cured pork realized from one to two cents a pound more, for the best quality, than the United States pork. The reason was simply, as I have said, and as those who have studied the question also say, that the feed we use for our pork produces a better quality than that produced by feeding corn to pigs. Therefore, if we enjoy that reputation now, are we going to jeopardize it by importing into this country a class of feed that would deteriorate the quality of our pork and put us upon the same level as the Americans, allowing them to become strong competitors with us? We have endeavoured to make a distinction between our products and theirs, in order to secure for us an advantage in the British market, and now if this motion is carried it will put us on a parallel with them, and we shall be exporting to the old country a class of pork similar to the American pork. Now, with regard to making the concessions

that were asked by the pork packers of Canada a few days ago, that is, the privilege of importing American hogs to be slaughtered in bond and the pork to be exported again, I oppose that strongly upon the very same ground, because I say that corn-fed pork is not as good as the pork raised upon the class of grains that we feed and therefore such pork so imported and then exported becomes doubly a competitor, because it is sent over from Canadian ports and will be recognized as pork raised in Canada, and in this way we destroy the reputation we have to-day in the British market of turning out a better pork than the United States. For these reasons I shall always oppose the importation of feed corn into Canada. We can raise all the feed we want for our cattle; we can raise pork as cheaply as they can, provided we turn our attention to raising those lines of feed best adapted to our soil and climate. We can feed our cattle and hogs quite as cheaply, and more profitably, upon the lines of grain we raise here, and when the product is sold it brings a better price. We now have the distinction of turning out a better class of product in cheese and pork than they do in the United States, and therefore we get a much larger profit on those lines than they do on the other side. I think it would be an unfortunate thing for the farmers of Canada if this motion carries, and if we again allow western corn to be brought into Canada free of duty.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). I am very pleased indeed to have the opportunity of standing on the floor of this House and advocating the same cause as my hon. friend who moved this motion, and I hope he is exercising that agricultural honesty to-day which he refused to do when he threw his influence against the Liberal candidate in the county of Brome during the last election. I hope he is honest in his intention, and knowing that he is a farmer and largely interested in the feeding of stock, I am very happy to-day to stand upon the same platform and advocate the same cause. I have no fear of Canada's suffering from American corn being allowed to come into this country duty free. We are placed in a very peculiar position at the present time. Our cattle are scheduled in the British market, thus preventing the shipment of stockers, as has been already shown; our cattle are quarantined in the United States to prevent any of our cattle going into that country, as they have been accustomed to do in the past, as stockers. Is it a fact that the American cattle are inferior to ours fed upon corn? Is it a fact that they do not take a lower stand in the British market? Let me read from the report I find in the Toronto "Evening News" of what was said by one of the biggest cattle importers in the province of Ontario:

"The abolition of the duty on corn would be one of the greatest blessings to farmers I know of," said A. J. Thompson, the cattle exporter, yesterday. "The duty was imposed to protect Canadian oats, but if a

farmer here was able to get feeding corn at, say 40 cents a bushel, there would be no better grain for fattening purposes. The corn-fed American bullock from the west will dress 100 pounds of beef and upwards more than an Ontario bullock of the live weight. Because of that, Canadian exporters are greatly handicapped in the English market, since the American exporter practically lands 100 pounds of beef free by the difference in the cattle. He has a start of \$6 or \$7 per head on us to commence with."

Now, we have been told that the Canadian farmer would be ruined if these grains were allowed to come into Canada duty free. We have heard that every time this discussion has come up with respect to free corn. While I am on my feet, I wish to advise the hon. gentlemen who take that position, to avail themselves of the reports that were laid before the House of Commons in 1882, to show the effect that the National Policy has had upon the agricultural industry of Canada in respect to coarse grains, and the report which was taken from the Chicago Board of Trade and the Montreal Board of Trade for the years 1877, 1878, 1880 and 1881, two years before the National Policy was imposed, when we had corn coming into Canada duty free, and two years after the National Policy was imposed, when corn was prevented from coming into Canada by the imposition of a duty of 7 cents. Now, what does this show? It shows that in 1877 we imported, for consumption in Canada, 8,260,039 bushels of corn. What was the difference between the price of oats in Chicago at that time and the price of oats in the city of Toronto? That report I mentioned, shows that the price of oats in Chicago was 31.77 cents per bushel, while in Toronto it was 43 cents, or nearly one-quarter higher in Toronto than in Chicago, while at the same time 8,000,000 bushels of corn were coming in to be consumed in Canada. When we come to 1878 we find that oats in Chicago were 22.66 cents, in Toronto 31.33, and 7,000,000 bushels of corn came into Canada during that year. Yet we find oats were a little over 8½ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. That was before the National Policy, while corn was coming in duty free. Take 1880, the year after the duty on corn was imposed, and we find that in Chicago oats realized 29.584 cents, in Toronto 36 cents, or only 6½ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago, while only 1,600,000 bushels of corn came into Canada, against 8,000,000 in 1888. When we come to 1881, the second year of the National Policy, we find oats in Chicago brought 37.83 cents, in Toronto only 39½ cents, or 1.92 cents higher in Toronto. That was two years after a duty was imposed on corn of 7½ cents per bushel, while, when corn came in free, in 1877, oats were 11 cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. Does not that prove conclusively that the Canadian farmer has not been injured as regards the price of oats, because let me say that these statistics are quoted from a report prepared to show the influence the National

Policy had upon the agricultural interests of the Dominion, and most certainly, if this report was to be taken as a sample, it had a most injurious effect on the farmers as regards their coarse grains. The same result is found to apply to rye and other coarse grains. In 1877, rye in Chicago sold at 62½ cents per bushel, in Toronto 70 cents, 7½ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. In 1878 it was still higher, the price in Toronto being 8½ cents higher than in Chicago. This was at the time there was no duty on corn. When we come to 1880, after the duty had been put on corn, we find the price of rye in Toronto only 1½ cents higher than in Chicago, while during the second year the duty was put on corn, rye was 1½ cents higher in Chicago than in Toronto, showing most conclusively that the admission of corn free in Canada had not injured the farmer in the sale of rye. We cannot compare peas, but we can make a comparison with respect to barley. In 1877 barley in Chicago sold for 58.04 cents, and in Toronto at 73 cents, a difference of 15½ cents in favour of Toronto. In 1881 barley in Chicago advanced to \$1.09, while in Toronto it was only 91 cents, showing a difference of 18½ cents in favour of Chicago, two years after the duty was imposed, while when corn came in free the price was 15 cents higher in Toronto. With respect to the statement that our corn does not produce as good pork as peas or barley, let me refer hon. gentlemen to Professor Robertson, a gentleman quoted in this House time and time again. In the sessional papers of the province of Ontario, 1890, page 186, there is a report of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, and tables appear showing the result of tests made there by Prof. Robertson with corn meal, pea meal, barley meal and middlings for fattening hogs. The result was as follows: 4.74 lbs. of corn meal were required to make one pound of pork, 1.85 of pea meal, 4.57 of barley meal and middlings. When the hogs were slaughtered, it was found they had shrunk as follows: 14 per cent corn-fed, 17 per cent barley meal and middlings, and 13 per cent pea meal, so the corn-fed animals were the most solid meat. I may mention that there were 16 hogs taken for the test, five being placed on corn meal, five on pea meal and six on barley meal and middlings. Then another test was the colour of the meat, and every one who knows anything about the market, especially as regards beef and pork, is aware that the colour of the meat is a very strong point with butchers. The test showed that the corn meal fed pork was a little brighter in colour, the pea meal fed standing next. Firmness of flesh was another point tested. We are all aware that in England they like nice solid meat, and the result showed that the corn and pea meal fed pork were equal in that respect, but the barley meal and middlings fed was a softer pork, and it was stated that the fat of the

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

corn-fed pork was a little more chalky and not so greasy as that fed with the other grains. Objection has been taken to greasy meat and greasy lard, and it will be noticed that the corn-fed pork had not those characteristics. This experiment was made to prove the value of the different varieties of grain for feeding pork. Professor Robertson was at the head of the dairying interest of Ontario at the time this bulletin was issued by him over his own name. From my own experience as a farmer, who feeds yearly 100 head of cattle for shipment to England, I may say that I have almost ceased feeding barley to any extent to animals for the old country market, because when the old country butcher receives a lot of beef fed on barley he declares they are soft and flabby; but if the meat is corn-fed, as Mr. Thompson, the cattle dealer of Toronto has said, it does not shrink, but handles well. I have thus shown that the Canadian farmers have not been injured by free importation of corn, as the hon. member for East Grey has attempted to show. In 1881, although a large quantity of corn came in, our farmers were receiving a higher price for their oats than in 1891. Take 1893 and see what the prices are to-day. There is no danger of injuring the sale of our coarse grains by allowing corn to come in duty free for the simple reason that oats are from 7 to 8 cents per bushel higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. That is the state of the market at the present time. Let me add that the Dominion Dairy Commissioner, Prof. Robertson, has stated in every place where I have heard him speak, that the time had come when the farmers of Ontario should cease to export their coarse grains, and not only consume all coarse grains raised on their own farms but also import grain for feeding purposes. There was no grain we could import to-day with the same benefit as we can Indian corn, if the duty were removed. The other day an hon. gentleman stated that if the farmers would feed all their coarse grains they would realize 75 cents a bushel by putting them into pork and beef. We can now bring in corn for 44 or 45 cents a bushel, and we can raise more meat to the bushel of corn than to the bushel of barley. If we can bring that to 75 cents it is clear profit made from the American farmer who raises that corn, and that profit goes into the pocket of the Canadian farmer. The time has come when the farmers of the province of Ontario must change their system of farming. We have been tied down on every hand. Our markets have been circumscribed in every respect, and we must produce in the very cheapest manner. Prof. Robertson and all others who speak on the manufacture of beef at the present time show us that we can produce the very best beef from corn ensilage, and if that be the case is it not quite clear that the fruit of the corn stalk will produce better beef and better pork than the ensilage itself? I hope the Government will take this question into their very

serious consideration. I may state that we are finding new foreign markets for some of our store cattle. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year, I find that Newfoundland took 2,312 head, and that is a fresh market for the Canadian farmer, while the Island of St. Pierre took 1,088 head of store cattle, which is also a new market. I hold, however, that the policy of this Government, as far as lies in their power, ought to be to encourage the farmers of the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada not to allow a single animal to leave our shores, except what is fit to go on the block. Prof. Robertson pointed out the correct road when he stated that the farmers of Canada should not only consume all their coarse grains but that they should be purchasers of coarse grains as well. If there is one mode more than another by which the Government can carry out the decision of their dairy commissioner, it is to allow corn to come in duty free. Last year we imported 1,685,527 bushels of corn, and of this 1,000,000 bushels were used by the distillers and the small remainder for fattening purposes. While we bring in that amount of corn, we also imported last year some 75,000 barrels of corn meal, and if you allowed corn to come in free the Canadian miller would get the benefit of our own home trade by manufacturing the corn meal in this country. We are told that there are certain counties in the province of Ontario which would be injured if corn were allowed to be imported free of duty. Both last year and this year I have examined the records with respect to the production of corn in the counties of Essex and Kent. I find from the Essex "Free Press" of the present month, that corn was selling at 43 cents a bushel in Windsor, while it was 44 cents a bushel in the city of Chicago, which is proof positive that the admission of corn free, cannot, to any extent, injure the Canadian farmer. I, myself, have visited the corn-growing localities in Canada, and have conversed with the farmers, and, while there is no doubt that there are men who would rather not see the duty removed, yet there are a large number who would like to see it removed. I hold that there is no grain that will produce better beef and better pork than corn, if the corn is fed along with the slops from the cheese factories and creameries. I admit that there is no food which we know of, when fed with grains, that will give such excellent meat or give the young animals such a start, as milk will, but I hold that it is in the interests of the farmer of this country, that we should get in corn free of duty. Even if the Government should not decide to remove the duty upon corn, I would strongly impress upon them that they should make a rebate of duty to the farmer when he feeds the corn to cattle for export purposes. This will encourage farmers who do not fatten cattle at the present time, to go into the business. There is, no doubt, a certain

amount of truth in the statement that the farmers are not all prepared to go into the beef and cattle business, yet I hold that it is the duty of the Government, in the interest of the whole Dominion, to educate the farmers to turn their attention to the raising of coarse grains and the consuming of them on the farm. I believe that if this duty is removed it will help the farmers in that respect. I may state that Alderman Franklin, of Toronto, a gentleman who, last election, took the stump, and was dead against removing the duty on corn, is, I am informed, now an advocate of free corn, because he is largely interested in the shipping of cattle to the old country, and he believes that to successfully continue that trade we must have free corn. There is hardly an individual who has studied this question closely, and who is personally acquainted with the result of feeding corn and other grains, who will not favour the proposal that the Government should abolish the duty, or, if they do not go that far, that they shall allow the farmer to get a rebate when he proves that the corn has been used for fattening purposes, and that the beef has been sent out of the country. There are many strong reasons at the present time why the Government should decide on this policy. In the first place, it is only a chance whether the scheduling of our cattle in England will ever be removed, and it is also only a chance whether we can get our cattle across to the United States. However, that is not of so much importance at the present time, as we only shipped 550 head to the United States last year. It is the duty of the Government to give the farmers the assistance that they can, and they can give them no greater assistance in fattening hogs and cattle than to allow corn to come into Canada duty free.

Mr. CAMERON. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length, but as this question has been repeatedly discussed, I desire to make some observations on it. It is a question which interests the farmers of the Dominion, particularly the poorer farmers, to a very great degree. In order to place the matter before the House, as I desire in a reasonable manner, I think it is due to myself and to the House to advert to the past history of the question in Parliament. It is frequently asserted in this House that the National Policy was adopted by Parliament in 1879, but the older members of this House recollect well that the National Policy was adopted previous to that time. It was adopted in 1870, but owing to a motion very similar to the one at present made, the National Policy collapsed. The peculiarity of the National Policy seems to me to be this: that if you take one brick out of the fabric the whole structure falls; I would, therefore, advise those who are interested in the National Policy in all sections of the Dominion to consider seriously the effect of removing one

item from the protection afforded by that policy. As my hon. friends may know, in the first session of this Parliament parties were very much mixed; in fact it was difficult to say to what party any individual member belonged. In the Government itself Conservatives and Liberals of the old school in Canada sat side by side, and in the House parties were mixed in such a manner that it was almost impossible for the leader of a party to say what would become of any question that might be discussed before the House. Many compromises had to be made before that time, and among other questions that of the tariff was simply a compromise between the tariffs that existed in the several provinces previous to Confederation. The customs duty in the province of Nova Scotia was, I think, 10 per cent, in New Brunswick 15 per cent and in old Canada 20 per cent; so that the tariff adopted during 1867-68 was simply a compromise between the highest and the lowest of the provincial tariffs, and was placed at 15 per cent. It was found, however, owing to the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty of 1866, that it was necessary for the Parliament of Canada to adopt a National Policy, and in 1869 members of Parliament, the press of the country, and people of common sense generally throughout the Dominion, strongly agitated for such a policy for this Dominion; and the Minister of Finance at that time, the Hon. John Rose, in his Budget speech in 1869, foreshadowed what afterwards became the National Policy. He was, in my opinion, the first Canadian statesman who suggested that the Liberal-Conservative party should adopt a National Policy. This is what he said on that occasion:

Before finally quitting this subject of our trade relations internally and with the United States, I hope I may be permitted to state that I think that our course since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty has been a correct one. We may now fairly say to our neighbours: "We do not complain of the abrogation of that treaty. We have no fault to find with you for your action. We know what your financial difficulties were when that action was taken. We know that the state of public opinion in your land, which, very unfairly to us, arose against us in consequence of events for which the Government and people of this country were not to blame. We know how much this directed public attention at the time to the trade and commercial relations between Canada and the United States; and we know how much it had to do with the repeal of the treaty. We know, however, that since that period, your internal taxation on your own people has been lessened; we believe that you have now juster impressions of our conduct during the war, and that the acrimony of feelings which once existed has long since passed away, while the natural loss arising from restricted commercial intercourse continues to be felt. We have hitherto refrained from retaliation; we have continued to accord you freely all the advantages you possessed during the operation of the treaty, and have made every allowance for the exceptional circumstances under which you abolished it. We have waited patiently and quietly, giving you meanwhile every advantage you enjoyed before. We have allowed your vessels the free navigation of our canals and rivers, though you do not al-

Mr. CAMERON.

low similar privileges to us. We have allowed you to fish in our waters at a mere nominal license, though our fish is heavily taxed on entering your markets. We have not sought to interfere with the transit of your goods in bond across the peninsula of Ontario, though you have coupled with onerous conditions a similar privilege to us. For it may not be generally known that though the right to pass goods in transit through the American territory is not denied, it is accompanied by conditions of a vexatious and costly character. We have allowed your coal to come in free, though you charge a heavy duty on ours. We allow your flour, hops and salt and other articles to be imported free, while you not only do not reciprocate, but you specially discriminate against our millers by charging more on flour than on grain. This state of things, we might fairly add, has gone on for three or four years, but you must understand it cannot continue. The time may soon come when we may require to have a national policy of our own, no matter whether that national policy may sin against this or that theory of political economy. For we must be guided chiefly, if not solely, by circumstances affecting ourselves, and we may have to consult our self-interest without consideration for others. Should the United States show any disposition to negotiate, we are bound to receive them cordially and meet them half way; the republic is the greater power, and it becomes us to respond cordially to her invitation. But it must be distinctly and unmistakably understood as the opinion of this country that, no matter how much the United States may hamper our commercial intercourse with them, we are not disposed to barter our constitutional rights, to give up our associations or our hopes of a national existence for mere commercial considerations. It must be chiefly understood that we are not, and never will be, disposed to give up our connection with and allegiance to the British Crown as the price of our admission to the markets of the republic. Let them not commit the mistake of deferring the negotiations in this hope.

These were the sentiments first officially announced by a member of the Government in the Dominion of Canada in favour of a National Policy, and this intimation gave an impulse in its favour throughout the country. During that year public men urged the incorporation of all British North America under one central Government. This was the first plank in the great National Policy platform which was inaugurated during that year. It was also urged by some of the statesmen of that time that the whole country from sea to sea should be bound together by rail, and that such a policy as would create an inter-provincial trade should be adopted. It was urged, further, that the products of the soil, the sea, the mine and the forest should be protected under the system of a National Policy, and that the different provinces should go hand in hand in such a way as would ensure the prosperity of the whole Dominion. I may refer briefly to a discussion which occurred in this House in 1870 as the result of this agitation. As I have already intimated, the parties were not well defined in this House during the first Parliament. Each individual spoke from the stand-point of his own constituency. Owing to the feeling which existed in favour of a National Policy, and particularly in favour of protection of the natural resources of this Dominion, an independent member of this House, a Liberal in politics, was the first

who made motion in the direction of such a policy. On the 7th March, 1870, Mr. Oliver, who then represented the county of Oxford, Ont., moved for an address to His Excellency, praying for the imposition of an import duty on wheat, flour, Indian corn, hops, coarse and fine salt and coal. He said :

The Government had sent a deputation to the West Indies and South America, with a view of opening up a trade with those countries, but since its return nothing had seemingly been done by the Government to open up these fields to our commerce.

And he went on to advocate the adoption of a policy of protection to the natural products of the country. Among the first who spoke in favour of that policy was another Liberal, Mr. M. C. Cameron, well known to the older members of this House, and he said :

If he for a moment believed that the motion of the member for Oxford would have the effect of retarding or preventing the renewal of the reciprocity treaty, he would sooner allow his constituents to suffer for a time longer, rather than jeopardize its renewal. In his humble judgment, the Government could take no better step than to protect Canadian products. Why should the Americans want the renewal of the reciprocity treaty? Are not all the Canadian markets open to them, while their markets are closed up against us in almost every commodity? They reap all the benefits of free trade, and we have all the evils of protection without any of its benefits.

He concluded by saying :

He hoped that the Finance Minister would see that the country was no longer left in the humiliating position of waiting patiently on another nation to legislate for the benefit of Canada.

Mr. Gibb, who also represented an Ontario constituency, advocated the same policy. So did Mr. Wood, and among the others who supported it was the Hon. Joseph Howe, then a Liberal in politics. On the 7th of March he said :

That for the last twenty years, a large majority of the people of the Maritime Provinces had been in favour of free trade in its widest sense. But the policy indicated by the gentlemen in this discussion was becoming popular there, not because they were less free traders than before, but because the United States were making use of their fiscal relations with us to attempt to coerce us into political union with them. We do not, said he, want such a policy, because we have ceased to be free traders, but because we wish to make it patent to all the world, that we are prepared to depart from sound principles of fiscal policy, rather than be coerced into political union with the United States.

Mr. Pope, of Compton, and Mr. Magill, who then represented Hamilton, Mr. Scatcherd, Mr. Colby and others, advocated the same policy, and Sir John Macdonald, after listening to the discussion, desired to postpone it. He said :

When the Government policy was propounded, he believed that it would meet the acceptance of the majority in the House, which, he believed, fairly represented the wishes and the feelings of the people of Canada.

The motion was then withdrawn. But during the year the Hon. John Rose, who had been

Minister of Finance, was called to occupy a position in England, and was succeeded by Sir Francis Hincks. In delivering his Budget speech, Sir Francis Hincks spoke as follows :

I cannot do better than state the views of my predecessor on this point. He said, in the course of his financial statement last year, speaking to the Americans :

"We have allowed your coal to come in free, though you charge a heavy duty on ours. We allow your flour, grain, hops and salt, and other articles to be imported free, while you not only do not reciprocate, but you specially discriminate against our millers by charging more on flour than on grain. This state of things, we might fairly add, has gone on for three or four years, but you must understand that it cannot continue. (Hear, hear.) The time may soon come when we may require to have a national policy of our own, no matter whether that national policy may sin against this or that theory of political economy. (Hear, hear.) For we must be guided chiefly, if not solely, by considerations affecting ourselves, and we may have to consult our self-interest without consideration for others."

Mr. Holton, who was then one of the leaders of the Opposition, spoke as follows :—

He did not intend to follow the Finance Minister through his speech, beyond stating broadly that, instead of a surplus of \$300,000 on the transactions of the last financial year, there would be found to be a deficit of \$1,000,000. At last the great National Policy had been born, and it meant, as far as it went, protection—an abnegation of the policy of the Empire.

I have thus proven conclusively that the National Policy was born in 1870, and that the natural products of our soil were protected by the fiscal policy during that year. Strange to say, even at its inception, the National Policy found itself in difficulties. Even before the close of the debate, the leader of the Government himself faltered and feared he would fail in carrying the National Policy, because it was moved by Mr. Holton that flour and coal should be placed on the free list. This created such a panic as only those who can realize what would occur if every person on both sides would speak from the particular interest of his own constituency, can imagine. If they would do so at present, we would not see the line so closely drawn in a question of this kind. I want to draw the attention of the House particularly to this fact. If there is an attempt to disconnect the protection of products of the soil from those of the sea, the mines and the factory, that will jeopardize the whole policy, and the interests, especially of the poorer classes of farmers, will suffer. When I hear the hon. members for Compton and Huron talking about the necessity of their obtaining large quantities of corn for the purpose of fattening their cattle, I am reminded that their line is not farming at all. It is no more farming, in the proper sense, than is the milling business. The farmers produce the wheat and the miller manufactures it, and so the farmer produces the coarse grain, and the monopolist farmers, if I may so call them, are those who use those grains and convert them into beef. They are not

farmers, but manufacturers in the same sense as millers are. What I call attention to particularly is the short life which the National Policy existed after its first inception in the Dominion, and to give the reasons why it failed. On the 22nd March, 1871, after the Act relating to customs duties had been read the second time and passed through committee, it was moved by Mr. Holton, in amendment to the motion for third reading :

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of so amending the same as to repeal the duties on coal, coke, flour and wheat.

The excitement during the discussion ran very high, and those who were interested in the success of the National Policy felt that the motion, from the temper of the House, would unquestionably carry, and it was proposed, at the direction of the members who supported the Government, that all articles connected with products of the soil and the mines, which had been protected by the policy of the previous year, should be included as well. Mr. Blanchet, I believe, who then represented a constituency in Quebec, moved in amendment that all the other articles which were protected under the National Policy, the products of the soil and of the mine particularly, should also be dropped and placed on the free list. So that in a House composed of a large number in favour of the National Policy, it was found that 103 members decided that the whole fabric should fall if any of it fell, and that only 28 sustained the amendment of Mr. Holton on its merits. But I rose at the present time chiefly for the purpose of urging upon those who are advocates of the interests of the poorer classes, particularly the poor farmers, the poor miners, the poor fishermen and the poor mechanics of the Dominion, that any course calculated to destroy the National Policy, piecemeal or as a whole, will be detrimental to their interests. I would urge upon those who are interested in coarse grains, as nearly all the farmers in this Dominion are, to see to it that American corn is not allowed to come in free of duty. On principle and in self-defence, I would urge upon the farmers to see that their interests are protected. I regret exceedingly to find that strong appeals have been made all over the Dominion to the poor farmers; but I think I am in a position to say that there is no class in this Dominion who are so well protected under the National Policy, and who pay so little taxation, as the poorer farmers in this country. It is almost unfortunate that persons who pretend to advocate the interests of the farmers should advocate a policy which they ought to know is very detrimental to the interests of the poorer classes of farmers in this Dominion. Now, I voted among the majority in 1871 in favour of taking the duty off all these articles, and I would do the same thing if a similar resolution were offered now. While I am in

Mr. CAMERON.

favour of the National Policy as a whole, I deprecate the idea of taking the duty off, even binder twine, if you will, coal oil, if you will, or any other article that is protected under the National Policy. I should give reasons why this policy should be pursued, even with regard to those articles. It was in existence in 1870 on coal oil, it has been continued from that time down to the present, and it would be a disaster to a very important natural industry in this country if the duty were taken off coal oil. The same might be said in reference to binder twine. While the farmers are protected heavily, I think they have no reason to complain if they are compelled to pay a light duty on binder twine. I tell those who advocate the interests of the farmers, clearly and distinctly, that if they disturb the National Policy, the first article that will be placed on the free list in this House, will be wheat and flour, as well as corn, and they make a grave mistake indeed by making motions which I admit to be made, in their opinion, in the interests of a large and important class of the people, but which after all are not in their interest, as will be made manifest to this House and the country. So far as I am personally concerned, I am bound to stand by the duty even on binder twine, although we are told it is under the control of a monopoly which is so far-reaching as to cover the United States and Canada. But if we take off the duty, the little competition which seems to arise now in certain localities in this Dominion on account of the protection which is afforded to that industry, would collapse, and that which now insures the cheapening of the article in the Dominion, would be sure to be taken away from the people. The cost of every commodity in this country depends altogether upon demand and supply, and if there is anything calculated to increase the supply of any commodity, it is to encourage its manufacture in the Dominion itself. It is vain to say that simply because an article is protected, the result necessarily increases the price of the commodity. I was amused to hear my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) point out how the price of oats was higher in Canada when corn was imported from the United States. If he reflects for a moment he would soon realize the reason. The price of every commodity in this Dominion is regulated by the supply. While corn was imported free from the United States, after the abrogation of the duty in 1871, until it was adopted again in 1879, the poorer classes of farmers in this Dominion were so discouraged at the small price for which they could sell their coarse grains, that to a large extent, they discontinued raising them; so that the supply of oats in this Dominion was largely curtailed. As every farmer knows, a large quantity of the coarser grains are necessary for their own consumption, and the quantity of the home product being largely reduced on account of the importation of

cheaper products from abroad, they had to be purchased at a higher figure even by themselves when they were required. The same result would follow again, and I therefore ask those particularly who advocate the interest of the farmers, not to disturb the National Policy, because if there is one class in this Dominion, I repeat, who are benefited by the National Policy in its entirety, it is the poorer farmers, and next to them come the poorer classes in all the other lines of industry.

Mr. SPROULE. I just want to give quotations from the market price in answer to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who said that at the present time oats were 7 cents a bushel higher in Buffalo than in Toronto.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to speak again.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not going to speak, I am only going to quote the market price.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I find in the "Globe" that in Chicago they are 31½ cents, and in Toronto, 34 cents, 3 cents higher in Toronto, instead of 7 cents less.

Mr. ROWAND. I would like to say a few words on this question before the House comes to a vote. I am not going to ask the House to go back to the times when the National Policy was introduced, as the hon. gentleman has done. I think that life is too short and time too valuable to discuss the condition of things in this country twenty-five years ago. Now, with regard to the question of bringing corn in free, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that it would lower the price of coarse grains to the farmer, that the poor farmers cannot afford to feed cattle and consume their coarse grains on the farm, but that they would have to sell them to other men who would make a profit out of them instead of the farmers. Now, I would just say that if the Government wish to keep these poor farmers in that condition, the policy advocated by the hon. member for East Grey will have precisely that effect. There is no doubt that our farmers must raise something; they must, to a certain extent, consume their own products on the farm. They cannot sell the straw, they cannot sell the hay. They must raise and feed cattle to some extent, and they cannot finish cattle for beef if they sell their coarse grains. At the present time, they cannot send stockers to the British market, because they are scheduled; they cannot send them to the United States, because there is a duty of \$10 per head; and there is to-day a further obstacle in the scheduling of cattle going into the United States. So that if these men are going to raise stock at all they must raise such stock as they can finish for the British market. Now, our condition to-day is very different from that of twenty years ago, it is very different from that of one year ago. One year

ago we could send stockers into the British market, we cannot do that now. Our cattle are scheduled there, and we must finish our cattle here before we can send the products there at all. Now, I think it is the duty of the Government and of the leading men to encourage and assist those farmers who raise cattle, to finish their cattle at home in order that they may be able to send the product to the British market. There is no other course that they can take, and if they are not in a position to finish cattle for the British market, the sooner the Government put them in that position the better, and the more assistance the Government can give them, the better will the Government fulfil its duty. We have experimental farms established, and we are paying large salaries to professors to educate the people with respect to the best modes of farming. During last year the Minister of Agriculture issued a circular, to which I desire to call the attention of the House. It was issued by the late Minister of Agriculture (Hon. John Carling), and contains the following:—

I am deeply impressed with the importance of the advantages which would accrue to the farming interests of Canada, from a more extensive and general feeding of the coarse grains to live stock on the farms on which they are grown, that I desire to call your attention to the subject-matter of two bulletins which have been issued recently from the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, and of which I inclose copies.

I must say that that is the best piece of advice ever issued by the Department of Agriculture. It clearly proves that by raising stock we can keep our farms in good condition. Our farm lands have been exhausted to a very large extent, and it is necessary to adopt some plan by which to return to the soil the fertilizing material which has been taken from it in the shape of grain shipped abroad, or in the shape of coarse grains utilized at home. Our professors have demonstrated that we can profitably consume our own coarse grains and have a margin of profit left, but the profit is really not confined to the margin realized. The bulk of the profit consists of returning to the soil a large portion of the fertility that was taken from it. Everyone knows that in feeding grain it is only partially used by the animal, that the residue is the large portion, and this can be returned to the soil. If we can consume our own grains, it is the best course to adopt, according to Prof. Robertson. He has shown that a bushel of frozen wheat can produce fourteen pounds of pork. If a bushel of frozen wheat can produce such a result, no doubt a bushel of sound grain would do even much better. I do not suppose that a bushel of wheat would produce much more than a bushel of peas. At all events, if we can feed our grain, and it appears we can, and realize 60 cents per bushel even from frozen wheat, which is as much as we realize from our best wheat, great benefit must accrue to the farmers. If we can turn this wheat into pork, a large

profit must result. I wish to enforce this point: If we can feed our own grains at a profit, we can buy grain from the United States and feed our cattle with it and secure a margin of profit; so, not only profitable returns will be secured to our farmers, but fertility will be restored to our farm lands. I do not see why, if the door is open to us, our farmers cannot lay under tribute the corn producers of the United States. If the Government will educate our farmers, as the late Minister of Agriculture has endeavoured to do, to consume their own coarse grains on their own farms, and encourage them to do so, and if they will admit corn duty free, because we must finish our cattle and cannot send them to the United States or Great Britain except as fat cattle, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will be rendering valuable assistance to the agricultural community. There is another point, which perhaps does not strike everybody, and it is this, that cattle are not raised in one year, but they are generally two or three years old before they are considered fit for market. If a man enters the cattle business and obtains a large number of young stock, and a scarcity of feed should occur, and the importation of American corn should be practically prohibited on account of the duty, then a serious difficulty would occur. We desire that our farmers shall have the opportunity of sending to the United States for corn, and if the Government will allow them to bring in corn free, great benefit will be conferred on agricultural interests.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I desire to say a word in support of the motion now before the House. This is a question in which my constituents are very deeply interested. In my county we do not grow corn very largely, and our farmers depend mainly on stock, finding it more profitable to make butter and cheese, raise stock and sell milk. Many of them have gone into the milk business, selling their milk in Montreal. All of them require corn for feeding purposes. I am fully convinced that the duty on corn has been very injurious and has proved a great hindrance to the prosperity of my county. Some time ago a public meeting of farmers was held in my county, called for the special purpose of considering this question. The meeting was held in the parish of St. Andrew's and was largely attended by Liberals and Conservatives, and the question was fully discussed in all its bearings. It was moved and carried unanimously, that, in the interest of the farmers, corn should be placed on the free list. I say unanimously, but there was one dissenting voice, that of a mechanic, but our farmers, without a single exception, voted in favour of placing corn on the free list. I am sure they know their business perfectly, and they are satisfied that free corn is absolutely necessary for their prosperity. I am requested to cast my vote and use my influence

Mr. ROWAND.

in favour of free corn. I am satisfied it would be a great benefit to my constituents if not only corn, but wheat and flour and all the prime necessaries of life, were placed upon the free list. I shall have much pleasure, therefore, in casting my vote in favour of the motion before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not rise to discuss the specific question raised by the motion, but the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) laid down a proposition which I do not think I, as a protectionist, should allow to go unchallenged. He laid down the proposition, that if we touch any part of the National Policy, the whole will disappear. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that this is a scientific structure, conceived scientifically and completed scientifically. Instead of that being the case, we know very well that the tariff was constituted and carried out as best it could in 1879, and that, since that time, it has been changed, and everyone who understands political economy and looks over the tariff at present will see that, from the point of view of a protectionist, it contains anomalies, and that in the interest of the National Policy, of which the hon. gentleman gave a very interesting history, and of the country, for which the National Policy was made—because the National Policy, I suppose, was made for the country and not the country for the National Policy—in both those interests it is desirable there should be a revision of that policy. The hon. gentleman laid down the proposition, that if you touch any part of this sacred edifice the whole will crumble to pieces, and he urges us to beware how we laid a hand on the ark of the National Policy as it presents itself to him. I take no such view of the tariff. The hon. gentleman travelled somewhat beyond the record and discussed binding twine and coal oil, although the House at the present time is dealing with the question of corn. As having a bearing on the proposal before the House I may give an illustration. There is at the present time \$4 per ton duty on pig iron. Anyone, I should think, would say that from the protectionist standpoint it is an anomaly in a protectionist tariff. There is hardly a manufacturer—outside of chemistry and agricultural products—who does not need iron, and here is the raw material of factory after factory taxed to the extent of \$4 per ton. That is an anomaly under a protective tariff, if you want to protect the manufacture of pig iron, the proper way to have done it was by a bonus, pure and simple, at so much a ton for the production of pig iron; but the pig iron itself should have been admitted into the country free of duty. It would be more justifiable to have \$4 a ton on pig iron under a revenue tariff than to have it under a protective tariff. But, Mr. Speaker, to return to the motion, of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), I will not follow my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) or my hon. friend from

East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in regard to the relative fattening qualities of peas and Indian corn, but I do say that when the proposition was made by the hon. member for Inverness that the farmer is, of all men, most interested in the maintenance of every detail of the tariff as it exists; I, as coming from a farming constituency, should have been very much interested if the hon. gentleman had pointed out, how the farmer is more interested in this matter than anybody else. On the contrary, Sir, I have to say, on behalf of the great farming country whence I come, that it is very difficult, indeed, to show that we gain by the National Policy. In fact, the proposition that you can protect the farmer is a proposition that it would seem to me a very difficult one to prove. Above all others, it is difficult to protect the farmer if he is a producer of wheat, and for the reason that he produces a surplus, and the moment that he produces a large surplus, and has to export it, how are you going to protect him?

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). You must have been reading my speech.

Mr. DAVIN. I never read a speech of yours in my life, and I might tell the hon. member that whenever he speaks in this House, I try to divert my attention in order that his dulcet tones may not reach me. I may tell him a fact, which, as a physician, may be interesting to him, namely, that on one or two occasions, when I did give him some attention, the result of his speaking was as detrimental to me as a fortnight's low fever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Three speeches would have been death to you.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose they would. It would be a difficult thing to show how you can protect the great wheat-growers at all, because, whenever you produce a surplus you have your chief market outside of the country you live in, and the price is regulated by conditions over which the legislature under which you live has no control at all. When my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) laid down the theory that the farmers would suffer so much if we interfered in the slightest degree with the National Policy, he should have shown us how you can protect the farmer. He should have gone further than that, and he should have got over this fact, that where the farmer, as is the case with us in the Northwest, is exporting large quantities of wheat, when he is in a country highly protected, in proportion as that protection acts successfully, in the same proportion the purchasing power for his wheat in his ultimate market declines. The farmers in the west would have considerable difficulty in understanding the proposition of my hon. friend, that they would suffer if any part of the National Policy is interfered with. I maintain that the only way that you can protect the farmer is, not by

putting duties on wheat or duties on other things of which he produces a surplus—that may in some instances give him what he may call a home market—but the way to protect him is to give him those things that he has to use on the farm at the lowest rate. That is the only way that you can protect the farmer. I hold that the National Policy, properly carried out, will benefit the farmer, because I believe that the National Policy, in its proper character, will lead to competition, which will cheapen prices, and if it does that, it gives him the implements which are necessary for his industry, at a lower rate. I have here some speeches made by United States senators in support of the McKinley tariff. They are out-and-out protectionists, they are supporters of a tariff that I suppose not a single National Policy man in Canada would attempt to advocate. What does the ablest of them, Senator Aldrich, say? He says:

As the senator from Vermont (Mr. Edmunds) very truly suggests, all of our previous experience shows that when American production and competition have been added to foreign production, the result has been a diminution in price.

Another senator, Mr. Elkins, speaks as follows:—

The Republican party also claims that home competition, under protection, is the surest means not only of establishing our manufacturing industries, but in the long run the safest to reduce the price of manufactured articles. In the United States there are now 300,000 manufacturing establishments, all in competition.

You see how he dwells on the competition, and, of course, the implication is, that if there is a combine, these high protectionists—higher, I suppose, than any protectionists we have here—would strike with a ruthless hand at it.

They employ more than five million of people, who receive in wages two billions annually. The result is now, and has been, under this competition that prices have been greatly reduced.

Now, I say that if those who advocate the interests of the farmer, can show that the duty on any given article is of such a character as to raise prices, that minute they have made out a case for interfering with the duty in that particular instance. Mr. Elkins goes on:

This is all the competition we want or can stand. If there were no protection we could not stand foreign competition. Home competition and home consumption tend to a general but healthful reduction of prices of products, while foreign competition is destructive of both the prices of labour and the American products. Free trade would destroy or greatly impair our manufacturing interests and home markets, while the prices of articles admitted free would remain the same or increase. Protection, instead of being a tax or a burden, as claimed by the Democratic party, not only enables us to build up our home manufactures, increase home consumption and thereby home markets, but in the long run, through home competition, the prices of manufactured products are reduced. Free trade never could accomplish this result.

Now, in what he goes on to say he echoes an opinion expressed by Mr. Garfield, who stated that he believed in protection leading to free trade; and here is what this supporter of the McKinley Bill says:

With proper protection and home competition, we can so firmly establish our manufacturing industries, and reduce the price of manufactured articles, that we can in time compete successfully with Europe in the markets of the world. When this time arrives we may declare for free trade, as England did, and it may be to our interest to do so. We want no free trade that does not come logically through protection, and we surely do not want it until we can compete successfully in the markets of the world with other countries; and if that time never comes, the United States will never want free trade.

Now, you see that these gentlemen, who are hide-bound protectionists, look to such a state of evolution in the industrial energies of the nation, that, in consequence of the protection of infant industries, the industrial forces of the nation shall be so developed that we shall be able to compete with all comers and will therefore be prepared for free trade. So that when my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) contends that whether or not we can show that in some cases there are combines and that in some cases the farmer has to pay more than he had previously to pay, nevertheless we must not touch a single item in the tariff, my hon. friend takes a position which is itself a 'reductio ad absurdum,' the fallacy of which does not need to be exposed. I do not want to go into the various questions that were raised in his speech, because they are not involved in the motion before us; but I do say that when the proper time comes, I think, I shall be able to show such reasons for the reduction or abolition of certain duties that at present affect the farmer, that it will be very difficult for some hon. gentlemen to go back to their constituencies unless they support me in my attempt to give that protection to the farmer which we alone can give him, namely, the protection of getting his goods at a fair rate in a fair market.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken, I suppose it is necessary for me to say a word or two in reference to the motion which has been discussed this afternoon. Naturally, I cannot help dealing with this question in much the same way as I dealt with the question of binder twine which was discussed in this House two or three days ago, that is, to express my satisfaction with the debate that has taken place and the information which has been brought out, and to say that the arguments on both sides, and the points of view which have been so ably represented, will be, of course, very carefully considered; but at the same time to say that, in view of the fact that within a very little time the Government proposes to make a statement in this House of its policy as regards the tariff generally, at a time when above all others it is opportune that that should be done, the Government does not

Mr. DAVIN.

wish in advance of that time to make its views known with regard to this special item of the tariff. While freely acknowledging the force, I mean the local force, of the views that have been brought out by the different speakers, I would like as well to leave this thought with the House—that the question as presented this afternoon appears to me to be one that is debatable, as to which there are strong arguments to be adduced on both sides, and one which affects different localities and different interests in different ways; and even if we were willing to take up this single question and settle it apart from all others at the present time, I think sufficient arguments have been adduced in this debate and a sufficient number of points of view have been represented, to make it necessary that the fullest consideration should be given to the subject before a decision is come to on one side or the other. There are some questions which may have the weight of argument almost entirely on one side. I do not think that can be said of this question. The argument, for instance, that there is a pressing necessity that the duty should be taken off corn at this time in view of the embargo which has been placed on our stockers in the old country, is an argument which may have force at this moment, but which may not two months hence. It is an argument which rests wholly on the assumption that the embargo on our cattle will be kept on. We are in hope, however, and I think we have good grounds for hoping, that the British Government, which is taking into consideration, at this very moment, our completed case, may come to the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia does not exist in Canada, and that the embargo which has been placed upon our stockers should be removed. In that case, the argument based upon the existence of the embargo will fall to the ground. I merely state this in order to show that although that argument may appear strong, and would gain a great deal more strength if the embargo were a settled thing, it does not count for so much, seeing that there is a contingency, and, I hope, a probability, that the embargo will be removed. With reference to the general question of the quality of meat which is made by using one kind of feed or another, that is a question for those who are more particularly skilled or experienced in these matters than myself; it is a matter for research in what you might call a scientific way; and, with regard to that, I am disposed, very strongly disposed, to have, to thoroughly digest and to give great weight to the opinions of men like Professor Robertson, who have studied that question, not merely as actual farmers, but from a scientific point of view, by feeding experimentally, and who have come to conclusions which, arrived at in that way, would have more weight than the ideas even of farmers who have not been feeding with that nicety of calculation and that accuracy of record with which

these experiments have been conducted, and as regards the results of which there ought to be as much certainty and surety as it is possible to obtain. I do not think it would be prudent at this time to come to a vote on this matter, in advance of the declaration of the Government as to its general tariff policy, which, as I informed my hon. friend last evening, I hope will be announced next week. That is not a long time to wait; and when the Government policy is put before the House, there will be plenty of opportunity for hon. gentlemen to express their views. Always premising this: That the Government is as anxious as it can be to serve the general interests of the country, that it is wedded to no policy other than the policy which is for the best interests of the country. It has never stood up for, and does not now stand up for, any absolute principle underlying tariffs, other than the principle that the circumstances and condition of the country must be the guide in determining what is for the best advantage of the country. In other words, there is a striking similarity, which just occurs to me now, between the practice of the Liberal-Conservative Government in this matter and the theory of the leader of the Opposition, who, in his speeches in Hamilton and Toronto—whether he had quite thought out the phrase or not—stated, as a matter of fundamental belief, what he crystallized in words something like these: The Liberal policy is the outgrowth of the circumstances and conditions of the country.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, when the hon. gentleman came to elaborate his policy, he proved to a demonstration that he did not care anything about the naturalness, the growth, the evolution from the circumstances and the conditions of the country, because he declared, if I remember aright, that he was like the Whig, he never changed, and that consequently he was eternally wedded to the principle of free trade. Whether the circumstances of the country were in one condition or another, it mattered not to him—there was a theory he and the Liberal party had adopted many years ago, and they did not propose to change it. Whether the skies be dark or bright, through whatever devious paths their policy may lead them, whether it may lead through Washington or Britain, or however long it may take to gain the open beyond, they were bound to go on to free trade. It might come possibly in fifteen years, and before they could get it they might have to make a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and then climb over the uniform tariff thus created encircling both countries, but they would venture anything for the sake of free trade. Now, the Liberal-Conservative policy does not develop on that principle. It is a policy which grows out of the conditions of the country; it is an evolution from the outgrowth and conditions

of the country as at any time they are. In 1878 and 1879, it was necessary that we should have a certain degree of protection in the best interests of this country. In the establishment of new industries and the development of our resources, the Government looked to the condition of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not. And the Liberal-Conservative Government framed a policy which was to meet the growth, the condition, and the circumstances of the country at that time. They have kept these in view ever since, and are disposed to keep them in view to-day; and if, after a very careful consideration of the circumstances existing to-day, it becomes patent to the Government that the tariff will have to be somewhat revised, the Government is prepared to do what the country, in its circumstances and its growth, requires that it should do. That has always been the position of the Liberal-Conservative Government, and in that respect I am quite sure that we shall meet with the cordial approval of the Liberal-Conservative party, and that we will have the loyal support of the country as well.

Mr. LAURIER. If the House will bear with me for two or three minutes, I would say that the hon. gentleman himself is sadly in need of the words of pity which he wasted upon me; and I would add: Do not weep on me, you daughter of Jerusalem, but weep on yourself and your moments of weakness. He has given us an exhibition of another moment of weakness. The Government, who has just spoken by the mouth of the hon. gentleman on this question, and which has been spoken simply to tell us it cannot say now what it will do in the matter, is suffering from another moment of weakness, because, not long ago, it had another policy on this subject, when it declared, by the mouth of the President of the Council, that it was ready to reduce the duty on corn. There was then an election in the city of Sherbrooke, at which the hon. gentleman, who is now the President of the Council, and who represents the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec in the Cabinet, was elected by acclamation. He spoke on divers questions, one of which was this identical question of corn, and he announced that it was the policy of the Government to-day to remove that duty. Here are his words, taken from the Montreal "Gazette," an authority which will not be denied:

But while believing in the National Policy, we do not believe that the protection given in any particular case should be unnecessary or unduly large, or that in the case of articles used universally by the people they should be made dearer to protect interests of comparatively small importance. I believe also that you desire to see such changes made from time to time as may be necessary to meet the changing conditions, and that, for example, if the Canadian farmer is shut out from the British market for store-cattle and can only export heavy beef, you want the raw material for the maturing of that beef as cheap as possible.

That was diplomatic language. What did it mean? Simply that the raw material necessary to make beef should be made as cheap as possible. That is, that the Government should make it as cheap as possible by taking off the duty on corn. The Government had one policy. Six weeks have elapsed, and they are suffering from another moment of weakness. The Liberal-Conservative party may be prepared to follow the hon. gentleman, but I am sure the country at large is not prepared to follow the Government in this departure from their declared policy of six weeks ago. The country was satisfied at that time that the Government had promised to remove the duty on corn.

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

After Recess.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of the proceedings of the conference recently held at Halifax between delegates from the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland upon the Fishery Question and other questions between the two Governments.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 8th February, 1893.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the foregoing Message and accompanying papers be printed forthwith, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison, for Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 16) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. AMYOT moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to make voting compulsory.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That has been so recently distributed that I should like to have it stand.

Mr. AMYOT. I suppose I shall have an opportunity during this session of testing the sense of the House upon the measure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAURIER.

SUPPLY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Extra allowance to W. Wallace, ex-postmaster at Victoria, B.C. \$240

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an item which has been criticised every time it has been brought before the House. It is an iniquitous system, under which not only a superannuation allowance can be paid to a retired officer, but an extra grant annually made to him. If there was one iniquitous transaction worse than another in connection with the Superannuation Act, it was the removal of Mr. Wallace in order to make a place for Mr. Shakespeare as postmaster of Victoria. The salary of \$2,000 a year is given to Mr. Shakespeare, and about \$1,200 is paid to Mr. Wallace, and this additional sum of \$240, in order to keep him quiet or satisfy him for being removed from his position. The system has undoubtedly been objectionable in many ways, but this particular feature of remunerating officers, not only by granting them the superannuation allowance to which they are entitled, but an additional allowance by adding years to their years of service, is a glaring abuse. No doubt Mr. Shakespeare is a very respectable man, and he was formerly a member of this House. I am casting no reflection on the appointment, but I am taking objection to the mode adopted to place him in the position of postmaster. I hope the Bill about to be introduced by the Minister of Finance will remedy abuses of this kind. I observe, by returns submitted recently, that the system of adding years of service in cases of superannuation still prevails, and in two cases mentioned in the return presented the other day, ten years were added to the time of service. This clearly indicates a gross abuse of the system, and the case of Mr. Wallace is an instance where the Superannuation Act was abused in order to make a place for the gentleman who now fills the position of postmaster at Victoria.

Experimental Farm. \$75,000

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). I desire to obtain some information with respect to the experimental farm. Last year's report contains a statement respecting the number of stock kept there, and in the accounts there appears a large expenditure under the several heads. Perhaps the minister will state the number of head of stock kept on the farm during last year.

Mr. FOSTER. On the Central Farm there were 10 Holsteins, 5 Ayrshires, 5 Shorthorns, 6 Devons, 10 Quebec Jerseys, 8 Jerseys, 30 grades, making a total of 66. On Brandon Farm there were 23, including Devons, Holsteins, Ayrshires, Galloways and Jerseys.

At Indian Head, N.W.T., Farm, there were 27, including Holsteins, Durhams, Polled Angus and grades. At Agassiz, B.C., Farm there are 18 head, including Herefords, Durhams and Ayrshires. At Nappan, N.S., there were 28 head, including Durhams, Ayrshires, Holsteins and some grades. The horses at the Central Farm number 15, at Brandon 10, at Agassiz 6, at Nappan 7, at Indian Head 8.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). I am astonished, after learning that there are only sixty-six head of cattle at the Central Farm, to find that a large expenditure has been incurred in connection with feeding cattle. No less than thirty-three tons of straw have been bought for the farm. We were told on a previous occasion that an experiment was in progress to show that it was possible to keep forty head of cattle on forty acres. We have since been told, however, that the experiment did not realize the expectations, and it was found to be possible to keep only twenty-five head on that acreage. If forty acres will maintain twenty-five head, how does it occur that \$1,600 are required to be expended for feed in order to keep sixty head on 460 acres?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is correct in stating that some fodder was bought last year, and that on the 460 acres, constituting the Central Experimental Farm, there are sixty head of cattle, or one to about every seven acres. It must, however, be borne in mind that a large portion of this Experimental Farm is occupied in experimenting work, such as testing different kinds of grain, roots, seeds and trees, and it would be quite unfair to treat it as a simple grain-raising and stock-feeding farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). In regard to the experimental portion of the farm, I admit that a large quantity of grain is raised and distributed among farmers, of which strict account should be kept, and it would be correct to purchase grain to replace that so distributed. One of the great necessities of the day is to show the farmers how large a number of cattle can be kept upon a small quantity of land; but on the forty acres on the Experimental Farm they have failed in doing this. They have four stablemen to take care of sixty-six head of cattle, when those cattle should be cared for in the most economical way. I cannot see why they should have to purchase straw and hay, when they can raise so much straw and corn fodder on the farm. I want an explanation of that.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I wish to inquire, on what principle the report of the Experimental Farm was distributed last year? About one-third of my constituents are French, and I applied for a number of French copies but received only a few. This year, I got very few English copies and no French at all. I would like to get a fair proportion for distribution among the French constituents in my county.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Saunders has charge of the distribution of the reports, and I have no doubt he distributed them fairly. A certain number of copies are printed and are divided up amongst the members of the House pro rata. The French copies are fewer in the number than the English, and are not distributed in the purely English provinces. I think a number of these were ordered to be printed at the request of the Committee on Agriculture, and the members were invited to send applications for copies which were distributed through the regular channels of the House, in proportion to the applications and the quantity on hand. These copies are not for a particular party, but for the whole House, and I am sure if my hon. friend will make his application he will get his proper share.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have the same complaint to make as the hon. member for Argen-teuil (Mr. Christie). I did not receive a single copy of the Experimental Farm Report or the Dairy Report of last year, although the Printing Committee ordered that they should be distributed equally amongst the members. I would like to know why some members received a full quantity, and other members none at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend made application for them?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The understanding at the Printing Committee was, that there should be made an equal distribution, but as far as I am concerned I have been left out altogether. When application was made to the members to state the number they required for their constituents some of them requested as many as 11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that the more keen witted member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who sits alongside of my hon. friend, and who represents a farming constituency, got his proportion. Perhaps the two supplies went to him through mistake.

Mr. GRIEVE. I am something in the same fix as the member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville). I did not receive any of the reports, and I would like to know if that hon. gentleman has got the proportion due to my constituency?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). An old politician said that a full confession was good for the soul, and I want to say that I was treated very liberally by the distribution department. I made a modest application, for I think, somewhere about five or six hundred copies of each report for my constituents. I thought that this number would enable me to reach all classes, who are interested in these questions in the riding, without regard to political complexion. I received that number quite bountifully and considerably more. In fact, I received so many that I said to my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Somerville), when a considerable time

had elapsed and none reached him, that it looked to me as though the distribution was one-sided, and I think I passed four or five hundred copies from my collection over to him, with the understanding that if he got his distribution afterwards he would make a readjustment. I have, therefore, nothing to complain of.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither has the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Certainly I have, because I think the officers of the House should attend to a business matter of that kind in a business way, and I think the distribution ought to be equal amongst the members. Unfortunately, we have not the Minister of Agriculture in this House or he would be able to tell us about the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. They are distributed through the House and not through the department.

Mr. GRIEVE. Would it be possible to have a number of these reports printed in German? In the county I represent, and in the adjoining county of Waterloo, there are a large number of German people who are among the best farmers and the best citizens we have in Canada, and there is no doubt that these reports would be of great advantage if some copies in the German language were distributed amongst the German farmers, as is done in the case of the English and French-speaking farmers. A large number of the German farmers in my constituency have asked me if it would be possible to get some of these Experimental Farm Reports printed in German, and I trust that the Minister of Finance will see his way to having that done.

Mr. FOSTER. Those reports are printed by order of the Printing Committee and the Committee on Agriculture, and that is a matter for those committees to decide. My hon. friend will probably not deny that the German farmers read and understand English, and can get the substance of these reports quite well in that language. If we undertake to print in all the languages of all the people who come to Canada, it will be rather an expensive operation. If it is a fact that there is a large body of our people who cannot read English, and who are interested in these reports, that would put a different complexion upon the matter, but I imagine that the Germans in that section of the country speak and read English and understand the reports.

Mr. GRIEVE. No doubt a majority of the German people can speak English, but there are a great many of them who cannot read English, and I think when any report of that kind is printed in their own language they can understand it much better. I have had frequent requests from many of my German friends asking that if possible these reports should be printed in their own language.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

Mr. SPEAKER. There are in my county a very large number of Germans, I think between 2,000 and 3,000, all of whom can read and write in their own language, but, unfortunately, many of them, being old-country Germans, who have come to this country within a comparatively recent period, are unable to read in the English language, and in many cases their children, who have been educated in this country, have been educated entirely in German. If it could be arranged to print a comparatively small number of these reports in German, I, for one, should be very much pleased.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Finance Minister says that we have not been in the habit of printing these reports in German. I believe that, during his time, we have not, but at the time I first came here we did print German pamphlets for immigration purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. But not the reports of the departments.

Mr. McMULLEN. Those pamphlets were very interesting to the Germans. I sent a number of them away myself, and the German people who received them appreciated them very much. I fully endorse what the hon. the Speaker has said. Although the Germans in Canada are generally able to speak and read the English language, many of them are not, and I would like very much, out of respect to the large number of Germans that we have in the country, to have a number of the Experimental Farm Reports printed for them in their own language. As the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Grieve) has said, they are a very desirable class of settlers, and I think we can afford to show some little interest in them by educating them in the best methods of agriculture through the medium of these reports.

Mr. CARGILL. I fully endorse the suggestion made by the hon. members who have preceded me with respect to the advisability of printing some of these reports in German. There are a very large number of Germans in my constituency, and they are a very progressive class of people; in fact, they are as fine a class of farmers as we have in that section of the country. I am, therefore, very strongly in favour of the next issue of these agricultural reports in connection with the Experimental Farm being printed in the German language.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, that I had an application from a gentleman in the west to have the report of the Experimental Farm, and also the report of the committee, printed in German. He complained that a considerable number of his people could not read the English language very well. I think I submitted the application to the Minister of Agriculture. I had also an application from a gentleman in the west to have

a number printed in Gaelic, and one from a gentleman in Manitoba, who said that there were a number of Scandinavians, Icelanders and Norwegians in that part of the country, who could only read in their native tongue, and he wanted a number translated and printed for them. But at that time the excitement ran so high over the dual languages that we were afraid we should multiply it, if we added two or three more; and when we considered the expense of translating and printing these reports in those different languages, I think the Minister of Agriculture came to the conclusion that it would be unwise to have it done, even though, as I believe, they would have done a great deal of good.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have repeatedly brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and he has agreed with me that it would be desirable to do everything that was possible to encourage German settlers; but he has not yet done anything in that direction. Requisitions have been made to me on many occasions by influential Germans to endeavour to obtain these reports in the German language. As has been said, all the old country Germans who have settled in Canada, are able to read and write in their own tongue, and they acquire a knowledge of the English language very rapidly; but some of those who have recently come in, and who wish to learn the modes and habits of the people of this country, would be very much benefited if they could get the reports which have been referred to printed in the German language. I have not had any applications from the Norwegians or Scandinavians in the Northwest for pamphlets in their language; but at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of there was a vacancy in the Department of Agriculture, and it was thought that the hon. gentleman was the prospective Minister; hence he got so many applications. I do not know that the expense of printing these reports would be so very great, and I think it would be a good thing for the Government to endeavour to popularize themselves by granting this favour to that large class of settlers. All those who are aware of the progressive and thrifty character of the German population, will bear me out in saying that we have no better class of settlers in the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Believing that the speeches which have just been delivered in favour of printing the reports of the Experimental Farm in the German language may have some effect on the Government, I desire to say a few words with regard to the printing of those reports. I can remember well when the Government had a number of immigration pamphlets printed in German—and I suppose circulated in Germany in order to encourage German immigration to this country—that they made a contract with a certain Mr. Bennett, of Prescott, to print these publica-

tions, although he was not a German and had no German type in his office. But they wanted to give him a contract, and they paid him, I believe, between \$7,000 and \$8,000 for the work. He fitted up his office with German type and filled the order. In making the investigation as to the amount which ought to have been paid for the printing of those pamphlets, I discovered, not only from my own knowledge of the printing business, but by obtaining the facts from a German printer in the town of Berlin, that the Government had paid Mr. Bennett enough, above what they ought to have paid him, to stock his office with steam printing presses and a complete outfit of type and furniture. Now, if the Government intend to get these pamphlets printed in German, I hope that, instead of getting them done at an English printing office at an exorbitant price, they will send them to an office carried on by a German.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that the German who applied intimated that so far as he was aware there was not a German printer in the country who could do the work with the stock of type he had, but that he would have to go to the expense of getting a supply of type, and that the Government for that reason would require to pay a larger figure for the work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) say there was no German printer in the country who could print those pamphlets?

Mr. SPROULE. There was no printer, so the writer informed me, who had sufficient type to print them without getting in an additional supply.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is just sheer nonsense. There is not a word of truth in the statement. There are German printing offices in the town of Berlin and Walkerton, capable of printing books fifty times as large and which have the type in their offices. It was just a sheer job on the part of the Government to benefit Mr. Bennett, and give him out of the pockets of the people some \$4,000 or \$5,000 unjustly.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has waxed indignant over nothing, because it was not for Mr. Bennett at all. The information was given to me by the gentleman I refer to, and the Government are not responsible.

Mr. BOWMAN. In the constituency I have the honour to represent, a large portion of the population speak German. It is quite true that the young generation growing up both speak and read the English language about as well as a native, but a large proportion of our farming community, who are Germans, do not speak English very well, and cannot read it readily. Consequently it is of considerable importance that these agricultural reports should be printed in their own tongue. There are at least a dozen constituencies in western Ontario where a

large proportion of the population are German, and the older people of that nationality do not read the English language so as to understand it clearly. I do hope that the chairman of the Agricultural Committee will take the necessary steps to secure the printing of a considerable number of these reports in German. I will just call attention to another very important fact in connection with these pamphlets, and that is, that the chairman, if these pamphlets are to be printed in German, should have them translated by some one who understands the language. There was great complaint among the Germans over the immigration pamphlets printed in their language some years ago. Some of the critics in the county of Waterloo said the translation was the most wretched they had ever seen, and I can vouch for the correctness of their criticism from my own knowledge of the German tongue. As regards the statement of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, that there are no German printing offices with sufficient type to do this work, there are five offices in the county of Waterloo where one of these pamphlets could be printed without taking down the type. I hope when he does get them printed, he will get some German to do the translating who understands the language, and send the job to the county of Waterloo.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say there were no printing offices, but the gentleman who wrote me said there were none. I was not aware of it myself.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The reports are now all in the hands of the Queen's Printer. He has informed me that they will be ready in a few days.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). If that be the case, we could discuss this question much more intelligently with the report of last year in our hands. Will the Minister be kind enough to allow this to lie over? It is one of the most important votes in the interest of the agricultural community, and we ought to be in full possession of all that has taken place during the last year on the farms before passing this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt these reports are hurried through as rapidly as they can be. They have to be compiled after the end of the year. The Agricultural Report is brought to the 31st of December, and this is only the 5th of February, so that I do not think the time elapsed is very unreasonable. The financial reports are only brought down to the 1st of July, and not to the end of the year.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Huron is not unreasonable in the request he has made. It is proposed to discuss the operations of the department for the past year without any official communication as to what the department are doing. Is that reasonable? Is the great subject of agriculture itself receiving fair treatment to-day? You

Mr. BOWMAN

have removed from the Department of Agriculture a gentleman who had great experience and devoted a great deal of attention to it. He thought it was worthy of the department that he should leave his seat in the Senate and come down to the House of Commons in order to answer for that department. But you have removed him from the department and appointed to the office a gentleman who may be perfectly familiar with the subject of his profession, but who certainly has not, to this moment, given the country any evidence that he has the faintest knowledge of the agricultural interests of this country. You have, therefore, very wisely, under the circumstances, put him beyond the range of criticism by removing him to the quiet of the Senate. The subject of agriculture is practically ignored by the Government. The Government have told the House that the whole country is prosperous. The Minister himself the other night told the House and the country that never within twenty years have agricultural interests been on a better basis than they are to-day. That is the opinion of the financial head of the Government, who to-night is representing the Department of Agriculture. Whilst we must not expect too much from him, yet when he undertakes to fill the office of Minister of Agriculture for the purpose of passing the Estimates, we have a right to expect him or some one here to assist him in order to answer all proper questions. Now, I maintain that this department can never be satisfactorily dealt with whilst the presiding officer of it is not more intimately acquainted with the subject itself, and who also does not occupy a seat in this House. You may adjourn the discussion to-night, but the same difficulty will come up another night. The minister will come here with some cut-and-dried answers. He cannot give the information that the presiding officer is expected to give, and the adjournment, after all, whilst it will be of great service, I trust, cannot meet the whole requirements of the situation, until you get a proper and competent officer as head of the department. I think the agriculturists of Canada have every reason to complain at the way their interests are slighted on all occasions, great and small, by the Government of the day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year, when the Experimental Farm was under discussion in the Estimates, we reached just such a dilemma as we have reached to-night. The hon. gentleman will remember that we were proceeding with the consideration of these very items, when it turned out that the report was in the hands of the printer, that the then Minister of Agriculture had sent it to the Printing Department, and was not able to answer questions with regard to that report. The hon. gentlemen opposite were so determined to press it through, that we sat all night, and on the return of the Premier he admitted at once that the contention of the Opposition was just and reasonable, namely,

that we should ask an adjournment until that report was in the hands of members of the House. Now, I think the Minister of Finance is over-stretching himself to-night in pressing upon the House these items, when the report of last year's expenditure is not in the hands of members. I really think that the demand of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is a very reasonable one, that we should leave this matter over until the report is in our hands. I endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I do not see how we are going to get along in this House with the Minister of Agriculture in the Senate. The agricultural interests of this country are undergoing a change at the present moment, and while we are here for the purpose of discussing the many important questions relating to that interest the Minister of Agriculture is in the Senate, unable to answer a single word or to give us any information. The Minister of Finance may consider himself a Solomon upon all points, but I think he will find that if he undertakes to answer everything connected with the Department of Agriculture, every question that is put, particularly those very important and pointed questions by the hon. member for South Huron, he will find that notwithstanding his extended knowledge he will hardly be able to satisfy the committee that he is so sufficiently well posted on all questions of agriculture as to take the place of the Minister of Agriculture, as well as fill the position of Minister of Finance. My impression is that if the Government wish to meet the general feeling of the farmers of this country they had better bring their Minister of Agriculture down from his retired and exalted position in the Senate, removed from being questioned on the all-important matters of agriculture, and they had better bring him here where he can be reached, and we will make the best use of him we can in the interest of the agriculturists.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not pretend to be a Solomon on agricultural matters. I am here to do the best I can; to answer questions and give information on all the items as they come up, and to make a careful note of all questions that are put and to which I am not able to give an answer. Solomon or not, even if my hon. friend who is criticising the agricultural estimates were Minister of Agriculture, he would find it very difficult to carry in his brain all the various items and be able to answer all the questions that a number of gentlemen might put to him in reference to the details of the agricultural farms of the country. It is a very difficult thing to do. I do not think that my hon. friend before me believes or thinks, or expects that every minute question as to the details of the farm can be answered off-hand, even by the Minister of Agriculture. That, I think, is quite impossible. We should be reasonable in that matter. Now, as to slighting the interests of agriculture, that is very well to say; but the records of this Government for the last ten years on agricul-

tural matters are before the country, and the country knows and appreciates what has been done by the Minister of Agriculture and the very large expenditure of money for the furtherance of agricultural interests. That is open and patent to everybody. Now, the Agricultural Report is not down. We have often gone through these Estimates when it was found that the reports were not laid upon the Table, because, after all, the amount of information that the members get from the reports brought down by the department, with the exception of two or three financial reports, is not availed of in the criticism of the Estimates, but are rather availed of for reading outside of that. The reports this year are further ahead than they have been for a series of years back. But if my hon. friend would rather that these items stand over until the report is before the House, I have no objection. I acknowledge that he has a right to all the information that is reasonable on the farm business, in which he takes so great an interest. If he thinks it better that this stand over I will be glad to let it stand until the report comes down.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think it is very desirable that we should have the report in our hands—not that I want to throw any impediment in the way of agriculture, because I do not believe there is any other member in this House who is more enthusiastic in his desire to benefit the agricultural interests than I am. But I want everything to be done in the very best possible manner in the interests of the farmers of Canada. I thank the Minister very much for allowing this item to stand over.

Mr. DEVLIN. Perhaps the Minister would answer the question I put a moment ago as to who has charge of the French correspondence of the Experimental Farm?

Mr. FOSTER. The French correspondence is in the hands of two gentlemen, a clerk and an assistant. I do not know the names of the gentlemen, but I am aware they are there.

Mr. DEVLIN. Looking at the Auditor-General's Report, pages 122 and 123, I find only one French name, that of a Mr. McMurray, on the list. In looking through the travelling expenses of officers on the farm we find almost all English names. I do not wish to cause annoyance by pressing this matter, but this may explain the trouble in regard to the distribution of the French reports. I complained that they had not yet appeared. Perhaps they have appeared, and I did not receive the share which I asked. However, probably the reports were sent in French to French counties and in English to English counties. I represent what may be called a dual language county, a county in which both languages are spoken and in which there is a very large French population, numbering at least 40,000, and also a considerable English-speaking population. Necessarily reports in both languages should

be supplied and distributed in such a county, and that is the reason why I complain of the non-appearance of the French reports and their non-delivery. A short time ago I received a letter from a gentleman who is thoroughly posted in connection with matters on the Experimental Farm, in which he affirms that, although there are gentlemen employed on the farm, who deliver very interesting and instructive lectures in the country, and especially in Ontario, no French lecturers are sent to the province of Quebec. I do not bring up this subject for the pleasure of complaining, but I trust it will receive the consideration of the Government, and, if they think proper, they will appoint gentlemen whom it would be easy to find in the province as well qualified as the English-speaking gentlemen sent to Ontario, to go through the province of Quebec and deliver lectures on the same subjects.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I fully agree with the statement of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), with respect to the want of qualified French-speaking officers on the experimental farm. The Government must remember that last year we repeatedly called their attention to the fact that numerous letters written in French had been sent to the Experimental Farm and no answers given to them. Last year they promised that that would be remedied; but, as just stated by the hon. member for Ottawa, when he looked into the Auditor-General's Report for this year, he found no more French officers than last year. The fact is that one looking at page 123-B of the Report cannot find a single French name amongst the officers of the Experimental Farm, except some labourers. I call to that fact the attention of the French members of the Government from the province of Quebec, as the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Angers) is not here. I call upon the French ministers from the province of Quebec to see that that state of things be remedied. Last year I had the opportunity of bringing up numerous complaints in this House, from newspapers as well as clergymen and other influential gentlemen in the province of Quebec, stating that when they sent letters written in the French language they never received an answer. The reason is very plain: it is because there is no officer there who might answer French correspondence. The only officer there conversant with the French language is Mr. Murray, but his duties are very secondary—they consist in taking the French visitors over the farm, and to explain to them the work which is carried out there. He is a zealous and well qualified officer. I know that should he be put in charge of the French correspondence, he could do it perfectly well. I call to that the earnest consideration of the French ministers in this House, in order that they may convey these matters to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, so that he may see to it that some French officers, by name and in fact,

Mr. DEVLIN.

that is to say, men who should be conversant with that language, be put into that office. That would effectively remove the present evil. I am aware that in the province of Quebec, the newspapers complain that farmers are not so much interested in agricultural works and experimental farms as the farmers of other provinces; that may be true, and it is to be regretted. But I know that the farmers of the province of Quebec cannot receive any information. They send letters, and when reports are sent to them they are English reports. I myself had quite a number of these English reports, which are perfectly useless, for there is not a single English farmer in my county. As to the French reports, I received them lately. So that it should not be a matter of surprise that the province of Quebec should be, in point of farming interests, behind the other provinces; it is not treated like the others are. As a matter of fact, I know, however, that this charge of want of qualification is ungrounded. I know that our farmers are as intelligent men as those of the other provinces, if not more so, and I only wish that they be treated by the Government with the courtesy and consideration shown those of the other provinces. I again call the attention of the French ministers in this House to this state of things, which is to be regretted.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) I can assure the hon. member that the attention of the new Minister of Agriculture was called to the matters referred to by him. I have no doubt, the fact is I was positively assured by him that these matters will soon be remedied.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I will be very happy to hear of it. I do not often congratulate the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, but I will congratulate him should he change that state of things. I would now like to know the meaning of the following word in page 125-B of the Auditor-General's Report: "Canaille, 4,000 lbs., \$36." I should like to know whether the Government grow that grain for the propagating of their friends.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The hon. member is mistaken; he ought to read the word in English.

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) What does it mean in English?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) I am told that the English word is "bran."

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I asked my English colleagues and was told by them that it meant nothing in English.

Aid to Agricultural Societies in the
North-west Territories \$7,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Have experiments been made in the North-west Territories in the cultivation of the tame grasses, timothy and clover, and, if so, with what results?

Mr. DALY. At both Indian Head and Brandon Experimental Farms very extensive experiments have been made in the cultivation of all native grasses and timothy and clover, with very favourable results.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am led to make this inquiry because, many years ago, on visiting the prairies of Illinois and Iowa, at the time those sections of the country were being first settled, it was a common report among the pioneers that timothy and clover would not grow on the prairie soil. I heard the same report in the North-west when I visited that country two or three years ago. The statement made by pioneers in the western states in that day with respect to their inability to raise tame grasses was entirely without foundation, and the truth is that one of the finest grass countries in the world for timothy may be found in the western states. It is a matter of great importance in the North-west as to whether tame grasses will succeed, and I am happy to hear that experiments have been made and the results have proved satisfactory.

The Haras National Co. \$6,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I desire to inquire if it is necessary to go to London to find a gentleman to examine these animals in Montreal. It is a slight placed upon the judgment of gentlemen both in the province of Quebec and in eastern Ontario to say that the Government cannot find any one possessing sufficient knowledge of animals to decide as to their merits, without going to London, Ont., for a man to visit Montreal, whose expenses must be paid. Cannot a judge of animals be found near Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say a judge might have been secured nearer Montreal. That gentleman, however, seems to have been employed by the Minister of Agriculture at the time and paid a small fee of \$46.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is there a permanent contract with this company?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, for five years; it has run two years and has three years yet to run.

Mr. DEVLIN. To whom is the money paid?

Mr. FOSTER. To the company.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Why could not the services of Mr. McEachren, of Montreal, have been secured, instead of paying a man to come from London and examine the horses?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know the nature of the contract entered into with this company, but if the hon. gentleman has paid any attention to what has been going on, he must have heard complaints from many sides that the horses supplied under this contract are very inferior animals, to say the least. I observe from the report that one of the horses was sent to the North-west, and this is what the report says:

In the latter part of May last the Percheron stallion "Clement" reached the farm from Montreal, for service in the neighbourhood. A Clyde or Shire stallion would prove much more acceptable to the farmers in the Territories than a Percheron, no matter how good the Percheron may be.

These animals are not giving satisfaction. The Percheron breed may not suit as well as the Clyde, but apart from the breed, complaints are coming to the Government that these are really inferior animals.

Mr. SCRIVER. Can the Minister of Finance inform the committee whether the same horses are kept on the Central Experimental Farm now as were there last year?

Mr. FOSTER. Two horses are kept on the Experimental Farm, and I think they are the same as last year. There have been complaints made as to the quality of some of the horses, but I think it is in the contract that if any of them become disabled, or anything of that kind, others shall be put in their place by the company.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman said this money was paid to the Haras National Company. Can he tell me who is the president of that company?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot.

Mr. DEVLIN. Can he say how many members form this company?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot. As my hon. friend will see this does not affect the contract.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think I can supply the information. The head of that company is the Hon. Louis Beaubien, Minister of Agriculture for the province of Quebec. He and his son-in-law are the whole company in fact. I may say from information which I have, that this payment of \$6,000 a year is a huge job. Not one of these stallions is worth \$1,000, and yet we are paying \$1,000 a year for each. Those who know tell me that none of these stallions would cost \$1,000 in France, where they were bought.

Mr. CHARLTON. \$1,000 a year is a most outrageous price. There is a job there unquestionably.

Mr. FOSTER. That includes the keep of the horses.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was on the farm last year and the year before, and I would not give the bonus that one horse gets for the two put together. They are utterly unsuitable and they are not the class of animals that can be used for the farms of this country. One of them is not fit to use for breeding. I say this not only on my own experience, but on the experience of a gentleman who probably knows more about it than I do. The only horses suitable in Canada are the coach horses, and the horses on the Experimental Farm are not at all the kind suitable for the English market.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the present Minister of Agriculture a good judge of horses?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Percheron horses are going out of use altogether in the United States, and, as my hon. friend from Wellington says, what we want in this country is lighter driving horses. If the Government would provide for fine coach horses they would be conferring a benefit on the farmers of this country. The Percheron stock in the States is going out of use, and horses of that class can be bought for the price of ordinary farm horses at the present time.

Quarantine Salaries and contingencies for organized districts. \$40,500

Mr. CHARLTON. What steps have the Government taken with regard to quarantining against the introduction of cholera into this country?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not present when I explained that fully the other day. I may say, in brief, that steps are being taken to put the four quarantine stations on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts in a state of thorough efficiency. On the chief quarantine station at Grosse Isle, \$50,000 or \$75,000 will be expended there in furnishing the equipment, shelters, hospitals and everything, on the most approved plan which is necessary for quarantine purposes. At Halifax similar preparation is being made: the quarantine station on Lawlor's Island is being arranged, the most perfect machinery for fumigating is being put in, and generally everything is being done that is necessary to make of it a first-class quarantine station. In the city of St. John everything necessary is being done and will be ready for the summer navigation. In British Columbia the quarantine station is being removed to William's Head, a little farther down, where a site is being purchased, and where an equipment costing about \$80,000 is being put in. These are the four principal quarantine stations, or what are called the organized districts. In addition, such precautions as are thought necessary will be taken at some of the more open ports, although it is not the purpose of the department to make a quarantine station of every port on the coast. That would be too expensive and would not be necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is another point with regard to which I would like some information. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, is probably aware that a proposition has been made in the United States to suspend the permission to land steerage passengers during the coming season—practically to suspend the immigration of steerage passengers. If that is done, it will probably throw a very large increase of that class of immigration upon our shores, and it may possibly lead to some complications between our own Government and that of the United States in regard to the introduction by way of the St. Lawrence of steerage passengers

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

going to the United States. Has a possible complication of that kind occurred to the Minister, and has it received any attention on the part of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: the Minister is keeping himself thoroughly in accord with that movement. At first, about a month ago, it would have seemed, from what knowledge we had through the press and otherwise, that there was a decided movement in the direction of stopping all that kind of immigration into the United States. I think the hon. gentleman himself will agree that later information rather inclines one to believe that that extreme step may not be taken. However, we do not know what will be done. The only thing for us to do is to watch the trend of events, and that, of course, the Minister of Agriculture is doing. I may say to the hon. gentleman who questioned me the other day that the authorities here are in accord with the authorities of the largest cities along the border and on the coasts to the south of us, and that measures are taken in accord, so that I think there will be no friction or disagreement.

Mr. WELSH. May I ask the hon. Minister what steps, if any, are being taken towards establishing a quarantine station at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Minister is looking after Charlottetown as well as other ports. Charlottetown, of course, does not occupy the same position as some other Atlantic ports in regard to immigration. The same may be said of the city of St. John, although a large number of coasting vessels call there. But I know that the Minister is looking after Charlottetown, and that whatever precautions are necessary will be taken.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I would like to ask what steps are being taken towards erecting a quarantine station at Sydney? I know that requisitions have been made for one there, and an engineer was sent down to make inquiries.

Mr. FOSTER. I can state that the Minister is considering the case of Sydney also.

Mr. STAIRS. I would like to ask if tenders have yet been asked for the work to be done at Lawlor's Island?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure that tenders have been asked, but I believe the work is going on.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to carry out the recommendations of the Sanitary Commission as to the Grosse Isle quarantine station? It is in the recollection of all the members of this House that that station was visited last year by scientific gentlemen from this country as well as from the United States, and they all agreed that the station was in a most wretched condition. I am aware that some improvements have

since been made, but one of the principal recommendations of that Sanitary Commission was that a deep-water wharf should be constructed at that point. It was considered that the steamships coming through the St. Lawrence could not stop anywhere near the present quarantine station in order to be disinfected. The disinfecting apparatus has to be worked at the wharf, and all the steamers cannot reach the present wharf. It was understood at the time that the Government intended to undertake the construction of a deep-water wharf; but what I have seen in the papers lately would seem to indicate that the Government have abandoned that idea because some extra dredging would be required. I can hardly think that that information is correct, because I do not believe that the Government would leave us in an unprotected condition on account of the extra expense that it would be necessary to incur. Some very expensive, and I hope effective apparatus has been obtained by the Government from the firm of Carrier, Laine & Co., of Levis, and has been sent to the quarantine station; but that apparatus will be perfectly useless, it will be impossible to use it, unless the deep-water wharf is built. I would like to know if the Government still adhere to their intention to build that wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the Government expressed its intention to build a deep-water wharf. The idea was broached and has been discussed very thoroughly between the Government and the steam-ship owners with the view of having everything done that was necessary, and with the view of not doing at a large expense what was not considered fairly necessary to provide ample protection. It is not true either that the Government decided not to build the wharf because some extra dredging is necessary. The dredging itself would be a small item in the whole expenditure. The wharf itself would be a very expensive work, and in no case would it be available for the season soon to open, when, if cholera comes at all, it will most probably come. A doubt has been expressed, and it has not, I believe, been solved up to the present time, whether in rough weather, with high winds blowing, it would be possible or safe for large steam-ships to come up to that wharf, even if it were built; and in rough weather alone a wharf would be necessary for the purpose of facilitating the proper fumigating of the ships. So that it has not yet been decided to build the wharf, and it is of the less importance that the decision has not been come to yet—for the question is not yet closed—because if it were decided now to build it, it would be impossible to have it available for the coming season. It is not true either that the apparatus which is being prepared for that station could not be used without the wharf. It can be used, and, as I said before, everything that is necessary towards the pro-

per fumigating of the vessels, the proper cleansing and proper care of those who are sick with cholera, or who have to be detained at quarantine, has been done or is being done; so that when the season of navigation opens everything will be in readiness to meet the eventuality which we all hope will not occur.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure that the country will learn with a very deep sense of disappointment of the words which have been just uttered by the hon. Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman is not in a position to say just now whether all the recommendations made by the Sanitary Commission will be carried out or not. It seems to me that the Government are taking that matter altogether too lightly. We know that last year the Minister visited the quarantine station and reported it to be in perfect order, whereas the Sanitary Commission who afterwards visited it reported it to be in a very imperfect condition and altogether unsuited for quarantine purposes. I think the report of these scientific men ought to be followed to the letter, no matter what the cost may be. That commission has recommended that a wharf should be built, and in my judgment it ought to be built. It may be that the wharf will not be ready for the coming season. Perhaps yes, and perhaps no; and even though it should not be, that is no reason why it should not be built, or why the work should not be commenced at the very earliest moment. In fact, the quarantine station ought to be always in such a state of repair that it would be ready to meet any emergency that might arise. We do not know when disease may come; it may come to-morrow or it may not come for ten years; but in the meantime, in this country, as in other countries, the quarantine regulations should be kept at the highest standard, and when the Sanitary Commission recommend that a wharf ought to be built at Grosse Isle station to make the quarantine what it ought to be, such a recommendation should be carried out to the letter. That is what was expected by the country at large. We are told that it is still under consideration whether a wharf is to be built or not. In such an important matter the time for consideration is past, and the time for action has come.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can hardly make that out, because I suppose he will agree that if ten thousand sanitary commissioners recommended that a wharf should be built, at a cost of \$150,000, it would be impossible to have it built in time for the approaching season. It is therefore, as I have said, an impossibility, so far as that goes. The Government have not come to a final decision in the matter, because, after having a conference with steamboat owners and the like, we have asked certain information which they are preparing for us. Suppose the Government

comes to a decision a month or two later, this being the winter season, which interferes with the work, it would be impossible then, if it be decided to build the work, to have it ready for the coming season of navigation, so that my hon. friend is entirely out when he attempts to blame the Government in connection with this wharf. The Sanitary Commissioner is an excellent authority as regards fumigation and all other matters of sanitation, but I suppose that steam-ship men and this Government must be allowed to have some little choice as to the building of wharves and matters of that kind, which hardly come within the scope of the Sanitary Commission. In any case, it is perfectly impossible to build the wharf in time for next season's navigation.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government do not tell us whether they will build it at all. The hon. gentleman rather deprecates the authority of scientific men on the question. I think their authority ought to be paramount, because, as I understand, this fumigating apparatus cannot be used except at the wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it can. There is not a vessel that goes into the port of New York which is fumigated at the wharf.

Mr. LAURIER. Where are they fumigated?

Mr. FOSTER. Out in the harbour.

Mr. LAURIER. Why do the Sanitary Commission recommend so strongly the wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. That bears out what I have said, that this is a matter which may well be left to the judgment and consideration of those who are not scientists. If my hon. friend will look at the harbour at Liverpool and the sanitary arrangements there, he will find that vessels are not fumigated at the wharfs there, any more than they are in New York, but are fumigated from tugs alongside them. The Government cannot be charged with dereliction of duty through not having taken every proper and reasonable precaution. The building of wharfs is a matter which must be left to their judgment, as a matter of business. If a wharf could be built there at which steamers could call and be fumigated and land their passengers at all seasons, that would be a great convenience to the shipping interests, but as regards fumigation, that can be very effectively done without a wharf.

Mr. LANGELEIR. I would like to know whether Dr. Montizambert, the superintendent of the quarantine, recommends the construction of the wharf? He has been there many years, and no man in this country knows better than he what is required for the station. I understand that he, among others, recommends the construction of a deep-water wharf, if not for the convenience of ships, at least for the landing of passengers. I have been at that station several times, and I know it is a very difficult one to land passen-

Mr. FOSTER.

gers at, as there is no place where the wind blows stronger, and it is certainly very dangerous when passengers have to be landed, especially sick passengers to have to land them in small boats.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to urge strongly on the Government the importance of being prepared for any emergency that may arise next spring in this connection. This country expects that everything the Government can possibly do will be done, and is willing to see that any amount of money is placed at the disposal of the Government to perfect arrangements for the prevention of cholera. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to assist the Government in every way in perfecting the sanitary arrangements at this station. The arrangements at that station were condemned last season, and this has a tendency to create great uneasiness in the minds of the people. I would like to know under whose supervision the sanitary arrangements have been provided?

Mr. FOSTER. Dr. Montizambert.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who has supervised the mechanical arrangements?

Mr. FOSTER. A special officer of the Public Works Department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, as far as the Government is concerned, all the apparatus has been provided, and everything is ready in case of an outbreak in the early spring.

Mr. FOSTER. Everything will be ready.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The necessity of doing this cannot be too fully impressed upon the Government. Those of us who saw the epidemic of cholera in Canada some years ago know the importance and gravity of this subject, and the great responsibility thrown on this Government and the House in seeing that the latest and most improved scientific apparatus is provided to prevent the introduction of cholera. I would feel that I was remiss in my duty if I did not urge upon the Government as strongly as possible, the importance of their being alive in this matter. I do not know whether the changes made in this department, which has the care of the health of the country, will be in the best interests of the country. I do not want to find fault with the Government in that respect, I did not rise for that purpose. But I think it is desirable that some person who understands those questions should be in charge of that department during the present season. I think it is almost to be regretted that this matter is entrusted to a new officer who has not been in the public service for any length of time, who has not given his attention to those matters so vital to the well-being of the people of this country. I do not say this in a political sense, I speak from a national stand-point. The gentleman who fills that position will have control of the destinies of this country in that respect, to a great ex-

tent, and the power, perhaps, if he has given his attention to these questions, of staying that pestilence and preventing its introduction into this country. I hope, sincerely, that the Government will redouble their efforts, and I think they will meet the wishes of this country by seeing that the most scientific appliances and the most approved apparatus and the best skilled experts in connection with this work should be secured. It may be well for the Government to have a gentleman there who is well qualified; I do not say anything against his qualifications, but I would think it wisdom on the part of the Government if they had a consultation with those who have given great attention to sanitary matters, who have made them a life study, and who are even more competent, perhaps, than those who have been stationed at quarantine stations for many years. I think it would be expedient if the Government were to employ some of those gentlemen in this country who have devoted almost their entire lives to sanitary matters, and who would be able to make a report, confidential if necessary, to the Government on the important matter that is before us. I think it is not safe, it is not desirable or wise, on the part of the Government, to entrust the whole care and responsibility for these matters to any one officer, however good he may be; but I believe that the opinions of those who are competent to judge on such matters should be taken by the Government, and this House will not begrudge them all the supplies that are necessary in order to secure the assistance of the greatest skill and wisdom that are available, in order that, if possible, this terrible pestilence may be kept out of our country.

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the Minister if there have been any complaints made from the quarantine station at Halifax with regard to the disinfecting apparatus used there being injurious to the clothing of the passengers. Recently there was a rumour that such was the case, but I was not aware whether a complaint had been made to the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman will find out, if he inquires into the matter, that such a circumstance is apt to take place, and that in fact it does take place in all ports where disinfectants are used. Where fumigation takes place it may be difficult to keep certain classes of articles from being injured. There were at first reports that injury had been done at the first disinfection at Grosse Isle. I had not heard of a like complaint from Halifax. I think the apparatus used is of the most modern kind. The best that can be had will be used, and as well as it can be used. I think the department has taken every precaution it possibly can take in that respect. The main object is to destroy the germs of the disease, and if the clothes have to suffer, it is better they should, than the

disease be brought in. At the same time, the latest and most scientific methods are taken for fumigation.

Mr. FLINT. As this subject has been discussed with considerable earnestness, and none too earnestly in view of its importance, I think we may conclude, from the attitude taken by the members of this side of the House who have spoken, that the Government should feel encouraged to go further in the matter of expenditure for all necessary purposes than they might otherwise do, if they feared a severe criticism for a lavish expenditure. I had the good fortune personally to inspect the Grosse Isle quarantine station at the close of last session, and I think I would only be doing justice to those through whose courtesy I had an opportunity of making the examination I did, as a duty in consequence of my position as a representative in this House—I would not be doing my duty, I say, if I did not express the great gratification which it afforded me to see the care and attention given by the various officials at that station. There must be, of course, a large number of representatives of the people, as well as an enormous number of the people themselves who are not aware of the great difficulties of the subject we have now under consideration. I am certain that I learned much which will be of great value in the consideration of matters of this kind coming before the House. I can congratulate the Government, conscientiously and sincerely, upon the character of the gentlemen who are in charge of that station at Grosse Isle. Their learning, their faithfulness, their enthusiasm in the cause of sanitary science, could scarcely be too highly praised. The people of the country are fortunate in having at that gateway to the Dominion, men of this character. I myself, perhaps, as well as others, might have underrated the amount of physical and mental worry which devotion to the duties of that office demands at the hands of these gentlemen. They have to visit vessels at all hours of the day and night, no matter what the weather may be, and their labour is none too highly compensated by the Government. I think that the representatives would support the Government in any measures that might be taken towards increasing and improving the accommodation afforded to the staff at Grosse Isle. I say frankly, that I was not pleased or gratified with the accommodation which the medical officers are now afforded at that place. I know that this matter has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the Government—although no complaint was made to me on that subject—in fact, I think there was a disposition to pass it by as of not very great importance. I do think that, in considering the difficulties those gentlemen have to overcome and the importance of the position they occupy, the Government could well expend several thousand dollars in improving the means they have of living comfortably and of establishing their families

comfortably in that place during the quarantine season. I congratulate the Government, and I am very glad to notice that they are taking steps towards introducing the very best improvements that are known in connection with the fumigation of vessels and of clothing and of passengers, and of such things as may be a cause of danger if allowed to enter into the country unfumigated. The subject of the deep water pier, I think, has been pressed upon the Government for many years. I can appreciate the reasons which induce the administration to shrink from the very large expenditure unless they felt that such expenditure was absolutely necessary. It is quite evident that a pier cannot be constructed at Grosse Isle for less than a hundred thousand dollars, that will be at all satisfactory to navigation. But it also must be evident to any person studying this matter that within the next two years a pier at which vessels can land their passengers and discharge their cargo, if necessary, and be properly fumigated, will be one of the necessities at that point. It will take several years, I presume, to construct such a pier, but if he will bear in mind the difference in the size of the ships navigating the St. Lawrence now and in use at the time when the pier was constructed, we can see that although we expend \$125,000, there would actually be no more accommodation for our vessels now than existed twenty-five or thirty years ago. Thirty years ago, a large majority of the ships and steamers could land their passengers at the present pier, but since that time the tonnage of vessels has enormously increased, so that they cannot come within many hundred yards of the present pier; and it will be a subject of great complaint if at any time during next season, or the season following, a large passenger steamer with 1,000 passengers should be detained in the river off Grosse Isle, unable to land passengers during a storm, with this dread disease rapidly increasing on board the vessel. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), probably the facilities for landing passengers are of more importance than those for fumigation. At present tug-boats and steamers can carry out fumigating apparatus, and more or less adequate disinfection can take place on the steamers; but in regard to the landing of passengers, we can conceive the desirability of landing 1,000 passengers in a storm and the difficulty under which the officers of the island would labour. I, therefore, join with hon. gentlemen in urging on the Government the desirability of taking into consideration as soon as possible the expenditure of the necessary sum to build a good and substantial pier at Grosse Isle, suitable for the largest class of vessels. Canada requires at least two of the most thorough steam disinfectors. One should be placed at Grosse Isle and the other probably on the Pacific coast. Grosse Isle stands at the gateway of

Mr. FLINT.

the Dominion. If we are well equipped at Grosse Isle, then we shall secure the confidence of the sanitary authorities south of us, as well as the confidence of the people of the whole country. I desire to inquire if the threatened difficulties on the question of jurisdiction between the authorities of the province of Quebec and the Dominion authorities, has been settled and adjusted. It was unfortunate that such a difficulty should have arisen, and I trust before next season all conflict of authority between the health officers of Quebec and the health officers of the Dominion will be so thoroughly adjusted and harmonized that we shall not see collisions occur, or any of the terrible effects of threatened conflict of jurisdiction which rendered the port of New York almost a scandal during the latter months of last season. I desire to ask the Government if these difficulties have been settled and adjusted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With that object in view, a conference took place last week between representatives of the Provincial Governments and those of the Dominion Government. They have adopted certain recommendations, and they will be laid before the Government, but we have not yet heard them. We will probably hear them tomorrow.

Mr. HEARN. It must, I am sure, be very gratifying and assuring to hon. members on both sides of the House to hear what has been said by hon. members of the Government and by the leader of the Opposition and by his hon. colleague for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) on the important question which has occupied the House for the last half hour or more. On the part of the Government we have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Finance, as well as the hon. the Premier, that all that medical science could suggest for the protection of the country against the introduction of disease by the St. Lawrence, has been carefully attended to by the Government. On behalf of the Opposition, we have the leader of that body, as well as the hon. member for Quebec Centre, urging that the Government shall undertake something more, and provide, by the building of a deep-water wharf, better facilities for the landing of passengers at Grosse Isle. The Government, in reply, have declared that that intention has not been abandoned, and while, for the coming season, it is not possible to have the work commenced and completed, yet it by no means follows that the work will not be carried out. This information cannot be otherwise than gratifying and assuring to the people of the country. For my own part, as one of the representatives of Quebec, I feel it my duty to tender thanks to the Government for their assurances, and to state at the same time, that I sincerely and earnestly trust that the anxiety given expression to by the leader of the Opposition and his colleague, the hon. member for Quebec Centre and the hon. member for Yarmouth

(Mr. Flint), touching the necessity for building this wharf, will commend itself to the attention of the Government, and that the result will be the construction of the wharf, if not next season, early in the season following.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no doubt the Government are fully impressed with the extent of the responsibility which rests on them in connection with this matter. It is a question far exceeding in importance any financial question or any questions affecting the mere material interests of the country. The introduction of cholera would be a national calamity of the most terrible character, and confronted with the possibility of the danger of the introduction of the disease, it behooves the Government to use every effort that lies in their power, to exhaust every means at their command to combat that disease. I am sure they do not need to be told that no criticism as to the expenditure they may deem it necessary to make in this connection will be indulged in on this side of the House. We do criticise the expenses of the Government rather sharply sometimes, and we consider some of them to be unnecessary, but, in this connection, whatever may be necessary to spend will be cheerfully voted by the House I am sure. It strikes me, from the discussion that has taken place, that the building of the deep water pier, although the Government may not be able to finish it in time for next summer, should be entered upon without delay, and pushed to completion as soon as possible, and I do not believe the expense incurred should deter the Government from undertaking the work. It seems to me, from what I heard and know in relation to the transfer of passengers from vessels lying in the stream at anchor, perhaps tossing and pitching in a heavy sea, that it will be a very difficult task, and involve great suffering to make such transfer, especially if this dread disease exists on the vessel. I hope the Government will see that consultation is had, that their officials keep in touch with the sanitary authorities of England and of the United States in this matter; that all the appliances that can be used will be used under the most enlightened medical supervision, and that all preventive methods that can be procured will be adopted. If the expenditure in connection with the deep water pier does not exceed \$100,000 or \$150,000, and if the work is necessary, the expenditure of that amount of money ought not to be considered an obstacle by them. I would ask the Minister of Finance what length of time will be necessary for the construction of this pier, what kind of material will be used, what amount of dredging has to be done, and the estimated cost to complete it with the utmost expedition?

Mr. FREMONT. I am most happy to see the great importance which the members of this House attach to the Grosse Isle quarantine station. I have had a good deal to do

with sanitary measures during the course of last summer, and I have met quite a number of medical men and members of sanitary associations who have visited that quarantine station. In the conversations I have had with them, they have all been unanimous in stating the utmost necessity of a deep water pier at Grosse Isle. Moreover, I am under the impression, and I think I am right in saying, that Dr. Montizambert, the superintendent of the station, has recommended the building of such a pier, not only this year, but in several of his previous annual reports. The hon. Minister of Finance has stated that a number of steam-ship owners were of opinion that the construction of such a pier was not a necessity. I would be very anxious to know the names of these steam-ship owners.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to relieve my hon. friend I may say that he misunderstood me. I stated just the opposite, that the steam-ship owners were favourable to the project.

Mr. FREMONT. I am glad to see that both the steam-ship owners and the medical men are favourable to the building of the pier. It may be quite true that it would be impossible to have this pier built for the approaching season, but still I think that the Government will not be fulfilling its duty if it does not take immediate steps to have this pier constructed with the shortest delay possible. I have been at Grosse Isle station in the course of last season, and I have seen all the inconvenience that results from the present system, both in the transshipment of passengers and the handling of whatever freight has to be disembarked for fumigating purposes. It has to be transhipped by tenders, and brought to the present wharf to be fumigated. The handling of such an amount of cargo is a loss of considerable time, as well as a danger to the parties who are engaged in the work. I have been told by persons who have studied the question, that disinfecting under the present system will detain vessels for a long time, and if this was the only objection, I think it would be sufficient to warrant the Government in taking immediate action. If a deep water pier should be constructed, I am told that the fumigating of a vessel and its cargo will only detain her a few hours at the station, which would not be a very great inconvenience to the shipping interest. For all these reasons the Government ought to do their utmost possible to ensure the construction of this wharf in the shortest time possible.

Mr. JONCAS. I first understood the Minister of Finance to say that one of the objections to the building of a deep water pier at Grosse Isle, was, that the steam-ship owners, or the pilots of the large steam-ship companies, had reported that it would be dangerous for their steamers to go to the wharf. Now, however, in answer to my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Fremont), the hon.

Minister says that the companies are quite willing to go to the wharf. That being the case, I ask why is it that the Government has not already decided to build a pier? Dr. Montizambert who has charge of that quarantine station has reported time and again in favour of building a wharf there, and if I am not mistaken the sanitary convention at Chicago last year strongly recommended the same thing. I am, therefore, at a loss to know why the Government has not decided to commence the work. It may be said that this wharf will not be ready for the opening of navigation, but if tenders are invited now, the work will certainly be completed before the latter part of the season. It is of the utmost importance that this pier should be constructed in view of the reports we have had from Dr. Montizambert, and from the scientific bodies who have made inquiries into the matter. If it were shown that the disinfection of vessels could be done as well by means of tenders as if a wharf were built, I can quite understand that the Government would have some reason not to spend such a large sum of money—perhaps \$200,000 or a quarter of a million of dollars—but it is clearly proven from the information which we have that the disinfection of vessels can be made more thoroughly and more rapidly if a deep water pier is built. So I think, under all the circumstances and for all these reasons, that the Government ought to decide to build the wharf, especially if the large steamship owners report that they have no objection to go to it, and that there is no danger in the vessels going there.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just a point I would like to make clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it. In the first place, I want to make it clear that the steamship owners are favourable to and recommend the building of a wharf, that Dr. Montizambert has also recommended it, and that the Sanitary Commission has done the same. But it is not clear, and has not been made clear—and this is the point on which we are getting information at present—that if the wharf were built it could be used in rough weather, the very time when it is most essential that the greatest facilities for fumigating the vessels should be afforded. Now, this is not a commercial wharf; it will not be used for commercial purposes. It will cost \$150,000 at least. If it is absolutely necessary to protect the country from the ravages of disease it will be built, commerce or no commerce, no matter what it costs; but if the wharf is simply a convenience in fine weather when the fumigation can be done with equal security and thoroughness without a wharf, though with a little greater delay, and if it is believed that in rough weather these big steamships could not and would not go to the wharf, then the Government have good ground for delaying to make its decision until these points are cleared up, and all the more so, as no interest suffers while we are

Mr. JONCAS.

obtaining the necessary data; for it is perfectly impossible to get this wharf built this year. The Government is often called an extravagant Government. In this instance it will be just as extravagant as the case may require, and the Opposition will find no fault in the amount that will be expended for this service. Therefore, that consideration is not keeping the Government back more than is necessary. There is no use, however, in building that wharf, unless there is to be a corresponding benefit derived from it.

Mr. LAURIER. Could you not put a few post offices on that wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever is necessary to inform the germs we will put there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What the hon. gentleman has said is true enough, but I think he will be held responsible to the country, if it should appear that the construction of this wharf is necessary to ward off the ravages of cholera, for not having taken steps to obtain the necessary information before now. The hon. gentleman knows that this is the eleventh hour at which to take measures to find out whether this wharf will be suitable in stormy weather or not. I remember last summer, when the whole country was agitated about the cholera, a medical association held its meeting in one of the leading cities in Canada; I do not know but it was in Ottawa. I read a report of that meeting in one of the papers and, if my recollection serves me rightly, the Government was there represented by the late Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Carling, and the construction of this wharf was urged upon him as a necessity. The expense of construction was spoken of, and I think the very figures mentioned by the hon. Minister to the House were then and there referred to, and the answer the then Minister of Agriculture gave to the medical association was that the Government had considered the matter, that the expense would not stand in the way, and that the wharf would be constructed. Immense cheering was said by the paper to have followed this statement, and a number of newspapers in the Maritime Provinces commented very favourably upon the pluck with which the Government had grappled with this question, and upon the readiness with which their mouthpiece had met the views of that medical association and announced that the expenditure of a few dollars were not going to stand in the way when the health of the country was at stake. That was all very well, but after these doctors delivered their opinions and the Government had spoken through the mouth of the Minister of Agriculture promising to build this wharf, it is rather extraordinary that the Minister of Finance should inform us that the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. JONCAS. If I am not misinformed, the Government are in receipt of contradic-

tory reports as to the feasibility of steamers landing at this wharf. I understand that the Government would be ready to build the wharf at Grosse Isle, if it were well understood that the large steamers would call and be fumigated there.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is advised that the pilots do not agree as to the feasibility of touching at the wharf and of its being used by the steam-ship companies. As regards the cholera germs, they can be destroyed just as thoroughly without a wharf as with one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would call attention to the fact that a couple of months ago the Government made the announcement that they were prepared to construct a wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was made by Mr. Carling. He said that the Government had ascertained not only the feasibility but the necessity. The hon. gentleman says that this Government is being continually charged with extravagance. When there is any political advantage to be gained they stick at no expense whatever, but when there is none they are economical to parsimony in the matter of public works. No one would accuse them of extravagance in this connection in the Maritime provinces. The only charge I make is that at the eleventh hour, the hon. gentleman is seeking for information which he should have acquired last year, and if the cholera strikes the country next spring, he will be called on to recklessly expend money which the exercise of prudence and diligence and the obtaining of information at the proper time would have saved.

Mr. BERGIN. I think the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is a little mistaken as to what took place at the meeting of the Medical Association.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not mistaken as to what was reported.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not think the association was at all unanimous in the idea that there should be a deep water wharf built at Grosse Isle. From the information I had, I opposed the building of that wharf, for this among other reasons, that it could only be used in fine weather. Since then, I have made further inquiry, and I have reason to believe that a wharf cannot be built there for the amount of money the Minister thought it could be built for, nor can it be built in the time he expected. As it is evident, from what we see in the papers, that the intense cold has not by any means killed out cholera in Europe, I would suggest that the Government should make inquiries as to whether there is not a more fitting place for a quarantine station than Grosse Isle. I am told that at Bic Island, near Rimouski, there is plenty of shelter and deep

water, and it is a safe port, which can be entered at all times.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much further down is it than Grosse Isle?

Mr. BERGIN. A good deal further, and therefore all the more safe.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much would be lost in the value of the buildings at Grosse Isle? What is the value of the buildings there?

Mr. FOSTER. There is not only that question, but also the expenditure for building up a new station, and while we are crossing the stream I do not think we need talk about swapping horses. We are at Grosse Isle for better or for worse during this period, but I may say to my hon. friend that the Government have made inquiries about several places, Bic and one or two others.

Mr. BERGIN. There would certainly be a large expenditure, but I do believe that unless the dead are cremated more mischief will be done than any saving in the cost of buildings would cover. The opinion of the Medical Association was that there should be another island purchased at Grosse Isle to which convalescents could be removed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have asked twice what is the estimated cost of that wharf, what is the character of the work, and what amount of dredging has to be done? How soon, by the use of all possible diligence, could that work be probably made ready for the landing of passengers from ocean steamers?

Mr. OUIMET. The estimated cost of the wharf, built in crib-work and filled with stone, amounts to about \$185,000. It could be built and completed, probably, by the end of August or the beginning of September.

Mr. CHARLTON. We might hope, perhaps, that if it could be done by the middle of August, it would be ready before we would likely have a visitation of cholera. Cases of cholera were not imported into New York harbour last year until the month of October. If the wharf is at all necessary, and it can be built by the end of summer, I think the Government ought to undertake the work without delay and prosecute it with all possible vigour—presuming, of course, that it is necessary.

To meet possible expenses in connection with public health, and with cholera, and other infectious diseases \$31,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What expenses are contemplated?

Mr. FOSTER. For the very purposes that my hon. friend and his colleagues have been urging us to undertake with a free hand—to prepare for any possible emergencies in the unorganized districts.

Mr. FLINT. Is part of this money to be used to improve the hospital for convalescents?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is possible that this sum may prove to be quite inadequate.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will open both his eyes when he sees the Supplementary Estimates.

Tracadie Lazaretto. \$4,600

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Minister any information to give with regard to that lazaretto?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing more than is usually given. The number of patients keeps about the same—about twenty-six.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is there an annual report made by those who are in charge of the institution, and if so, where does it appear?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and you will find it on page 21 of last year's Report of the Department of Agriculture.

For Winnipeg and St. Boniface
Hospitals. \$4,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How is this decrease secured?

Mr. FOSTER. That has been given for a number of years, and began, first, with the idea that immigrants passing through would become a burden on the city of Winnipeg for their care. A vote of \$10,000 was given, and certain restrictions and rules were adopted to prevent imposition as far as possible. The cause for that now has largely passed away, but it was considered inadvisable to drop the vote all at once. We think that the vote will disappear gradually in three years' time.

Cattle Quarantine. \$20,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How many cattle quarantine stations are maintained now on the frontier?

Mr. FOSTER. There is one at Metis, and one in the west at Point Edward, or Sarnia.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there one on the frontier of Manitoba, or one in British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a quarantine belt, I think, on the border between Canada and the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. How long has this quarantine regulation been in force on the frontier against cattle of the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it has been in force for a number of years.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the existence of this regulation probably anything to do with the order recently passed at Washington?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Mr. FLINT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. COSTIGAN presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, further papers respecting the enforcement by the Newfoundland authorities against Canadian vessels of the Newfoundland Act respecting the sale of bait to foreign fishing vessels.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, June, 1892.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the foregoing Message and accompanying papers be printed forthwith, and that Rule 19 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) further to amend chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. He said: The object of this Bill is to amend section 29 of the said Act, in order to extend the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and make it as nearly as possible similar to the jurisdiction of Her Majesty's Privy Council in cases of the province of Quebec. Strangely enough, there is a difference between these two jurisdictions. Cases which are deemed sufficiently important to be appealed to Her Majesty's Privy Council are not appealed to the Supreme Court, for instance, cases of servitude. The Bill is a very simple one. The change of a few words will make the clause in question nearly similar to the article of the Code of Civil Procedure which governs the appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DIGBY PIER CONTRACT.

Mr. BOWERS asked, In the case of the Digby pier to be finished, as per contract, in June, 1892, was there an amount deposited with the Government as surety for the due performance of the same? What was the amount? Was that amount forfeited by the estate of the late John Nicholson, for non-fulfilment of contract, and does the Government still retain possession of said

money? If not, why not? Does the Government intend to repair the old pier; and if so, will solid abutments be built on the north side of the present one and adjoining sufficiently strong for the Western Counties Railroad Company to place tracks or rails upon? Is the Government aware that the timber for the erection of a pier at Digby has been on hand for a long time and is of a perishable nature? As the worms destroy soft wood under water very rapidly at Digby, why have the Connollys been permitted to carry the hard wood timber away to St. John where the worms are not so destructive? Has the Government engineer made any report on the subject and what was the purport of the same? While the work has been in abeyance for 1892 have any persons been receiving money from the Government for supposed services rendered? If so, what amounts, and what have been the duties performed? Will the Government call for tenders for erecting the new pier, for which money is asked for by the Public Works Department, and for repairing the old part as soon as spring opens?

Mr. OUMET. An amount was deposited with the Government as surety for the due performance of the contract, which amount was \$2,378.90. The department is still in possession of the deposited security. The department intends repairing the old pier and making it sufficiently strong to permit of the railway placing tracks upon it. The greater part of the timber has been delivered by the contractor for about eighteen months. This timber is, with the exception of a small portion, the property of the contractors. None of the timber which was the property of the department has been taken by the Connollys or any one else. No report has been made. In January, 1892, John Welsh received, for measuring timber, \$25. It is expected that tenders will be called for the reconstruction of the old pier in a few weeks, in order that work may begin early in the spring. It is not the intention of the department to erect a new pier.

LURCHER SHOAL, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Has the Government taken into consideration the very dangerous character of the Lurcher Shoal lying within the Bay of Fundy, and the great amount of shipping and life annually endangered by it? Has the Government ever estimated the cost of placing and keeping a light-ship in position near said ledge, and will it take measures in the near future to find out the same?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The dangerous character of this shoal has been recognized by the department, and since 1882 an automatic whistling buoy has been moored there. The question of marking the shoal by a light-ship has been under consideration for some time,

but as no decision has been arrived at, no estimate of the cost has been made.

ST. MARY'S BAY BELL-BUOY, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Is the Government aware that the bell-buoy at present on the Trinity Rocks at the entrance of St. Mary's Bay, N.S., is entirely too small and does not answer the purpose designed, of warning mariners of their proximity to these dangerous breakers? Will the department take immediate steps to remedy the same?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No complaints have been made as to the size of the bell-buoy at this point, nor of its answering the purpose for which it is placed. It has on different occasions been carried away, or moved from its present position, by the violence of the sea, but otherwise no complaints have been received by the department.

VOTERS' LISTS—REVISION.

Mr. GRIEVE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the voters' lists revised during present year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

MARINE FOOD FISHERIES—PROPAGATION.

Mr. BOWERS asked, In view of the distribution of the treatise read before the Royal Society of Canada by Rev. Moses Harvey, on the artificial propagation of marine food fishes and the methods adopted by the Governments of the United States, Norway, Newfoundland and other European countries towards building nurseries and hatcheries for systematically increasing the propagation and distribution of codfish to the bays and waters of their respective countries; is it the intention of the Government of Canada to take immediate steps, by building hatcheries, to restock our bays and shores which, in late years, have been so rapidly depleted?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That matter is under the serious consideration of the Government.

PICKLED GOODS—DUTY.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware that the duty now levied on pickled goods is about equal to the price of the said goods? 2. Whether there are any manufactories of pickled goods in the country? 3. Whether it is the intention of the Government to move in this House for the abolition or reduction of the aforesaid duty?

Mr. WALLACE. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the Government is not aware that the duty now levied on pickled goods is about equal to the price of said goods, the fact being that the value of pickled

goods imported last year was \$67,436, and the duty levied on them, \$24,830. There are many manufactories of pickled goods in the country. As to the intention of the Government with reference to the aforesaid duty, the hon. gentleman will get his information when the Finance Minister declares the policy of the Government.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS—EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. FRECHETTE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause fresh geological surveys to be made in the counties of Megantic and Wolfe, in order to stimulate the development of the mining industries of every kind in that section of the country, such as the mining of asbestos, copper, slate and lime? Is it also the intention of the Government to grant a bonus for each ton of ore extracted from the said mines, during the first twelve months of working, with a view to induce capitalists to invest their money in the said counties?

Mr. DALY. The whole area referred to in the above notice of motion has been most carefully and repeatedly examined and reported on at intervals extending over fifty years. Every mine and mineral-bearing locality has been examined. The distribution of the formations has been described and carefully mapped on a scale of four miles to one inch, and further examination could not, I believe, result in finding additional facts having any bearing whatever on profitable mineral development. Therefore, and in view of the large and promising area, both in Quebec and Ontario, in which no such accurate examinations have yet been made, it would, I think, be unwise to devote more time to a re-examination in these counties—the last report and examination having been made as late as the Annual Reports, Volumes II., III. and IV., 1887-1889, in which latter is an exhaustive report "On the mineral resources of the province of Quebec," of course within the area already examined, embracing the whole of the Eastern Townships.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND—NEGOTIATIONS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I ask the indulgence of the House to make an observation on the subject of the Newfoundland papers, which were brought down with a Message from His Excellency, yesterday. I do so in deference to the wishes and views of our colleagues from St. John's, Nfld., who met with us at Halifax. Hon. members will see, I think, when the record is printed, that it is convenient that I should make a statement now in order that my explanation may be on record when the papers come into the hands of hon. members. They will see that in the proceedings of 14th November, 1892, I

Mr. WALLACE.

am reported as having made two sets of observations on the subject of proposals for the union of Newfoundland. The first of these sets of observations reads thus:

Sir John Thompson, reverting to the former discussion upon this subject, was still strongly of opinion that, although the question of union might not be finally disposed of at this conference, what had taken place should be made a part of the record. Though the subject of union was not specially mentioned in the Order of Council of Canada, it was understood that all matters affecting trade relations with Newfoundland might be discussed, and any proposition tending to a solution of the existing difficulties, not only might, but should, be considered. He must, therefore, insist that what had been said should be recorded in the proceedings of the conference; otherwise they would not be a correct record of what had taken place.

In the second set of observations, I am reported as saying:

Sir John Thompson, in reply to Mr. Harvey, said that the Canadian delegates could, of course, only discuss the questions which the Newfoundland delegates were willing to discuss, and must discuss them in the order desired by the Newfoundland delegates. He considered, however, that the question of union was one of the greatest pending between Canada and Newfoundland, and therefore within the authority of the delegates to discuss. In any case, he pressed that what had been said on this subject on Saturday and to-day should appear on the record, if any record of the discussion was intended to be preserved and made public. The expectation of the public in Canada was that the question of union would be brought forward, and if the delegates, on their return, should be asked whether that question was taken up, they could not be expected to deny the fact. If the record was silent on that subject, they would be obliged to contradict the record.

These minutes are signed by all the delegates. But two or three weeks ago I received from Sir William Whiteway, Premier of Newfoundland, and the gentleman who presided at the conference, a letter stating that at the last meeting of the conference it was agreed that the first set of those observations should be eliminated and the second should stand; and, in point of fact, the second does express about the same views as are expressed in the first. I could only reply at that time, and I can only say now, that I was not present when any arrangement was arrived at to eliminate any part of the observations here recorded. At the same time I do not deny that such an agreement may have been come to; I was absent for a short time from the last meeting. Mr. Bowell, who is the only other colleague with whom I could converse on the subject, was unable to recall any such arrangement, and therefore I communicated with Sir William Whiteway, stating that my recollection did not agree with his, and that therefore I could hardly alter the record then, more especially as copies of it had been transmitted to Her Majesty's Government, and perhaps to other quarters, and it was not in my power to recall them, and asking him if he attached much importance to the fact that the first set of observations, as well as the second, appeared on the

record, as I thought they were delivered. I have received a telegram from Sir William to-day, reiterating the request that the first set of observations should be eliminated, and from the tenor of his message I gather that the objection which he entertains to the first set of observations is, that they appear to imply that the Newfoundland delegates were resisting the appearance in the record of the conversation which had taken place on the previous day on the subject of union. I beg to say, while my recollection is still that the record is correct as to the two sets of observations, I hope it will not be inferred by the House that they were made with any view to resistance by our Newfoundland friends and colleagues to the record containing a narrative of what had taken place on the subject of union. Sir William calls my attention especially to the word "insist" in the first set of observations as seeming to imply that some insistence on that point is necessary. When I did prefer a request that the record should contain a statement of the conversation on the subject of union, I can only say it was cheerfully acquiesced in by our colleagues from Newfoundland, and I hope the House will not gather from the appearance of the first set of observations that there was any resistance on their part to the record containing a true and full narrative of what had taken place on the subject of union. The papers having been brought down, this is the only way in which I can meet the views of Sir William Whiteway and his colleagues, and I am sure the House will accept this statement as qualifying any implication which might arise, such as Sir William suggests, from the appearance of the first set of observations.

Mr. LAURIER. I accept the explanation offered by the hon. Premier as to the difference of opinion between the Canadian delegates and those from Newfoundland as to what actually took place at the conference. It is to be regretted, however, that more strict attention was not paid at the time to the manner in which the negotiations were set down in writing. I must take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Premier and his colleagues upon the improvement of their methods with respect to conducting negotiations, and I offer my sincere congratulations at this time. At Halifax they adopted very different methods from those they pursued at Washington, for in the former case they had the negotiations taken down in writing and have submitted them to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In this case I do not want it to be supposed by the hon. gentleman that there was any want of diligence or accuracy. The record of each day is signed, as it appears here; but on reconsideration, however, my colleagues from Newfoundland thought some wrong implication might be drawn from these words, and we could correct such impression in this way. The difference

to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is explained by the difference between the two conferences, one being official and formal and the other confidential and private.

TREATY BETWEEN FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to inquire from the First Minister if he is in a position to impart to the House any information with respect to the welcome news cabled to the press that a treaty of commerce has been signed between Great Britain, France and Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may be able to do so to-morrow; but the letters from the High Commissioner have only just arrived, and have not been laid before Council.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

Mr. WELDON moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise electors taking bribes. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, which was introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) in my absence, I have not very many observations to offer. The very title of the Bill, "An Act to disfranchise electors who have taken bribes," distinctly indicates its cardinal principle. Hon. members who have read the Bill will observe that a very familiar piece of machinery has been called into play to accomplish a substantially new purpose in this matter of dealing with electors who have taken bribes. This has been held to be a great evil in this and, I think, in all British countries and colonies where institutions like our own are found to exist. It is instructive to study the statutes of different British possessions with a view to ascertain how the legislatures of the mother country, of this country and of the colonies and other parts of the Empire have dealt with this evil to which I am calling the attention of Parliament in this Bill, and at which I am aiming to strike a blow. The machinery of the Bill, let me say, is taken with very few changes, and those altogether in the way of simplification and quickness of working, from an Act now on the Canadian Statute-book, which is itself largely a transcript of an old English statute. A Bill introduced by Mr. Blake in 1876 and carried through Parliament in that year, contemplated an inquiry made very much in the way of the inquiry provided for in this Bill, but which came to an entirely different end and conclusion. In the Bill introduced by Mr. Blake, which appears in our Revised Statutes, and which Parliament has therefore twice pronounced upon and accepted, it is provided that a commission may be appointed, where corrupt practices are alleged to have extensively prevailed in any county, to root out the whole matter, to get the names of all persons who are found guilty of corrupt practices,

and to report those to the Attorneys-General of the provinces with the idea that they would be dealt with under the ordinary criminal laws of Canada. The purpose of this Bill is entirely different. It does not purport to be a Bill for punishment. It is not in any sense of the word a penal measure; it is not in any sense of the word a punitive measure, and that is the special point I wish to emphasize in the few remarks I will make this afternoon. The aim of the Bill is very different from that. It proceeds from the principle, which I think is a good British principle, which is, I think, a good Canadian principle; namely, that the right of voting, the right of putting a ballot in the box, is a great power under our constitution, and one that cannot safely be left in the hands of a person who uses that right unworthily. The Bill proposes to deal with that unworthy class of persons, as we deal with our children in whose hands we find valuable things, and whom we know to be too young to take care of them. We take these valuable things away until they grow older and are able to take proper care of the precious things they handle. So, we say to the corrupt electors, if we find that they have sold their votes, that they have improvidently and improperly put into the control of another the power which the state placed in their own hands of expressing their own opinion, or if by accepting money they allow another to express his own opinions under the disguise of their ballot, we say, that the power of the franchise must be taken from them. That, Mr. Speaker, is the sum and substance of this Bill. The plan suggested in the Bill is that they should be disfranchised for a term of years which will cover two elections. The idea in that is, first of all, to give those people time to repent, to have their attention sharply called to the fact that they have behaved unworthily, and when they have grown wiser and better, that they can again recover their franchise. A larger and more important purpose of the Bill is, to protect the commonwealth, by disfranchising the briber, to protect ourselves. It is a common subject of complaint, and I think a fair subject of complaint, which we have all heard made in counties where notoriously large sums of money have been spent at an election; that honest men, who do not sell their votes and who vote as they feel, have their ballots swamped by the votes of men who have no opinion of their own, or who for money will express a different opinion from what they feel. The hope of this Bill is to say to the honest voters: If you feel strongly in the matter, if twenty-five of you in an electoral district take enough trouble to send a petition to the Governor-General, if you procure enough money to pay the travelling expenses, you will have it in your power to bring to the district an officer whose bounden duty it is to promote further inquiry in every way. The Bill says to those people: If there is enough feeling

Mr. WELDON.

against this bribery to induce you to get evidence to place before the officer, you can then, after a trial, get a list of persons who have taken bribes, and that black-letter list shall be handed to the proper officers, and these names shall be struck off the list of the revising barrister, with the result that in the next election and the election following these men shall not vote. The practical politicians in both parties have for many years told us, that there are in some counties a number of persons who simply will not exercise their franchise in elections, unless they be bought. This class is a standing temptation to the party managers on both sides, who sometimes feel obliged to avail themselves of the votes of these persons, in many cases not through baseness, but through fear. They fear that if the one party does not get their share of these votes, the other party will get them. I know one county in my own province—I may say it is not my own county—in which in one election some years ago the party managers dealt with these people, made a black-list of them, and agreed that the men who were understood on both sides to be spending money, would not approach the corrupt voters. The arrangement was kept in good faith, and these misguided men went off at five o'clock, at the end of the polling, not having been able to sell their votes. What this Bill aims at is, to protect party managers on both sides, party organizers and politicians, from the avarice and rapacity of these people, who have the power of the franchise, which they are not fit to have. That is an important point, but it is not one which I press very strongly in favour of the Bill. The great point which I wish to urge upon the House is, that a free state cannot have a very long life where wholesale bribery occurs at the polls. We can base our authority for that upon what has happened to other civilizations in other times. We have abundant examples that a free state, founded upon the will of the great mass of the people cannot live very long, preserving its life, if the habit of wholesale bribery at the polls becomes thoroughly established. There is in this evil a constant danger to the life of the state. I have an idea that if this Bill becomes law, and that, if in a county where the public feeling has been shocked by the outrageousness of the corruption at an election the machinery of this Bill is set in motion, it will prove a wholesome lesson. I am reasonably clear, from consultation with a number of my legal friends who have a good deal of experience in Nova Scotia in trying election petitions, that the people who are in earnest about the thing, can get all the evidence they want, if they take proper care, to purge the list from corrupt voters, so that when the next election comes, persons who are willing to run without giving bribes will have a fair chance of success. I have an idea that this Bill will not be called into play often. If it falls like a thunderbolt in a single county in a province and purges the list of 100 of these black sheep, the example will go to neigh-

bouring counties and the Bill will do its work silently like the loaded gun on the walls, of which you do not need to pull the trigger to enable it to give you protection. In the neighbouring districts the electors will learn that they will be liable to suffer if they take bribes, as the corrupt voters have suffered in another county. I believe that for the Bill to be of any use, it must be called into play in some of the first cases of corruption that happen in the next election, in order to teach a wholesome lesson to a particular county, and by the influence of that example to teach the same lesson to the constituencies generally. The first objection that will occur to any one who reads the Bill, as it occurred to me, when I first drafted it, is, that it is too limited in its scope. I may be told that the Bill is directed against people who take bribes, but that there is nothing said about those who give bribes. My answer is: that this criticism is based on an entire misunderstanding of my object. My object is a limited one. It is not to punish any one, but to take votes away from unworthy people, and the briber who is very often a much greater offender than the bribe-taker can be dealt with under the criminal law, which is now as stringent as a law can be. I believe that we need not add to the terrors of the law in that regard, for in my opinion the law is very drastic and very stringent now. If this were a Bill to punish, that criticism would be a good one, but as it is a Bill merely to take votes away from people who abuse the right of the franchise, that criticism does not seem to me to be a sound one. It is distinct from the object I had in view in submitting this measure to Parliament. A much graver objection, it seems to me, against the Bill, and one which deterred me for two or three years, I may frankly say, from introducing the principle—although I had it in my mind for two or three years to bring in such a Bill—is the objection that, in all conscience, there are now on the Statute-books sufficient and stringent laws dealing with the matter, and why come as a medicine-man with a new nostrum to try and cure that which the statutes have failed to remedy. I may be told that the most important cure for the evil is the use of moral agencies, a sounder pulpit, a sounder press, sounder universities, sounder common schools and sounder journals or magazines, to teach the people the meanness and immorality of this practice of selling votes, and that you must rely on these. To be sure you must rely largely on all these things; but if I am not wrong there is some hope of bringing this into practice, at least in the case of a county where there is a strong and earnest feeling against this whole wretched business, of giving and taking bribes. If you find that this Bill is faulty in detail, its provisions can be modified when we go into committee. But I believe that it will be found adequate, and that it will do good in a country where there is a feeling of public abhorrence at the

shameful practice against which it is directed. I need say but little more on the subject. I do not think there is a single member of this House, whether he belongs to the Liberal party or to my own party, who will not acknowledge that this is and has been for twenty years a great evil in Canada, as it is in all self-governing communities. A few days ago the Governor of New York, in his message to the Legislature, directed the most pungent paragraph of that message against this evil, and his remedy was to introduce our Canadian Bill, as he called it, providing for election petitions. Now, we have had that system in this country for almost twenty years, and I appeal to the members of this House, to the Liberals as well as to my Conservative friends, to say whether, in so far as it was meant to be a means of cleansing the constituencies and preventing bribery, it has not been a miserable and colossal failure. It has been used for other purposes altogether. In most counties it has been turned into an instrument of revenge, to harass and worry candidates. In some cases it has afforded opportunities to unscrupulous men of my own profession to drum up a bill of costs. It has been used for the purpose of forcing a new contest, and making the candidates go a second time before the electors within a few months. It seems to me that it has been used in 1892 practically to bring on a general election throughout Canada. Our friends opposite, seeing that the parties were very nearly balanced in this Chamber, were enabled by that Bill to force new contests in many places. In these ways the original purpose of the measure has often been lost sight of, and it has been made to serve purposes entirely foreign to that for which it was introduced, while it has not served the purpose of cleansing the counties of bribery and corruption. We have another Act, that of Mr. Blake, which was prepared with great skill. I have copied closely as much as I could of the machinery of that Act, which was well drafted; but the purport of that Act seems to betray that gentleman's incapacity to understand average human nature. You can see in every clause of it that the man who drafted it did not know what the common, every-day ment upon persons quite beyond our control. One could easily see that such a Bill would not be of much value to the country. It is too complicated, and depends for enforcement upon persons quite beyond our control. This Bill proposes to disentangle the subject from political party interests, and to place the punishment of bribery in the hands of men who, without reference to either one party or the other, will try to cleanse the counties of the whole miserable business, and will be ready to smite down any and all men found guilty of it. Now, before I sit down, let me say that, in my judgment, the gravest present evil in Canadian and American politics, and in the colonies of England in other parts of the world, is this evil of bribery.

Some hon. members may have read a carefully prepared address which was delivered a little over a year ago by Mr. Balfour—and I need not remind this House that there is not in the House of Commons of England a more clear-headed, cool-headed, thoughtful and profound man than Mr. Balfour—a careful and profound student, and one who knows a good deal of men. In that address, which attained a great deal of celebrity, Mr. Balfour pointed out in gloomy language why he thought some of the political institutions of his own country were going to smash before a very long time. He drew a parallel between the history of England for the last fifty or sixty years and the history of Athens before she fell; and in what he said, though his ideas were very gloomy indeed, he appeared to me to describe the condition of affairs existing, not only in his own country, but in our country as well. He pointed out how, in Athens, where the affairs of the state were in the control of the free citizens of that beautiful city, the demagogues came, with lies in their mouths and masks on their faces, telling the people that they were wiser than their rulers, just as many of us are too fond of flattering the people and the press of this country, and too slow to tell the people that we know better than they do how to deal with many technical questions, too slow to tell the press also that we, who have acquired special knowledge on certain subjects, know more of these subjects than they do. We know that for many years the public men of this country have been too much coerced by the press. Members of Parliament have been hounded for giving a clear expression of their feeling and their thinking in matters on which they have laboured long into the night, toiling and racking their brains to study and master them; and yet for twenty years they have been lectured by the press as being timid, servile time-servers. This is one of the evils which Mr. Balfour has pointed out as existing in England. Is the same thing true of Canada? I leave you to answer. I make no allusion to the press of one side or the other. Mr. Balfour further pointed out that in Athens, after the demagogues, came the bribers with means in their hands of corrupting the electors, sometimes singly and sometimes in masses, sometimes with free land and sometimes with free corn, one party outbidding the other in the magnitude of their bribes. And after the Athenian people had been corrupted for fifty or sixty years in this way, we know what happened. The most beautiful and perfect civilization which the world had ever seen, which had budded just before the days of Pericles, was gradually destroyed; its wilted petals were struck from the stem by Philip of Macedon. It was then that the boodlers came and corrupted the wind-bag orators of Athens, and smote down in her strength that city, which was the pride of her time, because her people had been enfeebled by political corruption—Athens, with her art, her beautiful temples

Mr. WELDON.

and statues, her great books, her beautiful women, her intellectual men, was cut off and destroyed. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has often reminded this House, in those eloquent and apposite allusions which enrich our debates so much, of how much Athens has done for us, of how often she has healed the wounded spirit of men and brought solace and succour to men who are maligned and misunderstood. In pointing to Athens, I simply follow the example suggested by Mr. Balfour's speech, and by reading an old edition of Aristotle on the constitution of Athens, and I do so to show how the wholesale bribery of people at the polls during two generations destroyed its civilization. We belong to a country whose laws go back for a thousand years. There is no parallel to it in modern or ancient history. We boast that we have free institutions; we boast that those institutions are the peculiar creation of the English race. But they cost something. The people who worked them out and struggled for them from generation to generation had to pay for the boon. I need not mention the price they paid; I need not quote names of men, the mention of which stirs the people two hundred years after these men are dead. We have paid for our liberties, and we would be a poor recreant crew if we should lose them through lack of courage in dealing with this colossal evil. I ask hon. members to forget that they are party men; and if they think that this Bill is capable of doing some good in some counties, if they think it will give honest men a chance to protect themselves against the boodlers, let them help this measure all they can now by allowing it to pass the second reading, and when it reaches the committee let them give it their helpful consideration in order to make it a useful law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

On order for second reading of Bill (No. 5) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday,

Mr. CHARLTON said: My purpose is to proceed with this Bill on Wednesday of next week, if nothing unforeseen takes place. My reason is that the superintendent of one of the railways wishes to read the provisions of the Bill before it is proceeded with. It has only been printed and distributed within a day or two, and I will allow it to stand over, in any event, in order that the House may become acquainted with it. The same remarks apply to the succeeding order.

Mr. LAURIER. Next Wednesday is Ash Wednesday, and I do not know whether the House is going to sit on that day or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am under the impression Ash Wednesday is not one of the holidays, but in any case we will take up the Bill on Thursday.

COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. AMYOT moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to make voting compulsory. He said: This Bill is the same as that which was reported by the sub-committee last year. It is in the same sense as the Bill presented a moment ago, to disfranchise electors who have taken a bribe. One of the great troubles we have to contend with during elections is to get the electors to the polls. A great many say: This year I am going if my day's work is paid, or I will go if they send for me. This is a mere pretext to be bribed. They know that if any one goes for them, that person will be provided with some money or something else to pay for their vote. I am of opinion that we should try every means possible to put down corruption. One of the great sources of expense and trouble to candidates is the refusal of the electors to come alone to the poll, and if, as has been done in some other countries, we make it obligatory on them to come without being sent for we will be taking a very good step in the right direction. I introduced my Bill two years ago. It has since been discussed by the press. It was discussed last year by the sub-committee and had the unanimous support of that committee. I will not trouble the House with the opinions of the press, as every hon. member has been in a position to read those comments. But I may mention that last year, a very important paper called "The Week" was distributed to every member containing some very good articles, amongst others an article written by one of our best officers, Mr. Wicksted, in support of this measure. I may also tell the House that many institutions, comprising a great many important citizens, after mature deliberation have adopted the principle of the Bill. I will quote amongst others the deliberations of the "Artisan and Workingman" of the 4th September, 1891. It was proposed by Mr. McDonald and seconded by Mr. O'Donoghue, that voting be made obligatory. The same decision was come to by the Knights of Labour on the 1st of July, 1891. I have here a copy of the resolution then passed:

Col. AMYOT, M.P.,

SIR,—At the last regular meeting of the above assembly—

That is, the noble order of the Knights of Labour—

—it was resolved that we endorse and approve of the Bill in favour of compulsory voting, introduced in the House of Commons by Col. Amyot, M.P., and that we ask the members of this city in Parliament to use their vote and influence in favour of its becoming the law.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours very truly,

G. WILKINS,

Sec.-Treas.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the French press. I hold in my hand an article from "Le Courrier du Canada" and "L'Evenement," of Que-

bec, approving generally the principle of the Bill. I shall speak presently of a paper that has not approved it. I have been asked: Is there any country where voting is compulsory? Well, Sir, we find that in Denmark the voting is compulsory and that everybody is bound to assist by appearing at the polls and recording his vote. I may quote from the constitution of the Kingdom of Denmark of 1849, revised and promulgated on the 28th January, 1866, the following sections:—

Sec. 64—The electors are bound under penalty to present themselves.

Sec. 74—Every person appointed an elector of the second degree is bound to accept the trust unless he can give legal excuse.

Sec. 75—Every elector of the second degree who makes default and abstains from voting is subject to a penalty of 20 rix-dollars.

That is about \$12 of our money.

Sec. 80—The electors of the second degree and prime electors must be present at the place and hour of election.

Sec. 92—Any person neglecting the duties imposed by the present Act is subject to a fine of 10 to 200 rix-dollars, unless a severer penalty has been imposed.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am informed, and in fact our reading shows, that the law is operated and is working very well in Denmark. We know also that, in the United States, many states of the Union are trying to introduce this system, as one of the best means of preventing corruption. Let me, now, Mr. Speaker, give a synopsis of the Bill, after which I shall deal with the objections made to it. The first clause says:

Every elector whose name is registered on the list of voters unless he has a reasonable excuse, shall appear.

"Unless he has a reasonable excuse." We will be asked: "What is a reasonable excuse?" Let me quote a number of examples: illness and infirmity, old age, accident, fire, absence, violent and sudden storm, necessary attendance at court. All these will be reasonable excuses. But who shall determine whether the excuse given comes within the category of "reasonable" excuses? This matter is left to the decision of the judge. In every case before a court the judge is bound to judge the facts. Suppose we have a case of misdemeanour; you must have proof of the intention. Who gives the law on the point to the jury? It is the judge, and then the jury who say whether the facts of the case show the intention. Suppose I sue a man for damages; who says if there is a damage, an infringement upon the law? The judge does that. It is the same under the Bill which I propose. In a case of force majeure—superior force—if, in answer to the action taken against me, I plead that I had been acting under a superior force which I could not master, which no human force could master, who decides whether it is a superior force or not? The judge. In every case where there is a contract to be inter-

preted, the court, the judge has to give his interpretation. It would be exactly the same under this Act. The elector is told: On the day of polling you are bound to register your vote; you have not done so; had you a reasonable excuse? But, Mr. Speaker, you may be sure, when this Bill becomes law, there will not be many electors who will expose themselves, no matter who they are, not only to the cost, but also to the shame, of being sued for not having exercised their right of voting. In any case before the courts, where you have to prove the intention, to weigh questions of fact, in every case, in fact, the judge must interpret the law. This Bill should not be opposed merely because it is new. I do not see why Canada should have to wait for other countries to take a step in the right direction. Under the second clause the penalty has been fixed at \$10—not exceeding \$10. I may say that it is provided that religious scruples shall be deemed a reasonable excuse. This feature is incorporated in the Bill, because I had received letters from certain sects—and I happened to know that such existed—telling me that they had religious scruples to taking part in an election. Of course, if a Catholic should come before the court and say: I did not vote, because I have religious scruples, he would be laughed at, because there is no such thing in the Catholic religion. On the contrary, it is considered a sacred duty to take part in and do our share in the administration of the affairs. But those who have religious scruples are known beforehand. We know those who do not take part in war because of religious scruples. Nobody can invent or simulate these scruples. We say furthermore:

Any other reasonable excuse under this action shall be a matter of pleading and the burden of proof shall be on the defendant.

This is because the one who has not gone to vote knows why he has refrained. He has taken his precautions and is ready to state and prove why he has not voted. It would be neither fair nor practical to leave to the opposite party the burden of alleging and proving why the defendant had not gone to the polls. In other words, it would not be right to call upon the prosecutor to prove a negative. The third clause says:

Every voter who shall not wish to exercise his right of voting shall notify the revising officer.

This has been done to answer the objections about the liberty of the subject. Anybody who does not want to vote needs only write to the revising officer, asking that his name be struck off the list. Then, Mr. Speaker, he will not be a burden to the canvassers and to the candidates. His name will not be read every night in the committee. There will remain on the list only those electors who want to exercise their franchise. The fourth clause is to establish the limitation of actions and to put it at three months. These are the general features of the Bill. Mr. Speaker,

Mr. AMYOT.

there is a French paper in Quebec. I will not name it, it is not represented in this House, a kind of religious paper, edited by a man much above the ordinary in sanctity, the only man who is right in this world, who is more intelligent, more learned, than anybody in this world. He says that I deserve to be chased from the country, because I wanted to deprive the citizens of their liberty.

Mr. GUAY. Give his name.

Mr. AMYOT. I will name him, if the hon. gentleman will defend him.

Mr. GUAY. No.

Mr. AMYOT. Then I will not name him, but the hon. gentleman knows who he is. Well, Mr. Speaker, my answer to that accusation is this: I do not think there is one law on our Statute-book, nor has there ever been, either religious, civil or criminal, which is not an infringement upon personal liberty. Take municipal law. You appoint a mayor and he is bound to act. You force citizens to keep their roads, you force them to pay taxes—this is an infringement upon liberty. Take the civil law. You force a man to act on a jury, to leave his occupation, his farm or his shop for that purpose—this is an infringement upon liberty. You force a man to come to court as a witness—this is an infringement upon liberty. In the religious order, also, what are its injunctions and prohibitions but infringements upon liberty? We are bound to worship God; we are bound to have respect for our father and mother; we are not allowed to kill, nor to rob, nor to perjure ourselves—all this is against liberty. The prohibition of selling liquor without a license is against liberty. Expropriations for the general good are against personal liberty. The necessity of registering titles of sales, etc., is an infringement upon personal liberty. In fact, what is human society itself, if not an abandonment of private rights for the general welfare of the partnership? I will translate a few words from a celebrated work entitled "Principles and Right of Nature":

Every citizen is bound to contribute, within the limit of his strength, to the general welfare of society, and to take its interests at heart.

Section 13. The public good is the principal object of each good citizen, and he must submit his own interest to the good of society.

Section 24. The liberty of each individual in the state is limited by the common interest of the state.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that the obligation of going to the polls is a restriction of liberty, but if it is for the benefit of society, everybody should be willing to subject himself to that restriction. It is for the general interest of society that every elector should be forced to go to the polls, so as to avoid the temptation of corruption, so that we may have pure elections; so that we may have representatives not elected by money, but elected by the convictions of the electors; so that we may have representatives who will

feel themselves independent of parties, because they will know that the same political convictions by which they were elected, will support them in their course in Parliament. The word "compulsory" means necessary attendance at the polls; but it does not mean, necessarily, voting for one or other of the candidates, because when the elector enters the polling booth, although he will be bound to take his ballot, he may either vote or not, he may either spoil his ballot or not, he may either write his name or not—he will do what he pleases. If both candidates are opposed to his convictions he will vote for neither of them; but he will have fulfilled the obligation of taking his ballot and doing as if he were voting. The consequence will be that the candidates and their friends, knowing that that man's name is on the list and that he is bound to go to the polls, will not hire teams to take him there, and will not expend much time and money in sending canvassers to him. No one will know what kind of a vote he will give, and consequently the candidates and their friends will endeavour to persuade him by arguments to vote as they wish, and will have no temptation to exert undue pressure upon him by unlawful means. With these few explanations, I leave the Bill in the hands of this honourable House. I wish I had the eloquence of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who preceded me; but I hope I shall have his support, because the principles he advocates are precisely those which guide me in this instance. I am in favour of every measure that will tend to diminish corruption. I want the electorate to act freely through conviction. I do not want elections to be carried by money or by corruption of any kind. I want the candidates to expose their case as a lawyer exposes his case before a court; and I want to make the electorate the tribunal, an honest, independent and fair tribunal, who, after having heard the pleadings on both sides, will give a verdict in the sense that they think will be best in their interest. Under those circumstances I think we will have a collective vote of all the intelligence and real intention of the country, and we will be sure always to have a Parliament representing the real sentiments of the people, on whichever side the majority may be for the time being.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the fullest liberty that citizens may enjoy, which is tantamount to saying that I am unable to approve of the Bill brought up before this House. I do not intend making a long speech, I simply intend to offer a few remarks. The first section of this Bill reads as follows:

46a. Every elector whose name is registered on the list of voters, unless he has a reasonable excuse, shall appear at the polling station of the electoral district where he is entitled to vote, within the hours fixed by law for taking the poll, and shall exercise his franchise according to law; otherwise he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten dollars, with costs.

Now, I am a voter, but I have the right to have a reasonable excuse. I fail to appear at the polling station to vote. A penal suit for \$10 is taken against me. I have not been able to offer any excuses and to whom should I have offered them? Is it to the returning officer? It is not stated in the law. I am dragged before a court; I offer my excuses to the court, and supposing they are deemed reasonable, who will pay the costs of these proceedings? Will it be me, who have a good excuse, or will it be the party who made the complaint? The latter can always say: You are bound to pay the costs, because you ought to have offered your excuses; had I known them I would not have made the complaint. And he would be justified in so saying, for he would have taken these proceedings under the law and he was not aware of the reasons or excuses I had to offer. Although not fined, I would be compelled to pay costs to the amount of \$20 or \$30. The second section states that religious scruples shall be deemed a reasonable excuse for every elector who did not vote. It reads as follows:

Religious scruples shall be deemed a reasonable excuse, and any other reasonable excuse under this section shall be a matter of pleading, and the burden of proof shall be upon the defendant.

The hon. member stated this section would only apply to a certain class of electors in the Dominion, because these electors belonged to a particular religious body. I say the hon. member is mistaken. A Roman Catholic and a Protestant may well have religious scruples that prevent them from voting. Will the Catholics and Protestants who, by reason of religious scruples fail to vote, be allowed to offer that as an excuse? I say there is not only the sect referred to by the hon. gentleman that will avail themselves of the excuse of religious scruples. Well might a Catholic decline to vote for a Protestant candidate and likewise a Protestant elector might think he has good reasons or scruples which in his mind warrant him not to vote for a Catholic candidate. In such a case, who, I ask, will have to decide whether the excuse based upon religious scruples holds good? Who will decide whether the reasons which prevented me from voting are acceptable in the spirit of this Bill? Should I have religious scruples, I might happen not to appear at the polling station, but then I am liable to an action under this section. Should I not go to the poll to record my vote, an action will be taken against me; I will be compelled to defend myself, and should the court be satisfied that my excuses are good, I will again be bound to pay the costs. As you see, Mr. Speaker, it is always a matter of costs. The third section states:

That every voter who shall not wish to exercise his right of voting shall notify the revising officer of his unwillingness to vote, on or before the day fixed for the final revision and certification of the lists of voters.

At the time of the preparation of the lists of voters, I might have a reason for notifying the

revising officer that I do not intend availing myself of my right of voting; but how will that work practically? Will it be an easy thing to work this section into practice? The lists of voters being only revised every two, three or even four years, how will I know, such a long time beforehand, whether my reasons for not voting will still exist when an election occurs? It might happen, on the contrary; that I might have good reasons for leading me to vote, and should my name not be on the lists of voters, I would be unable to vote. These are matters that cannot be controlled, for after all a gentleman who shall have availed himself of this section at the time of revising the lists might regret it and wish to exercise his right of voting two or three years after the revision being made. For these reasons, I think the practical working of this Bill will be very difficult, if not an utter impossibility. I understand that the object the hon. gentleman had in view, as well as the hon. gentleman who, a moment ago, moved for leave to introduce a Bill of the same kind, is to prevent, as far as possible, corruption during elections. Every gentleman who had to go through electoral contests knows that it costs something, that it costs more or less, but I say that should both of the candidates be willing to come to an understanding, it would be a very easy thing not to spend a cent during elections. Should both candidates be willing not to go through a canvassing tour in the county, to simply go through a speech-making tour, things would be very different from what they are now. It is what I once proposed to my opponent. I said to him: If I am more popular than you, I shall evidently be returned; if, on the contrary, you are the more popular man, well, you shall be returned. It is the true way to prevent electoral corruption; let candidates hold as many meetings as they like, let them discuss before the electors the great and little matters which are likely to interest them, it is all very well, but at any cost prevent canvassing. It is not through public meetings that corrupt practices go on; it is through canvassing from door to door that weak voters are tempted. Should there exist a law stating that canvassing shall be deemed a corrupt practice, I think a great many things would thus be prevented which we very properly so much complain of now. So-called committees are not necessary no more than canvassing. There will always be a sufficient number of free and right-minded voters who will go to the polls without any recourse to such means. A law stating that canvassing is prohibited under penalty of having the election declared null and void, would be a good deal more productive of good results than all these Bills that are now introduced here, with good intents I confess, but which can have no practical results. It is also stated, Mr. Speaker, that electors are unwilling to record their votes, that they must be given money to be led to exercising their right. I say that things are all the

other way—the elector likes to record his vote. He will, at all events, go to the polls without being called upon by a visitor willing to solicit and canvass him. Should we prevent canvassing, there would be no necessity for the making of laws to compel the electors to vote, at all events. The few who, during a contest would not vote because there was no canvassing, would be the first, at the next election to go to the polls. Why? Because they would know they could expect no money nor carriages. I repeat that not one of those electors would fail to go and vote at the next election. What do we now see? The polling stations are opened at nine o'clock in the morning, and there are hardly three or four electors ready to record their votes. Whose fault is it? I say it is the candidates' fault. If the elector remains at home, it is because he was told by the candidate or his canvassing agent: "There will be carriages to take you to the polling station, provisions given out to you—in a word, you will be treated like a gentleman." Is it then to be surprised at that the elector stays at home, waiting some one to come and take him. Generally it costs more to prevent an elector from voting than to have his vote—that I state generally speaking. It was also stated by the hon. member for Bellechasse that there are several laws restraining personal freedom, and he quoted, amongst others, the law of registration. I differ with the hon. gentleman. I cannot see that that law restrains the personal freedom. A person making a transaction on a property through a written agreement cannot find it wrong that that transaction be registered, so that it be made known. And why? The object in view is to make outsiders know the character of the transaction, in order to protect the parties concerned. Allowing a man to interfere with others is not protecting the personal freedom. Should that be allowed, it would be authorizing a thing likely to defraud and ruin interests worthy of protection. I think it would not be a well understood freedom, but rather an excess of liberty, for there ought to be lines drawn between liberty and exorbitant freedom. The license law was also quoted. Here again I am of a wholly different opinion. That law was passed to protect the personal freedom. Should every individual be allowed to sell liquor without a license, and to any one without being liable to be fined, it would be, indeed, a nice existing state of things. You could then see the father of a family spending in taverns his goods and those of his children. Notwithstanding the protective laws we have, that occurs, unhappily, even too often. Should that trade be free, the things we are now witnessing, and which are so much to be regretted, would become a general evil, and the acts we are now disapproving would, through an unchecked excess of liberty, become of a much more objectionable character. Therefore, the license law cannot be instanced as an argument in favour of the passing of this Bill. I am stating my views immediately,

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

although I know the Bill can be amended, either in the Committee or by this House. I know that the general purpose looks to an end which we are endeavouring to reach—that is, the electoral purity; but I do not think that the promoters of these bills will realize their expectations. As concerns this particular Bill, I believe it to be unpracticable, notwithstanding all the amendments that might be brought to it. I am satisfied the object for which it was brought up in this House cannot be reached.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to draw the attention of the House to the provisions of this Bill, in order that it may receive due consideration from hon. members. The principle embodied in the Bill, by which the hon. gentleman seeks to deprive the corrupt elector of the means he now possesses of forcing candidates into a species of corruption by insisting on being carried to the polls, is a sound one. So far, the hon. gentleman's object is a very worthy one, and in part, though probably not altogether, that object would be served by the Bill. I think the object would not be entirely served, for the reason that it is still in the power of the corrupt voter to stipulate that, unless he be carried to the poll, he will not vote for the candidate who has solicited his vote and with whom he pretends to concur, but will spoil his ballot when he gets there. It is absolutely impossible to frustrate the ingenuity of persons who are bent upon receiving money or aid corruptly at election times, except by punishing them and those who are willing to comply with their wishes, by penalties. I think as regards the measures we may adopt as to the right of voting and so forth, it is difficult indeed to strike at that abuse. But I think the Bill runs counter to some principles which are equally valuable with that which I have just mentioned. The Bill is based on the principle, for example, that there is a moral or political duty devolving on the electors to make a choice between two or three different candidates, or sets of candidates, who are running at the elections. I submit that that is not a sound principle, and is not one we should recognize. The Bill is founded on that principle. The hon. gentleman expresses dissent, but I insist on it. While it is made the primary duty of the voter to go to the poll; there is a subterfuge provided by which he may spoil his ballot, and defeat the principle of the Bill by not voting. There is no obligation, political or moral, on the voter to go to the poll for the purpose of spoiling his ballot. The Bill can only be justified as compelling voters to go to the polling places on the ground that there is some obligation resting on them to vote. I submit that that principle is not consistent with the procedure by which our elections are carried on. There should be as much freedom of choice on the part of a voter between voting and not voting as between

voting for A or voting for B. We must remember that the voter is not a perfectly free agent as regards his choice when he goes to the poll. When the polling takes place the nominations have been closed. It is not in his power to exercise his free choice as to whom he thinks should represent his riding in Parliament. He is confined in his choice to the candidates who have been nominated by a certain number of electors some time before, with their choice he may not have concurred, but a certain number of electors are required to put a candidate in nomination, and when the particular voter goes to the poll he finds that his choice is absolutely restricted, and if he votes at all, he must cast his vote as between A and B, with both of whose politics he may entirely disagree, and as to whom he may be of the opinion that neither of them is a fit man to represent the riding; and yet the Bill obliges him to vote, or, on the principle that he ought to vote, go to the poll for the purpose of spoiling his ballot. It seems to me that, under these circumstances, the person who thinks that neither candidate is fit to represent the county should be left free to express that opinion by remaining at home, and he ought not, above all things, as the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) has pointed out, to be obliged to appear before a judicial tribunal and be placed at the discretion of mercy of a justice of the peace as to what are sufficient reasons to exonerate him from going to the poll. The attention of the House was called to a very important point when the Bill was last discussed, I think in the session of 1891, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who recalled several historical incidents to the recollection of the House, for the purpose of showing that the free play of our constitutional system is best aided in many cases by abstention from voting, better even than by voting for one set of candidates or the other, and that, in many cases, elections are controlled by conscientious abstention of parties from voting where conscientious scruples exist against voting at all, or where the principles of the candidates are not, as regards either of them, in harmony with the opinion which the voter entertains. I must say, in justice to the hon. member, that the committee to whom the Bill was sent last year concurred in recommending it in the form in which it is now submitted to the House. Nevertheless, I have been unable to bring my own individual opinion to agree that the change would be a wise one, while, as I said before, it merits very great consideration on account of the purpose by which the hon. gentleman is actuated, and which he desires to impress on a statute. The hon. gentleman endeavours to meet one set of difficulties by the third subsection of the Bill, which enables a person desirous of abstaining from voting to have his name struck off the list by the revising officer before the list is finally made up. That, in all

probability, would meet the cases of those who have religious scruples against casting any vote at all; but it would meet no other class, because any other voter must necessarily be in suspense as to his opinion between rival candidates at the time the election list is made up, from the fact that the election itself is not then on, nominations have not been made, and he has no opportunity of knowing who will be candidates or sets of candidates in the contest. As the hon. member for L'Assomption has pointed out, there is very serious difficulty. I think, in the House adopting the principle that a man, for some good reason, it may be from entertaining the feeling that neither candidate is a candidate whom he desires to represent him in Parliament, desires to abstain from voting, should be obliged to go before the magistrate and have the burden of proof cast on him to show reasons why he should not be subjected to penalties and costs. I do not think that the force of that view is met by the mere statement that a man should be put to expense and trouble, and loss of time and labour in travelling many miles, and then have the opportunity of defeating the policy of the Bill itself by going in and spoiling his ballot. It appears to me that that is a mere subterfuge, and if we are to recognize at all the right of a man to abstain from voting, we ought to recognize it to the full extent of permitting him to stay at home.

Motion for second reading negatived.

DUTY ON COAL OIL.

Mr. CLEVELAND moved :

That it is expedient to place coal oil on the free list.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the motion, I beg to ask the indulgence of the House, as this is the first occasion on which I have had the honour to address this House. I feel that in favour of the motion which I have now placed in your hands, Sir, I should have the support of both parties—the support of my hon. friends on this side of the House and of hon. gentlemen opposite as well. I claim the assistance of the Government supporters, as I believe that it is the intention of the Government to extend needed relief to those on whom some duties under our protective system bear most heavily. I may say that there is no question, in the province of Quebec at least, which is fraught with so much interest and which is so much discussed at present as the removal of the duty on coal oil. I claim the support of hon. gentlemen opposite because it was they who placed the present duty upon oil. At a time, I admit, when oil was worth very much more than it is to-day. At the same time I believe that they should now be willing to assist in giving relief, and in helping to remove the excessive duty at present placed upon oil. Perhaps one example of how this tax bears heavily upon our Canadian people may be sufficient to convince

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

the House that there is need for tariff reform in this direction. American oil in Rock Island, on the American side, is now selling at 7½ cents per gallon, while in Stanstead, across the river, on the Canadian side, Canadian oil is as high as 26 cents per gallon. That is a difference in price which is entirely uncalled for, and which I believe to be unfair to Canadian consumers. I claim that no industry requires any such protection as that. Although a manufacturer myself and a protectionist, I only ask and expect a fair measure of protection, and I feel that no other industry in the country should wish or require more. I may also state that the quality of the lower grade of Canadian oil is very inferior. At all events, I know from experience, that the oil placed upon the market in the province of Quebec, at from 12 to 14 cents a gallon is both dirty and smoky, and not fit for use. This is the quality of oil that, as a rule, the poorer people are using. The Government, in my belief, should be perfectly willing to afford some relief to the people by removing the present exorbitant duty. Of course it will be advanced, in favour of continuing the duty, that the interests of Petrolea will suffer greatly; but is that small section of the country to weigh in the balance against the rest of this broad Dominion? This question is, of course, not of so much importance to the people of the cities and towns of Canada who largely use gas as an illuminant, but it is in the country parts, where the people use oil, that they suffer most, and I claim that it is these very people who are best entitled to any relief that can be extended to them. I trust that the Government will decide on taking some action in this matter, and I therefore move the resolution which I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the absence of the Minister of Finance, I beg to make a statement which I am sure he would have made if he were here, and which he has made with reference to similar motions with regard to the tariff. That is the statement, that at the request of the Government these motions shall not be pressed to a vote until the course of next week, because it is expected that next week the statement of the Minister of Finance shall be made with regard to the policy of the Government in this respect. I am aware of the view which has been put forward in answer to that request on two or three questions, namely, that these questions are not new. I do not claim that any of these motions in regard to the tariff which appear upon the Order Paper are new, but I say now, as I said upon a former occasion, that the convenience of carrying on the business of this House, to say nothing of the convenience of business interests involved, requires that these matters shall not be dealt with by an affirmative decision of the House, until the tariff is brought down, and until the Gov-

ernment is in a position to control the interests involved by putting into force immediately that which may be declared then to be the will of the House and the will of Parliament on these matters. With that view, I beg to move that the debate on this question be adjourned.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to make a few remarks on this subject before the question is put to the House, because I believe that this is a very important issue, and that it should be thoroughly discussed, and perhaps the members of the Government themselves would be anxious to hear what is to be said on both sides, so that when it comes up for consideration in the Council they will be in a position to understand the arguments for and against. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no idea at all to approach this question in any way but a just and proper manner. I have no objection to the oil interests, and personally I would like to see that industry thrive, so that what I will say will be, I believe, in the public interest, and in the interest of the consumers of oil in this country. I am under the impression now, and have been for years, that the duty on coal oil was too high. I do not say that we should, under our present policy select separate industries and take away the protection from them, but I believe it would be but justice in the interests of the people of this country that the duty on coal oil should be reduced. When I spoke last year upon the question, I suggested a protective duty of 5 cents a gallon instead of the present duty of 7½ cents, and after studying the question, I am still firmly of the opinion that it would be to the interest of the country to reduce the duty at least to that extent. There are three aspects from which we can view this question. One aspect is in respect to the crude material, the other is in regard to the illuminating or refined oil, and the third in reference to the rule adopted by the Government prohibiting the importation of oil in tank-cars. Now, I want to point out first that this is a very important industry, in which there is invested a very large sum of money. The oil men themselves say that they have invested in it about \$21,800,000. Now, in protecting an industry of that magnitude, we must be very careful not to do it an injustice. If the figures of the oil men are correct, it is a very large industry, and is entitled to the most careful consideration on the part of the Government. But I am afraid that the oil men, in placing these figures before the Canadian people, have not been as careful as they should be. I think I shall be able to show you satisfactorily that they have exaggerated the amount of capital invested and the number of men employed in this industry. I will first take their own figures as showing their own opinion of the industry in which they are engaged. From a statement made in the papers a few days ago, which no doubt the members of the Government have read,

I find that the amount invested in this industry is put down at \$21,800,000, and the amount invested in territory at \$12,000,000. It is said that there are 8,000 wells with drilling and equipment, which at \$500 each are worth \$4,000,000. Underground storage tanks are put down at \$1,000,000; refineries, wax-works, sperm candle works, the manufacture of lubricating and other oils, etc., are put at \$2,000,000; saw mills, barrel factories, drill tool factories, etc., are put at \$1,000,000; pipe lines with piping stations, 250 pumping rigs, and plant complete, are put down at \$1,000,000; delivery stations and plants located in different centres of the Dominion, tank-wagons, drilling tools, etc., are put down at \$800,000; making a total capital invested of \$21,800,000. This is a statement given by an oil producer in the "Globe" a few days ago. The same man says that there are employed 2,580 men in and around the works; in addition, there are travellers and office men, overseers and men attending the pipe lines and delivery stations, to the number say of 100; making the total number of men employed 2,680. The writer then says:

And it is important to note here that with the exception of choppers and teamsters they are all skilled workmen.

Now, that is the statement put forward by the oil men themselves, and I fear it is overdrawn. I do not think they have been fair in putting these figures before the country, and I will show you why. We are told that there are 610 teams and teamsters employed every day in the business. That number at \$3.50 a day would cost \$2,185 a day, or, in a year of 300 days, \$655,500. They tell us that there are 1,570 men who receive \$1.50 per day, or, in a year of 300 days, \$706,500; and they also tell us that there are 500 skilled men at work at \$2 per day, amounting in a year of 300 days to \$300,000. In other words, the total amount paid in wages in the year is \$1,662,000. Now, it is only fair to allow a certain percentage on the invested capital. In conversation with one of the principal oil men, I asked him if 4 per cent would be a high enough dividend to allow on the capital invested. He said it would be very low; yet that percentage would amount to \$872,000. Then allow 5 per cent for wear and tear, amounting to \$1,080,000; and allow 2 per cent for profit, which is surely not too high for those engaged in the business, amounting to \$436,000. On this calculation, the total amount paid in wages, in dividends on capital, on wear and tear, and on profit, would require \$4,050,000 a year. Now, I want to show that the figures given by the oil men are not correct, and are very misleading. I have here a statement which shows that the value of the whole output of the Petrolea oil refiners in illuminating oil, lubricating oil, paraffine oils, gas oil and paraffine wax, was \$1,638,000 all told in 1890. Now, if they have as many men employed as they say, how can they pay \$4,050,-

000 of expense and interest on their capital out of an output of \$1,638,000? For salaries alone they say that they pay \$1,662,000, or \$24,000 more than the amount of the output of the whole industry. Now, I mention this to show that the matter has not been placed honestly before us. These men have sought to lead the country to believe that their industry is larger than it really is, I fear to create an impression in the minds of the people that it should not be interfered with. The figures given in the public prints by them and sent to the members of this House, are deceptive and exaggerated to the extent I have shown. These men must either say that the figures given in the blue books are wrong in regard to their entire output, or they must admit that their own statements to the public are very greatly exaggerated. Now, the oil refiners tell us that they do not take advantage of the duty. Every hon. gentleman here knows very well, however, that every industry in the country takes advantage of the duty as far as it can do so. If they did not, they would not be here lobbying the members of this House in regard to the tariff. The oil men say that the oil they sell is only 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a gallon higher than the American oil. I had a conversation to-day with a gentleman on this subject. I said to him: "You are not making true comparisons: you are comparing the price of No. 1 water-white American oil, having a specific gravity of 7.85, with the price of your common No. 2 Canadian oil, having a specific gravity of 8.02." I asked him: "What is the price to-day of your No. 1 Canadian oil, with a specific gravity of 7.95?" He said, "15 cents in bulk." Now, that is the oil that should be compared, if it is comparable with the American oil; and every one knows that it is not equal in illuminating power with the first-class American oil. He also told me that out of the 10,000,000 gallons manufactured by the oil refiners of Canada, they only manufactured 2,000,000 gallons of this refined oil; and that they take full advantage of the duty on this 2,000,000 gallons if they sell it at 15 cents. How much does that take out of the Canadian consumer? The increased price of the 2,000,000 gallons would be at least \$160,000 by reason of the duty. Now, take the imported oil. We imported from the United States last year 5,637,149 gallons, at a value of \$471,690. On that we paid a duty of \$405,873.62, the price being $8\frac{3}{4}$ cents per gallon, and the duty 7 cents. If you add to this amount paid in duty, the cost of inspection and the duty on the barrels, equalling 2 cents per gallon, and amounting to \$112,742, you have a total of \$518,619. Then, you must add the importers' profit of 20 per cent on this amount, for the importer must make a profit on the cost of duty as well as on the price of the article, which amounts to \$103,723. That, added to the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

former amount, makes \$622,338. Now, when the retailer gets possession of the article, he puts on his profit of 40 per cent, which makes \$248,935 more, so that there is a total of \$871,274 added to the original cost by reason of the duty, or $15\frac{3}{4}$ cents a gallon. If this duty were removed, the profits on the duty as well would be wholly wiped out, because as the duty is part of the original cost to the importer, he adds his profits upon it as well as upon the original cost, and as profit after profit is put on, by the time the oil gets to the consumer, the consumer, instead of paying the duty alone, pays \$465,401 more. On the other hand, suppose the oil came in free, the people of Canada would pay as the original cost \$471,690. Add one cent per gallon for inspection, or \$56,371, the importers' profit of 20 per cent, or \$105,612, and the retailers' profit of 40 per cent, which comes to \$253,469, and we have a cost of \$887,142, or only $15\frac{3}{4}$ per gallon to the consumer, if the duties were removed. But at present, taking this $15\frac{3}{4}$ cents and $15\frac{3}{4}$ cents caused by the duty, it costs 31 cents to the consumer in Canada. But it may be said that it does not cost 31 cents as a rule. I do not say that the importer or the retailer always puts on 40 and 20 per cent. They may put on a little less or a little more in different parts of the country, where they get American oil at 26, 28 and 30 cents, and I see by the Auditor-General's Report that the Government have paid 35 cents a gallon for oil used on the Experimental Farm. So that we pay twice as much for the oil as we would if it came in free, or, in other words, we could get oil at a little over 15 cents for which we now pay prices ranging from 25 to 35 cents. I wish to draw attention particularly to the hardship of the prohibition against bringing in oil in tank-cars. I have a statement here which I will give the Government, in order that they may look into it. It shows that the oil cost the consumer $3\frac{1}{10}$ cents more on account of this prohibition than if it were permitted to come in in tank-cars. The present price of oil in Oil City, Pa., 7.85 specific gravity, is $5\frac{3}{4}$ cents per wine gallon, in barrels. How much will it cost to bring it here? There are 3,207 wine gallons in a car load, which, at $5\frac{3}{4}$ cents per gallon, would be \$184.41; 3,207 wine gallons are equal to 2,673 imperial, on which there is $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents duty, amounting to \$192.45. The duty on sixty barrels, which constitutes a car load, at 40 cents each, amounts to \$24; the inspection of sixty barrels at 30 cents each, amounts to \$18, and the freight on sixty barrels from Oil City to Peterborough would be \$66, making a total of \$484.86, making the cost of oil laid down in Peterborough $18\frac{1}{2}$ cents per imperial gallon. Sometimes the retailer is the importer, and, therefore, the profit added to the price of the oil is not so high as the percentage charged, if the oil was imported by other than the retailer. But other-

wise the importer adds his profit on selling to the retailer and the retailer adds his profit on selling to the consumer. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the price depends on whether the retailer is the importer or not. Now, let me give you the other side of the question. Taking the same oil in tanks, how much will it cost? As I said before, coal oil of 7.85 specific gravity sells to-day, in tank-cars in Oil City, Pennsylvania, at 30 cents per wine gallon, f.o.b. A tank-car contains 6,200 wine gallons. The cost of the oil, therefore, is \$201.50. The freight on a car of 28,300 lbs., at 27½ cents per 100 lbs. would be \$77.82. The cost of packages and barrelling in this country for 126 barrels would be \$126. Now, tank-cars contain, as I said, 6,200 wine gallons, or 5,267 imperial gallons. The duty on this, at 7½ cents per gallon, would be \$372.02. These items make a total of \$777.34, or 15½ cents per gallon, as against 18½ cents under the present system. Or, in other words, this method of importation would save to the consumer 3½ cents on every gallon imported. Last year there was imported into Canada 5,638,000 gallons, at which rate the yearly saving to the consumers of Canada, if this prohibition was removed, would be \$174,778. Further, the change would give employment to Canadian coopers in making 140,000 barrels, the number which would be required to contain this quantity of oil. This industry would give steady employment to 250 men. Labour would be given also to the workmen engaged in barrelling. I think, in view of these facts of which I challenge contradiction, the Government will clearly see it to be its duty to remove this prohibition, and at least to allow the American oil to come in in tank-cars. But there is another phase of this question to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. I hold that the Government should at least reduce the duty on crude oil. You well know, Mr. Speaker, that crude oil is becoming one of the most important articles in demand in the country for many purposes. There is now a prohibitory duty on crude oil. In the United States crude oil is sold at about 40 or 50 cents a barrel. The duty on that is 7½ cents, the same as on refined oil. Inspection and other charges bring this up to 9½ cents, or about 900 per cent on the value of the oil. The consequence of that high duty is, that crude oil is only to a very limited extent imported into Canada. The importation of crude oil would be advantageous to the refiners of Canada, because it would give them cheaper raw material and would give them the opportunity to supply the Canadian market. They could more easily compete with the American refiners, if they got their raw material cheaper. These men would not be confined to any particular section of the country; they could have their establishments anywhere, and they would thus be brought nearer to the consumers. Further, there would be a great advantage to the gas companies. As

you are aware, Mr. Speaker, coal-gas is now passing out of use, and they are now introducing a new gas called water-gas, manufactured from what is known as gas oil. Now, we find the manufacturers of gas oil throughout the country have been petitioning the Government to reduce the duty on gas oil, on the ground that they cannot produce gas as cheaply as otherwise they would do, and they go so far as to say that the Canadian industry does not produce a sufficient quantity of crude oil to supply the demand that is made upon them. Then again, Mr. Speaker, the introduction of crude oil free of duty, or at a much lower duty, would be advantageous in this way, that the lubricating oil which is manufactured from petroleum, would be considerably cheaper in this country and every industry using lubricating oil would get that oil at a lower price. This would benefit a very large number of people. Various paint oils which are manufactured from crude oil also, could be furnished at a lower price than at present. Again, it would be an advantage to a great many people in this country to get fuel oil. You know, Mr. Speaker, that fuel oil is used in many parts of the world to generate steam for the propulsion of machinery. On the Caspian Sea fuel oil is used to propel the steam-boats. But, to come nearer home, we find a large number of steamers on the coast of California using fuel oil. They find it more economical than to use wood or coal. Moreover, there are thousands of stationary engines in various parts of the United States using fuel oil instead of wood or coal. It is found that one dollar's worth of fuel oil is equal in steam-producing power to one-half ton of coal, it being regarded as cheaper for that purpose. Now, in this country we are prohibited from importing fuel oil, but if the price of this material could be reduced, it would be used very largely in our various manufacturing industries and for steam-boats and stationary engines. We are handicapped by the duty placed on this oil. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the tariff would do the following things: First, It prevents us importing in tank-cars and therefore burdens the consumer more than he would otherwise be burdened. Second, It compels him to buy high-priced barrels from the United States instead of being made in this country. Third, It takes from the coopers work which properly belongs to the people of this country. Fourth, It causes loss by leakage and by deterioration in quality. Fifth, The tariff prevents the refiner from getting crude oil, that is, cheap raw material. Sixth, It increases the price of lubricating oil. Seventh, It prevents the people from obtaining a cheap supply of fuel oil, gas oil, paraffine wax and many other things manufactured from the raw material. Without detaining the House much longer, I may say that I think I have brought to the attention of the Government three aspects of this question: First, The high duties on imported refined oils which

ought to be reduced. Second. The very high duty on the raw material, which, in my opinion, ought to be reduced. Third. The prohibition of the importation of oil in tank-cars which should be removed. If they would make the changes I have urged upon them they would confer a great benefit upon the consumers of coal oil in this country, and I am sure they would receive the blessings of the consumers, if not the blessings of the few oil men. I have shown you that the industry is an extensive one and requires the careful consideration of its interests. The Government should consider the interests of the consumers also, and I hope that next week, when the Government declare its policy on this question, it will be found that it has done something in the interest of the people of Canada by reducing the duty on coal oil.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Mr. Speaker, the motion in your hands is one for which I can certainly ask of this House its most careful consideration. Before this House is in a position to decide one way or the other it is most important that the members should be possessed of the facts concerning this business. It requires its most serious consideration, for fear that we may do an injury which we do not desire to do, to any particular trade or any large number of our fellow-citizens in this country. It is under these circumstances, representing, as I do, one of the ridings of Lambton, that I feel very deeply the responsibility that rests upon myself in endeavouring, in my humble way, to represent fairly before this House the industry which exists in that county. Sir, I refuse to treat this question in any other than in a broad and national spirit.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Yes; you may say "hear, hear," and I say "hear, hear." also—I refuse to deal with the question in any other way. True it is, that the industry is confined, at the present moment, so far as developed, to the county of Lambton; but surely for all that it is a Canadian industry; it is one of the most important of Canadian industries; it is an industry which is of so important a character that its destruction would prevent the development of the oil regions of Canada for a long time to come, if not for ever, and would remove from the minds of Canadians any idea of further developing the oil resources of Canada. The petroleum wealth of the county of Lambton is as much a part of the national wealth of the Dominion as the petroleum wealth of the United States is part of the wealth of that country. Do you think that they will not guard their petroleum industry because it is confined to the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania and one or two other places? Certainly they will. It is to-day one of the greatest industries of the United States, and has been developed there in a manner almost unprecedented in the history of the world.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Sir, I repudiate the statesman, and I would repudiate any man in this House, who would be so narrow and so contracted in his views as to refuse to look upon this question in a national light. The production of crude oil, as I stated, is alone being successfully carried on in the county of Lambton; but is it not well known to this House—is it not well known to Canadians—that the county of Lambton is by no means the only place in this country where oil is to be obtained? It is well known that in the Athabasca region we have to-day a very large section which by a report made to the Senate has shown to embrace an oil territory and which, when developed, will be larger than the Russian and the American fields put together. Then let us pass eastward. It is well known that there is oil in the Gaspé district. My hon. friend from that district (Mr. Joncas) tells me that an English company with a capital of £330,000 sterling, have already spent nearly \$220,000 in operations in that district. He showed me a letter yesterday from one of his constituents in Gaspé, some one, I presume, connected with the company, saying that if any change of tariff was made which would affect that industry in this country, these men would have to cease their operations, because their prospects would be ruined, and they would have no object whatever in carrying on business, feeling, as they would, that the moment that they discovered oil the Americans would control the market, and they themselves would get no return for the capital they had invested. I think, considering the great importance of this industry, the House will permit me to read a short extract from a lecture delivered by Mr. Marvin before the Royal Engineers, at Chatham, England, about three years ago. He says:

The area of 40,000 miles recommended to be reserved by no means represents the total, which one witness estimated at 100,000 miles of oil-bearing territory. To avoid minute details of a region of which few maps in England give an accurate representation, I may say, in general terms, that if the reader find Calgary, a well-known station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and strike about a couple of hundred miles due north to Edmonton, which is connected with the station by a coach road, he will reach a fringe of this great oil region. From the Edmonton district the oil belt stretches the whole distance in a north-westerly direction to the mouth of the Mackenzie River; a length of quite 2,000 miles as the crow flies. The Athabasca River runs through the middle of the oil district, which includes the whole of the Lesser Slave Lake on the one hand, and touches the shores of the Beaver Lake on the other. The Peace River is entirely included in the district, from the moment it quits the Rocky Mountains until, with the Athabasca, it flows into the Great Slave Lake, a course of over a thousand miles; and from Fort Smith, close to where they jointly flow into the lake, to the mouth of the Mackenzie River, a navigable run of 1,360 miles, there is oil the whole way. The general area is larger than that of all the petroleum districts of the present oil-producing countries put together, and the selection of the best southern section as a Crown domain is a measure that should be copied by the Indian Government without delay.

Those remarks made by Mr. Marvin were made subsequently to the report of our own Senate, which I will not read in whole, as I suppose nearly every one in the House has read it. The report of the Senate says :

It is not, however, to the steady thriving oil industry of Ontario that I desire to call attention, but to the newly discovered deposits in the great Mackenzie Basin, respecting which the Select Committee of the Senate of Canada appointed to inquire into the resources of the region, reported last year that: "The evidence submitted to your committee, points to the existence in the Athabasca and Mackenzie valleys of the most extensive petroleum field in America, if not in the world. The use of petroleum, and consequently the demand for it, are increasing at such a rapid ratio that it is probable that this great petroleum field will assume an enormous value in the near future, and will rank among the chief assets comprised in the Crown domain of the Dominion. For this reason your committee would suggest that a tract of about 40,000 square miles (the area of the Russian deposits at Baku is only 1,600 square miles) be, for the present, reserved from sale, and that as soon as possible its value may be more accurately tested by exploration and practical tests."

This report gives the limits of the oil territory which was recommended to be reserved. It may be said, perhaps, that that is of little value to us at the present day, because there are no railways, and that is perfectly true. There are no railways, and, in one sense, the region is inaccessible; but before those oil fields in Russia were developed they were much further away from railway communication than is Athabasca from our Canadian Pacific Railway. At the time the Caspian district was discovered there was no railway in the district, but shortly afterwards railways were constructed. The Russians, at that time, were importing over 13,000,000 gallons annually, of American oil. The Russian Government imposed a duty of 14 cents per gallon, and within four years of the discovery of petroleum, American oils were practically excluded, because the quantity that entered the country was reduced to the nominal one of 50,000 gallons. The tariff encouraged the petroleum industry beyond question, and if that tariff had not been established there would have been no petroleum industry in Russia to-day. This is conceded on all hands. After I have explained the extent of capital and labour employed in our country in developing the coal oil industry, I shall show that it would be a dangerous course to pursue either to allow the importation of American refined oil free, or even to trifle with or tamper with the tariff which, at the present moment, gives us our protection. If my remarks in this debate are more extended than usual, I trust I will be pardoned by hon. members on account of the attacks made on the industry by numerous newspapers in the country. Some have gone the length of publishing caricatures. One paper in Montreal occupied half a page with a caricature of an American girl and a Canadian girl buying petroleum. A number of the

articles have contained many misstatements, I will not say wilful misstatements, as to the quality and the price of oil, and as to the capital and labour employed in the industry. Those articles have shown to any one familiar with the business that the persons who wrote them were not well up in the subject, and it would have been well if, before they scattered these statements broadcast throughout the country, they had taken the trouble to ascertain the facts. The press, having done so much already, and having alarmed those engaged in the industry, I may be pardoned for trespassing longer on the time of the House than I otherwise would have thought of doing. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), a few days ago referred to the policy of the Government as stated in the Budget speech of 1882, and he said that speech was a guarantee to the people for the safety of capital they might invest in this country, and an assurance that the capital invested would be protected. Under the policy of a Conservative Government, under a policy that was inaugurated before the National Policy was ever thought of, under a policy decided upon thirty years ago, and under a tariff made by Hon. Alexander Mackenzie himself, and under assurances given in Parliament ever since 1877, capitalists have been invited to invest their money in developing the oil regions of Canada. A bargain was made to a certain extent—I speak figuratively—and capitalists were led to understand that their investments would be protected, and it is not difficult to understand that the people engaged in that industry in the county of Lambton feel alarmed at the agitation created by the newspapers. If Canada could not supply the home market with such petroleum as is required, if the Canadian producers were taxing the public to an extent that would make the buyers suffer in the least, if they were not giving a good article and did not possess an abundant supply, if they were using the tariff under a system of "combinations," thus raising the price of the article and taking extra profits from the consumer, then all assurances given by the Government would be cancelled as between them and the producers. But so long as the petroleum industry furnishes a good article and the quantity required in the country, and does not exact any money improperly from the public by reason of the tariff, so long as there are no combinations but free competition between producers and manufacturers, then the people are justified in looking to this House and the Government for a continuation of the protection under which this industry has grown and prospered. Since I have had the honour of holding a seat in this House there have been no combinations either among manufacturers or producers. I make this statement because it has been charged since I have been here that there were "rings" in the oil trade. There are no "rings" in the oil trade, nor have there been any "rings" since I have sat in Parlia-

ment. Another question worthy of consideration is the quality of the oil. I am free to admit that the quality of Canadian oil some years ago was not so good as it is to-day. But I am satisfied, and my opinion will be supported by many members of this House who have used Canadian oil, that Canada produces a first-class burning oil, and that those who use it are perfectly satisfied. Another important point is that our oil is, as a rule, a safer oil for burning purposes than the imported article, and the oil we supply to the public is an article that does not consume so quickly as the light grade of American oil that comes into this country. To the farmer and to all classes of the people who want a good reliable light, a safe and economical oil, I defy them to find any better on the continent of America than we can give them in the county of Lambton. I admit, Sir, that there are in this country and in the United States different grades of oil. We have a good, honest, economical, family oil in this country, and we have another grade called "extra" or "water-white." Did you ever find two qualities of oil in the United States? If you will ask any of your American neighbours you will find that there are two qualities there. The Standard Oil Co. are making a refined oil out of "Lima crude," which is bought at 17 or 18 cents a barrel, and forcing it over the country, but on the other hand they have first-class oil, a good water-white oil, and it is that quality that is mostly imported into this country. I may ask, why is that best quality mostly imported? Did you ever see any article imported into a foreign country of the poorest quality when the manufacturer wants to build up a trade in the foreign country? Are the worst qualities of Bass' ale and Guinness' Dublin stout sent to Canada to compete with the ales of local manufacture? No; they send their very best qualities. Is it not always understood that when the foreign manufacturer tries to secure a market he invariably sends the very best quality of the article which he produces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at six o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

Bill (No. 26) relating to the harbour of Thornbury, on the Georgian Bay.—(Mr. Sproule.)

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the past fiscal year, from the 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Haggart.)

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider proposed resolutions (p. 357) relative to the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not propose at this stage to offer any comment upon this measure, but I now inform the hon. gentleman that at some later stage, probably upon the second reading of this Bill, I shall take an opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the whole system of superannuation. The system of superannuation casts altogether too large a burden on the people of the country, and I venture to suggest at this moment to the hon. gentleman that we shall do our duty if we pass the whole system under review and substitute another, which will be more in accordance with the requirements of the service, as well as of the country.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance may as well inform the committee what the total amount of revenue will be, if the resolution should be adopted and embodied in the form of a Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. That somewhat depends on circumstances. This resolution is introduced upon which to found a bill which will be submitted to the House, if the House approves of this resolution, and the sole purpose of the Government in bringing this measure down is to obviate the burdens of the superannuation system. Hon. members on both sides of the House agree that the system which has been in vogue for a number of years has been a burdensome one. Each year its burdens are becoming more and more apparent. In speaking on this question the other day I gave some reasons as to why this system had become so burdensome, and it is not necessary to repeat them. Probably in the course of the discussion which will arise on the Bill, or on the motion which the hon. leader of the Opposition has announced he will make, these facts may be more fully brought out. If it had not been for that desire to meet what is the opinion of the Government, and I believe the opinion of the House, that the present system is too burdensome, and that it must be abolished or some

other system introduced in its place which will bear less heavily on the revenues of the country, this proposal would not have been brought to the attention of the House. The abatement under the present Act is very small. Years ago it was made fairly large, and if it had been kept at that figure and the fund had been well administered the burden would have been comparatively light; but when it was made 2 and 1½ per cent it immediately took from the system all fair basis of support. So it has been burdensome, and is burdensome at the present time. However, that is the system which has grown up. Under it the Civil Service has come in and contributed to the fund, and expects to partake of its benefits, and to that extent an understanding in the nature of a contract exists between the present Civil Service and the Government. They pay their abatements and they expect the advantages which come from the fund. This proposes to break off at the time of the passage of the Act, and divide the old superannuation system entirely from the system established by this Bill. The fund that will be raised under this system will be kept and administered by itself. The first proposal is to make the abatements much larger. As the hon. gentleman will see, it is for the larger salaries 3½ per cent, and for the lower 3 per cent per annum. It is proposed that the Government's contribution to the fund shall be interest at the rate of 6 per cent upon the moneys in the fund. That is the sole contribution the Government makes and the system is based upon calculations on healthy male mortality tables and at the rate of 6 per cent. The amount of the fund will depend on the number of civil servants contributing; but whether the amount is larger or smaller, on that basis it pays its own way and is of no further burden to the Government. I cannot, therefore, answer definitely the question asked by the hon. gentleman as to what I consider will be the amount of the fund. That depends entirely, as I have said, on the number of civil servants who come in from this on. The service at the present time is fairly well supplied with employees. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think it is too well supplied, and of course, there may be a difference of opinion on that subject. However, I call the attention of the House to the fact that civil service additions hereafter will chiefly be to make up vacancies which may occur from deaths or resignations. So that the same number of contributors and the same fund will not be possible under this new arrangement as when, for instance, we were commencing the superannuation system and took in the large number of servants who were at that time in the employment of the Government. The contribution of the Government, of course, begins at the minimum and increases in accordance with the number who enter the service, and the amount of money which accrues to the fund from their contributions. It is difficult to say either the amount or the number,

from the causes I have mentioned; but this point is certain, the system is self-sustaining on the 6 per cent basis. The contribution of the Government, then, is the amount of percentage between what the money is fairly worth to us, what we give for it in the savings bank and 6 per cent which we will pay on the moneys which are in the fund. It will commence at the minimum and gradually go up. If at any time under this arrangement Parliament comes to the conclusion that it will have no longer a superannuation system, the fund is able to sustain itself and carry those who have contributed to it. So that there will not hereafter be the argument, which there is now, that we have entered into contract with the civil service. If, say twenty years hence, Parliament comes to the conclusion that it will not longer have superannuation, there will be no argument against adopting that course drawn from the idea of a contract, and if we sweep away superannuation we will violate no agreement under which civil servants have paid in their money. We may at any time stop the system, and the basis on which this calculation has been computed will be sufficient, just as is the case in an insurance society, to carry those who at the time belonged to that system and contributed to the fund to the end.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, if I understand the measure aright, it will not apply to any civil servant now in the service of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. To none.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, practically speaking, it is rather in the far future when it will become an effective measure of relief. The hon. gentleman only proposed to apply this system to men appointed from and after the passage of this Act. We will leave that for future consideration. The point which strikes me about this Bill is that, if it is also, as I understand it, purely voluntary—

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is compulsory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then if it is compulsory, the hon. gentleman should be able to form a good idea of what it will come to in the long run.

Mr. FOSTER. We could, if we knew the number that would come in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You, no doubt, know pretty well. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, give the committee a rough idea as to what is the total amount of the salaries of those civil servants who are at present time entitled to the benefits of the Superannuation Act. I take it that the number includes all the civil servants at Ottawa and a very considerable number of the outside service.

Mr. FOSTER. I am having that statement made up, and will be prepared to submit it when the Bill is before the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It appears that we are to have two concurrent systems existing after this Bill passes. The present superannuation system will continue, with all its existing defects, and with the annual balance which year after year is charged against the fund, and the hon. gentleman, I understand, does not propose to increase the payments made by those now under the system.

Mr. FOSTER. Not by this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that the anomaly and injustice of which we are complaining with regard to the present superannuation system is not touched at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say also that the Bill I propose to introduce limits the recipient, or the contributor to the fund to the age of forty-five years. Under the present system, there is no limit of age, and a man may come to the service at seventy-five years old and contribute to the superannuation fund.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are all the civil servants bound to contribute under the present system?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; payment is taken perforce from their salaries.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any rule with reference to the age at which one may enter the Civil Service now?

Mr. FOSTER. In the inside service, yes; in the outside service, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can tell my hon. friend that there are cases where men have been considered to be too old at sixty, and have been superannuated, and men put in their places at the age of sixty-eight.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not difficult to find such a precedent in the long history of the Civil Service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of recent cases.

Resolution reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 27) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—COAL OIL DUTY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to correct a misstatement of a matter of fact, which, I am informed, occurred in the debate which took place yesterday. I am told that an hon. gentleman stated that the Mackenzie Government had imposed a duty on coal oil. That is not only not the fact, but it is the exact reverse of the fact. The

Mr. FOSTER.

duty on coal oil was imposed in 1868—I think the double duty was then imposed, one duty of customs and one of excise. In 1874, when the Mackenzie Government first revised the tariff, they left coal oil alone, but in 1877, when that question came up for discussion we absolutely abolished the excise duty which amounted to 5 cents per wine gallon, and we reduced the customs duty from 15 cents to 6 cents per gallon. No duty whatever was imposed by the Mackenzie Government, but the duty was abolished altogether in the case of excise, and reduced from 15 cents to 6 cents in the matter of customs.

FLOODS IN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, whether his attention has been called to the terrible calamity that has befallen our fellow-subjects in the colony of Queensland; where we see by recent reports, floods have devastated the colony causing a destruction of property to the amount of \$15,000,000, almost destroying the capital city of Brisbane, and necessarily involving a large number of individuals in very great suffering and loss. It seems to me this would be a fitting opportunity for us to show our sympathy and willingness to assist our fellow-subjects in that portion of the Empire. We, in this country have been singularly free from any misfortune, either by flood, fire, or pestilence, and I think we cannot better show our gratitude for the mercies we have reason to be thankful for, than by extending sympathy and liberality to any one who may be in distress, especially those who are of our own household. I would suggest to the Government the propriety of communicating with the Commissioner in London, who could easily ascertain from the agent of the Colony of Queensland whether assistance from this Government would be acceptable, and in what way, if acceptable, it could be most properly applied. Hon. gentlemen will recollect how very much the people of Newfoundland were gratified at the interest taken by the people of this country, when they met with a somewhat similar misfortune, and how the political acerbities which had then arisen were smoothed away by the fact being made evident that there was on this continent a sympathetic feeling for our fellow-subjects, a feeling expressed by the large subscriptions made on their behalf. It does seem to me that this is a fitting opportunity for us to extend to our fellow-subjects in Australia a similar relief. If we are not as prosperous as some of us would wish, yet we are rich enough to afford liberal assistance. I throw out this suggestion, and I trust it will be acceptable not only to the Government, but to the hon. members of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg to say that within a few days, in all probability, we shall have more in detail a statement as to the extent of the calamity to which the hon. gentle-

man alludes, and that we will give our best attention to his suggestion, and to the circumstances connected with the case.

THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a matter as to which, I think, the attention of this House ought to be called and on which we should have some explanation from the Government. I refer to the vacancy which now exists on the bench of the Supreme Court. If my memory fails me not, on the 22nd September last the late lamented Sir Wm. Ritchie, Chief Justice of that court, died, and the vacancy on the bench has not been filled up yet. Within a reasonable time afterwards the Government took the initiative, and very properly so, to fill up the presidency of the court by promoting Mr. Justice Strong to the eminent position of Chief Justice; but though one, and two, and three, and four months have elapsed since that time, the vacancy on the bench has not been filled. The court is composed of six judges, and I believe that five form a quorum. The court is about to open within a week or ten days, and I understand that one of the judges has obtained leave of absence, so that under existing circumstances, there is not a quorum of the bench to transact business. The delay of the Government, it seems to me, is quite unjustifiable, because if there is no quorum when the court opens, the loss upon the public will be very great. Apart altogether from that consideration, it seems to me that the character of the court is lowered if prompt attention is not given by the Government to any vacancy that may occur. There can be no reason whatever why so long a period as four months should be allowed to elapse before an appointment is made. Certainly nothing has been wanting on the part either of the bar or the bench of the provincial courts to get the vacancy filled. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that one day more ought not to be allowed to pass before an appointment is made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not able to acquiesce in the view of the hon. gentleman, that the delay which has taken place has been an undue delay; but the Government do not intend to allow the term to open without making provision for an additional judge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the face of what the hon. gentleman has said, I make no reference to the composition of the Supreme Court, as it now stands. I am glad to hear that it is the intention of the Government to make the appointment before the court meets. As it stands now, although I am no stickler for sectional appointments, the hon. gentleman knows that there are in the court three judges from Ontario, two from Quebec, and none at all from the maritime section; yet, assuming that there should be a proper determination of cases coming from the maritime part of the Dominion, it is, of course,

desirable that some one acquainted with the law as it exists there, should be appointed. But I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the present state of matters in Nova Scotia. In that province there are supposed to be seven judges. Up to the present time and, I think, for three years past, although we have been paying the salaries of seven judges, we have only had the services of six. Judge McDonald, I think I am correct in saying, applied three years ago for leave of absence for six months. The leave was granted and, I understand, was afterwards extended to twelve months. The twelve months expired, and Judge McDonald, I am credibly informed, has since made no pretense of attending to any judicial duties whatever. He does not live at the capital, and does not go there. He lives at his home in Antigonish county, and during all that time he has been drawing his full salary, although unable, owing to his physical infirmities, to discharge the duties of his office. This state of things ought not to continue. If Judge McDonald is unable to discharge the duties of his office, he ought to be superannuated. He is an old man and has been a long time on the bench, and is entitled to receive a superannuation allowance; but to permit a judge who, from physical or other infirmities, is unable to perform his duties, to remain in receipt of his full salary, while the court is weakened by the loss of one of its members, is, in my opinion, very little short of a judicial scandal. The hon. gentleman himself is, perhaps, the best judge whether or not seven judges are necessary in that province. I say nothing about that. I am not competent just now to give an opinion on that subject. But certainly the action taken by him for some time past indicates that, in his opinion, six judges are sufficient to discharge the duties. But whether they are or not, there is no reason why Judge McDonald, who does not make the slightest pretense of discharging his judicial duties, should continue to draw his full salary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One observation made by the hon. gentleman I am not aware whether he intended to apply to me or to the judge, that is, that the action some one had taken—I presume he means myself—indicated the belief that only six judges were necessary. I presume that is a fair inference from the conduct of the learned judge himself. But I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I have not taken any action in the matter whatever. It is true, three years ago, Judge McDonald obtained six months' leave of absence, which was afterwards extended to twelve months, and, I am sorry to say, that, owing to the state of his health, he has been unable to resume his duties. The learned judge has made no communication to me whatever, if I may except a note which I received two years ago, from which I expected his resignation in a

short time. I have learned from the public press, however, that the learned judge is supposed to have tendered his resignation and that I have refused to accept it, and have expressed the hope that he should remain on the bench. That is an entire mistake; and I further wish to say that the strictures in the press reflecting on myself in connection with the matter, and intimating that complaints had been made to me which would justify me in calling upon the learned judge to resign, are entirely groundless. No complaint has been made to the department, either by the public or the profession, as to any inconvenience resulting from the absence of the learned judge from duty. Personally I am opposed to a judge remaining in office and failing to discharge his duties. I am told that representations have been made to the learned judge by his colleagues that, out of respect to him, they are willing to discharge the judicial business during his absence. But I have no personal or official knowledge of that; I only know it from rumour.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may state that if the matter remains as it is at present, and no intimation is given that Judge McDonald will resume the duties of his office, I shall deem it my duty, before the session ends, to take the opinion of the House as to such a state of things being allowed to continue.

OFFICIAL DEBATES—TRANSLATION.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to call your attention to what is now going on with respect to the printing and distribution of the Debates of this House. The House was opened on the 26th January; we are now on the 10th February; 565 pages of the English version of the Debates are now printed and distributed, and not a single line of the French version has been as yet distributed. It is to be presumed that the House intend that the members belonging to one nationality or to the other should receive an equal treatment, and that the "Hansard" is not published for the exclusive information of English-speaking members, but also for the information of French-speaking members. It is hard to say where the blame lies. We are informed by the Chief Translator that he has translated upwards of 150 pages of the English version and that it is the Queen's Printer, or rather the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau who, for one reason or another, neglects or declines to print the French version. It will be agreed that it is neither fair nor reasonable that at this sixteenth day of the session, the French members should not have received a single line of the Debates published in their language, while the English members receive them day by day. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will cause this condition to cease, so that both sections in this House be put on an equal footing as regards the printing and publication of the Debates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Pay of the staff of Permanent
Corps of the Active Militia,
including allowances \$575,782

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose the hon. Minister who has just taken charge of that department—a department which has been subjected for years past to very severe and proper criticism—will take this opportunity of explaining whether or not the department is to be continued on the same lines as during the past eight or ten years, or what changes will be made. Would the hon. gentleman inform us how far he intends adopting the suggestions made by the General with regard to the different branches of the service?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). My hon. friend will see that a change is made in the manner of submitting the items, so that Parliament will be better able to understand what each expenditure is for and what increases with regard to staff or the service may be required. In the present year, it will be seen from the total estimates, there is a slight reduction, as compared with last year, in the headquarters and district staff. In the first item, the one we are on, there is a total decrease, owing to the rearrangement of the staff, of nearly \$5,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is the hon. Minister prepared to tell the House what is meant by this paragraph in the report of the Major-General commanding the forces. He says, speaking of the staff:

I have submitted details of a scheme for the re-organization of the staff, by which I propose to gain economy in administration, combined with a systematic instruction of staff officers in those important branches of their duty which have been hitherto ignored.

Will that scheme be laid before the House?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There is a scheme, as suggested by the General, under consideration at present, and which will be submitted after it has been attended to by the Governor-General in Council.

Mr. AMYOT. I see in the Estimates a decrease of \$10,000 in the estimate of the cartridge factory in Quebec. Is it intended to bring about gradually the disappearance of that factory, because \$40,000 will not be sufficient to work it? This factory employs a hundred people and furnishes cartridges, at least as cheaply as they could be imported. If we do not manufacture our own cartridges, we will have to buy them from England, and thus be departing in that respect from the principle of the National Policy. We must not forget that we get the clothing of the militia made in this country. That clothing costs us more than we would have to pay if we brought it out from England, but we thus encourage home manufacture and give employment to our own people. The same principle should be applied in the matter of cartridges. I think there is a certain de-

sire on the part of the General—for whom I have personally great respect, but he sometimes commits mistakes—to take away all those things from Quebec. He wanted to take away those old guns and sell them, too, for a few paltry dollars to the foundry. It would not be right to take away all our old souvenirs, which are among the charms of the oldest city on the continent. If we do not keep up this factory we will have to get our cartridges from England, which are not worth more than our own, and would cost just as much. As regards the quality, I see by the reports, and I happen myself to know by experiment, that the accuracy of shooting is certainly within the range of Imperial ammunition. I hope the hon. Minister will not adopt too quickly the ideas of any General sent out here. Of course England sends us her best and most devoted officers; but they do not understand this country, and want to apply to it the principles which rule in England. In England volunteer officers are generally rich, and the system there is not the same at all. English generals, who do not understand our militia, instead of helping it, work against it. I applied to the General to give us a special board of examiners in Quebec. I said: Your schools are all right; but it takes three months to go through, and our officers cannot afford that. Give us a special board to examine, at any rate, the officers who went through the North-west campaign. That was refused us, because our Generals do not understand the country. They do not know that, generally speaking, volunteer officers are not rich, and cannot give up their positions in the banks, shops or other commercial establishments to go and qualify themselves, though very often they are our best men. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia, who, we know, is devoted to the force, and who wishes to protect the force, before accepting all the suggestions of the General, will test the feeling of the officers of the service, and not accept too hastily the suggestions made. As to the cartridge factory, I beg him not to take any measure that would tend to diminish its usefulness.

Mr. LISTER. I think that if the hon. gentleman who has just spoken will take the trouble to read the report presented by the General in command of the militia force, he must be satisfied that the General is exactly the man for the position. For the first time since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, the General commanding has taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and has fearlessly stated the exact condition of the militia of this country. If we are to draw any inference from the report upon the militia force made by the General, we cannot but admit that that force is in a very demoralized condition indeed. I would remind the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that the question of the cartridge factory is not now immediately before us. The item to which we are now directing our attention is number 96: "Pay of staff, permanent corps and

active militia, including allowances." I would ask the Minister of Militia why it is that there is an increase in that item?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There is an increase of \$950 drill pay of city corps, \$450 drill pay of rural corps, an increase of \$10,000 for the pay of active militia attending schools of instruction. Then there are sundry reductions, as, for instance, a decrease in the headquarters staff and district staff together of about \$5,000; a decrease of about \$2,500 in marching allowance. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the page he will see all these particulars given.

Mr. LISTER. In the report?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No, in the Estimates, page 38. These details, as given, show that there is a total increase of only \$4,050 in the whole item.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Before this resolution is adopted, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if there has been any provision made to strengthen the 5th Princess Louise New Brunswick Hussars. That regiment has seven troops, and it requires, I understand, eight troops to constitute a full regiment. I have been urging upon the predecessors of the present Minister for some years, the necessity of completing this regiment. Last year I impressed it upon the Minister then in charge of the department, and he promised to refer the matter to the General for report. I afterwards communicated with him to learn the result of his communication with the General, and was informed that the General had reported as follows:—

I strongly recommend the addition of an eighth troop to the Princess Louise New Brunswick Hussars. The regiment is in a very efficient state, and its completion to the full number of troops required for a cavalry regiment, would strengthen materially the good spirit which already exists in all ranks.

I think this is a matter of very considerable importance, and I trust the Minister has made provision to have this regiment strengthened.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I may tell my hon. friend that it is my intention to give an additional company to the New Brunswick cavalry regiment he has mentioned; but I have not made provision for it this year. It is my purpose to have that company or corps organized some time this autumn, and provision for it will be made in next year's estimates.

Mr. CORBOULD. For the last two sessions I have been urging upon the Government the necessity of having a brigade of garrison artillery on the main land of British Columbia. At present the only militia corps is the company of garrison artillery in New Westminster. Vancouver being the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway I think it is certainly advisable to have a corps of garrison artillery in that city. Last year I was told that as soon as the then

Minister of Militia and the General commanding had visited British Columbia, the Government would act upon the report which the General might make on that district. I would like to ask the Minister whether the amount mentioned in the Estimates includes any sum for the purpose of forming a new corps of artillery on the main land of British Columbia?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This matter is under consideration, and everything possible will be done to meet the requirements of the people on the main land of British Columbia.

Mr. BERGIN. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister if he has under consideration the reorganization of the medical staff of the militia? I made a recommendation in 1885, after the difficulty in the North-west, on this matter. I suppose my hon. friend the Minister is aware that the medical men of the militia—the militia surgeons—have formed an association for the purpose of bringing before the Minister the needs of the medical service. If the hon. Minister is aware of these things, as I suppose he is, it having been brought under the notice of the General, I would like to know if it is his intention to do anything toward the reorganization of that service, which now is certainly not creditable to the country? The manner in which the medical stores and comforts are provided for the camps is also most discreditable. Of course, I do not forget that my hon. friend has been but a short time at the head of the department, but I hope he will see that something is done to put this department of the service in good shape.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I would like to ask the hon. Minister, in connection with this item, if he has taken into consideration the requirements of Annapolis for a battery? When I first entered Parliament in 1887, a large petition was presented to the department for this battery, and I understood at that time that there was not money for such a purpose. Now, I understand that it has been thought proper to disband a battery in Nova Scotia. That being the case, I think that the claims of Annapolis should have precedence in this matter. Annapolis Town is the oldest town in British North America, and the oldest in North America, with the exception of St. Augustine in Florida. A great deal has been said, both in the papers and in the Senate last session, with reference to this old town of Annapolis Royal. Nothing very special has been said but what has been referred to by myself during the sessions of Parliament since I first had the honour of representing the county. Annapolis garrison—the old fort of Annapolis—should be renovated and should not be neglected by the department, as it has been. The old block-house has been torn down, the ramparts are being destroyed, and no steps are being taken for their preservation. Nothing is done whatever for the preservation of the fort. I consider that this is a burning disgrace for

Mr. CORBOULD.

the Dominion of Canada, composed, as it is, of two nations, French and English, who should take a deep and abiding interest in the old place. I urge upon the department that they should not only keep these old fortifications in a state of preservation, but they should also give what has been asked by the citizens of that vicinity, a battery for that place, particularly as one battery in Nova Scotia has, within the last year, been disbanded, by the recommendation of the General.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). If I find upon examination that the battery has been disbanded, as mentioned by my hon. friend, and funds are placed at our disposal for the creation of a battery at Annapolis, I shall be very happy to comply with the wishes of the hon. gentleman. As regards what my hon. friend from Stormont and Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) has said, any report or suggestion of his will be received with every respect, as coming from a gentleman well qualified to speak on these matters. I may say that special attention is being given this year to a proper supply of medical stores for the proposed camps of instruction.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before the item passes, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to pages 50, 51, 52 and 53—C of the Auditor-General's Report. He will find there enumerated a lot of irregularities in the payment of officers and men. I think it is well to call his attention to the fact that a great many irregularities have taken place in that respect in the militia service. I notice that in one case, out of forty-five men in one company, twenty-two signatures are in one hand-writing, and twenty men have not even signed the pay-list, and so on. In company No. 4, forty-one out of forty-three signatures are in the hand-writing of Captain H. Tetu; in company 5, forty-two out of forty-four signatures are in one hand-writing. So all through the list. A great many officers and men were paid more than they were entitled to. In many cases men were paid who were not on the list at all, and the Auditor-General says the signatures were irregular, because, according to the regulations, each man entitled to receive pay should sign his own name, or make his mark and have it properly witnessed. Now, I think the fact that these irregularities are continued from year to year—because this matter was under discussion last session—must make it plain that some better supervision should be given to the payment of these men. Of course, we have the Auditor-General to supervise these payments; at the same time I think those who have charge of the Militia Department ought to see that some system is brought into force which will put a stop to these irregularities, and prevent officers drawing pay when they are not entitled to do so, and prevent the payment of men for services which are never rendered. I think the

Minister of Militia might give his attention to this matter, and if he can give any explanation of these irregularities I shall be happy to hear them.

Mr. DENISON. There is, no doubt, something in the remarks of the last speaker with respect to these irregularities; but we must not forget that a great many of the men are not able to sign their names, and therefore it is necessary for them to sign by their mark and have it witnessed by some one. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), a little while ago, spoke of the militia being in a very demoralized condition. I think that every officer of the force will agree with me when I say that the force is in as good a state now as it ever has been, and possibly better.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you speak of city or rural districts?

Mr. DENISON. I speak of the militia as a whole. I think that every year we are improving it by degrees, and getting nearer the ideal to which we are looking forward. Now, the rural militia have not had a proper opportunity, because they have only been allowed to drill every other year, and it is impossible for men who turn out once in two years to be as proficient and to do as well as those who turn out every year. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton were probably caused by the report of the General. I have read that report over, and so far as I can gather from it, there are just two points to which he specially directs attention: one is stores and equipments, and the other is the staff. I do not think he says a word in his report against the men of the militia force, nor, for that matter, against the officers. But he does refer to the staff; he says it requires reorganization; and as he has given special attention to that point, I have no doubt that he is correct. I know that a great many members of the staff are now becoming old, and, although I would be sorry to see them disappear from our ranks, still, when the efficiency of the staff requires it, they should not stand in the way. As to the equipment, the other point specially dwelt upon, I think the criticism of the General is well founded. In our own corps we have no complaint about the clothing, although I think, the saddlery is not as good as it might be—whether that is the fault of the manufacturers or contractor, I am not prepared to say. But I entirely endorse what the General said with regard to saddlery. For my own part, I regret to see that many of the corps are being reduced in number; I regret it only in the sense of seeing the force as a whole reduced in number; but it may be a proper move, and I approve of it if other corps are being formed in other places. In fact when corps become obsolete, or useless through being incompetent I think it is time they should be disbanded. But I know, and many

members of this House also know, that in almost every part of Canada there is a desire to form new corps, and wherever that can be done, they should be encouraged. For my own part, I would like to see the Government go even further in that direction than they have done in the past; I would like to see them pass a law that every young man between the ages of 18 and 21 should serve twelve days in the militia. Whether that would be a popular move, I do not know, and I do not care. That is my opinion, and I think that if every young man in the country between the ages of 18 and 21 had to serve twelve days, it would not hurt them at all, and they would always take an interest in the militia afterwards. It would be a good thing for the country if every man felt that he owed something to the state, and was ready to do his share.

Mr. LISTER. I am sure the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has not read the report of the General very carefully, or he would not contradict my statement that the militia force of the country was in a state of demoralization. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to page 2 of the report, where the General uses these words:

In my previous report I attributed the lack of efficiency of a considerable part of the active militia, to deficient inspection.

Now, if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to peruse the report made by the General previous to this one, I think he will find that the General says that the Canadian militia is not in an efficient condition. The hon. member for Stormont and Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), a few moments ago, asked whether it was the intention of the Government to reorganize the medical staff of the militia force. The hon. gentleman did not tell the committee wherein that staff is in a defective condition, or what he wished to have done.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the demoralized condition of the force. The General made use of the term, lack of efficiency.

Mr. LISTER. They are demoralized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the increase of \$2,200 in the staff at headquarters, and decrease of \$7,000 in the district staff.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That arises owing to a proposed readjustment of the district and headquarters staffs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the proposed change?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I propose to do away with some Brigade Majors. There is one vacancy in Quebec, and I propose to do away with some Brigade Majors in other districts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the hon. gentleman's intention is good, and his pro-

posal may be excellent, but the details should be submitted to the committee. Is the hon. gentleman going to fill the vacancy at Quebec, and what Brigade Majors are to be dispensed with?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). For 1892-93 the amount voted was \$30,875 for the district staff. I intend readjusting that staff so as to effect a reduction of \$7,000. Where a Deputy Adjutant-General commands a school of instruction, he will fill the place formerly occupied by a Brigade Major. In the case of Brigade Majors alone, I expect to effect a saving of the whole sum of \$7,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will that involve a reduction from thirteen to six?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Vacancies have occurred from time to time. The opinion has been expressed by this House that it would be desirable to abolish the Brigade Majors, and I propose to adopt that suggestion and carry it out, a similar recommendation having been made by the General commanding.

Mr. LISTER. What is the total number of Brigade Majors?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There have been eight.

Mr. LISTER. Are you going to abolish the office of Brigade Major altogether?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Is that how you will effect the saving?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the active militia force of the country?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Have any steps been taken to raise two or more troops of mounted infantry or dragoons for Manitoba. A reduction in the number of troops has taken place during the past year through the disbandment of the 91st and 95th, and it is generally understood that their places will be taken by a similar number of mounted men. Has anything been done to that end?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That matter is under the consideration of the department. In reply to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Semerville), as to the strictures that appear in the Auditor-General's Report respecting vouchers, I may say the money overpaid was refunded in the case mentioned. The matter having been brought to my attention, I will be careful that nothing of the kind occurs again. In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), I have only to say that I propose to conduct the department on a purely business basis. I have confidence in the General commanding, and I shall be influenced very much by his suggestions and

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

his advice, having regard also to my knowledge of this country and the fact that ours is a citizen soldiery. I intend to endeavour to place the militia on a thoroughly efficient footing, and no corps will be kept in existence which does not maintain its efficiency and discipline. I recognize the fact that it is absurd to have a paper militia of considerable nominal strength, when in reality the force is not up to the mark. I propose, with the advice and co-operation of the General commanding and the officers of my department, to place the militia on such a footing as will be satisfactory to the House and the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have any steps been taken for the purpose of rendering the force more effective by supplying the men with the most modern improved small-arms? The Snider rifle is rather antiquated, and if our volunteers were brought into actual conflict, and were called upon to cope with troops armed with more modern weapons, they would be placed at a serious disadvantage. I suppose this matter has received the attention of the Government, and the committee will be glad to know whether any changes are to be made, and what course the Government contemplate adopting in this matter.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That matter is also under consideration. It is one that will involve a very large expense. So many changes and improvements are continually taking place in small-arms that, until something definite is established, it would be inadvisable to incur a very large expenditure. But the matter will receive the most careful attention, and when the time comes to ask Parliament to vote money to replace what I must admit is now an antiquated form of rifle with a more modern weapon, I trust the proposal will receive the hearty support of hon. members on both sides of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. There will be no disposition manifested on the part of the Opposition to criticise or question any necessary expenditure the Government may adopt to make the force an effective one. I hope the Government will not hold this matter under consideration too long. If we need a volunteer force at all, we need an efficient one, and if we are ever called upon to face the enemy, the time may come unexpectedly and suddenly, and I think it is perhaps questionable whether the economical policy of refusing to incur necessary outlay for making a thoroughly efficient force is a good one. I would urge upon the Government to consider the propriety of placing that force upon an efficient footing by supplying them with the most modern and improved type of small-arms at an early date. In my opinion, it would be better to reduce the force, and to have the part which is kept in commission well armed than to have a much larger force with inferior arms. In this age of the world, if it is necessary to have a militia force at all, it should be well equipped and efficient. We

see that from the example of the great military nations of Europe, who, even at great inconvenience and expense, are changing their small-arms and keeping up with the world's progress in that respect. We should have our force thoroughly efficient in this country, even if we have to reduce the number of men.

Mr. BERGIN. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) and, I think, the member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) asked to know what recommendations had been made with regard to the medical and surgical departments of the militia. I have here the following in the report which I made in 1885 :

Recommendations.—Having thus briefly sketched the operations of the medical staff in the field, I may be permitted to direct attention to that which I consider to be the special weakness of the service—I mean the regimental system. During the late campaign it was found to be expensive, extravagant and almost unmanageable. With the exception, I think, of two or three corps, the Queen's Own, the Grenadiers, the Thirty-fifth and the Seventh Battalions, no regimental surgeon accompanied his regiment to the front. The Sixty-fifth, the Ninth, the Halifax Battalion, the Montreal Garrison Artillery, and others from the older provinces, all took with them volunteer surgeons, and, with the exception of the Halifax Battalion, not one of them—of the surgeons attached for the campaign—has made a satisfactory report of the cases treated by him or of the sanitary or unsanitary condition of his regiment that has reached me.

I think this goes to show that the medical service was in an extremely inefficient state at the time of the North-west rebellion, and I do not know that any attempt has been made to alter the condition of the service since.

Mr. LISTER. Have you made any representations to the Government?

Mr. BERGIN. Yes. The report goes on to say :

Surgeons recruited in an emergency—Regimental System.—Surgeons recruited in an emergency, without any previous military medical training, are apt to be, and as in some instances during the late campaign were found to be, very inefficient and, from their want of discipline and ignorance of military law, were very difficult of control, and gave no adequate service in return for the large amounts of money expended upon them for transport, pay and rations.

Medical Staff Corps.—I strongly recommend, therefore, that a Medical Staff Corps be formed, very much on the lines of the Medical Staff Corps of Her Majesty's service, due regard being had to the differences of conditions and nature of the two services. The British Medical Service, being a permanent one, ours, so to speak, being more of a temporary character its component parts often varying, frequently changing. The system which I propose includes an administrative and executive staff, field hospital corps, ambulance corps and a military cadet corps. From this latter, year by year, the staff surgeons to be drawn. In my opinion there should be a surgeon-general, the administrative head of the service, a deputy surgeon-general in each of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, a deputy surgeon-general for the Maritime provinces, a deputy surgeon-general for Manitoba, for the North-west Territories and British Columbia, one brigade-surgeon in each military district, one surgeon-major to each brigade division,—the present regimental-sur-

geons, whilst not severing their connection entirely with their regiments, to be considered as surgeons of the staff so long as they remain within their brigade divisions. To meet the future requirements of the service, both for surgeons of the staff, field hospitals and ambulance corps, I beg to recommend that medical cadet corps be established at the seats of our medical schools, say at Montreal, Toronto, Kingston, London, Halifax and Winnipeg; and thoroughly taught ambulance and field hospital work. After graduation, having passed a satisfactory examination, they would be eligible as surgeons of the staff. During their pupilage they can be made available, should the necessity arise, as quartermasters, assistant quartermasters, hospital sergeants, hospital orderlies, dressers, etc. From them could be obtained also, if necessary, some of the material for bearer companies. Before appointment as a surgeon, each candidate should be subjected to an examination, which should embrace the following subjects: *a.* Military surgery, including transport of sick and wounded. *b.* Military medicine and pathology and therapeutics. *c.* Military hygiene. *d.* Duties of executive medical officers during peace and war. He must also give evidence of having attended a complete course of operative surgery in some recognized Medical University; and, in the presence of the examiners, write a thesis upon some military medical or hygienic subject. All warrant officers should pass an examination such as is required by the medical regulations of Her Majesty's army. No staff surgeon should be promoted to the rank of surgeon-major until after ten years' service. No surgeon-major should be appointed to the rank of brigade-surgeon except on the grounds of ability and merit; and in accordance with the regulations laid down for the Medical Department of Her Majesty's Army.

There is a recommendation here that the medical officer of a battalion should take a course of military surgery. One of the difficulties in connection with the medical service is, that the surgeons of the different regiments are appointed, as the Minister knows, upon the recommendation of the officer commanding the battalion. Too often he recommends a surgeon for appointment on the ground of personal friendship, or that he is the brother, or the son, or the nephew of some personal friend, or because he thinks he will be politically serviceable to him. These are not the conditions upon which a man should be appointed. He should be an efficient military medical officer and have the necessary proof to show that he is efficient, or else he should not be appointed.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) to the report of the General in command, dated on the 31st December, 1891, in reference to the statement made by that hon. gentleman as to the condition of the militia force up to a recent period and probably down to the present time. He says :

That the Militia Act has not fulfilled the expectations formed 25 years ago, is sufficiently evident to any one who carefully examines the present condition of the force, and compares that condition with the objects, held in view by the Commission, to which I have referred. This is due to many causes, not the least of which is indicated by the fact that many important sections of the Act have remained wholly in abeyance. They never could and never can be prac-

tically applied, and their existence is calculated to give a delusive character to the power of defence possessed by the Dominion.

The time seems to have arrived when a fresh inquiry should be made into the working of the Militia Act, in order to ascertain how far it has provided an organization capable of adapting itself to ever-changing conditions and increasing responsibilities. Such an inquiry would furnish a fresh starting point and firm ground for those who are called upon to guide the policy of the Dominion on the question of the defence of its territory.

I asked the Minister of Militia, a few moments ago, and I do not think I properly understood the answer he gave, whether it was the intention of the Government to increase the militia force in this country. I understood him to say that new companies would be formed only when other companies had been disbanded. Am I correct in that?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). As the hon. gentleman will see from the character of the Estimates, it is not the present intention to increase the militia force.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the Minister of Militia, whether he will lend rifles to the volunteer rifle associations in the North-west Territories? We have no militia in the North-west Territories, but we may at any time be exposed to considerable danger. We have rifle associations at all the centres of population, and I need hardly tell you that these men who compose these associations, are not in a position to buy rifles themselves. These men band themselves together in these associations, go out regularly to practice, and have competed with rifle associations all over the Dominion, in some cases successfully, and it would be conducive to the cheap protection of the country that the Minister of Militia should supply them with arms. The hon. gentleman has in store large numbers of these rifles which are practically—I was going to say, but it would be too rhetorical—rotting away, and these arms should be utilized. My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has suggested that an improved arm should be given to the militia force. If that be done, as the Minister of Militia seems to indicate, there will be no use for these rifles now in store, so that it would be in accordance with the spirit of the Act, and it would be only justice to the people of the North-west, that he should lend these rifles to the associations. There are associations at Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Prince Albert, Edmonton, Battleford, Calgary and Macleod, and the number of rifles required would not be many. They are not necessarily very bloated organizations; but I may say that the military spirit in the North-west is as active as in any part of Canada, if not more active. The exigencies of a pioneer life do not leave them that plethora of wealth that may belong to some of the volunteer associations in other parts of Canada, and I hope my hon. friend will do what he can in this direction.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). If I find that there is a surplus in store, and that the regu-

Mr. LISTER.

lations will permit of my doing so, I shall be charmed to comply with the request of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia.

Mr. HUGHES. On the second page of the Major-General's Report, I notice the following statement:—

The Imperial Government has expressed its willingness to confer medals, for long service and good conduct, on non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent force, under conditions similar to those governing such rewards in the regular army.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if he has taken any steps to have this honour conferred on the soldiers of the active militia who are not of the permanent force?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes. We are in communication with the Imperial authorities, through the High Commissioner, on that subject.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would like to emphasize the question raised by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with respect to supplying the militia force with a better class of arms for shooting purposes. The officers of the militia in my riding complain of the arms at present supplied to the force, and one of them has written to me, asking me to urge the Government to supply a better class of arms for shooting purposes than those at present supplied, which, I understand, are practically lying idle in store. If we are to have a militia service at all, I think it should be made as effective as possible.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the system of allowances to militia officers?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That may be necessary. Owing to the short time that I have been at the head of the department, it may be necessary to continue that system for the present year; but I intend to discontinue it, so that the exact amount of the salary of each officer shall be seen in the Estimates from year to year.

Mr. LISTER. What do you propose to substitute?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). A fixed salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister refer to the \$40 which is usually allowed to the captain of each company? Is it proposed to abolish that?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No. I understood the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) to refer to the allowances to officers at headquarters.

Mr. LISTER. No. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to this statement in the Annual Report of the Department for the year ending 31st December, 1891:

The system, under which allowances are now granted to the Rural Militia, is open to very serious objections. Allowances are drawn annually for "drill instruction," and for "care of arms," for which the country

receives no real value. They are paid to officers who are incapable of imparting instruction, and who are unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge. In the majority of cases, these allowances are looked upon merely in the light of perquisites attaching to the command of a battalion or company. The fault does not rest with the officers, but with the system, which makes an impracticable demand upon them. Considering the sacrifices made by officers of the Rural Militia in the performance of their militia duty, it appears absolutely necessary that certain allowances, in addition to the pay of their rank, should be granted to those who exercise the most important functions. Such allowances should, however, be the payment for a distinct value received by the country.

These are the allowances I had reference to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that refers to the very allowances I mentioned.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is not intended to do away with them during the present year; but having heard the views of my hon. friends on the subject, I will give it special consideration.

Mr. LISTER. They are not our views.

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. gentlemen will refer to sections 315 and 390 of the Militia Regulations, they will find that those allowances are fixed by statute. As I pointed out last year, the allowance for the care of arms is all right, but the allowance for drill instruction is wrong. The latter encourages old officers to remain on the force long after their usefulness has gone. The allowance for the care of arms should remain, and the allowance for drill instruction should be abolished.

Mr. LISTER. The allowance for the care of arms should, I think, be given to some one who will look after them. I understood from the Minister that it was to be abolished, but I did not understand what, if anything, was to be substituted.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I did not intend to convey the impression that the allowance to captains for drill instruction, referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, would be abolished. It is not the present intention to do away with that system, but it is under consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked the Minister a little while ago what explanation, in detail, he had to give the committee of the contemplated changes of the staff, because the Major-General, in his report, seems to place great stress upon the reorganization of the staff. He quotes from his published report of the previous year, the following paragraph:—

I am thoroughly convinced that if the country is to receive an adequate return for its militia expenditure, a reorganization of the staff is necessary. The first step in that reorganization should be the more strict definition of the duties and responsibilities of the Major-General commanding the Militia, on the principle contained in Her Majesty's Order in Council, appended to the Queen's Regulations for the Army.

This should be followed by the distribution of the staff, in such manner as to ensure the proper performance of the duties and the maintenance of an efficient chain of responsibility.

Then he goes on in his report of this year to say:

I have submitted details of a scheme for the reorganization of the staff by which I propose to gain economy in administration, combined with the systematic instruction of staff officers in those important branches of their duty which have been hitherto ignored. I venture to hope that this policy will be adopted by the Government as a basis of a policy of militia reorganization. Until some such solid foundation is laid the work of the military executive cannot produce any permanent effect, and it will continue to be seriously hampered.

Now, these are very serious words, and it is a very thorough change that the General suggests. He has given that scheme in detail to the department, and the department proposes to make a change by increasing the headquarters staff by \$2,500, and decreasing the district staff by \$7,000. I wish to know whether those increases in the headquarters staff and decrease in the district staff have made been made in pursuance of the plan suggested by the General? The hon. gentleman must know what changes the General proposed to make and the House is entitled to know them.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I may tell my hon. friend that the estimates were carefully gone over by the Major-General and the deputy head and myself, and that they met with the approval and are in pursuance of the Major-General's policy. The chief item is the abolition of the office of Brigade-Major.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The General says in his report that he has submitted the details of a scheme for the reorganization of the staff, and the hon. Minister informs us that his estimates are based on that scheme. We should like to know those details.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They have met with my approval and are before His Excellency in Council. I am basing my estimates upon them, and possibly may be able at a later date to submit them, but at present I cannot do so as I have not the assent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LISTER. Before the hon. gentleman can ask us to vote this amount, it is his duty to state what the scheme is on which he asks for this sum. He cannot avoid doing so under the pretense that the matter is before the Council. The Council have evidently acted upon the recommendation, because the hon. gentleman tells us that this vote is based on it, and we have the undoubted right to insist on knowing what this recommendation is. It may be a proper one or it may not, but it does not follow that because it has been recommended by the Major-General this committee should vote money based on it. The hon. gentleman should either submit the details of the scheme or suspend the item until he can do so.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have stated to my hon. friend that I approve of the proposition of the Major-General.

Mr. LISTER. What is the proposition?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That I have placed it before my colleagues for their assent, and will be very happy to bring it down to the House at a later period. I am asking a reduced amount from this House.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no desire to put any obstacle in the way of the hon. gentleman, but when he tells us that part of the money he is now asking will be expended in a manner which has not yet had the sanction of the Council and which he cannot explain, we should let the item stand. So long as the Council has not made up its mind and the hon. gentleman is in doubt, he is not in a position to ask for this money.

Mr. TYRWHITT. With regard to the item for care of arms, I am of opinion that the money is well expended and the country gets good value. Very often armouries have to be provided at the expense of the captains. In my regimental division, with eight companies, we have only two armouries provided by the Government, so that six armouries have to be rented or given by the towns in which the companies are located. The arms should be—and I am sorry to say that in many instances they are not—cleaned at least once a month, and this would occupy one man for the day. In addition, a trusty man should be employed who would be at the call of the Brigade-Major, when the latter sees fit to go and inspect the armouries at uncertain intervals. The officer in charge of a company is called upon at all times to make good any losses which may occur, and which do occur during annual drills. Despite the greatest care, losses of rifles or accoutrements will occur, and these are stopped from the \$40 allowed each captain. Speaking from my own experience last camp my pay amounted to \$72, out of which \$31.50 was stopped for camp losses. I cheerfully paid this, as there was no fund to meet it, and I am of opinion that regimental officers receive very slight remuneration for the services given.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not propose to discuss a matter of administrative detail with the gallant colonel from Simcoe, but draw attention to the main point now before the committee. If I understand the General commanding rightly, he is of opinion that Canada is, to-day, in a state of military impotence, and that that will continue until certain suggestions he makes with regard to the entire reorganization of the staff are adopted. I will read the concluding paragraph of his report to show how very important his suggestions are, in his opinion:

I conclude this report by urging the adoption of this most necessary measure. Without it there will continue to exist in Canada, a condition of military impotence, for the defence of her territory, side by side with the outward semblance of a military body,

Mr. LISTER.

devoid of the organization which constitutes the living spirit, and motive power, of such a body

Why, no words could be more serious or more grave. And, at this moment, when the General actually informs the Canadian taxpayer that we have a system which is "devoid of the organization which constitutes the living spirit," that it is merely "the outward semblance of a military body," and that our condition is one of "military impotence," we are asked to vote a million and a half of money to continue the system. I think that the situation bids us pause, and, if there is a remedy—and there is a remedy, and the General tells us that he has submitted the details of a scheme to the Government—then I submit that the hon. gentleman is not acting fairly by this committee in asking them to pass this estimate until they have had the details of this remedy submitted to them. The hon. gentleman tells us he has submitted it to his colleagues. Very well. But he says that he is not yet in a position to say whether he and his colleagues have adopted the General's suggestions or not. Then let him withdraw this vote in the meantime until the Government has had time to reach a conclusion. But he must not ask, and he surely cannot ask this House to pass this vote, not knowing whether the system is to be continued during the present year. I doubt if the House is justified in voting this large sum of money under the circumstances—if a condition of "military impotence" is to be continued. We are not voting this money for mere pleasure. I know the tax-payers of this country are not contributing it for mere pleasure. I know that the assumption is that this money is to be applied for practical military purposes, and that results will be achieved such as to justify the expenditure. We have the highest authority tell us: I have submitted a scheme to remedy this state of affairs. We ask the Minister to bring down that scheme. But he can only tell us that he has submitted it to his colleagues and is not prepared to say whether they regard it as an efficient remedy or not. I submit to the hon. Minister as a practical, sensible member of this House, if it is reasonable to ask for this vote without giving us an explanation.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Perhaps the hon. gentleman and others who have spoken in like strain somewhat misunderstand me. There is a recommendation for the appointment of an additional officer on the headquarters staff, as you will see by the Estimates. Until the Governor-General in Council has agreed to the appointment of this officer I do not feel at liberty to bring the matter before the House. As regards any general scheme to increase the efficiency of the militia, that rests with the General himself, and such a scheme involves greater efficiency at headquarters, provided for by the addition to the staff, and greater zeal and efficiency infused into the schools of instruction and into the militia generally through-

out the country. That is the scheme. It is not a mystery which I wish to keep from my hon. friend. I am quite aware of the responsibilities of the position and what I owe to this House, and I have no wish whatever to keep any details from my hon. friends. The only item I have not explained was the appointment of this additional officer on the headquarters staff. This suggestion comes from General Herbert and it meets with my sympathy and approval. I have laid it before my colleagues and no doubt it will meet with their approval also.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is surely not serious in asking the House to believe that a single appointment covers the scheme for the reorganization of the staff by which the General proposes to "gain economy in administration combined with the systematic instruction of staff officers in those important branches of their duty which have been hitherto ignored." Why, Sir, there never was such an indictment brought against the militia of any country. We have been voting millions of money year after year for a department under the charge of the present Postmaster-General, and the public have supposed and believed that good results would follow. And now we are told that the whole thing is a farce and that the condition is one of "military impotence." The General is not a mere phrase-monger. Active men in his position are not given to using words they do not mean, they are practical men. When he uses serious and grave language of that kind I take it that he means what he says; and when he says that he has submitted a scheme which will alter this state of affairs entirely and make the militia efficient, I take it that he means what he says. The hon. gentleman surely would not ask us to believe that the single appointment of which he speaks is the whole scheme of reorganization which the General refers to. I hope the hon. gentleman will either take us into his confidence or withdraw the vote.

Mr. HUGHES. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman misunderstands the language of the report and the nature of this vote. The General's Report deals with the question of organization, and not with a question of efficiency on the part of the men. The report deals with the executive department, and not with the fighting qualities of the force. It is true these two things must go hand in hand in the upbuilding of a militia force, but I presume that the Minister of Militia, before he has been long in the harness, will have fully considered the scheme of the General. What that scheme is I do not know, but, judging by the ability he has displayed in those portions of the report with which I am familiar, I have no doubt that it is something thorough and radical. But the report of the General, as you will notice, speaks of "the outward semblance of a military body, devoid of the organization which constitutes the living spirit and motive

power of such a body." We have on paper a force of about thirty or forty thousand men. There is no doubt that force is not what it ought to be. It cannot be on such a small vote as is given. I have a notice on the Paper to which I intend to speak when it is reached. I shall then endeavour to present to the Minister of Militia and to this House the plan under which I think the fighting qualities, if I may use the term—possibly it would have a tendency to run hand in hand with the organization of the staff—would be considerably improved as compared with the present condition. We have in Canada many of the necessary qualities for a first-class military force. But we have, unfortunately, a large amount of what is absolutely unnecessary and detrimental to the force.

Mr. LISTER. Mouldering branches.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, Sir, mouldering branches, planted under the old regime, mouldering branches which I have been for many years endeavouring to have lopped away. I hope that under efficient management of the present Minister of Militia necessary reforms will be effected.

Mr. LISTER. We are trying the present Minister. We shall see how he gets along.

Mr. McMULLEN. I don't want unnecessarily to worry the hon. Minister, but from the answers he has given to questions that have been asked regarding the Major-General's recommendation, I think it is highly desirable that he should inform the committee as to whether he intends to adopt the changes in the staff to which Major-General Herbert refers in the last clause of his report. The hon. Minister has asked the committee to vote a sum to provide for the staff officers. From the report of the Major-General it seems plainly apparent that the organization is not the best. If that is clear, then it is still more clear that a different organization is necessary. Then he goes on to say that he outlined that organization; he has made a recommendation with regard to what it should be, how it should be constituted, the shape and form, and everything connected with it; and he says that he has urged its adoption. Now, the hon. member from Prince Edward Island asks: Is the Minister prepared to say that he is going to organize on the basis recommended by the Major-General, and what is the recommendation? We want to know what it is, and if he is prepared to organize the entire militia force on the basis recommended. I think we ought to know what the Minister intends to do, when we look at the fact that we have been spending from a million and a quarter to a million and a half a year on our militia force, and when we have before us a report of the Major-General, declaring that it is inefficient, it is disorganized, and in a demoralized condition. The whole thing, from top to bottom, from

garret to cellar, is rotten. Now, I think the Minister should be willing to tell the committee whether he is going to adopt the recommendation of the Major-General with regard to the alterations. We ought, by all means, to know what the scheme is with regard to the appointment. It is clear the Major-General does not refer to the appointment of that officer. Here he has outlined clearly, and laid before the Minister, a scheme, the acceptance of which he urges in the strongest terms, for the reorganization of the whole force, and we respectfully ask: What is that scheme, and does the Minister intend to adopt it?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The fact that I incorporated in my departmental report the report of the Major-General, which I might have treated as a confidential report, is sufficient guarantee to this House and the country that I intend to act on the Major-General's advice. I have gone over with him a scheme for the reorganization of the headquarters staff and the district staff. I will now give the outlines of the Major-General's scheme, which I have adopted: though, at the same time, I may say that I have not yet obtained the consent of Council to the adoption of the scheme, as it will require a vote of money. For this reason, I had some hesitation in laying it before the committee, but, with the permission of the Prime Minister, I will go on and explain the scheme of the Major-General, which I have adopted on his recommendation as a military man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the Council interfere with departmental management?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They interfere with money matters; they interfere with new appointments.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has never been in the Council.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Up to the present, there have been five Deputy Adjutants-General, eight Brigade-Majors and seven Commandants of schools. I propose to have four Deputy Adjutant-Generals commanding schools of instruction, who will receive \$1,825 each, as salary. There will be six not commanding schools of instruction, who will receive \$1,700; there will be an Assistant Inspector of Artillery, commanding Military District No. 3 of Kingston; there will be an Assistant Inspector of Artillery, commanding the School of Artillery at Quebec. Two Brigade-Majors will be retained, and two will be temporarily retained, one at Montreal and one in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Temporarily retained?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Well, nothing will be done without the knowledge of this House in that regard. He will be main-

Mr. McMULLEN.

tained during the present year, until the end of June, 1894. It is considered necessary that two of these officers should be retained. The Adjutant-General in Montreal does not speak both languages; a large proportion of the force there speak only the French language, and on that account I am retaining the Brigade-Major at Montreal. Then, at headquarters, the only proposed change is the appointment of an Assistant Adjutant-General at headquarters. That is considered desirable in the opinion of the Major-General, who thinks it would facilitate the more frequent and better inspection of the military schools throughout the country, and the various camps of instruction when they are formed for annual drill; also, the inspection of the military stores throughout the country, and other details of that nature.

Mr. LISTER. You are dismissing how many officers altogether, and you are appointing how many?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Dismissing six, and appointing one at headquarters.

Mr. LISTER. Is that the whole scheme?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to allow the military stores and supplies to be purchased by another department, or to continue the present pernicious system of the Militia Department purchasing and looking after the stores? I see the General recommends that another department should purchase.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That means that another branch of the Militia Department should look after the stores. The Quartermaster will look after that branch of the business. He will have that in charge, and the stores will not be purchased by the parties in charge of the stores.

Mr. LISTER. I do not understand that stores have ever been purchased by the parties in charge of the stores. Does the hon. gentleman give the committee to understand that stores have been purchased by the individuals in charge of the stores?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Never.

Mr. LISTER. I understood the Minister to say that stores had been purchased by the Militia Department, and have been stored and inspected.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. By the storekeepers. The storekeeper and the General made up the list of stores required, and that was submitted to the Minister, and the order was given by the department for the purchase of such stores.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Adjutant-General recommends that, by a committee of the staff officers, the militia stores should all be bought and inspected. Is it the Minister's intention to adopt that recommendation? We know that the duty of awarding tenders for con-

tracts has rested with the Minister himself; but the Major-General recommends that a different system should be adopted, and that all contracts should be awarded under the supervision of a committee of staff officers. Parliament has paid \$10 a day for the services of men to inspect militia clothing who possessed very little knowledge as to the standard of such clothing. Does the Minister intend to adopt that part of the General's Report recommending a change in the mode of purchasing supplies?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I do.

Mr. LISTER. The General's recommendation is this:

The system under which clothing, arms, equipment and military stores are now procured and issued to the militia, appears to me open to very serious objections.

The responsibility for purchasing stores, making contracts, viewing the stores furnished by contractors, as well as for their custody and final issue, is all vested in one office, regardless of the conflict of opposing interests, affected by the performance of duties of such widely different character. It would seem more in accordance with business principles to vest the responsibility for purchase and contracts in the financial or civil branch of the department, and give to the military executive the duties of custody, inspection and issue. This would be more easy since the amount of stores (exclusive of obsolete and condemned articles) in possession of the department amounts to little more than an "expense store" calculated to meet the current requirements of the militia, but not providing for any reserve.

Then the Minister, we understand, intends to follow the recommendation of the General, as I have read.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Immediately?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes; when the contracts have expired.

Mr. DENISON. From the statement made by the Minister, it appears that he proposes to do away with the Brigade-Major at Toronto, and, I suppose, the Adjutant-General there will do his work. I would suggest that a further saving might be effected by abolishing the Brigade-Major in Montreal and appointing a deputy Adjutant-General, who should be able to speak both English and French. The work there cannot be so difficult as in the Toronto district, which is the largest in the Dominion.

Salaries and wages of Civil Employees..... \$50,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. Minister explain the decrease of \$5,825?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This decrease is secured by abolishing the services of a number of civil employees, in accordance with the recommendation of the Major-General, who considers that this can be done without interfering with the efficiency of the service. The Major-General has made a tour of inspection throughout the country, and it is on his recommendation that this reduction is made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the reduction at headquarters or scattered throughout the Dominion?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is scattered over the Dominion.

Mr. BERGIN. In regard to the intention of the Government to remove the Brigade-Major at Toronto, of course his duties can be performed by the officer of the military school there, but in the Montreal district the military school is at St. John's.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice, in the Auditor-General's Report, that large sums of money are paid out every year for salaries of civil employees engaged in repairing certain works in connection with fortifications. Would it not be possible to have the work done, especially that of repairing fortifications, by the men of the permanent corps? If the men were on active service, the work would necessarily be done by them and not be given to outside men. I have seen, as I have visited different places from time to time, that civil employees are engaged doing work that men in the service should know how to perform. I think this is a matter worthy of consideration.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The suggestion is a valuable one, and I will keep it in mind.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister has not yet given any explanation of the reduction in the item for salaries and wages of civil employees. Perhaps he will explain in what class the reduction has taken place.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is proposed to reduce the expenses connected with military stores all over the country, by dismissing a certain number of men, in accordance with the suggestion of the General.

Mr. McMULLEN. What work have these men been engaged at?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They are caretakers, labourers and others in connection with the care of the stores in the various military districts.

Mr. LISTER. How are the stores to be taken care of, if the caretakers are discharged?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). If we accept one branch of the Major-General's Report, we must accept the other portions, and throw the responsibility on the Major-General.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it proposed to reduce the salaries of the present employees, or to dispense with their services?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I am dispensing with the services of superfluous men.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the number of the men whose services will be dispensed with?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I cannot tell at the moment.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman state the provision that will be made for the care of stores under the new regulations?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There will be fewer men, who will do more work, and they will be required to do it with greater efficiency.

Mr. BERGIN. What provision does the Minister intend to make for those officers who are to be dismissed, particularly the Brigade-Majors, some of whom have been a great many years in the service, and have not been very well paid during that time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister surely does not propose to superannuate them?

Mr. BERGIN. I do not believe in leaving them without anything.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have not made any proposal in connection with the matter, but I intend asking that a gratuity be given them in proportion to their length of service.

Mr. LISTER. Does the Minister propose to ask a vote in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Yes.

Military Properties, Works and	
Buildings.....	\$91,000

Mr. LISTER. Will the Minister explain this item?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They are made up as follows:—Grants to rifle ranges, armouries, magazines, &c., \$6,000; fuel, \$5,500; gas, electric light, \$6,000; clearing away snow, \$1,500; materials for targets, rifle ranges, &c., \$2,000; total, \$21,000. Item 5, construction and repairs to military buildings, \$70,000.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant). I do not speak as a military man, for I do not belong to the force, but it does seem to me, that in the report we get from the department, it would be better if there was some idea given of the condition of the property the Government is possessed of in these different military buildings throughout the Dominion. I find in the report of the architect there is a reference to repairs that have been made to certain buildings, but we have no information at all as to the condition of the various other buildings. Before the House votes sums of money in this way, we should have some brief information as to the state and condition of all the military properties. I am quite disappointed to find in this report that there is no reference whatever as to the condition of military property in different cities. I may mention, for instance, and I have brought it before the attention of this House before, that there is a drill shed, so-called, in Brantford, which

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

has been in a state of disrepair for months and for years, and yet we find no allusion made to that in this report. Comment has been made that the military force is not as effective as it ought to be, but I am only surprised, from what I know myself, that the military force is as effective as it is and possessed of so much spirit, under the treatment that some of the regiments, at any rate, have received from the Government. The report, referring to the Cayuga drill shed, mentions that there have been some repairs to the doors and windows, and a drain made around, and that the roof needs shingling very badly. What I am at a loss to understand is, how, if it is necessary to report that, we have no report from any of the officers of the department in reference to the drill shed of the Dufferin Rifles, than which, I believe, there is not a better battalion in the service of the country. It is true, that the roof of that drill shed does not require shingling badly, because there is no roof there at all, as it has partly been without a roof for months and for years. If the Minister will give the matter a little consideration, he will agree with me that, in wet weather especially, the proper place for a roof is on top of a building, and not on the ground. A roof does a great deal more harm than good when it is upon the ground, because it does positive injury in keeping the rain off the grass, which the battalion is anxious to keep in a nice condition. I want to know how you expect any efficiency, or how you expect to maintain a military spirit among your men when you force a battalion like that to put up for months and years with such a state of things. The Government had their architect up there, and they know about this matter; but there should be some reference in the report to it, so as to bring it before the attention of the House. I want to know whether there is a system to be used in reference to the militia of this country that will recognize it as a national force; that will free it from the control of outside agencies; that will have no regard as to the political complexion of the constituency in which the battalion may exist, and whether it will be treated on public and proper grounds. I say, Sir, that it is to the credit of the militia of Canada, and it is to the credit of the battalion in whose interest I speak now, that they have maintained their organization, and that they are as efficient as they are under the treatment they have received. I know that some steps are now being taken with reference to this matter, but the steps are being taken through the public and the martial spirit of the officers themselves, and I believe that now at last the Government has consented to pay the rent of a room where their arms can be stored. But for months and months, I might say for years the battalion that bears the honoured name of Dufferin, was located in a drill shed with a roof lying on the ground, a drill shed in which Ministers have addressed as-

sembled thousands, and where you would think even respect for the multitude that assembled to hear them would have been sufficient to cause them to supply a remedy. I do not want to jest in reference to this matter; but I make the practical suggestion, that in the report of the department we should have in concise shape a statement as to the condition of the drill sheds, and other military buildings in the country. I humbly submit again: that if you wish to maintain the efficiency of the force some regard must be had to what is just and right, and regiments and battalions must be dealt with in a fair, honest and equitable manner. If in looking over the different estimates voted there is found a certain battalion in a certain place given, not only \$10,000 or \$20,000, but \$50,000 without the municipality in which that battalion is located contributing one cent, and on the other hand, a rule made by the Government: that we will give you a certain amount if you supply the other certain amount, and if that cannot be done within your means, well, then, you can find your means as best you can.—I say, it must be disheartening to that battalion which is equal in efficiency and worth to any other battalion, to find such a state of things existing, and yet that is the condition that has existed with reference to the different battalions in this country. You find in the report, drill sheds on which money is expended for painting, and other little extra fixings,—which expenditure is right and proper, I do not doubt; but, I ask, how is it that you pay for painting and ornamenting the halls of certain battalions, and that another battalion is left for months and months with a drill shed, part of the roof of which is lying on the ground, has been lying on the ground, and which the Government and the Minister know has been lying on the ground. I do not make these remarks from any selfish stand-point, but I speak on the broad ground, that if you are going to discriminate as between battalions, and if you are going to deal with some battalions in this unfair way, that you will tend to deprive them of the patriotic spirit of which they are possessed. I speak particularly of the Dufferin Rifles, because I happen to know a little more in reference to them than to any others, and I say that nothing can more tend to dispirit them, than such a course of treatment, and nothing can speak more highly in reference to the spirit that prevails among the militia, and the militia officers of the country, than that under such discouraging circumstances, they have maintained the efficiency of their battalions. I say again, that it is a grave omission that there is no reference made in this report to the condition of our military buildings, and when the Minister asks a vote of \$93,000, he ought to be in a position to be able to tell us what buildings he intends to repair, and what buildings are in a state of disrepair, so that we may know that the money is not for painting or adorning certain buildings, which

however desirable, the building can do without, but that it shall be first applied to repairs that are absolutely necessary. Then we should be able to vote this money intelligently. I lay no charge against the Minister; he is new in his department; I believe he will discharge his duties fairly in that department; at the same time, it seems to me that the reform he must inaugurate is not simply to bring down a report of the architect as to a few buildings, but to give us a concise report of all the different properties that we may have, with their state of repair, so that when he is asking us for a grant of this kind, he will be able to tell us just where he intends to expend the money, and the House can form a judgment as to the fairness or desirability of his proposals.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have been delighted to listen to the eloquence of my hon. friend, and I regret to hear him confess that he does not himself belong to the force. Should he think proper to join it, I will advance him as rapidly as the rules of the force will permit, because I think he will be an ornament to it; but I would fear the disaster that must befall the drill shed if he were accustomed to speak in it very often. I can only promise my hon. friend that I will know no political distinctions in the management of the Militia Department. I think the greatest possible misfortune that could befall this country would be the introduction of political distinctions into the management of our militia force, and I will treat my hon. friend, so far as the interests of the riflemen are concerned, on the most-favoured-nation terms.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is a matter of regret that the reasonable demand of my hon. friend has not been acceded to. The hon. Minister says that of the \$91,000 which he asks for he proposes to expend \$70,000 in construction and repairs. My hon. friend refers to a drill shed in his own town which he says is in a bad state of repair, and he asks what drill sheds the Minister intends to expend this money upon. My hon. friend paid a compliment to the head of the department itself; and I want the hon. Minister to take special note of the charge he makes against the department, that the petty huckstering that has distinguished and disgraced the Public Works Department of this country has been carried out in the Militia Department as well, though of all departments in the public service, the Militia Department is the one into which above all others party considerations should never enter. But if my hon. friend has given the facts, political exigencies and not the welfare of the force have been the controlling influence in that department in the past. And I am surprised that the ex-Minister of Militia should hear such a charge made against the department, and not have a word to say in reply. If he chooses to accept it in silence, the House will draw its own con-

clusions. But I think the present Minister should read the main details of this vote, so that if my hon. friend finds that no part of the money is to be spent upon the drill shed he has referred to, he may have something further to say.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must deny absolutely and teetotally the charge which the hon. gentleman has brought against the department during the time I was looking after it. I deny that political considerations ever guided me in the conduct of that department. That charge has been made against me time and again, and has been answered; and I would remind the hon. gentleman that he has, in his own province, an instance of a person appointed on the permanent corps by myself who never belonged to the party with which I am connected.

Mr. LISTER. I am surprised at the ex-Minister of Militia getting up and making the remarks he has dared to make. Why, Sir, there is his condemnation in the report of the Major-General in command, who condemns the whole administration of the Militia Department for the last ten years. It is a notorious fact, known from one end of this country to the other, that that department became absolutely corrupt; its administration was rotten from the top to the bottom; every report presented to this House session after session proved it; and the hon. gentleman found that he could only satisfy public demands by leaving that department and getting another. But the Government must not imagine that that exculpates them from responsibility for the maladministration of that department. While the present Minister may administer it fairly and well, it is the duty of the representatives of the people to call the whole Government to account. We had this matter investigated by a committee of this House. We charged the head of that department with favouritism in the awarding of contracts; we charged him with clothing the militia with material that was not fit for the soldiery of this country, and these charges were proved. Nay, more, Sir; the evidence showed more than a suspicion that all was not square and above-board in the dealings of that department with contractors. Why, Sir, the department issued invitations to three favoured individuals to tender for the furnishing of supplies, and those individuals arranged among themselves that one should furnish the tunics, another the trousers, and another the overcoats, and they fixed their own prices; one contractor not tendering against another for a certain class of goods, so that they received, year after year, the prices they thought proper to demand. The report of the General shows that the clothing of the men was so rotten that the trousers supplied to them had worn out in less than twelve days. We charged the department with issuing to the soldiery of this country inferior articles of clothing, and the report of the General this year proves that the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

charges, which were made fruitlessly and vainly year after year, were well founded, and true to the very letter. No greater evidence of the scandalous administration of that office is it possible to place before Parliament and the country than the report of the General in command. The Government must answer for this, and we shall expect the hon. gentleman now at the head of the department to carry out his promise to reform its administration and prevent the corruption which has existed in the past. We shall expect him to purify it, in so far as he can; to make it non-political, and to make this force, which is discontented from one end of the country to the other, contented and efficient. We ask that, and any Minister who undertakes to administer the office and does not fulfil this expectation is not entitled to the confidence of this House or the people.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman, by his loud-mouthed declamation, to try and convince the House of facts which never existed. For three months, the hon. gentleman will remember, the administration of my department was under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee, and expert evidence taken, and it was proved that the clothing served out to the militia force was superior to any that had ever been imported. When the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was submitted to Parliament it was voted down by the largest majority ever given in this House. Those are facts, and those facts I can appeal to, as a justification of my administration of the department. The hon. gentleman says that the force was in such a state that its efficiency was interfered with. Is it not a fact, and is it not a bright page in our history, that when the force under my administration was called upon to do service in Canada it proved itself equal to any emergency? The hon. gentleman knows that well; but he is only carrying out the policy of his friends—running down everything Canadian and Canadian institutions, running down the militia force, not because his criticisms may be of any use in improving the force, but because it is one of the institutions of Canada, and because my administration of the department was sustained by a vote larger than ever given before. It comes with very bad grace from the hon. gentleman to stand up here and try to put in "Hansard" his loud expressions, and ask the Parliament of Canada to put faith in his statements.

Mr. LISTER. I am amazed at the boldness of the hon. gentleman. He knows there was a resolution passed by this House condemning the administration of the Militia Department, and a gentleman, who is one of his colleagues, the Comptroller of Customs, felt so convinced that the department over which the hon. gentleman presided was inefficiently conducted, that he felt himself

called upon to vote in favour of that resolution. The boldness of the hon. gentleman is almost unspeakable. It is but recently he left the Militia Department, and look at the report of the General commanding, a report which condemns the hon. gentleman notwithstanding all his high-sounding disclaimers. The Major-General says, speaking of the militia stores :

They are filled with an accumulation of worn-out and worthless equipments, obsolete military stores, and condemned utensils, for the care of which an unnecessary number of men are employed. They are subject to no regular system of inspection and there is no personal responsibility established in respect to them. The condition of a large proportion of the equipment in use in the militia is even worse than I have already represented. Not only is a great part of it worn-out with age, but much of that which is issued as new is of the worst possible quality. I have seen saddlery and other equipment, when issued fresh from store, which failed to endure the ordinary usage of a twelve days' camp. I have seen boots that had been issued to soldiers, the leather of which had no more consistency than paper. The condition of the artillery material in possession of field batteries is likewise worse than I had been led to believe. I have now personally inspected nearly all these batteries, and I find that in many cases, the carriages, which are of an old pattern, could not be depended upon to bear the strain of heavy firing.

Could there be a clearer condemnation of the administration of the Militia Department, while the hon. gentleman had charge of it, than this report ?

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Lowell.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Military Properties, &c. \$91,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the item you have just read, Mr. Chairman, came before the House, before recess, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), with that delicacy of touch which distinguishes him, made a slight attack against me regarding the administration of the Militia Department when I had the honour of presiding over it. The hon. gentleman, in that style which is so well known and so peculiar to him, made use of very strong expressions, no doubt, to hide the weakness of his case, because strong expressions are generally used by gentlemen who are discussing a bad cause. I told the hon. gentleman, and I repeat, that I stand

here prepared at any time to defend the department over which I preside and my administration of the department over which I presided at one of the critical periods in the history of our country. I stated, and I repeat, that the policy of the Government was, breaking away from that of the party with which the hon. gentleman is allied, to give out contracts in Canada and to keep for Canadians everything that would help Canada. I know that the policy which I advocated, when I became Minister of Militia, does not accord with the views of the hon. gentleman. I wanted to keep in Canada a couple of hundred thousand dollars of money which had been sent to England year after year to provide for the tunics and the uniforms used by our militia. I know well that the hon. gentleman would not approve of that policy, because that was a Canadian policy ; it was a policy to help Canada. The hon. gentleman might have preferred to send this two hundred thousand dollars across the line and to depute Mr. Farrer to go and meet the manufacturers of the United States and take that money away from Canadians. That was not the policy that I followed when I was Minister of Militia. It is not my statement alone that I submit to the House, but I submit also the verdict rendered by the House of Commons itself, after investigation held by a committee of the House. I do not appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of fair-play, but I appeal to the sense of fair-play of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, and I ask whether it is not a fact, that every book I had in my department and every official who could give evidence, was placed freely at the disposal of the committee ? I ask, also, if it is not the fact, that I facilitated by every means in my power the investigation of the charges which had been brought against me ? I did so because I considered then, as I do to-day, that the reputation of public men in Canada is important to Canada and because I desired, as head of the department, to do everything I could to make that investigation complete. Sir, a good many of our colleagues have left these benches since that investigation took place, but it is within the recollection of those who are still here, that that Committee on Public Accounts went into every question, they received expert evidence, they looked into the contracts which had been given and examined samples of the material furnished by contractors. And, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, in this House, by the largest majority that ever was given on a similar question, the charges levelled against the administration of the Department of Militia were set aside and the administration of that department was declared to have been what it should be. Now, Sir, I have been told that my policy led to giving contracts to political friends and without tender. Like every other head of a department I was in duty bound to take the advice of men, not all political friends of

mine, who, standing apart from political life and political battles, act as the paid servants of the public. It was my duty to look to my Deputy Minister and to the high officials in the department charged with important work of administration in the department. I was not the man who invented or inaugurated the policy of giving contracts for three years, but I trusted to the experience and ability of the officers in my department, not all political friends of mine, as already stated. I trusted to my deputy, Colonel Panet, who had been called to the Senate by the late lamented Mr. Mackenzie when he was Prime Minister of Canada, but who has been true to his department so far as I can ascertain. Why did I adopt the policy of three years contract? Sir, does not the reason appeal to the common sense of any business man? The fact that England and the continental powers employ only a few contractors to manufacture the uniforms for the army indicates that this work is a specialty. It was a specialty for Canada; it is a specialty that never would have developed if the hon. gentleman's principles had obtained in Canada. But the party governing Canada at that time was a party that wished to create a strong nationality in our country, and it is that party and its policy that has made of Canada what Canada is to-day. Mr. Chairman, if you will look into the contracts given by England and by the continental nations of Europe for military supplies, you will find that, even within these vast territories, these contracts are controlled by a few manufacturers. And when we gave out these contracts, determined to make as great a success as they have proved to be, it became evident that it would be necessary for the contractors to provide special appliances and to invest large amounts in machinery. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman may not know, but I know, from my past experience, that it became necessary for these contractors to import machinery which, under hydraulic pressure, could cut, at a given moment, hundreds of tunics, or whatever parts the tunics were composed of. There are dies which, under hydraulic pressure, cut these tunics and make them as perfect as machinery can make anything. The result of our experience was, that when we gave out contracts by tender, we lost, in Ottawa alone, by one contractor, thousands of dollars. He was the lowest tenderer, and believed that the policy of bidding below anybody else was a policy that might help him, but he knew well that it could not help the country. He put in a tender which we accepted as the lowest, but the coats which he manufactured could not be received, and we had to go out on the market, on the eve of the meeting of the camps, and purchase these very goods which the system now advocated by the hon. gentleman had prevented us from utilizing for the benefit of the militia force. Now, let me read the cause of my great mistake; let me read to you the reason of my attempt to give contracts to the detriment of Canada,

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

and to the detriment of the Department of Militia, as alleged by the hon. gentleman. Every time that I was called upon to offer a contract to the public, I went, as I was in duty bound, to my colleagues in Council, and I got the authority of Orders in Council to give those contracts, because it was considered that the mode we were adopting was the best change.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

OTTAWA, 5th August, 1887.

The undersigned has the honour to report that the military gray coats supplied in Canada for the past four years by the contractors, Messrs. James O'Brien & Co., Montreal, have been found most satisfactory to the department, both as regards quality of cloth and workmanship, the cost comparing most favourably with prices paid for similar articles formerly purchased in England. In view of the above facts, and as the present contractors have taken pains to meet the department's requirements in every respect, and have become fully acquainted with all the details connected with the manufacture of great coats, it is submitted that it would be advantageous to the service if, in future, a contract could be extended for three years, instead of calling for tenders annually; it being understood, of course, that payments to the contractors in each year should be subject to the votes of Parliament for the respective year.

Respectfully submitted,

EUGENE PANET.

Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Not only that, but I can appeal to the long experience, extending over many years, of Col. Macpherson, regarding military stores, a practical man, understanding the interests of Canada better than the hon. gentleman, and at the same time looking after the interests of the Militia Force of Canada; not crying down the growing industries of Canada, not trying to advertise to the world that we had to go across the Atlantic Ocean to get a tunic to clothe our soldiers who were fighting the battles of Canada. He wrote me a letter, in which he said:

The undersigned has the honour to report that the military gray coats supplied in Canada for the past four years by the contractors, James O'Brien & Co., Montreal, have been found most satisfactory to the department, both as regards quality of cloth and workmanship, the cost comparing most favourably with the prices paid for similar articles formerly purchased in England. In view of the above facts, and as the present contractors have taken pains to meet the department's requirements in every respect, and have become fully acquainted with all the details connected with the manufacture of great coats, it is submitted that it would be advantageous to the service if, in future, a contract could be extended to three years, instead of calling for tenders annually.

You cannot say that this policy which I inaugurated was my doing alone. I consulted, as I have already stated, men who could advise me. I did not consult the hon. gentleman about the policy we were going to follow, and if I had, I would, perhaps, have adopted a policy not at all in the interest of Canada. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman can find fault with the policy of keeping in Canada the money which we paid every year to English contractors. The point I wish to make is that that matter was

investigated, the investigation lasted for weeks, I think a couple of months, if I remember rightly. Upon going into Supply the matter came to a vote, and, as I have already said, our policy was endorsed, not alone by the usual majority of the Government in the House of Commons, but by the largest majority that had ever been given for the Government; consequently that large majority must have been mistaken as well as myself as to the best policy which it was in the interest of Canada to adopt. On that occasion, Mr. Mulock's amendment was voted down by, yeas, 54, and nays, 95. Well, Sir, I fall back upon that division, I fall back upon that vote, as a justification of the conduct of the department; and I am always prepared to take the responsibility of my acts, whether in my old department or in the department over which I preside at the present time. Now, the hon. gentleman fancied that he was making a terrible thrust when he told me that the report of the General was a condemnation of my administration. I say it is not. The hon. gentleman said that my boldness astonished him when I attempted to discuss my acts as administrator of the Militia Department. Now, Sir, I appeal to the spirit of fair-play of any gentleman who will read that report, and who is conversant with the Department of Militia and Defence. Remember that I had an experience of nearly twelve years. When I came into the Department of Militia we had the accumulated stores which had been transferred to us by the Imperial authorities. We had in every city in the Dominion stores which had been left, which, of course, were obsolete and not of advantage to Canada, but which on withdrawing her garrisons, England left for the use of the Dominion. Would it have been better for me, instead of pursuing a policy of building up the country and constructing a network of railways, to have taken that money and imported into Canada stores which we would not require except in an emergency? The hon. gentleman knows that during the troubles in the North-west, when it became necessary, within a fortnight, to send troops to the front, we were able to send 5,000 men perfectly equipped for service.

Mr. LISTER. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman said, no. But when the fight was going on, the hon. gentleman never attacked the department, and whatever money I asked, it was granted by Parliament. The work done by the volunteer force in Canada was a credit to her sons and a credit to herself. When the news came of the rebellion, we sent men forward within a few days, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was still an unfinished road, and when it was necessary to send heavy ordnance, powder and stores to the front for 5,000 men, and by doing so, as Lord Wolseley himself told me, we astonished old England. Have you never heard

complaints made in England against the stores which she, with her great wealth is incapable of finding or furnishing, as desired by those who criticise? I say the report of the General applies to the stores; but I ask, where did the hon. member find an attack against the clothing? It may be the policy of one or that of another to import tunics from England, or other countries, but let the expert evidence—I do not wish to take up the time of the House by reading it—taken on the charges made against my department in 1889, decide whether it was not proved beyond a doubt that the cloth was better and the make of the tunics was better than tunics imported from England. That report is not an attack on me. It is a report submitted by the General in his desire to improve the stores. It is for Parliament to decide whether it will vote the money necessary to make the suggested improvement or not. When Minister of Militia I appealed to Parliament to improve the armament. Year after year only a small amount was voted to improve the guns in the hands of the artillery. I tell this committee that if it is the desire of Parliament to follow in the wake of those who are experimenting with improved arms, the expense involved to secure improved rifles and ammunition will be so great that Parliament will hesitate before it decides on changing the present armament. The present gun did effective duty in the North-west and in Burmah, when selected by the Imperial authorities as being the most simple gun that could be placed in the hands of men who had received no mechanical training. All the improved magazine guns are very difficult to handle, and mechanical skill is required to repair them and fit them for actual use when they get out of order. When the General's report is read and examined it will be found that it is not an attack against the department of which he is a member to-day. The General is not a man who, forgetting the traditions of his profession, would attack the department when he himself was responsible for the advice given, nor would he turn his back on that department and attack, as the hon. gentleman has said, the head of that department at the time. But I am liberal-minded enough to understand that he may criticise matters respecting which he may entertain views different from those held by myself at that time. The amount voted by Parliament was an amount which permitted me to maintain the force in the condition in which it was maintained, and the force we had at that time was too large for the vote. It was sufficient to keep that force as it was kept, and no more, and it was impossible to launch into extravagances and adopt improvements which might have been desirable. The hon. gentleman read from the General's report that the clothing was deficient and the leather of the boots was not what leather ought to be. During my administration of the department every article was inspected by an inspector, who belongs

to the hon. gentleman's party, who is not a political friend of this Administration and never has been; but I recognized that he is looked upon as an authority and as a good inspector, and I trusted him, as I would trust him to-day. It is not because his political views and political friends differ from my political views and political friends that I should doubt his capacity; I trusted him because I thought he did his work well, and, in fact, a more painstaking officer in inspecting stores I never met. I am sorry to have detained the committee so long; but I thought it desirable to offer a few remarks in answer to the observations made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), respecting the administration of the department during the time when I was Minister of Militia.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. the ex-Minister of Militia must have been touched upon the raw when he found it necessary to occupy so much time in explaining his position and his administration of the affairs of the Department of Militia. When the hon. gentleman is attacked, when any person says anything that affects him or the administration of his office, he always makes a counter-attack by commenting on the delicacy of the attack made against him. Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that no language, however strong it might be, could properly convey an idea of the gross maladministration which characterized the department which he has just left. Of all cowardly defences I ever heard made by any member of this honourable House, the speech which the hon. gentleman has just made excels them all. What is, in effect, the defence the hon. gentleman has made here to-day? He says if those things are wrong, then you must blame my deputy, Col. Paquet, or Colonel somebody else. Do we not know that the livelihood of these men depends on the smile of the Minister above him? Do we not know that those gentlemen, according to the letter which he has thought proper to read here to-day, refers only to the great coats supplied by James O'Brien & Company? Where are the letters which say the tunics and trousers are all right? We have not got them, because they are not in existence. Sir, these charges were made, not by men in this House, but by the officers of the different battalions throughout the country. Complaints were made year after year, upon the floor of this House, at the instance of these men, that the clothing served out by the department was rotten, and was unfit for the covering of men. I say that it is a great thing, in the interests of this country, that we have at last a man at the head of the military organization of Canada who is bold enough, and has courage enough to let the country know just how miserably this department has been conducted in the past. No man on this side of the House has impugned the courage, or the integrity, or the patriotism of the volunteers who went to the

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

North-west during those troublous times, but I cannot forget that the loss of life which took place was on account of the maladministration of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, who fomented the rebellion, who drove these men to desperation, and who now take credit to themselves for shooting them down like dogs. Rebellion had to be subdued, but we found that the military organization of Canada was not in a condition to send men immediately to the field. They were sent to the front under circumstances of great difficulty; they had to endure great hardships, and never, in the history of the world, did a small rebellion such as that, cost so much money to the public treasury. Millions of dollars were spent, when it is safe to say that half the money would have answered, and, as a result of subduing that rebellion, my hon. friend has the privilege of wearing a star upon his breast and being called Sir Adolphe. These were the great things obtained by that miserable rebellion, brought about by the hon. gentleman and his confreres in the Cabinet at that time. Who charges the soldiers of Canada with not being up to their duty? No man on this side of the House has done it, and when the hon. gentleman tries to make such an idea believed, he tries to establish what is not the fact. There is no man in this country who is not willing that our own people should have the benefit of contracts to be let by the Government, provided always that the Government sees that the material furnished by these contractors is equal to that which can be obtained elsewhere. We do not complain that James O'Brien in Montreal, or the company in Hamilton, or the company in Halifax should supply these articles, but what we complain of is, that the Government accepted from these contractors articles inferior to what they could have purchased at the same price in other places. That is what we complain of, and the evidence of that, beyond any question or peradventure, is contained in the report of the General, presented to Parliament. It is idle for my friend, after fourteen years in power, to get up here and make the paltry excuse that what the General finds, was a relic of what was there when these hon. gentlemen went into power. Dare he say, that amongst these useless goods are not to be found the goods of James O'Brien, the goods of the Sanford Manufacturing Company and the goods of the other contractors? The Minister of Militia at that time favoured these contractors. He invited them to tender for certain things wanted for the militia, and, strange to say, the tenderers were only three men, each tendering for a certain article—one for tunics, one for trousers and one for overcoats; so that, as a matter of fact, these contractors received contracts from the Government for which there was no competition. I charge, moreover, that there was no public advertisement asking for

tenders, and that there were circular letters sent to favoured contractors of the Government and personal friends of the Minister. Sir, the hon. gentleman congratulates himself upon the House having approved of his conduct in the matter of letting these contracts; he congratulates himself upon having received the endorsement of this House by a large majority. Does it follow that that vote was right? Does the hon. gentleman believe that the people of this country are of the opinion that he did not collect more than \$100,000 to corrupt the electors of Quebec; notwithstanding the fact that this House voted to whitewash him, and to refer the charge to judges appointed by himself? Does the hon. gentleman believe that the country accepts that as a final verdict on the charges then made against him? Does he mean to say that that vote of the House must be accepted as a final settlement of these charges, and an entire exculpation so far as he is concerned? No, there can be no doubt about that. My hon. friend can squirm as he likes, he may wriggle about in his seat, he may use high-sounding words and rounded periods, he may try to excite the national feeling, and he may refer to Mr. Farrer as being an annexationist. But, who is Mr. Farrer? For long years he supported the hon. gentleman by pen and tongue; and I may tell the Postmaster-General that we find the men throughout this country who are leading the annexationist movement, are not friends of the Liberal party, but they are the friends of the ex-Minister of Militia. We are dealing here tonight with facts, and the question we have to decide, and the question we are discussing is: Was the clothing furnished to the Government under these contracts such as it ought to be? Sir, the report of the General does not apply to clothing alone, but it applies to equipment, as well. It applies to every branch of the Militia Department in this country, and it shows that that department under the administration of the hon. gentleman had become utterly decayed. It is a fact that cannot be gainsaid that it was impossible to get the ex-Minister of Militia to carry out promises which he made while Minister presiding over that department. There was disorganization and demoralization existing and prevailing, and percolating every portion of the military service of this country, and it was time for the country that some gentleman was appointed to take the place which the hon. gentleman had held so long. It is to be hoped that the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Militia may see his way to make such reforms, and to carry on the affairs of this department in such a manner as will give satisfaction to the people, and that there shall not be the slightest suspicion that anything wrong is going on in the department. I repeat what I stated in the beginning: That the people of Canada owe a deep debt of gratitude to the General who now commands the forces of this country for having given

proof of what we, on this side of the House, have charged for long years, that the Militia Department was mismanaged, if it was not actually corrupt.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman. I just desire to say a word or two upon the point at issue, which has arisen since the debate began. It is not so much, I take it, a question whether certain contracts were let for military clothing, and whether, on investigation, that clothing was found to be fairly good. That is not the question before the House. The question that was started before dinner, and on the issue of which the ex-Minister of Militia challenged the opinion of the House, was whether the management of the Militia Department for the past few years has been at all satisfactory to this country, and whether that department is at present in a state which can give any satisfaction to any loyal son of Canada; and that question cannot be settled by reference to a political parliamentary majority. There are other votes which much more conclusively indicate the mind of the public of this country on that subject. The hon. gentleman boasted that, during the North-west rebellion, he had only to come down to this Parliament to ask for what money he wanted, and it was granted. Sir, that is true, and I am in the judgment of the House when I say that no Minister of Militia has ever asked this House for any money to promote the well-being of the militia of Canada but that money has been cheerfully granted. I have seen exception taken to almost every grant proposed by the Government during the twelve years that I have sat in this House; but I have never heard a proposal made for money to promote the militia service of the country that has not been cheerfully agreed to. What has been the result? After the North-west rebellion was crushed—and into that subject I do not want to enter, it has been settled long ago—he told this House that it was necessary for the well-being of the militia of Canada that the grant for that service should be largely increased—almost doubled. Was there a man refused to grant his demands? No. Sir; the hon. gentleman got whatever he asked from year to year; from the time of that rebellion the hon. gentleman says he received and spent for this service, \$8,500,000. And does he tell this House that the question of the efficiency of the service or the question of the proper expenditure of that money can be determined by the numerical majority which he may have had on a motion as to whether the coats supplied by this firm or that firm were good or bad? Why, the hon. gentleman is insulting the intelligence of this House. I will not appeal to any party majority or to any political vote; I will not appeal even to the opinion of any member of this House; but I will take the impartial opinion of the Imperial General Officer who has been sent to command the militia of Canada, and I will ask hon. gentlemen in this House, and the

public outside, in what position do we find the militia service of Canada at the end of ten years, during which the hon. gentleman has had it under his control, and during which, as he says himself, he got every dollar he asked for? What is the verdict? It is contained in the concluding paragraph of the Major-General commanding, who says that the country is in a condition of military impotence, the result of official incompetence. Lest it should be thought by any one listening to me that I am exaggerating the General's report, I will read what he says:

I conclude this report by urging the adoption of this most necessary measure. Without it there will continue to exist in Canada, a condition of military impotence, for the defence of her territory, side by side with the outward semblance of a military body, devoid of the organization which constitutes the living spirit, and motive power, of such a body.

Sir, I think the annals of English Parliaments can be challenged to produce a verdict so condemnatory and damnatory of the policy of any party as that given by the General commanding with regard to the policy which has governed the militia of Canada for the past twelve years. And this, Sir, after we have voted money like water. The \$8,500,000 which has been spent since the rebellion closed has been absolutely wasted. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman talks about the manner in which he provided for the equipment of the force. It would be impertinent on my part to offer an opinion on the subject, but has the hon. gentleman read the report of the General commanding in regard to that? What does he say:

The condition of a large proportion of the equipment, in use in the militia, is even worse than I have already represented. Not only is a great part of it worn out with age, but much of that which is issued as new is of the worst possible quality. I have seen saddlery and other equipment, when issued fresh from store, which failed to endure the ordinary usage of a twelve days' camp. I have seen boots, that had been issued to soldiers, the leather of which had no more consistency than paper.

With such a damning verdict as that upon the results of his ten or twelve years of administration, the hon. gentleman comes into court and says: Although I cannot appeal to facts, I appeal to a political majority which was given on the occasion of a vote upon a motion condemning the letting of a contract for coats. Sir, the condition of the hon. gentleman is pitiable, and he stands here, to-day, condemned by the General commanding in burning words which, I was going to say, should bring an official blush of shame to the hon. gentleman's cheeks. We are not here to say whether matters of detail were carried out or not. That is not the point. The question is, what was the policy of the department; and any hon. gentleman who wishes to see what the result of its policy was, has but to turn to the General's report of last year, wherein he says:

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

The superiority of the artillery, and the marked inferiority of the infantry, are traceable to the same cause, viz., the manner in which the duty of inspection is carried out. In the artillery, the system instituted by General Strange, when inspector of artillery, and still efficiently carried out, makes the inspection at once a test of efficiency, a means of instruction and a source of emulation. The inspection of the other arms has degenerated into a mere parade or review, which is productive of no good result at all, but on the contrary, frequently directs the efforts of commanding officers into a wrong channel.

That is the policy the hon. gentleman inaugurated and carried out, and it is the fruits of that policy upon which the General gives his verdict. He says again:

Under the system hitherto followed no data are available on which to base a trustworthy estimate of the cost incidental to the training of the rural militia, but it is my belief that a considerably larger force could be trained than has hitherto been the case without any increase in the vote for drill and training. I am not prepared at present to recommend any such increase of expenditure. I am satisfied that in the past the results obtained in the militia training have not been commensurate with the expenditure, and I see only in improved organization a sufficient guarantee of such results.

The General, from beginning to end, complains that the hon. gentleman and his department had no efficient practical organization. What was the hon. gentleman there for? It was not to carry out details. The most junior member of this House knows that. He was there to inaugurate a policy; and, having inaugurated a policy and given his orders to his subordinates, if those orders were not properly carried out, he would probably have a right to condemn his subordinates and to quote their opinions in his defence, if attacked; but for the policy which animated and controlled the department of which he was the organizer and chief, he and he alone is responsible. I will repeat the statement of my hon. friend; it is cowardly, in the head of a department, when his policy is attacked, to throw the odium upon his subordinates, General this or Colonel that. I have no doubt that Colonel Panet and Colonel Powell did their duty; but the question is not whether they did or not, but what policy the hon. gentleman himself adopted. Again, as to the armament and equipment, what does the General say:

Under the system at present prevailing, it is idle to expect that rifles issued to the rural militia can be kept in good order.

Again, he says:

Moreover, the equipment does not exist in store, which it would be necessary to issue in event of grave emergency. I have not inspected a single battalion in which the men's boots would have stood one month's active service, or a regiment of cavalry or battery of artillery, in which the saddlery and harness could be expected to bear a similar strain.

Could there be any stronger condemnation of the policy which the hon. gentleman has carried out? One wonders almost that a General, in his position, could use such

language, as they generally resort to more diplomatic language; but here, in plain words, General Herbert says that the whole department, from top to bottom, is rotten, that the equipment, arms and clothing are in a disgraceful condition, and that there is not a regiment which could turn out to-morrow in a grave emergency, and stand one month's tramp. The General goes on to say that the clothing is fairly good in quality. The hon. Minister, however, was not responsible for the quality of the clothing, but for the system under which it is issued, and regarding that the General says:

But the system of issue is open to very great objection. It is complicated, expensive, and satisfies nobody.

Could criticism go further?—

I am of opinion that economy and efficiency would be better served were annual allowances in money granted to city corps, to enable them to supply their own clothing, the responsibility for the strict inspection of such clothing and of clothing accounts being fixed on the inspecting officer.

Then, in his supplementary report, General Herbert tells us that we are in a condition of military impotence. It was no personal feeling which prompted his attack on that department, and, therefore, when the House is assured by the General commanding, who is in no way connected with political parties or governed by political prejudice, that after eight years of expenditure the result is nil, and that to-day we are in a condition of military impotence, the Opposition would be wanting in their duty if they did not press this fact on the attention of the House so that the administration of the department may be improved in the future.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is greatly to be regretted that so much money should have been wasted for so many years in buying supplies that are worthless. I was sorry to see that the Minister loaded the responsibility largely upon his officials, for I do not think that any Minister should be permitted to shield himself behind a number of officials who cannot defend themselves on the floor of this House. One thing has been overlooked in this discussion, and that is that the place in Ottawa for storing these supplies is badly situated and unfit for the purpose. It is right close to the canal. I do not think that any building in this city could have been selected in which military stores are more likely to suffer injury. At the time the Opposition objected strenuously to the location, and to the price paid for the site and building, something like \$30,000. I do not know where you could get a building worse located, right close to the canal, a low, damp place, not at all suited for the purpose. That is one reason why a great deal of the military stores have been injured. In the first place, it is quite clear, from the report of the General, that the quality of the clothing was never what it should have been. The hon.

Minister says that he appointed a proper inspector, and this inspector is paid some \$10 a day for inspecting clothing; and it is a most deplorable condition of things that, after taking those precautions and paying such an enormous sum for inspection, we have evidence that the whole thing is rotten and useless. It is a pity that this condition of things should exist, and now that a new Minister has taken hold I hope he will try to work the department up to a better condition, for if it is to continue as depicted by General Herbert it would be much better to abolish the whole thing and run the risk of doing without military stores and equipment. It is nothing but a farce, this spending of \$1,250,000 to \$1,500,000 per year, for a condition of things such as set out in the General's report. I notice in the report sent in by Colonel Macpherson, that he has recommended the building of magazines for use of the stores-branch at Halifax, N.S., and at Victoria, B.C. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to build those with the vote now asked?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The \$70,000 is made up of small items. In the Auditor-General's Report, 1891-92, page C-14, will be found some of the items. I may tell the committee that the Deputy Adjutants-General from the different districts send in estimates of what they will want for repairs, and I have only asked for one-half the amount they required. I felt I would not be justified, in one year, putting in the large amount they asked. The character of the items may be found in Appendix No. 3 to the Militia and Defence Report of this year, signed by the acting architect, and hon. gentlemen may trust to the Auditor-General's Report of last year for details of the expenditure. It does not include any new buildings, as such items would be brought down by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. The paragraph to which I call the attention of the Minister he will find on page 30 of the Militia Report:

I have also to refer to the necessity of building magazines for the use of the stores branch at Halifax, N.S., and at Victoria, B.C. For the present the department has to depend upon the Imperial authorities at these stations for the temporary use of their magazines for the storage of powder and warlike stores. I wanted to know whether he intended to carry out that recommendation.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I am at present pressing the building of a magazine at Victoria under the Department of Public Works. I believe that ought to be built; that it is an absolute necessity, and I am pressing for the building of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any rent or charge for the magazine there belonging to Great Britain?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I understand that the magazine there is in a position which makes it a menace to the public safety, and the authorities at Victoria insisted upon its removal.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise just to make a point here which I think has been overlooked. I am well pleased to see the Militia Department investigated, and I am satisfied that in a very short time we shall find out that the true cause of this difficulty is not in the storage department; that it is not alone—I do not say that it is not at all—in the executive department, but that it lies rather in the management of the permanent corps, and the connection which exists between the permanent corps and the active force. However, that I shall speak about later on. A number of the speakers addressing the House this afternoon and evening, referred to the stores here across the canal basin. I think it will be found that the criticism in the report of the Major-General does not refer to the issue from the stores from the headquarters branch here. The boots referred to, I believe, were procured outside. One pair was found in Québec, which had not been supplied through the regular contracting quarter. The man had gone and purchased the boots from the contractor himself. The quality of the clothing that is supplied differs from that of a few years ago. At that time the trousers were often not what they ought to be, but the quality of the uniform supplied at the present time is superior, and I am satisfied that if any member of the House would take an hour or two to examine the stores, he would find that the uniforms are in every respect of very good quality. The saddlery and other material with which fault was found, was also, I believe, found at other points, some at Québec and some elsewhere. I would also point out another fact. Let the Government and the inspecting officers be as faithful and as careful as men can be, yet mistakes will arise. We all remember how a very few years ago—I do not remember whether the Major-General was in the force at that time or not—when the British troops were fighting in Egypt, they discovered that the bayonets—not merely the accoutrements, but the bayonets—given to the soldiers for active service, were made of pot metal. They discovered this when they came to the charge, when they found that the cuticle of the aborigines was so thick that the bayonets doubled up, leaving the British soldiers at the mercy of the negroes. We remember also, how in the Crimean war any number of mistakes were made and any number of swindles perpetrated in connection with the contracting. We remember also, that in Egypt the British soldiers found their Martini bullets and cartridges absolutely useless. They stuck in the rifles and could not be extracted, and thus the rifles were rendered useless, again placing the British soldier at the mercy of the enemy. I state this, not in defence of the department, for, as I say, I am pleased to have that department investigated, but merely to show that, however careful the officers may be, mistakes will arise.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not intend to trouble myself with the ancient history with which the late Minister of Militia has dealt. But I am pleased with the remarks of the present Minister, and if I say a few words, it is simply with the desire that the expressions made use of by the Minister shall not be regarded simply as empty words, only to be recorded in the "Hansard." He has stated that it would be a calamity to the Dominion of Canada if the Militia Department were conducted on a political basis. For my part, as a member of the force, I must say that I fear that to some extent in the past we have had that calamity in this country. However that may be, the new Minister has promised us that this shall not be the case in the future and that he will make many changes in relation to the force. I will say to my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Militia, who spoke so warmly on the question of the equipment to-night, that he must not forget, notwithstanding the strong protest he has made, that he has had representations made by the highest officers in the militia throughout the country with regard to the equipment and with regard to the quality of some of the stores furnished to the men. He has had it from the men and from the officers of almost every battalion throughout the country. He has heard it from members of this House, themselves members of the militia force. He seems to have a very short memory with regard to some of these things. The late hon. member for Frontenac, the Hon. Mr. Kirkpatrick, pointed out session after session to the hon. Minister the deficiency in the matter of equipment, and made suggestions which, to his mind, and, I think, to the mind of many other members of the militia force in this House, were in the direction of improvement. The hon. gentleman has told us that he has appealed to the House from time to time for an increased vote for the purpose of giving a more efficient equipment to the volunteers. I have been a member of this House for a good many years. I have stood in my place and urged for a great many sessions the desirability of improving the equipment, and from both sides the Minister has been urged, if his excuse was a good one that he had not money enough to make the small improvement desired, to ask for the necessary money and he would be supported. But, Sir, we have not been able to get the Minister at the head of the department to take enough interest in the representations made, not only by members of this House, but by the leading officers in the different divisions, in favour of better equipment. I desire, Sir, to impress this on the hon. Minister. If he will look at the reports he will see that but little importance has been attached to this matter. We find that, as a rule, the officers of the department here have been courteous and active and energetic, and have shown every desire to do their duty to the best of their ability. I have found, so far as my experience goes, that the militia

officers throughout the country are enthusiastic and energetic, and desirous of doing the best they can to maintain the force in a state of efficiency; and if the hon. gentleman who has now taken the position of Minister of Militia will look at the reports, or attend to the recommendations of these men who are so faithful to the force, I think he will find the representations made now with regard to the force are correct, and that, with very little effort on his part, by merely seconding the efforts of his officers throughout the Dominion, he will be able to make many important changes that will be in the interest of the volunteer force. Sir, it is ridiculous for the late Minister—perhaps that is too strong language—but, to my mind, it is entirely out of place for him to say that the supplies furnished were of good quality. He knows very well, and we know, and I know of my own personal knowledge, and have told him so, and other members have told him so, that the stores supplied were not of a good quality, and they did not begin to give satisfaction, or to wear the time which it was intended by the department they should last. I would call the Minister's attention to the suggestion that was made by the then hon. member for Frontenac, and other officers of this House, that a change in the system of inspection, or rather the issuing of the clothing, etc., after they were inspected, might make a decided improvement in the efficiency of the equipment for the different companies and battalions, without costing any more money. It was pointed out at that time that according to the regulations of the department each company is allowed a certain supply for a given number of years. During the past few years we have not been getting a proper quality of goods furnished. Instead of giving a full supply at the end of a certain term, let the officers inspecting report exactly the state of the clothing and equipment at the time of inspection, and if necessary to put that company in a proper state, let him supply just what might be required. That always seemed to me to be the proper way. A company, for some reason or other, might have a certain portion of their clothing in bad order and not be able to get a fresh supply. In many instances that have come under my own notice, there might be a certain portion of the clothing, etc., in good condition and fit for use, but they were not able to make up the full supply. Hon. members who have had experience, know how difficult it is for a captain or commanding officer to get his company to turn out when they have nothing like a proper equipment. I wish the Minister would take into consideration this system of dealing with supplies, which, I think, he would find to be a great improvement, and more satisfactory to the men, without particularly increasing the cost. In many instances we find that at the end of the term allowed, for some reason or other, the equipment may not be in a very good condition; but when application is made and

the company is entitled to a new issue, it is supplied to them irrespective of what state it may be in. Whether other difficulties might crop up in the working out of this system, which I do not foresee, I am not prepared to say. Of course, the officers in the department who will give the subject attention, will know with regard to that. I would ask the Minister to give the matter his consideration, and if possible to try and second the efforts of the officers of local battalions. The ex-Minister spoke about the efficiency of the equipment of the volunteers when they were called out during the rebellion. With regard to that, I must say that there is not a member of this House who will speak his mind freely, who does not know that if our men made a good showing on the field at that time, it was not in consequence of a good equipment, but in spite of a bad one. I would remind the committee of the position taken at the time by officers commanding battalions. My hon. friend, the present Minister of Public Works, if I remember rightly, protested so strongly that he actually refused to take the field unless something was done to improve the equipment of his men; and I think my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) also protested very strongly to the department. I remember distinctly that other members of the militia force, now members of this House, who were in active service at that time, but who are not now present in the House, made complaints about the inefficiency of the equipment when the men were called out, and made reports to the department with respect thereto. I say the Minister has no reason to take credit for the condition in which the men took the field at that time, and, I repeat, if they made a good showing it was owing to their pluck, energy and patriotism. We remember that their officers, and municipal councils, and private friends had to come to their assistance in almost every locality where they were called out before they were able to take the field at all. I think no person will pretend to dispute that. We remember that many of these questions came up in the House afterwards, when the House took an active interest in these matters. We were told by the Minister to-night that the reason for purchasing some of these supplies in Canada was his antipathy to buying goods in Great Britain. Well, I think that is rather strange. For my own part I would be in favour of buying goods in our own country if they were of the right quality and of a reasonable price; if not, I would not object to buying them in Great Britain. I did not suppose the Minister of Militia would have such an antipathy to Great Britain that he would consider it a crime to spend money in the old country. I have in my place during the last twelve years, at least, urged upon the Minister and the department the desirability of giving an improved equipment to the volunteer force. I think no one can dispute the desirability of doing this, in order to

relieve the officers and men of some of the expense and annoyance that they are put to for the want of such an equipment. I trust that the new Minister will take this matter into his consideration, and, I think, by means of a reorganization and a better way of doing business, he will be able to give better satisfaction in the future.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The discussion has taken a somewhat wider range than the item we are considering, and I come back to the subject under consideration. I desire to speak in somewhat of a subdued tone this time, as it appears that the last time I addressed the Minister he seemed to be so afraid that I would bring down the House upon his head, that he was unable to answer the question I put to him. He has referred us to the particulars of the vote to be found in Appendix No. 3 in this report, a matter of some \$75,000. He tells us that he has applications for more than double the amount, but he has cut it down one-half. Well, the question is whether it is wise, under these circumstances, to reduce the grant \$5,000, as he asks us to do. I suppose he has given it consideration. But the point I suggest is this, if the Minister will bear with me in suggesting it, as it may be a new departure in his report. I understand that the different military officers send in requests with reference to the different sheds and stores, and I would suggest that in his next report these requests should be published in a concise form, detailing the repairs that were required to the different properties and works of the department throughout the Dominion. Then, next year, we will have an appendix to his report, like this report No. 3, of his architect, detailing the work that has been done in the way of repairing, &c. The House would then be able to examine this report in the light of the requests and the representations made by those reporting on various buildings throughout the Dominion, and to judge as to whether the Minister had, with the amount of money placed at his disposal, expended it at the different points and on the buildings that stood in the greatest need. We would then be able to determine whether the money had been expended on works which might have been deferred for a year or two, while more pressing claims had been passed over. I have pointed out cases where there was an absolute necessity for the care of arms and Government property that there should be an expenditure made, and I pointed out that this has not been done, but money has been expended on ornamenting and repairing other buildings, expenditures right and proper in themselves, but which should not have been made when there were buildings requiring repairs, absolutely unfit for use and in which Government property was not protected. The suggestion I make is a practical one. I am not finding fault; but I suggest that if the Minister would bring

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

down these reports as to repairs that are necessary on the different buildings throughout the Dominion, then, on an examination of those reports, hon. members would be able to commend or criticise the Minister's action. Appendix No. 3 contains particulars of the drill sheds and other Government properties that have been repaired during the year, but we do not know what representations have been made with respect to other property on which nothing has been done. I desire to obtain this information, which I think will prove useful to the House, as enabling hon. members to form a proper conception as to the administration of the money voted to the department.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I think the suggestion is a very sensible and practical one. It may largely increase the volume of next year's report, but I will bring down the information to the House. I propose to furnish information respecting all the properties occupied by the Militia Department, the architect's report as to their condition and the Adjutant-General's report as to necessary repairs.

Warlike and other Stores. . . . \$66,700

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From this vote, I presume, saddlery and boots and shoes will have to be provided. Perhaps the Minister will explain how boots and saddlery are purchased; if by tender, who are the successful tenderers this year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he asks about saddlery. Boots and shoes are supplied in this manner: The matter is placed in the hands of the commandants of the several districts, and they obtain local tenders for boots and shoes, and where the articles have not been of a satisfactory character, such as has been referred to by the Major-General in his report, they have been returned and a new issue obtained from the contractor. All the contracts in connection with the Militia Department will be by public tender, duly advertised in the public press.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the present Minister possess the same antagonism to Great Britain as his predecessor has manifested to-night? Is that the policy adopted by the new Minister? The late Minister has deprecated having any dealings with England in connection with military stores; he spoke of it as being almost a disloyal and terrible offence. Is that the policy of the new Minister of the department?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In view of the statement made in the General's report as to the condition of the boots and shoes, it is obvious that in the public interest the present system should not be continued. The General has made a very serious indictment. He has stated that several of the boots and shoes were of the consistency of paper, a disgraceful condition of things.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is my intention that all contracts shall be let by public tender, and that the goods shall be thoroughly inspected. If inferior goods are passed the inspector will have to suffer, and he will be held responsible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose it is too much to ask that the same rule should be applied to the inspectors who have passed improper goods and proved faithless in the past. The hon. gentleman is really continuing the system that has proved ineffective in the past. The ex-Minister has expressed the opinion that these were minor matters, that he entrusted them to an inspector and other officials, and that he as Minister was not responsible. The new Minister must have observed from the tone of the remarks made by hon. members that such an excuse could be offered at a future day, and that he must adopt some effective measures to remedy this evil. This is not a matter of politics, but of the efficiency of a vital arm of the service. We all desire that this evil should be removed if possible, and some system should be adopted by which the department will not be imposed on in the future as it has been in the past.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). My information in regard to boots is exactly what I have stated to my hon. friend: that where unsuitable boots were supplied a new issue of boots were obtained in lieu thereof. It is my intention to recommend the appointment of a quartermaster-general, who will inspect the inspectors and supervise the stores and everything of that kind. I trust we shall be able to obtain the service of a man of standing and character, and that he will perform efficient service for the benefit of the militia.

Mr. McMULLEN. What disposal of the rubbish will be made—useless boots and clothing referred to in the report?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have not decided on that point. I intend to have every local inspector furnish a detailed statement of all stores belonging to the department in the different establishments. Articles that are useless will be sold by auction, for they occupy space and require the attention of caretakers.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the Auditor-General's Report, page F—167, I find that condemned stores were sold and realized \$1,110, but the expenses were \$114. That seems to be a considerable percentage to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. They were sold in different lots and in different parts of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will all the rubbish be gathered at one place and there be all sold?

Mr. BERGIN. That is all nonsense. It would not pay the freight to remove rubbish from one part of the country to another.

Mr. LISTER. What amount was voted for this service last year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The Estimates this year are submitted with such particular detail that I cannot fairly compare them with the Estimates of last year. They are framed on a different basis. We have made a new departure in the Militia Department, and every item is now placed under its proper heading and there is no grouping of items, a change that will prove of advantage to the House. The whole cost for stores, transportation and freight, as compared with last year, involves an increase of \$1,857. I cannot give item for item compared with last year. One of the objects we have in view is to have every item under its proper heading, so that the House and the country may be informed as to the sums voted for particular purposes and the manner in which they are expended.

Mr. LISTER. What items does the hon. gentleman include under "warlike and other stores"?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). We propose, each year, for five years, to take a small amount to improve our field artillery. It is proposed to establish repairing depots at one or two places, possibly Quebec and Toronto, to repair the equipments after camp. It has been found that saddlery and such like have become comparatively useless after camp, and it is proposed that these articles shall be collected at one or two centres and properly repaired, so that possibly a considerable saving may be effected.

Mr. DENISON. I think that the new arrangement of the items is an improvement, but I would like to see it so arranged that we could discover exactly the amount the permanent corps cost, and what is spent on the militia. It could be easily done in the department, but it is difficult to make it out in its present shape.

Mr. LISTER. Are the saddles made under contract? What is the name of the contractor?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is by contract for a certain number of saddles, but I forget the name of the contractor.

Mr. LISTER. Why does the hon. gentleman ask \$20,000 for field artillery and equipments?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This is a new vote. It is intended to ask a similar sum for a period of five years in order to get us proper field artillery.

Mr. LISTER. Where do you get them? Have you made any contract?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No; I believe we will have to get them from Great Britain.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister who makes out the requisition for

hospital stores? I suppose it is the Surgeon-General of Militia?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I understand the Surgeon-General makes out the requisition.

Mr. BERGIN. I fear the hon. Minister is mistaken. I have not been consulted since 1885.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not think it possible that any man acquainted with medicine or surgery could make out the requisition, judging from what I have seen of these supplies at the time of annual drills. The box of medicine sent to the camp I have been in for many years, contains things which are entirely out of date and are useless and worthless, and many of the requisite, simple remedies such as carbolic acid, are not to be found. I have represented over and over again in my reports, this condition of things but the same old box is sent back year after year. This is a matter which the Minister would do well to inquire into. If he would require the Surgeon-General to make out the requisition for the stores, he would probably get a more useful supply than he gets now. So far as the surgical department is concerned, nothing whatever is supplied. I do not know whether the department expects that the surgeons of this country are to be at the expense to supply all these things or not, but I can assure the Minister there is great need for reform in this branch of the service.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have noted what my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) said this afternoon, and also what has been now stated by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), and I will pay special attention to the matter.

Mr. LISTER. The complaint my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) has just made, is one I have brought before the attention of the ex-Minister of Militia three or four times. It is notorious that the medicines furnished to the different battalions are of such a kind as to call forth complaints and protests from the medical officers. Although the ex-Minister of Militia promised over and over again that this matter would be rectified, no steps were taken to remedy the things complained of by the medical gentlemen connected with the different regiments throughout the country. I ask the Minister now, whose duty it is to furnish this medicine, from whom it is procured, is it by contract, and on whose requisition? If there is a Surgeon-General, he ought to be the man to make the requisition, and upon him ought to rest the responsibility. If he is not consulted at all, and if some understrapper in the office undertakes to deal with it, I want to know it. We know that camp life does not agree with many of the volunteers until they become inured to it, and for the first few days of camp life, a great many of the soldiers

Mr. BORDEN.

take ill. It is exceedingly important that the medical men paid by the Government for the purpose of looking after the health of the volunteers should be properly provided with medicines suitable to the complaints for which the men are liable to suffer. I hope the Minister will be able to give me the information I desire to ask.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There is a military hospital medical chest furnished from headquarters to each camp, and the surgeon in charge may supplement that with any articles he requires upon requisition.

Mr. LISTER. That is not correct. Surgeons have told me that they have had to pay for the medicines themselves. When the surgeon requires medicines, who makes out the requisition, and where does he get them?

Mr. BERGIN. When I was the commander of a battalion in camp, I found that nothing of any real use was furnished in those old, dirty, tin boxes, and I instructed the surgeon of the battalion to send prescriptions to the medical men in the town near the camp. I signed the requisition for these, and it was paid by the department, sometimes after a long kick.

Mr. LISTER. I know that the medical man who went out with the Lambton battalion paid for medicines out of his own pocket.

Mr. BERGIN. Then he was not as smart as a Lambton man ought to be.

Mr. LISTER. He had not been in Parliament. Can the Minister tell me anything about this? Where does that box of medicine come from?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is supplied from the military stores at Ottawa, I suppose, as a matter of course, to each camp.

Mr. LISTER. Are those supplies purchased by contract?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I believe not.

Mr. DENISON. The way it has been managed where I have been in camp is this: The department furnish a medicine pannier, which is supposed to contain everything that is requisite for the camp. If certain medicines, which it is desirable to have, are not there, the brigade medical officer sends a requisition to the department and gets them.

Mr. BORDEN. For something over twenty years I have been in the active militia of this country, and the difficulty which has been referred to has been experienced by me during all that time. A box of drugs, very correctly described by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), is sent into camp. It is largely useless, containing things that are no good, and lacking things that are wanted. I have been asked by the Deputy Adjutant-General each year to make a report, complaining of that condition of things, and he promised to forward it to headquarters.

I have made half a dozen reports, but not the slightest attention has ever been paid to any requisition that I have made; and my brother surgeons in the force have informed me that their representations have met with the same fate. During camp I have sent for medicines which were urgently required, and I have had the greatest difficulty to get them paid for. In one case the Deputy Adjutant-General and myself divided the cost of getting medicines between us, because it was impossible to get it out of the department. This is a condition of things that certainly requires a remedy.

Mr. LISTER. Is it any part of the duty of the Surgeon-General to see that proper medicines are supplied to the military officers?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No, unless he is on duty and under pay.

Clothing and necessaries..... \$62,000

Mr. LISTER. Are these goods supplied under contract, and who are the contractors?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They are supplied under contract. I gave the names of the contractors the other day in this House, in reply to a question to my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. LISTER. Are the contracts still in existence, and are there separate contracts for the several portions of clothing, that is, one for trousers, one for tunics, and one for overcoats?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The contracts are still in existence. They run to the 1st of June next, when they will expire. I understand that there are separate portions of clothing.

Mr. LISTER. Were tenders invited?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I understand that tenders were obtained from the leading clothiers in Canada; but I do not know any details on that subject.

Mr. LISTER. Were those tenders asked for by public advertisement or by circular?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). By circular.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Minister to go on getting tenders in the same way when the present contracts expire, or will he invite tenders by public advertisement?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have told my hon. friend that invariably I intend, in the case of every article that can be tendered for, that tenders should be called for by public advertisement.

Mr. LISTER. And the contract given to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All these existing contracts expire next June?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). 30th of June, so I am informed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What quantity do the existing tenders authorize the contractors to supply? My recollection of the last Public Accounts Committee is that they found that there was an enormous amount, far in excess of what was required, in store.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That information is incorrect. My deputy informs me that we will require 2,000 overcoats, 5,000 tunics and 8,000 pairs of trousers. The contractors are limited to those amounts.

Transport and Freight of Militia. \$68,500

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant). How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the exact amount of \$40,000 for transport of active militia attending camps of instruction? Are the same camps held every year at the same places?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The figures have been carefully worked out by the Major-General and the deputy head and the Adjutant-General. I have decided that in future there will be a permanent camp. It is desirable, in the interests of the service and economy, that the system of migratory camps should be done away with. The points at which the camps will be held are mentioned in the reports.

Royal Military College of Canada \$70,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the total number of cadets?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Sixty-four.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that an increase over last year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Last year there were sixty-six.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think there ought to be some information in this Militia Report by way of comparison of the working of this military college, giving the cost, the attendance and the result each year. I have no desire to attack the college in any sense or way, but I would like to have data before me on which to form a judgment, and one has not that data in that report. I hope the hon. Minister will take steps to have some kind of comparative statement made up, so that we may see how many have attended college from the beginning, those who have taken their diplomas each year and those who have graduated with honours, and, if possible, a matter very interesting to the people and asked about every day, where the gentlemen who have taken the diplomas now are, how many of them are in the British army and how many employed otherwise? If we find that we are only spending money to educate young men who go to the United States it might be a matter for consideration how far we should continue that expenditure. If these gentlemen are graduating into the British army it is a different thing, or, if they are remaining in the

Dominion in military positions or any other positions, I do not care whether military or civil, it is desirable to know it. But if the majority of them, as is charged in the press, pass over to the United States, it might be a matter for consideration whether the expenditure should be continued, or whether steps should not be taken to check the tendency, on the part of the graduates, to pass to a foreign nation. I trust the hon. gentleman will try to have a comparative statement for next year.

Dominion Cartridge Factory--
Pay of Staff, cost of material,
machinery and all expenses ex-
cept buildings..... \$40,000

Mr. LISTER. You are asking for less this year than last. How is that?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There is a considerable quantity of ammunition in store and I intend to reduce the expenses of that factory. The factory itself is on trial; to my mind it is an experiment. Whether I shall continue to ask Parliament for a grant for that factory is a question which I could not answer, and it will depend a good deal on the working of the factory during the present year. There is a store quite sufficient for the needs during the coming year of those using Snider rifles, and I am advised by experts that if the store is allowed to accumulate the quality of the ammunition deteriorates. We think it a good deal better to use the ammunition in store and economize for awhile until we see our way clear in reference to the utility of continuing the factory.

Mr. LISTER. Can the hon. gentleman inform us how much the factory has cost the country since its establishment? Can he give an approximate statement?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I would be delighted if I could furnish my hon. friend with that information, but he has asked me one question too much. I am sorry I cannot give him the information impromptu.

Mr. LISTER. I think this matter is important. Would the hon. gentleman object to the item being allowed to stand?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will give the hon. gentleman information on concurrence. If the hon. gentleman sees this as I do, he will see we are approaching the same path by slow steps. I will either close that factory altogether or give a good account of it in the next twelve months.

Mr. LISTER. I should think the hon. Minister would not have much difficulty in coming to a conclusion in view of this statement of the General:

There is at present a considerable reserve of Snider ammunition, and the supply is maintained by the Dominion Cartridge Company, which turns out an antiquated form of cartridge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

That seems a good deal like the rest of the Militia Department.

In order to manufacture the ammunition required for a modern small bore rifle, considerable changes of machinery would be necessary, while the smokeless compound, which has taken the place of gunpowder, in the modern fire-arm, could not be procured in Canada.

If we are to be up with the times I suppose it would be necessary to have smokeless powder, and, according to this report it is impossible to procure that in Canada. It seems to be almost a waste of public money to spend it in making an antiquated form of cartridge. But I understand the Minister to say that, unless the factory this year gives a good account of itself, it will be closed.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I may tell the hon. gentleman frankly, and I may take the committee into my confidence, also, that the superintendent of the factory is here at my special request. I have not been able to have an interview with him to-day. But I intend to go into all the details with the superintendent, the Deputy Minister, and other officers who are fully informed. Meantime, I take this reduced vote for this year. The reason I take the reduced vote is that we have enough to furnish the militia of Canada with ammunition for the Snider rifle. We have that ammunition in store, and it is suited to the arm with which the force is supplied. This year we will turn out the Martini-Henri cartridge for the use of the permanent corps. That is what we shall be working at this summer. I intend to place the factory and the whole department on a business footing.

Mr. LISTER. Can the hon. gentleman say how the cost of manufacturing these cartridges at Quebec compares with the cost of cartridges purchased in England?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Including freight and other items, there is no very great difference. I am looking into that, and I will have it thoroughly sifted, and will treat the matter on a business basis.

Mr. LISTER. This year, of course, the Minister is slipping through, but he must remember that he has made a good many promises.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). They will all be in "Hansard," and I will paste them up.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has doubts about the usefulness of this cartridge factory, and is not able to give the information which has been asked for. He has done very well to-night. This is almost the last item, and the others are not important. If he will allow the item to stand, it can be dealt with again without much trouble.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). If my hon. friend wishes the item to stand, why, of course, I can refuse him nothing.

Monuments for Battle-fields of
Canada..... \$2,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What has been done in the way of erecting monuments?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). We have removed one of the monuments to the Senate, and I have not had an opportunity to consult with that monument up to this time, but I shall do so. I am endeavouring to carry out the wishes of the House in commemorating some of the battle-fields of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What monuments does the hon. gentleman contemplate erecting this year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is contemplated erecting monuments, at moderate cost, at Chateauguay, Stoney Creek, and possibly at Lundy's Lane.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought you had the money last year for that.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It was not spent. This is only a revote.

Mr. DENISON. I may mention to the Minister that this item of \$100 for a military institute at Toronto, appeared last year in the Estimates, and the Ontario Government also gave \$100. The item was dropped through some mistake, I imagine, and I would ask the Minister if he would insert it now.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be done now.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will submit the vote to the Minister of Finance and my other colleagues, and if possible, we will have it in a later estimate.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That when the House adjourns to-morrow, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next, at three o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 29) to further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DENISON (for Mr. McCarthy) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 28) to amend the North-west Territories Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DENISON. This Bill is the same as the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last year.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman state to the House the probable date on which this Bill will come up for second reading?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AMENDMENT TO THE DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. BELLEY (Translation) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to extend the time now fixed between the publishing of the proclamation and the nomination day, also the time between nomination and polling day, as regards the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. This county runs over several hundred leagues. Polls are scattered here and there in the county up to Natashquan, and it is, in fact, impossible now, within the time fixed, to take to each poll the documents required by law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 26) relating to the Harbour of Thornbury, on the Georgian Bay.—(Mr. Sproutle.)

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the brush and stone work at Sandy Island, Cascumpeque Harbour, been let by tender? If so, to whom and for what amount?

Mr. OUMET. The brush and stone work were let by tender, on the 16th of January, 1893, to Mr. George R. Montgomery, Prince county, for \$140, the work to be finished before the opening of navigation next year.

MR. TIMOTHY HARTNEDY.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, 1. When did Mr. Timothy Hartnedy enter the Civil Service? 2. Is he still a member of it? 3. If not, did he retire or was he dismissed? 4. Did

he contribute to the superannuation fund? 5. If so, how long has he been superannuated? 6. If not, is it the intention of the Government to grant him a superannuation allowance?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Harnedy was employed as a messenger in the Post Office, Ottawa, from 28th December, 1870, to the 15th April, 1875, and as a temporary messenger in the inside service from the 4th September, 1876, to 20th November, 1879. He was appointed a packer in the inside service on 1st July, 1883. 2. No. 3. He was dismissed. 4. He has not been superannuated. 6. It is not the intention of the Government to grant him any superannuation allowance.

CRIMINAL CODE.

Mr. BELLEY (for Mr. Leclair) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish members of the House with a copy of the Criminal Code, in addition to the statutes?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to do so.

U. S. CATTLE QUARANTINE.

Mr. ROWAND asked, What effect will the quarantine regulation lately adopted by the American Government against Canadian cattle have on sending cattle in bond to Boston or other American seaports for shipment to the British market?

Mr. FOSTER. The United States quarantine regulation, as published in the newspapers (the Government has not officially received any copy), would not admit of Canadian neat cattle crossing the frontier except for quarantine at the point of Buffalo. Canadian cattle, therefore, could not be sent in bond to Boston or other American seaports for shipment, unless a transit arrangement be made, similar to that under which American cattle pass from west to east through Ontario, from one United States port to another.

CATCHING OF SOFT FISH.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Bruneau) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to prohibit, this year again, in the province of Quebec, the catching of fish commonly known as "soft fish," up to the 1st July inclusively, as was done last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The instructions given this year to fishery officers in the province of Quebec as regards fishing for soft fish (poisson mou) during the close season for other fish, are the same as those given last year, which is to prohibit the catching of "soft fish" this year until the close season is over.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

WHALE FISHERY IN THE GULF.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to grant a bounty for the encouragement of the whale fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention of the Government to recommend to Parliament the granting of a bounty for the encouragement of the whale fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence at present.

MR. W. H. WHITELEY.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Whether the Government are aware that Mr. W. H. Whiteley, the officer intrusted with the protection of Canadian fishermen and Canadian fisheries, is the agent of a large Newfoundland house also engaged in the Labrador fisheries; and that Mr. W. H. Whiteley is himself at the head of a large fishery concern?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The department is aware of these facts, but as stated in a previous answer on this subject, no action is to be taken, pending a report from the proper officer.

CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CENTREVILLE, N.B.

Mr. COLTER asked, Is the Customs Department aware that the collector at Centreville, N.B., exacts a fee of 10 cents on every team load of goods or produce hauled across the International frontier and reported at Centreville for transit to Vanceboro', and is the collection of such fees made with the sanction of the department? If so, by what law or authority? 2. What is the amount of such fees collected by such collector the past financial year? 3. Are any such fees exacted at any other Customs port or place in Canada? 4. Has the form of report to be made to the collector at Centreville, by the persons in charge of the several teams or carriages hauling goods therefrom across the frontier for transit to Vanceboro', been approved of by the Department of Customs?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The Customs Department is not aware of the exaction of any fee by the officer of Customs at Centreville, N.B., which is a sub-port of the port of Woodstock, N.B. No officer of Customs is authorized by the department to exact any fee, even for the preparation of Customs' entries for importers, if they ask him to do so,—as it is not the duty of an officer to prepare importers' papers. Whenever the exaction of any such fee has been brought before the attention of the department, the officer concerned has been promptly advised that he is forbidden to make such charge, and that the importers should be required to prepare their own papers, or pay some broker for such service. 2. The department has no return of any fees having been collected by the officer at Centreville, N.B. 3. The answer

to this is covered by No. 1. 4. No special form of report has been authorized by this department to be used by the officer at Centreville, who has, so far as this department is aware, only been using the usual forms. If any special form of report is being used by the officer at Centreville, it has not been sanctioned by the department at Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not catch the first part of the hon. gentleman's answer; whether he stated that the officer was justified in charging 10 cents per team, provided he made out the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. He is not authorized.

KILDARE STATION.

Mr. PERRY asked, On whose recommendation was the late postmaster at Kildare Station, P.E.I., dismissed? Who has been appointed to succeed him? At whose recommendation was he appointed? Who is the mail carrier from the station to the post office? How much per trip is he getting?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A daily mail to Kildare Station was asked for in May, 1892, and it was then understood that if the daily mail were granted, the postmaster, Mr. N. J. Perry, would remove the post office to the vicinity of the station? The daily mail was granted, but the postmaster declined to carry out the understanding. Mr. A. Poirier, who lives at the station, was therefore appointed in his stead. Mr. J. N. Perry is the mail carrier, and his remuneration is \$13.60 a year.

WELLAND CANAL, NEW CULVERT—TENDERS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Were tenders called for the construction of the new culvert on the feeder of the Welland Canal, near Stromness? 2. If so, what were the names and addresses of each tenderer, and the respective amounts of each tender? 3. Which tender was accepted? 4. What is the name of the contractor or firm now doing the work?

Mr. HAGGART. Tenders were called for. The names of the tenderers and the amounts were: Messrs. James Lawson and Walton & Johnson, Thorold, \$5,805; Messrs. John K. Bradley and A. McLean, Dunnville and Stromness, \$8,265; Mr. Archie Macdonald, Stromness, \$5,356; Messrs. William Hutchison & Lattimore, Port Dalhousie and Dunnville, \$6,415. The tender of Archie Macdonald was accepted. The name of the contractor is Mr. Archie Macdonald.

I.C.R.—SALES OF NEWSPAPERS, &c.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Who has the contract for the sale of newspapers, fruit, &c., on the trains of the Intercolonial Railway, between Levis and Campbellton? 2.

Was the contract awarded on tender? 3. If so, who were the parties tendering, and what was the amount of each tender? 4. What amount is the contractor bound to pay for the Levis-Campbellton division? 5. For what term of years was the contract awarded? 6. Is the contract given for the whole length of the Intercolonial Railway, or only by divisions?

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Railway News Company have the contract. The contract was awarded on tender. The names of the parties tendering, and the amounts were: Eugene Michaud, Fraser-ville—Levis to Campbellton, \$525 per annum; the Loby Station Indicator Company, Montreal—Levis to St. John, Halifax, &c., \$500; the Canadian Railway News Company, Montreal—Levis to St. John, Halifax, &c., \$2,500, and east of Campbellton, \$1,750; A. Bremner, Halifax—Halifax to Mulgrave and St. John, \$500; Joseph Fortier, South Quebec—Levis to Campbellton, \$400; C. A. Dennis, Levis—Levis to Campbellton, \$480. The term of the contract is for one year from the 1st of August, 1892. The contract is given for the whole length of the Intercolonial Railway.

ALLEGED SEIZURE OF TOBACCO.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Are the Government aware that tobacco, kept in violation of the law, was seized on the premises of Messrs. Napoleon Aubin and Aime Beaulieu, of Ste. Flavie, in the county of Rimouski; 2. That a still was also seized on the premises of Napoleon Aubin; 3. If so, have legal proceedings been taken against the said parties, and what stage have the said proceedings, if so taken, now reached?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Government is not aware that tobacco, kept in violation of the law, was seized on the premises of Messrs. Napoleon Aubin and Aime Beaulieu, of Ste. Flavie, in the county of Rimouski. The Government has not been informed of the seizure of a still on the premises of Napoleon Aubin. It is needless to say, from the above statements, that no proceedings were instituted.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. GUAY asked, For what reason have the supernumerary employees of the Department of Agriculture not been paid since the 1st January, 1893?

Mr. FOSTER. A number of supernumerary employees have been, I think, paid since the 1st of January. If there are any who have not been paid, they are awaiting a vote in the Supplementary Estimates.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. C. S. CLARK.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has Mr. C. S. Clark been employed in the Department of

Justice at any time since 1891? If so, for what period and at what salary? Is he still employed in that department? If not, why not? Is he at present in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity and at what salary? Is this Mr. Clark the same Mr. Clark who, it is alleged, surreptitiously took Mr. Farrer's pamphlet from the office of Hunter, Rose & Co., Toronto, during the last general election? Was this pamphlet given to the Government directly or indirectly by Mr. Clark?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Clark was employed in the Department of Justice after 1891, and also for a portion of 1891. His employment in the Department of Justice terminated on the 31st of October, 1892. He had been in receipt of \$2 per day. He is not at present in the employment of the department; his services were no longer required. He is for the present employed as a temporary clerk in the Department of Agriculture, I think, in work connected with the Columbian Exhibition. This is the person who, in order to defeat a conspiracy to injure the commercial and fishery interests of this country with the object of coercing Canada into annexation, gave to a police officer a copy of a pamphlet, supposed to be the production of Mr. Farrer, in the annexation interest.

LETTER POSTAL RATE.

Mr. RIDER asked. Are the Government aware that in consequence of the lower rate of postage prevailing in the United States, particularly on ordinary letters, large numbers of Canadian letters destined to Canadian and other points are mailed in United States post offices along the border, thereby causing a considerable loss to the postal revenue of Canada? If so, what remedy does the Government propose to apply? Have the Government any intention of reducing the present rate of postage on ordinary letters?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government is aware that a number of letters are mailed at United States post offices where such post offices are in close proximity to Canadian towns or villages, as in the cases of St. Stephen and Calais, Derby Line and Stanstead, Windsor and Detroit. The postal convention between the United States and Canada provides that where mail matter is posted in either country in order to evade payment of the rate of postage payable in the other country, then the country to which such correspondence is mailed may charge an additional rate, and this regulation has been acted upon in cases where it has been deemed expedient to enforce it. The Government has no intention of reducing the rate of postage upon letters. The loss of revenue would be about \$700,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

THE CUSTOMS TARIFF.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That it is the opinion of this House that the duty on barbed wire, on agricultural implements, on coal oil and on cottons should be reduced so as to give no more than reasonable protection, and that the duty on binder twine should be abolished.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), when introducing his motion in regard to corn, remarked that it was not a motion of want of confidence in the Government. Well, Sir, I need hardly tell you that this is not a motion of want of confidence in the Government; and there is no reason whatever why a motion placed on the Paper as we place our motions should 'prima facie' be so considered. It is the constitutional way of bringing before the House the views of a member of Parliament in regard to any subject that he wishes to press upon the attention of the Government. If a motion assails the policy of the Government, if it directly asserts no confidence in the Government, it is of course a want of confidence motion; or if a member, on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, moves an amendment thereto of any kind, which the Government resists, and his amendment is carried, it may properly be considered a vote of want of confidence, because it is in direct opposition to that of the Government; but even that is a matter of opinion with the Government. I crave the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments while I press upon them certain views with regard to the tariff and especially with regard to that portion of the tariff to which my motion refers; and were my ability to place before the House the views I wish to express, equal to the importance of these views, I should have no fear about commanding the attention of the House. I wish first to refer to a remark which appeared in the newspapers, echoing a remark I heard here, to the effect that it was very strange that I should express views in opposition to those of the Government on the tariff, and yet that I should not vote with the Opposition. The reason is this, that I am a supporter of the Government, that I am a believer in the National Policy, and that it is from that stand-point I press upon the Government and this House the necessity of dealing with the subjects mentioned in my motion, in the way I suggest. There are, speaking broadly, three kinds of tariff. You can have a purely revenue tariff, or a moderately protective tariff, or a tariff that would be exclusive; and unless you have direct taxation, the latter would be a 'reductio ad absurdum,' because it would give you no revenue. But it is obvious that between a minimum protective tariff and a tariff excluding all foreign imports, there are many points where you could have tariffs, some of which would be moderate and some of which would be outrageously protective and oppressive. Of course, if you had a

tariff excluding foreign imports, then, in proportion as competition was limited by that exclusion, the local manufacturer could raise prices. There must, therefore, if you have a protective policy, be an ideal tariff which you must seek. There must be a tariff, moving along the ridge of which you will give that protection to native industries which will foster them and keep them healthy, and at the same time protect the people from the grasping policy of the manufacturer, protect the people from being mulcted in the goods they buy by being made to pay more for them than they ought. Any man, looking over the existing tariff and carefully comparing it with the tariff of 1883 in the United States, or 1890, or with the tariffs in Europe, or comparing one part of our own tariff with another part, cannot fail to come to the conclusion, that if we are to have a fairly good protective tariff—because that is all, I suppose, in practical affairs we can have—an ideal, a perfect tariff being so difficult to frame as to be really an impossibility—our present tariff needs very thorough and careful revision. It is not my business at present to show in what cases it would be necessary to make that revision, other than the points which relate to my present motion; but I will say this generally, that whenever you have a commodity which enters largely into the manufacture of goods, and where you have that article taxed—where it is the raw material of many industries—if you want to foster the production and manufacture of that article in the country, the proper way to do it is by means of bonuses. The commodity itself should be admitted free in order to protect the manufacture of the great variety of articles into which it enters. I ventured on a previous occasion, to which I may without impropriety refer, to say ‘a priori’ a combine must be condemned, and that above all a Government which has adopted a protective policy and a House of Commons which has pledged its majority to that policy, must strike at that combine. The other day, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) proposed to abolish the duty on oil. That is further than I would go. I agree with the hon. member for the east riding of Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) that this oil industry is a most important one, and that it has been built up with extraordinary rapidity to its present state of prosperity. I agree that it is in some respects, although a local industry, a national concern. I admit all that, but, as I followed the reasoning of my hon. friend the other afternoon, I could not help thinking of one of the characters in Dryden’s comedy, a distressed and sentimental maiden, who says: “My wound is great because it is so small,” and of the Duke of Buckingham who, rising in his box, said: “Then ’twould be greater were it none at all.” Now the converse is the kind of reasoning the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) indulged in. He pointed out that because the protec-

tion of coal oil was so enormous, the industry had made such great progress, and the inference which he would appear to press is that no oil from the outside should be admitted at all, and then it would be still more prosperous. If there was complete protection and complete exclusion; in fact, if you could blot out the sun and destroy the manufacture of candles and shut down on the electric light factories, his industry would be still more prosperous, although I fear it would be unequal to the demand for light in Canada. As I followed my hon. friend and as I read a paper sent to me by those gentlemen engaged in the manufacture of oil, I could not but be struck by this, that they, on the very question of tariff, as good as give up their whole case. They admit that they have an enormous protection. The manufacturers, when interviewed by trustworthy persons, one of whom is a Conservative and one a Reformer, admitted—and I do not think there can be any doubt about it—that they cannot produce as fine a quality of oil as the United States manufacturers and they cannot produce a sufficient quantity of the oil they do manufacture. They admit that, but they make statements as to the cost of bringing in the oil which I do not think are borne out by the facts, because I went and made inquiry. I made inquiries of some of the merchants inside and outside Ottawa, and I found that not only have you the 7½ cents duty on coal oil, but you pay 40 cents for each barrel; and I will remind my hon. friend the Finance Minister, that at one time it was 20 per cent and then 40 cents was charged, but that the merchants waited on him and urged a return of 20 cents, as the barrel was worth only \$1, and then an arrangement was made to charge 40 cents on the barrel to protect still further my hon. friend’s (Mr. Moncrieff’s) clients in Petrolea. Now, the way the importers of coal oil and the people of Canada want to have that imported is in tank-cars. If it is imported in tank-cars this charge of 40 cents for the barrel is saved. The tank-car can be run to a terminal point in Canada, and, in fact, the tanks can be taken about the streets, as in the United States, and coal oil measured out to the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, the calculation made by my hon. friend in regard to the cost of coal oil is hardly borne out by the fact. I have here a calculation of what it costs to bring in oil. The invoice cost of sixty barrels of refined oil is \$159.86, less 1 per cent for cash, \$158.26; freight to Ottawa, \$64.70, so that 2,640 gallons cost, in bond, \$222.96, or say, 84½ cents per Imperial gallon; duty on 2,640 gallons at 7½ cents per gallon, \$190.08; sixty barrels at 40 cents each, \$24; inspection fees, 30 cents per barrel, \$18; cartage from station, \$7.20; total, \$239.28, which, added to the cost of the oil, makes \$462.24, or say, 17.89 cents per Imperial gallon. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you add the freight to that, we can understand why it is that in Regina we pay 40 cents per

gallon, for coal oil, and in Dunmore and Lethbridge they pay 50 cents per gallon. If this duty were reduced, they would pay less by the amount of the reduction in duty, and not only less for the American oil, which they must have, but less for the Canadian oil. The cost, laid down free of duty, is 8'45 cents per Imperial gallon; the cost, duty paid, is 17'89 cents, so that the Canadian duty adds 9'44 cents per imperial gallon, or 113 per cent. Now, this is sold in Ottawa in large lots as follows:—

	Barrel lots.			
	1to2	5to7	10to12	15to18
Canadian water-white, 802.12½	12	11½	11½	11½
American do20	19½	19½	19½	19½
do white house21½	21½	21½	21	21

Well, Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to make it perfectly clear that it is not the retailer's action that accounts for the high price of oil. Instead of paying 40 cents in Regina, or 35 cents in Winnipeg, if we had not the present duty to pay, we would be able to buy for about 25 cents, 26 cents or 27 cents for American oil in Winnipeg, and some 28 cents or 29 cents in Regina. Now, Sir, I do not wish to labour that question of oil further; but I may, before passing on from it, say this, that we get a curious testimony from my hon. friend from Petrolea and from the manufacturer of coal oil who contributes an eloquent article to the Petrolea "Topic," of the 3rd of February, 1893, as to the great subject that I strike at in this motion. It affects the cotton, and it affects the binder twine; it affects the binders; that is the question of combines. My hon. friend, when speaking the other day, declared that one of the reasons why we should not touch the oil duty was that oil was not produced by a combine; that if it was a combine it should be struck at at once. He says:

if they were using the tariff—

And now mark, Mr. Speaker, the language my hon. friend from Petrolea uses; because of it I think I may say that I will have his support in pressing my views in regard to the binder twine and agricultural implements on the Government:

with a system of "combinations," thus raising the price of the article and taking extra profits from the consumer, then all assurances given by the Government would be cancelled as between them and the producers.

Now that, of course, I quite agree with. The writer in the Petrolea "Topic" said:

The oil industry of Canada has to contend against the most powerful, wealthy and unscrupulous combination and monopoly on this, or, so far as we know, on any other planet—a combination on which sways Legislatures, controls railways and subsidies, public newspapers, for the purpose of crushing out all competition and gratifying an insatiate and selfish greed. In order to mislead the Canadian people and thus induce them to destroy an important home industry, crush out competition and place themselves in a position where for the light which illuminates their homes they would be dependant on a soulless monopoly, beyond the natural boundary this combination quotes

Mr. DAVIN.

oil at a few points along our frontier at prices below the cost of production, while in other parts of the country where there is no competition and where Canadians are not supposed to know what is transpiring, the people are made to pay more for their light than the people in this country are paying. It is not possible for any person at all conversant with the position and circumstances of the oil trade, as now conducted in this country to believe that were the Government to commit an act of suicidal folly so criminal as to blot out the oil industry of Canada, as some people appear to desire, by which many other industries, dependent on this would be prostrated and hundreds of families here pauperized, the people of this country being thus made dependant for their light on a grinding foreign monopoly, beyond the possible reach of any effective competition, would get a better or cheaper article than they now obtain with an active home and foreign competition for their custom. Such a competition is not within the domain of intelligent supposition, much less is it believable.

Now, Sir, that sort of language, as applied to combines, is eloquent, it is true, and I hope, as my hon. friend endorses that article, that I will have his support in regard to the binder twine. Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to binder twine. That industry, I believe, is also the subject of a still pending motion before the House. A circular has been issued, signed by the Consumers' Cordage Company, and countersigned by Mr. Morris, the vice-president. I do not know why it was that my hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax, did not sign that circular as president, unless it be that the circular is, as I think, one of the most uncandid documents that ever emanated from any mercantile institution. It is a document intended to deceive the members of this House, to whom it was sent, and if the House will give me its attention I will establish that. This document, as I have said, is signed by the vice-president of the Consumers' Cordage Co., Mr. Morris. In this circular, quotations are given at places in Canada, and in Illinois and Dakota, of what binder twine is sold at. I will take the quotations at Chadwick, Illinois, and Valley City, North Dakota, and compare them with the figures given for Lucan and a point in Manitoba, and out of Mr. Morris' own mouth I will ask this House to pass judgment on the Consumers' Cordage Co. One of the first communications he quotes is from Miller & Smith, of Chadwick, Illinois, dated 29th January, 1892. Replying to a note from the Consumers' Cordage Co. they say:

Manila mixed, 11 cents early, 13 cents later.
do pure, 14 do 15 do

These figures, of course, varied some, but were about the standard price of the different grades throughout the country.

Then, on 2nd February, W. E. & C. Stanley wrote to Mr. Morris from Lucan:

Red Cap, 11½ cents; Blue Ribbon, 12½ cents. The same to Patrons of Industry.

Now, this looks well for the Consumers' Cordage Co., but what are the facts, which were, certainly, with some want of candor, kept from those persons to whom that circular was sent? Pure manila runs 690 feet to the

pound, and mixed, 570 to the pound; Blue Cap or Blue Ribbon, 550 feet to the pound; and Red Cap, 480 feet to the pound. Therefore, the farmers, and the Patrons of Industry, at and around Lucan, pay 15 cents for 690 feet of Blue Ribbon; and 16 cents for 690 of Red Cap, as compared with 14 cents and 13 cents for 690 feet of equally good twine sold at Chadwick, Illinois. Now, take quotations at Valley City, North Dakota, and at a point in Manitoba. Merrick, Anderson & Co., of Winnipeg, telegraphed Mr. Morris on the 9th instant:

Red Cap, 12 cents; Blue Cap, 13 cents, cost at Neepawa on the Manitoba and North-western Railway.

A. Gray writes from Valley City, North Dakota, 29th January, 1893:

Prices paid by consumers of binder twine for the year 1892, say—pure manila, 15 cents, standard, 13½.

Very well, at Neepawa, 17 cents was paid for 690 feet of Red Cap, and 16 cents for 690 feet of Blue Cap; or 2 cents and 2½ cents more, respectively, in Manitoba for a similar quality of twine, than was paid in North Dakota. Now, that difference on a pound of twine is a serious thing to the farmers. Hon. gentlemen need not be surprised if the farmers I represent are complaining; and I know that on this subject I represent the farmers of the west. From every part of the west I have received letters in regard to this matter since I put this motion on the Paper. Is it any wonder if the farmers of the west—I cannot speak for those of Ontario, because I have not heard from them—when they compare prices at Lucan and prices at Dakota, press for a reduction of the duty upon binder twine? I may say that I believe the figures given in this circular are quite correct. Now, my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) said he felt diffident when speaking on this question of binder twine. I do not wonder. I will say this for my hon. friend, that it goes against my grain to oppose him in any way. I cannot bear to do it. It is a difficult matter for me; but, as somebody has said, "Plato is my aunt, but truth is my sister." My hon. friend is a colleague in this House, and a respected colleague, but the interests of the farmers overtop my kindly feelings for him. My hon. friend told us that this was no monopoly, because, he said, the Ontario Government was going into the manufacture of binder twine; and he heard there was another company—I believe that is the Brantford Farmers' Company. I have heard of a Brantford company that was started, and it was swallowed up by this vast combine, as Aaron's serpents swallowed up the others. And, Mr. Speaker, although my hon. friend is the president of this company, he is, as I say, of all men I have known in this House, probably one of those who would most readily fix esteem; still, when dealing with

him as the president of this cordage company, I am reminded of what my Lord Byron says of Lambro:

Now, Lambro was the mildest mannered man,
That ever scuttled ship or cut a throat.

And although my hon. friend is the mildest-mannered man in this House, still, he is at the head of a combine. Now, I do not want him to take my opinion about a combine; I will not ask him, even, to take the opinion of any member of this House about a combine; I do not ask him to take the opinion of any editor in his own part of the country, about a combine; but I will ask him to take the opinion of one of his own colleagues. And who is this colleague whose opinion I will ask him to take? None other than Mr. Morris, his own vice-president. In 1888, this gentleman was at the head of the J. A. Converse Cordage Company, which was then the largest in Canada. It had been in a pool with a smaller concern. On 23th March, 1888, an Associated Press despatch was sent broadcast throughout the country, signed by Mr. Morris, announcing that he had withdrawn from the pool, and giving reasons for the step he had taken. Among other things, he said—and I will ask my hon. friend's attention to this:

We have all lost faith in combinations and are convinced that sooner or later such organizations will not be allowed to exist.

"Will not be allowed to exist?" Well, Mr. Speaker, why should they not be allowed to exist? The only reason why they could not be allowed by Government to exist is that they must be immoral; and I say that they are commercially immoral, as well as detrimental to the interests of the people of this country. Now, Sir, I have also put barbed wire in this motion as one of the things from which, in my opinion, the duty ought to be taken off. I do not want to have any industry injured that has been fostered by the National Policy; but where any manufacturer has abused the privileges of the National Policy, has abused excessive privileges, in those cases I want the Government to interfere. Now, as regards the matter of barbed wire. In the North-west and all over Manitoba, with rare exceptions, you have a prairie country and little timber. Barbed wire is a necessity for fencing. Let me show the House the interest the farmers of the North-west has in having the duty on barbed wire reduced. The quantity of barbed wire introduced into the country last year, up to 30th of June, 1892, from Great Britain was 15,792 lbs., of the value of \$589, on which a duty was charged of \$236; from the United States 171,283 lbs., of the value of \$5,363, on which a duty was charged of \$2,569. If the tariff were not too high altogether, surely more than that quantity would have come in when you consider what are the rates in the

United States for that article. I hold in my hand the "Iron Age and Hardware Bulletin," published in New York. It gives the prices of barbed wire all over the country. I will take barbed wire in Chicago, and compare the price with that at which it was sold at the same time in Montreal. The paper says :

During the past week the barbed wire market has been sluggish, with only a limited amount of business. Prices are without material change on a basis of \$2.35 to \$2.40 for carload lots of four-point galvanized at mill.

The duty on barbed wire is \$1.50 per 100 lbs., and the price at the factory at Montreal is \$4 per 100 lbs. Out west we have paid as much as 7 cents per lb., and during last year it was 6 cents. I need hardly point out to the Minister of Finance that this is a case where it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the farmer in the prairie country that the duty should be removed. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to remind the House, before I pass away from binder twine, that the first thing Mr. McKinley did was to lower the duty on binder twine, and the result to-day is that whereas a Canadian farmer would pay \$20 duty, under the McKinley Bill a United States farmer would only pay \$7 duty. That is under the McKinley tariff. Not only so, but Mr. McKinley threw off the duty on everything that entered into the manufacture of binder twine so as to lead to competition, because Mr. McKinley, who is a protectionist, and his friends are, as some quotations I made the other day show, as much opposed to combinations as any men could well be. In regard to cottons : there, too, you have a combine, and all I have said about combines in such matters applies to them ; and in regard to agricultural implements, I may say this, that I am in a position to say that a man who could speak with absolute authority declared that the manufacturers of agricultural implements would not feel very badly if the duty was only reduced to 25 per cent from 35 per cent. Suppose it was reduced to 10 or 15 per cent. I believe the manufacturer would still prosper and thrive, that the farmer would get his agricultural implements cheaper, and while the manufacturer might not be as great a millionaire and be able to scatter hundreds and thousands of dollars in donations, the farmers throughout the country would be greatly benefited. This does not apply only to the larger implements ; but if you examine the tariff you will find the duty on the smaller implements is heavier than the duty on the larger implements, and I would, therefore, suggest to the Government that when they come to revise the tariff, they should reduce it considerably on the smaller implements, that the duty on binder twine should be removed, that the duty on coal oil should be lessened and the duty on cottons should be reduced.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. When I finished addressing this House last Thursday afternoon.
Mr. DAVIN.

being at that time almost at the commencement of my remarks. I was referring to the question of the quality of our petroleum oil. I had said then that the quality was good, that we furnished to the people of Canada an oil as good as was made in the United States, and that, on the whole, the people of Canada are served with a better quality of burning oil than are the people of the United States. I admit that in the United States they produce a magnificent and a beautiful oil, and some of that very fine oil is imported into this country. I question very much, if this motion were carried, and if there were no protection on our oil, and if the trade of Canada were placed in the hands of the American monopolists, we would be as well served either as regards price or quality as we are to-day. At the present moment we furnish to the people a good, safe burning oil, an oil of which I have a sample here, and which members can examine. I called over the telephone to one of the large warehouses here and asked the parties to send up a sample of oil such as is sold in Petrolca at 10 cents per gallon in barrel, and 7½ cents in bulk. The sample I received is here. There are hundreds of barrels of it lying in that warehouse for sale in Ottawa, with nothing but the cost of freight added, and no leakage whatever. There has been a good deal of talk about leakage ; but with the system adopted in this country there is practically no leakage, because oil that is transported to such places as Ottawa is barrelled on the spot, and the merchant or farmer or anyone who wants it can go to the warehouse and obtain the full quantity marked on the barrels. This is an oil that almost everyone would consider a water-white. To an expert, and it would take a good expert to determine the contrary, it would be considered to be a shade from being water-white ; but it is an oil which, besides being cheap, will last longer and prove safer than American oil, and it is sold for 7½ cents per gallon in Petrolca in bulk. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I understand, stated to the House that I had made a misstatement in regard to the Government that placed the duty on coal oil. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if I would make a misstatement on that question, and if the hon. gentleman had taken the pains to read my remarks he would find that I had made no mistake. He said that I had stated that the Mackenzie Government was responsible for the duty on coal oil. I never said that, but I said the very reverse when I mentioned the facts, and allow me to read my remarks in "Hansard," to show that he was a little too fast in making the explanation to this House. What I said was :

Under the policy of the Conservative Government, under a policy that was inaugurated before the National Policy was ever thought of,—

That certainly was before the time of the Mackenzie Government.

—under the policy decided on thirty years ago, and under the tariff made by Hon. Alex. Mackenzie himself, under assurances given in Parliament ever since 1877, capitalists have been invited to invest their money in the coal oil regions of Canada.

Sir, before Mr. Mackenzie ever thought of being Premier of this country that tax was placed upon this commodity for the protection of a Canadian industry, which was being developed, and which this tax did develop. The hon. gentleman might have known that I could hardly have misstated the circumstances, because I have referred to the same thing over and over again in this House. I desire also to call your attention to a very slight error which would be very easily made by the reporters in taking my remarks of last Thursday. I am made to say that the Standard Oil Company are making a refined oil, "Lima crude light," which is sold at 17 cents or 18 cents a barrel, and forcing it over the country. That is not exactly what I said, nor does it convey my idea. What I said was this: The Standard Oil Company are making a refined oil out of Lima crude, which is being sold; that is, the crude oil is being sold at from 17 cents to 18 cents a barrel. Sufficient for the explanation. In addition to the development of the oil industries in Canada, which I referred to on Thursday, it slipped my memory to mention that other oil wells are being discovered in different parts of the Dominion. It is well known that in the Welland district, where they have been boring for gas, they discovered oil on the way down, and that oil is shut off by the casing, because it is gas they are after. In the Essex region, the district represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Allan), they have also discovered petroleum, but at the present moment the wells are shut off and only the gas is taken. I am not in a position to say what quantity of oil these wells would yield, but unquestionably there was oil discovered there, and the day is not far distant, if our industry is protected, when we shall produce petroleum in different places in Ontario, in different places in the west, and in different places in the east. When that day comes—and I wish it was right here now—if we had petroleum in the east and in the west, as we have it in the centre, why, Sir, there would be justification for this Government to-day to shut out every barrel of American oil that is brought into the country. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has referred to some remarks of mine, and I am glad to say that I do not retreat from anything that I stated before. He stated that when a combination was injuring the people of the country, that combination should be removed. There are two things to be considered in this respect; first, to decide if there is a combination, and the other to find out if that combination is charging exorbitant prices. As I stated, there is no combination in oil, nor has there been a combination in that trade for years, and so I am free from the imputation of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, and I am also free to stand here,

to ask protection for this industry from the Conservative Government, and as a part of the Conservative policy. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, stated that there was a duty of 40 cents upon oil casks. I may ask: Do you know of any cask that comes into the country free? Certainly not. They all have to pay duty, and what is the trouble about that? Now, with reference to the inspection. We have an inspection fee on the American oil of 30 cents a barrel. Canadian oil is subject only to an inspection of 10 cents per barrel. Why was this difference made? Was it made to please me, or was it made to please the people of Petrolea, as the hon. gentleman, perhaps, insinuated. Why, Sir, it was made for the very good reason that in the district where the oil is produced, it is inspected by thousands of barrels; but in the country at points where it is imported, it has frequently to be inspected by four or five barrel lots, and expensive instruments have to be sent out to test it. It costs more to inspect it in small quantities, and the small extra charge that is made on the barrel, at these outlying places, is made because the inspection is more expensive. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) are divided in their opinion on this question, and I suppose it is the privilege of all intelligent people to exercise their own judgment. One hon. gentleman is in favour of abolishing the duty altogether. I know what that would do. That would deprive a great number of people of the livelihood they make in Canada to-day; and then you would see an exodus leaving this country by the wagon load and going to the oil regions on the American side the moment such a tariff resolution was passed by this House. The other proposition is to reduce the duty upon oil. I shall endeavour to show this House, before I am through, that to reduce the duty upon oil would not gain the object the hon. gentleman seeks. I do not know what reduction he wants, but I will suppose it to be a trifling reduction. That will not reduce the price of oil to the consumer, and it will only benefit our friends on the American side. The hon. member also stated that oil is quoted in Winnipeg at some enormous price—

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me—perhaps I forgot to mention what my ideas were on that point, and probably what I now state will help him. What I would suggest will be this: That the barrel should be done away with, and that the oil should come in in bulk, that the duty should be lowered, and that the inspection fee should be lowered.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I understood that the hon. gentleman objected to the tax on the barrel, and I referred to that. What I state is: that the motion of one hon. gentleman to abolish the duty would have the effect of

killing the oil industry right off, and that the other motion to reduce the duty would have the effect of bleeding it slowly to death. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) posed in this House the other day as a very intelligent man, and as the instructor of capitalists, and in his nice, easy manner, he also instructed the Cabinet as to what he thought it was their duty to do in this case. That hon. gentleman commenced his attack upon the oil industry by reading what? by quoting from what? By quoting from an anonymous letter in the "Globe" newspaper. He never quoted a figure in this House, except some small tariff returns, in respect to the industry at Petrolia that was not taken from the anonymous letter to the "Globe," and having placed that letter before him, he commenced to knock it down piece by piece. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is fair for any member of this House to base his argument on such data. I should be very sorry, indeed, for his patients if they were treated in the same way. I should be very sorry if he diagnosed me in the same careless manner in which he has given his statistics to this House in reference to the oil trade. Why, Sir, the last thing any man of intelligence would do, would be to quote from an anonymous letter on which to base an argument, and then proceed to knock it down. In some respects, I agree with that letter; in some others, I think, perhaps, it is slightly overdrawn. But, Sir, I have nothing to do with the letter. Any person can write an anonymous letter, but it is not every member of Parliament who will take it as the basis of an argument. The hon. gentleman also complained of lobbyists in this House. I should like to ask what lobbyist he referred to. He is very particular about the dignity of Parliament. I will tell you who he referred to. He referred to gentlemen from the oil district of Canada, men of capital and men of position in this country, who were here in their own interests and in the interest of a Canadian industry, who came here to enlighten just such men as the hon. member; and he took advantage of their knowledge. He had an interview with one of them, and got certain information from him; but he certainly did not take that gentleman's remarks down correctly. He was very particular about the lobbyists who came to protect Canadian interests and industry, to give this Parliament information on the subject to be dealt with, and to meet any inquiry offered to them. Did the hon. gentleman tell us anything about the representative of the Standard Oil Co. who was here? Did he get his figures from that gentleman? I would like to ask him that question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will tell you in a little while.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Representatives of the Standard Oil Co. were here last year, and the paid representative of that company

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

has been here during this session lobbying members of this House. What do they want to lobby this House for? They want to do it in their own interest, in the hope of getting some reductions made in the tariff, some concessions in regard to the oil which they send into this country. Do they want these concessions for the benefit of the Canadian public? By no means; but for the benefit of the Standard Oil Co. and nobody else. While the hon. gentleman was very particular about the Canadian lobbyists who were here in the interest of the Canadian producers of oil, he was very careful to ignore the fact that the Standard Oil Co.'s representative was here lobbying members at the same time. Now, Sir, I am not going to quarrel with the hon. gentleman's figures regarding the price at which American oil can be laid down in this country. I think, however, I have the figures here in better shape than he has, because I have got them under the hand of the Standard Oil Co.'s agent in this very town, published in the "Citizen" newspaper last Saturday. Now, this gentleman who objected to the Canadian lobbyists, had a conversation with one of them, which he gives in his speech. He did not tell us who that gentleman was, but I will tell you. Why, Sir, the gentleman who gave the figures referred to was a gentleman who occupied a seat in this House until four or five years ago. In the conversation that took place between them the hon. member says he asked, "What is the price to-day of your No. 1 Canadian oil, with a specific gravity of 795?" Now, I do not know whether this is a mistake for 785. I am prepared to have it changed if it is wrong.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The gentleman to whom I was speaking said 795.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The hon. gentleman said that the gentleman told him, "15 cents in bulk." Now, Sir, if I am right in saying that Mr. Fairbank was the gentleman referred to—and I presume he was or the hon. gentleman would have contradicted me—Mr. Fairbank could not have made that statement. The price of that oil has been from 10 to 12 cents in bulk for the last two years. The price of 785 oil, which is a much lighter oil, and a more expensive oil to make, has not averaged over 12 cents in bulk for the last two years. The hon. member for West Huron has ridiculed the amount of capital invested in this industry, basing his calculations upon the same anonymous letter. He says also the whole output is about \$1,638,000. In that he is wrong to the amount of about \$400,000. He has also taken from the anonymous letter a statement of the wages paid to those engaged in the industry, and he says that the whole capital supposed to be invested in the industry is \$21,000,000. Then he takes 5 per cent interest on that amount and adds it to the amount of wages paid; and then he

tells this House that the sum total is more than the whole value of the output. If he had had a good basis to go upon, it would be well enough; but as his basis is an anonymous letter, I think I have a right to question his authority. But, Sir, I do not care for the moment what the amount of wages is, or what amount ought to be charged to interest. If the hon. gentleman had come to the town of Petrolea for his information, instead of going to an anonymous letter for it, he would have been able to get at the real facts for himself. And I can tell him that whatever is chargeable to interest or ought to be collected by way of interest, is sunk back in the ground in Petrolea, into the oil wells, and there is not a dollar accumulated in any person's pocket. Let me take hold of another statement of the hon. gentleman. He says that it would be a grand thing for the country if American oil were allowed to come in free in bulk, because that would give steady employment to 250 coopers the whole year round. I will show you, from the hon. gentleman's own calculations, that he is going to give the men about 55 or 56 cents a day. He says there are 140,000 barrels to make and that the making of them would give steady employment to 250 men the whole year. He must know, if he knows anything else except medicine—and I hope he does, that barrels to-day are made mostly by machinery, and that the labour in making a barrel does not exceed 30 cents, and that is an over-estimate. If you would take 140,000 at 30 cents, it will give you \$42,000, which, divided among 250 coopers, is equal to about \$168 to each cooper during the year, or 56 cents per day. The hon. gentleman must know that coopers never work for less than \$2.50 or \$3 per day, and I do not think that the coopers in Canada will thank him very much for starting them on this new industry at 56 cents per day. His whole premises are wrong. He says 140,000 barrels would require to be made in this country. Well, you can put all the American oil that comes into the country into 120,000 barrels. Is not every barrel in the country now that the country requires, and at all those outlying places where oil is sold wholesale they gather in the barrels again and allow the consumer for the empty barrels at the rate of 1½ cents to 2 cents per gallon. Does the hon. gentleman not know perfectly well, that the whole barrel requirements of the country are in the country at present, and that only about 10 per cent, being the allowance for breakages, &c., is all we would require to manufacture. So that, instead of having 140,000 barrels to make, you would only have 14,000, and you can find one institution in the country which will turn those out at the rate of 500 per day. I do not think the hon. gentleman is to be congratulated much on his figures. Then again, he refers to the injustice done to the gas companies.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed the hon. gentleman to go, I think, a little too far in referring to a previous debate.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Then I will not do so; but I suppose it will be in order to say that I understand some people claim it would be an advantage to the country if gas oil came in free. I suppose it will also be in order for me to say that the Gas Company of Toronto sent a circular inclosing a petition around amongst the members this year, and it will be in order for me to say that I was present with a deputation of the gas companies and manufacturers last year. The gas men urged their claims and said there would be no cause of complaint if gas oil would be sold at \$1 per barrel. They have been getting it at about 3 cents per gallon ever since, and I am informed some of the gas companies have a contract for it at that rate for next year. As they are getting it at 3 cents a gallon, that amounts only to \$1.05 per barrel. If the gas company had no reason to find fault the hon. gentleman need not take up the cudgels for them; but it was ascertained from that same deputation how much gas oil it took to make a thousand feet of gas. We ascertained that it just took 5 gallons, or 15 cents worth of that material to make a thousand feet of gas, and gas is sold in the city of Toronto at about \$1 for fuel purposes, and \$1.50 for light; and these prices are charged by the company that has sent in the petition to which I referred, and who are now complaining because gas oil is not admitted free. At that particular meeting we were very desirous of finding out what made the gas worth so much money, when the crude oil only cost 15 cents; but they were very delicate about giving the information, and we could not find out. But this little petition has given the whole thing away. Let me read the second paragraph:

That they were led to enter upon the manufacture of water gas.

So we find that the component properties of this gas are 15 cents worth of oil and the balance water. They seemed certainly very unreasonable indeed—getting water, I suppose free just now in Toronto, and yet complaining that the gas oil cost 15 cents. This puts me in mind of the story of a Texas legislator who was asked what he thought of the navy of the United States. "Well," he said, "I reckon we have got plenty of water, and all we want is a few ships." That is something like the claim of the Toronto gas people, supported by my hon. friend, who thinks they ought to have free oil. Why should they have free oil? Why should we pay a foreign nation for crude oil or gas oil, so long as we can furnish it ourselves in abundance at a reasonable price? We are doing that now; we are giving it at nearly the very price the gas companies said would be satisfactory to them. I wish to refer briefly to the reduction of the tariff

that was made by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in 1878. But before dealing with that question, I wish to call the attention of this House to the fact that the Mackenzie Government were asked to take this question into consideration in 1876. They took a year to consider the matter. They consulted with the trade as to what they should do. They kept in unison, so to speak, though acting independently from the trade. They got their ideas, and they reduced the tariff from 10 cents a wine gallon down to 6 cents or 7½ cents per imperial gallon, after they had thoroughly considered the whole question. Let me ask you what was the state of affairs at that time. When they reduced the tariff from 10 cents to 6 cents, refined oil in the United States was 15½ cents and crude oil in the United States was \$2.38 a barrel? Why, Sir, we could stand a reduction of the tariff at that time, and the crude men and the refiners of this country to-day would be perfectly willing to stand a reduction of the tariff if they could do it without annihilation. Now, Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in presenting his budget to the House, after he had carefully considered what the results would be, he had weighed whether it would injure the industry or not, placed his tariff at a figure that he thought would not injure the industry. He spoke as follows:—

The Government, therefore, have carefully considered this whole question with a desire to remove the burdens of the people as much as they could and yet not utterly to wipe out of existence a Canadian industry which had grown up under the protection of the law as enacted by hon. gentlemen opposite, the conclusion we arrive at is this: We propose to abolish the Excise duty altogether and to reduce the duty on imported petroleum from 15 cents per gallon, as it is at present, to 6 cents. It is necessary for us under existing circumstances to take back an equivalent for that amount. We think that we may fairly ask the country to recompense us by paying an additional duty of one penny sterling or 2 cents a pound on tea imported into the country.

Well, Sir, there are two very important things to be noted in that utterance; one is, that the hon. gentleman did not want to annihilate the industry, and the next, that he could not reduce the tariff without adding duties upon something else to make up the loss. Now, what was the result of that change? For the purpose of reducing the burdens of the people the then Finance Minister reduced the duty on petroleum which, figuratively speaking, collected \$72,000 from the people by way of duty, but in the very same year there was 11,000,000 lbs. of tea imported, which, at 2 cents a pound additional, would be an added burden of \$220,000. So that while taking off burdens with one hand and adding burdens with the other, he simply taxed the people that year \$148,000 more than if he had left the tariff alone altogether. Now, Sir, this resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asks the Gov-

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

ernment to reduce the duty. What would be the effect of reducing the duty; for, of course, it can be reduced only for a purpose? It would have the effect of allowing more American oil to come into this country than is coming in now. We will say that he has taken off a couple of cents, does he pretend to say that in the city of Winnipeg, where they are charging 35 cents, the consumer would get the oil at 43 cents? Does he pretend to say that in the city of Ottawa, where they are charging 35 cents, the consumer would get the oil for 33 cents? I will tell the hon. gentleman what the results of that would be. The American importer would take the 2 cents and the consumer would pay exactly the same as to-day. I told you that in 1877, when the tariff was reduced, oil was high, both crude and refined. The very next year, 1878, it went down lower a great deal, and between the reduction of price in the United States, and the reduction of tariff in our own country, the Americans began to increase their importations into Canada, and, while we had any quantity of crude to supply the demand they forced into this country during the next six years 10,070,945 gallons. In the six years previous to the reduction they had only exported to Canada 3,048,596 gallons, so that the oil importation into Canada in these six years after the reduction was an average of 1,678,450 per year more than the average of the six years prior to the reduction. So that any reduction would now have no other effect than that I have stated. I think, Sir, as a matter of record it would not be amiss that I should file a copy of American importations since 1872, as follows:—

AMERICAN OILS IMPORTED FOR FISCAL YEARS 1872 TO 1892.

Year.	Gallons.	Year.	Gallons.
1872	150,361	1883	3,086,316
1873	397,914	1884	3,160,282
1874	636,806	1885	3,767,441
1875	691,100	1886	3,819,146
1876	632,287	1887	4,290,003
1877	570,128	1888	4,523,056
1878	801,412	1889	4,650,274
1879	1,050,399	1890	4,985,722
1880	617,641	1891	5,071,365
1881	1,437,475	1892	5,636,514
1882	3,007,702		

Now, at the same time that the importations were thus increasing, I want the House to understand that Canada kept abreast with them, and that for the last twelve years she has filled the complement of two-thirds of the oil consumed in the country, while the Americans have furnished the other third. I have here, also, a record of Canadian oil inspected since 1880, as follows:—

CANADIAN OILS INSPECTED—CALENDAR YEARS
1880 TO, 1892.

Year.	Barrels.	Tons.	Gallons.
1880.....	137,722	2,968	6,212,331
1881.....	152,715	8,305	6,923,700
1882.....	145,191	7,552	6,571,355
1883.....	176,014	11,009	8,075,675
1884.....	191,190	9,594	8,651,520
1885.....	194,608	8,085	8,797,785
1886.....	183,102	22,788	8,353,530
1887.....	221,572	36,072	10,140,050
1888.....	217,587	23,928	9,911,055
1889.....	220,960	38,344	10,134,920
1890.....	236,768	44,196	11,010,340
1891.....	233,874	40,613	10,923,345
1892.....	253,414	42,239	11,814,825

Here, Sir, we have an answer to any assertion that may be made by any gentleman, wherever he may be, that Canada is falling short in her crude. She has increased every year in her production for the last twelve years, and she has produced nearly double the quantity of oil this year that she did in 1880, and the natural resources of Canada are, to-day, sufficient to supply, and would supply, the whole of the Canadian trade, if the Americans had not got control of some sections of the country and if a certain class of people had not their prejudice, not against Canadian articles as such, but a prejudice acquired in the old times, when Canadian oil was so bad. Any person who asks now for a gallon of Canadian oil, I do not care how strong his prejudices were, or how strong the smell of Canadian oil was some years ago, he will be satisfied with the price, the light, the odour and the colour. But, Sir, if you adopt a policy that will stop the drill working in Canada, then, for these fields that I have mentioned there is no future, and the wells we have to-day will unquestionably be things of the past. Now, let us see how the Americans used us in times of their prosperity. Gentlemen here may not know it, but let me assure you that, at the present moment, oil in America is at the lowest point it has ever touched in the history of the oil trade. It commenced at \$20 a barrel and to-day it is only worth 55 cents. So that we are asked to make legislation now, when the oil business of Canada is in a worse position to compete with the foreign manufacturers than it has ever been in the history of the trade, and I am going to ask this House not to pass any such resolution as this at this critical moment, at this vulnerable point in the history of a trade. Now, Sir, under the tariff of the United States, when their oil was less plentiful, at a time when we were competing with the Americans in foreign markets, they would not allow a single gallon of Canadian oil to be taken into their country. I believe they

were right; and I believe, also, it would, after reflection, be satisfactory to this country if every gallon of oil we use was supplied from our own wells. But what policy did they adopt? Talk in the newspapers, and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) talks about 100, 120 and 130 per cent protection. Did he ever look at the American tariff and find what they had against Canadian oil? If he looks, he will find that when they had their high tariff, they prohibited Canadian oil from going into their country, by a tariff which at times gave them a protection of 2,000 per cent. They had twenty cents a gallon against Canadian crude, and at times crude has been 1 cent a gallon. They always had 40 cents a gallon protection against the Canadian refined. Surely that was enough! That simply meant that not one gallon of Canadian oil should go into the United States. Forty cents specific per gallon on refined at the time they removed the duty, was at least 600 per cent. Sir, that hon. gentleman is very fond of referring to the other side, when he finds something there to suit his argument. Why don't he talk up this little thing I have shown him now? Why don't he say: Gentlemen, the Americans are a great people who know how to manage their affairs. They know how to encourage the industries of their country. Here they have put 600 per cent on refined; let us do the same and shut their oil out of this country. They put on 2,000 per cent on crude; why does he not say: "Let us do the same, and shut their crude out." No, he does not talk that way; he desires to have the motion of my hon. friend from West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) carried, whatever the results may be. Sir, the American Government never reduced the tariff that I have mentioned on Canadian oil, until they were in such a position, by the enormous quantities of oil they produced, by the plethora of oil that they got in gushing wells, until they were in a position, by over-production, to shut out every gallon of Canadian oil, whether refined or crude. Now, if there is one thing more than another that deserves our most careful consideration, it is the amount of capital invested in the oil regions. I do not pretend to be able to satisfy the hon. member for West Huron by counting up the wagons and horses that are employed; but I will give him two or three little figures, and he can work out the rest for himself. He can find out for himself, if he goes there, that there are about 25,000 acres of land embraced in that oil belt, putting the weakest land in along with the strongest; and he could not buy it—I will not say just at this moment, because they are all shaking in their boots at home—but he could not buy it a few weeks ago for less than \$200 an acre. If he will multiply those figures together it will amount to about \$5,000,000. Now, the hon. gentleman will probably say: I

have been over the assessment rolls ; I have examined the rolls of the township of Enniskillen, where there is oil, the township of Sarnia, and the township of Moore, in the riding of my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) ; and he will say that the assessments do not show that amount. Sir, the Legislature of Ontario passed an Act that mining lands should never be assessed at their mining value, but that they should only be assessed for farming purposes ; and you cannot find the mining value on the assessment roll. Now, I started with \$5,000,000. I will show you where there is another \$5,000,000. There are to-day, I believe, 6,500 wells pumping. Every one of these wells is furnished with a pump and casing, and cost between \$400 and \$500, to say nothing whatever of the machinery to run them. Up in our section we lump that in together, and call it about \$800 to a well. Now, if you multiply 6,500 by \$800, which is a fair estimate, you will find you have \$5,200,000. Throw off the \$200,000, under the circumstances to-day, and we will have \$5,000,000. Now, on top of that, do you know that there are many refineries in the country ? Petrolea and London have refineries ; in all, 13 or 15 refineries, and the capital invested is not a dollar less than \$3,000,000. Why, Sir, there are 800,000 barrels of underground tanks in Petrolea alone. There are at least 45 drilling rigs running. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know what these are. They are the tools with which the workmen drill the well ; and drilling rigs are worth about \$1,200 each. There are, on the average, six men to each well. They work night and day, but these operations have largely stopped during the last month or two. Do you know why ? Because there has been an agitation against their business, and capitalists are afraid of the consequences. You need not be surprised, if you visit the oil regions to-day, which are 20 miles long from one end to the other, if you find men standing there idle and waiting the results of these motions.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will you be kind enough to tell me what is the average production of each well ?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I will tell you everything ; and whatever I tell you is not anonymous, either. Whatever statement I make to you I pledge my word for it. The average production is about half a barrel to each well per day. If you will multiply that by 6,500—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will do the rest.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I will do it for you now. If you multiply that by 6,500, and multiply the product by the number of days in the year, it will tally out, and give you the total Canadian production. Now, some people will say there are \$20,000,000 in this business. I have already shown you over \$13-

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

000,000. We will allow the balance to go to the boiler shops, the machine shops, the cooper shops, without which industries the oil business cannot be run, and which owe their existence to the oil business. But it is not very material whether it is \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. But I want you to understand that it amounts to a great deal to the people of the oil regions who are engaged in that business ; because whatever the figures may be, it is every cent in the world that they have got ; and every cent in the world these men have got stands—I will not say in jeopardy—but stands subject to the vote of this House, whether it shall be wiped out or whether it shall be protected. Now, there is another question that this House has a right to understand, and that is the labour that is employed. Now, surely I need not be very particular on this point, because I will take that just about the same way as I did the other. It is necessary to tell you that some of these men employed on the rigs, apprentices probably, get a dollar a day ; the next man gets about a dollar and a half ; and the driller about two dollars and a half, according to circumstances. Hon. members can easily figure up how many men are employed in the drilling business alone. From three to six hands may be considered as being attached to a rig. In addition to the men drilling there are those engaged in refining. Hon. gentlemen will find the number placed at 270. Let that number go for the moment as correct. It must not, however, be supposed that those are all the people employed in that branch of the business. I want the House to understand that you cannot take twenty-five miles of territory, with 6,500 wells, and not have a large number of men employed. I have not figured up the exact number, but it must be in the hundreds. I can give, however, a general statement, and I may say that I do not believe that in the petroleum district, including the townships of Inniskillen, Moore, Sarnia and Dawn, there are less than 2,000 people employed one way or another in developing and carrying on these industries. Then, there are the refineries in London. In the computation I have made, however, I do not include the population of the district, but I have simply taken the number of people engaged in the business in Petrolea and other places I have named. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that I am exaggerating. Here is a list, published fifteen months ago, of the names of operators in the oil regions. I will give the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) a copy of this list, for he should have one. There is the name given and number of wells opposite each name, and the name of every well proprietor. This list includes the names of over 400 proprietors of wells which are being pumped. Since this list has been made out, from 50 to 100 names have been added, I can count myself, at a moment's notice, at least twenty-five new names. The total num-

ber given is 5,346 wells then being worked. Out of the list of 400 operators, it is very easy to extract 300 names of good, square honest working men who have every dollar they have earned since they came into the town and every dollar they brought with them, sunk in holes, many of them on the lots on which they are living. I cannot describe the Petrolea district in any other way than as a small British colony. It is a colony distinct from any other group of people gathered together and engaged in any other industry, because there is no industry like it in the country. If Parliament were to tamper materially with the tariff, it would have a terrible effect on that industry. If the drill should stop, production would stop. If you frightened capital, the drill would stop. Production having ceased, the result would be that American oil would come into the country in large quantities, and our wells would have to shut down, because our manufacturers could not get crude. That state of things would naturally follow. The wells and the whole property would be abandoned. I cannot describe the condition which our petroleum districts would present two years after it had been destroyed and the Standard Oil Co. allowed to control our trade, than by comparing it to a western prairie over which the grasshoppers had passed. It must also be remembered that every well in the district has contributed to the revenue of this country. There are 6,500 wells, without counting the abandoned ones, that number has practically paid each a poll-tax of not less than \$25 in the shape of duties on imported tubing, which is not manufactured in this country. Referring to workmen, let me say that all the work connected with the petroleum industry involves labour from beginning to end. Labour is involved in bringing in the foundation timber, in drilling the wells, in pumping the oil, in bringing the logs to the cooper shops, in manufacturing barrels and the refined oil. In our district it is nothing from 1st January to 31st December but labour, labour, labour. I have here the opinions expressed in writing by two gentlemen who visited our town some time ago as commissioners, representing the Toronto "Globe." Mr. J. E. Atkinson wrote to the "Globe" as follows, regarding his personal observations there, and I hope the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) will also visit the district some day, and he will ascertain that statements made by Mr. Atkinson are perfectly correct. Mr. Atkinson says:

The extent of the dependence of the whole community upon oil can scarcely be understood, except after a visit here. There is almost an entire absence of speculative operators, I am told, but every one is the owner of one or a group of wells, or else in saving until he can sink one. In front gardens and back yards, in close proximity to their dwellings, men have one or more oil wells, with pumps at work, their weather-stained poles and tar-smear'd walking-beams, less beautiful than flower beds, but more profitable.

When a man can afford to sink a well in his lot, he has it done, and rigged with a pump at an expense of about \$400. If he has not a sufficient number of wells to afford to put in an engine of his own, he hitches on to the nearest power, pays its owner 20 cents a day rent, and, if his well gives a barrel a day, makes a profit which, if it holds out, will pay him back his investment in a year. But, as with the larger producers, so it is with the beginners, the money goes back into the ground again. This has been going on for a quarter of a century. There have been few fortunes made, it is said, or, if they have, they are in the ground.

I think the opinions expressed by Mr. Atkinson corroborates the remarks I have made to this House. Mr. Cockin, who accompanied Mr. Atkinson, wrote as follows:—

It does not take an outsider long to become saturated with the spirit of the place; one readily recognizes the wonderful fascination exercised by the native industry. An oil farm, or a single oil well if you prefer it, is a refined sort of gambling carried on amidst moral surroundings and the direct sanction of the elect. There is all the witching charm of uncertainty in it. There are such vast possibilities connected with it. The imagination is excited to a conception of what might be, and there is little wonder that the clergy and laity alike are carried away by it and worship side by side with indisputable fervour at the greasy altar of the local mammon. Elsewhere in Canada the workman fashions a few flower-beds or a lawn out of the little patch that stretches from his door to the fence. The Petrolean sinks a well and trusts to Providence for the rest. Nearly every house on the street has its oil well, with a melancholy-sounding pump at work. The latter is connected with and is worked by an engine which may possibly be a quarter of a mile away. As a matter of fact no Petrolean worthy of the name keeps any loose cash hanging around uninvested. All his saved earnings, every cent of his family's hard-earned cash that can be scraped together, is rapidly and without the slightest hesitation put into one of these holes from whose depths comes the rich product which ultimately, in its refined state, is destined to illuminate thousands of homes throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. The large capitalists have what are called oil farms, ranging from one to twenty acres, in which many wells are sunk. These farms have underground pipes connecting their oil tanks with the refineries, which latter in some cases are miles away.

These two gentlemen visited Petrolea on behalf of the Toronto "Globe," and inspected the industry which is under discussion. I must say, on behalf of those two gentlemen, that their report is wonderfully correct. It is a tribute to the discerning powers of both gentlemen and well keeps up their reputation as able and trustworthy newspaper correspondents. Mr. Speaker, I come now to a part of my remarks which may be of some practical value, though after all I have told you, you will, I trust, feel possessed of the knowledge of how important an industry the oil trade is, and how dangerous it would be to pass any measure in this House which would turn these 2,000 men out on the street. The question of the price of oil troubles the Canadian consumers more than anything else, and I hope to give you a satisfactory account of what the prices are to-day in Canada. It must be taken into consideration that the oil

industry of Canada is at present confined to one locality, and the nearer you are to that district the less the cost of freight. Unfortunately, when you reside 2,000 miles away it is necessary that you should have to add freight to the price of the article. That is a little unfortunate for those who live at a distance; but surely those people for the sake of the small extra cost of freight on the quantity they use would not be in favour of jeopardizing the oil interests of this country. It is a most extraordinary thing indeed that the prices of oils should vary in the different localities to the extent that I shall show, for I believe that the whole dissatisfaction is mainly due to the difference in the prices ranging in various places. The wholesale price of some oils has not varied more than about a cent in twenty-four months, but the retail price is a matter of curiosity. I never knew that there were such retail prices charged until I came here, and my friends from Petrolea are astonished to find that an article produced in our district at hard-pan rates should be retailed throughout the country at such extravagant prices in some places, as to cause a feeling of hostility to that great industry. Let me give you a few examples of this. In the town of Dunnville, oil is selling at 25 cents a gallon; at Brighton it is also retailed at 25 cents, while in Madoc it is retailed at 15 cents. Can any mortal man explain why it should be only 15 cents a gallon in Madoc, which is more difficult of access, and 25 cents a gallon at Brighton and Dunnville? I find that along the line of the Pontiac Railway oil was selling at 30 cents per gallon until a few weeks ago; but I was informed by the hon. member for that county (Mr. Bryson) only last Saturday that he was glad to be able to inform me that the retailers in his section had reduced the price of burning oil from 30 cents down to 16 cents. How much difference would that make in the profit on a barrel? They reduced the profit on the barrel over \$6.50. Is not that enough to cause consternation to the people of Petrolea? I do not blame the people of this country for raising a row under such a condition of things as that. I sent this news home as to the enormous retail prices and I believe that the producers must take this matter in hand, and wherever there are too high prices for oil charged in any town, they must take action in the matter and arrange to give it cheaper to the consumer. That will be done, and must be done, because we cannot stand such an agitation as has been going on for some time past. I think that will, to a large extent, remedy the difficulty, because I have assurances from many hon. gentlemen here that, if it had not been for these enormous prices, there would have been none of this trouble whatever. I will ask this House to postpone action in the matter, and to watch attentively what the result of another year will be, before it sweeps out of existence this great industry, and accomplishing nothing but to favour one

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

of the greatest monopolies on the continent of America at the present moment. My hon. friend from Soulanges (Mr. Bain), near Montreal, has informed me that he has only charged 14 cents a gallon for oil for the last year or two; the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) has informed me that oil was 25 cents a gallon in Owen Sound some months ago, but now it is only 15. He was charged on the public platform that the combination in oil raised the prices, but he showed the people that the buyers only paid 7½ cents per gallon in bulk at Petrolea, or 10 cents by the barrel, and the result was, in a very short while that every oil store in town had a ticket in the window announcing that they were selling Canadian oil at 15 cents a gallon. There is no complaint as to the price of oil in Montreal and Quebec, but there are people complaining in other sections, and I do not blame them for it, because I would do the same if the retailers charged me such high prices. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) informed me the other day that oil was selling in Dundas at 12½ cents a gallon, which is lower than the other places I have mentioned. That is good for Dundas, and even at that price the retailer is making a reasonable profit. He must get his oil at about 11 cents, and he has a cent and a half per gallon on the oil, and 2 cents per gallon on the cost of the barrel, making 3½ cents per gallon profit, which, on 45 gallons in a barrel, amounts to over \$1.57½ per barrel profit. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) tells me that the price of oil in his district is 22 cents per gallon. That is a good price. At Essex Centre, oil sells at 15 cents a gallon, but at Ottawa they have been charging 30 and 35 cents per gallon, while every gallon that was sold at that price helped to swell the cry against the oil interests at Petrolea. Oil is delivered in the town of Woodstock at 20 cents a gallon, while away down in Quebec it is retailed at from 15 to 17 cents per gallon, at which place it is delivered without freight charges or leakage for 12½ cents a gallon wholesale. At Winnipeg it is sold at 45 cents a gallon, and at Brandon at somewhere about the same price. At Trenton, ten miles from Brighton, it is sold at 15 cents a gallon, and I have no doubt that nobody complains of the prices there. I am told that if you buy 5 gallons you get it at 12½ cents. The retailers in the city of Toronto were taking a little too much profit out of the consumers, and following agitation, which is doing some good in the country, the prices have come down. I find from an advertisement which I took out of a Toronto paper this morning, and I was very glad indeed to see it, that G. & J. Murray, the largest oil dealers in the city of Toronto—a place which is not a small corner store, but where you can buy one barrel or one thousand if you want to—are selling their best Canadian No. 1 coal oil at 12½ cents per gallon; and they say, "a trial order solicited." That is what

is coming out of this agitation. The trade are now fully alive to the state of affairs, and the producers and workmen of the oil district are determined that from this time forward the difficulty shall be remedied. If they were in any way to blame for these prices, I certainly should not be standing here to defend them; but they have been lying back, pumping the wells, supporting their families, and using their earnings for the development of the oil industry instead of putting it into the savings banks; and all the while the censure of the people of Canada has been directed to them because the retail price of oil has been so high. These articles in the "Globe," written by Messrs. Atkinson and Cockin, did a wonderful amount of good. I have been told by manufacturers that since those articles were published they have received a great many inquiries from people who were astonished to find that oil for which they had been paying 18 cents a gallon could be bought from the refiners at 11 or 12 cents per gallon by the single barrel. Here is a copy of a letter which was received by a large refiner in Petrolea:

LODGE No. 1171, PATRONS OF INDUSTRY,
COUNTY OF OXFORD,
RATHO, 11th February, 1893.

Your last shipment of refined oil, two barrels, received, and we are well satisfied with the quality and price. We were formerly paying at the stores from 18 cents to 20 cents, and find out now that it was the middleman and retailer who was making the exorbitant profits out of us. So long as the oil men do not combine, but sell at such price, 10½ to 11½ cents by the car lot, and give us good oil when we sell the empty barrel at 70 cents, we have no reason to complain about the oil. If you wish, you are at liberty to use this letter publicly.

We are, yours respectfully,
J. A. HEWITT, *President*.
JOHN LITTLE, *Secretary*.

Now, I stated a little while ago that the people of Canada were, on the whole, better served than the people of the United States, so far as prices and quality are concerned. I will give some idea how the Standard Oil Company place their oil in that country, and my authority will not be an anonymous letter, but the "Oil and Drug Reporter" of the United States. In it oil is quoted at 5½ cents at New York for export. With regard to home-trade lots, it says: "They continue in active request and are easy on the basis of 7½ to 7¾ cents a gallon." Now, we are told that we buy American oil for less than these figures. If so, it is because there is a protective tariff in this country, and the Americans want to get hold of the Canadian market, and they sell their oil lower for export to Canada whether they can afford to do so or not. But if we had no protection, would the Canadian farmer get any discount from the American trade? I think the very opposite would be the case. I also wish to call your attention to the fact that in the United States the farmers receive a good deal of the same kind of treatment as our farmers

have been receiving in this country, but from different hands. I have no doubt that the retailer there sometimes takes advantage of them, but I know what takes the advantage of them a good deal more. What price they have to pay depends on whether the Standard Oil Company have control of the market or not. I have here some information on that subject, which I obtained by sending a few weeks ago forms of affidavits to a number of people, with the request that they would send them to any of their friends in the States and get them to state therein the price they paid for oil. I am not going to read all the affidavits, but I will quote one so as to give the form:

That I have a correct knowledge of the price at which oil is sold by retail in the city of Minneapolis, and that it is 15 cents per wine gallon.

That is 18 cents per imperial gallon. And this affidavit is sworn to before a notary public. Now, I will give you the prices in some other places, stating in each case the equivalent price per imperial gallon. In the state of Dakota, the price at Watertown is 17 cents and at Auburn, 24 cents: there cannot be that difference in freights. In West Virginia, at Wheeling, it is 18 cents, and 15½ cents at Eureka. At Port Huron, Michigan, oil is selling at 7 cents, while at Bay City, only a few miles distant, in the same State, it is selling at 14½ cents. Now, I have some personal knowledge of this instance, because I was at Port Huron a short time ago, and there I saw a \$300 team of horses attached to an oil wagon, on which was brilliantly painted with golden letters, Standard Oil Co. I asked the man in charge of it the price at which he was selling the oil, and he told me 6 cents a gallon. Now, do you suppose that that is a fair price for the oil? Why, no. The Standard Oil Company does this for a purpose. Now, let us go on to Ohio. At Bellaire, in that state, the price is 18 cents a gallon, and at Elmore 14 cents. In Minnesota, at Pipestone, a place of four railways, the price is 18 cents, whereas at St. Paul it is 12 cents. In Wisconsin, at Milwaukee, the price is 14 cents, at Berlin 15½ cents, and at Jefferson 21½ cents, a difference of 7 cents a gallon between Milwaukee and Jefferson. Now, I will come to Newark, New Jersey, which is a little nearer home. There the oil sells at 20½ cents a gallon. I am giving these figures to show that even if we had free trade in oil, we should be subject to just such variations in price as the Americans have to pay.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I find from inquiries that in Maryland, at a place called Cumberland, oil is sold at 18 cents; in the State of New Hampshire, one of the New England States, in which it was mentioned some time

ago that no oil was sold over 10 cents. at Tilton in that state, it is sold at 18 cents, and in Springfield, Massachusetts, it is sold at 14½ cents. In Illinois, oil is taken by pipe line as far as Chicago, and at Danville, a city of 40,000 inhabitants, well situated on a line of railway, oil is sold at 24 cents. At Puebla, Colorado, it is sold at 6 cents. That is another of these instances which require explanation, and convinces us that we ought to be careful about letting ourselves fall into the hands of people who are creating these extraordinary prices. Puebla is an oil district not yet under the control of the Standard Oil Company, and that company are waging war against other oil proprietors in that district, and oil which used to sell at 25 cents a gallon a few months ago is now selling at 5 cents per wine gallon, the Standard Company having reduced it to that figure in order to destroy the oil industry in Colorado. As soon as that is accomplished they will be able to raise the price to the figures I have been quoting, from 18 to 24 cents. Coming to Washington Territory I find that in Helena, a large place, oil is selling at 30 cents per gallon. At Seattle it is selling at 30 cents per gallon, and very bad oil it is. I also find that in Alabama—and this is worthy of our most careful consideration—prior to 1888, the district was supplied by a refiner of the name of Rice. The Standard Oil Company made up their minds to control that district, and once they secured control, they raised the prices. I can give you a little interesting history of that, to show you what we may expect if we are going to surrender our industry into the hands of a foreign monopoly. I find that, prior to 1888, the selling price of oil—I give you this from sworn information, which any one will find in the records of the Congressional Committee—at a place called Selma, Alabama, oil was, at the time this war was commenced against the local companies, selling at 15 cents per gallon. That is only one of about twenty-five or thirty places where the Standard acted in that way, in almost every one of which they reduced the price, in order to crush their rivals. I could not be expected to send to every place mentioned in the evidence of Mr. Rice, but I sent to Selma a form of affidavit, asking that it be filled up with the current prices of oil there. Oil there was selling at 15 cents before the Standard began its war. They reduced it down to 8 cents, and now it is raised to 25 cents. That is sufficient proof to show you that the Standard Oil Company will take every means to secure trade and crush out opposition, and will then raise prices; and a fine field Canada would offer them, if they could come in here on the same terms and crush out competition. I have given you Selma; in addition let me give you prices at two or three other places. In Grove Hill, oil is selling at 24 to 30 cents per gallon. In Behman, it is selling at 24 cents per imperial gallon, and oil of the lowest grade at that. These are three places in the

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

state of Alabama in the districts where oil was formerly sold at 16 cents and then reduced to 8 cents by the competition of the Standard Company, and where now it cannot be bought under 24 to 30 cents. If that is what we want, all we have to do is to give an opportunity, and a mighty small one it needs, to the Americans to come in here and take possession of our market. Now, I think I should take the opportunity of telling the House the prices of Canadian oil in Canada. I shall give the wholesale prices at every large point from the east to the west, and then hon. gentlemen themselves can form their own opinion as to what should be a fair price for the retailer to charge. If you find that the retailer along that line is charging more than a reasonable price, all that I ask you to do is not to make the producer, the farmer, so to speak, of oil, who is working at his mines, responsible. I have here a tabulated statement showing, first, the prices to-day, those at which oil is actually selling; and, as those have not been exceeded by more than about half a cent or a cent in the past year or two, the figures are fair ones to go by. At Petrolia to-day the imperial gallon in barrels sells at 10 to 10½; equivalent to wine gallon, in barrels, 8½; imperial gallons, in bulk, 7½; and the American wine gallon, in bulk, 6½. Now, we go along the line and find that in barrels at Hamilton it is 11½ cents; in Toronto, 11½. These prices are freight paid and no leakage. The following is a tabulated list of prices, as it may be convenient for reference:—

WHOLESALE PRICES CANADIAN REFINED OILS.

Place at which delivered, Freight paid.	In Barrels, per Imperial Gallon.	In Barrels, per Wine Gallon.	In Bulk, per Imperial Gallon.	In Bulk, per Wine Gallon.
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
Petrolia, Ont.	10 to 10½	8½	7½	6½
Hamilton, Ont.	11½	9½	8½	7½
Toronto, do	11½	9½	8½	7½
Peterboro, do	12	10	9½	7½
Kingston, do	12	10	9½	7½
Ottawa, do	12½	10½	9½	7½
Montreal, Que.	12½	10½	9½	7½
Quebec, do	12½	10½	9½	7½
Moncton, N.B.	12½	10½	10	8½
St. John, do	12½	10½	10	8½
Halifax, N.S.	12½	10½	10	8½
Winnipeg, Man	18	15
Vancouver, B.C.	20	16½
New Westminster, B.C.	20	16½
Nanaimo, B.C.	20	16½

Now, if such are the prices, I would like to ask the House how much is the Canadian producer or manufacturer using of the duty? Oil in Petrolia is 7½ cents in bulk; the duty

is 7½ cents. No person in the House would attempt to say that we are using the smallest fraction of a cent for our own protection. But I will show you shortly why we need the protection and why it would be ruinous to us if it were interfered with. I should inform the House that the prices I gave are for car load lots, but I understand it can be bought at all these points by the barrel, or in five-barrel lots, at from ½ cent to 1 cent in advance of these prices. I think these different figures that I have quoted will enable the House fairly to know whether the fault lies with the producer if the public is being overcharged for a single gallon. When you talk of paying 7½ cents in bulk at Petrolea, or 10½ cents with an allowance back for the barrel if you return it, you must naturally conclude that, with crude oil selling at \$1.16 a barrel, the manufacturer has cut prices about as close as he can. Competition between the manufacturers has brought the prices of oil as low as any person can possibly expect, and, when you see that the price is practically the same as the duty itself, you must see that the facts fully confirm what I say and that the Canadian refiner, on these quotations, is not taking any protection whatever to himself. That quality of oil is what is called Prime White Oil, such as I showed you a few moments ago, such as I burn in my house, such as we all burn in our houses—good oil. There is another brand—and it would not be right if I did not explain this to the House—such a brand as is imported from the United States to-day, the very essence of the finest oil that can be made, this brand we make also and it can compete with any oil. I don't care how good it is, made in the United States, though we have to charge 3 cents or 4 cents a gallon more for it than for the prime white. So that you can add 3 cents or 4 cents to the quotations before given, and you have the prices for that oil. Now, I admit that, to a certain extent, the crude men, or the producer, and the oil refiner uses the protection which is given them on that quality. Of the oil that we make there is probably one-sixth of it turned out of that class. Now, who is it that uses that sixth? As a general rule it is used by people who have had a strong prejudice against the ordinary Canadian oil of the past, and who prefer this extra quality and are willing to pay for it. This oil costs the consumer 3 to 4 cents more than he could buy American if it came in free of duty. This extra price is not paid into the treasury, but the industry as I stated use the tariff to that extent—but it must be remembered it is paid by the wealthier portion of the community. But I mean to say, as I said before, that if that wall were down, you would not be able to get that quality of American oil at the price you get it to-day. Well, I am not here to legislate exclusively for the wealthy people of the country. I am here as well to look after the people that have not much—people like myself—poor. We have not many wealthy people up our way; and I have

already told you where their capital is invested, but I don't know where it would be if such a resolution as that before the House should carry. There is another class who, to a certain extent, suffer—though I do not call it suffering, because there is a 'quid pro quo.' We do not, for one moment, think that it is possible for the people at the far end of the Dominion to get their oil at as low a price as those who are close by. That is impossible; the laws of nature will not permit it. In the lower province districts, when they buy American oil, they pay a portion of the duty. As the quotations that I have given you show, American oil that is sold for export to Europe or Canada is evidently at about 2 cents or 2½ cents less than the trade prices to the trade in the United States. And so the people in the Maritime provinces have 2 cents or 2½ cents a gallon to start with, and in that view of the case, these gentlemen will have to consider two things. They may be buying American oil to-day. Well, now, I do not say they are not to buy American oil; they are free subjects. But, when I show that we can lay down, in St. John, oil at 12 cents an imperial gallon, paying the freight on it for that distance, I do not really think that they can come to any other conclusion but that that is a fair and reasonable price. These men are, as I said, those who pay a portion of this duty. That duty, you will remember, only applies to a proportion of the Canadian oil—that of the quality I spoke of—and that a small proportion. Now, the imported article brings revenue, and revenues are serviceable—as the Finance Minister can tell you—to the country. And though the revenue raised on oil may not be absolutely equal, man for man, over 4,000 miles, still the difference is not such, I think, that any one need wish to jeopardize, for a moment, an immense industry that exists to-day in the Dominion. Another thing for our consideration is this: Are we not sometimes paying too much in Canada even for American oil? I am told that in town here it is 35 cents to 40 cents a gallon. Now, the letter from the agent of the Standard, Mr. Morris, here, very carefully makes up a statement of the price to bring American oil into this country. He says that, without counting the freight, it costs 15.48 cents to lay American oil down in the city of Ottawa. Now, that, you remember, includes the barrel. The value of the barrel, and half a cent more will pay the freight. The barrel itself is worth, I think, 75 or 80 cents, and adding half a cent on the gallon to that, will allow him \$1.20 to pay the freight. Then that lays the oil down here for 16 cents, imperial gallon. Now, I will read an extract from this letter so that the House may be satisfied. It is signed by Mr. W. D. Morris, and he is complaining of the prices, just like the member for West Huron. He says:

The first cost of the oil per wine gallon in Buffalo is 5.50 cents.

I have shown you that is the export price in New York.

The duty is 6 cents, duty on barrel, 8; inspection fee, 6; total wine, 12.90. Add a fifth to make up cost of importation, 2.58.

So he adds his fifth on everything. Total addition, 15.48. Now, let me follow this out logically, if I can. Oil in Ottawa is 35 cents, the cost is 16. Now, you will tell me that 9 cents of that, I suppose, has been paid in duty, and inspection, and duty on the barrel. If you take 16 cents from 35, you have 19 cents left; and 19 cents a gallon profit on a barrel of oil, means \$8.50. That is not bad business to go into. The conclusion I want this House to draw is this: I have shown that the price of oil is 35 cents. I will take the Doctor's figures of 9 cents as covering all the improper charges, so to speak, duty and inspection, and that deducted from 35 cents will leave 26. Now, what claim can you make that that oil, with no duty and no inspection, would be sold at less than 26 cents? Then I will ask how you expect to get it any less? Would not the retailer want the same profit, would not the freights be the same, would not every other circumstance be the same? Now, just follow that round. Go down to Montreal. Here is the Montreal "Star" with a picture: On one side is a Canadian woman getting a gallon of oil for 28 cents, and on the other side an American woman getting three gallons for 28 cents. I suppose it is three wine gallons, although the paper does not say so. The inference of the picture and the article in the Montreal "Star" is this, that if we had a reduction of the whole duty the woman in Canada would get her oil for 8 cents. That is the inference, and that is what they say. Now, how could she get it for 8 cents? If it is 28 cents in this country now for a single gallon in Montreal, and you give a bonus to the retailer of the whole duty, or 9 cents to more than cover the whole duty and inspection, he would still be getting 19 cents for the gallon of American oil, which the "Star" says the woman on the other side gets for 8 cents. Just reason it out for yourselves, and you can come to no other conclusion than that the "Star's" figures are misleading. There are places in the States, exceptional places, where you can get it for 8 cents, and I told you one at 5 cents, and I told you another at 6 cents. You cannot go to the States, as a rule, and get oil less than 15 cents in near-by places, and from that to 30 cents in far-off places. Now, I ask this House, before they destroy this industry, to take time and ascertain whether my statements are correct. This whole agitation is, as I said, largely brought about by the desire of a foreign corporation to secure the Canadian market. That foreign corporation has had lobbyists, as the member for West Huron describes them, in the House both sessions, advocating no other interest than the interest of the Standard Oil Company. Now, I do

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

not know anything about the Standard Oil Company further than I have read; and sometimes we get a good deal of information in reading. I find from leading papers on the other side, I find from evidence taken in courts, I find from the decisions of judges of the highest courts in that country—from these sources I find their actions laid bare—and I think I may fairly ask this House, after I have read two or three extracts, whether they desire that our own Canadians should close their works and that the Standard Oil Company should take possession of the trade. If you want that, if you are willing that should be done, it never yet was the Conservative policy, and I do not believe it ever will be. But if you want that done, this motion is in the way to do it. Now, Mr. Rice, of whom I told you a while ago, was a competitor—and he had a right to be a competitor, had he not?—of this monopoly in the States. The monopoly made up their mind that they would close up Mr. Rice, though he was one of the largest manufacturers in that country. The way it is said they took to ruin Mr. Rice is this, and tricks they have played once you need not be at all alarmed but that they will play again. They took the plan of bulldozing the railways with their immense capital. The railways charged Mr. Rice more freight than they did the Standard and gave rebates; so that after Mr. Rice had paid his freights the railway hand back to the Standard Oil Company a large proportion of the freight rates that Mr. Rice had paid them. This was tried before Judge Baxter, a judge of one of the Federal courts, and just let me read you from his decision. He says:

That the Standard Oil Company and George Rice were competitors in the business of refining oil; that each obtained supplies in the neighbourhood of Macksburg, a station on said railroad (the Cleveland and Marietta Road,) from whence the same was carried to Marietta or Cleveland; and that for this service both were equally dependent upon the railroad, then in the hands of the receiver. It further appears that the Standard Oil Company desired to 'crush' Rice and his business, and that under a threat of building a pipe for the conveyance of its oil, and withdrawing its patronage from the receiver, O'Day, one of its agents, 'compelled Terry,' who was acting for and on behalf of the receiver, to carry its oil at 10 cents per barrel, and charge Rice 35 cents per barrel for a like service, and pay it 25 cents out of the 35 cents thus exacted from Rice, 'making,' in the judgment of the receiver, '\$25 per day clear money' for it 'on Rice's oil alone.'

The judge dismissed the receiver, and in doing so delivered this judgment. The Standard Oil Co., as all hon. members know, is now a power that hardly any one can withstand; corporations, firms and individuals fall within its power when it makes a march onward. To such an extent does its power extend in the United States that it is able to control railways. I am told that the company holds a controlling interest in 30,000 miles of railway, and the capital of the company is practically unlimited, as will be judged when I say that it is placed at \$300,000,000, according to the reports of reliable authorities. I will

read to the House an extract from an article from the last number of the "Forum," which is one of the most able publications in the United States. It gives a short history of the manner in which the Standard Oil Co. undertakes to destroy and ruin its competitors. The article also confirms what I have said in regard to the action of the company in crushing competitors and then raising the price, and I do not think I can quote a more reliable authority to the House. The article is written by Mr. Roger Sherman. At page 614, I read as follows:—

In Mr. Dodd's article, as well as in this, the wholesale prices are given, and these are usually of export oil at the harbour of New York. But this is not the price to the consumer. During the period of the Trust, the American consumer of petroleum has paid a very much greater price than 8 cents per gallon, except when it became necessary for the Standard Oil Trust to destroy a competitor by temporarily selling at a low price, sometimes below cost; and when competition was thus eliminated the price was raised. The prices paid by the consumer within and during the past ten years have been as high as 30 cents per gallon at non-competitive points.

It must be remembered that the price mentioned, 30 cents per gallon, is for a wine gallon, which is equal to 36 cents for an imperial gallon, and this has been the price at many points where there has been no competition, or where competition has been killed off. I continue:

Prices have ranged from 23 cents per gallon to 10, and stood at many places at 16 and 18. To-day, at competitive points, the price is often 8, 10 and 12 cents. These facts and figures speak for themselves. In this matter, as in all others, the trust has demonstrated that the reduction of price to the consumer, even where it has been real, has been made "for the purpose of crushing competition, and as soon as the end was accomplished the consumer paid for this short-lived cheapness by an immediate increase of price.

Within the past three years the Standard Oil Trust has entered upon a new system by which it is attempting to seize the ownership of all or nearly all of the oil-producing territory of the country, and add to its gigantic monopoly the only remaining branch of the petroleum industry which it does not fully control. It has organized corporations for drilling wells, acquired by purchase mining rights in vast acreages of land in Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, paying prices before unknown to the operator and beyond his reach. It is pressing drilling operations with its enormous capital, under conditions of a crude-oil market, of its own making, of about 54 cents per barrel, a price far below the cost of production. I say of its own making, because it is practically the only buyer from the well-owner. It is applying the power of money, acquired by the methods I have indicated, in unlawful and ruinous competition, for the purpose of driving out of the producing department of the business the experienced men who have made wealth for the country during more than a quarter of a century of their active lives. Under the system of individual activity barren spots have been made productive, cities have been built, railways constructed, homes established, and intelligent and prosperous communities have grown up.

That is the exact position which the oil industry of Canada occupies at the present day. It has grown by individual activity. This article shows that the Standard Oil Co. is

removing the individual element from the production of oil, and endeavours to control the whole oil region. I hope the House will agree with me that the article I have read fully bears out my statements. I have another article here from which I desire to read an extract, and it bears on the same line. The article I have read shows that the Standard Co. was killing off all competition, and it would matter little the means by which this result was brought about to the unfortunate man who gets squeezed so long as this great and gigantic monopoly gains its point. In March last one of the Standard Oil Trust gave a very handsome present to the Chicago University. It would be imagined that the oil community would be pleased to see a man who made his money honestly and fairly act liberally towards such an institution. But this man does not appear to stand with the Titusville press in the position of being entitled to the thanks of the community. An article in the Titusville "American Citizen," headed "American Standard," says:

Common decency, and the shame which sometimes comes to the most hardened, should have suppressed this publication by the Standard Trust, among the people where are found the victims of the insatiate greed of Rockefeller's Trust. Here are families left to struggle with poverty, because their heads have been driven to suicide by hopeless losses in their business of producing petroleum. Here are men who, by years of patient industry and attention to affairs, had accumulated property sufficient for their needs, and producing incomes ample for their comfort, who stand trembling and broken on the brink of insolvency, not knowing what will yet be the fate of themselves and their families. Here are properties which a few months since were worth in open market hundreds of thousands of dollars, now being sold by the sheriff, at from 10 to 25 cents on the dollar, of their real value. For these things the Standard Oil Trust, of which Rockefeller is the head, is directly responsible.

If we take steps in this House which will give an opportunity to that company to secure a foothold on Canadian soil, we may expect the same treatment as has been extended to communities on the other side of the line. I trust, Sir, and I feel, that this House has no intention of endorsing the resolution now under consideration. Let me tell you something in connection with the Standard Oil Company which is rather remarkable, and which substantiates the argument that I have adduced on this line. The price of refined oil to-day in New York in barrels on board ship, ready for transport to European countries, is cheaper than the price of the raw material. I want to repeat that again, because it is extraordinary, and you have got to look between the lines to understand it. The price of oil in barrels delivered in New York for export to Europe, is 5.30 cents per gallon for refined oil, and the price of the raw material delivered at the same spot is 5.35 cents. Therefore refined oil in bulk is sold at $1\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent less per gallon for export than crude oil at the same spot. How is that? I will tell you. It looks unreasonable, but it

is very plain why it is. The Standard Oil Company are the masters of the situation, and you cannot drive them from that position. They own pipe lines to New York through which crude and refined pass. The Tide Water Company had another pipe line, but time and tide wait for no man, between the Standard Oil Company and anybody else, and they are now pooling their receipts. The railway companies between the same points charge identically the same prices to carry crude or refined oil to New York as do the pipe lines, and they all pool together, and the Standard Company has the control. The Standard Company say: We want to do all the manufacturing in this country from our crude oil. There was exported last year of refined oil, 578,414,104 gallons, and of crude oil 103,101,811 gallons. Now, the Standard Company say: If we do not make this into refined oil, whatever country wants crude oil, has got to pay us refined oil prices for it. There is some talk of our getting crude oil into Canada. You can get anything in there as long as you have protection, but the moment you take the duty off, the result would be, that we in Canada would be treated in this matter the same as others are treated. They control in their own country the railway and pipe lines, and as money is no object to them where their business is concerned, ten or twenty millions of dollars would make no difference to them, in order to control the trade; and you would have to pay for crude as much as the price of the refined oil. This is an extraordinary state of affairs, but it goes to show the danger the House would be putting the country in by allowing an American monopoly a foothold which at any time might crush out a Canadian industry and injure the consumers as well. These figures which I have given are unquestionable, and they can be found at page 25 of the "Oil, Paint and Drug Reporter," of the 6th February, 1893. I think it would be well for just a few moments, if we would consider about how heavy this burden is which is supposed to be bearing down this country, and which causes all this alarm. I am told, and I think correctly, that the farmer would not on an average use more than 10 gallons of oil in a year. Now, the farmer and I take the same kind of oil, and neither of us pay a fraction of a cent to the Government because of the protective duty. But suppose for argument's saks that the farmer did pay in one year 2 or 3 cents per gallon on ten gallons of oil it would only amount to 30 cents. I can hardly imagine from that why all this commotion is brought about, except that it is an article on which the specific duty makes the ad valorem look very high. A person looking at the specific duty naturally says, how enormous it is; but then it must be remembered that we do not use it but comparatively to a small extent. I have told you that it is not justice to charge against the oil industry any-

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

thing that does not belong to it. I am sure if those farmers who are agitating so much against the duty on oil calmly consider the question carefully they would not seek to remove the duty when they found it would jeopardize the oil industry and injure their own interests to such an extent. My hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) is here to protect the farmer. The farmer is his client, and, so to speak, he is the advocate for the farmer; but neither he nor any one else can deny that the farmers of this country get more for certain articles than they would if there was free trade with the States. The farmer knows that on the whole he gets more for his beef, more for his pork, and more for his oats, than if we had free trade. Even allowing to be correct the figures of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), that on account of the duty the farmer pays 3 cents more, that would be 30 cents a year which the farmer would have to pay. But surely that would be balanced by the extra price that he sometimes gets on 10 lbs. of pork alone. The smallest part of a small pig would balance it for a year, and almost the head of a steer would pay for the whole duty, even admitting that the farmer had to pay it. He never saw any year, that he could not pay the duty, even if it were 30 cents, out of the increased price on the sale of ten or fifteen bushels of his oats. The farmer has no cause to complain about the coal oil duty. I never in my experience had an opportunity of explaining it to the farmers without satisfying them that my position was the correct one. Now, I think I have shown, I hope satisfactorily, that on almost two-thirds of the entire consumption in the country, the people of Canada do not pay one iota by reason of the tariff. I think I have shown that Canada has oil enough to supply our wants. At present there is a surplus, and as the demand increases Canada will have oil enough to meet it. When we cannot do that, then will be time enough to interfere with the industry. But until that time arrives the industry claims the protection of a quarter of a century. It requires to be protected from destruction. In our oil districts there are young lads working at the wells who were born on the ground, and whose fathers were born there. It is their heritage; it has grown with them; and so long as there is no combination, nothing but honest competition, I think the last thing that should be done is to take any step that would jeopardize that interest. I have shown you the prices of refined oil in different parts of the country, and I am sure that I have convinced this House that the refiners are not the exorbitant men they have been charged with being by some of the newspapers and by some public speakers. I have given you the prices so that you can make your own calculations; and any one who cannot obtain oil cheap enough from his retailer has only to communicate with head-

quarters, and the industry will be glad to give him relief. Where retailers ask a price out of all reason, the manufacturer himself will take the matter into his own charge. I have the assurance of many representatives of rural districts in this House, that if prices had been reasonable heretofore, there never would have been a word of complaint, and that if they were reduced to something like the figures which I have shown you exist in some places, there would never be another word of complaint. Now, I have endeavoured to show the House what would be the result of removing the protection from this industry. I think I have shown clearly that the result of the Americans getting control of this market would be that every gallon more of American oil brought into the country, at whatever price it might be sold, would displace a gallon of Canadian oil. In the meantime, while that slow process of extermination was going on, there would be no encouragement for men to continue drilling; the drill of the gentleman who was interviewed yesterday by the hon. member for East Huron would stop. The moment the drilling stopped, the production would stop, and the manufacturer would be unable to get the raw material, because experience shows that he cannot get it from the United States for export to foreign countries unless he pays a higher price for it than the price of the manufactured article. Therefore, to keep our own market we require this protection, not to enhance the price, or to take any advantage of the consumer, but to enable this trade to be carried on in our country, free from any American monopoly. Now, I would like to emphasize what I said in the early part of my remarks, because to my mind it is one of the greatest reasons why this House should not for a moment move in the direction asked for. The price of oil in the United States has never in its history been so low as it is at the present moment. At the time our tariff was reduced, the price in the States was \$2.38 a barrel for crude and 15½ cents a gallon for refined. At the present time the price of crude there is 55 cents a barrel. Under such circumstances the present protection is hardly enough. Oil matters on the other side are in an abnormal condition; oil is practically worth nothing, the price having been run down by the power of the Standard Oil Company. Things may turn, and the price of crude there may go up to a dollar or \$1.50; we cannot tell when it may suit the monopoly to put up the price. For all we know, we may yet strike bonanzas in this country. I myself in the sixties have seen a well flowing at the rate of 5,000 barrels a day. At present our wells are drilled to a depth of 500 feet. A deep test well is now being sunk. I do not pretend to be a prophet, to tell what the result will be; but we are looking to the deeper strata, and I am told by practical men that to grant the concession asked for the resolution would practically bleed the industry to

death. Now, some one may say that this statement is exaggerated. Is it not a very strange thing that, selling oil, as we do, at no more than the duty itself, the Americans still hold one-third of the market; and they cannot help holding it just now, because their oil over there costs them next to nothing, and they sell it at a discount on that price. The injury to the people in our district would be something no person can realize, unless he were there. The workmen who have laboured there for a lifetime, many of them, would be thrown out of employment. They would have to leave their savings in a hole in the ground. Their savings bank would be a bankrupt institution; and they could not carry it away. They would have to do, as we say in the territories, take up the well, if possible, and cut it into post-holes. There would be nothing left for the well men or the refiners, if the Canadian market were transferred to a foreign monopoly. Under these circumstances, I would ask that this House, if they have any hesitation in believing what I say, should, at any rate, halt before deciding to make any tariff alterations with regard to this article or removing the restrictions to importation in bulk. I am sure I can ask every gentleman in the House to allow this industry its fullest protection and to await the advent of another Parliament before making any change. If low prices in the United States were to continue as they are for ever, the Canadian people might say: We want a change; but the present condition is only temporary, when we have only got to this point, one year in a thousand, and when this is the only year American oil has been so low, I ask the House to pause and not be in a hurry to do that which they can never remedy again. If you once start this tide in the wrong direction, it would be on your consciences that you had been the cause of ruining hundreds upon hundreds of people and destroying millions of dollars worth of property. I might, perhaps, leave this question now to the House without further argument, but let me say I am a protectionist from first to last. I came here to support a protection Government. Every man has stood by the party since I came, and the large majority on this side represent most unmistakably the sentiments of the Canadian people. This Parliament is strong in its might and it is strong in its right, and I am sure that on this, as on all other occasions, this subject will receive particularly the careful consideration of the House. It may be said that this reduction now asked for, or the removal of the duties on some articles is a small question, but it involves the maintenance of the underlying principle of protection to our native industries on which this Government have secured the continued confidence of the country. Are you to commence to destroy that policy by piecemeal, because a common enemy has accidentally a commodity and can drown us out? Surely this House will carry out the

wishes of the people that sent us here, and do nothing in this matter. This House was elected by the people, with all these questions before them at the time; but if, in the opinion of hon. members, circumstances have so changed as to call for a reduction of the tariff on some industries, the House should be in possession of facts sufficient to warrant the carrying out of such changes. In this instance I simply ask the House to pause and wait for fuller information. The statement I have made I believe to be correct, but evidence under oath could be taken and render certain that of which we may now be in doubt; and if there is doubt in the minds of the House whether the oil industry could stand those alterations in the tariff asked for without absolute annihilation or serious loss, I ask the House to halt until next session, when it will be in a better position to say we have got facts now upon which we can deal with this matter. We are under no obligation to the United States, much less to the Standard Oil Company. The tariff across the line was built to protect their own industries, and well do they do it. Ours has been built for the purpose of protecting ours. Ours has accomplished the object the founders of the National Policy predicted, and I say the last thing that should be done would be to break that wall with which we have surrounded ourselves for our own protection. I say that wall should be maintained when it can be done fairly, in the interests of the public, for the purpose of protecting the industries of our country and keeping us in the successful and progressive line that Canada, under the policy of this Government, has followed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would not take up the time of the House but that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has paid a good deal of attention to some parts of my speech, and, therefore, in justice to myself, I must seek to correct him and defend my statements. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no personal interest in taking the position I do in reference to the coal oil duty. I have no axes to grind, and, therefore, I speak wholly from a national stand-point. I speak as a representative of the consumers of this country. I am not influenced by any monopoly in the United States or Canada, and I think that is little more than my hon. friend can say. I am here to speak on behalf of those who consume the oil and who believe that the tariff rates are too high and therefore cause a higher expenditure to the people than is right and just. I shall not go over many of my figures. The hon. gentleman did not attack them, for they are unassailable. He did not even prove or attempt to prove that the figures in the anonymous article to which he referred were wrong; in fact the limited number of figures he gave went to prove that the man who wrote that article and signed himself "Oil Consumer" was a man of ample intelligence concerning the matter upon which he had written.

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

In order to follow the hon. gentleman I have taken a few notes and I shall deal with his remarks in reference to the statements I have made. He got very wrathful, Mr. Speaker, at one time. In fact I think he worked up his feelings, because I cannot believe he conscientiously thought that he was speaking in the interests of the country, and in order to get up the energy and vim necessary to make his speech, he did as a lawyer whom I once knew, who, when he could not make an impression on the jury, abused the counsel on the other side. And so the hon. gentleman tried to abuse me and to discredit the statements that I made, statements that are in accordance with facts. Now, he said: The hon. member for Huron bases his remarks upon an anonymous letter. Mr. Speaker, that letter was first published in the "Globe" and it was afterwards reproduced by a paper published in a town from which he came, called the Petrolia "Topic," the editor of which is considered a friend and advocate of the interests of the coal oil men. That article was taken from the "Globe" and republished in the paper of the industry's own friends. And not only that, but a copy of the paper was sent to members of the House with the article marked so as to draw attention to it. And would you suppose for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that if the men at the seat of the oil industry were under the impression that these figures were right and sufficiently representative of their case to be quoted in their own paper and distributed to members of this House, that I was not justified in assuming that these figures were put forth by the industry of which we are speaking. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House to-night but will come to the conclusion that I was perfectly justified in using these figures when placed in my hand in that way. But now, Sir, they endeavour to repudiate these figures, because I have shown you beyond a shadow of doubt that these figures were exaggerated. I would ask the hon. member who raised this objection if he sought during his speech of two or three hours to correct these figures or give the figures which, in the opinion of the oil men, were the proper ones to place before this country and before this House. I say it was their duty to place a statement of the industry before this House. It is stated these figures have not been authorized. But if you look at the interviews which took place between the oil men in Petrolia and the "Globe" commissioners, to whom the hon. gentleman who spoke last has paid a high compliment for their fairness and justice in putting the interviews exactly as they took place, you will find it stated that the industry gave employment to 15,000. Others said 20,000, and still others 25,000. The person whose communication appears in this paper said it was 5,680, and the hon. gentleman himself stated upon the floor of this House that it was 2,000. Surely these hon. gentlemen who bring their

case before this Parliament should meet and decide upon one set of figures instead of coming before this Parliament and before this country with such diverse figures upon this question. The hon. gentleman tried to prove to this House that I insulted the hon. gentlemen who are here attending to the oil interests in their own behalf. There could be nothing false, and I say that advisedly, and he knew very well, from the words I used, that I made no reflection whatever upon any gentlemen who came here to consult the members upon this question. You can see from the words I used that I cast no reflections whatever upon these hon. gentlemen, for they are hon. gentlemen and have as much right to come here and lobby the members and speak to the members in regard to their interests as I have to stand here and speak in the interest of the consumers of this country. I said :

Every hon. gentleman here knows very well, however, that every industry in the country takes advantage of the duties as far as they can do so. If they did not they would never be here lobbying the members of this House in regard to the tariff.

Is that any reflection, directly or indirectly, upon these men? Are they not here lobbying; are they not here talking up their own interests? And have they not as much right to do so as I have to speak here to-night? The hon. gentleman would make it appear to the House that I was casting a reflection upon these men, and I thrust the accusation back in his face. And again, Sir, he cast a slur, as if I was under the influence of an oil company or any man belonging to it. He asked if I had any communications with the Standard Oil Company or its representatives, in speaking as I did. Would I not have more call to ask if he had any intercourse with an oil company in Canada? I was speaking in my place in this House as a representative of the people and in the interests of the consumers of the country. And if he said that my information came through the Standard Oil Company and that I spoke on their side, I can say that I stand here as a representative of the people, advocating the rights of the people as against the efforts to maintain a burdensome tax, and the hon. gentleman cannot say that he is here in the interests of the consumer. Again, he cast a reflection upon me by saying that I interviewed one of the oil men from Petrolea and got information from him and gave that information to the House. That was wrong. I interviewed no oil man; but an oil man interviewed me. He knew my opinion upon this matter, and we had a quiet conversation together. I said then, as I say now, that he did not compare No. 1 Water White American oil with the highest standard of Canadian oil, and it was not a fair comparison. I said to him: "What do you charge for your No. 1 Water White Canadian oil?" And he said: "For a specific gravity of 7.95 we charge 15 cents in bulk." These were the words made use of by that oil man. It was not a private

conversation, for some other members, while we were conversing on this question, came up and took part in the conversation. So I have divulged no private conversation that took place between him and myself. The hon. gentleman reflected upon me to-day, saying that I gave public expression in the House of Commons to a private or confidential conversation. There was no such a thing as a confidential conversation; and I reiterate here now—and perhaps that gentleman is with-in hearing of my voice—that his statement to me was that the price of No. 1 Water White Canadian oil, specific gravity 7.95, was 15 cents in bulk. Now my hon. friend thought I was greatly astray, and he appeared to take some amusement out of it, as if I knew nothing of what I was talking about in regard to the 140,000 barrels that it would take to barrel up the 5,637,000 imperial gallons that we imported last year. Now, Sir, it only requires a school boy to divide 5,637,000 by 40, the number of imperial gallons in a barrel, and he will find it requires 140,000.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Forty-five gallons in a barrel.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Forty, as a rule; there are some larger and some smaller. Now he says that it would not take 250 men to manufacture these barrels. He says a barrel is only worth 30 cents, and shortly afterwards he said that the refiners paid 80 cents for each barrel that was returned by the parties who purchased the oil. If the barrel was only worth 30 cents, how could the refiners pay 80 cents to the man who had sent them back empty after selling the oil? Does he not know that we have cooperages in this country in which the barrel is put up, the hoops put on, the machinery in operation—

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I never said anything of the kind. You are going astray. I said the labour in the barrel was 30 cents; I did not say the whole cost was 30 cents.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Very well, where were the staves prepared? Was there not labour in preparing the staves? Was there not labour in preparing the machinery? Was there not labour in preparing the bolts? Was there not labour required for cutting the staves preparatory to handing them over to the coopers? Now, when we talk about a cooperage, we mean an industry that includes every man in the manufacture, not merely the men who put the barrels together and put in the heads. It appears to me that the man who is living in the very centre of these works does not know how these barrels are made. He says that probably I understand more about medicine than politics. I am glad to say that I do; but I know as much of cooperage matters at Petrolea as he does, because he merely counts as coopers the men who take the staves and put them together and put the hoops thereon, not counting the labour that is employed in getting out the timber and working the machinery. Now,

you will find I was perfectly right, and I defy any gentleman to find a single fault in the figures I have used. Then he asks me a question: "Did the hon. member for East Huron look at the protection which the United States has placed upon oil?" That is not my duty. I suppose there are plenty of men in the United States who look after that interest. I am not here for the purpose of looking after the duties placed upon articles by the United States. I do not take my views from the United States; perhaps the hon. gentleman does. Sir, I stand here in the interest of the Canadian people; I stand here in the interest of the Canadian consumer; and, in my opinion, after giving thorough investigation into this question, I have come to the conclusion, yea, Mr. Speaker, and three-fourths of this House have come to the conclusion, that the duty on coal oil is far too high. Now, my hon. friend made a statement in regard to the size of the oil-producing territory. If I did not mistake his figures, he said it was twenty-five miles long and about ten miles wide.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I never used such figures. I said it extended twenty-five miles long, but I said nothing about the width. I said it included about 25,000 acres.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He said that each acre was worth \$200—not for farming purposes—oh, no. The farmers do not make so much out of their ground as to give that value to their land. They have to plod away year after year, but only make a small return, and, therefore, their property is depreciating in value; and, remember, the value of any investment is in proportion to the return therefrom. If the land throughout that territory is worth \$200 an acre, the question naturally arises, what has given it such a high value? Because the profits made out of the oil industry with such high protection are such that they can afford to pay \$200 an acre; but if it was used for farm purposes they could not pay \$50 an acre. That is proof that the oil interest is very lucrative to those who are engaged in it. Therefore, the oil men can afford to pay \$200 an acre, but the farmer can only pay \$50, and the man who pays \$50 not only receives a small return upon that \$50, but he is burdened down by a high duty in order to pay over to these parties that are engaged in that industry, profits that will enable them to pay \$200 per acre for the land which they use in that way. Now, my hon. friend has gone into some other figures. He says there are 6,500 wells. Now, it is a wonder to me that these men have not agreed upon a certain number of wells. One man, in his interview with these commissioners to which I have referred, said there were 7,000 wells. Another who has written that letter to which I have referred, says there are 8,000 producing wells. Now, comes another man, supposed to be an expert upon this question, and

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

he says there are only 6,500. Now, which of these statements are we to take? Does it not show that none of them understand this matter, or know their own business? But let us take 6,500 wells. Some of these oil producers tell me each well produces one barrel a day on an average; others tell me each well produces three-quarters of a barrel, and a third gentleman tells me they only produce one-half a barrel. I think it is fair to take the medium, three-quarters of a barrel. Now, three-quarters of a barrel from each one of the 8,000 wells would be 600 barrels a day, and multiply that number by 300 working days in the year, and we have 1,800,000. Now, what are the facts? I can show you here from a return that there are only 795,000 barrels of crude oil produced altogether. Does that not show to every intelligent mind what divers representations are made in regard to this matter? And it shows, too, that their representations are probably two and a half times larger than the actual product from the petroleum wells in the county of Lambton. Let me give to the House some other figures. The hon. gentleman who spoke a short time ago paid a compliment to Mr. J. E. Atkinson for representing matters as they were in Petrolea. The hon. member said that every small holder of a lot, when he had accumulated \$400 or \$500, sank a well and then got it attached to a jerker for the purpose of pumping, and he got his own money back in one year. Does not this statement show the extraordinary profit derived from these wells? Does any member of this House who invests \$500 or \$600 obtain a return of his money within one year from any investment? If the well produces only one-half barrel daily, the investment is returned in full within two years, and during every subsequent year several hundred dollars are received from the investment of \$500. The more hon. gentlemen speak on this question and the more figures they bring before the House, the more I am convinced that they have not been fair with Parliament or the country in submitting statistics. But that is not all. Some men have said that this industry gives employment to 15,000 people. That is the information given to the commissioners sent by the Toronto "Globe." Others have placed the number as high as 20,000 and even 25,000, and the persons from whose letters I quoted the other night gave the number as 2,689, and the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) has to-night declared that the industry gives employment to 2,000 men. Would it not be well if those gentlemen would meet and settle their figures, instead of my being compelled to lose time and breath in correcting their statistics for them? What is the whole burden of their complaint? It is the Standard Oil bogey. Every line of argument they have taken from the beginning to end of this discussion will equally apply

to every other industry in the country. Each industry is afraid that outside manufacturers will flood the country with their products, and the coal oil industry is afraid that the country will be flooded with the American product, and, because they entertain this fear, they expect the general consumers should be willing to be burdened with duties amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually so as to give high protection to this industry. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) stated that coal oil imported, without payment of duty, into Ottawa would cost from 24 to 26 cents per gallon. The hon. gentleman must have been astray in his calculations, in view of figures I will submit, and for which I challenge criticism. The cost of all the oil imported last year in bulk was \$471,900. Cost of inspection gave \$56,371. The profits paid to importers, at 20 cents, would be \$105,612, and the profits of the retailer, \$233,469, or a total cost, after having paid inspection and handling by importer and retailer, to the consumer, of \$887,142. Dividing that sum by 5,637,149, the total quantity imported, the price will be 15 cents as the price at Ottawa, and if you add 1 cent for freight, the price will be 16 cents, instead of 24 or 26 cents as mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I have no desire to detain the House longer. I have answered the objections brought forward against the arguments and statistics I submitted, and I repudiate the reflections attempted to be cast on my figures. I have nothing to say against the oil interest or against the men employed in it, in fact I have nothing but good words to say for them. I am not here, however, to discuss their interests, but rather to watch and guard the interests of my constituents and of the consumers at large, irrespective of any influence of any party or body that may be brought to bear on me. The welfare of my constituents and of the people of this country are far more dear to me than any influence that may be brought to bear on me by other interests, and, therefore, what I have said has been said in the interests of the country at large and not influenced by the Standard Oil or any other oil combination, and I have spoken freely and honestly my own opinions.

Mr. EDGAR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

L'ISLET ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Joseph Israel Tarte, Esq., for the Electoral District of L'Islet.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOSEPH ISRAEL TARTE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of L'Islet, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Choquette.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a further partial return to the Address for papers in the Manitoba School case.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask what are those papers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report of the argument before the Judicial Committee, and the record of the case.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Bain, Soulanges.)

Bill (No. 32) relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act incorporating the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. Marshall.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Calgary Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Calgary Hydraulic Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Messrs. Hughes and Campbell be added to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That it is desirable that the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be empowered to examine witnesses under oath or affirmation in relation to the Committee's inquiry into the matter of the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the ports of Great Britain on the 20th of October last, by order of the Imperial Board of Trade, and that the Committee

be hereby authorized by this House to examine such witnesses on oath or affirmation where affirmation is allowed by law.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. DICKEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 37) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: This Bill proposes to amend sections 179 and 180, with regard to immoral literature and circulars issued with a fraudulent purpose. The Act does not provide that advertising or the sending of such circulars by express shall be illegal. It is also thought that a fine should be imposed as an alternative to imprisonment. The present Bill is intended to supply these omissions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee on Thursday next to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act, and to provide for the appointment of a Civil Service Board consisting of three members; two at salaries of four hundred dollars per annum each, and one, who shall be Supervisor of the Civil Service, at a salary on appointment of not less than fifteen hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to a maximum of two thousand dollars.”

Motion agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question of the First Minister, of which I have given private notice, whether it is the intention of the Government to endeavour to secure the co-operation of the other British colonies in urging upon the Imperial Government the adoption of a policy of preferential trade between the Empire. If so, how soon will the Government take steps to secure such co-operation, and what are the steps the Government have in contemplation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the intention to invite the co-operation of the other colonies and to call their attention to the movement in Canada in that direction as soon as possible.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

He said: In rising to move that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means, it becomes my duty, in the first place, to make, as briefly as I possibly can, consistent with plainness, a statement of the operations of the preceding year, and of the current year, so far as

Mr. SPROULE.

we have overtaken it. In doing so, I desire, without further ceremony or prelude, to state that in March last, when I had the honour of making my financial statement in this House, I estimated that the revenue which would accrue during the year would be as follows:—

Customs.....	\$20,500,000
Excise.....	7,900,000
Miscellaneous.....	8,265,000
Total.....	\$36,665,000

The actual receipts were as follows:—

Customs.....	\$20,501,059
Excise.....	7,945,097
Miscellaneous.....	8,475,715
Total.....	\$36,921,871

showing a very slight excess of \$1,059 in Customs; an increase of \$45,097 in Excise, and an excess of \$210,715 in Miscellaneous. So that, whereas the total estimate for that period was \$36,665,000 the total receipts were \$36,921,871, being an excess of receipts over estimates of \$256,871. The following were the receipts during the preceding year of 1890-91:—

Customs.....	\$23,399,300
Excise.....	6,914,850
Miscellaneous.....	8,265,160
Total.....	\$38,579,310

This shows a decrease in Customs receipts during 1891-92, as compared with 1890-91, of \$2,898,241; an increase in Excise of \$1,030,247, and an increase in Miscellaneous of \$210,555, or a total of receipts in 1891-92 of \$36,921,871, as compared with a total of \$38,579,310 in 1890-91, showing a total decrease of \$1,657,439. In the case of the following articles we have received increased Customs duties:

Ale, beer and porter.....	\$ 27,136
Animals, living.....	2,319
Books, periodicals and other printed matter.....	15,410
Candles.....	1,252
Carriages.....	50,766
Carpets.....	11,740
Cement.....	1,162
Coal and coke.....	13,408
Drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines.....	31,523
Earthenware and china.....	37,228
Fancy goods.....	34,452
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of.....	25,916
Fruits, green.....	41,511
Furs and manufactures of.....	20,847
Glass do.....	9,388
Gloves and mitts.....	7,636
Gold and silver, manufactures of.....	3,655
Gun powder and other explosives.....	5,565
Iron and steel, manufactures of.....	70,979
Lead, and manufactures of.....	1,522
Leather, and manufactures of.....	29,504
Metal, composition and others.....	5,835
Oils, coal, kerosene, and products of.....	33,821
Packages.....	2,583
Paper, and manufactures of.....	21,564
Printing presses.....	2,702

Seeds and roots	\$10,900
Soap of all kinds	4,702
Spirits and wines upon which an increase of Customs duties was placed	12,874
Varnish	2,719
Vegetables	9,247
Wool, and manufactures of	132,214
All other dutiable goods	165,204
And from the following articles decreased duties were received:—	
Brass, and manufactures of	\$ 15,563
Breadstuffs	139,557
Bricks and tiles	11,963
Clocks and clock springs	1,878
Coffee	1,121
Coffee, and manufactures of	20,709
Cotton, and manufactures of	20,802
Crapes of all kinds	2,163
Embroideries, not otherwise provided for	13,715
Fish, and products of	2,935
Fruits and nuts, dried	3,440

Gutta percha and India rubber, manufactures of	\$43,461
Hats, caps and bonnets	18,318
Jewellery	12,510
Musical instruments	3,320
Oils, all other, N.E.S.	10,955
Oil cloth	4,207
Pickles, sauces and capers of all kinds	2,490
Butter, cheese, lard and meats ..	101,753
Salt	7,991
Ships and vessels and repairs on ..	7,551
Silk, manufactures of	64,045
Spices of all kinds	4,311
Stone, and manufactures of	16,815
Sugar of all kinds	3,064,462
Molasses	4,096
Sugar candy and confectionery ..	16,461
Tea	7,849
Tin, and manufactures of	2,190
Tobacco, and manufactures of	56,308
Watches, and parts of	19,158
Wood, and manufactures of	10,888
Coming to Excise, the changes are considerable, as shown by the following table:—	

	1890-91. Quantity.	1891-92. Quantity.	1890-91. Duty Accrued.	1891-92. Duty Accrued.	Increase.
Spirits	2,708,841	2,578,973	\$3,544,191	\$3,873,801	\$329,610
Malt	Lbs. 57,909,201	46,425,882	588,593	928,517	339,924
Cigars	101,117,080	104,521,493	605,017	623,952	18,935
Cigarettes	36,066,601	40,147,200	54,737	62,933	8,196
Tobacco and snuff	Lbs. 9,688,643	9,872,166	1,869,895	2,356,004	487,009
			6,662,433	7,846,107	1,183,674

The increased duty in spirits, as shown above, is due to the increased Excise placed upon them. The per capita consumption of Excise articles—the average of the whole country—has been always given, and I give it here as well:

	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Tobacco
	Gals.	Gals.	Gals.	Lbs.
Average for 1867	1 134	2 739	139	2 130
do 1890-91	745	3 790	111	2 292
do 1891-92	701	3 516	101	2 291

Generally, with regard to these different items of the revenue, it may be interesting for the House to know that, comparing 1891-92 with 1889-90, taking the full years before and after the increase and reduction of duty respectively, the imports in 1891-92 were \$116,978,943, against \$112,765,584 in 1889-90. But the duty accruing last year was only \$20,550,581, as compared with \$24,014,908 in 1889-90. Thus, though the imports for home consumption last year as

compared with the years 1889-90, were \$4,213,359 greater, the duty collected was \$3,464,327 less, or, in round figures, the Customs taxes were three and a half millions of dollars less than in 1889-90. The per capita Customs burden in 1889-90 was \$5.01, and in 1891-92 \$4.25, being a reduction per head in the burden of taxation of 76 cents. The duty per cent of dutiable and free goods in 1889-90 was 21.21; last year it was 17.56, a reduction of 3.65 in the rate of duty. It is as well to state here in carrying this a little further, that the total duty collected in 1891-92 from Customs was smaller than in the year 1882 by one and one-fifth millions, than in 1883 by two and one-half millions, than in 1887 by two millions, and than in 1889-90 by three and one-half millions of dollars, showing that the contention is true that the present Government, in the furtherance of its policy, is from year to year materially reducing the taxation of the country. In making the changes in the tariff in June, 1891, I estimated a loss upon the average consumption of sugar of \$3,500,000 in our revenue. I estimated a gain from the Excise duties of \$500,000 on malt, \$600,000 on spirits and \$400,000 on tobaccos. But the increase has not come up to the estimate. The increased gain in malt was \$339,924, in spirits \$329,-

610. In tobacco the estimate was exceeded. Whereas the estimate was \$400,000, the increase has been \$514,140. The total increase from these higher Excise duties was \$1,183,674. In order to meet these higher Excise duties to some extent, the duties on imports of these articles were slightly increased. The result was not to increase the revenue, for, although we received an increase in ale and porter of \$27,136, and in spirits and wines of \$12,874, we had a decrease in imported tobaccos of \$56,308, so that the total decrease in Customs amounts to \$16,298 so far as these increases were concerned. Therefore, as regards the increases and losses which were estimated, the revenue has gained less from the impositions upon malt and spirits, and we have lost more than I have estimated by taking off the duties upon sugar, on account of the increased consumption as shown by the following table :

SUGAR CONSUMPTION.

Year.	Lbs.	Value.	Duty.
		\$	\$
1888-89.....	223,841,171	5,837,895	3,675,724
1889-90.....	174,045,720	5,186,158	2,851,547
1890-91.....	197,163,919	5,005,397	3,138,894
1891-92.....	345,418,485	9,082,523	77,828

The figures indicate a consumption as per customs returns for 1891-92 of an average of about 70 pounds for each man, woman and child in the Dominion. So that if we had kept the same taxation upon the sugar for 1891-92 which ruled in the preceding year, instead of \$77,828, we should have got \$5,418,918. That is to say, at the same rate of consumption, we have actually removed from the taxation of the country five and one-third millions of dollars.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why didn't you do that ten years ago ?

Mr. FOSTER. Don't be in too great a hurry ; always make haste slowly. Deducting one million dollars of Excise which we added and which accrued from the increased Excise duties, the net decrease in taxation was four and one-third millions of dollars, which amounted to 90 cents per head of the total population. Now, it is fair to say that if the remission had not been made it is not probable that the consumption would have been quite so high, for the cheaper the product the greater the consumption ; that is notable in the case of tea and sugar, and articles of that kind. It is, however, true that in taking off the duties upon raw sugar we have remitted to this country, upon an actual necessary consumption of sugar, an amount of money in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000 during the last year. While on that point it may be just as well to make a statement in order to

Mr. FOSTER.

contrast the two policies, in order to meet to a certain extent, an assertion which is often heard, that the system of taxation and the amount of taxation as it bore upon certain classes, was less under the administration of our predecessors than under our own. Let me add this further statement : that we collected on coffee in 1892, \$7,177 ; but if the same duties had been paid upon the coffee consumed in this country last year as was placed upon coffee under the preceding administration, instead of the people having paid \$7,177 they would have paid \$66,746. Duty on tea was last year paid to the amount of \$8,265. If the same rates of duty had been paid last year as were paid under the preceding administration the country would have paid on the same consumption of tea \$1,266,233 instead of \$8,265. In the matter of rice, which is also the poor man's food, we paid last year \$80,762 ; but if the duties in force under the preceding administration upon the article of rice had been paid last year, instead of that amount the people would have paid \$229,820. In sugar, as I have stated, the duty of 1892 was about \$77,000, whereas under the rate of taxation existing under the preceding administration, the duty paid would have been \$4,433,109. That is to say, on these four articles alone, coffee, tea, rice and sugar, the country paid last year \$172,463 ; under the rate of taxation, upon a similar consumption, of the preceding administration, they would have paid \$6,000,905. Under the two rates of taxation the savings to the people in these articles alone last year was \$5,828,442. There is no dispute that in the case of every one of these articles every dollar of that taxation would have come out of the pockets of the consumer, because it is upon materials which are not grown in this country. With reference to receipts from Miscellaneous, I may say that last year they were the largest since Confederation, amounted to \$8,475,714, as against \$4,533,073 in 1878, \$4,075,907 in 1873, and \$1,978,247 in 1867 ; that is, the increase in earnings from 1867 to 1873 amounted to \$2,088,660 ; in 1878 the earnings further increased by \$457,166 ; in 1892 they had increased over 1878 by \$3,942,641, an increase of 87 per cent. I come now to speak for a few moments of the expenditures for the last year. The estimated expenditure in March last was \$36,650,000 ; the actual expenditure was \$36,765,894, an increase over the preceding year of \$422,327 on Consolidated Revenue Account alone. The increases, as will appear from the following table, took place in the following items of expenditure :—

Interest on Public Debt.....	\$ 179,841
Sinking Funds.....	89,782
Administration of Justice.....	24,130
Legislation.....	706,389
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics..	16,315
Quarantine.....	2,839
Superannuation.....	12,569
Railways and Canals (Consolidated Fund).....	20,649
Lighthouse and Coast Services....	11,042

Fisheries.....	\$10,408
Scientific Institutions.....	3,265
Subsidies to provinces.....	32,156
Customs.....	4,308
Excise.....	21,812
Post Office.....	154,444

On the other hand, in the following items there have been decreased expenditures:—

Charges of Management.....	\$ 8,674
Premium, Discount and Exchange.....	69,455
Civil Government.....	9,113
Penitentiaries.....	8,269
Immigration.....	3,440
Pensions.....	11,393
Militia.....	13,205
Mounted Police.....	39,046
Public Works (Consolidated Fund).....	309,694
Mail Subsidies and Steam-ship Subventions.....	47,910
Ocean and River Service.....	22,091
Marine Hospitals.....	1,065
Geological Survey.....	3,202
Indians.....	93,169
Government of the North-west Territories.....	4,468
Miscellaneous.....	17,098
Weights and Measures and Gas.....	3,331
Culling Timber.....	2,456
Adulteration of Food.....	1,337
Public Works (collection).....	6,193
Railways and Canals (collection).....	167,639
Dominion Lands.....	25,675

The actual expenditure on Consolidated Fund Account last year, when taken from the total revenue of last year, left a small but convenient surplus on that account, of \$155,977. The increase, as I have said, over and above the preceding year's expenditure on that account, was \$422,327. But the total increase, and more nearly and entirely to the increased cost of legislation, owing to the abnormal length of last session. Last year we paid for a session of Parliament of 219 days, at a cost of \$1,302,876. The preceding year, which was also a longer session than usual, we paid for 155 days, to the amount of \$596,486. Taking the preceding year as an abnormally long session, and deducting its cost from the session of last year, we find, as I have said, that the increase was \$706,390; that is, the increased expenditure and \$300,000 in addition, were due entirely to the abnormal length of the session, over which, of course, the Government had no control, and for which we are bound to maintain that the Government gave no occasion. Taking the expenditure for a series of years, from 1887-88 down, we find the following facts: The total expenditure on Consolidated Fund in 1887-88, was \$36,718,494. The average of the five years following that period was \$36,547,964. Last year it was \$36,765,894. So that it may be stated broadly that from 1887-88 up to the present time, there has been almost a dead level of expenditure on Consolidated Fund Account, and that this year, but for the abnormal length of the session, would have shown a decrease to about \$36,000,000, or a decrease from 1887-88, of \$700,000. Under this state of facts it cannot be contended, as it is often

asserted, and it cannot be proved, as the statement is often made, that this Government is rolling up the yearly expenditures of the country. On the contrary, they have been kept at a dead level, and but for the abnormally long session of last year, would have shown a decided decrease over a period of six years. Leaving the expenditure on the Consolidated Fund Account, let us see what was the result of the expenditure on capital account for the last year. Taking it in brief, I find that on capital account, excluding railway subsidies, we spent last year \$2,165,700, as against \$3,115,859 in the preceding year, a saving in expenditure, or a lessening in expenditure for last year over the preceding year in that regard, of \$950,159. Taking in the railway subsidies and treating that expenditure as on capital account, we spent last year \$3,413,915 as against \$4,381,564 in the preceding year, a saving in this expenditure of nearly \$1,000,000 as compared with the preceding year. The course of the capital account since 1887-88 has been continuously downward, commencing in that year with an expenditure of \$4,437,460; in the second year, 1888-89, \$4,420,313; in the third year, 1889-90, \$4,053,150; in 1890-91, \$3,115,860; in 1891-92, \$2,165,700, the average of these five years being \$3,638,436, the expenditure for the last year coming beneath the average of the last five years by \$1,472,796, and being less than the expenditure of 1887-88 by \$2,271,760. Taking the expenditure on Consolidated Fund Account and the expenditure on capital account, we find this state of things: that whereas the over-expenditure on the first was \$422,327, the under-expenditure on the second was \$967,649, making the total expenditure on Consolidated Fund and capital account, last year, \$545,322 less than the preceding year, thus again substantiating the fact that the expenditures of this country are year by year diminishing instead of growing larger. With respect to the debt of the country, it will be remembered that for two or three years I have been able to chronicle a very small addition to the debt. I am not able to do that this year. Having taken off the large revenue which accrued from sugars, and having offset that only by about one-third of its loss; we have had less surplus to draw from for our capital expenditure, and consequently had to meet a larger amount of capital expenditure out of borrowings. So, whereas in 1889 the net debt was \$237,530,041, in 1890 \$237,533,211, in 1891 \$237,809,030, in 1892 it rose to \$241,131,434, being an increase over the preceding year of \$3,322,404. But this increase in the debt is more apparent than real, which will appear from these considerations. Of that increase, \$970,000 arose from the cancelling of the North Shore Railway bonds, which before this year stood as assets for the country, although they produced no revenue, and although, under the peculiar arrangement which was made, they could have by no possibility produced

revenue in years to come. They have been written off. That adds to the increase of debt the amount of \$970,000, which, as I have said, is apparent and not real, so far as any benefit to the country as a producing asset is concerned. Then, again, we went last year on the market for a loan, and, as the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me knows, loans, if they are put on the English market at low rates of interest, sell at a discount. The loan that was put on the market last year was at 3 per cent, and, although under all the circumstances it realized more than we could have expected, and although, in comparison with all other countries seeking money last year we stood in the vantage ground, with the exception of Great Britain herself, which has, of course, great advantages, we yet sold that loan at a discount, and the amount of the discount became an addition to the capital account in the shape of an addition to our debt. It is, however, as I have said, more apparent than real. If it had been put on the market at the rate of 3 per cent, there would have been no discount, and there would then have been no debit to the capital account of the country. We would have paid the same in the end, but it would have been paid in the increased yearly interest, which would have come out of the Consolidated Fund and not have been charged to capital; but the discount on the loan, as the discount on all loans, has been charged to capital account, and so adds, as I have said, \$1,122,541 to the apparent increase of debt on capital account. With these explanations, which are meant simply to explain and modify, but not at all to do away with the fact which appears in our accounts, and which will always appear in our accounts, we have added \$3,322,404 to our debt during the past year. It is important that, in the interest of truth, the explanations should go along with the statement. They are meant to do just what they are meant to do and no more, to explain but not to palliate. It will be remembered that three or four years ago I made the statement that I thought we had reached the time when we should call a halt as regards the increase of the debt of the country, and that I thought I saw from that point of time the possibility of raising our revenues without increased taxation, and meeting therefrom the necessary services of the country, of laying up the yearly amount for the sinking fund, and of making a fair capital expenditure year by year, and of accomplishing that without adding to our debt. That promise or that prophecy was literally fulfilled up to the past year. It could not be fulfilled after that, because we took millions of dollars from our revenue in remitting the taxation upon raw sugar, which changed the aspect of affairs, and consequently we had to draw on loans for a certain amount of our capital expenditure. If, however, we had kept the duty on sugar, instead of having had this increase to the capital debt of the country of which I have just spoken, we would, from the revenue which would have accrued from sugar, not

Mr. FOSTER.

only have kept the debt from increasing, but we would have diminished the total net debt of the country by about \$2,000,000. So that my promise made at that time, was upon the set of circumstances then existing, and that it has not been literally fulfilled this year is because the Government thought it better to remit this enormous amount of taxation to the people of to-day, and to make the people of future years pay their proportion of the amount that was necessary for the capital works of the country, over and above what we can spend and spare of current revenue. As to the receipts for the current year, I find that from July of last year to 31st January of this year, the income has been \$21,772,600, as compared with an income last year of \$20,716,451. That is an increase in receipts of about \$1,000,000, as compared with the last year. Last year, we received in the second half of the year \$16,205,420. If we receive that same sum this year, which is a little doubtful, the whole revenue of the country will amount in the present year to a little more than \$38,000,000. The expenditure of the present year, up to 31st January, is \$19,189,893. The expenditure for the same period last year was \$19,817,325. The expenditure in the last five months of the last year was \$16,948,562. If the same rate of expenditure is observed during the last half of this year, we shall have expended \$36,500,000, or thereabouts; but I am not at all certain that the same rate of expenditure can be observed. We are, for instance, to pay additional interest upon our loans; we are to pay, I do not know how much, but a pretty round sum, for fitting up the quarantine facilities of the different ports of the country; and these two amounts, as will appear from the Supplementary Estimates, soon to be brought down, will swell by a very considerable amount the calculated expenditure of the current year in its last half beyond what was the expenditure during the last half of last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These figures, I suppose, are up to the 31st January?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Then again, we are spending more heavily on capital account for the purpose of finishing our canals. The Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which was begun about a year and a half ago, is being pushed forward to completion with all possible speed, so that, during this year, the expenditure will far exceed the expenditure of last year. All these things make me cautious about giving a forecast as to the result of the year, at this early period in the year. However, I think I may say this: That we will, out of the current income of the present year, pay all expenditures on account of Consolidated Fund and have a good balance to apply to capital account; whether or not it will meet the whole of the capital expenditure upon canals I cannot at this period of time say. This much is gratifying, that for seven months of the year, however, the revenues

so far, are nearly \$1,000,000 greater than they were during the corresponding period of last year; while the expenditures up to the present time are considerably less than during the corresponding months of last year. It is not necessary for me to explain to the House—the House is well aware of it already—that in order to meet the extra expenditure upon capital account, and to take up the temporary loans which had been running, a loan had to be put upon the British market. That is fully explained in the Public Accounts, and it has also been explained to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not very fully explained, in one point; you do not state the allowances that were made, what the loan actually netted.

Mr. FOSTER. That is stated in the accounts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. The items may not be in detail, as the items very seldom are. However, suffice it to state that a loan was put on the market for £2,250,000; that the price fixed was £91, and that the realization was £92 0s. 10^d. The loan was subscribed three times over or more; but what was a more gratifying feature of the last loan was this: that the number of individual subscribers to the loan was very much greater than in any former experience of loans that we have put upon the British market. The applicants numbered about 420, as compared with 367 for the issue of the £4,000,000 loan in 1888, a loan which was nearly twice as large. That, I think, shows a widened public interest in the financial affairs of Canada, and an increased confidence in the securities that Canada puts upon the British market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman had the particulars it would be a convenient time to state them. They were usually stated on such an occasion by his predecessors. If he has not he might lay them on the Table later.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the particulars at hand; but I can tell my hon. friend, in brief, what they are. We paid to those who negotiated the loan the exact commissions which were laid down in our contract. We paid to the brokers, as we had

always done, one-quarter per cent. There were no charges outside of that, except slight amounts for printing and the like.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were your allowances; when was the loan made payable?

Mr. FOSTER. Was that not detailed in the Public Accounts?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not see it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember the discount terms just now, but I will bring it down. It was nothing more than the spreading of the loan and the usual discount. I desire for a moment to call the attention of the House to the improved condition of things, so far as indicated by the savings of the country, and the position of the Savings Banks. It will be within the memory of the House, that on the 1st October, 1889, the new Order in Council went into force which reduced the interest allowed on deposits in the Savings Banks from 4 per cent to 3¹/₂ per cent. That, and perhaps other causes, led to an increase in the amount of withdrawals from the Savings Banks, which will be shown when I read the balances in the different years. On the 30th June, 1889, there was a balance of \$42,956,357. On the 30th June, 1890, that balance had decreased to \$41,012,465; and in 1891 it had decreased to \$39,400,026; being a total decrease during these two years, of \$3,556,330 as regards the Savings Banks alone. In 1892 matters began to mend, and that year shows an increase in the total balances in the Savings Banks of \$129,521; a small increase but upon the right side. However, the six months of the current year show an increase in the balance of \$443,210, which at the same rate would be equivalent to pretty nearly \$1,000,000 during the year, which shows that the tide has turned, so far as the deposits in the Savings Banks are concerned, that the drain upon them has ceased and has turned into an increasing surplus. As regards the total savings, as shown by the deposits in the different Government Savings Banks, in the chartered banks, in the City and District Savings Bank and in La Caisse d'Economie, they amounted on the various dates named to the following figures:—

	30th June, 1878.	30th June, 1888.	30th June, 1891.	30th June, 1892.	1st December, 1892.
	\$ cts.				
Post Office Savings Banks.....	2,754,484 03	20,689,032 62	21,738,648 09	22,298,401 65	22,891,074 45
Dominion do	5,742,529 32	20,682,025 61	17,661,378 07	17,231,145 98	17,081,682 47
Chartered Banks:—					
Deposits by public payable on demand.....	35,090,284 00	50,331,413 00	59,383,409 00	65,611,678 00	68,694,266 00
After notice or fixed date....	29,979,041 00	62,529,285 00	83,249,806 00	95,331,100 00	101,526,186 00
City and District Savings Bank, and La Caisse d'Economie....	5,631,172 00	10,475,292 00	10,982,231 00	12,236,099 00	12,904,195 55
Totals	79,197,510 35	164,707,048 23	193,015,472 16	212,708,424 63	222,997,404 47
Increases		85,509,537 35	28,308,324 93	19,682,952 47	10,288,979 84 (for 6 months).

These figures show that the normal increase in the general savings of the country, as denominated and defined in the deposits in these different banks, is maintained. I now come, for a moment, to speak of the commerce of the country during the past year. I am not going into the internal or domestic commerce or trade of the country, because, first, of the time that it would take, and, secondly, because, I am sorry to say, of the unfortunately defective statistics which we have with reference to our internal trade. That is found in every country. It is probably found in our country now more than it will be in the future, for I sincerely hope, and I believe it will be found to be the fact, that the new Minister of Trade and Commerce will devote himself particularly to the task of devising some method of obtaining statistical information, whereby the country shall be apprised of that most important of all the branches of its national life, its internal commerce and production. However, if we can judge from signs which come to the surface, the internal commerce of the country, during the past year, has

kept in advance of that of the preceding year and maintained a fair percentage of increase. Taking our railway returns, which are a fair index, and our returns of shipping and tonnage, which are also a fair index, they both show a considerable increase in 1891-92 over the preceding year. The railways show an increase in the miles operated of 578, in the passengers carried of 364,697, in the tons of freight carried of 661,061, and in the freight earnings of \$3,539,751. This shows that freight has been carried in increasing quantities, and that, therefore, there must have been an increased trade. As regards water-borne freight, we find a small, but, at the same time, satisfactory, percentage of increase. But it is when we come to the foreign trade of the country, where our statistics are fairly extensive and reliable, that we find the largest increase as indicated by the figures to which I shall ask the attention of the House. In view of the controversies which have been going on in regard to this subject, I have thought it well to present the figures of foreign trade for 1878, 1891 and 1892 :

	1878.	1891.	1892.	Percentage of 1891 over 1878.	Percentage of 1892 over 1891.
	\$	\$	\$		
Exports.....	79,323,667	98,417,296	113,963,375	24	15½
Total imports.....	93,089,787	119,967,638	127,406,068	28½	6½
Total trade.....	172,405,454	218,384,934	241,369,443	26½	11
Trade with Great Britain.....	83,372,719	91,328,384	106,254,984	9½	16
do United States.....	73,876,437	94,824,352	92,125,599	28	Decr. 2½
do France.....	1,754,394	2,565,877	2,770,173	46	8½
do Germany.....	521,580	4,336,232	6,526,228	731	50½
do Holland.....	266,764	404,532	846,167	51½	109
do West Indies.....	4,397,996	6,360,926	7,638,846	44½	20
do China and Japan.....	486,244	2,202,102	3,300,108	352½	49½
do other countries.....	1,366,532	3,685,842	5,168,657	169½	40

It will be seen that while there was a loss of trade with the United States of about \$2,000,000 in 1892, that was more than compensated—seven times compensated—by an increase of \$15,000,000 in our trade with Great Britain. It is sometimes stated that our trade with other countries in the world is not satisfactory. It is true that with the United States and Great Britain we do the most of our business ; but a comparison of the above figures shows that we are gradually, and in some instances rapidly, increasing the area of our commerce with other countries. The record I have given is, I think, one which is encouraging to the House, and which will be encouraging to the country, as showing a gradually-widening, and, to a certain extent, although as yet small in its entire amount, a

Mr. FOSTER.

rapid development of trade with the other great countries of the world. The record of our trade for last year is one which you may search our returns through in vain to find equalled. This shows an increased trade with Great Britain in 1892, over 1891, of \$15,000,000 ; with France, one-fifth of a million ; with Germany, two and a fifth millions ; with Holland, one-half a million ; with the West Indies, one and a third million ; with China and Japan, one and a tenth million, and with other countries, one and a half million, besides a small increase with Italy and Newfoundland, whilst the only large decrease we had was with the United States, of two and seven-tenths millions. Therefore, I state again, that the condition of our foreign trade

shows strongly in 1891-92 in our favour, and I believe it will be received by this House and by the country as an answer to the oft-made and baseless assertion, that the trade of our country is stunted and retrograde. Coming to the home products, the exports of Canada of these during the last year, as compared with 1892, show the following results:—

	1892.	1891.
Produce of the Mine.....	\$5,906,471	\$5,784,143
do Fisheries.....	9,675,398	9,715,401
do Forest.....	22,281,744	24,282,015
Farm products.....	50,708,134	39,634,599
Manufactures.....	7,040,988	6,296,249
Miscellaneous.....	71,518	45,337
Total.....	95,684,253	\$5,757,744

Increase..... \$9,926,509
do per cent..... 11½

That is a large increase in a single year. The increase in farm products alone goes to prove the assertion we make, that the farmers of this country are yearly producing more and finding larger and remunerative markets, and in this respect we can stand comparison with the producers of the rest of the world. More we cannot expect. We are in this world, in this age, united in a great

commercial bond with the peoples of other countries, all of us governed by the common wants of the world, and kept in close and constant communication by means of the telegraph wire and rapid transit, so that the world's wants and the world's yield are at once known and the prices of great staples fixed accordingly. Taking that into consideration, the increase of \$21,000,000 in the exports of farm products alone, during the past year, is a very gratifying extension in our trade. I wish to speak now for a moment about the diversion of trade, and there is one point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House and the country with regard to the tariff and our farmers. Everyone knows that about two or three years ago the duties upon farm products, bacon, ham, shoulders of beef, mutton, pork and lard were rearranged. At that time it became patent to the country that large supplies of these articles were coming in from the United States and displacing farmers' products in this country, and the Government came to the help of the farmers, at their request, and raised the duties upon these articles. What happened? Whereas in 1890 33,000,000 pounds of bacon, beef, mutton, pork and lard were brought in from the United States and distributed in this market, the importation fell, in 1891, to 17,000,000, and in 1892 it fell to 13,000,000; and whereas in 1890 the value of the importation was \$1,734,000, in 1891 it fell to \$973,000, and in 1892 to \$723,000. The following table shows the particulars:—

IMPORTS into Canada from the United States for the following Years ended 30th June, 1890, 1891 and 1892, of the following Articles:—

	1890.	1891.	1892.	Decrease from 1890.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Bacon, hams and shoulders.....	4,344,200	2,561,044	1,008,068	3,336,132
Beef.....	6,427,993	2,698,305	2,235,987	4,192,006
Mutton.....	246,343	6,322	11,560	234,803
Pork.....	17,161,592	11,085,111	9,492,965	7,668,627
Lard.....	4,882,831	988,999	691,246	4,191,585
Total.....	33,062,979	17,342,781	13,439,826	19,623,153
Value.....	\$1,729,403	\$968,568	\$723,081	\$1,006,322

That is, the decrease from 1890 made a market for our own farmers in this country by the exclusion of those products from the United States to the value of over \$1,000,000. So that you have to take this into account: that not only did our farmers increase their exports by the amount I have named, but that they had in the home market an increased sale to the extent of over \$1,000,000, required to supply the country in place of the American products, which were excluded from the United States, so that they obtained an enlarged market at home as well as an additional market abroad.

Mr. McNEILL. That shows the advantage of protection.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the diversion of trade, let me read to you the figures of 1891-92, with reference to some products of Canada exported to Great Britain, in order to make a comparison. Horned cattle fell off nearly \$1,000,000, owing to circumstances well known. Leaving that out of account, we find some very encouraging items. Canadian cheese, apples, and bacon have made their place in the British market. Canadian butter had also made a place for itself, but not a very enviable one; but under the operations of the

Dairy Commissioner and the dairy stations, which have been established by the Government to stimulate the production of a better quality, the quality of Canadian butter has been raised; it has been put upon the market in uniform quality, stamped as Canadian butter, making its own way, and comparing 1891 with 1892 we find that, whereas in 1891 only \$440,060 worth of Canadian butter was exported to Great Britain, last year \$877,455 worth found a place for itself in the British market, being an increase of 99 per cent. The following table speaks for itself:

STATEMENT of values of the following articles, produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain during years 1891 and 1892, with percentage of increase and decrease in each article.

	1891. Value.	1892. Value.	Per cent of Decrease.	Per cent of Increase.
Horned cattle.	\$ 8,425,396	\$ 7,481,613	11
Butter.....	440,060	877,455	99
Cheese.....	9,481,373	11,593,690	22
Bacon.....	589,599	1,089,060	...	84
Hams.....	36,398	53,939	48
Apples, green or ripe.....	1,235,247	1,405,527	14
Apples, dried..	7,353	10,692	45
Fruits, canned and preserved	9,500	23,679	149

	1891. Value.	1892. Value.	Per cent of Decrease.	Per cent of Increase.
Barley.....	\$ 75,225	\$1,233,844	1,540
Oats.....	5,954	1,975,485	33,079
Peas, whole...	1,439,747	2,332,307	62
do split...	45,601	89,781	96
Wheat.....	969,134	5,726,505	490
do flour...	851,912	1,110,368	30
Eggs.....	83,589	592,218	608
Horses.....	156,254	214,785	37

By the way, if you look into the Trade Reports you will find that the price of eggs—that much abused article—exported to the British market is one cent and a fraction per dozen higher in value than those exported to the American market. It is well that these figures should be noted and should be spread before the public, in order that they may see the actual expansion and the possibilities of the market in Great Britain for the products which they raise; and I wish to give also this statement, showing the increase in three of the great articles of Canadian export which have had their reputation made for them, and which have been consecutively and skillfully placed on the British market—cheese, cattle and apples, and also the exports of the great division of our products:

COMPARATIVE Statement of Exports, produce of Canada, for the Years 1868, 1878 and 1892.

	1868.	1878.	1892.	Per cent of Increase, 1892 over 1868.	Per cent of Increase, 1892 over 1878.
	\$	\$	\$		
Produce of the mine.....	1,446,857	2,816,347	5,906,471	308	109
do fisheries.....	3,357,510	6,853,975	9,675,398	188	40
do forest.....	18,262,170	19,511,575	22,281,744	22	14
Animals and products.....	6,893,167	14,019,857	28,594,850	314	103
Agricultural products.....	12,871,055	18,008,754	22,113,284	72	23
Manufactures.....	1,572,546	4,127,755	7,040,988	347	70
Cheese.....	* 620,543	3,997,521	11,652,412	1,779	189
Cattle.....	1,099,940	1,152,334	7,748,949	605	572
Apples.....	+ 87,333	*149,333	1,444,883	1,560	867

* From Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia only.

† Fruit, green.

This would keep up the train and trend of the thought I have been developing of the gradual and steady progress of the country in its external trade, and particularly in its exports. So much with reference to the commerce of Mr. FOSTER.

the country. I may not have succeeded in developing much interest with the hon. gentlemen opposite, or at least with some of them, in my figurative remarks; but now I come to the tariff; and, as I approach the tariff, I notice

that my hon. friends' interest deepens. I wish to state a few things with reference to the tariff and the tariff policy. No man with his eyes open would think for a moment of denying the fact that there is more or less agitation in the country with reference to the tariff and to trade conditions. One person will notice it from one stand-point, another from another stand-point. We may not all take statesman-like views; but, whatever views we take, this much is true, and we admit it, that there is an agitation on this matter, and that people are alive to the discussions upon trade policies and to discussions upon tariffs, and to the question what is to be the guiding policy now and for the future. Several things have conspired to make the agitation upon the tariff in this country possibly deeper to-day than it has been for a number of years. Will the House permit me to mention a few of these? In the first place there is a difference in view on the question of principle which has existed ever since we have been a country, which came to a point of cleavage direct and sharp in 1878, between those who believe that a free trade policy out and out is the proper policy for this country, let the revenue take care of itself, or take care of the revenue in whatever way you can; those who believed that a tariff for revenue purposes with incidental protection was the thing for this country, making the revenue the prime consideration, and distributing it so as incidentally to protect the industries of the country, and the third class of people, who believed that for Canada, under the conditions then existing, and which have existed since the principle of a sufficient and reasonable protection to the nascent industries of the country was to be followed first, and that revenue was to take care of itself on that line. Those were the three great schools of thought. We do not expect that because in 1878 one school of thought triumphed and concentrated its opinion in the tariff, but that to a large extent they are nourished to-day, as in 1879. Changes there have been. Men who believed in free trade have come to believe in protection. Maybe it has happened that some who believed in protection have come to believe in free trade, or a revenue tariff with incidental protection, or something of that kind. But the differences which existed then are differences which exist now, and they contribute to the agitation and discussion of the question at the present time with a vivacity probably greater than at former periods, from circumstances which I shall mention afterwards. Then again, there is an agitation evoked by dissatisfaction in regard to changes in the tariff in respect to relative or absolute protection which arise from various circumstances, for instance, in the differences in value that have arisen from 1878 to the present time. Whether specific duties alone or specific and ad valorem duties are placed upon these goods, the differences in value through a series of years

change the amount and incidence of protection. Dissatisfaction has arisen also from the fact of raw materials being in some cases cheapened, and in such cases the protection which was fair when raw materials were higher in price, becomes a little more than fair when raw materials lower in price. Out of all these reasons and others there might arise discussion and thought and, it may be, dissatisfaction, even among persons who believe in a protective policy, but who are not pleased with the changes in the relative or absolute scale of protection arising from the causes I have given. Then again, Sir, I am inclined to think that the McKinley Bill has done something towards sharpening this agitation in the country. Necessarily it did so. Hon. gentlemen opposite, before that Bill was passed, prophesied that it would do so; after it was passed, they declared that it did so, and I am not going to counter their declarations in that respect. For the McKinley Bill, whether it was so intended by its framers or not, did this and did it very effectually; it raised barriers against certain Canadian products, namely, farmers' products, and to that extent it interfered with trade and made necessary the diversion of trade, and every diversion of trade is followed necessarily by its train of dissatisfaction and loss. It may be, that after the diversion has been made, the people will be more prosperous, the markets will be more remunerative, but none the less every diversion of trade from one channel to another causes dissatisfaction and loss to individuals. So that I think the discussion has been sharpened in reference to this matter on account of the passage of the McKinley Bill. It certainly has been sharpened by the results of the elections which took place not long since in the United States of America, and which have been magnified without warrant, which have been unduly magnified by leaders of the party opposite, into a victory for free trade, pure and simple; and statements have been made throughout the length and breadth of the country that, owing to that change, a free-trade policy was to be inaugurated, and that great benefits would come in certain directions, and great changes would have to be made in this country. That has set people to thinking, that has set people to agitating and proposing, and that has added very materially to the discussions and the talk that is going on about this matter in the country to-day. For my own part, I differ with hon. gentlemen opposite, or on this side, who believe that the wings of free trade have been spread for a flight during all future ages in the United States of America, by the election of Mr. Cleveland. I cannot find it in the previous records of the party, I cannot find it in that latest concentration of the party doctrines upon tariff measures, the Mills Bill; I cannot find it in that latest utterance of President Cleveland in his acceptance of the candidature; I cannot find it in the thought, and feeling and breath of the American people to-

day. I think the man who stands up in this country and contributes his quota to the unrest, and dissatisfaction and discontent with the present state of things in this country, by preaching to them that now this second daughter of Britain has entered into free trade, and the next to follow will be the third daughter of Britain, Canada—I cannot believe that these men are doing the best, from a statesman-like point of view, for this country and for the people of this country. However, the fact is, that this has lent point to the discussion and thought about the tariff and trade policies. Then there is another thing which must be taken into account at the present time, and that is the unprecedentedly low price of cereals in the markets of the world; and directly upon that supervenes the effort of the demagogue, the effort of the unscrupulous man, to make the people believe that in some occult way all this is due to the miserable Government and the miserable policy which, for the time being, prevailed in this country. Now, Sir, no sane man, standing up before a number of sane men, will venture that argument. Every one is open, in his calmer moods, to the opinion, to the conviction of the truth, that, if the prices of cereals in the country are low, they are low from certain abnormal causes, and that they are probably temporarily low. But, whatever may be the cause, the fact of these low prices of cereal products throughout the country at the present time, adds point and strength to the discussion, and is used to spread dissatisfaction and discontent. Of course, an Opposition always has open to itself to take advantage of all these things. All things are fair in politics, it is said; and I suppose any average party would take advantage of all the circumstances that arose, and as they arose, to make sentiment against their opponents and in favour of themselves. And, Sir, of late, and with greater vigour, supervening on these things, has come an active propaganda in this country and in the country alongside of us, the end and aim of which, no, I will not put it that way—the result of which, whether it is the aim or not, is to make people unduly discontented and unduly unrestful. In this country everybody acknowledges the geographical difficulties, its great extent, its sparse population, its different races and creeds, its different sections with their different distribution of the resources with which nature has endowed them. But I hope every man also recognizes—if he does not he ought to—that this country, if it is to remain a country, if it is to become a great country, and to have permanence and durability imprinted upon it, has to learn the lesson, and learn it now, and keep it learned, that you cannot afford to appeal to the prejudices, or the poverty, or the wants of one section against another; that you cannot afford to pander to the prejudices or the likes of one class to the detriment of the whole. I am here to-day to state that I misjudge the Canadian people, I do

Mr. FOSTER.

not read aright the spirit of the Canadian people, if, man for man, throughout this country, when they are fairly talked to and fairly reasoned with, they will not lay down, as a basis, that we must get along together in this country; we do not ask that any class shall go scot free of taxes and burdens, while others pay an undue proportion; we do not ask that any section shall be lightly burdened while other sections are heavily loaded; but that class or section, whatever it may be, must, proportionately to its strength, bear its just and equal portion of the burdens that are necessary in order to carry on the affairs of this country, and to give it permanence and durability. I think it is an unfortunate thing that in order to gain power, and in order to make a point against their opponents, advantage is being taken of the present state of things to preach a doctrine in this country which, if it is adhered to, means disruption, and is opposed to the only policy which can give us true permanence and true prosperity. Sir, I wish to notice in passing that these men preach certain doctrines, they go before the people with certain statements; they go before the people with inferences from those statements, some of which they draw, and some of which they do not draw, but all of which they allow, and others which they force to be drawn; and I believe that there are people who go out from the meetings addressed by hon. gentlemen opposite with the firm belief that there is some way by which we can carry on all our services in this country, by which we can have perfect free trade, and will not have to pay a dollar of taxation. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite can define and point out any means or method by which that can be done, well and good; but, if not, the doctrine that ought to be preached in every school-house, on every platform, is that there is no way to build up a country in its public works, looking after its public services, giving it the improvements which the people need in the race of progress alongside of other countries to-day, no other way than by taxation; and that if the people will not bear reasonable burdens, they cannot expect to promote the building up and the improvement of the country. I think the Canadian people are sensible enough and strong enough to accept that doctrine, and to work under the impulse and in the spirit of that doctrine. So that I think, having stated these things, I have stated what leads to the unrest, the dissatisfaction, the agitation upon the tariff question; and I have tried to state them fully. We do not say that the policy we adopted in 1878, in the exact degree of protection that was placed upon the country at that time must be unvarying, must never be changed; but, out of all these causes I have mentioned, the feeling of unrest exists, and it reaches this House of Parliament, and that feeling will be met by the Government frankly, honestly and fairly. So

that the Government, while it wishes to give due weight, and no more than due weight, to any one of these causes, and to any one of these complaints; while it acknowledges their varying force, varying in proportion to their merit and their strength; although the Government does not intend to be either frightened or forced into doing something which it does not believe to be right; the Government takes its stand to-day, and is willing to have it known everywhere. What it proposes to do will be done after the most careful, and earnest, and due consideration, not extended beyond a reasonable period—than will be that which, as a matter of trade and tariff policy, is best for this country as a whole. It proposes to do what is best for all classes counted together, whilst giving due weight to the importance of, and to the position of, each class, and varying the burdens accordingly. It proposes to adopt a policy and to carry out the particular lines of that policy, with due regard and consideration as well to the internal conditions of Canada as to her position amongst other countries of the world under the present conditions of trade and tariffs. These are lines, and to what end? It may be asked, what does the Government propose to do, for these are generalities? I grant that these are generalities. It has been a discussion of generalities, or of principles, if you like to denominate them as such. Then the first question comes from my hon. friend, Will the Government adopt free trade? My answer to that is, no. I know I disappoint my hon. friend in not taking up the pet idol and dream of his heart, the one idea which is the bright star of his existence, towards which he treads his devious way, sometimes in one country, and sometimes in another, from platform to platform, but always with that bright particular star in sight; now, I believe, only fifteen years distant is this bright particular star of free trade, the freest of free trade. There are some considerations why the Government does not propose to adopt free trade. The first is the requirements of the revenue. A stronger man than I am, a deeper thinker than my hon. friend, a man in mental power who towers among the best, has stated it, and from a less prejudiced stand-point, perhaps, because he put it from the stand-point of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he has challenged any man to show how, in this country, now, or for many years to come, any scheme of free trade could be adopted which could be worked, and he expressed his conviction that the circumstances of the country precluded its adoption, and precluded the direct taxation which must necessarily follow upon its adoption. The requirements of the revenue prevent it; \$28,000,000, outside of earnings, have to be raised in this country for its current services. I invite hon. gentlemen to come down to particulars, and to show to this House and the country how they will effect savings in the different items of expenditure so as to reduce that

amount by a very large sum. Small savings can be made, small savings are being made, but that the services of this country require much, and are so important they cannot be stopped, is a truth with which every man is conversant; and the point arises as to how \$20,000,000 can be raised for the services of the country, \$20,000,000 from Customs revenue with free trade with all countries, or with any great country in the world. But, Sir, outside of that point, which is in passing, there is another reason why this country cannot adopt free trade at the present time. It is on account of the industrial and general development of the resources of this country. Here we have under a system adopted earlier than 1878 so far as incidental protection is concerned, in 1878 so far as absolute and direct protection is concerned, developed in this country large and varied interests. Nobody denies that. A vested capital of \$353,000,000, employing 368,000 hands, at a yearly wage of \$100,000,000 and a development of the wealth of the country to the value of \$90,000,000 annually—these are facts stated in cold figures of the census, taking 1891 and comparing it with 1881. This development of industries has gone on for years. It has reached a certain point, it cannot be sacrificed; neither has it reached that point where, unaided, it can yet stand the competition of countries like Great Britain or the United States, with their centuries of wealth behind them, with their great skill, with their enormous markets, with their great production which finds a market in the world in such large quantities. So that these have to be taken into account. Have not these industries grown since 1878? The figures I have given show that they have. They have kept population in this country—

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that hon. gentlemen opposite entertain that idea. These industries have kept population in this country which would otherwise have left it. They are keeping to-day in this country an increasing number of hands in employment, and the increased employment has its benefit in the way of wages, in the way of production, and so is felt throughout the whole country. We know from observation that these industries and this development of our industries has gone on rapidly since 1878. I do not need further to enlarge that idea. Let each hon. gentleman ask his own observation and experience, and let him contrast 1878 with to-day, and see the varieties of articles we manufacture to-day which were not manufactured by us then, that the proportion of articles in use in this country, now obtained from our manufacturers, is much larger; let him look over the whole field and take his own experience, and he will find, though in some cases there have been failures, in some cases there have been changes and vicissitudes, yet, on the whole, a great start has been made with respect to the manufacturing industries of the

country, and a great start made in developing in that way the resources of the country. Do hon. gentlemen ask the history of the im-

ports of raw material? It is contained in these figures :-

IMPORTS RAW MATERIALS, 1869, 1879 AND 1892.

	1869.	1879.	1892.	Per cent of Increase 1892 over 1869.	Per cent of Increase 1892 over 1879.
Wool	Lbs. 2,061,576	4,976,758	10,224,086	395	105
Cotton	" 1,245,208	9,720,708	46,322,525	3,620	376
Hides	\$ 891,488	1,202,890	1,837,102	106	53
Gutta percha.....	" 90,536	133,214	730,657	707	448
Hemp	" 199,179	199,179	877,989	438	340
Raw sugar	Lbs. *21,656,918	+22,925,779	+343,121,731	1,484	1,395
Lumber and timber..	\$ 203,276	531,278	1,094,635	438	106
Silk.....	"	35,556	260,299	735	632

* Sugar below No. 9 cane juice melado.

+ Sugar below No. 14 and melado.

If hon. gentlemen want further information, let them go to the census returns for the figures of industries for 1881 and 1891, and learn from these that the number of establishments have gone up from 49,000 to 75,000, an increase of 51 per cent; the capital investments from \$165,000,000 to \$353,000,000, an increase of 114 per cent; the number of employees from 254,000 to 367,000, an increase of 44½ per cent; wages paid, from

\$59,000,000 in 1881 to \$99,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 67 per cent; raw material from \$179,000,000 in 1881 to \$255,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 42 per cent. Value of products from \$309,000,000 in 1881 to \$475,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 53 per cent; an added value, according to the statistician, of \$33,000,000 per year in 1881, and of \$89,000,000 in 1891, added to the wealth of the country. These are the figures:

CANADIAN INDUSTRIES PER CENSUS RETURNS.

	1881.	1891.	Variation.	
			Increase.	Per cent.
Number of establishments.....	49,923	75,768	25,845	51·8
Capital invested.....	\$ 165,302,623	353,836,817	188,534,194	114
Number of employees.....	254,935	367,865	112,930	44·43
Wages paid	\$ 59,429,002	99,762,441	40,333,439	67·86
Cost of raw material.....	179,918,593	255,983,219	76,064,626	42·3
Value of products.....	309,676,068	475,455,705	165,779,637	53·5

Added wealth, 1871-1881..... \$33,000,000 per year.
do 1881-1891..... 89,000,000 do.

That is an additional proof that industries have taken root, and have grown and developed, and in so doing, have developed also the strength, and the richness, and the reliability of this country upon itself. But, Sir, if more is required let him look a little further at the increased home supply in 1892, as compared with 1878, and the great difference in the consuming population of this country—not so great as my hon. friend would think well, but yet a large increase in the consuming population of the country. That large increase has all been supplied by the home manufactures of this country; I

mean so far as ratio is concerned. Let him ask himself as to the increased exports of manufactured goods, being an advance of 70 per cent over 1878 and of 347 per cent over 1868, and let him ask himself as to the decreased imports of manufactured goods. Let him put all these things together, and he will gain a heightened and strengthened idea of what the industries of this country have attained in that time. Not only have the industries increased in themselves, but let us not forget their collateral advantages. Every ton of ore which is dug, every mill whose wheel re-

Mr. FOSTER.

volves, every cotton spindle that turns, every branch of industry that works up raw material brought in, or raw material obtained in this country, adds to the employment which the country needs, adds to the earnings of the country, and adds to the wealth of the country, to be shared in by every sober, intelligent, and industrious class in the community from one end of the Dominion to the other. These things lead me to the conclusion, and I think they will lead this House and this country to the conclusion, that we cannot adopt free trade, and open up these industries—nurtured from 1878 to the present time, I grant you, by a reasonable and I hope a sufficient protection,—that we cannot open up these, to the unlimited competition of old manufacturing countries like Great Britain and the United States of America, without sweeping away the larger proportion of our industrial development, and reaping all the want, and loss, and misery that will accrue. And after all what better would we be off if we did this? We would not be so well off, because some time, sooner or later, if Canada is ever to be a great country, and it is, it would come to the conclusion again that we would have once more to reverse our policy, and that we would have to develop our own industries and resources. No country in this world at the present time can be great on one branch of work alone, and this country of ours, taking its resources and capabilities into account, would be guilty of the height of madness, if it left everything to the pursuit of agriculture and the natural products, so to speak, and did not strive to be a manufacturing country, giving employment to its own people, and working up its own resources as well. The position of the Government is clear upon that. Will my hon. friend make his position equally clear? I have read his Hamilton speech and his Toronto speech, and for the life of me I do not know where he stands to-day; and there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country as well who cannot put their finger upon the trade policy of my hon. friend opposite and tell what it means. At one time he is all free trade; let the taxes take care of themselves. At another time he says: We must go slowly, free trade is in the distance, and we will come to it gradually. While at another time he is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and discriminations against the rest of the world; the very antithesis of free trade. What are we to judge from all these statements? The hon. gentleman had some quiet fun the other day at the speeches of Ministers, and when this House is in a leisure moment, and when I get more time, I propose to take a few of my hon. friend's speeches and dissect them. But, Sir, what I invite him to do now, as I invited him to do two years ago, is: that he should come out of the bush and into the open and tell us just where he stands. Well, Sir, the Government has an equally straight and equally

frank position to take upon the question of unrestricted reciprocity: but I am not going to take up the time of this House discussing that. Why? Because the country has discussed it and has given its verdict upon it in the general election with its eyes half open, and in the by-elections when it saw straight ahead on this question. Unrestricted reciprocity is a policy which, involving as it does discrimination against Great Britain, revolts the loyal feeling of the people; involving as it does free trade with the United States in manufactured articles, as well as in the products of the soil, strikes a blow at the manufacturing and industrial life of this country, and is repudiated by that class of the people. It is a policy which strikes a blow at the autonomy and self-respect of our people in that it inevitably hands over the autonomy and the tariff and fiscal legislation of this country to a foreign, a superior and a stronger power: and whether my hon. friend seasons it with independence or not I care not. Independence, or not, that policy adopted, and that policy carried out, means the extinction of Canada's separate, individual life, and the destruction of her aspirations after autonomy and nationality. I carry this further. The people have condemned it; they have thrown it out the back door, and they will throw every politician who stakes himself before the country on that policy, out of the same back door. Not in Canada to-day, nor in any year to come, will that kind of policy, pure and simple, when the people think it over and get to the bottom of it, command the support of a majority of the people of this country, or that flag ever be wafted to success: but, Sir, if there is anything like honourable reciprocity, anything like a reciprocity with mutual advantages, and which can be bought by not paying too dearly from the life blood and industrial blood of this country, if there is any reciprocity of that kind, this Government stands committed to take it, and to strive to get it. Sir, this Government does not stand to take that in which there is no honour, in which there is not a fair and mutual advantage, and in which it must pay for what it gets by the extinction of the country's name and independence. Well, Sir, there is another idea promulgated, and that is the pet idea. I was going to say, of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)—preferential trade; and the pet idea of many other gentlemen besides—an idea which, however much it may be laughed at by hon. gentlemen opposite, is an idea which, in its intrinsic worth and in the increasing favour and fervour of acceptance which it is meeting at the hands of thinkers and workers, ought not to be laughed at, which cannot be scouted, which has much to commend it. Even though it be not a present possibility, even though it be years in the future, it is an idea which has its groundwork in a thought wider than self or the selfish interest of any one country. It is an

idea which in its scope lifts one, which gives one an idea of Imperial potency and durability and strength, which is a good heaven to throw into the lower political life of any country—an idea of continents and islands spanning the globe, with climate and productions and resources of infinite variety, with great mental capacity and endowment, with all the instrumentalities of a great trade ready to hand, and with a commercial fleet that fills every sea. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that that idea, if it could be realized, would be the finest, the highest and the noblest thing that has been concentrated into political or public action since the world had a beginning. I am not going to say that it is a present possibility, but I am going to say that it is so potent an idea that it is well for Canada and well for every British country to hold the strongest vantage position for its possible adoption; and we do not know how soon changes in public opinion may bring nearer to a reality that which to many seems to-day but a dream and a vision. This Parliament has pledged itself on preferential free trade. I believe other colonies of the Empire will view it favourably and will also pledge themselves upon it. I know that an increasing number of thinkers and workers in Great Britain are favourable to that idea in the abstract, and many of them in the concrete, as well; and I know, too, that it has to meet the prejudice of a half-century of economic teaching, especially among the masses of the people in the old country, who have been nurtured and grown up in that teaching. As I said before, if it is not a present possibility, it is yet well for us to keep ourselves in a vantage position, where we may do our part to adopt it, if it becomes feasible. So much with reference to that. Now, Sir, after all this, the question comes, What then? There is only one thing left. My course of reasoning has brought hon. gentlemen along that line; and the one thing that is left, in the opinion of the Government, is that which the Government proposes to do. It proposes, in the first place, then, to keep the old landmarks in sight. There has been much talk about the old flag and the old policy. I will, at this time, for the sake of variety, give the remark a different turn. I will say that I believe, and the Government believes, that it is in the interest of this country, that we should not lose sight of the old landmarks which we set up in 1878, and which have remained ever since. I am not going further to state what has been done by this policy in its principle and in its application, faulty though in some respects that application may have been—yes, must have been, because it was administered by human means. But I am going to say this, that that is the line by which we have marched up to our present prosperity, and that it is with the idea of keeping these landmarks in sight that we propose to take the next step in the interest of this country. But my hon. friend says to me: The United States

Mr. FOSTER.

is going to have free trade in a few months, possibly. Suppose that were so—I do not believe it—but suppose it were so. My hon. friend would have to ask and answer another question: How did the United States attain to that position where it could throw its ports open and defy the competition of the world? It came to that position by the road, not simply of a reasonable protection always, but a protection which was oftentimes more than reasonable, but which it would put on, and which it kept on until it developed its immense iron resources, its immense resources of every kind, and secured its accumulation of skill and capital and power, and its market of nearly 70,000,000 people. It marched up to that point along the pathway of a strong and safe protection; and the argument has not reached a conclusion when my hon. friend is able to say: "The United States is going to have free trade next year, and Canada must have free trade as well." We have yet more to do; we have yet further progress to make; we have yet further to toil along the same line along which, from 1878 to the present time, we have come to the degree of prosperity and of development which we have reached. My hon. friend had some criticism when the Premier, in a speech in Toronto, spoke of the National Policy as being wider than the tariff. It is wider than the tariff; we have always contended that it was. The tariff, giving a reasonable protection, was simply one part of the National Policy, which was adopted by this Government firmly and strongly and unitedly in 1878, but which was had in view, in part or in whole, long before 1878 by the chiefs and leaders of the party who put it in full operation in 1879. What was that National Policy to do for Canada? It was to amalgamate and weld together the different scattered territories of this country. That was one branch. It was to open these to settlement, and to transport on easy and quick terms. That was another branch of it. It was to build up the young industries of this country in order that the development of its resources might take place, in order that this country might become, to a certain extent, a manufacturing country, self-reliant, giving employment, in large part, to its own people. This was also a component part of the National Policy. And this National Policy, drawn on these lines, was what the Government of this country placed itself upon in 1878, and it is that which it stands on to-day, although in part what was to be done at that time has been very largely done, especially as to the amalgamation of our territories and the opening up of our means and facilities for transport. We believed, in 1878, that a reasonable protection upon industries which could fairly have a chance to plant and develop themselves in this country, was the only means by which to lift the country out of the condition it was in in 1878—and we ought never to forget that condition; and, on account of that policy, great strides have been

made along the lines I have referred to. So that the Government proposes—and it takes the people into full confidence—not to abandon the principle of a fair and reasonable protection to the industries of this country. Now, as I said before, the Government takes its stand on the ground that all classes should bear proportionately equal burdens; and if, in the course of the investigation which is now taking place, and which will be continued for some further time, it is found that burdens press unduly on any class or section of the country, it will be the bounden duty of this Government to remedy that, and, if possible, equalize those burdens. If in the course of that investigation which is now going on, and which will be continued for some short time yet before a conclusion is reached, it be found that protection has been given to some industries which have no prospect at all of ever becoming fairly rooted in this country, it will become a question with this Government, whether or not it is not best to drop hot-house protection and give simply the reasonable and sufficient protection which is necessary in order to establish industries which, when established, will give some assurance of permanency and continued prosperity. These, then, are the present lines. To lighten the scale of taxation, in so far as possible, and in doing that, we must make up our minds to pare down, as far as we possibly can, all expenditures that are not absolutely necessary for the service of this country; to refuse expenditure on works which it would not be proper for a wise and economical Government to set on foot and continue in the country; to, as far as possible, adapt the scale of protection to legitimate industries and to what is reasonably necessary in order to establish and protect them; to use the raw material of the country, in so far as it can be used, and to extend the free list as far as possible, consistent with the revenue requirements of the country, in order to bring about this lessened taxation and this lessened scale of protection, which, lessened and equalized in that way, may be just as effective, and more effective, after the change has been made, than it was before. What I want to state is this, that information has been gathered by the Government, particularly by myself, during the past year, and that information will be gathered during the coming season; that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself, with the two level-headed business men who control the Customs and the Inland Revenue, propose during the coming year not only to listen to the complaints and the pleas of people who come to Ottawa to see us, but we propose to supplement that by a personal inspection and investigation of the various industries of the country. We propose to go further. We propose that it shall not be said that only one class has the ear of the Government, but that every class, the agricultural, the artisan, the manufac-

turing, the producing, or any class, shall have abundant opportunity to make out its case before the Government or some member of the Government and to have its plea and its grievances taken into consideration, and that the action of the Government shall be based upon the conclusions thus arrived at. During the next session of Parliament we propose to be ready, when Parliament opens or shortly thereafter, to bring down a tariff for this country revised on those lines, which shall not—and I want to make that plain, so that no feeling of panic may take place in the country—which shall not destroy and injure industries which are in this country to-day and which need reasonable protection in order to keep them up, but it will not assuredly, on the other side, give a measure of protection to any industry which will give it the opportunity of taking unduly from the pockets of the people by creating combines and monopolies, and thus making itself a burden instead of a benefit to the country. So much with reference to the future policy of the Government. We intend to be plainly and frankly understood. In that view, we ask our friends in the House to assist us in our investigation, by spreading the information broadcast, that every person can have access to the Government and can lay his plea before them, and that, having the benefit of their collective wisdom, we may arrive at a conclusion which shall embody the best for the country under its present circumstances and the best for the country in its immediate future. Certain things have been very strongly pressed upon us. Certain things have especially been urged with reference to their immediate remedy. Every person who undertakes the revision of the tariff, especially of a tariff framed on a protective principle, will very soon find out how, wherever he attempts to touch one single branch of industry in order to its relief and help, he immediately comes against the wires of other industries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt of it. We do not for a moment wish to leave that out of consideration. It is true, and it is a truth which prompts us to make haste slowly, and to thoroughly consider all industries before we venture a conclusion and adopt a policy with reference to particular industries. So that, therefore, careful revision is necessary, and many pleas, fair in themselves, have had to be shut out this year. We ask these people to wait the conclusion of the coming summer, and of the general revision which is to take place, when they will find their grievances, if they are just, remedied, and their complaints, if meritorious, as fully and fairly met as the Government can meet them. But there are two or three things of which I specially desire to speak, and which I would not wish to go over this session. A strong plea has been made

with reference to the export duty on logs. Hon. gentlemen who live in the sections which, I may say, are most closely affected by that business, understand its acute nature, and all hon. gentlemen who have studied the course of the lumber resources and interests of our country, and who desire to see these lumber resources conserved, as far as they reasonably can be, have had their attention drawn to this matter as well. The facts of the case are to-day that a most wasteful, and, I believe, entirely unnecessary drain is being made on the timber resources of this country under present conditions. I know it is a most difficult matter to decide just how much of the drain should take place, and, when you have decided that, it is still more difficult to so regulate it that it will keep within those bounds; but, over and above those difficulties there comes the strong warning that Canadian lumber resources, which should last us for centuries, are in danger of being prematurely exhausted, and it is well that this matter should undergo most serious and calm consideration, utterly removed from partizanship and trade reprisals, or the like, upon its own broad and sufficient basis. And I wish to state here that, during the coming summer, the Government will take steps, the steps that are necessary and that are most fitting, to gather all the information with respect to these matters that it can, to submit to the House at its next session. And I desire also to state, so far as the Government is concerned, should this investigation lead it to take a certain course, it will not consider that it is debarred from taking the course that is shown to be imperatively necessary because any persons have, last year or this year, on the existing state of things, bought limits or invested in timber lands in our country. The supreme consideration must be our own forest resources, and how to preserve them. I am not saying what conclusion will be reached; I cannot say, because the full information is not before the Government or the House, but we merely wish to enter the plea that, if the revision should be deemed necessary it will not be considered by the Government to be debarred by the fact that limits have been bought or purchases have been made on conditions which now exist. A strong agitation has been brought to the notice of the Government with reference to oils. We have heard that debated in this House. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have taken divers positions with regard to this duty. No cool, reasonable man, on either side, having thoroughly looked into it, can come to any other conclusion than that it is a most difficult question. We have to do justice to an industry which has been, from 1868 particularly, the pet of Governments, so far as protection is concerned, which enjoyed the caressing care of the old Government before 1873, the kindly encouragement of the Government from 1874 to 1879, and the continued favour of the Government from 1879 up to the present time. This industry, though I grant you that it is

Mr. FOSTER.

very largely local, has a strength and power in its plea which appeals to every sentiment of a Canadian, and would move every Canadian to go just as far as he could in order to save the wealth and preserve the industry of the people, individually, who have carried on that business and are carrying it on to-day. On the other side, there is the claim of the consumers, who demand that the oil shall be reduced in price, and who ask that the protection which is now given shall be either entirely removed or reduced. I am not going to add to the discussion of that subject by going into the merits of the case. After hon. gentlemen who understand it have spoken as they have in this House, the merits of that question ought to be fairly well understood. I am simply going to say what position the Government take with regard to it. There is a straight protection on oil of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per imperial gallon, exactly equivalent to the 6 cents per wine gallon which was upon it before the present rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per imperial gallon was made. There is, outside of that, a condition imposed upon trade and transport which has the effect of protecting that industry to a large extent, possibly to the extent of 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon, arising from the fact that transport is limited to certain vessels and in certain directions, and that the oil is subject to inspection, of course. This is outside of the straight protection, and what the Government propose to do, and they have thought over this matter very carefully, is to propose to this House that the transport shall be freed and that the straight duty shall remain for the present as it is. In that way, the abnormal and hidden protection, so to speak, will be taken away and transport will be left free to modern methods, and at the same time a large, I acknowledge it, and, I hope, a sufficient protection will be left to the industry, enough to serve it for the present at least. One other question has been pressed upon the Government, and that is the duty on binder twine. This is complained of especially by certain sections of the country, by the farming class, almost as a unit. That question has been debated in this House, as well, and I am not going into its merits. The protection given to the industry in the United States is, I think, about $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound, with free raw material. In this country the material is free and the protection upon it at present is 25 per cent. A disadvantage from which the manufacturers suffer in this country is in our later harvest and the consequent fact that the surplus of the United States binder twine, known to be a surplus, being left over after their crop is gathered, is still in time to come into this country for use in binding our own crop. It is not, therefore, the intention of the Government to take away the duty on binding twine entirely. It is an industry in this country; it gives employment to several hundreds of people. I have examined into the question, and, so far as I can see, it is not a

foreign monopoly, however strong and however close may have been, or to a certain extent is at the present time, the relation between the two. But I am bound to state this, that, as every one knows, a monopoly exists on the other side of the line. The industry is carried on in this country, notwithstanding the disadvantages I have referred to, and what the Government proposes to do is, while granting relief to the farmers and to those who use binder twine, at the same time to continue reasonable protection to the manufacturers. I shall propose to the committee that from and after the passage of the resolution, the duty on binder twine be reduced from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent. There is still one other question; that is the question of mining machinery. You will remember that three years ago we exempted from duty for three years mining machinery such as was not manufactured in Canada. The term expires in March of this year. I propose to ask the House to extend that privilege on mining machinery for three years longer. In the revision for next year we will take this matter up, and it may be that it will be placed upon a different, but, I hope, no more unfavourable basis. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for having listened so patiently to these lengthened remarks.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any time, and under any possible circumstances, the annual exposition, or even the annual reaffirmation of the financial policy of the Government, is a matter of considerable interest to all classes of Canada; and, on the present occasion, when, as the Minister correctly told us, there is an extraordinary feeling of unrest and disquiet pervading the masses of the community, there is no doubt that it is an occasion of more than usual interest. I am not quite sure that I can congratulate the hon. gentleman on having entirely risen to the level of the occasion; but to those who will take the trouble to read between the lines of his speech, the speech was undoubtedly significant enough. To us who have been in the habit of listening to that hon. gentleman and his compeers for a great many years, there was a rather remarkable absence of what I must call the braggadocio with respect to the National Policy, which has heretofore characterized utterances from that side of the House. There was also an almost complete absence of those taunts which used to be flung across the floor to gentlemen on this side, bidding them bow to the will of the people, and assuring them that the National Policy was so rooted in the innermost instincts of the people of Canada that our puny efforts to

disturb it were in vain. Sir, a change has come over the spirit of the dream of my hon. friend. He has had a vision. Possibly he may have dreamed that he heard the president of the young Conservatives of Toronto declaring that they were being annexed in job lots. Possibly he may have heard a gentleman who was whilom designated as the brains of the party, blaspheming the holy tariff, and speaking evil words even against the sacred gerrymander itself. Possibly the hon. gentleman is aware that the farmers' institutes, from one end of the country to another, are kicking against the wise and merciful provisions of his tariff. Possibly he is also aware that there is hardly a subsidized newspaper, or, perhaps, I should say, an insufficiently subsidized newspaper, that is not helping to swell the chorus. Under these circumstances, I can well understand that our political Vicar of Bray might be a good deal puzzled as to what was the duty of a conscientious public man. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that it is his duty to obey the powers that be, but, on the present occasion, the hon. gentleman is not quite sure who are the powers that be.

Mr. FOSTER. We know who are not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the hon. gentleman does. Well, Sir, under these circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman won't take it amiss if I suggest that if he has not looked to Washington exactly, he has certainly looked to that high-souled American statesman immortalized by Lowell, whose policy, very like the hon. gentleman's, was summed up in these beautiful lines:

There may be men of greater talents,
Who can't sit stidder on the fence.

Although, looking at the hon. gentleman's performances, I may remind him that while a fence may be a steady seat, a tight-rope performance of the rather acrobatic character we have seen to-night, is not apt to be so. Sir, there is a sort of resemblance, if I may say so, between the hon. gentleman and his policy. If I may make the remark without offence, I believe the hon. gentleman commenced his career as a professional philanthropist. Now, I understand that the business of a professional philanthropist is to make everybody else better, as it was the business of the National Policy to make everybody richer. Sir, I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever heard his late lamented leader give his opinion of what a professional philanthropist is? If he has not, I must gratify his curiosity on the present occasion. It is known to some hon. gentlemen in this House that in my green and salad days, ever so many years ago, I was in the habit myself, sometimes, of sitting at the feet of that estimable Gamaliel, and I am bound to say that I have been the recipient of not a little useful, and a great deal of very entertaining, knowledge from that hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, I recollect one

occasion when a question came up for discussion touching professional philanthropists. I remember also that I spoke inadvertently and somewhat slightly of that valuable class of men. Sir John took me up at once. Professional philanthropists, he assured me, were an exceedingly useful set of people. He, himself, always liked to have one or two professional philanthropists in his cabinet. They were useful, he said, for the purpose of keeping up the average of respectability, which, he remarked—and I entirely agreed with him—was sometimes quite a desideratum; but he went on to observe, and I remember the words well—possibly the hon. gentleman may have heard them—that he had noticed that men who went in to get a living by making other people better were apt, in course of time, to require extensive moral repairs themselves. Now, far be it from me to say that the hon. Finance Minister is in need of extensive moral repairs. I deprecate any such inference being taken from my words. Since he has become Minister of Finance it may be that his views on moral questions have broadened and widened considerably; but I am free to say that I believe him to be quite as pure-minded now as when he entered Parliament. But, as Sir John observed, the reason of this little defect in professional philanthropists was that virtue had gone out of them; and it did appear to me, after listening to the hon. gentleman's speech, that he likewise had come to the conclusion that virtue had gone out of the National Policy, and that some other device must speedily be sought for the purpose of circumventing people for their own good—for their own good, you will understand, Mr. Speaker—or else his seat and the seats of his colleagues were imperilled. Now, Sir, one thing at any rate is clear from the declaration of the hon. gentleman. By his own express statement and admission, which I will allude to more at length later on—and let me say it was one of the most remarkable statements I ever remember to have heard or read of a Minister of Finance making on a similar subject—the whole fiscal policy of the Government is now up for review, the whole fiscal policy is to be examined from the bottom up, for the hon. gentleman's declaration meant that and nothing else. We have had fourteen years of the hopeful experiment of endeavouring to make ourselves rich by increasing our taxes. What has been the result of that experiment? Sir, there is, let me tell the hon. gentleman, a very widespread feeling that the whole National Policy has been from first to last an egregious fraud. There are men to-day in the street and in the market place, in the shop and on the farm, wherever men are gathered to-day, all Canada over, who are recalling the predictions and the promises by which they were induced fourteen years ago to adopt this same National Policy, and they are comparing those promises and those predictions with the ascertained facts which confront

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

every one at this moment. It is not my purpose to enter minutely, at all events, into all the petty minutiae with which the Minister of Finance was obliged to fill a large part of his speech; but there is one rough and ready test which every man, learned or unlearned, can apply, which I have always felt and always said was a test worth a hundred thousand or a hundred thousand thousand of all those petty percentages and all those little quibbling details which have been presented to the House, if you want to ascertain whether the country is prosperous or not. If a country is prosperous, people all over the world will be glad to go there; they will be glad enough to stay in such a country, and they will be loth to leave it. That is a rough and ready test, I grant you, but it is one which every man can apply, and the truth of which no human being who knows anything of the position of the country will ever venture to dispute, and that test before I sit down I propose to apply to the hon. gentleman's arguments. We have to-night sundry fallacies to deal with, we have sundry, I will not call them falsehoods, but statements without foundation in fact to expose, and sundry conspiracies, I fear, to lay bare. Let us take up the long list of broken pledges by means of which hon. gentlemen opposite carried the country against Mr. Mackenzie and his Administration in 1878. Sir, I remember well, perhaps the Minister of Finance does not, because his parliamentary life is rather short compared with mine, how the people were told that give those hon. gentlemen the right to control the destinies of Canada and they would stop the exodus, they would provide a home market for everything our farmers could raise, they would restore the balance of trade—they laid great emphasis on restoring the balance of trade in those days—they would enrich our people, they would raise the value of land and raise the value of farm products (but the hon. gentleman has got new light on that question since that time) they would fill the Northwest from end to end with a teeming population, and, lastly, they would obtain reciprocity with the United States. The bare recital is enough. All those pledges and promises may well match with Sir Charles Tupper's famous declaration that in a few brief years, and ten years have elapsed since then, we would export 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from Manitoba, and on 31st December, 1890, \$58,300,000 would be paid into our treasury, as profits from the sale of our public lands, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not cost the people a sou. I shall make a short review, and a very short one, of the way in which those promises have been fulfilled. I regret not to see the hon. First Minister in his place, because the First Minister's view and mine with respect to the exodus differs slightly, and there would be given an opportunity on this occasion for the hon. gentleman to redeem the pledge he partly gave that he would review and con-

trovert the arguments I advanced on a recent occasion in opposition to some of his statements. With respect to the exodus, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: I am prepared to prove that so far from stopping the exodus, the exodus during the last ten years was double, and more than double, the exodus between 1871 and 1881, and it was three times as much as the exodus which took place in Mr. Mackenzie's time. I have taken the trouble to examine not in rely our own statistics, but the United States' statistics, and I have ascertained from them that the total annual exodus in Mr. Mackenzie's time was probably not more than 32,000 all told, from 1874 to 1878, and that it certainly did not exceed 42,000, taking into account the entire foreign-born immigration which came to Canada during that period. In the five years beginning 1874 and ending 1878, 148,000 immigrants, according to our own official returns, are stated to have come to Canada. Of those, 12,000 a year were required to make up the death rate, to keep up the number of immigrants to Canada at its former strength, and even if we lost all the remainder they would merely aggregate 88,000 people. We have the American statistics for 1874-75-76-77 and 1878. For 1874 and 1875 they group all the Americans together, north and south. For 1876-77 and 1878 they give correct figures. In 1876 the total Canadian-born immigrants from Canada to the United States amounted to 22,471; in 1877, 22,116; 1878, 25,518. So far as it is possible to ascertain, the number was about 25,000 in 1874 and 1875, making a reasonable deduction for the number of immigrants from Mexico, the West Indies, South America and other countries included with the Canadians who went to the United States. I do not allege that that was due entirely to the policy of Canada at the time, for the simple fact that during those five years emigration to the United States had almost entirely ceased, as any hon. gentleman can see if he examines the United States' statistics. But how does that compare with the emigration under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite? As I have said, the maximum immigration in Mr. Mackenzie's time was very little over 40,000 souls, putting together the foreign-born immigrants who came to Canada and the native-born Canadians who left. What was the number under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite? Our own census returns prove to a demonstration that we have lost 440,000 of our own native-born population, and the hon. gentleman's own statistics prove, unless those statistics are a lie, a fraud and a sham, that we have lost of foreign immigrants 727,000 more. Put these two figures together and you will find the loss to Canada of native-born Canadians, by far the most valuable class, and of foreign immigrants, amounts to a total of 1,167,000, being at the rate of 116,000 per annum during the last ten years, as against, in Mr. Mackenzie's time, an ex-

treme number, an over-estimated number, of 40,000 a year from both those classes. Those hon. gentlemen made every hustings ring in 1878 with their declamations as to how, if they were only permitted to enjoy the control of this country, a home market would be provided in every town and village for everything the farmer could raise. Our villages were to become towns and our towns were to become cities, and our cities were to become something hardly ever dreamed of in this country before. We were to have at our farmers' doors, markets which would consume every vegetable, every cereal, and every head of cattle and poultry that they could possibly raise. I do not think the hon. gentleman dare prate to the farmers of their home market to-day. They were to restore the balance of trade. Well, to my poor judgment, that was a silly proposal, but what is the fact? Do hon. gentlemen want to know the figures? Why, since 1878, the gross balance of trade is \$308,000,000 against us, an average of more than \$20,000,000 a year, and that was the way the hon. gentlemen fulfilled that promise. The hon. gentlemen were to enrich the people, they were to raise the value of farm products; but the present Finance Minister, having obtained a little more wisdom than his predecessors, tells us that no Government can raise the price of farm cereals. I appeal to all my hon. friends. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite themselves who took part in the election of 1878, if, from one end of Ontario to the other, and, I believe from one end of Canada to the other—although the price of farm products were double then what they are now—I appeal to them and ask if the cry of hon. gentlemen opposite was not that they could and would raise the price of everything that farmers had to sell. They were to fill the North-west with population. Well, Sir, if ever there was a miserable exhibit on the face of the earth, it is the exhibit which is made to-day in that fine country, under the policy of these hon. gentlemen. Why, at the present time, we have positively not got one family to the square league of the fertile lands of the North-west. We have spent \$100,000,000, more or less, in the last dozen years, and I doubt, Sir, if we can be shown to have added 10,000 families to the population of the North-west during the last dozen years, by reason of that enormous expenditure. But, above all, they told us that they would obtain reciprocity; as Sir John Macdonald put it: reciprocity of trade, or reciprocity of tariffs. That, also, I must deal with hereafter. It would take me altogether too long at this present moment to do justice to the strenuous efforts made by these hon. gentlemen, and by the Minister of Finance in particular, on two memorable occasions, to obtain reciprocity for the people of Canada. Now, I notice three fundamental errors in the speech of the Finance Minister, errors which affect his whole policy and the whole policy of his Government and his party. That hon. gentleman lays down, or did lay down, as a

proposition, that it was possible to increase our collective wealth by increasing our taxes. I beg leave to tell the hon. gentleman that I regard such a proposition as about the ne plus ultra of folly in a country like Canada. When the hon. gentleman is able to pour water into a sieve and keep it there, when the hon. gentleman is able to leap from one of these buildings and sustain himself in mid-air, by grasping his waistband, when the hon. gentleman can take snow in his hand and hold it before the fire without its melting; then, and not until then, will the hon. gentleman increase the collective wealth of the community by increasing their taxes. Sir, we do not look for grapes from thorns and we do not look for figs from thistles, but we had better do that than look for prosperity to a policy, the very key-note of which is to enrich one or two special classes at the expense of the great bulk of the community. I tell the hon. gentleman that his Government and his policy may indeed displace wealth—that they have done to a large extent—but they are helpless and powerless to create it. Then, Sir, the friends of the hon. gentleman, and I think the hon. gentleman himself, although he alluded to it but lightly, gave us to understand that because protection had brought prosperity, as he thought, to the United States, therefore that protection would bring prosperity to Canada also. I never heard that argument used by anybody without putting down the man who used it either as a charlatan who does know better, but who desires to delude the people, or as a man who is utterly and hopelessly ignorant of the very primary geographical conditions in which this country is placed. I have said often, and I repeat it here—because the hon. gentleman has made it necessary for me to go into some details in dealing with these general propositions—I repeat, that if an economist were called upon to select two countries in one of which the protective system would do the maximum of mischief, and another in which it would do the minimum of mischief, he would select as the one which was best able to bear a protective system without injury, the United States of North America, and he would also select as the one in which a protective system would assuredly do the maximum of mischief to the whole inhabitants of the country, the federation of this Dominion. In the United States you have met together every condition which would counteract the evil effects of a high protective system. You have a huge country, containing a population equal to two first-rate European nations, producing every article, I believe, which any nation can require to produce, having every variety of climate, from the tropic to the pole, and enjoying in itself a vast and most perfect system of free trade among twenty-five or thirty nations called states. You have, on this side of the border, a group of countries se-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

parated from each other by physical obstacles of a very formidable kind separated from each other by large tracts of inhospitable country, producing almost identically the same articles; not a homogeneous people by any means, with a very small population, comparatively speaking; and, in one word, you have combined in Canada every possible combination of circumstances which can make a protective system a huge and vicious mistake. The hon. the Finance Minister and his friends are in the habit of telling us that we need not complain, forsooth, of the amount of the taxes they levy upon us for the benefit of the manufacturers, because, he told us, the manufacturers are now able to produce in Canada as cheaply as in any other country. I doubt if a more impudent claim was ever advanced. If they are able to produce as cheaply in Canada as anywhere else, what right or what need have they of protection at all? But the fact is, that as to many articles, it is impossible, 'in rerum natura,' that you can produce them in Canada at all as cheaply as you can in other countries. I take issue in the most distinct fashion with the hon. gentleman on that question. I may tell him that Canada at present is essentially an agricultural country, and next to that, it is a mining, fishing and lumbering country, and while I am not in any respect disposed to depreciate the great importance of the manufacturing industries that exist, neither can I for one moment allow the hon. gentleman to mislead this House or to mislead the people into supposing that Canada has any peculiar aptitudes for a great many manufactures. There are certain manufactures which may develop naturally and fairly here, and if so, Sir, they will need no coddling by a protective tariff or in any other way. If our manufactures need anything for the purpose of their full and free development, what they need, and what the best of our manufacturers know that they need, is a larger market than they at present possess. I am well aware, Sir, that it is the habit of hon. gentlemen opposite to support these false contentions by impudently claiming for themselves, in the first place, the benefit of all the natural improvement which must take place in a great country like this, and in the second place, of claiming the benefit of all these wonderful scientific discoveries which from day to day, I might also say from hour to hour, are cheapening the process of manufacturing. Sir, science, I grant you, has partly undone the enormous mischief that protection has caused; but, Sir, what protection does is this: it intercepts the compensation which is due to our farmers and the other classes I have named. The prices of all their manufactures, their wheat, their beef, every article that they produce, have been falling heavily, and still more heavily, from year to year, until this year, as the hon. Minister admitted in his speech, the prices of most of our cereals have touched the lowest figure known for

nearly half a century. The Government may not be able to mitigate that; but what our Government does is at the same time to enable our protected manufacturers to deprive our farmers of the benefit which they ought to derive from the products of their industry. The Government cannot help the farmers to get one farthing more for their produce; but it does prevent them from buying as cheaply as they otherwise might. Meantime, the hon. gentleman, backed by his colleagues, continues to assert that all is well, and they give us proof, as the hon. gentleman to-night gave us proofs, of the truth of the assertion. He told us that the savings bank deposits had on the whole greatly increased, and that our bank deposits had likewise increased; he spoke of new railways, and I think he spoke of the growth of certain of our towns and cities. Now, I have no objection in the world to the hon. gentleman bringing forward those evidences, which are good as far as they go. I grant you that it is a good thing that the savings bank deposits have increased; I grant you that it is a good thing that our bank deposits have increased: I grant, if you like, that it is a good thing that certain cities have grown and prospered; but, after all, how far do all these things go? I repeat to the Minister of Finance what I said some nights ago to his chief: that evidences of debt are not necessarily evidences of increasing wealth; he tells us of the great increase in the savings bank deposits. Well, Sir, where is the money? The hon. gentleman has not got it. If a run were made on the savings bank, he knows, as he tells us in his own report which I hold in my hand, that he would have to go to England to borrow money to meet it. What does the increase in the deposits in the savings banks prove? It proves that the people of Canada owe the sum of money so deposited to a few individuals. Where is that money? A part of it, we know, is interred in the North-west rebellion; another part is interred in public works on the principle of paying \$3,000,000 for what is worth \$2,000,000; another part is going to pay railway subsidies for the purpose of keeping some hon. gentlemen behind the hon. Minister in good humour; and of the rest he can give as good an account of it as he pleases. With regard to the bank deposits, I wish to know if the hon. gentleman regards them as an unanswerable proof of increased prosperity in the country. It may or it may not be. It may go to show, and to a certain extent it does show, that under a protective system a much larger amount of money is required to carry on a given amount of trade than ever before. If you add enormously to the taxes on imported goods, there is no doubt that a larger amount of money will be required to carry on the same amount of trade as before. But, after all said and done, where are these same bank deposits, and by what are they represented? They are represented chiefly by discounts. The hon. gentleman knows that, although the

banks of Canada have a good and honourable record, if there were a run on those deposits to-day, they could not pay them, nor for that matter could the banks of any country do so. To a large extent these discounts go to show that owing to the unhappy disposition of people to forsake the country for the town, there are great many more men engaged in trade than the interests of the country require, and I fear that they are using much less of their own capital and much more of borrowed capital than ever before. But we will let that pass. There is, however, one significant fact that I am not going to let pass. It is a fact that I have brought time and again to the attention of the members of this House, and it shows the utter hollowness and worthlessness of these alleged proofs of the country's prosperity. Sir, to-day, throughout the province of Ontario, I dare to say, there are a hundred towns and villages in each of which there are bank offices having hundreds of thousands and it may be millions of dollars on deposit. Go to any one of those towns and villages and put up a house or a farm for auction, and even if you are willing to take 50 per cent of its real value, I am sorry to say that in the vast majority of cases, although there are hundreds of thousands of dollars lying comparatively idle, and bearing but 3 or 4 per cent interest, you will not be able to get a single bid for your property. Sir, it is not a proof of great and increasing prosperity in a country like Canada, possessing a large unoccupied area of fertile land, that there are an unusually large number of people who prefer to put their money in savings banks and get 3 or 4 per cent interest for it rather than to put it in house or land property; and these things, in so far as they are a proof at all of genuine wealth, are often more accurately described as being a proof of the displacement of wealth. But, Sir, I will allow for argument's sake that the hon. gentleman is right in telling us that these things represent real growth and real wealth. Is there no 'per contra' to all this? Is the hon. gentleman sitting there as Finance Minister unaware of the fact, which I know, which scores of men in this House know, which thousands outside of this House know, that in the older parts of Canada, at any rate, in Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, there is to-day a most unusual and extraordinary decrease in the value, first of all, of town and village property, and in the next place of farm property? Does the hon. gentleman not know that in the past twelve years there has been an enormous increase of debt along with this decrease in the value of property? Does he not know that our federal debt has increased enormously? Does he not know that our provincial debts have also increased enormously? Does he not know that our municipal debt, and our railroad indebtedness—because the moneys borrowed for the con-

struction of railways are a real debt upon the people of Canada—have enormously increased likewise; and that private indebtedness, as represented by moneys borrowed by our loan companies and invested in mortgages, has likewise increased enormously? I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us what his estimate is of the indebtedness of our people to outsiders on all these various scores. One of his colleagues, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), some years ago submitted a calculation to this House, according to which he estimated that we owed annually \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 of interest. I am not disposed to quarrel with that calculation. I am very much disposed to think that since that time our annual indebtedness for interest has considerably increased. But if it be correct, if we have to pay \$30,000,000 in the shape of interest to foreign creditors, and if you add to that the enormous amount of money we are likewise obliged to pay, not into our treasury, but in the shape of taxes to manufacturers, the hon. gentleman will see that we have very good ground for saying that the people of Canada at this moment are subjected to a burden far too heavy for them to bear. Now, Sir, in the meantime there are certain facts as to which there is no shadow of doubt. With the census returns now in our hands, there is no shadow of doubt that there has been in these ten years that I have alluded to, an enormous loss of the native-born population of Canada, of the very pink and flower of our population. There has been likewise, if there be one word of truth in the statement formally laid on the Table of the House by the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, a most enormous loss of the foreign imported immigration. And here I may pause for one moment to say that I, for my part, am willing enough to welcome any honest immigration, but I think, Sir, that the Government and the people of Canada will do well, looking at the enormous loss of their own people, to hesitate before they encourage much more foreign immigration. I have noticed, and noticed carefully, that the foreign immigration which has come to Canada of late years shows a most distinct deterioration, and I believe the same thing exists with respect to the immigration to the United States. In old times, no doubt, the immigration was composed of a very good class of people, as a whole. The difficulties that attended leaving their own country, and the expense of coming here, operated as a sort of natural selection, and a tolerably good class of immigrants came out. In fact, in the old days they would compare perhaps as favourably with the majority of the people from which they came as do the Canadians, I regret to say, who now go to the United States, compare with the majority they leave behind in Canada. But that is all altered. The improvements of transportation make it very easy to shunt upon us an inferior class of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

immigrants, and, no doubt, a very large number of those brought to Canada, under the auspices of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, have been of a very inferior class. There is danger here to the national life. We are suffering a double moral depreciation and degradation. First of all, these hon. gentlemen deprive us of the cream of our population, and then they water the skim-milk that remains. Some gentlemen on their side I dare say, could advise scientifically as to the proportion of water which should go into skim-milk. If you add to this the enormous increase in the real taxation of the people, and by that I mean not only what goes into the Treasury, but what goes out of the pockets of the people, can the hon. gentleman wonder that there is discontent and agitation from one end of the country to the other, more particularly when he and I know that all over Canada to-day a very large class of the very best of our population are daily and hourly being degraded from the position of free and independent landowners to that of mere tenants at will or hopelessly mortgaged men? Let us compare for a moment the progress we have made in this last decade with the progress we made in other decades. The hon. gentleman made a very great point of the enormous increase which the census shows in manufactures. Well, I have also taken the trouble to look through the census returns, and while I am glad to see there has been a considerable increase, I am sorry to be obliged to tell the hon. gentleman that he is utterly mistaken, and is misleading the House gravely when he declares that there is a greater proportionate increase in the most important respects between 1881 and 1891 than between 1871 and 1881. I take these census returns and look to two very important particulars. I look, in the first place, to the number of men employed. The increase in that respect amounted to 44 per cent; the increase between 1871 and 1881 amounted, I believe, to about 39 per cent. All the alleged gain that has been obtained has been a relative increase of some 4 or 5 per cent. And I turn to another item, to which the hon. gentleman directed special attention, the item of the amount of money employed. I do not consider that that is a very favourable showing. It requires to-day, \$353,000,000 of money to produce \$475,000,000 worth of goods, according to the hon. gentleman's census returns. Now, in 1881, it required \$165,000,000 to produce \$309,000,000 worth of goods. Consequently, whereas before we were able to produce by the employment of \$1 of capital nearly \$2 worth of goods, now it requires \$2 worth of capital to produce \$3 worth of goods—a very distinct alteration, and an alteration for the worse in that important respect. And so on for a very considerable number of other important matters. As I have told the hon. gentleman, I do not consider that, in a country like Canada, there is anything to boast of in the fact that there is a reasonable natural increase from year to

year. Does the hon. gentleman pay so very bad a compliment to his own policy as to think there would be no natural increase at all? Let us look at the rate of increase and compare it with that in the mother country, and let us return to that test which I have always pointed to as offering the best possible guarantee for a nation's real progress. I pointed out the other evening that in old Canada, that is to say in the five old provinces, our total increase during the last ten years had been barely $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. I turn to the returns for England and Wales, and I find that while, with our almost unlimited amount of vacant land in Ontario and Quebec, at any rate, and also some of the Maritime provinces, all we increased in that decade was $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, in England from 1861 to 1871 the increase was $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and from 1871 to 1881 it was $14\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and for this last period the increase is as nearly as possible 12 per cent. So that, practically speaking, the increase in England and Wales—an old country, a country which loses a great many of its population by emigration—has been in some decades twice as much as that which took place in our old provinces from 1881 to 1891. I notice that when the hon. gentlemen opposite are confronted with the facts of the census, or with the facts of the enormous depreciation of property in town, village and farm lands, their course has one merit—it has always been perfectly consistent. I will recall to the minds of my hon. friends behind me the numerous occasions in which, during past years, I have challenged the accuracies of the hon. gentleman's statements as to the growth of this country, and I ask them if the course of the Government was not on all occasions precisely the same. First of all, there was an impudent denial of the fact. That was usually followed by frantic abuse on their part, and on the part of their supporters and their hireling press, of myself and the other gentlemen who brought those unpleasant facts to their notice, and when the facts became too clear to be gainsaid or denied, then the hon. gentleman took refuge—in what? In the assertion, and often the very incorrect assertion, that it was a matter of no consequence, because in some hole or corner of the United States, in some little state of the Union, a similar state of things prevailed. Sir, a physician who, when asked to cure a patient of a wasting disease, would tell the patient that he knew of no remedy, but was able to inform him that there was a number of other people similarly attacked, would not be the kind of man I would like to employ. The hon. gentleman devoted, if I recollect aright, about an hour, or maybe an hour and a quarter to enunciating the policy of the Government. The policy of the Government! Well, Sir, the policy of the Government might have been defined in much shorter metre. The policy of the Government, Sir, as enunciated by the hon. gentleman is, briefly, to fling a tub to the whale. The policy of the

hon. gentleman reminds me very forcibly of an anecdote which I once heard of an American gentleman who, at an early period of this century, was sojourning at an English country house. This was at a time when the great American nation had not been educated on the subject of tips, and this frugal party was seriously exercised as to what he ought to do. So he took one acquaintance aside and asked him gravely, "What is the least sum I can give without appearing mean?" I think the hon. gentleman's Budget has been framed entirely on these lines. The spirit of this frugal Yankee has transmigrated into my hon. friend, and his one end and object at present is to ascertain: "What is the least I can do for the unfortunate farmer without appearing mean?" I cannot congratulate him, but it is the day of small things, and I suppose we must be grateful. And perhaps there may be something in the instalment plan on which the hon. gentleman intends to proceed. Sir, if ever there was a case in which the saying 'Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus' was verified it has been verified by the hon. gentleman this afternoon. Two and a half mortal hours the hon. gentleman consumed in telling us, first, that the Government did not know what to do about saw-logs; second, that the Government will allow us to import oil in tanks instead of in barrels; and, third, that the hon. gentleman will make the duty on binding twine 1 cent instead of 2 cents. But, Sir, that is not all, that is not all by any means. Over and above all this, Sir, the hon. gentleman has been good enough to say that a grand progress is about to be instituted. Is it to be by caravan or by Jamaica car, Mr. Speaker? Four Cabinet Ministers—no, two Cabinet Ministers and two apprentice boys will peddle old taxes for sale about the Dominion. Old taxes for sale! That positively is the policy of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman really means it, he has been monstrously injudicious. I recollect perfectly well how the vials of wrath were poured out on my devoted head because, some eighteen years ago, in the course of a speech made by His Excellency, I ventured to hint in the mildest way that within a month or so there would be some tariff changes. Sir, it seemed to me that the heavens and the earth were coming together. What I had done was unconstitutional; I was destroying trade, paralysing manufactures. But the hon. gentleman proposes during the whole year, if he really means what he says, to unsettle all trade, to unsettle all manufactures. Nobody is to know where he stands until the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have completed their pilgrimage and until a sufficient number of the old taxes have been sold. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman does not mean it, if all this is simply a device to gain time, if there has been a private arrangement with certain protected manufacturers that they need not disturb themselves, that this will all come out

right, that it will be managed in such a way that their interests at any rate will not suffer, then, I venture to say, a greater farce was never played off on any country than the proposition of the hon. gentleman to take a whole year to carefully consider what he, as Finance Minister, ought to be able to advise this country on to-day. As I have said, Sir, there is one fact which, after fifteen long years, has dawned on the hon. gentleman (I wonder has it dawned on any of his friends around him), and that is, that the Government cannot raise the price of cereals. Sir, you will recollect, and the House will recollect, that we were told by the hon. gentleman time and again that only demagogues would dare to say that the Government could raise the price of cereals, and yet my memory goes back to the time when this country, in 1878, was flooded with demagogues preaching that identical doctrine. The hon. gentleman tells us that our trade in agricultural products with Great Britain has increased by fifteen millions. Well, Sir, I am glad that, bad as the markets are, our farmers have a market at all, but I can tell the hon. gentleman this, that, as regards a large part of that fifteen millions, it is simply the measure of our loss, it is simply the amount of unprofitable trade which we have transacted in place of a much more profitable trade with our natural market. Sir, he was good enough to tell us that the Government came to the help of the farmer in 1889, when they put on a lot of taxes on American products, and got for him, I believe, a million or so of additional markets. And, Sir, he might have added that by that ill-timed and injudicious act he stuck the farmers of Canada for the McKinley tariff and all the mischief it has done them. Had he and his friends pursued, as they were advised from this side of the House, a wise, conservative policy, had they, knowing what was in contemplation from the United States, abstained from putting weapons into the hands of our opponents, the chances are a thousand to one that the most obnoxious portions of the McKinley tariff would never have been enacted. But when he chose in April to defy the American people and to put on taxes which he knew must bring retaliation, he and his Government stand convicted before this country of having, more than any other men, contributed to saddle the McKinley tariff on the farmers of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion. Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the Government lowered the sugar taxes. No doubt the Government, at the dictation of the aforesaid Mr. McKinley, did lower the duties. Did we hear one word of the remission of the sugar taxes until the American Government had made it impossible to keep them on? And when they did reduce them, they did it so as to reduce the amount received by the community in revenue, but not so as to disturb the profits of their refining friends. The utmost amount that could be taken was

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

taken out of the pockets of the people; but the smallest possible amount was taken out of the pocket of their friend, the chairman of the Conservative committee in Montreal. Sir, the hon. gentleman's ideas are excellent; but I am bound to say his practice is detestable. Now, I come to deal with what I must call the per capita fraud which the hon. gentleman has often referred to. If the hon. gentleman knew anything about what one of his followers calls "scientific protection" he would know that it is the absurdest nonsense to talk about a per capita reduction or a per capita anything else in connection with a protective tariff. Who does not know that the very essence, the very reason for imposing a protective tariff is to compel the bulk of the people to pay a very considerable sum to certain manufacturers, which sum does not go into the treasury? I am not arguing the point whether that is wise or foolish, but I say it is a necessity of the case, and, when that is so, what folly it is to talk of the per capita taxes levied on the people being measured by the sum which goes into the treasury. The tax is taken out of their pockets, and so far as the great mass of the consumers are concerned it does not matter to them whether it goes into the treasury or whether it goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. So, likewise, the hon. gentleman tells us that we cannot have free trade because we have \$30,000,000 of taxes to raise. The question suggests itself to my mind: Why have we \$30,000,000 of taxes to raise? Sir, I tell the hon. gentleman that had reasonable prudence and economy been used in the government of this country, had that Government been administered as the late Mr. Mackenzie would have administered it, we would not require to-day to raise \$30,000,000; I doubt if we would require to raise \$20,000,000; and they make their own vicious extravagance, their own folly, and worse than folly, the excuse for denying the people that relief which they have a right to claim. Sir, the hon. gentleman asked my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, for a policy. Well, this is not the first time the Minister of Finance has made that request. I recollect the hon. gentleman asked Mr. Blaine for a policy. Now he asks Mr. Laurier for a policy, and I have no doubt that Mr. Laurier will be quite prepared to prescribe a policy when he is called in, as I have intimated before.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to see his diploma.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What diploma has the hon. gentleman got to qualify him for the post of Finance Minister?

Mr. FOSTER. Good sense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has sense to sit steady on the fence, I grant, and I think that is the only claim he possesses. The hon. gentleman is good enough to bestow on my hon. friend whom I see at the

other end of the Chamber, considerable encouragement in the matter of preferential trade. I will also tell the hon. gentleman that I have no doubt the Finance Minister regards preferential trade as an excellent red herring to draw across the track; and so far, he is sure of the sympathy of the Minister of Finance if he will aid and assist him in that benevolent purpose. Now, the hon. gentleman dwelt at length on the percentages of increase in the volume of trade, and with great discrimination he selected 1878, the worst of a prolonged period of depression, as the starting point. Well, Sir, I can do, if I like—though I do not often take the trouble—a little in the matter of percentages, and I will tell him how they come out. I will begin at 1868 and go to 1878. In 1868 the grand total of our imports and exports was 130 millions; in 1878 it was 172 millions. The grand total had increased in those ten years, 42 millions, being at the rate of a little over 3 per cent per annum, compounded. From 1878 to 1888 the sum total had increased from 172 millions to about 201 millions, being less than 2 per cent per annum during those ten years, and 50 per cent less than the increase from 1868 to 1878. If he chooses to add the other five years, it would only make, all told, an increase of about 2½ per cent during the whole fourteen years from 1878 to 1892, as against the increase from 1868 to 1878. Well, it is satisfactory to know there is some increase; but I am bound to say, it does not strike me as being such an overwhelming increase for a country in the position of Canada. If we come to the hon. gentleman's favourite per capita argument, and if we take the trade of twenty years ago, we find that in 1873 our grand total of exports and imports was \$217,811,000. This year it is \$241,000,000. Now, our population in 1873 was under four millions, and our trade amounted to \$57 per head. In 1892, when our population is about five millions, our trade per head is \$48. Our trade to-day is \$9 per head less than it was nineteen years ago, and \$45 a family less than it was at that time. As I have said, I do not depreciate the increase, I am very glad to see it, but, at the same time, let the hon. gentleman do his—what shall I call it?—his roaring with some discretion, and not select facts that any school boy who has access to the Trade and Navigation Returns can turn upside down with five minutes' attention. Sir, the plain fact of the matter is this—and the Minister of Finance ought to understand it, and if he does not understand it, it will be our more or less painful duty to make it plain to him—the position of the greater part of Canada to-day, the position, at any rate, of the older provinces of Canada, is that of a country which has unfortunately fallen to a stationary or retrograde condition. There has been an enormous shrinkage in values, a shrinkage which largely overbears all the increases which the hon. gentleman has enumerated. Canada, moreover.—and this is a serious con-

sideration for a Minister of Finance, with or without a diploma—Canada, moreover, is largely a tribute-paying country. We are obliged every year, either on account of individual or general indebtedness, to pay a sum of about 25 to 30 millions to our English creditors. Further than that, Canada is an enormously taxed country. First of all, there is a tax of 30 millions which goes into the Federal treasury; next to that, there is a tax, as I believe, of an amount about or quite equal, which goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers; and thirdly, there is a very heavy tax paid to the United States Government under the operation of the McKinley tariff. Now, although I do not want to depreciate the value of English markets, I must tell the hon. gentleman, I must tell his followers, that they are leaning on a broken reed if they hope to induce the people of this country to believe that the English markets are going to compensate us, as regards the great majority of farm products, in any shape or way for the American markets we have lost. We may send cheese, we may send wheat, we may send beef, we may send dairy products generally to the English market and do well there; but for almost all other articles, for almost all the vegetables we raise, for our horses, for our barley and for our eggs, I tell the hon. gentleman that it is an absurdity, 'in rerum natura,' to suppose that the English market, under any circumstances, will ever be one-half as favourable to us as the American market is known to be. Now, Sir, I spoke just now of the amount which we paid to the protected manufacturers. This is an important point, bearing largely on the whole argument of the hon. gentleman. Now, I think those in the House on either side who have paid any attention to economic questions, will agree that the measure of a tax is of necessity the difference between the cost of the article consumed under such a system, and the cost of the same article in open market. I will apply that test to a very few manufactures. First of all, we will take the article of cotton. Now, Sir, from cotton last year we obtained a revenue of \$1,114,000. What was the tax that we paid on the article of cotton? There is a difficulty here, because there is some dispute as to the exact value of the cotton consumed in this country. Various figures have been given to me. Some persons put it at \$4 per head, some put it at a little less; but having made a careful examination into the amount formerly imported and the amount of raw material now consumed, I believe that I am well within the mark in saying that the total value of the cotton goods now consumed in Canada, ranges somewhere between \$17,000,000 and \$20,000,000, including what is imported and what is produced in this country. Sir, it is known to all hon. gentlemen here that our taxes on cotton, especially on the coarser varieties go into high figures; but I

assume for the purpose of this argument, and only for this purpose, that the taxes average 30 per cent. In that case our taxes on the cotton goods consumed in Canada would amount to considerably over \$5,000,000, and the amount that goes into the treasury is only \$1,100,000. In the case of sugar, of which the hon. gentleman has boasted so much, while I agree with him that the consumption is about 344,000,000 lbs., the tax is $\frac{3}{16}$ of a cent per pound, and though it may be quite true that the refiner was not able to extract the uttermost of his pound of flesh, but the people are compelled to pay at least \$2,000,000 a year for the benefit of the refiner, while only about \$80,000 goes into the public treasury. I take the case of binding twine, which the hon. gentleman has graciously been pleased to reduce from 2 cents to 1 cent. What was the amount of tax last year? It was shown to be $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, or 25 per cent, on 10,000,000 lbs., meaning a tax of \$250,000 a year, of which the revenue only received \$42,000. I take the case of rice, and in regard to that article his calculations differ from mine. We imported of clean rice about 3,000,000 lbs., and of paddy or uncleaned rice about 20,000,000 lbs. I do not know exactly the loss in the conversion of unclean into clean rice, but all rice consumed in Canada paid $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, that being the tax on the cleaned articles. That means that the people paid somebody, though not into the treasury, a tax of at least \$250,000, while the revenue received is only \$80,000. I will not dwell on the results of this oppressive system as regards coal oil or iron, which enters so largely into the consumption of all agriculturists, or binder twine; but taking those articles together, the taxes on the four which I have enumerated amount to from \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000 a year, while all that is received by the revenue is only \$1,250,000. I have paid no attention whatever to the well-known fact that in many of these cases the tax is enormously increased by the middleman's charges. It is well known to everybody that if you put a tax on an article and it passes, before it reaches the final consumer, through two or three hands, the tax is enormously increased. I have left that wholly and entirely out of the question. I have merely called attention to the enormous amount which, under the operation of any protective tariff, is taken out of the people's pockets over and above the sum which goes into the revenue. On most of those articles the taxes are imposed so as to hurt the farmer more especially, and you must remember that over and above this high taxation, over and above the high bonuses given to protected manufacturers, the condition of things is such that almost the whole weight falls on the farmers under the McKinley Bill, because, although it may not benefit the United States consumer, it does injure the Canadian producer. You will find my other statement is perfectly correct, that under the combined operations of these three heavy systems of taxation, taxation for Gov-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ernment purposes, taxation for the benefit of protected manufacturers, and taxation under the McKinley tariff, every acre of land now under cultivation in any portion of Canada is practically subject to a heavy rent. In fact, in many parts of Canada that rent is, I believe, after a careful examination, fully equal to the outside rent that is paid in any part of England for ordinary farm lands. Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough in a recent discussion to tell us that after all said and done it was really a law of nature, and that people nowadays will rush from the country to the towns, and there is no help for it. In other words, the policy of the Government may be defined as follows: They are aware there is a determination of blood to the head, and it is their policy by overtaxing the farmers, by making agriculture unproductive, to do everything in their power to increase it. That is practically their policy so far as the farmers are concerned. I turn to the manufacturers, the hon. gentleman's special proteges and friends. I am very dubious indeed if the great bulk of the manufacturers, as contradistinguished from a few specially petted interests, have gained anything under this tariff, and I make this assertion boldly. I think there is very strong reason to believe that the great bulk of the manufacturers in Canada would have prospered much more under the revenue tariff of 1878 than under the present system. Sir, those census statistics on which the hon. gentleman relies are essentially, I might almost say, on the face of them, statistics on which no thorough dependence can be placed. The hon. gentleman alluded some time ago to the very large increase in the number of industrial establishments. Well, Sir, that statement had attracted my eye also. I took eleven towns in Ontario which I knew best, and examined the list of industries, or rather industrial establishments which were credited to those towns, and I recommend hon. gentlemen in this House and my friends out of it to pay special attention to this list. I find that in Bowmanville, with a population of 3,377 souls, there were 86 industrial establishments; in Cobourg, with 4,829 souls, there were 83 industrial establishments; in Collingwood, with a population of 4,940, there were 78 industrial establishments; in Napanee, of which I know something, with a population of 3,434, I was happy to learn, for the first time in my life, that it possessed 84 industrial establishments; Oshawa, with a population of 4,066, had 94 industrial establishments; Trenton, with a population of 4,300, had 62 industrial establishments; Whitby, with a population of 2,786, had 92 industrial establishments; Port Hope, with a population of 5,042, had 140 industrial establishments; Strathroy, with a population of 3,316, had 132 industrial establishments; Mount Forest, with a population of 2,214, had 92 industrial establishments; in other words, in all those favoured places under the influence of the National Policy every five, six or seven fami-

lies had an industrial establishment between them. I believe if the hon. gentleman's census commissioners had counted every tinker, tailor, cobbler, carpenter, blacksmith and sewing girl in all those places they would not have made up the list. When I look at what they call manufactures, if I am to judge from the census taken under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1881, although they may be technically correct, there is not the slightest doubt that a very false impression will be created in the minds of the people by the grandiloquent statement that so many hundred millions of dollars worth of articles are manufactured. I have not the details for 1891, although the Minister of Finance may have them, and we will probably receive them in due course; but I have those for 1881, and I desire to call the special attention of the House to the way in which the list of manufacturing industries in Canada was made up. We had \$309,000,000 worth of manufactured articles in that year. Of these there was flour to the value of \$42,000,000; bakeries, \$9,500,000; tanneries, \$15,100,000; boots and shoes, \$13,000,000; sugar, \$9,600,000 (it took 700 hands to produce that value in sugar); meat, \$4,000,000; cheese, \$5,500,000; clothes, \$15,000,000; dressmakers' products, \$5,000,000; hatters' goods, \$3,300,000; carpenters were \$3,900,000, blacksmiths were \$7,200,000, carriage-makers were \$6,500,000, saw mills \$38,000,000, sash and door factories \$4,800,000, printing offices were \$2,700,000—what particular description of manufacture that is, I do not exactly see—paper mills were \$2,400,000, pulp mills \$4,750,000, ship yards \$3,557,000, and shingle mills \$776,000. In other words, out of their \$309,000,000, there were \$202,000,000 which, to say the truth, could have been in no possible respect benefited by the National Policy, or a policy of protection, except, possibly, the single article of sugar. I do submit, that in calling these things manufactures, the hon. gentleman has parted, not, perhaps, from technical accuracy, as his predecessors did, but he most assuredly contributed to convey a very false opinion to the majority of the people as to the extent of our manufactures. I suspect that when these \$470,000,000 of alleged manufactures come to be examined, that you will find in every case as in this, that an enormous mass of these so-called manufactures are hardly things that would be called manufactures at all, and that, in any case, from the very nature of the fact, they could derive no possible benefit, but rather the reverse, from a protective policy. I noticed amongst the \$7,000,000 worth of manufactured goods which the hon. gentleman boasted of having exported, one item for which I give the National Policy full credit. I notice that among these \$7,000,000 worth of goods, there was over \$1,000,000 worth of settlers' goods belonging to emigrants leaving this country for the United States. As to manufactures generally, I desire to say most explicitly, that I neither overrate nor under-

rate, nor wish to overrate their importance. Every man knows perfectly well that manufactures must have a place, and a very important place, in any country at all civilized. I have not the slightest wish to underrate in any shape or form the great importance of manufactures, but, Sir, for all that, I contend that the hon. gentleman is wholly wrong in endeavouring to convey to the people of Canada the idea that Canada has special advantages for becoming a great manufacturing country. I say that Canada is, above all, a great agricultural country; next to its great agricultural resources stands its mineral, its lumbering, and its fishing resources, and next after these, and I admit they are very important, come its manufactures. But, Sir, it is not in our time that Canada is likely to become a great manufacturing country, unless some very extraordinary scientific discovery occurs, and unless the conditions of manufacturing are totally altered, the very circumstances in which we are placed would appear to forbid it. Neither in age, nor climate, nor in density of population, nor from our products, nor our geographical situation, do we possess the advantages for becoming a great manufacturing country which other nations possess, and the Government, I believe, have been doing a very ill service to the manufacturers of Canada, by inducing many men to embark their capital and to risk their whole fortunes in manufactures for which this country was not well suited. There are manufactures which Canada might develop to an enormously greater extent than it has as yet done, and were the United States markets once thrown open to us, and were there free trade from one end of this continent to the other, I would look to see very great development of very many important industries in Canada. As it is, Sir, we resemble men who, having an inexhaustible gold-field at their feet, have chosen to devote themselves to the manufacture of artificial flowers, or, to borrow a metaphor from the hon. gentleman opposite, we seem to be at the present moment like men who, possessing the finest and most fertile wheat region of the world, choose rather to grow oranges in hot houses than to devote themselves to the proper exploitation of the soil. What are the remedies which are offered by us on this side of the House? The hon. gentleman desires to know our policy. I will tell the hon. gentleman what has been our policy from first to last. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous protective system which has been grinding out the vitals of the people of this country. I do not care in what particular way the reptile is destroyed. I do not care whether it is cut off by the head, or the tail, or in the middle; I do not care whether it is by free trade positive or absolute, or by revenue tariff or continental free trade. I wish to see my people redeemed from the degrading slavery which a few political and commercial knaves imposed upon

them. With respect to free trade with the United States, we have had some very remarkable admissions from these hon. gentlemen opposite. A few years ago they were constantly telling us that there was no possibility of obtaining reciprocal trade with the United States; but a few weeks ago the Premier of this country admitted in Toronto, that there was no difficulty whatever in obtaining reciprocity with the neighbouring republic. It follows, Sir, that when I first proposed that measure five years ago, Canada might have had reciprocal trade, if the Government had chosen to work for it; Canada to-day might have had 500,000 people which she has lost since that proposal was rejected, and Canada might also have doubled or trebled her trade with the United States, but these hon. gentlemen opposite would have none of it. Had they been honest in this matter, had they stuck to their original declaration, had they adopted and stood fast by the policy which the Finance Minister himself declared when I first brought forward this matter in 1888, why, Sir, then I would have said, that at least they have the credit of consistency. But what has their course been? When in 1888 I proposed that we should open negotiations with the United States, they refused deliberately, on the ground that they would make no effort whatever to have free trade with the States, unless they could secure the interests of the protected few. When in 1889 I repeated that motion I was met with a direct negative, and in 1890, as the House knows, when the motion was again proposed, Mr. Colby was good enough to blurt out the truth that the Government did not want anything to do with it, and that the Government did not even believe in the exchange of natural products. Now, Sir, what are we to say of the miserable falsehood which preceded and followed the elections of 1891, when these hon. gentlemen opposite dared to go to the country under the pretense that they required the mandate of the people to enable them to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, which they had not the remotest idea of honestly attempting to do? Has the House forgotten the humiliation to which Sir Charles Tupper was subjected when over his own head, he was obliged to report to the Government of Canada that he had to proceed with Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador, to the presence of Mr. Blaine, and there humbly to recant all that he had said to the people of Canada as to the alleged invitation of the United States Government to come and treat with them? Do they remember their whole conduct since 1886? What has been their policy as regard the United States? Their policy has been to snarl and to run away, their policy has been to bluster and to cringe, and I, for one, felt humiliation when the Finance Minister, rising in his place, told us that he, the Finance Minister of Canada, had to appeal to Mr. Blaine, the Premier of the United

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

States, to be instructed in what way he might raise taxes out of the people of Canada. I, for one, reaffirm my position. I say clearly and distinctly that as matters stand to-day in Canada—although it need not have been so, and although it was not always so—no great development is possible unless in some form or shape, either by the voluntary good-will of the United States or by a reciprocity treaty, the markets of the rest of this continent are thrown open to us. I say, Sir, that that condition is fixed for us by geographical considerations. I do not mean to say that we cannot enjoy a moderate prosperity without; but I do say that after the chances which Canada has thrown away, as in 1867, when she entered on the race of national existence, with extraordinary advantages over the United States, and which were thrown away by the folly of the Government of the day, and afterwards, in 1878, when we had pretty well extricated ourselves from the effects of the villainous improvidence of preceding Administrations—I say, Sir, that after throwing away those chances, it is no longer possible for us to hope for any great development of the really great resources which Canada possesses unless it is through obtaining access to the markets of the United States. But, Sir, although we may not be able to obtain that; although I am perfectly willing to own that the conduct of the Government of Canada for the past seven years has been such as to put a great impediment in our way; although there is no doubt that, from first to last, whether under Cleveland or under Harrison, they have so conducted themselves as to become objects of just suspicion to the American Government; yet I say that there is a good deal that still remains for us to do. We can reform this system. We can, beyond all doubt, if we choose, grant a great and permanent relief to the people of this country. We can reduce the taxation which now presses upon them. I am not now discussing what is abstractly the best; I am simply discussing what is the best possible. I say it is right that time and due consideration should be given. I say, although this is a case, not of cutting away mouldering branches, but of cutting down the entire Upas tree, it is right and proper that the bystanders should be duly warned. It is true that the Government have made reciprocity with the United States in their time and by them quite impossible; but there is no doubt that the tariff which we now have to deal with is a tariff vicious in the extreme. It is not merely a tariff under which great waste and huge extortion are perpetrated. It is a tariff that sins in every possible form. Now, what are the universal notes or marks of a good system of taxation? I will tell the hon. gentleman. A good and honest taxation will take as little as possible out of the pockets of the people beyond what goes into the treasury. A good and honest taxation will be uniform in its operation on all classes and sections; it will

spare the necessaries of life; and, although this is a lesser matter, it will take the taxation in such a way as to cause as little inconvenience as possible. Now, Sir, what is the character of the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite? By means of it they take twice as much out of the pockets of the people as goes into the treasury. They so arrange the taxation that it is specially unfair and unjust to the poorest classes of the community, specially unfair and unjust to the great consuming classes of this country, and sometimes specially unfair and unjust to the inhabitants of one section as compared with another. They tax food, fuel, light, clothing, the means of knowledge. Sir, there is another and further thing; this system of tariff protection, as instituted by them, has this further evil in it, that it practically organizes corruption. It practically makes it the interest of a large class of business men in Canada, controlling large sums of money, when appealed to by the Government, and especially when the hon. gentleman, as he now proposes to do, goes around the country taking their views and ascertaining what they will pay rather than have a particular tax abolished—it makes it their special interest to keep a corrupt Government in power if only that Government will give them the power of plundering the people in return. There is one fault in this system of taxation which requires particular attention. The whole system of specific duties levied by the hon. gentleman is distinctly bad. In the first place, it disguises the amount of the taxation; in the next place, the tax is always relatively increasing. Just as fast as scientific discoveries enable goods to be cheapened in price, a specific tax rises relatively in proportion. But the chief and greatest offence against good government is that such a tax invariably discriminates, and heavily discriminates, against the poorest consumer. I have taken a few cases, and only a few, to show the extreme injustice wrought by the present system. I take ordinary cottons, which are taxed 2 cents a yard and 15 cents ad valorem, or 55 per cent on the lowest grade consumed by the poorer classes, and only 30 per cent on the high grades, consumed by the wealthier classes. On the low grades of blankets consumed by the poor there is at least 50 per cent against 30 per cent on the higher grade. On shirts there is 60 per cent on the low grades against 25 per cent on the high grades. On rough coatings there is 60 per cent on the low grades against 25 per cent on the high grades. On oil-cloth there is 80 per cent on the low grades against 25 per cent on the high grades. On wall paper there is at least 100 per cent on the low grades against 30 per cent, and even considerably less, on the high grades. Sir, I have always believed, and I will make the hon. gentleman a present of the statement, that in a true and sound system of taxation, the object of the Government should be so to equalize matters, that as many days'

income should be taken from one man as from another, with this very important qualification, that incomes which are so small as not to do more than supply the recipient with the necessaries of life, should not be taxed at all. Sir, I advise the hon. gentleman, if he desires to have before him a true ideal system of taxation, to work towards that end, and I tell him that huge accumulations, under any circumstances, ought to be discouraged by wise statesmen; they are politically and socially dangerous. I tell him that it is his duty, and the duty of the Government, to do all that lies in their power to restrain combinations and corporations of every kind—to see that all these bodies, which derive their existence from us, are kept in their proper place as servants of the state and not masters, as too many of them seem to be. There is no doubt, also, that, under the hon. gentleman's policy, the cost of living in Canada has been enormously increased. It may not be in his knowledge, but it is in mine, that in the case of men possessing moderate incomes it is possible to-day to live in greater comfort in England at barely two-thirds of the expense that is necessary here. That is partly due to the natural condition of things here. In a climate with such extremes as ours, there is no doubt that living is, in many respects, more expensive than in more temperate climates. But the fact remains that, whereas, a comparatively short space of time ago, Canada was a cheap place to live in, under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite it has become a decidedly dearer country than England, and, I fear, in many respects, a dearer country than the United States. Now, I said awhile ago that one result of the policy of the Government had been, beyond all doubt, enormously to aggravate the exodus from this country, and I added, and now repeat, that there is one result of that exodus which has not been entirely or properly appreciated by our people. Sir, you cannot go on for many years, from year to year, driving away the very choicest part of your population without doing a great moral as well as physical injury, and I believe that the statement made some years ago by Mr. Leckie on this subject, in dealing with another country, well known to most of us, may be literally and properly applied to Canada. In speaking of the effect of the emigration from Ireland, he used these words. The examples he refers to are the Irishmen who have distinguished themselves abroad:

These examples might easily be increased, but they are quite sufficient to show how large a proportion of the energy and ability of Ireland was employed in foreign lands and how ruinous must have been the consequences at home. If, as there appears much reason to believe, there is such a thing as a hereditary transmission of moral and intellectual qualities, the removal from a nation of tens of thousands of the ablest and most energetic of its citizens must inevitably, by a mere physical law, result in the degradation of the race. Nor is it necessary to fall back upon any speculations of disputed science. In every community

there exists a small minority of men whose abilities, high purpose, and energy of will, mark them out as in some degree leaders of men. These take the first steps in every public enterprise, counteract by their example the vicious elements of the population, set the current and form the standard of public opinion, and infuse a healthy moral vigour into their nation. In Ireland for three or four generations such men were steadily weeded out. Can we wonder that the standard of public morals and of public spirit should have declined?

But not only were the healthiest elements driven away: corrupting influences of the most powerful kind infected those who remained.

Sir, placè Ireland for Canada, and you will have a very excellent illustration of what the policy of this Government for the last fourteen years has been employed in effecting. Sir, in the early part of the eighteenth century, to which these words refer, it may have taken five or six decades to do what, under existing conditions, has been done in Canada in ten or twelve years. And one of the chief counts I make against the policy of which these hon. gentlemen are so proud, is that, from first to last, the inevitable tendency of their policy has been to organize political corruption of the very vilest kind. The danger is vastly increased in such a country as ours by the exportation of the best of its youth, so that, while the danger increases, the resistance to it is diminished. In the United States it is different. There, whatever be the evils of their policy, at any rate the youth of the population remain, and it is to that fact very largely the success of the American people in emancipating themselves, as they have done, from the shackles of protection is to be ascribed. I have not time to-night to review our scale of expenditure. I will simply say that our general scale of expenditure for a population of 5,000,000 is monstrously extravagant. Our clothes are far too big. They were cut out for a population of 20,000,000 or 30,000,000. I need look no further than the benches opposite to illustrate this. What possible use can there be in a country like Canada for a Cabinet of fifteen Ministers, besides the Deputy Ministers? Why, Sir, 50,000,000 of people might be administered with the same staff. Look at the cost of administration and legislation. We have practically \$14,000,000 to expend, exclusive of charges for collection of revenue and interest, and it costs us every year \$2,000,000 to spend that amount. Turn to our Estimates, and review the number of clerks these gentlemen require. In Mr. Mackenzie's time, to do the same work, his Cabinet only required 480; hon. gentlemen opposite employ 826, and a whole regiment of extras besides. The hon. gentleman spoke very lightly of the consequences to Canada of the United States revising their tariff. I cannot agree with him there. If the United States do very largely reduce their tariff they will very largely cheapen the cost of living in that country. They will very largely cheapen the cost of production. The

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

United States farmers have to-day a very great advantage over ours in many ways. They get more for what they produce, and with the single exception of the article of woollen clothing they are enabled to purchase what they require at much lower rates, and even if we are fortunate enough to get our raw products admitted free, we will still be comparatively at a serious disadvantage compared with them. What is the part of true statesmanship, and what would be wise policy under such circumstances? Not, as these hon. gentlemen are doing, looking to Washington, and waiting until they know exactly what the United States are going to do before they proceed to bring down their tariff and announce their policy; but to anticipate the Americans, to give Canada, if they can, a little start; to give Canada the advantage of being made comparatively a cheap country to live in, which it is in their power to do by a reasonable and prompt readjustment of the tariff. Now, I have briefly to say this: I, for my part, indict the present policy of the Government, and I indict its present tariff on all counts. I say it is radically false in theory, and vicious in principle. I say that it is in the highest degree an unjust and an oppressive tariff. I say that it is most eminently unsuited to the genius and geographical position of the people of Canada. I say that it is in the highest degree an unjust and of the people, and that it discriminates against special sections. Practically, these hon. gentlemen reverse Robin Hood's good old rule, for whereas Robin Hood robbed the rich for the purpose of bestowing gifts on the poor, they rob the poor for the purpose of bestowing gifts on the rich. I say that these hon. gentlemen and their tariff are very largely responsible for the fact that a million of the best blood of Canada are now exiled in the United States. I say that their tariff directly fosters extravagance, that it is a veritable hot bed of corruption, that it debases and enslaves and is fast emasculating our people, and I say that we have no chance whatever of ever developing Canada, as it should be developed, until this thing is utterly and completely reformed, root and branch. And that there is no mistake about our intent and our policy, I move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"it be Resolved, That the present Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered."

Mr. HAGGART moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ask the consideration of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to a proposition that the debate just adjourned be continued from

day to day and have precedence over all other business except questions to be put by members.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I, for my part have no objection. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is absent, and I would be better pleased if the First Minister waited until he were here. Still, I think I may say that there is no objection.

Mr. DAVIN. If the Prime Minister will permit me—probably the motions on the Paper that would lead to no discussion might be taken on the private members' day?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can agree to that afterwards, I presume. I move:

That the adjourned debate on the motion for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto, be made the First Order on Thursday next, after Questions put by Members, and on each subsequent day until concluded.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Western Counties Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Yarmouth and Annapolis Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Ocean Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 42) to amend the Representation Act. He said: This is a short Bill which I introduce for the purpose of amending the Representation Act of last session in certain particulars which are of a clerical character, and which merely relate to the correction of the boundaries without making any change in any of the principles on which the Act was founded. The first section is more accurately to define the boundary lines of the electoral district of Nipissing. It enumerates the parishes,

and gives the boundaries with more technical accuracy. The second section is to correct an error in respect to the city of Ottawa. While the Bill was in committee, the committee adopted a section stating that the electoral district of the city of Ottawa should consist of the city of Ottawa, &c. &c., the limits of which had been changed since the passage of the previous distribution Act; but the law clerk, in placing the section, placed it as a paragraph to a section which provided that the places thereafter mentioned should return one representative. This would have had the effect of depriving the city of Ottawa of one of its members. Therefore, we provide that the city of Ottawa shall consist of the city of Ottawa, except that part thereof known as New Edinburgh, and shall return two members. Then there is an amendment substituting the word "east" for the word "west," in order to correct an error in respect of the boundary of one of the new districts of the county of Ottawa. In the next section we correct a mistake in respect to the electoral district of Hochelaga, providing that it shall consist of the towns of Ste. Cunegonde, St. Henri and Cote St. Antoine, and St. Gabriel ward of the city of Montreal. The Act of last session describes Cote St. Antoine and St. Gabriel as being wards of the city of Montreal, whereas St. Gabriel only is such. There was a parish left out in the description of Rouville and also in that of the electoral district of Bagot, and in Provencher some of the rural municipalities were left unenumerated.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what is the technical error which he intends to correct by his amendment in the district of Nipissing?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can describe it in a general way by saying that the description in the Act of last session did not suit the amended boundaries of the province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 43) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892. He said: Some of the errors it is intended to rectify are errors in printing, such as the numbers of sections, &c., which are referred to in other sections. There are also some clerical errors to be corrected. It is also intended to give the correct name to the quarter sessions of Ontario, because in one section that is described as general quarter sessions or general sessions. There is one other change, and one more important. We reduced certain specified offences to offences punishable with five years imprisonment, and in a general clause as to unenumerated offences of the same character, they were left with a punishment of seven years. The latter should be reduced as well as the for-

mer to five, so that they will both fall into the same class, as they were misdemeanours formerly. If left open to the larger punishment the procedure would be somewhat different, especially in the matter of challenges. The only change from the policy of the Act which I will ask the House to consider, is the section containing the provision that in the case of any offences committed before the Act came into force, the procedure should be the old procedure. That is, any offences committed before the 1st July, 1893, should be tried according to the procedure as it now exists. It is eminently expedient that the procedure should be uniform. Some years may elapse before some offences committed before the 1st July next will come to trial, and it would be inconvenient to have to ascertain, when they come to trial, what the former procedure was.

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the House is going to receive some valuable information which, we see by the newspapers, has been communicated to the hon. gentleman on the subject of the Criminal Code by one of the judges of the Supreme Court? If such a document exists, it is very important that the Government should lay it upon the Table, especially as we are going to legislate upon the Criminal Act of 1892.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to communicate to any hon. gentleman the letter referred to from Mr. Justice Taschereau. I did not receive it more than anybody else. It is one of those documents called an open letter, given to the public and not to the individual to whom it is ostensibly addressed. The observations it contained as regards the policy of the Act, were not overlooked. The subject was well considered by the joint committee, and the views of the learned judge are contrary to the professional opinion of both Houses of Parliament, and utterly condemned by nearly every judge of the United Kingdom who has expressed an opinion on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

U. S. QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Will the quarantine regulations adopted by the United States against Canadian cattle affect or prevent our Canadian cattle being shipped direct to the World's Fair, at Chicago? If so, as we have no pleuro-pneumonia disease in our Canadian cattle, does the Government intend withdrawing from the exhibition altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that information was received yesterday by the Department of Agriculture, by which it will be seen that regulations will be made by which Canadian cattle may be exhibited. It will be necessary for intending exhibitors to notify this department and obtain permit before shipment. They must give numbers and description of

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

cattle, and show a statement of where they have been a year previous to shipment, and accompany this by a certificate of a Canadian veterinary inspector that no contagious disease has existed in respective localities. On arrival they will be subject to inspection by a veterinary surgeon of this department.

THOMAS J. WATTERS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, 1. Date of appointment of Thomas John Watters in Customs Department, also salary in 1891, 1892 and the present year? 2. Is he still an employee of the Customs Department? 3. Has it been brought to the notice of the department that he is engaged in business with a view to derive profit therefrom? 4. Has the Governor-General in Council given his express permission allowing said T. J. Watters to engage in trade with a view to derive profit therefrom? 5. Has any person or persons during November and December, 1892, made charges against said T. J. Watters? 6. How often has said T. J. Watters been absent from his departmental duties without leave since March, 1891, up to 9th February instant? 7. Does he have to report each morning and sign the register the same as other clerks; and if so, how often has he not done so, and has any notice or action been taken of such neglect? 8. What action does the department propose to take in reference to the charges made against Mr. Watters?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Watters was appointed 1st July, 1869. His salary in 1891 was \$2,200. His salary in 1892 was \$2,250 up to March, 1892; it was \$2,800 after that date. His salary for current year is \$2,800. In answer to second question, yes. In answer to third question, yes. In answer to fourth question, no, such permission has not been asked. Fifth question, yes. Sixth, there is no record against Mr. Watters of any absence without leave from March, 1891, to 9th February instant. Seventh, Mr. Watters has not reported each morning or signed the register the same as other clerks, and has not been expected to do so. Eighth, No action has yet been taken, but at the close of the session I shall take up the complaints and give the same careful consideration.

MR. GASTON P. LABAT.

Mr. BRODEUR (Translation) asked, How long has Mr. Gaston P. Labat been employed in the Montreal post office? What are his duties? Has he passed the Civil Service examinations? Of what origin is he? On whose recommendation was he appointed? Is his position temporary or permanent?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I beg to state that Mr. Labat was temporarily employed as letter carrier in Montreal, from the 7th to 31st December, 1892, at \$360 per annum. He has not passed his Civil Service examinations, and

so could not be continued in the service of the Government. Since the 1st January last, he is employed temporarily as labourer in the post office. He is of French origin. He has lived in Canada for several years. He was sergeant-major in "B" battery and served during the trouble in the North-west. He was recommended to me by several persons who were acquainted with him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to point out a very gross misrepresentation in the "Empire" with regard to myself. In the "Empire" of 15th February we have this statement:

Mr. Davin's "ideal protection" is not exactly what this country wants. Practical, useful, serviceable protection is what it requires.

If, Sir, I had only referred to ideal protection and then gone on to speak of some other subject I should have allowed that paragraph to go as the emanation of a—however, I shall not name the animal, because he has long ears and he might hear me and he might not think the metaphor complimentary. But, Sir, I will show that it was a gross and wilful misrepresentation. What I stated was this:

There must, therefore, if you have a protective policy, be an ideal tariff which you must seek. There must be a tariff, moving along the lines of which you will give that protection to native industries which will foster them and keep them healthy, and at the same time protect the people from the grasping policy of the manufacturer, protect the people from being mulcted in the goods they buy by being made to pay more for them than they ought. Any man, looking over the existing tariff and carefully comparing it with the tariff of 1883 in the United States, or 1890, or with the tariffs in Europe, or comparing one part of our own tariff with another part, cannot fail to come to the conclusion, that if we are to have a fairly good protective tariff—because that is all, I suppose, in practical affairs we can have, an ideal, a perfect tariff being so difficult to frame as to be really an impossibility—our present tariff needs very thorough and careful revision.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in the very sentence, or in the very context, where I used the phrase "ideal protection" I stated that I did not think the ideal was possible of attainment, but I contended that, if we were to have that practical and serviceable tariff which is the only tariff any practical man desires, we must aim at an ideal tariff. The only way a man can explain that paragraph in the "Empire" is this: that the people on the "Empire" think that, if any member of the Conservative party shows the least evidence that he has a brain that will think for itself or a particle of independence, this paper has a right to either belittle him in one case, or bludgeon him in the other, and I say it is in the interest of the Conservative party that I should—

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the hon. member's attention to the inconvenience of entering upon a discussion of this nature. It

is quite permissible, by the acquiescence, by the indulgence of the House to deny improper or imperfect reports that may be made in the newspapers, but I think it would be very inconvenient to enter into a discussion of the reasons that actuate a newspaper.

Mr. DAVIN. I am always most deferential to the Chair, so I will be guided by you.

THE PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that a very great inconvenience to members has resulted from not receiving the Budget debate which took place the day before yesterday but which was not printed yesterday afternoon. I cannot understand why it was found necessary to suspend operations in the printing department, thus preventing members from receiving the report of the speech of the Finance Minister and the reply of the hon. member for South Oxford. If we are to discuss the important matters contained in the Budget debate, it is highly desirable that the report of that debate should be in the hands of members as soon as possible, but because the Printing Bureau suspended operations yesterday this report has only been put in the hands of members a few moments ago. I would draw the attention of the House to the report adopted last session. If the hon. Secretary of State, under whose department the Bureau is conducted, will turn up the Journals of the House of last session, he will see there the report adopted on the 2nd of July, clause 3 of which reads as follows:—

The printing shall be performed daily on such size of sheet as may be directed; and shall contain the speeches which shall have been delivered at the previous sitting of the House, and these shall be published as reported, in the language in which they are delivered. The said sheets to be delivered at the Distribution Office by 3 o'clock p.m., after each sitting.

I contend that the postponement of the printing of the Budget debate is in direct violation of that report, which was submitted to this House on the 2nd of July last and was adopted by this House. I would like to know on what grounds the bureau was allowed to suspend operations at such a very important juncture as the delivery of the Budget Speech, the report of which it is so important to have promptly in the hands of members.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Knowing that this subject would be brought up to-day and some information required, I sent to Mr. Dawson for an explanation, and I am sure the hon. member will accept the explanation he has given me for the House. Mr. Dawson says he has found difficulty in arranging for the work on holidays such as yesterday, and he admits making the mistake of thinking that, this being a holiday in all the departments, his also would follow the same rule. But he says that on reflection it was a mistake on his part and one which is not likely to occur

again. In view of that fact, I think the hon. gentleman will accept for this time the explanation.

WAYS AND MEANS--THE TARIFF.

House resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, before replying to the criticisms of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the speech of the Finance Minister, I may be permitted to offer my congratulations to my colleague, the Finance Minister, on the splendid speech he has made to this House, and on the splendid statement which he has made, showing that without increasing the expenditure of this country and without increasing the indebtedness of the country, great development has taken place in the form of public works and by assistance rendered to public works from one end of the country to the other. I congratulate him upon his presentation of the evidences of increased prosperity, as shown by the savings banks, by the trade of the country, by the reduction of insolvencies, by the deposits in the banks and by the banking loans and discounts, evidences taken by every person in the country as sufficient to prove our general prosperity. I shall not enter into detail of these items at present, because, in my criticism of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), I shall have to deal with them more fully as they come up. The hon. gentleman prefaced his speech with some personal reflections upon my hon. friend the Finance Minister. He started out by saying that he was a professional philanthropist; and he quoted from some remark of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald when he formed his Cabinet, to the effect that in the formation of his Cabinet he always chose two or three professional philanthropists for the purpose of appeasing public sentiment, and bringing up the average of the Cabinet. He stated further, in reference to the professional philanthropists, that they were apt to part with so much virtue in their peregrinations throughout the country, that there was very little left of them but a few immoralities. I suppose at that time the hon. gentleman from South Oxford was a candidate for a position in the cabinet of the right hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take the trouble of telling the hon. gentleman that he knows that is not true.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, the hon. gentleman was at least a waiting candidate; I suppose that in the eyes of the right hon. gentleman at that time, he did not possess the balancing qualities which entitled him to a

Mr. COSTIGAN.

position in the Cabinet. If the hon. gentleman is remarkable for anything, he is remarkable for being the antithesis of a professional philanthropist. He excels in distributing throughout the country speeches of a vitriolic character, predicting blue ruin; and considering the amount of this literature with which the hon. gentleman has drenched the country, I should suppose that nothing but the virtues were left in him now. I suppose if the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was alive now and wished to form a Cabinet, there would be enough virtue in the hon. gentleman now to entitle him to a seat in a Tory Cabinet. He stepped quickly down from that subject to what he calls the most infamous piece of legislation that was ever perpetrated in a free country, the National Policy, the result of which he has so graphically described time and time again in this House. Now let me give you a little history of the National Policy. When the Conservative party came into power in 1878, they found a deficiency between the revenue and expenditure; they found that the country had been getting into debt. In fact, since the departure from power of the Conservative Government in 1873, the indebtedness of this country had been increasing from year to year, and when the Conservative party came back to power they propounded this National Policy, in 1879. What was the effect of it? There was no longer any deficiencies. The country was able to meet its expenditure from year to year, manufactures were fostered, and the country became prosperous. The result was that after a certain number of years we were able to keep our young men at home by employing them in manufactories, thus increasing the population of the country, and preventing the emigration of many who would otherwise have gone to a foreign country. In the course of ten years, from 1882 to 1892, the Conservative Government were able to take off imposts from the people of this country which, if they had been collected, would have amounted to nearly 24 millions of dollars; besides that, they placed upon the free list goods which, under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, paid a duty, placing 113 articles more upon the free list than were upon it between 1874 and 1878. I may state that that is still the policy of the Government at the present day. The National Policy in this country has tended to the development of the country; has enabled us to make the tariff reforms which we intend to make; it has created a large class of manufacturers, in addition to the mining, agricultural and fishing industries which existed before, and the trade of which the hon. gentleman said the country should be confined. This policy has developed a large class of manufacturers in this country, and had enabled them to sell goods as cheaply as they could be obtained in any other country in the world. The people of Canada are able to purchase cotton and woollen goods manu-

factured in this country, and agricultural implements, of quite as good a quality, and as cheaply, as any other people on the face of the globe. In addition to these advantages, we have the articles manufactured in this country, and keep our own people at home to a much larger extent than we otherwise would. Then the hon. gentleman passed quickly on to his favourite subject, the exodus. You will remember the letter in the "Economist" last year, in which he stated that in each decade this country lost by emigration, 1,500,000 people. You all remember, too, his description two days ago of the condition of the agricultural classes in this country; how the poor farmers were being "bled white," and forced by the infamous tariff of this Government to abandon their farms and move into the towns, and then, reduced so that they were hardly able to walk, being forced to emigrate to the United States. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman got his figures of the amount of the exodus which took place between 1874 and 1878. I suppose he took them from the returns of the American officers on the frontier, which were so uncertain that Mr. Nimmo, who was presiding over that department, ordered them to be dropped for the future. Now, I have taken pains to look into the figures in order to find out exactly, from the United States census returns, the number of Canadians on the other side. According to the United States census returns of 1890 there were 980,000 people born in British America then living in the United States, less those from Newfoundland, which reduced that number to 973,752, as the total number of Canadians in the United States in 1890. In 1880, according to the United States census, the number of Canadians in that country was 712,368. That gives an increase in ten years of 261,385, to which ought to be added the average death rate on that number of people for the decade. The total number of Canadians in the United States in 1880 was 712,368; the total number in 1870 was 490,041, showing an increase in ten years of 222,327, to which number, of course, must be added the death rate for that time. That is the exact number of Canadians in the United States at those several periods, according to the only correct statistical record which we can find. So we see that an average of perhaps 25,000 people per year have emigrated from this country into the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman states that it is the policy of this Government which has forced these people to emigrate to the United States. In making that statement the hon. gentleman says something which is known to every person who has relatives in the United States, to be untrue. As every one in this country knows, emigration from Canada has been continuous since the first Government in Quebec drew the attention of the Imperial Government to it, and gave reasons, which have been true from then to the present time, of the immigration of the people of this country to the other side.

Every one is perfectly well aware that the reason is that our people imagine they will be able to better their condition in the United States. Is this immigration attributed to the taxes levied by the present Administration, or to our form of Government? No, Sir; the people know well, even from the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, that this is not the fact. Let me ask hon. members to listen to some remarks made in 1887; I think some hon. gentlemen opposite will remember the remarks when I read them. They are as follows:—

I find, Sir, on looking over the returns for the province of Ontario, the largest and most populous province in the Dominion, that out of thirty-eight counties into which it is divided, there were only thirty-five in which the increase was 10 per cent during the ten years. Precisely the same thing has occurred under the same conditions in the great state of New York and other states of the Union which are in the most highly prosperous condition.

I thought I heard the hon. gentleman opposite complain that comparison had been made with individual states, and it was asked why the whole of the states of the Union were not taken for purposes of comparison. The remarks to which I have referred were continued as follows:—

I am therefore justified in warning the House that, so far as regards the older provinces of the Dominion, we ought not to look for any very large increase of population. Although we may fairly expect that our people will grow rapidly in wealth, we cannot look for any great increase in their numbers. Any hon. gentleman who is desirous of further examining the matter and testing the correctness of the statements I have made, will find upon reference to our own returns and those of the United States, that they are only too well founded. The stationary position of our population does undoubtedly bear very strongly upon the question whether we cannot expect any very large increase in the gross income of the country.

Surely such a statement could not have been made by any hon. gentleman opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who made the statement?

Mr. HAGGART. Hon. members will find these remarks in the Budget speech of Sir Richard Cartwright in 1874, page 18. That hon. gentleman has prophesied as to the probable result. For a number of years, until the large nation to the south of us was in a large degree developed, the trend of population was naturally in that direction, instead of northward. But now that has ceased, and we may look to the future, when the hon. gentleman, if he lives to see the result of the next census, will find that his prophecy of woe has been altogether wrong. Now I will deal with the trade policy of the hon. gentleman. The House will remember that in 1888 the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved a resolution on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and I suppose that resolution formulated the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I will read its language for the benefit of hon. members who may not remember them. It ran as follows:—

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps, at an early date, to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

Whenever the people understood on what terms we could obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, whenever they knew that it was by parting with our heritage as an independent nation or as a portion of the British Empire, whenever they knew that, in order to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, we would have to adopt the tariff of the United States, a tariff against the whole world, and especially a discriminating tariff against the country which was the birthplace of a great many of us, and from whose people we have all descended, whenever the people knew that we would have to part with everything that an Anglo-Saxon, a Briton held dear, and to dispose of the management of our own affairs, hon. gentlemen opposite were compelled to drop it. They dare not proceed further; no man could be elected on that doctrine when the people understood what they would have to pay for unrestricted reciprocity. In 1891 they commenced to drop the cry for unrestricted reciprocity. As my leader stated in Toronto the other day, we could have had unrestricted reciprocity. It was offered to us down at Washington. We all know the terms on which it was offered; that we should have a discriminating tariff specially directed against Great Britain. It was acknowledged, on all hands, that the effect would be to destroy our manufactures, and our commerce would pass from our ports to the ports of the United States. What odds, it might be asked, and perhaps was asked, Canada might be in the position of several states of the Union, without commerce and without manufactures, but still having mining, agriculture and fishing, and, perhaps, be even a rich community. Those were the conditions on which we could obtain unrestricted reciprocity, and those conditions are known to every intelligent man—parting with our birthright as Britons, becoming part and portion, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, of this immense continent to which no rules of political economy apply, affiliated with the United States, which is an immense continent and a world in itself, consisting of kingdoms in the form of states, greater than any in Europe, a perfect paradise, a portion of the Elysian fields, into which we could enter on condition that we dropped our manufactures, did away with our connection with Great Britain, handed over the control of our tariff to the United States, and destroyed the commerce of this country. Hon. gentlemen op-

Mr. HAGGART.

posite saw the folly of their position. They commenced to abandon that policy in 1891. This is seen in the following resolution, moved by the hon. gentleman opposite:—

That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artisans, miners, fishermen and farmers; and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next, should be conducted upon the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured as well as natural products.

Not one word of unrestricted reciprocity in that; we were only going to have extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States. We come down now to the resolution of 1893, moved the other night by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which says:

That the present Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of free trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered.

I suppose, as an explanation of this, we must look at the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, made in Toronto recently and reported in the "Globe." I will read what he says:

I will repeat that there is but one remedy which must be applied, and it is decreased taxation and increased markets. Reform the tariff and reform it in the line of absolute free trade, such as is known in England, that shall be the goal for us. Of course, in our present position, it is not possible for us to adopt free trade in its entirety, as it is in England, but then England's free trade was not adopted at a fell sweep, but gradually, and so as not to jeopardize any existing interest.

Let us see what the Hon. Mr. Blake says upon this matter. He was speaking of free trade, and in his address at Malvern, he said:

No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of free trade for Canada he may be, has yet suggested—no man, I believe, can suggest—a practical plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make or can make, within our bounds, or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem, and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada.

That is our contention. The man who advocates free trade is bound to prove the possibility or practicability of our acquiring it:

I have not believed it soluble in my day, and any chance of its solubility, if chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge, and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics.

Notwithstanding the statement of Mr. Blake, free trade is not yet removed from the domain of practical politics by these hon. gentlemen opposite. It is by free trade they propose to

get into power and govern the country ; as the hon. leader of the Opposition says : Free trade such as in England, which is not possible at present, but possible in a few years. Perhaps the Hon. Edward Blake was only speaking for himself when he made this speech, but I invite the attention of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the following words of Mr. Blake and we will see whether Mr. Blake was speaking by the book or not :—

I may add that the Liberal party are agreed as to this, and that between myself and Sir Richard Cartwright, whom I mention particularly because the opposite has been declared by our opponents, there is a general consonance of opinion.

Was the Hon. Edward Blake speaking by the book then ? Had he the authority to voice the opinion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ? I ask the leader of the Opposition, did the Hon. Mr. Blake receive his consent, and was he speaking for the Liberal party when he made that speech ? These hon. gentlemen opposite are condemned from their own leader ; they are condemned from their own mouths. They are proposing a policy which they have declared impracticable, and I shall endeavour to prove, independent of the statement of the Hon. Edward Blake, independent of the consonance of the Liberal party and of the opinion of Sir Richard Cartwright that Mr. Blake's statement was true. Let us look at the revenue and expenditure of this country. Every one knows that, first of all, we have to consider the interest on the national debt, which must be provided for, and which amounts to \$12,000,000 a year. I am speaking in round numbers for the purpose of illustrating my argument. That \$12,000,000 is a charge upon the revenues of the country. It is for the payment of interest upon our indebtedness, and for the indebtedness the members of the Opposition are as responsible as the members on this side of the House. I can give details to show how our debt was incurred, and to show that the hon. gentlemen opposite are as responsible for every cent of it as we are. Then we have other charges for the subsidies to the provinces, which amount to \$4,000,000 a year. How are hon. gentlemen opposite going to get out of that charge, when they adopt free trade ? I suppose they will get out of it by following the plan proposed by Mr. Mercier, and adopted by the conference of the Provincial Governments in Quebec, viz., by adding \$2,000,000 more a year to the subsidies for the different provinces. That plan, I believe, received the support of the leader of the Opposition. If I am not mistaken, I heard him state in this House, that if he got into power, he would see the plans proposed at the Quebec conference carried out, and that plan, as I have said, would add \$2,000,000 a year more to the subsidies. Then, we have the charge for the collection of revenue, amounting to \$9,250,000. Do the hon. gentlemen opposite propose any plan by which

that shall be decreased ? Is not the rate per cent for the collection of Customs as low now as it was when they were in power, from 1873 to 1878, and is there not between that time and now but very little difference in the cost for collection of the inland revenue ? The expenditure on the Post Office is an increasing amount from year to year, as the business of the country increases, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to show one single item by which the cost shall be decreased. I will show to the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, from 1873 to 1878, the deficits which they had on the Intercolonial Railway, which then only extended 714 miles. From 1874 to 1875, the deficit was \$281,000 ; from 1875 to 1876, \$243,000 ; from 1876 to 1877, \$507,000 ; from 1877 to 1878, \$482,000, and from 1878 to 1879, \$716,000. These were their annual deficits on a railway 714 miles long. The Government is managing that railway, which is now 1,175 miles in length, and I promise the people of this country, that the management of that road will not cost the country \$50,000 a year. This year it will not cost us that much, nor will it for a number of years to come. How do hon. gentlemen propose to decrease that amount ? For the Administration of Justice there is \$700,000 ; for civil government, \$1,300,000 ; for Indian affairs, \$1,000,000 ; for penitentiaries, \$350,000 ; for legislation, \$1,000,000 ; for militia, \$1,300,000 ; for police, \$750,000 ; for lighthouse and coast service, \$500,000 ; for immigration, \$250,000 ; for public works, \$1,500,000. The last item they can strike out altogether and save the whole amount ; but how does the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), like that ? And what do the hon. gentleman's supporters from Quebec think of striking out the sum of \$1,500,000 for public works ? The hon. member for Queen's, the other night, said he could not find fault with this Government for being niggardly in its expenditure on public works ; but he complained—I will give his whole sentence—that when the expenditure was for political purposes it was extravagant. Then for ocean and river service there is \$400,000, and for fisheries, \$340,000. Now, if the hon. gentlemen are going to proceed towards free trade, I challenge them to mention the particular items on which they propose to make reductions, and to tell us exactly how the expenditure of this country is going to be made lower than \$35,000,000 a year. What a farce it is for them to talk in their resolution of moving in the direction of free trade, unless they can show the particular manner in which they intend to do it. How do they propose to do that in the face of the statement made by Mr. Blake at Malvern, with which they will be met in every part of the country ? In that speech Mr. Blake stated that he voiced the views of the Opposition, and that he had the particular sanction of the hon. member for South Oxford in making the statement he did. And still we find the hon. gentleman trimming his

sails to catch what he calls the uneasy feeling in the community, although, according to his statement in 1887, the community were then mad. Now, I stated a while ago that the hon. gentlemen opposite were as responsible for every bit of the indebtedness of this country as the Government and their supporters in this House. Let me prove my assertion by showing how the debt of the country was contracted. The provincial debts assumed at the time of Confederation amounted to \$109,430,146. Afterwards, by an Act we allowed to the different provinces \$30,743,392. Then, \$43,911,351 was expended on the Intercolonial Railway, and both parties, Reformers and Conservatives alike, were in favour of building that railway and were perfectly agreeable to our assumption of the indebtedness of the provinces. Then add one single other item, that is, the Government expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway, amounting to \$61,977,948; and, independently of a dozen other items, the sums I have mentioned aggregate more than the total indebtedness of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us on this side of the House of having heaped up the debt of this country; but our management of the finances of the country is such that we are paying a smaller sum in interest than hon. gentlemen opposite were when they managed the finances of the country; and for the total amount of interest we are paying every hon. member opposite is responsible as well as the party on this side of the House. Besides making these enormous expenditures I have mentioned, we have expended on public works, the development of the North-west and other undertakings throughout the country the enormous sum of \$193,000,000. The hon. gentleman gave us a long description of how the poor farmer in this country was forced from his farm by the iniquitous National Policy of this Government, and stated, in the words of his letter to the "Economist," that the farmer was being "bled white," and that the taxes were so framed that nearly the whole burden of our taxation fell upon the poor agriculturists of this country. He made the amazing statement, that the people of this country not only pay \$30,000,000 to the revenues of this country, \$30,000,000 to the manufacturers, but \$30,000,000 more in the shape of interest for money borrowed from the old country, and, over and above all this, suffer a loss of nearly an equal amount in the reduced prices of what they have to sell, owing to the McKinley Bill. In other words, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, this National Policy imposes a burden upon the poor agriculturist, or at least the labouring portion of the community, of nearly \$120,000,000 a year. This statement has only to be made to show its absurdity on its face. It is ridiculous. The amount of interest which we pay on money borrowed is properly marked by the amount of interest charged against us on loans made

Mr. HAGGART.

in the old country, amounting to nearly \$12,000,000 a year, and this amount is included in the \$30,000,000 which the hon. gentleman says is paid on money borrowed in the old country. There is no way of verifying the amount, but the simple statement will bring the laugh of ridicule from every financial man in the country, that \$120,000,000 a year is forced out of the pockets of the people of this country every year by the infamous National Policy. Then, the hon. gentleman stated that we were responsible for the McKinley Bill. If I remember rightly, the McKinley Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives and nearly passed before the hon. Minister of Finance made his Budget speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it was not passed till October, and our Budget was brought down in April. The assent of the President was given on or about the 5th October.

Mr. HAGGART. Every item in it in reference to farm products was in the Bill before the hon. Minister made his Budget speech, and was passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it was not passed.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill was introduced in the House long before the tariff statement was made by my hon. friend, and it is absurd to say that it was the policy of this Government that brought about the passage of the McKinley Bill. Anyway, it would not make any difference, according to the line of argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), whom I do not see in his place. In looking over the "Debates" yesterday for the purpose of my argument to-day I had the pleasure of reading some of that hon. gentleman's speeches on the McKinley Bill, in which he argued that the principle adopted in the McKinley Bill would not have the slightest effect on the people of this country. He spoke of farmers taking barley from the county of Essex to Detroit, and stated that when they came to Windsor they found that barley there was worth \$1.70 per 100 pounds, and when they reached Detroit it was worth \$2. They took it over to Detroit, where they had to pay 30 cents a bushel, but got, it is true, \$2 per bushel. What was the statement of the hon. gentleman who represents Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in this House? He asked who paid the duty, and replied that no injury was done the Canadian farmer at all; that it was the brewer on the other side who was obliged to pay 30 cents duty, and exclaimed what a ridiculous affair it was. According to the argument of his friend, the farmer who went over there, if we have to pay 30 cents on our grain going to the United States, we should impose a duty of 30 cents on grain coming in here, and we would then be taking, according to the argument of the hon. gentleman, 30 cents out of the pockets of our people for the purpose of revenging ourselves for the 30 cents taken

out of the pockets of the brewers on the other side. These hon. gentlemen change their views on political economy to suit their case. In this, no doubt, they follow the lead of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who said that in that large country, the United States, which is a continent in itself, no rules of political economy apply as they do in the older countries of Europe. What is the whole thing underlying the motion which the hon. gentleman has made in amendment to the motion to go into Supply? What does he offer to the people of this country? He says that the expenditure of this Government is extravagant, and that if his party get into power they will reduce the expenditure, and so rearrange the duties in the direction of free trade that they will bear equally on all classes of the community; that specific duties are wrong in principle, and that they will apply *ad valorem* ones. That was the statement made by the hon. gentleman up west, and that is the statement embodied in his present amendment. They are going to reduce the expenditure and apply *ad valorem* instead of specific duties. The question whether an *ad valorem* is better than a specific duty I will not discuss. A good deal can be said either way. In principle, the *ad valorem* duty is perhaps the correct form; but there are some articles which require specific duties. I remember the arguments of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this House in favour of specific duties. I have heard him argue that perhaps it was the proper way for the purpose of levying taxes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; you never did. You may have heard that it was, on a particular article, but never that specific duties were proper.

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard the hon. gentleman say, when putting specific duties on tea and coffee—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART—that the effect of putting specific duties on tea and coffee, although the rich man who drank his Bohea would have to pay the same amount as the poor man who used a cheaper and adulterated quality, was to prevent fraud. I have heard his remarks when he applied specific duties to wines coming into the country, in which he spoke of the advantages of such duties, and I have heard him on several other occasions speaking in the same sense. The philosophical question, whether *ad valorem* or specific duties are the best, was equally balanced in his mind, but he was inclined to favour specific duties. I remember his reminding us that the Australian colonies had all adopted specific duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why, no they never did. You will find no such statement of mine.

Mr. HAGGART. I will read from Sir Richard Cartwright's Budget speech of 1873,

page 35, which is the best authority I have on the subject. He was announcing the increase of some liquor duties, and he said:

In doing this, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the same remark applies to our course on some other duties, that we prefer to place specific duties instead *ad valorem* duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On particular articles, but you never heard me advocate general specific duties.

Mr. HAGGART:

I am aware that *ad valorem* duties appear to be the fairer mode, but I believe that this is one of these cases in which the theory is one way and the practice another. Practically we find that frauds are attempted under this system, and valuers really do themselves in a sort of rough justice, what we propose to do here. I find that in the Australian colonies, which are closely akin to ourselves, the specific duties are to some extent replacing the *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, on that class of articles, but on none other.

Mr. HAGGART. I will leave it to the House whether that does not corroborate every word of the statement I have made with reference to the hon. gentleman. He is a new convert to the belief in the ills which are perpetrated by specific duties. He was a friend of free trade principles when it was impossible to apply them to this country. He afterwards acquiesced in his leader, the Hon. Mr. Blake, making the statement he did in Malvern. The only two things in the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman are a free trade tariff and a reduction in expenditure. I defy any one to find a single item in which the hon. gentleman proposes to reduce the expenditure. Let the hon. gentleman show where he will reduce it, so as to enable us, inside of fifty years, to have free trade such as exists in England to-day. The House should ask hon. gentlemen opposite, when they get up and move a policy, to show how that policy can be carried out. The country has a right to know how they propose to carry out their free trade principles. But from day to day these hon. gentlemen alter their utterances. One day they say, through the Hon. Mr. Blake, that it is impossible to carry out free trade principles in this country; and before we entertain the idea that it can be done, we should, first of all, ask the person who proposes it, how it can be done. To-day, abandoning his Elysian field of unrestricted reciprocity, the hon. gentleman proposes this to the people of Canada as a panacea, or the something which will hurl us from our seats and place him and his party in power. What argument has he offered in support of his proposition? Not a single one, and I hope that the speakers who follow me will be prepared to offer to the House and the country something substantial in support of it. The hon. gentleman, in criticising the remarks of my hon.

friend the Minister of Finance, who instanced the increased deposits in the savings banks, the increased circulation in the country, the large consumption of sugar and a lot of other things, as evidencing the growth and prosperity of the country, rather underrated these. He asked how did the \$40,000,000 which were in the savings banks show an increase in the wealth of the country. He asked had the Finance Minister any gold for the purpose of redeeming it, and said we all knew that he had no gold, and that if a run were made upon the banks of the country, although they are well managed, good institutions, not one of them could stand the drain. Does the hon. gentleman not know that this \$40,000,000 reduces the outside amount of our indebtedness to a foreign country, and that the interest we would otherwise be obliged to pay outside this country goes to our own people? Does he forget his remarks in 1878 with reference to one of the signs of the prosperity of the country. What did he give as some of the principal evidences by which we should judge of the prosperity of the country? He said: Look at our savings banks; look at our circulation, especially look at the amount of life insurance in force, because if the country was prosperous the people would pay their money to maintain their life insurance. His views are entirely changed to-day. Those who were listening to the hon. gentleman the day before yesterday must have been struck by the change in his tone. He now says that savings banks are no sign of prosperity, insurance is no sign of prosperity, the increased circulation of the banks and the increased deposits in the banks are only evidences that the people of this country are not trading on their own capital, but trading more on borrowed capital than they used to do. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to what he said when he was more careful of his remarks upon the same subject. I will put the hon. member's statement at one time side by side with his statement of the day before yesterday. In the Budget speech of 1877, page 7, he declares:

Banks do undoubtedly afford us certain standards by which we may estimate with tolerable precision the increased volume of business throughout Canada.

These standards he declares are usually considered reliable. What are these signs? For instance, circulation—(is it possible that he should have entertained such sentiments)—the increase of banking deposits, increase of deposits in Government savings banks (and these he thinks are specially valuable), the increase of the fishery product, the increase of exports of agricultural products and the products of the forest and the increased export of manufactures, the quantity of sugar imported, and the amount of life insurance in force. The hon. gentleman gives this last as a valuable sign, indicating the prosperity of the country. These were the signs of pros-

Mr. HAGGART.

perity which were quoted by my hon. friend the Finance Minister. These were the signs which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave as evidences of prosperity in 1877.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which you repudiated.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They did not exist then.

Mr. HAGGART. Every financial authority regards these things as signs of the prosperity of a country. In this connection I would give a quotation from the "Monetary Times" of 3rd February, 1893, to show how closely this paper follows the line of my hon. friend the Finance Minister and the line taken by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his statement as Finance Minister in 1887:

The following are universally held to be indicators of prosperity in any country, namely:—

1. A large diminution in insolvencies.
2. A large increase in the deposits in banks.
3. Considerable increase in banking loans and discounts.
4. Considerable increase in the return of clearing houses.

Of course they had no clearing houses in 1877 and the hon. gentleman could not quote their operations as evidences of prosperity at that time.

5. Considerable increase in the bank circulation, in spite of the low prices of some commodities.

The above five conditions are all undoubted facts relating to the country, as a whole, at present, every province of the Dominion being included. Let us see what the figures show in these five conditions. In 1892, as compared with 1891, the decrease in insolvencies was \$3,000,000. In 1892, notwithstanding the increased business of the country and the great number of persons engaged in mercantile pursuits, the insolvencies, compared with the period from 1875 to 1879, when the hon. gentleman had the direction of the financial affairs of this country, were less, on the average, by \$12,924,000 a year. The increase in the deposits in the banks in 1892, compared with 1891, was \$19,300,000, and, as compared with the average of the years from 1875 to 1879, the increase was \$97,938,000. The increase in the banking loans in 1892, compared with 1891, was \$7,500,000, and, as compared with the average of the years from 1875 to 1879, the increase was \$85,200,000. This is a considerable increase in the circulation of this country, and shows the enormous quantities of produce that must be moved, compared with the years I have quoted, because the low prices give the dollar a far greater purchasing power in agricultural products than at that time. This is further evidenced by the shipping returns of the country. Those returns show that the shipping that is required for the purpose of carrying the produce of the country is

nearly four-fold what it was in the average of the years between 1873 and 1878. Now, I would like to know how the tests apply—though to some it might, perhaps, seem invidious to inquire—to the time when the hon. gentleman was ruling the destinies of this country from 1873. The year 1873 is his favourite year of comparison. But we know that was the last year of the Conservative Government. I would like to show what these statements prove in regard to the decrease in prosperity of the country from 1873 to 1875. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated, as I have shown, that the amount of life insurance in the country was specially likely to show the increase of wealth among the people. Let us look at the comparison as to life insurance between this year, 1890, which, I think, is the last year for which we have the returns, and the period between 1873 and 1878. The total life insurance in force in 1875 was \$85,009,264. In 1878 it had decreased to \$84,751,937. In 1890 the total life insurance in the country was \$248,424,567. In 1875 the total life insurance effected per annum was \$15,074,258. Compare that with 1878, because, when the people are not prosperous there is nothing that they more quickly drop than the payments on their life insurance. In 1878 the total amount of life insurance effected was \$12,169,755, a decrease in this item as the total life insurance in force. In 1890 the amount of new insurance effected reached the enormous sum of \$40,523,456. Now, another test which the hon. gentleman wished to apply as showing the prosperity of the country was the enormous amount of bank deposits. In 1874 the bank deposits amounted to \$78,790,368. In 1878 they had decreased to \$71,900,195. In 1891 they have increased to the sum of \$149,431,573. Thus, testing the prosperity of the country by the very rules laid down by the hon. gentleman, is it not clearly established that this country is prospering to an extent, and an increasing extent, as great as that of any other country on the face of the globe? The country, as the hon. gentleman stated in his speech in 1877, might not show the expected advance in population, because he stated that there had been no increase of population in the older provinces. But the result has fulfilled his expectations, and his statement in 1877, in that there has been an enormous increase in the wealth of the country. Now, I do not think that any hon. gentleman will deny the fact that this country has prospered; at the least, the evidence is, to me, incontrovertible. Now, how has this advance been obtained? By bleeding the farmers till they are white? No, Sir. Let us compare the percentage of Customs duties levied on the people under the Conservative Government with the percentage levied upon the people when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The tariff of Customs by percentages averaged in 1879, 16.10 per cent; in 1892, 17.56 per cent, or 1.46 per cent more

in 1892 than in 1879. Yet in the interval, under that increased duty, what has been the progress of this country? We have built 8,500 miles of railway; the tonnage carried by these railroads has nearly trebled, the exact figures being 7,832,000 tons in the former period and about 23,000,000 tons at present, while the number of passengers carried has increased from 6,444,000 to nearly 14,000,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Between what years are the comparisons made?

Mr. HAGGART. Between 1879 and 1892. We have expended upon our great lines of interprovincial trade nearly seventy-nine millions of dollars. We have developed and improved our canal system; and I may state to the House that in nearly three years our canal system will be completed to the depth contemplated by the commissioners; the Welland Canal has been completed to that depth, the Cornwall Canal has been completed, and the Lachine Canal is nearly completed. Although we have been making such enormous expenditures, the revenue has been equal to them for the last five or six years. There was a little increase in the indebtedness last year, which increase was fully explained by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, in the assumption of nearly \$900,000 of the bonds of Quebec for building the North Shore Railway, and giving them over to the company. That was the transfer of one of the assets, and, by so much, increased our debt. Then, there was the sale or the transfer of a certain amount of our floating indebtedness, about two millions and a quarter sterling, or nearly ten million dollars. That added to our nominal indebtedness over two million dollars. It is only a change in the name. We are paying less interest than we did before, but the operation nominally adds to the increased indebtedness, and leaves a small expenditure of about \$1,300,000 on capital account above revenue. For the three or four years preceding, our revenue nearly equalled the expenditure on capital account for all other purposes. I think the Finance Minister will be able to promise the country that when the large expenditure on the Sault Ste. Marie locks, for the purpose of completing our canal navigation, will have ceased in about three years, we will be able to make further tariff reforms in the direction the hon. gentleman wishes. Then, in addition, I am happy to be able to say, without making any egotistical remarks, that I have been able to remove another incubus on the revenue of the country of six or seven hundred thousand dollars annually, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. With but a little increased expenditure, we will be able to undertake and complete all those things which we have promised; and at the expiration of these three years we will be able to return to a considerably decreasing annual expenditure, although

I hope to see a large expenditure on public works for the purpose of developing our harbours and building works of utility in different sections of the country. I do not suppose that the actual expenditure of \$1,500,000 will decrease, it will continue from year to year; but the Finance Minister may be assured that he will be able to lessen the taxes of the country three years from the present time, by a further amount of \$2,000,000 annually. Sir, I will state, in conclusion, that the people of this country are to be congratulated upon the management of their finances. The Government have done everything that it was possible to do towards the reduction of the expenditure, having a due regard to the requirements of the country, the extension of our railway systems and our public works; so, on the whole, I feel confident that the verdict of the people will be that we have managed the affairs of the country in an economical and prudent manner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In rising to address the House on this occasion I desire, first of all to agree, so far as I can, with the remarks that have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me. I am happy to be able to agree with him so far as to extend my congratulations to the Finance Minister for the clear manner in which he made the financial part of his speech. I wish I could compliment him as heartily on the fairness of his manner; I wish I could compliment him also upon being as clear with reference to what is to be the policy of the party opposite. They have asked for ours. They think we are indefinite; but I think any one reading over carefully the remarks of the Finance Minister, seeing how he balanced this way and balanced that way, and never got down on either side—I think it would be difficult for any one to say that his exposition of the future policy of the Government was made as plain as his financial statement. I think it was made in such a way, and I regret it, that it will tend to upset and demoralize trade for a whole twelve months in the Dominion of Canada. It is rather a serious matter. I am afraid the Finance Minister did not give it proper consideration; but pressed for changes in the tariff, and not knowing how to answer them very well, he had to take refuge in seeking time, and therefore was unable to adopt any other language than the language he used. The hon. Minister of Railways congratulates the Finance Minister on the increased exports of the country. I do not know that I can congratulate the Minister particularly on the increased exports. I could congratulate the country as a whole if the Finance Minister had done anything to increase the value of the exports; then I would have been very glad to extend my congratulations to him also. But when I fail to see that he has done anything at all in the direction of increasing exports, I can only congratulate the country, but I am

Mr. HAGGART.

forced to withhold congratulation from the Minister himself. The hon. Minister of Railways lost much valuable time in addressing the House from either one or two causes, neither of which is very creditable to him, I must admit. When an hon. gentleman is discussing a resolution that is printed in the Journals of the House, it is inexcusable ignorance, especially if he happens to occupy the position of a member of the Government, if he does not read that resolution, especially when it is confined to a few lines; and I might add that it is inexcusable if he does not read it with sufficient care to read it aright. There might be another suggestion, but I will not use that as applied to the case of the hon. gentleman, because that would suppose something disreputable; it would be to the effect that, knowing the language of the resolution was not what he read, nevertheless he read it in the way he did in order to distort it, and to lead to false conclusions about it. The hon. gentleman read the resolution that was offered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as follows:—

That it be resolved that the present Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade.

The words "freer trade" were read by the Minister of Railways as "free trade." The hon. gentleman then, for a long time, proceeded to point out that it was impossible we could just now have free trade in this country, that Edward Blake had said it was impossible, and that, therefore, the policy we were advocating was impracticable, that we did not mean it and that no attempt would be made to carry it out. We were asked where we would obtain our revenue; yet, at the same time, a resolution was before the hon. gentleman, in which we declared:

That the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered.

That is how we propose to get the money to carry on the affairs of the country. So you see, Mr. Speaker, all the space of time wasted in denouncing free trade as being the policy of the Liberal party, and using arguments with respect to how the revenue would be raised, when there is a declaration in the resolution as to how taxation is to be raised, that it is to be raised by collecting an amount to be levied only as the necessities of the Government, honestly and economically administered, require. Sir, the hon. gentleman was scarcely fair in his strictures on the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on many points. I touch upon one. He charged that my hon. friend had said that the deposits in the savings banks and in the chartered banks were no evidence whatever of the prosperity or wealth of a nation. What he did say was this:

I grant you that it is a good thing that the savings-bank deposits have increased; I grant, if you like, it is a good thing that certain cities have grown and prospered; but, after all, how far do these things go?

The argument of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was that these increases afforded some indication of growth; but they were not all that was claimed for them on the part of the Government, and yet the Minister of Railways charged my hon. friend with stating that they afforded no indication whatever of the wealth or prosperity of a country. Congratulating the Minister of Finance on the increased exports and imports and the grand balance of trade, I would desire to point out to the House that when that hon. gentleman made his comparisons between different years he was variable in his selection, that he did not use the same years at all times. We find him jumping from 1868 to 1878, from 1878 to 1892, from 1878 to 1891, and from 1891 to 1892; but his favourite year for purposes of comparison, when dealing with certain subjects, was 1878, I suppose because it was the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, and because the figures of the total trade of the country for that particular year suited his purpose. The hon. gentleman compared 1878 in its total aggregate trade, imports and exports, with 1892, and he told the House there was an increase of 26 per cent in those fourteen years in our grand aggregate of trade. We can rejoice with him on that fact. But if this statement was made to show that it was an unprecedented increase, I beg to remind him that if he will take 1878 and see what the aggregate trade of the Dominion was in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, I will not ask him to go back fourteen years, but only ten years. He will find that there was in 1878 31 per cent increase in ten years, as against 26 per cent increase in the fourteen years in question. The Minister of Finance congratulates the House upon the fact that our trade with Great Britain had increased. Sir, I rejoice in the increase of trade with Great Britain. I rejoice in the increase of trade with any nation that will trade with us. Canada wants trade and commerce; but I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman this: he takes the position, that because a greater quantity of our products had been marketed, since the adoption of the McKinley Bill, in the United Kingdom than hitherto, no injury had been done to Canada. Let me remind him that the very diversion of trade to England proved that a barrier had in the meantime been raised against us in a country that provided a more accessible and profitable market for us. Who will deny, that if we take an article to Great Britain, we will sell it at some price? The question Canada has to consider is, in which country can we sell each article for the best and highest price? When the hon. gentleman rejoices in the fact of increased exports to Great Britain, I can only go with him in so

far as he recognizes that those increased exports to Great Britain have been forced there because we have been shut out of the market that would have been better for us and where more profit would have been realized to the producer and the country. I now come to notice a point which has been dwelt upon very largely by hon. gentlemen opposite, one which was dwelt upon by the Minister of Railways and also by the Minister of Finance. I come to speak now of the manufacturing industries of this country. They have engaged a great deal of the attention of this Government during the past fourteen years. They have been called fond names, their praises have been sounded, their prosperity declared, and the Government has taken credit for it all. I grant you, there is a little change in the tone of the Finance Minister this year. He has discovered that there is a feeling of unrest and disquiet in the country; he said, it has reached this Chamber, and therefore he has taken his halting position, his waiting position. It has burst upon him very suddenly, it has burst upon hon. gentlemen opposite very suddenly. If their National Policy, with reference to the manufacturing industries of the country, had been all they claimed for it during the past fourteen years, how comes it that in a few short months they find out that it is not all that was claimed for it, that it needs revision, that it needs a commission appointed, and that they must go and inquire into it and find out all about it? How comes it? Have the hon. gentlemen opposite lost faith in their own policy? Have not they the courage to stand by their own policy, when for fourteen years they have declared in our hearing, that Canada's prosperity lay absolutely in the direction of maintaining it, and, if necessary, strengthening the protection that was given to the manufacturing industries of this country? Now they tell us they are not so very sure about it. The Minister of Finance will take some experts with him and he will visit the different manufacturing industries and see how they are getting on, and he will be gracious enough, he has told us, to even open his ear to let the farmers and the artisan have a word with him in reference to the working of his great National Policy. I will deal with that a little more in the future, but just now I want to refute the arguments which are now made, and have been made by these gentlemen for years past, with reference to what their policy has done for the manufactures of this country. Sir, I resent it as a piece of effrontery for hon. gentlemen to stand up in this House and claim that the great manufacturing industries of Canada are the products of the National Policy, or owe their existence to the National Policy. That they multiplied manufacturers, I will grant, that they have given to a very few of those who are engaged in manufacturing lines exceptional facilities, I will not deny; but that there are manufacturing in-

dustries in this country, is not, I claim, due to the National Policy, but due to the people who saw that in Canada there was opportunity for development in that line as well as in any other. When these gentlemen talk to you about 1878, and say that there were then no manufacturers in this country that were doing anything, and that ruin and desolation was upon them; I challenge them to the proof. I deny the statement. There was a committee of this House appointed in 1876, and the report of the committee refutes their statement. Take the list of failures that occurred during the Mackenzie Administration among the manufacturers of this country, and take the record of failures among the manufacturing classes since the inception of the National Policy, and I venture to say, you will find more capital sunk, wasted, and destroyed under the National Policy, than there was during the whole time the Mackenzie Government was in power. Why, Sir, do the hon. gentlemen forget that in 1876, sixteen years ago, Canadian manufacturers exhibited at the World's Fair in Philadelphia, and that the manufactures of Canada at that time challenged the admiration of the world? Do they not know that under the influence of that exhibition, aided by the Mackenzie Government, which was always ready to aid in a legitimate way all the industries of this country, that a great trade sprang up with neighbouring nations, until in 1878, not only were we manufacturing in all the great staple lines for the people of this country, but we were exporting to other nations \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods each year. Sir, I want to tell the hon. gentleman this: that in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, which they picture as a year fatal to manufacturers, the manufacturers of Canada were not only supplying their own markets, but they exported that year to other countries, as many manufactured goods as the manufacturers of this country have been able to export on an annual average for the last ten years, under the National Policy. And yet they speak as if our industries were all due to them. These statements may be doubted, but allow me to read the countries with which we had opened up an export trade at that time: Great Britain, United States, Newfoundland, British West Indies, Australia, Norway and Sweden, Germany, New Zealand, South America, Spanish West Indies, French West Indies, Danish West Indies, Hayti, British Guiana, Mexico, St. Pierre, Central America, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Holland, Africa, East Indies, Labrador and the Falkland Islands. To all these countries the manufacturers under the Mackenzie Administration were shipping the products of their factories, and to the extent, as I said before, of over \$4,000,000 a year, an extent equal to the average exportation of these articles during the last ten years of this Administration. What were these goods which we then exported? Do you tell me they were merely in one or two

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

articles? I will read you the list of what we were exporting, and then you will be able to recognize whether these manufacturing industries were in existence or not at that time. Mr. Speaker, I will venture to say that you will find all the great manufacturing industries of the country at the present time were in existence and doing well. Agricultural implements, trade was opened up with Australia and with other countries in that line then; carriages, clothing, cordage, ropes and twines, cottons and furs, glass and glassware, grinding stones, ground plaster, hats and caps, India rubber manufactures, iron castings and stoves, pig iron, machinery, sewing machines, other iron and hardware, leather, sole and upper, boots and shoes, harness and saddlery, other manufactures of leather, organs, pianos, oil cake, soap, starch, steel and the manufactures of, wrought stone, tobacco manufactures, vinegar, all kinds of manufactures of wood, and woollens. Will the hon. gentleman opposite tell me any industry of great importance that is in existence to-day that was not in existence during the Mackenzie Administration? And yet, these gentlemen claim that they have been the means of fostering and developing and promoting these industries. Well, Sir, that all arose under a revenue tariff, was a legitimate growth under which the manufacturers were doing well, growing with the country, meeting the requirements of the country in these lines, and steadily pushing out and on with their trade. When the National Policy was adopted, an undue stimulus was given to those industries. Capital was rushed into them and sunk in them, and in some lines the men who had invested their capital were forced, in order to save it from destruction, to amalgamate their concerns and restrict the output. For much of the disaster that had taken place among the legitimate manufacturing industries of this country, this Government is responsible; for the benefit that has come to the legitimate industries, I deny their right to any credit; on the contrary: in the great majority of cases their policy has been to the actual detriment of those industries. Now, I have read to you a list of the different lines that we were manufacturing, and the different countries to which we exported, and I would ask the Government one question: If the manufacturers of this country are in the feeble and weakly condition that they describe, unable under fair conditions to hold their own in competition with the manufacturers of other countries, what is the use of their spending the public money of this country to enable those manufacturers to exhibit their productions in the city of Chicago against those of the other nations of the world? Is the exhibit to be made there for the glory of the American nation, in order to merely swell the number of exhibits? No; the manufacturers of this country who will exhibit there will exhibit with a business purpose, that is, in order that

the people of all nations who come there shall view the manufacturing capabilities of Canada side by side with those of other nations, confident that they can secure under fair conditions a fair share of the trade in manufactures in the markets of the world. That is the confidence they have in themselves. Sir, what is the position of the great bulk of those manufacturers under the National Policy? Increased protection has been given in many lines, which has had the effect of bringing on the manufacturers the condemnation of the people, when the manufacturers themselves have not deserved that condemnation. Why? Because the Government, in the adjustment of their tariff, while putting additional protection upon many manufactured articles and thus enhancing the cost to the consumer, have nevertheless failed to give the manufacturer greater protection than he enjoyed under the revenue tariff of 1878. Why? Any man who is conversant with trade knows it; because they have burdened the great manufacturing lines with duties on their raw material, which have compelled them to raise their prices to the consumer, or else they would be in a worse position than before. I need not endeavour to enforce that statement. When Sir Charles Tupper was putting the increased duties on iron he alluded to that fact, and what did he say:

What I propose to ask this House to do, in adopting the policy of vitalizing this great industry for Canada, is to take the duty off anthracite coal and make it free. The moment that is done we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, at all events, served by anthracite coal, making that description of anthracite iron which is so highly valued by gentlemen connected with foundries.

He saw that those additional duties on iron would add to the cost of the different lines of manufacture, and into how many lines does iron enter as raw material? Seeing that he said:

The effect of the removal of the duty on anthracite coal will be not only to give great relief to the public who use anthracite coal, but also to give a great relief to the manufacturers of iron, who will have to pay on their raw material a larger price than before; but they will receive a considerable portion of that back in the form of remitted duty.

So Sir Charles Tupper understood, as any business man can understand, that the amount of protection accorded to any one particular industry is the difference between the duty on the article produced and the duty levied on the raw material that enters into its manufacture; and you can see that when you commence putting a heavy duty on that which is the raw material in some branches of trade, and as you progress higher and higher, your taxes must increase until the manufacturer seems to have an amount of protection, which he really has not, but which compels the consumer to pay a higher price for the goods he produces. He is not to blame for it; but it is done in the endeavour to foster some particular article which it is thought is not susceptible of being

maintained under fair conditions in Canada. Now, having alluded to the previous exports of manufactured goods and having compared them with the exports under the present Government, I would like to be permitted to seem to digress for a moment from that subject, in order to read to you what was said in this House—you will remember it, I dare say, Mr. Speaker—five or six years ago by a gentleman who then became the Finance Minister of Canada. He was replying to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was pointing out that there would be a deficit that year, and in order to quiet fears and to soothe my hon. friend, Mr. McLelan replied to him in the following beautiful and poetic language:

He has talked about the people of this country being depleted; but we know that there is nothing of the kind, as an actual fact. The same old story is being re-enacted all over the Dominion; love is being made in the frosts of winter and in the sunlight of summer; the orange blossoms are being worn, and marriage bells sounded and new homes are being formed from one end of this land to the other. We do not take up a newspaper but we find that a new home has been founded, and by and by, in obedience to the great command to be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, there will be a new cradle put in a new home, to be added to the 200,000 cradles in this Dominion which are now rocking young Canadians who will grow to Canadian men and women and give their strength and their energies to the development of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that these words echo in your ears as they do in mine. It is a scene I delight to think upon; but when I allude to it in connection with this matter of the export of manufactured goods, you will wonder where it comes in. It comes in because I was rudely awakened from the dream of the happy condition of this country by an item, in black and white, inserted by the Minister of Customs among the exports of manufactured goods. What is it? Household effects? Oh, what disillusion is involved in these words! What is it? new homes being founded and babies being rocked in Canadian cradles to become Canadian men and women to build up and develop this country, the babies, cradles and all have fled to another country. I could stand the loss of the cradle, but I bewail the loss of the baby. How do these gentlemen, who say there is no exodus, get over what they are forced to enter in their records, that \$1,166,059 worth of household effects have been exported? What does that mean? Why, it means that the homes have been broken up. It means, not that our young men have crossed the line for temporary employment, as they perhaps did under the Mackenzie Administration, when we find no such item of export, but that these homes, which Mr. McLelan pictured, in which Canadian infants were being rocked and brought up, have been torn up, the parents have gone, the household effects have gone, the families gone; and that these people, instead of lending their aid and energy to bring up and de-

velop this Canada of ours, are giving their capital and strength to build up a foreign nation. Sir, the Government may, perhaps, after this revelation made by the Minister of Customs, in his returns, console this House by saying that, while they cannot deny that homes have been broken up, that the babies and the cradles have been taken away, they yet can rejoice in the possession of something which takes their place, and which they claim peculiarly their own and can hug to their bosoms stronger than ever. They have still their infant industries. We are referred to the census returns as an indication of the great growth and development of the industrial institutions of this country; we are told that they have increased by many thousands. So they have, as they are enumerated. We are told that we have 75,768 industrial establishments; but, if you will look into the returns, you will find that there is only one in every eight of the industrial establishments tabulated which are worked by steam-power. I am inclined to the belief that the development claimed by those hon. gentlemen of the manufacturing industry under the National Policy took place largely three or four years after the adoption of their policy, when, as I pointed out, under the undue stimulus given it, capital was rushed into different manufacturing industries, to the ruin and sacrifice of capital and the withdrawal from other walks and avenues, into the factories, of thousands of individuals only to be thrown out of work and out of wages. Since then, I think it will be difficult for hon. gentlemen to show that there has been any material increase at all. In 1884, just when our Finance Minister thought that the country was showing remarkable development and prosperity in the various manufactures, he sent a commission to visit different factories and industrial institutions in Ontario and Quebec, and make a report upon them. And what did he find? I will read the results of a few of them. I find from the census of 1891, that there were 199 agricultural implement factories in Ontario and Quebec, employing 3,813 hands. In 1884, 57 establishments out of the 199 were visited, and they gave employment to 3,219 souls; so that the total increase in the last seven years of the National Policy in this line has been 142 establishments and 594 hands. This takes in large factories and manufacturers who employ, perhaps, not more than one or two hands. Of furniture factories, the census tells us there are 1,263 establishments, with 6,688 souls employed in them. When forty-three out of 1,263 were visited in 1884, about one-third the total number of hands that were found in this industry in 1891 were engaged in these forty-three establishments. And in foundries and machine shops, you will find that in the 172 which existed in 1884, the number of men employed was only one-third less than the number employed in the 676 reported in the census of 1891. And so of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the 4,285 boot and shoe establishments found in the census, which employed 15,648 men. In sixty establishments visited out of the 4,285 there were found in 1884 about one-half that number of employees. So in cotton mills. The commission at that time were able to discover three more cotton mills in Ontario and Quebec seven years ago than are noted in the census of 1891. I say this looks like stagnation since 1884. It does not look like industrial development, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to compare those figures and say whether they think that all the credit they have been claiming for themselves is really due them. Now, Sir, I want to speak with reference to the subject which is contained in the latter part of the amendment, the necessity of limiting the collection of taxes to the requirements of the Government, honestly and economically administered. When the Finance Minister rejoices in the large exports of 1892, as a source of wealth for this country, I also rejoice, but I do not give the credit to the Minister of Finance; I do not give credit to any enactment passed by the Parliament of Canada. I give the credit where hon. gentlemen opposite will join with me in giving it; I give the credit to a kind Providence that in 1891 smiled upon our fields and gave us such a harvest throughout this vast Dominion as we never had before. Sir, it is well known that the returns of June, 1892, contain the record of sales of the harvest of the previous year. But, Sir, I think that the Minister of Finance, even if he were more anxious than he is for praise, would not ask me to accord to him the praise of giving sunshine and rain to make a fruitful season and to bring forth an abundant crop. There is one way in which, perhaps, the country might have been indebted to the Minister of Finance in relation to the increased exports. Providence blessed us with a large crop; if the Minister of Finance or the Government had been the means of opening markets for this country that would have enabled the farmers to realize a larger price for their crops than they would have got in the market in which it is sold, then, Sir, I would give them credit for it. But will they tell me where they opened a single market for the farmer? I believe that by their policy they in part contributed to closing one of the most profitable markets for much of that which the farmer has to sell. I believe some millions might have been added to the export of \$20,000,000 in 1892, by reason of the higher prices the farmers would have received, had they been free to enter the market to which the Liberal party say it is desirable the farmers of Canada should have access. But while it was impossible for the Government to cause good crops, I believe it was possible for them to have done something in securing better markets, which would have added to the value of the crops and to the wealth of the country, and they failed to do it. They have done this, on the

other hand, for which I hold them responsible—they have minimized the effect to the people of the crops by the excessive expenditure they have entailed upon this country by their administration. I desire to give a few figures with reference to this matter. I have taken off a table of the total exports of Canada for the past ten years, and a comparative statement of the taxes taken from the people during the past ten years. When I have read this, Mr. Speaker, I shall have answered in part a serious inquiry among the business men of this country during last year and this year, a question which the people felt themselves unable to solve and that was: How is it, with such a magnificent harvest in all parts of the Dominion as we had last year, that trade is so stagnant, that money is so scarce that it cannot be obtained with the freedom we thought it could, that it is not to be found in the channels of commerce? Sir, they will find from this table one of the reasons. It is that money that came into the country, that was the wealth of the country that ought to have circulated through the channels of trade and commerce enriching every one, has been taken by this Government out of circulation; it has been taken out of the wealth of the people and has been squandered by the Government in a manner they will be unable to defend. Sir, I do not hold them to too strict a line. I take these figures from their own Trade and Navigation Returns. I ask them to take it on the basis on which they put it there and no basis could be fairer. Take the Trade and Navigation Returns and read the per capita tax imposed by the Government from Confederation to the present time. Divide it, as I have done, for the purpose of comparison, into three periods of five years each. Taking the five years of the Reform Administration, what do we find? We find that in those five years there was an average per capita Customs tax taken from the people of this country of \$3.44 per head. Take a period under gentlemen opposite, the five years, from 1883 to 1887, and you will find there was an annual average per capita tax laid upon the people of Canada of \$4.60. I take another period of five years, from 1888 to 1892, and I find the annual per capita tax was \$4.77. The increase of the per capita tax in the period from 1883 to 1887 over the period from 1874 to 1878 was \$1.16 per head of the population, which, estimating on a population of say four and one-half millions, means that they took in each of these years \$5,220,000, or in the five years \$26,100,000 more in taxation than was taken by the Mackenzie Administration when they were in power. I desire the House to mark, Mr. Speaker, that this is a per capita calculation. It would not be fair to charge the Government with that increased expenditure while making no allowance for increased population and consequent increased expenditure. This is based upon the actual population at the time, so that, as the taxes increased the

population increased. It is a per capita tax and they must be held absolutely to the results. Of course, if the population remained stationary at the figure it was in Mr. Mackenzie's time, and if you figured the per capita tax from 1883 to 1888 on that basis, it would be far more than \$4.60 per head. But they have taken the estimate of increased population into account, and, therefore, for purposes of comparison, this is absolutely accurate, so far as I can judge, and cannot be assailed from any point. Take the second period from 1888 to 1892, when the annual tax per capita was, as I have stated, \$4.77. That was \$1.33 per head more than was taken under the Mackenzie Administration. Figure that upon an estimated population of 4,750,000 and it gives \$6,317,500, or, in the five years, they took \$31,587,500 more than was taken by the Mackenzie Government during their period of occupancy of the Treasury benches. Sir, what does that mean? Putting these two amounts together, it means that in the last ten years \$57,687,500 of excessive taxation has been wrung out of the people of this country, taken out of their wealth and squandered by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, it is on the per capita basis, they get the credit for increase of population; and when I point out that \$57,687,500 are taken from the people that ought to have remained in their pockets, then, I think, we can begin to see, in part, how it is that while Providence has favoured us, as Providence has scarce favoured any other nation, with a rich inheritance, this Government has been equal to the task of destroying the prosperity we would have had if these blessings of Providence had been left to us undisturbed. They have succeeded in doing that, without, I maintain, any resulting advantages to the people of this country. Sir, there is only one possible answer to the figures I have given, one possible way in which they could be weakened, and it may be in this direction, that hon. gentlemen opposite might say: You did not raise enough taxation under the Mackenzie Administration to pay the expenses of the Government; you had your deficits. I reply: The Mackenzie Administration had their deficits, but they also had their surpluses. I reply that the present Government have had their surpluses, they have had their deficits also; but whether under the Mackenzie Administration, or the Thompson Administration, or the Macdonald Administration, deficits and surpluses, come how they may, will, either on the one side or the other, manifest themselves, and take their place in the public debt. Let me point out that while, during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration, the increase to the public debt was \$6,407,421 per annum, there has been, under these gentlemen, during their ten years, an average increase per annum of \$8,266,472. They have taken \$57,000,000 of the people's money, and they have added \$2,000,000 a

year more to the public debt than was added under the Mackenzie Administration. In this calculation I have said nothing as to the wealth taken from the people of this country through the manufacturers that have been forced, for one reason or another, to take extra prices for goods the people consumed. I am not one of those who believe that the consumers of Canada pay in all cases the full amount of duty on the Canadian manufactured articles; I do not take that extreme position, I do not believe it is correct. But it is a more incorrect, a more indefensible statement, should it be made, that the imposition of taxes upon manufactured goods is not taken advantage of, and is not in any case added to the price of the goods that a person buys. Sir, an honest protectionist will not hold that position, he will not advance the argument that the price to the consumer is not increased, but he would argue compensating advantages as his reason. But that it does take an extra amount of money from the pockets of the people, not only on the goods they import, but on like goods manufactured in the country, I think is beyond the cavil of any man who desires to discuss the question intelligently and fairly. But I leave that one side; and we will consider just what this Government have taken in actual cash, out of the taxes collected from the people by the custom-house. I desire to enforce that, as it can be best enforced, I think, by some comparisons. We talk about millions in this House, and we talk about them very glibly, so that they lose their force and their meaning; but I will give you one or two facts, and ask you to endeavour to realize, if you can, the impoverishing course of the Government upon the people of this country. I have taken here from the Trade and Navigation Returns, a table of the total exports from the Dominion of Canada during the ten years that they have taken this extra fifty-seven millions of money from the people, and let us realize what a sum \$57,000,000 is by comparing it with each of the following items. In ten years, the total exports of our magnificent barley crop, aided in its value by the freer access we had to the United States market during many of those years—that magnificent crop, gathered from all parts of the Dominion, added to the wealth of this country \$7,000,000 less than this Government took from them. All the wheat, the flour, the oats, the hay, that this vast Dominion was able to export from Manitoba, from British Columbia, and from every other province of the Dominion—the total exports of all these articles, including the magnificent harvest of last year, was \$57,798,397, and that Government, during the last ten years, took almost every dollar that was brought into this country to add to its wealth as the result of the export of all the wheat, flour, oats and hay that were exported from this country. Sir, if they rejoice over the increased exports sent from this country, which add to the wealth

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

of this country, they do well; but when they wipe out an item like that by the excessive taxation they are wringing from the people of this country, I trust they will get some conception of the course they have been pursuing, and of the state to which they have brought the country. Then there is the magnificent trade in horned cattle, which has developed to \$63,460,497 in ten years. Magnificent receipt, but all but thirteen millions of it was taken by that Government in excessive taxation. Of horses, there were \$18,558,463 worth exported in ten years; but three times all the money that you received from all the exports of your horses, has been taken out of the wealth of the country by that Government opposite. Of the product of the mines, all the iron and all the other products, the total exports in ten years were fifteen millions less than the amount of money in extra taxation that this Government have taken from the people of Canada. The total exports of our magnificent fisheries from the Atlantic to the Pacific and on the sea-coast, amounted in ten years, to \$81,938,067—seven years out of the ten, the benefit from the total products of the fisheries of this country have been wiped out by the Government, taken from the people in the way of Customs taxation. The total products of the forest amounted to \$230,779,664; two and a half years out of the ten years, the product of our forest, that magnificent source of income, has been wiped out by excessive taxation. The total export of the manufactures of this country amounted to \$43,841,000; \$14,000,000 more than the total export of manufactures have been taken by this Government. Of animals and their products, embracing cheese, butter, and all the other products of animals, amounting, in ten years, to \$243,163,515; the receipts of nearly two and a half years out of the ten have been taken and lost to the people by this Government wringing them out of their pockets in extra taxation. Of the total of agricultural products, embracing everything that you grow in the field and on the farm, exported in ten years, amounting to \$162,752,312 over three and a half years' product out of the ten has been taken by this Government in excessive taxation during the last ten years, over and above what the Mackenzie Government took, and with which they carried on the affairs of the country in all its departments, keeping up its public works and developing the country; and in addition to taking \$57,000,000 of money by extra taxation during those ten years the Government added \$2,000,000 per year more to the public debt than was added during the Mackenzie Administration.

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

After Recess.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When the House rose at six o'clock I was endeavour-

ing to show the excessive taxation that had been levied on the country during the period of the administration of this Government. From the tables I submitted, I think it was manifest to any one that we had a country that is grand in its resources, a country of which we might justly be proud, or, I venture the suggestion, it would not have borne as well as it has done the strain that has been placed upon it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I should like to point out what I might term one of the many fallacies—perhaps I should not use that term—one of the many one-sided and misleading statements that are to be found in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. If you remember, Sir, he stated with great emphasis that on the articles of sugar, tea, coffee and rice, four articles, the Government had levied a small amount of taxation, that if the rate of duty that was levied under the Cartwright tariff had been applied to the imports of those articles during the past year, there would have been a difference of \$5,823,442; and he added:

There is that saving between the two rates of taxation to the people of this country.

I do not stop now to inquire as to the effect of placing raw sugar under No. 14 on the free list on the quantity imported. Everyone knows that if you make an article cheap the consumption is greater. It is not with that point I wish to deal; but I wish to point out how utterly misleading it is to suppose that there has been a reduction in the taxation of the people by that amount of \$5,000,000 odd, which, it seems to me, such an expression, standing as it does, stated as it was, would lead the country to understand. The hon. gentleman did not tell the people at the same time as he made the statement, which I conceive would only have been fair and proper on his part, that while they had saved, if we take the statement of the hon. gentleman, \$5,000,000 odd to the people on those four articles of taxation, he had taken more than double the amount from them by increasing the taxes on other products. What does it matter to the country whether \$5,000,000 had been levied on this or that article, save and except that the articles he mentioned had this merit, that all the duty levied on them would go into the public treasury, while it was possible to impose a rate of taxation upon other articles that, in order to bring such an amount of revenue, would involve the imposition of a large taxation indirectly on the people, but which did not go into the treasury. What the people of the country are concerned about is not so much the articles on which taxation is levied, though in that case and in that light the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is not to be compared in the interests of the people with the policy that prevailed before, but what they are concerned about is, what amount of money have you wrung out of the

people by the scale of your taxation on all articles. That is the question that gives them concern, and the Minister knows that the Government had taken \$8,000,000 more taxation that year out of the people than did the Mackenzie Administration. The Minister of Finance is well aware that for some years before that time the Government took between \$10,000,000 and \$11,000,000 annually more from the people than the Mackenzie Administration had done. What is the use of talking to the people of saving them \$5,000,000 of taxation on certain articles, if the hon. gentleman has taken double the amount of that taxation out of their pockets on other articles? The Minister of Finance told us further—and he was fair in doing so—it was brought out in his explanation of his inability to keep the public debt at the figure at which it was and not increase it during the past year, when some millions have been added to it, that when he gave this relief from the burden of taxation on sugar, he had not been able to maintain the public debt at the point at which it stood because of the loss of revenue sustained by placing sugar on the free list, and he was forced to make up the amount lost by that condition of taxation by borrowing money and adding it to the public debt. He said he thought it was fair that posterity should bear part of the expense of the public works which were being constructed. I do not find fault with that contention; but the fact remains, and the country will note it, that the hon. gentleman was not able to keep the public debt at the point at which it stood and raise a revenue equal to his expenditure with the reduced duty on the article of sugar. We heard this afternoon from the Minister of Railways allusions to a change of policy on the part of the Liberal party. He alluded to unrestricted reciprocity; that that had been dropped and no one was thinking about it; that it involved discrimination against Great Britain; that it involved the total destruction of our manufactures, and that we had discovered that it would not do to appeal to the people on that line. Sir, those hon. gentlemen give their own definition of unrestricted reciprocity. It would be better, I think, if they would define clearly what their own policy is, and allow the Liberals to define theirs. The hon. gentleman asked, what does unrestricted reciprocity mean? Hon. gentlemen opposite have professed, I wish I could say in my heart that they have done anything else than professed, that they desired freer trade relations with the people of the United States, and desired to secure a reciprocal arrangement with them; but they took care to inform us that, while they might enter upon negotiations, they would be on a restricted basis, that the discussion would be confined to reciprocity in natural products, and that the consideration of manufactured articles would not be allowed to enter into the discussion. The Liberal party, in contradistinction to that

policy, were in favour of entering into negotiations, talking over the practicability of obtaining freer trade relations or reciprocity with the people of the United States, and they would not restrict the subjects discussed and passed under review, and would not withhold manufactures from the discussion, but the discussion on the whole items which enter into the trade with the two countries would be unrestricted, and an effort would be made to ascertain to what extent we could secure reciprocal trade arrangements with the people to the south of us. That has been our policy. It involved no dishonour. Not one on this side of the House desires any reciprocity treaty with dishonour. The Liberals believe that it would be in the interest of the people of the United States, and that it would be in the interest of the people of Canada, if they could trade more freely together. The Liberal party thought that an object such as that was worthy the attention of statesmen, and they believed further, that an honest attempt ought to be made to get it. And, Sir, if the people of the country only rightly understood the position of hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to that matter, if they only thoroughly comprehended the manner in which these hon. gentlemen have played with it, I think they would agree upon the point that if it be in the interests of this country to have freer trade relations with the United States to a greater, or to a lesser or to such a degree as was possible, then the way to attain it, the most likely means, rather, of obtaining it, would be to put in power men who are in favour of reciprocity and who would make an honest attempt to secure it; and to take the reins of power out of the hands of men who, while professing to seek it, have, by their speeches on the platform and elsewhere, made clear the fact that they did not desire it; men who have made it more difficult to obtain, by reason of the course they have pursued in the negotiations that have already been entered upon. Speaking as a member of the Liberal party, I am to-day in favour of securing the freest possible trade relations with the people of the United States, consistent with the dignity, the honour and the stability of both countries. We are told by gentlemen opposite: "You will blot out your manufacturing industries if you have free trade with the United States." I denounce that sentiment as unworthy of the men who utter it, and as unpatriotic in its nature. What does it involve? To speak of the manufacturers of Canada not being able to hold their own with the manufacturers of the United States in a fair field and no favour, is to depreciate the intellect and the brain of Canadian manufacturers, and to underrate the skill, the energy, the industry of every artisan in Canada. I repudiate such a sentiment. I hold that Canadians are the equal of the people of any other nation in the world, and as proof of the ability of the Canadian manu-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

facturer and artisan, I point to the fact that they are able to hold their own in fair competition and in a free market with the United States manufacturers and artisans. I point, as proof, to the positions occupied by tens of thousands, nay, by hundreds of thousands, of our fellow-Canadians, who are to-day in the United States many with their capital invested in manufactures there. I point to the Canadian artisans, who by their skill and their energy are building up the vast industries of that country, and I tell you that, take them man for man, the Canadian artisan in the American workshop does not fear comparison with any man from any country or from any clime, who stands beside him. I tell you, Sir, that the Canadian brain, pitted against the brain furnished by any other nationality—in a country where there are representatives of almost every nationality—the Canadian brain holds its own with the best brain that can be found in the United States. Yet these gentlemen opposite say: If you have reciprocity in manufactured goods and free and fair markets for all, the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian artisan, being of inferior material, would go down in the strife. I repudiate that. Oh, that Canada should be governed by men who take such a view of the capabilities of her people? I tell these hon. gentlemen opposite that what the Canadian manufacturer, as well as the Canadian farmer, the Canadian lumberman, the Canadian fisherman and the Canadian miner want, is larger markets and freer trade with the people of the world. If the Finance Minister could secure to these manufacturers a larger market for that which they produce, he, although he says now it would ruin them, he, in my judgment, would soon find out that he had benefited the manufacturers, as well as he would benefit the agriculturists and all other industries in this country. The hon. gentleman has spoken of preferential trade. He has sought by his language to lead the people of this country to believe that perhaps there is something in that, and that if they will only submit to the burdens which his Government has placed upon them, by and by, he says, he thinks there may be a change in the feeling in England. On what is this hope based which he holds out to the people? It is true that he admits with fairness and honesty that there is a strong prejudice, as he terms it, against preferential trade in England, but he thinks that England will by and by learn the lesson which he himself has learned, that a nation can enrich itself by protection. But the English people seem slow to learn that. Not very long ago, Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Conservative party in England—if I read his words aright—in speaking on this subject, said: He doubted not only its expediency, but he doubted its morality. If you find an English statesman of the position of Lord Salisbury believing that a certain course is immoral, it will take

a long time to have a high-minded statesman of the British Empire enter upon a course that is viewed in that light. It is not only Lord Salisbury who has the same view on this question in England. Last summer there was a great meeting of business men in the city of London, England, representatives from all the self-governing colonies of the Empire, meeting with the Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain and Ireland to discuss questions of trade and commerce, to see by what means commerce might be developed between Britain and the outlying portions of the Empire, and how closely commercial union might be established between the colonies and the mother land. One of the resolutions that was submitted in that commercial congress, comprising, I suppose, the best business men that were to be found throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain and Ireland, comprising the representatives of the chambers of commerce and boards of trade of the different Canadian cities and of the Australian and other dependencies, the following resolution was brought forward by Mr. Medley, of the London Chamber of Commerce :—

That in the opinion of this congress, any fiscal union between the mother country and her colonies and dependencies by means of preferential duties, being based on protection, would be politically dangerous, and economically disastrous, and that the arrangement which more than any other would conduce to an intimate commercial union, would be by our self-governing colonies adopting as closely as circumstances will permit, the non-protective policy of the mother country.

Sir Charles Tupper moved an amendment to the resolution in the following words :—

Whereas, the British Empire, covering one-eighth of the habitable globe, with a population of 350,000,000, can supply the home market with the production of every clime at the lowest possible cost, and whereas a national sentiment of mutual interest and brotherhood should promote more extended trade relations between the mother country and its many colonies and possessions,—Resolved, That in order to extend the exchange and consumption of the home staple products in every part of the British Empire, a slight differential duty should be adopted by the Imperial and Colonial Governments, in favour of the home productions against the imported foreign articles.

Slight differential duty ! The vote was taken: the amendment was put first, and it was voted down by thirty-three in favour of it to fifty-eight against it. Among the thirty-three who voted for it only seven of the English chambers of commerce are to be found, while among those who voted against it we find thirty-eight of the English chambers. So that thirty-eight to seven of the English chambers of commerce voted down the proposition that you could promote trade between the countries by the imposition of slight preferential duties ; and the original motion of Mr. Medley was then adopted by a vote of forty-seven for to thirty-four against. I have not a record to show how the English

chambers stood in that vote ; but judging by their vote on the amendment, I presume that they stood in about the same proportion ; and in adopting Mr. Medley's motion they put upon record their belief that "any fiscal union between the mother country and her colonies and dependencies by means of preferential duties, being based upon protection, would be politically dangerous and economically disastrous." Sir, whether the chambers of commerce there represented, a large majority of them, or the Finance Minister, may be right or wrong, I need not attempt to decide. But I will say that the Finance Minister had a ground for stating there was a strong prejudice against it in the minds of the English people, and I will say also, that he holds views very radically different from the views held by the English chambers of commerce ; for what they declare would be politically dangerous and economically disastrous, he, desiring to please the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), declared if it could be carried out—I speak from memory—would be the grandest thing that had ever been accomplished since man was created. Well, Sir, whether it be desirable or be not desirable, the Minister himself admits that it cannot be brought about soon, and what the country wants to know is whether, after that admission, you have no relief for the people of this country save that proposition. You do not propose it yourself ; you say it cannot be accomplished for years at any rate. What the people have a right to ask is, what are you going to do for the country now ? Is it to remain burdened by taxation, with its energies crippled, its markets restricted, during all these years, and not a hand is to be put forth or an effort made in any direction to secure freer trade ? Is that to be the course of the Government ? Such it would seem to be ; for while professing to seek reciprocity or freer trade arrangements with the United States, they are taking the ground that they will exclude manufactures from the consideration of the question, that they will limit themselves to natural products, although the leading men of the United States have told them over and over again that they cannot hope to secure reciprocity on any such lines. Well, I come now to consider the policy that the Minister was expected to propose ; I have to put it that way, for he did not propose it. Balancing his speech, as I said, this way and that way, it is impossible to tell what the course of the Government is to be, save and except that they are at sea and do not know what to do, and tremble lest they should take a step that might lose them their position on the Treasury benches. But with what gravity of countenance, with what solemnity of manner, with what emphasis did the Finance Minister play with the House the other day. He is not a practical joker ; yet, I was going to say, if I might use the expression, it looked very much as if he had been attempting a "sell" upon

the House. We were listening, not on this side of the House alone, but on his own side as well, to see what the Government intended to do. After the Minister had pointed out how there had been a divergence of sentiment on this question ever since 1878, how some held this view, and some held that view, and some held another view, and how this difference of opinion had been accentuated by the low prices of grain, and had been further accentuated by the McKinley tariff and other causes, the question had been brought to the Houses of Parliament and it had reached the ears of the Ministers, and he would now deal with the question. And so the House expected that now we should have the policy of the Government detailed, that we should have something plain and explicit. They are asking from the leader of the Opposition the details of his policy before he is charged with the duty of formulating it, while they themselves are declining to give even an intelligible cue to what their policy is to be. Sir, after the many minutes that had been taken in leading up to the question by a discussion of all the different views that were taken, the Finance Minister announced—and Government supporters crept down to chairs nearer to him with expectant ears to hear his policy :

So that the Government, while it wishes to give due weight, and no more than due weight, to any of these causes, and to any one of these complaints; while it acknowledges the varying forces, varying in proportion to their merit and their strength; although the Government does not intend to be either frightened or forced into doing something which it does not believe to be right; the Government takes this stand to-day, and is willing to have it known broadcast,—

The expectancy was great.—

--that what it proposes to do will be done after the most careful, and earnest, and due consideration, not extended beyond a reasonable period--

Movement on the part of the hon. gentleman's supporters who think, at least, they have got it.

-- they propose to do that which, as a matter of trade and tariff policy, is best for this country as a whole.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not for me to explain; it is for the Finance Minister to do that; he left them a little more in doubt. You will find hesitancy on the part of the gentlemen supporting the Government this time, I fancy, in this debate. It was plain sailing during previous sessions for fourteen years. All you had to do on the other side was to utter the words "National Policy," in order to elicit the cheers of hon. gentlemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a single cheer now, and that comes from the gentleman who tried the other day to pull out one of the bricks. It did not matter whether Sir Charles Tupper put 50 cents a ton on coal; when he did it under the name of the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

National Policy, lauding it in the same breath, cheers were heard to the echo. When Sir Charles Tupper took the duty off anthracite coal, and told them it was a great relief to the burdens of the people, using the words "National Policy" at the same time, like cheers were heard; and so with every article, whether the duty was put on or whether it was taken off. The Finance Minister put an increased duty on sugar, coupling it with the National Policy, and cheers rang through the Chamber. He took it off, and said: I have thrown off \$3,500,000 of taxation from you, and then they cheered because it was the National Policy; but where are they now? The Ministry are not only going to, after due consideration, what is best in the interests of the whole country, but the Finance Minister has given us to understand that, as a cry, the old flag and the old policy is played out, and now it is to be the old landmarks, and it will take hon. gentlemen opposite all their time, while this Budget debate lasts, to find out what these landmarks are and where they are, so that I am afraid they will not be able to give us the benefit of their views and ability on this important occasion. Well, what do you think the Minister proposes to do? He has told us that he wants time for consideration. I do not wonder at it. After declaring for fourteen years that they had a policy which was the very quintessence of all that was good in the interests of this country, after not hesitating to denounce as a traitor anybody who would question that, to be obliged now to come down, after a short interval between two sessions of Parliament, and hint that possibly the whole thing was wrong from top to bottom, is rather hard. The hon. gentleman wants time to consider. He wants time to break the news to the country. He is not prepared to admit just yet that the National Policy proved a failure. Rumours that it is a partial failure have reached his ears, but he is not in a position to know. It is generally supposed that a Ministry, especially when their members are so strong that they can divide up subjects among themselves, would be able to have some idea of the necessities and requirements of the country, and of their duty as a Government. One would naturally suppose that the 130 or 140 of their supporters, coming from the east and the west, coming from provinces large and provinces small, possessed of information as to the state of the country and its requirements in their different localities, would be consulted by the Government. One would naturally suppose that the duty of the Government would be to take their advice and learn what might be learned from those trusted representatives of the people. During the many years I have sat here, I have noticed that Government supporters have been insulted, as I thought, in many ways. I have often wondered at their lack of courage, I have often wondered at their submission to the treatment they received, and I say that, in the

proposition of the Minister of Finance, if ever there was an insult rendered to members of Parliament, it is rendered them now in the plan he has just declared he is about to pursue. Why not consult the members of this House? I speak not of members of the Opposition, but surely he might consult the 130 or 140 of his supporters, and find out the state of the country, the feeling of the country, the condition of the country, and of commerce, from them. But no, he declares, in fact, that they are not able to guide him in this matter, that he himself will associate with himself three other experts, and that, during the recess, they will ascertain the state of the country and what the duty of the Government is. These four gentlemen will do what? They will make a personal inspection of the different industries of the country. I trust they will do that in a thorough manner, if they will undertake it at all. Does the hon. gentleman know the task he is undertaking? Does he propose, when he says that, only to select two or three or a dozen manufacturers, and ask their views, and learn from them what the Government ought to do in the best interests of the whole country? Sir, if he assumes that line and is actuated by that idea, I beg to remind him that his own officials have reported to us that there are 75,768 industrial establishments in this country, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I beg to remind him that whether these establishments be small or great the proprietors of them are citizens of this country and are as much entitled to have their voices heard and to have weight given to their opinions as are the few who may have attained greater proportions so far as capital and the employment of labour are concerned. Has the hon. gentleman figured what it will take, what labour it will involve, to say nothing of the insult heaped upon his followers in this proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. It will take all summer, won't it?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The commission surely will not work on Sunday. If they do not, there are some other days they will not work, and I take it there will only be 300 days in their working year. First, you must leave out fifty-two Sundays; then, as patriotic men, the commissioners cannot work on the Queen's Birthday, and certainly not on the First of July. And it is possible that there might be another day near the middle of July on which part of the troupe would refuse to play in that comedy. So that, taking these holidays out, they have only about 300 days in which they can work. Now, he did not detail to us whether these four are to go in the one car Jamaica or whether there is to be a separate car for each, one to make for the Pacific and another down to the Atlantic, for I take it that the people of British Columbia and the people of Prince Edward Island will want

to have an opportunity of presenting their views on this as well as those of the other provinces. So, whether they will divide the party and one go one way and another another way, I do not know, but if they do it will take a long time to compare notes when they get back. If they do not divide, they will have to do 252 industries per day. But if they do divide, then each man will have to see not more than sixty-three a day and talk to the proprietor and ask him how trade is and what he thinks the duty of the Finance Minister in this matter is and whether he thinks he could do with a little reduction in the rate of protection given him. That would allow them ten minutes conversation with each man, working ten hours a day and travelling at night. When they come back they will have ascertained the views of the heads only of the different industrial establishments. But, on the basis of this ten minute interview, how about getting the views of the men, the artisans, that are working in these factories burdened under the rate of taxation that is upon them? Is no time to be taken to hear these men, whose interests are just as dear to them, whose rights are to be maintained by a righteous Government as much as those of the man who employs them? What about the great agricultural class, are they to be heard, are they to have time to present their case? I ask the Minister if he has not laid out a large task for himself and the three gentlemen he has associated with him, in order to arrive at a wise decision as to what is the best in the interests of the whole country? Sir, the Minister made a speech last year. He was not then ashamed of the old flag or the old policy. He was, like his supporters behind him, ready to stand up for both, and speaking on the question of reciprocity, he said:

If the Canadian manufacturers cannot have a fair entrance into the markets of the United States, where we would, of course, meet with strong competition from the accumulations of skill and capital that are there, he can at least under the shelter of a proper protection, supply the great and growing home market for manufactures, and with the stability insured at home, he can push his wares into those countries where they find entrance on more favourable terms.

Stability was necessary to the success of the manufacturer, according to the Finance Minister's speech last year; but what is the keynote of his speech this year? Is it stability? It is wavering; it is doubt. Business men of the country and manufacturers cannot tell what is to be the policy and what changes are to be made by the Government. I venture to say the hon. gentleman has unsettled business, and has created a feeling of disquiet and fear, if not panic, throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. Sir Leonard Tilley told us, when he was Finance Minister, and when the House was dissolved before the proper time upon one occasion, that the reason for this action was that millions of money were waiting for investment, and that it would not be invested before the election because

those who owned it did not know what policy was to prevail. If he was right then, how can the Finance Minister expect investments now that no one can tell from his speech what his course is to be? Sir, it would have been better if that portion of the hon. gentleman's speech had been omitted; it would have been better in my judgment, it would have been safer for the country, if he had met the question fairly and squarely and dealt with it. It would have been better had he recognized the necessity of change and acted upon it, or, if he believed what he had been preaching for the last fourteen years, that the Government were right, he should have had the courage and manliness to stand by it and say so, and not produce this feeling of unrest and disquiet which the announcement of his speech will make throughout the country.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am told it is not necessary to notice the interrupter. Now, without wishing to detain the House longer—for I wish to give my friend the Minister of the Interior, who is to follow me, a good portion of the evening, and not to detain him until too late in the night, and as I am getting tired of long speeches when made by other members of the House, and I suppose they are equally tired of long speeches when they are made by me—let me ask why should the confidence of the people of this country be continued in the present Government? Is it for anything in their past record that ought to commend them? Is it their present course, with their self-confessed inability to grasp the condition of the country or to tell what it is their duty to do? Sir, I allude to certain things in the history of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, not with a view to casting ridicule upon them, but with this one object in view: I hold, Sir, that in trusting the destinies of the country to any set of men, it is desirable in the interests of the country, that they should be men possessed of that breadth of mind pertaining to a statesman that can forecast, with moderate accuracy, the condition of affairs under a certain line of policy, so that the country should not be committed to a policy which must involve loss and the laying of burdens upon the people greater than they are able to bear. Sir, what is their record? I arraign the Government that sits opposite, and that has sat opposite for the last fourteen years, and charge that they have been wrong in almost every forecast they have ever made with reference to this country and what was best to be done. I say not only they have been wrong, but they have been so utterly and enormously wrong that they have brought this country to a comparative state of poverty that would not have been conceived possible in case of a country as rich as Canada and with her immense resources and possibilities. Sir, they started out on a wrong basis. I did not believe their basis; but they started out with

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

legislation upon this basis when their Finance Minister declared that the reason the country was not more prosperous was because they allowed too many foreign goods to come in this country; that the secret of the prosperity of a nation was to be found by putting on duties and shutting out imports. If you had a larger import than export, the balance of trade was against you; and that balance of trade against you, represented the measure of the loss to the country. Sir, I did not believe it; it was a fallacy, and I think the hon. gentlemen themselves are beginning to ascertain it. In one year they turned the balance of trade in our favour; and I remember the cheers that went up when they declared that now they had found the secret, now they had entered upon that course of legislation which would give prosperity to the country. Year succeeded year, and what was the result? Why, the result was, that from 1881 to 1885, a period of five years, the balance of trade against them was \$20,636,841 annually, just about as great as it was during the Mackenzie Administration, when they said it was evidence that the country was misgoverned. In the five succeeding years, down to 1892, their annual adverse balance of trade has been greater than it was during the Mackenzie Administration. If gentlemen lay down as a cardinal principle, that if you have the balance of trade against you, you are poorer by that extent, I ask them how they can deny, according to their own reasoning, that the country is poorer now than it was during the Mackenzie Administration? Sir Charles Tupper, when he imposed the iron duties in 1887, I think it was, still held to that fallacy, as I consider it; but it is a fallacy that these gentlemen hold as statesmanship. He alluded to this balance of trade that was against us and urged as one of the reasons for putting on the excessive duties on iron, that it would be produced in this country, and the vast imports of iron and the manufactures of iron, coming from other countries, would wipe out the adverse balance of trade that was against us and thus ensure stability to the country. In their forecast of what they would do in this matter, they were wrong, and I am glad they were wrong, for I do not hold that the balance of trade against a country proves by any means that the country is poorer by that amount. In reference to the theory of expenditure, what did they tell us? They denounced the Mackenzie Administration for a yearly expenditure of \$23,000,000 or \$24,000,000, and declared that \$23,000,000 was enough to run the country upon, and what has it come to now? Thirty-six million dollars where they said twenty-two millions would do. Admitting there is more population in the country, and adding the percentage, they will find that they are expending ten millions more to-day than they were under the Mackenzie Administration. If, then, there was danger to the country under the expenditure of Mr. Mackenzie of ten millions less than

their own, is there not greater danger to the country now? Where is the statesmanship of these men who said they could hold the expenditure to that amount, and have allowed it to increase until it has reached the enormous sum of \$36,000,000? Sir, in no way is their blundering, their incapacity to be seen more clearly than in Manitoba and the North-west. Sir, as a Canadian, desiring, as every one of you desire, to see my country become great and prosperous, and above all things, that the people may be happy and contented, I have desired, with strong desire, and do still desire, that the North-west and the province of Manitoba should fill up with a people that might find happy homes there, a population that would develop the resources of that country, that would give us strength in numbers, stability as a nation, and prosperity as a people. Sir, these gentlemen promised us, when they led this House into an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars, that it would not be a burden too great upon us, because we would see that under their management thousands and hundreds of thousands of people would flow into that country, settle this land, and help us to bear the burdens that we were taking upon ourselves, and reduce the rate of taxation that was upon us. What has been the result? Sir, the prediction of the then First Minister and the then Minister of Finance was that by the year 1890, at the lowest calculation, which they said was a calculation absurdly low, we should have 637,775 souls in the North-west and Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Rot.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, my friend, if it is rot, I would advise you to take less of it. There are certain courtesies, Mr. Speaker, that are due from one hon. member of this House to another. I would be the last man to resent a good-natured, pleasant interruption, but persistent interruption, rude and vulgar in its nature, you would not expect me to submit to. Well, Sir, I was telling you what the First Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, said would take place in that country, and what he said was endorsed by the votes and the cheers of the men who sat behind him; and now what is the result? Where was their wisdom, their forethought, their forecast, in that matter? The census counted the people in those countries, and found but 221,996, found only one-third of the number of people that we were assured would be living there when we were induced to make that expenditure. I remember when they asked Parliament to sanction their policy, that Sir Charles Tupper himself, who did not often hesitate at anything, hesitated in asking the House for that enormous vote, pledging the resources and the wealth of this country to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, because he said, it would be a burden greater than the people could be expected to bear if they had to bear it alone.

But he said there need be no fear on that point, and the First Minister endorsed what he said and declared that as the result of the sales of land in the North-west, we would have by 1892, two years ago, in the public treasury either cash in hand or securities as good as cash to the amount of \$69,000,000, and, therefore, the Canadian Pacific Railway would not involve this country in any burdens in the shape of increased taxation. That was the calculation. What was the result? Will the Minister of Finance tell me, taking the total sales of land in that country from that day down to 1890, taking the total receipts on the one hand and the disbursements on the other and including the charges for all surveys, whether a dollar of profit has been derived from that source. That is where we are landed. We have not the money, the debt is upon us, and the taxation has to be borne by us. That has been the course of hon. gentlemen opposite. They predicted increased wealth to the country through the National Policy. Have they increased the wealth of the country under it, as we increased the wealth of the country before it was adopted? Have they increased the value of farms in the provinces of the Dominion in this year 1892 over the value of farms in 1878? Is there any hon. gentleman who will answer that question now?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I think the hon. gentleman's answer will not receive credence on this side of the House by any one fortunate enough to own farm lands. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may know a certain tract of land, some small parcel of land which has increased in value; but I am asking if the great farm lands of this country would sell to-day at a higher price than they realized in 1878, with like buildings and in like condition? Sir, the people of this country will answer that question for themselves, each one according to his own experience, and I am quite willing, having asked the question, to leave the intelligent agriculturists of this Dominion from one end to the other to supply the answer, and if they can say that those lands have been increased in value by virtue of the National Policy, then I would say to them, support it; but if they say that those lands have not increased in value, then they are bound to acknowledge that this Government misconceived the effects that would be produced by the National Policy in the direction of conferring benefits on the agriculturists. I do not desire to continue the debate longer, but to allow the Minister of Interior, who will follow me, to speak at a comparatively early hour. In conclusion I must say that, taking the history of this country, the history of its management of its lands and its resources, the amount of taxation that has been wrung from the people by its administration in all departments, I am unable to find that which ought to commend it to the support

of the electors, and certainly if the history of their past legislation does not justify confidence being reposed in them, I ask what there is in the present position and attitude of the Government, sitting in their seats helpless to determine what they ought to do or what the country requires, to justify the maintenance in power of these men, and whether it would not be in the interests of the country to replace them by men who believe they know what ought to be done in the interests of this Dominion, and, knowing it, are prepared to do it, and do it now if the opportunity was given them.

Mr. DALY. You can naturally understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am somewhat abashed, having to reply to an hon. gentleman so old in debate, so old in experience, and so old a politician as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. And more particularly do I feel my position as I have had to sit here during two hours and a half listening to the hon. gentleman's stentorian tones, and seeing his fiery eyes, and having his manly finger pointed at me, as if his voice were not sufficiently strong, and if his manner was not sufficiently earnest, and as if he could not impress upon the House his arguments except by enforcing them by pointing his finger at me. I can only say that, listening to the hon. gentleman, I have listened to what I have listened to before; I have listened to what hon. gentlemen have listened to before, and I have listened to what numerous audiences throughout Ontario listened to during the last general elections, and during the by-elections. It is the same old story, the same old wail; and I suppose that will continue until such time as the condition of affairs unhappily shall be changed in Canada, and those hon. gentlemen occupy the seats which we occupy at this present time. The hon. gentleman has, I take it, made the best possible argument he can, and made the greatest onslaught possible on the policy of this Government. And what does it all amount to? It amounts simply to this, that we have a reiteration of the old chestnuts that have been used for years, and exception taken to the Minister of Finance's announcement of the policy of the Government. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the Minister of Finance's words meant nothing, that they could not be construed to mean anything. The reason the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is not pleased with the words of the Finance Minister in announcing the policy of the Government is, that he considered that the hon. gentleman would possibly have acted, not the manly part he did in presenting the views of the Government and supporting them as Finance Minister, but that he would have taken the cowardly part adopted by politicians in years past. The Finance Minister, in making his announcement to the House the other day, told hon. members that he was telling the truth, that he had no reason to disregard the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

truth, and he desired to make a manly, straightforward and open explanation of the policy of the Government. And what is that policy? That policy is that we will remain with the old landmarks—those were the words which the hon. gentleman used—with the old flag, and with the old policy. And more than that, he said there was a feeling of unrest throughout the country and the Government were prepared to meet the condition of affairs in Canada to-day by making such changes in the tariff as would meet present circumstances. But the Minister of Finance had the manliness and courage to say, and the Government have the manliness and courage to say that they do not believe they, with one fell swoop, within the very short time they have occupied the Treasury benches, can go to work and undo a tariff framed some fourteen years ago. The hon. gentleman ridiculed the statement of the Finance Minister that he intended, in company with his colleagues, to visit different parts of the Dominion during the recess, in order to ascertain the condition of affairs. The hon. gentleman said that the Finance Minister would have to visit some 700,000 factories, that he would have to interview so many hundreds of thousands of mechanics, that he would have to work night and day and even on Sundays and holidays in order to fulfil his mission, and that even then he could not accomplish it. While my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) was banteringly alluding to this, it occurred to me that, if the Minister wished his views to reach all the manufacturers and the supposed distressed agriculturists of Canada, he should hire a hall and get the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Paterson) to proclaim upon the roof tops the position of affairs, for I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman's voice would reach through many constituencies, and would make the announcement far and wide. My hon. friend who has just spoken takes exception to the initiation of the National Policy. He said that there was no occasion for this policy, but he forgets that when the National Policy was announced by the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, who then led the Opposition in this House, there was a feeling of unrest throughout the length and breadth of Canada such as does not exist to-day. He remembers, no doubt, however, that he was a supporter of the Mackenzie Government which had been in power for about four years, and which had as Finance Minister, the present member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member has forgotten that the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Administration was not prepared, as the present Finance Minister is, to listen to the voice of the people with reference to trade matters and the condition of affairs, but that on the contrary, he turned a deaf ear to them. They asked for bread and he gave them a stone, and, Sir, so intense was the feeling of the country at that time, that when the Mackenzie Administration appealed to the people,

the electorate of Canada hurled them from power. When Sir John Macdonald came into office, he carried out the promises he had made to the people when he was in opposition, and he brought forward in due course the resolution upon which was based the National Policy. If I mistake not—"Hansard" may not record it, although history does—the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) had some ideas in favour of a policy, which if not the National Policy, was at all events akin to it. I do not think that the hon. gentleman himself was in accord with the policy of Sir Richard Cartwright at that time. It would occupy too much of the time of the House if I were to follow the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) through all his peregrinations, and I shall but briefly allude to some of his arguments. He quoted figures to try to show that the exports of Canada were as great during the time of the Mackenzie Administration as they have been since, and that we exported to as many countries then as we do now. I do not gainsay the hon. gentleman's figures. No doubt we did export largely then; but the reason was that we had to export our manufactures, because at that time we had no market for them in our own country. The cry of the people against the Government of that day was: that the Americans were making a slaughter market of Canada; that they were running our home products out of our home market, and I do not suppose that any class of the people felt this more than did the fellow-citizens of my hon. friend who lives in Brantford. I am glad to be able to say that we are exporting in a greater ratio to-day than we did then; that we are exporting to the same and to other foreign countries, and that we are exporting to a great market which we had not at that time, namely, the market of Manitoba, Northwest, and British Columbia. We have got our home market to-day, and we have got as well other foreign markets, which we had not in 1878. The hon. gentleman would lead us to believe in his statement that the National Policy has done nothing for this country, and that Canadians are not to-day in a prosperous condition. It seems to me almost a waste of time for the Finance Minister and other speakers on this side of the House to give figures here day after day; to show that this country is in a most prosperous condition, when hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to believe it. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave figures the other night in reference to our aggregate trade, and he endeavoured to make the House believe that under his Administration this country had enjoyed as large a volume of trade as it does now. We have only to look at the Trade and Navigation Returns to show the incorrectness of this statement. The total exports of Canada in 1868 were of the value of \$131,027,532. In 1874, under the wise Administration of Sir John Macdonald they rose to \$217,565,510, an

increase of \$86,537,978, but in 1874, when the Liberal Government came into power, although our aggregate trade amounted to 217,000,000 odd dollars, I regret to say, and the shame is upon gentlemen on the other side of the House, that our trade decreased to \$153,445,682 in 1878, or a loss in a few years of \$64,119,828; but, Sir, a new era had dawned upon our country, and the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald assumed power, and announced his National Policy, and the trade which in 1879 dwindled down to \$153,445,682 has risen in the year 1892 to over \$241,369,443, an increase in the thirteen years between 1879 and 1892, of \$87,923,761. That should indicate to any fair-minded man, that Canada is, in an immense degree, more prosperous to-day than she was under the Liberal regime. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) lives in the manufacturing city of Brantford, a city which is shown, by the census returns, to have gained in population and wealth in a greater ratio than almost any other town in Ontario, and it is extraordinary to me that he should have the hardihood to stand here to-night and say that this country is not prosperous. I find, by the census returns, that the city of Brantford had, in 1881, a population of 9,616 and in 1891 a population of 12,753, an increase, in ten years, of 3,137 or 32.6 per cent. So far as trade is concerned, in the city of Brantford, I find by "Bulletin No. 12," that in 1881 there were 140 manufacturing establishments, and in 1891, 250. The capital invested in that city in 1881 was \$1,028,983, which, in 1891, amounted to \$3,231,879. In 1881 the number of hands employed in Brantford was 1,306, but in 1891 it amounted to 2,185. The wages paid in Brantford in 1881 were \$433,828, while in 1891, that sum increased to \$1,031,675. The cost of material in 1881 was \$1,122,747, and in 1891, \$1,894,926, while the value of the products of the factory in 1881 was \$1,931,097, which rose, in 1891, to \$4,280,009. These are the figures pertaining to the condition of affairs in the town in which the hon. gentleman lives, but, forsooth, he would lead this House, and the people of the country to believe that the province of Ontario—the banner province, we may say, of the Confederation—is not in as prosperous condition as it was in 1878. He would lead us to believe that the farmers and manufacturers are poverty-stricken, that the people are unduly weighted by taxation, on account of the National Policy, that they cannot earn a livelihood here, and that the farmer cannot get fair prices for his produce. One would think, to hear his lamentable tale, told in stentorian tones, that the people residing in the province of Ontario, were in a worse condition than those of the southern states of America. But when I quote to you the statistics furnished by the Ontario Government, not by this Government, I think you will come to the conclusion that, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, she is in a pretty prosperous condition, and that—

I say it without fear of contradiction—there is no state in the Union to-day, having a population and soil similar to those of Ontario, in one-half or one-quarter as prosperous a condition as that province. I find that the value of farm property in Ontario in 1891 was placed at \$971,886,063, made up as follows:—\$621,245,223 of farm land, \$191,268,327 of buildings, \$50,651,442 of implements, and \$108,721,076 of live stock; and the total value of field crops of the province was placed at \$129,923,667; and the report says:

The growth of the farming industry is seen in the fact that during ten years the value of farm buildings has increased by 44 per cent, of farm implements by 36 per cent, and live stock by 35 per cent.

Now, the hon. gentleman said that he would ask any member of this House to say whether the value of farm lands had not decreased throughout the length and breadth of Canada, compared with ten years ago. I will admit that in the province of Ontario farm lands have decreased in value during the last ten years; but they have not decreased below their proper value. I say that the farm lands of Ontario to-day are at their proper value. The value placed upon them ten years ago was a fictitious value, fixed by the fact that there was not sufficient uncleared land ready for cultivation, and that consequently land was greatly in demand by immigrants coming here from other lands and by men who desired to increase their holdings or who had sons they desired to place upon farms. For these reasons farm lands went up to \$75 of \$100 an acre. But if the value of farm lands is lower to-day than it was ten years ago, is it right to charge this Government or their policy with that depreciation? I say that an argument of that kind is the height of absurdity. The value of lands in Ontario and in the other older provinces in Canada has been affected by the same cause as the value of farm lands on the other side of the line, namely, by the fact of farmers moving away from the older sections of the country and going to the western portions of Canada and the United States where farming land is very much cheaper. That is the chief reason for the depreciation; and if farm lands have decreased in value in the province of Ontario, they have also decreased in value in New England and other states of the Union. When the Toronto "Globe" was engaged, as I think in a very unpatriotic work in sending correspondents throughout the province of Ontario to ascertain the feelings of the people on different subjects, it sent them to visit the state of New York. It published one letter from that state, and then stopped. Was it because it found that the farmers there were in a worse condition than ours? I think it was, because I think the quotations that I will read will show that the farmers there, if not in as bad a condition as hon. gentlemen allege our farmers are, they are at least in an equally poor condition, and their farms have decreased quite as much in value.

Mr. English, the president of the village of Albion, said: Some of our farmers are well off but the majority are not. Fruit, beans, barley and wheat are our staple crops, but there is no money in the latter article at its present price, which is 72 cents a bushel. A good many farmers are heavily mortgaged, although the excellent crop last year helped to raise them somewhat.

Mr. Fitch, a lawyer, acquainted with the farming district said: It is the exception where the farmer owns an unencumbered farm in Orleans county, although as a rule they do not live extravagantly.

Mr. Marvin Warner, a farmer, gave some startling figures regarding the depreciation of property in his county. He said the depreciation in farm lands during the last decade has been, at the least, 30 per cent. Land that I refused \$150 an acre for ten years ago I could not get \$100 for now. Lands assessed ten years ago at \$100 are now assessed at \$70 and \$75.

Mr. Oscar Foster, a farmer of Barrie Centre, said: The greater half of our farms are encumbered. Land is lower in value than it was owing to the development of the grain raising country out west.

Mr. Marvin J. Grinnell, a member of the Local Farmers Institute, said: The depression under which our farmers have been labouring is due partially to mismanagement, partially to unavoidable causes. The rapid progress we have made in wiping out our national debt is offset by the constantly increasing pension debt.

Mr. Stephen Hallock, a wealthy farmer said: The condition of the farmer is generally poor.

Now, I am not going to weary the House with any more quotations, but I think I have shown conclusively, from the statements of farmers in western New York, that those people are in a worse condition than our farmers. Now, Sir, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Paterson, Brant), with the view, I suppose, of showing the country, or those who may read his speech, that we have not prospered under the National Policy, made a quotation from a speech delivered in this House in 1835 by the late Mr. McLelan, the then Finance Minister; and the words are so apt and suit the present condition of affairs so well that I will quote them again; but I will endeavour not to do so in that mournful, dolorous tone assumed by the hon. gentleman. What Mr. McLelan said, and what the hon. gentleman tried to ridicule and make so much fun of, was as follows:—

The same old story is being re-enacted all over the Dominion; love is being made in the frosts of winter and in the sunlight of summer; the orange blossoms are being worn and the marriage bells sounded and new homes are being formed from one end of this land to the other; and bye and bye there will be a new cradle put in the new home to be added to the 200,000 cradles in this Dominion, which are now rocking young Canadians, who will grow to Canadian men and women, and give their strength and their energies to the development of this country.

Now, Sir, although that is poetical language—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Now, honestly, didn't I read it better than you do?

Mr. DALY. I do not think so. The hon. gentleman read it with the idea of ridiculing it and in a tone to indicate to any one listen-

Mr. DALY.

ing to him that the statements contained in it were not true. As I was going to say, it is in flowery language, and the hon. gentleman, in attempting to ridicule it, said that the cradles were not here. He quoted from the Trade and Navigation Returns to show that so many million dollars worth of household effects had been exported from this country, and he said that among them the cradles must have gone. It may be true that the Trade and Navigation Returns show that we have exported household effects, and amongst these there may have been cradles; but I am glad to say, as a Canadian, that if those goods are going out of Ontario or Quebec into the United States, we have the happy spectacle in Manitoba and the North-west Territories of seeing these misguided people, who left this country for Dakota, returning with their cattle and horses and their cradles and their babies. And the mother, with the British heart in her, who has been living under the Yankee flag for four or five years in misery and destitution, hugs that dear little baby to her breast and thanks God she is back under the British flag again. I am not overdrawing the picture. I have seen myself on the prairies of Manitoba, in the summer of last year and the year before, men who had left this country nine or ten years ago for Dakota, who told me they went there because they read in certain Canadian newspapers that Dakota was a good place to go to, and because they were influenced by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were Grits when they left, but they said they had come back as good Tories as there were in the land. They had been misled into going to a country, pictured to them as flowing with milk and honey, but where they found nothing but desolation and blizzards and no fuel. They got together what little they had left, their oxen, with the big covered wagon, and their children, and they brought along their cows and their horses, or whatever they had, and they brought their babies, too. And mark my words, if those mothers are what I know other Canadian mothers to be, they will ever instil into the minds of their young ones such sentiments of loyalty that you will never hear them calling out for unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union or any other anti-Canadian policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are continually referring to the exodus. I do not think that, either sleeping or waking, the hon. member for South Oxford is ever so happy as when he is rolling his tongue around the word "exodus." My only regret on his account is, that there is not an "r" in it, that he cannot pronounce it, for instance, "exordus," so that he might roll the "r," which, no doubt, would give him great satisfaction, because when speaking of the National Policy, he is ever fond of denouncing its "wringing" thousands of dollars from the pockets of the people. We only get the oyster in the months in which there is an "r," and we only hear these adjectives with

the long burr when we hear the hon. gentleman speaking of the National Policy. I hardly believe that the hon. gentleman would endeavour to mislead this House by making a statement he did not believe to be true, and I will be charitable enough to say that when he made the statement which I will quote from his speech of last year, he was carried away by that feeling which seems to permeate the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is their desire to do everything or anything to get into office—anything that will crush "the villainous" National policy. In connection with the exodus, I find in his speech, page 207 of last year's "Hansard," that in order to make a point which might be quoted in the Toronto "Globe," and other Reform papers, and reach the electors of Canada, he said:—

We have lost, at least, an average of 100,000 of population per annum for the last ten years, and they actually ask us to be content with things as they are.

I do not believe that the hon. gentleman willfully made that statement; but it is in black and white. There it is in cold type upon the "Hansard," that we lost in the last ten years from Canada, by people leaving it, 100,000 per year, or a million in all; but according to the figures quoted by the Minister of Railways to-day, taken from the American census, there are exactly 980,000 Canadians all told in the United States to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Native-born.

Mr. DALY. Take it native-born; he has the hardihood to say that there had gone into the United States this last ten years 1,000,000 Canadians. If other statements made by himself and other members on that side are on a par with that statement, what are the people to believe? Why is there an unrest in the country? Is not such a statement as that sufficient to create unrest—a statement in which there is not a word of truth. Worse than that. The hon. gentleman is very fond of saying that we are losing our choicest young men—the cream of our population. I am not so foolish for one moment as to gainsay that we are losing young men from Canada. But what is the reason? In Toronto and Montreal, and in every city in Canada, where there are medical schools, they are grinding out doctors every year. Osgoode Hall, in Toronto, is grinding out lawyers four terms in every year; veterinary schools are turning out veterinary surgeons; and dentists and chemists and other professional men are being turned out rapidly. Is there room in our population for all the doctors and lawyers and dentists and veterinary surgeons and chemists that are being turned out from year to year? No; there is not, and naturally those men have to go to a people numbering 60,000,000 in order to practice their professions. More than that, those young men have been going there in a greater ratio during these past ten years, because these lawyers,

doctors, and other professional men have been graduating more rapidly during that period. And who are they? Mostly the sons of farmers, sons of men who have made their money on farms, and have been able to give their children a superior education. If we examine the census, will we find the same number of professional men went from Canada to the other side of the line from 1871 to 1881, as from 1881 to 1891? They will not, and that emphasizes this fact, that the farmer of Canada, although he imagines he is not so prosperous to-day, instead of sending his boys to a log school-house, as he did twenty years ago, sends them to college at Toronto or Montreal, and his daughters take music lessons, and where there used to be nothing but the scrubbing-board in the house, in days gone by, they have now a piano and an organ. As one born in the province of Ontario, and who left it not more than twelve years ago, I remember seeing the farmer and his wife, instead of coming in in their dog-cart and buggy, with silver-mounted harness and beautiful horses, coming in on their ox-sled; and instead of the young ladies being decked with bonnets and hats, and feathers and flowers, they were content with shawls over their heads and very little on their feet. But the condition of affairs, as I find it in Ontario, on my return, after twelve years absence, so far as the farming community of Ontario is concerned, marks a progress that has not been reached in any state of the Union. And you, gentlemen, know it, and if you do not, you wilfully shut your eyes to the progress of events about you. Take the western counties, take the Huron tract; go there and ask the farmers as to their condition to-day as compared with that of fifteen years ago. You find the bank barn where there was a log barn, the comfortable brick house instead of the log house, and improvement after improvement on all hands, marking great progress. Going back to where I left off, I say the census does not show that we have lost a million young men in the last ten years, as the hon. gentleman contends. I have the figures, authentic figures, taken from the United States census of 1870, 1880 and 1890. The total increase in the number of people that left Canada for the United States from 1880 to 1890 was 263,938. The hon. gentleman said a million. That is not much of an error, I suppose, for a Grit politician. Where are these young men gone to? Have they gone to the western states, to New York or the middle states? No; out of the total of 263,938 Canadians that left Canada within that decade, we find that 147,207 went to the North Atlantic division. Now, the North Atlantic division is composed of the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and of the grand total of 980,938 that left Canada from the beginning of time up to 1890, 490,229 of them

Mr. DALY.

went to these states. Now, the increase in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island was 132,068, and in Massachusetts alone the increase was 88,299. Of the total of 980,938 Canadians that went to the other side up to 1890, 490,229 were in the states that I have named, showing very conclusively, to my mind, that if there was an exodus from Canada it was from the province of Quebec and the Maritime provinces to these states. What does that mean? Does that show that there is unrest among our farmers, that these Canadians who move to the other side are of the agricultural class? Does anybody believe, who knows anything about these states, that they hold out any inducement to a Canadian farmer to give up his farm in Quebec or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia or Ontario, and go over there? I was there last year, and I never saw a field of wheat throughout the length and breadth of these states. You will find only occasionally a field of oats and a few patches of corn and hay and potatoes, and does that condition of affairs hold out any inducement to farmers accustomed to life in this country? These figures indicate to me that the Canadian population in the United States are largely artisans or operatives. I will say further that, in addition to these and the professional men, the Canadians in the United States are in a large measure made up of men connected with the railways. I remember myself, some years ago, in the town I came from in Ontario, a railway centre, we were turning out firemen and engine-drivers and fitters and other machinists in the shops. We had only the Grand Trunk, the Great Western and the Northern railways at that time. When these young men learned their business there was nothing for them to do but to go to the other side and get work, but many of them have got back again, and, as you travel from Port Arthur to the Pacific on the Canadian Pacific Railway, you will find many of these men employed there. At every point where there is a machine shop you will find that the foreman is a Canadian, who got his trade at the old Grand Trunk Railway shops in Montreal or London or Stratford, and were compelled to go to the other side to find work. The conductors and station agents are the same. All these men, previous to the building of this great road, were compelled to go to the other side. What did gentlemen opposite do to remedy that? Did they make an effort to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway, to make this great railway, which has brought back these young men to Canada? No, they did not. So far as this question of exodus is concerned, when we realize the fact that we are only a population of 5,000,000 and the United States have 60,000,000, it is a mere bagatelle. We, hardy northern people, with sound brains, strong muscles and good morals are able to send over our young men to take the highest positions in the land. If it is an argument proving that

Canada is not in a prosperous condition to show that there are many Canadians there, the principle ought to hold good throughout. We find that in London there are more Scotchmen than in Edinburgh, more Irishmen than in Dublin and more Jews than in all Palestine. Does that mean necessarily that Scotland is not prosperous, that Ireland is not prosperous? It simply means that they have a hardy race in Scotland and a clever race in Ireland, and that their young men go abroad as our young Canadians go abroad. I have my own flesh and blood on the other side, and not only they but every person I know of, my native-born Canadian friends is doing well and rising to the top of the tree. I am particularly interested in this question of exodus, because I am one of those who—I do not know exactly how to put it—but let us say I am part of that exodus. When I found my profession overcrowded in my native town twelve years or so ago, I had my opportunity to go to any state of the Union. The province of Manitoba was then in its infancy, with only 130 miles of railway within its boundary, but I chose to go there, even though I had to go through the United States to get there, and forego all the advantages held out to me in Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and other cities. I went there, just as hundreds and thousands of other young Canadians did. If I have not convinced the hon. gentleman by the figures I have given as to the exodus, I have convinced the friends behind me and every reasonable, reading person that this matter of the exodus is entirely exploded. Particularly so, when we find a gentleman occupying the position the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has occupied in this House, deliberately getting up, as he did last session, and stating that there was an exodus of a million people to the United States in ten years, when, as a matter of fact, the statistics of the United States show that there was an exodus of only 260,000. That hon. gentleman is not alone in these statements. We find leading him the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who seems to make this his pet hobby. Notwithstanding the months, and we might say years, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) used his opportunities to go up and down the province of Ontario and parade his fad of commercial union, afterwards unrestricted reciprocity and so on, the people did not agree with him. He and his friends met with defeat in the general elections and with even worse disaster in the by-elections, and so chagrined, so soured, so incensed, was the hon. gentleman, because his arguments and statements had not met with the encouragement that he thought they deserved because the people had rejected him and because this Conservative Administration was again returned to power, we find that, without regard to his native land, without regard to the prosperity of his native country he was bound to wreak his revenge.

He could not have his way at the polls, but, in revenge, he wrote that celebrated letter to the "Economist." He wrote to the "Economist," but he did not economize the truth when he wrote, because we find that in connection with this question of the exodus the hon. gentleman stated:

That even in a comparatively short space of time this ill-advised policy had resulted in a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada.

Now, that is very complimentary to the 490,000 that went to the Eastern States. Does the hon. gentleman say they are the very choicest people of Canada? Worse than that, he says:

That two or three cities, and perhaps a score of towns have increased considerably later on, but the great mass of the population, and particularly the agricultural class, are distinctly poorer and less prosperous than they were twelve years ago.

He concludes by saying:

One thing, I think, ought to be clear to all intelligent Englishmen, and that is, that it is utterly impossible that Canada can prosper under her present conditions,—isolated, and in danger of being still more completely isolated, from trade and commerce with the entire continent to which she belongs geographically, losing her population at the rate of one million and a half in ten years.

Now, I have shown, out of the mouths of those two gentlemen, that either they were not sincere, or they were making statements they knew to be wrong. I have shown conclusively by the figures of the Census Bureau of the United States that, instead of the exodus having been one million, as one gentleman said, or a million and a half as another one said, from 1880 to 1890, our total exodus was 260,000. Now, the hon. gentleman said that he would like any person to show that farm values had not improved. I admit that farm values in Ontario are not what they were; but I am glad to say that farm lands in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories have increased in value; that where you could buy a farm for \$2.50 or \$4 an acre ten years ago, you have to pay \$15 or \$20 now. What has been your loss in Ontario has been our gain in the province of Manitoba. Now, hon. gentlemen have dealt considerably with the exodus both in the House and outside, but I never yet heard the figures given in connection with the census of Manitoba. We have heard from those hon. gentlemen that the increase of population in that province has not been so great as it should be, commensurate with the amount of money expended upon immigration, has not been commensurate with the amount of money spent upon Dominion lands, has not been commensurate with the amount of money spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I have here a table of statistics, extracted from the census returns, showing the progress of that province in population, agriculture and manufactures, in the decade between 1881 and 1891:

	1881.	1891.	Increase.
Population.....	62,260	152,506	90,246
Dwelling houses.....	12,400	29,176	16,776
Total acres occupied.....	1,511,437	4,416,592	2,905,155
do improved.....	208,147	1,043,434	835,287
do under crop.....	188,282	1,038,398	850,116
do in pasture.....	17,185	3,161,192	3,144,007
do woodland.....		211,964	
do gardens and orchards.....	2,680	5,034	2,354
*Number of occupiers.....	5,263	22,574	17,311
Acres in wheat.....	45,750	896,471	850,721
Bushels of wheat raised.....	929,095	16,092,130	15,163,035
Acres in barley.....		56,505	
Bushels of barley raised.....	232,784	1,452,433	1,219,649
Acres in oats.....		256,211	
Bushels of oats raised.....	1,118,807	8,470,212	7,351,405
Acres in rye.....		951	
Bushels of rye raised.....	1,203	12,952	11,749
Acres in peas and beans.....			
Bushels of peas and beans raised.....	8,991	11,308	2,317
Acres in hay.....	100,561		
Tons of hay raised.....	185,279	485,230	299,951
Acres in potatoes.....	3,330	9,791	6,461
Bushels of potatoes raised.....	413,726	1,757,231	1,343,505
Acres in turnips and other roots.....		2,102	
Bushels of turnips and other roots raised.....	161,031	547,559	386,528
Other products—hops, tobacco, grass, seeds, &c..... Lbs.	24,066	83,751	59,685
Stock—			
Horses, number of.....	11,800	86,753	74,953
Working oxen.....	8,872	19,288	10,416
Milch cows.....	17,624	82,614	64,990
Other horned cattle.....	24,580	127,805	103,225
Sheep, number of.....	5,908	35,816	29,908
Swine do.....	15,405	53,019	37,614
Turkeys, geese, ducks, hens and other fowl, number of.....		535,015	
Cattle killed or sold for export in year.....	4,562	38,124	33,562
Sheep do do.....	1,363	12,748	11,385
Swine do do.....	17,896	37,916	20,020
Home-made butter..... Lbs.	857,868	4,857,132	3,999,264
do cheese.....	19,589	116,177	96,588
Honey.....	880	4,411	3,531
Wool.....	16,376	Fine... 39,814 Coarse... 78,830	
		118,644	102,268
Orchard products..... Bush.	1,646	3,637	1,991
Industrial Establishments—			
Number of manufacturing establishments.....	344	1,029	685
do employees.....	1,921	4,375	2,454
Capital invested per head of population..... \$	20 00	36 60	16 60
Output per head of population..... \$	51 70	66 40	14 70
Wages paid per employee..... \$	393 80	433 00	39 20
Cheese Factories—			
Number of.....		23	
Capital invested..... \$		27,980 00	
Hands employed.....		45	
Wages paid..... \$		10,514 00	
Value of raw material..... \$		35,188 00	
do finished products.....		56,497 00	
Butter Factories—			
Number of.....		8	
Capital invested..... \$		60,000 00	
Hands employed.....		30	
Wages paid..... \$		11,694 00	
Value of raw material..... \$		24,702 00	
do finished products.....		47,390 00	

*Occupiers of land 10 acres and upwards.

Mr. DALY.

INCREASE IN PERCENTAGE.

Population	144 per cent.
Acres in wheat	1,859 do
Bushels of wheat raised	1,632 do
Number of horses	635 do
Milch cows	368 do
Other horned cattle	419 do
Sheep—Number of	506 do

Sir, I venture to say that with the same population and under the same circumstances, there is not a state in the Union that can compare with Manitoba in the figures I have given, showing the same ratio of increase in the number and value of the articles of agriculture that I have named. Now, having given these figures showing the prosperity of that country, and knowing the facts from my own residence there during all these years, all I can say to my hon. friends opposite is that if they are dissatisfied with their lot in Ontario, or in the other eastern provinces, get up and migrate to that western country, and they will find by hard work and industry that they will get a good livelihood, and remain under the old flag. The hon. gentleman tried to make out that we in Canada are suffering in the same ratio as they are on the other side of the line. I read in a paper to-night a despatch from Chicago which I will read to the House :

A despatch from Chicago of Monday says that 3,500 families—equal to nearly half the population of Ottawa—are receiving aid from the Cook county charitable agent, to keep them from starvation. These are merely a few of the people in want in that great city. The Chicago papers, however, devote considerable attention to the business dullness in Toronto.

Now, Sir, we have not any soup kitchens in Canada to-day ; we are not feeding 3,500 people in Toronto, in Montreal or in Ottawa, as they are in Chicago ; but there was a day, long to be remembered in the history of Canada, when we had soup kitchens right in the city of Ottawa. That condition of things has changed, and I want to say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are dissatisfied with the policy that has been announced by the Minister of Finance, they must remember—and I think that our farmers and our people will remember—that this Government has not yet been formed three months. Rome was not built in a day. You do not expect a Government composed of young men, some of them who have never been in office before, to take hold of a matter like the National Policy, and to reform our tariff in that short time. But I can say to hon. gentlemen and to the country that this Government is composed of Canadians, every one of whom is animated by one desire, irrespective of our political leanings, and that is, to do the best, according to our light and according to our conscience, in the interests of Canada. We can be actuated by no other motive ; we can have no other desire. The prosperity of Canada is our prosperity ; the prosperity of this Government is the prosperity of the Empire. I desire as a Canadian-born,

and as a member of this Canadian Government, to uphold any policy framed in the best interests of this country, and representing as I do those great prairies of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and British Columbia with its untold millions of undeveloped wealth, so long as I have breath I wish hon. gentlemen behind me and all hon. members to believe that I, equally with the hon. Premier and all the members of this Government, am actuated by one desire, and that is to promote the best interests of Canada as a whole

Mr. EDGAR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company. — (Mr. LaRiviere.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation and Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Roome.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Corporation.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Atlantic and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fauvel.)

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved :

That the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Friday next, the 24th instant, in accord-

ance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Calgary Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

PRIVILEGE—THE NOVA SCOTIA COAL FIELDS—DEPUTATION TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are called—and, in order to put myself in order before the House, I shall move the adjournment of the House—I desire to bring to the attention of the House, for its consideration, a matter which seems to me of very considerable importance. I suppose that we all recognize here that we have, or are supposed to have, well-established parliamentary institutions. We have not only our various departments of legislation under our federal system, but we have a responsible Executive Council which advises His Excellency on all those matters which pertain to the Crown. Now, Sir, there has grown up within the last two or three years a practice which seems to me wholly at variance with the principles of parliamentary government. A few years ago there was carried through the Legislature of Quebec a measure which was claimed to be within its jurisdiction. This measure the Government here, the advisers of His Excellency the Governor-General, were asked to disallow. A motion was made in the House calling upon the House to urge upon the Government and upon His Excellency the propriety of that disallowance. That motion was lost. Subsequently, a self-constituted committee waited upon His Excellency the Governor-General in Quebec and advised him as to the course which he ought to take in reference to that measure and censured him for, as it was said, giving a reply which was dictated to him by the Minister of Justice for the time being. Now, Sir, if I rightly understand our parliamentary system it is this, that, while His Excellency, or the Sovereign, may call to her councils the leaders of the party enjoying the confidence of Parliament, the persons thus called are solely responsible for the acts of Her Majesty in the United Kingdom and for the acts of His Excellency the Governor-General as representative of Her Majesty in this country. There are no back-stairs advisers, there are no voluntary organizations of councils of the Crown

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

recognized under the constitutional system. It is true, Sir, that frequently the House of Commons, in its collective capacity is regarded as the paramount authority for the guidance of the Crown with regard to matters of public authority. Then Senate, too, may tender its advice. I understand Sir, that a measure within the jurisdiction of the Government and Legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, as that jurisdiction is defined by the British North America Act, and about this there can be no differences of opinion, has been passed by that Legislature, and that His Excellency has been asked to interfere and to disallow that Act. Now, that advice was not tendered, as I understand, by the responsible advisers of the Crown, and it is important that this House should know how far members of the House or persons who are not members may, with propriety, organize themselves into committees of council, wait upon His Excellency and tender him advice with regard to matters of very great public importance, matters that might result, if their advice were recognized or acted upon, in producing a political crisis in the province, might overturn the Local Administration within that province and frustrate the policy upon which it had entered with the sanction and approval of a majority of the people's representatives in that province. I do not recognize as having any place in our constitutional system, the private and individual opinions of parties who have no representative character. They have, no doubt, a right to speak, Sir, but they have a right to speak through the constitutional organ, the organ which, under our system, is provided for the reception of any opinions which they have to express or any grievances of which they believe they have a right to complain. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, that others than these I have mentioned; the two Houses of Parliament and the official and recognized advisers of the Crown, have any authority to approach His Excellency any more than they would have to approach Her Majesty. I do not think, Sir, that an instance can be found during the whole reign of the present Sovereign where parties having any ground of complaint, or having any grievances for which redress is sought, have approached Her Majesty personally. In every instance they have gone to some Minister of the Crown, usually the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who is the organ between the Crown and the public with regard to all matters that concern the people of the United Kingdom. We have not, perhaps, differentiated our departmental duties with the same particularity that they have in the United Kingdom; but we have here, as organs for the expression of the opinions of the Crown, and for the receipt of advice, persons designated by statute, whose duties are well defined under some Act of Parliament, or under the constitution itself. I dare say that many will remember that in the case of the impeachment

of Lord Danby, who was recognized at that time as the leading Minister, or the Prime Minister, so far as there was a Prime Minister in England at that time, among the charges brought against him was this, that although he held this position of First Minister, so far as that position was recognized, he was impeached because he undertook to act as the organ of the Crown with regard to foreign matters when there was another party, a colleague of his, who was possessed of those functions and those duties. But later, when the Reform Bill was under discussion, it will be remembered that the Duke of Wellington, acting in his capacity as a Privy Councillor, wrote a letter to the King advising him with regard to the then state of public affairs, and the King answered this communication before he had communicated its contents to his colleagues. Well, it is well recognized as within the technical rights of a Privy Councillor that, although holding no other official position, he may, in an emergency, tender to the Crown his advice. But Lord Grey, at that time Prime Minister, expressed the opinion that that duty could not be discharged consistently with the duties that devolved upon Ministers who were responsible to the Crown for the advice which was tendered, and for the acts of the Crown in connection with public matters. After that discussion the King informed his Prime Minister that he would not in future undertake to hold any communication, or to give any answer to any party upon any public matter without having submitted it to his advisers for consideration. Every one will understand how thoroughly incompatible it may be to give advice even for one who, under the old doctrines of the constitution, was competent to give that advice—how incompatible that is with the theory and practice of ministerial responsibility as they are recognized in our day. Now, it is said that this is an Imperial question, that this was a question affecting Imperial interests, and that it was a matter about which any party was at liberty to give advice. I do not admit any such doctrine at all. I do not know His Excellency, in any other capacity than that of Governor-General, has any power to act in the way in which it was suggested he should act. How could His Excellency disallow a measure, how could he interfere with regard to a measure, falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of a Local Legislature, whether it was a wise or unwise measure to adopt on their part, except in his capacity as Governor-General? It is in that capacity that he is supposed to take action; it is in that capacity that advice is to be given to him, and I think that no system could well be more incompatible with the proper responsibility of Minister, more incompatible with our notions of parliamentary government, than for persons, either inside of Parliament or outside, constituting themselves into a committee of council, and as such, undertaking to advise the Crown.

Now, Sir, I would like to know how far Ministers have given their sanction to this course, I would like to know how far they have advised His Excellency that it is proper to receive parties who were not Ministers of the Crown in order to receive from them advice with regard to great public matters. I think that the acts of His Excellency, in his public capacity, are acts for which his advisers are responsible; and it does seem to me that it would be introducing a system wholly at variance with English parliamentary government, wholly incompatible with the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown, if this practice should obtain any foothold in this country. I think, Sir, that for members of this House, or even Ministers of the Crown, to undertake to interfere with acts of the Local Legislature of any province that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of that Legislature, or acts within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Administration, is a very serious matter indeed, and is one which ought not to receive countenance and support, even when undertaken by Ministers of the Crown, much less ought to receive any countenance when undertaken by those who have no ministerial responsibility to this House and over whose actions, in this respect, the House can exercise no other than judicial control.

Mr. WELDON. I ask the liberty to address myself for a moment to the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Inasmuch as I, in company with three gentlemen—Mr. Wood, an influential resident of Sackville, in the province of New Brunswick, and Mr. John McDougald, of Westville, in the county of Pictou, in the province of Nova Scotia, and Mr. Alex. McNeill, who resides in the town of Warton, in the north riding of Bruce, in the province of Ontario, holding ourselves to be loyal subjects of our Queen, had our attention called to a danger which, as we believed, threatened the interests of the Empire, and having, as we thought, some facts that were of value and that we thought ought to be laid before our Queen, we took occasion, not to go in person to the foot of the Throne across the seas, but to go to the representative of the Queen in this country. Our apprehension was that as four humble—I speak, I think, without offending my three associates—subjects of Her Majesty, we had a right to approach our Sovereign by petition. That, we understood to be the undoubted right of every subject of the Queen, a right which, if the petition were couched in courteous language, would not be denied. If the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will draw any distinction between the right of written representation and the right of verbal representation, I would like to hear it made and sustained. The point was taken that we four gentlemen had no representative capacity. There is no doubt about that; we did not pretend that we had

any representative capacity ; but, being children of British parents, under the common law we were subjects of the British Queen, and had, therefore, the common law right of approaching the foot of the Throne. It had come to my knowledge before I left the city of Halifax, through a conversation with a naval officer of very great experience and influential citizens, that under the terms of an arrangement recently made and a charter recently enacted and signed, there was given over to a syndicate of capitalists, with power to assign their rights to foreign corporations, coal lands, including two-thirds of the coal deposits of Eastern Canada. It appeared that in the future, within the term of 99 years, with which those gentlemen would exercise control over more than two-thirds of the coal areas of Nova Scotia, these areas might under the lease fall absolutely into the hands of a foreign corporation. It further appeared that, under a Nova Scotia Act of last year, those same gentlemen could, if they had sufficient capital to buy them, also obtain control of all the other mines in Cape Breton and on the main land of Nova Scotia, and that under the arrangement those properties might some day fall into the hands of foreign corporations which had a political purpose, and that there was danger that this important and only coaling station in Her Majesty's possession on the northern hemisphere on the west side of the Atlantic ocean, which was at present a source of strength to the North Atlantic and West Indian squadron, would be in danger of being crippled, or destroyed at a critical time. It was said by those gentlemen that, for example, in the case of war between our own country and Russia, a foreign corporation owning those mines might be induced by Russian gold to destroy, blow up or fire those mines, by which the coal supply of Nova Scotia would be cut off, and English fleets, instead of having coal in Nova Scotia to rest on, would have to spend their time in protecting barges bringing coal across the Atlantic, and in fighting for their own lives instead of being engaged in protecting Canadian ports and Canadian merchant ships. These were not the views of Mr. Weldon ; but they were the opinions of men of experience, who took occasion to speak to me, believing I was a loyal subject of Her Majesty the Queen. Being in possession of those views, I admit I could not say I fully shared the apprehension entertained by those gentlemen, I did not know, and I am not sufficient of a naval expert to have an opinion in that regard ; but being in possession of that information, and having in my hands copies of the Mining Act, under which such powers might be given to a foreign syndicate, having a copy of the lease which was given to the Boston syndicate or the Whitney syndicate, having a copy of the old lease under which the present mines are operated in Nova Scotia, having a copy of the most remarkable charter given to the Whit-

Mr. WELDON.

ney syndicate, I thought it was not only my right, but, if I am not taking myself too seriously, I thought it would be very judicious to place this information in the hand of our Queen. To talk of indictment or criminal procedure and impeachment and to compare the case of Lord Danby with the action of Mr. McNeill, Mr. Wood, Mr. McDougall and Mr. Weldon, who desired to place certain facts before the Queen, was absurd, for Lord Danby accepted millions of French gold in the shape of a bribe. If I followed the example of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who took himself too seriously in describing the other day his mission to Washington, I should detail our visit. If the hon. gentleman had any spirit of banter and badinage, had called us tailors of Tooley Street, we would have accepted the laugh ; but he takes the matter too seriously and describes this visit of ours as a grave constitutional matter, and I should like him to name the constitutional sin that has been committed, and to state the grounds on which he denies our right to address the Queen. If information is required as to what was done, I am perfectly willing to afford it, and as I am a candid man like the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I am perfectly willing to tell what we did. We visited His Excellency, and Mr. McDougald made some pungent observations, to which His Excellency listened with admirable politeness. Mr. Wood spoke at greater length, with the clearness and moderation which always characterizes him when he speaks, and His Excellency listened to him with attention. Mr. McNeill, always the guardian of the Empire, by day and by night, in summer and in winter, in season and out of season, would see no peril threaten the British nation, and your humble servant, who made a rather poor fist of it, as they told me afterwards, said what I wanted to say. Then His Excellency, with most vice-regal tact and prudence, acknowledged that he was very pleased indeed to see four British gentlemen—

Some hon. MEMBERS. What did he say ?

Mr. WELDON. I have told hon. members what the sum and substance of the interview was, and I have mentioned nearly all that happened. I leave the House to say if this is not a tempest in a tea-pot.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has altogether misunderstood my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). My hon. friend never questioned the motives which actuated the hon. gentleman and the other hon. gentlemen who took in their hands the interests of the British Empire ; he simply questioned the constitutionality of their actions. It was certainly open to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and still more open to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), to take such legitimate and constitutional steps as they thought advisable to save the

interests of the Empire, if they thought those interests were in danger. They appear to have thought that this action of the Legislature of Nova Scotia was a danger to the Empire, and they wanted to draw the attention of the Queen to it, and therefore visited the Governor-General. But I ask why? Had they so little faith in the loyalty of the Prime Minister, who is the adviser of the Queen in these matters? Did the hon. gentleman believe that the Prime Minister was not up to the requirements of the situation, that his loyalty was not up to the mark in this matter and he would not give His Excellency proper advice? Of course, it is open to any subject in the land to approach the Throne; but my hon. friend will agree that the manner of approaching the Throne has changed a little from the time of the old Saxon Heptarchy. In the time of Edward the Confessor it was possible to go direct to the king, but now Queen Victoria, represented in this country by His Excellency, has constitutional advisers to advise her, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that His Excellency could not give him any answer. The only thing he could do was to act on the advice of his Ministers. The information should have been communicated in the first instance, as I believe it was communicated on a subsequent occasion, to the Prime Minister, who would have advised His Excellency as to what course was to be taken, if really the Empire was in danger. Whether the Empire was really in danger or not, is more than I can say at present. I have not yet seen the resolutions of the members of the Legislature, but I am bound to say that when I know the resolutions have the support of such a loyal man as the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen), I do not think the Empire can be very much in danger.

Mr. McKEEN. I do not consider I have much to say at this time, but having listened to the explanation of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in regard to his mission to the Governor-General, I must say that, looking at the matter from my standpoint, I cannot but think that he was needlessly alarmed. It certainly gives one a sense of security to know that we have men who are so vigilant and so watchful as to be ever on the alert, and who are not satisfied with the Administration that we have here, but take upon themselves the responsibility of going to the Governor-General to warn him of the dangers to be apprehended. I am glad to know that there are gentlemen here like our friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), whose interest in our great Mother is such that he is always so ready, not only to attend to the interests of Ontario, but also to go down into the Island of Cape Breton and there safe-guard the common weal. Let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. There are several large coal areas in Cape Breton, bordering on the Atlantic coast. These mines are

worked, and have been worked for the last twenty years. We will assume that a war breaks out between England and the United States, or any other power. It has been alleged that in such an event the American, or foreign owners of these mines can flood them, or else destroy them by blowing them up, or in some other way. We know, and every one acquainted with these mines knows that it is impossible to blow them up with gunpowder, and that it would take at least two months to flood any of them. We are within telegraphic communication with the garrison at Halifax, and suppose such an attempt was made, in five minutes afterwards the commander of the barracks at Halifax would be notified. He must be notified by any loyal magistrate in the country, and in ten hours, if necessary, a company of soldiers could be on the ground to protect these great interests. Looking at the matter from a business stand-point, the apprehension of these loyal gentlemen who are infinitely more loyal than the Queen herself, seems to me most childish.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss with my hon. friend the question, whether or not it is prejudicial and dangerous to the interests of the Empire that an alien corporation should obtain control of all the coal fields in the Maritime provinces. I do not rise to discuss that question with the hon. gentleman, because it is a matter that does not admit of discussion, for it is patent and clear upon the face of it that it is not only dangerous to the best interests of the Dominion, but dangerous to the interests of the Empire—if the interests of the Dominion be connected with the interests of the Empire. But what I do wish to say, in reply to what has fallen from my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, is this: That no discourtesy was intended towards my hon. friend the leader of the Government, or towards the Government, when we went to see His Excellency on this question. I take it that the Government of this Dominion are the custodians of the interests of the Dominion, but that they are not the custodians of the interests of the entire Empire. I should no sooner have thought that I was debarred from going to the Dominion Government rather than to the Ontario Government, with reference to a matter that was connected with the interests of the Dominion, than I should think that I was debarred from going to the Governor-General rather than to the Dominion Government, in reference to a matter that was connected with the interests of the Empire. If the matter is injurious to the best interests of the Dominion, I take it that the Dominion Government, primarily and directly, is the body to appeal to; but if the matter is injurious to the interests of the Empire, I take it that the representative of the Empire is the person primarily to be approached. The representative of the Empire, in this country,

is, as I understand, the Governor-General, and not the Dominion Government, and it was from that point of view that my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the other gentlemen approached His Excellency. I have yet to learn, and I shall be very glad to be enlightened upon the subject, wherein that view, which we hold, is a mistaken one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to enter into the merits of the question, having but an imperfect knowledge of the facts, but this much is known to the House and was made known to my hon. and enthusiastic friend, who guards so zealously the interests of the Empire, that the Bill which he complains of related to a subject-matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Parliament. As a member of this Parliament, I take it that he may or may not have a right to discuss any question that he puts on the Order Paper, but if he wishes to give expression to his views so that they may reach the proper quarter, namely, His Excellency's advisers, he should take advantage of his presence in this House to discuss the question openly and fairly here. The hon. gentleman must see that he is trying to establish a very hazardous precedent. If His Excellency can receive a private deputation of members upon this subject, and take his advice from them, he might do a similar thing upon almost any subject which any clique of members in this House choose to urge upon him. Therefore, the precedent is dangerous. I believe that the House is thoroughly satisfied on this point, that the hon. gentlemen in their zeal for the public service, and in accordance with that ever bubbling loyalty which distinguishes them, have done that which they are now sorry for.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Not at all.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They have acted unconstitutionally.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They have attempted to usurp functions which belong to the Prime Minister and his colleagues. If they have lost confidence in the advice which the Prime Minister and his colleagues give to the Governor-General, it was their duty and their right to move want of confidence in this House, and to express their views here. But, Mr. Speaker, I rise chiefly for the purpose of asking the Government, led by the Prime Minister, how far they are prepared to endorse the action of private members of this House, waiting upon His Excellency and seeking to influence and advise him upon the public matters of the day. I think the House will agree with me, that those only have a right to do that who compose the Executive Council of His Excellency. I would like to hear from the Government, whether this delegation, in any way, met with their approval or sanction.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am one of the members against whom this charge is made, and I would like to say in reply to the hon. gentleman, that we did not go to His Excellency with any intention of giving him advice or of seeking His Excellency's advice upon any subject. We look upon this matter as very much more serious than my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) would have this House believe it is. In our opinion, the action which has been taken by the Nova Scotia Legislature in reference to a large portion of the coal in Nova Scotia may be fraught with very great danger to very important interests in this country. We think, in the first place, that the consumers of coal in the lower provinces may be very seriously affected. This interest is one which comes under the control of this Parliament, and with which His Excellency or the Imperial Parliament would have nothing to do; but we think, besides, that Imperial interests may be jeopardized by the extraordinary action of the Legislature of Nova Scotia. As for our conduct in going to His Excellency to represent certain facts which had come to our notice with regard to this matter, I have never heard it contended before that it was not the privilege of any subject in this country to go to His Excellency and inform him of any fact which came within our knowledge, and which we supposed might be of interest either to him personally or to the Imperial authority which he represents here, to understand. Those were the motives which actuated me in going there, and I must confess that I was very much surprised, on coming into the House just now, to learn that any imputation had been cast upon us because of our proceedings in the matter.

Mr. FRASER. I would not rise if this question did not relate to the province from which I come. I want to call the attention of the House to the difference between the position taken by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and that taken by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). Until the latter hon. gentleman rose, the only point raised was the Imperial character of the danger; but the hon. member for Westmoreland has raised another point, namely, that the price of coal is likely to be increased. So that, so far as he is concerned, and overshadowing the Imperial interest of this country, is the fact that he is going to pay a little more for his coal. And it has come to this, that legislation that is going to affect in a little degree what a man pays for a commodity, is sufficient warrant for him to constitute himself an adviser of the Governor-General.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I did not say that.

Mr. FRASER. I have taken down his words: "Fraught with danger to persons in this country and as affecting the price of coal."

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I never said anything about the price of coal. I distinctly said that, so far as the interests of the consumers of coal were concerned, it was this Parliament and the Local Legislature that had to deal with them.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman said that, I certainly did not so hear him. If so, I accept his statement; the "Hansard" will show it; as I took it down, it was the very opposite. But let that be as it may. "Fraught with danger to persons in this country!" How could the affair be fraught with danger to persons in this country except in so far as it affected their interests? What I contend is, that if the Legislature of Nova Scotia had the right to pass the legislation in question, then these hon. gentlemen had no right to take the course they did, because in doing so they might have seriously affected all the interests with which the Local Government were dealing in the country. While I do not deny the right of any subject to approach the representative of Her Majesty, I ask, should these gentlemen be the sole judges of the question which it is right for them to approach His Excellency upon? I say that the gentlemen themselves are not to decide what that question is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who should?

Mr. FRASER. The occasion, and not their judgment of the occasion. Now, I do not look on His Excellency as having two sides, one for his regular advisers and another for other people. I should regret very much if this should be the case; but, after the playful allusions of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, particularly those of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), who, I know, is not capable of any malice in his breast—he is too good for that—we find that it was really the overflowing loyalty of those men to the Queen, and not considerations relating to this country or as to what affected the best material interests of Nova Scotia, that moved these gentlemen in the course they took. I am glad, however, that the matter has been brought up, as the result will probably serve as a warning to others in the future.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not understand that any of us differ with regard to the constitutional usage in a matter of this kind. There seems to be, between the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friends who waited upon His Excellency, a concurrence of opinion that it is quite beyond constitutional usage for any person to approach His Excellency for the purpose of giving advice. I am sure that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in bringing the matter to the notice of the House, was influenced by an opinion that the facts were different from what they now transpire to have been. The hon. member probably learned from newspaper reports, as I did

myself, that these gentlemen, who were supposed to be a delegation, had waited upon His Excellency for the purpose of urging His Excellency to disallow a statute of one of the provinces of Canada; and the hon. gentleman, naturally enough, supposed that a grave breach of constitutional usage had been committed in that regard, and, for that reason, brought the matter to the attention of the House. But it transpires, from the explanation given by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), and my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), that the facts were about these: That these gentlemen, in accordance with the custom that prevails at every session of Parliament, had occasion to call upon His Excellency, as other members of Parliament had, and that, in the course of the conversation which then took place, it was ascertained that subjects which were there spoken of affected Imperial interests, in their view, and possibly in the view of His Excellency, and affected, also, the consideration which his advisers should give to subjects of public importance. His Excellency, it seems to me, with great delicacy and propriety, immediately requested that any facts which they wished to lay before him, or which they had mentioned in their conversation, should be laid before him in such a form that they could be presented to his advisers for their consideration. So far, perfect courtesy appears to have prevailed between the members who attended His Excellency for the purpose of paying their respects, and who had this interesting conversation, as well as perfect dignity and propriety on the part of His Excellency in receiving them; and it would seem, likewise, that the interview passed off with the utmost harmony on both sides, and that the constitution was not broken after all. Under these circumstances, it strikes me that we shall all feel more comfortable for the matter having been brought to the notice of the House this afternoon, because, in the first place, we have the assurance that nothing of the grave character which the newspapers reported occurred on that occasion, and, in the second place, we have the assurance of the great interest which these gentlemen take in interests which are Imperial and which concern, likewise, the people of Canada; and, for my part, while I am not prepared at all to discuss any feature of the coal transaction—not having seen the statute in question, not having yet had time to read the debates on the subject in the Provincial Legislature, and being in a state of expectancy for the arrival, any hour, of that statute for review and for advice to His Excellency whether it should be allowed or disallowed—I merely mention, as a further point upon which we can congratulate ourselves, the active and lively interest which gentlemen on both sides take in the welfare of my native province, and in the interests of the Dominion as they might be affected

by the legislation of that province. But above all we shall feel more comfortable and pleased because we find that when there was the slightest suspicion, arising from newspaper reports, that there was any want of confidence in the Executive of this country, on the part of any members on this side of the House, those who are willing to spring first to the rescue are gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, we of the province of Quebec were happy, very happy, to hear the hon. the First Minister determine so clearly the responsible system and state how it ought to be carried out in this country. For two years we heard notions very different from these in the province of Quebec. And I am asking myself how it is that there should be a rule for the English element and a different one for the French element of the province of Quebec? I always thought that the true constitutional theory was that the Crown can only be approached and advised by responsible Ministers, by those who received the duty and mission to advise it. And that which is for me a matter of surprise, after hearing the First Minister, is that he should have called to sit with him a political man who did away with the constitutional rules just stated to us. The province of Quebec will, I am sure, be happy to learn that constitutional rules ought to be respected. But then it will be grieved to learn that whenever the French province of Quebec is concerned, these constitutional rules are done away with. I thought I could not let this opportunity pass without making these remarks. It is for us a matter of concern to know whether there is a law for the French province of Quebec and a different one for the other provinces. I do not see the French Ministers in their seats.

Some hon. MEMBERS. There is Mr. Ouimet.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Yes, I see one of them there. I will ask him to publicly endorse the statements just made by the honourable the leader of the Government. Is he willing to say that the province of Quebec ought to be dealt with in a different way than the other provinces? I have heard and read speeches which he delivered outside of this House, and which were far from being in harmony with that of the hon. the First Minister. We will have an opportunity, in this House, to ask that the parliamentary theories just expounded by the hon. the First Minister be put into practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot help congratulating the Minister of Justice on the explanation he has given of the conduct of the new Council. There was, in the time of George the Third, a body of zealous friends supporting His Majesty, known as the King's Friends, who, on many occasions overturned Administrations. I dare say the First Minister is not at all

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

afraid that the hon. gentlemen who have constituted themselves into a new body of advisers to the Crown, will seriously interfere with the safety or permanency of the Administration, but they do very seriously interfere with constitutional principles and constitutional practice. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has told the House that he simply approached His Excellency the Governor-General as he would have approached the Queen as a humble petitioner, and did not go there for the purpose of giving advice—

Mr. WELDON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—for the purpose of giving information.

Mr. WELDON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Well, I would say this to the hon. gentleman, that if he were in the United Kingdom and desired to communicate his views to Her Majesty, he would find it necessary to make that communication through some responsible Minister of the Crown. He would hardly be permitted to wait on Her Majesty and give that information which he thinks must necessarily lead to some kind of parliamentary or administrative action. The hon. gentleman has waited upon Her Majesty's representative, and it is to that I take exception. These hon. gentlemen have no right to wait upon His Excellency for the purpose of giving information upon which they thought administrative action ought to be based. There is but one conclusion to be drawn from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. What was his object in waiting upon His Excellency and giving this information, which he thought important to communicate in the interests of the Empire. Why, it was to secure the disallowance of a particular measure, to put an end to a particular contract, to frustrate the policy of the Government and the Legislature of one of our provinces, that was what the hon. gentleman aimed at. It was for that, he purposed giving that information; and in his estimation, if he failed to accomplish that object, then his mission to His Excellency was a matter of no practical importance and of no direct consequence. Now, I say again, that the parties upon whom the hon. gentlemen ought to have waited, if they had anything to communicate, if they had any information they thought it necessary Her Majesty should possess, were the constitutional advisers of Her Majesty who sit in this Parliament. They were the parties, and the only parties, if they desired to communicate information, apart from this House, except by resolution in this House, upon whom they could constitutionally wait for the purpose of giving this information. Her Majesty possesses all power, legislative and administrative, and Her Majesty can do alone no act whatever. She must act through the constitutional organs with which the law has provided her.

and she must receive information through those channels. She can receive information constitutionally in no other way, and when these hon. gentlemen undertook to wait upon His Excellency, as the representative of Her Majesty, they undertook to violate the principles of parliamentary government, as they are established in England and in this country. Now, I say that that is a matter, whatever may be the practical result in this particular instance, of very great importance, and this House can never look with indifference upon an attempt to establish a practice or a usage of this sort by a number of gentlemen who may constitute themselves—I care not whether they are in or out of Parliament—into a council for the purpose of informing or advising Her Majesty's representative; because in a legal or constitutional point of view, there is no difference between waiting on His Excellency for the purpose of giving him information with a view to lead to action in a particular direction, and undertaking to advise him to act in that specific way. The result in either case is equally wrong and equally at variance with the principle of ministerial responsibility. The First Minister has congratulated himself on the support which he has received from this side of the House in this matter. Well, Sir, I think the hon. Minister is entitled to that support. The hon. Minister has resting upon him the responsibility, and responsibility and power should always be commensurate with each other. We intend to hold the hon. gentleman to strict parliamentary responsibility, and if we countenance for one moment the attempt of other parties to intervene to advise His Excellency in a manner which gives the hon. gentleman no control, we would be relieving the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches from the constitutional responsibility which the law imposes upon them. I think that that responsibility should be preserved, that it should be kept in the full measure, and, in order that it may be kept in the full measure, it is not proper that a party, either upon that side of the House or upon this side, or outside of the House, should undertake to discharge the duties which the law has assigned to the Ministers of the Crown. Sir, I have accomplished the object which I had in view in making this motion, and with the leave of the House I will now withdraw it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before the hon. gentleman withdraws his motion, I would like to ask a question, and that is, whether he thinks he is right in arguing that a person cannot give information to the representative of the Sovereign without also assuming that a certain course is to follow? What right has he to assume that the gentlemen who waited upon His Excellency advised him or in any way gave him to understand that they wished him to disallow the Act? He has no right to assume that. If that doctrine is to be carried out, it means that the

Governor-General is to close his ears and shut his eyes to what is going on around him. What difference does it make whence he gets his information? If he sees a statement in the newspapers affecting Imperial interests, according to the hon. gentleman, he is not to notice it because he has not got it from the Secretary of State. This doctrine would lead to ridiculous conclusions, and I think the hon. gentleman carries his doctrine a great deal too far when he assumed that the information in this case was given with a view to attaining a particular end. I take it that the doctrine is this: If His Excellency thought the question of sufficient importance, he would go to his constitutional advisers, and would not take action without their advice. But to say that he is not to receive information because the receiving of that information is to be assumed as intended to lead to a particular course, is stretching that doctrine to a point which would entirely destroy the common law right, which I do not understand the hon. gentleman to deny. It would bring the thing to a ridiculous extreme, and I think the distinction may be drawn, at what point I do not say at this moment, between matters strictly and purely of Imperial interest and those affecting the Dominion or a province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have a healing suggestion to make. I fully recognize everything that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated on the constitutional question, but I do think, after what the First Minister has stated, that it would be a thousand pities if strained relations should exist between him and four such loyal supporters as the hon. gentlemen referred to. Could not the hon. First Minister make them Ministers without portfolios and without pay? If he did so, all these constitutional difficulties would vanish.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has asked me a question; if it is in order I will answer it. The constitutional channel for giving information to His Excellency on public matters which it is intended shall be—

Mr. O'BRIEN. There! The hon. gentleman says "intended." He has no right to assume that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am saying what the hon. gentlemen themselves said. They had been advised by officers of the navy that if this measure was passed it would lead to certain results, and, believing what they were told and taking alarm at it, they waited upon His Excellency. The proper channel through which information should be communicated to His Excellency is his constitutional Council. The proper organs through which the public are to convey information to the Crown, are the constitutional organs of the Crown. They are not to constitute themselves such organs, and I repeat the words of a distinguished English Minister

more than a century ago who said: "I will never consent to a body of political janissaries organizing themselves into advisers of the Crown in order to apply the bow-string to my neck." That is practically what I object to, and it is because these proceedings must in the end lead to this abuse that they are not permitted by law.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman lectured my three friends and myself for our course on Friday last. I think I can remind him of a little lack of courtesy on his own part in making a direct personal charge against ourselves, which, in his judgment, should lead to our impeachment, without giving the usual courtesy of notice that the matter was to be brought up. When we spoke to His Excellency on this matter, there were a number of practical and very obvious suggestions which we did not feel bound to urge, but which might well have occurred to Lord Stanley or the Imperial Government. For instance, if they thought it advisable now or in the future, twenty, thirty, forty or sixty years from now, they could do as Lord Beaconsfield did when he bought the shares of the Suez Canal. They could have bought a coal mine of their own, and thus have had Imperial ownership and protection to safeguard the North Atlantic and West India squadrons' coal reserves in Nova Scotia without raising any constitutional question.

Mr. McKEEN. If I might be allowed to explain, I think the hon. gentleman for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is mistaken. These coal mines are all sold already. So what opportunity would the British Government have of buying coal?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would not have attempted to address the House on this occasion had it not been for the observation made by the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). That hon. gentleman, in his speech to-day, indicates that the Government we have in this House are not advisers of Her Glorious Majesty. In the capacity of British Empire Loyalists, he and his friends went kindly and considerately to the Governor-General, not in order to advise him to disallow the Bill, but merely for the purpose of enlightening His Excellency. I do not know whether the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) or the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had lost confidence in the Government because the members of the Government have recently been down to Washington a great many times, but they thought it incumbent upon them, in order to have His Excellency informed, to go and convey this information to him in this irregular manner. It is said that the subject can, at any time, have access to the foot of the Throne occupied by Her Majesty the Queen. Still, it is understood that petitions are often presented irregularly to Her Majesty, and that those who present them are generally arrested and taken charge of by the police.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

I am glad that this fate did not befall these British Empire Loyalists who went in this irregular manner to the foot of the Throne last week. They are all free still, but whether His Excellency or those who advise His Excellency will allow this violation of the constitution to remain without due punishment is for them to consider and determine. I was very much astonished when I heard of the action of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), for he is understood to be a very strong loyalist; but I think these gentlemen acted more like rebels when they departed from the old landmarks which the Minister of Finance has asked us to stand by. In leaving these old landmarks they occupied a position like those who disregard the constitution and the practices which have been handed down to us, and I for one very much regret it. If I did not know the gentlemen I would be inclined to believe that they were rebels. They would not have taken this course if they were not rebels, and knowing that they are plausible and fair men who occasionally shout for the old constitution and the old flag, I would put them down as being ultra dyed rebels. If I had the formation of the Cabinet perhaps I might adopt the proposition made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and give these gentlemen portfolios without pay, or make them Privy Councillors without portfolios and without pay. I think the First Minister would be more troubled with them in that capacity than he is now. He would be then, to a certain extent, held responsible, although he would not be able to gloss over as nicely as he did to-day the peculiar and irregular act which they manifested on this occasion. However, if their efforts will be productive of keeping down the price of coal, we will excuse the irregularities; we will overlook the violation of the constitution of which they were guilty, and we will excuse them to a certain extent. Although they did not obey the constitution, still, if they have brought down the price of coal, or if they get the duty taken off coal, we will, perhaps, forgive them for this violation. I hope that in future when they go to the foot of the Throne they will go through the constitutional advisers of His Excellency the Governor-General. I would like to see our Tory friends keep in line. There are some Tories who are radical when they are out; it may be that this wing of the Tory party are out, and they are radicals now. They are striving to get in. It may be that the cold wave that swept over those benches at the birth of triplets the other day has made some impression on some of our friends over there. It may have been this that decided them to take the course they did, and ask His Excellency to take this irregular step. I hope the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will not again have to bring up any ultra violations of the constitution, though unintentional, I will give these gentlemen the credit of believing. I wish them to

understand that we on this side of the House wish to maintain the responsibility of Her Majesty's advisers to this Parliament, and if they have any petition, or if they think that any wrong is being done to the coal interests of Nova Scotia, they will address themselves to the local Administration.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1893, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 17th February, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. EDGAR. I fear it will be rather hard to draw the attention of the House away from that very interesting and somewhat amusing constitutional debate that we have just listened to, and ask them to consider again the dryer subject of the tariff. The latest incident of the Budget debate was the speech which we had the pleasure of listening to last night, of the Minister of the Interior. I think most of his friends will be willing to admit that it chiefly consisted of the old stock arguments of former years and of former campaigns. I admit, Sir, that those arguments were delivered with a great deal of force and with considerable volubility. I suppose that maiden speeches of Ministers are entitled, to a certain extent, to be exempted from criticism, like the maiden speeches of members of Parliament. If it were not so, I would be a little tempted to comment upon the rather undignified attempt at mimicry which the Minister of the Interior tried last night at the expense of an old and honoured member of this House; and I would be inclined to recommend him, in the future, to assume, even if he did not feel, more of the dignity suited to an occupant of the Treasury benches. I remarked one great omis-

sion from the speech of the Minister of the Interior. I heard not a word from him as to a promise or even a hint of any immigration policy for the North-west. I think, Sir, that the country expected that the Minister would have taken some stand upon that important question. The most we heard in that direction from him last night was a reference to the bringing back of a few settlers from Dakota, who had left the older provinces of the Dominion. The repatriation of a few families is all very well; but it is not migration from the older provinces of Canada into the North-west that we want; it is immigration from other countries. It is better, I admit, that the settlers who leave the older provinces should go into our own North-west than that they should go into the United States. But mere migration of settlers from one part of Canada to another will never make this country rich or great. Surely now, after we have spent so many tens of millions of dollars opening up the North-west, we were entitled to hear some comprehensive scheme of immigration suggested, by which the best settlers from England, Ireland and Scotland and the pick of settlers from Europe, would be drawn to the North-west, where we should have tens of thousands going in and not a few scattered hundreds of repatriated Canadians. I was surprised, I must admit, and disappointed, to hear the Minister of the Interior speak with the highest degree of satisfaction, and even of pride, of the increases that have been made in the population of his own province of Manitoba during the last ten years. He seemed to glory in the fact, that in ten years that province has added 92,000 to its population. Why, Sir, that is just as nearly as possible the number that has been added in the same time to the population of the one city of Toronto, and yet that is a cause of rejoicing for the Minister of the Interior. He should have apologised for it instead of being proud of it. We should have had half a million increase of population in that time. The Minister, however, displayed a good deal of frankness on some points. He apologized for the inaction of his colleagues in the matter of tariff reform on the ground that they had been so short a time in office. Well, Sir, imagine the Minister of Finance allowing his new colleague to apologise for him, and to say that he cannot yet undertake any reform of the tariff because he has been so short a time in office, after being five or six years in that position. The Minister of Interior must have been thinking of himself and his colleague, the member for Sherbrooke, when he spoke about Ministers having been so short a time in office. At all events, we know that the member for Sherbrooke, who is now President of the Council, has been sufficiently long in office to have changed his mind on a very important question of tariff reform and to have decided, although a few weeks ago he deemed it most important to allow the importation of corn free for feeding purposes, that

no such necessity exists now. I do not think I can do better, in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, than to pass by the general considerations which might be made use of in support of his motion, and confine myself to a certain specific class of tariff reform which I think urgently demands, and has for some time demanded the attention of the Government. I think that while general considerations have great weight, they have been very well put so far in this debate, and will be still further brought forward; but we know they are very often attempted to be answered by some general assertion to the contrary, some contradiction, some perversion of the facts or figures. But I propose to bring forward today a sample case of tariff reform, in which I will give facts and figures which cannot be set aside and cannot be ignored or refuted by general assertions about the prosperity of the country, but that must be met face to face and dealt with. I propose to deal with one of the most interesting of those famous infant industries of the National Policy, I mean the cotton trade of Canada. This is probably the largest and best grown of all those infants. I think it has been the most spoiled, and is the most saucy, and it certainly is the most dangerous of them all. The proposals I will make as to that industry are covered by the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, which calls for a general reduction of the customs duties, and I think, before I have spoken very long, the House will agree with me that such a reduction is imperatively necessary at the present time. I venture to say those duties are too high. They are so high as to be most burdensome to the people, in the first place. Then they are so high as to be a source of actual loss to the revenue. Then they are also so high as to be an obstacle to the extension of trade to Great Britain, and finally they are so high as to afford unreasonable profits to insatiable combines. To look at this question fairly and fully we should examine first as to what those duties are, both as to the rates, the percentages of the duties, and as to the gross amount of the tax. The duties collected in 1892 upon imported cotton manufactures amounted to \$1,114,424, or 27⁹/₁₀ per cent, call it 28 per cent, of the value as shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Those duties so collected varied from a minimum of 10 per cent ad valorem on prunella for boots and shoes, which is raw material to a certain extent, to a maximum duty of 48 per cent on the item of shirts of cotton. The above duties are paid to the revenue as duties, and are received by the country; but the tariff is so arranged that on the coarser goods the specific duties per yard or per pound are so heavy that they are not paid at all as duties, and the poor man pays the higher tax on them to the protected manufacturer. That is, of course, what those high duties are for, and the result works beautifully. One or two examples of the effect of those specific duties in addition to

Mr. EDGAR.

the ad valorem duties upon the coarser kinds of cotton goods, the goods used by the poorer classes, will illustrate what I mean. I am not going to weary the House by a long list, such as I might give it, but I will only take three cases. Cotton shirtings, for instance, such as are worn by workmen, are taxed 2 cents per square yard, specific duty, in addition to 15 per cent ad valorem. Imported goods of this kind, 27 inches in width, cost from 2d. to 4d. sterling per yard, averaging 3d., which in our currency is 6 cents per yard. This would be a tax of 2.40 cents per yard, or 40 per cent on cotton shirting. Woven cotton materials, such as gingham used for women's and children's dresses, aprons &c., are taxed to the same extent as cotton shirtings, namely, 2 cents per square yard specific duty, and 15 per cent ad valorem. These cost from 1¹/₂d. to 4d. sterling per yard, making the tax from 35 per cent to 45 per cent. One other item, and a very important one, of these specific duties is, cotton hosiery. The specific duty upon cotton hosiery is 10 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem. On cotton hosiery costing 2s. per dozen the tax would be, as nearly as possible, 65 per cent on the value. So much for the duty paid, first to the Government and second to the manufacturer. I have already said that the Government collects \$1,114,424 per annum; and now let us see what is annually paid by the consumers of this country to the manufacturers. In order to ascertain that, you must make a calculation to find out what is the value of the gross output from the mills in Canada. There are no statistics available to the public which will show that in its simple form, but there are, however, several ways of making the calculation which are quite satisfactory. For instance, from the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that taking the year 1882, and comparing it with the year 1892, there was an increased importation of raw material for the manufacture of cotton goods in the latter year as compared with the former of 26,000,000 lbs., which increased importation of raw material caused a decrease in the importation of manufactured goods to the value of \$7,000,000. That means that \$7,000,000 worth of goods less came into the country by importation, and were therefore manufactured at home, because we cannot assume that as the population increases we consume less. The Trade and Navigation Returns gave us the total importation of raw cotton for 1892 as 46,000,000 lbs., and that will show in the same proportion that the home manufactures of that year were to the value of \$12,380,000, because, if an extra importation of 26,000,000 lbs. raw material showed an increase of \$7,000,000 in home manufactures, then a total importation of 46,000,000 lbs. will give a total home output of \$12,380,000 worth. That test can be checked very readily in another way. In the report of the Montreal Cotton Company, presented at their meeting held in Montreal on the Tuesday of

this week, they state that their output for the past year was to the value of \$1,468,000. Now, from another return, I know that this company has 54,000 spindles in operation, and I know that the total spindles of all the cotton mills in Canada amount to 520,000. Taking the cost of the output of that one mill of 54,000 spindles, at \$1,468,000, therefore, the value of the output of the 520,000 spindles in operation in the mills of Canada would be \$14,000,000, or considerably beyond the other estimate I have made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is exclusive of importations.

Mr. EDGAR. That is the value of the output of the whole mills of Canada, exclusive of importations, which amount to \$4,000,000 in round numbers, so that the total consumption of cotton in Canada would be \$18,000,000 worth. I heard my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the other evening, estimate the total consumption at from \$17,000,000 to \$20,000,000, so that his estimate corresponds with my figures. We are now dealing with the portion of that total consumption which represents the output of the mills in Canada at \$14,000,000. Now, what taxes are paid by the people of Canada to the Canadian manufacturers upon that output? We have seen that the Government collects at the rate of 28 per cent on the value of goods that come in, and we have seen that duties which exclude many of the other goods range from 35 per cent to 40 per cent and 45 per cent and even 65 per cent. We know that in selling these goods, the manufacturers are obliged to put the prices at the mills a shade below the protective duty. They cannot take it quite all, for if they did, they would invite importation and competition; and so they put it just a shade below, in order to prevent competition from abroad. I want to be very moderate in my estimate, and although I believe I could really put the rate of taxation that is paid to the manufacturers at 35 per cent, I shall only, for the purposes of my calculations, place it at exactly the same rate which the Government receives on the goods that come into the country, namely, 28 per cent. That percentage of duty on \$14,000,000 amounts to \$3,920,000 per annum, which, according to the most moderate estimate of the tariff, is put into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers. If we are to pay that from year to year, and year in and year out, as a tax upon the people, we may capitalize that annual sum so as to see what it amounts to. Why, Sir, capitalized, it would amount to \$100,000,000, which we are paying to the Canadian cotton manufacturers in order to foster this infant industry. I will try to show what this tax of \$4,000,000 per annum for the benefit of the mills means. Remember, Sir, that this tax is in addition to the \$14,000,000, which would be the value of the output of cotton, if imported into

this country without a tax. It is the value without the duty. They get the \$4,000,000 annually, and they get the \$14,000,000, too. Now, the question is, does not that \$14,000,000, which is the imported price of their output, pay them well for manufacturing? I say that it pays them very well, and I will prove that it does. We all know that the most important items in the manufacture of cotton are two: one great item is the cost of raw material, and the other great item the wages paid. Do these two items cost them \$14,000,000 a year or anything like that? Fortunately we can arrive at an exact estimate of what the expenses under these heads are. Referring again to the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1892, I find that the 46,000,000 lbs. of raw material imported into this country in that year—of course, it was imported free—is put down as having cost \$3,673,933. Now, how can we ascertain what wages were paid in the manufacture of this \$14,000,000 worth of cotton? In the last census returns the total number of cotton operatives in Canada is given as 8,033. Those returns also admit that less than half the operatives are men; 58 per cent of them are women and children. Of men, women and children there are only 8,033 employed in that industry; and by the census bulletin we find the average wages, not of all these operatives, but the average wages of the cotton operatives in the province of Ontario, which, I am sure, is not the lowest average. From the way in which the census bulletins are made up, I do not think that the compiler, for the purpose of boasting about high wages, would have given the lowest wages paid in all the provinces. He has given the average wages paid in the cotton mills in Ontario, which are \$280 per head. That would make the total wages of the 8,033 operatives amount to \$2,249,240; and this amount, added to the cost of the raw material, \$3,673,933, makes a total of \$5,923,173, or say, in round figures, \$6,000,000. Deducting this amount from the \$14,000,000 worth of cotton produced (without taking into account the \$4,000,000 of taxes which they received), there is a margin of \$8,000,000 left to these cotton manufacturers on their output at the import price, over and above the cost of management, dividends and interest. This certainly puts an end to the story we often hear in favour of the protected industries, in this case at any rate, that the taxes we are paying go as wages to the operatives. Why, Sir, the wages and the cost of raw materials are paid out of the actual cost of the \$14,000,000 worth, and there is \$8,000,000 left, and after that the manufacturers come and take the \$4,000,000 of taxes out of the people besides for their own benefit. Who dares to say that one cent of that amount goes to pay the wages of the operatives? Now, Sir, under a fair management of any business concern, I say that this \$8,000,000, which is 57 per cent beyond the

amount of wages and raw material, should leave a profit without any protection at all; and I think the proof that it does leave a profit without any protection at all, will be complete, if I can show that the Canadian cotton mills can successfully compete in the outside world with England and the United States without any protection. And, Sir, they do it; they do it in the market of China. The Canadian mills sent large quantities of manufactured cotton last year to China; in that year they sent to China \$228,958 worth of cotton manufactured goods to compete with those of England and the world without a single cent of protection. Our Canadian mills can supply the heathen Chinese with cottons without protection, while they extort \$4,000,000 per annum from the long-suffering Canadians by means of this tariff. I will show, too, that they had fortune favouring them to an extraordinary extent besides. Not only had the mills the \$4,000,000 of protection, but in 1892, as the Trade and Navigation Returns show, the raw material had fallen in price very much. In 1890 the price averaged 10.2 cents per pound, whereas in 1892 it averaged only 7.9 cents per pound. Therefore the 46,000,000 lbs. imported in 1892 were cheaper than they would have been under the rate of 1890 by over \$1,000,000. The manufacturers thus saved \$1,000,000 on their importation of raw material in the last year of which we have a record, and, of course, you would suppose when making that immense saving in addition to their protection, they must have raised the wages of their employees. No, Sir; that was not what they were there for. They would raise the dividends; but never the wages. Then did they reduce the prices of cottons to the consumer? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker; they were there to make large reserve funds, and not to reduce the prices to the consumer. On the contrary, within the last twelve months they have raised the prices from 10 to 25 per cent upon the goods they have manufactured. When the cost of their raw material tumbled down \$1,000,000, did they offer to reduce the duties? Did they come to the country and say: You have been protecting us; we required a support in years gone by; we do not require it now; reduce some of the duties; we can stand alone; we can compete in China with England, and we will give the people of Canada the benefit? No, Sir; they did nothing of the kind; but they watered their stock in order to absorb the enormous and unreasonable profits which they had been making. Now, it will be remembered that last session I called the attention of this House to the powerful combines which were being formed among the cotton mills in Canada, namely, the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, with a capital of \$5,000,000, and the Canadian Coloured Cotton Mills Company, also with a capital of \$5,000,000. These two companies were chartered by a few men in Montreal in 1890 and 1892, and they swallowed up nearly

Mr. EDGAR.

every one of the independent mills in Canada. I will read you a list of the mills which have been absorbed by the Dominion Cotton Company:—

1. Hochelaga, Que. [two mills].
2. Coaticooke, Que.
3. Craven, Ont. [which makes cotton for the China trade].
4. Kingston, Ont. [which makes cotton for the China trade].
5. Chambly, Que.
6. Moncton, N.B. [which also manufactures for the China trade].
7. The Nova Scotia, N.S.
8. Windsor, N.S.
9. Magog, Que.

Now, the Coloured Cotton Company, which is formed by the same organization, with the same president and the same management, and largely the same shareholders as the Dominion Cotton Company, controls the following mills:—

1. Lybster, Ont. [which is not only controlled but, I believe, closed].
2. Dundas, Ont. [also closed].
3. Canada, Ont.
4. Stormont, Ont.
5. Hamilton, Ont.
6. The Ontario, Ont.
7. Merritton, Ont.
8. St. Croix, N.B.
9. Gibson, N.B.

What are left outside of that combine? There is the Montreal Cotton Company, I admit, but although that company nominally stands outside this concern, it is really in it. The same gentleman is president of the three concerns. It is not managed by the same management as these other two big companies, but it is in the combine all the same, so that there is no relief for the country in that respect. Then, what have we outside? We have the Merchants' Cotton Mill at St. Henri, with 27,000 spindles, and I believe that is the only mill in Canada which practically gives any sort of competition to the combine. It gives competition in white cottons, and is controlled by some wealthy men, who find it better to go on as they are, but who, no doubt, will permit themselves to be swallowed up when it suits them. Then we have a little mill at Yarmouth of 4,500 spindles, and a small one at St. Johns, and a small one at Montmorenci. These mills have a total of 67,500 spindles, out of 520,100 in the whole Dominion. All the rest are absolutely controlled by this combine. I have said something about the watering of the stock of these companies. Now, here is a little bit of recent history of the Dominion Cotton Company. It is the one of these two great combines which was first incorporated—in incorporated in 1890—soon got into full swing and is making admirable profits now. On the 1st of September, 1892, the paid-up capital—I shall not inquire how it was paid up, for I do not know—was quoted as \$1,500,000. I will assume it was all bona

vide paid up, either by the present shareholders in cash, or by the transfer of interests in the mills which were swallowed up, or one way or the other. Now, on the 7th of the same month, September last, a scheme for watering the stock was made public, although outsiders knew it for some time and had been quietly buying up the stock. The statement made by the company was that they had only been paying 8 and 10 per cent dividends, but that their profits for the last three years had been from 22 to 27 per cent, and they therefore proposed that, by paying \$10 per share, each stockholder would be entitled to a fully paid-up share of \$100 of the new stock, thus increasing the capital to \$3,000,000 by that delightful method. They watered their stock to absorb some of these dividends that they were becoming ashamed of.

Mr. MULOCK. They needed protection in that way.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the effect of that watering. It is this: The original shareholders, the shareholders with the \$1,500,000 stock—I do not know how they got it, but call them the original paid-up shareholders—those who subscribed for the first stock and paid for it at par, got two paid-up shares of \$100 each at a cost of \$55 each. They paid \$110 for the two shares, worth, at par, \$100 each. As to the value of the watered stock, I see by the Montreal "Gazette" of this morning that 140 per cent was paid at the Board of the Stock Exchange for paid-up stock of the Dominion Company. Now, that gives to each shareholder who, as we have seen, only pays \$55 per share, a profit of \$85 per share, or over 154 per cent profit on his capital. He can realize that rate to-day on every share he holds, besides receiving the regular dividends of 8 and 10 per cent. Then the Coloured Cotton Co. has been less than a year in existence, and it is doing admirably, I understand, probably quite as well as the other company, and, no doubt, getting ready to make the same sort of a deal. And I have no doubt that this Government and this Parliament will facilitate their action in every reasonable way. Now, I said that the Montreal Cotton Co. was practically the same concern, although not under the same management as these two big combines. Mr. A. F. Gault is president of this and of the other two. Well, they had their meeting this week, and their stock is selling as high as 159 and 160, and it is stated in the Montreal "Gazette" of the 7th of February, that the profits for the year are figured at about 15 per cent on the actual working paid-up capital. The nominal paid-up capital is stated to be \$1,000,000, and, Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to learn that they admit a surplus reserve of \$645,934. They have added \$80,000 to that this month, that is they have either added it or have set it aside to be

added. I am not quite sure whether the total I have given includes the \$80,000 or not. But, in addition to paying their dividends, they have piled up a surplus reserve of \$645,934. Now, Sir, the annual general meeting of this company was held on Tuesday of this week, and they proposed to increase the stock from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000. Of course they have to get the sanction of the Government to do that, and I have no doubt they will get it with great facility, and then they have to go through such processes as they may be advised, and as their experience will readily suggest, for watering that stock or otherwise getting the greatest profit out of it. Now, Sir, I say that this tax is so high as to destroy the revenue of the country from the importation of cotton. In 1882 the revenue received by the country on the importation of cottons was \$2,476,640. That was before the great inrush of capital, or when that inrush, to which I will refer more fully in a moment, was just beginning. And now, under the high protective duties which have come into force, but which had not fully come into play, we have got, as I show you, a revenue reduced to less than one-half its former amount, or a total of \$1,114,000 this year. All this tax is clearly levied upon the Canadian consumer, the bulk of this tax is levied against British manufacturers, and it is levied in favour of the cotton combine. That is, perhaps, the simplest way to put it. Now, levying it on the Canadian consumer may be called patriotism, but it is a patriotism that favours only the few, the very few, stockholders of these combines; it is a patriotism that plunders the whole of the rest of the population of Canada for the benefit of these stockholders. So much for that part of this patriotism. Then, by this tax, we shut out British manufacturers. Is that loyalty? That is the 50 per cent loyalty, that is the old flag loyalty, the cotton flag loyalty which we hear so much about, shutting out the British manufacturer by taxing the Canadian people in favour of the cotton combine. Next, Sir, let me inquire, for a moment, who have been sufferers from this high protective tariff since 1879, when it was brought into existence? I contend that there are two classes that suffer. I have only spoken to you, so far, of one class, the consumers. But, Sir, the first to lose money were those who had been deluded into rushing into this business to share the enormous profits that were made at first when the high duties were put on. What were the natural results? There was a great inrush of capital, and twice as many millions of dollars of hard Canadian cash were put into the construction of cotton mills and their machinery as could find profitable employment. The companies cut one another's throats; they competed to the death, and the time soon came when they paid no dividends. The Canadian consumer for a short time got the benefit of that, I will admit; but who wants to get the benefit of cheap goods at that expense? Nobody; that

was never the policy of our party. Mr. Speaker; but, Sir, those who, invited and encouraged and urged by the advocates of the National Policy, and dazzled by the prospect of high dividends, put their money honestly and fairly into the business, suffered the natural result; they lost their money, or at least a large part of it. Some people lost their all. The market was glutted. I turned up the quotations in the Montreal "Gazette" of the various cotton stocks on the 25th July, 1885. The Canadian Cotton Company, now part of this combine, was then quoted at 35 cents. These are the buyers' offers that I give, and there were no transactions reported on that day at all. The Montreal Cotton Company, the one that had the meeting this week, and the one that is to double its capital, is quoted at 52½ cents on the dollar. That stock is now quoted at 160. Then there is the Dundas mill, which is also in the combine now, then quoted at 30 cents on the dollar. The Stormont mill, another of the combines, stood at 25 cents on the dollar. The Hudon mill stood at 64 cents on the dollar; this mill is also in the combine, under the name of the Hochelaga Company. It was amalgamated with the St. Anne's Company, and became consolidated in the combine under the name of The Hochelaga. These quotations, and I do not think they are the lowest, show that the men who invested in these industries were then standing to lose or had lost in many cases 75 per cent of the money they had put in. Then the strong, as is usual, drove the weaker to the wall. The wreckers came and wrecked some of these companies, froze out the stockholders, grabbed their mills, water privileges and machinery, and combined against the rest, and, as they became stronger, by cutting prices when necessary, and by all sorts of schemes, which these long-headed business men knew how to work, they forced the owners of other mills out and gave them stock at what figure they choose, and bonds at what was agreed upon, and got the control of their mills also. Mighty little cash they paid for it. It was done nearly all in bonds and stocks of these two big combines. I understand there was a little class who made money, too, but the original men did not. There were certain men given a hint of this thing, friends of the combine, who expected it would come. They went and bought up stocks at a low rate, and then, when the combine was ready, they came in. I heard of one case of a man making in a very short time, and with very little trouble, \$100,000 in that way. He was not one of the original combine men, but he made his little profit on the turn-over. Now, Sir, the Canadian public are paying that \$4,000,000 annually to keep up this infant industry, formed, as I have shown you, and as is undeniably true, on the ruins of thousands, and inflated with millions of fictitious capital. I hope the fathers of the National Policy are proud of their work. There is another

Mr. EDGAR.

important matter to which I must refer. What position is the dry-goods trade absolutely at the mercy of this great combine. They must have cotton goods, and they have got to buy them from the combines; they can buy them nowhere else. They have got to take what they are given and pay what they are asked. Sir, if you, or any members of this House, go among your wholesale constituents, the merchants who buy from these combines, and ask them privately what they think of it, they may tell you privately; they dare not let you use their name in public, because they would be hounded and driven out of their business by this haughty combine, if they chose to do so. It is legalized tyranny and wholesale robbery. Will anybody say that under these circumstances competition is possible, because there is no law to prevent any man starting another mill and making competition? Why, Sir, with half of their present strength, or half of their present resources or prosperity, the combine killed out all competition. No sane man dare venture in, for he would be undersold and ruined, if it cost the combine \$1,000,000. It would be nothing to them, when they are getting four millions and upwards out of the people every year. Talk about competition under circumstances like that. You might as well expect competition against the whiskey combine, which was another institution created, also, by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LISTER. The biggest combine in America.

Mr. EDGAR. With their provision for two years' storage for whiskey. They knew it was to be an enormous combine, it was worth while paying for it, and I have no doubt it was paid for, or it would not have been created by a paternal Government. Now, Sir, I contend that the Government have a double responsibility in this matter. The high tariff maintains that monopoly now, and the Government with its own hands created these two great companies. Last session I moved here for returns as to the increase of the stock of these two companies. The result? They show that the Dominion Company, of which I have been talking, as having just watered their stock 100 per cent, a million and a half of dollars were incorporated with only \$100,000 capital, on the 28th November, 1890. In December of the same year, they petitioned the Governor-General in Council to be allowed to increase that capital stock to \$5,000,000. The petition stated that the increase was required for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the company, and it was evident on the face of the papers that the object was to buy up a whole string of these companies, a list of which I read you a while ago and which they have already bought up. Now, what has the Government to do about that? What responsibility had they? Well, I will tell you, Sir, the

Joint Stock Companies Act, under which this company applied for an increase of its capital from one hundred thousand dollars to five millions, a fifty-fold increase of its capital says that this cannot take place until a by-law has been passed, until proof has been given to the Governor-General in Council of the expediency and bona fide character of this increase. The Minister has brought down, and I have on my desk here, returns showing the evidence before them, and it was as I tell you, that this increase was required to buy up these other companies. The Government considered that that was expedient, they were satisfied of the expediency of this object, and of the bona fide character of this increase. It was undoubtedly bona fide intended by the promoters. But if the Government thought that it is expedient to increase the stock in that irregular way—because it is an irregular way to give any company such an increase as that—I say they have an extraordinary notion of what is expedient in the interest of this country.

Mr. MULLOCK. Does the hon. gentleman say that the papers submitted to the Government on which they asked for an increase, on their face disclosed the nature of the increase, that it was to enable the petitioning company to buy up all these other cotton mills?

Mr. EDGAR. It was set out on the face of the papers on which the application was made. Undoubtedly that was the explanation that they received, and the evidence that they received, of the expediency. Very well, that was the case of the Dominion Cotton Company. Then I want to say a word about another point. Now, in the ordinary incorporation of a company, the Minister of Justice knows that with a capital of \$100,000, fifty thousand only is required to be subscribed. And remember, Mr. Speaker, their capital was, as originally patented, \$100,000, which they subscribed to qualify them for the increase. They got their increase to \$5,000,000, and if they had had to go in the ordinary way to the Government to get an incorporation with a capital of \$5,000,000 for any legitimate object whatever, they would have had to subscribe one-half of that, or \$2,500,000 before they could have got the charter. But that would never have satisfied their book, because it would not have given them an opportunity to form this combination in the first place, and to water the stock, as they have done, in the second place. They would have had to assume a liability by the subscription of \$2,500,000, which no law would enable them to water, which they must pay up in hard cash or its equivalent, or the courts would know the reason why. But by this back-door system, they, by a subscription of the \$100,000 only, got from the Dominion Government a charter for \$5,000,000 of capital, showing on the face of the application an intention to absorb these companies. Does the Minister of Justice imagine that we will think he was so simple

as not to know that was a combine, and so simple as not to know that it was suspicious on the face of it, that its objects were apparent, that is to say, to form a combine and to water the stock? If the Minister of Justice does not know it, has he no colleagues in the Government who would know it? That was what was done in the case of the Dominion Cotton Company. But, Sir, the facts are still worse, if possible, in the case of the Coloured Cotton Company. The Dominion Cotton Company got this increase in December, 1890. This Coloured Cotton Company was composed of the same men, the same applicants, who were prepared to buy up the coloured mills, the long list of which I have read. In doing so, they knew the trick. They did not subscribe stock to the amount of \$5,000,000; not at all, they placed the stock at \$100,000 and obtained a charter for that amount; they subscribed the \$100,000 and paid up 50 per cent on it. I desire to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the charter issued was dated 27th February, 1892, with a capital of \$100,000, and on the same day, without waiting one hour—and they must have got the news of the granting of the charter by telegraph—the parties held a meeting of shareholders and a meeting of directors, and they passed by-laws and decided to petition for power to increase the capital up to \$5,000,000. This was done even before they had seen their charter, for it was done on the day the charter was dated at the office in Ottawa. The papers I have in my desk disclose the same state of facts, namely, that \$100,000 stock was subscribed, and as regards the increase of the capital to \$5,000,000, it was an irregular proceeding and a monstrous breach of the power of the Governor in Council, to dispense with the subscription of \$2,500,000 of that stock and leave the company with a subscription of only \$100,000. No doubt, the company intended to secure all the cotton mills in Canada. The Government must have known everything as to what was going on, and yet with indecent haste, on 7th March, they issued supplementary Letters Patent allowing the increase, one week after the date of the original charter. Suppose the Government were innocent and careless in the first instance, they could not plead that they were innocent in the second case. I hold that the Government are responsible for this condition of affairs, that by their executive acts they placed it within the power of these companies to frame these combines, and by their legislative action they have made themselves responsible for maintaining them in power. They are responsible in a double sense. I ventured to hint, when moving for these papers a year ago, that that was their object. The object was evidently a combine, partially carried out then and which was to be carried out further. What did the Minister of Justice say to me at that time? He said:

If it were established, as the hon. gentleman seems to assert, that the tariff was the means of enabling such a company to act oppressively to the consumer, it would certainly not very long remain so.

Now, Sir, I call on the Premier, who was then Minister of Justice, to make good his words. I have demonstrated beyond a peradventure that the tariff is the means of enabling the companies to act oppressively to the consumer, and I say that the Government of this country are derelict in their duty not to know, as well as I do, that it is so. When the facts are open to my inquiry and my investigation, surely the Government, with all the means at their command can ascertain the facts as well as a private member of Parliament, and I can give them no excuse. The resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is correct in stating that the tariff should be at once thoroughly reformed, and if there is one reform more than another which is demanded by the circumstances of the case, and by the country, when the people shall know one-half or one-tenth of the facts established, it is the substantial and real reduction of the cotton duties. This reduction must not be put off until the Government and the Minister of Finance have perambulated through this country, the Finance Minister hunting for a grievance with a bandage over his eyes, taking round as his menagerie the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Controllers, which he can exhibit as being new and curious varieties of animals, not of much use, it is true, but very expensive. I warn the First Minister that the country will not be satisfied with his allowing the present condition to continue, as a thoroughly vigorous reduction of the tariff at this session of Parliament is imperatively demanded.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) to give effect to an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Corporation of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 14) to wind up the Montreal Mining Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 21) to confer certain powers upon the Corporation of the Municipality of the Town of Calgary.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Bain, Soulanges.)

Bill (No. 32) relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name

Mr. EDGAR.

to "The Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate "The Woodmen of the World."—(Mr. Marshall.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Calgary Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Calgary Hydraulic Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Western Counties Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Yarmouth and Annapolis Railway Company."—(Mr. Flint.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Ocean Accident Insurance Corporation.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance, last Tuesday, for the first time in many a long and weary day, drew a smile to the faces, and I hope, sent a thrill of pleasure to the hearts of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition; for then, for the first time, they heard from that unexpected source, the dear old familiar story that, in some parts of Canada, there was a degree of unrest and dissatisfaction; and, I venture to say, Sir, that if the members of that august body have any sense of humour in their composition, another smile must have flitted across their faces during the progress of this debate, for, if anything could call up such an expression, it would be to see the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) berating the tariff because it is not as satisfactory and not as favourable to the manufacturers as the old tariff of 1878; while his faithful followers from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), in their turn, with equal acerbity, berated the same tariff on account of the monopoly it has created by the untoward protection it has afforded to these same manufacturers. Sir, I am sorry to see that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is not in his seat, for I do not intend to follow him in the attack he made this afternoon on the one particular branch of the tariff which was supposed to be exemplified by the combination in the cotton trade of this country. It seemed to me, looking at the matter with all seriousness and sincerity that while we all recognize the loss that this House would sustain if that hon. member were to transfer his versatile talents to another sphere, it possi-

bly might not be unwise on his part to transfer those talents from this sphere, where they seem to be doomed to perpetual oblivion, to the stock exchange of a neighbouring city, where, judging from the financial knowledge he has displayed this afternoon, he would soon become a monarch. After hearing him say this afternoon that the cotton manufacturers had last year derived a profit of \$8,000,000, I turned to the stock reports of the Toronto "Globe" of yesterday, and found that none of the stocks of the cotton companies were quoted at an unreasonable figure. I found the Canada Cotton Company quoted at from 111 to 109, the Montreal Cotton Company at from 155 to 152, and the Dominion Cotton Company at from 138 to 139; and I think, Sir, that it is rather casting discredit on the intelligence of this House—a thing that perhaps some hon. gentlemen are sometimes too ready to do—to suggest that those three companies can accumulate the enormous profit of \$8,000,000 in one year, while the people of this country have so little idea of the way they are being robbed by them, that capitalists are willing to pay on the open market no higher prices for their stocks than those I have read. Without looking further to see whether the National Policy had anything to do with the alleged combination, the subsequent remarks of that hon. gentleman when he said that on the 25th of July, 1885, six or seven years after the inauguration of this policy, cotton stocks were offered at 35 cents and 52½ cents on the dollar without bidders would surely be sufficient to show that whatever burthen, if any, the people of this country are labouring under, they cannot be attributed to this National Policy; but in an attack a great deal depends on the source from which the attack comes, and as a resident of an unfortunate city, which was robbed of \$300,000 some years ago, I remember a piece of legislation on the part of the Ontario Legislature, by which one of the great railway companies of this country was allowed to gobble up all the smaller railways of the country, and by which the city of Belleville was robbed of \$300,000 which it granted to one of those roads on certain conditions, and I remember that that scheme was assisted, as has been said and never denied, among others, by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). When he condemns the Ontario Government for the most gigantic act of spoliation that was ever authorized by any Legislature, it will be time enough for him to take up the cudgels in this House to attack the operations carried on by these corporations. I believe that in some parts of this country there is a feeling of unrest and disquiet, and no wonder, for many gentlemen in speeches throughout the country, and in the public press, have been telling the people that the election in the United States was based on the distinct issue of protection versus free trade. I would not venture to say that any gentleman sitting in this assembly could be ignorant of

the issues in that campaign; but it has been stated by some gentlemen throughout the length and breadth of this land, that the true issue therein was protection versus free trade, and that the United States is now on the threshold of free trade. Therefore, I say it is no wonder that a feeling of unrest and disquiet is permeating the people of this country. I found such a feeling existing in my riding a short time ago, and I was urged to entreat the Government not to remove the duty on corn imported into this country; for our farmers, having learned from the practical tests made by the Experimental Farm that they can feed their stock with their own grains, feel that it would be the height of madness for this Government to remove the duty on American corn, and thus deprive them of the advantage of a protective tariff. These farmers, looking at the subject as a matter of common sense, say that if the duty is taken off corn, the next demand will come from the butchers to have the duty taken off beef, pork, lard and other things of that kind; and then the days will return that existed before this Government put them to an end by increasing the duties—those days when the Americans were delivering meats from Chicago in the markets of Canada at prices which would have driven our farmers to poverty if they had not received sufficient protection upon the things they were producing. But it has been found that the prices of the products of our farmers have been improving, and for them, as well as for the manufacturers and other classes of the people, protection has indeed been a good thing. It has seemed to me—and I hope I am not presumptuous in saying it—that in days to come, when the historian takes his pen in hand to write the history of this country, no page will seem more incredible, and certainly none will seem more grotesque, than that which describes this august assembly, composed of men from the Atlantic to the Pacific, sent here to legislate in the interest of the community, spending day after day in session and after session in an interminable debate on the merits of the National Policy. Surely by this time, after that policy has been tried for fourteen years, not only every member of this House—we take that for granted—but every man in the country, has an opinion which will not be altered by anything that may be said here, whether that policy has been a success or not; and I venture to think that it will be thought an almost incredible thing by the historian looking back to this time, that the members of this House should be willing to waste their time at such an enormous expenditure of money in discussing this threadbare and oft-repeated question. But, Sir, when we come to consider a question of this kind, there are different kinds of arguments used, and certainly some are not used by gentlemen who are anxious to expedite matters and come to the conclusion of the debate as soon as possible. There is one form

of argument which has been outside of this House—I will not say inside of this House—which consists of very industriously and laboriously constructing a tremendous man of straw, and then, lance in hand, swooping down and demolishing him, reminding one of the tilt of the famous Spanish knight at the windmill. Is it not beneath the dignity of a member of a body like this to waste the time of his fellow-members, if not his own time, in such a discussion? When we find hon. gentlemen opposite time and again protesting the loyalty of the Liberal party, when no man on this side has ever denied their loyalty, they are simply raising a man of straw for the express purpose of knocking him down; and I venture to say, if I may depart from the strict historical ground of truth and take a flight of fancy, that the very man who does that is the man who, if challenged from the opposite side of the House to repudiate a newspaper, a supporter in his own riding, which had come out with articles which were a disgrace to the constituency and a scandal to the member representing it, such a man would be perfectly certain when challenged to repudiate and deny such an article, to hold his peace and not offend his annexationist supporter. There is another style of argument we sometimes hear, a style that reminds one of a certain estimable bird, the ostrich, which, when warned of impending danger, buries its head in the sand, and then, seeing no ill, fears none, and with perfect complacency awaits the coming danger. That is the style of argument often used in this House, and which was used the other night by an hon. gentleman who said that the policy of the Government was so detestable that in order to get rid of it he was prepared to adopt a revenue tariff, or a continental free trade, or unrestricted reciprocity, or he did not care what else. It is not surely treating this House with proper consideration for hon. gentlemen to be so utterly blinded by political prejudice as to be utterly indifferent what policy will succeed the National Policy, provided that policy can be overturned; and to be so utterly regardless of the consideration due the people as to imagine they are prepared to overthrow the National Policy, which they have adopted and ratified again and again, when the party advocating its overthrow has nothing better to suggest than one of these three widely divergent policies. As has been pointed out by the hon. First Minister in Ontario, a short time ago, and it cannot be too often emphasized, people sometimes think that the National Policy is synonymous with the tariff; and this despite the fact that, time and again, election after election, they have been reminded that the tariff is but one branch of the National Policy, namely, the fiscal branch. When, in 1878, after suffering depression and all the evils of an unwise Administration during five years, the people were called to give their decision at the polls, the paramount subject in their minds was the evils they had

suffered, and the people of Canada, smarting under their burdens, grasped at the policy put before them by the then Opposition, the National Policy, which seemed to afford a remedy for the ills under which they were suffering, and, no doubt, in supporting the National Policy, as they did, in 1878, they supported it mainly as a fiscal policy. But time rolled on, and when, in 1882, the Government again appealed to the people and sailed into the fight under the old banner of the National Policy, the fiscal branch of that policy was by no means the only or the most important factor in the fight. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was then the main issue which divided the two parties, although the fiscal policy was by no means lost sight of. The Government went into that fight under the old banner, which stood also for national progress, and came out victorious. In 1887 the Government again faced the people at the polls, again under the old banner, and they relied not only on the fiscal branch of their policy, but on the national prosperity with which it has proved itself synonymous as well. So much was this the case, that the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake), in his Malvern speech, admitted that it was impossible to carry on the affairs of the country with any other policy, and in 1887 the Government again achieved victory, under the same old flag which symbolized National Policy, national progress and national prosperity as well. When last the Government appealed to the country, when the tocsin sounded in 1891, and the forces on both sides prepared for war, and when the Opposition propounded the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which, rightly or wrongly, the majority of Canadians, every American statesman, every American politician, every American newspaper writer of any repute, unhesitatingly said was one which Americans should support because it tended to annexation, that policy which drove from the leadership of the opposite side of the House the ablest man who ever filled that position from the time of Confederation down to the leadership of the genial, courteous gentleman who at present controls its councils, when the circumstances were such as to ring from the venerable old chief who so long directed this House, his stirring battle-cry, "A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die," we went into the fight with the old banner, but this time it stood also for national preservation. Since then we have continued to march under the old National Policy banner, which means national policy, national progress, national prosperity, and national preservation. But attacks are made first on one item of this fiscal branch of the policy, and then on another item, and I sometimes wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite think hon. gentlemen on this side are so easily to be deceived, and the wool so easily pulled over their eyes, that they will be induced to support first this attack on the

Mr. NORTHRUP.

National Policy and then another attack, and after that still another, so that finally, after long waiting, hon. gentlemen opposite may awake some morning and find that the National Policy has at last disappeared. We suspected on this side of the House that such was the policy of our friends opposite. But, if we had any doubts about the matter, the Toronto "Globe" came forward and gave us to understand the position occupied by hon. gentlemen on the other side :

The fact that the member's views as to the tariff reform are confined to one or two articles is no reason why his aid in detaching these articles from the national policy structure should not be cheerfully accepted. If every one removes the particular brick that he objects to, there won't be much of the noble structure standing by the time they get through with it.

But gentlemen on this side of the House, I am satisfied, are prepared to stand by the Government in their determination not to allow the National Policy to be destroyed item by item ; and I feel that however the utterances of the Finance Minister may be misunderstood and misrepresented, there has gone forth through the length and breadth of this land a clear understanding of his statement that, as circumstances change, as our industries multiply and increase, as business extends, as competition widens, as new avenues of trade are opened up, as all the changes occur that time must necessarily bring, changes in details must be made in our fiscal policy, from time to time, as they have been made from 1879 to the present day ; and that the Government, in setting about the task of making these changes, is as determined in 1893 as it was in 1879 to stand by the principle of the National Policy in all its branches, fiscal and others. Before proceeding to discuss other points, I hope I will be pardoned if I call attention to what seems rather a misunderstanding than anything else in the speech of hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps more outside than in this House. It is unfortunate that it has become altogether too much the custom to bandy about charges of disloyalty freely. Heaven knows politics are bitter enough at their best. The best of friends, starting in on an election fight, in the heat of the contest, and with the party prizes in view, will naturally give vent to their excitement and a'low feelings to prevail which they will regret when the contest is over. There is nothing more irritating than those charges of disloyalty. It has often seemed to me that if gentlemen who repeat the charge of disloyalty would thoroughly grasp the distinction between patriotism and loyalty, we would find fewer charges of disloyalty brought than we do. I have found that gentlemen, in replying to that charge, unfortunately are apt to confuse patriotism with disloyalty, and repudiate the charge of one when they intended to repudiate the charge of the other. To illustrate what I mean, when our volunteers were called to the front in 1896 to repel a foreign

horde of miscreants prepared to overrun our land, they were inspired by patriotism ; but when in Britain's hour of need, some of our brave citizens volunteered to serve under the British flag in the Crimea and in Egypt, they were inspired by loyalty and not patriotism ; and it seems to me that hon. gentlemen, in discussing this question, might consider whether or not, in advocating a discrimination against the mother land, admitting their patriotism to the full, there might not be ground at least given to excuse those who differ from them in having some doubts as to their loyalty. While, at the same time, if gentlemen will persistently run down their own land, if they will decry the land which gave them birth and in which they live, if they will tell of the terribly mortgaged state of the farmers and the people of this country without telling at the same time of the mortgaged state of the farmers and people of other lands, if they will tell of the distress which is supposed to exist in this land, while telling nothing of the distress which exists in other lands, if they will tell of the ruinous prices of the farm produce of this country and not of the ruinous prices of farm produce in other countries—if in this way they continue to minimize the virtues of this country and exaggerate the virtues of other countries, I think, however loyal they may be, they must not be surprised if some unthinking people are inclined to suspect that they are not as truly patriotic as they should be. Now, Sir, proceeding to discuss the question which seems to be before the House more particularly than any other, the practical results of the National Policy, as to whether or not that policy has been a success, it seems to me that everybody will admit that in this world we cannot judge of anything save by comparison. The man who is rightly considered a well-to-do man in the rear townships or the small village, transferring himself and his assets to a metropolitan city, is found to be little better than a pauper, and so on all through the world, every judgment we form must be based on a comparison and, therefore, there are certain standards which must be set up, from which we draw our deductions and according to which we form our opinions as to the success or failure of this, that or the other matter. Now, it seems to me that the question at issue is whether the country is or is not prosperous. There are certain obvious ways of testing the question as to the prosperity of the country. One would think that if it were found that the railway mileage of the country had vastly increased, that the passengers carried and the freight carried had vastly increased, if the shipping of the country had vastly increased and the freight and passengers carried had vastly increased, if it were found that the savings in the banks had vastly increased, if it were found that in the mother land, in the market of the world, where the keenest capitalists make it their

life study to judge the prosperity of other lands and the value of securities of other lands, that our securities rank among the highest and that these keen capitalists believe that we are a successful and a prosperous people, we might be content ourselves to take for granted what seems to be testified on every hand within our country and also without. Perhaps because these sources of judgment all tend to the same conclusions, our friends opposite are afraid to trust them and they have brought forth the most extraordinary argument to prove that the National Policy is a failure and that the people of this country are not truly prosperous. Putting their argument in a very few words, I think it comes to this: Granted that the population of this country in 1881 was, in round numbers, 4,300,000 granted that in 1891 the population was about 4,800,000—I am speaking in round numbers—the increase was about half a million. Granted that the average rate of increase is more than 12 per cent in a country that is prosperous, they argue that because we have only increased this half million in ten years, making only a little over 11 per cent, and other countries have increased in larger proportion, therefore, Canada is not a prosperous country. I think that is the first of the argument addressed to this House this session, as well as innumerable times last session. In discussion this item perhaps it would assist in the understanding of it if we express it in syllogistic form. I think we would express it thus: Every nation that is prosperous increases more than 12 per cent in ten years; Canada has not increased more than 12 per cent in ten years; therefore, Canada is not prosperous. Now, looking at the argument as an argument, there is no doubt that there is not a flaw in it. If it be true that every nation that is prosperous increases more than 12 per cent in ten years, if it be also true that Canada did not increase more than 12 per cent in ten years, then it is perfectly certain that Canada is not a prosperous country. But, in considering the argument, we have naturally to examine the statement of facts to see if those statements are in accord with the facts or not. The first statement is that all nations that are prosperous increase at a rate of more than 12 per cent in ten years. The simplest way to verify such a proposition, of course, is to look at the records and study the experience of other countries and find out what that experience really is. Let us first take a country which is very dear, as it well may be to many gentlemen on this side as well as on the other side of the House. Look at the increase of population in France. That increase is so slight as to be hardly worth expressing in the form of percentage. In 1886 the population of France was 38,218,903; in 1891 it had increased to 38,343,192, only a hundred thousand in a population of 38,000,000 in five years. I will not bother carrying that into the per-

Mr. NORTHROP.

centage; it is too small to pay attention to. Taking Germany, we find that in 1885 the population was 46,855,704, and in 1890 it was 49,416,476. The annual rate of increase in Germany during these years was 1.06, making for the ten years not 11 per cent. If we go back over German history, from 1871 to the present day, we find that at no time until last year, with one exception, was the increase so high as during that period. It may be said that the emigration from Germany was so great as to account for this small increase. But, as a matter of fact, the emigration was not sufficient to affect the comparison. The emigrants from 1886 to 1890 were only 456,136, which, compared with the population of 49,000,000, is too small to affect the result. Then, look at Belgium and the Netherlands. From 1876 to 1889 the annual increase was .85 per cent, or at the rate of 8.50 for ten years. From 1880 to 1890 the annual increase was at the rate of 1.02 per cent, or 10.20 per cent for ten years. In the Netherlands in 1889 the population was 4,411,415, and in 1890 it was 4,564,565. In the ten years the increase was but .09 per cent, or at the rate of only 90 for ten years. And if we look to the mother land, Great Britain, we find that in the last decade, from 1881 to 1891, the increase was only 8.17 per cent. In 1881 the population was 35,241,482, and in 1891 it was 37,888,153. Looking at Scotland, we find that the increase in the same time was only 7.96. And so we find, looking at all these countries, that the rate of increase is not more than 12 per cent, and therefore, the first premise laid down by our friends opposite is contrary to the fact, for the increase of population in the country being less than 12 per cent is not proof that that country is not prosperous. The second proposition is that in Canada we have not increased more than 12 per cent in the last ten years. I suppose every member in this House is conversant, as most of the people of this country are, with the fact that the census of 1881 was taken in one way and the census of 1891 in another way. There was a time for discussing the comparative merits and values of these methods, but whatever may be thought of the comparative merits, we may all admit that the census of 1881 shows all the people that were in this country, and certainly some more, and there is no reason whatever for saying that the census of 1891 shows more than the actual number of people in the country at the time it was taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, oh!

Mr. NORTHROP. Why, Sir, in 1881, if a family were living in Ottawa here, and the census enumerator came round and wished to know the number of that family he would be told, perhaps, that there were the father and the mother, two children at home, one in Montreal, one in Quebec and two in the States. They were all put down as in Ottawa. And when the census enumerators

in Quebec and Montreal went their rounds they found the two referred to as living in those cities and recorded them there also. Those who come from the lower provinces, and who know the extent of the emigration from Quebec to the other side of the line, can see what a monstrous difference it would have made with the population of Quebec if the census had been taken that way, that not only every member of the family who had only temporarily left his home was put down as living here at the time, but also all others unless the head of the family happened to state they would never return. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the "Debates" in 1882, page 165, they will find that the census returns of the previous decade were before the House, and the question was as to whether they had been taken 'de facto' or 'de jure'; and Mr. Blake arose in this Chamber, and said:

In some cases they have counted every person who belonged to a house, even although that person had been a very long time resident in foreign parts, unless the head of the household would say he was quite sure the person was not coming back. In other instances men who have been absent eight, ten or twenty years have, as I have been informed by persons in the locality who were familiar with the circumstances, been counted.

And on page 166:

It is entirely uncertain then, under the circumstances, what our population numbers. Nobody can tell by this mode of taking the census, the actual number of our Canadian population.

Now, Sir, when we find a gentleman who is admitted to be the pride of the Reform party, from his place in the House, making such a statement as that the census of 1881 was taken in such a way that no person could tell what the population of the country was. I ask, is it fair for hon. gentlemen opposite now to take it for granted that that census was perfect, and to argue from that census so as to exaggerate the number of people who have left this country, and to draw the deduction that this country is not prosperous? Surely we can appeal to gentlemen opposite, surely if the National Policy is the failure and the fraud that they charge it is—and we quite recognize the right of hon. gentlemen to hold such an opinion—surely if it is such a failure, there must be bona fide grounds for complaint, there must be grounds for complaint against it which can be verified by facts, without basing their complaint on the census of 1881, which their own leader publicly declared was utterly fallacious. Now, when I am speaking on this subject, without wasting more time, a cognate subject occurs to my mind. Speaking in a similar way a few nights ago, the hon. member for South Oxford, a Privy Councillor, too, I believe, slurringly attacked the Government for the late addition to the Cabinet, and stated that in Great Britain there were only eleven or twelve Cabinet Ministers, while here we

have but seventeen or eighteen. Now, I think it is beneath the dignity of this House for a gentleman occupying his position—for nobody disputes his ability—it is beneath his dignity and beneath the respect due to this House for any gentleman to make any statement like that. He said that there were eleven or twelve Cabinet Ministers in the old country (while they have eighteen or twenty), and if that were all, a difference of nearly 100 per cent would surely be enough to entitle hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to ask him for a withdrawal of the statement. That hon. gentleman must have known, he is too acute a historical student to not have known that the number of the Ministry in the old country is upwards of fifty—fifty-three, I believe, is the exact number.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, oh!

Mr. NORTHRUP. I speak by the books. It is a very easy matter to verify. I am drawing a distinction between Cabinet Ministers and the Ministry; perhaps my hon. friend does not know the difference. Perhaps it has been so long since some hon. gentlemen have been concerned in a Cabinet that they have forgotten the distinction; but there is a distinction between a Cabinet Minister and a Minister not of the Cabinet, and if they will take the trouble to investigate the matter they will find that there are over fifty Ministers in Great Britain to-day. If you look at the various colonies—and they, after all, are the only places to which we can look for any light on this subject, because in those colonies alone have the people a system of government resembling our own—in those various colonies it will be found that the number of Ministers is not disproportionately small as compared with the number of Ministers that govern this Dominion. Take, for example, Newfoundland, with a population of 197,000. They do not seem to think that seven Cabinet Ministers are too many. If we look at New South Wales, with a population of 1,000,000, they do not think that nine Ministers are too many. Victoria, with a population of 1,050,000, has ten Ministers. In South Australia, with a population of 320,000, seven Ministers are required. In New Zealand, with a population of 640,000, of whom 41,000 are Maoris, there are seven Cabinet Ministers. So we will find, if we look around the colonies, that this Dominion will compare very favourably with the other British possessions in the number of its Ministry, looking to the respective populations and respective wealth of the colonies. Now, Sir, in conclusion, there is just one point to which I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. In looking through the census returns of Ontario I have discovered either a most extraordinary coincidence or a judgment of Providence—I confess I do not know which. In studying the census returns of that province, I found, as I say, a marvellous coin-

vidence, or a judgment of Providence, that they tell the story they do. Without pretending myself to attach any blame to hon. gentlemen opposite, I think they at least might take advice in a friendly way; and when they find that Providence—admitting they are always right—is always on this side of the House, it would be good judgment on their part as soon as possible to range themselves on the same side as Providence. Now, we know perfectly well that whatever may be the faults of this side of the House, we have never been accused of running down or maligning our country. We may, perhaps, over-estimate the virtues of our province; we may, perhaps, sometimes be led to discount too largely the possibilities of our country; but certainly we, as a party, can not be accused of maligning or running down our country. I will not say that members of the Opposition are justly so accused, but it is most certainly a fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are accused of maligning the country. Certainly hon. gentlemen opposite, if they are not prepared to distrust their own ears, must have heard many of their own number and their supporters throughout the country singing in one endless chorus the praises of another adjoining land, to the discredit and disadvantage of this land. When we come to look at the census returns of 1890, it is surely, as I say, either a marvellous coincidence or a judgment of Providence, that the counties from which the exodus is so striking, are the very counties that are not represented by gentlemen on this side of the House; and the counties in which the increase has been striking, are the counties that are represented by gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, I see the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) meets that statement with a ghastly smile. I have no desire to wound the feelings of that hon. gentleman; I wish rather to please that urbane and genial disposition which has promoted so much hilarity in this House; and, therefore, with all respect, I bow in admiration of the eloquence which has been exercised so successfully in the past as to diminish the population in South Grey by 2,031 souls in one short decade.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is no record.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes, that is the record, and the hon. gentleman has employed his abilities in a manner less patriotic and loyal than we might have hoped.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the portion of the riding where I do not live, where they are under the influence of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. NORTHRUP. They seem, at least, to have been influenced by the member for South Grey, or else he would have us believe that the member in the adjoining riding was accountable for his presence here. But looking over the division list of this House, I think it will be found that, speaking in round

Mr. NORTHRUP.

numbers, the Government majority from Ontario is about twenty-eight out of a representation of ninety; so that, I think, I am correct in saying that if the Government had two more supporters, they would have two-thirds of the members from Ontario. Under these circumstances, it would be fair to assume that, if we take the number of ridings in which there have been decreases, there would be two-thirds Conservatives and one-third Reformers. That is a fair way of comparing it. But that is not the tale told by the census. If we look at the ridings that show Conservative losses we find thirteen; if we look at the Reform losses we find they number twenty-two, so that although nearly two-thirds of the representation in this House from Ontario is Conservative, two Reform ridings show a decrease to every one Conservative riding. Then, again, there are ridings that show gains, and here, too, we might expect we would have two-thirds; but if we look at them we find about thirty-eight Conservative ridings showing gains and only thirteen Reform ridings. So we find, if we take one riding after another, the practical result of the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen seems to be this, that in the ridings in which the people have been told continuously and unceasingly, year after year, that the country was going to the dogs and that it was not a fit country to live in, the people have left the Dominion and gone to seek a foreign and more blessed land; whereas, in other parts of this country where the people have been educated and informed as to the true facts, in fact the constituencies represented by hon. members on this side of the House, we find the gains have been great and the losses have been few. Surely if there was no higher motive than that of self-interest, we might, in view of such result, appeal to our Reform friends to join with us in trying to bring about a truly national policy, for I sometimes think we are liable to err in the one way and to go to one extreme, just in the same way as hon. gentlemen opposite are liable to err in the other direction. I think we sometimes hear so much about the wealth of this country, of its inexhaustible soil, forest and fisheries and mineral wealth, we are inclined to think Canada is already a great country, whereas it is at the best only potentially great. We have all the factors which go to constitute true national greatness, but though we have the factors, those factors of themselves will no more make us a truly great country than will the coal while it lies buried under the earth serve to warm and cheer those who walk on the ground above it. We need not only those great factors, which themselves are indispensable, but we require all the ability, skill, experience and harmony that possibly can be secured in this country if those factors are to achieve the great destiny which Heaven has laid out for us. Now would be a most opportune time, when hon. gentlemen opposite have been pressing for certain tariff changes, pressing

to have reductions made in the duties.—and their last attack on the duties seems to come down merely to that,—for hon. gentlemen opposite to come out like men and instruct the Government, if the Government is in need of advice and if they have all the wells of wisdom in their ranks and we have none, and give the Government the benefit of their advice and experience as to how the National Policy, not alone in its fiscal branch, but in all its branches, could be made more perfect and thorough than it is to-day. On the contrary, instead of doing this, their very last motion placed on the paper by the hon. member for South Oxford embodies a deliberate, I will not say a wilful, but an unfortunate attack on the farming community. It is, of course, only following out the lines of his famous motion of 1891 in this House, when he moved to reduce the duties on all articles of prime necessity, but the amendment moved the other day to reduce the tariff in the direction of free trade on the articles necessarily used by the great consuming classes, the hon. gentleman must be aware was striking directly at the corn, breadstuffs, meat, pork and such articles as are largely produced by the farmers. And therefore, as representing an agricultural constituency, I stand here to claim from the Government that they will give to my constituents, who are agriculturists, the same degree of protection as is extended to manufacturers, and when I find hon. gentlemen opposite differing though they may among themselves as to the degree of protection given and the value of that protection, when I find it is stated that manufacturers are growing wealthy through protection, I, as the representative of an agricultural constituency, stand here to demand from the Government of which I am a humble supporter, that, in the revision of the tariff during the coming twelve months, the interests of our agricultural people, which are the largest and most important class of the community, shall be duly considered.

Mr. FRASER. I congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House on the clever manner in which he balanced his speech, following very closely the tactics of the hon. the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman began by extolling the glories of the National Policy, and stating that it was not to be interfered with. He ended by a pathetic appeal to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to extend our assistance to the Government to bring about tariff changes. The National Policy in all its glory was to be continued; but the under-current is now even striking him as well as others, and he now appeals to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for assistance. I can truly tell him that, except the assistance which this side of the House has always given to hon. gentlemen opposite, in pointing out their faults and showing how far astray they have been in neglecting the interests of

this country, advice to which, up to the present moment, they have turned a deaf ear, hon. gentlemen opposite will receive no assistance. On the eve of the change that must come, I can understand the whining heard on the other side for a change of method, that we, animated by a desire to promote the welfare of this country, should join with hon. gentlemen opposite in bringing about a change, in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may get the glory resulting from the action of the Opposition during all these years in pointing out the defects of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman has referred to the counties in Ontario. I am not able just now to verify his statements, and I accept them. But of all the cruel thrusts that Ministers have received from their supporters, the thrust administered by the hon. gentleman was the most cruel. He spoke about the counties represented by Conservatives as increasing. He forgot that the county represented by the Minister of Finance made the most disreputable change in that respect of any county in the lower provinces, and that the Premier's own county went back on the party to the extent of nearly 2,000 votes at the last census, that the late Minister of Customs, in his county, in Ontario, fell woefully behind, and that the Minister of Fisheries, in the county of Pictou, likewise fell badly behind. The hon. gentleman did not know these facts; he thought he would make a point by intimating that there was more human vigour about Conservatives and, therefore, there was an increase in population.

Mr. NORTHERUP. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pardon me for a moment. The constituency of the late Minister of Customs gave an increased majority of 1,734.

Mr. FRASER. If I am wrong in that statement, it is only one county to be taken from the list. I am satisfied as to the accuracy of my statement respecting the counties in Nova Scotia, of which I have made a study. It was very cruel on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring disrespect on the Minister of Finance and also to call attention to the county represented by the Premier, and to show that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had fallen back in the greatest county in Nova Scotia, Pictou, and, for that matter, the greatest county in the Dominion, because it possesses more industries than any other county. During the last ten years, for every man, woman and child who came into the county, and for every child born there during that period, an able-bodied man and woman left the county, and 1,000 more. Yet we are to be grateful for that census. The hon. gentleman has intimated that there is a great difference between the two methods of taking the census. We have heard that statement again and again. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will show the House in what the difference consists and what would be the

results of the census under the two methods. It is very easy to say that these results have been brought about simply by a difference in the manner in taking the census; but the hon. gentleman has been very careful not to point out the difference in the two methods. While on the question of the census, in regard to which the hon. gentleman seemed to make a very strong point, I will call attention to some statistics, but I will not go beyond the lower provinces for examples. Let me say that the hon. gentleman was very unfortunate in the counties he selected. Fancy an hon. gentleman in Canada, with its boundless resources, rich beyond any other country in the world, its virgin soil, farm lands ready for cultivation, comparing it with a country like France or Belgium or Germany, and adding the statement, that we should thank God if we prospered better than they did. It was unfortunate that he selected the only protectionist countries in Europe to prove it, and when he refers to Great Britain and shows that the rate of increase is not so much, he forgets that Great Britain is peopling the earth, and that she is sending forth her men and her women to India and Australia and to all her possessions to strengthen British connection throughout the world. There is no country in the world that sends out so many of her people from her busy hives of industry with greater good to herself than Great Britain does. After all that can be said against free trade Britain, and after all the people she sends out to her colonies throughout the world, she comes up in her increase of population nearly to Canada, a country which has the finest resources in the world and the greatest opportunities for increasing the number of her people. Why is that? It is because England is right in her fiscal policy. She gives that freedom to commerce, and those advantages to skill and labour, which add to the wealth of the greatest country. Let me speak of the province of Nova Scotia. There, for example, we increased 2·25 per cent in the last ten years. In Prince Edward Island they increased ·18 and in New Brunswick they increased ·02 per cent. The hon. gentleman told us that it was hardly worth while taking into consideration the increase of 100,000 in the population of France, but let me ask him is ·02 of an increase a very big thing for New Brunswick, or is 1·17 a very great increase for the whole of the lower provinces for the last ten years? I claim that we have a rich country down by the sea. I claim that we have many advantages, and I claim that were it not for our fallacious fiscal policy we would keep our people at home, and have a great increase in our population. Last winter, when I looked at the province of New Brunswick, and found that for the ten years they had only increased ·02 per cent I was rather surprised, and I rather hinted that the members themselves ought to feel that that was not just as good a show-

Mr. FRASER.

ing as they ought to make. What is the proof of wealth, Mr. Speaker? Is it the savings bank deposits? That may be one element of proof, but the only real proof of the advance of any country is the proof of its increasing population.

Mr. GILLIES. Take China, for instance.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman thinks that is smart. It is a proof of the advance China is making, even though she is not so far advanced as other nations, but if the hon. gentleman knew anything about the history of China, he would know that, surrounded as she is by walls, by customs, and language, and everything that keeps her within herself, except the few that she sends to the outer world, or, rather, the few who are sent out by companies in order to make money out of them—her people do not wish to leave their own land. But the people increase there, and the country is great in respect to her own institutions, and great in respect to everything that makes her in her own estimation a great country. I was taught in my young days that the greatest glory of any country, aye, and the greatest glory of any family, was increase. I was taught that when the ancient Hebrew patriarch was called out at night and asked to look at the stars, and when he was told that he could not count them for number, that the blessing of all others that the Creator promised him, as making him the King that he was, that his seed should be like unto the sand upon the sea-shore. That does not appear to suit the modern methods of the protection policy. Foolish old man that he was, to accept a promise like that. Had he lived in these golden days of protection, he would have been told that the greatest glory of a country was an increase of ·02 per cent in ten years. In the census bulletin that was prepared by the statistician I find a reason given for this want of increase of population. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I beg pardon; I was addressing members on this side of the House. You know, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that no report is now brought down by the men employed by the present Government without that official document giving a reason, if there is anything against the policy of the Government. Your Year Book, and your everything that gives statistics, must have a reason given if there is anything in the figures which tell against the policy of the Government. Just fancy, Whittaker's Almanac, or the Statesman's Year Book, after giving the cold facts about any country, setting out to give some reason why they did not suit the particular fancy of the editor. Well, the man who published these statistics gave a reason why our population had not increased. He first of all speaks about the lower provinces, and, so far, he admits that there is really an exodus down there, notwithstanding

the oft-repeated remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite to the contrary. He says :

The tendency to reduction in the size of the average family observed in the Maritime provinces is in accord with the teaching of all recent census takings in other countries. But the reduction in the average family does not account in whole for the stagnation of population revealed by the census returns. The population has moved in larger numbers than in previous decades.

So far as that is concerned, he admits that there has been a greater exodus from the lower provinces than in previous decades. But then he treats here with reference to the result of the general census. He says :

The causes for this decrease are : 1st, the decay of early marriages, and 2nd, the increasing tendency to celibacy.

That means, first of all, that the people do not get married soon enough ; and secondly, that they do not get married at all.

The first cause is the effect of the increasingly complex conditions of life.

That is good. These complex conditions of life are rather good when you consider the whole question.

The second is due to the spread of education which enables females to become better wage earners, and therefore less interested in marriage.

Now, that is the opinion of the statistician himself, and that is the reason he gives for there being no increase in population. In other words, he says that our female population never were educated before ; oh no, and when they get little better educated they will not get married at all. I can very well understand from that how such a brilliant gentleman as the hon. gentleman from West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) has continued in his state. It is because when the ladies get educated, for example, they won't get married. I ask hon. members seriously, did any person hear of a slander upon our country like that ? Talk about all that is said of our country by all the Grits in this Dominion and you won't find a worse slander upon the people of Canada than that. Are the eyes of our bright maidens less attractive than they were ten years ago ? Are our modern mothers less anxious to make family connections with bright young men to start a household, than they were before ? Has it come to this, Mr. Speaker, that all these charms added to that disposition of our nature planted by the Divine Creator, is such, that we are dying out, and that we do not want to live in this beautiful country. Added to all that we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that those who go away are no good, and that the country is better without them. Well, perhaps so, but I am here, Mr. Speaker, knowing something of the young men and young women of our country, and following out that which was so eloquently said by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) last evening, I say : That the very flower of our country leave us. I regret it, and I

want to state here, and now, that knowing all the circumstances, I regret it all the more, because I would rather see the young men and young women of this country live in Canada even to less advantage than they do across the border, in order that we might build up a country. The man who closes his eyes to the fact of our decrease in population, and who says that we are rich and prosperous and increasing, is a man who has never learned to go deep into the causes that bring about such a sad state in any country. Do we not all want that this country should increase in population ? What else is going to build up this country ? What else is going to enable us to pay the debt of this country ? What else is going to enable us to make this country what it should be but keeping our people here ? I am not going into the causes why they leave : but I have heard it from platform to platform, dinned into the ears of the people of Canada, that somewhere there was a magician who would, with a Prospero's wand, call up at his bidding our young men and young women who had gone from us, and would bring them home again. Has it failed ? What is the cause ? Mr. Speaker, the man who says that the weaker part of our population goes and that this country is better without them is a slanderer, and I so denounce him here. I know myself that the young men and the young women who leave their country love their country as well as others do. I know them ; and the hillside and the brook and the woody dell, aye, and the music of the waves, are as dear to them as to any people in this world ; and when they leave their country, they leave it why ? To better their fortune. I have seen them leave, parting from father and mother, sister and brother, as they went to push their fortunes elsewhere. And after they went away, what was the first thing they did ? Was it to dress themselves, to conform to the fashion of the country, to spend all they made upon themselves ? No ; but the first missive that came from the dear one who was absent, contained \$5 or \$10 to lessen the burden at home ; and that came continually until the little mortgage was paid. And yet these are said to be the weaklings of this country, without whom the country is better off. If there are slanderers in this country, they are those who hint that the stronger and the better remain at home while the weaker go away. As good stay as go, I admit, but as good go as stay. Now, how are we going to improve this state of things ? We are not going to improve it by simply saying that it does not exist—that there is no exodus—when the statistician who gives us these beautiful reasons for it says that there is. I heard an hon. gentleman last night speak of the marvellous growth of the North-west. Well, I rejoice in that ; but the growth is small, and is confined to a very small area. It reminds one of the story of the man who wrote up a town, and who spoke of its mar-

vellous growth, saying that it had increased in population in one year a hundred per cent. when the fact was that the year before he was there alone, and during the year one family had added itself to the place. You cannot give a fair indication of the real increase in the Northwest by merely stating the general percentage. That country is the hope of Canada. I would rather see our young men going there than to the United States; but the fact is, they are not going here, as they should. It is useless for hon. gentlemen to say that the census does not disclose this state of things. It does, and it would be well for them to meet the question squarely. They will have to meet it; they are going to meet it now; they know that they must meet it. The hon. gentleman said it was very wrong that members on this side of the House should move special resolutions against special industries, and he called upon the Government to protect corn. The man in this House who seemed anxious, not simply to overtake, but to surpass all others in his effort to get a resolution on the Notice Paper in favour of taking the duty off corn, was a supporter of the party on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). Therefore, it was specially cruel for the hon. gentleman to say that we must not move special resolutions, when his own friends are moving them. And why are they moving these special resolutions? Simply because they find they have to, that is all. The most hopeful feature of the recent election in the United States was the number of men who left the Republican party to join the Democratic party. There are a few hopeful signs of the times in this country, and I am thankful for them. Believing, as I do, that this country will never be what it can be or what it is designed to be, until these shackles are broken, I welcome right heartily all the tariff reformers who are now speaking and writing and moving in the direction of compelling this Government, who for so many years have been entrenched in their own security, to give us tariff reform. What are the most hopeful signs of the times? Such papers as the Toronto "News," the Toronto "Telegram" and the Montreal "Star," and the two brightest cartoonists in Canada, have caught the spirit; and even in the room in this House where hon. gentlemen opposite congregate, you can find evidences of the spirit that is abroad. Bengough and Hunter are teaching the people. Then, we are receiving the assistance of men who formerly and perhaps strongly were attached to the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says there must be tariff reform. The hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) says there must be tariff reform. The hon. member for Assinibola West (Mr. Davin) says there must be tariff reform, notwithstanding that his face now almost shows the trickling of the blood from

Mr. FRASER.

the bludgeons used against him, when he dares to say it. When he is speaking in favour of tariff reform, I know that he does so because it is the popular thing in his own constituency, and I have no doubt he will vote, as he always does, in his own interest. Then, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) has moved in this direction, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) finds that he must do something. And the hon. member for Simcoe South (Mr. Tyrwhitt) is thinking over the matter. That hon. gentleman, a true son of Mars, fears that perhaps he should not go too far. Judging by his attitude, as he looks at the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and then at the Government, he is thinking: How happy could I be with either were the other dear charmer away; and he is not just prepared,—he is almost persuaded,—but he fears. Discipline keeps him, and a Tory he was born, and he is afraid a Tory he will die. I fear that too; but I am thankful even for moments when the light breaks in upon a man, and shows him that there is something about him that he never conceived, and which he feels is in the air. And then we have the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and I will say that, so far as he is concerned, anything he will say, if I am not very much mistaken in that hon. gentleman, will be the result of conviction; and when that conviction comes he will go where it leads him. These are signs of the times. And I might mention innumerable instances outside of men, perhaps not so prominent, but men of ability, men who are looking about them, the presidents of boards of trade and others. And then we have resolutions passed by farmers and others. Why, it was a fortunate thing for the Minister of Finance that he got through with his Budget speech and made the enormous changes in this tariff he did, before that representation of 100,000 Patrons of Industry came down here. Does the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) think he knows more about the farmers than the Patrons of Industry? As the hon. member for Assinibola (Mr. Davin) once said, fancy any man leading a great movement and he only a nisi prius lawyer. Does he think a nisi prius lawyer understands as much about the farmers as the hundred thousand Patrons of Industry who know what the farmers want, who know what they can sell, who balance their accounts, and know what is left after they have paid their debts and squared with the world? If he says he knows more than the hundred thousand men who have urged this platform in no uncertain sound, then he has more confidence in his judgment than I have. As a class, the farmers understand as much about their business as any other men in the country; and they will not be content until such time as the burdens are removed, which will make easier the lot of that class, the foundation of classes. What do these men say? They ask for a tariff for revenue only. Just

exactly the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But no, says the hon. gentleman who last spoke; they want no such thing as a tariff for revenue only; protection is what the farmers want. How grossly ignorant these hundred thousand men are. Perhaps they are unsanctified Grits who are desiring annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear, says an hon. gentleman opposite. I recommend the Patrons of Industry in East Northumberland to that hon. gentleman. I say these men know what they are talking about, and they are asking for reciprocal trade on fair and equitable terms between Canada and the world. Strange that these farmers, these men whom hon. gentlemen opposite have always looked to as the dark back-ground of the picture to bring out the manufacturers of the country—good enough at election times—strange that these men should want a reciprocal trade with the world. They are not afraid; they have the instinct of the Britons from whom they come, those Britons, who, when the nations of Europe raised their wall of protection against them, were not afraid, but took the raw material from all countries in the world to their own busy hives of industry in England, and sent that raw material back to the very countries from which it was taken, and compelled these countries to buy it in a manufactured state. They never knew what it was to fear any man. Our farmers have the right stuff in them. They are not the kind of men who have been nursed all these years and who think that nothing will suit them but nursing. They work all day; they know exactly what it costs to raise a bushel of wheat, and what it brings, and are not afraid of competition with the world. They are not afraid of competition with the men to the south of them, who have larger farms; and although England is getting up a large trade with India, selling more goods to India, and buying Indian wheat, our Canadian farmers are willing to compete in the British market against the products of India. To follow up what has been so eloquently said by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), I too feel humiliated every time I think that a wall must be raised about us to give us protection. Fancy men with a land and climate unsurpassed wanting these privileges. I have heard hon. gentlemen speak in this House of the glories of protection—men in whose counties there was not a single industry except farming and fishing. How were they benefitted by protection? But the cry of the old policy caught them, the National Policy, the policy of progress, of prosperity, and of preservation, as the last speaker said, when ringing the changes on the phrase. He was alliterative, certainly, but I cannot say he was convincing. I think the policy might be described by one word, so far as Canada is concerned. It is a national poultice—that

is what it has been during all these years. So far as the manufactures of Canada are concerned, only a few of them wanted it. The best men in Canada did not want it.

Mr. SPROULE. They showed by their votes that they did want it.

Mr. FRASER. I did not know that the manufacturers were the whole of Canada. The farmers were told that this National Policy was going to enhance all the prices of their products. Has it done so? The hon. member who last spoke said we had better markets and better prices. I will refer him to the farmers to settle that question. All I know is that the quotations are all against him. Then we are said to be disloyal, and the hon. gentleman drew a nice distinction between patriotism and loyalty. How very disloyal Mr. Gladstone must have been the other day when he made Her Majesty say in her Speech from the Throne that she regretted there was agricultural depression in England, and Mr. Gladstone said that while he was in power. It would be bad enough if he were in opposition, but he is honest enough, even when in power, to admit that there is depression when he finds it exists. These gentlemen say we are disloyal because we tell the people the truth. Would it not be far worse if we did not speak the truth? Should we not be prophets of evil if we cried Peace, Peace, where there was no peace? That is what these hon. gentlemen are doing. I commend them to the judgments that were pronounced upon such men. The penalties were severe. Now, Mr. Speaker, coming to one other question: the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) spoke about the United States election, and he said that the tariff had nothing to do with it. Let me just read you one or two things on that point. If ever there was an election that was run upon a square issue that election was the last election in the United States. Now, let me read the resolution of the Republican party:

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman should not say that I said the tariff had nothing to do with it. I was not such an idiot as to say anything of that kind.

Mr. FRASER. If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. NORTHRUP. No one could misunderstand me. I did not say anything resembling that. I said it was not issue between protection and free trade, which is a very different question. But that is about as near as hon. gentlemen get to accuracy.

Mr. FRASER. Did the hon. gentleman say a question of free or freer trade?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I did not say freer trade, I said free trade—free, free.

Mr. FRASER. No one has said it was an issue between free trade and protection. The hon. gentleman need not quibble. He said

this was a resolution for free trade. He ought to have learned from the castigation the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Paterson) gave the Government last evening. There is not a word here about free trade. The hon. gentleman should read the resolution.

Mr. NORTHROP. The hon. gentleman should not misrepresent what I said.

Mr. FRASER. I am not misrepresenting him. Who would have thought the hon. gentleman would have spoken about an election involving a question of free trade when he was discussing an amendment about freer trade. Is he dishonest? Is he bringing in issues that do not belong here? The issue of free trade is not raised here at all; when it is raised I shall be ready to discuss it. In the meantime let us understand the record and keep to that. It is a question between freer trade and protection, and these are the questions I am going to discuss. These are the questions before us now and if the hon. gentleman's remarks meant anything except to deceive, they meant that the fight in the United States was not one between freer trade and protection. There is no free trade now discussed either here or in England. It will be discussed, and that right early, but in the meantime let us keep to the subject before the House. There never was an issue more squarely joined between two parties than the issue of tariff reform between the parties in the United States. The Minister of Finance saw nothing in all this to show that the question was raised. Let me read the Republican platform:

We maintain the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the Republican Congress.

Now, turn to the Democratic platform. It will be remembered that there was a section of the Democratic party tainted with a sort of pseudo-protection, but this is the platform of the party as adopted:

We denounce the Republican policy of protection as a fraud on the labour of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few.

The Finance Minister would lead us to suppose that protection was a good thing until it had done its work, when it could be got rid of. But the Democrats declared it to be a fraud now and always. It is not a fraud that grows from that which is good in the beginning, but is in itself a fraud.

We declare it to be fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only.

That is in accord with the resolution of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright):

And we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

Mr. FRASER.

That was the issue, and to the country they went upon that issue. We cannot raise the question as to whether protection is constitutional or not. I admit, but I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is just as illegal to have protection in Canada as it was unconstitutional to have it in the United States. What, after all, is the pact between Government and people? Every man is born with a right to use the blessings of Providence as he sees fit—to get wealth, to keep wealth, to make wealth and exchange wealth. And he gives up his liberty, when he comes to be governed, only to the extent that is necessary for the safety of the country. But never in that pact between the people and the Government did we give up the right to the Government to single out one man in the country and provide that he should have an advantage over his fellows. So that, so far as we are concerned, it being against the spirit of our constitution, I maintain that protection is an infringement upon the right of every citizen in Canada, just as much as it would be if a municipality passed a by-law by which they made a number of tax-payers pay the taxes of another. So I, from a different point of view, declare, as the Democratic party did, the belief that no Government has a right inherent within itself, nor has it received from the people the right, to give one man in the country a single advantage that is not guaranteed to every other. We boast of our glorious freedom, but where is that freedom, when one man is made to pay more than he ought in order to build up an industry in the interests of another? No person but the Almighty can so adjust a protective tariff as to make the burden fall equally upon all the people. If the latter asks for protection and gets it, the shoemaker who makes his shoes, must receive equal protection for what he furnishes to the other, and so with the coat-maker, and so all round, until every man gets back from every other man the amount he has given him. That is why it is that to take a step even in this direction is wrong. It is wrong and immoral, and this was the question before the people of the United States in their last election. Men who towered high above their fellows, like Judge Gresham and Wells and Carl Schurz and other great men in the United States, maintained and declared that protection was immoral. Any man who read the open letters that were invited by the reviews during the time of the election, will find that these men gave forth no uncertain sound, declaring that the whole system was immoral. And how are gentlemen opposite going to meet the situation? It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the methods proposed are not of the best character. I could have understood it very well, if the Government had said: We will not do anything. I am sure they have not yielded without some reason. And now we are to have four gentlemen two Ministers and two Controllers, sent out all over the Dominion to find out the state of the country. Did it occur to the hon. Finance

Minister that it was a little late for him to begin to think about this? Did it occur to him, that if the result is going to be a good one, he ought to have been looking around the country some years ago? If the people were suffering, if any wrong existed, the fact should have been known to him. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the thing is not honest. There is a reason for it, but the reason is not given. The reason for the whole thing is, that great changes are going to be made by the Congress of the United States and we must follow in its wake. Of course, the Government could not be honest about that, for where would the old flag be, if they had to acknowledge that they must wait to see what the Americans were going to do? Why not tell the truth, and say we are bound together in the lot of life, not only as human beings but as nations; that where one suffers another suffers. It is an eternal truth "that no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself," and the nation that attempts to rise upon any other platform than the fact that we depend upon our neighbours as they depend upon us, that they exercise an influence on us as we must on them, is a nation that is binding itself, or rather enclosing itself with a wall of selfishness that is dictated by motives inconsistent with and antagonistic to the best interests of the country. Why, they will wait at the bidding of the United States while shouting for the old party and the old flag. They took the duties off sugar. They never would have done it; they never would have been able to boast of free sugar, only the Americans compelled them to do it. Why not be honest? Now, I agree with the Finance Minister that the Americans are not going to pass any tariff for our advantage unless it will be for their advantage. I admit that; but they know that trade is beneficial to all the parties concerned, and they are going to have it. Trade is not for one nation or for one people, and the nation that thinks that by enclosing itself by walls, it is going to build itself up and become strong and populous has yet to learn the primary lessons of history. I listened to the beautiful passage in which the Finance Minister spoke about preferential trade. It was a beautiful idea—all parts of Great Britain trading with each other. My individual opinion is that that is the honest dream of a visionary experimentalist. It is a beautiful idea; but I can see no point at all in a ship owner in Nova Scotia with a load of fish, or a load of lumber, or a load of coal, or a load of iron ore going around to Australia to sell it for the glory of the federation of the Empire, when he can run ten or fifteen times to the United States and make freight all the time, exchanging it for the goods we want, and getting wealth. There is a more beautiful picture still, and that is the whitened sails of every nation passing and repassing one another on the great seas, each carrying the wealth of one nation to another, exchanging the goods as free as the air that the Great Creator sends

equally to all nations, to the palace of the rich and the cottage of the poor. It is only the selfish man that takes the Creator's gifts that are given with every bounty and throttles them for the purpose of selfish individuality. They are all free to us. Now, I know that time has not yet come; we have not yet reached that stage. We must learn. It took England a long time to learn many of the salutary lessons of her present history. It took ages for her to learn that land might become free in the hands of the common people, and still the nation be prosperous and great. It took ages for her to learn that each individual man has the same right as any titled lord or duke in the realm. So it will take a long time for any nation to learn this great truth that free trade—and in the end come it will—is for the advantage of all nations. No sane man can deny that. I look to a picture far in advance of the little circumscribed picture of the Minister of Finance—I look to this world trading as freely as neighbours with one another. Such was the dream of a great English statesman who became converted—the hon. Minister of Finance is not getting converted, but I know his education, his better reason, teaches him that the policy of protection is the policy of the few who are seeking to enrich themselves at the expense of the many. He has adopted a new word, he calls our industries "nascent" industries. Now, it seems to me he is going back, Mr. Speaker. That is not so far advanced as an infant industry. A nascent industry is beginning to exist, beginning to grow, and entering upon being. A nascent state is a state—I think, perhaps, that is what he refers to—"the state of a gaseous body at the moment of its liberation from previous combinations." That is just exactly what it means. There is going to be a liberation from the combinations in which the Government have been held for the last fifteen years. When the hon. gentleman gets information from the people there is going to be a liberation. I do not know whether he will be successful. Perhaps the nascent passions and interests that are now controlling him may lead to better results, but I think the term is certainly not as good as the other. I suppose he thinks it is time to get another name for what he used to call an infant; at least, it is nearly time that this infant ceased to be nursed by him. He is not like myself, a powerful man, and I can fancy him struggling with a fourteen-year-old infant. 't is a heavy burden. The whole country is put under contribution to feed it 30 per cent pap. It won't take anything but that, and it kicks, and squirms, and yells if the poor over-burdened tax-payers offer it only 20 per cent, or 25 per cent nourishment. So he wants to get another name for it. It will be infant no longer, it will be nascent. Well, perhaps, it will after he returns from his search for information. I want to say one word to my hon. friends from Nova Scotia. I felt very

much humiliated when I found they were not consulted in this matter. Of all the policies I have yet heard, here or elsewhere, the one that seeks to gain information in a few short months as to the state of the country, by going around the country, is the worst. Take my own province. Could not the members for Halifax tell him something about Halifax county. The senior member (Mr. Kenny) could tell him something about the dry goods business. He could tell him something about the wholesale importers, he could tell him he is going out of the business now, and the chances are that the Government will utilize the building which he has been using for dry goods. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Putnam) could tell him something about shipping, without going very far from his place. He would tell him what freight he is getting just now. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) might tell him about trade in that county. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) might tell him something about trade in that county, he might tell him something about the parts of the county where they find that trade is absolutely necessary with the United States. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) could tell him something about the state there also. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Patterson) could tell him something about the rich marshes and beautiful land of that lovely county. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper)—well, he is in the Government and could tell him all about that. The Premier represents Antigonish. The Finance Minister need not go there, because the Premier could tell him all about it. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) could give him just as correct information as he could get if he went down there himself, about the state of the country, but the hon. member for Richmond does not seem to be trusted. Both the hon. members for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen and Mr. McDougald) could tell about the trade down there, but it seems that they do not know. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) might tell him about the great wealth that the people of that county are making. Then the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) might tell him—but I suppose he will not listen to that hon. member now, because the Minister is trying to find some bricks that he can take out of that beautiful edifice. The hon. member told him that if he took out one brick, the whole structure would be gone, and so the Finance Minister has lost confidence in him. Then, while he would not go for information from hon. gentlemen who are opposed to him, he might, in Yarmouth, get some information from the man who gave up his Dominion office for a little while to oppose the hon. member for that county (Mr. Flint), and then went snugly back into the old office again. The hon. member for Digby, who was defeated twice, and who understands all about the county, could give him some information, and the

Mr. FRASER.

gentleman who contested King's could tell him something of the condition of the farmers there and the number of encumbrances on land. The gentleman who contested Queen's could tell him, at least, something about Newfoundland, and that might be very important in framing a new tariff. I, in Guysborough, was opposed, too, by a gentleman in the Government employ, at a small salary, and he might tell the Minister something about the county. So, as regards Nova Scotia, there are abundant opportunities for the Government to obtain all the information required.

Mr. LISTER. How about Lunenburg?

Mr. FRASER. Did I pass it? The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) can give the Minister information in regard to all the counties in Nova Scotia. But the proposition of the Minister of Finance is one of the most ridiculous proposals ever made. Fancy a Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain making a statement to the people of the nation that he would consider the question of the tariff after he had visited Manchester, Hull and Bristol, gone up to Scotland and taken a peep at Ireland? Such a proposal would be received with derisive cheers by his own supporters. For what purpose are the representatives of constituencies here except to give the Government information as to the condition of trade? Do not the public journals furnish such information? For what purpose are the various delegations coming to the Capital, and for what purpose are public bodies passing resolutions and forwarding them to the Government? Are not these the channels through which hon. gentlemen opposite should obtain information? Does the Minister of Finance think that his critical eye can detect the faults of the present system better than hon. members who represent the people in this House? Such is not the fact, by any means. This whole proposal is an attempt to deceive the people by making them think that the hon. gentleman is in earnest in regard to effecting changes in the tariff. When he obtains all his information and is compelled to alter the tariff in compliance with that adopted by the United States Congress, he will say that the information he received was to that effect. But if, perchance, no change was made in the United States tariff, the Minister of Finance will come back to this House and declare that there was no need of changes, and he will be backed up in that opinion by men who will always be found ready to stand by the old policy, by the same methods as in the past. I am glad this issue is directly raised. I appeal with confidence, as every member on this side of the House can appeal with confidence, on this issue to the people of Canada. They have learned their lesson by suffering, and they have made this demand. The Government are nothing but the pipes to express the opinions and wishes of the people, and the people demand

that the tariff shall be reformed. Tariff reform is the cry everywhere, and those hon. gentlemen need not think that they can avert it by burying their heads. They are sleeping, as did the Republican party in the United States, when they believed that the people were so impregnated with protection that nothing could dislodge that party, and they awakened to the fact that the whole country was against them. So it will be here. Tariff reform is consonant with the best interests of this country. I will vote with pleasure for the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, because it means that by tariff reform the people will gain what they have lost, that the farmers and toilers of this country, the men who have to toil for their daily bread, will have something done for them in the direction of lightening the burdens imposed on them. I wish the Minister of Finance would exhibit an honest desire to come back to first principles, and that next year he would be able to enjoy a like reflection to that indulged in by the great English statesman, who became a convert during the corn law agitation, that at least he could rejoice that those whose lot was the most hard and difficult could now eat their bread with greater pleasure because cheaper, and he had the satisfaction of knowing that he brought about this result. You cannot stem the tide that has risen in this country for freer trade relations: you cannot stem it by a loud outcry of loyalty to the old flag or anything else. The old landmarks are fading away, and despite the cry of injuring the National Policy and its unity, and that this question of tariff is only part of it—which is the plea we have heard this session only—tariff reform must come. I commend the hon. gentlemen opposite to study with their constituents the condition of this Dominion. You cannot follow a wrong policy year after year and not have its effects return with terrific force. Believing that protection as administered here is a wrong against this country. I believe a reformation is at hand. I believe that this wrong must be rectified. I believe the men and women in this country, who have at last found that this policy is not what it was represented, who accepted it upon the pledge of hon. gentlemen opposite, but who have found from its enforcement that it is a sham, a fraud and a pretense, will at the first opportunity declare that they want freer trade relations with the world, that their interests are bound up with the interests of others, and that man for man they fear no competition with any foreigner, be he on this continent or not. They are willing to open their gates to the freest trade possible with all nations of the world, confident that their skill, their honesty, their brawn and muscle, their power to labour will equal that of the people of any nation, that Canadians need fear no fair competition, that they are not pampered children who need to be protected in their nurses'

arms, but they are brave men and women, who, conscious of their own power and ability to labour, who, feeling they have the best country to live in, a heritage handed down to them to make better by individual effort, cry out for such a tariff reform as will sweep away the miserable refuge of lies which has so long detained them from participating in the privileges and blessings of this country.

Mr. BENNETT. It is not often the leader of the Opposition is to be congratulated on the results he has achieved, but he can be fairly congratulated on the success he has accomplished to-day. This afternoon, in the person of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) he introduced a tragedian, and to-night he introduced a comedian of the highest order. We have had something in the shape of tragedy, and the whole has finished up with a screaming farce, furnished by the hon. member for Guysborough, and I think he may fairly congratulate himself on his success in that role. We in Western Ontario have been led to believe that the people by the sea, who were accustomed to partake of large quantities of fish, developed an immense amount of brain power, but I must doubt the truth of that statement henceforth, and believe that fish, instead of producing brain power, produces gas, and that not of a very brilliant quality. How does this Ministry meet this House to-night? I ask hon. gentlemen to compare the Ministry to-day with the Ministry of 1878. At that time there was a party in power supported by a majority equally large as the majority which supports the present Government. Did the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Administration proclaim to the country that he was in a position to meet the evils that then existed? Did he state that the Government were able, by legislation or in practice, to change the current of events and bring about a different state of affairs to that which then existed? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who doubtless is so exhausted after his great speech of the other evening, that he is not in his place to-night, made the following statement then:—

I have not attempted to deny, neither has any man eminent in mercantile life attempted to measure accurately the extent of the depression which now exists, and which from various causes has been increased to a most unwonted extent.

Sir, is that the statement of the present Finance Minister? I ask is that the statement of the Conservative press of this country—that we are in such a state of depression, and that the country is so stagnant that the like had never been seen before? Does the Finance Minister, and do the Cabinet of the present day confess, as the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Administration confessed, that they were powerless to act, that they were utterly unable to cope with then existing evils and that they were helpless to raise their

hands to stem the tide of stagnation that was then in force? No; the Government of to-day offers a remedy. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), speaking at that time, said:

We do not believe we can attain prosperity by Act of Parliament. The people of Canada can only grow richer by the exercise of greater frugality and hard work.

Was not that a peculiar policy to offer to the people? Was not that a plain intimation to them that if they would work harder, eat less and dress more meanly they would be able to succeed? Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that the Finance Minister has not made sufficient intimations relative to changes in the tariff; but we on this side of the House will, I believe, support the principle which he has set in motion, namely, that changes in that direction should be gone about quietly and systematically. That is the principle that has been adopted since the National Policy, since its inception, and that is the principle which, I trust, will ever be held to, and will ever be kept in view by the Government. I wish now to direct the attention of the House to a matter which the Finance Minister referred to in his speech. I speak of the lumbering industry of this country, in which the constituency which I have the honour to represent is greatly interested. I need not dilate upon the merits, or upon the extent of the lumbering industry, because every gentleman in this House, from whatever province he may come, be it from a lumbering centre or not, must realize the importance of this great industry and recognize its good effects on the prosperity of the country at large. It is not a trade that has invested in it, money by the thousands, but by the millions. It is a trade that gives employment, not to hundreds of men, but to thousands of our people. For that reason, that line of industry should be considered most carefully, and should be treated with the greatest possible attention by the present Government. Moreover, Sir, we in the province of Ontario do complain with a great deal of cause, and with a great deal of justice, that the Local Administration in that province has not only been inimical to that industry, but that they have done it on all occasions where they have had the opportunity a most positive injury. The present policy of that Government, a policy which has existed since Confederation in the province of Ontario relative to the timber limits is this: that there shall be sold from time to time, limits paying so much of a bonus as a right to cut timber on such limits, that in addition to the bonus so paid there shall be paid dues in each year, and in addition to that the payment of ground rent. To-day there are under license in the province of Ontario upwards of 4,500 square miles of timber lands. These sales have taken place from time to time, not as the circumstances

Mr. BENNETT.

of the case warranted, not as the desire of the people was evidenced, but as the requirements, and as the wants, and as the interests of a depleted exchequer in that province necessitated. Now, Sir, what has been the result of these timber limits sales? The result has been that there have been sold in 1881, 1885, 1887, 1890 and 1892, limits amounting in all to some 4,500 miles, the bonus upon which has been over \$5,000,000. Quoting from the "Canada Lumberman" of the month of January last, I read the following:—

McArthur Bros., of Toronto, recently sold a body of Canadian timber for \$550,000 to Hurst & Fisher, of Michigan, which cost them fifteen years before \$75,000. Sound common sense and shrewd business foresight have played successfully with this concern.

By instituting a comparison it will be seen that the limit purchased by these lumbermen had advanced in a few years to seven times its original cost, and applying the same principle to the other limits sold, you will find that the Ontario Government have sacrificed \$30,000,000 of the lumber resources of the people of that province. If it were possible on the part of the McArthur Bros. to purchase the limit for that amount, and it was possible because they did purchase it, then it must be quite plain when they sold at such an advanced price, that had the Ontario Government conserved these pine limits, as they could have done, and as they should have done for the people, then the province of Ontario would be \$30,000,000 richer at the present time. The answer given to this complaint is: That it was impossible for the Government to hold the limits on account of the fact that fires might occur. Now, if the McArthur Bros. could hold a limit despite fires why could not the province of Ontario? And if the McArthur Bros. could thus hold one limit why could not the province of Ontario hold a great many more? What has been the policy of the Ontario Government all through in respect to these timber limits? I will grant that when the first sale of timber limits was made the trouble that we have now to face was not then imminent. Up to that time limits had been sold freely to Canadians, the lumber was manufactured in Canada, and as a result our own people got the benefit of the manufacturing. But in the year 1881 a new change of affairs presented itself. On that occasion at the sale in the Legislative Assembly room in Toronto there were present a large number of American buyers, and it was generally announced then that the reason of their being present was to purchase Canadian limits, and to tow the logs across Lake Huron to the United States. That was an opportunity when the Ontario Government could have interfered. That was an occasion, when with the most open notice, they could have placed such restrictions upon these sales that it would have been an utter impossibility that the people of the province should be brought face to face

with the great difficulties which present themselves to-day. Now, Sir, what followed after that? In 1885 another sale took place, and there was another opportunity afforded the Government to prevent our present difficulties, but what excuse did they then shelter behind? They took shelter behind the same statement as was adduced by the commissioner of the Crown Lands in the month of October last year, namely, that if they did not give free and fair competition between Americans and Canadian the result would be that the prices would not have been so high. I say it would have been better if the sales had been so made, that the limits should have actually been sacrificed to Canadians, and the timber afterwards manufactured in our own country. Even after failing to do that, there was another plan which they could have adopted, and which would have the same effect, and which it is not too late even yet to adopt. That plan has been asked and demanded from the Government time and again, but up to the present they have refused point blank to comply with the request. The proposition was to impose upon the limits a restriction of say an advance of \$5 for dues with a rebate of \$4 on such lumber as was manufactured in the country. Let me ask what was probably the principal reason for these sales being made without restrictions. If the hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to turn up the records of the sales, they will find in the list of purchasers on that occasion such ideal and practical lumbermen as John A. Barron, who was formerly member of Parliament in this House, Robert Jaffray, purveyor-general for grocery supplies to the colonization roads in Ontario, and other gentlemen of that ilk; men who never expected to work these limits but men who expected to sell them at an advanced rate; men who had thrown about them the guardianship of the Ontario Government and thought that whatever the Dominion Government might do, the Ontario Government would be prepared to stand by them in regard to letting the timber go out of the country. But when this state of affairs was going on, was the Dominion Government silent? Was the Administration of Sir John Macdonald—because he was then Premier—permitting this to go on? On turning to the records you will find that in 1886, when this great difficulty had been presented to the Dominion authorities, after the local Government had been appealed to in vain to stop these vast, these almost unlimited quantities of timber going out of the country, there was then placed upon pine timber exported from the province of Ontario, a duty of \$2 per thousand, with this further reservation, that under an Order in Council the Dominion Government might, at any time, cause to be imposed a further duty of \$1 per thousand on such timber. But, Sir, that was not all. The Order in Council did at last go into effect, with the result that on the 13th November,

1888, the Dominion Government caused to be placed on logs exported from the province of Ontario to the United States, a duty of \$3 per thousand. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen to contrast the policies of the two Governments in this regard. Here was the Ontario Government, the actual owners of the pine limits; here were the men who had the custody and control of those limits, who could have surrounded them with such safe-guards that it would have been impossible for the state of things to take place which we see staring us in the face to-day, offering no help, while the Dominion Government was doing all in its power to prevent these vast quantities of timber going out of the country. But at that time, I confess, the danger was not so plain as it is to-day, by reason of the local causes that existed on the Georgian Bay, the district which is most seriously affected. Local causes, then, tended to draw off attention. At that time there was a large demand for lumber in Manitoba and the North-west, because the Rainy River district had not then been worked. The Canadian Pacific Railway was also under construction, and for that work large quantities of lumber were purchased in the Georgian Bay district. In addition, there was at that time a large lumber trade with South America, and owing to these causes the great danger that exists to-day was not then so patent and so plain. Well, what happened afterwards? With the end of the wedge inserted, with the political leverage firmly placed behind, with the Jaffrays and the Barrons, and other Grit politicians in the province of Ontario selling these limits to American buyers, at once the machinery was set in order on the other side of the line, and a move was made. A threat was made that unless the export duty was removed, there would be placed an additional duty on sawn lumber going there from the Dominion of Canada. The result would have been, if not fatal, at least very injurious to the lumber industries of this country if that increased tariff had been imposed. Then on this side the lumbermen, irrespective of their political leanings, were drawn into a union, and on May 19, 1888, in answer to the hon. member for Pontiac, Sir John Macdonald intimated that in the event of the United States Government lowering the duty on white pine, the export duty would be taken off sawlogs; and to-day the duty on lumber going into the United States is \$1 per thousand, while there is no duty on timber going out of this country. What is the result of this? I will now point out. When the pine was owned by many mill-owners along the Georgian Bay, a large number of small tugs brought logs to the mills in rafts; and the crews of the tugs lived in different towns of that district. But where there were many tugs then there is hardly one in use to-day. It is true we do sometimes hear the whistle of a tug. The solemn stillness of the Sabbath is sometimes broken by one of the tugs belong-

ing to the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) going in there; and I hope that hon gentleman in his Sunday observance Bill will insert a clause to save us from such annoyances on that day. Some other difficulties we are face to face with to-day. There are brought into the country large numbers of men from the United States. I do not say that the Americans refuse to allow Canadians to work in their lumber shanties. They do not; but the better class of men are brought from the United States, and the reason is apparent. In the first place, they have their own tugs, and these tugs bring with them from Michigan their supplies of pork; and I hope that this session the Finance Minister will place such a duty on pork as will prohibit any coming in this way to the north shore of the Georgian Bay. They also bring in a large number of men. It is an acknowledged fact that a large number of Americans are employed in the camps on the north shore, whereas Canadians are prevented from going to work in the lumber camps of Michigan by the Alien Labour Law. That there are large numbers of men from the States employed in these lumber districts I will prove by extracts from papers. Here is one:

Messrs. Ring & Merrill, the American lumber firm, are lumbering extensively in this neighbourhood with gangs of men mostly brought from Saginaw, Chicago and other United States points.

Here is one from the Alpena, Michigan, "Journal":

Mr. W. C. Simonson, land-looker for A. Pack, who had been over in Canada, and who spent some time in the camps in the Spanish River country, arrived home Saturday night. He reports everything in that vicinity as moving along nicely, and says that in the three camps there for Alpena parties there are about 120 Alpena men, all enjoying the best of health. They will put in there this season about twenty millions, which will be rafted to this city for sawing.

Now, they not only bring in men, but they even introduced supplies for camp purposes. On this subject, here is an extract from the "Canada Lumberman," of 8th November last:

Merrill, Ring & Co. have shipped a large cargo of utensils to be used in their logging operations in your country. Among the stuff are forty logging sleighs made by a local manufacturer, on which the duty of course will be a considerable item.

Now, I say that this is a matter which demands at the hands of the Government the most serious and careful consideration. This year, on a low estimate, I am assured by responsible men, there will be taken from the north shore of the Georgian Bay 400,000,000 feet of lumber. How long can this go on? Figures prove that to-day, of the once great pine region of the north shore, only about 10 per cent remains; and unless vigorous steps are taken difficulties will result, and that before very long. Not only do we suffer in that regard, but there is also great disadvantage occasioned to towns on the shores of the Georgian Bay, which, at great expense,

Mr. BENNETT.

have constructed docks for the accommodation of the immense quantities of lumber which in the fall of every year had been sent out from the mills and shipped away. And why? Because the lumber is not being sawn on the north shore. Now, I want to be fair in my statement for this reason, that the interests of my riding are diverse. I will admit that the man who to-day owns a Canadian limit and mill would infinitely prefer that the state of affairs should continue which exists to-day rather than return to the \$2 duty. I will admit that under the McKinley Bill, by an automatic movement, so to speak, there would be a return to the \$2 duty; but even if there were, it would be infinitely better that should exist than we should continue in the position in which we are now. I regret that the Government have been in the past very much misled by statements in this House. In fact, I regret to say that I believe they attached some little importance to the remarks of my predecessor from East Simcoe in this House, when he assured the Government that if they did not at once promise that the \$1 duty imposed on lumber would be removed many mills on the Georgian Bay would be closed, and that if they dared to impose an export duty—mark you, this gentleman who was looking after the interests of a large constituency, dared the Government to do this—on logs, they would close up all the mills. My predecessor, Dr. Spohn, misrepresented the conditions of affairs there, and stated what was not in the common interests of all, but only what was in the interests of a few. What we contend to-day is that there should be one of two courses. There should be either a return to the export duty or we should have our lumber admitted into the United States free of duty. I know that it is not within the province of this House to legislate that our lumber should be admitted there free of duty; but it is within the province of this Ministry to make a representation to the United States Government, that if they will not admit our lumber free of duty, we will at once impose a prohibitory export duty on logs going into that country. I do not blame the lumbermen who have bought, or the Local Government, who have sold these limits, if they wish to sell more at high prices, through competition between Americans and Canadians; but I do say this, that, as the Ontario Government have determined to sacrifice the interests of the masses, this Government should not hesitate to do what is fair to all, irrespective, as the Minister of Finance has said, of whether it interferes with vested interests or not. It is true that these limits have been bought and paid for, but there was no guarantee to the purchasers that they would forever have the privilege of exporting logs out of the country free of duty. I may add that when there was \$2 duty against lumber, we were able to export lumber to the United States in large quantities; and to-day, owing to the depletion of their own

forests the Americans are prepared to buy our lumber even to a grater extent than when the \$2 duty did exist. As regards the matter of export duty, I have only this to say that a return to the old export duty of \$2 or \$3 would be suicidal. It would only provoke on the part of the Americans a return to the duty of \$2 or perhaps further reprisals by imposing a higher duty. If an export duty is placed on logs, it should be a prohibitory duty. I will grant that the question is a vexed one, and that the interests are diverse; but I say that the interests of the thousands of people who are engaged in the work of their hands in the lumber industry should be first looked after rather than the interests of these men who are today wealthy. Now, the Budget debate has taken a very wide range. Hon. members have gone from Dan to Beershebah. In fact, the last speaker, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) went a little further, and I do not propose at this late hour to trespass on the time of House with any remarks on that score. I would be pleased to see a little unanimity on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite as to their policy. Let them go, as the Minister of Finance has said, into the open and there tell us fairly and honestly what it is. Is it the policy of the Reform Association as announced at North Norfolk, and as enunciated by their secretary, Mr. Donly, a policy of annexation with the people of the United States? If it is, then the Conservative party are prepared to meet them in open fight on that question and abide the result. If, on the other hand, it is a policy of reciprocity with the United States, all that can be said must be this: that we cannot, as has been pointed out from time to time, enter into any arrangement with the people of the United States for free trade, save on one condition, and that condition must be this, that we must place against Great Britain a tariff uniform with the United States tariff against other countries, as they will not permit Canada to be a dumping ground for British manufactured goods through which they could be smuggled across the line. After the gloomy predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite, I must say it was a complete change to hear the amusing speech, as I may term it, to use a mild phrase, of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who for once forgot his cry of distress and mourning. It is absurd to point, as hon. gentlemen do, to the people of Ontario as being in such abject poverty. So far as the census figures go, they show in my riding a very considerable increase in the past ten years, and that is due to this fact that it is a comparatively new riding. There were hundreds of acres of land owned by the Canadian Land Company, and lands from which the pine had been taken, and which had been sold to the farmers' sons, and the result was that the townships re-

turns show a most decided increase in the assessment rate. As far as the mortgage question is concerned, a careful reference to the state of mortgages all over the province of Ontario will show that there are causes other than those ascribed by hon. gentlemen opposite for these mortgages. For instance, it was only a few weeks since when a case came to my notice of a farmer who bought the adjoining farm to his own for \$1,000, which he paid for with \$600 cash and raised the balance by a mortgage of \$400 on his own farm. So you will find many such reasons, from one end of the country to the other, to account for mortgages; and surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not argue that it is not a proof of prosperity when a farmer from his savings is enabled to purchase the adjoining farm by means of ready cash and a small mortgage on his own. The hour is late, and I do not propose to go further into this matter. My object was to bring to the attention of the Minister and this House this grave question of the depletion of the forests in Ontario. I contend that it is a grave question that American capitalists should come into Canada and invest in timber lands, as they have done, and deplete those lands at the cost of the labouring men of this country, and when you look at the timber business in all its present bearings you see that it is not only the man who works with his hands in the saw-mill or who is employed in getting out the logs who is affected, but also the mercantile classes who live in these towns and the farmers in the neighbouring parts of the country. And it must be borne in mind that this summer this vast quantity of pine, four hundred million feet, would be sufficient to run forty large saw-mills employing a great number of men, distributing money through the country and increasing our wealth. And I do trust the Minister of Finance will not wait until the report has been made, but considering the stand the Government have taken upon this question, will recognize that the appeal is to this Government and to this Government only, because the Ontario Government have been appealed to but in vain, and will seize the opportunity which now offers and I trust they will pass such legislation as will prevent and prohibit the continuance of the export of this vast quantity of logs from the province of Ontario year after year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1892.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser for Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act incorporating the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. McInerney.)

Bill (No. 57) to amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Automatic Telephone and Electric Company of Canada.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Girouard.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRiviere.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation and Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Ryckman, for Mr. Roome.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Corporation.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt, for Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg, for Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Atlantic and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the South-eastern Railway.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Calgary Street Railway Company.—(Mr. Corbould, for Mr. Davis.)

TONNAGE OF CANADIAN SHIPPING.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What was the total registered tonnage of Canadian shipping on the 31st December, 1892?

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The department have no means of knowing the number of vessels registered out of Canada but owned by people residing in Canada. It is understood, however, that several large steam-ships and many sailing vessels owned in Canada wholly or in part are registered in the United Kingdom. The following is the tonnage registered to December, 1892, viz. :—

Provinces.	Number of Vessels.	Number of Steamers.	Gross Tonnage of Steamers.	Total Register of Tonnage.
New Brunswick..	946	101	8,950	181,779
Nova Scotia.....	2,731	123	18,743	425,690
Quebec.....	1,408	275	75,884	162,638
Ontario.....	1,347	755	96,497	141,750
Prince E. Island.	196	21	4,896	22,706
Manitoba.....	81	54	6,134	6,118
British Columbia	298	173	23,607	23,448
Total.....	7,007	1,502	234,711	964,129

POST OFFICE AT KEMPTVILLE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) for Sir Richard Cartwright) asked, Whether the Postmaster-General is aware that complaints have been made to the department by Mrs. Leslie, of Kemptville, that several letters addressed to her have been opened at said office? Whether any investigation has been made into said complaints? If so, whether any report thereon has been made? Whether said report has been acted on? Who is the postmaster, and who is the assistant postmaster at Kemptville?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Complaints have been made to the department of the nature mentioned, and an investigation has been made. A report was made in February, 1891, but no recommendation was made by the inspector, and no action was taken. The postmaster is H. G. Ferguson, and the assistant postmaster, J. D. Ferguson. Mr. Leslie, the husband of the complainant, was for many years assistant postmaster at Kemptville, his father being postmaster. On the appointment (owing to the resignation of the late postmaster) of the present postmaster, Mr. H. G. Ferguson, Mr. Leslie's services as assistant were dispensed with.

FISHING IN COUNTY OF RICHELIEU.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, Has the fishery overseer for the county of Richelieu been instructed to prohibit fishing within the limits of his district at this season of the year? Have the Government been informed that the fishermen of the county of Richelieu, and more particularly of the parish of Ste. Anne de Sorel, have been notified of such prohibition?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The fishery overseer for the county of Richelieu has been instructed to prohibit net fishing under the ice within the limits of his district. Similar instructions have been given to other overseers in the province of Quebec. The department has been informed that the fishermen of the county of Richelieu, and more particularly those of the parish of Ste. Anne de Sorel, were notified of such prohibition.

WALKERTON MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether the contract for carrying the mail from Walkerton to the railway station has been recently let? 2. If so, to whom and at what rate per year? 3. Was it let by public tender? 4. If so, who tendered, and what was the amount of each tender? If not let by public tender, why not? 6. Does the party who received the contract hold any other Government position? If so, what, and what salary is attached to it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. Yes. 2. Andrew McLean, 25 cents per trip. 3. No. 5. The existing contract was renewed under statutory authority on the same terms and conditions. 6. The department is not aware that Mr. McLean holds any other Government position, but I will have inquiry made.

ST. PASCAL AND KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CARROLL asked, Whether the Government called for tenders for carrying the mail between St. Paschal and Kamouraska, in 1892? Was the lowest tender accepted; and if not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The existing contract for this service will expire on 31st March, 1893. On 25th October last notices were issued inviting tenders. On 3rd November the existing contract was renewed, and the notices withdrawn.

I. C. R.—ST. CHARLES BRANCH.

Mr. CARROLL asked, Under the direction of what engineer was the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial Railway constructed?

Mr. HAGGART. The engineers in charge of the work were Mr. Peter Archibald and Mr. W. B. McKenzie.

PIERS AT KAMOURASKA.

Mr. CARROLL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry on the work begun in 1882 on the piers at Kamouraska and at Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere?

Mr. OUMET. The work on these piers has been completed.

GASPE AND CHICOUTIMI JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, What is the reason that the judges of the Superior Courts in the judicial districts of Gaspé and Chicoutimi are paid \$500 each less than other judges of the same courts in the province of Quebec? Is it the intention of the Government to place the judges of these districts on a uniform salary as their colleagues in the said province of Quebec?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume that the direct answer to the hon. gentleman's question would be that the law fixes the salary at \$500 less; but I presume the hon. gentleman desires to know the policy of that difference, and upon that I have only to say that the statute for many years has remained as at present. I presume that the difference was suggested by the reduced expense of living in those districts and the smaller amount of labour which devolves on the judges there. It is not the intention of the Government to propose to change the salaries of those judges until a general measure is adopted dealing with the salaries of all the judges of that class.

NEW HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER.

Mr. FRASER asked, Has the Government received the report of Mr. Shewen, C.E., on survey made as to cost, &c., for the breakwater at New Harbour, Guysborough County? If so, what is the nature of the breakwater he proposes? Estimated cost? Do the Government propose to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to build said breakwater?

Mr. OUMET. Yes, a report has been received. The engineer in his report on New Harbour, Guysborough County, suggests the construction of two piers of piles, brush and stone, at the mouth of St. Catherines River, with the necessary dredging. The cost is estimated at \$27,550. The question as to placing a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the work is now under consideration.

ADMISSION OF AMERICAN CATTLE INTO THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, Whether settlers' cattle are admitted into the Canadian North-west from the United States without quarantine; on inspection only? If so, is it the intention of the Government to enforce quarantine regulations against all American cattle entering Canada? Have representations been made to the Government at any time, either written or verbal, of the danger of the British Government scheduling Canadian cattle if settlers' cattle were admitted into Manitoba and the North-west Territories from the United States without quarantine?

Mr. FOSTER. Settlers' cattle are not admitted into the Canadian North-west from the United States without quarantine, and they are admitted on inspection only.

Mr. LAURIER. Since when ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is now enforcing quarantine regulations against all American cattle entering the Canadian North-west. No representations, either written or verbal, of the danger of the British Government scheduling Canadian cattle if settlers' cattle were admitted into Manitoba and the North-west Territories from the United States without quarantine, were before the Government previous to Canadian cattle being scheduled by the British Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Since when has this order gone into force ?

Mr. FOSTER. Since Saturday.

PHIDIME BELANGER.

Mr. TARTE asked, What is the position now held by Phidime Belanger, surveyor, formerly of L'Islet ? What is his salary ? How long has he been in his position in the employment of the Government ?

Mr. DALY. Mr. Belanger is at present a Dominion land surveyor in the employment of the Department of the Interior. His salary is \$1,500 per annum. He has been in his present employment since 29th April, 1892, and he is one of the most capable men in the profession, and has been engaged in survey work for the Government at various times, and for varying periods for the past ten years. He is not, and never has been, in the permanent employment of the Government.

CUSTOM-HOUSE, ST. JOHN.

Mr. COLTER (for Mr. Gillmor) asked, Who were the tenderers for the copper work on the roof of the Custom-house at St. John, N.B., and what was the amount of each tender ? Was any tender accepted ? If so, whose tender ? Did the successful tenderer proceed with the work ? If he did not, was the contract offered to the next lowest or any other tenderer ? If not, why not ? Was the deposit of the unsuccessful tenderer forfeited ? Under what arrangement was the work done, or is now being done ? Who has been or is inspecting the work, and what has been or is the amount of his pay ? Who is supplying or has supplied the copper and what price is the Government to pay for it ?

Mr. OUMET. The tenderers were John E. Wilson, St. John, \$5,380 ; G. Hebener, \$5,900 ; Douglas & Plunkett, Toronto, \$6,725 ; Douglas, Douglas, Matthews & Bell, \$6,920 ; McGourty & Donaghue, St. John, \$8,158 ; James McDade, \$8,884. The lowest tender, that of John E. Wilson, was accepted. The Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

successful tenderer did not proceed with the work. The contract was awarded to the next lowest, who declined. It is not the practice of the department to forfeit the deposit made by unsuccessful tenderers. The work is being done by day labour, under the direction of the chief architect, represented at St. John by S. Adams, one of the clerks of works at headquarters, who has direct charge of the work. S. Adams has been inspecting the work. His salary is \$90 per month. The copper has been supplied by W. H. Thorne & Co., at 14 cents per pound for the original quantity tendered for, and 15½ cents per pound for some additional quantity.

POSTMASTER OF CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware that Mr. A. Beaulieu, postmaster of the parish of Cap St. Ignace, has left the said parish in order to reside elsewhere ? 2. Did Mr. Beaulieu send in his resignation as postmaster, on leaving the parish ; if not, is it the intention of the Government to cancel his appointment ? 3. Have any persons made application for appointment to the position of postmaster in the place of the said Beaulieu ; if so, who are the said persons ?

Sir A. P. CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I beg to state the department was informed that Mr. Beaulieu spends three days each week away at Cap St. Ignace, and when he is thus away the business of the post office is under the charge of assistants who perform their duties in a satisfactory manner. Mr. Beaulieu has not sent in his resignation. In answer to the third question, MM. Gamache and Bissonnette made application.

POST OFFICE OF NOTRE DAME DU ROSAIRE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to comply with the petition of the inhabitants of Notre Dame du Rosaire and others, asking that the post office be located in close proximity to the church ?

Sir A. P. CARON. (Translation.) This matter is under consideration : I asked for information which has not reached me yet.

THE EMPLOYEES UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF MR. F. X. BERLINGUET.

Mr. DESAULNIERS (Translation) asked, What was the amount paid to employees of the Government, whether permanent or temporary, in the districts placed under the supervision of Thomas F. X. Berlinguet, C.E., between 29th June, 1891, and 29th June, 1892, and from 29th June, 1892, to 31st December, 1892 ? What are the names of the said employees, and the amounts paid to each of them respectively ? What amount of money was

spent by the Government in the said district during that period, exclusive of sums paid to Mr. Berlinguet ?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The names of the persons employed by the Government in the district placed under the supervision of the engineer, Mr. Berlinguet, are included in so many pay-lists that it would be impossible to get them in an answer to a question. If the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers) is willing to make a motion to that effect, he will have all the information he requires in this question.

THE HERCHMER COMMISSION.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to point out that there is a motion of mine on the Paper calling for the report of Mr. Justice Wetmore, who inquired into the charges against Mr. Commissioner Herchmer. I venture to suggest to the Government that this report should be brought down without waiting for us to arrive at the motion in regular form. It has long been in print; it has been given from Minister to Minister, and it has been shown to outsiders, I believe. I hope my hon. friend the President of the Council will bring it down immediately.

Mr. IVES. I will have the papers prepared so as to bring them down at the earliest moment; perhaps before the hon. gentleman has an opportunity of making his motion.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend will allow me, I can hardly think there is any necessity for delay. The report is in print.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, according to the understanding we arrived at last session, no papers should be tabled except on motion made here. I would, perhaps, suggest that unopposed motions should be taken, and then the papers can be brought down without delay. If it meets the unanimous consent of the House, I would suggest that we should proceed with the unopposed motions.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that refers to motions which are not the subject of debate and which are simply for the production of papers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we might do that.

HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE— OFFICERS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing : 1. The names, age, birth-place, salary, origin and religion of the permanent officers and servants of the Senate and House of Commons, and the permanent officers and servants employed in the Library of Parliament, as they stood at the end of the first session of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. 2. The changes, with dates, which have taken place with respect to the said permanent offi-

cers and servants, in each and every succeeding session, up to date. 3. The names, age, birth-place, salary, origin and religion, of the permanent officers and servants of the Senate and House of Commons, and the permanent officers and servants employed in the Library of Parliament, as they now stand on their respective pay-lists; and the same particulars respecting the extra clerks, or those having temporary or sessional connection with the said Houses and Library at the present moment. 4. The sums paid for extra work or outside work to the permanent officers and servants of the Senate and House of Commons, and the permanent officers and servants employed in the Library of Parliament, from the first session of the Parliament of Canada up to date.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to let that motion stand. It calls for a return from the Senate, and it is not in the power of the House to order returns from the Senate. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, when he comes to move it, he would consider the propriety of restricting it somewhat, because it calls for the birthplace, salary, origin and religion of many persons who are dead, and it might take a long time to ascertain these particulars.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will withdraw it and put it in another shape.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copy of the report of the Honourable Mr. Justice Wetmore, appointed by Royal Commission to inquire into certain charges against Lawrence Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, petitions and other documents received and exchanged by the Government, respecting the dismissal of Edouard Lesage, postmaster of St. Léon, in the county of Maskinongé, and to any appointment or appointments made to the position since the discharge of the said official.—(Mr. Legris.)

Return showing the quantity of pig iron produced in Canada in the years 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879 and 1880, and bounty paid, if any, during those years. Also amount of pig iron imported from Great Britain and the United States respectively, and the total amount imported during those years.—(Mr. Macdonald, Huron.)

Return of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and other papers relating to the suspension of Mr. Edward Hackett, Inspector of Fisheries, Prince Edward Island, in the year 1892; together with copies of the charges made against Mr. Hackett, the authority given to the commissioner in Prince Edward Island to take evidence on such charges, the evidence taken, and the report of the Minister of Marine thereon, together with any letters, correspondence, orders or reports relating to the reinstatement of Mr. Hackett.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all correspondence and reports accumulated between the years 1876 and 1893 in the hands of the Government relating to the Lurcher Shoal, near the entrance to the Bay of Fundy, and proposed means for the protection of navigation in that vicinity.—(Mr. Bowers.)

Papers, documents, correspondence, &c., addressed to the Government in relation to the best means to be adopted to prevent the spreading of cholera.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Evidence taken before Mr. James G. Moylan, Inspector of Penitentiaries, in connection with the investigation or investigations held by that official at Kingston Penitentiary during the past year which resulted in the dismissal or resignation of certain officials of that institution.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Copies of all petitions, letters and documents whatsoever, in relation to the change in the location of the post office of Notre Dame du Rosaire.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Copy of the claims made by Messrs. F. B. McNamee & Co., contractors, in connection with the recommendations made by a select committee of the House of Commons, June, 1887, with all reports, Orders in Council and other papers relating thereto.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Return of all persons receiving fishery bounties in the Counties of Victoria and Guysborough, N.S., for the year 1892, with amount paid each.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Copy of any report to Council made by Hon. J. A. Chapleau when Minister of Customs, on the reorganization of the Customs Department or recommending changes regarding that department.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Copy of the questions put and the subjects submitted to the parties who presented themselves for preliminary or qualifying examination, or both, at the last examination for the Civil Service.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Return showing the number of Experimental Farm reports published for the year 1891; the number published in English and French respectively; the number allotted to each member of the House of Commons and Senate, and the number still on hand.—(Mr. Grieve.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Before entering upon the consideration of the matter before the House—the National Policy, its promises and its failures—I wish briefly to answer the charge made by the hon. gentleman who last spoke on the opposite side against the administration of public lands by the Ontario Government, and show that such a charge comes with very bad grace from a supporter of the administration of the public lands by this Government. He charged that the administration of public lands by the Ontario Government was inimical to the best interests of the people of that province and caused them a loss of \$30,000,000 in money. That charge is one which, in my opinion, should not have been made in this House. If made at all, it should have been made in the Ontario Assembly, where it would be met and where it would be satisfactorily shown that no such loss, or any loss, ever resulted from the administration of public lands in that province. I wish, however, to show briefly to those who

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

may believe in the opinions expressed by that hon. gentleman, that the administration of public lands in Ontario has been more in the interests of the people of that province than has the administration of public lands in the Dominion been in the interest of this country. The mode adopted by the Ontario Government of selling their lands came before the Legislature of that province several times during the last few years, and met with the approval of both parties there, who agreed it was the best plan that could have been put in effect. In fact, when the discussion arose regarding the system of placing these lands on the market, the late leader of the Conservative party in the House then, the Hon. M. C. Cameron, gave his adhesion to the plan adopted by Mr. Mowat and his Ministers. Some time later an objection was raised by one of the Conservative members and the question again came under discussion, and during that discussion the system in force was endorsed by the present leader of the Conservative party, Mr. W. R. Meredith, only four members of the Conservative party objecting to it. Under that system, at certain intervals, timber limits are put on the market for sale. Advertisements are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country, so that several months previous everybody had notice to attend the public sale and could purchase limits if he bid high enough. In 1887, the Ontario Government realized from their sale of lands no less than \$2,859 per square mile. For a limit of fifty miles the result would be \$142,950 at that price. The ground rent would be \$150, or \$3 per square mile, and the timber dues would be \$12,500 for the limit, which would make a total of \$155,600 realized by the sale of 1887. Now, according to the regulations of the Dominion, they would realize upon the same number of miles as follows:—A bonus on fifty square miles, nothing; ground rent at \$5 per square mile, \$250; timber dues, 75 cents per thousand feet of board measure, \$9,625, or \$9,875 as against \$155,600 realized by the regulation of the Local Legislature, or a sum in favour of the regulation which the hon. gentleman criticised in his speech, of \$145,725. Now, the hon. gentleman could not bring any charge of extravagance or corruption in connection with the administration of the department in Ontario, but if he knew the history of the administration of public lands at Ottawa, he could not have said so much. For, in 1883 and 1884, according to the land regulation of the Dominion Government, they issued Orders in Council to thirty-two of their own supporters for 1,507 square miles, for which they did not receive one dollar of bonus. Now, if that 1,507 square miles had been in the hands of the Local Legislature to be disposed of, it would come out in this way: A bonus, according to the average price, of \$3,722,290. But, according to the regulation of the Dominion, that \$3,722,290 went into the pockets of private individuals

and supporters of the Government. I think, in view of the history of the administration of public lands, it came with a very bad grace from my hon. friend the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to bring a charge against the Ontario Government for the administration of the public domain. I may take time to refer to a few other facts of which he should have taken notice. He does not remember the history of Hunters' Island, when, under the administration of the Dominion Government, the timber there was sold for \$7,500, and, a few months afterwards, sold to a Chicago syndicate for \$650,000, or nearly three-quarters of a million, which came out of the public domain of this country and was about to go into the pockets of private individuals. But Sir Oliver Mowat got possession of the disputed territory just previous to the bargain being consummated and saved to the province of Ontario this large quantity of timber. The hon. member also must remember the story of the Rykert timber limit. That gentleman received 100 square miles, according to the regulations of the Dominion Government, for the sum of \$500. He afterwards resold that for \$200,000, put a large portion of it in his own pocket and in the pockets of those who were with him in the transaction. And who does not remember the question that came up here a few years ago in regard to the timber limit of Mr. Robillard, a member of the House at that time as he is at present, who received seventy-nine square miles of timber limits for the small sum of \$316. Shortly after that he sold that timber limit for \$50,000 and pocketed his share—one-third of it. That timber limit was worked for two years and then sold for \$60,000. It was worked for two years afterwards and then sold for \$100,000, so that the \$316 in the Treasury of the Government multiplied to \$100,000 in the pockets of private individuals. Now, I challenge any person in this country to bring charges of that kind against the administration of the public lands in the province of Ontario. Therefore, I think, as I said before, that it came with a very bad grace from the hon. gentleman to make a charge here in reference to that question. Mr. Speaker, I now come to deal with the National Policy, its promises and its failures. In order that you may have the full wording of the so-called National Policy resolution, I read it to you. The resolution moved in the House of Commons by the late Sir John Macdonald, in 1878, was as follows:—

That the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing, and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving, as it ought to do,

in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

I want to show how far these promises have been carried out and how far they have failed. First, it was promised to develop the agricultural interest. The Tory party of that day sought to make the country believe that the depression arose from the peculiar fiscal system of that day, that is, a revenue tariff. They sought to make the farmers of this country believe that if protection was introduced and established in this country it would produce a home market for the products the farmers had to sell and that the prices which they realized then would be much increased under the stimulus which this protection would give them in keeping out American cattle and American products which came in competition with their own. That was their argument. Now, at that time it was a very plausible argument. We believed then, as we believe now, that no protective system could be established to protect the farmers, as the farmers of the country produced surplus products, and these products had to be sent from this country to find a market on their merits, and that these products, coming into open competition with the similar products from other countries, a protective tariff could not raise the price to the farmers. But, as I said before, the argument was plausible to the farmer and many of them accepted it. But they have been sadly disappointed. In fact an hon. gentleman who was a supporter, and is still an inconsistent supporter of the party in power, admitted in his speech the other day that we could not protect the farmer. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said it was impossible to protect the farmer. I do not know where he got that new light, but I think it must have been from the very able speeches presenting the facts which have been made in this House from time to time. If not, he must have received the light from the pressure brought to bear upon him in that great North-west country by the farmers who had had practical experience to teach them that the farmer could not be protected. He stated, as I understood, that the only way to protect the farmers was to give them a cheap market to buy in. Last session the hon. gentleman made a remark to me that we got things cheaper under the National Policy than we could possibly get them if the National Policy was removed. But, Sir, by the same pressure, and by the same influence of his constituents, and his practical experience in buying in the markets of the world, he was forced to come to a different conclusion, and he was forced to express that conclusion on the floor of this House in opposition to his conclusion of last year. That shows you, Sir, that the country is bearing down on the politicians, and bringing an influence to bear upon them, forcing them to express the true public sentiment in regard to this matter,

instead of speaking from a party stand-point. Now, to show you that the farmers are not satisfied, I will read a few extracts from some of the Tory papers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The Minister of the Interior represents the district from which this paper comes; it is a Tory paper, and I suppose supported him in his election. I will quote from the Brandon "Mail":

Under the proofs we have already advanced, and that may be advanced from day to day, there is no longer an argument for adhesion to the National Policy as it exists in its relation to the farmer, and no man will defend it, except those who are either under the influence of the manufacturer or wedded to a fad for what it may bring.

Now, Sir, that is strong language by a Conservative paper, and I am sure that the editor of that paper was brought to this conclusion by the influence of the farming community in that neighbourhood, by knowing their wants, by knowing what they paid for the things they bought, and the prices which they received for what they had to sell. Now, let me give you an expression of opinion by another Conservative paper in that section of the country, the Moosomin "Spectator":

The time has come for the duty on implements and twine to be reduced, as also that on coal oil, and we believe, further, that the wishes of the people in these respects must be met by the present Government and perhaps at the present session of Parliament. The country expects it, and the North-west not only expects but has a right to demand it.

So we see that there are organs of public opinion speaking out boldly, speaking out freely, speaking from a personal stand-point, and a knowledge of the wants of the community, yet speaking in opposition to the party which they formerly supported in this country; and this, to my mind, proves clearly that the men who understand their own interests, who know what they pay for those articles under the National Policy, are perceiving that it is in their interest not to support that policy any further, but rather to support their own interests as they should do. But there is another paper in the North-west Territories from which I wish to quote a few words. I understand that the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is the proprietor of that paper. It says:

We are in a position to say that a revolution has taken place in the rural districts of Ontario on the subject of the tariff, and we know what the opinion is here and in Manitoba. We are quite certain that the members from the counties will have to vote in favour of those resolutions.

Sir, there is the opinion of a supporter of the Government, a paper which has supported the Government in all the elections, not only saying that there has been a great change in the North-west, but there is a great change in the province of Ontario, among the farmers in regard to the tariff. Here we have, coming from all parts of the Dominion, testimony from the farmers themselves that the National Policy, so far as they are concerned,

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

has been an absolute and complete failure. Now, we can only benefit the farmers in three ways. First, we can benefit the farmers by improving the condition of the soil; but I do not think that any Conservative will go so far as to contend that the National Policy can have any influence in increasing the fertility of the soil. The second way that we can benefit the farmers is by giving them better markets to sell in. Now, the National Policy has had a tendency to take good markets away from them. It has, to a very large extent, prevented them from selling their products in their natural markets, the United States. A large number of the articles which they sent there in years past are now kept out by the double line of Customs that has been established by two foolish Governments. Now, have the farmers received any more for the products of the soil? Have they received any more for their wheat, for their flour, for their barley, for their eggs, for their horses, for their poultry, their lambs, their potatoes, their hay, their cheese and their butter? Now, I am in possession of facts to show that the prices obtained under the National Policy are lower, on the average, than the prices obtained before the National Policy came into existence. I have here a statement showing the number of cents higher that each bushel and each pound brought under the old regime, under the revenue tariff, than it has brought under the support of the so-called National Policy:

Article.	Price from 1874-78.	Price from 1879-92.	Difference.
	\$	\$	¢
Wheat	1.11	.96	.15
Barley85	.65	.20
Oats42	.38	.04
Pease71	.66	.05
Dressed hogs	7.04	6.80	.24
Butter23	.20	.03
Apples, per barrel	2.69	2.30	.39
Hay	18.00	11.00	7.00
Wool34	.22	.12

Now, any farmer can see that the National Policy had no influence whatever in increasing the price of his products, and, therefore, it has been of no benefit to them. But it may be said, and probably will be said: Now, you do not really suppose that any Government is able to increase the prices of those products; the price of those products is fixed in the English market where they are sold, and, therefore, we cannot expect that, under any fiscal policy, the prices of these articles can be increased. That is what we always contended; but the authors of the National Policy promised that it would increase the prices of these products to the Canadian farmer, and now we ask the Conservative

party, who inaugurated the National Policy, to make good, so far as they can, the promises they have made, or else acknowledge that those promises were false and misleading. Now, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, have the articles which the Canadian farmer requires to consume been increased in price, or are they cheaper than they were before? We know that they are not as cheap as they would be if the duty was less or removed, because we have the testimony of these very men from various parts of the country, seeking to remove the duty on agricultural implements, for one thing, evidently testifying that the price of agricultural implements is higher than it should be, under the influence of the National Policy. I do not say that agricultural implement manufacturers are deriving all the benefits from the protective duty given to them; for, on the one hand, they have to pay a large duty on the raw material which enters into the manufacture of those implements, and this counterbalances nearly all the advantages that they receive at the other end from the protection which is given them. Now, if the duties were removed from the raw material, from the iron which enters largely into the manufacture of agricultural implements, the manufacturers could make those implements much cheaper, and the farmers could buy them much cheaper, than they do now. Has the price of woollen goods in this country fallen, comparably with what it would under a different fiscal policy? It is well known that we pay millions in duties on woollen goods used by the Canadian people, and the larger proportion and the higher duties are paid by the working classes and the farmers, who use that class of goods on which there is a specific as well as an ad valorem duty, which press very heavily on those who consume the coarser and heavier woollen goods. Have the Government made binding twine cheaper than it would have been under a different trade policy? The farmers have paid during the last ten years \$2,000,000 on binding twine which they would not have paid if the duty had been the same as was paid on binding twine imported into the United States. This can easily and conclusively be shown, because the other day the Minister of Finance, speaking on the Budget, gave the House to understand that on binding twine he was prepared to reduce the duty to 12½ cents instead of 25 cents per pound, which was the duty previously. What has been the result throughout the country? Binding twine has already fallen 1 cent per pound on the open market, testifying that the presence of the duty on the article increased the price to the consumer, for so soon as the announcement made by the Government became known binding twine fell in price 1 cent per pound. So it is evident those articles under the National Policy are not so cheap as they would otherwise be. Take the article of cotton. This House the other day heard a very able, clear and explicit speech on the

question of cottons, in which it was shown beyond any possibility of contradiction that the people of this country had paid over \$3,000,000 in duties on cottons more than would have been paid if there had been reasonable duties imposed on those products. If those duties were removed, a large proportion of the amount paid would be saved to the people, just as has been found to be the case in regard to articles on which duties have been removed. Take coal oil, for instance. When the Minister of Finance promised to remove the duties, or rather what he called the hidden duty, a change soon followed. That duty was supposed to amount to a very small sum. We find, however, that a marked result has taken place, even in the town from which I come. When I left, Canadian oil was selling at from 18 cents to 20 cents per gallon, and now the price is announced in the papers to-day as being 12½ cents. There has been a reduction of 6½ cents per gallon on account of more favourable arrangements made by dealers. My hon. friend who opposed me the other night on this question came over to me the other day, and we had a conversation on the fact that coal oil had fallen in price all over the country, in consequence of the removal of this hidden duty, by which the manufacturers have no longer the power to charge the consumers as much as formerly, thus consumers can save money by the removal of this so-called hidden duty. These facts prove to my mind at least that the farmer has not been placed in a position in which he can sell his products at a higher price, or buy the articles he consumes cheaper than formerly. I might show a similar state of facts existing both in regard to hardware and iron. I have, however, shown this House clearly that the National Policy has not fostered or benefited the agricultural interests of the country. The next question is, has it fostered and developed the mining industries which it promised to develop? There is no country in the world possessing the same facilities as Canada for the development of the iron industry, the copper industry and the nickel industry. There is no country in the world that possesses the same amount of wealth in copper as we possess on the north shore of Lake Superior. There is no more extensive region possessing copper ore than the Lake Superior region, and yet there is hardly a sound of a hammer to be heard there, and for the hum of industry we listen in vain. It is not so on the other side of the line, in Michigan, which is a generation younger than Ontario, for we find there thousands and thousands of men engaged in the development of the copper industry, notwithstanding the fact that they are obliged to transport that copper 1,000 miles to the smelting furnaces of Pittsburg, to meet the fuel there, and that trade is booming every day while our copper regions are lying silent. Yet the National Policy is supposed to develop that industry. Has this policy de-

veloped the iron industry in the country? There is no country in the world—I can truly repeat these words with respect to iron—that possesses the same facilities for developing the iron industry as Canada possesses. The iron ore of Nova Scotia is of first-class quality, the coal region is contiguous to the iron beds, the limestone rocks are in the same neighbourhood, they being used as flux in the melting of iron, ships are within a few miles of these places, railways are penetrating the mountains of iron in every direction for the purpose of providing facilities for transporting the manufactured articles. I repeat that no other place on the continent possesses the same advantages and facilities for carrying on this industry. The Dominion has incurred a very large expense in protecting the iron industry. We have imported during the last ten years 755,000 tons of pig iron, on which a duty was paid of \$2,234,000. A bounty was also paid on pig iron produced here during those years to the amount of \$329,000, or making a total sum paid by this country for the purpose of protecting the pig iron industry, of \$2,563,000. Let us see how much we have received from that expenditure. The production of pig iron in 1878 was about 16,000 tons, the production of pig iron in 1892 was a little less than 20,000 tons, or an increase of only 4,000 tons, after spending \$2,500,000 in granting protection to that industry. Last year we imported 68,918 tons, on which we paid \$275,000 duty. We paid on 20,000 tons manufactured, \$40,000 bounty, and the profit which the manufacturers were able to place on the home product on account of the duty, was \$80,000. We have paid to protect the iron industries for one year \$395,800, and that sum was paid for 20,000 tons, even supposing that the protection was the cause of the production of those 20,000 tons. We have paid on every ton \$19.75, in addition to purchasing the iron after it was manufactured, at a cost of \$10.50 per ton, that being the cost of production last year; or, in other words, we paid twice as much for the protection as the iron was worth after it was placed on the market. But did this protection increase the iron ore product in Nova Scotia? Let me give the House some figures in connection with the production of iron ore in that province. In 1880 iron ore was produced in Nova Scotia to the amount of 51,193 tons; in 1881, 39,843 tons; 1882, 42,135 tons; 1883, 52,410 tons; 1884, 54,885 tons; 1885, 48,129 tons; 1886, 44,388 tons; 1887, 43,532 tons; 1888, 42,610 tons; 1889, 54,161 tons; 1890, 49,206 tons, these being the last figures I can obtain from an authentic source. Take the period of five years, from 1880 to 1884, inclusive, and we find the average production of iron ore in Nova Scotia was 48,000 tons, and taking the last five years, from 1885 to 1890, we find that the production was 47,000 tons. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1888, when Sir Charles Tupper in his Budget speech pro-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

posed to put on an extra duty for the protection of the iron industry, he portrayed in glowing language the extraordinary bounds which the production of iron was to take. He pictured in his own mind that in two or three years we would have at least 25,000 people engaged in the production of iron, and although there was a duty of \$4 a ton and a bounty of \$2 a ton put on at that time, in two years afterwards, notwithstanding all this fostering of the industry, the production of iron was less than it was before. This proves that we are paying far too much out of the pockets of the people for all the improvement in the production of iron that we get in return. There is another point which I wish to make. Last year we imported, in round numbers, \$10,000,000 worth of iron, and we have paid on that \$2,800,000 duty. When it came into the hands of the importer, he would at least add 25 per cent as profit before it passed out of his hands to the consumer. That would amount to \$700,000, or taking the duty and the profit, it would represent an extra cost to the people of \$3,500,000. As far as I could ascertain from the different documents through which I looked for information, as well as from information which I received from other sources, I find that the protection of the iron industry in this country will cost a similar sum to the consumers by reason of the increased price which it enables the sellers of iron to put on the home production of all kinds. The Canadian people are, therefore, paying \$7,000,000 annually on account of the duty upon iron products including what is imported, and what is manufactured in this country. Just think of it for a moment, Mr. Speaker, \$7,000,000 a year coming out of the hard-earned money of the people of this country, and principally from the farmers, because, as we all know, the agricultural implements used by the farmers are largely composed of iron. Their threshing machines, their mowers, their reapers, their drills, their ploughs, their rakes and all implements that they use on the farm, are largely composed of iron. Therefore, a larger proportion of this \$7,000,000 comes directly out of the pockets of the farmers than out of the pockets of any other class of the people. Did you ever consider how much this enormous sum would amount to in, say, ten years only? That would be \$70,000,000 of money which in ten years is drained from the people of this country in order to give protection to the iron industry without any good result whatever accruing from it. Had this iron industry developed under protection, and if there was a prospect of its being able to stand on its own foundation after a few years of protection, then it would not be so bad; but when we find that there is no improvement, then I think it is time for the Government to call a halt in this matter, and relieve the consumer by reducing the duty \$70,000,000—as much as the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way cost our people in cash ; half as much again as the whole system of the canals of the Dominion has cost ; twice as much as the original cost of the Intercolonial Railway ; twice as much as the total annual expenditure of the Government for the conduct of the affairs of the country and the construction of public works ; as much as would pay the interest on the public debt for seven years ; that is what comes out of the pockets of the people every ten years in order to give protection to the iron industry. This amount which comes out of the pockets of the people for the protection of the iron industry and which, be it remembered, does not result in an increased production, would buy a strip of land one mile in width, extending from Halifax to Vancouver, at \$25 an acre. If that amount of \$70,000,000 was transformed into gold, and then a ton put on each wagon, there would be 150 wagons, requiring 150 teams to draw them, and it would form a golden procession of one mile in length. Need we be astonished, when such a drain is made on the people of this country, and largely from the farming classes, that we are under a cloud and in a state of depression. We need not wonder that the country is depressed when we look into the matter in this way. I come to a point now on which my hon. friends opposite may say : There they are again defaming their country. I am going to speak for a short time in reference to the exodus, and I suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite, taught by their superiors in office, will say : There goes the Liberal party again, defaming the country and spreading before the world that our people are leaving us to find a home in foreign lands. How unpatriotic ? How wrong to make the statement that our people are not doing well. Well, I do not believe it is anything of the kind. I believe that when we come here, we come to consult together in reference to the country and its conditions. It is the same as when two doctors are called in to consult over a patient who is very sick. The patient may have the best character in the world, but we come to investigate his present condition, and that is the thing to seek. I do not think it will be any reflection on the part of the doctors to say to him : Mr. So-and-So, you are sick. You have certain troubles, and we must consult together to find a remedy in order to restore you to convalescence and health. It would be no reflection on the man's character. His character would be as good as it was before, but he was sick and he required a certain remedy. We are here to-day, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of considering the condition of this country, and if we find that the people of this country are not in a good condition, it is for us frankly to express it one to the other, and to seek by the wisdom of both parties to put them in a better position than we find them to-day. I suppose that was the position that the leaders of the Conservative party took when they spoke in very nearly the same language as we are now speaking

in reference to the state of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Except that they lied.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Probably as my hon. friend says. Let me read to you the opinion of the "Empire," and I suppose that Tory opinion will be considered good by gentlemen opposite. The "Empire" blames the Liberal party for the exodus and for the present condition of the country, and in the issue of 27th August, 1891, it says :

That the last decade has not shown a larger increase, is in no inconsiderable measure due to the tactics of these politicians who have persistently preached discouragement. They have induced men to leave the country and assailed and hindered in the money markets of the world, the great commercial undertakings of Canada.

Then, in order to prove, or to give a foundation for this statement, it quotes an extract from the speech delivered by the Hon. Edward Blake on 18th April, 1880 :

There has been great shrinkage in bank stocks. There has been great depreciation of the value of real estate. There has been a depression in trade and commerce.

And the "Empire" remarks :

Pleasant reading this must have been for intending emigrants.

Now, I will give you some pleasant reading for intending emigrants from another source, which the "Empire" did not quote and moralize upon in the same way. They are similar statements to those made by Mr. Blake, but they were made under different conditions :

I regret to say that we must point to depreciated values and small dividends. To-day we have limited markets with low prices. To-day the country is greatly depressed.

You would almost think, from the language used, that it was the same gentleman who spoke in the one case as in the other. But, Sir, this was not spoken by a Liberal, but by a man who stood high, and who still stands high, in the estimation of the Conservative party—a man who was at one time the Finance Minister of this country. He made use of these words while delivering his Budget speech in this House. Since that time he has been elevated to a higher position still ; he is now the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. I mean Sir Leonard Tilley. Sir, if it was unpatriotic on the part of Mr. Blake to make statements of that kind, how was it on the part of the Finance Minister of that day ? But, Sir, let me give you some further samples of the literature which was cast abroad a few years ago. Here are some choice specimens :

The Dominion in all its provinces has now for some years been suffering from commercial depression and financial stringency, unexampled in severity in the memory of the most active man of to-day.

This would have been splendid literature to send to England and Germany to induce emigrants to come to this country. Surely, if the Conservatives endorsed this language,

they cannot find much fault with the mild language in which Mr. Blake expressed his opinion that the country was sore depressed. The extract goes on :

These have gone on increasing in intensity, until now, it may be said, that the sound chiefly heard on our streets is one of complaining.

History has repeated itself, and we now hear from one end of the country to the other a wail of complaint. It goes on :

Many of the farmers in the favoured province of Ontario have been impelled to import large quantities of corn for provender, and even in some districts, wheat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, was it not very foolish indeed for any man to say that it was due to the policy of the Government that wheat did not grow? I do not think any Government has the power of bringing refreshing showers of rain and sunshine. I think that is in the hands of Providence. The reason the people of that day were compelled to import wheat and grain was that their own lands at that particular juncture refused to yield a sufficiency. That was not the fault of the Government; and yet it was impressed on the people of the country that the late Mackenzie Government was responsible for that. But the gentleman whose speech I am quoting went still further. He said :

The aggregate amount of money borrowed by them and secured by mortgages upon their homesteads during the last nine or ten months is undoubtedly larger than was ever before borrowed by them in the same space of time.

When we speak about mortgages, we are told that we are decrying our country, that we are sending a bad opinion of it to various parts of the world; but here was a gentleman who spoke of more mortgages having been placed on property during the nine or ten months previous to the time he was speaking than ever before. Then he winds up :

Is there no science in statesmanship? Are Cabinet Ministers only cashiers to receive and distribute the revenue, and officers of the law to preserve the peace? If these are their duties our Ministers are too many and vastly overpaid.

Now, who was it that made such a tirade as this against this country? Who would hon. gentlemen opposite imagine would do it? He was a member of the late Sir John Macdonald's Government. He was afterwards elevated to the Senate and became the leader of that body. He ultimately received tokens of esteem at the hands of Her Majesty Queen Victoria and was dubbed knight, and is now known about this country as Sir David Macpherson, one of the leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party. And yet neither in the "Empire" nor in any of the other Tory papers of this country has one word of reference been made to the language used by these men a few years ago. But I want to quote a little more, so as to silence these men for ever.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Blue ruin.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When blue ruin is the cry on both sides, we would have very little to say, and when you take the blue ruin from these speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is very little left in them. Now, an hon. gentleman occupying a very high and proud position in the councils of this country, spoke as follows :—

Our credit was good in England, in the United States and all the world over, but gentlemen, what do we see now? Instead of confidence there is distrust. Instead of solvency, look at the official Gazette, and every Saturday they show a long string of insolvencies.

Look around you, and you see the horny hands of toil asking leave to labour. They are now beggars. They do not desire to have silver spoons placed in their mouths, but they desire to have a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.

But what do we see? We see them drifting off to the United States. We see the skilled artisans, the strong-handed young men and the active young women of Lower Canada drifting off to Lowell, to New Hampshire, to Maine, to Connecticut, adding to the wealth, to the power and the strength of a foreign nation, and depleting poor Canada.

Now, who was the man who was so unpatriotic as to stump this country from end to end preaching such doctrines from the public platforms? Sir, he was the man who said on one occasion that "a British subject he was born and a British subject he would die"—a man whose memory is revered by gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches. The same man said in 1877 :

We have no workpeople. Our workpeople have gone off to United States. Let any man visit any of the manufacturing of the United States and there he will find the Canadian artisan working and doing well, and therefore not going back. It grieved me to the soul as a Canadian, when in Sherbrooke the other day, to be told that the population had decreased under the malign influence of the Liberal Government. People whom we ought to have kept among ourselves, men, women and children that ought to have been working in our factories, have been driven away by the unwise, by the demented—to use a good Scotch phrase—by the insane policy, or want of policy, of the Liberal Government.

You see he attributed the whole exodus to the malign influence of the Liberal Government, although the hon. Finance Minister, while delivering his Budget speech the other day, said that whatever the fiscal policy was, whether it was free trade or a revenue tariff or a protective tariff, the people would go away. He goes on to say even worse than that. He says :

The people we ought to have kept among ourselves, the men, women and children who ought to have been working in our factories, have been driven by the unwise, by the demented, to use a Scotch phrase, by the insane policy, or want of policy, of the Liberal Government out of the country.

Will any of the hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us, in the face of such a torrent of invective, of decrying and bewailing our coun-

try? Now, I do not say that Sir John Macdonald or Sir David Macpherson, or any of those men, if they believed conscientiously that the country was in that condition, were wrong in expressing their opinion. On the contrary, it was their duty to do so and to try and influence the people to adopt any change of policy which they conscientiously thought would bring about an improvement. It is equally the duty of the Liberal party to-day to point out the means of safety and induce the people to bring pressure on the Government to adopt such means and thus remove the depression under which we are suffering. The hon. gentleman proposed a remedy. He said:

If the country had a judicious system of taxation the working people would be toiling and doing well in their own country.

Well, he could judge for himself what was a judicious system of taxation, and he established what, in his opinion, was such a system; and we had the right to expect that, if his remedy were a good one, the people would remain in the country and its condition would improve. Have they remained with us? I am not going at length to argue out the census, but I will give a few figures which I challenge any gentleman on the Treasury benches to answer satisfactorily. I hope the hon. gentleman who is to follow me will take a note of this. We had the right to expect in this country a natural increase equal to the United States. It has always been the general opinion that the natural increase of Canada was greater than that of the United States. We know, as a fact, that the families in Canada are, as a rule, larger than those in the United States, and, therefore, without straining a point at all, we could expect, at least, a natural increase in this country equal to that in the United States. Very well, if that assumption is correct, we know that the natural increase during the last decade in the United States was 14 per cent, and that the immigration into the United States was from 10 to 12 per cent, making altogether an increase of about 25 per cent. Now, if our natural increase had been equal to that of the United States, namely, 14 per cent, that percentage of our population in 1881 would give 604,000 of a natural increase. Then, according to the report of the Department of Agriculture we find that we brought into this country 886,000 of immigrants since 1881, who expressed their intention of remaining in Canada, and it cost us about \$3,000,000 to bring these people in. If you add the 604,000 natural increase which we had a right to expect, to these 886,000 who came in, intending to settle here, you get a total of 1,490,000. Subtract from that our actual increase, which was 504,000, and you have 986,000 missing. Instead of an increase of 1,490,000, which we should have, we have only 504,000. Where are the 986,000 gone? If it will be

said that our natural increase was less than that of the United States, let hon. gentlemen opposite give us their reason for that opinion, because it used to be larger, and if the number I have mentioned, and which I have taken from the Government reports, actually came into the country, I repeat my question. Where are they gone? They are not found in any of the provinces of the Dominion, and therefore we must conclude that the 986,000 people we should have here, have gone somewhere else. With regard to the number of Canadians in the United States in 1871, 1881 and 1891, I have nothing to say. I do not say that 986,000 Canadians went away from Canada. There may not have been 300,000 who went away; but the people whom we brought in to be settlers and citizens of this country—they and the Canadians together, to the extent of 986,000, have gone, according to the census returns. In the American census returns no special notice would be taken of foreigners who went into the United States from Canada; but that number has undoubtedly gone from Canada and gone somewhere, and I want a reasonable and plausible solution to the question: Where have they gone? Hon. gentlemen opposite say we are not fair, when we compare the census of one section of the United States with another section of ours. I am going to take up the challenge thrown out by the Minister of Finance the other day in his Budget speech to the hon. member for South Oxford, when he said:

Let me call my hon. friend's attention to the North Atlantic states, nine in number, and when he is going over census statistics, let me ask him to thoroughly consider that portion of it, the New England States and the North Atlantic states, nine in number, running from Maine down to Pennsylvania, taking in, of course, the great state of New York and all between. It is more fair to take those two great stretches of country and compare the two.

He asked us to take the nine North Atlantic states and compare them with those portions of Canada which are comparatively settled, and I think that would be a fair comparison. What does that comparison show? I find, after having gone over the census of the nine states referred to—Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Vermont and Connecticut—that they had in 1880 a population of 14,507,407, and in 1890, ten years later, a population of 17,364,429, or an increase of 2,887,022, or a percentage of increase of 19.69, as compared with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario, which show an increase of 7.84. That is nearly three times as much increase in those very states, which he said would furnish a fair comparison, as in the provinces I have mentioned. Let me now select a few states, of which the following table will show the growth of population:—

Name of State.	1880.	1890.	Increase.	Per cent.
1 Maine	648,936	660,266	11,330	1.75
2 New Hampshire	346,991	375,827	28,836	8.3
3 Massachusetts	1,783,085	3,233,407	1,450,322	25.3
4 Rhode Island	276,531	345,343	68,812	25
5 Connecticut	622,700	745,861	123,161	20
6 New York	5,082,871	5,981,934	899,063	17.7
7 New Jersey	1,131,116	1,441,017	309,901	27.4
8 Pennsylvania	4,282,891	5,248,574	965,683	22.5
9 Vermont	332,280	332,205	-75	-8.1
Total increase	14,507,407	17,364,429	2,857,022	19.69

In the last state an increase was not expected, because it is a very poor state, much poorer than it was ten or twelve years ago, and some of the land has been washed from the mountain side, leaving the bare stone, and some of the land besides has greatly depreciated, so that the people have had to abandon their farms. No condition of that kind can be found to exist in any of our provinces, and, therefore, the same conditions were not operative, and a comparison between Vermont and many of our eastern provinces would not be just. Now, take the increases in our provinces. In Nova Scotia the increase was only 2.25 per cent. Notwithstanding that it is a fair agricultural country, notwithstanding that it is a great mineral country, notwithstanding that it is a great fishing country, it had increased in population only 2.25 per cent. New Brunswick, a province having large capabilities of expansion and land comparatively good, much better than the land in Vermont, only increased .02 per cent. Prince Edward Island, also a rich and fertile province, with magnificent fisheries, only increased 18 per cent. Quebec increased 9.53 per cent, and Ontario 9.65 per cent, making an average, as I said, of 7.84 per cent, as compared with 19.69 per cent in the North Atlantic states, with which the hon. gentleman asked us to make a comparison. Thus, we have taken up his own position, we have accepted his own challenge and have proven by the figures placed before us in the census of Canada and the census of the United States that Canada has not increased as we would naturally expect it to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another point. The National Policy has failed to find many new markets for the Canadian people. The Finance Minister, four years ago, in 1889, boasted in these words :

South America with its different Governments, with its vast natural resources, with its demand for certain articles which we can supply of the best kind, is ready to trade with us.

Well, Sir, we could not say anything against that statement in 1889. But how much have we traded with them and they with us since that time? Our export in that very year,

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

when these words were spoken, was \$1,489,000, and, in 1892, after waiting three years for what we expected to be a great trade, we find that it has fallen to \$1,027,500, or \$461,500 less than when he boasted there was an opening for the great trade for Canada, or nearly 40 per cent less. But in the same speech he said :

The West Indies, rich in elements of trade which complement ours afford a field for which we believe to be a permanent and profitable trade.

Now, Sir, in 1879, we had an export trade with that country of \$3,500,000. Now, after thirteen years of expectation, after a visit of the Finance Minister to these islands for the purpose of establishing a larger and more extensive trade, after an exhibition of the Canadian products made there under the commissionership of Mr. Brown, at large expense to this country, after all these efforts have been made, we find that our export trade in 1892 was only \$46,000 more than it was thirteen years ago, or an increase of only 1.3 per cent. And yet we are told that new markets are being opened up and developed for the sale of the products of the Canadian people. This increase would not pay the expense of the commissioner. More than that, since that time subsidized steamers have been placed upon that route, running from St. John and Halifax to the West Indies, subsidized by the Canadian Government, and, after several years of that expenditure, we have only \$46,000 worth of goods sent to that country more than we had in 1879. And still, the Finance Minister tells us that we are opening up a great trade with foreign countries. The Finance Minister goes on still further and says :

Lying out to the east are China and Japan, and the Government, mindful of the possibilities of trade in that direction which have already been developed,—

Then he went on to say that development had occurred in this way—that the Canadian Pacific Railway had now been built across the continent, making an iron band carrying the trade of Canada, and then the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers were on the Pacific subsidized to a very large amount by this Government, carrying our trade with China and Japan. Now, Sir, let us see what has been accomplished. In 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government, when there was no Canadian Pacific Railway, when there was no subsidized steamers running from Vancouver to China and Japan, when, in fact, there was no Vancouver, and when the Rocky Mountains formed a complete barrier between us and the Pacific coast, and products had to go by a roundabout way, \$102,500 worth of Canadian products were exported to China and Japan. And in 1881, when they possessed these great facilities of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the subsidized steam-ship lines, they only sent \$78,800, or about \$24,000 less than they had sent thirteen years ago. Sir, last year there was an up-

ward bound in this export trade. In 1892 Canada sent to China and Japan \$283,000 worth of goods. You notice that is over double what was sent in 1878. But of that amount \$229,000 was cotton, sent from the mills of Canada. And the Finance Minister would take to himself pride and credit because so large a quantity of cotton was shipped to China and Japan. But I would like the hon. gentleman who is to follow me to tell how the Canadian mills can compete with the United States and Britain and sell on equal terms in China and Japan, when they cannot sell on equal terms in Canada? I will tell you how it is, Sir. They have slaughtered, to a certain extent, \$229,000 worth of cottons for the purpose of clearing out the overplus in the Canadian market, and, no sooner did they export that quantity, than they raised the price to Canadian people 15 per cent higher than it was before. So that, in reality, this export to China and Japan has been a burden on the Canadian people. The tariff enabled them to sell cheaply in these markets and make up the loss, if there was a loss, by charging it to the consumers of cotton in this country. Now, I will refer briefly to two or three other countries where they have failed to increase our trade. We exported to Belgium in 1878, \$50,000 worth, and in 1892, \$56,000, not as much more as would fill a village store. To Newfoundland, our sister colony, we sent \$2,095,000, and, in 1892, the export fell off to \$1,751,000, or \$344,000 less than we sent thirteen years ago. To Australia we sent, in 1878, when we had not the same facilities for sending as now, \$652,000, and now, with all our facilities, we only sent \$745,000 in 1892, or \$93,000 more. Take France, a country with which our people should trade very largely, as many of our people are of the same nationality, the same tongue, the same religion, the same sympathy. But, instead of a larger trade, our trade has been reduced. In 1878 we exported to France \$370,000, and, in 1892, \$368,000. To Spain, in 1878, we exported \$48,000, and, in 1892, \$93,000. To Italy, in 1878, we exported \$152,000 and only \$149,000 in 1892. To Great Britain our exports were \$46,000,000 in 1878, and in 1892, \$65,000,000. That \$65,000,000 requires a little explanation. A large portion of that trade was diverted from its proper and natural market by the operation of the McKinley Bill. For instance, a large portion of our horses, a great part of the eggs exported from this country and many other things were diverted to the British market, and in that way our export to that country was increased last year. The percentage of increase to Great Britain during the last twelve years was 41 per cent. To the United States, in 1878, we sent \$25,000,000 worth, and last year \$39,000,000, or an increase, notwithstanding the obstacles that were thrown in our way to get into their market, of 56 per cent, as compared with 41 per cent increase to the British market. Sir,

the National Policy has not materially enlarged the labour market. We remember that the promise was made in 1878 that if the National Policy was established a large number of manufactories would be erected in different sections of the Dominion, which would employ a far greater number of hands, and the people who were standing idle, according to Sir John A. Macdonald's testimony, would be picked up and taken into those factories. Now, I have taken considerable trouble to go over twenty-nine of the principal industries of the province of Ontario, and to ascertain the number of men employed in each of them in the years 1871, 1881 and 1891 respectively, to see if there was a greater labour market open to the people of the country under the National Policy than during the period between 1871 and 1881. Everybody will see that I have selected the most important ones. In three parallel columns I give the number of persons employed :

Name of Industry.	1871.	1881.	1891.
1 Agricultural implement factories.....	2,143	3,201	3,373
2 Cutlery.....	11	67	17
3 Furniture.....	2,769	3,460	4,698
4 Boots and shoes....	6,354	5,827	4,396
5 Woollen mills.....	3,690	5,121	5,174
6 Tanneries.....	1,584	1,528	1,631
7 Saw mills.....	13,821	16,846	23,894
8 Sash and door factories	1,548	2,286	2,355
9 Hosiery.....	244	1,316	563
10 Blacksmithing.....	4,810	6,026	5,321
11 Cotton factories....	495	1,683	2,496
12 Flour and grist mills..	2,759	3,565	3,442
13 Oil refineries.....	433	379	270
14 Tobacco works.....	707	1,164	576
15 Shipbuilding.....	460	367	597
16 Salt works.....	175	243	244
17 Nails and tack factories	16	80	129
18 Musical instruments...	387	817	1,974
19 Cheese factories.....	909	1,638	1,922
20 Engine building.....	508	560	1,232
21 Car and locomotive works.....	Nil.	1,622	795
22 Glass works.....	98	333	265
23 Paint and varnish....	6	59	179
24 Paper manufacturers..	344	690	688
25 Bookbinders.....	365	651	795
26 Lime kilns.....	1,099	1,133	1,005
27 Rope and twine.....	138	164	242
28 Foundries and machine shops.....	4,686	5,021	6,161
29 Cooperages.....	1,837	1,843	1,660
	52,283	67,690	83,194

From 1871 to 1881--15,407=29%
 1881 to 1891--15,504=23%

In other words, from 1871 to 1881 there was an increase in the number of hands employed in those different factories, of 15,407, or an increase of 29 per cent. From the year 1881

to 1891 there was an increase in the number of hands of 15,504, or 23 per cent. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that before the existence of the National Policy, the increase in the number of hands employed in those factories was greater than under the protective system. I do not say that these factories have not turned out a greater product; they have done so, by reason of introduction of better machinery; but they did not give a better labour market to those to whom it was promised, and therefore the National Policy did not give those promised blessings to the labouring classes of this country whom Sir John A. Macdonald said were being driven out of the country, who were asking for bread and were being given a stone. Another charge that I bring against the National Policy is that it discriminates against the poor man, and the farmer in particular, in that it imposes higher duties upon the articles principally used by them. I believe that in any policy where taxes have to be gathered from the people care should be taken to levy the lower tax on the poor people, and the higher tax on those better able to pay it. Now, the National Policy has been in direct opposition to that principle, which I can prove from facts and figures of an authentic character. Let me give you another table in the articles of cottons, hosiery and sewing machines, showing how the duties bear more heavily upon the poor man and the farmer than upon the wealthier classes:—

	\$	Duty, per cent.
Carpets (cotton warp), at per yard.	0 20	45
do do do	0 50	30
Carpets, all wool, at per yard....	1 00	30
do high grades.		25
Sewing machines, each.	25 00	32
do do	65 00	24½
Hosiery, per dozen.	2 00	30
do do	8 00	22½

Now, let me give you a few other facts which I wish to go before the farmers of this country:

Ordinary grass scythes—Canadian duty \$2.40 per dozen, making actual rate of duty 66½ per cent.

Manure forks (first quality), 4 prong, plain, long handles—Canadian duty \$2 per dozen and 20 per cent, or \$2.72 per dozen, making actual rate of duty 75 per cent.

Hay forks and hoes (first quality)—Canadian duty 60c. per dozen and 25 per cent, making an actual duty of 55 per cent.

Garden rakes, twelve teeth malleable, ten teeth malleable—60c. per dozen and 25 per cent. Actual duty 65 per cent., 73 per cent.

Spades and shovels, ordinary plain black, polished steel—Duty \$1 and 25 per cent. Actual duty 50 per cent.

Picks, mattocks, &c.—1c. per lb. and 25 per cent. Actual rate 60 per cent.

Barbed wire (galvanized)—Quoted in foreign papers, 1890, \$3.30 per 100 lbs. Duty 50 per cent.

Building paper or straw sheathing—Duty 50c. per 100. Duty 60 per cent.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Bolts and nuts—Duty 1½c. per lb. and 30 per cent, making the actual duty 70 per cent.

Clothes wringers—\$12 per dozen and 30 per cent, making the duty 103 per cent.

Coal oil—140 per cent.

Common wood screws—1 inch, 11c. per lb. or 90 per cent duty.

Cut nails, steel or iron—\$1 per keg, or 60 per cent duty.

Cutlery (table knives)—50c. per doz. and 20 per cent, or 75 per cent.

Now, these are examples to show you plainly that the National Policy is unfair in its application of duties upon different classes of people in this country. Where we can get silks, jewelry and fine things of that kind for 20, 25 and 30 per cent, the tariff charges 50 to 75 per cent on the class of articles required by those men who earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow; and I say it is unjust, it is impolitic, it is unnatural, to place such burdens upon the people who are the least able to bear them, and relieving those who are better able to pay. Now, I want to place before the House a few wise remarks made by one of the wisest statesmen Canada ever had, a man whose eloquence frequently rang through the House, and entertained the people as well as instructed them, a man who had a deeper and a wider grasp of public affairs in this country, probably, than any other statesman who ever sat in this House, an hon. gentleman who has now left us, and I hope he will be successful in the mission he has undertaken—I mean the Hon. Edward Blake. He says, in regard to the National Policy:

Its real tendency has been towards disintegration and annexation.

Is there anything more true? Is there not unrest and agitation through the country at the present time for constitutional changes, owing to this protective system? Is that change desired because the people are tired with their connection with the British Empire? Not at all. Is it because our system of government is not the best that you can find among men? We all admit that it is. It possesses the permanent principle of a monarchical form of government and the liberal and progressive principle of a republican government; in addition, it combines many principles suggested by the experience of the Canadian people. There is no one to-day who would exchange our system of government for that of the United States. Is it because England interferes with our freedom of legislation? No, she does not interfere with us. We have ample room to legislate for our own country. She never throws any burdens or difficulties in our way; we always have gone forward and legislated in our own interests, and therefore it is not because of interference by the British people that a cry for annexation is raised in the country. It is because the people's burdens are doubled, it is because heavy burdens are imposed on them by the protective system inaugurated in 1879. The

people have not been prosperous, and they believe that whatever change may come, they will be more prosperous in another country and under some other form of government than they are at the present time in Canada. Give the people prosperity, give them more money in their pockets at the end of the year, and the tendency to annexation will pass away, and our people will be perfectly satisfied to live under the good old flag that waves over us, and that has waved over the British Empire for a thousand years. Mr. Blake goes on further to say :

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration, and a North-west empty still.

Is not this the fact? Has not the census proved the correctness of this prophecy, made before the statistics were published, that we were left with a small population, and that our population has not increased as we expected? Has it not left the North-west empty still, after 20 years of efforts on the part of the Canadian people? Is not this shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the rich lands offered free by the Government, Manitoba, the richest of all sections of that country, only contains 154,000 people? Mr. Blake might well say, "and a North-west empty still." Then he said further :

It has left us with an enormous debt, an extravagant expenditure, an expensive tariff, with restricted markets, with trade diverted from its natural into less profitable channels.

Has not all this prophecy proved to be true? Have we not an enormous debt? Sir Leonard Tilley, twelve years ago, said that he could run the Dominion expenditure efficiently with \$22,000,000, and yet the expenditure to-day is between \$36,000,000 and \$37,000,000; and in view of this fact, is not Mr. Blake's statement true, that we have an extravagant expenditure? Have we not an expensive tariff? Is not a tariff under which the Government places enormous duties on the necessaries of life an expensive one? Have we not diverted trade from its natural market on the other side of the line? Have we not diverted trade in barley, poultry, horses and eggs from its natural market in the United States to markets that are less lucrative to the people of Canada? We must admit such is the case under the present condition of affairs in Canada. Mr. Blake further said :

Worse far worse; it has left us with a lower standard of public virtue; it has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised.

Is not this the case? Is not the standard of political virtue lower than it was twelve years ago? Have not the Government tied our hands by the gerrymander and by the Franchise Act? They tied the hands of the Liberal party by the Gerrymander in 1882, with the result that the Tories were again returned to power. Notwithstanding the influence of the National Policy they were afraid to face the general elections of 1887, and they prepared themselves by

passing the Franchise Act, which again tied the hands of the Liberal party, placing the power in the hands of their own friends to prepare the voters' lists and thus, in the language of Mr. Blake, our hands were tied. Were not our hands tied by the enormous amounts of money spent illegally throughout the country? The investigation held two years ago showed there was bribery and corruption in the departments of the Government. The charges made against the Postmaster-General proved that large sums of money were spent in order to carry the elections in the province of Quebec, and in this way our hands were tied, not only by the gerrymander of 1882, not only by the Franchise Act of 1885, but by the money spent in bribery for the purpose of carrying the Tory party once more into power. It may be said that my statements are not true. I can prove that my statements are true; that our hands were tied. In this House to-day the Liberal party of Ontario is only represented by 33 members, while the Conservatives are represented by 59 members. If our hands were not tied that could not be the case. The number of votes polled by the Conservative party in the general elections, corrected by the by-election returns, was 186,000; the number of votes polled by the Liberal party was 182,000, showing almost an equality between the Liberals and the Conservatives. Are we dealt with fairly as regards representation in this House? If our hands were not tied by the action of the Franchise Act and the Redistribution Act we would more evenly balance the conditions than we do under the present condition. For every 3,150 votes polled by the Conservatives a member was returned to Parliament by the party. For every 5,550 votes polled by the Liberals, only one member of parliament was returned to Parliament by their party. Does not this fact prove to a demonstration the inequality of the present system? On what condition and on what principle should we be required to poll 5,550 votes to secure a representative when the Tories secure a representative by polling 3,150 votes? It is truly, as Mr. Blake said, our hands are tied by the iniquitous legislation passed by the Conservative party, by which they have kept themselves in power—and the country knows it. In conclusion I have shown that the National Policy has not fostered or benefited the great agriculturists of Canada. I have shown that the National Policy has failed to develop the great mining resources of our country, although burdened with duty and bounty to accomplish that end, and it has been abundantly shown that, although the tariff gave great advantages to some manufacturers who obtained their raw material free, or nearly so, it burdened others with a high duty upon their raw material. It was proven, beyond a doubt, that it has not kept our people in the country, as it was promised to do, but that nearly a million dis-

appeared somewhere. It is shown that the country is not as prosperous as it should be, and that the National Policy is unable to bring any relief, as it has failed to secure reciprocity with the United States, towards which it was said to move. It has also failed to give new markets for the products of our country, and failed to enlarge, to any considerable extent, the markets we possess. It has shown that it has burdened our people with heavy and unnecessary taxation, in the form of Customs profits on duties, and profits afforded manufacturers by reason of the duties. It has been shown that it unfairly discriminates against the poor man in placing a higher duty upon the class of goods consumed by him. It has been abundantly proven that it is largely responsible for the present unrest in the country, and the agitation for organic changes. It has been proven to be one, at least, of the causes of the depreciation of farm lands. It has been shown to be the parent of the monopolies which prey upon the material interests of the people. It has prevented the people of Canada from making the most of the product of their labour in buying and selling, and it is, therefore, a violation of the most sacred rights of the people.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McLENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have to compliment the Minister of Finance upon the able and very satisfactory statement which he furnished to this House in his Budget speech, a statement which proves the prosperity and development of our country, and which shows as well his able management of the finances of Canada. We find from that statement that the average annual increase in our debt for the last four years has been only about \$900,000, and when we take into consideration that the North Shore bonds were charged up to capital account, and also the fact that the discount on the loan floated in England should really not be a charge upon the financial transactions of last year, we see that the average increase of debt is really very much less than it would seem at first sight. Every one understands that if that loan was placed on the market at a higher rate of interest, it would not stand against the debt of the country to-day, and consequently it is but fair to take this into consideration in making an estimate of the financial condition of the country. If the debt were relieved of these charges, as it should in all fairness be, it would bring the average increase down to \$377,000 a year. Now, when we also take into consideration the fact that the Government, by its policy, wiped off burdens of the people to the amount of five or six millions of dollars a year, we must admit that the Finance Minister was enabled to make a very favourable showing to the House. This present condition of our financial affairs, when compared with

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the financial showing of the Mackenzie Administration, between the years 1874 and 1879, is very satisfactory, and very creditable to the Finance Minister of to-day. During the last four years of the Liberal Government, it increased the debt of the country to the extent of between \$6,000,000 and \$7,000,000 a year, and if you add to that \$4,500,000 received by them from the Fishery Award, it would make the increase of the debt under their administration, at between \$7,000,000 and \$8,000,000 a year. Taking all this into consideration, I think the statement of the Finance Minister was the most satisfactory that could possibly be placed before the House. Now, Sir, it will be necessary for me to deal with some of the arguments of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald). He is an old parliamentarian, a man who has been in this House for many years, and I was rather surprised that during his two hours' speech, he adduced arguments, some of which, at least, were most ridiculous. The hon. gentleman stated that the price of grain was higher during the administration of the Mackenzie Government than it is to-day. I admit that the price was higher then than it is now, but we must also remember that the price of grain was higher in Great Britain in those days than at present. Every one knows that the markets of Great Britain govern the markets of this country in prices. Now, I find that in 1873, just before hon. gentlemen opposite went into power, the price of wheat in England was \$1.78 a bushel, whereas, when they went out of power, it was \$1.33 a bushel, or 45 cents less than it was when they took charge of the affairs of this country. However, though I point out this fact, I admit that it is no argument at all against a Government, and it is not necessary for me to waste any time over it. The hon. gentleman says that the National Policy has taken away from the farmers their market. How can he seriously argue that? The Government of this country do not prevent the farmers from exporting their goods. Do not the United States Congress legislate in the interest of the people of the United States, and if they see fit to levy duties on articles going there from this country, is it reasonable to blame this Government or their policy for those duties? The hon. gentleman knows that the United States have extensive trade with other countries than Canada—that they are getting larger quantities of goods from other countries than from the Dominion of Canada; they are legislating in their own interest entirely, and we cannot possibly compel them to legislate merely to satisfy the people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite waste hours in talking about the price of a dozen of eggs or a bushel of potatoes in the United States or Great Britain. I would like some of the hon. gentlemen who speak in this way to explain to us how they propose to remedy that condition of affairs. They have never undertaken to do so. If they have such a thing as a policy, they

should place it definitely and distinctly before the country. They should inform the farmers and tax-payers of this country what they propose to do if they are successful in their aspirations. The hon. member for East Huron speaks of the protection on woollen goods and the protection on iron. Well, his own argument, and the argument of other hon. gentlemen opposite, is sufficient to answer fully what he advanced on those subjects. We know that these hon. gentlemen have advocated unrestricted reciprocity with the United States; and, were they to get it, they would certainly then have to accept the American tariff, under which they would be paying higher duties on both iron and woollen goods than they are paying to-day. That is, I think, a sufficient answer to his contention in that matter. He speaks of mortgages, but he cannot furnish any record of mortgages that will substantiate the statement he has made. These hon. gentlemen have, for years, been decrying this country. It looks, Sir, as though there were two parties in this House—one party upholding the country, and the other party defaming it. Nothing too bad can be said by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House against Canada; and when they charged Canada with depression, they never ventured to make a comparison of the condition of this country with that of any other country. The hon. member for East Huron has also spoken about the exodus from this country to the United States. He called special attention to that subject, and asked that whoever should follow him should answer his question, where the Canadians who had left this country for the United States had gone? Well, since the hon. gentleman asked me especially to attend to this question, I am going to deal with it fully later on. The hon. gentleman argued, just as he and his friends have been doing for years, that the farmers were leaving Canada to better their condition—to secure the advantage of the magnificent market of 65,000,000 people in the United States. He says there is an unrest in the country, and that their hands are tied. Well, Sir, I am not surprised at his saying that there is an unrest. I have here a list of the elections that have taken place since the general election of 1891, and I am not surprised at these hon. gentlemen being rather uneasy at the situation of affairs in this country. The hon. member who has just been speaking attaches great importance to the remarks of a Tory paper published in the North-west. It is well that he can find a Tory paper now and then that shows a little sympathy for his party. No doubt the editor would like to increase the circulation of his paper among the hon. gentleman's Grit friends in that country, and it is natural that he should give them a little encouragement now and then. Now, to show you the cause of the unrest

which disturbs the soul of the hon. gentleman, I will give you a list of the by-elections carried by the Conservative party, and if I were to give you the majorities, the statement would show still worse for the hon. gentlemen opposite. There is North Lanark, Glengarry, Laval, Halton, East Middlesex, South Victoria, Prince Edward, East Elgin, Quebec West, Two Mountains, Richmond, N.S., Montcalm, Brome, Lennox, East Bruce, North Victoria, Soulanges, Vaudreuil, South Perth, Montmorency, East Hastings, South Ontario, East Simcoe, West Huron, Monck, West Northumberland, Montreal Centre, Brockville, Selkirk, Frontenac, Terrebonne, West York, Sherbrooke, North Hastings, East York, West Assiniboia and Soulanges; and in many cases the Conservative candidate was elected by acclamation. No wonder that there is an unrest, and that their hands are tied. Now, why are their hands tied? Their hands were tied when they lost the assistance of Mr. Mercier, the toll collector, and their gang, in the province of Quebec. That was what caused the results in the by-elections.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes; it was not your policy.

Mr. McLENNAN. The hon. member for East Huron said that it took many thousands to elect a Reformer. Well, I admit it. But that is really the most ridiculous argument that has ever been advanced in this House. For instance, we carried the whole St. Lawrence district, westward; we carried twenty counties, and there is not one Reformer representing them. Add the population of these counties together, and see how many votes are required to elect a Reformer. The hon. gentleman has acknowledged that we reduced the tax on coal oil to a very great extent, and that it is selling now at several cents a gallon less than it was before. He also acknowledges that the price of binding twine has been considerably reduced. With regard to getting a treaty with the United States for our farm produce and everything else we have to export, our Government have done everything they could to obtain such a treaty of reciprocity, and there is no doubt that both they and the hon. gentlemen opposite as well, if in power, could get a treaty of reciprocity with the United States were they willing to give preferential treatment to American industries and discriminate on the same terms as the Americans against the whole world, and Great Britain in particular. Our neighbours want a uniform tariff—which must be the tariff of the United States—for both countries. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says he does not care how we get it so long as we can manage to deal with the United States on equal terms. Well, they insist on our excise duties being the same as theirs, and I do not see how any Canadian Government could accept reciprocity with them on that basis. I would ask the leader

of the Opposition, to say yes or no, whether he would be willing to accept a treaty with the United States on the terms laid down by Mr. Blaine, namely: preferential treatment to American manufactures, discrimination against the world, particularly Great Britain, and a uniform tariff and excise. I do not think he will answer that question. I will await his answer. He makes no reply! If the Opposition would, had they the power, accept what they pretend to be seeking to get, they must admit that they are willing to accept a protective tariff which is twice as high as the one we have at present, and would be willing to sell their birth-right and their nationality for the sake of obtaining free access to this market of 60,000,000, about which they talk so much and which they say would bring so much prosperity to the farmers of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has told us that our people have left Canada because they have lost faith and hope in their country on account of our protective tariff, and because our country has sunk to a frightfully low condition: but it is rather strange to find that people would leave this country on account of our high tariff, and instead of going to England or some other country, where the tariffs are low, in fact, where there is next to no tariff, go to the United States which is protected to the extent of 60 to 65 per cent, while Canada is protected only to the extent of 30 per cent. It would seem that our people, according to this hon. gentleman, like protection so well that they are eager to go where they can get it in larger doses. With regard to the exodus, I wish to explain to this House the position, from a farming stand-point, of the farmers in the eastern, middle and western states, where hon. gentlemen opposite say our people seek refuge from the baneful effects of the policy of this Government. I want to place a fair statement before this House, that we may form some idea whether the contentions of these hon. gentlemen are well founded. I think, Sir, I shall be able to show conclusively that their statements are entirely unfounded. First of all, as this is a protective country and Great Britain is a free trade country, let me draw your attention to some extracts of evidence given before the Royal Commission on the depression of trade and industry in Great Britain, to show what the condition of that country really is. Looking into Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics, I find that the value of land in the United Kingdom has decreased, from 1880 to 1887, to the extent of \$1,036,690,000. I find that in Great Britain, according to this report, the annual decrease in value is \$150,000,000, or \$7 per acre per year. We can understand that land is much higher in Great Britain than it is in Canada or the United States, which will account for the large decrease per acre. There is also a decrease in grain produced from 1840 to 1889, of 88,000,000 bushels in that country. Now, I have a

Mr. McLENNAN.

report here of the Royal Commission on the depression of trade and industry in the United Kingdom in 1886. Mr. G. Rea, who is a practical farmer and an authority on agricultural matters, before this commission on 11th March, 1886, said that he thought the depression was due in a great measure to the fall in prices and the great increase of expenses and taxation, and that a great many farms had been thrown up. He said:

I have not a doubt that there is not a farmer in the country who, taking his capital into account, is not 40 per cent poorer than he was twelve years ago. His capital is reduced 40 per cent in consequence of the reduction in the value of animals and stock in general.

He thinks that for the last few years every tenant has been losing a portion of his rental, that is, he has paid it out of capital, and, during the last year, he thinks that 15 to 20 per cent of the rent has been paid out of capital. Sir James Caird, who is an acknowledged authority on agricultural matters, was examined on the 4th March, 1886, and gave evidence as follows. He was asked:

Have you made any generalization of the results of this depression?

He answered:

Yes, I have. The present as compared with ten years ago would show on an average that the landlords have lost 30 per cent, the tenants 60 per cent, and the labourers 10 per cent. Forty per cent loss on farms, which are chiefly arable; secondly, upon farms which are half pasture and half arable, 30 per cent; on hill farms, where it is all moor or grass, 20 per cent. That is with regard to the landlords. With regard to the tenants, in first case chiefly arable farms, capital ordinarily lost, and no income as a matter of fact from the farm. On the first class, the chiefly arable farms, the tenant's loss is 40 per cent; second class, 25 per cent, and very little income, and on the third, 10 per cent, and very little income. Wages have fallen 15 per cent from what they were ten years ago.

Now, Sir, here are the records of that country, taken from the best authority that is to be found up to that time, an authority which nobody can dispute. There is so much said about protection and free trade, that it is necessary to make a comparison between the farming interests in that country and this. I will read you from a recent address of Lord Salisbury. This is what he says:

The mother country is suffering from a severe depression which affects all branches of production. The competition of America and Australia has told heavily upon agriculture, and her manufactures are confronted in every quarter with hostile tariffs. The consequence is stagnation in her productive activity, and suffering among the labouring and mechanical classes. This unhappy condition of affairs has led recently to a feeling in favour of imposing protective duties upon imports, resolutions in favour of that policy having been passed by the Conservatives and Constitutional Union and by a great agricultural convention within the past few months.

Lord Salisbury's position in England is well known, and he has a broad and comprehensive knowledge of the requirements of the people of that country. I have

no doubt, therefore, that the next great issue in that country will be free trade or protection. Let me draw your attention to a statement made by the Right Hon. Mr. Chaplin, M.P., formerly Minister of Agriculture in Lord Salisbury's Ministry and agricultural leader of the Conservative party in England. Addressing 3,000 agriculturists a few days ago, he said :

With regard to foreign competition the remedy which he knew perfectly well would find favour in their eyes before all others, was protection. On that point he could add nothing to what he said in London, but they must not suppose for a moment he was in any degree hostile to protection. On the contrary, all his sympathies were very much with them, and very much in that direction. He never had much sympathy with the doctrines of the extreme free trader, and he had less than ever now, as he saw before him the results which, day by day, they had produced.

Now, Sir, this is the condition of affairs in Great Britain, and it is rather peculiar that, while the friends of the farmer in that country are advocating protection, the people who claim to be the friends of the farmers in this country, are advocating a policy which has brought the British farmer to the very verge of ruin. My hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) called my attention especially to the fact, as he holds it to be, that the farmers and the people generally of this country are going to the United States. I will now make a comparison, based upon the best authority that can be found as to the prosperity which those who go to the United States find there. I base my figures on the census bulletins of that country, which have cost the people of the United States many millions of dollars to furnish, and I think this House will agree that this is the best authority that can be got in that country. I was anxious to make a fair comparison between this country and the United States with regard to population, position and condition generally. First, I found that in the United States census they had taken separately cities and towns as low as 1,000 population, while in Canada they have only taken those separately as low as towns and villages of 1,500 population. I went to Mr. Johnson, the statistician, and asked him if I could in any way get the population of the small towns between 1,000 and 1,500 inhabitants, so that I might be in a position to make a fair comparison between these countries. He endeavoured to get them for me and did get Quebec and Ontario, but said that in the lower provinces he could not give them, as they were not kept separate from other municipalities. So I have Ontario and Quebec, and I am going into this matter fully, as I desire to explain the case to the people of this country, whom the gentlemen opposite have been trying to influence to leave this country to take advantage of this "sixty million" market. The population of Canada, as we all know, is 4,832,679. Ontario's population is 2,114-

321. Of these, there are in towns and villages of over 1,000 inhabitants, 634,053; the country population, outside of towns and cities, is 1,449,668, or 68.57 per cent of all the people outside of towns and villages of over 1,000 inhabitants. In Quebec the population is 1,488,535; in towns and villages over one thousand, 449,801; country population outside these towns and villages, 1,038,724, or 68.79 per cent. Take Ontario and Quebec together, and you find that the population outside of towns and cities of 1,000 and over is 69.18 per cent. Turn now to the United States. We find that New York has a population of 5,997,853. Of these, there are in cities and towns of over 1,000, 4,125,782; country population outside of these towns and cities, 1,872,071, or 31 per cent, as against 69.18 per cent in Ontario and Quebec. This should be almost enough of itself to convince the people of this country that the farmers of Canada are not leaving this country to take up their abode in the United States. Now, Sir, there has been a great deal said about the New England states. The hon. gentleman who asked me to pay so much attention to this matter mentioned, I think, nearly all the states within the New England group. The population of Vermont is 332,422, according to the census of the United States. In towns and cities of over 1,000 inhabitants there are 251,079; country population outside of these towns and villages, 81,343, or 24.1 per cent, as against 69.18 per cent in Ontario and Quebec. In Maine we find a population of 661,086; in towns and cities over 1,000, 507,103, or 23 per cent, as against 69 per cent in Ontario and Quebec. In New Hampshire the population is 376,530; in towns and cities over 1,000, 300,803; country population outside of these cities and towns, 75,723, or 20 per cent. Connecticut's population, according to the census, is 746,258; in towns and cities over 1,000, 682,416; country population outside these towns and cities, 63,842, or less than 9 per cent. Now we come to Massachusetts. This is the state which the hon. member for South Oxford has been comparing with Canada, of course, showing how its population is increasing. We are all fully aware that this state is a strong manufacturing state. We find there is a total population of 2,238,943; in towns and cities of over 1,000, there are 2,176,938, and a country population of only 62,005, or less than three per cent outside of the towns and cities, as against 69 per cent in Ontario and Quebec. Now, I think it will be admitted by every member from the Maritime provinces that more people emigrate from those provinces to the state of Massachusetts than to any other state of the Union. Why do they go? I will undertake to show you later. Now, I will take the state of Rhode Island, a manufacturing state, where a great many of our people go. The total population is 345,506, in towns and cities, 342,122, leaving a country population of only

3,384, or less than 1 per cent, as against the 69 per cent of a rural population in Canada. The total population of New England is 4,700,745, or nearly the same population as all Canada; and outside of towns and cities containing over 1,000 population, there are only 440,280. You may say that there are small villages in the United States, and there are small villages in Canada under 1,000, and so I make the comparison between towns and villages containing over a thousand in both countries. It will be clear that our people do not go to the United States in order to better their condition as farmers. The whole country population of New England is only 9.36 per cent as against 69 per cent in Ontario and Quebec. Now, let me make a comparison with the Maritime provinces, of which so much has been said. I have taken the towns and villages containing between 1,000 and 1,500 population in Ontario and Quebec, which make about 2 per cent of the total population, and I have applied this on the same basis to the Maritime provinces. In those provinces I find a total population of 880,737; in cities and towns of over 1,500, there are 169,514; and in towns and villages of over 1,000 and under 1,500, at the same percentage as in Ontario and Quebec, there are 17,600. This would leave a population of 693,623, or 79 per cent outside of towns and cities, as against 9 per cent in the New England states. Now, this is 253,000, or over 57 per cent in the rural sections of the Maritime provinces, more than the whole of the New England states. There are 1,900,000, or 226 per cent more in the rural sections of Ontario, than in the whole of the New England states, though the population of the New England states is about equal to that of Canada; and there are 598,000, or 136 per cent more in the country sections in the province of Quebec, than there is in the New England states. Now, the land acreage under crop in Massachusetts and Rhode Island is not as much as the average county in the province of Ontario, and the municipal and state debt of New York and the New England states is \$347,593,000, or \$110,000,000 more than the whole debt of Canada. The interest on this debt will have to be collected and paid by direct taxation on the people. To give an idea of taxation in the state of New York, I will give some figures from the Toronto "Globe," and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute that authority. According to a statement I saw in that paper some time ago, there is in the state of New York a direct municipal tax and a state tax—on 200 acres, \$132; on 150 acres, \$125; on 90 acres, \$60. In the city of New York over \$33,000,000 are collected every year, which last year was over \$22 per head of the whole population, or \$12,000,000 more than the whole Customs tax of Canada. If you take into consideration the fact that the floating population cannot be reached by direct taxation, and if you charge this up to each individual who pays taxes, I

Mr. McLENNAN.

have no doubt it would reach to \$50 or \$60 per head of the taxable population of that city. It would be well for the farmers of our country to take into consideration this comparison of taxation between the two countries, and to ask themselves whether they would like to have such a taxation levied upon them in Canada. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said as reported in "Hansard," on page 338 of the year 1892:

I believe that it is to-day calculated by American statisticians that there are more New Brunswickers and Nova Scotians, between the ages I have mentioned, 20 and 40, to be found in Massachusetts and sister New England states, than remain in the provinces which the hon. gentlemen and their colleagues represent.

Now, I find that in these provinces there is a population of 880,737. In the whole of the New England states there are only 440,280 in the rural sections, or less than one-half of the total population in the Maritime provinces. Now, these people from the Maritime provinces have gone to the New England states to seek employment in the industries of that country. I think that the leader of the Opposition was down in Boston some time ago, where he addressed his fellow-countrymen. It was asked: What are these emigrants from the province of Quebec doing in New England states? Certainly they cannot be on farms. There are only 440,000 that we can find there, so they must be engaged in manufacturing industries. They are engaged in manufactures fostered and encouraged by the American people, and it must strike any hon. gentleman in this House very forcibly that the more manufacturing industries we have in the country the more people we can employ and keep within our own borders. Now, Sir, I have no doubt that the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite have done more to drive our Canadians out of the country than any other cause. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not only driven people out of this country, but they have prevented other people from coming here. So favourably have they spoken of the United States, and especially of certain sections of that country, that the portraits of hon. gentlemen opposite have appeared as frontispieces of pamphlets circulated among immigrants who come here, to prejudice them against this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak so strongly in favour of the interests of the United States and especially of Kansas and certain states, that our people were induced and encouraged to go across the line, but they learned by sad experience that that country is not what it is recommended to be by these hon. gentlemen. When a man is entrusted with the representation of a constituency in this House, when a gentleman has occupied the position of Minister of Finance and has received a title from Her Majesty, and making statements of the character made by the hon. gentleman and his friends, for many years past, I say it is cruel on the part of any Canadian with a heart

within him, and entertaining any true Canadian feeling, to make statements that place our country at a disadvantage with every other country in the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk loudly of the depression in Canada, but they do not present facts to maintain their allegations. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always declaring that Providence did not favour them when in power. They earnestly desire that Providence should be in their favour on the eve of an election, and they would be glad to see depression existing at such a time; but they have not found depression to prevail since the hon. gentlemen who now conduct the public affairs have been in office, and in fact they have carried on public affairs to the satisfaction of our people, as expressed so often in thunder tones at the polls. Many statements have been made respecting mortgages, and I desire to draw the attention of the House to the position of the United States respecting mortgages. I base my calculations upon the American census, which cost some millions of dollars to prepare. The mortgage debt on 1st January, 1890, in Alabama was \$39,027,000, or \$26 per head; in Iowa, \$119,034,000, or \$104 per head; in Illinois, \$384,299,000, or \$100 per head. It will be remembered that Iowa and Illinois are situated in the very heart of the United States, and are considered to include the best farming sections in the country. Kansas, that country whose immigration circulars contain portraits of some hon. gentlemen opposite, has a debt of \$235,485,000, or \$170 per head, or \$850 for every family of five, or a mortgage against every 4.77 of the whole population of the state. When I speak of a mortgage of \$850 against any family, I do not mean against each family mortgaged, but against every family in the state. Those five states had, on 1st January, 1890, real estate mortgages amounting to \$906,669,000, or an average of \$83.80 per head, subject to an interest charge for one year of \$67,505,000. I have not time to go over the statistics of each state separately, but I will read to the House a statement covering the whole United States, prepared by Mr. Porter, the census commissioner. He says in Extra Census Bulletin No. 3:

A small army of 2,500 special agents and clerks has been employed to make an abstract of every mortgage placed on record in every county in the United States, and that the agents of the Census office have as a matter of fact overhauled the records in every state and territory. They have travelled on horseback and on foot through the most sparsely settled districts of our vast domain in search of mortgages and have done their work so industriously and so thoroughly that we have now on file in Washington as a result of their labour, the abstracts of about 9,000,000 mortgages.

There are about 12,000,000 families in the United States. Comment is unnecessary. The census commissioner says there are 9,000,000 mortgages. These facts will bear out the statement I venture to make, that that country is not so prosperous as it is represented to our people. There appears to

be one mortgage for every seven of the people over the whole of the United States; there are no two families, on an average, who are not mortgaged; yet these are the people who have the advantage of the 65,000,000 market. I have stated the facts, and if any hon. member wishes to dispute them, I can furnish him with the census records. I will now deal with some of the best agricultural counties in the United States, so that people in our own counties may make a comparison. In Cass county, Iowa, the debt is \$2,584,099. There is 95½ per cent on acres and 4 per cent on lots. The debt per head is \$137. When I mention acres it means farms, and lots means towns and villages, so that you will see that the large percentage is on farms. There is one mortgage to every seven people. Of the assessed number of acres 67½ per cent are mortgaged. In Delaware county, Iowa, which is represented as being one of the most prosperous counties in the state, the population is 17,349, a decrease of 601 in ten years. The total debt is \$1,636,109; 90 per cent of the total is on acres and 10 per cent on lots. There is one mortgage to eleven of population, and a debt of \$94 per head. Johnson county, Iowa, has a debt of \$1,769,666, of which over 87 per cent is on acres. The debt is \$77 per head. I will now read the report from the census bulletin in the United States of one of the best counties in the state of Illinois:

BUREAU COUNTY, see page 7, Extra Census Bulletin No. 3.

Bureau County (Illinois) is a standard agricultural county of the better sort, organized in the year 1837, containing 35,041 inhabitants, and 547,429 taxed acres. It is about 100 miles south-west of Chicago, and is traversed by two trunk railroads and their branches. The present owners and occupants of the soil are largely the descendants in the first or second degree of the pioneers who settled the county and prospered from the first fruits of the land and the opportunities offered by the development of trade and transportation.

When this county was selected for special investigation it was represented to the Census office that its people, during the past decade, had been suffering from continued business depression, that while crops and live stock were flourishing, it cost more to raise them than they were worth in the market; that land values had consequently declined, that the farmers had become poorer, indebtedness had increased, and that many farms had been mortgaged for money to defray the living expenses of their owners or had been sold at a sacrifice in order that the owners might remove to newer states.

This county has an existing debt of \$4,766,139, of which \$4,396,763, or 92.25 per cent of the total, is on acres and \$369,377, or 7.75 per cent of the total, is on lots. The population being 35,014, the per capita indebtedness is \$136 and the per family indebtedness \$656, and there are 12.31 persons or 2.56 families on the average to each mortgage in force.

Now, Sir, as they very often speak of chattel mortgages, I will deal with them. The only official record that I can find in Canada is in the province of Ontario, and the only official record that I have in the United States is in

the state of Nebraska. Two years ago the Legislature of Nebraska passed a law requiring the registrar of deeds in each county to keep a tabulated record of the mortgages filed and released, both real estate and chattel. The law took effect in 1891. For the year ending 31st May, 1892, the chattel mortgages filed amounted to \$25,138,216, or \$23.74 per head of the population of the state. In Ontario, on 31st December, 1891, the chattel mortgages amounted to \$8,595,417, or \$4.01 per head. You will therefore see that the chattel mortgages in Ontario, Canada, amount to \$4.01 per head, as against \$23.74 in the United States. The chattel mortgages against farmers in Ontario were reduced, in 1891, by \$125,696. The percentage of farmers in Ontario is 68.57 per cent and the proportion of the total chattel mortgages against them is 34.61 per cent. This shows that, although they form more than two-thirds of the population, there is only one-third of the total chattel mortgages against them. Let me quote from the letter of General Weaver, one of the presidential candidates in the November election. In that letter General Weaver thus describes the western farmer :

The people are in poverty ; their substance is being devoured by heartless monopolists, trusts and money sharks ; labour is largely unemployed, and where work is obtained, the wages are for the most part unremunerative, and the products of labour not paying the cost of production. This is a matter of serious concern to the whole people.

Further than that, Sir, the "American Farmer," a leading agricultural journal, says, in its last issue :

The farmers are fast being reduced to the condition of serfs and the American workingman is becoming the American slave. Such is the position of the American farmer in the highly favoured and advantageously situated western states.

As a contrast to this, let me give you the figures as to the condition of Ontario, a province which hon. gentlemen opposite often refer to as being on the verge of ruin. I have taken my information from the Report of the Bureau of Industries, the most reliable record that can be obtained, and which is published by Sir Oliver Mowat's Government. Sir Oliver Mowat may have faults, politically, but he is loyal to the interests of Canada, and he is willing to extend to this country that fair-play and justice that is due to it. He has the means at his command of getting a true record of the condition of Ontario ; he has an army of officials throughout the province ; he has the municipal machinery of the country which he can take advantage of ; so that he has opportunity for obtaining an accurate record that hon. gentlemen opposite do not possess, although they profess to know a great deal about the province. Now, in thirteen of the staple crops in Ontario I find the average under crop from 1882 to 1891, inclusive, ten years, was 7,517,606 acres. The average for the last six years is 7,814,893. In 1891 they had increased to 7,834,213. This

Mr. McLENNAN.

is 316,607 acres above the average for the last ten years, and 219,320 acres above the average for the last six years. The value of these crops in 1891 was \$8,677,906 over the average for ten years. There is a very small falling off in the value of farm lands in Ontario. This is more than made up by the increase in the value of stock and implements. There is a total increase of \$959,033 in farm stock and implements in 1891 over 1890. Now, here is a statement from the report of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics for 1890 :

The value of the farm land of the province of Ontario is about 2 per cent below the average derived for the nine years, but owing to additions in the values of buildings, implements and live stock, the total farm property is about 1 per cent higher than the average annual value.

This shows that our country is not in the deplorable condition that hon. gentlemen opposite represent. When they wish to make any comparisons they ought to furnish some record that is reliable to back their statements up. Now, we find that in the United States the farm population has very largely decreased, yet farm stocks have very largely increased there as well as in Canada. Horses have increased on the farm by 4,500,000 ; mules by 600,000, and milch cows by 4,389,000 ; and other cattle 16,500,000. The price of horses in the United States, the average for the whole country, is put down at \$65.01, which is not any more than the average price of horses in this country. The average price of milch cows in the United States is \$21, which is less than the average price in this country. Now, Sir, the point which I wish to make is this, that even if the market of the United States should be opened to us, the farmers there are overstocked with horses, owing to the general adoption of electricity in the cities and towns, reducing the demand for horses, and lowering the price ; so that the market of the United States in that particular branch would not be as valuable to Canada to-day as it was some years ago. Now, Sir, we hear men speak of free trade as if it meant nothing more than free trade ; but the question has often been asked from this side of the House, how they were going to raise the necessary revenue, and the same question has been asked throughout the country. But they refuse to tell ; they never have told. We must have a revenue ; we cannot get along without it. Now, if these hon. gentlemen are going to place any policy before the people of this country, they should do as Sir John A. Macdonald did in 1878 : they should tell the people clearly and distinctly what they propose to do for them, so that the electors will be in a position to record their votes intelligently, knowing what they are voting on. We know why the hon. gentlemen have not revealed the great secret to the people of the country. We know that it is because their policy would mean direct taxation upon the farmers and property owners of this country. We know that they

tried to steal a march on the people and obtain their confidence without telling them what they were going to do. The adoption of direct taxation would be a serious step for the farmers and tax-payers of this country to take. The rich man can invest his money in many ways, not only in this country, but in other countries, and in that way escape taxation. The floating population cannot be reached by direct taxation. We know that you cannot reach the total population by a direct tax, but you can reach the farmer. The farm and chattels are there. The tax collector, the bailiff and the sheriff will take charge of them if payments are not made promptly. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of tariff reform, as if they could wipe off so much of the burdens of the country and that nothing more would be done, but let the people go scot free, without their having to pay anything. They speak of tariff reform in the United States, but before we can make a comparison between the United States and Canada, we must compare the administration and position of both countries. Let us suppose, for a moment, that Ontario is one of the states of the Union. What would be the first burden levied upon her? Instead of having to pay an indirect tax of 30 per cent, she would have to pay an indirect tax of from 60 to 65 per cent. She would then have to support herself, because she would get nothing from the central Government. She would have to build her own public works, her own canals, bonus her own railways, bear the expense of her own administration of justice, support her own militia, and she would have to do all that by direct taxation, as have other states of the Union. But what is her position to-day? The Dominion Government are only taxing the people 30 per cent upon Customs imports, and the greater portion by far of that is borne by the wealthier classes of the population. We have assumed the debts of the provinces. We are collecting the revenue and paying out in cash every year to the provinces at 4 per cent, on the responsibility we have undertaken, \$4,360,000. We are paying also to the provinces in subsidies over \$4,000,000 a year, so that we have to collect money to meet the liabilities of the provinces to the extent of over \$8,000,000 a year. That is the amount our Government is raising and paying in cash, out of the revenue they collect, to the provinces for interest on the debts of the provinces, which they have assumed, and on the provincial subsidies, amounting to about \$40,000 for each average-sized county. All this we are paying out of our 30 per cent tariff. In order to make a fair comparison between the United States and Canada, the United States would first have to reduce their tariff from 65 to 30 per cent and assume the debts of the State Governments, and give the State Governments a subsidy of about \$60,000,000 a year, which would be in the same proportion as Canada

is giving her provinces, and besides this amount relieve them of the responsibility of building their railways, canals and tunnels, maintaining their militia and administration of justice, and a thousand other things too numerous to mention. When they do for their State Governments what we do for the provinces in Canada, and when they have reduced their duty to 30 per cent, then you can commence to make a comparison between the United States and Canada, and not till then. I have made a comparison between Canada and Great Britain and the United States, based upon the best authority, authority which no man in this House can dispute. I have given facts which cannot be denied, and my object in doing this was to place the different conditions of the different countries mentioned fairly before the House and the people of the country generally; and as there is so much said by hon. gentlemen opposite about the inducements held out to our people to go to the other side, that it was but right the people should know what they have fairly to expect, if they yield to the inducements held out by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have shown the depression in Great Britain, a depression amounting to \$7 per acre every year in the value of land, 30 to 40 per cent every year in the income of the owners, 30 to 40 per cent in the income of the tenants, and 15 per cent in the wages of agricultural labourers. I have also read a report of the mortgages as given by the United States commissioners, which shows that there are 9,000,000 of mortgages in the United States to about 12,000,000 families. I have shown you that the east, middle and western States are in a condition of depression unknown in this country. It is not many months ago since the people of Dakota, that land to which our people were recommended to go by hon. gentlemen opposite, were appealing to Washington and elsewhere, even Toronto and other parts of Canada, for assistance to keep them from starving and to enable them to buy seed grain for the coming spring. Such a condition of things never existed in this country, the nearest approach to it being during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, when our cities and municipalities had to furnish the people with soup kitchens to keep them from starving. In conclusion, let me say that I believe Canada to-day is the most prosperous country in the world. There may be many more millions in Great Britain and the United States; but our wealth is better distributed, and there is no man in this country to-day, willing and able to work, who cannot secure work and make a respectable living. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will cast out the policies they have submitted to this House, and will adopt one which will be a Canadian policy, for the general benefit of the country, and that every man in Canada will feel that he is a Canadian and a British subject, and will proudly hold up his hand

and say of Canada: "This is my own my native land."

Mr. DEVLIN. If I cannot agree with all that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I must pay him the compliment of having treated the House to a speech, in which he quoted figures at great length, and in which good nature, in so far as his own country is concerned, abounded. But I cannot say he was even just in dealing with the United States. He said that we must admit that the markets of Great Britain govern the world, and, furthermore, that we cannot possibly compel the United States to legislate for our benefit. We never pretended that we could compel them to do so. The hon. gentleman added, we have not undertaken to give a remedy. A remedy for what? He admits by this that evils exist since a remedy is required. He says we are running Canada down and that there is nothing too bad which we will not say of it. I thought that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) in his excellent speech had disposed of that argument. Further on he complains of unrest, or rather contends that we complain that this feeling of unrest exists. If the hon. gentleman will carefully read the speech delivered in this House on Tuesday last by the hon. Finance Minister, he will find that the Finance Minister himself complains of the unrest that exists in this country. And this unrest is not in the ranks of the Liberal party, but in the ranks of the Conservative party. The unrest is to be found in the mind and heart of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and others. The hon. gentleman did not forget to pay his compliment to the Hon. Mr. Mercier, attributing to that gentleman evils that we are now beginning to hear repeated very frequently. I shall not deal with these to-night, as I think hon. gentlemen representing the province of Quebec disposed of them very effectively less than ten days ago. The hon. gentleman said in regard to the treaty of reciprocity that the party to which he belonged had done the best they could. Mighty little! What have they done? They have taken a couple or three trips to Washington. They have returned as they went, empty-handed. That is all they have done. The hon. gentleman spoke furthermore, and at great length, on the exodus. I shall refer to that part of his speech later on. He says that our people do not go to the United States to better their condition. What do they go for, for fun? He says that if we were to abandon our manufacturers it would be a bad thing for Canada. I agree with him. He finally complained that the speeches delivered on this side had driven the people out of the country. It is not very good evidence of the force of the attractions provided by the Government of the day to say that a speech or two can overcome the effect of all the alleged good acts of the Administration which the hon. gentleman

Mr. McLENNAN.

supports. He finally spoke of depression and of Providence, put in a word of abuse against the United States, and said that any man in this country who wants work can get it. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him, there are men here to-day, there are men here every day, trying to get work and who cannot get it, and it would surprise me very much to know that the hon. gentleman has not seen them, that he does not receive a card or perhaps three or four or five cards every day from supporters of his, or admirers of his in the city who are anxious to get work, whether in the buildings or elsewhere. The hon. gentleman also spoke some words of strong praise of the speech delivered by the hon. Finance Minister, and with that portion of the hon. gentleman's address I cannot possibly agree. Certainly, since the first day of Confederation there have been many remarkable Budget speeches made in this House. It is no exaggeration to say that not one of them was ever awaited in this House and this country with more feverish suspense and manifest anxiety than the one delivered on Tuesday last. I think, further, it is no exaggeration to say that no former Budget speech created so much and such well founded disappointment. What were the expectations of the country, and how were they treated? It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the historic promise, and especially to the historic expression conveying that promise, made by the Prime Minister when speaking in the great city of Toronto a few months ago, to the effect that the mouldering branches of the existing policy would disappear. The policy has been announced, and yet, if we except a couple of chips taken off, the branches remain. It was expected, indeed, that such a change in this policy would be made that when it would be announced in the House it would be one which would be almost a total stranger. The position reminds one very much of the famous answer given at a coroner's inquest; one of the witnesses had been warned to be very careful as to statements he made. The question was asked of him: "Do you know this man here who was found dead on the track? Is he a total stranger?" and witness replied: "No, Sir; he lost a leg entirely: he is only a partial stranger." But Mr. Speaker, we cannot even say that much of this policy; it has not lost a branch in its entirety. The fact is that when the Prime Minister went out into the country and came in contact with the people, when he felt the pulse of the people, he perceived that what we on this side have been asserting all along was correct, namely, that there were mouldering branches forming part of this policy, and he immediately promised remedial legislation. Now, no doubt when he returned to Ottawa some colleagues of his thought differently upon the subject, and though there is no official record of what took place at the meeting called to discuss the subject, we have every reason to believe they found it

a terrible task. It has been brought out in debate in this House, and it has been brought out in the speech delivered at Stayner by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the late Prime Minister is not the creator of the National Policy; that it owes its existence, not to the late Sir John Macdonald, but that the gentlemen who inspired the inception of this policy were the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and if all that has been said is true, they were largely indebted in their advocacy of this cause and in the formation of the policy to Messrs. Goldwin Smith and Farrer. It was pretty hard indeed to expect from such a combination a healthy product. We are charged with treason for saying this much, as these gentlemen are now, that they have had their eyes open and see daylight as it is, and have declared that this policy is causing sad havoc in more than one section of the country, and that it should, if not in whole, at least in great part, be done away with. We have heard the speech delivered in this House a few days ago by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and in that speech he complains bitterly of the effects of certain portions of the National Policy. But he went still further than that in an article appearing in his paper:

What the manufacturer desires is something wholly different from what the protectionist statesman desires. The latter desires to foster home industries; the former desire—McKinleyism—a rampart under cover of which they may prey on the community. According to Edmund About, members of the Greek Government at Athens, in his time, were in league with the banditti. There is no or little moral difference between such a league and the over-protection of manufacturers whereby the farmers are heavily salted; but there is this great practical difference, that Hadgi Stavros and his robbers made comparatively few victims and their victims were the rich and idle; but two or three combines like those of the binder twine, the coal oil, and the implement men, levy ransom scientifically, by contract and legal process, on the whole farming community. Like the Irish landlord prior to Gladstone's agrarian legislation, they take the blood and sweat of the agriculturist and live in splendour and become princes in the land.

Sir, I do not think that a Liberal ever used language as strong as that which I have just quoted and which I have not the slightest doubt, was written by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Then, again, I could refer to the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); we could recall the utterances of the President of the Young Conservative Association, of Toronto; we could likewise recall what was telegraphed down to this city the other day concerning the Young Conservatives of Winnipeg; and we could lay particular emphasis upon the statement made only a few moments ago by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), a statement which was made before him by the Minister of Finance, that unrest prevailed in this country. Why, Sir, this is the first session we have been told that unrest and uneasiness prevailed in this

country. Up to this time their common song was that blessed peace prevailed in every part of the country; and now they come and tell us that unrest is in their ranks—at all events, we know that it is. When the National Policy was again placed on the table of the Ministers for inspection, I have not the slightest doubt they found there was not a branch of it but was mouldering, not a feature connected with it but was distorted and disfigured, not an element in its composition but was putrid. The soul of the thing was bad, the body worse, and the limbs tottering. Yet these gentlemen come and ask us to pay tribute to this their idol. When motion after motion was made in this House attacking this policy, what was the answer of the Prime Minister? Wait, said he, till to-morrow; wait till you have heard my own Finance Minister. At least, if he did not use those exact words, we could infer them from his significant glance. Wait till you have heard this Finance Minister who will now appear in all his strength, who has had his last moment of weakness. Wait till he performs this great financial feat which will astonish the House and the country even more than his previous efforts astonished the powerful organizations with which he had long been connected. Sir, we have heard the Finance Minister; we have heard him struggling to describe what he considered to be the great difficulty of the question. He has, as usual, abused the Liberal party, but that will not satisfy the country. He has not cut off the branches that we were promised would be cut off. Sir, he has stabbed in vital parts, not the National Policy, but the very best interests of this country. Now he tells us that he cannot make these alterations which were promised until he has the aid of the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, who are to accompany him on a pilgrimage throughout the country. These three gentlemen will travel through the country, no doubt, under the guidance of the Minister of Trade, to find out—what? To find out what we know already; to find out evils which have been pointed out in this House over and over again, and which exist. Has the evidence not been already sufficient? Let me take an instance. He wants to find out, no doubt, how the cotton tax has affected this country. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) the other day how the people of Canada are suffering under the imposition of this tax. Will he be able to tell the House on his return that this tax, in a particular manner, has benefited Canada at large? Will he be able to tell us that there is no such a thing as a cotton combine? That this tax imposed, not for revenue purposes, but for the purpose of protection, has indeed given birth to a great many cotton factories throughout the land? No, Sir. After he has returned from his pilgrimage he will come and tell us that the result of this tax is that a huge cotton combine has been formed

in the country, which is fleecing the taxpayers and which is putting millions of dollars into the pockets of a few at the expense of the many. That is the result of the Conservative policy. We know, Mr. Speaker, what has been done in regard to the sugar tax, which, it is claimed, has been remitted. The Finance Minister tells us to-day, in a boastful spirit, that he has remitted millions of dollars to the people, and literature is circulated in every part of the country calculated to induce the people to believe that millions of dollars are being handed right back to them to be put into their pockets. Why, Sir, when he stands up here and makes this boast he forgets that he is doing what the Liberal party in this House and in the country have been demanding for years, that is, to take the sugar tax off. He has simply stolen a branch from the great tree of the Liberal party, and he has put it in his hat and feels proud over it. Why, he need not go out into the country to find that the tax on binder twine is bearing heavily upon the community. The Conservative Association with which, I believe, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is connected, has told him so; the farmers from every part of the country have invited him to take that off; and so, Sir, with all these taxes which have been levied during many years for the benefit of the few. If he were to travel from one end of the country to the other; if he were to inspect every factory and every house in the community, he will never be able to establish, in the matter of cotton, in the matter of sugar, binder twine, and coal oil, that the taxes imposed upon them have been beneficial to the country. I propose quoting further remarks made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in regard to the tax on agricultural implements. I think if that hon. gentleman is sincere in his advocacy of tariff reform, if he is sincere in his desire to obtain those benefits which we have been advocating, and the removal of the heavy taxes which exist in those branches he has mentioned, the best thing he can do is to support the amendment before the House, which demands tariff reform, pure and simple. He quotes a farmer as saying:

That hundred thousand dollars recently donated by Monopolist Massey to an educational institution, was really given, not by Mr. Massey, but by the farmers of the North-west.

Sir, in regard to this gentleman, who, no doubt, is the most heavily protected manufacturer in Canada, by this tax on agricultural implements, it has been well pointed out that he is able to compete in Australia with English, American and German manufacturers, and there to sell at prices as low as they do, and even at prices lower than they are being sold at in Canada to-day. All these taxes have been imposed, so we are told, for the purpose of encouraging manufacturers, and they must be continued. The House and the country know well that the Minister of Fin-

Mr. DEVLIN.

ance can offer no other excuse than this: that he is afraid to discharge the duty required of him by the circumstances of trade in this country, and by the conditions of the country; that he is afraid to estrange a few political followers, and, perhaps, to estrange in the country a few political supporters. A few weeks ago we heard in this House the eloquent periods of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), when he recalled certain pages of history. He spoke of the courage manifested by the Athenians, if I mistake not. He did well to recall these grand lessons which are to be found in history. He could have gone further, and quoted the courage of the Carthagenians and the Romans. Sir, when Carthage was in danger, when the resources of that great city had been exhausted, the sons of Carthage went out generously to defend the city; and it is even said that the very maids of Carthage surrendered their gold and their jewels for their country's sake. There were patriots in those days, and no combinesters. Sir, when the Roman was called by duty from his business in the city, or from the Roman fields, he cheerfully responded to the call. But it must not be forgotten that there were patriots in those days, and they did not live in a "red parlour," nor did they take their orders from a "red parlour." Our Tory Catilina is at the very gates of our country. He has taken possession of its seven hills and valleys, he has fastened his fangs in the very heart of the country, he has forged shackles, and the slavery which he has enacted by statute is simply appalling. All this is done for the sake of special interests. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I think, the other day said this policy is a good one. While an hon. member on this side of the House was speaking, that hon. gentleman declared that the policy was a good one and worthy of the support of the people. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has a poor memory. Only four or five years ago the farmers of his county returned him by a majority of nearly 500, but when they found out the true intent of the National Policy, they returned him by five or six votes. A little more of such support and he will have to seek pastures new and fresh fields.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not due to the National Policy, but to the Jesuit question.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. gentleman wants to know what the farmers think of his policy, I ask him to consider the resolution moved in Kingston on 20th January, which demands that in view of the depressed condition of Canadian agriculture—I am not stating this, but the farmers are stating this—and of the important bearing which this industry has on the prosperity of this country, in the opinion of this convention, a reorganization of the fiscal policy of the Dominion, with a view to lighten the burdens on the farmers and promote freer trade relations with Great Britain

and foreign countries, and open larger and better market for agricultural products, would be in the best interests of the farming community. I also call the attention of the hon. gentleman to resolutions in favour of tariff reform adopted by the Farmers' Institute when it was closing its proceedings on 9th February, in Toronto. The hon. gentleman who preceded me, spoke at great length of the exodus which exists. That subject has perhaps been more discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite than by hon. members on this side of the House, for they are well aware that they must defend it in some way or other. The Minister of Interior himself spoke on the same subject, and he referred to the fact that he himself—and I congratulate and admire him for it—thought enough of his country to go into a far province, there to build up his own fortune. He did well to do so, and he has certainly built up a fine fortune. He declared that he was proud of the province from which he came and I repeat that I admire him for it. There are many others who are equally anxious to remain in their own province and in their own country, but they are unable to do so. Is this because the sky of the foreign country is dearer to them than their own Canadian sky? Is it because they see there those who are more dear to them than those who, during previous years in their own country, tenderly cared for them and looked after them? No, they would much prefer remaining in the old home, the dear home of early days. They favour more the Canadian sky than the foreign sky, but they go to a foreign country to improve their fortune and to seek that success which they fail to secure at home. The Minister of the Interior, in endeavouring to answer hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, denied that there are, at the present time, in the United States over 1,000,000 Canadians. Did the hon. gentleman deny that in the United States there are a great many Canadians? Not at all. The Minister of Railways and Canals, during this debate, stated that the number was not so large as was represented. I think the hon. member's statement was satisfactorily answered by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald). The Minister's statement was that there were 490,000 Canadians in the United States in 1870, and 973,000 in 1890; and he asked where was the one and a half million of Canadians which the member for South Oxford declared now resided in the United States? The hon. gentleman did not state that those were native-born Canadians. He never referred to the 886,000 emigrants, who, at great expense and after great labour, were induced to come to this country; and we may fairly ask where are those 886,000 emigrants who were brought to this country. Are they to be found in the North-west? No; not even in that land of promise, spoken of by Sir Charles Tupper, when, fourteen years ago, he declared that if the Conservatives were re-

turned to power, there would not be a scanty population in the North-west, but there would be millions there. Where are the millions to-day? Certainly they are not to be found in that country. The hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke at great length in regard to the prices which farmers are obtaining for their products. Let me refer to a few prices which the farmers are obtaining on this side, and the prices which the farmers are obtaining on the other side of the line. A farmer at Sarnia went over to Port Huron in order to obtain figures to make a comparison as to the prices realized for grain and some farm products there, as compared with the Canadian side, and the result was as follows:—The price of wheat at Port Huron was then, and had been all summer, 8 cents per bushel higher than on the Canadian side. Oats in Sarnia were sold at 28 cents per bushel, while they brought 34 cents in Port Huron and 36 cents in Detroit. Barley, which is, this year, a poor sample in Michigan, realized from 40 to 60 cents at Port Huron, while the highest price obtained at Sarnia was 35 cents. The writer goes on further to state that in Port Huron the best American coal oil can be bought at 6 cents per gallon wholesale, and by retail 12 cents per imperial gallon, while in Sarnia, Canadian oil, which is a very much inferior article, sold recently at 28 cents per imperial gallon. Special attention is called to the fact that barbed wire brought a much lower price on the other side than on this side, and also that at Port Huron \$2 bought a keg of nails, while at Sarnia the cost was \$3.50. A change is now suggested in the Government policy, and it is in the direction of an imposition of an export duty on logs. Last year the President of the Council advocated the imposition of an export duty. The proposition was not entertained by the House, but, no doubt, now that he has a seat in the councils of the nation, he thinks he is bound to see that this export duty on logs shall be imposed. I, myself, in this House last year, read a number of letters from the most prominent lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley, all protesting against the imposition of this import duty. It would simply have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of upsetting to a certain extent existing contracts, and of creating uneasiness and uncertainty in the lumber trade. It will result in injuring our mills, perhaps of lowering wages, and it certainly, on account of such reasons, will have the effect of lowering the value of the limits of the mill owners. Remember that all these special taxes which are imposed and which have been maintained for years, are simply maintained because of special interests and because of certain invested rights. Special interests, remember, that make one man the master and the other a slave, one man a monopolist and a capitalist and the other a pauper, one man the occupant, perhaps, of a palace or a castle, drives the other

into exile and makes him a supplicant at a stranger's door. These special interests that were denounced in the parable of Dives and of Lazarus, which have crimsoned the pages of history, and in whose very wake follow deceit and ruin, poverty and crime and starvation. It was only a few years ago that a great war was waged upon this continent in the cause of special interests, and in order to maintain the greatest system of slavery which ever existed. That was the plea set up, Sir, and to-day, when the people are suffering beneath the lashes of a cruel and oppressive policy, the only excuse offered is: that special interests must be protected, that we have created combinesters and we must not unmake them, that we have created a Red Parlour, and that we have sworn, from that Red Parlour we must get our orders. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) referred at great length to the United States. He quoted figures to prove that depression existed there, and that the farmers there are not as well off as they are in Canada. I hope that our farmers will have more prosperity, not that I wish our neighbours any harm, but that I wish that our own people shall occupy a high position. But, Sir, I do not think, in view of what has transpired during recent years, that it is well to speak of this foreign people in this way. I, myself, do not advocate, never did advocate, and never will advocate annexation to the United States. I believe that our country should be perfectly well off as it is, and I believe that the link connecting Canada with Great Britain is capable of providing all the happiness that our people may require. I certainly do not believe that this link shall always continue in existence. A day may come when a change in our condition may be imperative; but I do not believe that that change will ever be in the direction of annexation. It will be higher; it will be grander, and it will be better. It will be more in keeping with the tone and pulsation of the national heart of this people. It will be independence when the people of this country shall have sufficiently multiplied, and when the country shall have sufficiently grown to warrant such a change. Sir, we know what a year we have just gone through, and I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) of the fact that it was a great year for America, that we celebrated the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America, and that such an occasion as that would naturally bring back to us recollections which it would be well to weigh. History confirms us in the belief that the discovery of America was in more than one sense a blessing to humanity. Here upon this continent the toiler can hope for the reward of his labour; here the persecuted of every nation, whether of his politics, whether of his faith, can hope to find peace, security and shelter; here, there was to be not license, but honesty and liberty of speech and of thought and of action, as

Mr. DEVLIN.

well as the protection that wisely framed, wisely designed, and wisely administered laws could afford. There, where the Atlantic's billows lash the American shore; there the restless spirit of tyranny must stop, for it has been written above that the soil of America should be consecrated to freedom, and that it should be the natural haven of man's happiness and of his prosperity. I would remind my hon. friend that our heritage in common with those across the line extends even beyond such considerations, if we consider origin, language and affinity of feeling. Why, Sir, the very lessons of history loudly proclaim that those descended from a common parent should live in harmony and in peace. We naturally must admire very much what our neighbours have done to build up their country, and the manner in which they have lavished their wealth to promote its progress. We have much to learn from them; they have, perhaps, not a little to learn from us; but we both together should learn this great truth: that we must live in amity and friendly intercourse. Our American cousins cherish freedom and independence; so do we. They love their country, with its laws, and its institutions; so do we ours. They proclaim that their country is the grandest in the world. We admit that it is after ours. They boast of having independence, and we have gradually secured ours. They boast of the grandeur of the beginning of their national history; we are not ashamed of ours. We are proud of the early history of Canada, proud of the sacrifices made by our Canadian heroes in the time of peace as in the time of war, under the flag of old France and under the proud ensign of Britain. And, Sir, to pursue this, I can say that both nations are anxious to make even more rapid strides in the path of progress and in trade and in science and in agriculture, and in all the fine arts of modern civilization. Both are anxious to extend their domain over all that is good and worth having; and, situated as we are, side by side, with nothing but an imaginary line intervening, with like and with common interests, descendants of the same parent races, we should live as brothers, and understand that our mission will have failed if we cannot follow it out in peace and harmony. There is not a difficulty arising which cannot be adjusted honourably by means of wise statesmanship, and in a manner agreeable to the dignity of each state. I will not detain the attention of the House longer in dealing with the arguments of the hon. gentleman who proceeded me, but I will point this out: That it is at all events satisfactory to us to see hon. gentlemen opposite now rising in their seats in this House one after another, admitting that the Liberal party in Canada is loyal, admitting that the leader of the Liberal party in Canada is loyal and that the members following him are loyal. An hon. gentleman the other day said: But we never charged that you were disloyal. What a poor memory he has! He

must have been asleep for the last four years, when they had no other song against us, or at least when they had no other cry against us than this, that we were traitors to the flag of our country, and traitors to our country itself. And, Sir, our leader, who, to-day, on account of the grandeur of his character, and on account of the purity of his motives, triumphs over the machinations of the men who tried to ruin him, must feel proud, and it is satisfactory to know that the Conservative Hamilton "Spectator," the most violent Conservative paper of this country, was forced the other day to admit that this grand leader, whom it is our honour to follow was not only a graceful and distinguished orator, but that he was a man of the highest personal integrity, who did honour to his province and to his country. And our own Prime Minister, than whom there is not a man in the country I more respect, in the city of Toronto, no doubt, felt that it was necessary that he should stand up and proclaim that there was not in the House of Commons a man deserving of more admiration than the leader of the Opposition. What a grand vindication all this is, and what a grand triumph it is for our leader and for the party to which he belongs. And why were we proclaimed traitors? Why were we charged with treason? Simply because we refused to fall down before this very policy which we are told to-day by its progenitors is a bad thing for Canada. Because we refused to accept this policy; because we asked these hon. gentlemen to show us the tall chimneys which we were promised would rise in every part of Canada, to attract the millions of population who were to come into the country and to promote the prosperity we were told would flourish in every part of Canada; and simply because we accepted the facts as we found them, and not such facts as were presented to us in figures that were not always accurate. We have been reminded twice to-day of the victory of 1891; we have been twice reminded of the victories obtained in the by-elections. Well, Sir, we accepted the verdict of 1891. Let me, however, recall to the hon. gentleman who reminded us of these elections, an answer that was once given on behalf of the old guard that surrounded a great emperor. When fortune went straight against that emperor, when all seemed lost to him, when the shades of night were falling upon the grandeur of his life, when everything seemed to have been sacrificed on the battlefield, there stood still the old guard, with its captain at its head. The victorious enemy, admiring the bravery that had been displayed by the old guard, and wishing to spare the lives of its members, approached and said: "Surrender, and I will spare you your life;" and the answer came quickly, "The old guard may die, but the old guard never surrenders." Sir, we have been reminded twice here to-day, and frequently during this debate, of the fact

that we were defeated in 1891 and in the by-elections; but our artillery is beginning to tell in the ranks of our opponents. It is bringing down such prominent generals as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), as well as many other men throughout this country. The Minister of the Interior, the other day, asked us to admire his province, the province of Manitoba. When he speaks of the grandeur of that province, I am with him. I admire that province as much as he does, and look forward as hopefully to its future; and it is not only that province that we have to think of. Our whole country is a magnificent country, with a wonderful wealth of land, forest and stream, with minerals in abundance and with a soil which in fertility yields to none. We have a magnificent race of men, a splendid race of Canadians, as active and thrifty, as temperate and industrious, as any race in the world; and, if I were permitted here to say so, our Canadian women, possessed of every personal charm, of every grace of mind, of every quality of heart, of high physical and mental culture, have not their equals in the wide world. We have also an excellent form of government; and, although it may not be a perfect one, we must admit that it possesses safeguards and privileges of a very high character indeed. Our country is broad, extending from ocean to ocean, having ample room for the settler, offering a warm welcome to him from whatever land he comes, who is honestly anxious to make this country his home. It matters not, Sir, at what altar he kneels, what language he speaks; so long as he pledges fidelity to the obligations of Canadian citizenship, he is welcome to our country—welcome, Sir, to a country which does not desire strife, nor religious, national or racial hatred; welcome to a country that is bound to preserve the honour of its flag, to maintain the peace of its homes, and to promote the prosperity of its people. We on this side believe that tariff reform, good, sound tariff reform, will procure this measure of happiness for our country; hence our reason for supporting it. We believe that it will bring back to our country the Canadians who have left it; we believe that it will build up the tall chimneys, increase our population, assure the stability of our institutions, and brighten our future.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitation that I follow the eloquent address which has been delivered by the hon. member who has just sat down. I wish, however, to ask you to come down from the clouds and back to this prosaic earth, while I discuss for a short time the questions that have been raised in this debate. The first question that occurs to my mind is the one that we have heard so much about in this country—a question which it is very desirable to answer in a proper way, and which I desire

to answer in as fair a spirit as I can to both sides of the House. That question is, is Canada prosperous? It is a question that has been answered by the Conservative party in the affirmative. They have declared that Canada is fairly prosperous. We have heard another answer given on a great many platforms in this Dominion, as well as in this House by hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, who say that this country is not prosperous, but that it is being ruined by the policy of the party now in power. They say that the people are taxed so heavily that it is impossible for them to enjoy the comforts of life. Now, I wish to ask what do we mean when we talk about prosperity? I suppose we do not mean for one moment that every man in this country is a rich man. Such a state of things has never happened since the world has existed, and I suppose never will happen. I suppose when we talk about prosperity we mean that there are rich men, that there are men in moderate circumstances, that there are men whom we call poor men, but who are able to earn a sufficiency for their daily wants. That is a state of affairs which I would define as a prosperous state for a country. If I found that there were thousands of men in this country out of employment, thousands who were starving for lack of the necessaries of life, if I found that bread and everything required to make a man fairly comfortable was not to be had in this country, then I should say that this country was bordering on a state of ruin. But, if I found, as I do find, going through the country, that there are many men who have amassed great fortunes here, that there are other men who have amassed small fortunes, and have such a sufficiency for their wants that they are able now to retire from active work and live on what they have acquired; when I find as I travel through the country that people are well dressed and comfortably clad everywhere, and when I do not find any signs of starvation, even in those parts of the country where ruin is said to exist, then I am led myself to answer this question in the affirmative, and to say that Canada is a fairly prosperous country. If we wish to find a country that is not prosperous, I am sure we would not pick out Canada. We might go to Russia and see the starving peasants of whom we have heard so much and for whom we have felt so much sympathy. But if we wanted to find a country which is not very prosperous, we might go to some parts of Europe, where we would find the workingmen, not feeding as ours do, on the best of bread and butter, but who never see butter and very seldom see meat, but live on what is called black bread and thick milk. We might well say of such a country as that, that it is not prosperous, and even if we went to England itself, if we went through that country and visited the manufacturing towns, and saw how a great many people live there, if we saw how a great many people live in the city of London, we would say that England

Mr. CRAIG.

does not compare for one moment with the country to which we are proud and happy to belong. What is the standard of hon. gentlemen opposite when they decry Canada? They hold up the United States almost always as a paradise. They tell us that there a man has the best of everything. Now, I am very glad to agree with them in saying that the United States is a prosperous country. There are a great many wealthy men in it, and a great many men who are in comfortable circumstances. In fact, the majority of the people are, but still I believe we will find, if we go into their large cities, that there is more destitution in one of those great centres than we would find in all Canada combined. Is Canada, as a whole, less prosperous than the United States? If we take a fair view of this question, and that is what I desire to do, if we ask the merchants of this country and the manufacturers—though I suppose our friends opposite would not include the manufacturers at all, for they seem to think that these people are all making fortunes out of the National Policy, though I am not aware that on that point our manufacturers would agree with them—but if we ask the workingmen of this country, and the farmers, we would find very few of them complaining that they were being ruined and driven to desperation because of the policy, so much condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that the people of Canada are fairly prosperous. I know that we have not many millionaires among us, I know that our young men are sometimes fascinated on hearing of men in the States worth fifty millions and a hundred millions and ten millions, and fancy that they could do equally as well, and I must say that our young men, as a rule, do well in the United States. I must say that, by their early training, their stability and integrity of character, they generally are successful on the other side of the line; but if we will go into our large cities in Canada we will find them equally successful. We will find our young men from the farms and the small country towns occupying positions of great responsibility in the large manufacturing establishments in our cities. I admit that the McKinley tariff has pressed rather hard on some of our farmers. In the constituency I have the honour to represent, I know that is the case. There barley used to be extensively raised, and when the McKinley Bill came into force many of our farmers complained of the high duty very much; but I am glad to say that we have, in our part of the country, an industry which takes the place, in a great measure, of barley raising, and that is the raising of pease. In Port Hope, for instance, I know a gentleman who deals largely in pease and pays high prices for them. I am not aware whether this is the case in other parts of the country, and I refer to this simply to show that I am treating this question in a candid spirit, and am willing

to admit that the McKinley Bill presses hardly on a good many of our farmers. We have been blamed very often for quoting statistics to prove our prosperity, and I was rather amused at the witty remark which the leader of the Opposition made at the board of trade dinner at Toronto. At that banquet the Minister of Finance, in his eloquent speech, quoted many statistics to show that this country is prospering, and the leader of the Opposition, in reply, remarked that if his party were in power they would not need any statistics to prove our prosperity, because the people would know that they were prosperous and would not require any proof. That may be very witty, but, after all, why is it necessary for us to quote these statistics? It is necessary for the very good reason that a great many people do not know what is going on and require to be enlightened, for people are apt, sometimes, to fancy that things are not as good as they are. Then there is another cogent reason, and that is because our friends opposite are constantly exclaiming that Canada is going backwards, so that, in order to refute their assertions and show that we are really prospering, it is necessary to quote figures and facts. Suppose these statistics pointed the other way; suppose they showed that Canada was going down, does any one suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite would not use them, and could we blame them if they did? For my part, I think they would be perfectly justified in doing so; but, unfortunately for them, instead of the figures proving the country is not prosperous, they support our contention that the country is advancing. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite deny that Canada is prosperous? I do not believe it is because they believe what they say, for I cannot imagine that they do not know that Canada is going ahead. I cannot imagine that they do not know that the people are moderately well off, or that they do not agree with the First Minister of Ontario, who said that the farmers of this country are more comfortably off than those of any other country in the world. Why, then, are these hon. gentlemen constantly telling the people the contrary? There can only be one reason. It is said that everything is fair in politics, and while I do not hold to this maxim, still, very often, it is acted upon by the Opposition in order to discredit to the Government and its policy. They say to the people: You are not prospering, Canada is going backwards, we have certainly a fine country, but its resources are not being properly developed; turn out the Government in power, and put us in their places, and then you will see a change. Well, while I do not like to recall unpleasant reminiscences, I cannot help at this moment thinking that the country at one time did take these gentlemen at their word and put them in power, in order to see what they could do. What was the result? Did the country prosper? I admit that at that time

there was a general depression all over the world. I admit that the Government of that day had a difficult task, but they failed in that task, and it was left for the Conservative party to show the people how they could help to bring about prosperity. I do not think that any Government can make a country prosperous. I am not one of those who believe that any Government can give good crops to the country or raise the price of crops, but I believe that there is a good deal which a good Government can do, and I believe that this Government has done a great deal in the last fourteen years to bring about prosperity. Now, the easiest thing in the world is to criticise. I have often found that out myself. I may look at a man doing something and think I could do it much better myself, but when I undertake the task, I find it more difficult than I expected. It is very easy to say that the Government are not doing right, put us in power and we will show what ought to be done, but I think before the country is willing to take these people at their word, we will require to know what their policy is. Now, Sir, what is their plan? I am not sure that they have abandoned unrestricted reciprocity. I have heard some say that they have done so; but I do not know whether they have or not. I suppose they have not; but I think they are trying to modify it or put it in some other form of language. I find that unrestricted reciprocity, however, is one remedy; I find that freer trade relations is another remedy. I suppose the amendment we have had presented to us by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the latest remedy. Well, Sir, I agree with part of that amendment. I agree with the amendment where it speaks about the Government being efficiently and economically administered. I think the taxes collected are now limited to the sum required to carry on the affairs of the country. I do not think that money is collected that is unnecessary. I believe that the Government is efficiently and economically administered, and I find that nearly all the taxes or all the taxes are required to do this; and so with that part of the amendment I can quite agree; but, Sir, it is to the first part that I am unable to agree; that amendment says that the present customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion. Now I do not know who "the great consuming classes are." We have very few classes in this country. We are all workingmen here. I find very few people who do not work; who are not engaged in business. I do not know if the hon. gentleman means the farmers. Perhaps they may be the great consuming classes; but they are the producing classes as well. But take the workingman. In what way does the tariff bear heavily and unjustly upon him? I step in to see him; he is getting his breakfast; let us stay. I ask what he is having for breakfast. Well, he says, I have coffee. How much tax

do you pay on coffee? None at all. Well, what else have you? Well, I have bread and butter, and perhaps an egg, and I have sugar. There is no tax on that; and so I find that all he has for breakfast is free. We have really a free breakfast table in this country. I find also that what he has for his tea at night is free. He has no tax upon his tea. There was a time when there was a tax on tea and a tax on coffee. At that time we did not find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declaring in this House or in the country that the customs tariff bore heavily or unjustly upon the workingmen. Well, I ask that man how much he is taxed on his clothes. A very good suit of clothes can be bought for \$15, I believe; perhaps less. Perhaps a very good suit can be bought for \$10. I do not think there is much tax in that. I do not think the workingmen will complain much about that. How much for his shirt? I find a good shirt can be bought for 75 cents, and I think the workingmen would not complain of much tax about that. Well, what does he pay taxes on. One thing I can find he pays taxes on, is his necktie. That is made of silk. How much did he pay for that? He bought it for 25 cents. I do not think he can be very heavily oppressed on that. And so we do not find that he is oppressed on what he eats or what he wears. Perhaps he pays a little tax; he will not complain of that. He is living in this country enjoying its benefits, and is willing to pay something towards the maintenance of the country. I think the workingman of this country will agree with me, if I put this case to him. For my part, I cannot see that he is oppressively or unfairly taxed, and, therefore, I cannot agree that this customs tariff "bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes." Apply the same questions to the farmer. I find that with the farmer there are compensating advantages. I find that the farmer has some benefits from this tariff, which is so "unjust" and "oppressive." He is protected on his beef, on his mutton, on his pork and on his corn. I do not think the farmer will grumble much about that. He might, perhaps, say: I think I pay too much for that reaping machine and some of these implements that I use. I do not know that he does. I am not prepared to go into that question now. I am assured by some, that he pays no more than he would pay on the other side of the line, no more than he would if there was no duty at all. For this reason also, I cannot agree with that part of the amendment. Now, there is another part of the amendment which declares that this tariff "should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade." Now, I think we come in the direction of the policy of the leader of the Opposition. I do not want to do him injustice, and if I am wrong, I desire to be corrected. But I think he advocated a policy moving in the direction of free trade, de-

Mr. CRAIG.

claring that his party should keep that end always in view. We have not got there exactly yet. This is for "freer" trade, which, I suppose, is not quite so free as free trade. Well now, Mr. Speaker, while I can agree with the latter part of the amendment, I must reject the greater part of it, for the reasons I have given. And now I come to another policy, the policy of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). He laid down this idea of reciprocity. I have taken down his words, so that I might make no mistakes. He advocated "the freest system of reciprocity consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries." Now, I do not know whether he believes in unrestricted reciprocity or not. I do not know what sort of reciprocity he wants. He defined it in that way, but, as he has given it, it might mean anything or nothing; it is a very indefinite statement. I ask myself this question: Is discrimination against Great Britain and the rest of the world consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries? Now, Sir, I am in favour of reciprocity. I have said so every time I have spoken in this House on this subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How far would you go?

Mr. CRAIG. My constituents are favourable to reciprocity; I say that distinctly. I hope the Government are also; I believe they are. But I was asked how far I would go. I will go as far as the hon. member for South Brant. Reciprocity to please me must be consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. That is the distance I go, and I think every member on this side of the House is willing to go just that far and I do not think we are willing to go any further. So that I think we may accept the statement of the hon. member for South Brant as the statement of our policy. Now, Sir, I ask what definition does the hon. member for Brant apply to a treaty that would allow our tariff to be framed at Washington? I think that is the question which might be answered by some of the gentlemen opposite. Although I am in favour of reciprocity and of reciprocity such as I have spoken of, a fair reciprocity, a reciprocity which would allow us to have our own tariff, a reciprocity which would not ruin our manufacturers. I am afraid that some of our friends on the other side of the House are not in favour of reciprocity. They say they are, but I am afraid they are not. I am afraid their attitude on this question has prevented, or has helped to prevent, our getting fair reciprocity. Why, Sir, what is reciprocity after all? It is a bargain. But if I want to make a bargain with somebody else and another man comes along and says: Don't make a bargain with him, make a bargain with me; I will give you everything for nothing; I will give you everything you want. He will not make a bargain with me. And when our commissioners went

to Washington to talk reciprocity, I can imagine the representatives of the United States saying: We don't want to deal with you; there are other people in Canada who tell us that they will give us a better treaty than you are ready to make; we will not make a bargain with you at all. I think the Reform party by their attitude on this question have in some measure hindered the arranging of a fair reciprocity measure in this country. Now, I say further, I have great hopes myself, from the recent election in the United States. Some of my friends on this side have not quite as much hope as I have in this respect. I think we shall secure better treatment from the Cleveland Administration than we have had from the present Administration. I cannot help thinking so. I have heard it said sometimes that we make a great mistake in having any such idea. Now, I do not think for a moment that the United States are going to adopt free trade, I do not think any country in the world is going to adopt free trade. Free trade is a very nice thing to talk about, but there is no such thing at present in the world; I do not think there ever was, and I doubt very much if there ever will be. Every country must have a revenue, and how can they get it except by taxing articles that come into the country? But the contest in the States was fought, mainly, on the McKinley tariff, and the party who sustained the McKinley tariff were defeated, overwhelmingly defeated, at the polls in the recent election. I believe that the McKinley tariff will be repealed, and that we shall obtain better treatment from the United States under the coming Administration than we have had in the past. Now, Sir, I wish to refer to a subject which has been on my mind for some time, a subject on which, I think, both parties in this House will agree with me, and that is the desirability of having friendly relations with the United States. Sir, whatever we may say about reciprocity, however we may differ as to what kind of reciprocity is desirable for this country, I think we all ought to agree, and we all do agree, in the desirability of having friendly relations with that great country. Now, Sir, I have great respect for the press, I think we all have, I think all politicians have. I have great respect for the press, because I believe it is the greatest power at the present time; and I wish to say here, without any offence to the press, that I think some harm has been done by the press of both parties. One section of the press has written in such a manner as to give the United States the idea that Canada cannot exist without their markets, that Canada cannot get along without the United States. They have written in that strain almost entirely. Well, Sir, I do not think it is desirable to give them that impression, because it is a false impression. But on the other hand, another portion of the press goes to the opposite extreme. They have said that we do not care anything

about dealing with the United States, we can get along without them. Now, I do not deny that sometimes the action of the United States Government has almost justified these remarks; but, at the same time, in my opinion, these remarks are not wise. I am of the opinion that they are not calculated to promote what is so desirable, the most friendly feeling between these two countries. I have sometimes seen sarcastic references to the States, which, perhaps, in themselves do not amount to much; but I am satisfied they are copied in papers on the other side of the line, and used by those who do not desire friendly relations with this country, and they are magnified and exaggerated. Now, Sir, I appeal to the press to correct these ideas. They can do it better than any one else. From what I know of the people of this country, it is their desire to live on the most friendly terms with the people of the United States. The United States Government, like all Governments, have a large constituency to please. It is impossible for them to please every one. Sometimes they do things which, I am sure, are against their own judgment. Now, in saying this, I do not advocate, for one moment, a truckling policy. I think such a policy would make us despised by them, and despised by our own people. I believe in maintaining our self-respect; but, at the same time, I think we should do everything we can to bring about and maintain with that great country the most friendly feelings and the most friendly relations. After all, they are a great market for us. They are a desirable market. We are a good market to them for a good many things, and they buy from us. Now, let us have patience. Providence has made us neighbours; let us see to it that we are friends. In listening to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other night, I noticed one remark of his which deserves a little attention. In referring to the statistics given by the Minister of Finance of our large exports to Great Britain, he said: "Well, I do not think the Government deserve any credit for that. Providence gave us large crops, and hence we had large exports." Well, I agree with him that the Government did not give us large crops; but at the same time I think that the Government deserve great credit for developing the British market. When the markets of the United States were shut against us in a great measure by the McKinley tariff, the Government did not sit down idle; but they helped the exporters of this country to find new markets, and they helped to develop the markets which had already been found. In this connection I would give special praise to the Department of Agriculture for what they have done in this matter, in sending to England and Scotland Professor Robertson to develop the trade in cheese and the trade in butter. I think his mission over there will prove very successful, and that we shall reap much benefit from it. I am sure that all fair-minded men will think that the

Government deserve great credit for acting in this manner. Now, Sir, we hear a great deal about natural markets. Well, some argue that Britain is our natural market. So it is for some things. Britain is our natural market for cattle, for cheese, for butter, for apples and some other things. But, at the same time, the United States is our natural market for other things. Some argue that Britain is our natural market, and our only natural market. I do not think so. Britain is our natural market for the things I have mentioned, and for some others which I cannot refer to; but at the same time, I maintain that the United States is our natural market for barley, for eggs, for horses, for lambs. I find these things are constantly being shipped; I find that large numbers of lambs are constantly shipped now to the United States in spite of the duty, and more, I think, would be shipped there if the duty was less, or taken off. I mention this fact because I believe in cultivating both markets; I believe in developing the English market, and I believe in cultivating, as far as we can, the American market. Now, Sir, I come to a point which, I think, is of much importance at the present time, and that is the question of tariff revision. I am very glad to know that the Government recognize that there is a feeling in the country for tariff revision. In my opinion, this is the case: I believe there is a feeling in favour of tariff revision. I think the Government, in recognizing the feeling, are acting wisely. I remember there was a Government at one time who did not recognize the feelings of the country; we know the result. Now, I believe the Government should not always follow the spasmodic feelings in the country, if they are spasmodic; but, after all, if the people of this country are determined to have a thing, they are going to have it, there is no doubt of that at all. If there is a widespread feeling throughout the country for a certain thing, I hold that the Government are not acting a wise part by saying: We know better than you do, you know nothing about this matter at all. We have certain ideas on this question. We do not believe in the doctrines that are advocated at this moment, and we are going to maintain our own doctrines. I do not believe that is a wise policy. So, Sir, I think the Government are acting wisely in recognizing that there is a feeling in the country in favour of some tariff revision. I know there is a feeling of this kind in my constituency, I am free to confess it; and I think it is right the Government should know it. I suppose it is a natural feeling among Reformers. I am not speaking of them; I suppose they constantly advocate that policy except when they are in power themselves—of course that makes a difference. But I must confess that Conservatives in my constituency are in favour of tariff revision, I want to say that frankly. I am in favour of it myself. I think there are changes that could be made in the tariff

Mr. CRAIG.

which would be to the advantage of this country. We have a National Policy. These things do not last for ever; the country does not always continue in the same condition. I believe one reason that brought about this feeling in this country was the result of the recent elections in the United States. I think they have had considerable effect in stirring up an agitation in this country. What are the Government doing? I want to refer, for one moment, to coal oil and binding twine. I know there was a strong feeling among a good many people that coal oil should be free; I believe that feeling was worked up in the country, and I do not know but that it was right. It does look anomalous to have such a heavy tax on an article largely used by the people all over the country, and if the Government could have seen their way to have coal oil free, I should have been much pleased to support the resolution. There was, however, only one reason why it was not made free, and that was because millions of dollars were invested in the development of the coal oil industry. Under the policy of this Government and of the Government that preceded it, wells have been sunk and the coal oil industry has been developed, and it would seem a rather harsh proceeding to strike a fatal blow at this industry, upon which depend 2,000 men for their livelihood. In order to show the feeling of the working classes on this subject, I may mention this circumstance: a workingman spoke to me in regard to coal oil when I was home on Saturday. He asked if the Government were going to take the duty off coal oil, and I replied that I considered it probable that they would take off part of the duty, although, of course, I did not know. He then said that such a reduction would make coal oil cheaper. I then pointed out that if the duty were wholly removed, no less than 2,000 men now engaged in that industry would be thrown out of employment. He then was quite willing to pay his share of the tax, in order that the industry might not be ruined. I believe the effect of what has been done by the Government will be to reduce the price; in fact, I understand the price has already fallen. Moreover, it will tend to make the men engaged in the business more pushing and energetic, and compel them to see that exorbitant prices are not charged by retailers, as has been the case in times past, I think they should do that, and they should have taken such steps long ago. The producers affirm that there is no necessity for high prices being charged; if such is the case, they should, in their own interest, see it is not done. In regard to binding twine, I am satisfied with the reduction proposed. I have two interests in binding twine. There is a large binding twine industry in my constituency, and I also know that a good many farmers want binding twine free. At all events, I believe binding twine will now be reduced in price by the

change in duty proposed by the Government. While this feeling prevails in this country, or is supposed to prevail, what action should the Government take under the circumstances? Should they turn a deaf ear? I have discussed that question already, and I think the Government should not do so. I consider the people have a right to have their views brought before the Government, and also have them attended to. What is the attitude of the Government. It is declared by some persons that the Government should at once, during this session, have revised the tariff; but, in my opinion, it is not so easy to revise the tariff as it is to talk about revision. It is easy to say that this and that duty should be reduced, but it is not so easy to do justice to all interests. Yet this is what, not only the members of this House, but the members of the Government desire to do—they want to do justice to all interests in this country. They do not want to do something that will prove to be a mistake. Now, how is this going to be done? Can it be done by taking items haphazard and looking over the tariff hurriedly and striking out this duty and the other duty, without making inquiry? I think you will all say no. What, then, is the Government's plan? It is to hear all sides. If there are any propositions to reduce the duty on certain articles, the Government will hear what the manufacturers have to say in the matter. If they are able to show good reason for retaining the duties, if they can show that the prices are not increased and that a reduction of the tariff would not materially reduce the price, I suppose the tariff will not be reduced; but if it can be shown that the tariff is extravagant and oppressive, that there is no necessity for retaining the duty, I suppose it will be removed. The member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in speaking on the matter, made a great deal of fun by quoting portions of the speech of the Minister of Finance. He said the Minister of Finance was going to travel over the country with a menagerie. It is easy, however, to ridicule anything. It is desirable that members of the Government should travel over the country occasionally and see the people and let the people see them, visit some of the towns and see what industries are established there and talk with practical men who know the subjects on which they speak. It is easy to theorise, but it is different when we get hold of men who thoroughly understand a certain business. I know this is what the Government propose to do, and I commend them for it. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) read in a very amusing manner the statement that the Government are going to do what is best for the country as a whole. I do not see anything ridiculous in that statement. If the Government do not intend to do what is best for the country as a whole, we would blame them. The Government are perfectly right in de-

siring to do what is right for the country as a whole; we would blame them if they proposed to do otherwise. They must look at the different parts of the country, and we have entered into Confederation not that one part shall receive all the advantages but that the benefits shall be reciprocal. I do not know that it will be very interesting to this House if I give my own views on this subject; but my views are these: moderate protection for our manufactures. I am not in favour of uprooting the National Policy. I think the National Policy has been a boon to this country, and members on the Opposition side of the House, if they were not talking politically, would confess that in some lines that policy has benefited the country. I do not deny that the National Policy has defects. I do not deny that there are parts of the National Policy that can be removed with advantage. It takes time to find these defects out. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite will say that they have been talking this way all the time. But when we have wholesale condemnation, it does not amount to anything. Hon. gentlemen opposite have condemned the whole system continuously. If we had adopted free trade they would have condemned it as being a policy that would be certain to ruin this country, and so we cannot be guided by what hon. gentlemen opposite condemn. So I am in favour of moderate protection, and I am not in favour of excessive protection on any line. I think, however, there are some lines that ought to be protected, and those cases should be brought to the attention of the Government. I have some matters that I will bring to their attention, and I believe the burdens will be removed when brought to their notice. I believe we should have a low tariff, as low as is consistent with the revenue of the country, on goods imported that are not manufactured in the Dominion. There are goods which are not made in this country, there are goods which cannot be made profitably in this country. There are goods which men have tried to make in this country, but have failed to make with any profit to themselves or anybody else. I believe a protective tariff was put on some of these goods in order to encourage their manufacture, but when we find that they can not be profitably made here, I believe that that tariff should be reduced. I am in favour of as low a tariff as possible, on goods not made in this country, so that all the people of this country may, as far as possible, get everything at as low a rate as they can. I do not believe in the encouragement of monopolies. We have heard a great deal about monopolies. There may be some in this country, but I do not think that all combines are monopolies. I think that sometimes a combine is a necessity, because it may occur that the prices of goods are cut so low by competition that there is no money made at all. Where there is a combine, but where reasonable prices only are charged, I would not call that a monopoly;

but where I find excessive prices are charged, and that a monopoly is formed in order to extort excessive prices from the people, then I would take away all encouragement from them. I agree with gentlemen on the other side of the House in advocating economy. I believe we all agree in that. I am happy to say that I believe that we have an economical Government; I do not know whether gentlemen on the other side of the House will agree with me here, but, I think, however, they will agree that we have an economical Finance Minister. I have sometimes heard that he was too economical, and that he was not willing to grant even what was necessary to carry on the Government of this country, but I think that is erring on the right side. I believe in having a man to look after the finances of this country who is economical, and perhaps a little too economical, so that if there are any members of the Cabinet who are a little extravagant he may keep them in order. I apologize for detaining the House so long at this late hour. I wish to say here, that I accept the promise of the Government in all good faith. We have the promise that they are going to hear what the people have to say, and I think the promise goes a little further, and reaches to the extent that they are going to give us tariff revision next session. I think it was said that we should have a general revision of the tariff. I accept the promise of the Government in all good faith. I am satisfied with what they say on that question and I look with confidence to the future and when the mouldering branches are lopped off and a fair reciprocity treaty made with the United States, I look forward with confidence to Canada entering on a new era of prosperity.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat on the apparent sincerity which characterized his speech. I regret, however, that after fully approving of the amendment now before the House, he should have concluded by saying that he would continue to support the Government. Since the beginning of this discussion, we are witnessing a strange spectacle: we have seen the hon. members on the other side standing up successively and asking for reforms of the tariff, asking that the duties upon certain articles be removed. These gentlemen complain that the taxes are too high on certain necessaries of life. They bring up petitions sent to them by the Conservative associations of their counties asking for a reduction of the duties in the spirit of the amendment now before the House; and yet they conclude by saying that they always have faith in the Government. It is a strange spectacle, I must repeat, and it reminds me of the inscription Dante puts on the gate of Hell: "Let ye who come in here leave all hope at the door." It seems to me the members who occupy seats on the ministerial side, when they go in room No. 16, see written on

Mr. CRAIG.

the door: "Let you who come in here leave all freedom, if not all hope, at the door." Notwithstanding the representations which reach them from all parts, the hand that guides them is stronger than they; they cannot vote the way they would like. We are satisfied of this after what we have heard since the opening of this debate; were they as free as we are, they would vote for the amendment. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat told us with much ingenuousness he was in favour of our policy; he did not exactly say so in words, but we shall know it by his vote. Then he stated that the duties were not too high, and that upon certain necessaries of life, upon articles consumed at breakfast and supper, there were no duties. It is true, there are no duties upon sugar, tea and coffee, but, Mr. Speaker, although the duties are removed from certain articles, it is nevertheless a fact—according to official data—that the duties per capita are higher than under the Mackenzie regime. Thus, by referring to the Public Accounts, we see that in 1878, the rate per capita was only \$4.32, while now it is \$6.36. Now, although the duties were removed from certain articles, it is plain it must have been imposed upon others, since we now pay over \$2 a head more than in 1878. It is alleged as a crime against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that they state the country is not prosperous. We are blamed as depreciating the country. Warning a man that he is following a wrong path, going in a wrong way, seems to me rendering him a service and not disparaging him. Moreover, we have only to refer to public documents, to the census and to the Conservative newspapers, to ascertain whether the country is prosperous or not; for the policy inaugurated in 1878 had for its object to make it prosperous. And the then leader of the Opposition, Sir John A. Macdonald, made the following statement in a motion:—

That this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion.

Therefore the famous policy advocated in 1878 was bound to make the country prosperous. We are thus entitled to ask the Government for an account of the promises they made to us. What do we see now? We see the hon. members on the other side standing up one after another and stating there is much uneasiness in the country. We see the political associations of their counties asking for a reduction of the tariff. We have only to take the ministerial mouth-piece in Toronto, the "Empire," of the 9th instant, which, speaking of the failure of a certain Michael McConnell, says that three or four years ago, he was worth \$250,000 and that now his properties have decreased to \$100,000. When the ministerial organs concede that much, are we not playing the part of patriots when ac-

cusing the existing fiscal system? Have we not the right to cause these facts to be known by the people and the Government? But there is more than that. It appears the Government have not much faith in their friends, since they informed us of a committee of investigation on the state of affairs in the country; and the hon. member who has just taken his seat, approved of this committee. Well, I think it is an insult to offer them; it looks as if the Government had no faith in their representatives, no more than they have confidence in the Government, since they take upon themselves, as it occurred some days ago, to advise the Governor-General. The Government are insulting their friends, when composing this committee of the Minister of Commerce and the two Controllers so as to know what to do. But why on earth are elections ordered? It is to send here representatives who will state the needs of the people. And what time will it take that committee to run through the country so as to be informed? In the first place, they will have to learn several languages, and when they come in the province of Quebec, they will have to learn French. When they come in my county to be informed as to the condition of the thirty-seven manufactures there existing, according to the census, while in reality there are hardly five; when they go to Caughnawaga they will have to learn the Indian language, in order to examine the forty-five manufactures which happen to be there according to the census, but they will possibly be able to get information from the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier), who is said to be conversant with the Indian language. It is not only an insult to the friends of the Government, but it is a farce. The Government would be better off were they to state plainly, as stated already by some hon. members on this side of the House, that they are willing to wait till the fiscal policy of the United States be made known, and then they will change their own policy. It would have been more courageous, not to say more honest, on the part of the Minister of Finance, had he not left the House and country in doubt, but stated that they are waiting till the policy of Mr. Cleveland and his Government towards this country be made known to base their own upon it. I say our country is not prosperous; does any one want another evidence of this? Let us walk over the streets in Ottawa, and, at every two or three houses we will find a poster showing that the house is to let. People are constantly urging their political friends to get them placed. I again say we are not disparaging the country, our provinces and our counties when we represent to the Government what their very friends are constantly saying to them. Now, another argument brought forward by these gentlemen to show that the country is very prosperous and that the people are contented, is the result of the

general election in 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891. They are, it seems, glorious halting-places for these gentlemen. If we only knew the secret of their success in those times as well as we know the secret of their defeat at certain times, I am sure they would not have to boast; on the contrary, I think they would have to be ashamed. As already stated by me in this House and proclaimed by others, the policy of the Government was never plainly and honestly put before the people. In 1878, the Conservative party were telling us that we ought to readjust the tariff and adopt a policy which would keep in this country the people who were going away and leaving their homes because the country could not give them what was necessary for their living. We all know how the Conservative party succeeded in 1882. The counties were gerrymandered so as to drown out the Liberal counties. In 1887, we had the Franchise Bill, which is, I could say, a disgracefulness through which they succeeded in taking away from the Liberal party a good many electoral divisions, through the assistance of revising officers, which at that time allowed themselves to be the tools of the powers that be. Through these means they succeeded in taking the majority away from us. In 1891, an election occurred notwithstanding the promises made, and in spite of that, the Government came very near being ruined, and through the disclosures which were made later on, through the initiative of the gentleman who now sits on my left (Mr. Tarte) it is true that, should these monstrous scandals have been known then, these gentlemen would not have succeeded in securing even the slight majority they had when this election was over. But let us take as an evidence of the popular feeling, the election of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who came out victorious in spite of the hon. Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron), who went down into the county, and remembered that, while he was the War Minister, he had not failed to bring with him many ammunitions. In spite of that, how is it that he has not succeeded? It is because, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government and our own policy were readily brought before the people. After this sincere and honest statement of our policy, we fought like men, and notwithstanding all the ability of the hon. Minister, seconded by the utmost devotion of his friends, he bit the dust. Yet it was a very close county; the strength of both parties had proved almost equal in the previous election, the Conservative candidate having been returned by a majority of five. In spite of that what has happened? The Government there underwent a defeat they must regret more than others, on account of the circumstances which attended it. Now, these gentlemen state that the results of the popular tests referred to by them are an evidence in favour of the policy of the Government. It is an argument worth nothing, for the reasons alleged by us, but supposing it

should be worth something, how is it that the Government intend changing their policy? If the people are so much in favour of that policy; how is it that the Government do not keep their tariff, and why especially should they leave the old flag of which we have so much heard? If this tariff is worth anything for the country, how is that they pledge themselves to change it? They seem, it is true, willing to do away with the old flag; that is, I suppose, on account of the old leader being away. He being gone, they feel bound to change the system. I say that at the next election, and I hope it will take place as early as possible, we will find that the public feeling is not in favour of these gentlemen. When we say the country is not prosperous, we are charged with crying the country down. Be that as it may, the results we are witnessing, being considered, are we not entitled to state that this prosperity of which they speak so much exists nowhere? In fact, the official documents state that we have caused to come to this country, at a large expense, for the last ten years, 830,000 emigrants. Well, according to the census, we have only increased 500,000, as far as population goes. We, therefore, lost in round numbers, 330,000 on that sole emigration. Further than that, for that is not all, we have lost all the natural increase in the population of this country. With this result, I am right when saying that we have lost, for the last ten years, upwards of one million and a half, that is, comparing the population as stated, and that which we should have, the emigration and natural increase of our population being considered. That is what we have gained by ten years of the protectionist system. Under this bad regime of the Liberal Government of Mr. Mackenzie, things had another turn. Let us see in short what the state of affairs was then, and let us make a little comparison. We shall then be in a position to see under what regime the country was most prosperous. In 1871, the province of Ontario, and I admit this country has benefited in a certain proportion of the policy called the National Policy, the increase in population was 18.6 per 100 during the period between 1871 and 1881. Now, we find that, according to the census of 1891, this increase has only been 9.93 per 100 for the ten years between 1881 and 1891. Wherefrom it appears that under the protection system, so boasted by the hon. members on the other side, Ontario, which is inhabited by industrious and enterprising people, has only increased its population by 9.93 per 100, while under the Liberal policy the increase was 18.6 per 100. In the province of Quebec we had increased 14 per 100 from 1871 to 1881, and during the period between 1881 and 1891 the increase was only 9.53 per 100. Therefore, in summing up, during the ten years of the Liberal regime we had an increase in population of 18.97 per 100, while under the protective system now in force, that increase was only 11.74 per 100. In the

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

presence of such results, in the presence of official figures brought down by the very officials of the Government, have we not the right to state that they have realized the promise made in 1878, that the protectionist policy did not give us the results promised? Instead of keeping our people at home, emigration is more active than ever. Instead of increasing our population, this policy is the cause of its being decreased. But, Mr. Speaker, let us examine another part of the census. In 1881 there existed in Canada, according to the census of that year, 46,583 vacant or unoccupied houses, while in 1892, according to the last census, the number of those unoccupied houses reaches 54,182, that is to say in 1891 there were 7,599 unoccupied houses more than in 1881, or, in other words, there were 7,599 unoccupied houses more under the protective system than under the old system. Therefore emigration has increased, since there is a greater number of vacant houses. This policy of protection was therefore no cause for keeping into the country the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who went to the United States to work and earn their living and that of their family, and who were to be kept into this country through this policy of protection; it neither peopled the North-west as promised. But let us go a little further in the official documents containing the facts made known by the officers who had the charge of the last census. Let us see what was the result of the protection as regards the minor towns. It is important to know how far the protection policy favoured the industrial and other interests of these minor cities. Let us take Berthierville: in 1871 there was there a population of 1,433; in 1881 the population was 2,156, and in 1891 it went down to 1,537. The village of Laprairie, where the Government made such an expenditure, where they erected a magnificent post office, where, in a word, they made a large expenditure, that village had, in 1871, a population of 1,259. In 1881 the population had increased a little, and it reached 1,340. But in 1891, after ten years of the protection system and ministerial favours, this place has only got 1,246 souls. It is a decrease of 100 in round numbers. L'Assomption, which, in 1871, had a population of 1,210, and in 1881, 1,313, has only got 1,256 in 1891. Levis, a little town located in the county so well represented by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Guay), which was not favoured, as was Laprairie with a magnificent post office, since they decline to put one there, had in 1871 a population of 6,691, in 1881 a population of 7,597, and in 1891, that population had fallen down to 7,301. Take likewise Dunham, in the county of Missisquoi, in 1871 that place had a population of 3,316; in 1881 a population of 3,702 and in 1891 a population of 2,466. There lies a great decrease. Stanbridge—well, they will not say that if that locality has not prospered, and if its population did not increase, it was owing

to being represented by a Liberal; on the contrary, the county in which Stanbridge is included has for its representative here a good Conservative. I make this statement because they often charge us with being the cause of the despondency which happens in the part of our people and causes them to go away, for they freely say that it is through our fault that the Canadians cross the line. In 1871, Stanbridge had a population of 5,024. In 1881 that population reached 5,348, and in spite of what the protective policy did during these last ten years, in 1891 the population of Stanbridge was only 941. The town of Montmagny, situated in the county which I represent, had, in 1871, a population of 1,512. In 1881 it had 1,738, while in 1891 it had only 1,697. Be that as it may, I might say, by the way, the census gives us thirty-seven industrial establishments, although, as I have said a moment ago, I only know four or five. To reach that number of thirty-seven manufactures in Montmagny they must have taken in all the candy stores. It is quite absurd to say that Montmagny has thirty-seven manufactures, while there are hardly four or five there. I must repeat it. If the census was stating the truth, I would, indeed, be the first to support the Government, or rather, I would be inclining to give them my support, should their policy have for its result the opening of manufactures in my county. The population of Montmagny fell down from 1,738 in 1871 to 1,697 in 1891, after ten years of the protective system, of a policy deemed national. However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to state to you that in my county, we have very good lands; we have a population sober, intelligent, honest; we have the advantage of a railway which crosses the country of Montmagny; moreover, the town is bound on the north by the St. Lawrence river, which affords it great shipping facilities. Besides, it is, so to speak, situated at the doors of Quebec. Well, notwithstanding all these advantages, the population of Montmagny has decreased. The reason of it is very simple: the people had to go, had to take the road to the United States, in order to find work which they could not find at home. If the Canadians emigrate to the United States, it is not for the pleasure of leaving their country, but because they can live better there. The policy of the Government, Mr. Speaker, sends away, not only the industrial classes, but especially our hardy farmers. The farmers are obliged to give up their farms because they cannot sell their produce at paying prices. The county of Quebec was for a long time represented by the hon. Postmaster-General. Let us take the three divisions of the city of Quebec, and the county of Quebec. This was a place of industry and commerce. In the course of the last ten years—this is unbelievable, but the official documents stand as a proof of the fact—the population of Quebec, the three divisions of the county, has decreased by 111 souls; and yet, from 1871 to

1881 it had increased by 4,300. One can thus take the list of the counties and find everywhere the same result. Let us see, how, the city of St. John, N. B., represented here by three friends of the Government. During the last ten years the population of that city has decreased by 3,392. Well, it is our right to call the attention of the Government to this state of things, and to say to them and their friends that they are wrong in not accepting the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), especially when it is known that many of them are in favour of this amendment, that they are wrong to cause it to be said everywhere by the papers that we take an unpatriotic stand by denouncing this state of things. When they feel that the policy which they uphold is bad, and necessarily leads the country to ruin and political anarchy. In my opinion we do the work of good citizens in notifying these gentlemen that we are ready to lend them a hand in remodelling the tariff and remedying the situation. As I said before, the policy inaugurated in 1878 had as its object the development not only of the manufactures, but of agriculture, and the other interests of Canada. Some have progressed a little. Some manufacturers, by forming themselves into combines in order to control the prices, have succeeded in building fortunes. I admit that there are some persons who are ready to open their purses in election times, in order to keep up this system of protection, in which they find their profits. But apart from them there is not a man who can claim to have been benefited by the National Policy. I especially address my friends from the province of Quebec, to whom I have just shown that the very city of Quebec has decreased in population. As a compensation for this policy the Maritime provinces have a tax against the foreign coal, which allows them to reap certain benefits. For Ontario there is a duty on the flour which helps to bear the burden of taxes. But for the province of Quebec there is nothing. And more than any, the inhabitants of that province are in need of a change, or a remodelling of the fiscal policy of the country. In the Maritime provinces, and in the province of Ontario, one tax is offset by another—people take from one pocket and put into another. I own that this is not much of a protection, but at least they can say they have something. In the province of Quebec there is not even such an offset. Therefore, we must work with all our might to bring about the change required by the amendment. The hon. Minister of Finance was saying the other day, boasting, as he is wont to do, that he had succeeded in putting into the consumers' pocket the sum of four millions of dollars through the reduction of taxes. I admit that the tax has been reduced on sugar, as well as on tea and coffee, but as the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) so justly said a moment ago, it is a tax, then, which

you have removed, and your admission of it is in your very statement. It is ten years that we have been saying that. It is ten years that we have been telling you that the burden of taxation is heavy on the consumer; it is ten years that you have been taxing us, in order to prevent such competition as would lower prices and favour consumers; and now you come and show that we were right by claiming that you have relieved the people from four million of taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Government to do the same in respect to flour, coal, corn, agricultural implements and binding twine. Your would-be protective duties on those goods are as many taxes which the people will have to pay in the future, if you maintain them. If you wish to know, Mr. Speaker, the amount which this policy has cost the country, I am ready to give it. Here is, from official documents, what has been the increase of taxes since the advent of these gentlemen into power. In 1878, the last year of the Liberal regime of Mr. Mackenzie, eighteen million dollars only were paid into the Dominion treasury. To-day the revenue from the same sources is thirty millions. It is, therefore, twelve million dollars more that the consumer has to pay under the present regime. Remove the surplus of twelve millions, for I do not see why the country cannot be governed with a revenue of twenty-four millions, as was done in 1878. But, I would probably be told, there are additional expenses to meet. Well, I will say in answer to this objection, that the amendment by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) provides for that. If, under the Mackenzie regime, twenty-four millions were enough to meet all the legitimate expenses of the country, I do not see why twenty-eight millions would not be enough now. However, I see that it is again the same amount that the Government is to collect this year. I say that it would be easy to meet all the legitimate expenses with less revenue, that is to say, with a reduction of taxes. But, of course, the expenses would have to be reduced. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) said the other day that the Intercolonial Railway would give this year a deficit of about fifty thousand dollars, only I do not say that such will really be the case, for, if I believe information which has come to me, it would appear that the rolling stock is in such a dilapidated condition as to necessitate a considerable expenditure. If this expenditure is not made now, it will simply be in order that there be shown a reduction of the expenditure toward the extinction of the deficit. But let us take this statement as true. This will mean six hundred thousand dollars off the total expenditure. Now, strike off the revising officers and reduce the expenses of the administration of justice; cut off all the useless employees who burden the Civil Service budget—for to-day there are eight hundred employees, while there were a great many less under Mr. Mackenzie;

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

with all these savings you will be able to remove the duties on sugar, coal, flour, agricultural implements, etc. Notwithstanding all such reductions in the tariff, the Government would still have a revenue of from twenty-eight to thirty million dollars—which should be quite sufficient to meet the legitimate requirements of the public service. But these gentlemen are not satisfied with saying that their policy makes the country prosperous; they also boast of economizing. This economy is like our prosperity—much spoken of but never seen. You never meet a Conservative newspaper man in public meetings who does not maintain that the Government is a model of economy. Everywhere these gentlemen on the right, and their friends, constantly speak of great savings made by the Government. But where are they? There is so little saving done, these gentlemen have conducted the affairs with such extravagance, that they have increased the debt by a very considerable amount. Thus the debt, which at the downfall of the Mackenzie Government was only one hundred and forty million dollars, is now two hundred and forty millions, which means an increase of over one hundred million dollars. Such is the way the affairs of the country have been administered since we have a Conservative Government. I will not detain the attention of the House any longer, but I thought it to be my duty to offer these few observations. In conclusion I will refer to a motion made in 1878 by the then leader of the Opposition:

That this House is of opinion that the welfare of the country requires the adoption of the National Policy, which, by means of a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will favour and encourage agriculture, the mines, the manufactures and other interests of Canada.

It is evident in the face of what is going on and of what we see, that their promises are not being fulfilled. Was the then Opposition in good faith? I do not know. Was this motion made with the object of capturing the confidence of the people? I do not know. If it was made in bad faith it was doubly unfortunate. But if that motion was made in sincerity there need be no shame in reversing it to-day. There should be no harm in saying that there is a remedy for the general depression in reciprocity or in a remodelling of the tariff. There should be no harm for the hon. gentlemen opposite in saying that they favoured a reform of the tariff, since they could not fulfil their promises with the protective system. The second portion of this famous motion of 1878 reads as follows:—

That such a policy would keep in Canada thousands of our countrymen who are now obliged to exile themselves to find employment which they are denied at home.

The second paragraph is as fallacious as was the first. We find the proof of this in the census, in the number of empty houses,

and also in the number of immigrants, who after having come to settle in this country, have left us. If we take into consideration the natural increase of the population of the country, we find that we have not kept our own people at home. Therefore we see that the two propositions of this motion have failed. The country is less prosperous and the country has decreased. I therefore cannot see in what we can be considered disloyal to the country, when we say that the Conservatives have not fulfilled their promises. Now what do we propose as a remedy? We wish for no revolution. We do not ask for annexation nor any system of special government. We propose simply to be loyal to the country by adopting a policy which will secure its welfare. We also propose to be loyal to England. But for my part I am before all loyal to the country that gives me my life. I am loyal to the country, under whatever flag that allows me to earn my living and that of my family. We would be unworthy of the position that we occupy if, with a view to a simple and political advancement, with the object of overthrowing the Government, we were to deny the prosperity of the country if such prosperity existed. But, Mr. Speaker, we are told, you say this in order to attain power, to gain the favour of the people, to get possession of the Treasury. It is easy to reply to this. If such were our object we would have only to do as certain members do, we would only have to say the majority is on the other side of the House, let us join the majority. But we believe, we sincerely believe, that the Government's policy is bad, that they are in a dangerous way which leads to a financial and commercial abyss, and we ask them to stop. If they refuse, we warn the country and are not responsible for the consequences. The hon. members on the right who have spoken on this question think as we do, and have declared so, yet they vote for the Government notwithstanding. Then they must be as disloyal as we, since they admit that the taxes are too onerous on the consumer; they must be as disloyal as we since they admit that a readjustment of the tariff is necessary and that the country should be administered more economically. The hon. members on the right said that they were in favour of important changes in the tariff, then why, I ask, do they intend to vote against the amendment before the House? Are they not free agents? They well know that if they voted against the Government, and according to their conviction those who furnished the money for their elections would drop them and they could not be returned any more. This is why we see them take the singular position which they assume whenever the tariff is discussed. This is why they speak in one sense and vote in another. I do not wish to detain the House any longer, as I am speaking a language which is not understood by all. I have said enough, however,

to justify the conversion of many, if they are capable of conversion. We have a right, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House and of the country to the promises of these gentlemen on the right, and to ask their condemnation when we prove that they have not kept them. However, they may accuse us of crying down the country, we will continue to give voice to the just claims of the consumers and the tax-payers of this Dominion, and our course inspired by duty, will be in the direction of the greatest good of the country in general and of our province in particular.

Mr. BELLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—DEATH OF MR. GORDON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House. He said: Mr. Speaker. In moving the adjournment of the House, I feel it my duty to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that we have received authoritative news to-night of the death of one of our colleagues, the late member for Nanaimo, B.C. (Mr. Gordon). I am sure that I can say, with the greatest earnestness, on behalf of the gentlemen who sat with him on this side of the House, that ever since he entered Parliament, and that is something over ten years ago, he has proved himself a most useful and faithful member. The devotion which he gave to his constituency has not been exceeded by that of the most assiduous member of Parliament, and those of us who had occasion to observe the manner in which he was respected in his own constituency, and the manner in which his public services were appreciated there, felt more honoured than ever by his acquaintance, and by the fact that we were co-operating with him in public life. It is very regretful indeed that he has been taken away under circumstances of unusual distress. His health has been failing for years, and many of us remarked during last session that he was then almost struggling with death. The knowledge which has come to us since indicates that his departure was especially melancholy. I feel bound, in moving the adjournment—as I would have done at an earlier period of the day, if we had been assured certainly of the announcement—to call to the attention of the House the sad loss of so worthy a member.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I very sincerely join in every word that has been uttered by the Prime Minister as to the esteem in which everybody held our late lamented colleague, Mr. Gordon. Though on this side of the House we have not had the same occasion to associate with him as his political friends had, still it is a pleasure for me to bear testimony to the high char-

acter which he always maintained here. The hon. gentleman seemed to be one of those happy men who had no enemies, and who, while they can differ from opponents, still can always remain on the best of terms with them. It was always a pleasure on this side of the House to look at his genial and cheerful countenance, and whenever he took part in our debates, it was always a pleasure to listen to the way in which he put forth his arguments and his own views, and which he always did in a manner so as to give offence to nobody, but pleasure to all. I am sure that his death is a great loss to his political friends especially, but it is also a loss to the whole House; to his opponents as well as to those who were most intimately associated with him. Once more I beg to say that I join in the expressions of regret which have been given utterance to by the Prime Minister.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Canada Carriage Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish, with the indulgence of the House, to say a few words by way of personal explanation. I find by the report in the "Empire" of what occurred here the other day in reference to the visit of certain members of this House to His Excellency, that my hon. friend the First Minister is reported as follows:—

It transpires from the explanation of Mr. Weldon and the other gentlemen that the facts were about these:

I may say the "Hansard" report mentions my name as one of those who made the explanation.

That these gentlemen, in accordance with the usage which prevails during every session of Parliament, took occasion to call upon His Excellency, as other members of Parliament do. (Laughter.) I understand that to be the substance of what they state. In the course of the conversation which then took place, this subject, which, in the view of these gentlemen might possibly affect Imperial interests, was mentioned, and as it might be a matter requiring the consideration of his advisers, His Excellency, with great delicacy and propriety, immediately requested that any facts in their possession should be laid before

Mr. LAURIER.

him in such a form that they could be presented to his advisers for their consideration. It would seem that the interview passed off with the utmost harmony on both sides, and that the constitution was not broken after all. Under these circumstances it strikes me we shall all feel more comfortable for the matter having been brought up in the House this afternoon, because, in the first place, it appears that nothing of the grave character which the newspapers reported as having transpired on that occasion really took place.

I find by reference to the official report that that is, in substance, what my hon. friend said on that occasion. I had fancied at the time that he had said as here reported, but I could not hear very well, for we all know the acoustic properties of this House are not what might be desired, but I found on speaking to several members on this side of the House, that they differed from me as to the purport of the remarks that had fallen from the First Minister. However, I find that this is practically what he did say. I am quite sure the majority of hon. members, on this side of the House at least, understood that my hon. friend the First Minister was simply pursuing the same course the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had pursued in poking a little fun at the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and that he was not in any degree expressing the deliberate opinion that this was the explanation we had offered of our visit to His Excellency, nor that he in any degree endorsed the extraordinary constitutional principles which the hon. member for Bothwell attempted to lay down in this House. But I find that is not the view which the public have taken of those remarks. A very general misconception prevails, for it is supposed that the First Minister really meant to say that this was the explanation which we had given of our visit. I am exceedingly unwilling to bring the subject before the House, or at any time to occupy the time of the House in reference to anything personal to myself; but it is quite impossible that I can allow myself to stand before the public in the position of having endeavoured to escape from an embarrassing position by making a misstatement of the facts. The facts were these: that we approached His Excellency for the express purpose of laying certain facts before him.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, for the purpose of laying certain facts before him. I do not wish any misconception to exist, so far as I am concerned, with respect to that matter. That was the object, and the sole object of our going to see His Excellency on that occasion. We had previously brought this matter to the notice of the Dominion Government. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had done so, and I understood he was received by the First Minister and by the Minister of Finance with the greatest courtesy, and that they listened with the greatest attention and patience to what he said. However, the

hon. gentleman can speak as to that. We had brought that matter, from the Dominion point of view, before the Dominion Government. We considered that we had another avenue by which we might approach the end we had in view, and that was by bringing the matter to the notice of the statesman who is here to represent Imperial interests, as well as to be the head of this Government. We considered that His Excellency is here in a dual capacity, as the head of the Dominion Government and also as the representative of the Imperial Government and as the representative of Imperial interests. I wish to enter into no argument with respect to that point, whether we are right or wrong in regard to it; but I merely wish it to be distinctly understood what our objects were and why we called on His Excellency. We believed there was an imminent and pressing danger, not only to this Dominion but to the Empire. We understood an immense alien corporation had secured from two-thirds to three-fourths of all the coal measures in the province of Nova Scotia, and were in a position to secure the balance; and we understood also, and indeed we knew, that they had secured those measures under a lease which was altogether unprecedented in character in Canada. Whereas under all leases that have been granted to our own people for the prosecution of the coal industry—

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to a personal explanation.

Mr. McNEILL. I am at once ready, Mr. Speaker, to bow to your ruling. I am explaining why we went to see His Excellency, and the motives which induced us to go. If you, Sir, rule that I am going too far, I will bow to your ruling. I was merely going on to say that this was a lease which differed altogether from any other lease that had been granted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you have ruled that I should not proceed further?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman should go into the question of the lease itself or the motives that may have induced the Nova Scotia Government to issue that lease, but he should confine himself to a statement of the facts and of the object he had in view.

Mr. McNEILL. I certainly did not wish to say anything respecting the motives of the Nova Scotia Government. I will not say more on the subject than this, that we had no idea of offering advice to His Excellency. I am quite sure such a thought never entered into the mind of any one who went to His Excellency, but we visited him to lay these facts before him in his capacity as an officer of the Imperial Government. As I understand it, his own Government do not offer

him advice in his capacity as an Imperial officer. We considered, and we still consider, that we were perfectly within our constitutional right in going to him to call his attention to this matter, which we looked upon as of the very gravest importance to the Empire. From a Canadian point of view, we had already brought the matter before the notice of our own Government. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to add.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Mr. Speaker, before the Government Orders are called, I wish, on the question of fact, to endorse what the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has said. I have re-read my remarks in the discussion of Friday last, and any one who will take the trouble to read them will see from the whole tone of what I said, that we meant to be understood as going directly and expressly, as we did go directly and expressly, to His Excellency for the purpose mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill). I was sorry that my remarks were misunderstood by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In truth, I thought that his observations were not intended seriously. It was only when I heard his leader and his colleague from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) supporting him—and these latter two speeches having been made after I had spoken and had lost my right to speak again—it was only then that I discovered that the thing was really seriously meant. When the criticism upon us was first made it seemed to me so perfectly preposterous that I could not think the hon. gentleman was in earnest. The flippancy of my remarks was due mainly to that fact. I have the same opinion now that I had when we first arranged to call upon His Excellency as to the gravity of the danger. I repeat again that I do not claim to have that authority on military or naval subjects which could enable me to speak on my own behalf, but I was in receipt of news in reference to this matter which seemed to me to be very grave. I claim the right asserted by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), to go to His Excellency, without any discourtesy to our leaders, in reference to a matter which could not come before him in the ordinary way as the head of the Canadian Government, and to represent the case to him as an officer of the Imperial Government. I was glad my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) put me right by saying that we have urged the Canadian aspects of this coal deal upon our leader at the earliest day. The very second day after I arrived in Ottawa I did go to my leader, and I can testify to the courtesy and sympathy and patience with which my leader heard me, on a very busy morning. I had an opportunity two days later of going into the question pretty fully with the Minister of Finance, so that the notion which seems to prevail here in the House, that there was any misunderstanding or that there was any intention of going behind the back of our leaders, is not founded at all upon fact.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not without hesitation that I rise for the first time in this House to express my humble opinion on the important question which occupies us in this moment. And, must I say it, I would have remained silent still longer had I not counted on the indulgence of the hon. members on both sides of this House; I do not, Mr. Speaker, flatter myself with the idea that I shall bring into this debate, arguments which the hon. members who have preceded me may have forgotten, or not thought of. I simply wish to take my share in the present debate. It would be enough in order to justify my support of the policy of the party to which I belong, to go over the events which have taken place in the country within the last eighteen years, and which are the living, palpable evidence that the Conservative party has not failed in the task which it had undertaken, of giving new life to the affairs of the country, and that it had shown itself jealous of the progress and general prosperity of the nation. To deny this progress, to deny this prosperity, which is everywhere to be seen, is to deny evidence, is to deny facts which have manifested themselves in the country during the last eighteen years. It is to court disappointment before the people, who after all, have eyes to see, and ears to hear with, and who will always know how to distinguish between the regime which protects the farmer, the merchant and the working man; and the regime under which they started during four consecutive years. One remembers that epoch of 1878, when Sir John A. Macdonald, after having covered the Dominion, carried his signal victory over the Liberals. One remembers that it was in 1878 that he unfolded to the country this idea of a National Policy, a policy which has since then not only been approved in its conception, but sanctioned in its practice at three different times, namely, in 1882, 1887 and 1891. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this idea brought forth by Sir John Macdonald has been sanctioned at different periods by immense majorities. Therefore the policy that we defend to-day is not to speak, our policy; it is the policy of the people; the policy which they have commissioned us to defend before the country, and before the House. It is then the duty of Conservatives to support this policy, and try to have it sanctioned by the greatest majority in this House. I say then, that when the Liberals claim here that this policy has been ruinous—some have even said that it was immoral—it is not the Conservative party in this House that is accused, but it is the people who are so accused of supporting a ruinous

Mr. WELDON.

and immoral policy. What have been the results of this policy inaugurated in the year 1878? They are easy to see. We have to-day manufactories everywhere; trade has taken a new start; the agricultural community is a hundred fold more prosperous than it was in 1878. These are facts which nobody can deny. One has only to go over our rural counties to become convinced that this policy has succeeded in bettering the condition of the farmer, not only by the direct effect of the principle underlying it, but also by the fostering which, owing to the revenues brought in, the Government was enabled to afford to all the public enterprises and the great improvements needed throughout the Dominion. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) asked last night: "What have we gained in the province of Quebec through the National Policy?" We have gained all the public works existing to-day; all our railways built in consequence of this National Policy. If we have to-day in the district of Quebec the Lac St. Jean Railway, is it not thanks to the subsidies granted by the Government to this enterprise, which has been called a national one? Is it not thanks to revenues brought in solely by this policy? I ask the House, could we have built this railway, which to-day offers to colonization an immense territory, and which in the month of June next will extend as far as Chicoutimi, shortly to reach the fine parishes of St. Alphonse and St. Alexis? Now, I will ask, was this railroad built in the interests of the manufacturers or of colonization? Again, the Baie des Chaleurs railway. Has that railway been built for the manufacturers or for colonization? The answer is easy. The hon. member for Montmagny said that we have had nothing in the province of Quebec out of the National Policy. Well, I say he either does not know what is going on, or he lacks good faith. I cannot believe that he would come before this House to deceive it, I would rather believe the first alternative. Now let me look at the progress made in Montreal, the great commercial metropolis of Canada. What gave birth, in Montreal, to the cotton manufactories, and other great industries, which make its prosperity? Was it the Mackenzie Government policy, or that of Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration? But let us come down to Quebec, which the hon. member for Montmagny knows well. Upon what are sustained the great boot and shoe manufactories of Quebec? What gives bread to the thousands of workmen employed in the manufactories of St. Roch's? Is it the Mackenzie policy or the National Policy? Let us ask these workmen; they will tell us that unrestricted reciprocity will ruin these industries and close the doors of these manufactories. They understand that we are not able to resist the influence and the capital of the United States manufacturers. This is perfectly reasonable; but the hon. member for Montmagny seemed to overlook it last night. Thus the improvement of our canals,

and the construction of our railways have been the work of the Conservative party and of the National Policy. And if to-day our workingmen can earn bread for themselves and their families they owe it to this National Policy, which we defend, and which I hope will last long. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) said last night "the people are with us." Unfortunately, they do not vote with you. However, he mentioned the election in L'Islet, and said this election proves it. We have had there fair-play, he said; we have met on equal ground and with equal arms, and we have brought them down. I will take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to differ with the hon. member. I say that in the recent election in the county of L'Islet the question of protection versus unrestricted reciprocity has not been so frankly, so honestly put as he said last night. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the county of L'Islet was a former Liberal stronghold, that we had by accident, so to speak, carried at the general elections of 1891. It was not, therefore, a county where the two parties were on the same footing as to their respective strength; but moreover the election of the hon. gentleman for L'Islet has not been made on the question of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, as was said by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) the question of protection versus reciprocity was not squarely put. Consequently no such conclusions as those drawn by the member for Montmagny can be derived from this election. The member elected at L'Islet was not the candidate of unrestricted reciprocity, but rather the representative of protection, if I am to believe his declarations. I hold in my hand several extracts from his newspaper—the newspaper which he has edited for many years—the late "Le Canadien." And what did he say in this paper? Let us see, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. member for L'Islet appreciated the Liberal policy, and we will see that he is far from holding the same views of his neighbour for Montmagny:

Whatever may be said, on the whole our affairs are very prosperous. It is evidently wiser to continue with new ardour the works which we have so well begun, rather than to unsettle our people, paralyze its efforts by projects impossible to realize.

This was written on the 2nd June, 1887. Referring to unrestricted reciprocity, the main programme of the Liberal party, he, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), now one of the Liberal leaders of the province of Quebec, the leader of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), wrote on the 14th August, 1887:

We conclude that in any project of development of our commercial relations with the American republic, we shall also have to be guided by the principle of protection for our national industries. This will be an efficient means of obtaining reasonable compensations for the concessions which we may think fit to make. It is easy to see by what we have just said that we strongly disapprove those who continue the untimely movement in favour of unrestricted reciprocity.

Again, on the 28th May, 1888, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), one of the Liberal leaders who supports the Opposition, one of those whom the member of Montmagny supports, wrote the following:—

If the opposition makes the political blunder of continuing before the electoral body the campaign, which it has so ingloriously conducted in the House of Commons in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, all the friends of protection for our national industry shall have to join their forces in order to oppose an invincible resistance to those who so strongly misappreciate the interests of Canada, and the result of the new struggle will not be doubtful. The national policy will triumph for a fourth time.

These are, Mr. Speaker, the very words of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), one of those whom the hon. member for Montmagny supports, and the election of whom he holds up as an evidence that the people is against us and does not want the protective policy. What did the member for L'Islet say again on the 3rd of November, 1888? and I wish especially to draw the attention of the House to the words which I am going to quote. I will also point to the hon. members of the Opposition that these words do not come from us, but from one of their leaders of this day. On 3rd November, 1888, the member for L'Islet wrote:

Our farmers have now an excellent market in their own country, and they will not commit the folly of handing it over to foreign competition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, was I not right in answering as I did the assertion of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) when he said that the fight in L'Islet had been square against protection, and that the result showed that the people are against the policy of the Conservative policy, and favourable to that of the Opposition. In claiming this, he made a mistake—a grievous mistake. It was a protectionist who was elected in L'Islet, and not a supporter of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Montmagny spoke of the L'Islet election as an evidence that the people is against protection and favourable to the political programme of the Opposition. Where then were the people in the various by-elections which took place in the district? In Quebec West, how is it then that the hon. member who represents that division was elected by a larger majority than had ever been given in that riding for a great number of years? Was not the policy of unrestricted reciprocity crushed down at that election where the Conservative majority reached a figure unheard of until then? After having returned a Liberal, has not the county of Montmorency elected in 1892 a Conservative, my hon. friend, Mr. Turcotte, who so worthily represents that county? What happened at that election? Did the policy of unrestricted reciprocity carry the day? Is it not true, on the contrary, that the Oppositionist candidate felt that the popular feeling was so strong against him that he had to withdraw from the struggle and allow the Con-

servative candidate to be returned by acclamation? In the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, have the Liberals hoisted the flag of unrestricted reciprocity? No, Mr. Speaker, there were even three candidates in the field, and not one of them dared to speak in favour of that policy. All proclaimed themselves protectionists, and my opponents even tried to make the people believe that they were more so than I am. Why did they not speak against the National Policy? Because the people is favourable to this policy and repels that of the Liberal party. Why is the people in favour of the National Policy? Because this policy has worked for the good of the country and has allowed the Government to do great things. No one will ever succeed, Mr. Speaker, in getting the people to believe that they must give up protection and adopt the programme of unrestricted reciprocity, this delusion, this chimera, which cannot give the results anticipated. My opponents declared themselves favourable to the Government's policy, and note, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party gave all its support to those opponents of his. Just as in 1891 when they succeeded in defeating the now hon. Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Caron). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) last night spoke words to be regretted, and which it is my duty to take up. Speaking of the Conservative members, he told the House that when we entered Room No. 16, we leave our freedom at the door: that we are only slaves in the service of the Government, and that we cannot vote any more against the policy of the Government, because in doing so we risk losing the money furnished by the manufacturers to insure our elections. I consider these words insulting to the members who give their confidence to the Government. I protest against these words because I believe that the Conservative members in this House are as independent as the hon. member for Montmagny. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) is not a man so superior, morally, intellectually, or in the matters of fortune, that he can boast of being more independent than we are. We can, I think, stand on his level. We are no more slaves to our party than he to his. When we follow our leaders whose lines are towards the good of the country, we do nothing but our duty as free and independent men. As to the manufacturers' money spoken of by the hon. member, I can assure him that we will never fall in our duty for such consideration. As to myself, personally, I have not received a cent from the ministers; I do not know whether the party got money from the manufacturers, but what I do know is that the Liberal party made its election in 1891 with the sweatings from the public treasury of the province of Quebec. What I know is that fifty or sixty thousand dollars were taken from the chest of that province for the Dominion General Elections for 1891. It is the Liberal party which benefited by the

Mr. BELLEY.

plunder revealed by the Baie des Chaleurs, and other scandals. I recall these matters, Mr. Speaker, not as a useless recrimination, but because we have been taunted as slaves ready to follow their leaders anywhere. We follow our political leaders, not because we are not free to do otherwise, but because they deserve our support and our confidence in every respect. We may well follow our party and do so through conviction. We may well support the present Government and the policy which they are carrying out, because we believe that this policy works for the good of the country. At any rate no one may deny us our convictions. These are, Mr. Speaker, the few observations, which I had to make on the subject before the House. The work of the Conservative party is not over. It must continue the work it has carried on since 1878, keeping abreast of circumstances of time and place as they present themselves. The Conservative party has laid the foundation, it has built the walls of the edifice, it must now crown its work. It will have to follow in this the same scheme of architecture: for it is evident, that another would illy crown the monument. The same principle has to be followed and applied to the new circumstances, while the work may be done with different material and in forms more delicate. The hon. member for Montmagny said last night, now that the old chieftain is dead your policy must change Mr. Speaker, we do not change policy. We may modify it, but we respect the principle which the old chieftain, as he is called, laid down in 1878. We are not ashamed to follow the line he has traced for us. He has left lasting traces. I have not known him personally, I have never even seen him, but everything within these walls still tells of his high personality. The best gift he left to us, however, is the worthy continuer of his work, the present Prime Minister. This Premier, by the leave of the hon. member for Montmagny, will know how to carry victoriously the Conservative flag throughout the Dominion, and that in the interest of our common land.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, even if I were not bound by parliamentary custom to congratulate the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay on the manner in which he has made his "debut" in this House, it would be a duty and a pleasure to me to render him homage for the ability which he can put into a bad cause. Recently elected, by the help of the high and powerful protection of the Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Caron), it is quite natural that he should hasten to pay his tribute of praise to the National Policy, which probably brought into his own election fund subscriptions which have not a little contributed to give him a seat in the House of Commons. I believe that there is in that quite ground enough upon which to grow feelings of gratitude. However, it seems to me there should be limits to grati-

tude, and my hon. friend, the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay would not have impaired the power of his eloquence, would not have lost his reputation as a thorough and through partisan of the system of political dependence, if he had bridled a little the expression of his admiration and enthusiasm for the National Policy. Truly, in witnessing such solemn gestures, in hearing such a magnificent voice as his, in listening to the pompous eulogy of the National Policy, and recollecting the animated phases of his election, I was expecting that the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in his great admiration for the National Policy, was going to tell us that it was that policy that had invented the telegraph which enabled Mgr. Bosse, during his election, to fortify the weak points of his electoral organization. I was also expecting that the hon. member would attribute to the merits of the National Policy the invention of the match boxes, which sometimes also replaced the official tin boxes in which are to be deposited the voters' ballots. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has stopped short of that. Besides his eulogium of the advantages of the National Policy was pompous enough to allow him to stop short of these absurdities which I was prepared to hear. He could also have checked himself from many other things which he, however, had the audacity to say, as, for example, to repeat to satiety how prosperous this country is, and how this prosperity is due to the National Policy. It is true that the Minister of Finance has said the same thing, but the Minister of Finance is obliged by his position to do all he can to make us believe what is not true, and he acquitted himself fully. But with us members our duty is to believe only what we know to be true, and especially not to believe what we know to be false. Truly, when we consider the misery in which a great part of the people, especially the rural population, suffer to-day; when we realize that they are obliged to emigrate to the United States because of the prevailing distress, and when, on another hand, we witness the emphasis with which we are told that the country is prosperous, can the members who say these things expect to be taken seriously; should they not rather be taken as strangers to the country in which they live? I am astonished that the Tory party, which lectures us at every turn, which constantly accuses us of treason because we do not mimic closely enough the English nation—the mother land—I am astonished, I say, that they should allow to enter into their own customs, precedents so contrary to what is practised in the Imperial Parliament. One would truly think, Mr. Speaker, that speaking the truth is to be avoided, while the contrary holds elsewhere. I was reading lately in the Speech from the Throne pronounced at the opening of the Imperial Parliament now in session in London, a whole paragraph devoted to regret over the misery suffered by the population in certain parts of Eng-

land. Here, on the contrary, truth must be hidden. Is that the proper way to remedy the evils pressing upon the people? Is it by hiding the ills that they can best be remedied? In making this statement which I have just mentioned, in the Speech delivered from the Throne in the Imperial Parliament, has Mr. Gladstone belittled himself, has he lowered himself as a statesman, and will he be considered as a man inferior to—say the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley), who, in the wake of the hon. Minister of Finance, declared that this country is prosperous? It is not disloyalty, Mr. Speaker, to speak simply the truth. It is to show one's sincerity. It is to show one self patriotic, to face the situation of the country in order to study and remedy it. The hon. member made another error in his speech, when he accused us of being disloyal, of decrying the country when we say it is not prosperous. These charges have already many times been refuted by a great number of members on this side of the House. However, it seems that these refutations are of no avail with members who know how to flourish their arms in a show of eloquence, but upon whom arguments seem to be powerless. We have seen them launch into comparisons. I am willing to follow them on that ground. Here is a comparison that I am going to make. Let us suppose that the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) be the country, or rather—this would be too much honour—let us suppose that the hon. Minister of Finance be the country. The physician of the hon. Minister of Finance finds that he is afflicted with a serious disease, but this physician thinks that he must not discourage the patient, and, with that object in view, he thinks proper to hide the truth from him. He must not tell him he is sick, but on the contrary, he must make him believe that his health is perfect. On the complaint of the hon. Minister of Finance, saying to his physician: I am suffering from a general depression of the whole system; what is the matter with me? The physician answers: Oh, it is nothing but a moment of weakness; it will be over in a moment; your health is really unimpaired; have no fear. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what fate would await the hon. Minister of Finance at the hand of such a physician, if he did not seek the services of another doctor who would apply another regime and would tell him the truth as to the state of his health. Who is our best friend, I pray, if not the one who tells us the truth? And is not the best physician also the one who recognizes the gravity of the case and sets about to treat it seriously? Surely, the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) cannot deserve to be called the best friend of the Government. I said, Mr. Speaker, that we should face the situation. It is useless to deny it, there prevails in the country a general depression. The Conservative press, as well as the Lib-

eral, ask for a remedy for this state of things, and what does the Government reply to our prayers? We are going to have an investigation; we are going to appoint a commission to this effect, and we will try to remedy whatever evil there be. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not what should satisfy and reassure us, considering especially the iniquity which for the last thirteen years has been perpetrated upon the agricultural community. Let one read the tariff and see what infamy it constitutes to the prejudice of the farmers. The farming implements are subject to a tax altogether disproportionate to those on other goods. The agricultural implements are taxed 35 per cent, while the musical implements pay only 25 per cent. It would seem that the Government thought less of a plough than of a tune on the flute or the fiddle. The dental and surgical implements are only taxed 20 per cent, that is to say, 15 less than the agricultural implements. Is this reasonable, I ask, Mr. Speaker? Iron pays \$3 a ton, and steel \$13 a ton. Now, there is not a single farming implement in which iron does not enter, while nickel, which may be considered and is really a thing of luxury, comes in free. Is this reasonable? Coal oil pays 7 cents duty per gallon. It is here that a reduction has been made in the cost of barrelling this oil, and I congratulate the Government on this; but I am entitled to complain of nothing more having been done in the way of reform, for when you are doing right you should not stop half way, especially when the people have been suffering for twelve years. As I have just said, notwithstanding the reduction made, coal oil is still cumbered with a tax of 7 cents per gallon, while the oil of roses which the dukes use on their hair and handkerchiefs comes in free. Steel pens—I will be told, perhaps, that this is an insignificant item, but I only mention it because it seems that the purpose has been to tax the poor heavily, while dealing gently with the rich—steel pens, I say, bear 30 per cent, while gold pens only pay 20 per cent. Why this difference? Ebony and mahogany, which hardly enter in the furniture used by the poor, are imported free. This is not more reasonable than the cases I have mentioned already. Precious stones, mother-of-pearl, which are only used by the rich, are free, while the instruments which are used in agriculture bear a burden of 35 per cent. Tin is also admitted free. Not even for the velocipedes has an exception been made; they pay 5 per cent less than the farmers' implements. I have mentioned these articles in order to show the House that the tariff is particularly onerous on the agricultural class, and that it is framed to the advantage of the rich. I could point out other articles, but I would fear to occupy uselessly the time of the House. Where has this system landed us? Let us take the facts and examine them. I will for this purpose confine myself to an altogether rural com-

Mr. MONET.

munity, and let me first choose the county of Napierville, which I have the honour to represent in this House. What are figures of the last census. The village of Napierville had in 1881 a population of 922; in 1891 it had come down to 860. In 1881 the parish of St. Cyprien had a population of 1,887, while in 1891 it was only 1,703, having decreased by 184. I will point out that in the parishes the decrease is still greater than in the villages; the decrease is enormous. The parish of St. Edouard counted in 1881, 1,499 souls, and in 1891, 1,290, a difference of 209. It is easy to notice, also, that beside this decrease we have also lost all the natural increase of population. In 1881, St. Michel had 1,651 souls, and in 1891, there were only left 1,619. The other parishes also show a decrease. In fact there is not a single parish in the county but has decreased in population. In the aggregate the county has lost 666 souls of a farming population during the last decade. In the county of Laprairie, a county represented by a friend of the Government, the parish of Laprairie had, in 1881, a population of 1,841 souls. In 1891 this figure had fallen to 1,574, a decrease of 267. It will not be said that it is the speeches of the Liberals, those dishonest and disloyal men, which have caused this depopulation, considering that this county is represented by a good Conservative, notwithstanding which fact we find a decrease of 267 for the last decade. The village of Laprairie showed a population of 1,341 in 1881; in 1891 it had fallen to 1,246, a decrease of 94. Caughnawaga, a place so greatly favoured by the National Policy that the manufactories have increased there to a number of 45, if we are to believe the census—I suppose basket-making has been counted as manufacturing—Caughnawaga, I say, shows an increase of 252 for the last ten years. The parish of St. Constant had in 1881, 1,722 souls; in 1891 it had only 1,572, a decrease of 150. St. Isidore had 1,591 souls in 1881, and 1,463 in 1891, which is a loss of 128. St. Jacques-le-Mineur, counted 1,603 inhabitants in 1881, and 1,393 in 1891, a loss of 210. St. Philippe counted 1,655 in 1887, and 1,716 in 1891, an increase of 62. Thus, I have just enumerated the parishes of two counties, and among them all there is only that of St. Philippe which shows a slight increase of 62. Of ten parishes, nine have decreased, and largely decreased. What is the teaching which is to be derived from this decrease of our population? It is that the agricultural class, the rural interests, are ill-treated under the present system, and that it is time some thought should be given to protecting them, not by such a system of protection as we have, but by giving them markets and openings for the disposal of their produce, such as they would get from reciprocity. With a protective tariff we only work in antagonism to these interests. I could mention other counties, the figures regarding which I hold

in my hand, but such enumerations are pretty monotonous, and they all go to show the same result, a general decrease in the population. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay is incapable to prove, figures in hand, and by a pure and simple argument, the efficiency and the advantages of the National Policy, without pointing out, as those who have an argument always do—to the results of the ballot. We have been supported in 1882, in 1887, and in 1891. We have especially been supported in the election of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. Hearing him, you would think that all the Liberals had gathered there in his county to work for Mr. Savard, his opponent, whom he defeated in his last election. Is it not time to cease giving such bye-elections as evidence of the approval of the country in general? A bye-election, when canvassers have gathered in a county to work the public sentiment, can not be held as a criterion of public opinion. And besides, even if my hon. friend for Chicoutimi and Saguenay had been fairly elected—we know, however, how he was elected—but even, I say, if he had been elected fairly, and without undue influence, should we not have the same reason to say that, in the county of L'Islet, where the Liberal candidate was elected, the people are with us. There was there a fair and open battle, and yet the member for L'Islet to-day is among the Opposition to the present Government. Are we not right in saying, after the election of L'Islet, that the people are with us? And let it not be said that the other party did not do its best. We know very well that the hon. Postmaster-General had it at heart to defeat the member for L'Islet. We know very well that certain Ministers and certain occupants of the judicial bench had an interest in his defeat, and yet he has triumphed through the will and free vote of the people. Is this election not enough to off-set the argument drawn from the other bye-elections where corruption did more work than the discussions on the hustings? The member of Chicoutimi and Saguenay has also found much to praise in the National Policy for the subsidies granted to railways. He has had the audacity to mention the subsidy given to the Lac St. Jean railway. The hon. Postmaster-General is not in his seat. If he were, it seems to me he would blush in hearing the mention of the subsidies granted to this railway. There was recently a commission of investigation appointed by the Government which held its sitting in Quebec, and the hon. Postmaster-General—who is so pure and honest—the hon. Postmaster-General, whose mission it is to direct the opinions of the counties where an election is being held, has owned before this commission to having received from Mr. Ross, Mr. Beemer's money-man and the Government's bounty giver—the sum of \$25,000. What has he done with these \$25,000? Used them to pay for masses? Certainly not. To

pay for prayers for the recovery of our violated rights in Manitoba? Surely not. And yet, had there not been other pecuniary help towards the election of the Conservatives, I am pretty sure that the member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay would not be sitting in this House. Mr. Speaker, I have held the floor long enough, and I do not mean to continue. I will only take the liberty to point out to the Government to what class they do the most wrong in maintaining the present tariff. I have no confidence in the commission which it is the Government's intention to appoint. The hon. Minister of Finance told us that he would probably go over the country to gather information. Whom will he interview? The manufacturers. But are the manufacturers going to give information against their own interests? Is he going to question the farmers, those who really suffer from this protection? But we, the representatives of the farmers, we, the members for the rural districts, do we not tell the Government in what misery the farmers are living? We are not alone in informing them on this point. Their friends in the House, and the Conservative press of the country are constantly doing the same. Well, if you refuse to listen to the voice of the members—their representatives—whom are you going to hear before that commission? I suspect that we will soon have a general election, and that the manufacturers, seeing themselves in danger, will subscribe twice more than usual to carry the elections. If that is not the object, there is need of a commission to bring about the changes that are required to-day. You have assailed the farmers last year in redistributing the seats of this House, in reducing the number of their representatives; but they have enough members left yet to make you understand the sense and the necessity of the tariff reforms which we claim for the agricultural community. And woe to the Government if they do not understand this demand. As I said before, you have assailed the most numerous class of the country, one which could crush you like glass should you venture soon to go to the polls. You have assailed a class which you cannot buy when it once understands the programme of the present Opposition. You have assailed a class which produces everything, the class which, should it fold its arms for some ten years, would reduce to famine all the others, all the other classes that have only to eat, sleep and idle. You have assailed a class, a great part of which have been forced to emigrate, leaving here fathers and brothers to avenge them. And this vengeance will be all the more terrible because it will be exercised on the polling day.

Mr. SPROULE. Seeing that we have the liberty of using the dual language in this Chamber, I will not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman who has just spoken so eloquently in his own tongue, because he has, I appre-

head, an advantage over me in understanding English, while I cannot speak French. Therefore, I will take the liberty of speaking in my own language. At the outset I may say that I think we have a fair right to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon the plain, business-like statement of the condition of this country which he presented to this House in his Budget speech. He is the man above all others charged with the duty of looking after the financial affairs of this Dominion, and keeping an account of the income and the outlay, and it is the duty of the Government to which he belongs to so shape their policy that the financial statement which he makes at the end of the year will commend itself, not only to the judgment of this House, but to the country; and he is to be congratulated on being able to present such a favourable statement to the people of Canada, in regard to the management of their affairs and the economy which he and his colleagues have displayed, as well as their energy in developing the country and promoting its relations with other countries. The hon. Finance Minister has given us the thirteenth statement that has been made since the National Policy was introduced, and it is for this House to judge whether or not that policy has fulfilled the expectations with which it was introduced in 1878, or whether it has been a failure. Now, what was the first thing it was to accomplish? The first was to raise a revenue for the needs of the country. We know that our country, like all others, requires a large amount of money for its public works, its railways, and all other means of perfecting the highways of commerce and enabling the people to bring to their doors the necessities and conveniences of life, so that they may carry on their operations successfully, economically and comfortably; and one of the problems which the Government has to solve every year is how to raise that money so that the people will feel it the least. The National Policy was devised for that purpose in 1879, because in 1878, 1877 and 1876 there had been deficiencies in the revenue every year. I need not turn to the public accounts to show that the National Policy has been the means of providing us with ample revenue for the needs of the country, for I think that no one will dare to dispute the fact at this time, even though we have been spending money lavishly in various ways for the development of the country from 1878 to the present time, over and above what has been necessary to keep up our payments on the public debt. The next point was, would the National Policy give employment to the people of the country? Before its introduction a great many of our people were out of employment, and our opponents say that the National Policy has not given them employment, so that we are obliged to give facts and figures to show that it has accomplished that end. In this connection I may be pardoned if I refer to a number of lines in which there

Mr. SPROULE.

has been a development. When hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has not given employment to any considerable number of people, I would like to ask them who were the people who made the \$165,769,637 worth of manufactured goods made in 1891 more than were made in 1881. Surely they were the artisans and labouring men of the country. Therefore, the National Policy must have given employment to those who were engaged in increasing the output of our manufactories to that extent. Then, if you look at the statistics which we have at hand, you will find that 112,930 more hands were employed in the manufactories of the country in 1891 than in 1881. If the National Policy so stimulated the manufacturers of the country as to enable them to employ that number of additional hands, it must have given employment to them. We might ask further, who made the machinery and plant, constructed the buildings, and carried on the other different operations in connection with the additional manufacturing establishments which have been brought into existence between 1881 and 1891? In 1891 we find that there were 25,845 new industrial establishments more than there were in 1881. Is it possible that the buildings and the machinery, most of which was made in Canada, could be got for these establishments, and that operations could be carried on in them without giving employment to a large additional number of workingmen? It seems to me so plain that you would scarcely expect any reasonable man to contradict the statement that the National Policy has given employment to the people of Canada. Then, again, in 1878 we exported to other countries only about \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. We find that last year we exported no less than \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods more than we did in 1878; and we exported that quantity of goods more than we needed for home consumption, we must have given employment to a great deal of additional labour. Therefore, I think I may fairly claim that the contention is made good that the National Policy has given employment to labour. The next object of the National Policy was to keep the home market for our own people. Has it done so? Well, we find that last year there were consumed in Canada, of manufactured goods made in the country, \$157,769,637 more than in 1881. Deduct the \$4,000,000 worth of exports that went out in 1878, and the \$8,000,000 worth that went out last year, and still there were no less than \$150,000,000 worth of goods consumed in Canada. Now, why were they consumed in Canada? Because foreign goods were shut out to that extent, and to that extent Canadians had the advantage of their home market for the products of their own labour, and largely made from raw materials produced in the country. Therefore, we may say that the National Policy has given our people the home market. But we are told that the farmers of Canada

have not received any advantage from the home market, for their products are not consumed in Canada. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen who speak in that way do not look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, otherwise they would come to a different conclusion. I will not give the figures for every year since the introduction of the National Policy; I will simply show the value of goods that have been kept out of the country in one or two years, so as to enable us to judge how far the National Policy has benefited the farmers of Canada by giving them the home market for their products. We put a duty on corn, wheat and oats, and what was the result? The first year it kept out American grain, which formerly competed with the grain of Canadian farmers, to the extent of 12,000,000 bushels, and to that extent the Canadian farmer must have been benefited. And in addition to the benefit which he received from the additional market given him at home for that very large quantity, he had also the benefit of the saving he must have made in the cost of transport of that grain to foreign markets, through his having found for it a market at home. The Americans were competing with us in the furnishing of meats to our own people—to the artisans, labourers, and, in many instances, the farmers themselves. We put a duty on beef, pork and mutton, and with what result? In one year we kept out no less than 15,000,000 pounds of those meats, and thus gave our Canadian farmers an additional market to that extent at home. Some people may say that we did not consume as much, but such a statement cannot hold in face of the natural growth going on in the country all the time, through the large increase in the number of hands employed in the manufactories of the country, which were turning out \$165,000,000 more of goods per year than before the National Policy. But as the value of meats kept going down in the western states every year, the western farmer again became our competitor in a very deleterious manner. And we induced the Government to raise the duties again. The Government did not raise the duties quite as high as our Canadian farmers desired, but still they raised them to some extent. They raised the duty on some lines of pork to 3 cents a pound, and on other lines to 1½ cents per pound, and on beef to 3 cents a pound. We asked to have the duty 3 cents all round. What was the result? The operation of that duty, during the last year, has kept out no less than 19,672,000 pounds of meat, nearly 20,000,000 pounds of meat, which, formerly, was supplied by the western farmers, largely from Chicago, in competition with our own. That amount was kept out by virtue of that policy, and the Canadian farmer had an additional market at home to that extent for the meats he raised. Taking the Report of the Bureau of Industries, I find that the development in the province of Ontario in that line

has been very large on account of that policy. They increased their production in one year nearly three-quarters of a million dollars worth, and will go on increasing in proportion as the demand creates a market. That policy furnished them, in the line of beef, pork and mutton—which although only one line—a larger market to the extent of \$1,011,144 than they had before, and it gave that market to them at their own doors—a market created by the increase of the number of hands employed in the factories and the consequent increased consumption. In addition to that this policy shut out millions of pounds of American lard, something like 7,000,000 of pounds, and millions of pounds of American butter, which was not the healthy butter made in Canada, but oleomargarine, a spurious and inferior grade, which sold at a small price, came into competition with the Canadian product. The result is that to-day the Canadian farmer enjoys the benefit of increased home consumption for his own butter. It gave an additional market by the consumption of the increased number of hands employed, not only in our factories, but in building our railways and our canals and harbours, and in making machinery for the various lines of industry in which the people are engaged. It was also claimed for the National Policy that it would reduce the cost of living. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the cost of living is not reduced. I cannot understand how they can set up such a contention, in face of the fact that you can go to any store in the country and see, on comparing quotations with prices before the National Policy was introduced, how the necessaries of life have become cheapened since then. To-day, for instance, you can buy twenty-five pounds of sugar for \$1, when in 1878 you could only buy eight pounds for the same money. I refer to granulated sugar. I would ask, is not the cost of living cheapened when you can get nearly three times the quantity of tea for \$1 that you could in 1878? To-day you can buy flannels at from 12 to 17 cents per yard which in 1878 cost from 35 to 45 cents. I have here a quotation of cottons which I got at one of the stores on Sparks street, giving the prices at 3½ cents per yard up to 6 cents, and for best prints, guaranteed fast colours, only 5½ cents. In 1878, these cottons could not be bought at lower than from 8 to 10 cents, which now you can purchase at 3½ cents per yard. We were told by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the other day, that the cotton combine of this country is one of the most nefarious institutions we have. I am not going to make any plea in favour of combines, because there can be no doubt that if they unduly enhance the prices to the consumer they to that extent are an injury, but there is no just reason for throwing the responsibility on the National Policy. To-day we have the benefit of purchasing cotton at about one-third of the price at which it was sold in 1878, and this is due to the

greater number of factories in the country to-day, as compared with 1878. Take tweeds. I looked into a store to-day, and I saw them quoted at from 35 to 40 cents per yard, and the proprietor assured me he had sold the same goods in 1878 at from 65 to 85 cents, and as high as \$1. I take these various lines, and I ask, do they not show that the cost of living is reduced? The average reduction in the cost of woollen goods has been about 45 per cent in the last twelve years.

Mr. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman made a comparison between the prices here now for these goods and the prices in the United States or England?

Mr. SPROULE. I will refer to that further on. The hon. gentleman has drawn my attention to it, and I intend before leaving the subject to discuss it. Of course, I do not attribute the full reduction to the National Policy. It would be bad logic and a very bad precedent to do so, but I do attribute it very largely to the National Policy, on account of the competition brought about in the country through the increased number of establishments due to that policy. Before the National Policy was introduced we had very few. Now, as hon. gentlemen opposite themselves say, we have more than the needs of the country require, and the result is that competition is so strong, they are cutting down prices so low that to-day we are told it does not pay to manufacture. But we held that the National Policy would reduce the cost of living, and I am giving this as an argument that it has done so, and that one of the elements of that reduction has been the competition. I say we find to-day that woollen goods have been reduced in cost during the last few years about 45 per cent. We find cotton goods have been reduced over 60 per cent to the people of Canada. And when, by the operation of the National Policy, the number of cotton mills that have been established, the large amount of raw cotton that has been brought in, a reduction has followed, we have a right fairly to give the National Policy credit for a large share of it. It is true the raw material has been reduced somewhat in price, but there is a reduction of the prices of cotton to-day, and the Canadian people get the benefit. Groceries have been reduced, but not by the National Policy, with the exception of, perhaps, one or two lines, tea, sugar and other classes of groceries, which we bring direct from the countries where they are made or produced. By the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and putting the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers on the Pacific we get a direct route to China, Japan, Hong Kong and those eastern countries that supply us with the raw sugar and tea and other lines which are found so cheap to-day. And by virtue of the policy we are able to bring these goods in direct and at less cost for transportation, and, therefore, we are able to sell them so much cheaper to the people of this country. By the National

Mr. SPROULE.

Policy we have a large number of sugar refineries in Canada which have brought raw sugar in in very large quantities, and the result is that you are able now to buy twenty-five pounds of sugar to-day for a dollar where you could only buy eight pounds in 1878. For these reasons I contend that no one can fairly say that the National Policy has not reduced the cost of living. Then, again, it was said that the National Policy would benefit the people by giving them better wages. Our opponents say that wages are lower to-day than they formerly were. I take the report of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, and I assume that is the most reliable information we have at the present time, and I find, that wages have not been materially reduced, but that they have been increased very largely in many lines. And if I look at the amount of wages paid by the manufacturers of the country in the last few years, over the amount they paid in 1878, I cannot but come to the conclusion that wages are getting higher. The amount of wages paid in manufacturing establishments, in 1891 over 1881, was \$40,333,000. Forty millions of dollars in wages to-day more than in the earlier years of the National Policy! Then tell me the National Policy is ruining this country. I have dealt with these lines very briefly, and I want to diverge for a short time to reply to some of the arguments that have been advanced by gentlemen opposite regarding what they claim to be the baneful effects of the National Policy. I read in the "Hansard" report of the speech of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson):

We will consider just what this Government have taken in actual cash, out of the taxes collected from the people by the Custom-house. I desire to enforce that, as it can be best enforced, I think, by one or two comparisons. But I will give you one or two facts and ask you to realize if you can, the impoverishing course of the Government upon the people of this country.

And then he goes on to say:

In ten years the total exports of our magnificent barley crop, aided in its value by the freer access we had to the United States markets during many of those years—that magnificent crop gathered from all parts of the Dominion added to the wealth of the country \$7,000,000 less than this Government took from them.

Then he goes on to say that the total exports of the wheat and flour, and hay and oats that have been sent out of this vast Dominion from British Columbia and from every other province, including the magnificent harvest of last year, was \$57,798,397, and the Government during the last ten years took almost every dollar that was brought into this country to add to its wealth as the result of that export of wheat, flour, oats and hay. This, he says, was done by the operations of the National Policy. He goes on:

Sir, if they rejoice over the increased exports sent from this country which add to the wealth of this country they do well; but when they wipe out an item like that by the excessive taxation they are wringing from the people of this country I trust they will get some conception of the course they have been pursuing,

and of the state to which they have brought the country.

Then he says :

Then there is the magnificent trade in horned cattle which has developed to \$63,460,497 in ten years. Magnificent receipt, all but thirteen millions of it was taken by the Government in excessive taxation. Of horses there were \$18,558,463 worth exported in ten years ; but three times all the money that you received from all the exports of your horses has been taken out of the wealth of the country by that Government opposite. Of the product of the mines, all the iron and all other products, the total exports in ten years were fifteen millions less than the amount of money in extra taxation that this Government have taken from the people of Canada.

Then he speaks of "our magnificent fisheries." and says that "seven years out of the ten the benefit from the total product of the fisheries of this country have been wiped out by the Government," taken from the people of this country by the National Policy. Then he goes on to say that the total product of the forests amounts to \$230,000,000, and says "two and a half years out of the ten years the product of our forests, that magnificent source of income, has been wiped out." by the operations of this policy. The total exports of manufactures, he says, has been \$43,000,000 ; "fourteen millions more than the total export of manufactures have been taken by this Government." He proceeds :

Of animals and their products, embracing cheese, butter and all the other products of animals, amounting in ten years to \$243,163,515 ; the receipts on nearly two and a half years out of the ten years have been taken and lost to the people by this Government wringing them out of their pockets in extra taxation.

What does the hon. gentleman wish to convey by that, other than to lead the people to believe that the returns we have received from all these various lines have been neutralized to the people, that this wealth has been taken away from the people, leaving them so much poorer ? I have here a clipping from a paper printed in Brantford, the hon. gentleman's own town, and evidently they noticed his speech. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat at this moment, because I would like him to hear what is said about him :

Mr. W. Paterson has made his annual attack in the House on the National Policy. The member for South Brant has prospered vastly under the fiscal administration of the Government, and five years after its introduction in a business notice of the firm it was announced that the concern had "doubled itself."

It had "doubled itself" in five years after the introduction of this policy, that, according to him, was impoverishing the manufacturers of this country. Yet he is one of those manufacturers.

And that he (Mr. Paterson, M.P. for South Brant and kicker against the National Policy) would be obliged to "increase its facilities and increase its quarters for manufacturing more extensively."

This article quotes the "Globe's" report of the hon. gentleman's speech as follows :—

Three or four years after the introduction of the National Policy, under the undue stimulus given to manufacturing industries, capital was rushed in, to the ruin of capital and the sacrifice of trade of other countries, and ultimately to the injury of the wage earners. Since then, he would ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to show that there had been any increase at all.

But here is a history given by this paper of what the National Policy has done for his own town, and surely the hon. gentleman is intelligent enough, when he is walking about the streets of that town, to keep his eyes open and see what is going on around him. I cannot but think that he is cognizant of it, but he conceals the fact in this House and goes on to attack the National Policy :

In 1883, as already stated, Mr. Paterson was himself enabled to report a "doubled business" and the factory has since been further enlarged.

This is one of the manufacturers who are being reduced to poverty by the National Policy :

In 1883, A. Harris, Son & Co. were reported as giving "employment to about 150 artisans and labourers." To-day the same concern has 475 men on the pay-roll.

Was that an evidence that the manufacturers of the country are being impoverished, that their business was being reduced, and their capital swept away ?

In 1883, the Waterous Engine Works were announced as having 180 men. To-day they have 230.

This is right under Mr. Paterson's nose, right under his eyes ; and notwithstanding that fact he tells the people of this country that they have been impoverished by the National Policy.

In 1883 the Brantford Carriage Company did not exist. To-day it is a prosperous concern, employing 100 men.

They are all right in Brantford, where Paterson lives.

In 1883, the Gould Bicycle and Bee Keepers' Supply Companies did not exist. To-day they employ about sixty hands between them, and are putting up a new factory. The Cotton Mill is the very outcome of the National Policy, and Mr. Paterson cannot object to the whole credit of it being attributed to that measure. The concern to-day employs 205 hands, an increase since 1883 of about sixty.

And this is the only way that we can account for the fact that cottons and prints are so cheap to the consumers of Canada to-day, compared with what they were in 1878 :

In 1883, the Brantford Box Factory employed probably about a dozen of hands ; to-day the concern is an enlarged building, with about fifty hands. In 1883, the Cordage Factory did not exist. To-day some seventy-five hands find employment in it. In 1883, the Cockshutt Plough Company had thirty-three hands ; to-day they have sixty-five, or double the former number. Here is a total of some 900 additional hands employed in that town, without referring to Buck's Stove Works, the Soap Factory, the Baine Waggon Works, the Starch Works, the New Farmers' Binder Twine Factory, and other enterprises, which are all prospering apace, and have

greatly increased their capacity. Mr. Paterson, in view of such facts and figures, ought to have more sense than to get up in the House and talk the rubbish to which he gave utterance on Wednesday.

Now, I think I may appeal to the members of this House if it is not unfair in the hon. member to tell the people of this country that the manufactures are waning under the effects of the National Policy, when he himself, who is one of them, in a few years developed the output of his factory and increased his wealth, and has been increasing it rapidly from that day to the present time. Then, I take the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) who tells us that the National Policy has been an injury to Canada. He says that the National Policy has caused an exodus from Canada. Now, I need not say anything about that, because many hon. gentlemen in this House, have already given sufficient arguments to convince at least all reasonable men that such has not been the case. There is really no ground for such a contention, nor can it be successfully established. He says the National Policy has increased the debt of the country. Well, our debt has not been increasing rapidly of late years; for the last three or four years it has scarcely increased any. We find that to-day it stands at about what it was four years ago. He says that it did not reduce the cost of the necessaries of life. I think I have answered that in the figures I have given. He says it did not increase the farmers' market; I think I have also answered that. He says that the National Policy that we want to-day is a tariff for revenue. Well, that is just exactly what the National Policy has been. It has raised a revenue, and after it raised more than sufficient revenue for the wants of the country, the Government commenced to take off the duty upon those articles that represent the prime necessaries of life. The hon. gentleman goes on to complain and grumble. He says "our hands are tied." They are tied by what? He pretended to say they are tied, somehow or other, by the operations of the Government. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who tied their hands? It was the electorate at the polls during the last election; it was the votes cast at the last election that tied their hands, and the people thought they were doing a wise thing for the country when they did so. I believe that since then the people would be very glad if, in addition to tying their hands, they had also tied their tongues, because it would have been better for the people of the country, for if so we would not find them decrying Canada as they are doing to-day; we would not find these unfair comparisons made between our country and other countries, that they are making to-day. Now I will take up some of the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and what do I find? I think it would be a good thing for Canada had she been able, by the votes of her people, to tie the tongues of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as their hands.

Mr. SPROULE.

Sir, I think if that hon. gentleman is given to one thing more than another, it is to indulging in the use of adjectives in the superlative degree. He is something like John Bunyan, in his "Pilgrim's Progress"—he is always in the "slough of despond," when he is talking about Canada, and he is always upon the pinnacle, when he is talking about other countries. His abuse is characterized by language peculiar to himself. I will give you a few of his beautiful adjectives, in order that they may be taken down, because they appear from year to year in his speeches in reply to the Budget speech, and it will be satisfactory for the people of this country to know the opinion he has of it:

I never heard that argument used, he says, without putting down the gentleman who used it, either as a charlatan, or as a man who is utterly and hopelessly ignorant of the very primary geographical conditions in which this country is placed.

Then he speaks of the United States and draws a comparison between the two countries. Look at the bright, beautiful picture he draws there. Then he draws a comparison between the capabilities of this country and those of the United States for manufacturing. Of the United States he says:

You have a large country—

Thereby assuming that ours is a very small one, and yet we have more territory than they.

—containing a population equal to two first-class European nations, producing every article which a nation can produce, having every variety of climate, from the tropic to the pole, and enjoying in itself a vast and most perfect system of free trade among 25 or 30 nations called states.

This is the country he is always looking to, and he asks our people to look to it. Now, let me draw attention to his remarks regarding Canada:

You have a group of countries separated from each other by physical obstacles,—

Something very hard to overcome, or that cannot be overcome.

—of a most formidable kind; separated from each other by large tracts of inhospitable country,—

This is the picture he draws of Canada, and which he compares with the United States.

—producing almost identically the same articles; and not a homogeneous people by any means, with a very small population.

"Not a homogeneous people." No, there are always French and English in this country. They are not a homogeneous people, and, therefore, it is not to be supposed that we can manufacture successfully in this country. I wonder if he thought for a moment of the number of nationalities that are represented by the population of the country to the south of us. Going on, he says:

You have combined in Canada every possible combination of circumstances which can make a protective system a huge and vicious mistake.

These are very strong words, but I presume he intended them to have their full weight when speaking of Canada. There is nothing bright in the picture of Canada, the brightness is all on the other side. He does not even give us the silver shield that he was once represented to have held up in speaking of this country. Regarding the contention that manufacturers are now able to produce in Canada as cheaply as in any other country, he replies :

I doubt if a more impudent claim was ever advanced.

And yet the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says that they are producing cotton so cheap that they can compete with the whole world, they have been sending millions of yards of cotton to China and Japan in competition with the whole world. Still, his leader says he doubts if a more impudent claim was ever advanced :

I cannot for one moment allow the hon. gentlemen opposite to mislead the House, or to mislead the people into supposing that Canada has any peculiar aptitudes for great manufactures. Neither in age, nor in density of population, nor from her products, nor her geographical situation, do we possess advantages for becoming a great manufacturing country.

Is not this a fearful picture to draw of a country that has developed so rapidly during the last ten or twelve years? This is his opinion of a country with the vast resources that nature has put at our disposal, in the mines, in the forests, and in the natural products that enter into manufactures. Has he forgot the magnificent water powers that we have, the highways for commerce, the numerous lines of railways that cheapen the cost of transport over our great extent of territory?

He is aware that it is the habit of hon. gentlemen opposite to support the false contentions by impudently claiming for themselves, the benefit of all natural improvements, which must take place in a country like this. And of all the wonderful scientific discoveries which from day to day are cheapening the process of manufacturing; these causes, I grant you, have partly undone the enormous mischief that protection has caused.

Then he goes on to speak of this country, and he draws a comparison between the condition of this country and the United States. Speaking of Canada, he said that the Minister of Finance had declared that the country was prosperous; how did he attempt to prove it? He, the Minister of Railways, stated that there were more miles of railway than in 1878—8,500 miles more; that we had deepened and enlarged our canals, which carried millions of tons more freight than in 1878; that there were millions of dollars more in the post office savings banks and other savings banks and monetary institutions as compared with 1878. While the Minister of Finance had given these evidences that the country was prosperous, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) turns around and said: Admitting all this to be true, what of it? Then he told

us that the savings banks deposits had on the whole increased; that our bank deposits had likewise increased; that the railways had increased, and the growth of certain towns and cities. He said:

I grant you that it is a good thing that the savings banks deposits have increased; I grant you that it is a good thing that our bank deposits have increased; I grant you that certain cities have grown and prospered; but after all, how far do these things go?

How far do they represent wealth and development?

He told us of the great increase of the savings banks deposits; well, sir, where is the money? the hon. gentleman has not got it. If a run was made on the banks he would have to borrow it. What does the deposits in the savings banks prove? It proves that the people of Canada owe the money to a few individuals. Where is the money? But after all is said and done, where are these same bank deposits, and by what are they represented?

One would think that the hon. gentleman wished to create a panic in the country, and a run on the banks. We do not claim that the Minister of Finance carries the money round in his pocket, ready to dole out at any time; but when the depositors ask for their money they will find it placed at their disposal. They have saved that money by their economy and enterprise, and as the result of the condition of things due to the management of public affairs by the Government which during the last fourteen years has been conducting the administration. They have saved that money, and it represents wealth, and it is in the savings banks to-day. Speaking about the decrease in the value of property, he says:

There has been a most unusual and extraordinary decrease in value, and at the same time an enormous increase of the debt, along with this decrease in the value of property. Does he not know that our federal debt has increased enormously; that our provincial debts have increased enormously; that our municipal debts have increased enormously?

The hon. gentleman speaks in the superlative degree. He says: "Moneys borrowed by the loaning companies have increased enormously." When he comes to the debt, he says: "The debt has been enormously increased." He dwells on the fact that the provincial debts have enormously increased, or that the municipal debts have enormously increased, and, therefore, I presume the responsibility for all the burdens on the people he places at the door of the National Policy and the Dominion Government. He has nothing to say about the acts of the Provincial Government, and as to how much debt they are rolling up, but he places all the responsibility at the door of the Conservative party here. I have here some of the hon. gentleman's beautiful expressions, and the collection is an interesting one. I will read a few of them for the benefit of the House: "Enormous amount of money we pay into the Treasury." "Enormous loss to the native-born population."

"Enormous loss to the foreign imported immigration." "Enormous decrease in the value of property in towns, villages and farm lands." "The Finance Minister has been monstrously injudicious." "His, the Finance Minister's ideas are excellent, but his works are detestable." "It is the absurdest nonsense to talk about per capita reduction, or a per capita anything else, in connection with the National Policy." "There has been an enormous shrinkage in values." "Canada is an enormously taxed country." "The tax is enormously increased by the middleman." "Our general scale of expenditure is monstrously extravagant." Everything is enormous, from his point of view. Then the hon. gentleman continues to decry this country, not only here, but in the country from which we draw our immigration. Writing to the "Economist," the hon. gentleman says that during thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation; that there exists a tremendous exodus and very great depreciation in farm lands; that there has been an immense increase in the aggregate debt of this country; that the great mass of the people, notably the farmers of Canada, are distinctly poorer than they were twelve years ago; that the census shows that Canada lost, in the last ten years, 1,500,000 of her people; that the agriculturists of this country have been simply bled white, and that \$60,000,000 are taken annually out of the pockets of the people for federal taxation; that it is utterly impossible for Canada to prosper under the present condition; that if there is no change Confederation must perish, rotten before it had time to become half ripe, as a result of the vice and folly with which its affairs have been administered. That is the information the hon. gentleman gives the world through this English journal, which is circulated in the country from which we hope to draw immigrants. Let me show how true these statements are, and how far they are justified by the facts. He states that the farmers of this country have decreased in wealth during the past twelve years. I have not the statistics which would enable the House to judge in reference to the whole Dominion, but as the province of Ontario is noted for its farming—and, of course, for its manufacturing—I have, fortunately, for that province figures which can be appropriately quoted in this connection. What do we find, from the report of the Bureau of Industries for 1889, published by the Ontario Government? The hon. gentleman told us that the farm values in Ontario have greatly decreased in recent years, but, in contradiction of that statement, we have the evidence furnished by this report of the Ontario Government, furnished by a source over which the Conservative Government has no control, and furnished by the Mowat Government, which is hostile to the Government here, and, therefore, very unlikely to make the figures in any way favourable to the con-

Mr. SPROULE.

tentions of the Conservatives. From that report of the Ontario Government, I find that, in 1882, the values of farms in Ontario were, in round numbers, \$632,000,000; in 1883, \$654,000,000; in 1884, \$625,000,000; and going on to 1889, without giving the intervening years, I find that the farm values are set down at \$632,000,000, the same as they were in 1882. This is the land, without the buildings or crops or cattle. Some hon. gentlemen may say: Yes, but the farmers have been improving their farms since. I admit myself that there has been a shrinkage in the value of farm lands in Ontario, as there has been all over the world, but I distinctly and emphatically deny that it is of serious import to the farmers of Canada, or to the farmers of Ontario, who are living on their farms from year to year and who do not intend to sell. What matters it to a farmer if his farm is worth \$10,000 or \$5,000, if he makes as much out of it when it is worth \$5,000 as when it is worth \$10,000, or makes as much out of it when it was worth \$10,000 as when it was worth \$5,000? What matters it to the farmers if there is a reduction in the value, so long as they are not parting with their farms, when they are getting the same return from them and when they are getting sufficient returns to enable them to carry on the operations of life? It is a matter of very little concern to them whether the value of the farms go up or down, except, of course, unless they want to sell out and leave. Now, let us take the value of the farm buildings, and it will give us an idea as to whether the farmers are getting richer or poorer. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in his letter to the "Economist," that the farmers are bled white and that they are distinctly poorer than they were twelve years ago. In answer to that, I again take the statistics of the Bureau of Industries and it shows that, in 1882, the farm buildings in Ontario were worth \$132,000,000, while in 1889, they were worth \$192,000,000. I have not quoted the values for the intermediate years; but that increase of \$60,000,000 in these seven years proves conclusively that the farmers are not getting poorer in respect to the value of their buildings. Now, with reference to farm implements. Some hon. gentlemen say that implements are getting dear, but, as a matter of fact, the very reverse is the case. Implements are 25 per cent cheaper to-day than they were in 1879, but notwithstanding that they are getting cheaper every year by virtue of the active competition in their manufacture. I find from this same report of the Ontario Government, that, in 1882, their implements were worth to the farmers of Ontario \$37,000,000, while they were worth, in 1889, \$51,000,000. Surely with implements \$14,000,000 more valuable in 1889 than in 1882, the farmers are not poor in regard to the implements they are possessed of. Let us see now as to the value of the live stock owned by Ontario farmers. Again,

according to the report of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, they were worth \$80,000,000 in 1882, but in 1889 they were worth \$105,000,000. Since 1882, therefore, the value of live stock to the farmers of Ontario has increased \$25,000,000, and yet the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the farmer is distinctly poorer to-day than he was twelve years ago. I take the value of the farms, and the farming implements, and the live stock in Ontario, and what do I find? Notwithstanding the reduction in the value of the farms—and I hold that is of little consequence to the farmer who does not want to exchange his land—I find that in all these lines the farmers of the province of Ontario were worth, in 1882, \$882,000,000, while to-day they are worth \$982,000,000, or in other words they are worth \$100,000,000 more than they were a few years ago. These figures are taken from a source which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will not challenge the correctness of, and based on them, it is easy to refute his contention, and to come to the conclusion that he has made a statement which is not borne out by facts or figures as far, at least, as the province of Ontario is concerned. The farmers of Ontario being worth, in those three branches of industry, \$100,000,000 more in 1889 than they were in 1882, then, I ask, where is the contention of the hon. gentleman that the farmers are growing poorer by virtue of the National Policy? I say that such a statement cannot be supported by the facts. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) went into another calculation, and he said that the farmers were growing poorer because they had more mortgages on their farms, and he also has stated that they had more mortgages than the farmers of the United States. I shall only deal briefly with that, because it has been referred to at great length time after time in this House, and very conclusive arguments have been drawn from the figures that were presented. However, I shall give a few figures in reference to the matter. In the province of Ontario there are 54 loan companies lending money to the farmers, and what is the story told in their returns to the Provincial Government as published in this same report of the Bureau of Statistics? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that the farmers are growing poor, that they are hopelessly burdened by debt, and by their chattel mortgages and their land mortgages. Now, what do we find from this report? In the year 1889, these 54 companies loaned out in the province of Ontario \$20,391,348; while in that same year the people paid back to these same companies \$19,941,263. They borrowed \$20,000,000, and they paid back \$19,000,000. We come now to the year 1890. If the farmers were getting poor you would expect them to borrow more and to pay back less, but in the

year 1890, I find that instead of borrowing \$20,000,000, they borrowed only \$17,263,028, and they paid back \$19,114,906. In the year 1891, if they were getting poorer they would still be borrowing more of necessity, and paying back less, but instead of borrowing \$20,000,000, as in 1889, they only borrowed \$16,797,699, and they paid back \$19,943,157. They paid back over \$3,000,000 more than they borrowed in that year. In 1889 they borrowed more than they paid back, in 1890 they paid back more than they borrowed, and in 1891 they paid back nearly \$4,000,000 more than they borrowed. Surely this shows that the Canadian farmer is not so hard up, or so impoverished as the hon. member for South Oxford tries to make out that he is. I come now to chattel mortgages, and from the official report of the Ontario Government, I find that in 1891 the total chattel mortgages against the farmers of that province were 10,989, amounting to \$3,097,601, or an average of \$282, while in 1890 the total chattel mortgages amounted to \$3,223,297, an average of \$305. That shows clearly that the statement of the hon. gentleman in this particular is not borne out by the facts. Now, let me ask what represents the wealth of a country? It has been said that its prosperity may be fairly measured by its wealth, and the condition of its people, and not by its population. We hear hon. gentlemen constantly contending that because our population has not increased as rapidly as they would like, therefore, the country is becoming impoverished. To my mind it is not the population of a country that indicates its prosperity, but it is the condition of its people. It is not a matter of so much importance to us to know whether our country has 5,000,000 or 50,000,000, as it is to know that the 5,000,000 are well fed and well clothed, while the 50,000,000 might be in poverty and starving. China has a population of 450,000,000, but every year some hundreds of thousands of its people die of starvation. There is an increase of population in that country, but not an increase of wealth. When Ireland had a population of 7,000,000 she was worse off than she is now, when she has only between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000. Therefore, it is of less importance whether we have 5,000,000 or 50,000,000 than it is to know that, whatever number we have, they are properly housed, comfortably clad, and sufficiently fed. Do hon. gentlemen find many vacant houses in the towns and cities of our country to-day, or that the public treasury is drawn upon extensively to keep our people from starvation? I say they do not. Take up the public papers, and you do not find the indications of such starvation in our cities as you find in Chicago or New York or other great cities in that highly favoured land which hon. gentlemen opposite highly eulogize; but our people, as a whole, are comparatively well off. There are a great many reasons why our people have not increased in num-

ber so rapidly as some hon. gentlemen think they should. Every medical man and every man who has paid attention to statistics knows that the more wealthy people become and the more luxuries they have, the lower is the natural rate of increase in population; whereas, according as the necessaries of life decrease, even to the very verge of starvation, the more rapid becomes the natural increase of the population. This is a fact that cannot be denied. Along with the increase of wealth and luxury there is a decrease in the number of births from year to year, whereas, along with an increase in poverty, starvation and hard work, there is an increase in the number of births. Now, what are the signs of wealth and prosperity in the country? Surely they are to be found in the development of the country, in its railways, which have increased to the extent of 8,500 miles in fourteen years, in the number and the magnitude of our canals, in our telegraph lines, in the tonnage and number of our vessels, in the extension of postal facilities and post offices, in the trade and commerce of the country, in the imports and exports, in the amount of freight carried on our railways, in the amount of money saved, out of the earnings of the people, as shown by their deposits in the savings banks and in other banks of the country, beyond what is required to carry on the business operations of the country. Then, we have a moderate debt, we have our people employed, we have comfort in our homes, and we have no considerable want in our country to-day. Go through the country in whatever direction you please, look into any farmer's home at meal time, and he is able to give you a good meal; look at his children, and you find them comfortably clad. This has been a long and severe winter, and yet you do not hear any considerable complaints of want on the part of the country people. They have better farm buildings, better stock and implements, better homes, supplied with organs, pianos and luxuries of different kinds, where a few years ago they had only the necessaries of life. We find all these things in our country to-day; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite continue to decry their country and to make out that it is not wealthy, that it is bled white, impoverished, in debt, and going to destruction. Now, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in dealing with the intentions of the Finance Minister regarding changes in the tariff, proceeds to say that the Finance Minister is going to alarm the people. These are his words:

But what is the key-note of his speech this year? Is it stability? It is wavering; it is doubt. Business men of the country and manufacturers cannot tell what is to be the policy and what changes are to be made by the Government. I venture to say the hon. gentleman has unsettled business, and has created a feeling of disquiet and fear, if not panic, throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion.

Now, that is the hon. gentleman's opinion, that the hon. Finance Minister has created

Mr. SPROULE.

disquietude; but what would be the disquietude and the panic in the country if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were in a position to carry out what he declared he would do? We have had the National Policy before the country for a great many years, and how has it been fought? The hon. member for South Oxford has been telling the House and the country what he and his friends would be prepared to do if they were in power. When the National Policy was introduced in 1878 it was fought by the Reform party for all it was worth, and they were defeated. The country believed that we required a National Policy. It was again fought in 1882, when they also fought our policy with regard to building the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1887 they had a new policy. It was then commercial union, which was to be the panacea for the commercial ills of Canada. At that time Mr. Blake announced that they would fight the National Policy no longer, and that his friend, Sir Richard Cartwright, agreed with him in that. But they found that their policy of commercial union did not take with the people, and in 1891 they came forward with their policy of unrestricted reciprocity, or continental free trade; and every time they appealed to the electors of the country they were defeated, and each time they have changed their policy and adopted something new. Now, the Finance Minister says to them: You have condemned everything we have done; what is your policy? Let the people know what you are going to do in the event of your getting into power, so that they may be able to judge whether or not it is likely to injure the country. Well, I will read the information that the hon. member for South Oxford has given on that point, so that you may compare it with the criticisms of the hon. member for South Brant, and judge whether it would be likely to disturb the manufacturers of this country, or unsettle affairs or create a panic. This is what he says:

The hon. gentleman desires to know our policy. I will tell the hon. gentleman what has been our policy from first to last. Our policy has been from first to last to destroy this villainous protective system which has been grinding out the vitals of the people of this country. I do not care in what particular way the reptile is destroyed. I do not care whether it is cut off by the head, or the tail, or in the middle; I do not care whether it is by free trade positive or absolute, or by revenue tariff or continental free trade. I wish to see my people redeemed from the degrading slavery which a few political and commercial knaves imposed upon them.

He does not care what the result is. He is going to destroy the National Policy. He does not care whether he cuts off its head, tail or middle; he has got to the verge of despair. He reminds me of the story of an ancient maiden lady, who had reached that time of life when she became afraid she would never get a husband. One day she went out to the woods to pray for one, and she

prayed: "Oh, Lord, for a man!" An owl that was sitting on a tree close by, said: "Who, who." She thought it was an answer to her prayer, and said: "Anybody, so long as it is a man." In like manner, the hon. gentleman is ready for any policy, no matter what, provided he can get rid of the National Policy. He is ready for commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, anything at all, so long as he can destroy the National Policy and put these men out of office and get into their place. He is like Bunyan's character in the "Pilgrim's Progress," standing in the slough of despond. He knows that the time is passing, that the country is not willing to let him and his friends into power, and he is ready for anything, whether detrimental or otherwise, whether it may or may not unsettle trade, so long as it will put him and his party on the Treasury benches. But the people are not likely to do that in the present or in the near future. Is trade so very bad to-day in the country? I take up our Canadian "Journal of Commerce," and I find it reviews the trade of the country as follows:—

The wholesale houses report a continuance of the brisk trade noted last month. Winter stocks have been very closely sold up, which is not usually the case, while orders for spring trade have been all that sanguine people expected. To use the expression of a commission merchant, who has been thoroughly over the ground, trade has not been better among dry goods men for the past twelve years.

Notwithstanding that hopeless condition of the country, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for North Brant depict to us, the "Canadian Trade Journal" takes the hopeful view I have just quoted. It proceeds to say:

Notwithstanding this there has been quite a sprinkling of retail failures during the month. These may be due to exceptional causes, as the bank reports, regarding the way payments were met on the 4th February, show that a much greater than ordinary percentage of notes has been paid—at least such has been the case throughout Ontario and Quebec. Reports from the mills are very satisfactory. The cotton mills report trade in very good shape, all the factories running to their full capacity, except the Dundas and Lybster, while the Brantford wincey mill will be started on cotton goods. The woollen manufacturers are in equally good spirits, many of them being sold up for the whole season to come and being compelled to refuse good orders that are beyond their capacity to carry out. The only thing they desire is a little better price.

This I take from the "Journal of Commerce," a non-political paper. It shows the trade and condition of the country to be very satisfactory. But hon. gentlemen opposite say: We have an exodus, our people are going to a foreign country, and we cannot get them back; and they say this is because of the National Policy, which has increased everything that the farmers buy and decreased in value everything they have to sell. Their farming implements have in-

creased in price, while the value of their stock has decreased, and consequently they are leaving the country. Well, I have a few letters here, written by Americans who went out to our western country to examine its fitness for settlement and to compare the conditions of life there with those of their own localities in the States. Mr. James Hudson, of Groton, South Dakota, writing to a friend, says of the Alberta district:

We examined this district thoroughly. After driving over it for several days, and visiting a number of farmers and stockmen, we pronounce this the best country we ever saw for mixed farming and especially for stock-raising. Stockmen here are all making money. Steers selling for 4 cents when we can get only 1 to 2 cents in South Dakota. Taxes are very low. There is yet lots of homestead land where any man over eighteen can take up a quarter section timber, water, coal, hay and grass without limit; good laws, good society. We know that this is just the place for men to make homes and where industry will meet a certain reward. In conclusion we tell our friends in South Dakota that are not satisfied with their success there, that if they go to either Prince Albert or Edmonton, and go into either mixed farming or stock-raising we believe there is no place on this continent where success is as likely to crown their efforts.

Other gentlemen, speaking of the number of men they met in that country, say:

As a result of our visit here, we have no hesitation in saying that this is without exception the best stock country we have ever seen, in our opinion. While here we met men from Idaho, Washington Territory, Nevada, and in fact almost every state in the Union, and there was but one opinion expressed by those and that was the same as ours. We never believed that such a country as this could be found. As far as the eye could see in every direction it was nothing but a succession of rich, tall grass, beautiful lakes, clear running streams, groves of trees for shelter, in fact the whole country presented a park-like appearance more beautiful than our imagination could have pictured.

The farmers we met here were all delighted with the country, and those of them who had been there for a number of years were doing well and are increasing their herds in large numbers. We saw cattle there that had never seen the inside of a stable and were rolling fat and fit for the butcher's stall, in fact equal to our beef after having been fed three months on corn. We are well aware that that is saying a good deal for spring beef having lived out all winter with nothing but the natural grass and no shelter; but it is nevertheless the truth and we feel bound to state it exactly as we found it.

This is signed by Adam Stafford, R. D. Cass, Frank Caldwell and John G. Gibbon, all of Scotland, South Dakota, who came from those elysian fields painted so brightly by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Here is another extract:

We consider the country far ahead of our part of North Dakota, and we are going there to make our homes. Three of our party took up homesteads, one of us buying railroad land. Each quarter has about forty acres of timber. We believe Alberta has no equal as a stock country. We never saw such stock as is grown in Alberta, almost without the help of man! We made inquiry as to the price of agricultural implements as compared with the price in North

Dakota, and we find that, quality for quality, implements are fully as cheap in the Canadian North-west. We also carefully examined the relative prices of groceries and clothing; we found woollens of all kinds one-third cheaper, groceries about the same. As many of our neighbours in North Dakota are anxious to find some place where it is possible to make comfortable homes, we have no hesitation in telling all such that in the Canadian North-west such a place is to be found. We found the cities of Winnipeg, Brandon, Calgary and others far beyond our expectations. We were glad to find taxes very low as compared with North Dakota. We found excellent schools.

Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), referring to this matter, said that in that country, above all other places in the Dominion, do we find experienced the baneful effects of the policy inaugurated by the Conservative party. If such be the case, how is it that throughout all that country—through the disputed section of Ontario, through Manitoba and the North-west Territories, down to the Pacific slope—through all that vast territory, where the burdens of life have been made so heavy by virtue of the National Policy and the mismanagement of this Government, the people are so ignorant of what they are suffering from that they will not send a single man here in opposition to the Government? How is it that all through this vast territory hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to convince the people that they are injured by the policy of this Government? Surely, reasonable people must admit that the people out there cannot be so much disaffected, as we are told they are, by the policy carried out by this Government, when they do not send a single representative here to express their dissatisfaction? And that is one of the strongest arguments to the contrary. Notwithstanding all these things, I say, we are living on, and we believe we are living in prosperity. It may be we are living in a fool's paradise, but we get enough to eat and enough to drink and enough to wear, and there is no great destitution in our country. We find that our railways are increasing their mileage; we find that the highways of commerce are being perfected; and we find development going on in every quarter of the country. And yet we are told there is no prosperity in Canada. Now, while all these things are being done, there are some things still to be done, I admit, before we stay our hand. The Government have a work to do. What is it? To uproot the National Policy? I say no; their work is not to uproot the National Policy. What, then, do we still need? We need to perfect the National Policy where we find that it is bearing injuriously upon any class. The Finance Minister has said that we intend to make inquiry and, having ascertained where the policy is defective, we will endeavour to make it as perfect as possible. Gentlemen opposite say that he will injure trade, because he is going to ask the people what they want. That is

Mr. SPROULE.

one thing that his predecessor, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), would not do. He knew better than the people what they ought to have, and, therefore, he would not consult them. He knew more about manufacturing than the manufacturers did, and, therefore, even though they asked it, he would not give them assistance. He would not condescend to examine into the condition of affairs in various parts of the country, as the Finance Minister now proposes to do. I believe that in some lines combines are being formed and that they will keep from the people the benefits which would otherwise come to them through the National Policy. I believe that is a matter for the Government to examine into, and, as far as possible, to prevent these combines. Combines may be found under the National Policy, but they are found also in countries that have free trade, and the effects of them are being felt in free trade countries as well as in countries that have protection. I believe we want an export duty on logs. I am not going into that question now, because I have a notice on the Paper relating to it, and I intend to go more fully into the subject when that order is called. But I may say a few words with regard to it now. The principle of the National Policy is to give employment to our people at home. If we send out of our country raw material, logs, the getting out of which gives employment to over 7,000 men about Georgian Bay, we give employment to 7,000 men in manufacturing them into lumber in the United States. In this we are not acting in accordance with the National Policy. If we allow an amount of money to be expended over there that should be expended here, we are not carrying out the principles of the National Policy. Therefore, we must make a change, and we must put an export duty on logs. We must perfect our steam-ship lines. One of the great needs of the present day is a fast steam-ship line to England. With that line we should be able to compete with foreign countries. If we have refrigerators put upon these steam-ships we will perfect our highways of commerce so that we may take the products of the Canadian farmers and lay them down in the mother country where we find our most profitable market. If the Government do this they will prove themselves equal to the occasion as they have always done. Then we want to educate the farmers of this country in reference to the best lines of production. This is being done to-day through the Experimental Farms. This work is already being done. It is a commendable work, it is a valuable work, and the country is getting the benefit of it. Notwithstanding all that is said, I say we ought to stand by the National Policy, because it proved Canada's salvation in her hour of need. It has given us a revenue, it has given employment to our people, it has afforded a home market for the Canadian producer, it has led us on to prosperity, and we ought to stand by it and by the men who

introduced it and have carried it through to success.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In rising to address the House upon the very important question that we have been discussing for the last few days, allow me, before I enter into any of the arguments of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), to make a few remarks with respect to what was said by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). I find, Sir, that that hon. gentleman, in addressing the House, said the workingman was not taxed either on what he eats or on what he wears. He stated that the farmer had a free breakfast table. But, in saying so he forgot to tell this House, and through this House the country, that the table itself was taxed to the tune of 35 per cent, that the chair upon which the man sits at his breakfast is taxed 35 per cent. He also forgot to say that the flour that might be made from his own wheat was taxed 75 cents a barrel, and that the workingman also has to pay this tax. He forgot to say that when the workingman rises in the morning and goes to wash himself, the soap he uses is taxed 14 cents per pound, or something like 30 per cent. He forgot to tell you that the towel also was taxed 25 per cent. He forgot to say that if he had a comb to straighten his hair, it was taxed to the tune of 35 per cent, and, if he had a looking-glass, it also was taxed. His sugar is taxed, his coffee is taxed, almost everything that goes upon the workingman's table is taxed, except what comes directly from the farmer. The blankets that the workingman uses when he goes to bed are taxed from 40 to 60, 70 and even 80 per cent. The clothes of the workingman and his family, which cost something like \$90 per annum, represent a tax of over \$30. His coal oil is taxed. And yet they will tell the workingman that he is free of taxation on what he eats and what he wears. I suppose that in their explanation, gentlemen opposite would say that the workingmen ought not to wear any of the finer tweeds of the goods coming from the old country, that the goods he ought to wear are goods of Canadian manufacture. Let me remind the hon. gentlemen that the Canadian manufacturer is benefited upon his cotton goods and upon his woollen goods to the whole extent of the protection. The merchant going to the old country purchasing goods and bringing them into Canada, pays a duty upon woollen goods of an average of 30 to 40 per cent. Upon cotton goods he pays a duty of from 24 to nearly 40 per cent, and before these goods reach the workingmen the duty is represented by an increased cost of 40 to 60 per cent. And yet they tell us that the workingmen pay no duty. Let me say, Sir, that the

only difference between the goods imported into this country from Britain and the United States, is that the individual purchasing foreign goods in Canada has got to pay the whole amount of the duty along with the price of the goods, while there is little under 2 per cent of freight and insurance to be added to the price of Canadian goods put upon the market. That is all the advantage the workingman gets; he has got to pay the whole cost of the goods and the amount of duty added. I was astonished at the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) stating that he was in favour of the duty being removed from coal oil, and what reason did he give for the Government not removing that duty? Why, he told us that there were several millions of money invested, and that we could not see this money swept away. I would ask: Where did the manufacturers get these millions of money to invest? We know that the oil industry is not a new industry in Canada, that it has been established for a length of time, and we know that those who have been engaged in that business have all become independent as regards their pecuniary circumstances. He stated, also, that there were 2,000 workingmen engaged in that business, and they would all be thrown out of employment at once. They accuse us of decrying Canada; was there ever a stronger statement made in this House to show, either that Canada is not naturally fitted for carrying on that industry, or for taking the raw material and manufacturing coal oil, or that our workingmen are not as intelligent, not as energetic, as the Americans, and therefore not able to cope with them? I hold that if we take this view of the question, we will never sweep away a single item of the National Policy, because all the different industries can come forward and say that they have large amounts of money invested, and a large number of workingmen employed. Is that any reason why the consumers of this country should be taxed to the tune of 134 and 135 per cent upon coal oil? Is it any reason why the raw material should be protected to the tune of nearly 1,000 per cent? Sir, I hold that the argument adduced by the hon. gentleman is no argument whatever. The workingmen of Canada to-day pay a duty annually to this Government, on account of the National Policy, of between \$30 and \$40 if not more, when we take into account everything they consume in their houses, and that is a grievous burden upon the workingmen of this country. There is not a single hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has had the hardihood to rise and say that the National Policy has increased the per capita wages of the workingmen. They have stated that some \$40,000,000 have been given as wages to the artisans of this country. I hold that the artisans in this country is not as well off to-day as he was before the National Policy was imposed. Now, I will take up the statements

of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I find that one of the first statements he made was a very misleading one, indeed. He told us that in 1878 there were \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods exported from the Dominion of Canada, and then he turned around and told us there were \$34,000,000 worth of goods exported during the last year. Did he mean to say these were manufactured goods? He did not say that this \$34,000,000 represented manufactured goods, and I am unable to understand what the hon. gentleman really meant, when the whole amount of manufactured goods exported, excluding household goods and rags, amounted to \$6,471,000 in 1892. I find that during the regime of the Mackenzie Government, in 1876, there was \$5,972,000 worth of manufactured goods exported from Canada, only \$49,000 less than during the last year. That is not great progress for the manufacturing industries of this country to make from that time down to the present, and that was long before the National Policy was imposed. I find that during 1876 and 1877 there were \$10,088,000 worth of manufactured goods exported from Canada, and that is more, in proportion to the population, than the amount that was exported in 1892. Now, we were told that the farmers were protected in the articles of beef, pork and sheep, and we were told the amount of protection that we had got, and the large quantity of goods that were shipped out of this country under that protection. Just allow me to show you what protection we enjoy at the present time with respect to hogs, cattle and sheep. I find that some of the latest quotations give the price of live hogs in Chicago at \$8.60, and I find in the same paper that dressed hogs are quoted in Toronto at the same price, \$8.60. That is the protection that we get against hogs coming to Canada from the United States—their live hogs bring as high a price in Chicago as our dressed hogs do in Toronto. Now, with respect to beef. We all know that during the last few years, in the United States, their beef cattle brought a better price during the shipping season, and during the winter season as well, than they did in Canada. What is the condition of things to-day? Beef cattle in Chicago are worth from \$5.90 to \$6.10 per 100 pounds while in Canada we find that our best beef cattle are worth a little, if any, over \$4.50. That is the protection that we get against cattle, hogs and sheep coming in from the United States. During the last year we sent to the United States 290,925 sheep, and what was the result? Why, we were protected to this extent, that we had to pay \$228,000 to get those sheep into the markets of the United States. Sweep away the duty, and I fear not to state that the markets in a very short time will be equalized in the two countries. Now, we have been told by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in language most emphatic, that the condition of the farmers

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

in this country was more miserable than I ever heard it described upon this side of the House. Let me quote the hon. gentleman's language, and when a man is condemned out of his own mouth it is the strongest condemnation that can be brought against him. Only a few days ago, when we were talking of what had taken place in Canada, the hon. gentleman said:

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) endeavoured, two years ago, to convince this House it was for the purpose of feeding cattle that we required free corn, because the object was to get the feed at the lowest possible price, so as to provide beef at the smallest cost to export to England. I said then, and I repeat to-day, that if every man were a cattle-feeder, it would be to his advantage to bring in free corn to feed his cattle, because, if he could not raise the quantity of food requisite for the purpose of fattening cattle, it would be very important he should get it at the lowest possible price. But it is unfortunately the fact that a very small percentage of our farmers are cattle-feeders to-day.

Yet the hon. gentleman told the House that the number of barns were increasing and the farmers were erecting them so as to enable them to feed cattle, which was a most profitable business. He further said:

In the first place, a large percentage of them have not the money to build suitable barns and stables in which to keep their cattle during the winter, and feed them so to make them prime beef. In the second place, they cannot afford to be out of their money the length of time involved if they raise cattle.

No member of this House has yet endeavoured to represent the farmers of Ontario in such a miserable and depressed condition. We have always held that the National Policy bears heavily on the agriculturist, but we never heard an hon. gentleman on the Government side of the House make such a statement as that volunteered by this hon. gentleman. I believe the hon. gentleman, in a moment of weakness, spoke what he believed to be the truth with respect to the farmers in his own section of Ontario. No doubt, eighteen out of twenty farmers to-day are obliged to depend on the sale of their coarse grains, and anything that entered into competition with them would prove injurious to the farmers. The hon. gentleman further said:

Not only through the summer would they have to wait, but through the fall and winter, some six months, and in the meantime, feed their cattle a very large amount of what means money before they could get a return. I believe that eighteen out of every twenty farmers are obliged to depend upon the sale of their coarse grains, and anything coming into competition with these coarse grains in our market, must be detrimental to the Canadian farmers. Just in proportion as a man becomes a feeder of cattle, like the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who feeds a hundred head of cattle per year, becomes antagonistic to the interests of the great majority of Canadian farmers.

I hold that any one has done a good service if he has been able to convince the farmers that the purchasing and feeding of stock

constitutes a remunerative business. The statement presented to the House by that hon. gentleman respecting the condition of Ontario farmers was given undoubtedly in a moment of weakness, when he did not expect it would be turned against himself at a future time. Another argument he presented was this: He stated that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) had alleged that the Government have spent large sums of money, more than all the manufacturers had brought into the country during a number of years. But the hon. gentleman ought to have been sufficiently honest to have shown the connection in which this language was used by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). That hon. member showed that the per capita tax on the people was much larger than that imposed by the Mackenzie Government, that the per capita tax amounted to \$3.40 from 1873 to 1877, and from 1880 to 1892, \$4.77, and the hon. member made a calculation showing that, during the latter five years, the Government had taken out of the pockets of the people, for the purpose of governing this country, \$26,100,000, for which they had made no adequate return. Further, that calculation was a fair and honest one, because it took the per capita tax and included the increase of population. The hon. gentleman further showed that the per capita tax from 1888 to 1892 was \$4.77, and that it amounted, during each year, calculating the population at 4,750,000, to \$6,317,000, which, for three years, gives a total of \$31,587,000. He went on to show that, during those ten years, no less than \$57,687,500 had been taken out of the pockets of the people by the present Government more than the Government of Mr. Mackenzie would have taken out of the treasury, if they had remained in power and had conducted public affairs in the same honest and economical manner they adopted from 1873 to 1877. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) never attempted to show that the argument of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) was not a fair statement of the facts, as laid down by him to the House with respect to the per capita taxation and the amount of the Government expenditure. We have heard much during this debate with respect to the condition of the country, and, for the first time, we have the Minister of Finance admitting that there is a considerable amount of uneasiness, and that this uneasiness is pervading all classes. I am glad to know the hon. gentleman has come to that conclusion, and that this uneasiness has been brought to his notice. I shall, however, attempt to show that a very false estimate prevails as to the prosperity of Ontario farmers. If I can show that the farmers of the Dominion, especially those of Ontario, are obliged to pay as much to produce the products which have been, of late, exported in large quantities, as they obtained, I shall establish the fact that the trade is not a paying one, and that the

farmers are not in a prosperous condition. The agitation against the present duties is not confined to Reformers, but is taken part in by Conservatives. The Central Farmers' Institute recently passed a resolution to this effect:

Resolved, that this institute composed of farmers representing every electoral district in Ontario, memorializes the Dominion Government and asks them to allow all goods manufactured in Britain to be imported into Canada free of duty.

I am happy to say that the farmers in Ontario are becoming alive to their own interests. I was much pleased to see the other day a deputation from the Patrons of Industry at the capital. They came here under instructions to ask the Government to reduce the duty on coal oil, binding twine and corn, and to pass a law to prevent any combination raising prices beyond fair rates. At the Farmers' Institute, a Conservative spoke plainly and gave his views to the Government. I now call the attention of the Minister of Finance to his statement. The gentleman is Mr. Torrance, reeve of Stanley, and he is reported in the "Empire" to have spoken as follows:—

He thought that the duties imposed on imports were a hardship upon the Canadian consumer. The farmers should not look to Washington or any foreign capital, for relief, but should apply to Ottawa to have the embargoes upon foreign manufacturers removed. He thought that if the Government took such a step the country would at once commence to advance with great strides.

My friend thought the mouldering branches were going to be stripped, and the protection tree left pretty bare; but by this time he will have found that the reduction simply amounts to the removal of a very small twig in the shape of the reduction on binding twine from 25 to 12½ per cent, and a reduction in the duty on coal oil by the amount of one cent per gallon, and I suppose to remove the inspection fee altogether, but about that I am not certain. I was astounded to hear the Finance Minister state the other day that, after examining the coal oil question very closely, he had come to the conclusion that the protection for the coal oil refiners had amounted to something like 2 cents a gallon. Let me tell the hon. gentleman what I pay for coal oil myself. I buy it by the barrel because we use a large quantity in the house and stables, and we get it at wholesale prices, but I have to pay 24 cents a gallon for it in Seaford, and an oil manufacturer has shown me conclusively that this protection amounts to something like 134 per cent. I yet hope that the hon. gentleman will take into consideration the prayer of the petition presented by the Patrons of Industry in Ontario. They are a respectable and a numerous body in that province. They have 2,000 lodges, with something like fifty members in each, so that we have 100,000 Patrons of Industry in Ontario, all asking for tariff reform. I tell

the Government that if they ignore the petition of these gentlemen that they will find during next election that these gentlemen have been watching them very closely. I was rather surprised and amused to hear the Finance Minister, the other evening, ask the leader of the Opposition to come out of the bush and to define his policy and defend it. Why, Sir, the statement of the Finance Minister itself shows that the policy of the leader of the Opposition is approved all over the country to-day. The Finance Minister stated that, together with the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, he would go through the country and interview the manufacturers. Evidently the manufacturers hold more of the trade destinies of this country in their hands, according to his view, than the Government itself, and so they will be asked to give the Government an idea of what their policy should be. The hon. gentleman also said that they would interview the farmers. That is the first time I ever heard them admit that the farmers of Canada were not flourishing under the National Policy; because, if they are going to interview the farmers, they must feel that the farmers are aggrieved and are not so prosperous as we have been led to believe by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Finance Minister also told us that charlatans and agitators went amongst the farmers and told them that the National Policy was the cause of the low prices in grain, and that this statement was not correct. Let me ask if the hon. gentleman himself ever makes a statement which is not thoroughly accurate. Does he ever make a statement to mislead the people of this country? Let me read this language to the House, and then they will be able to judge. He says:

The idea of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) of preferential trade relations between all parts of the Empire, one which in its intrinsic worth and in favour of reciprocity ought not to be laughed at and cannot be scouted even though its accomplishment be years in the future. It was an idea which had its ground-work in a thought which was wider than the interests of any one country, and was replete with the leaven of grandeur. If it could be brought about it would be the finest and noblest idea that has been concentrated into action since the world began. And it would be well for Canada and every British country to hold the strongest position in preparation for its public achievement. Canada and other colonies were pledged to preferential tariff.

Did the hon. gentleman pledge Canada during the time he was in England last, or when was Canada pledged, or how was Canada pledged? That is something I would like to know. I was not aware before that Canada had been in any way pledged to preferential duties. I knew that the people of Canada were free to adopt their own tariff, but I never knew that they were pledged to retain their present tariff against English goods unless the British Government gives us, as a colony, a preferential tariff on our goods going into the British

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

market, as against foreign goods. He goes on:

And there was a growing sentiment in its favour in the old country, where it has to meet the prejudice of a half century of economic teaching.

Now, Sir, let us see how far this grand idea has spread in the old country. I hold in my hand the following taken from the Ottawa "Citizen" of February 5th, 1893:

SALISBURY ON TARIFF WAR.

London, Feb. 4.—Lord Salisbury opened the Liverpool electric railway to-day. Accompanied by the Earl of Lathom and Lord Kelvin, the mayor of Liverpool, and the directors of the railroad, his Lordship entered a train and passed along the line. The train ran smoothly at the rate of twenty-two miles an hour. Crowds of spectators thronged the route and occasionally cheered. Afterwards, at the Liverpool town hall, in replying to an address from the Chamber of Commerce, Lord Salisbury referred to the increased difficulties with which the British merchants had to contend in the way of foreign competition. Lord Salisbury said that a tariff on corn was absolutely outside of the dreams of any politician. He questioned both the morality and expediency of the use of tariffs as a weapon against other nations, and mentioned as an instance in illustration of his argument, the fiscal wars between France and Italy, and France and Switzerland, as producing disaster to all concerned. Lord Salisbury defended the colonial extension of English rule. The whole world, he said, was benefited by British colonization, and should other nations obtain the colonies they might not use them in the same generous manner as the English, but they might fence them round with a wall of brass against English commerce.

When Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Opposition in England at the present time, gives utterance to such a statement, he must be a long way behind our friend the Finance Minister here. He does not see this grand idea of the Canadian Finance Minister. It will take a good deal of economic teaching, and I do not doubt but it will be necessary for the Finance Minister, and for the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to go across the ocean once or twice more to educate the statesmen of England up to the condition of taking up this question and dealing with it. Now, Sir, we have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite time and again in this House about how prosperous the farmers in this country are. There is one argument we can use with respect to the prosperity of the farmer, and it is this: If the farmers have been producing at a loss, if the crops they have been raising have not been paying the amount that has been spent in their production—and I am positive they have not—then the country must be rather in a bad condition. I will give a few facts to prove this. I may mention that the prices which I am about to quote are taken from the Seaforth "Expositor" for the month of December, and they were the ruling prices in the markets for grain at that time; and the cost of production is taken from a table in the Sessional Papers of the province of Ontario for the year 1887.

STATEMENT of cost of production and value of grain raised in Ontario in 1892.

	Fall Wheat.	Spring Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Peas.
Bushels per acre.....	21	12½	24½	34½	18½
Price per bushel.....	\$ 0 62	0 62	0 32	0 28	0 50
Cost of production per acre.....	\$ 19 43	15 50	14 83	14 78	15 47
Value per acre.....	\$ 13 02	7 88	7 84	9 47	9 37
Loss per acre.....	\$ 6 41	7 62	6 99	5 04	5 10
Total product, acres.....	966,522	651,302	499,225	1,861,469	774,732
Total loss.....	\$ 6,185,405	4,962,921	2,489,582	9,381,803	3,751,133
Value of straw per acre.....	\$ 2 95	2 66	2 87	3 60	2 44
Value of grain and straw per acre.....	\$ 15 97	10 94	10 70	13 34	11 81
Net loss per acre.....	\$ 3 46	4 96	4 13	1 44	3 66
Total net loss.....	\$ 3,344,269	3,230,457	2,061,779	2,680,515	2,835,519

We find, as the result of this calculation, that, last year, there was a total loss to the farmers of Ontario, on the value of these crops, as compared with the cost of production, of \$26,970,844; or, allowing them the value of their straw, a loss of \$14,152,539. Now, Mr. Speaker, I need not say to you that there is not an industry in the province of Ontario that could have stood the strain that the industry of agriculture has stood for a number of years past. This industry has been taxed to the very utmost. Wherever there is an industry in which the cost of production exceeds the amount received for the goods produced, it is impossible that that industry can be in a healthy condition. Now, Sir, lest it should be supposed that my statement is not correct, I will fall back upon an authority that I do not believe will be disputed by a single gentleman in this House. I will fall back upon a statement given by the Ontario statistician, Mr. Blue, of the cost of producing fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats and peas for the years from 1885 to 1889. He gives the cost of production and the quantity produced per acre, and he shows that, between those years, the annual loss per acre, on the fall wheat, was \$3.77; on spring wheat, \$4.15; on barley, \$1; on oats, \$3.32; on peas, \$3.92, and on corn, \$4. These are statements that cannot be set aside, and, in the face of them, how can any one say that the farmers of the province of Ontario are in a prosperous condition? Nor is this condition of affairs peculiar to the province of Ontario. Here is a statement taken from a Conservative paper, the Seaforth "Sun," in 1891, showing that in the state of Michigan, in 1889, it cost \$18,200,000 to produce wheat which was valued at \$16,728,000, or a loss of \$1,471,000. It also shows that the total cost of the corn crop in the state of Michigan, in the same year, was \$12,269,000 and its value \$7,254,000, a loss to the farmers of Michigan, on that one crop, of \$5,014,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite may tell us that the farmers are not as well off in the state of Michigan and other states of

the Union as they are in the province of Ontario to-day; but we are told that the National Policy would increase the price of grains for the farmers of this country. Now, according to the statements I have made, the total acreage, in the province of Ontario, of the grains that I have mentioned was 4,753,000 acres. The total number of farms in Ontario containing one hundred acres is something like 215,000, and there are 21,000,000 acres of occupied land in that province, which would give some 215,000 farms of one hundred acres each, allowing 895 acres to go for waste land upon which grain cannot be raised. The average cleared land upon each farm in Ontario, according to the Bureau of Industries, is fifty-two acres, and supposing that each farm has twenty-two acres of grain, the statement I have made shows a loss of \$66 to each farmer annually. But supposing each farm had forty-four acres of grain, the loss would be \$132 per year. With respect to the prices of grain, I hold that the promises to the farmers have not been fulfilled. Although we are told by the hon. member for North Grey to-day that the National Policy has given us a market of over 12,000,000 bushels of grain annually, and that the farmers of Ontario had been benefited to that amount. I beg to differ from him, and I want the hon. gentleman to give a fair solution of the statement I am about to give. My statement is this: In 1887 oats were 11 cents per bushel higher in Toronto than in Chicago. In 1878, they were 8 cents higher. I found that in 1877 there were over 8,000,000 bushels of Indian corn brought into Canada and consumed; in 1878 there were over 7,000,000 of bushels imported into and consumed in Canada. When I come to 1880, a year after the National Policy had been imposed, I find that oats were only 6½ cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. In 1881 they were only 2 cents higher, and yet only 2,000,000 bushels of grain came into Canada in that year against 8,000,000 in 1878. While oats were 11 cents higher in Chicago

in 1878, they were only 2 cents higher in 1881, showing conclusively that the coarse grains of the farmers of Ontario are not in prices of wheat. I have given it to this country free. Let me take a statement from the abstract of 1886 with respect to the prices of wheat. I have given it to this House before, but it will stand giving again. It is such an awful example of what the National Policy has done to the farmers of the Dominion. I find that wheat in Montreal was \$1.33 per bushel in 1881, and in New York \$1.11 per bushel, or 22 cents higher in Montreal than in New York; and remember that 1881 was just after the National Policy had fairly commenced to make its influence felt in this country. In 1882, wheat was \$1.30 in Montreal and \$1.18 in New York. In 1883, it was \$1.14 in Montreal and \$1.12 in New York. In 1884, it was \$1.05 in Montreal and \$1.06 in New York. In 1885, it was 93 cents in Montreal and 86 cents in New York. In 1886, it was 85 cents in Montreal and 87 cents in New York. Mark that during those six years, while wheat had fallen 24 cents per bushel in the United States, under the influence of this blessed National Policy, it had fallen 48 cents in Canada. That was giving the farmers of this country protection with a vengeance, and that is continuing at the present time. I have quotations here taken from the "Evening Mail," of 19th January, 1892, of grain in Buffalo and Toronto:—

	Buffalo.	Toronto.	Difference in favour of Buffalo.
Spring wheat.....	\$1.00½	87½ cts.	13 cts.
Fall wheat.....	99	91½ "	7½ "
Oats.....	40	34½ "	5½ "
Barley.....	89	50 "	39 "

I have taken the "Mail" during the last few years, and have culled from it a statement of the prices of grain in Toronto and Buffalo, and I find that fall wheat was 10 cents higher per bushel in Buffalo than in Toronto; spring wheat also 10 cents higher, barley 36 cents higher, and oats 5 cents higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. Now, let me show what amount of money the Canadian farmer is losing through not having access to that market. On 966,522 acres of fall wheat he lost \$2,029,696; on spring wheat he lost \$814,127, and on barley \$4,403,166, compared with the American farmer. On oats he lost \$3,332,000, or in all there was a difference between what the Canadian and the American farmer received, taking the amount of grain raised in the province of Ontario, of \$10,579,217. This is what the National Policy has done for Canada, and I fear not to state that if we had reciprocity with the United States the markets of that country and those of Ontario would be equalized within a very short time, and the farmers on the other side of the line would not have the advantage they now enjoy over the farmers of Ontario. Let me just go over a few articles sold by the ordinary farmer in Ontario, which he can easily sell off a hundred

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

acres of land annually, and on which he has to pay duties before he can bring them into the United States. The duties on these going into the United States are as follows:—

1 horse.....	\$30 00
20 lambs at 75 cts. each.....	15 00
60 lbs. of wool.....	7 20
200 bushels of barley.....	72 00
200 bushels of wheat.....	20 00
300 dozens of eggs.....	9 00
200 bushels of oats.....	10 00
5 tons of hay.....	20 00
100 bushels of potatoes.....	25 00

and although we have been told that we have supplemented the market we lost in barley by putting peas in their stead, let me state that we have lost on peas. The United States purchased our peas before the McKinley Bill, but now they put a duty of 40 cents a bushel on peas, so that we lose \$40 on 100 bushels. On 20 barrels of apples at 75 cents per barrel we lose \$15, making a total loss of \$263. There is a loss of \$263 to the Canadian farmer in placing that quantity of goods upon the American market as compared with his American neighbour. Now, we have been told that the Canadian farmer pays no duty. Why, Sir, let me enumerate a few articles that the Canadian farmer will purchase. On binding twine, say 80 pounds, \$2.50; barb wire, 5000 pounds, \$7.70; coal oil, 20 gallons, \$2; boots and shoes, \$40 worth, for a family, at 25 per cent duty, \$10; agricultural implements, \$1,000 for a farm, would represent \$30 a year. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this is too large an amount to be paid for implements upon a common farm in Ontario; but let me state, Mr. Speaker, that the amount spent for agricultural implements upon the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa is between \$6,000 and \$7,000, and it was commenced only some three or four years ago. So I do not think \$1,000 for implements upon an ordinary farm too much. A set of implements will last only ten years, so that the duty upon them represents \$30 a year. Now, the farmer must pay 75 cents a barrel on flour ground out of his own wheat, because the miller takes his wheat at the market price, and gives him flour at the market price. He will use six barrels a year, so that the duty he pays is \$4.50. Then take cotton goods, upon which he will pay a duty of, say \$5—so you have a total of \$61 upon these articles. Between his purchases being increased by \$61 and his losses on his sales as I have shown, there is a loss of \$320 a year to the Canadian farmer, which he would not suffer if he had unrestricted trade with the United States. Now, let me say that I do not believe he would benefit to the whole extent of that sum, but I am quite positive that over \$150 a year would go into the pocket of every farmer upon a good fair 100-acre farm in the province of Ontario if we had reciprocity with the United States. Now, let me compare the condition of the farmer with that of the workingman. We have had a good deal said about the workingman. Let me say that

R

one reason why the population of the province of Ontario are gathering into the towns and cities and leaving the agricultural districts is that the farmers of the province are not able, under present conditions, to hire the help upon the farm that they would like to do, and let me say that if it were not for the industry, frugality and economy practised by the farmers they could not have stood the enormous strain which has been put upon them within the last few years. Why, Sir, the hired man is in a better position than the farmer at the end of the year. The average wage of a young man hired by the year is \$158. We will give the \$58 to keep him in clothing. What does he pay to the Government upon that? He has to pay not less than \$20 duty upon the clothing he wears. Then he has \$50 to take a little pleasure trip and enjoy himself, and he has \$50 to the good at the end of the year, which is more than the majority of farmers in the province of Ontario have to-day. The average man with a family has a wage of \$257 a year. Most of the men with families have a house, they get a cow kept and they have fire wood and a garden, so that, in reality, most of them will receive as good as \$300 a year. Still, I do not envy the workmen in the province of Ontario, with a wife and large family, to be supported out of \$300 a year. It will cost him over \$90 for clothing for the average family, and he will pay over \$30 duty upon that clothing and other necessary articles for the use of his family. That is the condition of the workmen in Ontario when compared with the farmers of the province. Now, Sir, we are advocating free corn to come into the province of Ontario. Free corn would be a great blessing to the farmers of this province. I know whereof I speak; I know that free corn would not injure the farmer in the sale of his coarse grains. I am convinced, and the farmers are convinced, that free corn would be a boon, and I am glad that this is one of the articles the Patrons of Industry ask the Government to remove the duty from. For a number of years we asked to have the duty on corn removed, or at least that the farmer should be placed upon a footing of equality with the distillers, and have a rebate upon the corn fed to cattle exported out of this country. I am not aware whether the rebate is still paid to distillers upon the corn used in distilling liquor which is sent out of this country. In 1892, 1,865,000 bushels of corn came into Canada for consumption. Now, into Great Britain during that year there was imported 86,875,000 bushels from all countries. From the United States Britain imported 46,453,000 bushels of corn; from Canada 2,049,000 bushels, which came from the United States and which was sent to the old country. Now, Sir, into Great Britain 642,000 cattle were imported from all countries. From Canada 107,000 were imported; from the United States 384,000. The Canadian farmer has to meet in the markets

of the old country the British farmer and the American farmer, who have both free corn, and thus the Canadian farmer is placed at a great disadvantage with his competitors. Let me refer you, Sir, to the statement of a large cattle buyer in Toronto lately. That gentleman stated that cattle from the United States that had been fed upon corn in going into the British market, weighed 100 pounds on the hoof more than cattle coming from Canada fed on softer grains. If the farmer could sell 200 bushels of barley at 64 cents per bushel he would have \$128. For this he could purchase 290 bushels of corn at 44 cents. That would give him 290 bushels of feed, eight pounds to the bushel better than the barley. I am positive this would give relief to the farmers of the province of Ontario and would do more to improve their position in the market of the old country than anything else would. I have here another statement showing that when in Toronto fat cattle were selling on 30th January, 1893, at 4½ cents, in Chicago the price was 5 to 6 cents, and, for shippers, from 4.70 to 5.70 cents, being higher than our Canadian beef cattle were selling for at that time. And yet we are told the Canadian farmers are protected against the importation of cattle, hogs and sheep from the United States. No greater fallacy was ever imposed upon the people of this country than to say that we have protection against the cattle coming from the United States. Why, Sir, if we had a free market and free ingress and egress to and from the United States to ship our cattle to the English market, we would be in much a better position. During 1891-92 cattle were being shipped from Boston for 25s. and 26s. per head, while we were paying 66s., and as high as 70s. per head. Thus we are placed at a disadvantage in every respect. Free corn would certainly give us relief, and let me say again that this has been shown by experiment. The same was shown with respect to pork by the experiment made in the Ontario Experimental Farm, when the corn fed pork shrunk only 14 per cent from the live animal to the dressed meat. Pea meal, 17 per cent; barley and middlings, 15.6. The corn and pea meal were equal in fairness to the barley, showing conclusively that corn is one of the best grains that we can get to feed in the province of Ontario, and that it would be a great benefit to our farmers, if we could get free corn. Now, with respect to binder twine, I am not going to say a great deal. I will repeat what I said in the debate a few days ago, and that is, that in the province of Ontario, while last year we put into the Treasury \$7,932, we paid over to the cordage companies, \$194,755. For \$1 that went into the Treasury, \$22 were taken out of the pockets of the farmers. Binder twine will have to come down in price, not by reason of the action of the Government, but in spite of their action. I see by the papers to-day that the Government of the province of Ontario are turning out binder twine in the

Central Prison, Toronto, at a cost of 9 cents per pound. They cannot produce it at present as cheaply as they will be able to do by and by, for the reason that the prisoners are not yet adpets at the work, and it requires some time for them to get a knowledge of the industry, which will enable them to produce the article at the lowest possible price. In the county of Huron, the farmers paid \$8,673 for binder twine, of which only about \$300 went into the Treasury. That is a very large tax indeed upon the farmers. I have a statement here drawn up by a manufacturing company of binder twine in Philadelphia, dated 29th July, 1891 :

To Messrs. Keyle and Barrell Nutshell.

DEAR SIRS, --At the request of Messrs. Coon Bros. & Co., of this city, we mail you samples of binder twine as follows :--

Standard mixed, sisal and manila, 7½ cents per lb. ; mixed russian, all free on board at Philadelphia, 7½ cents, less 2 per cent for cash in car lots. We shade these prices ½c. per pound. These are very low prices, and the reason is the lateness of the season.

The rate from Philadelphia, 28 cents in car lots ; 41 cents for less.

Hoping to be favoured with an order.

JOHN F. BAILEY & CO.

There is a statement showing that binder twine, in 1891, could have been laid down in the province of Ontario at some 8 cents per pound, paying freight, because that amounted to quite a cent per pound, and 41 cents for less than car loads. Here is another statement dated 8th January, 1892, from a manufacturing firm in Belfast :

BELFAST, 8th January, 1891.

Our to-day's prices are as under :--

Manila binder twine, about 650 feet per pound, 5d. per pound.

Sisal binder twine, about 550 feet per pound, 4d. per pound.

Free on board at Liverpool. Payment by 90 days sight draft net or less 2 per cent discount for cash against documents.

These are the prices at which binder twine could have been laid down in the province of Ontario in 1891. The farmers in the province of Ontario were paying 14 and 15 cents for binder twine, and, during the last year, binder twine cost me 13 cents per pound for what it took to bind my crops. So we find that we have not to thank the Government to-day for the reduction on binder twine, because circumstances have almost compelled them to reduce the duty from 25 per cent to 12½. They are also manufacturing binder twine in Brantford, and the very company that is manufacturing in Brantford, backed up by the Patrons of Industry, are asking the Government to-day to remove the duty, because they believe they can manufacture binder twine as cheaply as any company in the world. Now, as to the duty upon iron. In 1878 the product was about 16,000 tons ; in 1890 it had gone up to something like 21,000 tons. The duty of \$4 per ton yielded \$86,800, and the bounty of \$2 per ton amounted to \$43,400, so that \$130,200

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

went into the pockets of the iron manufacturers of Canada during that year. Let me say that we have not increased the output to any great extent, and the duty upon iron is a grievous burden, not only upon the farmers but upon the manufacturers of agricultural implements. Let me show the duties upon some of the articles. Upon barbed wire we pay 1½ cents per pound, and there is a duty of nearly 50 per cent on the cost of the barbed wire. Upon scythes we pay 70 per cent, upon hay knives 70, and upon spades 50. A large number of agricultural implements come into Canada. Now, I will give you the opinion of an iron manufacturer in Canada as to the effect of the duty upon iron, both as it affects the manufacturers of agricultural implements, and the farmers :

Take pig iron for instance, which is very largely used, and it will show the position of the Canadian manufacturers :--

One ton of 2,240 lbs. costs at furnace in United States.....	\$9 15
Duty on 2,240.....	4 48

It will be seen that the duty is 48 per cent on the price paid for the iron, while the duty on agricultural implements coming into Canada is 35 per cent. Now, how does this operate when the United States manufacturer sends his goods into Canada? The iron for his machines is bought from the same smelting furnaces, and at the same price that the Canadian manufacturer pays. Both manufacturers buy a large portion of the stock in the early fall, but as the machines are not required until the following spring and summer, the manufacturer in the United States does not ship his machines into Canada until about the time the machines are required for use; hence the duty is not paid for at least six months after the Canadian manufacturer has paid his 48 per cent duty on the iron he has been manufacturing. Thus the Canadian manufacturer loses six months interest on the duty paid. The United States manufacturer brings his goods into Canada at 35 per cent, while our manufacturer pays 48 per cent on the raw material. To illustrate still further how our manufacturers are oppressed by the tariff, take the following :--

Pig iron, as purchased by the United States manufacturer, 1,000 tons (gross) at \$9.15 per ton	\$ 9,150 00
--	-------------

This iron is bought 1st October, and the machines shipped into Canada on 1st March, when the duty is paid.

Now we will see how it is with the Canadian manufacturer. He buys 1st October :--

1,000 tons (gross) pig iron at \$9.15 per ton.....	\$ 9,150 00
Duty on above paid 1st Oct.....	4,480 00
Interest on duty from October until March.....	274 50

Total cost for 1,000 tons of iron.....	\$13,908 50
Total cost of 1,000 tons of iron to U. S. manufacturer	9,150 00

Excess in cost of 1,000 tons of iron to Canada manufacturer.....	\$ 4,758 50
--	-------------

The above statement clearly shows that the actual cost of pig iron is 53 per cent more to the Canadian than to the American manufacturer. In the face of this 52 per cent, the United States manufacturers are permitted to bring their machines into Canada at 35 per cent, which is 17 per cent less than the Canadian has to pay for his raw material. It will be seen by this that the enormous duty on pig iron is a heavy burden to our manufacturers of farm implements, and

even a much heavier burden on our farmers, as iron enters very largely into the construction of all farm machinery and tools.

We have been told time and time again by hon. gentlemen opposite that we scarcely receive any agricultural implements from outside countries. I have examined the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find there were imported last year: 361 drills, on which a duty was paid of \$4,395, or \$12 on each machine; harrows, 146, on which a duty was paid of \$707; binders, 670, of the total value of \$65,070, on which duty was paid of \$22,774, or \$34 on each machine; ploughs, 2,033, duty \$10,499, or \$5 each; scythes, 1,005 dozen, duty \$1,655; spades and shovels, 1,084 dozen, duty \$2,679; other agricultural implements paid a duty of \$25,926. I contend that these figures prove that the Canadian farmers have to pay the cost of agricultural implements and 35 per cent duty over the price charged the United States farmers. During last fall I paid a visit to the North-west. I met Mr. Symmonds, who was coming down from Prince Albert, and who was in charge of a party of Mennonites, who were proposing to settle in the North-west. I am happy to be able to agree with the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the country around Prince Albert and Edmonton form as fine sections as any in the whole North-west. The land is unexcelled, the country is well watered, and there is plenty of timber, while in the Edmonton district fuel is abundant, and that district is certainly one of the most advantageous for settlement. The party had visited that country, having come up from Kansas. Mr. Symmonds had conducted those gentlemen through Manitoba and the North-west, intending, as I have said, to locate in Canada. They had brought a list of prices of agricultural implements and other goods in Kansas, so that they would be able to make a comparison with prices in the North-west, and Mr. Symmonds told me that on binders alone there was a difference of \$40 on the price of each machine as between the North-west and Kansas. On account of the very high duty on agricultural implements, and the lower price that our farmers receive for their grain—because they had examined into this matter and found that the farmers in southern Manitoba were receiving from 5 to 10 cents per bushel less than the farmers in North Dakota—they had decided not to come to Canada to settle, notwithstanding any statement that may be made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I now come to woollen goods. In 1870 we imported wool goods to the value of \$8,533,000; in 1882, \$10,341,000, or an increase of \$1,805,000. The duty paid in 1892 amounted to \$3,095,000. Of wool we imported in 1878 the value of \$6,230,000; 1892, \$10,224,000. That I hold to be a great injustice to the farmers of Ontario. While they have been called upon to pay 30, 40, 45, and even 60 per cent on the cost of woollen fabrics, no less than 10,224,000

pounds of wool came into Canada, duty free, thus preventing our farmers realizing the price for their wool which they should fairly obtain. There were over 900,000 pounds of wool sent to the United States market from Canada in 1892, on which we had to pay 12½ cents per pound duty. That, no doubt, involved a loss of \$659,000 to the farmers of Ontario on the price of wool alone, because during 1890 the production of wool was 5,498,000 pounds, upon which we lost 12 cents per pound on account of foreign wool being admitted into Canada duty free. We have been told a great deal in regard to reduction in the price of woollen goods, and this matter was referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I have looked into the statistics. I find according to the British trade table that from 1870 to 1874 the prices of woollen goods averaged 13½d. per yard, while the price was 9d. from 1885 to 1889. It thus appears that in Britain the price was reduced at least 50 per cent, and yet we are told that any reduction in price here on woollen goods is due to the National Policy. The cost of goods has not, however, been reduced in Canada as in Great Britain, because we have had an increase of duty on those goods from 7½ to 30 per cent. I consider that the farmers of Ontario to-day have to pay duties on woollen goods coming from the manufacturers of Canada, and the whole full price besides, and there is a small margin of 2 per cent for freight and insurance for putting Canadian goods on the Canadian market. I now come to cotton goods. In 1878 cotton goods to the value of \$7,418 entered Canada. In 1892 the value of these goods imported was \$3,992,000. Of raw cotton there were imported in 1878, 7,243,413 pounds; but in 1892 the imports reached 42,075,000 pounds. We were told to-day that there had been a marvellous reduction in the price of cotton goods in Canada. Let me point out that between 1865 and 1869 the price per 100 weight of raw cotton in Britain was £5 11s. 9d., but between 1885 and 1889 it had been reduced to £2 12s. 2d., or less than half its former price, and yet, notwithstanding this reduction, which is the real cause of the reduced price, gentlemen opposite claim credit for the reduction of the price in Canadian cotton goods. I find also that "piece goods" had fallen in Great Britain from 3.41d. per yard between 1869 and 1874 to 2½d. in 1885, which is also nearly one-half the former price. This is a greater reduction in England in the price of cotton than my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us had taken place in Canada under the National Policy. While at the present time we only take into the public treasury \$1,014,423 in duty on cotton, yet, as was shown by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) by reason of this high protective duty, \$4,000,000 went into the pocket of the cotton combines, so that for every dollar that goes into the public treasury more than \$2 goes to the cotton manufac-

turers. I quote the following as showing the state of the condition of the cotton industry in Canada to-day :

THURSDAY, 2nd February.

The local stock market showed improvement to-day and although not remarkably active seems to some extent to have got out of the rut it has been in for some days. New York and London prices were just about steady on the whole.

The cause of the improvement here is largely due to a bull movement in the cotton stocks headed by Montreal. It is understood that this company is proposing to make a new issue of stock, increasing the present capital of \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000, and the stock to be allotted to present holders in the proportion of a share for two. What the terms of the issue are is not known as yet, but it is said that the stock is to be watered to a considerable extent as was the case in the Dominion Cotton Company, to cover up the enormous profits the company have been making, which last year amounted to over 22 per cent. In order to increase their capital it will be necessary to obtain power from the Government to do so, as the present amount, \$1,000,000, is all they are authorized to have. The stock opened a full point higher at 147, and went up by leaps until 153½ was reached, which was the closing figure. On Monday it sold at 142, so that the stock had risen 11½ per cent in the last four days. The other cotton stocks were firmer in sympathy, Dominion selling ½ higher at 140, and Coloured ¾ higher at 108½.

If our cotton manufacturers are able to send goods to China and Japan to compete with the United States and Great Britain in that market, it is time there was a reduction on the cost of the goods in this country. Is it fair or just to impose such a tax on the farmers and workingmen of Canada so that our cotton companies can afford to go into foreign countries amongst the heathen Chinese and Japanese and give them goods cheaper than they are sold at in Canada? It is a slur upon civilization to say that the people of a free country can be imposed upon to such an extent, and yet that is the condition in Canada to-day with reference to cotton goods. We have been told by the Finance Minister that our markets had increased to such an enormous extent in goods going from Canada to the British market, and that whilst we had increased the export of agricultural products over \$15,000,000 during the last year or two to the British market, that it more than repaid us for the small reduction of \$2,000,000 lost in sending goods to the American market. The hon. gentleman referred to horses. I find that in 1890 we exported 16,180 horses, while in 1892 we only exported 9,261, leaving 6,982 horses in the country, calculating the value at the prices of those exported, leaving \$1,096,174 worth of horses in Canada that cannot find a market. Is it to be wondered at that all over the province of Ontario, and Quebec, too, there is a large surplus of horses upon which the farmers cannot realize, and yet we are told by the Government that they have found a paying market for us in Great Britain? Such is not the case. I have a letter from a relation of mine who takes

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

horses to the old country. His son went there last December, and he tells me that the market is so very dull in Britain that he does not think he will come out here next summer. To-day buyers are purchasing the best horses in my own county and in the neighbouring county of Perth and Stratford and taking them to the United States and paying the enormous duty. We have, therefore, lost a market for over \$1,096,000 worth of horses in the United States, and that market has not been provided elsewhere. Another item of our export trade is eggs. In 1890 we exported 12,825,000 dozen of eggs, and in 1892 only 7,931,000 of eggs, so that there were 4,894,000 dozens less exported from Canada last year than before the McKinley Bill, or representing a value in dollars amounting to \$21,000. Although the Finance Minister told us that eggs sent to the English market had realized 1½ cents more than they did in the American market, even according to his own statement those engaged in the industry in Canada, if they had not to pay 5 cents per dozen duty on eggs going into the United States, would have realized 3½ cents more per dozen if we had reciprocity, than they realized in the English market. We have been told that the Government found a market for us for pease in Britain, and that this supplants the market for barley. In 1890 we exported 9,937,000 bushels of barley, most of which went to the United States, but in 1892 we only exported 5,202,000 bushels, or 4,736,977 bushels less than in 1890, or a loss of \$2,392,000. Therefore, on these three items of horses, barley and eggs, alone, the Canadian farmer for want of reciprocity with the United States, has lost a market amounting in value to \$4,210,000. It is no use for the Canadian Government to tell us that they have found a market for us in Britain, and that they are cultivating that market. We have always had the British market. We have always been sending our produce to the British market when it paid, and our farmers found that until the McKinley Bill was passed it did not pay them to send their horses, eggs and barley to the British market to any great extent. I hold our Government in a great measure responsible for the McKinley Bill. Mr. McKinley himself stated in the Congress of the United States, during the time his Bill was under discussion, that while it had been said that the Bill was a retaliatory measure against the Government of Canada for not observing their own tariff statute of 1879, and for reimposing certain duties in 1890 which they had removed in 1888, and while it was not a retaliatory measure, yet they could not forget entirely the action of the Canadian Government in that respect. Therefore, I hold that our Government are to blame for the loss of the United States market for \$4,210,341 worth of our horses, eggs and barley. Now, just let me go over a few articles that we sent to the United States in 1892, giving in each case the number or quality and the

amount of duty that we had to pay to obtain access to that market for them :

Article.	Number or Quantity.	Duty Paid.
Horses.....	9,261	\$276,830
Eggs, doz.....	3,918,015	195,900
Sheep.....	290,074	217,611
Barley, bush.....	2,721,168	816,350
Wheat, bush.....	1,489,881	247,976
Hay, tons.....	67,068	268,268
Potatoes, bush.....	135,324	33,831
Pease, bush.....	527,912	211,164
Oats, bush.....	155,947	16,594
Apples, brls.....	16,995	12,746
Total duty paid.....		\$2,296,771

Yet hon. gentlemen tell us that the American market is not the best market for the Canadian farmer for these classes of products. Now, Sir, the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, told us that he had taken off \$5,821,422 of taxation, every cent of which would have come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. But he told us also that this amount of taxation was taken off goods that were not manufactured in Canada. That is just where we find fault with the present Government. We believe that the true policy of a Government in imposing tariff taxation is to impose it for revenue purposes only, and for that reason duties ought to be imposed upon goods not manufactured in the country, and not for such goods as iron, where, perhaps, \$2 comes out of the pocket of the farmer for every one that goes into the Treasury; not on binding twine, where \$22 comes out of the pocket of the farmer for every one dollar that goes into the Treasury; not on cotton goods, where for every dollar that goes into the Treasury, \$2 goes to the combines; not on sugar, where over \$2,000,000 goes into the pockets of the refiners and only \$75,000 goes into the Treasury, or in reality where for every dollar that goes into the Treasury, at least \$25 goes into the pockets of the refiners, on the calculation of 70 pounds per capita which was given by the Finance Minister. Now, Sir, we have heard a great deal about the misery that exists in the United States. We have heard about the great distress that exists in the state of Northern Dakota. Well, I have a quotation here from the Ottawa "Citizen" of 4th April, 1892, with respect to the measure of prosperity that prevails in certain states of the Union. It is a good Conservative paper, and, therefore, its statements must be true. We have never heard anything from hon. gentlemen opposite about the United States except blue ruin; and yet this is what the "Citizen" says:

The following taken from the Breeders Gazette relative to the movement of the farming community of Illinois will be of interest. The farmers, like ours are going west and leaving their farms, but not quite for the same reason as applies in Canada:—The following reports from counties in Central Illinois, from which farmers are moving west, clearly shows that the cause of this exodus is the enhanced value of farm-

ing lands in this state. From Bloomington comes the following. The hegira of farmers from McLean County and other portions of Central Illinois, which set in earnest about a year ago, continues this year in even more remarkable proportions than anticipated. It set in this immediate vicinity with the emigration last year of some 30 families in the neighbourhood of Heyworth, who nearly all located upon lands about Webster City, Ia. The high price of land and the advancing rents for farm acres in Central Illinois are the impelling forces which have set in motion this wholesale departure of agriculturists for Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, and also for portions of Indiana and Southern Illinois, where land is cheaper. Within the last four years farm land in McLean County has advanced in price at least 40 per cent. This year the sales of land have been unusually numerous, prices ranging from \$80 to as high as \$110 an acre. While farming pays a fair profit even at these prices for land, holders here have concluded that by selling out their possessions at the prices which they can now obtain and emigrating with their cash and stocks to states where lands are from 40 to 60 per cent cheaper, they can do better. Many of this class have realized 100 per cent profit or even more upon their investment in lands in a region within a few years, and besides have accumulated heavy bank accounts from the profits of farming and stock raising.

Now, Sir, let me give you a quotation from a farmer who left the county of Huron and went to the province of Manitoba to settle:

To read some of the papers of Manitoba a person would be led to believe that Dakota must be nearly depopulated and impoverished, while Manitoba is the reverse. However, we have our own ideas about that part of it and would like to ask why, if that country is so much better off than ours, do they not get as good a price for their grain and also why North Dakota is flooded with labouring men from Manitoba nearly every harvest. In one of the Manitoba papers of a recent issue I saw an item from a small town where barley was selling for 13 cents a bushel, but had risen two cents. In Langdon, at the same time, barley was selling for from 24 to 34 cents a bushel, and, at the same time, oats that were selling in Manitoba for 16 and 18 cents, were being sold in Langdon for 23 cents. Wheat has also been selling from 5 to 10 cents a bushel higher here than in Manitoba, till the last two weeks, when the millers of that country raised the price about 5 cents, which will not benefit the farmers much, as they have a very small share of wheat on hand now, and I have no doubt if there was a large amount of wheat held by farmers, the price would have remained as it was. Last harvest there were plenty of men came from Manitoba and worked with farmers around here. I had the pleasure of having one myself from that famous country, and a good one he was, too. Being asked why he came here to work, he stated that there wasn't enough money over there for him. It seems as if Manitobans were jealous of any prosperity in Dakota, and try all they can to hurt and keep us from going ahead. One paper, the Manitoba *Free Press*, had the gall to say that Manitoba hard wheat was worth more in Liverpool than Dakota hard wheat was, as if an imaginary line would make a difference in the wheat of Manitoba and Dakota.

Let me state that I have never believed in a country building up its own character or reputation upon the misfortunes of another; and, while I admit the North-west is an excellent country, a country far beyond North Dakota for settlers, let me state that as long as the Government pursue the policy they

are now pursuing, it will be impossible for them to get settlers to go there. We have heard a great deal about the exodus. According to the census returns, 440,000 native Canadians have left Canada and gone to the United States from 1881 to 1891. I wonder if any gentleman in this House understands the whole meaning of this. I have taken the province of Ontario and the towns and cities in Ontario, and I find that their population is as follows:—

Toronto.....	181,220
Hamilton.....	48,980
Ottawa.....	44,154
London.....	31,977
Kingston.....	19,264
Brantford.....	12,753
Guelph.....	10,539
Windsor.....	10,322
Belleville.....	9,914
Peterborough.....	9,717
Stratford.....	9,510
St. Catharines.....	9,170
Chatham.....	9,052
Brockville.....	8,793
Woodstock.....	8,612
St. Thomas.....	10,370
Galt.....	7,535
Total.....	441,882

There is only a population in all these cities of Ontario of 441,882. Think of the devastation that has taken place by the emigration of the best blood of the Dominion! Why, the statement was made long ago that every man coming to this country was worth at least \$1,000! If that be the case, what must have been our loss through the young men who have left us and gone to the United States? Calculate that number of individuals at \$1,000 each, and you have a loss to the Dominion of \$440,000,000, according to the estimate which came from that side of the House, that every immigrant was worth \$1,000 to Canada. Let us see how that would affect the rural districts. Ontario is divided into ten districts. Take two of those districts comprising Bruce, Huron, Middlesex, Essex, Elgin, Bothwell, Lambton and Norfolk, and in these, the two most populous districts of Ontario, we have a population of only 450,000, so that, had the exodus been entirely from those two districts, it would leave them with only 10,000 of a population, or we have an exodus only 10,000 short of the population of these two districts. It is painful to think of the effect the National Policy has had on the Dominion. Now, the Government tell us it is not the National Policy which has had this effect, but the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me show from a source that cannot be doubted the opinion of gentlemen who came to this country to examine into its capabilities and report what kind of a field Canada would be for immigration, the effect which the National Policy has had on this country. I refer to the report of the tenant farmer, Mr. McQueen, who, after going through the Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

country and giving his impressions, concluded thus:

I must now give the conclusions I have formed from an emigration point of view, of the capabilities and resources of the Maritime provinces. Any one reading my report will have some idea of what they are. I may here say my co-delegate and I held exactly the same views, and came to the same conclusions regarding the state of the country. As many former delegates to Canada and the Maritime provinces have given such glowing, and I think rather misleading and overdrawn reports of the country, it places me in a delicate and unenviable position to be compelled to do the reverse. I cannot say anything derogatory of the resources and capabilities of the provinces: they are great, and capable of great development, particularly the mineral. But facts prove that agriculture or farming has for a number of years, but more clearly since the McKinley Bill came into operation, been on the down grade and in a very depressed state. Nearly all the young people are leaving the old folks on their farms and going to the States. Land consequently is badly farmed and getting run down, houses and buildings in many instances falling out of repair. Any number of farms can be purchased at very low figures, often at less than the houses and buildings on them cost. A large number of farms are heavily mortgaged. The output of coal is increasing very slowly, and the iron industry is not developing as it ought to do. The census returns issued some months ago showed that the increase of population in the Maritime provinces during the last ten years was very small, not at all commensurate with the natural increase of population and the number of emigrants coming into the provinces. The questions naturally arise: What is the cause of this depression? And can I recommend farmers, labourers or artisans to emigrate to the Maritime provinces? In answer to the first question, from my own observation and from all I could hear and learn, it is from the want of better trade relations with the United States, the natural market for the surplus produce. Some may say you have nothing to do with the question—it is out of your province and touches on politics; but I hold it so closely associated with our mission and the object of our report that we are bound to bring it forward. In answer to the second question, as to recommending emigrants to go to the Maritime provinces, until there is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, so that farmers would have a better market and be able to command higher prices for their produce, I must decidedly say "No." In coming to this conclusion I may say I went to the provinces unbiassed and unprejudiced, and have endeavoured to give an honest and just report.

(Sd.) JOHN McQUEEN.

Oakwood, Selkirk, Scotland, Jan. 18th, 1892.

The same gentleman sent a letter to the "North British Agriculturist," published in Scotland, in answer to a correspondence in that paper, and in that letter he states that he believes the policy pursued by the Government of the Dominion will drive the people of Canada into annexation. Here are the feelings and views of a gentleman who came out here with nothing but the best wishes for the Dominion, and who has given his views of the results of the Government policy as he found them. What he has said with respect of the Maritime provinces, hold good with respect to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, as regards our trade relations with the United States, and it holds good also with

respect to our North-west Territories. When in British Columbia, in conversation with a number of gentlemen there, I asked them what their views were with respect to the trade question, and I was told that they had no feeling in common with eastern Canada, so far as trade was concerned, that their whole interests lay in having trade relations with the United States. There was a statement made with respect to loan companies in the province of Ontario. I went to the "Statistical Record," and I found the statement of loan companies from 1882. In that year they had \$68,025,000 loaned on mortgages. In 1886 they had \$84,573,000, and in 1890 this had risen to \$105,532,000. That shows that, while there was only \$16,000,000 of increase in the four years from 1882 to 1886, there was an increase of \$31,000,000 from 1886 to 1890, showing that the people of this country are not in the same prosperous condition they have been in the past. If the present Government hold the reins of power for a short time longer, I am satisfied they will find that, perhaps not three-quarters, but at least one-half, of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada will have to give up their farms. I state what I know, when I say that the farmers of the province of Ontario never were in such a depressed condition in any time within the forty-nine years of my residence in this county. Their debts have become greater and their mortgages greater within the last few years than they were formerly. The farmers of Ontario and the workingmen of Ontario have been a long-suffering people, but the signs of times are that they are not going to suffer much longer. I believe that the organization that has been formed, will bring such pressure to bear on the Government that if they do not give us relief before another election comes around, they will find themselves occupying the benches to the left of the Speaker. The Government must feel and must know these things, and if they do not feel and do not know them, that itself is proof that their policy is made regardless of the interests of the farmers and workingmen, and proves that they are unfit to manage the affairs of this country.

Mr. BERGIN. If it were not that the hon. gentleman is here in the flesh, I might believe all the tale of desolation and poverty and decay which the last speaker says has come to the farmers of Canada. Anyone who knows that hon. gentleman, will not for a moment believe that if this country were in the state of almost destitution that he pictures, he would remain in it for twenty-four hours. His presence here is the best proof that the statements he has made with regard to the farmers of Canada are not correct. He tells us, Sir, that every interest in this country is in almost as ruinous a condition as that of the agriculturist. He pictures to us the sad condition, not only of the farmer, but of the working classes,

and he went over a long list of the articles which are used by the farmer and by the workingman, and which are taxed 30 to 50 and 70 per cent. I think he overlooked hardly one article that is used by these classes, nor did he fail to show from his point of view that the farmers and labourers of the country generally are taxed from 30 to 40 and 50 per cent, and in some instances I think he went as high as 1,000 per cent. Now, judging from the way in which he has condemned the tariff and the duties imposed upon these different articles, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he proposes to conduct the affairs of this country. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman how he intends to carry on government in this country. If he will not permit any article that goes into consumption in this country to be taxed, I would like to ask him how he comes to be in Parliament to-day? Because if, ever since 1878, the Government of this country had been conducted upon the principles he has laid down, we would have no Parliament, we would have no country, we would have no people. This, Sir, is the natural result of such doctrines as have been laid down by the hon. gentleman. I ought not, perhaps, to complain of the hon. gentleman, because any one who has listened to him to-night would know to which party he belonged, and would know that he is a typical member of his party, and that he is carrying out the principles of that party, which, from the day it lost power, from 1878 until to-day, has sought to degrade and destroy, if possible, the character of Canada, its people and its institutions. He has been a faithful follower of his leaders, and he has given us the party doctrine, "usque ad nauseam." This hon. gentleman tells us that he met a Mr. Symmonds, and from the description he gives of him, I should fancy Mr. Symmonds to be very much the same kind of politician as himself. I ask those who have heard the hon. gentleman to-night, what sort of information they would expect the hon. gentleman to give to Mr. Symmonds, who, he says, desired to make his home in this country. I ask what sort of a British subject Mr. Symmonds must have been, who, because he would have been obliged to pay a few dollars more for his agricultural implements, would prefer to go to the United States and live under a foreign flag to remaining in Canada and living under the British flag. But Mr. Symmonds did not tell the truth. I have here a paper edited by a Reformer, published at Edmonton, a thousand miles further away than Winnipeg, showing that the statements made by the gentleman were not true. He said that in Dakota they could buy agricultural implements, reapers, and so on, from \$40 to \$60 cheaper than they could be bought in Winnipeg, or Manitoba. This paper, "The Edmonton Bulletin," published by a Reformer, with the sole object of giving information to intending settlers, shows in its

answers to letters that were sent to the editor from the United States, that these statements are not true. This is the correspondence, with the answers given by the editor :

LETTERS OF INQUIRY.

WALLA, P. O., Grand Forks Co., N. D.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—There are several families getting ready to start for your country in the spring and we wish to know about the time it will be safe to fetch our cattle that they may live on the grass or whether the frozen prairie is all burned off or not—we would like to come as soon as possible in order to get some crops in. I hear the Beaver Lake country is all located that is any good. We intend to fetch a sawmill with us as we hear there is plenty of timber in that district. I would like to know if the Beaver Lake district is surveyed and in the market. We are all ready to come as soon as we can learn the snow is all gone so that our stock can live. Yours, etc.

GEO. G. SMITH.

REPLY.

The ground is generally bare of snow in the beginning of April sometimes sooner, and crops are sown in the latter end of that month and throughout May. The Beaver Lake country was surveyed last summer and is now open for settlement, the good land is not nearly all taken up and there is some very fine timber throughout the whole of this district—Tamarack, spruce, birch, poplar and cotton wood. There were no prairie fires in this district last summer so all the frozen grass is still under the snow. Ed.

FAIRFIELD, Spokane Co., Wash., U.S.A.

EDITOR EDMONTON BULLETIN,—There are quite a number of people in this vicinity who think of migrating to your part of the country next season. I being one of the number, from what I have read so far I think I shall like it. I should like a little more knowledge of the cost of all kinds of agricultural implements, the cost of lumber, lime, doors, windows and also prices of live stock of all kinds poultry and in fact I should like to find out the price of things generally that a farmer would likely want to buy, especially hay, oats and wheat. I have a full supply of all kinds of farming implements and stock and I want to find out whether it would be better to sell here or take them with me when I come. I should like to know as much as possible of the climate in regard to severe storms, the depth of snow, how cold it gets and whether you have severe wind storms and snow blockades. A number of neighbours have got the "Alberta fever" very much. Do you raise winter wheat or spring wheat mostly in your parts and what are wheat, oats and barley selling at now?

Hoping to hear of some of those inquiries in your valuable little paper.

I remain yours truly,

WM. F. SIEGLE,

REPLY.

The prices of implements, &c., up here are as follows :—

Now, here is what the editor says, in reply to the questions, as to the prices of these goods :

Massey-Harris binder \$155 each, time \$175 two payments; Toronto mower 4 feet 3 inches cut \$60 cash, \$70 time two payments; Sharp's rake \$30 cash, Mr. BERGIN.

\$35 time two payments; seeder, two-horse \$85 cash, \$95 time two payments; harrows, 60 steel teeth \$16 cash, \$17 time two payments; disc harrows, \$37 cash, \$43 time two payments; fanning mills \$35 cash, \$40 time two payments :

I paid \$10 for a disc harrow this summer, but that is 3,000 miles nearer by. These gentlemen were satisfied and they came into the country. Now, I do not think any one will have discovered any symptom of regret in the heart of this hon. gentleman that things have gone to ruin in Canada, that the farmers and the labourers had been reduced to such straits, because he wound up with a warm eulogium on the state of Dakota. He said the Manitobans were jealous of it, and that they could buy everything cheaper in Dakota. The inference is irresistible that the hon. gentleman's sympathies are entirely on the other side, and that if he is here it is because he cannot, perhaps, dispose of his property, for he would no doubt like to be where his heart is, in the United States.

I cannot conceive for a moment of a man who really loves Canada, whose children are born in this country, speaking of Canada as this gentleman has done, if he has any love for its Government or the flag under which he lives. In dealing with the taxation of this country, he makes misleading statements. To listen to him one would suppose that no one purchases anything in this country but goods manufactured in England, France, Germany, or some other foreign country; because, when speaking of the cost of an article, he adds to it the duty, which he magnifies very often, and is not always correct, I am sorry to say. But going before an audience who did not know whether he was telling the truth, I have no doubt that he would mislead a great many people, and lead them to think that this country was not such a country as we represent it to be. We believe that we have one of the greatest countries, if not the greatest, upon the face of the earth. We believe that we have in Canada as proud, as intellectual, as industrious a population as God ever sent upon the face of the globe. We believe we are able to hold our own with any nation under the canopy of heaven; and yet we have men getting up in this House and speaking of this country, of its people, of its commerce, as if there was nothing good within our borders. A pretty character he gives to the farmers of Ontario. Sir, he had the indecency, upon the opening of his speech to-night, to taunt my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with having slandered the farmers of this country. He said that no man on that side of the House, whatever he thought, had said that the farmers of this country were paupers or were ignorant. Why, Sir, his ears must have been closed. This sort of thing is slung across the House to us every day. Even the ex-Minister of Finance tells the people of this country that it was owing to the ignorance of the farmers that the Tories had succeeded in carrying the elections

in 1878. That is the belief of all those people on the other side now, and it is for that reason that he tells us to-day—what is not correct—that the loss of grain to the Ontario farmers, leaving out the straw, on account of protection last year, was \$22,000,000. This gentleman deals in formidable figures, his arithmetic is of an extensive character. He told us a little while ago that whilst there was a loss of \$22,000,000 on grain, we have lost, through people who had left this country, something over \$400,000,000 last year. That may be, in the estimation of that hon. gentleman, sound logic, but it sounds to me very much like bosh, and I think it will be so regarded by the people of this country. He says, too, that the labourers and the people generally are not fit for manufactures, and he finds, also, that the country is not adapted to manufactures; yet, Sir, we have made the most magnificent progress in manufactures in this country since the introduction of the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has been a failure. Well, if the National Policy has not been a failure it is not because of the honest efforts of gentlemen opposite to benefit their country; it is not because gentlemen opposite have given anything like a fair or intelligent consideration to the National Policy. The National Policy was inaugurated for the purpose of taking us out of the sad and sickening condition in which this country found itself before 1879. Why, Sir, we might go back to those days and contrast the condition of the country with its condition to-day, feeling that we did a great, a noble and a patriotic work when we initiated the National Policy. We remember that at that time trade was almost stagnant, as it was on the other side of the line. We remember that in those days we had—as my hon. friend, the other stalwart Tory from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), said last night—we had soup kitchens everywhere. We had in this province itself, not only Canadian tramps, but American tramps, filling our highways to such an extent that the farmers were afraid to go to their beds at night without thoroughly examining their barns, lest they should be burned out before morning by these tramps. All that has passed away. There is nothing in this country to-day but prosperity, except in the hearts of gentlemen opposite. It is true that hon. gentlemen say the National Policy has failed, to a certain extent. We never pretended to say to the people of this country that the National Policy was perfect, and that, as we initiated it, it would meet every change of time and of condition. What we did say was that we would endeavour to put these struggling industries upon their feet, and sustain them until they were in a condition to sustain themselves, and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we have accomplished that; but gentlemen come before this House and they ask us to do away with the duty upon binder twine; they ask us to do away with the duty upon coal oil; they ask us to do away with the duty upon agricu-

tural implements; they ask us to do away with the duty upon barbed wire, and I agree that not only should the duty be reduced on barbed wire, but barbed wire should be prohibited altogether, and a sensible wire, which will do no harm to cattle, or to horses, or to sheep, should be introduced. They ask that the duty be taken off corn. For my part I am prepared to meet the question fairly and to consider it, and if I find that the duty is onerous on any one, I am willing to have it removed from the article complained of. I am not prepared to say that to-night, or any time during this session. I shall so vote, on the contrary, I shall not vote for a reduction in the duty on any of those articles during this session. I prefer to trust the Government to trusting hon. gentlemen who in advance seek to bring up motions on many different articles so as to commit weak-kneed people, and there may be some on this side of the House, to their fallacies. They know it is not possible for them to put this tariff in a condition that will render it perfectly acceptable to the people, as the Government will be able to do. In the first place, they have not the confidence of the country, and when they have not the confidence of the people, everything they do or propose to do will be looked upon with suspicion, and people will not credit them with any desire to advance the country's interests. The men who have slandered it from the day they left office until now are not the men who have the true interests of Canada at heart and are not the men who will be trusted by honest Canadians. I think I have said all that it is necessary to say with respect to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, but I have some comments to offer in regard to the remarks that were made the other night respecting the industry which has made the little town in which I live one of the most flourishing of Canadian towns, whose people are as happy and contented, as well off and as comfortable as they can be in any town on this side of the Atlantic. Let me contrast the condition of that little town in 1878—the Factory town as it is known all over the country, Cornwall—with its condition to-day. There was no work in our town. The one cotton mill we had was not running, even at half time. Sometimes it had not cotton, and it could not run at all. The woollen mill was in very much the same condition. Trade was stagnant, it was dead. Our people were trying to get bread at home, but they could not find it. The grass grew on our streets, all because a deaf ear was turned to the different industries of the country by the Minister of Finance of that day. The people could not starve, they were determined to have bread; they drove that Government from power, and they sent me here to represent them and to vote for the National Policy. I, therefore, have taken a deep interest in the manufactures of our town. I have made it my business to become thor-

oughly acquainted with all the operations of the various industries in the town, and I am here to-night to say that the statements made with respect to the cotton industry by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) have no foundation. That hon. gentleman made a very strong speech, and I was amazed when I read it, because I felt he was entirely astray. I do not believe the hon. gentleman wilfully made the gross misstatements which are contained in that speech; I believe he was misled. I do not know whether he was misled by himself or by some one else, but, at all events, he adopted a method of calculation which could not fail to lead him into a maze, and, as a consequence, he propounded to this House a mass of absurdities with respect to the condition of that industry, which it would be difficult for him to have exceeded if he had been working at it for a year or more. That hon. gentleman's speech foreshadowed what I said a little while ago, that hon. gentlemen opposite were endeavouring, by bringing up particular industries and submitting motions and carrying them to a vote to discredit us in advance, and, if possible, prevent the Government carrying out any amendments that might be necessary to the tariff. And hon. gentlemen opposite had this further object in view, that should we, unfortunately, because I think it would be unfortunate if we took their advice on anything, for they have always been on the wrong side, take their advice and remove the duty or reduce the duty on certain articles, they would go to the country and say they compelled the Government to reduce the duties on binding twine or on coal oil or on anything else. So far as I am concerned, no such opportunity shall be given to them. I shall, as I said before, trust the Government, and not leave myself to their tender mercies. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said:

I do not think I can do better, in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, than to pass by the general considerations which might be made use of in support of his motion, and confine myself to a certain specific class of tariff reform which I think urgently demands, and has for some time demanded the attention of the Government. I think that while general considerations have great weight, they have been very well put so far in this debate, and will be still further brought forward; but we know they are very often attempted to be answered by some general assertion to the contrary, some contradiction, some perversion of the facts or figures.

I say the contradictions and perversions of facts and figures come from the gentleman who makes the attack on the cotton industry, not from this side of the House. He further said:

But I propose to bring forward to-day a sample case of tariff reform, in which I will give facts and figures which cannot be set aside and cannot be ignored by general assertions about the prosperity of the country, but that must be met face to face and dealt with. I propose to deal with one of the most interesting of those famous infant industries of the National Policy, I mean the cotton trade of Canada. This is

Mr. BERGIN.

probably the largest and best grown of all those infants. I think it has been the most spoiled, and is the most saucy, and it certainly is the most dangerous of them all.

This cotton industry, since 1879, has given employment to about 7,000 more hands than were employed previous to 1878. Previous to that year we had a few struggling mills, as I described a few moments ago. We had the Valleyfield mill, we had also the Hochelega mill and a few other mills, employing 2,000 hands altogether. To-day there are in the Dominion twenty-four mills, all thriving, all working full time, and the operatives are happy and contented. In contrast to the blue-ruin exposition of my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) I will give you the list of the mills of that time and the number of hands employed, sometimes employed three days in the week and sometimes two. The Dundas mill, 450 hands; Canada Cotton, 500; Hudon, 280; Parks, 120—which was after all only a yarn mill with a few looms;—the Valleyfield mill, 450; and the Lybster mill, 200, or 2,000 hands in all. After the introduction of the National Policy the Dundas mill increased over 30 per cent, but in consequence of bad management and other causes it did not succeed, and was bought by the Dominion Cotton Company; part of the machinery was removed to the Falls of Montmorency mills, and the remaining portion to the Cornwall mills. After the introduction of the National Policy, in 1878, the Canada Cotton Mill was doubled in extent, the Hudon mill was increased to three times its former capacity, the Parks mill has been wiped out, and the Montreal Cotton Company has been increased more than 50 per cent. As I have stated we have twenty-four mills in Canada at present. Those mills have cost \$13,700,000, and the yearly production is not as the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said of the value of \$18,000,000, but \$8,750,000, and the yearly wages paid to the 9,000 hands employed amounts to \$2,350,000. The hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that these mills produced \$18,000,000 worth of cotton per year by a peculiar mode of calculation of his own. He says:

Fourteen million dollars is the value of the output of the whole mills of Canada, exclusive of importations, which amount to \$4,000,000 in round numbers, so that the total consumption of cotton in Canada would be \$18,000,000 worth. I heard my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the other evening, estimate the total consumption at from \$17,000,000 to \$20,000,000, so that his estimate exactly corresponds with my figures. We are now dealing with the portion of that total consumption which represents the output of the mills in Canada at \$14,000,000. Now, what taxes are paid by the people of Canada to the Canadian manufacturers upon that output? We have seen that the Government collects at the rate of 28 per cent on the goods that come in, and we have seen that the other goods range from 35 per cent to 40 per cent and 45 per cent and 65 per cent taxation. We know that in selling these goods, the manufacturers are obliged to put the prices at the mills, a shade below the protective duty. They can-

not take it quite off, for if they did, they would invite importation and competition; and so they put it just a shade below, in order to prevent competition from abroad. I want to be very moderate in my estimate, and although I believe I could really put the rate of taxation that is paid to the manufacturers at 35 per cent, I shall only for the purposes of my calculations, place it at exactly the sum which the Government receives on the goods that come into the country, namely, 28 per cent. That percentage of duty on \$14,000,000 amounts to \$3,920,000 per annum, which, according to the most moderate estimate of the tariff, is put into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers. If we are to pay that from year to year, and year in and year out, as a tax upon the people, we may capitalize that annual sum so as to see what it amounts to. Why, Sir, capitalized, it would amount to \$100,000,000, which we are paying to the Canadian cotton manufacturers in order to foster this infant industry.

His mode of calculation is this: He says that 26,000,000 pounds of raw material were imported in 1879, as against 46,000,000 pounds of raw material in 1892, and he says, taking the price of that 46,000,000 pounds which is nearly \$4,000,000, and adding it to the wages paid to the hands, you will have in round numbers the sum of \$6,000,000. This \$6,000,000, taken from the value of the output, which he placed at \$14,000,000, would leave \$8,000,000 as a profit to the manufacturers. Let me state to the hon. gentleman that I have in my possession the figures taken from the books of the company and that the output is not \$14,000,000 a year, but, as I told him a little while ago, it is \$8,750,000. My hon. friend evidently knows little about the cotton industry. He evidently imagines because 46,000,000 pounds of raw material were imported, and so many million dollars worth of goods sold in the same year, that he had a right to estimate that that 46,000,000 pounds of raw material would make \$14,000,000 worth of goods. The hon. gentleman is not quite fair in his calculation, because he says that the wages and the cost of the raw material deducted from the imaginary \$14,000,000, at which he values the output, shows what the profits of the mills were. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be aware that there is very great loss and very great waste in cotton. He does not seem to know that there is a large amount of cotton lost in the picking-room, and a large loss even before it reaches there. He does not seem to be aware that there is a considerable loss of cotton in the carding-room, and a considerable loss in the dyeing-room. He does not seem to be aware that besides all that, there is a large amount of waste. He does not take into account the expenses of management, nor has he taken into account the interest on the capital of \$13,700,000, which these mills have cost. He has not taken into account either the amount of duty which these mills are obliged to pay to the Government year after year upon machinery that they import, solely for the purpose in repairing the machinery in use, exclusive altogether of the duty they pay upon new machinery which they are obliged to bring into this country when they change the character of the goods they are manufac-

turing. He does not take into account that for cartage alone, between the mills and the steamers and the railways, they are obliged to pay \$500,000 a year. He does not take into account that these mills purchase in Canada of stores and goods manufactured in Canada to enable them to carry on their business, over \$750,000 worth a year. All this he has forgotten, and in that way he has contrived to pile up a monument of \$8,000,000, which he says are the net profits accruing to the cotton manufacturers of Canada. Why, Sir, the statement is a monstrous exaggeration. No such thing could possibly occur. He tells us, moreover,—and it is a statement which should not go to the country unchallenged, that the merchants of Canada are obliged to buy from a corporation of so tyrannical and arbitrary a character the goods that they require for their customers, and they dare not refuse to pay the prices which these companies ask. I ask the hon. gentleman himself, how he can make such a statement as that, in the face of the fact that there is the St. Henri mill in Montreal, and that there are five or six other independent mills. If there is room for these mills, there is also room for many others. Let these hon. gentlemen—wealthy men like my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—imitate the conduct of leading Conservatives; let them put their hands into their pockets and help to assist the industries of this country, instead of decrying them. If these mills are the profitable institutions that they say they are, these gentlemen would be ready to assist them at any moment. We know that nearly all the capital of a number of the mills was wiped out; we know that the proprietors had to sell to save a shred of their capital; we know that they were glad to sell to the Dominion Mills Cotton Company and to the Dominion Mills Coloured Cotton Company. These men have taken their lives in their hands, and they are now doing what they did from 1878 to 1889: they are hanging on, as it were, by the eyelashes; they are stretching their credit to the utmost in order to make their mills profitable and successful. If they fail in this, the principal men in this combination will go to the ground. And why was this combination necessary? Why was it that all the other mills failed to make money? It was because they were too small; the management of them cost too much money, and the labour necessary to enable them to turn out goods suitable for the market, had to be skilled labour. Thus, so much was added to the expense, that it was impossible for these mills to succeed, and their failure was the natural outcome of endeavouring to do too much with too small capital. It is now hoped that, with better machinery and increased skill in labour—because we now have skilled labour in Canada, as we had not in

1879—they will be able to put goods on the market at a cheaper rate. Heretofore, every mill was manufacturing gray or white or coloured goods, and every time an order came, the manager was obliged to change the machinery, which involved loss of time, loss of labour, and stoppage of the mill, very often for days at a time. No industry could prosper under such methods. But to-day, as I have said, it is believed that, with increased and improved machinery, and by producing only one kind of goods in each mill, it will be possible to turn out goods, as they are being turned out to-day, equal, yes, better than those produced in the old country and imported into Canada. The hon. gentleman says that the people of this country pay \$4,000,000 duty upon the cotton goods imported, and that they pay this sum into the pockets of the manufacturers. I would like to know, from the hon. gentleman, how he is going to make it manifest to me that \$4,000,000 worth of imported goods, which, according to his own showing, paid only 28 per cent, could have placed in the coffers of the manufacturers the sum of \$4,000,000. If he had considered, he would have seen that the amount paid was not \$4,000,000, but the interest on \$4,000,000 at 28 per cent. That is one of the cards of the hon. gentleman's house that has toppled and fallen away. The hon. gentleman, when he adds that amount to the \$14,000,000 which he arrived at by the rule of thumb, and by making these false charges, is placing this industry before the country in such an obnoxious light as to make it appear that men—honourable men, the foremost men in the Dominion of Canada, men who have hitherto borne an irreproachable name, men who are known as thorough business men—are so many sharpers and swindlers. He did the same last session, when the Prime Minister stated that if the hon. gentleman could show that the prosperity of any interest was interfered with by these combinations, the Government would consider it their duty to inquire into the matter, and would prevent anything of that kind being done illegally. What did the hon. gentleman say in his speech the other day? Did he show that these "combinationsters," as he calls them, have done anything wrong? Did he show that they charge higher for their goods than the price of goods of equal quality brought from the mother country? Not at all. The only article upon which he was able to place anything like a doubt was that of cotton shirts. That cotton shirt business troubled him terribly. It was over 100 per cent; and he compared the Canadian cotton shirts with English goods which sold in the market at the same price. If he knew anything about the cotton shirt industry, why did he not tell the House that the cotton shirts brought from the old country and sold at the price he stated were China clay-filled, with scarcely any cotton in them, and that the cotton shirts manufac-

Mr. BERGIN.

ured in this country are far better and last much longer, because they are composed of pure material? This is the sort of indictment that he has laid against the cotton industry of this country. He asked us whether, after pocketing \$8,000,000, which he says was drawn from the hard earnings of the people, these men, living in their palaces, had offered to give any increase in wages to those they employed. Why, Sir, I do not suppose there is a more happy and contented class of people anywhere in any country than the people employed in the cotton factories of this country. I invite my hon. friend to come and spend Saturday and Sunday with me at my home in Cornwall, and if, when he comes back here, he does not say that he has seen more beautiful women, better dressed young women, and better dressed young men, and more signs of prosperity there than in any other place in Canada, not excepting the city of Toronto, then I will agree that all he has said about the cotton industries is not true. I will take him to the homes of those people. I will show him the little homes they have earned working in these cotton mills, furnished and arranged with a taste and a show of luxury that will astonish him. And they will tell him that they owe it all to the cotton industry. They will tell him more—that they are all National Policy boys and girls. And they will tell him more than that, that if he wants to get a second look at them and be again invited inside their doors he must be a National Policy man too. This hon. gentleman told us that not only did the mill owners reduce the wages of their employees, but that they refused to sell goods to any but those who hold their tongues and would decline to make any complaint as to the character of the goods or as to their price; and he branded them as cowards and dishonourable men. The mercantile community are neither cowards nor dishonourable. And I venture to say that the hon. gentleman cannot name a man in the mercantile world of this country who will make such a statement before this assembly. So far from the goods of this company not being regarded as fit for the market by the merchants of this country, they approve of them very highly. They order them in advance, and, more than that, they declare that there never has been such a good quality of goods produced before in Canada as are now being produced by these cotton mills. The hon. gentleman told us that the National Policy did us no good, because it did not reduce the price of goods, and he adds that these mills have increased the prices of goods lately. I have here a telegram which I received this afternoon from David Morrice & Sons upon this subject, in which they say that on a few goods bought—when these mills were purchased at 50 per cent—at 50 per cent below the cost of production, they considered they were entitled to make a profit on, and they did raise the price of those goods, but

not to the price of goods they are manufacturing in their own mills. The telegram which I received was as follows:—

Few advances were made on goods absolutely sold under cost owing to previous competition of small mills. Raw cotton largely advanced in price last fall, notwithstanding this prices of goods continued the same. The best proof of goods being sold under cost was the fact of the Dundas and other mills losing large sums in their manufacture. The entire trade were perfectly aware and fully realized the losses being made.

This was legitimate business, but on that slight foundation the hon. gentleman built his serious charge that these mill-owners, now that their mills were placed on a proper footing and making money, were undertaking to fleece the people and make them pay larger prices for their goods because the people could not go anywhere else. I think I have answered every serious point this hon. gentleman has raised. I have shown the House that the promoters of these industries, previous to 1878 and up to about a few years ago, all sunk large sums. They lost at least 50 per cent of their capital, and, in some of the mills, they lost all their capital, which is the best evidence we can have that the bloated monopolists, of which my hon. friend spoke, do not exist in Canada. No such creation has been the result of the National Policy, so far as the cotton mills are concerned, and, to-day, we are selling goods at prices much lower than they brought before. Denims are being sold to-day at 25 per cent, gingham at 30 per cent and gray cottons at 30 per cent less than they were sold at formerly, and other goods in the same proportion. My hon. friend said that coarse goods were taxed much higher than any other and that the poor people were obliged to pay more for them. What is the fact? I have here a statement, which is in the hands of every wholesale merchant and jobber in this country, and which shows the prices for goods in 1878 and 1892 respectively:

	1878.	1892.
	11 cents	8½ cents.
Denims	12½ "	10½ "
	14½ "	12½ "
	16½ "	13½ "
Ginghams	7 "	5½ "
	10 "	6½ "
	12½ "	8½ "
Bleached shirtings	6½ "	5½ "
	9½ "	6½ "
	10½ "	9½ "
	12½ "	10½ "
	9½ "	8½ "
	13½ "	11 "
Ticking	11½ "	8½ "
	14 "	10 "
	16½ "	12½ "
	18 "	14 "
	19 "	16½ "

	1878.	1892.
Apron checks	14 cents.	10 cents.
	12½ "	8½ "
	9½ "	7½ "
Cheese cloth	5 "	3½ "

The difference in values to-day as shown above is about as follows:—

Gray cottons	25½	per cent less than in 1872.
Canton flannels	25	" "
Bags, about	25	" "
Yarns	25	" "
Bleached shirtings	17	" "
Tickings	25	" "
Apron checks, nearly	25	" "
Cheese cloth	30	" "

I have a word to say with regard to the meeting of the Montreal Cotton Company, to which my hon. friend alluded the other day. He said that at that meeting the directors took power to increase the capital stock of the company \$2,000,000. Now, Sir, the Montreal Cotton Company, the Valleyfield mill, has been in existence since before 1878, and, like all the others, it paid no dividends until within a few years. It did, at one time, pay a dividend for one year, just as the Hochelaga did for two years, and as did some of the others, but which others, I am sorry to say, paid their dividends out of capital and not out of their earnings. To-day the Montreal Cotton Company is the proprietor of the Magog mills. They are the only mills that are turning out prints to-day in Canada, and they are turning these out at the rate of 80,000 yards a month, and yet cannot keep up with their orders. They have, therefore, asked for an extension of \$2,000,000 in their capital, so that they may be able to increase the capacity of the mill at Valleyfield and of the print mill at Magog, and they guarantee that every dollar of that increased capital will be used, not in watering stock, but in extending the capacity of these two mills. Mr. Speaker, I have done. I have nothing more to say to the hon. gentleman except to repeat my invitation, and I am satisfied that if he accepts it, and has a little talk with my little girls, he will come back here a supporter of the National Policy.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley), has thought proper to refer to the recent election held in the county of L'Islet. I really fail to perceive what glory or profit he has hoped to get out of it. However, that concerns him. I believe that I have been elected in the county of L'Islet, and am sure it has been without false pretenses, after one of the most vigorous contests that has ever been carried on in that part of the province. I have had after me two Ministers of the Crown, and if I have triumphed, it is due to the most absolute devotion of my friends and to the intelligence of the county that I now represent. The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay

(Mr. Belley), said that I had run as a straight protectionist in the county of L'Islet. I believe that my political career, already pretty long, has been absolutely without cowardice in the various positions that I have thought it my duty to take on subjects of public interest. I have never attempted to deceive any one as to my views concerning the politics of my country, and in L'Islet I have followed the same line of conduct. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I had taken the trouble of preparing a written programme. I will not read the whole of it, but here are a few excerpts therefrom, touching the question of the tariff :

I am resolved to turn all my efforts towards obtaining changes in the tariff, such as to permit the agricultural class to buy cheaply the things they need, and to sell dearer the produce of the soil.

The manufacturers in the large cities who realize hundreds of thousands of dollars profit per year, by means of the present tariff oppose these reforms. They are organized into an association, and without party distinctions they support the Government, the policy of which builds their fortune. From their point of view they are right. The so-called National Policy, adopted in 1879, with the object of favouring the establishment and development of our industries in preventing foreign products from entering Canada, has not to-day the same *raison d'être*.

The interests of the manufacturers have been protected long enough. The hour has come for protecting the interests of agriculture. The manufacturers' interest is to keep the Canadian market closed against the manufactured products of the United States, in order to sell their own goods at higher prices.

The interest of the Canadian farmer is to work towards having the American market opened to him, in order to sell dearer his produce.

And further on I said :

Let us see that the American market which is practically closed against us, be opened to us, so what we may sell there, our horses, our potatoes, our eggs, fowls, &c.

The Canadian farmer will find in that a double interest. First, he will pay less for what he needs, and he will sell his produce to better advantage.

The struggle is then really between the farmer who needs the American market and the manufacturer who is afraid to make less profits if the American manufacturer can come and compete with him for the sale of furniture, farming implements, cottons, fabrics, vehicles, &c.

I believe that it is impossible better to define a political situation. As I said before, the contest in L'Islet was vigorous. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) did me the honour to come down into the county accompanied by the train of promises which always follows so important a man. The hon. Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Cram) also saw fit to pay me a visit during the campaign, we received him well—as the people of L'Islet always know how to receive those who visit them. The hon. Minister had decided to defeat me anyhow. Like Bonaparte haranguing his soldiers, he said : "From the height of the victories which we have won together, you are watched." All that the Government can command of influence ; all that it can bring into play in

Mr. TARTE.

the matter of patronage and of seductions calculated to lower the consciences, all that was brought to bear against me. Yet, I asked it then—and I ask it again to-day—what had I done so bad as to deserve the war which was waged against me ? During the session of 1891, I had a seat in this House. I had voted three-quarters of the time with the members on the other side. I had, it is true, publicly and firmly taken up a question of public morality, the same position as other men had taken, but which they did not have the courage to keep to the end. That is what I had done, and I see nothing to justify the violence which I met. The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) has boasted of the numerous by-elections carried by the Conservative party. There is no denying it, the Opposition has lost a good deal of ground since the last appeal to the public—when it came very near to capturing the power. But what is the good of arguing from successes obtained by the Government in the by-elections ? For those who know how those elections are made, there is nothing surprising that the Government should carry them. I have made elections with the members who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, and without betraying any secret, I can say here, that I know how these successes are brought about. The influence of the Government, too often scandalously exercised, plays in them a very considerable role. The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) knows that if he was elected, it is because he appealed to the public cupidity during his election. He was the candidate of the Government, the Government was ready to vote money, subsidies. That is what I read in the newspaper which he inspires.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am not the inspirer of that paper.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am glad of it on the hon. member's account, for never, in my long experience as a journalist, have I read writings more conducive to the degradation of public sentiment than those of the newspaper which he now repudiates. The fight which returned the hon. member was simply between those who wanted money, and those who wanted to vote according to the dictates of their own consciences. And the hon. member did not accept the candidature offered him until he had come up here to Ottawa, to have himself consecrated with the ministerial holy oils. In L'Islet, as I have said, the hon. Postmaster-General did me the honour of leading the campaign against me. We fought open-faced, frankly. Of course the dollar bags were against us. But we had in the county of L'Islet, a county which, thank God, was not for sale. It is a great consolation after all—whatever be the parties with which they sympathize, to find such counties. The contest was largely upon the

question of the tariff. The county of L'Islet borders upon the international line, and I am certain to be the expression of my electors when saying that in this county, there is a very earnest desire for a change in the treated from a doctrinaire point of view, tariff. The question of tariff cannot be They are essentially business questions, and consequently must be judged according to the times and according to the circumstances—the circumstances not alone of a country, but of the different lands with which such country does, or may do business. I am of those who believe that in 1878, and in the preceding years, there was certainly a deep desire for a change in the fiscal policy. And surely if Sir John Macdonald ever gave a manifest proof of his great ability, it was in seizing the current of opinion which then manifested itself. I am also of those who believe that the changes then brought about, have responded partially, at least, to the hopes which the authors of the policy called the National Policy had founded. In 1878 I took an active part in the campaign which then took place. I fought through that campaign in company with some of the present ministers, and especially with the hon. Postmaster-General and the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Our base of argument was this: We wanted to develop the industry of the country by protecting it against foreign competition. But we had in view the object which all desired then, of bringing the American Government to renew with us the treaties which it had itself abrogated. Who does not remember, Mr. Speaker, the by-elections that we fought, for instance that of Drummond and Arthabaska in 1877? It is one of the contests that I regret the most, be it said by the way. Well, we carried those by-elections and the general elections by saying, let us adopt a protective tariff, and we will force the American Government to treat with us. The illusion we had then must have vanished to-day; but it has even served to carry the elections of 1891. And Sir John Macdonald gave proof then again, in my estimation, of his great ability, in asking for the necessary authorization to conclude a treaty calculated to render freer our commercial relations with our neighbours. If we consider the reasons given by Sir John A. Macdonald to the Governor-General to obtain the dissolution of Parliament before the time fixed by the constitution, we will find almost verbatim the motion which is now before us. Sir John A. Macdonald understood that his policy of 1878 had had its day. He has disappeared from the scene. I believe if he were here to-day—and it is a great national loss that we sustained when he disappeared—I believe, I say, that we would have another policy than that which we now have. I have had myself enough political intercourse with him to believe that I speak the truth in making this assertion. He was replaced by Mr. Abbott. Sir John Abbott has now disappeared from amongst us. One must not say more harm than

is proper of a man that is gone. However, I believe it is allowable to remember that he was a shrewd lawyer, and a wire-puller extremely cunning. Instead of making fiscal reforms, his mind turned towards carrying elections. The Opposition had committed, at least in the province of Ontario, the error of not contesting as many elections as had been contested against it. Sir John Abbott, surrounded himself with able men, with colleagues who understood campaign tactics, and they resolved to deal a fatal blow to the Opposition. Sir John Abbott resolved to lay hand upon power in the province of Quebec. This is probably not a proper opportunity for speaking at length here of what took place in the province of Quebec during the last two years. However, as the matter has been alluded to before, I will be allowed to say that Sir John Abbott, in securing for the party which he was leading in the Dominion Parliament, the power in Quebec, played for a very high stake. He won the game, he gave to his friends the benefits which are always to be derived from power in a province like that of Quebec, which, however, resembles all the others. After having increased the strength of his party he withdrew, loaded with honours which he had long coveted. He had as his successor the present Prime Minister. This gentleman is without contest one of the most distinguished men of the House of Commons. He formed a government, after having long pondered over the problem. The operation, however, seemed easy, as it must have been expected for some time. The present Government is a singular compound. It is a motley gathering. It caters to all tastes. By the side of devoted servants of the Pope there are devoted disciples of the Prince of Orange. By the side of great men there are men—very great. There are others less tall. Upon the whole, one can say that this administration—which figures now about a dozen and a half—is to-day about complete. It is an astonishing thing that the more complete the Government becomes, the less ready it is to carry on the business of the country. In fact, what do we hear now? If not to-morrow, to-morrow. To-morrow, the school question, which we have been promised would be settled without any delay! If there is one question with regard to which the hon. Prime Minister, among others, has made formal promises—public and private promises—by the voice of many of his colleagues, it certainly is the school question. And what do we hear? To-morrow! next year! On the question of the tariff it is the same. It is quite possible that to-morrow, that next year, the present House of Commons may have ceased to exist, that there may have been made a new appeal to the people. Well, I believe that we are right in asking that something be done now. Why delay any longer? Addressing especially the Ministers who represent my province, I ask them, why these delays? Why these endless puttings

off which we witness? The hon. Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Caron) represents a county next to mine. I ask him to tell us whether it is not true that his county depopulates itself by hundreds every year? My county is one of the richest as to farming. Everything, fruit and whatever can be drawn from the soil, is cultivated there to advantage and successfully. And yet the figure of population lowers, and lowers considerably. Why is this? The reason is easily found and can be given without difficulty. Here it is. The French-Canadian farmer just now cannot sell his produce at paying prices. Who is the man who, representing a rural county, and having some knowledge of the present state of things, would dare deny these facts? The so-called National Policy has formerly had my support. I do not intend to repudiate my past. I believe that this policy has done some good, but I ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Angers) and the hon. Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Caron), where is the county which to-day wants no modification of that policy? The member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Belley) spoke of the several elections which have taken place in the district of Quebec, and boasted of them as so many triumphs of the present policy. He has alluded to the election of Quebec West. If he did not live so far from Quebec he would know that the population of Quebec West had decreased by 40 per cent; that the value of property has also decreased in a proportion of forty, fifty, sixty and even seventy per cent; and that many properties that were worth hundreds of thousands of dollars are now being given away. As a question of fact, the state of things prevailing there is incredible. Yet the Minister says: Wait, wait till to-morrow. I do not understand this way of dealing. We have a million of our countrymen on foreign soil. In fact, there are so many French-Canadians on the other side of the border, that we can ask ourselves: Where is our country? and the Ministers tell us: Wait, wait till to-morrow! I accuse them of having, in too many circumstances, sacrificed the interests of their race. The hon. Postmaster-General knows how many times, in our intimate intercourse, I have reproached them with this—it is not, I believe, a lack of discretion to remind him of this—and he knows that he was often of my opinion. We had in the person of the present Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec a man of great talent, who could have done much for his race, but he has abandoned the political arena. I regret to see that Mr. Chapleau has gone out of active politics. He has been replaced by a man who has been my chief, who has had my entire political affection. I was young then, I was at an age when perhaps love is easy. He is a Minister in the present Government, and his portfolio is one of the most important. We have heard it said that before accepting this portfolio he had put to

Mr. FARTE.

the Prime Minister certain conditions. My intelligent friend, who sits to my right (Mr. Choquette), was present when a Senator declared in a public meeting, that the Minister of Agriculture had only accepted after having obtained the promise that the Manitoba school question would be settled without delay, I therefore hope, that with regard to this question, there will be an end to saying to us, to-morrow; and I trust a solution will shortly be reached. Let there be no delusion, Mr. Speaker. Those who emigrate do not do so for the pleasure of it. No, they may have faults, but they are attached to their native land. Our province may also have its faults, but the climate is good and wholesome, the country is pleasant, and the towns intelligent and cultured. The man who leaves the province of Quebec, leaves us because he cannot do otherwise. I have visited Canadian centres in the United States and have not met a single one of my countrymen who did not say to me: We have been obliged to go. In face of such a state of things, are we to fold our arms and say that there is nothing to be done? As a journalist, I have gone to the trouble of sending agents through the country, to gather exact information regarding the emigration movement. I instructed them to be absolutely impartial, and to tell me nothing but the strict truth. They have reported to me what they saw, and what they heard, and these reports have been published. They show that in most of the counties, for the last three or four years, the emigration has been greater than ever. During my last election I made it a point to ask the railway agents in the county of L'Islet and in that of Kamouraska, to tell me how many tickets they sold for foreign parts. The parish of Ste. Anne situated in the county of Kamouraska is a rich farming locality. Well, the agent at this parish told me that in the months of March and April he sold a hundred tickets, and those to families who leave the province of Quebec to emigrate to the United States. Do the French Ministers realize the condition of the farming community? I hesitate to believe it, for I cannot conceive that they would not seek the means of remedying it, instead of telling us to wait, and giving us more or less frivolous reasons. Thus in a speech by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Angers), speaking of the French Canadian emigration to the United States, he is reported to have said that it was not to be wondered at because the farmers of the states of Vermont and Maine emigrate also. He must know that if the farmers of Maine and Vermont move away from their fields, they at least remain on the American soil, while those who leave us go to a foreign country, leave our land never to come back. I will add this, Mr. Speaker, for I have a habit of not hiding my opinion. If the Government do not realize the terrible position in which the agricultural community now is,

they must expect, not only that there will be discontent, but that they will witness a revolt against our institutions. Things must be taken as they are in this world. When the people is not content it looks elsewhere to better itself. Why deny that there now exists in the country a feeling to be deplored but which we should not blind ourselves to. We would be astonished if a plebiscite was taken to-morrow. I do not fear to say that in two-thirds of the counties of the province of Quebec, owing to the difficulty of the situation we are in, people must pronounce for annexation. I am hostile to annexation. But let us face the truth like men. It is not by doing as the ostrich does—hiding its head in the sand—that we will govern the country. Let us take the facts as we should take them. This feeling for annexation does not only exist among the French population of Quebec. The hon. Minister whom I see before me, and who represents here the Eastern Townships knows that there is a strong annexation movement among the English population of that region. Mr. Speaker, if we want to be a nation we must keep our population. We see it go like spilt water, an eminent man wrote me the other day. It seems to me that in face of such a situation it is dangerous, it is disastrous to say always, to-morrow! I am not of those who hold that every thing must be demolished, and if the hon. leader of the Opposition should come into power to-morrow, I do not believe that he would pull down the columns of the temple. That is not what we want. We want a change in the tariff. The hon. member for North Simcoe, from what I have heard, is to propose a motion to reduce by ten per cent the duties on the importations from the mother land. I, right here, declare that I am in favour of this proposition. But I ask why the same thing should not be done as to all other countries? It is shown that our manufacturers can stand competition. They have become exporters. Not only do they supply the needs of the country, but they compete in other lands. We can, therefore, adopt now a policy quite different from that which we adopted ten years ago. And yet the Government tell us that they do not want to do any thing. They do not want to act, but they give no reason therefor. Addressing again the French Ministers, I ask them whether do they want to lead us? During the last three years they have allowed the French language to be abolished in Manitoba. During the last three years they have allowed the schools—guaranteed to us by the constitution—to be abolished. Now, without a word, without a protestation, without an effort to better the situation, they allow the province of Quebec to become depopulated. Whither are they drifting? The delights of office may seduce for a time, but it seems to me that in the end with men whose spirit and heart are well placed, they must not dominate the sense, of duty and preservation. We have been made the richer

by many comparisons during this debate. We have been told that under Mr. Mackenzie's regime, things went so and so—there were soup kitchens for the people—there was this and there was that. I would like to be given fewer comparisons, fewer figures and more prosperity. Many things can be done with figures. Some of my colleagues were realising to me here yesterday figures from the census. For instance, in the enlightened town where my neighbour, the hon. member for Montmagny lives, I believe that the census gives us something like thirty-five manufactories. Now, the hon. member tells us that there are not ten. I ask the hon. Prime Minister—and I hope he can understand me in my mother tongue—to open his eyes. I take him for an honest man. I ask him to say whether a census with such errors is not a gigantic fraud? We are given figures and those figures are absolutely false. The same thing may be said of the returns for the town of Sorel, which gives 128 manufactories, while some ten might be found. Well, I ask myself how such a census can be quoted before such an assembly as the House of Commons? In the Senate, one of the hon. senators has put with regard to the census of the population, questions which will have to be met. After having made some studies on this important subject, I have no doubt that, as to population the same system of trumpery was adopted as concerning the manufactories. The census, in my opinion, should be taken over again. Two years ago the city of New York caused her census to be retaken, because the official returns were false. Both sides of the House, and the French element especially, should insist that the census, which was made to our detriment, should be taken over again. One would say that there exists an element which would like to see us disappear. Yet, our race has not been disloyal. It has respected the laws. Until now we have borne our share of the public burdens. The province of Quebec is being depopulated—and nothing is said. Our language is being abolished, and nothing is said, even applause is sometimes heard. The constitution is seen broken, trampled upon where we are concerned, and nothing is said. Truly one would believe that there are groups in the country which resemble that fanatical element which, after the conquest, thought of eradicating us from the soil. Attempts are made to-day to ruin us financially in the province of Quebec, to crush us wherever we are in the minority. And yet the French Ministers remain impassible in the face of a situation which they cannot deny. I do not wish to be uselessly disagreeable to them, but I believe that the combined shoulders of the three of them are not broad enough to carry the mantle of Sir George Etienne Cartier. There is no doubt that, thanks to protection, a certain number of manufacturers have built up large fortunes, but there is no doubt either, that the public fortune is not equitably divided. In Montreal we see men who, poor in 1878, have become

millionaires. We see at the same time the rural districts losing their population. I say that the man who knows anything of political economy, must, in the face of such a situation, reflect and look for a remedy. I know in Montreal a number of excellent manufacturers who in the past were good Liberals, and who now are in favour of the present administration. When you speak to them in private intercourse and you ask them what would happen if the duties were lowered ten or fifteen per cent, they answer you that they could live with their industry, but that they would make less money. There is not the shadow of a doubt that the tariff could be reduced without hurting our industries, and I do not hesitate to speak my mind on the subject. The time has come to no longer delay this customs reform. As I said before, I am not in favour of a policy which would consist in demolishing everything. The question is not to demolish but to come to the rescue of those who suffer. We ask simply to restore the equilibrium which should exist between all classes of society. Should we not make a change in the tariff, we would be the only country in the world remaining bound to a policy, the reasons for which circumstances had modified. The American people have given us the example which remains for us to follow. If the Government had behaved—I will not say with more decency, the word would not, perhaps, be parliamentary—but with less arrogance toward the authorities in Washington, we would not to-day have to face the present state of things. The Ministers went to Washington with the intention of doing nothing. There is no hiding it, the only policy of the Government to-day consists in staying themselves on the large fortunes which they have accumulated in the hands of the men who serve them in difficult days. When we are told of successful elections as proofs of the popularity of the ministerial policy, we are mocked. Who does not know that those by-elections cost the Government much money? The average by-election cost five or ten thousand dollars. What was the cost of the L'Islet election? Ah, if the hon. Postmaster-General would speak to me with the confidence of yore, he would tell me. In Soulanges, where we were only defeated by a small majority, the bank notes circulated like letters in a city post office. I believe I know public feeling in the province of Quebec; and if we had elections, I do not fear to say that we would carry them by a majority unknown until now, provided we fought as we should fight. Popular sentiment is against the Government, against its fiscal policy, against its "personnel." Let not the Government believe that they will have too short a session. Of course, I only speak in my own name. We will only leave the floor of this House when the Government tell us what they intend to do. We will not go until the school question is elucidated. I have been commissioned by the electors of L'Islet to ask the Government to keep their

Mr. TARTE.

promises, and I will endeavour to have them keep them. It is not for us to tell them what they should do; it behooves the Government to develop its own policy. There is no precedent in the history of the parliamentary world for such conduct as that of the Government. Here is a little province, Manitoba, settled with people who for the most part reached there with passage tickets paid by ourselves, which puts the constitution aside, and the Government finds nothing else to say but "We must go to the courts of justice, before we know what to do." They might as well say that they will send the tariff question to the judges. The fact is that the Government seems to have taken to governing us by means of the judges. I can tell them that the country does not want this any longer. Our wish, I repeat it, is not to demolish anything which is useful; but, on another hand, we want to see maintained only what is worth maintaining. On both sides of the House, many figures have been quoted, and in that respect the debate is exhausted. Every one has shown his way of thinking. For my part, I will conclude by saying to the Government: You have not kept the promises which you had made. You carried the last elections by saying that you wanted authorization for a treaty with the American people, and you did all you could do not to obtain such a treaty. After the elections in 1891 you were to settle the Manitoba school question, if that question was to be decided against us by the courts. You made this promise in a report which was sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor-General. You engaged the honour of the Crown, and you want the Crown now to lie to the people of the country. Do have the courage to say what you intend to do, or say, "We have made you promises, but now we cannot fulfil them." Your duty is to give the country peace and harmony, and to maintain the constitution intact. Do not fear, be true to that duty. There is no factious opposition here. As representative of the county of L'Islet, I am ready to act on this school question in such a way as to facilitate the Government's task; I am ready to give them my help if they want to be faithful to their promises and their duty. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I invite the hon. Postmaster-General (Sir A. P. Caron), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Anger), who represents the French element in the Administration, to speak at least a language that we may understand. In the county of L'Islet, at a popular meeting—it is not always easy to enter into complex explanations at such meetings—I asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to keep the promises that have been made by the Premier himself, and to tell the people what course the Government intended to follow with regard to the school question. The hon. Minister thought fit to dispense with an answer to my question, but we are not at a popular meeting now. We can explain ourselves at ease, and renew

our request as long as no satisfactory answer is given. In the name of the province of Quebec of which I am one of the representatives, I ask the French Ministers to take the floor after me and state to the House what they intend to do, what the Government intend to do in connection with the school question. Let them tell us whether we are to get the justice to which we are entitled. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the Government may then look for material co-operation from this side of the House. But it is not by telling us that we have built railways, that the Lake St. John Railway is constructed; that wharfs have been built, &c., that they will any longer blind public opinion. All the railways we have, without an exception, have been built with borrowed money. Let there be no delusion on this. I am not of those who will blame the Government for what they have done for the railways in the past, but I enter my protest against all useless delays in the matter of vital questions. In doing so I am certain that I express the sentiment, not only of the electors of my county, but also of the majority of the electors of the province of Quebec.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether the papers in connection with the Kingston Penitentiary have been laid on the Table. I understood the evidence was to have been laid on the Table a few days ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I did not lay this evidence on the Table. It is ready; but I saw a motion on the Paper to produce it, and I was waiting until that motion was reached. I can bring the Papers down to-morrow.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPORT DUTIES ON LUMBER.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chap. 33 and 51 Vic., chap. 15.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. member will explain the object of the Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. The object of the Bill is to place the lumber trade of this country in a position of greater security with respect to export duties than it fancies itself to occupy at the present moment. Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada contains a provision, section 6, which establishes export duties, and schedule E classifies the lumber and names the amount on each class. Section 1 of chapter 15, 51 Vic., gives the Governor in Council power to increase those duties or diminish or suspend them. By the action of the Governor in Council the duties have been suspended under the provisions of the statutory offer contained in the McKinley Bill. It was done on 14th October, 1890, and owing to the declaration of the Minister of Finance when delivering his Budget speech the other day, a feeling of unrest and fear exists in the minds of a great many lumbermen that this important interest may be dealt with hastily by the Government, by the reimposition of the duties, or by taking action without due consideration. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance will remember that the course of the Government on this matter has been in the past somewhat erratic. The duties were first placed at \$1, then they were increased to \$2, and the power contained in chapter 15 of 51 Vic. was assumed by the Governor in Council. The duties were then increased by the Governor in Council to \$3, to the great alarm of the lumber interest, and, after a short time, they were placed back again at \$2. This seeming want of any fixed principle in dealing with this matter has impressed the lumber trade with a fear that the Government might be induced again, under the provisions of chapter 15 of 51 Vic., to take some action in the matter that might be detrimental to the interests of the lumber trade. The trade feels it is a question of sufficient importance to warrant full consideration in open debate in the House of Commons, and this Bill provides that section 6 of chapter 33 and section 15 of chapter 51 shall be repealed, and that the Governor in Council shall be debarred from dealing with the question of the export duties, except by the consent of Parliament, so that if the matter is considered by the Government and any action is desired in the matter, action shall only be taken after full discussion in open debate, in which all interests may be heard. That is the object of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES AT TORONTO.

Mr. COATSWORTH asked, Whether the Government has been aware, through its officers or otherwise, of the unsuitability of the Government buildings in Toronto for carrying on the Government business in a satisfactory manner? If so, what is the pur-

port of the information or report received? Has the attention of the Government or Public Works Department been called to the advisability of placing all the Government offices in Toronto in one building; and if so, what steps are being taken to carry out that project?

Mr. OUMET. The subject-matter of the questions has been brought to the attention of the Government, and reports have been ordered to be made with a view to giving the public service all the accommodation that may be judged necessary.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN DALHOUSIE AND GASPE.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to ask for tenders for the service of mails between Dalhousie, N.B., and Gaspé Basin, or to continue the same subsidy of \$12,500 to the steamer "Admiral" for the said services?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract which has been in existence for some years between the Government and the steamer "Admiral" has now lapsed, and it is the intention of the Government to call for tenders for a new service.

THE POSTMASTER OF LIVERPOOL, COUNTY OF LEVIS.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) asked, Have the Government accepted the resignation of Mr. Albert Forcade as postmaster of New Liverpool, in the county of Levis? Have any persons applied to be appointed in his stead? If so, who are the said persons? Who has been appointed postmaster of New Liverpool, and on whose recommendation has the appointment been made?

Sir A. P. CARON. (Translation.) Mr. Albert Forcade resigned on the 20th December, 1892. His resignation was accepted on the 28th of the same month. The applications made to the department were from MM. Michel Robert McReady and Honore McReady. Mr. Michel McReady was appointed postmaster on the 28th December, 1892.

CORNWALLIS VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause the mails to be carried over the Cornwallis Valley Branch Railway, and when? What are the names of the post offices to be served, and how many times a day will each be served? Will the carrying of the mails from the railway stations to the respective post offices be let by public tender and contract? Has the Government authorized a private citizen of King's county, N.S., either directly or through any official, to negotiate for private offers for the carrying of the said mails?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is the intention of the Government to utilize the Cornwallis

Mr. COATSWORTH.

Valley Railway for mail service as soon as arrangements can be completed, which will be almost immediately. Canning, Kingsport, Sheffield and Centreville will be served four times daily; Saxon Street, Upper Dyke Village and Upper Canard twice daily; Port Williams, Church Street, Lower Canard and Canard and Chipman's Corners once daily; Medford tri-weekly.

Mr. BORDEN. Will the contract be let by public tender?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No doubt such will be the case, as that is always done.

I. C. R.—EMPLOYEES DISCHARGED.

Mr. GUAY asked, How many permanent employees of the Intercolonial Railway at the following stations:—Chaudière Curve, Hadlow Cove, Levis and Harlaka—were discharged between 1st May, 1892, and 1st December, 1892? Have some of them been reinstated in their positions since their discharge? If so, why and how many, and at which of the stations aforesaid?

Mr. HAGGART. The total number of employees dismissed between 1st May, 1892, and 1st December, 1892, was, at Chaudière, 7; Hadlow, 10; Harlaka, 1; Levis, 10. Of those whose services were dispensed with at Chaudière, two car-repairers and one switchman have been re-employed. At Hadlow two call boys have been re-employed. At Levis the assistant baggagemaster and three porters have been re-employed.

THE COTTON TARIFF.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, In view of the very important statement made in this House on the 17th of February by the hon. member for South Ontario regarding the combinations formed by the cotton manufacturers of Canada, and in view of the promise of the First Minister last session as follows:—

If it were established as the hon. gentleman seems to assert, that the tariff was the means of enabling such a company to act oppressively to the consumers, it would certainly not very long remain so,—

what action do the Government intend to take in order to relieve the consumers of cotton from the extortion to which they are subjected, whereby four millions of dollars in excess of the value has been abstracted from said consumers during the last year under the present tariff?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman's question is not in order, Mr. Speaker. He will have to withdraw the assertions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am willing to drop the last clause if the hon. Minister will answer the previous clauses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The last clause is not the only objection.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I will put it in another shape.

VALUE OF CANADIAN FISHERIES.

Mr. LISTER asked, When will the supplementary report of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, comprising statement of yield and value of the Canadian fisheries, be distributed to members?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The supplementary report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, comprising statements of the yield and value of the Canadian fisheries, etc., is now being prepared, and will be distributed to members as soon as printed. These statistics are for the calendar year. They take a long time to compile. The particulars necessary to complete them come from remote districts, where fishing is actively pursued until the very close of navigation, necessarily involving much labour and precluding the possibility of laying them on the Table of the House by the opening of Parliament.

I. C. R.—RATES ON COAL AND IRON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What rate of freight is charged on the Intercolonial Railway for the carriage of coal from Stellarton to Londonderry mines; also, what is the rate of freight charged on pig iron from Londonderry westward by the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. 1st. Freight on coal from Stellarton to Londonderry mines, 30 cents per ton; 2nd. Intercolonial Railway proportion of rate on pig iron from Londonderry mines for the west, via Chaudiere, ranges from \$1.97 to \$2.79 per ton, or an average of \$2.38.

WRIT FOR SOUTH MIDDLESEX.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to call the attention of the Government to the fact, that although the Speaker's warrant has been issued for some time for the election in South Middlesex, the writ has not yet been issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Of course, no blame is to be attached to the clerk; he is waiting the action of the Government to appoint a returning officer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will see about that matter to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Mr. Speaker, there were two reasons last night why I moved the adjournment of the debate. In the first place, so seldom do I trouble the House that I thought I might venture to ask your in-

dulgence for a short time this afternoon, and in the second place, I felt that some of the statements made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) were of such a character, that I thought they should not be allowed to go unchallenged to the country. I would not consider these statements so objectionable were they made by him simply as the hon. member for that riding, but he is known throughout the length and breadth of the province of Ontario, from his long connections with the farmers' institutes, not only as a practical, but as a progressive and prosperous farmer, and I considered that his assertions might have considerable weight with the farmers of that province. I have the honour to represent a riding which is a typical one in the province of Ontario. It is mainly agricultural, having three towns, in one of which there are extensive manufactures. From time immemorial that riding has had very strong Reform leanings. In fact in 1878 its verdict was against the National Policy, not only in the farming districts but also in the manufacturing town of Oshawa, and this verdict was given notwithstanding that the Conservative candidate was one of the most popular men who ever lived in the riding, the late Hon. T. N. Gibbs. Favours from the Conservative Government had no weight in that riding, because any favours which the riding may have received had been given by the Government of which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was the Finance Minister, and these favours have been somewhat supplemented by the Ontario Government, the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. From this point of view the question naturally arises: Why has that constituency gone Conservative; why have the farmers changed their votes from Reform to Conservative, and why has the manufacturing town of Oshawa which gave a number of Reform majorities, changed its political leanings, so that now its people support the Conservative Government and the National Policy? I need not discuss the effect of the National Policy on the manufacturing industries, either in the town of Oshawa or in the Dominion generally, because, even hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted that a policy of protection is in the interests of the manufacturers and the artisans. In fact, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that these classes are bloodthirsty monsters fattening upon the farmers' life blood, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other evening—I do not say in quite so musical a voice, but certainly in a much louder one—stated that the manufacturers of the Dominion were not in as good a position to-day as they were in 1878. The opinions of these two hon. gentlemen are supported by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who declared that protection was fraudulent and immoral. I do not propose to endeavour to attain that hon. gentleman's high moral standard; the Bible is

sufficient for me, because it states that one is worse than an infidel who will not take care of his own.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). As I understand protection, it is a policy by which a country does take care of its own. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) also declared loudly against combines, but he took good care not to state in this House that he was closely connected with one of the greatest combines to be found in this Dominion, the Law Society of the province of Ontario. I take it for granted, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is right when he states that the manufacturers and the artisans of Canada are benefited by the National Policy, and, I take it, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—almost the only representative of the manufacturers they have left them on the other side of the House—is wrong in his contention. Now let us see if the statement made by these hon. gentlemen, that the success of our manufacturing industries has been purchased at the expense of the farmers, is correct. The farmers are in a very large majority in this country, their interests are predominantly large, and anything that affects them prejudicially must be felt by the whole people. Let me ask, does the country show any ill effects from this National Policy? Is Canada in a worse condition to-day than it was in the past when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was declaring his donothing and his fly-on-the-wheel policy, which characterized the unfortunate series of years when he was Finance Minister? Figures used to contradict the statements of these hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and they contradict their statements to-day, and when they are driven into a corner on this point, we hear them declare: that hard times during that period were spread all over the world, but that Canada suffered less than any other country. I do not propose to-day to overwhelm you with figures, but I will just submit a few. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has tried to show from our trade returns that the country is not prosperous, and I propose to use some of the same figures that he has used more than once in this House, as well as some of the trade returns issued by the country to the south of us, in making a comparison of the two periods, under Conservative rule and under Reform rule respectively. The total trade of the United States in 1867 was \$690,000,000; in 1874 it was \$1,153,000,000, an increase of 57 per cent. In 1879 it had only increased to \$1,156,000,000—it was almost at a standstill; in 1892 it had increased to \$1,857,000,000, or 60 per cent. The trade of Canada in 1868 was \$131,000,000; in 1874 it had increased to \$217,000,000, or 66 per cent; in 1879 it had decreased to \$153,000,000, a decrease of 29 per cent; in 1892

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

it rose to \$241,000,000, an increase of 57 per cent in 13 years. Now, what does this show? It shows that the only period in which the trade of Canada retrograded was that unfortunate period between 1874 and 1879, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Along with the extension of our foreign trade since 1879 it must be remembered that our inter-provincial trade has increased enormously. Now, the Government policy, as I understand it, is not only for the purpose of raising a revenue, but it has in view also the promotion of the interests of the farmers and all other classes in the community. It was promised that the National Policy would secure to the farmer his home market. Has it done that? Travel upon either of our two great highways, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, and you will see a great many refrigerator cars carrying beef. A great deal of that beef may be going to England; but large quantities of it go also to the eastern states to supply the large cities and towns and villages there. We know that this trade would have existed in Canada too but for the increased duty placed upon that article three years ago. So it is with many other articles. Our farmers have certainly gained from the duty on wheat. The local market is unquestionably the best market for wheat, because it insures the farmer getting back some of the refuse of the wheat he sells. The National Policy has also enlarged his market. There has been since its introduction an enormous increase in the importation of raw products into Canada. The census taken two years after the introduction of the National Policy showed that there had been not only a large increase in the imports of raw materials, but a very large increase in the number of artisans employed, and that being the case, there is no question that the home market of the farmers was very much enlarged. In 1878 the artisans and mechanics of this country had very low wages, and along with that, they could only get work during a portion of the year; but that has been all changed by the National Policy. I know that in my own riding, during that period, moulders were getting only \$1.50 per day for only a portion of the year, whereas to-day they are, getting work all the year round at \$2.25 per day; and the wages of labourers have increased 25 per cent. The farmers were also promised that the National Policy would secure for them better prices. There is no question that prices in Canada to-day for all farm products are relatively higher than they are in New York or London. It was also promised that we should be able to buy cheaper. The hon. member for South Oxford has stated that the farmers of Canada are bled white. Now, what are the facts? Let us see. The machinery we have been manufacturing of late years is very much improved and it is worth a great deal more to us than it was in earlier days. All the goods used by the farmer are cheaper, from the

boots on his feet to the cap on his head, from the plough with which he breaks the ground, to the thresher that separates the grain. A binder which cost \$325 in 1878, can be purchased to-day for \$115; a mower which then cost \$80, can be purchased to-day for \$55; a seed-drill which then cost \$95, can be purchased now for \$55; a horse-rake which then cost \$35, can be purchased now for \$25; a plough which then cost \$16, can be purchased now for \$12. Wagons, buggies, sugar, tea, coffee, cottons, woollens, boots and shoes are all cheaper in the same ratio. It is stated that articles can be manufactured cheaper. That, to a certain extent, may be true, but in the main it is not. Now, I have stated that to-day we are buying cheaper, and I am prepared to show you that we are selling more. In 1892 we exported of animals and their products \$28,000,000, and of agricultural products, \$22,000,000, making a total of \$50,000,000. In 1878 we exported of animals and their products, \$14,000,000, and of agricultural products, \$18,000,000, making a total of \$32,000,000, showing a difference in these exports between 1879 and 1892 of over \$18,000,000. The difference in our imports of breadstuffs for consumption in 1891 over 1878, was nearly \$11,000,000. Our imports of provisions have increased in the same time by \$3,000,000. Now, our population has increased by half a million, and assuming that it costs \$40 a year, as has been stated, to feed each person, the value of the food for this increase of population would be \$20,000,000, which makes a total of \$52,000,000. I think that proves conclusively that the farmers of Canada are selling more by \$50,000,000 in 1892 than they did in 1878. We are not only selling more, but we are able to buy cheaper. Therefore, I can scarcely understand the contention of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the farmers of this country are in a state of unrest. They were in a worse state of unrest in 1878. I know that there is a certain amount of unrest among the farmers of Canada to-day; I am prepared to admit that; but it is not to be found in the ranks of the Conservative farmers of Canada. The farmer friends of hon. gentlemen opposite are in a state of unrest, and why is it? My experience leads me to this conclusion, that the keenest politicians to be found in my riding are the Reform farmers, who are disappointed because their friends cannot get into office. For that reason they are in a state of unrest, and they are likely to continue so. Now, I want to draw your attention to one of the statements made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) last night, that the cost of producing grain was so high in Ontario that it could not be grown profitably to-day. I admit that there is a certain amount of force in his contentions, but I wish to impress upon this House and the country that we have grown too much grain and that our farmers would do better if they would turn

their attention to something else. If they continue on the old lines of trying to produce grains of different kinds, they cannot make as much money as they could by going on other lines. If it takes too much, as the hon. gentleman contends, to produce grain, the farmer cannot blame the National Policy for that, for it lies at his hands to turn his attention to other lines, as the Government have pointed out from time to time. The Government have been experimenting from year to year on their different farms throughout the Dominion in order to show how we can change our mode of farming and reap increased profits, and it is for our farmers to take advantage of these experiments. Another statement of the hon. gentleman was that we are losing so much yearly upon the articles we send into the United States. One of those articles he mentioned was horses. Well, nobody knows better than the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) that his statement in that connection was mere buncombe. He knows that we have lost the American trade in horses, and that it is worth nothing to-day to us. Why is it that the decrease in pure-bred horses to-day is much greater than in the commoner kind, although on the pure-bred there is no duty? There is nothing in that argument. If the American market is worth nothing to us to-day in horses, it is mainly because electricity has taken the place of horses on the street railways in all the towns and cities of the United States. The hon. gentleman mentioned another article, that of hogs, and said they are higher in the United States than they are in Canada to-day, and from this he draws the conclusion that if we had reciprocity we would gain by it. But what has happened this year has happened but once before in the last ten years, and would it be wise for our Government because of this exceptional state of things, to take the course indicated by the hon. gentleman? Then, with regard to the question of corn, the hon. gentleman said that its free admission would be a great benefit to our farmers by cheapening the production of pork. But why is it that Canadian pork to-day is worth more in England than the American pork, although Canadian pork is not fed on corn? It is generally admitted that corn does not produce the best of pork; and if we brought corn in the country and used it to feed our hogs, that article of export would soon lose the hold it has in England to-day. As a farmer myself, representing a constituency in which there is a great deal of feeding done, I have no hesitation whatever in declaring that I do not believe one hundred bushels of corn would be bought in that riding to-day, if it were admitted free, and, therefore, I think that the course of the Government in retaining the duty is highly to be commended. Another of the hon. gentleman's statements was in connection with the labouring man on the farm who, he said, has to pay \$20 duty per year on the clothing he wears. No-

body knows better than the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) that that statement has very little if any foundation. Boots can be purchased to-day, such as the labouring man wears, cheaper in Canada than in the United States; his coat, vest, pants and underclothing can be bought in Canada cheaper to-day than on the other side of the line; and if he has saved a certain amount of money and wants to sport imported goods on a Sunday, he has a right to contribute to the revenue of the country. Reference was also made by the hon. gentleman to binder twine. That is a question which has excited a great deal of attention throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and the hon. gentleman has perhaps been one of those who helped most to intensify that feeling. He made the statement that the Central prison was able to produce twine now at 9 cents a pound. Here is the Government engaged in an industry which pays no interest upon the amount invested in the building, which pays no taxes or wages, and yet they can produce the article at 9 cents per pound. Why, in my riding last year we had only to pay from 10 to 12 cents per pound for binder twine, just as good as any manufactured in that prison, and I doubt very much whether the prison-manufactured article will compare favourably with the twine manufactured outside, for the reason that the convicts are only confined for short dates, so that by the time they have properly learned the business they leave the prison, besides being in unjust competition with honest labour. Whilst our farmers may have many difficulties to encounter, and I am prepared candidly to admit that fact, they are selling more to-day and buying cheaper, and I cannot but come to the conclusion that the Government has acted wisely in deciding, before making any great change, to carefully look into the whole matter, item by item, and I venture to predict that a year from now, when these things come before the House, a statement will be made which will be as satisfactory as the course and policy of the present administration of the Conservative party has been in the past.

Mr. CHARLTON. For the last fourteen years we have been engaged from time to time in discussing the system of protection or the National Policy. We have had it discussed in various ways. Some speakers, like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, have discussed it, for the purpose of making the worse appear the better cause, for the purpose of bolstering up the institution for political and partisan objects, as is generally done by speakers on the opposite side. Other speakers have discussed this question for the purpose of arriving at the truth, if possible, and of ascertaining whether the allegations made with reference to this policy are correct. I think that the evidences of revolt existing in various parts of the country would indicate most unmistakably that the public mind is arriving at the conclusion that the views of the Government are altogether wrong and

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).

that those who attack this policy do so on ample and just grounds. We have had in this House this session evidences of this feeling of dissatisfaction. We have had motions emanating from that side of the House against the duty on binder twine, coal oil and corn. These are evidences of a dissatisfaction existing in the ranks of the party opposite, which is not fully laid bare by the slight surface indications we are permitted to note. We have, Sir, evidence that this feeling of insecurity, this feeling of dissatisfaction is a widespread one, from the fact that the Government itself proposes to modify its policy, proposes to take into consideration the various arguments that have been advanced, to have commissioners make a tour of the country for the purpose of examining into the industries of Canada, promising to be governed by the information thus obtained in the modifications of the National Policy which they propose to make. I presume, Sir, they will find the task a difficult one. It is like taking out stones from an arch, with the danger of bringing down the whole structure about their ears. The National Policy interests are so interwoven with one another, are so mutually dependent upon one another, that one duty can scarcely be removed without affecting a great many industries. And when the Government proceed to the consideration of this question and attempt tariff reforms, we, upon this side, shall watch, with a great deal of interest and curiosity, the result of the experiment they may be disposed to make with reference to the reduction of duties. I do not believe, Sir, that the thing can be done unless they change their policy, and, if the position taken by the hon. member for South Ontario is a correct one, if the policy has conferred such blessings and benefits upon this country as the hon. gentleman represents, I should like to know why the Government should entertain, for a moment, the proposition to modify this policy at all. If it is what the hon. gentleman claims, we need no modification and the very course the Government propose to adopt is evidence that the Government and the supporters of the Government are not honest in the representations they make of the blessings conferred upon the country by this policy. It is clear that while they are urging that the policy is all that could be desired, they acknowledge, by their actions, that it requires modifications, and that they are compelled to consider the propriety of making modifications. Sir, we are passing through a period of our history when we may profit by the experience of a much larger country to the south of us. We copied this policy, Sir, from the United States. We have put this policy in operation upon a stage much less favourable for its operation than the United States, in a country of more restricted resources and much smaller population, and so the evils which have followed have become even more

palpably manifest than in the United States. We are likely to follow the United States in another respect. They had an election in that country last fall, in which the people declared themselves unequivocally against the "National Policy" of that country. Two years ago an overwhelming majority were returned to Congress opposed to this policy, and, in November last, a president opposed to the existing system was elected by a larger majority than any of his predecessors for many years. The defeat of protection was overwhelming. As we have followed their example in instituting protection and have suffered all the evils the system is calculated to produce, so we are likely to follow their example in the next general election in having an overwhelming popular verdict against this system recorded in Canada as has been rendered against this same system in the United States last fall.

Protection, Sir, notwithstanding all that may be said in favour of it, is neither more nor less than a species of slavery. The slave is deprived of the product of his labour and is obliged to work without compensation. The producing classes in a country where protection is in vogue are deprived of a portion of the products of their labour and are compelled to pay taxes for the benefit of combines and monopolies; they are made tributary to favoured classes, and, to the extent that they suffer in this respect, they are slaves under this system. It is a system as indefensible upon the broad principles of justice as slavery which is absolute and unconditional. What are the farmers of this country compelled to do, notwithstanding all that my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith) says? The hon. gentleman says the National Policy has redeemed the promise made for it to create a home market which would absorb the productions of our farms. And, in the very next breath, he tells us that the farmers of Canada exported last year \$28,000,000 worth of animals and their produce and \$22,000,000 of their agricultural products. Thus, in almost the same moment of time, he says that the National Policy has made a market for the farmer and also that the farmers have been obliged to export \$50,000,000 of their products, notwithstanding the promise that the National Policy would create a market which would absorb them all. The hon. gentleman tells us that the prices of farm products are more satisfactory in this country than they were in 1878. I wonder the hon. gentleman did not blush when he made that assertion. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country could have the prices they had under the Mackenzie Administration. I wish we could have again \$1 a bushel for barley and \$1.25 for wheat. Sir, if the farmers of this country could have the scale of prices that were in vogue from 1874 to 1878, we would not have the depression existing in this country which does exist at the present moment. The hon. gentleman makes a comparison between the

exportation of produce from this country and the imports into this country for various periods. And he takes a period of depression, a period of world-wide depression existing from 1873 to 1878, and gravely informs us that because there was not a great expansion of trade at that time when there was no expansion of trade in any of the nations on the globe, the policy in vogue at that time, tried in comparison with the one that succeeded it, is thereby proven a failure. He speaks of the desirability of farmers changing their methods of work and mode of farming. I suppose the hon. gentleman is referring to the two-rowed barley business. What he says reminds me of an Irishman in the west, whose cellar was flooded by the bursting of a water pipe. He went to the city clerk to see about it, and the city clerk told him that the city would fix the pipe and the water would be pumped out of his cellar. "But," he said, "my lot has been flooded, too." "Well," said the clerk, "we will get the water off your lot and it will dry up, and the thing'll be all right." "But," persisted the Irishman, "my chickens are drowned." "Then," answered the clerk, "why in thunder don't you raise ducks?" So the farmer is advised to raise ducks; they are advised to raise two-rowed barley, or go into the business of fattening cattle for the English market. A great many schemes are proposed for the benefit of the farmers by the enterprising Government opposite, and these schemes are just now about as reasonable and successful as either of the instances I give. Sir, the farmer of this country is beginning to realize, and it is not the Reform farmer alone who realizes it, that his surplus productions are sold in the open markets of the world. He must compete in England in selling wheat with the Coolie labour of India; he must sell in the open markets of the world, and must meet the widest and fiercest competition from every producer of the same article all over the globe, and must therefore sell at the lowest rate. This is the condition of the farmer when he has anything to sell abroad. But he begins to see that even when he sells at home, the price of the surplus product which is shipped abroad fixes the price at which he must sell in the home market. And, when he comes to buy, he finds that he has to buy in a restricted market. He is not allowed to take advantage of the competition from which he suffers when he sells, but he must make his purchases in a market from which competition is excluded and where the price of everything is artificially enhanced. He realizes that while he sells in the open market he buys in a restricted market in which the restrictions are for the benefit of combines and monopolies. The farmer is beginning to see that this state of things is one that he cannot and must not sanction. It is one which he will vote against at the first

opportunity he has to do so. He feels severely the gigantic burdens the Government has placed upon him. He finds that he must pay interest on \$60,000,000 of debt incurred in subsidizing a railway built to the lands of the North-west, the result of which is to bring them into competition with the cheaper fertile lands of that country and to depress the price of his own productions. He is paying interest upon a debt contracted for building canals in which he had no interest, which were built for the trade of the western states of America. He is paying interest upon a sum amounting to nearly \$250,000,000, a debt of \$50 a head resting upon every man, woman and child. Every man, woman and child is required to pay over \$2 annually in interest upon that debt. He is helping to pay the expenses of an extravagant Government. He is paying interest on the railway subsidies that the Government have granted from time to time for political purposes, in order that they might make somebody solid in some particular riding, and at the same time have a chance to toll these subsidies to the extent of 20, 30 or 40 per cent for election purposes. He is bearing all these burdens, and he is dissatisfied, there is no question about it. There is a feeling of unrest in the country, as my hon. friend says, and that feeling of unrest is not confined to Liberal farmers. It is widespread, it is general, it pervades all parts and all classes; and those who are upholding this system, when they next appeal to the country, will learn something about the extent of that feeling of discontent that now exists among the farmers of this country. Sir, the farmer is learning some more lessons with regard to political economy. He is learning that the number of dollars of duty paid by him and extracted from his pocket, is not a correct measure of the loss he sustains in consequence of this system. He is beginning to understand that every dollar of duty upon an article is so much added to its cost, and that before that article reaches him, there is added to that duty the profits of the wholesaler and the retailer, making it at least 40 per cent more, and that for every dollar the Government receives, he pays \$1.40 at least, in many cases, \$1.50. He begins to understand the question of incidental taxation. He begins to understand that the policy of protection is not to realize revenue, but to exclude goods from the country, and that the real operation of protection is to enable the manufacturer to raise the prices of all the goods that he produces to a point just within the amount for which these goods can be imported and the duties paid; and that, consequently, on all articles of domestic manufacture, the farmer is paying what those articles would cost, if bought in the open markets of the world, and in addition to that, he is paying to the manufacturer almost the sum of the duty that the Government would collect, if these goods were imported. The result of this is what? Last year

Mr. CHARLTON.

the duties were \$20,550,000. The duties, added to the cost of the article and the profit from those duties which the wholesale and retail dealers made, amounted to over \$8,000,000, over 40 cents on the dollar. That was the incidental tax the farmer paid. If the basis is correct, which is established by many American political economists, that for every \$3 of duty paid into the Government the farmer pays \$5 of incidental taxation to the domestic manufacturers, then the incidental tax the farmer has paid in consequence of the existence of the duties upon the class of goods that is brought into the country, and manufactured in the country, has amounted to \$34,000,000 more. So the loss of the consuming class of farmers is the amount of the duty, \$20,550,000, the profit upon the duty, \$8,000,000, and the incidental taxation, or the enhanced cost of the domestic goods produced in this country, \$42,000,000, or the sum of \$64,000,000 extracted from the pockets of the consumers of this country in order that the Government may realize a duty of \$20,550,000. Now, this may not be mathematically correct; of course, it is an approximate calculation. It may be more; it probably is more. It may be less; but in any event the sum is enormous, and the farmer is being bled in these ways I have mentioned. Now, this is a wasteful system. Of course, it would be better to resort to direct taxation than to compel these men to pay three to one, or even two to one, on the amount of customs taxation that is collected. Now, Sir, the assertion is often made, and was made by my hon. friend from South Ontario, that goods are cheaper than they were ten years ago. Suppose they are. The question is: Are goods as cheap as they would be if the duties were removed?

An hon. MEMBER. Cheaper.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some political economist opposite says they are cheaper. I suppose coal oil is cheaper than it would be if the duties were removed. According to his theory, double the duty, and it would be still cheaper. The question is: Would goods be as cheap as they are, or cheaper than they are, if the duties were removed? and the answer of any sane man would be, Yes, and they are dearer to the extent of the duty in almost all cases. If goods are cheaper than they were ten years ago, the question is how much cheaper would they be if the restrictions upon trade were removed? That is the question we have got to deal with, and the other is quite foreign to the inquiry. Now, the system of protection is one that enables the manufacturer, in many cases, to charge a higher rate for his goods than he can afford to produce them for. It is a well-known fact that Canadian purchasers can go to the United States and buy goods for importation into Canada cheaper than the merchants in that country can buy them, in many cases 20 or 30 per cent cheaper, for the reason that the tariff enables the Am-

erican manufacturer to bleed his own customers where he has control of the market; and if a foreigner comes there to buy and the manufacturer has to compete with outside parties, then he puts the price down to the level where he has a fair profit, which is 20 or 30 per cent less, even than he sells to his own customers. We have an instance of this kind in Canada in the Cordage Company at Halifax. You can go to St. John's, Newfoundland, and buy cordage made by that company 2 cents a pound cheaper than in Halifax. Why is that? Because they are selling it in Halifax, protected by the tariff duties, at 2 cents a pound more than a fair profit for manufacturing it; but if they are selling it in Newfoundland they have to compete with cordage companies elsewhere, and they have to sell it at a figure which affords them a profit which makes it desirable for them to sell there; but it does not enable them to get the price they can get in Halifax where they have control. We find that illustrated in the history of the cotton companies in this country. The enormous dividends they are paying, the enormous sums they are carrying to rest, all indicate that they are making higher profits than they are entitled to make, and the tariff constructed by hon. gentlemen opposite is a machine designed for the purpose of enabling these concerns to bleed the consumers of the country by charging prices greatly in excess of the price at which they might afford to manufacture those goods, and at which they would manufacture them if they were subjected to competition. Now, in view of all these facts we have a demand for a sweeping tariff reform, and if hon. gentlemen opposite can give us that reform, all right. If they cannot give it, the people will, in my humble opinion, try somebody else upon whom will devolve the duty of doing it. As to how fast we should make this change, of course, that is a question to be considered. We have the manufacturers to consider, we have the farmers to consider, the lumberman, the fisherman, the mine owner and the labourer—we have all these classes of interests to consider. Heretofore we have been considering the interest of the manufacturer only. Of course, we must not lose sight of his interest entirely, we must not wantonly do him an injustice, but we must not let him profit at the expense of the other producing classes of this country. We must endeavour to do justice to all, and to remove these enormous and unjust burdens that exist under the National Policy system in vogue to-day.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to review very briefly a few of the points made in the debate hitherto. It is a question, of course, that has been pretty well thrashed out; to use a common expression, and I shall not have very much to say upon it. I shall not go into it as extensively, or treat of so many subjects, as I should have done had I spoken earlier in the debate. I wish to re-

fer briefly, at the outset, to some statements made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech with respect to a question of very great importance to one of the leading interests of the country. I refer to the lumber interests, and I refer to the statements made by the hon. gentleman with regard to the intention of the Government respecting the export duty on logs. I had not the pleasure of listening to the speech of the Minister of Finance, but I find in "Hansard" he is reported to have said:

The facts of the case are to-day that a most wasteful, and I believe entirely unnecessary, drain is being made on the timber resources of this country under present conditions.

And further:

It is well that this matter should undergo most serious and calm consideration, utterly removed from partisanship or trade reprisals, or the like, upon its own broad and sufficient basis.

And still further:

It (the Government) will not consider that it is debarred from taking the course that is shown to be imperatively necessary because any persons have, last year or this year, on the existing state of things, bought limits or invested in timber lands in our country.

That is to say, that no vested interests in this respect are to be considered. He will consider vested rights in manufactures, but the vested rights of a man investing his money in timber limits will not receive any consideration from the Government whatever. The lumber industry of this country has been in a depressed condition for a good many years past, until last year. Last year the lumbermen of Canada were prosperous. They had nearly reached the condition when the shackles on the trade were entirely removed. The duty on lumber going into the American market was \$1 per thousand on white pine lumber, the export duty had been removed, and the lumber trade was in a high degree of prosperity. The condition of the trade was satisfactory to those who were engaged in it, and the indications with respect to it were very clearly shown by the result of the timber limit sale held by the Government of Ontario last fall, when 600 miles of timber put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder realized bonuses of \$2,300,000, an enormous sum, and one much in excess of the bonuses received on any previous sale. I quote this sale as indicating the state of prosperity and the buoyant feeling existing in the lumber circles of this country. Now, it will be borne in mind that this trade is one which the Government does not foster; on the contrary, it is a trade upon which the Government imposes burdens. The National Policy bears heavily on this trade; the duties upon chain, axes, saws, all kinds of tools, blankets and material used in the lumber camp have been endured without a murmur. The Government have conferred no benefit, they have not fostered the trade in any way

whatever; on the contrary, they have imposed heavy exactions on the trade; and the effect of an announcement such as that made by the Minister of Finance a week ago, to-day, is a disquieting one. Here are men who have purchased timber, and the time of the year has arrived when they will be making contracts of sale. These logs will soon be reaching the mill, they will soon undergo the process of manufacture into lumber, and buyers will come to purchase. On the one hand, the buyer does not know whether the export duty will be reimposed and lumber duties go up in the United States in consequence; and the seller, on the other hand, does not know, and this state of uncertainty is embarrassing to both purchaser and seller, and has a demoralizing and unfavourable influence upon that great trade. Sir, I should like to inquire why the Government feels it incumbent upon itself to harry this business. Their policy has been one of change. They first levied an export duty of \$1, then they put it up to \$2, then they increased the duty to \$3, they then put it back to \$2, then, under the statutory provisions of the McKinley Bill, they removed it, and they are now considering what they had better do next. The lumber trade does not know what the Government intend to do, and in this case, as in the case of all important industries, uncertainty has a disastrous effect on the trade. I regret that the Minister of Finance saw fit to make such an announcement in his Budget speech. He would have acted more wisely if he had made his investigation first and arrived at a conclusion as to whether a change was desirable, than to first make the announcement he did a week ago. With respect to the export of logs, the American limit holder would, in the great majority of cases, prefer to manufacture his logs in this country; but there are degrees of uncertainty, in various respects, that deter him from doing so. In the first place, the Ontario Government have refused to make the tenure as regards Crown dues permanent; they have refused to give the limit holder a Crown dues' rate of \$1 per thousand with the assurance that this will continue for a fixed period, and the American is left ignorant as to how soon that regulation may be changed, and uncertain as to the moment at which the Ontario Government may increase the dues. Then the attitude of the Government here is another factor that deters the American lumberman from engaging in the construction of mills in Canada. He can tow his logs over to the United States and suspend his operations next year, if necessary, but, if he builds a mill, he invests a large sum, and the profit on that investment depends on his ability to use the mill continuously year after year; and if he is subject to uncertainty as regards the tenure of the Crown dues by the Ontario Government, and the additional uncertainty whether there will be an export duty or not and whether there will be an increase of the American im-

Mr. CHARLTON.

port duty, contingent on the imposition of the export duty, he naturally refrains from making an investment, and continues to carry on his business as he has done during two or three years past, towing logs and sawing them at mills already built, rather than making investments in fixed plant in this country under the conditions I have named. The truth is that at the present moment the advantages are in favour of sawing lumber in Canada. The lumberman who tows logs to Michigan does so at a disadvantage. I may take my own case. I gave a contract last year for sawing a certain quantity of logs in Canada at \$3 per thousand, which included towing about 10 miles to the mill. It costs \$1 per thousand to pay the American duty, and \$2.25 freight to Buffalo or Tonawanda, New York, making a total of \$6.25. If I had towed those logs to Michigan, the cost of towing to Saginaw would have been \$1.50, the expense of towing the logs up the Saginaw River to the mill from 35 cents to 60 cents, on an average 50 cents, the cost of sawing there \$2, freight to Tonawanda or Buffalo, \$2.25, which makes exactly the same sum as the cost of placing that lumber on the Buffalo market, sawn either at a Canadian mill, situated as the one was where I did my sawing, or taking the logs to Saginaw and sawing them there. In the one case the \$1 per thousand duty was saved, but the disadvantages almost exactly compensated for that. There was, however, the risk of towing not taken into account. I presume that no company of underwriters would insure log rafts at 10 per cent, and men engaged in log towing generally place the percentage of loss as equal to 75 cents per thousand.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman talks of towing logs to Saginaw and sending them to market at Tonawanda. What about the freight from one place to the other?

Mr. CHARLTON. The freight is the same from Georgian Bay ports as it is from Saginaw. The difference in favour of sawing in Canada would be whatever the risk was in towing, whether it is 10 per cent, amounting to about \$1, or 75 cents, as is generally supposed. The American who tows his logs to Saginaw to saw is placed at a disadvantage equal to this towing risk. Under these circumstances the Americans would be glad to build mills in Canada, and all that is necessary to secure a transfer of the business of manufacturing from the American to the Georgian Bay side is to give a sense of security and permanence, first, as to the Crown dues of Ontario, and second, as to the policy of the Canadian Government. If that were secured, we would see fewer logs towed, and more lumber sawn on this side.

With regard to the depleting of our limits, which the Finance Minister laments, let me inquire: What were these limits sold for? Was the purpose in selling these limits to prohibit the buyer from cut-

ting the timber, or was it intended, after selling him the limits, to throw obstructions in the way of carrying on his business? I think, on the contrary, that these limits were sold to the buyers for the purpose of being worked. I think that the Government sold them, first of all, for the purpose of securing such revenue as it could by receiving bonuses at the sale, and, secondly, for securing Crown dues on the timber as it is cut by the owner and sent to the markets. Now, with regard to the depletion of the forests. The province of Ontario contains 197,000 square miles. Less than 25,000 square miles of that is under cultivation. The Government have placed under license, since Confederation, less than 10,000 square miles of timber. The amount placed under license before Confederation was 12,500 square miles, and I venture to say, that, on at least one-third of that area placed under license since Confederation, not a stick has yet been cut, and the amount of timber remaining on the other two-thirds is more than one-half the total quantity originally there. If there are 25,000 square miles of cultivated land, and 22,000 miles of timber land, under license, deduct that 47,000 square miles from the 197,000 square miles and you have the amount of unlicensed territory and forest land in private hands in the province of Ontario, which is 157,000 out of the total cost of 197,000 square miles.

Mr. REID. What about the water? Is there any included in that?

Mr. CHARLTON. Of the amount put under license before and since Confederation, the quantity now said by the Crown land authorities to be actually under license is less than 16,000 square miles, which covers water as well as land. It is estimated that there are 197,000 square miles of territory in the province, at least 150,000 square miles of this, besides the amount covered by license, is in forest. Now, there is not more than one-tenth of the forest area of Ontario under license to-day, and the policy of the province of Ontario has been a careful and conservative policy. The Government of that province is wide awake to the necessity of conserving their timber resources, and it does not intend to bring this territory into market faster than the wants of the country require. It intends to reserve a vast area of unoccupied lands, and, consequently, the alarm that is felt with regard to the depletion of the forests in that province is unnecessary and unfounded. If only about one-tenth of the total forest area of that province is under license, surely hon. gentlemen will realize that the alarm felt about the depletion of the forests of the province is without foundation.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what Mr. Phipps, your commissioner, said in Toronto.

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot tell what Mr. Phipps says. Here on one hand is the area

of the province, here the amount of cultivated land, here on the other hand the statistics as to the amount of that land placed under license and the amount remaining, and you put the two latter sums together, and the balance is the unoccupied territory, which amounts to 150,000 square miles at least, which is not covered by license, and which is still under timber, and from my personal observation I can say that the best timbered sections of Ontario are yet to be placed under license. But it may be asked, why do the people export logs? Simply because it is to their advantage to do so. Why does the lumberman of Maine export his logs to Canada? Because it is to his advantage. Why does the lumberman on the Georgian Bay export his logs to the United States? Because it is to his advantage. Business men will figure up these things for themselves, and if you do not interfere with them they will make that use of their property which is most conducive to their prosperity, and every time you do interfere with them you are doing mischief rather than good. We might as well talk about depleting our mines, we might as well talk about depleting our granaries, we might as well talk about depleting our herds, we might as well talk about an export duty upon barley for the purpose of having it all made into malt in this country, we might as well talk about an export duty on wool, and we might as well talk about an export duty on wheat for the purpose of having it all ground in this country, as to talk about an export duty on logs. The best way to do with this matter is to let it regulate itself. When people talk about the depletion of forests, they fail to remember that, up to this time, the balance of trade in saw-logs exported has been in favour of Canada, and that we have imported more logs than we have exported. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the year ending 30th June, 1892, our export of logs was to the value of \$798,000, and our imports, including an estimate based upon the average of several years past, into New Brunswick, added to the imports given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, amounted to the value of \$951,000, or, in other words, we imported last year \$150,000 worth of logs in excess of the amount we exported.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman know that the Trade and Navigation Returns do not keep an account of a large number of them?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Trade and Navigation Returns are supposed to take account of all logs exported.

Mr. SPROULE. But they do not.

Mr. CHARLTON. You cannot get a clearance for a raft without making a return of the quantity of timber in that raft, and a raft is not a nice little thing to smuggle out

of the country. You cannot put it in your waistcoat pocket. No logs are sent out of the country that are not reported to the Custom-house, and it is an imputation on the character of our officers to say that our Trade and Navigation Returns are not reliable. I am surprised to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) casting reflections on his own Government.

Mr. SPROULE. The "Canada Lumberman" says that all the logs are not included in the returns.

Mr. CHARLTON. The "Canada Lumberman" is one thing and the Trade and Navigation Returns another, and if my hon. friend places more reliance on the "Canada Lumberman" than he does on the official documents of his Government, why then I have no quarrel with him. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the period extending from 1884 to 1890, the value of our export of logs was \$3,289,000, and the value of our import of logs, including New Brunswick, was \$8,468,000, and the balance of our imports in excess of our export of logs during that period was \$5,179,000. In face of the fact that the trade—if it is an advantage to import logs and saw them—is vastly in our favour, and has been up to this time. I would ask what reason exists for insisting upon the imposition of an export duty? Are we suffering? If we have imported over \$5,000,000 worth more than we have exported, why should these hon. gentlemen make a row about it? If we imported last year \$150,000 worth more than we exported, what reason was there for that statement made by the Finance Minister, which is unsettling one of the most important industries of the country; I refer to the statement that he proposed to take into consideration, whether he intended to take a step to ruin that industry. What reason is there for medical men, who know more about pills—if they know anything about them—than they do about saw-logs, making such a noise on this matter?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. Sit down, please; I have not time now.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not under an arrangement of treaty that logs are entered from Maine; or is it not by freedom of trade between the two countries, the same as we allow them to take our logs out? It is a treaty that regulates that, and the Americans enter the logs and saw them in Canada of their own motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be by treaty. It does not matter for what reason they come to the province of New Brunswick. The fact is that they do come in there and are manufactured in the mills at St. John. There is just as much profit derived from manufacturing 1,000 feet of logs in New Brunswick as there is for manufacturing 1,000 feet of logs in Saginaw.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. SPROULE. No, because they will not employ Canadians there.

Mr. CHARLTON. If we reap an advantage of this kind, why should we take exception to another party having a fair show with us? Why should we imperil our lumber interests by allowing selfish considerations to interfere, and by which we want to have the whole benefit and to allow no benefit to the other side? Now, Sir, the Americans understand this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. So do the Canadians.

Mr. CHARLTON. My friend over there reminds me of the old woman who made some tea which was very hot, but very weak.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the story?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will tell him the remainder later on, as I have not time now. The McKinley Bill, which went into operation on the 6th October, 1890, made a provision which reduced the duty upon pine lumber to \$1 a thousand, and, connected with that proviso, I will read the following from the official document, section 218 of the United States Tariff Act of 1890:—

Provided, That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon pine, spruce, elm or other logs, or upon stave bolts, shingle-wood, or heading blocks exported to the United States from such country, then the duty upon the sawed lumber herein provided for, when imported from such country, shall remain the same as fixed by law in force prior to the passage of this Act.

That is, any person who imported lumber from the country imposing such an export duty would not be permitted to take advantage of the reduction in duty provided by the Act, but would be obliged to pay the duty which existed prior to the passage of that Act, which was \$2 per 1,000 feet. In other words, a statutory offer was made by the McKinley Bill to this country, to the effect that if we removed the export duty on logs, the American Government would reduce the duty on lumber to \$1 per 1,000, but that if we did not remove the export duty, they would leave the duty on our lumber at \$2 per 1,000. Sir John A. Macdonald and his colleagues wisely accepted that offer and removed the export duty, and thereby secured a reduction of the duty on lumber. That was done in the interest of the pine trade of this country, and at this moment the pine trade seems nervous and apprehensive, when a statement is made by the Government that it even thinks of considering the propriety of putting back that export duty, and causing a reimposition of the \$2 duty on our lumber going into the United States. Now, the Americans understand perfectly well that this export duty is an indefensible and vexatious one. They understand perfectly well that they have sent us about three times as many logs as we have sent them. Their constitution prohibits

Congress imposing an export duty, wisely prohibits it, and therefore they are disposed to resent our imposition of an export duty. They are disposed to consider it an unfriendly act, and as they cannot retaliate in kind, they propose to retaliate in another way. Here is a Bill, which was introduced into Congress on the 4th day of last month, by a Democratic member, and which shows how they propose to retaliate.

Mr. SPROULE. That was after you were at Washington.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; my trip was somewhat after that. I may govern the legislation of the United States when I am there; but they have to do a little work without me when I am not there. This Bill is as follows:

A Bill to impose duties on lumber, wood pulp, and other articles, in case any foreign country shall impose any export duties on the materials from which they are made.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon saw-logs, pulp wood or other raw forest products designed for the use of American mills or factories, the import duty upon the product of saw-logs, pulp wood and other raw forest products of the kinds upon which such export duty is imposed, such as lumber and wood pulp, shall, when imported in the United States from such country, be increased by a sum equivalent to the amount of such export duty; and if such article is upon the free list, a rate of duty equivalent to such export duty shall be imposed upon it. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered and directed to make and enforce such rules as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying the foregoing provisions into effect.

Now, in the first place, we cannot put an export duty on logs without getting back the \$2 duty on lumber; under the provision of the McKinley Act that is done instantly upon the reimposition of the export duty. We should have also hanging over our heads the prospect of the passage of this Bill, and I consider it almost certain that it would pass. In that case, the position would be that if we reimposed the export duty on logs, we should have to face an American duty of \$4 a thousand on lumber; and no practical lumberman needs to be asked whether he would consider that condition of things ruinous to the trade or not. Every one knows that it would be ruinous, and the lumber interest is a dangerous thing for medical men to trifle with. They had better confine themselves to their own business. The lumbermen, who have millions of dollars invested in their business, prefer to attend to it themselves. They prefer that the Government should let matters rest as they are, and they can give good reasons for this. It is true, the spruce men are dissatisfied, and I regret that they were not allowed to participate in the reduction of the duty on lumber, as it was expected they should. But they were not, and if we reimpose the export duty and this Bill passes, the spruce men will have the advantage of an increase in the duty from \$2

to \$3 a thousand. So that the condition of things is that if the export duty is reimposed, the owner of spruce timber gets no advantage, while the duty on pine lumber will be doubled; and if that should be done, we should have staring us in the face the prospect of this Bill being adopted, and the duty on lumber being placed at \$4 a thousand. This is surely a condition of things sufficient to alarm the lumber interest, and it does alarm them.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman who introduced that Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. It was introduced by a Democratic member of the name of Weadock. Do you know him?

Mr. SPROULE. I will know more about him after a little.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be said that the adoption of this provision would not be allowed, because it would be prejudicial to the interests of American lumbermen holding interests in Canada, and also because the interests of American lumbermen in Michigan would not permit its adoption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. If you canvass the men engaged in the lumber interest in Michigan to-day, you will find that two-thirds of them are not interested in Canada at all, but that they are in favour of the imposition of the highest rate of duty on lumber that they can possibly secure. Go outside of Michigan, and hunt throughout the length and breadth of the United States, and you will hardly find a lumberman who is not in favour of a higher duty. You will find that the lumbermen of Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Southern States, Maine, California, Oregon and Washington, are all in favour of the imposition of a higher rate of duty; and the few Michigan lumbermen who are interested in Canadian lumber would be perfectly powerless in Congress; their influence would count for nothing whatever. I repeat that nineteen-twentieths of the lumbering interest in the United States are in favour of higher duties, and they would seize upon such an act as the reimposition of an export duty on logs by this Government as a pretext for urging upon Congress the imposition of higher duties upon lumber. A deputation of lumbermen visited Washington last winter, and magnified the fact that the Ontario Government in disposing of some timber limits in the Rainy River district had made it a condition that the lumber should be manufactured in Canada, and made that an excuse for urging Congress that the duty on lumber should be increased; and let this Government impose an export duty on logs with the knowledge they now possess of the state of the trade, and we will have legislation introduced and carried through that will add that export duty to the import duty, whatever it may be. That is considered a moral certainty. And we will have urging that legislation, the lumbering interests of the south,

of the Pacific slope, of the Mississippi Valley, and of Maine. Now, it may be said that the Americans cannot do without our pine.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The doctor says "hear hear." He knows more about pills than he does about that matter. The fact is, and every lumberman in this House knows it, that the market for Canadian lumber is being circumscribed in area every year. We have been nearly driven from the American market for red pine lumber. We find that the southern pine is encroaching on our markets from year to year; we find that southern white wood is being used in preference to pine for finishing purposes, because it is cheaper. I have the testimony of mill men, who run trim mills, which cut up wood for finishing purposes, and they say that all through the northern states 2,000 feet of white wood is used to every 1,000 feet of pine for interior house finish. It is used all through the northern states to a great extent, and it is used entirely in the south. I have a statement of the owner of a mill at Tonawanda, New York, that he bought cypress at \$32 a thousand feet for the purpose of converting into doors, sashes, blinds, wainscoting and trimming for house finishing, and that it was nicer, more saleable and more popular with builders than pine, which he could not buy at less than \$45 per 1,000 feet for the same purpose. The result is that our pine has to a considerable extent been driven from the American market. There are vast areas of southern pine. I have seen pine forests in the south almost ready for the lumberman, where you could trace the rows of the old cotton fields, as the pine there renews itself invariably, which it does not in the north, so that the supply in the south, if cared for, can be made perpetual. The United States, therefore, may be, and can be quite independent of us, and we cannot force them to take our lumber, and if we put ourselves in the position the hon. gentleman's statements foreshadowed, we will be met by a retaliation of a kind that will force the Government to do what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said they have often done, sneak out of a hole they strutted into. The step taken by the hon. gentleman may be, and probably is, a piece of bluff. He thinks he can bluff the United States into admitting our lumber free. I do not know anything about the game, but I am told it is not considered a safe game where you bluff on a weak hand and your opponent is liable to call you down. I do not think the Minister of Finance has a strong enough hand to play the game, and he had better not try.

With regard to the depletion of our forests, I suppose everybody wants free lumber. I am sure the lumbermen in Canada want it? If we had free admission of lumber into the United States would that arrest the depletion of our forests? If that

Mr. CHARLTON.

is the reason which actuates the Minister of Finance in taking the position he foreshadows—if he proposes to impose an export duty in order to arrest the depletion of our forests, and at the same time desires free lumber, which will accelerate that depletion—is his position a logical one? I think not. We all desire free lumber, which would make the business more prosperous. Of course it would lead to a more rapid depletion of the limits under license; but, as I said before, the Ontario Government, with that wise regard for the future which has characterized almost all its policy, has reserved out of its entire area of limits 150,000 square miles, which it has not licensed, and at the rate at which it is putting its territory under license—less than 10,000 miles licensed since 1867—it will take about three hundred years before the whole territory will be leased. Under these conditions we need not borrow trouble on that score.

I have a word to say to my hon. friend, the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). The other night the hon. gentleman indulged in some pretty severe criticism on the policy of the Ontario Government, and in the course of his speech he made this statement:

Let me ask what is probably the principal reasons for these sales—

The hon. gentleman was referring to the sales made in 1885.

—being made without restrictions? If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to turn up the records of the sales, he will find on the list of purchasers on that occasion such ideal and practical lumbermen as John A. Barron, who was formerly member of Parliament in this House, Robert Jaffray, purveyor-general for grocery supplies to the colonization roads in Ontario, and other gentlemen of that ilk; men who never expected to work these limits, but men who expected to sell them at an advanced rate; men who had thrown about them the guardianship of the Ontario Government, and thought that whatever the Dominion Government might do, the Ontario Government would be prepared to stand by them in regard to letting the lumber go out of the country.

This statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is a charge against the Ontario Government, that its own creatures were manipulating affairs and buying timber limits, and that the policy of that Government, in refusing to place restrictions on the exportation of that lumber, was a policy adopted in their interests. They were ideal lumbermen. Well, there was another ideal lumberman there on that occasion, and, while picking out the notes in his brethren's eyes, he ought to have made reference to the beam in his own. There was a gentleman at that sale by the name of W. H. Bennett, who, at present, represents East Simcoe in this House, and he purchased berths 5 and 8, the first containing sixty-nine square miles and the second thirteen and a half square miles, or in all, eighty-two and a half square miles. Mr. Jaffray, one of the other ideal lumbermen he referred to, purchased eleven square miles, so that the hon. gentleman was just eight times as great a

sinner as Mr. Jaffray. And, I think, in casting imputations upon these ideal lumbermen, Messrs. Jaffray and Barron, because they were Reformers, the hon. gentleman ought to have made reference to W. H. Bennett, who bought eighty-two and a half miles.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make an explanation?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly I shall, as I do not want to do the hon. gentleman an injustice.

Mr. BENNETT. On that occasion I acted as solicitor for Burton Bros., who are lumbermen, and whose men had made a survey of these limits with the view of ascertaining their value. Mr. Jaffray and the others were profiting by their experience, and I did act for Burton Bros., so that the others would not take advantage of their knowledge.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have an acknowledgment from the hon. gentleman that he bought the limits. Now, on what conditions did Mr. Jaffray and Mr. Barron buy the limits they purchased? Mr. Jaffray bought for the Collins Inlet Company and Mr. Barron bought for another company, as solicitors, exactly in the same way as Mr. Bennett did; and I hold it was not the act of a gentleman, knowing all the circumstances, as my hon. friend does apparently, to cast an imputation on these two men for doing exactly the same thing as he did.

Mr. BENNETT. For whom did Mr. Barron buy?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not aware, but he did not buy for himself, and his name does not appear in the records of the Crown Lands Department as a license-holder. If the hon. gentleman wants to know for whom Mr. Barron bought, I will ascertain and inform him, but he bought in exactly the same way as did the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and the conduct of the hon. gentleman is a pretty small piece of business. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Ontario Government ought to have imposed restrictions at the time of the sale, that they ought to have made provision that this timber should not be taken out of the country? Should they? What were they selling timber for? It is a source of revenue. The Ontario Government, like the Quebec Government, have control of the Crown domain, and from the management of this domain they expect to derive a revenue to meet the expenditures of the Government. This is one of the assets of the province of Ontario, and, as wise administrators of the affairs of the province, it is their duty to make the most they can out of their timber resources. Suppose they had put a restriction on the use of the timber sold on that occasion, would they have received the bonuses they did receive? The hon. gentleman is well aware they would not have received one-half the amount. By making such a regu-

lation as the hon. gentleman proposes, they would prejudice their own interests, and, as wise men, they placed these lands on the market and sold them without reserve to the highest bidder, with a view of obtaining the highest price they could and with the calculation that they would obtain it. The hon. gentleman says that they should now make a charge of Crown dues of \$5 per 1,000 feet and remit \$4 on the logs that are not taken out of the country. They have not the power to do that. They have sold the limits subject to certain conditions, and they must abide by those conditions. It is doubtful if they could increase the Crown dues at all if the question were tested and whether they could do that or not, they could not make a discrimination between the owners because one is an American and the other a Canadian. They have not made any such condition in their terms of sale, and they cannot make the proposed change without violating the principles of justice. Then the hon. gentleman tells us, Sir, that these American lumbermen are bringing in their sleighs and teams and are paying the duty, and that they are actually bringing in men. Well, Mr. Speaker, I admit that that is a reversal of the order of nature, there is no doubt about that. The current of men has been the other way; it has been flowing out of the country. The idea of bringing men into this country is a new one, and I do not wonder that it rather staggers my hon. friend. We have sent about 1,000,000 men out of this country to the United States, but the idea of bringing any back is one that we ought not to entertain, I presume. If the hon. gentleman will introduce a Bill putting a poll-tax on Yankees, as well as Chinamen, no doubt this business can be arrested, that is, if the Bill passes. But, for my part, I cannot see what damage this country would suffer from the importation of a few thousand men. The more of them that will come, I should say, if they are respectable, decent citizens, the better. I know from personal connection with this business that men are needed, that men are hard to get. The effect on the lumber trade of the removal of export duty on logs and the reduction of the United States duties on lumber has been to create a demand for men. I myself went through a Lake Erie district to get men, offering from \$22 to \$32 a month for common labourers, and still found them scarce, and we were glad to get them at that. I know that these changes have made a great demand for labour. The removal of the export duty and the reduction of the American Customs duty on lumber has improved business in the small towns of the Georgian Bay region. It has given a boom to everything. The idea my hon. friend sets forth that there is no sawing being done there, that the saw mills are idle, is very much like his other assertions. I myself was obliged to tow a raft of logs to Michigan because all the mills in that vicinity were busy and I could not get them

sawed. Yet the hon. gentleman tells us that the saw-mills are idle, that there are no mills running. No, Sir; the mills on the north shore, so far as I know, were employed, and they will, no doubt, be employed this season. The statement that 400,000,000 feet of logs will be exported from this country next season is a gross exaggeration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is desirable to obtain free lumber, I think the prudent course to take would be just to remain quiet for a while. The Democratic party in the United States has as one of its most important principles, the admission of raw material free of duty. Now, lumber is a raw material and it is likely that one of the first acts of the Democratic Government will be to admit lumber free of duty. But I do not think they will admit it free if we carry on this game of bluff that my hon. friend the Finance Minister has instituted. If we adopt his policy of retaliation, we adopt the policy calculated to defeat the very purpose we seek to attain. If we attempt this policy of imposing an export duty on saw-logs, we shall defeat our own object of obtaining free lumber. The Americans, I repeat, will resent our act if we are guilty of the folly of imposing this duty. Now, I hope my hon. friend the Finance Minister will not be cruel to Mr. Cleveland. I would dislike to have him bluff Mr. Cleveland very severely. Mr. Cleveland would not take it kindly, perhaps. And, speaking seriously, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cleveland is the last man to attempt to play this game upon. I presume, Sir, you recollect that when Mr. Cleveland was President before, he proposed to take very summary measures with Canada. He proposed, Sir, to engage in a kind of retaliation, compared with which the late act of the present President, Mr. Harrison, was mere child's play. I have here a letter written by Mr. Cleveland to a friend of his concerning the relations of Canada, and I have also the message sent by Mr. Cleveland to Congress with regard to retaliation. It will be found from this that Mr. Cleveland proposed to adopt what we might call very arbitrary measures. In his message to Congress President Cleveland says :

Plainly stated, the policy of national retaliation manifestly embraces the infliction of the greatest harm upon those who have injured, with the least possible damage to ourselves. There is also an evident propriety as well as an invitation to moral support, found in visiting upon the offending party the same measure or kind of treatment of which we complain, and as far as possible within the same lines. And above all things the plan of retaliation, if entered upon, should be thorough and vigorous.

These considerations lead me at this time to invoke the aid and counsel of the Congress and its support in such a further grant of power as seems to me necessary and desirable to render effective the policy I have indicated.

Mr. Cleveland proposed to suspend commercial relations with Canada entirely. He proposed to do this because of grievances, real or fancied, that the United States had suffered at the hands of Canada. Now, Sir, in view

Mr. CHARLTON.

of the fact that the United States in years past exported to Canada three times the quantity of logs it imports from Canada; in view of the fact that the United States is unable to retaliate in kind, because of the imposition of an export duty is unconstitutional, if our Government now proceeds to impose an export duty on saw-logs, it is manifest it will invite and will receive retaliation from the United States and that retaliation will take the form of the passage of a Bill such as I have read to impose an import duty equal to the export duty levied. There are now two Bills before Congress to admit Canadian lumber free, and both provide that when any nation imposes an export duty on logs, lumber from that country shall be subjected to the duty previously imposed. There is a feeling of animosity in the United States to an export duty. The United States Government and the United States people from the earliest days of their history have considered export duties unwise and unjust. The fact that such duties are prohibited by the constitution proves this and indicates that we will invite and will insure retaliation in some form if our Government takes a step foreshadowed in the remarks made by the Minister of Finance. Sir, the motive of an export duty is in almost every case a selfish one. Some, for instance, advocate an export duty on pulp wood. The object of those who desire this duty is to corner the pulp materials and hold in reserve these woods until they are ready to buy them. Many saw-mill owners have advocated an export duty because they did not want logs sent out of the country. They wanted them made cheap and kept cheap for their benefit. One of the most vigorous of the agitators in favour of the export duty is a firm by the name of Moyle Brothers, of John's Island, in the north channel of Georgian Bay, who clandestinely removed a mill which was mortgaged and brought it to Canada and set it up, and now they are howling about an export duty, because they want the logs kept till they get ready to saw them. They have not got money enough to buy them now, and they want the Government to put a restriction upon exportation, so that they would be made cheap and kept cheap till these men get ready to take advantage of the same. That is about as patriotic as the motives generally are that actuate men advocating this measure, except it may be, now and then, some medical man who takes it up as a hobby.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about as nearly correct as the hon. gentleman usually gets when dealing with the subject.

Mr. CHARLTON. I propose to pass from the question of the export duty. I hope my hon. friend will be relieved. I will give him credit for sincerity, but I do not know how much common sense I would consider he possessed in the matter. But he is sincere, no doubt, he sincerely desires to do a thing which would be very prejudicial to the interests of the country if he succeeded.

I propose now to say a few words about some of the statements made by the Minister of the Interior, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place. The Minister of the Interior made a statement, during his speech, to the effect that the farmers of the state of New York were worse off than those of Canada, as shown by the "Globe" commissioners' report. Well, they were rather bad authority to appeal to for sustaining his position, as I will proceed to show. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Government party are very desirous of making it appear to the farmers of this country that there is no advantage to be gained by access to the American market, free of duty, and if they can convince the Canadian farmer that his American brother is no better off than he is, and receives no better prices than he does, and that his condition is just as depressed as his own, and that he is labouring under just as great difficulties in consequence of that depression, why, then, they have succeeded in their purpose. My hon. friend, in pursuance of that line of policy, makes the assertion in his speech that the American farmers are worse off than those in Canada, as shown by the "Globe" commissioners' report. Now, I think the assertion is worthy of being examined. I think it is worth while that I should state the real facts as set forth by the "Globe" commissioners. The "Globe" newspaper was worthy of great credit for its enterprise in sending these commissioners to ascertain the state of public feeling and the state of public business in various parts of the province of Ontario, and then, in sending these same gentlemen to the state of New York to make inquiries in corresponding lines of business there, so as to be able to draw a contrast between the condition of these people in the two countries. Now, here is one of the letters from Albion, New York, written on the 20th day of January, by Mr. Cockin. I do not know what his politics are, I have understood he is a Conservative, but that does not matter, I presume, if he is a truthful man. Mr. Cockin, in describing an interview with a farmer by the name of Stephen Halleck, reputed to be one of the wealthiest farmers in Orleans county, New York, and the possessor of a farm of 200 acres, writes as follows:—

"I feed 54 head of cattle for the New York market. Last year I got \$3.80 per 100 lbs., and that is the lowest price I ever got. In 1891 I got \$5.50. My farm is valued at \$25,000. It is run on the most approved system. I don't buy everything that comes along, but what I do buy I pay cash for it and get the discount. The condition of the farmer is generally poor, but he has only himself to blame—he lives too expensively and won't look ahead; he incurs liabilities in the present which he is unable to meet in the future. I don't want annexation, and a majority of our people you will find are of the same opinion. We have not had an increase of population in this county; in fact, if I remember rightly, one of our local papers showed that the deaths have exceeded the births in Orleans county during 1892."

Below I give Mr. Halleck's figures for the past year's work. It should be remembered that this is a

model farm, one worked with plenty of capital, high intelligence, by a proprietor who gives the closest attention to every nickel expended on the place:—	
30 acres in barley, 1,500 bush. at 67c.....	\$1,005
40 do wheat, 1,600 do	1,200
15 do beans, 350 do at \$1.50.....	525
50 do hay, 75 tons at \$11 a ton.....	825
Apples and other fruits	1,275
(8 acres in bush and balance of land in pasture.)	-----
Gross value of yield.....	\$4,830
Expenditure—	
Hired help.....	\$ 500
Taxes	132
Insurance.....	30
Improvements (the farm is in good shape).....	50
Day help.....	50

Total	\$ 762
Profit for 1892.....	4,068

Now, I would ask any practical farmer in this House to point out to me any two-hundred-acre farm in the province of Ontario or in the Dominion of Canada, where the net profits for the last year were \$4,068. I do not think any such case can be found. Then, in the same communication, is a letter from Mr. Atkinson. I believe he does not give the name of the farmer to whom he refers in the quotation I am about to read. This farmer, says:

We get papers and letters from there [Canada], and we can make a comparison. Your barley is preferred over ours, although I believe we grow some that is as good. Your oats are heavier and worth more. Your lambs are larger and better for mutton, while if the duty were taken off wool you would command this market. We cannot grow pease like you, but have to send over and get our seed every year. Besides these you could sell beans, potatoes, eggs and poultry here. The farmer, too, gave me a list of the products of his farm, as follows:—

Barley, 9 acres, 355 bush., 68 cents.....	\$ 241
Wheat, 16 acres, 295 bush., 75 cents.....	221
Beans, 7 acres, 120 bush., \$1.60.....	192
Oats, 6 acres, 287 bush., 35 cents.....	100
Corn, 5 acres, 600 bush. (in cob), 28 cents.....	168
Hay, 10 tons, \$12.....	120
Fruit.....	600

Total.....	\$1,642

Canadian horses, he said, were brought over to New York state and sold for work purposes until the McKinley tariff stopped them. A great many have been purchased from the western states since that time, but the Canadian horses are short-legged and hardy and better liked. "Free trade," he said, "would be a bad thing for us because it would be a good thing for Canadians."

He does not give the size of the farm, but probably it is a hundred-acre farm. Then, in a letter summing up the result of their investigations, which was given to the world quite recently, Mr. Atkinson says:

There is practically no difference of opinion in the country districts with regard to the benefit of access to the United States markets for our natural products.

And later on:

The condition of Ontario farmers, in the face of being shut out of the most profitable market for many

of their chief products, is evidence of the fertility and resource of the land and the industry, intelligence and pluck of the farmers of the province. No state of the Union could have survived being walled off from trading with the remaining states, and it must give to those who know the natural advantages of Ontario an abounding faith in the prosperity which would come to our farmers with free trade that in only the most favoured portions of the state are the farmers enjoying a higher standard of living and in a generally better position. The farmers in the states freely acknowledge the superiority of Ontario barley, horses, lambs, pease, oats, wool, cheese and other products, and admit that Ontario farmers would have an advantage under a free trading arrangement. This and other evidence all goes to show the advantages of free trade with the states. * * * * *

To sum up public opinion as it has been found during the inquiry, it calls for an immediate reduction of the tariff, and as wide a measure of reciprocity with the states as can be obtained, as soon as possible, and to include manufactures as well as natural products.

Mr. Cockin, in concluding his letter, says :

In a recent debate in the Dominion House, the Minister of Finance, in reply to Sir Richard Cartwright, quoted our letters from Albion, N.Y., or rather, from a portion of those letters, to show that the condition of the New York state farmer is more deplorable than that of the farmer in Ontario. The Hon. Mr. Foster should or could have readily seen from those letters that the condition of the American farmer in New York state is superior to that of our people. And why? The difference between the two is this: The Yankee farmer in New York state is hard up from high living, unnecessary expenditures, and from having been financially overweighted at the outset of his farming career. If a careful, intelligent man, and not financially pressed in the initial stage, he can hardly fail to do well. The Canadian farmer, on the other hand, is hard up, even when his farm is unencumbered. Each is striving to attain to independent circumstances. The American farmer could if he would. The Canadian farmer would if he could.

A local paper published portions of my second letter from Albion, with the contents carefully elided, giving its readers thereby an entirely erroneous idea of the condition of the American farmer. Amongst other interviews, it alludes to the one with Mr. Stephen Hallock, and prints this much of one paragraph: "The condition of the farmer is generally poor." There it stops. Had it finished the sentence it would have read: "The condition of the farmer is generally poor, but he has only himself to blame; he lives expensively, and won't look ahead." In addition, this paper in question would have given the added information that Mr. Hallock last year made a profit of \$4,068 out of his 200-acre farm. It is easy—nothing easier—to make a sentence sound vastly different by the elimination of essential words. The 53rd Psalm says: "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." When I quote that, I give the psalmist's words and intentions correctly, but if I eliminated everything except "there is no God," and stay my pen there, I place David in an altogether false and unfair position. Everything depends upon how a sentence is put. "I cast my mite upon the crystal sea," said the gentle maiden. "Horribly sea-sick," quoth her more prosaic papa. Yes, everything depends upon how you put a thing

The testimony furnished by the "Globe" commissioners in the state of New York, and the comparison they drew between the condition of the farming community there and the condition of farmers in Canada,

Mr. CHARLTON.

clearly and unmistakably points to the facts, that the American farmer, if burdened by debt or in straitened circumstances, is placed in that position by his own extravagance and lack of thrift, that generally he is in a more prosperous condition than the Ontario farmer, and that he receives higher prices for all the products of his farm. If the Ontario farmer, with his energy and knowledge of agriculture, and with his superior land, enjoyed the advantage of the same market as the American farmer, he would exchange a position and condition of depression and want for a condition of prosperity of the most gratifying character. There is no doubt about it. The assertion made by the Minister of the Interior, that the farmers of New York state were poorer than those of Canada, as shown by the reports of the "Globe" commissioners, either betrayed great ignorance or a hasty reading of the article, or no reading at all, or the statement was made designedly and purposely to mislead the House and the country by an assertion that was lacking the very essentials of truth. I know myself, by personal observation, that lands away in the western states, in the centre of Illinois, are more valuable than lands in any portion of Canada. I was there last fall, and lands in the centre of the grand prairie of Illinois, possessing no special advantages, and seven or eight miles from a railway station, realize as high as \$90 per acre, while in the centre of Iowa farms are worth up to \$70 per acre. Everything in the United States in regard to agricultural interests indicates more wealth and greater prosperity than the conditions here, and if our farmers had free access to the United States markets and obtained the prices American farmers secure, the condition of things here would be vastly changed. The Minister of the Interior spoke of the great progress in Ontario, and drew a comparison between the condition of agriculture nowadays with olden times, when the pioneers were clearing up the forests, and when they were carrying their grist to the mill by wagons drawn by oxen, and attending church in the same way. Naturally there has been progress. We have enjoyed some good times in Canada since then. We had twelve or thirteen years of reciprocity with the United States, a period of great prosperity. Of course there was a depression in the period from 1873 to 1877, and there has been a season of depression since 1890, but on the whole there has been progress. The question is not whether there has been absolute progress or not, but the question is, what degree of progress could be made under the most satisfactory circumstances; the question is, could we have done better than we have done? We assert the affirmative, and we desire that the farmers of Ontario shall be placed under circumstances where they will have an opportunity of showing what they are capable of doing in competition with their American brothers when placed under similar conditions.

I now come to refer to remarks made by the Minister of Railways, and I am glad to see him in his seat. The Minister informed us that when the people understood that, in order to obtain reciprocity we must accept the tariff of the United States, they dropped it and the Liberal party. If am quoting the hon. gentleman inaccurately, I hope he will correct me. What did the people understand? Did they not understand from the assertions of the Minister of Railways and other members of the Government, that the people were going to secure reciprocity, that they were about to give it to the people, that they had it in their grasp, and that they actually dissolved Parliament and appealed to the people on that issue.

Mr. HAGGART. I was speaking of unrestricted reciprocity. Does the hon. gentleman not know the difference?

Mr. CHARLTON. What kind of reciprocity did the hon. gentleman tell the people they were going to get?

Mr. HAGGART. I never spoke anything of the kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. You said you were going to give them the treaty of 1854.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not; I never mentioned anything of the kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. The treaty of 1854 with alterations and emendations. When the question of a reciprocity treaty with the United States was being discussed, a subject which the Liberal party had made an issue and discussed before the people, the Government took alarm and they dissolved the House and brought on the elections prematurely one year in advance of their proper time, in order to forestall the Liberal party and take from us the benefit we would derive from that issue on which we proposed to go to the people. They stole our clothes. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have been naked, blind and destitute to-day if they had not stolen them. They have not, however, made proper use of them. They declared to the people that they were about to secure reciprocity, that the people need not pay any attention to the Grits, that they, the Government, would obtain it; that they were going to dissolve the House and appeal to the country, and obtain a new House fresh from the people, not a moribund House, to consider the reciprocity treaty, which without doubt would be submitted to them. Those were the assertions made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they went to the country. They were false assertions, of course; they were nothing more or less than political fiction. Those were the arguments of the Ministers, stated broadly. They brought down to the House a copy of the despatch to the Home Government, dated Ottawa, 13th December, 1890, and although at this session we have asked the Government to bring down the

correspondence in regard to this matter, they cannot do it. They have been two years attempting to do so, but have been unable, and they now declare they have to ask the consent of the Home Government; but we know that they could give on the 3rd February the essential portion of a document sent to the Home Government on 13th December preceding, and they can give the whole or any part of the correspondence that suits their purpose, and they can withhold from the people such portions as do not suit their purpose and would tell against them. They promised the people reciprocity, they asserted they were going to get it, that they were certain to get reciprocity on the lines of the treaty of 1854, with such changes as the altered circumstances of the two countries require.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have my hon. friend understand what he is saying, and the result of such an assertion. I would like to ask him for the proof of that assertion. He just now made the assertion, in so many words, that we said we were certain of getting a reciprocity treaty. Will he show the proof?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will read the hon. gentleman the document.

Mr. LAURIER. At all events there is no doubt that the assertion was false.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the least doubt that it is a false assertion in the mouth of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in his mouth, but in the mouth of the advisers of His Excellency.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is your proof?

Mr. CHARLTON. On the 3rd day of February the Government organ, the Toronto "Empire," contained the following—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. We want your proof.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it not an authorized source of information?

Mr. FOSTER. Something like your Norfolk paper.

Mr. CHARLTON. How did the "Empire" have a Government despatch in connection with that if there was no collusion between the Government and that journal? How did it have that despatch?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman means to deal fairly he will stick to the one question. He has asserted a thing which I say has no foundation on fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I have brought it to the hon. gentleman's attention, and I ask him for proof.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let him get through and he will give it to you.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before I am allowed to read the very first line of the document the hon. gentleman impugns the authority of the medium through which that communication is conveyed. I ask the hon. gentleman if there was not authority in that medium, how did the "Empire" come in possession of the official document in connection with it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. From the "Canada Gazette."

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps it is not necessary to read these reasons given by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot bear out your assertion, and you know it; you cannot do it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will read:

In view of the foregoing important statement—

That is a statement of dissolution.

—the question will naturally be asked: What are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government have, through Her Majesty's Government, made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to the extension of our commerce with that country.—

Mr. FOSTER. A long way off from your proof yet.

Mr. CHARLTON:

—These proposals have been submitted to the President of the United States for consideration,—

Mr. FOSTER. Still a long way off.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was not so either.

—and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government shall be able to deal with it by a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House.

Mr. FOSTER: Miles away from your proof yet.

Mr. CHARLTON. By the declarations of their organs, by statements from the stump and every hustings, the Government did assert that it had received proposals from the President of the United States and that negotiations were in progress. If the Government had not professed to entertain the expectations that these alleged negotiations would be successful, why should they dissolve the House? They assigned as a reason for the dissolution, that they did not want a moribund House to deal with that question, but that they wanted a House fresh from the people. They stated that they were at that moment negotiating and that they expected to successfully consummate that treaty. That was the statement sent out to the people of Canada. That was the assertion made by this Government. That was the plea upon which they went to the people. They deceived the people. They led them to suppose that they were just about to

Mr. CHARLTON

obtain a reciprocity treaty, that they had received proposals from the President of the United States, that everything was going on swimmingly; and the truth was, that they had received no proposal; the truth was, that their assertion was denied by the Secretary of State of the United States, on the 30th January; the truth was, that they were playing a game with the people of Canada which was the reverse of ingenuous; and the truth was, Sir, that the British Minister at Washington had danced attendance upon the Department of State day after day, supplicating for the privilege to send commissioners to Washington, and that the Government of the United States did not listen favourably to this proposal. But after repeated supplications and requests that a commission should be received, Mr. Blaine said there was nothing in the law to prevent the people of Canada from sending a commission, if they chose, and if the commission came to Washington, he could not, without discourtesy, refuse to see them; and then we had this game played in connection with a political struggle in this country. We had that assertion.

Mr. FOSTER. What assertion?

Mr. CHARLTON. We had this assertion made, in fact.

Mr. FOSTER. What assertion?

Mr. CHARLTON. We had this assertion made, in fact, made by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot show what assertion.

Mr. LAURIER. I will show again and again that Mr. Blaine himself took Sir Charles Tupper to task for his statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Blaine did nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen—

Mr. LAURIER. I will prove it again and again, and read the proof at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume, under parliamentary usage, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman will have a chance to reply to me?

Mr. FOSTER. You have not made good your assertion.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a little embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should interrupt me so often.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the attention of the House to the rule that precludes the interruption of a speaker, except on a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) give us his authority?

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman asks me to give Mr. Blaine's letter, and I will do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all; I did not ask you for that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Blaine had his attention called to the fact that assertions were made, that negotiations were in progress between the Canadian Government and the Government at Washington, for the purpose of securing a reciprocity treaty. He had his attention called to that fact by Mr. Baker, a member of Congress from Rochester, N.Y., and Mr. Blaine replied to that inquiry, as to whether this assertion, which was going the rounds of the Canadian papers, and as being assigned as a reason for the probable dissolution of the House of Commons of Canada, was true, and on the 29th January, 1891, Mr. Blaine wrote to his friend, Mr. Baker, as follows:—

I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be sure, no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper coming to Washington.

Now, Sir, take the whole chain of circumstances. After the election the three commissioners went to Washington, and how were they received? Why, General Harrison practically told them they might go to Hades, and he would go off on a visit. They were not received at all. They received a rebuff. They turned about and went home without having accomplished anything. There was a deep feeling of irritation in Washington at the conduct of the Canadian Government in reference to this matter, and that feeling of irritation was all the deeper because Mr. Blaine and the Administration at Washington were restrained by diplomatic etiquette from laying bare the facts surrounding this matter, and we could only get at these things by snatches here and there. We have here been denied access to the correspondence, but I dare say the commissioners in Washington were not ignorant of the gossip of that city about this matter, were not ignorant of the fact that it was represented that Sir Julian Pauncefote, when these pretended revelations with regard to negotiations were made, went to Mr. Blaine and apologized in the most earnest manner, for a seeming breach of faith on his part and professed a deep sense of humiliation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They thought it was a good political trick.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt they may think that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are proud of it, are you not?

Mr. CHARLTON. The United States Government was made a catspaw by a designing and shameless Administration to pull Tory chestnuts out of the fire in an election contest in Canada. They were made the unconscious instruments to forward the interests of the gentlemen opposite, and they felt justly indignant.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that authority?

Mr. CHARLTON. I was speaking to you about it, and I am asking the hon. gentleman, if he did not hear some of that gossip when he was in Washington? Now, I come to the subsequent visit of this commission. They visited Washington again. Their negotiations were fruitless. Their negotiations were intended to be fruitless, for that was a part of the game. We have the statement made by Secretary Foster, not Secretary Foste, of the Canadian Finance Department, but Secretary Foster of the State Department at Washington, in regard to this matter. Mr. Foster says:

During the Reciprocity Conference of last winter Mr. Blaine did not insist that in a reciprocity arrangement a uniform tariff would be necessary for both Canada and the United States, nor much less that it should be on the line of the present United States tariff. He did ask that the schedule should not be confined to natural products, but that it should include an agreed list of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States, and because of these two conditions the negotiations were fruitless.

He did not ask for a common tariff; he did not ask for unrestricted reciprocity—neither the one or the other; but that the agreement should include a list of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States. Now, this is the kind of a treaty that our commissioners could have got. Notwithstanding the bad odour in which they stood at Washington, notwithstanding that the Washington Government believed that they had been guilty of perfidious conduct, it was still in their power to secure a reciprocity treaty on the lines laid down by Secretary Foster's statement, which I have just read, and they would not do it—why? Oh, it would have been discriminating against England. Yes, they would have been guilty of the terrible sin of discrimination, and would have brought down on our heads the wrath of England. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the draft treaty of reciprocity negotiated by the Hon. George Brown in the year 1874, a treaty substantially of the same character as that which Mr. Foster's letter indicates could have been negotiated in the year 1892, and that treaty met with the approval of the British Government. We have in this document the formal approval by Earl Derby of the conditions. In a communication from the Foreign Office, dated 22nd May, 1874, we have the following from Earl Derby, addressed to Sir Edward Thornton:—

I have received your despatch of the 28th ultimo, forwarding a copy of the memorandum containing proposals for a Reciprocity Treaty, which has been submitted by yourself and Mr. Brown to the United States Government, and I have to state to you that Her Majesty's Government approve this paper, which appears to be drawn up with care and ability.

What was this paper? What were the conditions contained in it? Here is the schedule of the goods that were to be interchanged between the two countries free of duty: schedule A, natural products; schedule B, agricultural implements, forty in number; schedule C, manufactures, a list of thirty-seven articles. We have, in this list, axes, cultivators, forks, grain drills, hoes, hand or horse, horse-power machines, reapers, reapers and mowers combined, spades, shovels, scythes, threshing machines, etc. In the schedule of manufactures, we have boots and shoes, cotton manufactures of all descriptions, cabinet-ware and furniture, carriages, carts, wagons, iron goods, bar, hoop, pig, puddled, rod, sheet or scrap, nails, spikes, bolts, tacks, bracks or springs, castings, leather, harness and saddlery, mill or factory or steam-boat fixed engines, and machines, printing paper, printing type, presses and folders, satinettes of wool and cotton, tweeds of wool solely, and a great variety of other articles. Here was a treaty which Mr. Brown and the British Minister at Washington had negotiated, which had been submitted to the British Government, and which had been approved by Lord Derby, although it discriminated against England in the same sense in which these hon. gentlemen claim that a treaty such as they could have negotiated a year ago would have discriminated. In view of the indications they had of England's intention with reference to the Brown draft treaty, we know that their fears were quite needless, and I think that the reasons they assign are not the real reasons. I think that they object to a reciprocity treaty which will open the Canadian market to American goods of any kind, not because it will discriminate against England, or because England has any disinclination to allow such a treaty to be negotiated, but because of the dictates of the Red Parlour; and, in the interest of that one industry, the manufacturing industry of this country, the Government have controlled and shaped their policy, and have disregarded the interest of the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, the fisherman, the labourer and every other class of the Canadian people except that small fraction represented by the manufacturing class.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question, whether he is aware that that arrangement was declared by the Hon. George Brown himself to be without the feature of discrimination against Great Britain?

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to inquire how that arrangement could be carried into
Mr. CHARLTON.

effect without discrimination against Great Britain? It could not be done.

An hon. MEMBER. Answer the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have answered the question. There is the treaty, there is the list of manufactured goods; there can be no doubt of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen have been telling the country that they are in favour of reciprocity. I have heard that statement made in this House year after year. Who thinks they are in favour of reciprocity? They are, I admit, in favour of reciprocity in natural products. Of course, they are. So would I be, and so would everybody be on this side of the House. But to talk about reciprocity in natural products, under the circumstances, is to insult common sense—simply that and nothing more. We have been assured by American statesmen every year since the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated in 1866, that they would never again grant reciprocity in natural products. That is a foregone conclusion; we cannot get it. If we talked to the people of this country honestly about reciprocity, we must talk about some attainable measure of reciprocity, not about some unattainable scheme which is foredoomed to failure, as that of hon. gentlemen opposite was when they sent their representatives to Washington on the last occasion. Now, I assert that if the Liberal party were in power they could get a reciprocity treaty with the United States. I assert that without hesitation. I have reason to assert it, from the declarations of prominent men in the Democratic party—from the declarations of Mr. Springer, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and from the declarations of Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. The Democratic party would naturally be disposed to give us reciprocity. It would not be necessary to have a uniform tariff. It would not be necessary to have that bugbear of the Finance Minister, unrestricted reciprocity. I believe we could obtain reciprocity substantially on the lines laid down in the draft Brown treaty; that, I firmly believe; and if we were to make an honest effort to obtain reciprocity, we would succeed. We have made efforts for reciprocity in natural products time and time again. We sent a commission to Washington in 1866, consisting of Sir Alexander Galt, Sir W. P. Howland, Mr. Smith, of New Brunswick, and Mr. Henry, of Nova Scotia, to see if we could get reciprocity in natural products, and failed. We sent Sir John Rose in 1869 on the same errand, and again failed. We sent the Hon. George Brown in 1874, and the treaty to which I have referred was negotiated, but it was lost in the United States Senate. The commissioners of this Government went again in 1892, and again failed; and we shall always fail, if we seek for reciprocity in natural products alone. The Americans will

not grant us the privilege of selling to them everything we have to sell, unless we grant them the privilege of selling to us what they have to sell. That is a settled question. If we secure reciprocity at all, we must be willing to have it on lines which will enable the Americans to sell us manufactured goods in return for our natural products of the soil.

That being the case, the next question to consider is, if reciprocity is obtainable upon these conditions, would it be to our advantage to get it? I just want to consider that question very briefly. Would it be to our advantage to procure reciprocity from the United States if we had to go outside of a treaty that was confined to natural products alone, if we had to negotiate a treaty which would admit manufactured goods of various kinds to allow the Americans to sell to us goods we require in return for what we purchase from them? Under the McKinley Bill, I need hardly recapitulate the burdens under which we labour. We pay a duty of 30 cents per bushel on barley; \$30 per head on horses; \$10 on cattle; \$1.50 on sheep; 5 cents per dozen on eggs; 25 cents per bushel on potatoes; 25 cents per bushel on apples; 40 cents on malt; \$4 on hay; 10 cents per pound on wool; 5 cents on poultry; 6 cents per pound on butter; 40 cents per bushel on beans, and 40 cents on pease. Now, if these duties were paid by the consumer it would matter nothing to us; but if, on the contrary, we receive for the productions we send to the United States the price in that market less these duties it is a very important matter to us whether we can secure the removal of these duties or not. It is unnecessary to go at this time into the question as to who pays the duty. Every farmer understands that. The quotations in the Trade Returns of both sides of the line settle that question. According to the American papers, barley is 30 cents per bushel, plus the freight, higher in their markets than in Canada. Prices of horses, sheep, cattle, eggs, potatoes, apples, malt—in all these articles upon which duties are levied you will find that the market quotations are lower in Canada than in the United States to the extent of the duty and transportation in each case, and were these duties removed the amount would simply be added to the price in Canada without materially affecting the condition of the American farmers one way or the other. In looking over some American statistics I was very much struck the other day by the fact that, not only has there not been any growth of trade between these two contiguous nations since 1867, but there has been a diminution in the exports of this country. It is a remarkable fact. The United States have doubled their population and trebled their wealth, yet the trade between the two countries has been retrograding. I find by some American statistics contained in the "Tribune" almanac of New York, a publication reported to be a reliable authority, that

we exported to the United States in 1866 to the value of \$48,528,000, and in 1892 our exports only amounted to \$35,334,000, being a shrinkage in twenty-six years of \$13,194,000, or 27 per cent. I find that we imported from the United States, in 1866, \$27,905,000, and in 1892, \$61,715,000, showing an increase in our imports from the United States in twenty-six years of \$33,810,000, or 121 per cent. So that our imports increased by that large percentage, 121 per cent, and our exports decreased 27 per cent. Now, the balance of trade against us last year, according to American statistics, was \$26,381,000, and the balance of trade in our favour in 1866, \$23,623,000. That certainly does not indicate a healthy state of trade; and if we take our own Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that our exports to the United States, without short returns, being added, were \$39,950,000, in 1866, and in 1892, without short returns, they were \$35,640,000, or an actual shrinkage in our export to the United States, after twenty-six years, of \$4,310,000 or 10 per cent. In face of the fact that the American population had doubled, and their wealth trebled, our exports according to our own returns to that country have actually diminished, as compared with twenty-six years ago, leaving out the question of short returns, which do not figure in the return of exports in 1866. There have been but three years since 1866, the last year of reciprocity, when our exports to the United States equalled our exports that year, namely, 1873, 1882, and 1889. With the exception of these three years, under the influence of repressive and hostile tariffs, we have failed to export Canadian products to the extent we did in 1866, when the population of that country was one-half of what it is to-day.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 57) to amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Canada Carriage Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. CHARLTON. Having pointed out the effect upon the commerce between the United States and the Dominion of Canada of re-

restrictive tariff legislation since 1866, and having shown that the volume of our exports to that country have actually diminished during that period, and were last year some \$4,000,000 less than in the year 1866, I wish next to draw attention to the condition of matters, the aggravated condition of matters, as regards increase under the McKinley Bill of the restrictive measures which had been in vogue before. And for this purpose I select certain articles for which the United States furnish our chief market and draw a comparison between the export of these articles to the United States in the year 1890, the year immediately preceding the McKinley Bill's coming into operation, and the year 1892, the year in which that measure was fully in operation and its effects were fully felt. I take the articles of horses, horned cattle, poultry, eggs, wool, flax, apples, barley, split pease, hay, malt, potatoes and vegetables :

COMPARISON of exports in certain articles between 1890 and 1892.

Articles.	1890.	1892.	Decrease.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Horses	1,887,895 00	1,094,461 00	793,434 00
Horned cattle	104,623 00	21,327 00	83,296 00
Poultry.....	105,612 00	44,537 00	61,075 00
Eggs.....	1,793,104 00	494,409 00	1,298,695 00
Wool.....	235,436 00	200,125 00	35,311 00
Flax.....	175,563 00	112,360 00	63,203 00
Apples.....	149,479 00	27,661 00	121,818 00
Barley.....	4,582,561 00	1,354,485 00	3,228,076 00
Split pease.....	74,215 00	20,460 00	53,755 00
Hay.....	922,797 00	598,567 00	324,230 00
Malt.....	149,310 00	20 00	149,290 00
Potatoes.....	308,915 00	41,886 00	267,029 00
Vegetables.....	80,976 00	68,948 00	12,028 00
	10,570,486 00	4,079,246 00	6,491,240 00

Certainly, if this Bill was designed to put an end to commercial transactions between the two countries, it is rapidly working in that direction, and nothing could illustrate more strikingly the evil influence exerted by restrictive legislation upon commercial transactions between the two countries than the operation of the McKinley Bill during this period. We see very well what the effect of restriction has been, but the probable effect of absolute free trade between the two countries is a very interesting subject to speculate upon, and while we cannot arrive with absolute certainty at a conclusion as to what the volume of trade might become in a given term of years under the operation of free trade and the striking off of the trammels that now exist upon the trade of the two countries, we can arrive approximately at what the results would be. Under the operation of the reciprocity treaty which came into effect in 1854 and which was abrogated in 1866, the exports of the British pro-

Mr. CHARLTON.

vinces to the United States increased with phenomenal rapidity. Our exports to the United States in the year 1854 were \$10,000,000, in round numbers ; our exports in 1866, according to our own statistics, were \$40,000,000, and according to the American statistics, \$48,000,000. The increase was a four-fold increase in thirteen years. We quadrupled our transactions with the United States between 1854 and 1866. Now, if the free trade arrangement had been continued, if there had been no abrogation of the reciprocity treaty, and if the increase in exports to the United States had been annually as great as they were from 1854 to 1866, our exports to that country last year, of the productions of the Canadian forest, field, mines and fisheries, would have been \$100,000,000. If we quadrupled our export trade with the United States in thirteen years under reciprocity, it is not unreasonable to suppose that we would have quadrupled that again in double that period, in twenty-six years, and that our exports last year, instead of being less than thirty-six millions, would have been one hundred and sixty millions. I have no doubt that if the country had continued under the operation of free trade, we would have had an enormous commerce with the United States, equalling one hundred and sixty millions, at least, of exports to that country and a corresponding increase in the amount of imports from that country. We can readily understand the influence that would have been exerted upon the prosperity and upon the future of Canada by a trade with the United States four times greater than it is, and with every probability that with an increased population, we would have had greater wealth. We would have had, not only this vast increase of trade with the United States, but a large trade also with Great Britain and with other portions of the world. Our position, Mr. Speaker, for trade with the United States is peculiarly advantageous. There is not one of the producing states of the American Union, having their market in the great sea-board cities, as favourably situated for access to those cities and for access to all the consuming markets of the United States, as is the province of Ontario. The states to the west of us—the states of Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska—all these states actually pass across our territory if they take their shortest route to the eastern markets. We are between these states and their market, and I repeat that our position is peculiarly favourable, in a geographical sense. Then, our position is a favourable one in other respects. We have in Ontario, and in the greater part of the Dominion of Canada, excellent climatic conditions, a good soil that produces a great variety of the articles that find a market in the sea-board cities, and of a superior quality to any produced in the American states. We have within easy reach of us 6,000,000 people in cities. The population of the cities of New York, Brook-

lyn, Jersey City, Newark, Philadelphia, Albany, Rochester, Buffalo, Boston—all these great centres of trade—are within easy reach of this province. We have trunk lines of railway leading down to each one of them, and if the shackles were stricken from trade, the inevitable consequence to Ontario would be vast accession to the business of the country, a revival of trade and prosperity among the farmers, and prosperity among all classes whose business is in any way dependent upon the farmers of this country.

There is another branch of business which I have alluded to once or twice, and to which my attention has been drawn in connection with my duties, lately, as chairman of the Mining Commission of Ontario—I refer to the development of our mineral resources. Not only have we extraordinary agricultural resources, and peculiar advantages of position in the matter of reaching the markets of the sea-board for our agricultural productions, but we have enormous mineral resources, and our advantages for reaching a market with the minerals of this country are fully as great as our exceptional advantages with regard to our agricultural productions. We have a trade in minerals, an exceedingly small one. With our immense deposits of iron ore north of Lake Ontario, iron ore deposits up the valley of the Ottawa and up the valley of the Gatineau, iron ore deposits of extraordinary richness in the late disputed territory north of Lake Superior, fully as accessible as the iron ore of Michigan—with all these deposits of iron ore, we sent to the United States last year only 7,707 tons; while there was a trade in iron ore from the Lake Superior ports and the Lake Michigan ports to the Lake Erie ports alone of over 8,000,000 long tons. Now, we ought to participate in that trade, we have advantages for doing it. We could participate in that trade quite as advantageously as the mines having their outlets at Escanaba, Marquette and Two Harbours, and we are debarred from participation in that trade by the iron ore duties. We might share almost equally in that trade of 8,000,000 tons, but we have this paltry pitance of 7,707 tons which amounts to nothing at all. Last year we shipped to the United States fifty-eight tons of copper ore, where we should be shipping thousands of tons of copper ore to be smelted in the American works. We shipped last year from Nova Scotia 210,000 tons of coal to the sea-board cities. Now, Nova Scotia is the natural source of supply of coal for nearly the whole of the New England states. It can supply the cities of New York and Philadelphia upon more advantageous terms, and with greater ease, than those cities can be supplied from the coal mines of the interior of the state of Pennsylvania. Nova Scotia ought to ship, at least, 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 tons of coal annually to New England and to the sea-board cities, and would do it if the shackles were removed from trade, if the duty upon coal was removed. Here we are with a trade of

200,000 tons that ought to be at least twenty times that amount, and would be twenty times that amount if the restrictions were removed. The United States last year used \$54,000,000 worth of various kinds of building stones, and we sent to that country the paltry amount of \$52,000 worth. They used over a thousand times as much as we furnished them. There is no mineral production for the supply of which we have such advantages as in structural material. We have around the great lakes on the north shore, quarries of the most superior quality, quarries of marble, quarries of freestone, quarries of sandstone, quarries of granite, right along deep water on the lake shore where we could load this material on vessels. All around these lakes are great cities like Chicago, with its million of inhabitants, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, Erie; and the natural source of supply for stone for all these cities is the Canadian quarries. Stone can be shipped by water through the Erie canal to New York and Philadelphia. In the business of furnishing structural material, in the business of furnishing the productions of our quarries on the north side of our great lakes, we ought to have, at least, one-tenth of the \$54,000,000 worth of the trade in the structural material required by the United States. We ought to supply them with \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 worth of structural material in the great lake region. Now, if our mineral resources were developed, as they would be developed under a system of free trade, if we could participate in the American iron business by furnishing ore, if we could send copper ore to their smelters, if we could participate in the coal trade, if Nova Scotia could have its fair share of the business upon an equal footing, with no favours asked, if we had access to the American market for structural material from our quarries, we would build up speedily a trade which would swell to an amount of exports not less than \$20,000,000 annually, and which would distribute in money annually paid for labour in this country, from \$12,000,000 to \$13,000,000 a year. Instead of that we have practically nothing—7,707 tons of iron ore, \$52,000 worth of stone, 58 tons of copper ore, and 210,000 tons of coal. We are, in fact, not aware, we fail to realize the enormous opportunities that we might grasp, and that we would grasp if restrictions on trade were removed.

In the discussion of this question, the Minister of Railways, the other afternoon, said, "it was acknowledged that this policy of free trade would do away with our manufactures, as was the case with several new states." The hon. gentleman is not in his seat, and I am sorry. I wanted to ask that hon. gentleman, who acknowledges this? I have not heard of it being acknowledged. I also wanted to ask him, what new states have been deprived of their manufactures by free trade with the other states? I should feel very much enlightened if I received an answer

to either of these two questions. It is very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman who made the assertion is not here to substantiate it. The truth is, and it is a very significant fact, that the percentage of increase in manufactures is greatest in the newer of the states and the percentage of the increase is lowest in the old states which form the great manufacturing centre, and the tendency of progression seems to be most strongly in the direction of the newer states in the Union. I find on making a comparison between 1870 and 1880—I have not the figures of 1890, as the compendium is not yet published and the figures are not accessible—that Massachusetts shows an increase of 14 per cent during the ten years, New York 37 per cent, Connecticut 15 per cent, New Jersey 5 per cent, Pennsylvania 5 per cent, Ohio 30 per cent, Indiana 36 per cent, Michigan 59 per cent, Illinois 100 per cent, Minnesota 228 per cent, Iowa 52 per cent and California 74 per cent, and manufacturing industries in the southern states show large increases, notably in Alabama. In the face of the assertion made by the Minister that the manufactures of the newer states were crippled out of existence by the manufactures of older states, I should like to have placed these figures before him. The manufacturing interests of the new states are increasing more rapidly than those of the old states, and I have no doubt the manufacturing interests of the Dominion on the whole would be benefited by obtaining a larger market, and by having 70,000,000 of consumers instead of 5,000,000. The increase in some of the western cities has been very remarkable. For instance, between 1870 and 1880, Louisville manufactures increased by \$38,000,000, Chicago by \$249,000,000, Milwaukee by \$43,000,000, St. Louis by \$143,000,000, San Francisco by \$78,000,000 and Birmingham, Ala. by \$50,000,000. All these statistics prove conclusively that the assertion made by the Minister of Railways was utterly without foundation, or that it was an assertion made recklessly. The hon. gentleman had no foundation on which to base it, or the hon. gentleman purposely made a statement which would not bear investigation. So far as the ability of our manufacturers is concerned, I am not willing to admit that the Canadian is an inferior being, I am not willing to admit that a Canadian, with equal chances, will not hold his own, and be able to cope with, any other man. I think the Canadians hold their own very well in the United States, and I know that as a rule they are succeeding, that no class of the population in the United States are making more headway than our people are doing; they are energetic, they take hold of business with vim, they possess the qualities necessary to success, and they are succeeding, and these men in Canada, if they had the chance to reach a market of 65,000,000 on the other side of the line, would be

Mr. CHARLTON.

equally successful in any manufacturing business that is not a pampered concern and requires pap fed by a National Policy to keep it alive, but any business that is a natural business and adapted to the country, would succeed. In some lines, I have no doubt, there would be a phenomenal increase. For instance, manufacturers of anything in the character of woodenware. We have exceptional advantages for carrying on a business of that kind. We would almost monopolize the manufacture of wood pulp and would manufacture paper extensively. We would to a large extent manufacture leather, for we have the tan bark, which is now becoming scarce in the United States. We would also very largely increase our manufactures of woollen goods and tweeds, and I firmly believe that the results of obtaining free trade with the United States and the opening up of their markets to that kind of our manufactured products, would result, not in ruin to our manufacturer, but in a great increase in the output of the manufacturing establishments of this Dominion. I have no fear whatever of any disaster as the result of free trade to manufacturing industries of this kind, and I am happy to say that, in conversation with scores of manufacturers of this country, I have found that in the vast majority of cases they express no concern about this matter, but they say if they can get access to the United States market on equal terms with American manufacturers, all they want is an arrangement to continue in operation as long as possible, that they are perfectly prepared to enter into such an arrangement at any moment, and are quite prepared to take care of themselves.

Another point made by the hon. gentleman was what he asserts to be the revenue difficulty. If we entered into this arrangement, we were told by the Minister of Finance and by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, we would be obliged to resort to direct taxation, that we cannot make an arrangement for reciprocal trade with the United States without calling on the tax-gatherer and raising part of the additional revenue required by direct taxation. I do not believe there is any foundation for that assertion. If we were to secure partial reciprocity with the United States, that is reciprocity on a list of manufactured goods, which Mr. Foster in his letter mentions, and which indicates that he expected the United States and the Canadian Governments might make an arrangement which would not cover the whole list of goods produced by both countries, if we arrange a certain list of goods as articles to be covered by reciprocity treaty, we should lose duties only on those covered by the schedule adopted. But if we entered into an arrangement, admitting every article from the United States free of duty and sacrificed the whole of the duties derived from American importations, we would sacrifice \$8,000,000 annually of revenue. The question is, can that sum be made good without resort being

had to direct taxation? I assert that it can. We would have, of course, to readjust our fiscal system, we would have to resort to a certain line of taxes that are purely revenue taxes. We might put a duty on tea and coffee. Those duties are less objectionable than on the class of goods produced in the country, because you thereby escape incidental taxation. The consumer pays for what is imported, and if there is nothing of the kind produced in the country, the article is not enhanced in price. We might impose a small duty on sugar, say 1 cent per pound, and we could furnish sugar to consumers at an advance of only one-fifth of a cent per pound on the present prices, because there is now a duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound for the purpose of enabling the refiner to meet competitors without protection. A duty of 1 cent per pound would amount to \$3,300,000, and the consumer would get this advantage by the amount of the duty going into the Treasury of the country, instead of into the pockets of the refiner. Then we might impose an income tax. That tax was resorted to in England.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, a tax on the wealthy men of the country is something to which the great majority of men would not object. Perhaps the Minister of Finance might object to a tax of 5 per cent on his official salary, which would reduce it by \$400; but the country would favour the taxing of all incomes of that kind; it would yield, too, a large sum, and by means of a small revenue tax on sugar of one cent per pound to the revenue, instead of eight-tenths of a cent for the benefit of the refiner, by means of imposing income tax and by means of increasing the excise duty, the \$3,000,000 would be provided---

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). They could cut down the expenses.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is another thing I was about to refer, and to which my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has directed my attention. We could retrench in our expenditure if we had placed on us the necessity for retrenchment. Is there any reason why, with an increase of 11 per cent in the population, the expenses of this country should have increased 40 or 50 per cent? There is no reason whatever for that. Let us go back to the scale of expenditure which existed ten years ago, and we would save enough to cover the deficiency of \$8,000,000 without imposing extra taxes. It is only a bugbear which these hon. gentlemen raise to frighten the people of the country when they threaten that we shall be obliged to resort to direct taxation if we bestow upon Canada the great advantages that will result from free access to the American market. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that we were obliged to resort to direct taxation to provide for this \$8,000,000.

what would we have to compensate our people for that? We would have a saving of \$8,000,000 on American duties, which, in place of going into the coffers of the Government, would go into the pockets of the people in the shape of their being able to buy goods cheaper. We would have a saving of the profits on these duties which constitute part of the cost, amounting to 40 cents on the dollar, and which would aggregate \$3,000,000. We would have a saving to the people of the incidental taxes, that is, the increased cost of goods manufactured in this country, with which these goods on which duties are paid come into competition, which, according to Mr. Springer, amounts to \$5 incidental, to \$3 direct, and which would amount, in all, to at least \$8,000,000 more. We would have a saving to the people of this country of the duty paid on their products going into the United States, which would represent \$5,000,000 on the present volume of exports of natural products to that country. We would thus have \$23,000,000 in all to compensate for the loss of \$8,000,000, even though we were obliged to resort to direct taxation, but I assert that there is no necessity to resort to direct taxation. We can raise a revenue by the imposition of a revenue tax upon articles not now taxed; by the imposition of 1 cent a pound on sugar in place of the eight-tenths of a cent per pound now levied for the benefit of the refiners, and also by an income tax. In these ways we can secure the necessary revenue which would enable us to give this country the blessings of reciprocity with the States.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We could repeal the Franchise Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. We could repeal the Franchise Act and save something else besides our credit. If we had reciprocity with the States, we would have increased production and increased exports, we would have brighter prospects, we would grow in wealth and we would grow in population, not at the miserable rate of 11 per cent in ten years, but at the rate of 25 or 30 or, possibly, 40 per cent in the decade. We would grow in the volume of business transacted, we would grow rapidly in tax-paying capabilities, and even if for a time it were necessary to leave a little gap between expenditure and receipts and to shoulder a small deficit, as we have often done before, we would soon catch up with the measure of our responsibilities and be able to shoulder our burdens and march along with the utmost ease, in consequence of the increased prosperity, the acquisition of population and the increase of wealth which would be sure to result by opening up to this Dominion the market of the 65,000,000 of people to the south of us. These are the points, Mr. Speaker, that I intended to refer to before you left the Chair at six o'clock.

Now, Sir, we are assured by the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that all this talk of ours is treasonable.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some one says, "Hear, hear." Is it a treasonable thing, Sir, to adopt a policy that will make Canada a nation? Is it a treasonable thing to adopt a policy that will enormously swell the imports and the exports of this great country, and utilize its great developed resources? Is it treason, Sir, to adopt a policy that will increase our population, that will increase our wealth, that will increase our power, that will increase our self-respect and make of us the great people that God designed should inherit this grand country, extending from ocean to ocean? This is treason, is it? The poor beggarly policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite reminds me of the story of a Presbyterian elder, who, in giving a charge to his minister, said: "Brother, God keep you humble, and we will keep you poor." That is what the Government design to do by us. They design to keep us humble and poor by this policy of restriction, which is intended to make us too weak and too destitute of ambition even to get up and travel in the direction of prosperity, if it were placed before us. The arguments used by the hon. gentlemen opposite are fallacious. They tell us that unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufactures. That is false. They tell us that we cannot get it. There is no foundation for that assertion. We can get it. They tell us it would not give our farmers better prices. Nothing is further from the truth than that assertion. The truth is that it would increase the values of the products of the farmers, and every farmer in this Dominion knows that access to the American market is all that he requires to bridge over the chasm that exists between depression and prosperity. They tell us it would not be permitted by England, but I have shown tonight the draft of a treaty in which England did permit, and sanction, and endeavour to consummate, a treaty that discriminated against her in the same manner, and almost to the same extent as would a treaty such as we are prepared to negotiate with the United States. They tell us, Sir, that it would lead to direct taxation, but I have shown already that there is no foundation for that assertion. They tell us that we are now prospering and happy, and that we can do better without such a treaty. They cannot deceive the country with such nonsense as that. Finally, they tell us that it is a disloyal policy, and that it will lead us to annexation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the policy we are pursuing now will lead us to annexation, and if the other policy should lead us to annexation it is not worse than the policy we are under at present. I would rather reach annexation through the door of prosperity, and expansion, and increased wealth, than to go through as a miserable

Mr. CHARLTON.

beggar asking to be brought into the American fold because the evils of our policy were so great that we had reached that point when we could no longer live without knocking at the door of the American union. However, this is a question which does not properly enter into the consideration of the matter we are discussing. We cannot forecast what the future political effect of any policy will be. We cannot forecast what the future destiny of this country will be. We do not know what result the forces at work will produce. We have nothing to do with these questions; but, Sir, we have something to do with grasping at an opportunity that lies directly in our path, and the result of which we know will be to give us prosperity, to give us increased wealth, to give us increased population, and to make that population happy and prosperous. I for one, Sir, propose to advocate, at all times, and with all the force I possess, the adoption of that policy so satisfactory in the good results it will produce, so necessary for the prosperity of this country, a policy of seeking for and obtaining reciprocity with the United States of America, a policy which the gentlemen on the opposite side will never adopt, a policy that they have cruelly trifled with, and deceived the people upon, and a policy on which they will be brought to judgment before the people, and condemned for chicanery, fraudulent transactions, deception and mendacity.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side appears to have got it into his head that the Finance Minister in his speech promised to make changes in the tariff; but, so far as I am aware, the Finance Minister did not promise to make any changes in the tariff. What I did understand him to promise was to look into the affairs of the country to see whether it was desirable or not that any such changes should be made, and that if he found that any changes were desirable and in the best interests of the country, the Government would make them. I think this is the policy that ought to be pursued by the Government, and I would not support any Government that would not be prepared to make any changes that they considered to be in the best interests of the country. We have heard a great deal in this debate of what was promised at the time of the adoption of the National Policy. According to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the farmers were promised a ready market at home for all they could produce. Now, I have no recollection of any such promise as that having been made. I can understand that the promise was made that the National Policy would increase the home market, and I think it has increased it, and increased it very largely. There was another thing promised in Lennox during that campaign, and, perhaps, there were very few ridings in the Dominion where the question of pro-

tection was better and more fully discussed than in that riding, for that was the riding represented at that time by the Finance Minister in the Mackenzie Administration. What was promised there particularly was that the National Policy would not only provide a better market for the produce of the country, but would lower the rate of interest, so that people would not be called upon to pay 9 or 10 per cent for money—a promise which, I think, has been fully carried out, because it is now as easy to borrow money at 5, 6 or 7 per cent as it was during the days of the Mackenzie Administration to borrow it at 8, 9 or 10 per cent. In fact, I have a vivid recollection as a business man how difficult it was to borrow money at all at that time; for the banks were quite as hard-up as ordinary business people, and if you took paper to a bank, no matter how good it might be, the banker would tell you that he could not discount it, not because it was not good, but simply because he had not the money. The hon. member for North Norfolk laid a great deal of stress upon the "Globe's" commissioners who were sent throughout the country to inquire into the condition of the country. Well, I remember seeing a comment upon that matter in a paper published in Hamilton, called the "Templar," which the hon. gentleman probably takes, as he is a temperance man. The writer stated that he never read the letters of the "Globe's" commissioners, because he knew that they would get what they were sent out to get, and I think that is very probable. Now, Mr. Speaker, the great difference between the Opposition and the Government is this: the Opposition say, as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the other night, that it makes very little difference on what we pay duties so long as we have to pay them. Now, I take direct issue with him on that statement. I think it makes a very material difference on what we pay duties. It makes a very great difference to the farmers, mechanics and working people generally, and the Finance Minister told us that had the Cartwright tariff prevailed last year on tea, sugar, coffee and rice, we would have paid nearly \$6,000,000 more than we did pay. Now, these are articles which are used by every family in this Dominion, and quite as much by the poor man as by the rich. Consequently, if the old duties had been imposed on these articles they would have weighed very heavily on the poor man. I think the Government acted wisely and well in removing the duties from these necessities of life. That is the policy of the Government, and that ought to be the policy of every Government—to take the duties off the prime necessities of life as much as possible, and to leave the duties on the luxuries of life. Then the rich will pay in proportion to their ability, while the poor man will be favoured to some extent. But, Sir, there is another aspect of this, on which reference has been made in this debate, and to which I wish to refer. I

wish to call the attention of the House to a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his answer to the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance. He said:

Had the Government been administered, as the late Mr. Mackenzie would have administered it, we would not require to-day to raise \$30,000,000. I doubt if we would have required to raise \$20,000,000.

Now, Sir, I have looked over the Public Accounts as far as I have been able, and I have been thinking about this question for some time, and for the life of me I cannot tell on what the hon. gentleman has based his calculation. He has certainly not based it on anything that happened during the time of the administration of the Mackenzie Government, because in no year during the five that they were in power did they reduce the expenditure to \$20,000,000. In fact, in no year did they reduce the expenditure to as low a point as they found it when they took office. What is the fact. The last year of the Macdonald Administration was 1873-74, and in that year the total expenditure was \$23,316,316. The next year, 1874-75, which was the first full year of the Mackenzie Administration, the expenditure was \$23,713,000; the next year it was increased to over \$24,000,000; the next year it was over \$23,509,000; and in the last year of the Administration, 1878-79, it was \$24,455,000. Now, Sir, I could understand an expenditure like this if times were prosperous and if the country were progressing; but how could we justify an expenditure like that at a time when a general depression was felt all over the country, not only by business men, but by the banks, and by every other class of the community? Then, Sir, we find that these gentlemen added 2½ per cent to the taxation of the people; and notwithstanding this increased burden upon the people, they were not able to meet the expenditure, but they had a deficit during the five years they were in power of over \$6,000,000. Added to that, notwithstanding the hard times and the depression among the people, they had added to the net debt of this country \$40,000,000. And then they talk about economical government; and the ex-Finance Minister of that Government had the cheek—I was going to say, but I do not wish to use an unparliamentary word—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, that's all right.

Mr. WILSON,—he had the cheek to stand up in the House and tell us that if the Mackenzie Government had been in power they would have been able to carry on the Government for \$20,000,000. Now, Sir, I want to see where these deficits came from, and what was the cause of them. In my opinion it is very important that we should know that, so as to judge whether these hon. gentlemen administered the affairs of the country economically or not. Well, Sir, in 1874, when they took office, our imports were over \$128,-

000,000, and in 1877 they had fallen to only \$99,327,000, a decrease of \$28,885,000. Now, Sir, the revenue yielded, under a 15 per cent tariff, in 1874, when the hon. gentlemen took office, was \$14,421,882. But under the 17½ per cent tariff, which they imposed on the people, the revenue in 1877 only yielded \$12,548,000, a decrease of \$1,873,000. Well, I think it would be fair to suppose that, under an economical government, the cost of collecting this revenue should not be more than it was under the corrupt administration, as hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to call it, of their predecessors. But what we find is this, that, although the revenue had fallen off, the cost of collecting it had increased over \$63,000, under the economical government of hon. gentlemen opposite, and then they would like to make us believe that they had been more economical than their predecessors and far more economical than their successors. I wish to show just how much it cost per cent as between these two Administrations. In 1873-74, it cost 4·55 per cent to collect the revenue on Customs. Under the Administration of the Reform party, for the year 1876-77, it cost 5·75 per cent, or an increase of 1·20, and it cost, in 1891, under the present Administration, 3·83 per cent to collect the revenue, or a saving to the country of 1·92 per cent. Now, I hold that so far as the Customs Department is concerned, the hon. gentleman did not show, and I think he cannot show, any saving that would justify the remark he made with reference to the amount of revenue required to run the affairs of this country. In the Excise the result is about the same. The falling off between 1874 and 1876 was \$653,000, and there was a slight increase in the cost of collecting the revenue of \$4,222. But when we come to the Post Office Department, that large department which never was expected, in our time, to have a revenue as large as the expenditure, when these hon. gentlemen took office in 1873, we had 4,518 post offices in the Dominion, the revenue from which was \$1,406,000, and the expenditure \$1,553,000, leaving an expenditure over receipts of \$146,619, or an expenditure over receipts to each office in the Dominion, of about \$32·50. When we come down to 1878, the last year of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, we find that the number of post offices had increased to 5,378, and that the revenue had increased to \$1,620,000. But the expenditure had also increased until it reached \$2,110,000, so that it exceeded the revenue by \$490,393, or it cost, per office, during the last year of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, \$93 more than the receipts, or nearly three times as much as it had cost under the previous Administration. That hon. gentleman may not think I am unfair, I am willing to come right down to the year 1892, and compare it with the Administration which is reported to us as being economical, straightforward, honest and pure. In 1892 the num-

Mr. WILSON.

ber of post offices had increased to 8,288, the receipts were \$3,542,000 and the expenditure \$4,205,000, or an expenditure over receipts of \$663,374; the cost, per office, over the receipts was \$80, or \$13 per office less than it was under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the next item I come to is one that hon. gentlemen may feel disposed to look on with some doubt, as they have been continually talking about immigrants coming to this country, and not staying here. But they themselves have a curious experience with reference to this matter. During the last four years of their Administration, from 1875 to 1878, both years included, they brought to this country, according to the reports and Blue-books, 109,904 immigrants, and these cost the people of this country, per head, \$8·74. That is what they cost under that economical, pure, upright, shall I say holy Administration. For the last four years, under the present Administration, from 1888 to 1891, both included, there were brought into this country 337,598 persons, at a cost per head of \$1·95, or a decrease of \$6·79 per head; so that every immigrant brought in under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite, cost this country a little more than what it cost us to bring four in under the present Administration. Is it any wonder that this Administration should have a strong backing on this side, and is it any wonder that when we went to the country in the bye-elections, the people, when they heard these facts, returned almost without a break, Conservatives to represent them? Now I come to a matter of considerable importance to this country, perhaps. I find that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made a great wail because our exports to the United States had fallen off so much since 1868. Well, I think I can give the hon. gentleman the reason. In these old times we did not have the facilities to export our farming products, and we allowed the Americans to act as middlemen, and they pocketed the profits. Was it to be expected that the American people, who had for export in 1891 \$321,671,000 worth of farm products, would require what we have? They had for export, after supplying their own people, more than eight times what we exported altogether, and this is the reason why, I believe, they did not want our products, as they had in the past. In 1890 we exported of farm products \$35,442,000 worth. Now, the hon. gentleman simply took a few of the articles which we export more largely to the United States than we do to anywhere else, and I do not think there is any person on this side of the House who is prepared to dispute the fact that there are some things we might send to the United States better than anywhere else, but it does not follow that the Americans are our best customers. I want to give a list of the articles of farm products which we exported in 1890-91: Horses, cattle, sheep, swine and other animals, mutton, pork, bacon, ham, beef, all other meats,

hides, wool, lard, butter, cheese, poultry, eggs, wheat, barley, oats, pease, beans, rye, corn, cornmeal, oatmeal, flour, bran, potatoes, flax, flaxseed, hemp, trees, tobacco, fruits, apples, dried apples, ripe and green currants, grapes, plums, and berries of all kinds. Now, I think it will be conceded that that list represents pretty fully the things we raise upon the farm and that we have for export. And, Sir, we exported in 1890 of these articles almost thirty-five and one-half millions worth, and out of that we sent a little over twenty-one millions worth to the mother country, and to the United States we sent a little over \$13,000,000 worth. But, Sir, when you come to consider how much we took back from each of these countries, you will see, I think, that the trade between the United States and this country was more a trade for the accommodation of the people than for any great profit there was in it for the people of this country, because, while we shipped to the mother country over \$21,000,000 worth of these articles, we only took back about \$1,500,000 worth of the same kind of articles; and, while we shipped \$13,000,000 worth to the United States we took back more than \$10,500,000 worth; showing that except about \$2,500,000 worth, we took back from the United States as much as we sent. The same thing applies to the years 1891 and 1892, and I think from this showing it can be readily seen that our natural market is with the people who consume the articles which we have for sale, and that the people of the United States, who raise a great deal more of these articles than they can consume, must find other markets for themselves. I do not consider the United States our natural market. Secondly, I think the Government of the day have done wisely and well in seeking other markets and opening up other markets for our products. While we have been comparatively shut out by the McKinley Bill—there is no getting away from that—still we cannot help that, and if hon. gentlemen were in power, I do not think they could make any very serious change with reference to that matter. I trust the Government of the day will, during the coming year, look fully into this matter. I do not think they should lay down any hard and fast rule; I think they should conduct the Government of this country in the best interests of the people, and if the changes are necessary, they ought to be made, and if they are not necessary, they ought not to be made.

Mr. CALVIN. In view of the flood of eloquence to which we have listened for some days, and looking forward to that which is to follow, it would be presumption on my part to suppose that I have anything to say that would add to the general intelligence on the subject in hand. But, if you will bear with me for a moment, what I have to say will not be in the way of argument, but in the form of a statement of opinion or belief.

My voice is for a revision of the tariff, believing that it is necessary, with a view to the lightening of burdens which press upon our people at this time. In his deliverance at Toronto, the hon. First Minister promised that he would deal with the mouldering branches, but we find that in all his extended vision he has been able to see so far only two—binder twine and coal oil. I say he seems, or the Ministry seems, to see only two, but they have dealt effectually to me with only one. I think we may fairly say that the users of binder twine have had given to them the relief they desired, and that that mouldering branch no longer blocks their way. But with regard to the other, to continue the hon. gentleman's metaphor, I think the result of the action of the Government has been simply to break off enough of the decayed limb to show us how rotten that limb is. However, we have the promise of the hon. gentleman that during the recess they will make full and complete inquiry of the people of this country, of all classes and in all localities, as to the desirability of granting the relief, and, thus fortified with concentrated combined intelligence of the whole people, they will after a few months again meet this House and give the relief that is desired. May I say that I earnestly hope—and I say this in all sincerity—that the scheme which shall be born of this effort will command our admiration and our votes. But I desire for myself to say that I regret that the Ministry have thought that this delay is necessary, and, as my voice is for revision, I feel that I shall be obliged at this time, sorry though I am, to differ from my friends, to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words upon this all important question which has been discussed for several days. I am sure that we hailed with considerable delight the evidently conscientious utterance of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He has come to the conclusion that, in order to meet the demands and wishes of his constituency, it would be necessary that he should support the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think it augurs a better day for the people of this country, and especially for the agriculturists of this country, when we see the evidences given by such hon. gentlemen as the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that revision of the tariff is in the air. And, Sir, knowing that we have a Government in this country that very much resembles a wooden weather-cock on the top of a barn, always ready to turn the way the wind blows, we may hope that the revision will take place. No doubt they will try to find out, in the perambulating course through the country which the Finance Minister and his assistants is to undertake,

what the real feeling of the people of this country is with regard to revision. They can ascertain the opinion of the people if they are not very much deceived by the manufacturers, because if they want to get a true expression of opinion they have got to keep out of the clutches and away from the influence of the manufacturers of this country. Now, the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) made some reference to the promises that had been made with regard to the National Policy before 1878. The hon. gentleman denied that any promises were made with regard to increasing the home market for the farmers of this country or with regard to the effects to follow the establishment of factories. He surely has not read Mr. Colby's speech. I would recommend him, before he again stands before this House to speak upon this question to read the speeches of his friends, particularly the speech delivered by Mr. Colby on the 12th February, 1878. After he has read that speech, I am sure he will not dare, nor will any gentleman who has read it dare, to say that promises were not made to the people of this country that the inception of the National Policy would be sure to give to the farmers of this country increased markets for a large proportion of the commodities they have for sale. Now that promise has never been fulfilled. He also said that the Mackenzie Government increased the annual expenditure while they were in office, and also that they had increased the debt. Well, it is a matter of surprise to me that any man in this House can venture to charge the Mackenzie Government with being responsible for the increased debt. If any gentleman will look back over the record he will find that the predecessors of the Mackenzie Government, by their policy, and the contracts they had entered into before the Mackenzie Government came into power, had committed that Government to the expenditure of almost every dollar of the increased debt incurred during their term of office. The honour of the country demanded that the contracts they had previously made should be carried out. Sir, it is a policy of the very worst and most brazen kind for hon. gentlemen opposite to repeat, night after night, the statement that the Mackenzie Government increased the debt and increased the annual expenditure. However, my hon. friend appears to have got well back into the past history of the country in his address, but I would advise him, when he undertakes to speak again, to get fed on catchup before he undertakes to address the House on questions of that kind. There is another point mentioned by the hon. member for South Ontario, to which I wish to reply. He says that he sat in this House representing a constituency that had previously elected a Reformer, and some time previous to that had elected a Conservative. He gave us to understand that the people of that county had changed their opinions since 1878, and therefore had sent him to this House. He forgot to mention that the constituency he

Mr. McMULLEN.

represents was gerrymandered in 1882. One of the strongest Reform townships in that constituency was taken out of it and put into another constituency, in order, if possible, to change its complexion, and ensure the return to this House of a man holding the political views that he does himself. Then he went on to brag of the improvements in his town, the increased population, the increased number of its factories and their output. Now, what do we find? We find that Oshawa, in 1888, had factories employing 937 hands, and in 1891 they employed 921 hands, or 16 less ten years afterwards than were employed in 1881. In 1881 the value of the factories was estimated at \$1,207,300; in 1891 the value was \$1,154,583, or \$42,715 less in 1891. In his town of Oshawa, by the census of 1891, there was a population of 3,992; by the census of 1891 there was a population of 4,065, or an increase in ten years of 66. The riding of South Ontario, according to the census of 1881, had a population of 20,244; in 1891 it was only 18,371, or 1,873 less than in 1881. Now, it is amusing that, in face of this official record, that hon. gentlemen should refer so boastfully to the great progress and prosperity that attended the introduction of the National Policy in South Ontario, and particularly in the town of Oshawa. Then he referred to the matter of binding twine. I am glad that the Government have decided to take off a portion of the duty on binding twine; I should very much like, indeed, if they had taken it all off, and allowed the farmers of this country to get binding twine duty free. I think they are entitled to that, judging from the hardships and privations to which they have been subjected. I think it would have been a fitting recognition of the sympathy of this House, and the sympathy of the Government, if they have any at all, toward the farmers of this country, that at least they should allow them to have binding twine free. I wish now to refer to a few points in connection with the National Policy, because it is the basis of all this discussion, it is the point upon which the whole question of our trade relations turn. I shall endeavour to prove, in the first place, that the National Policy increased our debt; in the second place, that it increased our taxes; and in the third place, that it has produced financial profligacy in this country. Now, in 1878 our debt was \$140,000,000; it is now \$240,000,000. Our ordinary expenditure in 1878 was \$23,500,000, and at that time Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper declared, from this side of the House, that it was altogether too much to ask a population that then amounted to nearly 4,000,000, to contribute annually for the expenses of government, \$23,500,000. They condemned loudly the Mackenzie Government for that outlay. But we find that our annual expenditure has now risen to the sum of \$37,500,000. In the two decades ending 1891, the population increased 29 per cent, the international trade,

28 per cent, and the federal taxes, 84 per cent. Now, it has been said boastfully by the Finance Minister, as well as by others, that we have very remunerative investments for a great deal of the money that has been spent. Well, if we look at the way in which the Intercolonial Railway has been handled, an institution in which this country has sunk fifty millions of money, we find that that road has saddled us with an annual loss of about half a million a year. However, we are glad to be able to recognize an improvement in the expenditure on this railway, and the Minister of Railways has announced that he hopes to be able in a short time to make the receipts meet the expenditure. But that only shows that profligacy of the worst character has characterized its management for many years. Had it been prudently and properly managed, had men only been engaged upon it that were necessary for its efficient operation, the road would have, at least, paid running expenses all the time. In place of that, and owing to the profligacy that has characterized the management of that line, we have the pitiable exhibition of an annual deficit varying from \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year. Next comes the Welland Canal, which has cost this country about twenty-four millions of money. It costs nearly one million a year to keep it open. Last year 90 per cent of its tonnage was from the United States, and 10 per cent was from Canada, or the United States freight that passed through the Welland Canal last year was 877,231 tons against 97,782 tons from Canada. The total value of shipments last year was a little over two millions, while the total cost of keeping the canal open, and the expenditure connected with it, with the interest on the investment, amounted to \$1,000,000. Now, the National Policy has increased the customs tax from \$3.12 per head in 1878-79, to \$4.60 a head in 1889-90. The per capita increase is 48 per cent; and yet our friends opposite will rise and iterate and reiterate the statement that the National Policy has not increased the taxes to the people of the country. I do not understand how they can explain away the figures and facts contained in the blue books, when these figures clearly show that the taxes of the people are very materially increased. The per capita tax in 1878 was \$3.12, while in 1890 it was \$4.60. But this does not show by any means the increased cost to the people of the goods manufactured. We know perfectly well that the moment you raise the duty on any commodity, if it is manufactured within the country, the price goes up. Take, for example, cotton goods. When the duty was increased from 17 per cent to 27½ per cent, the cost of those goods increased proportionally to the increased duty. Hon. gentlemen may say that cottons have fallen in price. It was a grand thing for hon. gentlemen opposite and for the National Policy that the general price of goods in England declined,

and consequently there was a proportionate fall here, except the duty. If it had not been so, it would have been a serious matter for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a fall in the price of raw materials.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Controller of Customs desires, he may challenge my statements when I have finished; but I defy him to successfully controvert the statements and facts I am now presenting to the House. I have handled goods and sold goods over the counter, as he has done. I know they became cheaper in price. I also am aware that the moment the duty went up here, the price rose proportionately. When the Magog mills first started the duty on prints was increased to 22 per cent, then to 25, and ultimately to 27½ per cent in order to enable that company to compete with imported goods. Notwithstanding the fact that our people were imposed on by being compelled to pay that increased duty, the mills were not successful, and for some time they were closed. These facts prove clearly that the National Policy has increased the price of commodities to the people. Take pig iron. In 1883-84, 29,393 tons of pig iron were manufactured in this country under a bounty of \$1.50 per ton; in 1890-91 only 15,147 tons were manufactured under a bounty of \$2 per ton; in 1891-92, under an increased duty, the output was 14,246 tons less than in 1883-84. We paid during the last nine years \$328,293 in bounty, and the product last year was considerably short of what it was in previous years. In 1891-92 we produced only 15,147 tons, although a bounty was paid of \$30,294, as against 29,323 tons 1883-84. Last year we imported 69,000 tons of pig iron, which paid a duty of \$275,797. There is no commodity either brought in or manufactured in this country that so seriously affects the farming community as pig iron, in consequence of the duty imposed on it. When Sir Charles Tupper introduced the proposed change in the tariff, in order to secure protection for pig iron in Canada, he painted in glowing colours the results that would follow the adoption of that duty. He told the people that there would be blast furnaces scattered through the country from end to end. He pointed out in glowing terms the advantages of that particular industry being established here, as well as other industries. An injustice now exists at Londonderry Iron Works, Nova Scotia. Those works have obtained new machinery, and are now manufacturing iron pipe from iron produced at their own mines. The company are paid \$2 per ton for producing the pig iron, and these works are competing with manufacturers of iron pipe in the country using iron imported under a duty of \$4 per ton. That gives the Londonderry company a decided advantage, and it is another proof of the readiness of manufacturers under the operation of the National Policy to take ad-

vantage of every change and every opportunity afforded them to place fresh imposts on the people." During the nine years we have paid duty and bounty to the amount of \$2,810,556, sufficient to pay about 700 men wages at the rate of \$1.50 per day for every working day during those nine years, and leave a good surplus. The statement made from this side of the House with respect to the position of the farmers on the barley question have been challenged in this House, as well as on the stump. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the farmers are not in a worse condition under the McKinley Bill than formerly, and that if the Bill were repealed there would be little change. That is a fallacy. We know well that that was not the argument which hon. gentlemen opposite used before the introduction of the National Policy. We know that Sir John Macdonald pointed out very clearly that the very opposite would result. He declared that if a farmer in Canada had a farm yielding barley, and there was a contiguous farm in the United States yielding barley, the fact of the duty being paid on Canadian barley going to the United States showed that the Canadian barley on the Canadian farm was not worth within 10 cents per bushel of the American barley. That is a proper argument. Under the operation of the McKinley Bill, however, the farmers are suffering, and they have begun to realize it for themselves. The lack of market clearly shows that our farmers are suffering from the effects of that Bill, and if we could by a change of policy or by the courteous treatment of Americans secure a reciprocity such as was indicated by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) it would be a national blessing to our people. The average price of barley in Canada is 45 cents, while it is 75 cents in the United States. If there was free trade between the two countries the Canadian farmer could obtain six gallons of coal oil for one bushel of barley. Under the present arrangement he obtains only 2½ gallons. Again, take coal oil. The duty on coal oil has not been altered, but the restrictions respecting importation have been removed. The Minister of Finance, I understand, intends to permit it to be imported in tank cars, and the restriction imposed by coal-oil dealers some years ago, has been removed, but even now coal oil that was sold at 12½ cents in the United States, was worth 28 cents in Canada. There is one point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House. The Minister of Finance stated that the importations into Canada this year included 350,000,000 pounds of sugar, and if he had imposed the duty on that sugar that formerly went into the Treasury, no less than \$5,418,918 would have been realized. But he did not tell the House that by the alteration two years ago he placed the duty derived from sugar in the pockets of the refiners, and not of the people, by making an imposition of eight-tenths of a cent per

Mr. McMULLEN.

pound on sugar manufactured in this country, and the refiners pocketed last year no less than \$2,763,349. Taking that from the amount of the duty the hon. gentleman says he would have received, had the duty remained, only \$2,655,571. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the gross amount of duty taken from the users of sugar in this country was about \$3,000,000. The manufacturers now take \$2,763,000 from the consumers, but the country gets nothing of that, so that in reality the Canadian consumers of sugar only escape a duty of \$300,000, and not \$5,000,000, as the Finance Minister stated. In the United States, sugar—"16 Dutch standard," the quality largely used by the poorer classes—is admitted free of duty. In Canada we only admit sugar up to "14. Dutch Standard," and on all manufactured sugar over that quality we collect \$16 a ton, while in the United States they only collect \$10 a ton. That shows that the people are paying a considerable tax on sugar, a tax which goes into the manufacturers' pockets and not one single farthing of it into the Dominion Treasury. I contend, Sir, that the condition of the farmers of this country is not at all so prosperous as it was in 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the improved condition of our agriculturists under the operations of the National Policy, but I think I can give figures to show that that boast is a false one. In 1878 the farmers were doing well. The average price of wheat in England from 1875 to 1878 was 48s. per quarter, while from 1885 to 1890 the price averaged in England 32s. per quarter, or a decrease of 35 per cent. At that time the farmer raised his products under a revenue tariff of 17½ per cent, but he now has to pay a tariff of over 25 per cent. At the inception of the National Policy the Tories told the farmer that he would have a better home market, that Britain was too remote, that competition in the Liverpool market was too keen, and that under the National Policy factories would spring up everywhere in Canada and he would secure a home market. These statements are in keeping with the fallacies and the humbug and the folly that has been preached from every platform in this country by every hon. gentleman opposite, who, unfortunately, have succeeded so far in misleading and fooling and deceiving the farming community of this Dominion. Have the farmers of this Dominion secured a home market under the National Policy? Let us see. In 1873 we exported farm products to the value of \$32,000,000; in 1890 we exported \$42,000,000 worth, and in 1892 we exported \$60,881,183 worth. That clearly shows that, instead of the export of farm produce decreasing, owing to the introduction of the National Policy, it has increased year after year. Then again, with reference to the population of the country. The population of twenty-one counties in the province of Ontario shows a decrease since 1881. However, my hon. friend from East Grey

(Mr. Sproule) rather undertook to show that the population of a country was no evidence of its wealth or prosperity. It is a very peculiar argument, and it is an argument that would be used only by himself. Under his ideas we should immediately inaugurate a system of sending out of the country all the poorer classes, because, if the prosperity of the country is to be measured by the average individual wealth of each inhabitant, then the less of the poor we have amongst us the better, and, if we adopt that course, according to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), we will show a much better state of things in Canada than at present. Hon. gentlemen opposite have abandoned the idea of bringing the producer and the consumer close together, they saw it would have a good effect on both. They now say that a free British market is the market for Canada. You would fancy, to listen to the glowing terms in which hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the British market, that it was open to none but Canadians. They know, as we all know, that when the Canadian farmer goes to the English market, he has to compete on the same terms with the Americans and with the inhabitants of India, and with the inhabitants of the world, and the sensible Englishman will not give the Canadian one penny more for anything he has to sell than he will give for the same produce of the Hindoo and the heathen. When the Canadian farmer complains of the want of the American market, he is told by hon. gentlemen opposite that he is a traitor and that he is disloyal, and the Minister of Finance, in his speech, has endeavoured to fill the mouths of his Laarkes and his Clarkes and his Sproules, and his Montagues, with arguments to tell the farmers of this country, that when they speak about extended markets in the United States they are disloyal to the old flag. However, Sir, it is amusing to see how quickly hon. gentlemen opposite take advantage of the American flag in order to better their own condition, as they have done in many cases. The Minister of Finance drew the attention of the House to four articles on which he said a less duty was now imposed than during the time of the Mackenzie Government. He referred to coffee, tea, rice and sugar, and he said that he would have secured a revenue of \$6,905,000 on these articles if the duty was the same as it was under the Mackenzie Administration. The Finance Minister forgot to mention, however, other articles upon which he is now imposing a heavy duty, and on which in the time of the Mackenzie Government, the tax was much lighter. Take, for instance, crockery and chinaware. In 1876 we imported of these \$430,888 worth, and the Mackenzie Government collected a duty of 17½ per cent or \$75,409.72. Under the National Policy, last year, we imported \$748,810 worth, and the Government collected on that a duty of \$250,022.46. Take, again,

cotton goods. Under the Mackenzie Government, in the year 1876, we imported cotton goods to the value of \$3,554,064, on which, at a duty of 17½ per cent, the Government collected \$621,974.53. Last year, under the National Policy, we imported cotton goods to the value of \$3,992,440, upon which the Government collected a duty of \$1,114,424.33. But, Sir, it would take me too long to go over the different items and show the increases. The best way in which we can measure the operations of the National Policy, and the tariff under which we live, is to compare it with the tariff during the Mackenzie Administration. The total value of imports into this country in 1876 amounted to \$119,615,736, upon which a duty was collected of \$15,354,099. In 1892, the total value of goods imported was \$116,978,943—hon. gentlemen will notice that it was nearly \$3,000,000 less than in 1846—and on that total importation the people of this country had to pay a duty of \$20,550,581. The people bought \$3,000,000 less goods, but they paid \$5,196,472 more duty than they paid in 1876. But, Sir, I made a careful and concise statement of the amount of duty collected in the last fifteen years. Taking it year after year and making that calculation in proportion to the number of inhabitants, we find the following results:—In the five years that the Mackenzie Government were in power, the taxes collected were as follows:—

1875-76.....	\$18,614,415
1876-77.....	17,697,914
1877-78.....	17,841,938
1878-79.....	18,476,813
1879-80.....	18,479,576
Total.....	\$91,110,666

Or, taking the population at 4,000,000, an average taxation, for the whole period, of \$22.80 per capita. Now, during the next half decade, the taxes collected were as follows:—

1880-81.....	\$23,942,138
1881-82.....	27,549,046
1882-83.....	29,269,698
1883-84.....	25,483,199
1884-85.....	25,381,529
Total.....	\$131,625,610

Or an average tax, estimating the population at 4,500,000, of \$29.24 per capita. Deducting \$22.80 per capita, which was the taxation during the previous five years, we have an average per capita excess during the five years, 1880-85, over the five years, 1875-80, of \$6.44 per capita. In the next half decade the taxes collected were as follows:—

1885-86.....	\$25,226,456
1886-87.....	28,687,000
1887-88.....	28,177,413
1888-89.....	30,613,522
1889-90.....	31,587,071
Total.....	\$144,291,463

Or a per capita taxation during the five years, on a population of 4,829,411, as given by the census of 1891, of \$30, an excess of \$7.20 per capita over the five years, 1875-80. The statements I have given show that \$28,980,000 more taxes were taken out of the people's pockets during the five years, 1880-85, than during the five years, 1875-80, and that \$34,560,000 more taxes were taken out of their pockets in the last five years than in the five years, 1875-80; or a gross sum in the last ten years of \$63,540,000 more than was taken during the previous five years. But, Sir, estimating that the people of this country use \$5 worth of home-manufactured goods for every \$5 worth imported, and estimating that the duty is collected in the shape of increased prices on these goods, the gross taxation to which the people of this country have been subjected during the past ten years amounted to \$169,440,000. In the face of this statement it is not much wonder that those who are not producers in this country, but who are consumers, for instance, the farming community, are growing poorer instead of richer. No country in the world approaches us in the way of borrowing and spending money. On the enlargement of the canals we have spent \$56,000,000. No country in the world can approach this. Since 1881 the net debt has risen from \$155,000,000 to \$240,000,000, an increase of \$85,000,000. Our neighbours in the United States have developed their country as rapidly as we have developed ours, and altogether by private enterprise without adding a dollar to the national or state debts. Mr. Porter, the superintendent of the United States census, says that from 1880 to 1890 they have paid the federal, state, county, city and town debts over \$1,800,000,000. The per capita amount of each of these debts, according to the last census, was as follows: Federal debt, \$14.24; state and territorial debts, \$3.66; county debts, \$2.27; debts, municipalities, \$11.48; debts of school districts, 60 cents; in all, \$32.25 per capita. With us the federal and provincial debts alone, without taking into account the county or city or municipality indebtedness, amounts to \$54 per capita. The net federal and state debt of the United States to each family of five is \$90, while in Canada it is \$270, or \$3 for every \$1. Besides heaping up liabilities we have enormously increased taxes, as I have already proved by the figures which I have submitted to the House. Now, it is highly to be desired that we should increase the population of this country, both in the older portions and in the North-west. Unless we can do this, by bringing in immigrants and keeping them here and inducing them to settle on our wild lands, we can never hope properly to develop the country. Now, the Finance Minister made some reference to the increased shipments of produce to England, speaking in that connection of the shipments of horses and butter. If there is any industry in this country which may be greatly extended and developed, it is

Mr. McMULLEN.

the making of butter. If we could secure the adoption of the dairying business by the farmers of Ontario in particular, we could make very rapid advance in the general financial well-being of that class, and I am glad to know that efforts have been made in the direction of educating those people to the dairying process, both by the Provincial and Dominion Governments. If the Minister of Finance, however, were disposed to assist the people in the matter of developing the dairy business, I would recommend them to offer a bonus, as is done in Victoria, Australia. There they have developed the butter business with England by offering a bounty of one penny for every pound of Australian butter sold in the British market at over nine pence per pound, and they give an export bounty of three pence per pound for every pound sold in the British market at over a shilling per pound. If my hon. friend would introduce a measure of that kind, if he would offer to the butter producers of this country a bounty on their export of creamery butter, he would undoubtedly largely help to develop the production and shipment of butter, and lead to a very great improvement in dairying. And there is more room in England for the sale of butter than anything else. With regard to eggs, the Minister of Finance made some reference to the fact that eggs brought more by 1½ cents in the English than in the American market. But he must know perfectly well that it costs from 3½ to 4 cents per dozen more to pack eggs for shipment to the English market than to the American market. It will not do to put them up in the same manner. They have to be very expensively packed in boxes of a certain size and description, so that when they reach the other side these packages may be cut in two and made into half boxes. The cost, therefore, of the preparation of eggs for the English market, and the extra cost of shipment, is 3 to 4 cents per dozen more than it costs to prepare them for shipment and pay cost of carriage to the American market; and, consequently, you require to get a considerably increased price in the English market as compared with the American. Again, take horses. The Minister of Finance drew the attention of the House to the fact that in 1891 we had increased our export of horses to the English market. I find, however, that that export was very limited. He said that our export had increased 37 per cent, but carefully refrained from giving the total number shipped. He was willing to snatch at anything in order to try and create the impression that the English market was the market for horses. Now what do we find? In 1891 we exported 1,223 horses to England, and in 1892, 1,369, or 147 more in 1892 than in 1891. The Minister of Finance was careful not to give the figures, but told us boastfully that we had increased our shipment of horses to England by 37 per cent. On the other hand, Sir, des-

pite the McKinley Bill, which imposes a tax of \$30 per head on the horses we export to the United States, we sent to that country in 1892, 9,261 horses. However, the Minister of Finance wanted to give his friends something to say on the stump with regard to the increased export of horses to England. He told us that he was going to revise the tariff during next session of Parliament. In my opinion there never was a more injudicious statement made to the people of any country. By this statement the Minister of Finance will disturb the whole basis of trade this year. People who handle shelf and heavy hardware and iron will endeavour to dispose of all that they have and considerably decrease their imports until they know what the Government policy will be. The same effect will be observed in many lines of manufactured goods. If the Minister had made up his mind to limit by an announcement the importation of goods during this year, he could not more effectually accomplish that object than by expressing his intention to revise the tariff next session. Whatever the intentions of the Government may be with regard to the tariff, it was their duty to have kept those intentions to themselves. There has been a good deal said with regard to population. I contend that the best way in which to measure the prosperity of the country is to note the increase or decrease of its population, and the best way in which we can measure our progress is by comparing the province of Ontario with those states in the Union with which we can most equitably make a comparison. Take, for instance, the state of Michigan, which, in point of soil, and climate and otherwise, is very like Ontario. That state contained in 1880, 1,636,539 people, and in 1890, 2,093,000, showing an increase in ten years of nearly 28 per cent. Compare that with Ontario, which is considerably larger than the state of Michigan. In 1880, the population of the province of Ontario was 1,900,000, and in 1890 it was 2,100,000, showing the increase in the ten years of 10½ per cent. Thus, while the state of Michigan had increased 28 per cent, Ontario had only increased 10½. Take Dakota. In 1880 the population of Dakota was 135,000 and in 1890 it was 510,000, showing an increase of 36 per cent. Take Washington territory, the population of which in 1880 was 75,000, and in 1890 345,000, showing an increase of 365 per cent. These figures show very clearly that in these states, the climate and soil of which are very much the same as the climate and soil of Ontario, the increase in population has been considerably in excess of that of our province. That clearly shows there must be something wrong in a fiscal policy which keeps back the population of the magnificent province of Ontario, whose climate and soil are not surpassed by any other state or province on this continent. My impression, from the announcement made by the Finance Minister to the House, is that the Government intend

to adjust their policy to meet the changed conditions that inevitably will be made in the United States. The Government of that country will have to carry out the mandate given by the people with regard to tariff reform. The American people have suffered under the heel of restriction and protection for twenty-five years. Hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed to the United States a country in which the farmers are no better off than in Canada. That I quite admit, and have already stated the reason why. It is because the farmers of the United States have suffered from the existence of combines; i. e. is because they have been subjected to the extortions that are the result of a protective tariff. The Republican party, which is responsible for the inception of that tariff, tried its best to keep the farming community in line by introducing the McKinley Bill, and by virtually telling them that by this Bill the party would make them all rich and enable them to compel the city consumers who extorted from them for years their hard earnings, giving little or no return, to disgorge. But the farmers have got their eyes widely opened to the extortions to which they have been subjected by the Republican party of the United States, and they took the bit in their teeth and went with determination straight for tariff reform, or as near free trade as the interests of their country would permit; and the Government of that country will have to follow in line and give these people the relief they require. No, Sir; the Finance Minister knows that we can never keep up the regiment of protective officers along the border of this Dominion to keep the people from smuggling goods from the United States when the prices there go down. If the tariff is reduced in the United States, as it will undoubtedly be, and prices are made considerably lower than they are in Canada, I would like to see the Finance Minister with his Minister of Customs—rather his Controller of Customs—and his Controller of Inland Revenue stop the smuggling that would inevitably result from very considerable reductions of the tariff of the United States. The hon. gentleman knows well that he cannot do it. The very moment the United States took the duty off tea, that moment the Government here fell into line and took off that duty on our side. When the United States took the duty off sugar, gentlemen opposite also removed the duty; and, Sir, even the promised reduction indicated in the speech of the Finance Minister is not promised as a matter of choice on their part, but is given by reason of the reduction of duty in the United States, which compels the change. The Government of Canada will not go into the revision of the tariff this year, but they have signified their intention of doing something in that line next year, because they know that if the United States reduce duties they will be driven to the necessity of making the reductions also. Now, Sir, we have to face the restricted conditions

and impoverishing conditions of a large portion of our community, because, while there are many men better off than they were prior to the institution of the National Policy, the masses of the people who are earning their daily bread by the sweat of their brow are not better off; only those who had invested in manufacturing institutions and are reaping the rich reward of their operations are better off. The labouring man, Sir, is taxed for the spade that he takes in his hand 60 per cent; he is taxed on the hoe 50 per cent, on the fork 60 per cent; he is taxed for the shirt that covers his back from 25 to 30 per cent; on the hat that covers his head 25 to 30 per cent; he is taxed for every item that enters into every day use far more than he was taxed under the operation of the previous tariff, and to say to him that his condition is better is to tell him what he knows is not true. But, Sir, it is a matter of surprise how successful hon. gentlemen opposite have been in fooling and humbugging and deceiving the labouring and farming classes of this country. In 1878 they gained power by promising to the people better markets for their products. In 1882 they dared not go to the country upon their record, but they secured the passing of a gerrymander Bill, and by one of the most villainous laws ever placed on the Statute-books of any country, they secured the majority to support them in 1882. In 1887, by passing a Franchise Bill and by increased iron duties and by making many promises of the development that would follow their re-election—promises that were never realized—they managed on that occasion to secure by a narrow majority the support of this House. In 1892, how did they accomplish it? They went before the people of this country, addressing themselves particularly to the farming community. They knew they had the manufacturers, those interested in the operations of the National Policy, who were merely replenishing their pockets out of the earnings of the people of this country. This class had in their own pockets and in their balance sheets the arguments to induce them to support the Government. But the Government felt that it would be necessary to make some impression upon the farming community, and so they went before the people, declaring that they had an invitation to go to Washington on the 4th March and enter into negotiations for an international trade arrangement with the United States. They went before the people of this country, saying what was not true. It has been proved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to-day, that that statement was not true. All the evidence, every statement made by the people of the United States regarding the conference, proves that it was not true, and, to cap the climax, when Sir Charles Tupper went down to Washington and was challenged with regard to the statements made by the Canadian Ministers and by himself, on the stump,

Mr. McMULLEN.

to the people of this country, he admitted that that statement was not true and that the contention of the United States Minister, with regard to what was said in Washington at the time when the Ministers went down there, was a proper and correct statement. Sir, the people of this country were misled, they were fooled, they were humbugged, and the farmers and the working people of this country have themselves to blame for permitting themselves to place confidence in the people who deceived them upon that and previous occasions. But my impression is, that the days of humbugging the people are coming rapidly to an end. I think the Government will find it pretty hard to get up another will-o'-the-wisp scheme that will enable them again to fool the people. They have to show some evidence more tangible and secure than the evidence and promises they made in 1891 with regard to a trade treaty with the United States. We on this side want to have a treaty made. And for that reason we are charged with being disloyal, with being anxious to sell the country to the United States. But gentlemen opposite have withdrawn these charges which were made on the stump—charges that the Liberal party was disloyal to the Crown of England because we desired freer trade relations with the United States. We desire to live on terms of courtesy and amity with the people of the United States. We do not wish them to fancy that we will get on our knees to beg a treaty of them. But if the Government had used the people of the United States as they ought to have used them, if they had gone to Washington with a desire to make a treaty, they could have had it. But they did not do so. They went there to frustrate the making of a treaty. The hon. Finance Minister, instead of offering reasons why a treaty should be entered into, began to point out objections. He pointed out the difficulty with regard to the manufacturing of woollen goods and asked: how is that to be got over? That in itself shows that they have no desire to make a treaty. They want to bar the door against a treaty. And last session of Parliament the Finance Minister comes before the House and tells us the negotiations are at an end, that a treaty is impossible. We cannot get a treaty, he said, unless we are ready to discriminate against the mother country and unless we are ready to abnegate our rights as a nation and hand over our tariff-making to the United States. Such a statement is not true. The evidence shows the very opposite to be the case. As stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a treaty on the lines proposed by the Hon. George Brown, which would be an advantageous treaty to the people of this country, as well as to the people of the United States, could be got if the Government desired it. But the Government do not want it. They talk of getting a treaty only

in the natural products of the farm, the forests, the field and the mine. But we know that they cannot get such a treaty, and the Americans would be fools to make a treaty on such a basis. From 1854 to 1866, when the last treaty of reciprocity was in operation, \$240,000,000 worth of goods were sent from Canada to the United States, while the United States sold to us only \$126,000,000 worth, so that the balance of trade in our favour was about \$120,000,000. Well, in face of that, how can you expect the United States to renew the treaty? What do the people of the United States virtually say by the opposition they offered to the treaty? They say to the people of Canada: You send us horses, we have not horses to send to you. You send us lambs, we have not got lambs to send to you. You send us barley, we have not got barley to send to you in return. But we are willing to take your barley, your horses, your eggs, your lambs, your hay, if you are willing to take, in return from us, the commodities we have to sell. Allow us to prepare our schedule of the commodities that we desire to get rid of, and you prepare your schedule of the commodities that you desire to sell. But the hon. gentlemen opposite want to prepare the schedule of both countries; they want to say not only what we shall sell to the United States, but what the people of the United States shall sell to us. Any person who will consider the enormous trade of the United States will see clearly that by trying to commit them to a tariff of that kind, you are trying to bind them down to something they will never submit to. Now, I contend that, under this condition of things, it was an exceedingly imprudent move on the part of the Government to increase the number of Ministers and thus increase the annual outlay of this country. I contend that the Ministers who held portfolios previous to this year, were amply sufficient to conduct the affairs of this country properly and carefully, if the brains that filled each of those positions were up to the standard that can be secured in this country. I admit frankly that in many cases we are very poorly served. We are paying a very high price for the statesmanship of some of the Ministers that occupy Cabinet positions. I quite admit that. It is composed, in many cases, of men whom nature never intended for any such position, and they have been simply ostracised by a chapter of accidents that has brought them into a position that they were never qualified to fill. Now, I see the President of the Council in his place. He has got a very heterogeneous collection of councillors to preside over; there are seventeen, I believe, altogether. I suppose the hon. gentleman is going to try to manage matters so as to keep them peaceable and quiet. He is going, I presume, to dehorn the Controller of Customs so that he will not inflict any grievous bodily injury upon the Solicitor-General, and he is going

to dehorn the Solicitor-General so that he won't stab, in the vital parts, the Controller of Customs. He will keep them all at peace with each other. The hon. gentleman understands how to handle bullocks. He has been in that kind of business many years. He was in it away down in Texas where he did a considerable business of that kind, and I do not know any man on that side of the House better qualified to preside over the sixteen political bullocks he has got around him, than the hon. member who now occupies the position of President of the Council. He must see that judging from the amount of brains, and the intelligence, and the ability that have been displayed by some of them since this House met, we are paying pretty dearly for the services they are giving us. I contend that we have been on the down grade, politically, for some years. Look at the exposures that have been made before the Public Accounts Committee and the Privileges and Elections Committee of this House during the last two or three years. We have had exhibitions, Sir, that have aroused the indignation and called forth the surprise of all enlightened countries, and all parts of the British Empire. There is not a journal published in London, even the most pronounced Conservative journal, that has not denounced, in the strongest terms, the disgraceful state of affairs that has attended our political career during the last ten years. We have seen civil servants stamping around the peacock plumes, living at the country's expense; third-class clerks living in style equal to that of a Deputy-Minister; and first-class rascals living like nabobs, taking the money of the country that has been improperly stolen and abstracted, and putting it in their own pockets. Take for instance an Arnoldi, and his brass dogs and his jolly "Joe" trips—all such cases show clearly the scandalous manner in which the affairs of this country have been handled by a lot of reckless and indifferent Ministers. Take the case of the late Minister of Public Works, who presided over the affairs of that department for some fourteen years. During that time he spent about \$43,000,000 upon public works. Now, we could only get at the inside of part of that expenditure. Owing to a quarrel that took place between the contractors, we have only been able to unravel three of the contracts, the Cross-wall in Quebec, the harbour improvements in Montreal and the graving dock at Victoria. Now, what was the result of the investigations that were held with regard to those three contracts? It was proved clearly that those contracts should only cost this country, if done at tender prices, \$2,184,000; but they actually cost \$3,137,000, or 40 per cent in excess of the legitimate price at which those works should have been performed. The country lost \$953,000 in those three contracts. Now, if we could get at the inside secrets of all the other contracts, the other \$40,000,000 that was spent in that depart-

ment, I have no doubt it would be seen that we have lost on them 25 per cent of the total amount. It shows that this country is struggling under an increased debt of \$10,500,000 owing to the extravagance, the incapacity, and the neglect of the ex-Minister of Public Works. What has been done with him? He has merely been turned out of the Cabinet; he has been taken down from the lofty position he occupied as Cabinet Minister, and he has been sent over to our side, where he is now sitting on the stool of repentance for the misdeeds of which he has been guilty for a number of years. Then we had the late Secretary of State, who presided over the Printing Bureau. Why, Sir, was there ever a more scandalous condition of affairs on earth than was disclosed in connection with the Printing Bureau, with the Senecals, and the Bronskills, and the Dansereaus, the men with whom he had associated, and who had fleeced this country of something like \$50,000 of money that should have been in the pockets of this Dominion? What has been done with him? Why, Sir, in place of having meted out to him the punishment he deserved, and the punishment that he would have got at the hands of the people if they had a chance to inflict it upon him, he has been sent down to Quebec to occupy the position of Lieutenant-Governor for five years. I say that if that man had had a proper punishment administered to him, such as the people of this country would pronounce upon him if they were able, he would now be behind the prison bars at Kingston instead of in the place he now occupies. These scandalous doings have brought Canada into the unfortunate plight in which she is to-day, our debt enormously increased, our annual expenditure enormously increased, our markets cut off. The McKinley Bill has fenced us out from our most desirable markets, and we are here in an embarrassed condition, and in a political condition that is greatly to be regretted. I say it is a great pity that the people of this country ever permitted the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury-benches to handle the affairs of this country in the scandalous manner in which they have been handling them. I hope that all the evidences of political iniquity that have existed, and of the deceptions practised upon the people of this country during the last ten years will come vividly before their minds, and when they obtain an opportunity they will pronounce their opinion that the men who condoned those crimes, who permitted those men to escape, who allowed such rascalities to be carried on and practices of deception to be practised on the people, and who failed to implement their promises, should be displaced from power, and decide in favour of tariff reform, political reform and a change of Government and the placing at the head of affairs a body of men who will seek to bring about a better state of affairs than have pre-

Mr. McMULLEN.

vailed in this country during the last 15 years.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). I desire for a few moments to beg the indulgence of the House, not, however, with the hope of adding interest to the debate, although this is assumed to be one of the most important issues in the eyes of the public. I do not doubt that very great interest has been felt all over the country with regard to this question, and when we consider the various positions taken by hon. gentlemen, no wonder that great interest is felt throughout the country. But while the interest in the country seems to be very greatly aroused, I am sorry to say, judging by appearances, the interest manifested at first in this House has quite fallen off. I do not know whether this is due to the vigour of the earlier attacks of the Opposition or to the vigorous replies offered from this side of the House to the attacks made, proving too exhaustive, but from present evidences the interest is somewhat flagging. I therefore enter the debate at a time when perhaps a short speech will be most in order. As I have said, the interest taken in the debate is largely increased by the fact that on both sides of the House certain modifications of the tariff were anticipated. While some demands came from the Opposition, certain requests also came from members on this side of the House. This action on the part of members on this side of the House has been looked upon in a peculiar light. The name of "wobbler," and so on, used in a contemptuous sense, of course, has been given to members who were of opinion that in certain respects the Government might properly make modifications in the tariff; but while, of course, demands would be naturally expected from the Opposition, no doubt hon. members on this side of the House have also the right and they are sent here for the purpose, to advise the Government as to what might be considered a proper course to pursue in regard to certain items of the tariff. The Government in times past, as we know, have lowered or removed the duties on certain articles—sugar particularly. That being the case, hon. members on this side, as well as on the other side of the House, are perfectly warranted in deciding that perhaps the present state of affairs is such as to permit and allow modifications of taxes in some other respects. I did not have my name attached to any motion looking to the revision of the duties on coal oil or the free admission of binding twine, but at the same time I must confess that I had a certain amount of sympathy with the motions in connection with those articles. I make this statement because I reside in a county that is one of the finest agricultural counties in Ontario, and there a feeling prevails that in some respects the tariff might be modified, and coal oil, of course, and binding twine were articles specially mentioned as those that might be dealt with. I may say, however, that my county, being an agricultural county, has very little sympathy with free corn.

It is impossible to suppose that a county raising far more coarse grains than it can consume, would favour free corn. But that is by the way. I consider that this being the feeling in my county, it is my duty to express that feeling, and that I am sent to this House for no other purpose; but I consider, from the matter of fact way in which the Minister of Finance met the issue, the Government favour the action of members on this side of the House and seemingly approve it, because, if I rightly read the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance, we have a promise of a certain amount of tariff revision along the lines we indicate, so far as the finances and condition of the country will permit. While we take this position, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, including the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), regard it as a most remarkable spectacle. I do not see the hon. gentleman in his seat; but I hope it was not so remarkable as was the oratorical effect he tried to make out of it. We are only doing our duty, and I hope in this respect our course will be approved in whatever way the country will view our proposals. I have no doubt that the course mapped out by the Minister of Finance, to carry out his promise of revision in the near future, will meet with the full approval it deserves. But I am glad to see that, while revision is to take place, the Minister of Finance announces that the National Policy is to be kept in view. I think it should undoubtedly be kept in view, for although we have listened to strong and vigorous indictments of that policy, we are so accustomed to them that we bear them with considerable grace, and I do not think the National Policy should be sacrificed for any such reasons as have been adduced. The figures given by the Minister of Finance and by the Minister of Railways and others, go to prove conclusively that, so far as any human institution can do so, the National Policy has thoroughly and well fulfilled the object for which it was designed, and this notwithstanding all the slurs cast upon it and the attempts made to laugh it out of existence. Among the charges made against the National Policy, I find one charge is framed in this way: We have been told that it was designed as a measure of retaliation against our neighbours, and that by this means we were to secure a reciprocity treaty. If such was its design, it has failed in that respect. But I contend that it was not its design. It was not designed also, as was stated in another place, on the principle that it was the only way in which to make a young and comparatively poor people strong and rich, by surrounding them with a high tariff wall. I consider that there is very little evidence to show that this was the design; and if it were, it certainly has not succeeded. But I hold that it was not designed either with a view of oppressing the poor or benefiting the rich, or placing in their

hands a means of successfully squeezing the blood out of the poor; it was designed, I think, on the broad principles of developing our resources and encouraging, within moderate limits, the growth of manufacturing interests and also workingmen's interests as well as the agricultural interests, which have not been slighted in any way. The farming interests have been regarded and carefully looked after, and all interests of the country have been made inter-dependent, which I consider a most important point. While these have been the main points looked after by the National Policy, we must not forget that it was also designed with a view of producing, in an equitable manner, a sufficient revenue with which to run this country. We have heard during the debate the amount of money invested on public works. We believe those sums have been well invested. We believe nothing will conduce to the growth of our country more fully and satisfactorily than such investments and while we feel that those investments were made satisfactorily and with a view to develop the resources of our country, we also feel that for the most part they have been of a right character and have been carefully managed. I feel, then, that when we regard the amount of money invested in manufacturing industries here, the amount of money not only invested in manufactures, but in industries of all kind, we cannot help but feel that the National Policy does not deserve the slur cast upon it. Like every other human institution, it is, no doubt, susceptible of improvement, and there is not the slightest doubt that this Government will improve these defects as they are met with. The chief ground upon which a demurrer can be taken to the success of the National Policy, as a whole, is in reference to its bearing on our agricultural interests, and yet, Sir, if we examine the causes of the present depression in agriculture, we will find that they are dependent, in no way, on the National Policy. I can safely say, for Eastern Ontario, with which I have most experience, that any depression which exists there can be attributed to two or three causes remote from the effect of the National Policy. The first and the chief of these is the failure of crops for several years past, with the exception, perhaps, of the year 1891. Another thing which has seriously affected the agricultural industry is the disturbance of trade created by the McKinley Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to talk as if we ourselves were responsible for the passing of that measure in the United States, but the charge seems so absurd on its face that it is hardly necessary to say that we had nothing to do with it. However, whatever the cause of such a law being brought into force, it has seriously disturbed our financial interests and it accounts in some instances, for depression in our farming interests. There are other reasons which might account for this depression. I think that, in

many cases, our farmers have been a little too greedy to acquire land. I know that prices in my own county for some years past have been excessively high, and that the farmers were not warranted in paying them. I think, also, that the success with which agents have pushed the sales of their pianos and organs, and implements of all kinds, has not tended to replenish the pockets of the agriculturists. A transition period in trade is one of great anxiety, and it must necessarily create some loss, which will, no doubt, have to be borne by the agriculturist, to some extent. That being the case, we must feel that the Government has exerted themselves in every way to counteract it, by diverting the attention of the agriculturists to the dairying interest, and there is not the slightest doubt that this interest has been successfully prosecuted and promoted throughout the Dominion. While the results obtained from the land have not been so satisfactory, there is no doubt that our farmers have a mine of wealth in dairying, and, as the industry develops, it will, no doubt, place them in as good a position as ever they were. One thing must be remembered in connection with the development of this industry, and that is, that while the land has been cropped to death, I might say, the pursuit of dairy farming will, to a large extent, enable these lands to be recuperated. This being the case, and as we have also the promise of the Finance Minister that there will be a revision of the tariff, I do not believe that the charges against the National Policy have any force at all. No doubt some of our people feel—they have been told so so often that they must believe it, perforce—that perhaps they are unjustly taxed, and the remarks of the Finance Minister on this point touched the key note of the whole position. I will, with the permission of the House, quote a few sentences from his speech :

But that class or section, wherever it may be, must proportionately to its strength, bear its just and equal proportions of the burdens that are necessary in order to carry on the affairs of this country and to give a permanence and durability.

That is the point of view from which every member of this House, and every man of this country should regard the matter. Each and every one of us must be to a certain extent prepared in the present state of affairs to bear a fair portion of the taxes placed upon us for the development of our country. I think that it does not become the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to try and create class feeling among the people as he endeavours to do in the latter part of his speech. He charges that the working of the tariff is most oppressive to the poorer portion of the people, and that it discriminates against special classes. I do not believe that any such thing is contemplated by the tariff, and I think that it is wrong for the hon. gentleman to endeavour to arouse such Mr. Ross (Dundas).

a state of feeling as that. It may be that in a few of our manufactured goods, where specific duties are levied, they do bear, perhaps, a little hard upon some of the people, but to say that it was designed for that purpose is quite another thing. Against that statement of the hon. member we have the definite proposal of the Government to meet just such cases, and to remodel the tariff in that respect. With regard to some of the particular changes in the tariff which have been asked for by hon. gentlemen, I may say that while coal oil, and binder twine, have received special attention, I seriously hope that the Government will, when taking into consideration these things, as they promised, not forget to give their attention to the iron duties. I wish now to offer a few remarks in reference to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). In the first place, as an abstract proposition, and excepting the first clause of it, I do not know that there is a great deal about it not to commend it to the minds of the members of this House. As an abstract proposition, so far as it goes, it is satisfactory, and any member of the House might vote for it; but the first clause is, I believe, unjust and entirely out of place. It says :

That the present customs tariffs bears heavily and unjustly on the great consuming classes of the Dominion, and should be at once reformed in the direction of freer trade.

The charge that the tariff bears unjustly upon the consuming classes is without foundation, the proposer of the amendment to the contrary notwithstanding; but that it should be reformed in the direction of freer trade, I do not find much objection to, when we consider that it only goes to the length of the sum required to meet the expenses of the Government efficiently and economically administered. The gravamen of the whole thing is in that. What do we regard as efficient and economic administration? We on this side of the House have no fault to find, or but very little fault to find, with the present administration of the affairs of the country. As the Minister of Railways and Canals said very pointedly: there is no doubt that good value has been, for the most part received for our expenditure, and he very properly asked the hon. member opposite to point out how he was going to run the country with any less money than was at present spent. That, I think, is rather a difficult question to answer, because I believe that our expenditure must continue very nearly as large as it is at present, and we notice that our income and outlay are about on a par. That being the case, it appears difficult to see in what way our affairs could be more efficiently or economically administered. There is a peculiar feature of this amendment of hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), to which I wish to direct attention. It must give great relief to some hon.

gentlemen on the other side of the House to see that there is no mention in it of unrestricted reciprocity, or anything in that direction. I know that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) will vote for the amendment with a much freer heart on that account, than he otherwise would have done.

Mr. SEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I would not be fulfilling the duty which I owe to my constituents were I not to speak on the amendment which is now before the House, an amendment which I am sure is approved of by a large majority of the farmers of the country. I think, Sir, that the reason the farmers have not received more consideration in the past is that they have not been unanimous in making their demands. We have an instance in the present session of what they can accomplish by unanimity of action. A large number of petitions from farmers were presented here in favour of taking the duty off binding twine, and we see that a little has been done in that direction. Petitions were also presented in favour of the reduction on coal oil, and something in that direction has been done. Therefore, I think that if the farming community state their case properly, and get the support which they have a right to expect, they will receive more consideration from this House than they have had in the past. Now, I intend in what I say to go upon a line which has not been touched upon during this debate that is, to make a comparison between the farming industry and the manufacturing industry. We find by the census bulletins that the manufacturers of this country have a large amount of capital invested, and we find also that a great many manufacturers have received no benefit from the National Policy, but that, on the contrary, that policy has been a positive disadvantage to them. Until I saw these bulletins I had no idea that some of them made such large profits as they have done. In bulletin No. 10 we find a catechism as to what is an industrial establishment, from the view-point of the census, and this is the answer given :

An industrial establishment is a place where one or several persons are employed in manufacturing, altering, making up or changing from one shape into another, materials for sale, use or consumption. Thus, limestone is a raw product, the taking of which out of the quarry pertains to mining. The burning of the limestone is an operation which changes the form, employs labour and capital to effect the change and gives to the product an enhanced value. The census returns do not take cognizance of the quarrying, in connection with industrial establishments. Breaking a big stone into a score of small stones does not change the form though the result is an article of increased value. The preparation of the limestone and its transformation into an article altogether different in appearance from the original, constitute the lime kilns, in which the operations are carried on, industrial establishments to be included in the returns of the census.

The blacksmith takes iron in its various forms and works it up into horseshoes, horseshoe-nails and other articles, increasing its value by his skill and

labour. He is just as much entitled to have his smithy called an industrial establishment as is the owner of a nail factory or of a locomotive works.

We do not consider a butcher's shop an industrial establishment, though the "porker" strung up by the heels in the doorway is changed very considerably in appearance in consequence of the operations denuding him of his bristles and depriving him of his interior. But if the pig is cut up into prime mess, short ribs, clear sides, salted, smoked into bacon and hams, canvased, pickled or otherwise prepared, we consider that the establishment in which these changes are effected should be ranked as industrial establishment, just as much as the printing office in which figures and words are stamped upon paper and issued as a label, a poster or a newspaper.

This shows that nearly every place where labour is expended in changing material from one thing to another, is classed as an industrial establishment. I find here a most important statement to the effect that in 1881, after deducting wages and cost of material, the capital invested in industrial establishments had a percentage profit of 42 per cent out of which to pay the percentage of interest, insurance, depreciation and loss by bad debts, and in 1891 the percentage of profit was 33 per cent. So that, when there are a large number of industrial establishments that are not benefited by the National Policy, it must be seen at a glance that some industrial establishments make extraordinary profits. Now, in order to make this clear, I will refer to bulletin No. 8, which classes among industrial establishments, blacksmithing, steel and iron works, carriage-making, harness and saddlery, lime kilns, sash and door factories, boot and shoe factories, tailors, clothiers, hatters and furriers, creameries, cheese factories, saw-mills, planing-mills, bakers, flour and grist-mills, oil factories, and so on. These are all called industrial establishments. Most of them were in existence before the National Policy, and some of them have suffered from the operation of that policy. For instance, it is well known that a large number of blacksmith shops existed in this country before the inauguration of the National Policy, and they have suffered positive loss under its operation. Blacksmiths told me at the time the duty on iron was increased that it caused a loss to them, because it compelled them to pay more for their material, while they could not charge the farmers any higher price for the little jobs they did for them. The saw-mills, who employ 23,000 people in round numbers, have not been benefited by the National Policy. Neither have the bakers. Neither have the creameries. Neither have the cheese factories, which have turned out over \$11,000,000 worth of cheese that we have exported to the old country; yet they are classed as industrial establishments, though it is well known that they have received no advantage whatever from the National Policy. Cheese and butter making belong more to the natural industry of farming than it does to manufacturing. So that if we go over the whole list of industrial es-

establishments given in these bulletins, we find that the spoon-fed or infant industries only represent a small portion of the industries of the country. I see that the industries which take the largest profits under the National Policy are those which employ very few hands. The cotton mills employ in New Brunswick 1,752, in Nova Scotia 463, in Quebec 3,323, and in Ontario 2,495, making a total of 8,033 engaged in the manufacture of cotton. The sugar refineries, also one of the pet industries with very large profits, and known to be one of the worst combines in this country, employ 212 persons in Nova Scotia and 1,545 in Quebec, making in all 1,757. If we add to these the total number of persons employed in the oil refineries, 270, we find that these three industries employ in all only 10,090 persons. We had also under review the binding twine industry, and were informed that a reduction in the tariff would hurt 1,500 persons engaged in it. But it has been shown very clearly in this House that about 4,000,000 acres of crop in barley, wheat and oats, were cut in the province of Ontario last year; and taking an average of 2½ lbs. of binder twine per acre, that would give an amount of duty of \$202,000 of which less than \$8,000 went into the Treasury, and the balance, \$194,000, into the pockets of the manufacturers. You see, therefore, that these 1,500 persons engaged in this industry cost the people a very large amount. The farming industry in Ontario represents alone a capital of \$971,000,000, the assessable property being 225,000,000 acres. That would give 225,000 farmers 100 acres each, and if we add fifty per cent to that number for help, allowing one servant to every two farmers, that would give 338,000 persons engaged in that business, whereas in the manufacturing industries the amount invested in land, houses and machinery is only \$172,000 capital, and the capital required to carry on the business for the whole Dominion is \$181,000. The House will see, by this comparison, of what paramount importance the farming interest is compared with the manufacturing, and yet the latter always receives the best consideration of the Government. No doubt the reason is that the farming interest is not brought before the House with sufficient prominence every year. We see that four industries representing less than 11,000 people get nearly everything they want. But they use method, they come here and press their case, and their interests are consequently regarded while those of the larger farming community are disregarded. In my opinion, there are only two methods which can be of material advantage to the farmers in this Dominion. One is free trade with the United States, so far as possible, and the other is reduction in the tariff. Now, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that the McKinley tariff was not due to any fault on the part of this Government. On the contrary, I believe our

Mr. SEMPLE.

R

Government are to blame in the matter, and shall give you my reasons for so thinking. Mr. McKinley had his Bill before Congress. In the meantime this House met, and our Finance Minister made his Budget speech, on the 27th March, 1890. Representations were made to this Government by the small fruit growers, the nursery-men in the Niagara district, and the millers and others in favour of an increase of duties on the various articles in which they dealt. Increased duties were asked on flour, and pork and beef, and small fruits. These people said, we want a prohibitory duty imposed so that Canadians may have complete control of their own market; and in accordance with their representations, the Finance Minister increased the duties largely on pork and beef, added 25 cents on each barrel of flour, and raised the tariff on apples, clover seed and small fruits imported from the United States into this country. This House prorogued on the 16th of the following May, and the McKinley Bill went into effect the 6th of October following. The Democrats were in favour of throwing that bill out, and so were some of the Republicans, but on seeing the attitude of the Canadians, the Americans said we will treat them in the same manner. They want to keep their small market for themselves, we will keep our large market for ourselves, and the McKinley Bill was passed. Had the Minister of Finance shown judgment at that time he would have waited; but instead of that, by his actions he precipitated the passing of that measure. He helped it on by putting a lever in the hands of its friends, so that I think our Government are justly responsible for that measure which has done so much harm to this country. I was glad to hear the other evening the moderate speech of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). He said he was in favour of reciprocity and of lowering the duties, but he wished to wait. That is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was the course they took in shelving the temperance question, on the pretence that they wished to ascertain the sentiment of the country, and in the same way, in this matter of reducing the tariff, they have adopted a waiting policy in order that they may stave off the evil day as long as possible. In discussing the advantages of free and unrestricted trade with the United States, I do not consider it fair to compare 1890 with 1891, because in 1890 the McKinley Bill was in force from the 6th of October, and, therefore, part of the year was under the McKinley Bill and part was not. I shall take the year before and compare 1891 with 1889. Now, there were exported into Great Britain in 1891, 1,369 horses, value \$214,785; to the United States, 9,261 were imported, value \$1,094,461. You see, Sir, that even with a duty of \$30 on each horse, and sometimes \$45 and \$50, the United States is really the only market there is for horses. It has been contended that the electric rail-

ways are displacing a number of horses. That may be true to a certain extent, but we know Sir, notwithstanding the effect of electric railways, that in 1891, the last year of which we have an account in the Trade and Navigation Returns, we received \$1,094,461 from the United States for horses. For every horse we sold to Great Britain we sold six to the United States. And still when we sent these horses to England they went free of duty, and those that were sent to the United States were charged at the rate of \$30 for the poorest horse, and some at the rate of \$45 and \$50, and even higher. That proves completely that the Canadian farmer had to pay a duty in order to get his horses into the United States' markets. But in 1889 there was a better showing. In that year there were exported to Great Britain 164 horses, valued at \$26,975, while to the United States we exported 17,767 horses, value \$2,113,782. So that in 1891 there was received \$769,655 less for horses than in 1889. In 1891 there were exported to Britain 2,439,957 bushels of barley, value, \$1,233,844, and to the United States, 2,721,168 bushels of barley, value \$1,354,485. In 1889 we exported to Great Britain 6,312 bushels of barley, value \$3,836, and to the United States 9,716,893 bushels, value, \$6,464,603. Of this the large sum of \$6,329,505 was received by the province of Ontario alone. In 1891 the amount received for barley by the whole Dominion was \$3,716,139 less than Ontario alone received in 1889. In 1891 our exports of eggs to Great Britain was 3,987,655 dozen, value \$592,218, and in the same year we exported to the United States 3,918,050 dozen, value \$494,409. Now, compare this with 1889. In that year the export of eggs to Great Britain was only 98 dozen of eggs at a value of \$18, while to the United States we sent 14,011,017 dozen, value \$2,156,725. This shows that when there was no McKinley tariff there was no thought of exporting eggs to England, for only the nominal sum of \$18 was received for eggs sent to Great Britain in 1889. The effect of the McKinley Bill was to compel the people of this country to try the British market for eggs, and the result has not been very satisfactory, and it has involved a great loss to the farmers of the Dominion. In 1891, \$1,076,927 less was received from the United States for the sale of eggs than in 1889. There has, therefore, been a loss of nearly \$6,000,000 on these articles of horses, barley and eggs, the loss mainly upon the province of Ontario. In 1891 we exported to the United States 165,947 bushels of oats, value \$54,623 ; 527,912 bushels of pease, value \$463,354 ; and 1,489,881 bushels of wheat, value \$871,263. These all paid duty. In the same year we exported to Great Britain, free of duty, 5,743,720 bushels of oats, value \$1,983,130 ; 3,337,139 bushels of pease, value \$2,249,932 ; 6,810,664 bushels of wheat, value \$5,726,505 ; and of cheese, a total value of \$11,652,412, making a total in these four articles of \$21,591,979. Let me

give you a few figures showing the duties paid on some of the principal products of the farm shipped to the United States :

Exports to the United States and Duty paid in 1891.

	Duty paid.
2,721,168 bush. barley.....	\$ 816,350
9,261 horses.....	277,830
3,918,015 doz. eggs.....	195,900
167,604 tons hay.....	268,268
165,947 bush. oats.....	16,594
527,912 do pease.....	211,164
1,489,881 do wheat.....	297,976
Sheep.....	217,555
	\$2,301,737

Thus we paid in duty \$2,301,737. Add to the loss which the farmer thus suffered the difference between what he received in 1891 and in 1889 for the sale of the most profitable products of his farm, and you will have some idea of the great loss which the McKinley Bill has entailed upon the people of this country, and will understand the general anxiety of the producing classes to have it removed. Now, I quite agree with the hon. member for East Durham when he says that in his opinion the McKinley tariff will be removed. I have been frequently asked my opinion on this question and I have always said I believed it would be removed, and for this reason—not that the United States will remove it for the benefit of the people of Canada, but they will remove it for their own benefit. And the policy that has been announced by the Democratic party is a reduction of the tariff to the requirements of the Government honestly and economically administered. But while this tariff has been injurious and even ruinous to large classes of the people of this country, it has, no doubt, been an evil to the people of the United States as well. The Michigan farmers were told the same story, the farmers of Ohio were told the same story, the farmers of New York were told the same story. They wanted to keep the products of the farms of Canada out and protect their own farmers. But in those very places where they expected to make large gains, they were disappointed. Now, as to the barley industry, it has been nearly ruined in this country. Our farmers were in the habit of receiving about 75 cents per bushel for barley, and since that tariff came into operation they have only been receiving 30 or 40 cents. The McKinley tariff has also hurt the maltsters in the United States, because it is a well known fact that they cannot make the best quality of ale except with Canadian barley No. 1. The United States have been in the habit of competing with Great Britain in the export of ale to other countries. They can no longer do so, because their native barley produces an inferior quality of ale. Now, Sir, one reason why I think the McKinley Tariff will be reduced, is to be found in the remarks of Mr. Wilson, Chairman of the Democratic Convention. At the convention Mr. Wilson, in making his speech, which was the key-note of the campaign, said :

Free government is self-government. There is no self-government where the people do not control their own elections and levy their own taxes. When either of these rights is taken away or diminished a breach is made, not in the outer defences, but in the citadel of our freedom. For years we have been struggling to recover the lost right of taxing ourselves, and now we are threatened with the loss of the greatest right of governing ourselves. The loss of one follows in necessary succession the loss of the other. When you confer on a Government the power of dealing out wealth, you unchain every evil that can prey upon it, and eventually destroy free institutions—excessive taxation, class legislation, bullion dollar congresses, a corrupt civil service, a debauched ballot box, and purchased elections. In every campaign the privilege of taxing the people will be bartered for contributions to corrupt them at the polls; after every victory a new McKinley Bill to repay these contributions, which taxes were wrung from the people. For every self-governing people there can be no more momentous question than the question of taxation. It is the question, as Mr. Burke truly said, around which all the great battles of freedom have been fought. It is the question out of which grow all the tissues of government. Until we settle this question wisely, permanently, justly, we build all other reforms on a foundation of sand. We, and the great party we represent, are to-day for tariff reform, because it is the only gateway to genuine democratic government. The Democratic party believes that frugality is the essential virtue of free government. It believes that taxes should be limited to public needs, and be levied by the plain rule of justice and economy. We are for the protection that protects, and for the reciprocity that reciprocates. We are in favour of protecting every man in the enjoyment of his labour, diminished only by his proper contribution to the support of the Government, and we are for that real reciprocity, not through dickering diplomacy and presidential proclamations, but by laws of Congress, that remove all unnecessary obstacles between the American producer and the markets.

The same year there was held a meeting in Cleveland, at which the Democratic Convention contains the following plank:—

We favour closer commercial relations with Canada and the removal of the embarrassing and annoying restrictions which only vex our people without yielding substantial revenue to the Government. Speaking before the convention upon reciprocity, Mr. Thurman said the time is near when the people will express their belief in complete and not restricted reciprocity. If reciprocity, which has always been a Democratic, not a Republican doctrine, is a good thing with South America, why would it not be a better thing in Canada and Europe,

He does not confine his ideas to Canada alone, but he speaks of Europe as well—

with which our trade is a hundredfold greater than it is with South America? The time has also come when the people will say to the powers that be, that the honest workingman shall no longer be compelled by law to contribute a part of his hard-earned savings to help maintain those who, under the forms of law, have robbed him for over a quarter of a century; when they will no longer sustain any party which levies and collects one dollar of taxes over and above that which is required to wisely and economically administer the affairs of the Government; when they will give due notice that infant industries that have been nursed for 100 years have arrived at the age when they must take care of themselves; when they will brand a protective tariff as stealing, its advocates as beggars, and demand that we must have a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. SEMPLE.

At another meeting held in the same state, the following deliverance was made:—

We demand the reduction of tariff taxes, and will continue the battle for tariff reform until the cause of the people is triumphant. All money taken by law from the people shall go into the public treasury. Tariff taxes shall be for revenue only. All so-called protective tariff taxes are dishonest, wasteful and corrupting. They plunder the masses to enrich the few. They have crippled agriculture, retarded manufacturing, created trusts, destroyed commerce and corrupted our law-makers. Therefore we are opposed to the McKinley Tariff Bill now pending in Congress.

The state of Michigan, also a Republican state, in convention, spoke on the same subject:

We denounce and condemn the high tariff policy of the present Administration, and demand that our tariff and internal revenue taxes shall not be higher than to maintain the Government economically administered. We especially condemn the McKinley Tariff Bill, which still further restricts the market for American products, while it increases the burden of taxation. We denounce it, because it has not a section or a line that will open a new market for a single bushel of wheat or a single barrel of pork, and also because it still further restricts our market and limits our trade with the world—a policy that must more and more depress American agriculture, lessen the value of American farms, and increase the cost of living to the American people.

These were resolutions passed in Republican states, but the whole voice of the Democratic party in all their conventions was in the same direction. Now, they have a chance to make right that which was wrong, and some wished to have a special session of Congress to do away with the McKinley Tariff. No doubt, they will move cautiously in the matter. When there are so many interests affected they will take ample time to consider, and we shall, no doubt, be gainers to a large extent through the action of Congress. The utterances that I have just read, show that the people have come to the conclusion to stand shoulder to shoulder in the endeavour to counteract the efforts of the monopolists in the combines and trusts that have existed there to so large an extent. I am glad to see that in our country there are gratifying signs pointing in the same direction. We have seen in this House many petitions presented from sources from which heretofore similar petitions have not come—from Conservative associations all over this country. I was much gratified the other day at seeing the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) lay on the Table of this House a bundle of petitions bearing over 13,000 signatures, asking that the duty be taken off binding twine, coal oil, corn and barbed wire. There are other petitions with over 14,000 signatures, asking that it be made criminal for combines to take unjust profits from the people. These are healthy signs of the times, and they indicate that the people are beginning to awaken to the position they occupy. It may be thought that we cannot at present secure free trade with the United States, and that this is not an opportune moment to discuss the question; but the

world moves, and we may prove to be nearer that result than the people suppose. If such a treaty were negotiated, every farm with 100 acres of good land would be worth more as regards the value of its products by at least \$100 a year than at present and this amount spread over the whole country would be decidedly advantageous, and it would certainly assist in keeping our own people in the country. There is another good sign of the times. In the other Chamber—which usually displays very little interest in the discussion of public questions—there is a thorough tariff reformer in the person of Senator Boulton. He has studied the question thoroughly, and notwithstanding frequent interruptions while speaking the other day, he succeeded in making his point. He showed that in Manitoba, where there is an average duty of 25 per cent, while the export of wheat reached \$10,000,000, only \$7,500,000 were realized, because of this duty. If Manitoba is to become prosperous, a great change must be brought about. The Minister of the Interior spoke the other evening as if the immigration department was suffering from dry rot, which, I suppose, meant that the country did not get the value of the money expended. He, however, explained nothing with respect to the policy he intends to pursue, although it is evident that if Manitoba is to increase in population, the burdens on the people must be reduced. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the other day mentioned that barbed wire was sold in Chicago by the car lot for \$2.35 and \$2.40 per 100 pounds, but in Manitoba the farmers were compelled to pay from \$6 to \$7 per 100 pounds. It is the same in regard to everything the farmer has to buy, and so while he may raise a good crop, when he has paid the duty and expense, there is little or nothing left. Senator Boulton also mentioned that he sold oats for 13 cents per bushel, and the cost of carriage was 20 cents; wheat he had sold at from 25 to 50 cents and the carriage was 30 cents per bushel. When these facts are taken into account, it is evident that the only way of increasing immigration is to remove these incumbrances. It is useless to bring people into the country at great expense, because no sooner have they reached there, than they leave when opportunity offers, and it is apparent to everyone that that fine country has not made the progress that the people might fairly have expected.

Mr. SPROULE. Where can you buy wheat in Manitoba for 30 cents a bushel? We offered 60 cents and could not get it.

Mr. SEMPLE. That is Senator Boulton's statement regarding the wheat sold by him. At the present time there are three farmers' organizations in the country. One of these is the Farmers' Institute. At a meeting held in Toronto the following resolution was adopted:—

36

That whereas the farmers of Canada during the last thirteen years have largely supported a protective policy for the purpose of establishing and building up the manufacturing interests of this country, and whereas such manufacturing industries as are suitable for this country have received such assistance for a period long enough to enable them to withstand fair and open competition; and whereas, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, at its annual meeting held in Toronto, 7th February, declares and reaffirms its determination to support and perpetuate the high tariff policy,—

Be it therefore resolved, that this meeting hereby declares and affirms that to continue and perpetuate such high tariff policy will be detrimental to the vital interests of the agricultural community, that we are of the opinion that the time has come for the adoption of free trade with Britain, and the same privilege to foreign countries that will give a like privilege to us.

Last year I received a petition from the Grange, another farmers' association, on the subject. I received the following communication from the secretary of the association, Mr. Wilkie:—

We think it only reasonable that the binder twine of the farmer should be exempt from duty, when the hooks, nets, seines, and twine of the fishermen pays no duty. Not that we find any fault with this, but we ask the same condition for the farmer's binder twine. Little or no twine is imported. The raw material pays no duty and the 25 per cent duty enables the combine to extort just so much more from the consumers for their own extra profits. The American duty is only $\frac{1}{5}$ of a cent per pound, which makes twine cheaper there than here.

Another farmers' association, which has a large membership although it has not been long in existence, is that known as the Patrons of Industry. I understand a respectable deputation was in the city the other day requesting the Minister of Finance to take into his serious consideration the advisability of reducing the duty on binding twine, coal oil, corn and barbed wire. The association's platform includes:

Tariff for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall as far as possible upon the luxuries, and not upon the necessaries of life.

Reciprocal trade on fair and equitable terms between Canada and the United States.

These are the two great changes needed to benefit the farmers of this country. Now, Sir, a great deal has been said about annexation, and constant taunts in reference to it have been thrown across the floor of this House, but I consider that the present Government is in a large measure responsible for this sentiment in Ontario. I am glad to say that in my section of the province I hear very little of annexation, but in the sections which are contiguous to the United States, and where the people deal most with the United States and know the advantages of that trade, there is, I understand, a wide feeling in favour of political union. These people have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite, in the press, and on the platform, and in this House: that the meaning of unrestricted reciprocity and freer trade between the two countries, is annexation. They have come to

the conclusion, from the utterances of the Ministers, that freer trade cannot be obtained, and in consequence they advocate annexation as the only means by which they can get this reciprocity of trade which is so much desired by all the farmers of the country. Much has been said with regard to the future of our country, but that is a question which is not within the range of practical politics. I think that we cannot do better than to remain as we are at present. If we may judge the future increase of our population, by the increase for the last twenty or thirty years, there will be no danger of this country becoming so unwieldy that we cannot remain under the flag of Great Britain, and I hope and I believe that we shall so remain. There are some in this country who advocate independence, but I do not see how that will help us very much. There may be a sentiment in favour of that, but as for annexation only a small fraction of the people favour it. There would be no feeling for annexation at all if the restrictions on trade were removed, and if you remove these burdens you will make the people contented and happy, and opposed to any political change. Our farmers believe that the nearer the market the better, and on the other side of the line they see ten or twelve millions of people engaged in manufacturing, who need what we can produce in the province of Ontario to supply their wants, and they feel that, when they cannot trade with them, they wish to settle the difficulty at once and become part and parcel of that great country. We neither want Independence, Annexation or Imperial Federation. Imperial Federation is only a dream at the best, and very few think seriously of it. The farming industry is one of the greatest industries in the Dominion, in fact it is at the beginning of all industries, and when the farmers are prosperous those engaged in all other industries will prosper as well. If they have not the wherewithal to supply themselves with necessities, every other class of the community is obliged to share in the depression. Hon. gentlemen opposite have compared the exports of last year with the year 1878, but they did not mention that last year we had a very bountiful harvest and that a large amount of grain lay on the farmers' hands for export after supplying the local demands. In 1878 that was not the case, because there were poor crops and the farmers had very little to sell. It is always the case that in some years, we will have good crops and a good harvest, and that at other times the reverse will be the case. It depends on this in a great measure whether the country is prosperous or not. Reference has been made also by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the prosperity of the country. Every one who knows the rural parts of the country, knows that the people engaged in agriculture are not prosperous. We wish they were prosperous. I have seen the time when Ontario was prosperous, and when we remember all

Mr. SEMPLE.

the energy that has been expended by the farmers, and all the capital they have invested, they should be very prosperous indeed. Ontario is one of the finest provinces in the world, and there is nothing in any part of the United States to compare with it. A few years ago I noticed a return in which there was a comparison made for eight years—1882 and 1889—between fourteen states of the Union, and the province of Ontario was, on the comparison, ahead in barley, wheat and oats in the yields per acre. We should naturally conclude from this that the farmers of such a fertile province should be prosperous. I am sorry to say that the population has largely decreased in that province, and that all the time our young men are leaving it for the simple reason that they can do better elsewhere. They can go to a country that is worse to all intents and purposes, and yet they can make more out of their labour than they can in this country with all its natural advantages. Not long ago I met a man whom I knew, who had been in Montana, and he said that he would go there although he acknowledged it was not so good a place as Ontario, because the morals of the people were not so high, and he would like to remain at home, but he said: I have a family and I cannot prosper as I would wish, and if I can sell my farm I will bring my family away also. I know two young men, practical farmers, who were taught in the school of agriculture, as they are taught in the county of Wellington, and they went to the United States. They came back to their father, and they said to him: Father we have rented farms and we would not take 100 acres free and remain at home with you; we can do much better where we are. The young men of our country go to the place where they can do the best, and that is the reason why they leave us. It is a sad thing to see in this young country so many of the best of our population leaving us. Take the returns of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, and we find that he stated over his own signature that 886,000 immigrants came into this country during ten years, but the returns of the Census Commissioner showed us that the increase for that period was only 504,000, and that we had lost all the natural increase, besides 362,000 souls as well. Whoever studies the matter must know that there is something radically wrong with the Government of a country where such a state of things exist. As it is getting late in the night, and as I have stated my opinions on this very important question, I will conclude by expressing the hope that we will see an improvement in our condition in the near future. I hope to see the farmers of this country, not as they have been in the past, hewers of wood and drawers of water, but well-to-do and prosperous. I hope that they will unite as one man to secure their rights, and to secure what is needed for the progress of their industry, just as the manufacturers of this country

have done. I have shown to-night that although a great many of the manufacturers have received no benefit from the National Policy, yet the profits of the manufacturers in Canada in 1891 amounted to 33 per cent on the amount of capital invested. I venture to say that if you ask the farmers of the country, most of them will tell you that they have not made three per cent. Last fall I happened to be in the eastern part of my constituency, where I saw three good farmers who know how to farm very well; and these men being good Conservatives, of course did not want to belittle their country, but they told me that they would not have 10 bushels of wheat to the acre, and most of their land was in spring wheat, which in that locality is the staple crop. When I tell you that spring wheat is quoted in Toronto at 62 cents a bushel, you can easily understand that farming is a very unprofitable business at the present time. Now, Sir, I was astonished to hear the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) say that prices were higher here than in New York or London. When I heard that statement I went to the reading-room and consulted the "Empire" in which I found winter wheat quoted at 77½ cents in Buffalo, against 67 cents in Toronto, oats at from 38 to 39 cents in Buffalo, against from 34 to 35 cents in Toronto, barley, No. 1 at 45 cents, No. 2 at 40 cents, and No. 3 at 33 cents in Toronto, against from 75 cents to 83 cents in Buffalo. I was also astonished to see in that paper that in Albany No. 1 barley was from 92 to 93 cents per bushel, and No. 2 from 84 to 85 cents. I think the hon. gentleman had not consulted the party organ, or else he would not have made that statement. I have noticed that there has been more freedom of expression in this debate than is customary in this House, and I think it is a very good thing. We had the spectacle of an hon. member on the other side of the House making a complaint that the party organ had been trying to gag him, and to deprive him of free speech. Every effort is being made to keep the party in line; but when we see that there is a great division on the tariff, and that Conservatives are as earnest as Reformers in favour of tariff reduction, we may well believe that there is a grand future before this country. We believe that the McKinley Bill will be abolished, and that we shall have a reduction in the tariff. While some are in favour of reducing the tariff on goods coming from Great Britain, some of those who pretend to be ultra loyalists say: No, we do not want to do that for Great Britain unless Great Britain gives us preferential trade. They are not willing to trust their friends any further than they can see them; they want the bargain made before hand. But if we could receive cotton and iron goods at a great reduction from Great Britain, it would be highly beneficial to the people of this country. Now, without trespassing any further on the patience of the House, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the

hon. member for South Oxford, to the effect that the present tariff bears heavily on the great consuming classes of the Dominion, and should at once be thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade, and that the amount of taxes collected should be limited to the sums required to meet the necessities of government efficiently and economically administered.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, were it not for the very deep interest which the question now being debated by the House has for the people that I have the honour of representing, I would not thus early from my place in the House presume to occupy any of the time of the hon. members. But, Sir, I shall endeavour, in a few words, to show you what importance the question has for the people of the province from which I come, and why they take such a deep interest in it. In 1880, 1881 and 1882 the acreage under cultivation in that country was not sufficient to supply the wants of the settlers, not to speak of those engaged in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every pound of flour, beef, potatoes, and everything else required by the men engaged on that road had to be imported from the United States. Contrast that state of things with the immense crop produced last year by the province of Manitoba alone, which is only about one-fourth of that great country. The Manitoba Government returns show that there were 14,500,000 bushels of wheat, 11,500,000 bushels of oats, 2,000,000 bushels of barley, 2,250,000 bushels of potatoes, 6,750,000 bushels of turnips, and about 200,000 tons of hay. From these facts you will readily understand the number of agricultural implements, and the quantity of binding twine, barbed wire, nails and everything else required to supply the demand in a new country like that. For that reason this question has a special importance for the people of Manitoba. So far as I am personally concerned, and I think I speak the sentiments of those whom I represent, I may say that I am not satisfied exactly with the reductions that have been made. I had expected and hoped for more; but in consultation with the hon. the Minister of Finance, he assured me that it is the intention of the Government at a very early date, during the recess, to go thoroughly into this question, thoroughly to revise the tariff as regards what will be suitable for that province, and also for the whole Dominion of Canada. In Manitoba you will find that almost every farm has from \$1,500 to \$2,000 worth of agricultural implements. Much of this machinery is old and useless; still we had to purchase it. In 1880 and 1881 we were paying \$275 for binders which you could not give away to-day. What has the National Policy done in that respect? In 1892 we have a binder better worth \$500 than the binders for which we paid \$275 were worth \$100, and we get them for \$140. Our opponents

will say: That makes no difference, you would have got your binders from the other side anyhow. Had we done so, where would our money have gone? Where would our people have been employed? Where would the money have gone that those people got for their labour? It would have been in the United States instead of being in our banks, which are sending it to that country and lending it at 7 per cent. There is not one of the western states where money can be procured as cheaply as it can be in Manitoba for any legitimate business. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat spoke of the low price of wheat. Well, I do not think that the National Policy has anything to do with the price of wheat in Canada, and if the hon. gentleman knows anything at all about the matter, he must know that the price of wheat was never, in the history of the world, so low as it is to-day. There are 105,000,000 bushels visible in the market. The like was never known before, and that is the cause of the low price of grain, and not the National Policy or the Conservative or any other government. I am very much surprised to see an hon. gentleman using that kind of argument. Senator Boulton has said, according to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that wheat sells at 30 cents a bushel in Manitoba. It must have been frozen wheat. The price of wheat in Manitoba has been undoubtedly low, but the present price is 48 to 56 cents, and the price is governed by the Liverpool market and not by the rates in any other part of Canada. The Liverpool market controls the price, and not the Conservative party or the Liberal party or any other party. So far as I am concerned, I am not like the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin). I am not going to support that amendment. Why should I support it? Why should I support those people (the Opposition)? What did they do when in power? They said we were a sink hole and many other things I would not like to repeat. What railway did they ever build for us? Did they open up the country or make any preparation to open it up? According to the policy of our opponents, the people would never be able to get there, and those who were in would never be able to get out, and we would not have 14,000,000 bushels of wheat for export to-day. If I might be permitted to give those gentlemen advice, I would say to them: admit that the policy you have enunciated is wrong, admit that we have outstripped your expectations, admit that ours is a greater country than you thought, and that you made a mistake about that railroad, and promise to build another railroad. If you would talk like that, you would not have solid Conservative ranks from that country facing you to-day, but would have some support. Apparently, however, you have no faith in your country. I do not know why you should not have faith in it. Where is the place on the face of the

Mr. Boyd

earth to-day where the people are better off than in Canada? Name the place. Is it England, with 250,000 people in the city of London alone starving, and with dock labourers working for \$2.88 a week, and only half of them able to get labour at that rate? You talk about our people, where can you find the people on the face of the earth happier and more prosperous than the people of Canada to-day? Travel from Halifax to British Columbia, as I have done, and where will you find beggars and paupers? I have been in all the large cities in the United States from California back to Minneapolis, and have never been in any city where I have not met beggars seeking alms, and I have yet to meet the man in Manitoba or British Columbia who has ever asked me for a cent. I do not think I will take up any more of the time of the House. I may say that I will support the motion of the Government. I intend to support the hon. Finance Minister, who has promised us that the tariff shall be revised in such a way as will suit the whole Dominion of Canada and be in the best interests of the country. We stood by the Conservative party and the National Policy when probably we might have done better, but the people of eastern Canada built a railroad into our country for us. They opened up the country, and if it had not been for the Conservative party I would not have gone there and would not be here to-day, nor would my friend the hon. Minister of the Interior. Manitoba is willing and ready to pay her share of the taxation of the country, as she has always done, and show her gratitude to the party which has done so much for her. I thank you, Sir, and the House for your kind indulgence and patience in listening to these few remarks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. leader of the Opposition has called attention to the fact that the papers in the Manitoba School question have not been printed. I understand that the papers which are material are those I now move:

That the return to the Address of the House of Commons, laid on the Table on the 10th instant, containing a copy of the report of the Committee of the Privy Council to His Excellency the Governor-General, on the 9th September, 1892, on the Manitoba School Act, be printed forthwith, and that Rule No. 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. LAURIER. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman had moved for the printing of the papers. However, there has been some misunderstanding as to that, and I agree very willingly to his motion. These papers are not all that should be brought down, but in my judgment they are quite sufficient for the purpose of the discussion which will take place on this matter. I apprehend that they contain the report of

the sub-committee of the Privy Council and the petition on which the report is based.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was also under the impression that I had moved for the printing of the papers. The House would be greatly delayed if we were to wait until they are all printed; but if any hon. gentleman calls attention to any other documents he desires, I will make a similar motion.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CATHOLIC MUTUAL BENEFIT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to a circumstance, on which I will base a motion, that occurred yesterday, by which the machinery of Parliament seems to have got agog; the cog-wheels are out of place, and matters are not running smoothly by any means. It occurred through the mistake of one of our innocent and younger members of Parliament, and I have to introduce this motion in order to get the parliamentary wheels back in their proper running trim. Therefore, I move:

That the Order of the House of yesterday, referring to the petition of O. K. Fraser, president, and Samuel R. Brown, secretary of the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada; praying for an Act of incorporation, to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, be discharged.

That order was in contravention of the rules of the House, the rule being that a preliminary petition shall be first introduced and then placed afterwards before the Standing Orders Committee, who will report to this House whether there have been sufficient excuses alleged in the petition for not presenting the petition in time in the first place.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DEVLIN moved:

That the petition of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association, presented this day, praying for an Act of Parliament, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be read and received and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

He said: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the delay was inevitable. I heard the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Mills) that the petition was presented by one of the

innocent and younger members of Parliament. I may say that I do not happen to be that gentleman, as the petition was presented by another gentleman, who is my senior in age and my superior in every way. There has been an unavoidable delay, however, and I trust that the House will be kind enough to pass the motion.

Motion agreed to.

RECEIPT OF PARLIAMENTARY FEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 61) relating to moneys payable in connection with proceedings before Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a Bill to regulate and bring under the general rule, the receipt, care and payment of moneys in connection with private Bills and the like. Up to the present time they have been received by the clerk of private Bills, and have been deposited in a bank to the credit of the accountant. All return fees have been paid on the order of the clerk of private Bills, and the balance, whatever it was, has been paid to the credit of the Receiver-General. That was also the practice in a good many branches of the service; but of late years the policy has been to have all moneys that are received deposited at once to the credit of the Receiver-General, and to make provision in the appropriations for the payment of whatever is necessary in the different services. It is to bring the moneys referred to under the general rule that this Bill is introduced. It is the same as the British practice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada for the calendar year 1892.—(Mr. Foster.)

WINNIPEG MILITIA HOSPITAL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg) asked. Is the building erected as a hospital for the permanent corps of militia stationed at Winnipeg ready for occupation? If not, when will it be finished, and what is the cause of the delay that has occurred?

Mr. OUIMET. The building is ready, with the exception of the heating apparatus, which will be placed in position without further delay.

PORT DALHOUSIE FERRY SERVICE.

Mr. GIBSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a more efficient and safe ferry service at Port Dalhousie, Ont., in time for the opening of navigation on the Welland Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not proposed to make any change in the present ferry service at Port Dalhousie.

MANUFACTURERS IN MONTMAGNY.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Choquette) asked, What are the names of the thirty-seven manufacturers mentioned in the last census as existing in the town of Montmagny?

Mr. FOSTER. The information in the census schedules was obtained by sworn enumerators on the understanding that nothing but general statistical results should be published. No names nor personal particulars can therefore be communicated.

NORTH-WEST CATTLE QUARANTINE.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, Has the Order in Council, in cap. 7 of the Consolidated Orders in Council of 1889, regulating the admission of neat cattle into Manitoba and the provisional districts of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, from the United States, or the United States territories, for stock or for breeding purposes, requiring their inspection and further detention in quarantine for ninety days, remained continuously in force up to the present time? Have the above quarantine regulations been at any time or times suspended or relaxed? If so, at what date, for what periods, to what extent, and for what reason, and at what date were they reimposed?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no order on the subject referred to of 1889; but the order of 1887, which in its terms provides for a detention of neat cattle "in quarantine for a period of ninety days, or such other period as may be indicated by the Minister of Agriculture, in such manner as shall be ordered by him," remained in force until the 18th instant. It was carried on in its exact terms during the whole period of its existence. The order of the 18th instant made the detention of ninety days absolute.

SUPERANNUATION OF G. F. BAILLAIRGE.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, On what grounds was George Frederic Baillairge, an employee of the Department of Public Works, placed on the superannuation list on the 1st of January, 1891.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Mr. Baillairge was superannuated on account of his advanced age (66 years) and his infirmities, as well as of the long period of his services.

LEASE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND MESSRS. MCCARTHY.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, Have the Government renewed the lease existing between the Crown and the Messrs. McCarthy, of Sorel, of lands and premises held by the Mr. GIBSON.

Government at St. Joseph de Sorel? What is the date of the said new lease? What is the rental under the lease and the duration thereof? Was the lease executed by a notary, and if so, what notary?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The lease referred to has not yet been passed. It is intended to lease Mr. McCarthy's premises from the 1st of January last for a period of five years at a rental of \$1,200 per year.

MANUFACTURERS IN SOREL.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, What are the names of the 128 manufacturers at Sorel, as set out in Bulletin No. 2 of the last census.

Mr. FOSTER. The information in the census schedules was obtained by sworn enumerators on the understanding that nothing but general statistical results should be published. No names nor personal particulars can therefore be communicated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Which, I may state for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, has always been the practice in taking the census of Canada.

JAMES HOWDEN'S SALARY.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, What is the salary of James Howden, an employee of the Public Works Department, and where does he reside?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The salary of Mr. Howden is \$2,500 per annum. He resides at Ottawa, and occupies the position of Superintendent of the dredgings in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

CLAIMS OF MESSRS. C. MONGEAU, N. MONGEAU, D. MILLETTE AND M. MONGEAU.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay the several balances due to Charles Mongeau, Napoleon Mongeau, Dolphis Millette and Maurice Mongeau, vessel owners, of Ste. Anne de Sorel, for carriage of stone in their vessels, in 1890, for the construction of the breakwater at Ste. Anne de Sorel. Has Mr. Berlinguet, the engineer interested with the said works, forwarded the accounts of the parties aforesaid? Are the Government aware that on the 10th of January, 1892, on the eve of the last by-election in the County of Richelieu, the following sums were paid to the parties above named on account of their claim; to Charles Mongeau, \$57; to Napoleon Mongeau, \$207; to Mr. Dolphis Millette, 165; to Maurice Mongeau, \$75. Is there a contract between the Government and Moise Lesperance,

farmer, of Ste. Anne de Sorel, for the performance of the said works? If so, what were the terms thereof?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The Department of Public Works has no knowledge of there being any balances due to the persons named by the hon. member. Mr. Berlinguet has not sent any account. The Department of Public Works has no knowledge of any sums of money having been paid to Charles Mongeau, Napoleon Mongeau and Maurice Mongeau. On the 10th of January, 1892, a cheque was issued to the order of Dolphis Millette for the sum of \$162 for stone delivered at the Yamaska dam. There is no contract between the Government and Mr. Moise Lesperance.

TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Mulock) asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to a statement which recently appeared in portions of the press to the effect that certain cattle alleged to be suffering from tuberculosis were, on or about the 17th of February instant, slaughtered at Toronto by order of the health officer of that city? If so, what steps, if any, have the Government taken and when, in order to ascertain whether said cattle were actually affected with tuberculosis?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has not been informed respecting the allegation in the question relating to the slaughter of cattle on the 17th instant at Toronto, affected by tuberculosis. The Government has not up to the present caused the provisions of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act to be applied to the disease of tuberculosis among cattle.

DISCHARGE OF CONSTABLE GIBEAULT.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. What are the reasons which led to the discharge of Constable Gibeault of the Dominion Police? 2. Was a sworn inquiry demanded by Constable Gibeault, in relation to his dismissal? 3. If so, was it granted; and if not, why not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON: This constable was fined for deserting his post while on duty. He retaliated by making charges against his superior officer, principally of fanaticism and partiality, which appeared on investigation to be quite unfounded. These charges were preferred in the first instance by the constable in consequence of this fine, and he requested permission to withdraw the objectionable terms in which they were stated, alleging that his letter containing the charges had been written by another for him, and that being unable to read or write he was not aware of the nature of the language which it contained. Having withdrawn the objectionable language in the charges, the charges themselves were investigated on the 6th of February, 1892, by the

Deputy Minister of Justice, who reported that Gibeault had failed to substantiate them. Subsequently, on the 4th of May, 1892, he repeated the charges in the same terms as those in which they were originally stated, and asked for a further investigation. The matter was again investigated by an officer of the Department of Justice, and before the investigation was concluded the constable proposed, through his counsel, to withdraw the charges on condition of his being reinstated in his office, he having been in the meantime suspended. That was declined, and the investigation was proceeded with. After hearing all the parties concerned and their witnesses, the officer reported that the plaintiff had entirely failed to substantiate his charges. On both occasions, Gibeault was represented by counsel; and the latter practically abandoned the charge of fanaticism. It was not deemed necessary to have a sworn inquiry on statements not made under oath. Mr. Gibeault's charges appear not to have been well founded.

J. J. DAVIDSON.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, When was J. J. Davidson appointed dry goods appraiser at Montreal? What was his salary at time of appointment? Has he been transferred from Montreal to Toronto, and for what reason? Has a person named Cuthbert, of Toronto, been appointed dry goods appraiser for Montreal, and what duties is he discharging there? Has there been a young man of the name of Lavoie appointed assistant appraiser in the dry goods department in the Custom-house, Montreal? What is his salary? Has he had experience? Is he a son of one of the collectors? What experience has he had, and is he the same person who made in 1891-92, out of Customs seizures, \$287.85?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. J. J. Davidson was appointed dry goods appraiser at Montreal the 1st of December, 1891. His salary at the time of appointment was \$1,400 per annum; he was transferred from Montreal to Toronto because an experienced man was required to take the place of dry goods appraiser Sargeant (resigned). A person named Cuthbert, of Toronto, was not appointed dry goods appraiser for Montreal, but is now acting assistant appraiser at Montreal. A young man named Lavoie was appointed assistant appraiser in the dry goods department in the Custom-house at Montreal, at a salary of \$800 per annum; he has had experience; he is not the son of one of the collectors; there is no collector at present at that port. He has had experience since 1885 in the dry goods appraiser's department, and is the same person who received in 1891-92, out of Customs seizures, the sum of \$287.85.

SOUTH MIDDLESEX.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the vacancy in the

representation of South Middlesex. Has a returning officer been appointed and the writ issued?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, the returning officer has not been appointed and the writ has not been issued, but it will be on Saturday.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know when we may expect the papers connected with the Manitoba School Acts to be printed and brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are all brought down. I moved last night, at the adjournment, for the printing of the first set of papers; and I intimated that if any hon. gentleman desired to have the other papers printed, he need only signify his desire and a similar motion will be made. The first set includes the petitions on which the appeal is based and the report of the sub-committee to which they were referred.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be very important to have the argument of the counsel before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council printed.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend was not in the House last evening when I suggested, and the First Minister agreed, to have the report of the sub-committee of the Privy Council printed with all the petitions on which that report is based. If we are to wait until the argument before the Privy Council is printed, I am afraid the delay will be too great.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He would be a bold man indeed who, at this stage of the debate, which has now lasted six days, could hope to say a great deal that was either new or interesting, and my main excuse for intruding myself upon the House at present is that I think it right to present a few statements of fact from the stand-point of the Maritime provinces. And while I do so, I do not desire the House to understand that I wish to judge the important question we are discussing from a sectional stand-point at all. I cannot, however, fail to note that the larger number of those, and properly so, who have taken part in the debate, have spoken from the two larger provinces of Canada, and each one spoke from the local stand-point of his own province, and without reference to the Maritime provinces.

Mr. LAURIER

Throughout the whole Dominion, I do not suppose there was any section, in which such great hopes were indulged at the inception of Confederation or so many prophecies of brilliant times made, as in the Maritime provinces, and I think if there is one thing both sides can agree upon, it is this, that, so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, at any rate, not one of those promises has been fulfilled, and not any province of the three has reached forward to a measurable distance of that prosperity which was predicted and hoped for when we unfortunately joined this Confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen interrupt me with cries of "Oh." I do not wish to disparage the efforts made to form a great nationality in this Dominion. I do not wish to blame other parts of the Dominion for the want of prosperity existing in the Maritime provinces. I am frank enough and honest enough to admit that if there is a part of the Dominion responsible for the National Policy and the evils which have followed in its train, it is the Maritime provinces. It was only a few years ago that a protectionist was something unknown in those provinces. The people had prospered under free trade, or under the nearest approach to it possible, with the debts we owed and the liabilities we had to assume; and every one knows that when the prosperity we had then under practical free trade was joined to reciprocity with the States, there was an enormous increase of wealth in that portion of the Dominion. The man in those days who would have ventured to stand up and announce himself a protectionist would have been hooted from the hustings. But, Sir, a change came over the spirit of their dream, and there is no use of blinking the fact that the National Policy has been supported for the last fourteen years with greater fervour and greater zeal by those members who come from the Maritime provinces than by any others; and if it is fraught with evil for us, if we are suffering from its effects more than the rest of the Dominion, I am frank enough to say that we have ourselves to blame. But, Sir, the National Policy is upon its trial in a way that it never was before. We have been attacking this policy year after year from this side of the House. We have been showing, each from his local stand-point, that it is a failure and an injury to the country. We, from the Maritime provinces, have shown that shipping has decreased, that land has gone down in value, that people are leaving the country and that we are poverty-stricken as compared with what we were years ago. But our cry has fallen upon deaf ears. But the National Policy is upon trial now, not only by its opponents, but in the House by its friends. We have the Order Paper covered with motions presented by its friends attacking this policy, attacking the duties on corn, coal oil, agricultural im-

plements, binder twine, iron and other things. And, strange to say, we have a plaintive cry coming up, of all places in the world, from Cape Breton, voiced by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who says: Touch not a single brick or the whole edifice will fall. This is a most extraordinary state of affairs. Those who are now most strenuous in their support of the National Policy are those who are being punished most severely by it. Of all places in the Dominion, Cape Breton has suffered perhaps the most. From that island there has been a greater percentage of exodus than from any other part of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It cannot be denied, and to-day, commercial atrophy, which is prevalent all over the Maritime provinces, is more prevalent in Cape Breton than anywhere else.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When I have finished the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to refute what I have said, not only by saying "no," but by producing some evidence in support of his statements. In the midst of this trial of the National Policy we have the Finance Minister coming forward and putting the best face upon it. He tells us that Canada, after all, is in a state of prosperity. He does not tell us in so many words that Canada owes that prosperity to the National Policy, but he hints at that, or leaves it to be inferred, hoping that the people will draw that inference, and doing what he can to induce those who are attacking the policy to cease those attacks. His method is ingenious, but I do not know that it is one very much to be commended. The hon. gentleman takes a period of twenty years and chooses that year which has the largest amount of trade, 1892, and that which has the smallest amount of trade, 1873, and claims the difference between these two as the measure of the increased prosperity of Canada. Well, Sir, is that fair; is it a candid and honest statement to present to the public? I do not think it is. We have had our ups and downs in trade matters since 1873, but, as a matter of fact, as has been already stated in this debate, the trade of Canada to-day is very little in advance of what it was in 1873 and 1874, nearly twenty years ago. It is a most unfair thing, therefore, to take that year when the trade of Canada was at its lowest and compare it with the year 1892, and claim the difference as the measure of the country's prosperity. But, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman to take a different line; to take a period and not one particular year. Take that unfortunate period, as hon. gentlemen opposite regard it, that period that is denounced by them as one of the most disastrous in Canadian history, the period from 1873 to 1878, and compare that with the last five years, and then

judge of our prosperity. I think that is a fair view of the case. You hear hon. gentlemen say: We are all right; we are going ahead fairly well. They are satisfied with the increase in our population, satisfied with the increases which the census returns show in our manufactures. I am obliged to say, that many of these hon. gentlemen are perfectly honest in what they state, and that the difference between us arises from the difference in the point of view from which we look at it. These gentlemen are satisfied with small things. Why, Sir, if Canada is progressing in population one-fourth or even one-fifth as rapidly as it was hoped she would, and as we had a right to expect, these gentlemen say that is all right. But we are not satisfied. With the great natural material resources that Canada possesses, we had a right to hope and expect that the country would have progressed, not only in population, but also in wealth and manufactures and in output of surplus products, very much more than the statistics show she has done. Why, it would be a singular thing if, with the enormous extent of increased territory, with the enormous increase in the quantity of our lands under tillage, with the increase (though not so much as it ought to be) in our population, within the last twenty years, we should not be exporting now more than we did twenty years ago. And still, Sir, the fact is, that we are to-day exporting very little more than we were in the years 1873 and 1874.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not as much from the same territory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend says that from the same territory we do not export so much. No doubt he is right, for to-day we count in the exports of the great granary of the world, the North-west, which, twenty years ago, added nothing to our exports. Now, Sir, take the increase of prosperity such as the hon. gentlemen have shown to be. Is that prosperity in any way attributable to the National Policy? Was the National Policy designed to increase the export of our surplus products, or did the most enthusiastic prophet of its results or the most ardent supporter of it say that it would result in such an increase? The National Policy was to limit the exports of our surplus and to provide a home market for those products. Therefore, if there has been an increase in the exports of our products, I do not think any supporter of the National Policy can claim that it is owing to that policy. What has been that increase? Why, Sir, if you consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, and examine the details of exports, you will find that the increase is almost entirely in animals and their products. Surely the National Policy has nothing to do with that. If there had been a great increase in the output of manufactures, I could understand giving the National Policy the credit for it. But, as I understand it, there has

been an increase last year of only \$800,000 in manufactured products exported from this Dominion, including, in those exports, I believe, and, speaking in round numbers, a million and a quarter of settlers' effects. That has been already dwelt upon so effectively that I now only refer to it. But, while there has been this slight increase of \$800,000 in the exports of manufactures, there has been an increase of over \$15,000,000 in the export of farm produce and animals and their products. The hon. gentleman says that if we look to the savings banks deposits or to the deposits in the chartered banks, or, if we consider the increase in the shipping and railway mileage and freight carriage, and in the life insurance in force, we will find, in all these points, evidence to show that Canada has prospered. Well, Sir, that is a very fair argument to use and there is no doubt that these afford one sound basis to test the prosperity of the country. But, as a matter of fact, allowing for the interest on the deposits in the savings banks, the hon. gentleman knows that the cash withdrawals have largely exceeded the cash deposits. Last year over \$1,000,000 was withdrawn from the savings banks more than was deposited in those institutions, and the same has been going on for several years. I do not mean to say that a very strong argument can be drawn from that, but it is a fact. The hon. gentleman says that there has been an increase in our shipping, that our railway mileage has increased, and that the goods we carry upon the railways have increased, and so on. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if, in the last decade, when we have borrowed \$100,000,000 from abroad, and spent it in this country, and thereby increased the public debt to that amount, it would be a strange thing. I say, if there was not some evidence in the increased mileage of our railways and in the carriage upon those railways as a result of the spending of that enormous amount of money, and it must show itself in our bank deposits, and in many other ways. But we have danced and we have got to pay the piper; and there is no doubt that in the near future—in the present, I may say—the effects are being felt in the enormous amount of interest which we yearly have to send from this country to pay on our debt. Now, let us examine for a moment or two these census returns to see how far these statements which the hon. gentleman made—and I am going to speak almost entirely from a Maritime stand-point—are borne out by the facts. Speaking generally, we know that if Canada had held her own with regard to population, she would have had to-day over six million people; she ought to have had over six million people. She had 4,324,000, by the census of 1881, and the natural increase, and the immigrants which were brought into the country at the tax-payers' expense, if they had remained here, would make over six millions; and we have got

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

only 4,832,000. We have lost in the ten years, in round numbers, a million and a quarter. Sir, I do not know that any Finance Minister, in the history of any British province, ever had to stand up and face such an appalling fact as that. Canada is not like an old country, where the lands are all taken up, and where the surplus population leaves the country to go abroad, seeking new fields in which to make a living. Here is a new country, a virgin soil, illimitable plains, magnificent fisheries, great coal mines, gold mines, and mines of other minerals, room for millions, a free country, a new country, with as good a constitution, I believe, as is to be found in the wide world. Nature has given it everything to induce the overtaxed people of the old world to come here; nevertheless, in ten years you have lost more people than even Napoleon lost in the costly and devastating wars he carried on during his lifetime. It is the most appalling fact, I say again, that you can meet with in the history of any British province. I do not care where, and I do not care in what period of the world, and hon. gentlemen pass it by as if it was nothing at all. Sir, I do not lay so much stress upon the fact that we lost our immigrants. I do not expect, myself, that these men, when they come to this country, would stay here. They found it a much dearer country to live in than they expected. They found that the National Policy was withering up the country, and they left it. But I do deeply regret the enormous loss which the country has sustained in its bone and sinew which have left the Maritime provinces and other parts of the Dominion. We stand to-day with a loss of from four to five hundred thousand of our native-born population in ten years, leaving the immigrants out of the question altogether. That fact is sufficient of itself to justify any man in saying that the policy which drives half a million people away from the country in ten years must be a ruinous policy. Now, Sir, how are we in the Maritime provinces?—I said I was going to speak from that stand-point. In 1871 we had 767,000 people there; in 1881 we had 870,000; in 1891 we had 880,000. Well, what does that show? There ought to have been an increase in the last decade of 175,000. We are not troubled, Mr. Speaker, in the argument, on this branch of the case with an influx of any immigrants at all, we have no immigrants down there. We are dealing with the population and the natural increase of the population of these three provinces. Well, we should have had an increase of 175,000 in ten years. How many have we had? A pitiable 10,000. We have lost in ten years, in those three Maritime provinces alone, 165,000 people, and all of them in the prime of life, the bone and sinew of the country, the people who made the country, and if they had continued to remain here, would have made it prosperous. But oh, it is said, this is a natural thing. Everybody leaves here and goes to the west. People

leave the country and go to the cities. Is that the case with us? Not at all, because if you take the three chief cities in the Maritime provinces, the chief city in each province, St. John, Halifax and Charlottetown, you will find their aggregate population in 1881 was 73,712, in 1891 it was 74,113, a gain in the ten years of 400 people in the three chief cities of the Maritime provinces. Why, Sir, an increase of 2 per cent a year ought to have given us an increase of very nearly 15,000 people, but we have lost in that ten years out of these cities alone—and I am confining my argument for the moment to the cities, to meet the argument which was advanced that the people are going from the country to the cities—we have lost 14,500 people from these three cities in the Maritime provinces. Sir, can you wonder that people come here and complain; can you wonder that we have been lifting up your voices year after year in denouncing the policy which has brought about, and is bringing about, such dreadful results? Now, that was not so in old times. Take the previous decade from 1871 to 1881. The increase in that period in the three Maritime provinces should have been 153,000, and it was actually 103,000; or we lost in that decade 50,000 people, or 5,000 a year. That was bad enough; but what was the last decade in comparison with it? Instead of losing 50,000 we lost 165,000, or 16,500 a year. The exodus which went on in the Maritime provinces between 1871 and 1881 was trebled between 1881 and 1891, and I suppose there is no part of the great world itself so favoured by nature, from which there has been such an exodus and a desertion as from those three provinces. I do not wonder, and I do not blame the young men. I am in a position to be consulted by a great many of them, and I do my best to try and keep them at home; but what inducements have we got to offer them? Our wharfs are bare of shipping. I am old enough to remember when an enormous shipping trade was carried on from all these cities I have spoken of; when the harbours were alive with square-rigged ships, when hundreds and thousands of labourers were employed on those wharfs; but the wharfs are empty now, the warehouses are vacant, and many of them are going into decay; and I say that he is not a true patriot, coming from the Maritime provinces, who, either by thought, word or deed, supports the cursed system which has brought this about.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman swears. He says "cursed."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Cursed, yes; accursed of God and man.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't speak of any one else but yourself.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not speak for you. The hon. gentleman stated that we ought to be proud, that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon the marvellous increase in the shipping of this Dominion, that there

had been such an enormous increase in the tonnage of the shipping employed in carrying off the produce of this Dominion. So far, so good. There has, no doubt, been an increase; but is it an increase upon which we ought to congratulate ourselves? Let us examine the figures and see. In 1873 the registered shipping of this Dominion was 1,073,718 tons; in 1878 it had reached high-water mark, and was 1,333,015 tons, being an increase of 259,297 tons in those five years. That, according to the figures from which the Marine Department make up the value of this shipping, gave an increase in value of \$7,778,000. The National Policy came in, and this shipping stands to-day at 964,149 tons, a decrease since 1878 of 363,866 tons, in value \$11,000,000. That is a nice showing for the Maritime provinces: the registered shipping of the Dominion has decreased during that period over \$11,000,000, three-quarters of that loss belonging to the Maritime provinces, as any one can see who looks at the figures. Our ship-building as an industry is wiped out; it is at an end. We built last year only 52,000 tons, as compared with 190,000 tons in 1873. But take the figures the hon. gentleman himself has submitted. The return of sea-going vessels entering and clearing at Canadian ports, which shows an increase apparently on the face of the figures, does not afford cause for unmixed satisfaction. I make that assertion because the increase is entirely in foreign ships. So far as Canadian ships are concerned, the figures do not show an increase: we are in a stationary condition, and the percentage of Canadian goods exported and carried in our own ships is very much less than it was eight or ten years ago. What are the figures? In 1879 we had 6,088,000 tons of shipping and 1,865,000 tons weight of freight carried. Of that quantity, Canadian bottoms carried 667,000 tons, or 35½ per cent. In 1891 the aggregate trade increased to 10,695,000 tons of shipping, carrying 3,129,000 tons of freight, of which Canadian bottoms carried 683,116 tons, just the same quantity of freight carried in 1879, and just the same tonnage of Canadian ships carrying it. So, whereas the percentage we carried in 1879 was 35·55 in Canadian vessels, to-day we carry 21·83 per cent, Canadian tonnage employed in 1879 was 1,736,000 tons; in 1891, 1,791,000 tons. So hon. members will see there has been no increase so far as Canadian bottoms are concerned, that our tonnage is the same, that we are carrying the same quantity of freight, and that all our increased exports are being carried in foreign bottoms. What does that mean? To-day, of the total sea-borne trade of the country, 80 per cent is carried in foreign bottoms, and 20 in Canadian ships. So this means that the profits derived from the trade are going to foreigners, that the men employed in transporting our surplus exports are foreigners, that the money made out of the carrying trade

goes into the pockets of foreigners, and not into Canadian pockets. I consider the Minister of Finance was hardly fair in comparing 1892 with 1878, and it would have been fairer to have compared the five years of famine, as they were called, when the Liberal party were in power, with the last five years, when the country was supposed to be enjoying a period of prosperity. If this comparison were made, what would be the result? Canadian imports: 1873 to 1878, \$536,000,000; Customs tax, \$68,000,000; 1888 to 1892, imports, \$592,000,000; Customs tax, \$114,000,000, the increase in imports being \$56,000,000, and in Customs tax, \$56,000,000. How did the trade in the Maritime provinces during those five years compare with the last five years? The total trade from 1874 to 1878 was, Nova Scotia, \$86,344,000; New Brunswick, \$73,238,000; Prince Edward Island, \$15,184,000, or a total, during the five years from 1874 to 1878, of \$174,767,000. Between 1888 and 1892 the total trade of Nova Scotia was \$94,755,000; New Brunswick, \$63,783,000; Prince Edward Island, \$8,631,000, or a total of \$167,145,000, showing a decrease in the total trade of those three provinces during the five years of \$7,622,474. Comment on those figures is unnecessary. Instead of increasing, we are decreasing, not only in population, but in the aggregate of our trade, exports and imports, and everybody who knows anything about the Maritime provinces knows that the figures bear out the facts. So the House will see that the province from which I come, which had a total trade during the five years from 1874 to 1878 of over \$15,000,000, has been reduced during the last five years to \$9,000,000. I do not mean to say there is that actual reduction. I think interprovincial trade accounts for some of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would be something awful if we had a falling off to the extent of one-half in our total trade during the last five years, as compared with the period from 1873 to 1878. It is bad enough as it is—I do not want to colour it. If I have any object in life, it is to make things look as well as they can be made to appear in the Maritime provinces. All I have in the world, all I hope to have, is centred there. It is my home, and in all probability it will continue to be my home for the rest of my life, and if I have any aspiration, it is to make my home as beautiful, thriving and prosperous as possible. That is my desire and hope. I do not come here to preach blue ruin, to present a black picture to this House; but I come here to tell hon. gentlemen facts, and not to hide them, and I say the man who desires to approach statesmanship and submit measures to improve the condition of the country must know what is its actual condition before he can bring forward the necessary measures of relief. I say any attempt to hide or cover the existing state of facts in any part of the Dominion is dishonest and unfair. I

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

speaking these words in soberness, I speak them in sorrow. I regret to have to put this picture before the House. I regret that the people are leaving the Maritime provinces in hordes, as if a plague were there. I regret more than that, that the only member of the House who can be found to cheer the statement is the hon. member for Cape Breton, who sits opposite me. The hon. gentleman thinks it is fine fun, no doubt, but it is not fine fun for that part of the country; and it is not a matter for congratulation to any true lover of his country who comes from that part of the Dominion, to observe the discreditable showing which its trade makes in the Public Accounts. As to the population, the House has already received figures. It would be interesting to go into some of the details if time permitted. One of the most interesting features is, that the three counties in the Maritime provinces which show the greatest exodus are the three counties represented by the three important members of the Administration, the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine. King's, N.B., shows an actual loss of population of 2,527 in a population of 25,000 odd. Antigonish shows an actual loss of 1,948 in a population of 18,000. Pictou, 994 in a population of 34,000. Now, Sir, if these three counties had retained their natural increase alone, without a single immigrant going in, how would they have stood? King's County would have gained 4,618, and, if you add that to the actual loss sustained, it shows that during these ten years 7,145 people have fled from the county which the hon. Minister of Finance represents. That is prosperity. In Antigonish the increase would have been 3,600, but the decrease has actually been 1,948, or 5,548 have fled from that county. In Pictou the increase should have been 6,900, but, as a matter of fact, there was a decrease of 994, and so 7,894 fled from that county; or over 20,000 people fled the past ten years from the three counties represented by the three Ministers. Yet, Sir, these gentlemen insist upon telling us down by the sea, when this decimating process is going on, that we ought to feel satisfied with the condition of affairs. However, I am sure the House is more interested in dealing with what is to come in the future than with what has gone by, and we have to look at what the Government proposes to do about it. The other night the Finance Minister spoke as the oracle spoke of old, and his remarks can be interpreted to mean anything that anybody likes. I suppose he congratulates himself upon the fact that he used language so nebulous and so mystic that come what will, and whether he makes a tariff revision or not, he will be able to show that there was nothing in his speech inconsistent with his action. Those who hope for a revision of the tariff, if they are optimistic, may read between the lines and find a sort of promise, and those National Policy

men who want to adhere to the policy as it is—

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—of whom there is a representative in the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron)—

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—they can find comfort in the statement of the Finance Minister also. But, Sir, for those who believe that the time has come when there should be a thorough revision of the tariff, I am afraid there is not much hope. I do not propose to discuss—and I am sure members will be glad to hear it—many of the figures contained in our Trade Returns, or to single out many articles and discuss whether the duty should be removed from them or not. I have a great deal of sympathy with those members who object to the tariff being interfered with in detail. I think the National Policy, as a whole, ought to be sustained as a whole, or put down as a whole. I do not think it is fair to take, for instance, coal oil, and remove the duty from that, and to leave other duties equally bad and equally indefensible alone. I do not think it is fair to single out cotton and to remove the duty from that article, while an equally indefensible duty is left on other articles.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Nor to single out pork.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nor pork, as the hon. gentleman says. We have had the cotton question discussed in this House with an ability and thoroughness which leaves nothing to be desired. My hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) who took the question up, has thoroughly exposed the rottenness of the existing system, and if the only answer that can be given to him, is the answer given by the hon. member from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), I predict, Sir, a very short reign for the cotton lords in this country. We have had the coal oil question discussed in a very able manner, and I do not propose to deal with that, but I propose for a moment to call the attention of the House to the question of iron, which has not received that attention which it ought to, and the reason I propose to call the attention of the House to it is, because I was struck at the time the iron duties were introduced, with the magnificent promises and predictions which were made by Sir Charles Tupper. But, Sir, 'ex uno disce omnes,' and as the National Policy has been a failure with regard to iron so it has with others. We were told by Sir Charles Tupper at that time when the iron duties were increased, that prosperity was to flow all over the Dominion, that blast furnaces were to be opened in Carleton, N.B., and in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and along the shores of the lakes, and away up in the Northwest and over in British Columbia. Twenty thousand able-bodied people, representing a

population of 100,000, were to be brought into this county; the balance of trade was to be rectified, and, when the copestone, in the guise of increased duties on iron, as he told us, was put on the National Policy arch, there was to be nothing but peace and prosperity from one end of the Dominion to the other. There were reasons given why this should be the case. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman who introduced the iron duties told us, that if we adopted in this country the policy of the United States Government and protected the iron industry, there were special reasons in Canada why it should grow as no other industry ever grew. He told us that we had here the coal, and the iron, and more than that, we had the fluxes, and the country which had iron and coal and fluxes together, could not help but become a great manufactory of iron products. Hon. gentlemen who were not in the House at that time may think I am exaggerating, but I took the trouble this morning to go through the Budget speech of 1887 made by the hon. gentleman who is now High Commissioner in England, and I propose to give the House one or two short extracts from it, to show the arguments which were used to induce the members of this House to tax the people of this country, nearly a million dollars extra per year for the ostensible reason that we are going to build up a great iron industry here. When he proposed an increase of the iron duties in 1887, Sir Charles said :

The time is not long since, when charcoal iron was one of the most important industries in Ontario and Quebec. I have no hesitation in saying that if the protection we have given to cotton and woollen, and all other industries of Canada be applied to iron to-morrow, it will show what the past history of Canada has shown, that these charcoal iron industries will again be in full blast, and that in Ontario and Quebec they will become most essential and important industries to-morrow as they were in days gone by.

He was not going to wait a year, but the very day after the duty came into force we were going to have blast furnaces established all along the line throughout Quebec and Ontario. A little further on in his speech he says :

Now, charcoal iron from bog iron ore was formerly an important industry both in Ontario and Quebec, and charcoal iron was also made in Carleton, N.B., where to-day, under a policy of fostering the industry in the same way as the cotton, woolen and other industries have been fostered, that blast furnace in Carleton would again be lighted up, and would be the foundation of a new and extensive industry in the province of New Brunswick.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Colter), how long the blast furnace has been going on in his county ?

Mr. COLTER. We cannot see it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, nor nobody else ; but the country has paid an enormous sum of money because this House yielded to the arguments with which the hon. gentleman succeeded in foisting these iron duties upon us. Then he went on to rectify the

balance of trade ; that was the next thing he was going to do. As to that, he said :

If you subtract the amount of imports paid by Canada for iron to sustain the iron industries of other countries, you will find it is nearly equal to the amount by which our imports have exceeded our exports : and if you want to balance the trade of the country, if you want to have no outgoing beyond the incoming of the country, cut the gordian knot, put the iron industry upon the same footing and foundation that you have put all the other industries of Canada, and you will sweep away to a large extent the balance of trade which stands recorded against Canada up to the present time.

Why, Sir, there was nothing in the world that this gentleman could not do, if we would only allow him to tax the people on the iron they used. He goes on—and I want to embalm it in “Hansard,” so that it will be easily accessible—to say further :

What I propose to ask this House to do in adopting the policy of vitalizing this great industry for Canada is to take the duty off anthracite coal and make it free. The moment that is done we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, at all events, served by anthracite coal, making that description of anthracite iron which is so highly valued. * * *

I think when I have given the distances I shall have settled the problem that nothing will be easier than to establish blast furnaces in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario by which we can not only manufacture unlimited quantities of charcoal iron, but manufacture the iron by the use of anthracite coal. * * *

Now, Sir, you may ask me what about the great North-west.

He had settled the rest of Canada, he had established blast furnaces everywhere, and now he was going out westward, and going by rail too.

Well, Sir, it is well known that you have in the North-west the most boundless supply of coal to be found in any part of this Dominion. And you have not only 50,000 square miles of this bituminous coal in the great North-west, but you have in Big Island, in Lake Winnipeg, a valuable deposit of iron ore and any quantity of timber to make charcoal to convert it into iron. All it requires is the adoption of this policy in order to establish at an early day, industries for the manufacture of iron in the North-west, as well as in other portions of the country. And what more? Across the Rocky Mountains, need I tell you that in British Columbia you have one of the most magnificent deposits of iron ore on Texada Island that is to be found in any place in the world, and that you have in Nanaimo coal fields to furnish fuel to put blast furnaces in operation at an early day. I say that with the prospect of opening up trade with Australia, with China and Japan : although I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, I believe that at no distant day you will have in the province of British Columbia an iron industry built up which will compare favourably with that of any other industry in this country.

Mr. PRIOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sir, I have never had the pleasure or the honour of being in British Columbia, but I call upon the hon. gentleman to tell this House how many blast furnaces have been established there since these iron duties were put on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How many ?

Mr. PRIOR. Wages are too high there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister of that day, the present High Commissioner, having established blast furnaces all along the line right out to British Columbia, proceeds to put population into the country. He goes on in these words :

Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. * * * Now this estimate of 100,000 souls does not take into account the manufacture of castings and forgings, cutlery and edged tools, hardware, machinery or engines and steel rails. Were we to manufacture these, and there is no reason we should not steadily progress to that point, the population I have mentioned of 100,000 souls would be no less than trebled.

Well, Sir, I admired the hon. gentleman's modesty because he did not want to treble the 100,000 souls just then ; he was willing to leave that for a few years. But here you had in 1887 a balance of trade redressed ; you had 20,000 men living in prosperity, representing 100,000 souls, added to the population ; you had blast furnaces established from Carleton county, N.B., all through Quebec and Ontario, along the prairies of the north-west, across the Rocky Mountains, and flourishing in British Columbia as they did nowhere else. But, Sir, in one of those weak moments for which this House ought to be punished, it yielded to the vote of the siren—yielded to his arguments and his seductive promises, and allowed him to levy on the poor tax-payers of this country increased taxes which since then have ranged at nearly \$1,000,000 a year. And what was it all done for, Sir? I am now going to ask the House for one short moment to compare the promises with the performances. Sir, all this was done to build up the pig iron industry, to enable us to make pig iron in this country, and to compel the people to buy it at prices much higher than they could buy it from abroad. We gave in the first place a bounty ; then we levied a high duty on imported pig iron, amounting to a total protection of \$6 a ton. We were going to produce all the pig iron we needed in this country. What are the facts? In 1887, the year the duties were imposed, we produced 39,728 tons ; in 1891 we produced 13,400 tons ; and in 1892 we produced 20,200 tons. Why, Sir, the production of pig iron has been reduced almost one-half, notwithstanding the fact that you have taxed the people so enormously in order to obtain an increased output of that article. Then, the importations of pig iron in 1887 were 45,000 tons, and in 1892, 68,918 tons. So that while we have produced only one-half of what we did before, we have very largely increased our imports. Sir, what was the effect of putting this increased duty upon iron? In 1887 we imported \$9,746,667 worth of iron on which we paid a duty of \$2,168,392 ; in 1888 we imported \$9,757,204 worth, on which we paid \$2,932,151, or an

increased duty of \$840,000. Without wearying the House with the details, I will give the results. In 1889 the increased duty was \$966,000, and in 1891 and 1892 it was about \$900,000. Sir, this country has paid to the tune of nearly \$4,000,000 extra in the shape of taxes, since 1887, upon iron and steel and the manufactures of those articles, with the hope that some few of the promises which were clothed in such magnificent language by the Finance Minister of that day would be brought about; and yet to-day, Sir, we stand barren of the promised results; we have neither the people nor the furnaces. Sir, it was the same with reference to every other article. The House has been humbugged, the people have been fooled, the money has been taken out of their pockets; and tariff revision, which ought not to be postponed to the distant future, but at once taken in hand, ought to be applied to iron, as well as to cotton, to coal oil and to other articles. The hon. gentleman was anxious at a certain stage of this debate to know what the Opposition were going to do. I think he was told by the financial leader the direction which his tariff revision was going to take, and I am quite satisfied that there is not a man in the House who calmly and coolly looks at these figures but is convinced in his own mind, though his party allegiance compels him to vote the other way, that it was a scandal and a disgrace to this Parliament to impose these taxes on the people; and now that they know the wretched results, they ought to be prepared to revise the tariff and lower all these duties to their former figures. Now, I want to say a word or two as to the policy the Government has indicated, and as to the references which the hon. Finance Minister has made to preferential trade and reciprocity. With regard to preferential trade, I am sorry that my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is not in his place to-day. There is no gentleman in the House whom I more admire for his earnestness and sincerity than the hon. gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He is the leader of a small band in this House and this country, who hope to obtain, at some period or another, preferential trade with Great Britain; who hope that Great Britain will tax the corn of all other countries and let Canada's in free, and who, when she does that, are prepared to graciously condescend to reduce the differential duties we now impose on British goods in favour of Canadian manufactures. Well, the hon. gentleman was treated to about twenty minutes of taffy by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance did not want to say anything very harsh; he did not tell the hon. gentleman that the whole thing was a screaming farce, but he told him it was not practicable, and any man in his senses, who takes up the blue-books and looks at the proportion which Canada has of Great Britain's total tariff, will see how ridiculous the thing is. Great Britain imported, in 1891,

£420,691,997 sterling worth of goods. How much of this did Canada send her? Just 3 per cent, or £12,600,000 worth. The entire British possessions sent, £96,161,214 sterling worth, or 23 per cent, and the foreign world sent 77 per cent; yet the hon. gentleman actually asks that the foreign trade of Great Britain, which is such an enormous proportion of the whole, should be taxed in order to foster the colonial trade which is such an infinitesimal proportion. In 1891, Great Britain imported 13,262,592 quarters of wheat. Of this Canada sent 634,768 quarters, or a little more than 5 per cent, and yet Great Britain is asked to tax 95 per cent of the wheat which goes into her country in order to encourage the 5 per cent coming from Canada. The thing need only be stated to show its absurdity. Of flour Great Britain imported 3,349,600 quarters, of which 2,740,607 came from the United States, and Great Britain is to tax that, in order that the very small proportion which comes from Canada should have the preference in her markets and her people have the privilege of paying higher prices. In 1890, Great Britain exported £263,530,585 sterling worth of goods, of which British North America took £7,225,911 worth, or less than 3 per cent. Our trade with Great Britain is less than 3 per cent of her total trade, and yet it is really by sensible men argued in this House that the policy should be urged on Great Britain of taxing 97 per cent of her trade in order to encourage the 3 per cent which comes from Canada. The thing is so ridiculous that the facts need only be stated to expose its absurdity.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody proposes that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had hopes that my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) who made a tour through Great Britain last year and told the people of Great Britain that Canada was unanimous in favour of his resolution, would explain to the House how he justified that statement. Canada is by no means unanimous in supporting his resolution. A very large number of Canadians think that the tax imposed by Canada on British goods and the discrimination shown against British manufactures in favour of Canadian manufactures is unjust and improper, and think that tax should be reduced, and a large number of the members of this House put themselves on record here last year in that direction; but I was not aware that the majority, or that a large proportion even of the people of Canada were in favour of the policy which the hon. member for Bruce advocates. I want to call the attention of the House, before closing my lengthy remarks, to the question of reciprocity, which, to my mind, is the greatest and most important that can be raised in the Parliament of this Dominion. Of this I am satisfied, that in the Maritime provinces there is no question which is so much discussed as reciprocal trade with the United States. How does this question stand? There

has been—I was going to use a stronger word—a malignant attempt to falsify and misrepresent the policy of this side of the House upon that question the last three or four years. Hon. gentlemen on this side are sincerely desirous of obtaining reciprocal trade with the States; but I do not think there ever was a sentiment uttered by any responsible leader on this side, which indicated that we were prepared to accept a treaty sacrificing the independence of Canada. We desire a treaty and the broadest treaty that can be obtained, but a treaty consistent with the commercial and political independence of Canada. Why, my hon. friend himself, the leader of our party, when he went down to Boston a few years ago, and spoke at the great gathering there, told his hearers and through the press, the American nation, that, anxious and eager as the Liberal party were to obtain an honourable and a fair trade treaty, they were not prepared to sacrifice their political allegiance to Great Britain or their political independence to secure it. The sentiment has been expressed time and again by the Liberal leaders, and hon. gentlemen opposite, when we first tabled our proposition with regard to reciprocity, at once adopted an unfair and a disingenuous course, when they alleged that the policy would involve the surrender by Canada of its commercial or political independence. Sir, we desired unrestricted reciprocity. We were like the late Finance Minister, who desired to go to the United States absolutely unfettered, and we used the term "unrestricted reciprocity." We stated to the Americans: We want to discuss the matter with you without being tied or trammelled in any way. We are not afraid to discuss it. We want an unrestricted discussion of the whole question; we want to deal with every article, face to face, as one business man deals with another. That was our proposition. We did not expect to obtain reciprocal trade in every single article. Not at all. What we hoped to get was as broad and generous a measure as was consistent with the well-being and at the same time with the commercial and political independence of this country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Unrestricted discussion and unrestricted reciprocity are two different things.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may please himself with drawing any distinction he likes. He has heard this side of the House give their statement of the policy, and it is the same I am using now—from year to year. We hoped for the broadest measure of free trade that may be obtained. We are prepared, in order to obtain that, to send commissioners or plenipotentiaries to Washington who will be perfectly untrammelled, but there is this always to be said, that when they do negotiate a treaty that treaty must never go into

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

operation until it is laid before and approved by the people of Canada. What were we told? I say that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for sowing in the minds of the American people the false idea that one-half of the people of this country are disloyal. In order to gain their paltry party triumph, they did not scruple to tell the American people that one-half the Canadian people were disloyal, and that the Canadian Liberal party was a disloyal party. They did that for the mean, unworthy purpose of obtaining power, and there is prevailing to-day all over the United States, as a direct result of the libel of these hon. gentlemen opposite, the idea that the Liberal party are false to their Queen and their country. It is not true, and some hon. gentlemen opposite have the generosity to-day to say so. There never has been any appreciable section of people in the Maritime provinces at least in favour of annexation. Not one section of that country, I would not say not one man, because every shade of opinion has some advocates, but no appreciable proportion of men with us favour this policy. It was always so. The people want to live under the constitution they have now, under the flag they have now, and God helping them, they are determined to do it. And these gentlemen opposite who went about slandering the party to which I belong, slandering one-half the people, knew that it was false at the time they said it, and knew they said it for the contemptible and unworthy purpose of creeping into power again. What has been the history of this question? If one wanted to indulge in reprisals upon this question of the assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries it could be shown that the hon. gentleman's political god was the man who proposed it, not once only, but two or three times. Why, Sir, is it not on record that in 1864 the Government, led by Sir John Macdonald, of which Mr. Galt was Finance Minister, proposed to the American Government to assimilate the tariffs of Customs and Excise duties of Canada with the Customs and the Excise duties of the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. One tariff around both countries?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it not true that that was proposed? Is it not true, also, that Hon. George Brown, the leader of the Liberal party, left Sir John Macdonald because of that very proposal?

Mr. FOSTER. You assume that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does anybody doubt it? Sir, I will appeal to the record. I say that in the year 1874, Hon. George Brown, standing in the Senate, deliberately stated that he left the Government led by Sir John Macdonald in 1864-65, because of the attempt made by that Government to assimilate the Customs and Excise duties of this country with those of the United States. The words he used were these:

I was not willing that the customs and excise duties of Canada should be assimilated to the prohibitory rates of the United States—and very especially was I unwilling that any such arrangement should be entered into with the United States, dependent on the frail tenure of reciprocal legislation, repealable at any moment at the caprice of either party. * * * My colleagues determined to proceed in the manner I deprecated; I could not be responsible for such a policy; and to avoid responsibility for it, I resigned office.

Afterwards, in 1870, a formal proposition was made by Sir John Macdonald's Government to the United States of America. The proposition contained a number of items, and among them one for the assimilation of our Customs and Excise duties to those of the United States. Hon. George Brown said that he read the "projet," that he saw a copy of it; he declared that, in the Senate, and it is there on record to this day. What did we propose? Did we propose anything of that kind? No. We did not advocate commercial union. Whatever may be its advantages or disadvantages, that has never been proposed by the Liberal party of this country. I do not wish to be tiresome by repeating myself, but it cannot be made too plain that our object was to institute negotiations having for their object the largest measure of free trade that could be obtained consistently with the dignity and independence of this country. Well, Sir, what did the Finance Minister do? He told us in this House time and again, and he told the people of the country from every platform upon which he stood, that our proposition practically meant commercial union, that it meant the assimilation of our tariff to that of the United States, and that it could not be otherwise.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Reciprocity of tariffs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said that our proposal meant a uniform tariff, and that that uniform tariff must be the tariff of the United States.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Reciprocity of tariffs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not dealing with the hon. gentleman who interrupts me; I have paid my respects to him before. He should remember that there are others in the House who have to be dealt with besides himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) taught his followers to adopt the same line of argument, and I will undertake to say that throughout this broad Dominion there was not a platform on which reciprocity with the United States was discussed, but the statement was made by the Minister of Finance or one of his friends that our proposal practically meant commercial union and the adoption of a uniform tariff and that the prohibitory tariff of the United States. I believe that the narrow majority which they obtained at the last general election was gained because the people believed that statement. The people thought the

Liberal policy necessarily involved a uniform tariff, in the first place, and, in the second place, that that tariff must be the prohibitory tariff of the United States, and the people said: We will not have it, because, if we accept that, better have commercial union and save all the expense and trouble of the line of Custom-houses between the two countries. Now, Sir, what is the fact? The hon. gentleman had made up his mind that it must be so. He went to the people and told the people, in the famous manifesto put forth by the Government: If we are returned to power we will get a reciprocity treaty, or, at least, try for one.

Mr. FOSTER. That is better.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; and there was not one of your supporters but told the people you would get it. I know that on every platform on which I stood, my opponents, the speakers on the other side, invariably declared: We are for the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the enlargements and modifications which the change of circumstances have made necessary; we will put in lists of manufactures as well as natural products; our party has been invited to Washington to discuss the question of reciprocity. The lie was told at Toronto and was taken up by every Conservative newspaper, and repeated on every platform, and the people, believing what was told them, believing that the party in power had been invited to Washington to negotiate a broad, a generous treaty of reciprocity, involving more than the treaty of 1854, sent them back to power to carry on these negotiations. Why, Sir, we know that there was nothing those gentlemen scrupled to say in order to gain power. They stooped so low that even their High Commissioner made a statement which he was only too glad to retract when he got to Washington, only too glad to get down on his knees and apologize for. Talk about national humiliation! Canada was never humiliated as she was on that occasion. Think of it! Her High Commissioner, the second in command in the Government, ex-Finance Minister of the country, obliged to say to the authorities at Washington: It is true I carried the election in my country by telling the people that you had invited me here to negotiate a treaty; the statement was false; I knew it to be false when I made it, and I now humbly apologize. That was practically what was done. Humiliation was heaped upon Canada in order that the Tory party might save their offices. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, having made up his mind that these things were involved in the policy of the Liberal party, went to Washington; and he came back, as we all know, empty-handed. He came back, Sir, not only without furthering the cause which we have at heart, but after putting all the obstacles in the way of it he possibly could. The hon. gentleman came back to this House and made a statement, and I appeal to hon. members of in-

dependent cast of mind on both sides of this House to say whether this House or the country has been treated by the hon. gentleman in a spirit of fair-play in this matter. There is a record in existence, and they acknowledge it, a record of what they said and of what proposals they made, of the manner in which their proposals were received and of the counter-proposals made on the other side. That record the people of this country are entitled to. That record should have been laid on the Table of this House long since. That record would long ago have been laid on the Table of this House, if there were not good reasons for withholding it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is self-evident.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the hon. gentleman knows the reasons, and I am going to show him that those reasons are not unknown to us. We know perhaps a little more than he thinks. The hon. gentleman came to this House and told us that he had seen Mr. Blaine and that Mr. Blaine had said that there must be a uniform tariff and that tariff must be the tariff of the United States. He said also that Mr. Blaine had declared that there must be discrimination against the mother country, and so on. But in order that I may not misrepresent the hon. gentleman, I will read from the revised copy of his tariff speech, in which he referred to this matter. Having given details, he summed it all up, and I suppose the summing up will be sufficient. The hon. gentleman said :

I think it is only necessary for me to put in brief the results, and they are simply these : that so long as the present party and the present policy is maintained in the United States, in one branch or the other of the Legislature or in the Executive, we cannot hope for any treaty with the United States, except upon these lines, viz., a treaty which will take in both natural products and manufactured goods ; a treaty unlimited in its scope—

“Unlimited in its scope,” mark you.

—of which the basis is a preferential treatment in our market with discrimination especially against Great Britain and against other countries ; a treaty that must be accompanied by a uniform tariff, and this tariff equalized with that of the United States of America. These are in brief the results which have been arrived at.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House will see that the hon. gentleman stated five distinct things as essentially necessary ; first, that the treaty should be unlimited in its scope ; second, that it should discriminate against Great Britain ; third, that it should provide for a uniform tariff ; fourth, that such uniform tariff should be that of the United States of America, and fifth, that it should embrace natural products and manufactured goods. So far as the statement was made by him that the treaty must embrace manufactured goods as well as natural products, there is no doubt the hon. gentleman was correct. No sane man, on either side of the House, believes that

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

it was possible to negotiate a treaty in natural products only ; but that is the proposal that hon. gentlemen went there with, and that is the proposal they made to Mr. Blaine, simply a treaty in natural products, as I will prove to him in a moment. Sir, I do not want to accuse the Finance Minister of wilful misrepresentation : I trust I have too much respect for him and for myself to make a charge on the floor of this House, that he would stand up here and wilfully state that which he did not believe to be true. But what I am leading the House to is this : that the hon. gentleman had argued himself into a state of mind that all these things must inevitably follow, and he says they did follow ; but it was all a figment of his imagination. I say it was not required that there should be a uniform tariff ; I say it was not required that the treaty should be unlimited in its scope ; I say it was not required that we should adopt the tariff of the United States of America—I say that not one of these three things were required of us by the United States in the negotiations which took place ; and I am speaking by the book, too ; I know what I am saying. I hold in my hand here—for although we have been treated with disrespect and want of courtesy by gentlemen opposite, although the Government have deliberately and for their own purposes, withheld the record, we have access to the records laid before Congress by the Government of the United States. I hold in my hand now the official statement made to the President, and transmitted by him to Congress, signed by James G. Blaine, the late Secretary of State, in which that gentleman details the whole of this interview, and says what he required, and what proposals the other gentlemen made, and what counter proposals he submitted ; and I propose, with the indulgence of the House, to read that to the House, and I state that not one of the three things which the hon. gentleman stated were essential, were ever referred to or demanded by Mr. Blaine at all. This report is dated Washington, 15th April, 1892, and is addressed to the President. The first part of it, leading up to the interview, I suppose it is unnecessary to read. Afterwards, Mr. Blaine says :

At the first conference, on February 10th, the commissioners stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 (which was terminated in 1886 by the action of the Congress of the United States), with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles, should be confined to natural products and should not embrace manufactured articles.

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854, nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone ; and that, in view of the great

development of industrial interests in the United States, and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favoured exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favours to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty on their introduction into Canada.

The reply given to them was that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States and Canada, and that other countries which were not parties to it, should not enjoy gratuitously the favours which the two neighbouring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations, and with a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.

Upon receiving this reply, the Canadian commissioners asked that the further consideration of the subject be adjourned till another conference, to enable them to consult as to the course which they would adopt in view of the foregoing declarations.

In the conference of the 11th the Canadian commissioners stated that they had given careful consideration to the suggestion that manufactured goods should be included in the schedule of articles for exchange in a reciprocity convention, and to the desire expressed by the Government of the United States that such American goods, on their introduction into Canada, should be afforded preferential treatment over similar goods from other countries; and they announced, with an expression of regret, that they did not consider it possible to meet the expectations of the Government of the United States in these respects. In the first place, they encountered a serious obstacle in the matter of revenue. If any considerable list of manufactured goods of the United States should be admitted free into Canada it would entail a material loss to the Dominion treasury, and if the same favours were likewise extended to the merchandise of other countries the loss of revenue would be much greater. They felt that they would not be able to recoup these losses by other methods of taxation. In the second place, it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods a preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States from the benefits of which Great Britain and its colonies should be excluded.

The announcement of these conclusions of the Canadian commissioners was accepted as a bar to further negotiations on this subject, and it was not again discussed except in connection with the fishing privileges on the Atlantic coast.

Now, I have given to the House every word of the official statement made by Mr. Blaine to the President, in order that it might be laid before Congress, of what took place between the Canadian commissioners and the American commissioners, and I appeal to the House if in that statement there is one word which, directly or by necessary implication involves the truth of one of these three state-

ments made by the Finance Minister. Where did Mr. Blaine, or where did any man at that conference, say, as the Finance Minister came back here and reported, that the treaty must necessarily be unlimited in its scope? On the contrary, Mr. Blaine says that he desired to have a fair list of manufactures, the very opposite of what the hon. gentleman stated. I charge the hon. gentleman upon the records now before us, because inasmuch as he has refused to give his record to the House we are bound to accept the only official record made public, that he and his colleagues went to Washington designedly to prevent any treaty being made. There never was a fairer proposal made than that submitted by the Secretary of State of the United States, and never a more insane or silly proposal than the counter-proposal submitted from this side of the line. The hon. gentleman made a proposal that he knew could not be accepted. What did Sir John Macdonald state in this House a few years ago? He said it was nonsense to expect that a treaty in natural products could be negotiated with the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew that. Mr. Blaine had told them that, as appeared in the letter which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) read yesterday; Sir Charles Tupper told the same thing, as the result of his visit to Washington for the purpose of entering into treaty negotiations. Everybody knew this to be the case, except the three commissioners who went from Canada to Washington and made a proposal which they knew would be rejected and must be rejected, and I charge on them that the proposal was made for the purpose of having it rejected. I charge the hon. gentleman that there is not a word in the record that justifies in the slightest particular the statement he made that if a treaty was negotiated, it must be unlimited in its scope. I desire to press that point on hon. gentlemen in this House, and so far as my voice will reach on the electorate of this country, that the proposition made on the part of the United States was not a proposition for a treaty of unlimited or unrestricted reciprocity, but a proposal for a treaty in respect of which one side was to propose one article and the other side to propose another article, and after discussion a list was to be agreed on by both sides, as business men would agree upon a list, and the list of articles was thus to be prepared in the interests, fairly and honourably, of both countries. The hon. gentleman told the House not once, but three times, that Mr. Blaine insisted on a uniform tariff between the two countries. I challenge the hon. gentleman, now that the record is here at his disposal, to place his finger on one word that will justify that statement. The hon. gentleman stated three times again that not only must there be a uniform tariff, but it must be the prohibitory tariff of the United States. I challenge him now to substantiate that; I place the record at his disposal, and I will allow him, and

I am sure the House will cordially grant him the privilege, to read from his own record which he has not yet submitted to Parliament—I dare him to show that there is any ground whatever for the serious statements he has made for the purpose of destroying and damning the policy of his opponents. This is not a matter which can be trifled with. I am well aware that no treaty can be negotiated between this country and the United States unless it embraces some manufactured articles along with natural products. I say, further, that it is not desirable a treaty should be confined to natural products alone. If we can agree on a list of articles, as the Hon. George Brown did in 1874, it would not only be to our interest alone, but to the mutual interests of the people of both countries. Such a treaty, when negotiated, necessarily must be confined to the parties negotiating it. It is absurd to argue that Australia, the different West India Islands, the Cape of Good Hope and all the dependencies of Great Britain should enjoy the same privileges under this treaty as the Dominion of Canada, which is the party negotiating it. Is it reasonable or fair? Every hon. gentleman knows that the very essence of a reciprocity treaty is that the reciprocal concessions made by the contracting parties shall be mutual and confined to the contracting parties. It is absurd to talk of any other course being adopted; and when you say that if you put down a list of articles and allow them to come in from the United States to Canada, you must also allow the same articles to come in from the Cape of Good Hope, Australia, India and the West Indies, you are doing your best to strangle a treaty, instead of attempting to carry it to completion. I charge on the hon. gentleman opposite, and it is a charge he will have to answer, if not here, before his constituents, that he, more than any one else, is responsible for the failure to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, and he is responsible for all the loss and injury that will follow to Canada as the result of the failure of those negotiations. The hon. gentleman has not only failed to negotiate a treaty, but he has likewise placed obstacles in the way of those who may follow him, of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Difficult as it was under almost all circumstances, and requiring as it did the best brains of Canada, by reason of inherent difficulties which, at first sight, seemed almost insurmountable, yet, to have our own representatives going to Washington and raising fresh difficulties, is more than man can bear. I say it is adding insult to injury, and the hon. gentleman is condemned by the record, I have read, for having falsified the facts. Remember, Mr. Speaker, I am not charging—

Mr. FOSTER. You had better be sure of that before you state it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have stated it, and, not only so, I have read the hon. gentleman the record on which I base my statement. Moreover, I have challenged the hon. gentleman to produce the record which he has secreted and kept back, and I have the right to deduce from that fact what I have deduced, because it is principle of evidence that the man who has evidence in his possession, and keeps it back, shall have the strongest presumption made against himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is said that, because you negotiate a treaty with the United States, and because, forsooth, you embody in it a small or a large list, as the case may be, of manufactured articles, and because 'ex necessitate' there must be discrimination against Great Britain, so far as that list of articles is concerned, and to that extent, you must therefore abandon all attempts at negotiation. Why? When the Hon. George Brown negotiated the treaty of 1874 what do I find? That objection of discrimination was taken to the treaty negotiated by that hon. gentleman. My hon. friend the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) read the list of articles embodied in the treaty negotiated by Hon. George Brown, and I am not going to recapitulate the list to the House. I am glad, however, they will appear in "Hansard," where they can be read by the people. This list is also set out in the official documents which Mr. Blaine submitted to Congress last year. Suffice it to say it embraced cottons and cotton goods, iron and many iron manufactures, leather and its manufactures, and tweeds of wool solely. It was charged then that Mr. Brown discriminated against England.—

Mr. FOSTER. Who made the charge?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's friends throughout the country, and that complaint was sent to the old country for the consideration of Her Majesty's advisers. It was sent to the Secretary of the Colonies and by him to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, it was remitted by him to the Board of Trade for the consideration of those eminent authorities on matters of trade; and that board gave its opinion to the Foreign Secretary, and that opinion was, that, although that objection was a tenable one in 1854, and as against the reciprocity treaty of that date, now that Canada had supreme power over its fiscal affairs, the objection was untenable and worthless. Upon this matter, as upon all other matters relating to this subject, I propose to appeal to the record. I want the facts presented to the House and the country. I think it is of essential importance that we should obtain the actual facts on this question, and, having the facts, I am prepared to discuss the justice of the proposition we have made on any platform in this country and before any body of the people. Now, Sir, there were sent to the Home Government the proposals made by

Sir Edward Thornton and Senator George Brown to the American Government, and they were remitted, as I say, to the Board of Trade, and, on that point of discrimination, what said the Board of Trade? This is the quotation from the official blue-book:

We shall then make the following proposition: Renewal of the treaty of 1854 for twenty-one years including the fisheries, with the addition of the free admission of salt, manufactures of wood, manufactures of steel articles, or of these conjointly, agricultural implements, and a few other trifling articles.

Here is the reply of the Board of Trade:

To this no objection can be taken. Whatever criticisms may have been made on the original reciprocity treaty, on the ground that Canada was setting up differential duties in favour of the United States, both against this country and countries with which we have most favoured nations treaties, no such objections can be taken now.

Mr. FOSTER. And why?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let us get to the facts, if you please. Let me alone while I am pressing this argument home. It may not suit the hon. gentleman just now.

Mr. FOSTER. It suits me first-rate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to press it home. You will have an opportunity of trying to explain it by and by. When Lord Derby had received that memo. from the Board of Trade, then he penned the despatch approving of the treaty which my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) read to the House yesterday. Let me ask the attention of the Finance Minister for a moment to the wording of that treaty:

It is agreed that the articles enumerated in the schedules "A," "B" and "C" hereunto annexed, being the growth, produce or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada or of the United States of America, shall, on their importation from the one country into the other from the 1st July, 1875, to the 30th June, 1876, both included, pay only two-thirds of the duty payable at the date of this treaty on the importations into such country of such articles respectively; and from the 1st July, 1876, to the 30th June, 1877, both included, shall pay one-third of such duties. And on and after the 1st July, 1877, for the period of years mentioned in article 13 in this treaty shall be admitted free of duty into each country respectively.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there a word there more than we ask to have put into a treaty to-day? Do these words not necessarily involve discrimination against the other colonies of Great Britain?

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me to ask a question; just one question?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let my hon. friend possess his soul for a moment. Do these words not necessarily involve discrimination against goods coming from England, and did they not receive the approval of the British Board of Trade, and the endorsement of Lord Derby, the Conservative Secretary for the Colonies?

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me to ask you a question?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman read from that treaty one clause, or one line, which states that it shall be a condition of the treaty that the articles admitted free from the United States into Great Britain shall not be admitted on the same terms from Great Britain?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely the hon. gentleman is astute enough sometimes to see a point.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you answer my question?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely he sees that there are words allowing a reciprocity of trade between two particular countries, and two particular countries alone.

Mr. FOSTER. No, Sir, not alone.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And confining the articles to those which are the growth, produce or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada and the United States respectively. The hon. gentleman may put his construction upon it, but he will not find any lawyer who values his reputation to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot put any other construction upon it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is completely astray in the matter. If he will pardon me for saying so; he may know something of figures, but he knows little of construing language, if he puts any other construction on these words than I have put on them. They show that after a certain date the articles specified in the treaty, being the growth, produce or manufacture of one or other country, shall be admitted from Canada to the United States, and from the United States to Canada, and no living man could imagine that that involved the admission of goods from the Cape of Good Hope or from Australia or from Great Britain. Nay, more; to show the hon. gentleman that this was understood, this very question of discrimination which we are debating was left by the Secretary for the Colonies to the Board of Trade, and the Board of Trade reported: that whatever objections there might be in 1854, it was now too late, and there were no objections now. So that, not only from the words of the record, but from the facts which transpired in England between the Secretary for the Colonies and the Board of Trade. I say that no man can come to any other conclusion, than that that treaty involved what every other treaty must necessarily involve, namely, that the rest of the world who are not parties to it shall not enjoy its concessions or advantages. Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker; that there may be no possible doubt on this other question which I have referred to, I will ask the House to allow me to read the emphatic

denial of the truth of the statement the Finance Minister made to this House of the interview between the hon. gentlemen opposite and the Secretary of the United States. Mr. Blaine's statement contains a denial emphatic and clear, because it details everything that took place and it does not say one word about these conditions which our Finance Minister said he proposed to insert; but General Foster, the present Secretary of State removes every possible doubt, because when he had seen the statement of the Finance Minister in this House he says:

During the reciprocity conference of last winter, Mr. Blaine did not insist that in a reciprocity arrangement a uniform tariff might be necessary for both Canada and the United States, nor much less that it should be on the line of the present United States tariff. He did ask that the schedule should not be confined to natural products, but should include an agreed list of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States; and because of these two conditions the negotiations were fruitless.

Sir, the Finance Minister occupies what is a pitiable position before this House and before this country. He has made statements on the most important negotiations that have been undertaken for many years between Canada and the United States, which statements have been emphatically repudiated and distinctly and categorically denied by General Foster, the present Secretary of State, and which have been practically denied also by the late Secretary of State, the Hon. J. G. Blaine. I leave the Finance Minister in his dilemma. I leave him, when he addresses the House again to explain how he can reconcile the extraordinary position he holds. General Foster was present at all the negotiations, and he was present because of his thorough knowledge of the facts required to be looked into, when the negotiations were being proceeded with. No more competent authority could be found in the United States than the gentleman who now, with such credit to himself, fills the position of Secretary of State. I state here that the Finance Minister, so long as he remains in power, has placed beyond all possibility the attainment of any reciprocity treaty. Not only that, but he has placed all the difficulties possible in the way of his successors obtaining such a treaty. But I have confidence in the ability of my hon. friends of the Liberal party who sit on each side of me, that when the day comes—as coming it is in the very near future, and make no mistake about that—that the Liberals are intrusted with the reins of power in this country, notwithstanding all that the hon. gentlemen opposite have done, we will be able then to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity in trade with the United States, a treaty which will not only be beneficial to the United States, but which will be enormously

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

beneficial to Canada, as a whole, and especially to that particular province which I have the honour to represent. But, Sir, in the meantime and until we are in a position to carry out these promises which we make to the people, we will turn our attention to tariff reform; we will say that here and now is the time to lop off the mouldering branch. The hon. gentlemen were told last night by a voice from their own ranks, in words they could not deny, that instead of lopping off the mouldering branches they had only broken off sufficient to show the rottenness within. That is where their policy has brought them, this beautiful National Policy, which was to stop the emigration from the country and increase our population, which was to create a home market and render us independent of foreign markets, which was to secure for us reciprocity with the United States. These were its promises; what have been its performances? After making all due allowance for increase in population, as my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) did the other day, it has abstracted no less than sixty or seventy millions of extra taxes from the pockets of the people in the shape of Customs duties, and it has withdrawn from them at least an equal amount and transferred it to the pockets of the manufacturers. It has doubled the exodus from Canada which existed between 1871 and 1881, and trebled it in the Maritime provinces, of which I have given you the figures. It has left us more dependent than ever on foreign markets, and it has taken away one of the strings to our bow which we once possessed in the United States market because there is no doubt that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite provoked those features of the McKimley Bill which specially struck against Canada. It has rendered reciprocity impossible of attainment while the hon. gentlemen remain in power, and largely increased the difficulties of their successors. Sir, in 1887, when Sir Charles Tupper put that keystone upon the National Policy arch, he assured us that prosperity would follow throughout this Dominion. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) came into the treasury, he heard the rumblings of discontent which presaged the storm. He set himself to work to dig about and dung that National Policy tree. He almost tore it up by the roots three years ago, when he revised his tariff from end to end. What is the position to-day? Has the rumbling ceased? No, Sir; in the ranks of his own party he knows that there is unrest and disquiet. He knows that from the very centres of commerce in this Dominion thousands are crying out, not merely for a revision of the tariff, but for a thorough reform of that tariff. He knows that the farming population all over this land are crying out for relief, and their mouthpieces in this House, not on one side alone, but on both sides, are moving for reductions of the duties

on agricultural implements and of the other duties which press specially on the agricultural population. But the hon. gentleman feeds them with promises, nothing more. Next year, he says, after he has gone around the country with the apprentices that my hon. friend referred to—

Mr. FOSTER. Chestnut.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Chestnut it is, and a very good one, and I am not ashamed to repeat it. When the hon. gentleman comes back with his apprentices, he will do what? He will do something for the good of the country at large, whatever that may be. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that his Order Paper bristles with resolutions striking at the root of his policy, proposed by his own men. This National Policy tree, which they are so fond of talking about, and the mouldering branches of which they are going to lop off—this National Policy tree, which we were told was going to luxuriate and bear fruit, one of the hon. gentleman's friends tells us is rotten, and when he breaks off a branch it only exposes the rottenness inside. Sir, I admit that for a small portion of the manufacturers of this country it has borne fruit; but for the people at large it has no blossoms, it bears no leaves, it yields no fruit, and the mandate is going forth all over this country, from one end to the other, that it must be cut down and not allowed longer to encumber the ground.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent, and shall I call it the fervid address of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), is, I regret to say, only another proof, if proof were needed, of the degradation which an otherwise good and noble nature incurs by associating with men whose political creed is one that can only lead to the degradation and destruction of the higher patriotic instincts and aspirations. It may be, Sir, that his near proximity to the representative of North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) communicated to him some of that hon. gentleman's bitterness of feeling to this his native country. It may be that, seated, as he is, with such an easy conductor between him and the member for North Norfolk, the stream of political poison has passed from the one to the other. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is an easy conductor, for I should think that in matters of this kind he would be such an absorbent that he would retain all the political poison that might pass from the member for North Norfolk, and not allow it to reach the hon. member for Queen's. Sir, for two blessed hours last night, the hon. member for North Norfolk not only exhausted time, but almost encroached on eternity, in his everlasting praise and defence of the American lumbering system. He depicted to us the glories of that great country to the south of us. He showed what a miserable, poor, craven, stricken lot we were, that we

were unable to hold our own in the race of competition. I felt at the time that if I rose to reply I should be compelled to apologize to this House for taking hon. members away from the consideration of the interests and glory of the great republic to the south of us, and asking them to come for a few moments to give attention to the subject that pertained to our own national welfare. Sir, I am sick, dead sick, of the efforts made by the Opposition at all times to thrust down our throats the example held out by the United States. The hon. member for Queen's tells us that he is here as a representative of the Maritime provinces, and in that narrow sectional spirit which he has imbibed from the party, though contrary to his nature, he gives us a discourse pertaining, he tells us, more particularly to the little province from which he hails. Now, Sir, I happen to know something of the island of Prince Edward: and though my hon. friend undertakes to pose as a representative of the Maritime provinces, the Maritime provinces deny his right to assume any such title. They have sent to this House a band of noble men, and with the single exception of the Island of Prince Edward, they unanimously support the Government. Well, I regret to see my hon. friend, a man with good and noble aspirations, so far forgot himself as to take the stand he has done, and to take sides with the hon. member for North Norfolk in the picture he has given of our national degradation. Why, Sir, it was only last night that the hon. member for North Norfolk was bewailing the condition of those poor farmers who have lately become the special property of Opposition; and what did he tell us? He told us that we had incurred a debt of some \$250,000,000, that \$60,000,000 had been paid towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that a large proportion of this was paid by the farmers. In counting up the enormous burdens which were laid upon the farmers, he calculated that no less a sum was paid by them than \$63,000,000 annually. Well, I have been brought up in this House by the Opposition to believe that the Canadian farmer is a poor, down-trodden man, and that so far from being able to contribute \$63,000,000 per year, he never in his wildest dreams could imagine himself ever being able to pay a tithe of that amount. I take these \$63,000,000, which are payable annually by the farmers, as my hon. friend states, and I divide them fairly among the 600,000 farmers of the Dominion, and I find that, according to the calculation of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), every farmer pays in duty alone no less a sum than \$105 per year. The statement the hon. gentleman makes in this instance is on a par with the others he has made. He pointed out to us a farmer in New York state as having made on his farm no less a sum than \$4,000 a year. I turn to a book recently published

in that state called "American Farmer," and what do I find? The hon. gentleman tells us that the Canadian farmer can only eke out a miserable existence, that he can not better himself even if he would, but that the American farmer, if he would only deny himself a few of the luxuries and live like an ordinary man, would soon regain his prosperous position. Well, this impartial authority, which I have mentioned, arrives at the conclusion, after gathering data, that not less than 25 per cent of the farmers in an important section on the American side are in the grip of the usurer, and adds that the evil is a growing one. The writer goes on to say:

The value of farm lands has seldom been lower during the last thirty years than now.

And mind you, Sir, these are not ordinary farmers, who thus suffer; they are not men against whom the imputation of lack of enterprise, thought or skill can be cast, for the authority I refer to thus describes them:

The average farm proprietor of the community is as fine a type of man as the average in any city or country in North America—frugal, industrious, intelligent, quick of wit, and ambitious beyond the average man.

And yet this authority tells us that the average income of the best of these men is only \$350 a year, and that:

We have for some time entertained the opinion that thousands of our land proprietors, on less fruitful lands, are in this country, forced to meet necessities of life for their families, and pay the demands made upon them by society out of less than \$250 per year.

Well, Sir, we have here the assurance that the farmer in the United States has but \$250 per year income, and yet the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) tells us that the Canadian farmer, although less well off than the American farmer, is able, by some hook or crook, to contribute no less a sum than \$105 annually, not for purchases, but simply as duties paid on the purchases he makes. Such statements are an outrage on the common sense of this country, and I think it is most disgraceful that, in our political contests, hon. gentlemen should not scruple to have recourse to extravagant statements of this kind in order to make our farmers discontented with their condition. We have been led in this House, by the constant reiteration of the assertion, to believe that a mortgage is something of which we ought to be ashamed. Now, I consider a mortgage simply as so much borrowed capital. A mortgage may often be regarded indeed as a measure of the prosperity of the country. The farmer simply anticipates receipts from his lands, and borrows the money from the loan companies. That is a mortgage. A merchant anticipates the receipts from his goods and borrows the money from a bank. That is a discount. Now we are all proud and ready to acknowledge that our discounts have greatly increased. We look upon that as a proof of

Mr. COCKBURN.

increasing business and increasing profits; but when a farmer wishes to borrow money, on the same security, by anticipating receipts from his investment in land, we are told that he is in a most deplorable condition. As an illustration of my contention, that the borrowing of capital by the farmer must not be regarded as any indication of his having fallen into an evil condition, I would direct your attention to a late census bulletin of the United States, and I would commend it to the attention of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is fully cognizant not only of all the various states of the Union, but apparently of all the various statesmen:

A bulletin recently issued by the United States Census Bureau on certain features of the mortgage indebtedness in the five states of Alabama, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas and Tennessee contains striking evidence of the general truth that mortgages are a sign of ambition and prosperity rather than of the despair and failure of land owners. They show the buying of property of men without capital enough to pay for it entirely rather than the incurring of indebtedness by those already owning land. If this were not so it is certain that Alabama and Tennessee, in which states a once wealthy slave-holding class of land-owners was largely reduced to poverty by the civil war, rather than Illinois, Iowa and Kansas, would show the greater increase in mortgage indebtedness and the highest proportion of mortgages to population and to the value of all the property encumbered. The official records show, however, that in the two southern states the proportion of mortgages to population is only about one-third as great as in the three northern states which have enjoyed much more rapid growth and greater prosperity. In proportion to all the real estate and to the real estate mortgaged, the contrast is also remarkable. In ratio of the debt in force to the estimated true value of all real estate, in 1889, the year covered by the census, was 10.96 per cent in Alabama, 14.06 per cent in Illinois, 17.61 per cent in Iowa, 28.13 per cent in Kansas, and only 8.67 per cent in Tennessee. These figures are sufficient in themselves to show at a glance how absurd it is to treat real estate mortgages in a growing and enterprising country as evidence of general misfortune and industrial distress.

I think, while this general wail on the part of the farmers has been going on, it is well to direct our attention to the results. I speak only with reference to Ontario, representing, as I partly do, that province, and as that has been the province which has been selected by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and others as an example. I find that during the last year all the mortgages on real estate amounted to \$106,404,856. I may say that I am a director in two of our leading loan companies, and therefore have opportunities of making myself conversant with the transactions passing through those companies, and I am prepared to state that the mortgages which are incurred are not, as a rule, incurred by men in destitute circumstances, but by men who want to better the condition of their holdings, or who wish to start their sons in life or their daughters in marriage, and feel it necessary to assume some temporary burden. How are these burdens paid off? Are they the dead incubus on

the community which they are represented to be? Why, the whole amount in default in 1880 to the loan companies out of the \$106,404,856 capital, was only 8.60 per cent. But last year, eleven years later, instead of an increase, we find a great reduction, we find that the amount in default was 2.04 per cent, or \$2 per \$100. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen in this House if they can have better evidence of the general prosperity of the country than the fact that eleven years ago there was 8.60 per cent on mortgage in default, whereas now there is only a fraction over 2 per cent in default. And, Mr. Speaker, the same tendency is to be noted with reference to unpaid and overdue notes protested. Why, Sir, in 1880 the percentage was 4.24; last year it was only 1.03. I think we may fairly appeal to this as a proof of the prosperity of the country. But, Sir, I am free, at the same time, to confess that there has been a material reduction in the selling value of the farms of the province of Ontario. I am perfectly free to accept the statement of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that that reduction has been, as I think he said, 25 per cent. I should have been much astonished had there not been a reduction; I am much astonished that that reduction has not been greater. But, Sir, I am not prepared to attribute that reduction to any action of the Government or to any policy they have pursued. I think that the cause of this reduction lies deeper and, at the same time, more plainly to be seen. We must not forget, Sir, that during the last ten years, in which time this reduction has taken place, we have brought into competition with the lands of Ontario millions of acres of the best wheat-growing lands in the world. It is impossible to believe that the market can be flooded with any class of goods without the price of that class of goods depreciating. The same laws of political economy that apply to the sale of boots, or vegetables, or anything else must apply to the purchase of land. When we, in Ontario, in a spirit of self-sacrifice, let us say, contributed our quota to develop the lands of Manitoba and the North-west, we did it conscious that there would necessarily follow a depreciation in the value of our own lands. But, Sir, it is a depression that exists not only in Ontario, but, to a certain extent, all over the world. And while we have a temporary loss in the depreciation of 25 per cent in the value of the lands of Ontario, think what an enormous gain we have made in the increased value given to the millions of acres in the North-west. Let us ask ourselves if in that we have not received infinitely great compensation for the sacrifice we have made? I will not speak as does the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and limit myself to the island of Prince Edward, or to the Maritime provinces. I care not whether we come from Halifax or Victoria, or Toronto or Winnipeg. We

are here representing no one section; we have to deal with a great and mighty Dominion. And, when I frankly confess the fact that there has been a diminution in the value of lands in the province of Ontario of 25 per cent, I am proud to say that, if there has been a loss in one sense to the province, there has been an infinitely greater gain in the great North-west, and the amount we have added to the value of the national assets is a return of thousands per cent on every dollar of value of which we have been deprived. Why, Sir, the narrow spirit that animates hon. gentlemen opposite is something that is almost intolerable. The very opening remarks, last night, of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) were an attack upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and how little it had done. And the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when in Brampton, in 1884, imbued with narrowness of spirit, caught from his associate, told the audience, which applauded him to the skies, that the running of the Canadian Pacific Railway was actually an impossibility, that the grades which the engineers were laying were grades over which no locomotive could ever run.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. COCKBURN. I am quoting from the speech of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), delivered at Brampton in 1884.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But what are you quoting from?

Mr. COCKBURN. We have, Sir, the same narrow spirit in the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He made this attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Had the narrow policy of hon. gentlemen opposite been carried out, my hon. friend the talented member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) would have been obliged to make his journey here to take part in the councils of the nation in a rather odd way. I suppose he would have come ten or twenty miles by rail, then he would have transferred to another of the shreds and patches of this route and would have come twenty miles further by an omnibus, then, perhaps, he would have been whisked along another twenty miles in a reindeer sledge, then a dog train would have carried him 100 or 200 miles, and, after that, he might have been told: You can make the rest of your way on skates or by toboggan or snow-shoes as best you can. That is the spirit and policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and when my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) drew special attention to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the burdens which he said it laid upon the shoulders of our workmen, he did not know—or, perhaps, he did know but did not wish to say—that the expenditures of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone in the year 1892 for wages paid directly to their own

employees in Canada and for wages paid by manufacturers of supplies used by the railway and manufactured in Canada were upwards of \$11,000,000. So, Sir, in this one item alone, we have nearly one-third of the whole amount we require for the interest on that great national debt over which my hon. friend shed crocodile tears. And in addition we have there one-third of the cost of the collection of the revenue for all purposes whatsoever.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock I was drawing the attention of the House to the narrow and puny spirit which characterized the policy of the Opposition in this House. I was drawing attention to the fact that from the beginning to the end of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they had been opposed to it in all its phases; and I was showing that, during the last year alone, the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway for wages paid directly to their own employees in Canada, and for wages paid by manufacturers of supplies used by the railway and manufactured in Canada, was upwards of \$11,000,000; and I said that on that one item alone nearly one-third of the whole amount paid out during the year for interest on the public debt, for collection of the revenue, and for all other purposes whatsoever, had been paid by this road, the building of which had been declared by one of the leading Opposition members to be an impossibility. Sir, the same narrow spirit has been betrayed, and is being betrayed, by the Opposition throughout their whole policy. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), on the wail which he made over the misfortunes which had fallen on the devoted head of his poor country, seemed to cast longing eyes on the fine old square-rigged ships which once frequented the ports of his tidy little island. He drew our attention to the fact that there was formerly a busy hum of industry at every port, that thousands of ships came and went from these ports, and carried on a busy traffic with the whole civilized world. He seemed to regard such modern inventions as the Allan and Dominion line of steam-ships as inventions of the devil that ought to be avoided, things that were interfering with the quiet current of life that pervades that tight little island. He told us that he must condemn the policy which has resulted in the withdrawal of those nice, old square-rigged ships. Why, Sir, if he is to pose here as the representative of the Maritime provinces—

Mr. CAMERON. Oh, no.

Mr. COCKBURN. He claimed that privilege, and I must say 't was a bold effort
Mr. COCKBURN.

on his part, disclaimed, I believe, by every province. But he took the position here that he was representing those interests, and he uttered such a cry of woe as to lead us to believe he contracted the same disease from being seated alongside the emblem of woe, and having close to him the other equally decided emblem. Sir, I am afraid our friend from Prince Edward Island, owing to his being shut off during so many months of the year from communication with the mainland, has gone to sleep and will never awake until such time as the great tunnel has been built. Sir, he is the representative Rip Van Winkle of the Maritime provinces; and he seems to dream of the good old time when he thought a passage would be made away to the Pacific Coast in some jolly old omnibus. His thoughts are still of the past, and he can see no trade except the trade which is carried by his wooden ships from port to port. He seems to deny altogether, and not to be aware of the fact, that there is such a thing as inter-provincial trade. In speaking of the deplorable condition of things, while compelled to admit that there is an annual product from agriculture of some \$850,000,000, he might have drawn our attention to the fact that only \$49,000,000 of that great product was exported, and that, therefore, that interprovincial trade alone must rise to the figure of \$300,000,000. Sir, the tactics pursued by the Opposition are most unfair. They take hold of the blue-books, and they twist this figure and twist the other figure, and then wish to send such statements to the country as a fair representation of its condition. Now, one would think that the difficulties under which our shipping is labouring on the island of Prince Edward and in the Maritime provinces, was a malady confined entirely to that particular part of the world. But, Sir, I happened to have lying on that table, at the very time the hon. gentleman was making that statement, a paper published in Montreal, the "Daily Witness," and in this I read an account of a meeting held yesterday in New York, by the United States and Brazil Steamship Company, and one of the directors makes the following statement:

Just now it looks dark for the company.—

Just as it looks dark for Prince Edward Island.

—There are 8,000 steam-ships tied up at docks in different parts of the world. American lines cannot stand the competition.

Perhaps my friend, with his Rip Van Winkle ideas, may think that, as these are iron ships, not the fine old square-rigged ships of the Maritime provinces, that they merit the fate that has befallen them; but I want others, who may not be blessed with the same ante-diluvian tastes, to understand that in modern times we run our commerce in iron built ships, and that it is no ordinary case where 8,000 iron steam-ships are tied up idle at their docks. Why, Sir, this was a tribute to

the National Policy. What are we to say of the policy of the whole civilized world, which has resulted in tying up 8,000 large iron steam-ships? My hon. friend seemed to think it was a nice day when each little square-built vessel went out with its little cargo and traded from port to port, and stopped a few hours and asked the time of day, and how all the children were, and how madame was; and what a nice thing it would be if we could only return to that primeval condition of happiness, a kind of primitive Eden. But he says that that day has gone and the ships are gone. Did it never occur to him, that while it may have been a source of enjoyment for him to go down and have his little crack or chat with the captains, as they came from the little neighbouring ports and anchored alongside some of the ports of Prince Edward Island—did it not occur to him that that trade was done now at one-tenth of the price by these large steamers and that the charges of conducting trade by these square-rigged ships must have been infinitely heavier to bear than those for conducting trade by the large iron ships, such as those of the Allan and Dominion lines? Suppose a movement were made to transport our grain in the whale-back vessels which would go through our canals and carry our 80,000 or 100,000 bushels of wheat in one vessel, no doubt my hon. friend would get up here and say it was contrary to the National Policy that anything but a square-rigged ship should go through the canals, and that a special toll should be imposed on any ship that was not a wooden ship and square-rigged. Now, Sir, he has shown this narrowness of spirit, which, I am glad to say, does not characterize all the members from the Maritime provinces, not only in regard to this matter, but also in the manner in which he made an attack on the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill). That hon. member when he visited England, thought he might say a word for his own land. He did not go to Washington to hold midnight meetings to see how he could stab Canada, nor did he hob-nob with and know all the intricate secrets of the Washington Cabinet, as they appear to be known to my hon. friend for North Norfolk. My hon. friend was in England as a private citizen, and openly, honestly, in the light of day, he tried to see if he could not draw closer those bonds of loving friendship that he hopes, and I hope, will ever unite us to the dear old mother land. And this action is to be brought up in this House, forsooth. He is to be asked what was the reason of this mission. Mission to whom? To his own fellow-citizens. When an hon. member of this House dares to visit the mother country, which gives us the protection of its army and navy and diplomatic service free of charge, whose people are ready to shed their blood for us, and who, at an expense of £800,000,000, have acquired their great Colonial Empire and handed it over to us, without demanding one farthing or

one fraction for the immense sacrifices they have made—when my hon. friend goes to the old country, to the dear old land, and addresses public assemblies, asking how we can enlarge our trade, he is, forsooth, to be called to account. If he had gone privately and shown to our enemies how they could best destroy this colony, if he had told them how best they could place us in such a position that we would be compelled to go down on our knees and accept the foreign yoke, if he had pointed out to them our most vulnerable part and told them how to inflict a death blow upon us, then hon. gentlemen opposite would have been prepared to receive him with open arms, to vote him a true patriot, one of their own party, and a man after their own heart. Shame to any hon. member who can be so narrow-minded in his ideas as to call to account any hon. gentleman because he openly, honestly, and in the light of day, sought to strengthen the ties that bind this colony to the mother country. Not content with attacking every principle held dear by my hon. friend, he attempted to turn my hon. friend's position into ridicule, by stating that he had only 3 per cent of the Empire's trade to offer. My hon. friend has none of the provincial ideas that characterize the speeches of the hon. gentleman. He went there as a citizen, not of Toronto, not of Bruce, not of Canada even, but he went there as a citizen of the British Empire, and as such he spoke to the people of a grand Imperial policy for Canada and the whole colonial empire. But my hon. friend from Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has told us that he does not speak to us as a Canadian, as a man with the same heart and sympathies as ourselves, bound to build up a great and mighty Empire, but he speaks to us peculiarly from a maritime point of view, just as if I were to address the House from a Toronto point of view, I had better address the House from the point of view of Toronto Centre, or speak as the representative of St. John's ward. It is too absurd. I might, of course, take that ground because I would then represent more citizens in that ward alone than the hon. gentleman represents in Queen's county; but I hope the day will never come that this country will be governed by such narrow ideas, that its representatives will be driven into such narrow views, or that when they decide the great question of the tariff or the great question of our future, they will consider whether a man is from the north, south, east or west of Canada. It is sufficient to know that he is a Canadian, that he has the same thoughts, the same desires and the same aims, and while I am proud to hail from the grand banner province of Ontario I am no less proud to welcome and see around me those from every other part of this Dominion. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said last night that we had stolen our policy from them, or as he eloquently put it, we had stolen their clothes. Well, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the utter nakedness of the hon.

gentlemen opposite, I think it must be true. A more tattered, ragged, tattered-demonion lot in politics I never saw. Their clothes have been stolen; but if the ideas of the tailor dated back to the time of the ideas of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, we must cut a sorry figure; they will take us to be masquerading in the clothes of the early part of the fifteenth century. No; we have no desire to masquerade in the clothes of the hon. Opposition. We have our own ideas, and unluckily or luckily for the country they cannot run in consonance with theirs. They are a narrow-gauge road entirely; it is only small traffic they will ever be able to carry. Sir, as I was showing the House, instead of grumbling as hon. gentlemen have done at every stage in connection with the construction of this great highway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, built to open up our great national birthright in the North-west, they as the special protectors of the farmers, as the special protectors of the labouring classes, should have regarded it in an entirely different light, because that very road which they oppose has expended in Canadian labour and in wages and in manufactured goods made in Canada by Canadians, no less than \$11,000,000, while this road, according to statements of the hon. member for North Norfolk, is indebted to the country in the sum of \$69,000,000. Those \$11,000,000 represent five times over the interest we pay on the \$60,000,000, and I have no doubt—I am not making one of the prophecies made by Sir Charles Tupper in which the hon. gentlemen profess to have very little confidence, but I am making a statement—that in a few years, instead of paying out in wages and on work \$11,000,000, the Canadian Pacific Railway will be paying a sum equal to the whole amount we now spend during the year for interest on public debt, for the collection of our revenue, and for every other purpose. I know no grander investment for this country, and no one can realize how immense is the acquisition made to our national assets by the value that has been given to that immense territory. Sir, I am not speaking of Ontario, or of Quebec, or of the Maritime provinces, or of British Columbia, but I am saying: that admitting there is a reduction of 25 per cent on the value of the farm land in Ontario, or in Quebec also, if you like; yet we have gained in the increased value of the assets of this country, far more than we have lost. And when agriculture in Ontario adapts itself to the changed circumstances of the country, as it will, we shall within ten years have regained much of the value which we have lost, and lost but temporarily, I hope. Sir, so bigoted seems to be the feeling on the part of the Opposition, that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is no fool, but a man up in many a wile, asked us coolly yesterday: Why do you not pay

Mr. COCKBURN.

the farmer \$1.25 per bushel for his wheat; as if, forsooth, the Government by its mere fiat could determine the price of wheat or anything else. Such a statement must either have been made with a desire of stirring up strife in this country, or it must have been the result of an ignorance more colossal than I can imagine. Does the hon. gentleman think, as they used to think in the Middle Ages, that the king by his decree can fix the price of commodities? Why, Sir, the price of wheat is fixed neither here in Canada, nor is it fixed in the United States, nor is it fixed in England, nor is it fixed, as we are apt to think, in Liverpool—the price of wheat is recorded, if you like, at Liverpool, and flashed by the telegraph across the Pacific and Atlantic oceans—but the price of wheat is determined far away in the northern plains of India, where we have to compete with the cheap labour that is to be had there, and our only hope of sustaining prices in our great North-west is that the people in India themselves will become consumers of the products they raise, and that then there will be a larger profit left for our Canadian farmers. What nonsense it is to complain of the price of wheat being lower now than it was years ago. Are there any goods for sale that are not lower in price? It would be a miraculous thing, if with all our improved machinery, and our means of multiplying labour, we were not able to provide for the working people and for ourselves, more comfort for the same money. It is a step in the advance of civilization, and the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) shows, that there is another Rip Van Winkle who wants to go back to the primeval times. The hon. gentleman dealt with our farmers, and he indulged in this cry of woe, which, when I first entered this House, I must confess, simple-minded as I was, went to my heart, and I thought what a terrible lot it must be for our poor farmers. Yesterday I began to doubt my own senses as my friend poured forth his lamentations on behalf of the farmer, and had I not got from him the assurance that every farmer in Canada paid a tax of \$105 every year—more duty than I think I pay myself—had I not got from him that assurance, and divided this \$63,000,000 that the farmers pay among them, I do not know but that I might have been unable to address you here his evening. Of course, after the cry of the farmers, comes the talk about the exodus, and my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) modestly placed it at a little sum of 1,250,000 people. He has shown, I think, conclusively, how more people have left Prince Edward Island than ever lived in it. Some of our friends can prove anything, but they ought to know that there is a certain brain power needed to discern the proper use of statistics, and not only that, but a certain disposition to regard them fairly, impartially, and scientifically, and if a man by use of statistics, is determined to prove in what a fearful condition this country is,

why, he would be a born fool if the statistics did not supply all the information he needs. Lord Bacon, in one of his essays, says: that a man brings back from a foreign country what he takes there; meaning that what he gathers in his travels depends very much upon his previous education, and I think that these hon. gentlemen opposite afford us a very fair illustration of the apothegm of Lord Bacon. Now, Sir, I think it was established very clearly the other evening by my friend, the Minister of the Interior, who I regret to see is not in his seat just now, for whom I have the highest respect, whom I have known from his childhood upwards and for whom I predict a brilliant career—the hon. Minister of the Interior showed us that yearly, during the last ten years, about 25,000 people have left this country; 250,000 in round numbers during the last ten years. Well, I do not think that a very large number. We know in fact that this exodus, about which so much has been said, started nearly one hundred years ago, started, in fact, with the early settlement of the country, and it will go on until such time as a kind of equilibrium is established between the northern and southern parts of this country. I do not know whether all of us are so enamoured of the thermometer 20 or 30 degrees below zero, or even at zero, that in immigrating we should select a country where the cold reaches that point. Accordingly it is but natural that settlers coming from Europe should find their way towards the south, and it is also natural that such of our own people as are obliged to leave the country, should go thither. Looking at this exodus we find the fact: That one-half, or over 13,000 of the 25,000 who left this country for the United States go to New England. Why is that? They go for two reasons; the chief of which is that they can find employment in the factories there. Now, if my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had kept to his original idea of over ten years ago, and built up the large cities in Canada that he spoke of as having been built up and affording such attractions in the United States; if he had kept steadily to his national policy at that time, at a time when he determined that there was nothing like protection to build up a city, the chances are that we would have been able to retain our present population. My hon. friend ought not to be hard on us, because you see we hold still to the opinions which he held some years ago, namely, that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by judicious protection. Here is what the hon. gentleman said in this very House of Commons:

I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion—

The agricultural interests, above all things.

—would be promoted by protection, and the manufacturer being brought to the door of the farmer—

Not away in Milwaukee or Chicago.

—would afford a market for a great many articles of

produce that would not be saleable in a market 3,000 miles away.

And then, warming up to his subject, with that ardent feeling which he displays in debate, he says:

With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist—

He always has him in view—

—can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops.

He says further:

It has been charged that protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country.

He is talking as usual of the United States.

That may be true; but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States last year reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000.

Well, I have just drawn his attention to the fact that our internal commerce last year in natural products was over \$300,000,000. Then he says:

What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade? Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cotton in 1824 British manufacturers crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the republic, but the imposition of 25 per cent duty on foreign cottons had the effect in a few years, not only of building up manufactures, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufactories before their own industries were established. In 1860 the United States were exporters of cottons, exporting nearly 10 per cent of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade. All attempts to establish iron industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals—higher, on the average, than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But when a protective duty was imposed iron manufactories were established, and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market.

Then, speaking about articles of food, he says:

It is simply because they have by protection built up manufacturing cities with a numerous population that consumes not only the vast products of their own country, but also afford a better market for our products than we in the Dominion possess.

These words are from the Budget debate, and are headed "Mr. Charlton, member for North Norfolk." Now, I ask the hon. gentleman to deal patiently with us. If the same light that dawned upon him has not yet, owing to the high heaven in which he soars, reached the sublunary sphere and illumined our minds, he must know that it is simply because of the transcendent distance of the great heaven above us, from which it sometimes takes a thousand years for a ray of light to strike the earth—and I hope the light will not strike us any sooner than that; and I have the hope that my hon. friend may yet have such light shed upon him that we shall have an illumination suit-

able to the occasion. Now, Sir, I have said that one-half of this exodus of 25,000 yearly went to New England, and went there because there they could get that work which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wished us to secure in Canada for our own people by the policy he was advocating. They are attracted thither by the large cities which he yesterday pointed out to us as our natural market, not thinking of the time when he considered the propriety of our building up large cities of our own where our farmers would find a market for their produce. And, Sir, there is this consideration, which is a very remarkable one, that, owing to the configuration of Canada, the problem that we have of building up our North-west is a much more difficult problem than that which has been given to the United States to solve; for, right alongside the Maritime provinces are these large manufacturing cities, to which transport is easy and cheap, and which access to and from is equally easy and cheap; so that it is but natural that the flow of emigration from this country, especially from the province of Quebec and the Maritime provinces, should be directed towards the manufacturing centres of the New England states; and I have no doubt that the desire of the Conservative party, and a part of their National Policy, is to build up such centres as will enable us to retain our own industries and our own population. Now, Sir, looking to the condition of the whole Dominion, as reviewed by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, I think he will admit that we have fair reason to be thankful, whether we are to look at the immense increase in the deposits of the banks—and here I cannot but draw the attention of the House to the statement made the other evening by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I did not think that, knowing as he did, the responsibility that must go with and the credence which would be given to words uttered by him, he would have been cruel enough to inflict such a wound upon Canada as to make the statement, however true it might be, that, however much we might boast of our deposits in the various banks, if a run were to set in on those banks, they would be unable to meet it. Sir, he knows as well as I do, and as every man in this House knows, that no bank in this world, not even the Bank of England nor the Bank of France, could stand against a run when that run becomes, as the hon. gentleman said, a universal one. It is impossible. Banks are the creation of credit, the creation of confidence, and it was a wrong thing of him to say anything that might tend to break that confidence which exists between the public and our banking system. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island told you that, no doubt, there were large savings accumulating in the banks and in the savings banks of the country, the Government savings banks and the post of-

Mr. COCKBURN.

office savings banks; but he said—and a glow of satisfaction pervaded his genial countenance when he said so—but they are withdrawing that money; last year they withdrew a million and a half, and they are going on withdrawing it. Why should it give any pleasure to our hon. friends to think that there should be any lack of confidence in the ultimate power of the Government or of this country to pay its debts? Why, Sir, he was correct in saying that there had been withdrawals, but why did he not mention the reason? He knows well the reason. There is no part of the Dominion where the savings per head are so large as they are in his own tidy little province. And they know both sides of a dollar as well and as clearly as any man in this world. And if they withdrew their deposits for awhile, why did they do so? Simply because the Government, feeling its own strength and feeling confident in the resources of the country, chose to offer one-half per cent less for the use of money. They had been paying 4 per cent before on deposits, and our friends in Prince Edward Island crowded in, but when the Government decided to pay only 3½, our Prince Edward Island friends hunted all round to see if there was any place where they could obtain four. They had a perfect right to do this; and now that the Government savings bank interest stands at 3½, the money is being again crowded in, because the banks, as a rule, are paying less than that. I thank the Lord that these laws of political economy are immutable, and that no Government or Opposition can change them, otherwise I think we would be in a very sad plight. We have seen, as the hon. gentleman says, our trade with the world increased. Last year I was glad to see an increase of \$15,000,000 in our trade with the mother land, but I regret to notice at the same time a diminution in our trade with our neighbours to the south of over \$2,000,000. Commerce admits of no prejudice. I care not where I trade. I am content to make a dollar from my cousin across the border, or a sovereign from my brother in England, or a franc from the Frenchman, or a lira from an Italian, or a mark from a German. They are all the same to me; all is fish that comes to my net; and, therefore, while I am glad to notice this great increase in our trade with the mother land—and the more glad because that market is not one of convenience like the market of the United States, but one on which we can steadily rely for a persistent and steady demand for our goods, which is of great importance in commercial matters—I regret that our trade has decreased with our neighbours to the south. Attention has been drawn also to the increase in railway travel and freight, which indicates a corresponding increase in the internal trade of the country, and I have already pointed out that our internal trade in farm products alone must be over \$300,000,000. We have seen at the same time an increase made in

our canals. It is well for us to remember that the transport by canal and by water is less than one-fifth the transport by rail, and I trust the time is not far distant when, in the interest not only of our brethren down by the Atlantic, but in the interest of the North-west—in fact, in the interest of the whole Dominion—those canals will be so enlarged that we shall be able to so cheapen transport down to the Maritime provinces, that the tax which now they cheerfully bear will be so alleviated that they will scarcely feel the burden. I wish to draw attention to the great increase in life insurance. If there is one thing more than another which shows the thrifty habits of a nation, it is the amount of life insurance; and I find that during the last year the amount carried exceeds by \$5,000,000 our whole of \$250,000,000 debt, which so appals the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). As an indication of increasing confidence in our resources by the outside world. I would draw attention to the fact that the subscriptions to our last loan in England were three times greater than the amount required. The progress of the country is indicated also by the decrease in the number of our insolvencies; and we see additional guarantees of our prosperity and progress in the fact that during the last ten years we have been relieved of burdens which, had they continued to the present, would have approximated some four and twenty millions. We have seen our progress also in the fact that 80 cents per head, or \$4 per family, of taxes were remitted last year, and that no less than 113 articles have been added to the free list under the Conservative Government. But yet, Sir, in spite of all these evidences of the great progress which this country has made, a spirit of unrest and disquiet exists; and I am glad to hear that the Government have determined to meet this spirit frankly, honestly and fairly, with such a policy as will be best for the country as a whole. I know that the feeling, rightly or wrongly, is gradually spreading throughout this country; that we are leaving, perhaps unwisely, the safe mooring in which we lodged, when we started the National Policy in the year 1879, and that if the Government is not careful against yielding to the clamorous demands made by many a one for increased protection, the ship of state may gradually drift away from those safe moorings and perhaps get wrecked on the rocks and shallows of Canadian McKinleyism. But I am happy to think that the Government have determined to grapple fearlessly with this matter. I know that the charge has been made from the Opposition side of the House that this commission of inquiry is not such a one as a calm consideration of the whole question would have justified. It has been pointed out that a spirit of unrest and disquiet and dissatisfaction must thereby be engendered. It has been urged that if two Ministers are to stay here at Ottawa during the summer with two

Controllers—embryo Ministers—to help them in this matter, a feeling of distrust will arise, and our industries will be partly, for a time, paralyzed. I think in opposition to that, however fair the argument may be, one may fairly place the confidence which the people have felt in the present Government that they will fulfil to the letter any promises they do make. I trust that the investigation which is about to be made will be conducted with the spirit and determination to carry out fully the promises made by the Finance Minister. I do not think that this policy, if entered upon in the spirit in which the coal oil and the binder twine questions are being dealt with, will be satisfactory to the country. Two very tender twigs have been delicately lopped off, shall I say, or rather pruned or trimmed on the parent tree; but the principle in the case of coal oil has been left standing, that the natural product should be protected by a tariff of over 500 per cent, while the same article, when refined by Canadian labour and brought into competition with American labour, is subject to a protection of only one-third that rate. I think, therefore, that when the commission takes up this question, they should take it up in no mere mincing spirit. Such, I believe, is not the spirit of the country now. I think it is evident that the Government will not be caught sleeping, as our friends were not many years ago, when they had to confess that they were so imbecile they knew not how to deal with the position. I have confidence that the Ministry will probe these questions to the bottom. But while they will apply the pruning-knife, I believe they will be careful how they handle it. Sir, this is a great question, requiring careful treatment. It is an important question how you ought to deal with a capital of \$353,000,000 invested in manufacturing; you must proceed carefully when you are dealing with the very life-blood, the wages, of 367,000 workmen, drawing an annual wage of \$100,000,000; you have to look twice before you move when you are to legislate so that you may affect \$475,000,000 of products, which yield a net profit, I suppose, of \$90,000,000 a year. When I look at these figures, I cannot but think of the rash over-confidence of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, who desires us to rush into the tariff revision at once. I can only attribute it to the narrowness of the spirit in which he has regarded everything, that he seems to think it as easy to deal with the \$353,000,000 of capital, the 367,000 employees, the \$100,000,000 of wages, and the \$475,000,000 of products as it would be for the tight little island in which he lives to settle the question of a new bridge, or of the improvement of a macadamized road. Sir, we can never forget that in dealing with the question of tariff we are dealing with the question of revenue. Three courses have been offered to us. We have free trade. But I think, under the present circumstances of our country, as Mr. Blake says, free trade is dead.

We have had Commercial Union. And the good sense of the people damned it. It was then trotted out as Unrestricted Reciprocity. But it was driven back with ignominy from the polls by the common sense of the people. And then these apostles, driven from every corner, found refuge in Continental Union. For a time they blinded the people with a mere shibboleth, but when the by-elections came, and after they had lost the golden money key with which they had solved many a difficulty, when Mr. Mercier was no longer to the fore, when we lay there abandoned by gods and men, when no more sums of \$28,000 could be filched from the poor workingmen of the Baie des Chaleurs to put up in elections, when no more sending for another hundred thousand—

An hon. MEMBER. Another ten thousand

Mr. COCKBURN. Ah, gentlemen, there was a time when we went another ten thousand, but they saw us and went ten times better. They called us. And it would require a generation of demoralization for the party of purity and principle to which I belong, to equal one tithe of the ignominy, the brazen, unblushing ignominy, with which they used the money filched from the horny-handed sons of toil of the province of Quebec. Driven to abandon Continental Union, their ideas have changed, and we have hon. gentlemen speaking in a grandiose way of the great Anglo-Saxon Union. But now another policy is propounded. It is no longer commercial union, it is no longer unrestricted reciprocity, it is no longer continental union, it is no longer even Anglo-Saxon union, but it is Freer Trade. But how come they to ask for freer trade? They have stood up there, to put it in their own elegant language, with both feet for free trade, and how can they have freer trade than free trade? I do not know. I cannot understand this wonderful proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He asks me here to agree with this: "Be it resolved that the Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion." Sir, we understand the term "classes" to mean a body of men distinct from the workingmen. Surely, it cannot be that our friends opposite are going to abandon the cry of the farmer and the workingman and run after the classes. Surely, they have ransacked heaven and earth, and I might say they have gone even lower, in search of some policy to cover them. And yet they seem as naked as the day when their political clothes were stolen from them. Not a step further can they march, and now, forsooth, they seek to pretend that they are the special guardians of the consuming classes; they, the men who tried to stop this \$11,000,000 from going to the employees and others through the Canadian Pacific Railway, the men who have tried to block every step of progress that has been attempted within the last five-and-twenty years by the

Mr. COCKBURN.

Liberal-Conservative party, the party that has given to the workingmen all the privileges that they now enjoy. I am asked to say "that the tariff should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade." I know not what sort of trade this can be. Can it mean that gentlemen opposite, finding themselves naked and utterly helpless and forlorn, weary and dispirited, have determined to throw themselves into our arms and say: We will take your policy; only make the trade a little freer, and let us down easy? I do not know that we ought to treat them as the prodigal son was treated, for their position is not exactly the same—he had at least the satisfaction of having had a good old time before he repented. I would like to offer them a mess of pottage, but I know not what to do with them. They are of our own blood; they are our kinsmen, and in the hour of adversity, in the hour of agony, in the last great trouble of their little existence, they come to us and say: It is only freer trade we want; we abandon Commercial Union, away with Reciprocity; down with Continental Union; trample under the foot Anglo-Saxon Unionism; we see no chance of ever reaching our haven, except by the path you have trodden, and our only hope is in taking lessons from you. Now, there is the question of Free Trade. We have afterwards to consider the question of tariff for revenue only to meet expenses. This seems to be partly what is aimed at by the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, "Such a sum as is required to meet the expenses of the Government efficiently and economically administered." I do not know what experience my friends have had in the management of government. Their ideas must be somewhat antediluvian. It is many a long day since they have had a chance of practising the art of government, and if there are a few stragglers left, oldish men who once on a time, in the distant past, sat on this side of the House, they may still have ideas left which may be of service to the public, and they may think that this Government is not economically and efficiently managed. I do not wish to say anything about efficiency, that I take for granted; but I can assure them, as to economy, I have tried in vain to melt the heart of the Finance Minister, and a harder and a meaner man, in money respects, I never met. Now, there is the third alternative, if I may use the word, still left to us, and that is, how to deal with the tariff for revenue and at the same time encourage our native industries. Now, I do not go in for free trade, I do not go in for tariff for revenue only. I still adhere to my principles of a national policy, and under the National Policy I wish a tariff for revenue, and I wish it supplemented by such an additional tariff, if I may use the words, as will foster and protect our native industries. It is a difficult task which has been assigned to the Government to determine how this

policy shall be apportioned. The quarrel with the Government just now, if there is any quarrel, is not in reference to the National Policy, it is with reference to the application of the principles of the National Policy. People think, after fourteen years' experience, that there are certain industries which have been fostered, and fostered, too, with a delicate hand, and which ought now to be self-supporting; and they think it unfair that if there are such industries, the public should have, out of their hard earnings, to supplement moneys which merely go into the pockets of the manufacturers. To illustrate what I mean, I should like to draw your attention to some remarks made the other evening by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Speaking of cotton goods, calicoes, he draws attention to the hardships of the tariff as they affect the workingman. Speaking of the duties on shirts, &c., being 48 per cent, he says:

The above duties are paid to the revenue as duties, and are received by the country: but the tariff is so arranged that on the coarser goods the specific duties per yard or per pound are so heavy that they are not paid at all as duties, and the poor man pays the higher tax on them to the protected manufacturer. That is, of course, what those high duties are for, and the result works beautifully. One or two examples of the effect of those specific duties in addition to the ad valorem duties upon the coarser kinds of cotton goods, the goods used by the poorer classes, will illustrate what I mean. I am not going to weary the House by a long list, such as I might give it, but I will only take three cases. Cotton shirtings, for instance, such as are worn by workingmen, are taxed 2 cents per square yard, specific duty, in addition to 15 per cent ad valorem. Imported goods of this kind, 27 inches in width, cost from 2d. to 4d. sterling per yard, averaging 3d., which in our currency is 6 cents per yard. This would be a tax of 2.40 per yard, or 40 per cent on cotton sheeting.

He says further on:

Our Canadian mills can supply the heathen Chinese with cottons without protection, while they extort \$4,000,000 per annum from the long-suffering Canadians by means of this tariff.

Now, I consider a statement of this kind most unfair. The gentleman must have known, if he made any inquiry, that such goods are not imported into this country, and that, although the tariff states there is a duty of 48 per cent on those goods, that duty is not exacted. I will illustrate my argument from facts of my own observation. I have here a statement showing the cost of certain descriptions of cotton goods in Manchester, with the rate of duty:

Description of Goods.	Sterling Cost	Present Duty.	Pay Duty.
Check shirtings and coloured cottons	s. d.		p. c.
do	0 2 $\frac{1}{2}$	2c. per s. yd. & 15 p.c.	48
do	0 4 $\frac{1}{2}$	2c. do 15 do	32
do	0 6	2c. do 15 do	28
do	0 7	2c. do 15 do	26
do	0 8	2c. do 15 do	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
do	0 9	2c. do 15 do	23 $\frac{1}{2}$
do	0 10	2c. do 15 do	22 $\frac{1}{2}$

Description of Goods.	Sterling Cost	Present Duty.	Pay Duty.
Gray and bleached cotton	s. d.		p. c.
do	0 2 $\frac{1}{2}$	1c. per lb. & 15 p.c.	36
do	0 3 $\frac{1}{2}$	1c. do 15 do	28
do	0 4 $\frac{1}{2}$	1c. do 15 do	27
do	0 6	1c. do 15 do	23 $\frac{1}{2}$
do	0 7	1c. do 15 do	22
do	0 8	1c. do 15 do	21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Flannels, wool, 4 oz. to yd.	0 6	10c. per lb. & 20 p.c.	40
do	0 9	10c. do 20 do	34
do	1 0	10c. do 20 do	30
do	1 4	10c. do 20 do	28
do	1 7	10c. do 20 do	26 $\frac{1}{2}$
do	1 10	10c. do 20 do	25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Tweeds, cloth, 8 oz. to yd.	0 9	10c. do 20 do	42
do	1 0	10c. do 20 do	40
do	1 6	10c. do 20 do	36
do	2 6	10c. do 20 do	28
do	3 6	10c. do 20 do	26
do	5 0	10c. do 20 do	24
Tweeds, cloth, 12 oz. to yd.	0 10 $\frac{1}{2}$	10c. do 20 do	56
do	1 4	10c. do 20 do	43
do	1 10	10c. do 20 do	37
do	2 8	10c. do 20 do	34
do	3 6	10c. do 20 do	29
do	5 0	10c. do 20 do	26
Overcoatings, 28 oz. to yd.	1 2	10c. do 20 do	80
do	1 8	10c. do 20 do	64
do	2 2	10c. do 20 do	54
do	3 0	10c. do 20 do	44
do	4 0	10c. do 20 do	38
do	5 0	10c. do 20 do	34
do	7 6	10c. do 20 do	30
Gray blankets, per lb.	0 4 $\frac{1}{2}$	10c. do 20 do	130
do	0 9	10c. do 20 do	87
White blankets, per lb.	1 0	10c. do do do	62
do	1 6	10c. do do do	47
do	2 0	10c. do do do	40
do	2 6	10c. do do do	36
do	3 0	10c. do do do	33

Printed and dyed cottons 32 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c., as used by the masses.

Silks, satins and silk velvets 30 p. c., as used by the classes.

I want to draw the attention to the fact that, owing to the fostering action of the National Policy, on certain grades of woollen, cotton and other manufactures, we are able now to produce these goods cheaper than we are able to import them; but at the same time I cannot but feel with hon. gentlemen opposite that they have a ground of complaint, and that is, that the tariff should remain fixed as it is. I may be told that the tariff is kept at 48 or 35 or 26 per cent with a view to protecting our country from being made a slaughter-market. That may be the case. But I think our manufactures, especially of this class of goods, are either able now to stand entirely alone or should do with such a moderate tariff in the shape of protection as would enable them to carry on their business. I would not, however, leave it to

any Government to interfere directly with the course of trade on the ground that a "combine" might exist. Of course, so long as we have a tariff of 48 per cent on those cottons, we are holding out a direct incentive, an incentive more or less direct, to the manufacturers in this country to combine and raise the price of cottons, and it is perfectly possible under such a tariff that they would reap enormous profits. At the same time I would not wish to establish such a tariff, and leave it to the Government, or leave it to any Government, however great my confidence may be in this Government, to control, by special interference, the commercial interests of this country. Well, Sir, at the same time I may notice with respect to the specific duty that it does bear hardly on the poorer class. We have heard, and we all know, that the poorer classes of goods have fallen 50 per cent in value; they are down to one-half what they were before. The poor man is not getting the benefit of this to the full extent, inasmuch as the specific duty remains the same, while the article itself may have dropped one-half. The specific duty on a pair of stockings would remain the same to the poor man, although the article itself had fallen one-half in value. I think, therefore, in any rearrangement of the tariff it would be advisable, as far as practicable—I know in many cases it cannot be done, and there must be a specific duty—that due regard should be had to placing the duties on the basis of ad valorem duties. In conclusion, I have merely to say that I trust we will remain one country, prepared to assume our own burdens, and that we will be careful to enter into no embarrassing commercial treaties. I think the experience we have had during the past years ought to give us confidence in ourselves. We have seen the McKinley Bill place upon us an iron hand, and for the moment even those who had confidence in this country seemed to waver; but the Liberal-Conservative party stood firm, and we have shown by our action that we are able in an efficient manner to manage our own commercial affairs. You may make a treaty with the United States, you may make a treaty with England or with France. There are certain undeniable advantages, I admit; but, at the same time, you are taking a young country and forcing its commerce into a particular groove, and after ten or fifteen years, when its commerce has fallen into that particular channel, you may find the treaty suddenly rescinded, and the trade of this country thrown back, with all the disorganization of commerce which such a change naturally involves. I trust, therefore, we will be careful not too much to complicate our position with commercial treaties entered into with any country whatever. Naturally enough, we are looking to the new policy of the Democrats in the United States. Our hon. friends opposite seem to laugh, and think it odd we should consider that question. I think that one plea might have been put

Mr. COCKBURN.

forward for delaying the tariff, namely, while there were great dangers in delay, especially after the proclamation had gone forth that an inquiry would take place, it was to be expected that we must take account of the changes that might be made by the new Democratic party in the United States. No people can live alongside a nation of 65,000,000 souls, with a boundary line, undistinguishable at many points, extending for 3,000 miles, without our tariff being more or less influenced or controlled by them. I trust in the new tariff to which we are to be treated next session, a fair and reasonable protection will be given, such as is necessary to establish and protect industries that will take permanent root in the country and may be expected ultimately to stand alone. For my own part, I trust that the consumer will no longer be forced to pay a duty under a protective tariff to encourage the manufacture of those goods in this country which have been bonused or offered to be bonused during the last fourteen years, and of which no manufacture has yet been attempted, for this duty neither aids nor protects any one, and fails in its purpose. It oppresses the consumer and it adds unnecessarily to the burden which he has to bear. But this, however, is not the only objectionable result, for if it were, it might be borne; but the English manufacturer, who supplies this market, finding that when the duty is added to the value of the goods, the article he is sending becomes too expensive, produces an inferior article of a value calculated to meet the views of purchasers, and thus we are doing injury to ourselves, and our protective tariff is not contributing to benefit the interests of the country. I trust, therefore, that the protection afforded to such goods will be lopped off, as no attempt has been made or will be made to manufacture them in this country. I am glad to hear that railway bonuses will be diminished. Cheaper living is an essential condition to the progress of the country, and to the filling up of our great North-west, and however much I trust our young friend, the Minister of the Interior, in whom I have expressed such unbounded confidence, to fill up that vast territory under his control, the first and the greatest desideratum will be to make the country as cheap to live in as the corresponding country to the south of us. I trust, therefore, that all expenses not necessary will be cut down, and that some steps will be taken to reduce the railway bonus system. So far as my experience goes, it has not been fraught with unqualified advantage to the country, and I think we have arrived at that time when we may consider how we may considerably reduce such bonuses, and ask such enterprises to stand on their own commercial basis.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, sometimes with earnestness and sometimes in a spirit of banter, criticised the motives of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and ac-

cused him of narrowness of spirit and of bitterness; but, in all his long speech, he made no attempt to answer the arguments of the hon. member, nor did he dispute one of the statements made by that hon. gentleman. He indulged in the usual frantic effort to prove the prosperity of the country by the use of figures, quoting the values of bank and other stocks, which, according to his argument, prove that the people are prosperous. He referred us to the poverty of the American farmers, and to the fact that their lands were heavily mortgaged, and he implied that the Canadian farmers ought to be content to be poor, because their American neighbours, engaged in the same calling, were poor also. That reminds me of the man whose crop was destroyed by a storm, which had also destroyed the crops of his neighbours, and who consoled himself by piously exclaiming that he thanked God his neighbours were as badly off as himself. Therefore, according to the hon. gentleman, the Canadian farmer, if mortgaged, and if labouring under a heavy load of indebtedness, can also console himself by piously exclaiming that he thanks God that the American farmer is heavily mortgaged as himself. But, singularly enough, after having dwelt for some time on the fact of American mortgages, he assured us that mortgages on farm lands were a sign of prosperity, and that, as discounts indicated a healthy vitality in trade, so mortgages indicated prosperity among the farmers. I commend this view to the farmers of the country who are labouring under the disadvantages of heavily mortgaged lands. The hon. gentleman also offered as an evidence of the prosperity of the farmers, the fact that, whereas some time ago—he did not state the year—the mortgagees were in default to the extent of 8½ per cent; last year, after having marketed a magnificent crop, the farmers were in default only 2 per cent. The fact that they were in default at all, surely shows that there was something wrong, because the harvest of 1891, which they had just marketed, was one the like of which we have not had for very many years. The hon. gentleman accused the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) with having objected to the selection of the route which had been selected by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Why, it is well known that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is going to construct a road from Dunmore to Hope, a town near the coast across the Crow's Nest Pass, so as to shorten the distance between the east and west, but chiefly to avoid the terrible 4½ per cent grade in the Kicking Horse Pass, which shows that the objection to the original route was well taken by my hon. friend. Three times the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) told us of the \$11,000,000 that were spent by the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the traffic earnings which were contributed by the people of this country. Ex-

actly what point in support of the policy of the Government he was endeavouring to make I fail to see, as I think hon. members of the House also fail to see. He assured us that the construction of that road, and the opening up of the lands of the North-west was the one sole cause of the depreciation of the values of land in the province of Ontario, but he said we had compensative advantages, and that, while it was true that our lands had decreased in value in the older provinces to the extent of at least 25 per cent, yet the lands of the North-west had increased in value. He waxed eloquent over his breadth of spirit and stated that he was not so narrow as to look at the questions from a circumscribed point of view, but that he looked at them from a national point of view, and so he said that the increased value of the land in the North-west compensated us for the decreased value in our lands. Exactly what share of the increase in the values of North-west lands, the farmers of Ontario are to enjoy he did not tell us. The earnest denunciation of the National Policy, which he made at the National Club banquet in Toronto, on the 21st of December last, found but a very faint echo in his speech of to-night. The hon. member (Mr. Cockburn) then said: That it was the duty of the Government to radically modify the tariff, reform it, and also to cultivate the closest and most friendly trade relations with the United States. Now, after having for years denounced the Liberal party for advocating a policy of "looking to Washington," he calmly to-night advises the Government to delay the readjustment of the tariff until they will ascertain what the people at Washington are going to do. That is certainly a deliberate advocacy of the policy of "looking to Washington." It was rather unfair of the hon. gentleman—and I was sorry to hear him make the allusion after the statement made by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening—to say that that hon. gentleman had made a midnight visit to Washington to see how he could stab Canada.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I never said anything about a midnight visit.

Mr. DAWSON. I accept, of course, the hon. gentleman's correction; but that is what I distinctly understood him to say. Then, amending it, the hon. gentleman alluded to the visit of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to Washington to see how he could stab Canada.

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me again to draw his attention to the fact that I never did say that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) went to Washington. I did not say he ever went to Washington. He has a perfect right to go to Washington. I go to Washington myself, and I am glad to meet him there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Then what did you say ?

Mr. COCKBURN. What I said was, that my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) did not go to Washington. That is what I said, and I know he did not go to Washington.

Mr. DAWSON. Then the hon. gentleman did say that the hon. member from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) did not go to Washington to endeavour to stab Canada, and that was a deliberate allusion to the incident that occurred in this House a few evenings ago, when the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was accused of having visited Washington for that purpose. At any rate, a deprecatory allusion to the fact that any hon. gentleman should visit Washington, and that he is esteemed by the statesmen of a country with whom England is at peace, certainly discloses a very serious narrowness of spirit. It is no crime for any man to be esteemed by the statesmen of any land ; that any hon. gentleman in this House is esteemed by the statesmen of that great country certainly must confer honour upon him. Such narrowness is unworthy of any member of this House, though perhaps it might be worthy of a St. John's ward politician. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would have us believe that in these later days it is a crime to visit Kentucky in search of a wife.

Mr. COCKBURN. Order.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Canada is to be congratulated, and the people of Canada are to be congratulated, that the Finance Minister was in the position to make the statement he did in introducing his Budget speech. He triumphantly says : that the record of our trade for the last year is one for which you might search the Returns in vain to find an equal. He points triumphantly to the figures of our imports and exports, and he makes the announcement in such a tone as to inspire the vociferous applause of his followers : that our imports increased 6½ per cent, and our exports increased 15½ per cent ; that the volume of our exports increased in the year from \$98,000,000 to \$113,000,000. The people of Canada are to be congratulated, that the Finance Minister is able to make this statement ; but he seemed to take the whole credit to himself for the increase of exports. What was the cause of the increase of our exports ? The simple fact that the harvest of 1891 was a bountiful one, and that the results of marketing it were included in the returns for the year ending the 30th June, 1892. It is the farmers who are in a position to say :

We plough the field and scatter
The good seed on the land,
But it is fed and watered
By God's Almighty hand.

What have the Government to do with it ?
Though the farmer sows the seed, the Gov-

Mr. DAWSON,

ernment would have us believe that it is they who give the increase. They point to the expansion of the exports, and, while admitting that the farmers had something to do with it, they triumphantly exclaim : " We did this. It was Betsy and I that killed this bear." I look over the exports, and I find that the increase in the value of the exports was as follows :—Pease, \$1,400,000 ; rye, \$2,000,000 ; oats, \$2,000,000 ; wheat, \$8,000,000 ; and cheese, \$2,000,000. Here is our whole \$15,000,000 of increase or more, in these five items alone. Every other item of increase in our exports is balanced by an equal shrinkage in the value of our exports. It is ridiculous for the Government to claim that they caused the increase in our exports. We had \$8,000,000 worth of wheat and \$2,000,000 worth of rye—these are two items in which the Ontario farmer, the farmer of the province of Quebec, and the farmer of the Maritime provinces have but little interest, for we know that the cultivation of rye is not a very desirable thing, and these provinces are not now producing a very large quantity of wheat. The \$8,000,000 put in circulation by this export of wheat was of very little benefit to the farmers in these older provinces. It was circulated throughout the North-west, and it is finding its way east in payments for agricultural implements and other supplies for the farmers of that part of the country. Undoubtedly it was felt in a quickened trade in our cities, but it failed to better the condition of the eastern farmers. For many years the condition of the farmers in Canada has not been what every fair-minded man would wish it to be and what many men think it ought to be. This has been recognized by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the press serving them throughout the country. Some years ago the press undertook to give some advice to the farmers. Among other things they advised them to grow better paying crops, such as two-rowed barley, to raise hens that would lay big eggs, to breed \$250 horses instead of \$125 horses, and to go in for cheese and bullocks for the English market. Well, Mr. Speaker, the farmers went in for growing two-rowed barley, and their crop was a pretty considerable one. In 1892 they marketed 5,200,000 bushels for \$2,600,000 ; but the year before they marketed 4,900,000 bushels for \$2,900,000. Although we sold 300,000 bushels of barley more in 1892 than we did in 1891, we received \$300,000 less for the crop ; and now the farmers may be justified in saying : Let any fool who may, grow two-rowed barley ; the two-rowed barley advocated so stoutly in the Blue-books of the Dominion, has proved to be a miserable failure and has entailed vast loss on the farmers of this country. The farmers also raised hens that laid big eggs, but they could get no hen to guarantee that her eggs would be fresh when placed upon the English market. It is unpatriotic, perhaps, to doubt the value of the English market ; but in spite of all that has

been said and written in favour of the English market, in spite of all the efforts made to put that market to the best use in the past, the ugly fact stares us in the face, and the public records of the country confirm it, that our export trade in eggs has fallen off \$80,536. The farmers bred \$250 horses, to find that nobody wanted them at that price, and very few at any price. The loss of the United States market, it was said, would be made good by the opening up of other markets. It was said that Great Britain would take from us all the horses that we could raise of a class suitable for the British trade. We have such horses in large numbers; there are stables full of them all over the land, as the farmers in this House can testify, but there is nobody wanting them. Last year we found that England purchased from us only 1,369, against 9,261 which we sent to the United States, in spite of tariff restrictions, while all the rest of the world purchased from us only 433 horses, leaving as I said, our stables full of horses unsold and unsaleable, for want of a market. Our trade in the year fell off \$88,000. We raised bullocks for the British market, and last year our exports of live stock fell off a round million of dollars and rather more. The sales of cheese increased \$2,000,000. The Government did this, of course. It was to their policy that was due the abundant pasturage of the preceding year, the better prices in the English market the fact that the farmer kept out of their natural market for beans, barley, eggs, horses and many other commodities that had previously been selling freely therein, had enlarged their dairies. None of these facts had anything to do with the increase in our exports. It was simply because of the paternal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They take credit for every item of increase in our exports, and among others, our increased exports of cheese last year. In spite of our swollen exports, in spite of the records contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns, the cry has gone up that the tariff must be reformed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have joined us in that cry. The fact that they are crying out for reform betrays their belief in the rottenness of every branch of the National Policy tree. It betrays their fear that that tree, which they planted in 1878, and whose growth and development has been at the expense of the people, is tottering to its fall, and they wish to stand from under. Judging by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, some of which are very figurative, one would think that they at last saw that this structure which they had so carefully erected, this National Policy temple, which had been built upon the sands of false principles of political economy, is now so wrecked by the floods of criticism which have been falling upon it these many years, that they dare not take out so much as a brick from the wall of the tottering edifice, lest it should fall about their ears and bury them in its

ruins. Now, we have heard a good deal of the promises made, that knavish manufacturers who combine for the purpose of plundering the public, should be punished. Many manufacturers have availed themselves to the fullest extent of the privileges accorded to them by the policy of protection pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. Many big fortunes had been made by those who have had the care of these infant industries. The nursing of such infants seems to have been profitable to their parents and to their sponsors in this House, many of whom, no doubt, owe their seats to the peculiar influences exerted by the owners of those industries. Protected by law against competition from without, they combine to kill competition at home. I admit that it is possible for manufacturers to combine for a legitimate purpose. The Ottawa "Citizen" a little time ago cited the case of an industry of this class. Speaking of the Standard Oil Trust, the Ottawa "Citizen," in its editorial columns, said:

It has aimed at the concentration of identical interests in order to facilitate economy in management and in the methods of operation. It has improved the quality of illuminating oil, lowered the price, and vastly increased the business. The history of this combine is one of remarkable interest. In 1872 refined oil sold at wholesale for 25 cents per gallon; in 1890 the average price was 7 cents per gallon. In the cost of this article \$285,000,000 per year were saved to the public by the reduction in price.

Now, if combines would bring about such results as that, we would have very little fault to find with them. They are here represented to aim at the concentration of identical interests, in order to promote economy in operation, with a view to reduction of the cost and consequent lower prices. But this is not the method pursued by the combinesters of this country. There are many manufactures that are of immense value to the country. There are many which are essential to the development of the wealth of the country; there are many which are doing their share in building up our country. In fact, one may say that the great bulk of them are. In so far as I am concerned, the only war I would wage is against the pampered manufacturers who abuse and rob the people to whose forbearance they owe their ability to plunder. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, promised reform. He said:

I would not give a measure of protection to any industry which would give it the opportunity of taking unduly from the pockets of the people by creating combines and monopolies, and thus making itself a burden instead of a benefit to the country.

Now, a few days ago, speaking of combines, the Toronto "Globe" said that they were easier to form than to detect. It is not often easy to get on the track of these gentlemen. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they will spend a year gathering information. Well, I can give them some information now, and I will place upon the records of this House

a case that I think I can prove against one combine at least. It's not one of the largest, but it is an important industry in this country. I refer to the Trunk and Bag Manufacturers' Association of Canada, limited, of course, in everything but cheapness. There are fifty-six of these factories, according to the census returns, employing 810 hands. Some time ago I received a circular, as follows, re The Trunk and Bag Manufacturers Association of Canada (limited) :—

TORONTO, 12th January, 1893.

DEAR SIR,—We beg to advise you that after this date the above association, which comprises all the leading trunk and bag manufacturers throughout Canada will sell at the prices and "terms" they have agreed upon. Revised price list and terms will be mailed you in a few days.

Yours truly,

(Sd.) R. T. JENKINS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Shortly after receiving that circular I sent a small order to a firm in Toronto, and received, in reply, this letter :

TORONTO, 30th January, 1893.

DEAR SIR,—Your esteemed order received, but before shipping thought better to send invoice as the prices are slightly increased thereon by the trade association. If you desire goods at once as per invoice "inclosed," please telegraph instructions at our expense.

Yours respectfully,

(Sd.) THE M. LANGMUIR MFG. CO.
OF TORONTO (LTD.).

JOHN DEGRUCHY, Secretary.

I received a price list from that firm on 1st July, 1892, but shortly after the receipt of this letter they sent me another price list dated 13th January, 1893. I went carefully over the whole list and found that it contained 445 articles. They had reduced the price of two only, left sixty-six untouched, and had advanced the price of 377. I carefully added together the values of these 377, and found that the increase in price amounted almost exactly to 11½ per cent, a very considerable advance in six months; so that while neither wages nor raw material had increased, the prices, under the shelter of a protecting tariff of 30 per cent, had increased. They simply followed the lead of the sugar refiners, the cotton manufacturers, the binder twine twistors, and other owners of industries throughout the country, and combined to advance prices for their own gain. With reference to this little industry, I join the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in his demand, and call upon the Minister of Finance to punish this combine by withdrawing its protection. Protection is profitable to all in the ring. It is very profitable to be able, at a time when the cost of production has not been increased, to increase the price 11½ per cent. But the farmer has no such power. There is no method by which he can avail himself of combinations to raise his prices. The only way in which he can be protected is by letting him buy his supplies

Mr. Dawson.

in the cheapest market, and find markets into which it will be most profitable for him to sell. He wishes for tariff reform, but hon. gentlemen opposite, learned in the law and medicine, assure the farmers that they require no reformation of the tariff, that their condition is just right as it is. They differ from the Patrons of Industry and the agricultural societies who are petitioning this House for the abolition of the duties on binder twine, coal oil, barb wire and agricultural implements. These men complain that the duties press heavily on the agricultural class, but hon. gentlemen opposite know better, and say that these men do not know what they are talking about. There is a duty of 30 per cent on stoves; 31 per cent on clothing; 33 per cent on flannels; 38 per cent on under clothing; 35 per cent on implements for the farms and on furniture for the home, on horse shoes, harness, chains, gloves, mitts, rubber clothing, on mowers, reapers, drills etc.; 36½ per cent on bar iron; 49 per cent on barb-wire fencing; 63 per cent on clothes wringers; 64 per cent on bolts from England, and 43 on bolts from the United States. These figures are taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year. There is 48 per cent on the farmer's cheap wagon or cart, and 40 per cent if he buys a better one, and 35 per cent on a still better. These are the burdens placed on our farmers and artisans by our present tariff; and if by that tariff you have at last forced the farmer to give up his farm and turn navy, you charge him 30 per cent on his wheelbarrow. Cotton yarns for manufacturers you admit free, but the farmer's housewife, if she wishes to use yarn on her 30 per cent knitter must pay 24 per cent. Surely he can take consolation in the fact that his 48 per cent wagon will jolt less violently when passing the rich man's carriage, which is admitted under 35 per cent. If his back aches under 35 per cent, 38 per cent, 49 per cent and 64 per cent burdens, will it not console him to know that silks and velvets are charged only a duty of 30 per cent; if he has to pay 63 per cent on his wife's clothes wringer, he will be comforted by reflecting that the combiner's wife can import her jewellery of gold and silver at 20 per cent, and can bring in all the costly paintings which adorn her parlours, free of duty. The demand is made that the burdens of the people shall be lightened. I sincerely hope, in the interest of this country, that the Government will listen to that demand. But, also, it is demanded that markets be found, that markets be opened everywhere, but particularly in the great nation to the south of us. It was said that in compensation for the loss of the American market we were developing a trade with the British West Indies. Sir, I hold in my hand a circular signed by a ship-owner, a manufacturer, a brewer and a merchant advocating the employment of a gentleman to travel through

Canada to instruct and encourage our people to develop the Canadian West India trade. This circular says: "It is most important that this gentleman's services should be secured, as the Canadian trade"—with the West Indies—"outside of fish is in greater danger of drying up than at any former time." This shows that we are not developing a market with the British West Indies. We are not getting any market that compensates us for the market we have lost, and, therefore, an honest attempt must be made, and made at once, to recover for us the market of the United States. In spite of the colossal tariff barrier, a mighty trade has been flowing across the line which separates these two countries. This barrier has been strengthening for years, and yet the trade in 1891 was 28 per cent greater than the trade of 1878. But the enemies of trade brought their work to a climax in the McKinley Bill, a measure which was meant to be prohibitory, as the National Policy was meant to be prohibitory; yet, under the operation of that Bill our trade with the United States fell off last year less than 3 per cent, and now stands \$92,000,000, out of the \$241,000,000 of our total trade. Nearly 40 per cent of our total trade with the world is with the United States. If these barriers were removed between the two countries, such a mighty flow of trade would set in between them as would result inevitably in the enrichment of the people who dwell here. Every Canadian enterprise would be benefited. But we have among us some industries, a few limp, boneless, jelly-fish infants, which, after thirteen years of coddling are still crying out for more protection, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I care not how soon the worthless existence of such coddled infants is closed for ever by the inrush of honest competition. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) declared that in the face of American competition our home industries would suffer, our factories would be closed and our commerce destroyed. Let those who will believe this report. No man wishes the manufacturers of this country to be subjected to competition with the American manufacturers without warning. That has been repeatedly set forth by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But we have in our country unlimited water-power, magnificent transportation facilities, an industrial population which for intelligence, honesty and industry is unequalled on the face of the globe, so, why cannot our manufacturers compete with the Americans on this continent of America? We have in this Canada of ours less call for tall chimneys than other countries, because we have a better power than steam in our unlimited water-powers. There is no reason why our countless streams should not be lined with manufactories, except the fact that we lack a market for the output. Give us the American market and such a hum of industry would arise as would inspire even

the Minister of Railways and Canals with faith and confidence in Canadians. Enlarge our markets in that direction for our fishermen, and I venture to prophesy that the increase in our trade would be half a million dollars instead of the pitiful \$47,000 of last year. Open the markets for our minerals and I am certain our exports would exceed those of the present time by at least a million of dollars. Open the market there for our lumber and we would have an increased trade instead of a decrease of two millions of dollars as we had last year. There would be no necessity for an export duty on logs then, because the logs would not leave this country. They would be sawn, dressed and manufactured in the building material here, providing employment for tens of thousands in addition to the vast army now employed by this unprotected industry. As to the benefit which would result to the farmer it is unnecessary to argue. It is said, among other things, that Canadians could not stand the competition of the Americans in dairy products. The export of dairy products from the United States, in 1892, was \$11,000,000, against about \$12,750,000 from the Dominion of Canada. What does this mean? Does it mean that the United States are non-producers of dairy products? Not at all; it simply means that the Americans have in their own country an immense home market and the quantity which they had to sell abroad was a million and three-quarters less than we had to send out. Now, their centres of population are as easy of access to the farmers of our country as to the farmers of the United States. We produce an admittedly superior dairy product, and, if their markets were opened to us, our dairy farmers could compete with theirs in their own market. Both countries are exporters of beef and bread-stuffs. The home market prices in both are ruled by the prices received for the exports. Whether the product is sold at home or abroad, the price remains the same to the farmer. But by the development of trade with the United States, the freeing of trade from the shackles at present put upon it, the farmer would derive untold benefits in the market on many of his commodities, particularly on his eggs, barley, horses, poultry, lambs, hay and dairy products. Let us have this market. Let the hon. gentlemen settle down to business. Let them go to this new government in the United States determined to negotiate a treaty on business principles. As patriotic Canadians, let them consider what is best for Canada, leaving British statesmen to manage the trade concerns of the mother land. To Canadian hands Great Britain has entrusted the destiny of Canada. It is the duty of the statesmen of this country to do what they can to make Canada great and prosperous. It is not disloyal, it cannot be disloyal, to enter into a trade treaty with a friendly power which would benefit Canada. If, to secure that treaty, Canada was called

upon to sacrifice her honour, it could not benefit Canada, and no Canadian would favour such a treaty. Let the hon. gentlemen inform the Americans that Liberals and Conservatives will demand as a first principle that the treaty to be agreed upon shall be a business matter, in no sense involving the political destiny of either country. For hon. gentlemen to go into the United States in any other spirit would be sure to bring upon them the contempt of the men who have built up the great nation to the south of us, of which all Anglo-Saxon people are proud. The hon. gentlemen have rendered difficult the negotiation of any trade duty. They are playing into the hands of the jingo minority of the United States by proclaiming what they know is not true—that the Liberals of Canada are advocating annexation and doing what they can to bring it about. Well they know that should danger threaten this country brave Liberal hearts and strong Liberal hands would unite with others to preserve on the map of America the beloved name of Canada. Reform is demanded by the people; enlarged markets are demanded by the people; better markets are demanded by the people. If the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches will not readjust the tariff so as to remove the intolerable burthens now crushing the people of this country; if they will not remove the National Policy tree, which has been condemned by the people who planted it, whose branches are admittedly rotten; if they will not cease legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many; if they will not, or cannot, negotiate a treaty with our neighbours; let the people of Canada rise and at the next general election drive these hon. gentlemen from the Treasury benches; let them arise and replace these men by others who will make an honest attempt to effect a treaty which will be honourable to both countries and a benefit to Canada, replace them by those whose tariff legislation will not enable the few to amass fortunes wrung from the hard earnings of the sons of toil, replace them by men who will give an equal chance in this country to all, by men who will, above all, give the people an honest, clean, business-like Government whose purity is guaranteed by the spotless character of our beloved leader.

Mr. LACHAPPELLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will forgive me if I spare it the preamble which necessarily precedes the maiden speech of every new member. I will therefore enter immediately upon the subject of the debate; and I will say that the main point of the great contest which has been going on for some years in connection with the National Policy bears, as ever with our opponents, on the Budget Speech by the hon. Minister of Finance. Our opponents hope, every time, that the new speech by the Minister of Finance will be for them something of a Troy horse.

Mr. DAWSON.

which will permit them to enter the fortress of power. That is the reason why the debate is so keen, so violent, on their side. I will not treat the question, Mr. Speaker, from a dogmatic nor a theoretical point of view. However, before going into details, I will take the liberty to say—and experience is there that shows it—that if one consults the authorities, the men who have given their attention to this serious question, one will find on the one hand that the philosophers and theoreticians are generally in favour of free trade, while on the other hand the practical men of all countries are in favour of protection. Such is, Mr. Speaker, what one finds if one wants to study this serious question from a theoretical standpoint. It is not, however, from that point of view that I wish to speak to this hon. assembly, and I immediately enter into details. Protection, that is to say, the National Policy, was introduced in our country in 1878. We all know under what circumstances it was inaugurated. It was an absolutely necessary means of bringing back to the country a prosperity which had been steadily decreasing during the four years which the Liberal Government had passed in power. It was under those circumstances that the lamented Sir John A. Macdonald thought proper to resort to a new scheme, a move which was absolutely urgent, to rescue the country. He said so himself in proper terms, he wrote it then in the programme of that day, that protection was to have as a result the national prosperity; that it was necessary in a country as young as ours. Now, ever since 1878, has the National Policy been repudiated by the people of Canada? Every time the electorate was consulted—first in 1878, then in 1882, in 1887, in 1891, and in the forty by-elections which took place since the last general elections—was not the verdict of the people always the same? In face of that, the National Policy must be the policy of the Dominion of Canada, and must remain its policy. These are facts on which we must rest. Our opponents could not challenge the force of these facts. The country continues to give the Government its confidence, since it continues to believe that their policy makes its prosperity. This is an unassailable and irrefutable proof. Not to admit such a proof given and reiterated by the electors, is to challenge it, a thing which would hardly be proper on the part of a representative of the people. We, the members who support the Government, have held and continue to hold that this policy has realized the hopes of those who have introduced it in the country, and that it continues to bear the fruits that were expected from it. Such is the reason why we, the supporters of the Government, are obliged to continue them our confidence, and say to our hon. opponents of the Opposition: Your amendment having in view a modification of the National Policy, could not receive our support. Mr. Speaker, a perusal of the public

documents showing the public wealth, is enough to confirm us in the opinion we hold. I will not enter into details, as a large number of figures would fatigue the House; the thing has been gone over, and to repeat it would be idle. I will only call the attention of the House to certain special facts which have not, perhaps, been presented, as I wish they had been, and as I purpose to present them. An essential point which seems to me to have been overlooked is the following: The imports into the country have been spoken of. The point I wish to bring under your attention is not the figures which represent those imports, but the special character thereof. I find in that the necessary elements of proof for establishing that the protective tariff is a guarantee of industrial activity and of public wealth. I suppose that if there enters in the country two millions of raw material while there entered formerly two millions of manufactured goods, I am justified in saying that the two millions of raw material represent four times that value by the transformation which this material has undergone. And who benefits by this transformation if not the industrial population? It is the workingmen of our country who get this immense benefit. I will only give a few details without wishing to enter upon long developments. I will draw the attention of the House to the former import returns concerning a class of goods which is now being manufactured at home, giving to our workingmen a considerable sum of employment. Before 1878, the quantity of cotton imported here was eight millions of pounds; to-day we import forty-six million pounds of raw material, which proves the development of this industry, the creation and, I repeat it, the development of an important industry in the Dominion of Canada. On another hand there is raw sugar of which we imported only twenty-five million pounds in 1878; to-day our raw sugar import reaches the figure of three hundred and sixty-three millions of pounds. There are other items in the tables of imports, the figures of which are very large, and which clearly show the truth which I want to establish, to wit, that our opponents are mistaken when they charge us with not having increased our importations since the raw material imported represents a value infinitely greater than before. Such is the truth, and I think that it is the most complete demonstration that I can make of the fact that the National Policy has produced excellent results and consequently that it has increased the public wealth. Mr. Speaker, another argument has been brought forward. It has been contended that the National Policy was instituted and is maintained to make fortunes for the few. It seems to me that there is here a principle which is lost sight of. There is a positive, natural solidarity between the various classes of a community. That which makes the fortunes of the ones cannot be the evil of the others. If a portion of one people is prosperous, the

other portion must also benefit therefrom to a certain extent. Such is the principle which I set forth. The National Policy, while making the fortunes of a certain number, as has been contended, must have increased the sum of business done, and had beneficent results for the people of the vicinity of the cities thus favoured by the tariff. This is an undeniable fact which should have its weight. This development of the centres benefited and made prosperous by the National Policy is known to all. See what has taken place in the neighbourhood of the large centres which have been benefited by the policy of the Government. Mr. Speaker, the public wealth due to the National Policy is not to be gainsaid. Indeed I say that the public wealth was enhanced generally by this policy. At any rate, the great centres have really and largely prospered since its inauguration. All our cities have drawn considerable advantages from it. The last census of 1891 is there to prove the large development of the country in point of wealth as well as of population. In all the cities of Canada the population has increased, as I have said, and the census establishes the fact beyond all doubt. Some have been moved with pity about the decrease in the figures of the population of certain parts of Canada, and more particularly in the province of Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take the liberty to tell those who have cried out over the emigration, over the depopulation of our rural districts, that they certainly exaggerate as well in the appreciation of the cause of such emigration and such depopulation, as in the appreciation of the results of that emigration and depopulation. The causes of that emigration have not been truly and reasonably appreciated. But, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the emigration from the rural districts does not only take place to the profit of neighbouring countries, but to a large extent in favour of our own towns. And why, Mr. Speaker? Evidently this is again the result of the industrial activity fostered under the influence of the National Policy. The large centres developing, the rural parts must evidently allow their population to come and swell that of the great centres. And I may say to my hon. colleague, the member for Napierville, who lamented the other evening the depopulation of his county—which is my own native county,—I may tell him, Mr. Speaker, to come to Montreal and he will find in St. Henri, St. Cunegonde and other neighbouring localities, all the friends whose absence he grieves. I would return them to him. What I say here of the county of Napierville may be said of a large number of others where last census shows a decrease of population. On another hand, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the matter of our people's emigration to the United States, they somewhat overdo sentimentality. With regard to emigration, there is this to say: the Canadian is certainly a traveller by his

nature. This love for displacement is due to his peculiar organization, to his nature, and in this, Mr. Speaker, lies to a great extent the explanation of this emigration. I think I am justified in saying that this is one of the causes which send our countrymen to seek their fortune in the neighbouring republic. Many other causes might be mentioned—first, the spirit of adventure, the thirst for new scenes, then the hope of making fortune, a hope which is not always realized, for it is too often but a deceptive dream. And that dream is what allures so many away from the country. These reasons will explain, Mr. Speaker, this undeniable fact of the desertion of the country by our countrymen. But I will not grieve beyond measure over the fact that some have thought proper to cross over the 45th line, for this does not really mean a loss of national strength. We might call this but a transportation. We know perfectly that our Canadians do their duty in the United States as in Canada. The national expansion takes place there as well as here. Then why unduly mourn? I will go further, I hold that this emigration goes on naturally. And being convinced that the emigration is a natural result, and not one due to extraordinary causes, as our opponents would have us believe, I would certainly not be disposed to make large sacrifices, to ask the Government to make large sacrifices, to bring back from the United States those who naturally and spontaneously have thought proper to take the road to that country. Those who will not succeed there are sure to come back. Already there are a large number of them who leave the United States to go and settle in the North-west. As to those who are doing well there, any sacrifices and any attempts we would make to bring them back would be fruitless. That would not succeed nor anything else. But let us come back to the policy which occupies us now. I say that our opponents charge the National Policy with not having given the results which we, Conservatives, expected therefrom. I say that these gentlemen are not in the right of it. The few observations I have offered are from a general stand-point. I could enter into certain details and show how special parts of our country are benefited by this policy. Let us take, for instance, the county of Hochelaga. I arrived in that county in 1876, two years before the introduction of the National Policy. All the houses were closed, so to speak, in the town of St. Henri, in St. Gabriel, Ste. Cunegonde, Hochelaga and St. Jean Baptiste. What happened? As soon as it has been understood that the Government had a policy calculated to help the workingmen, to open the manufactories, revive the sleeping industries, there was a considerable awakening in those localities. The population doubled and trebled. This was a direct result of the National Policy. It is undeniable that this policy could not be disturbed without seriously affecting the Ca-

Mr. LACHAPELLE.

nadian people, the workingman and every citizen. It could not be modified in accordance with the amendment now before us. The hon. gentlemen opposite represent the National Policy as a real evil, and as a remedy they offer free trade, that is to say a policy diametrically opposed to that which prevails since 1878. The name given to this remedy has not always been the same, and I would be much puzzled to use the fittest expression for the remedy which our opponents offer the country to cure a would-be evil which only exists in their imagination. Is the proffered remedy really applicable? I see in the speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in Hamilton, the following statement intended to meet the objection which we made to his political theories:

They also object to us, gentlemen, that reciprocity would be infeasible, because it would entail uniformity of tariffs between the two countries. The objection is not new, and you are aware of all the lamentable inferences the Conservatives are apt to draw from it. Unrestricted reciprocity! they say, with dismay, but it could only mean common tariffs, and then it would be giving away the control to the most powerful of the two nations, that is we would be governed from Washington, as regards the tariff—

Well, this statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition could hardly be accepted gratuitously. We contend that the readjusting of the tariff, should our opponents reach power, could not be done by Canada, and would be settled in all its details by the Washington Government. That is what we contend. To prove the truth of this, Mr. Speaker, I ask the permission to call your attention to the following extract from a great newspaper—the Chicago "Times"—the value of which cannot be questioned. Here is what I find in that paper:

It must not be forgotten that this proposition implies the full giving away, by the Canadian Parliament to the American Congress, of all control of the principal source of revenue of the Dominion of Canada, that is, of the tariff. Whatever the American Congress will be pleased to do, with respect to the tariff, the Canadian Government will have to accept it immediately. Under this arrangement, our Congress would exercise even a greater power, with respect to Canada than if both countries were politically united, for commercial union, as proposed, would give to the people of the Dominion of Canada neither voice nor right of vote at Washington. Our Congress would not only establish and change, according to its own free will, all the duties exacted from the Canadian people, but, moreover, our officers and courts would frame all rules and give all decisions respecting the tariff, both for Canada and the United States.

There, Mr. Speaker, is a statement which is the expression of opinion of an important American paper, and which justifies us in saying that, should the Liberals come into power, a settlement of the tariff could not be in our hands so as to protect us as we are now protected. This is certainly a statement which tends to prove that the remedy which we are offered would be more injurious and dangerous than the evil which it is calculated to cure. The New York "Evening Post" writes in the same strain:

If Canada wishes to have the same tariff as the United States, the charge of fixing the tariff must be left to the American Congress, or in other words the power of taxing the Canadians must be yielded to the United States, and that power of taxing very soon involves all other powers in its train. All those who are interested in this matter, either in the United States or in Canada, should not lose sight of this. The United States could not allow a small province-like Canada to determine what should be their import duties.

Here we have a second example, upon which I rest, to say to our opponents, and particularly to the leader of the Opposition, that we cannot regard as serious the assertions he made in Hamilton, as to what would happen should they see the triumph of their ideas. Has the question of making up for the revenue which we would lose, and which we cannot spare, been settled by the gentlemen opposite? In 1887, the Hon. Edward Blake declared that he had not yet met a single man who had found a practical means of raising the revenue which we would lose by the establishment of free trade. I will ask the hon. gentlemen if they are further advanced than the Hon. Edward Blake was? I will ask them if they have found the solution of this great and difficult problem, which consists in discovering new sources of revenue to make up for the loss which the triumph of their policy would entail? Mr. Speaker, there is another question which, in the course of this debate, has occupied the minds of the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. It seems that with a certain number of speakers the analysis of the different political questions, gives little satisfaction. They spoke as if they thought it would be easier to make a point in this House, than it would be, with the same means, to make it elsewhere. I mean this—and render my thought clearer—it is said that the debt figure has increased materially since 1878, since 1880, and the simple statement is made without any explanations being given, which might help to account for this increase. A debt may increase without the debtor necessarily being impoverished by the same. Mr. Speaker, this is a natural fact, that the debt should increase in proportion to the business to be done; only I will tell the hon. gentlemen that if the debt has increased in a rather large proportion, the fact can be easily explained by any serious man who will look at both sides of things, and who wishes neither to deceive himself nor others. The debt has increased, but an equivalent has been given, not only an equivalent, but much more than the increase of the debt. We have built works of different kinds; we have built railways, we have built canals; we have relieved different provinces by means of large subsidies. I may well say, then, that if the debt has been increased by eighty-five or eighty-six millions, and if ninety millions have been given to the country, it is not very reasonable to seek to disturb the people by arguments of that kind. We have increased our assets in a greater proportion than our liabilities, and in face of this statement—es-

entially favourable to the country—we must draw the conclusion that the administration of public affairs by the Conservative party since 1878 is calculated to show that this party deserves the confidence of the country. What is the most important enterprise that has been accomplished? It is useless to name it. We have undertaken—in spite of our opponents—the gigantic work of building the Pacific Railway, a work which we have accomplished in the very short space of seven years. This work, which the hon. gentlemen opposite pretended was impossible, we have accomplished, and at a cost much below the amount which they considered necessary for that when they were in power. Well, Mr. Speaker, this great expenditure, which covers half of the increase of the public debt during the last ten years, should the Liberals reproach the Conservative party with it? As was well said by one of the speakers who has touched this point, do the advantages which have resulted from the construction of the Canadian Pacific from the time it was first operated until to-day, not already sufficiently compensate for the sacrifices which we have made in the building of this national railway, indispensable for the connecting of the different parts of the Confederation? I contend that we cannot reasonably be reproached with that expenditure. The same thing holds as to the outlay for the enlarging and deepening of our canals. Could the money devoted to relieve the provinces of debts difficult to meet be again a reproach to us? Can our opponents blame us for having undertaken the sacrifice of some eight or ten millions for those provinces? Well, these are the items which solely constitute the increases of the public debt. They represent beneficial, industrial improvements, and it ill-becomes our opponents to blame us, and to try and have it believed that the public debt has increased at an alarming rate. The country does not look at things in such light. Nor abroad either are things viewed in that way, since, from the time of the completion of the gigantic undertaking called the Canadian Pacific, our standing all the world over has reached such a plane that Canada ranks as the third nation in point of credit, and since, among the fifty colonies which compose the great British Empire, the Dominion of Canada stands first on the London market. I say that it is wrong to come to this House and try to make the supporters of the Government believe that the increase of the public debt has gone on at an alarming rate. Let the hon. gentlemen go and say that in some far-off corner of the country, far from this House, this may be allowed to them; but they cut poor figures repeating here such things which could not stand a moment of examination. Mr. Speaker, my object has been to gather a few observations around these three principal questions. I wanted to show that the National Policy is not an evil. I wanted to show that the modification which is pro-

posed to be made to this policy is not a remedy. And finally I wanted to establish that if the public debt was increased the increase was certainly justifiable. In connection with this last question I might add that it is not always by taking the net figure of the debt that a correct idea can be formed as to the real state of the debt; and that, certain circumstances being given, a debt may well be increased without any one suffering any the more. That is what I wanted to have understood. If we view our debt in the light of the interest thereon, I may say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that our debt has virtually been reduced, for the interest on that debt having been reduced, we now pay less than we did. Well, in face of this, it ill-becomes the hon. gentlemen to say that the debt weighs more heavily on the shoulders of the people than it did six years ago. For, indeed, if we pay less interest we must be less burdened. I cannot conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, without giving a few moments of attention to the speech delivered the other evening by the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). As an old colleague, an old comrade and friend, I may say, I will be allowed to believe that I am justified in devoting to him the concluding words of my speech. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) after having been aggressive in the first part of his speech, has been less so in the last. I regret that the hon. member should not have thought better to confine himself to that tone. He made the following statement, to wit, that the National Policy certainly produced good results when it was established in 1878. However, he seems to me not to have shown that the policy which was good in 1878 has become bad now. So that I do not find, Mr. Speaker, in that part of his speech a sufficient reason for justifying his political conduct. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) added that the fanatical element which existed after the conquest seemed to be still alive. Is the hon. member very sure, Mr. Speaker, of finding in the ranks of the party which he has recently joined, less fanaticism than in the Conservative party? I do not admit his assertion, but taking it as it is, I say to the hon. member that I don't regard this as justifying his course. I will ask him if he finds men well disposed towards the Canadians and Catholics in the party which he has joined, if he finds in his new party more guarantees than he had in the party whose ranks he has left. I do not see that there is sufficient ground to justify the hon. member in his assertion. Was there anything else in his speech which could explain his conduct? Mr. Speaker, the hon. member protested against the composition of the Cabinet. Is there in this sufficient cause, I ask again, to justify his action? Has the organization of the Cabinet not been done in a satisfactory manner for the province of Quebec, as well as for the other provinces of the Confederation? I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this third grievance of the hon. member for L'Islet can constitute any more

Mr. LACHAPPELLE.

than the two others a sufficient reason for his having taken the position he has taken. The hon. member brought other charges against us. He said we always put off until to-morrow what we could do to-day. Will he find among his new friends a desire of acting more promptly than there exists among the party to which he has belonged until now? Have the Conservative party not always given a serious attention to all the questions which came before them? Again, I think he was wrong. Mr. Speaker, there is another statement made by the hon. member which I wish to take up. He said to us: "I do not want to demolish." This was the conclusion of his speech. Is there in that a justification for his political conduct? Is the party which he now joins not the party the policy of which consists in demolishing? No, if he does not wish to demolish, he should not remain with those who spend one-half of their time in demolishing and the other in building nothing. The different points of his speech seem to offer no serious reason to justify his conduct before the country. He contends, Mr. Speaker, that the county which elected him commissioned him to act as he does, and that is his justification. I do not know whether this is enough of a reason to satisfy him. If so, he is easy to satisfy; for there is nothing in that to justify his course. It is well known that he was only elected by a few votes in a county which generally gives hundreds of votes of majority to the Liberal candidates. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was necessary to devote these few remarks to a former supporter of the Government. I will briefly sum up what I said. The Conservative party inaugurated a policy which has, ever since 1878, always received the sanction of the people, and which has worked for the welfare of the country. Those who are at the head of affairs continue to work with a view to ensuring the country's prosperity, the natural result of that policy. Our leaders say, we are well disposed to enter into a treaty with our neighbours, but never to debase ourselves for that purpose. Our leaders say that it is better to speak well of our country than to revile it. And as a conclusion I will say, that those who are to stay at the head of affairs, those who are to be the masters of the country, are not those who accuse it, those who want to belittle it, but those who want always to defend and to aggrandize it.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that I am entitled to ask very specially for the indulgence of members on both sides of this House, since during last session as well as during the present one, I did not trouble them much with my speeches. Allow me also to offer my most earnest and cordial congratulations to the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle) for his brilliant "debut" in this House. His speech, in style as well as in thought, was indeed a brilliant one, and he has not deluded the expectations of his friends nor those on this side of the House. However, these expecta-

tions were not realized from the same standpoint. And I was not at all astonished to see the hon. member for Hochelaga kneeling on the steps of the altar of protection. And so, in his enthusiasm for that great National Policy, he began praying and calling for a very special protection from heaven to his party. He started out by stating a fact which seems to me to be existing in his mind only, for it is not to be found in practice nor in the books written on political economy. The hon. gentleman started out by stating that philosophers were in favour of free trade, but that practical men were in favour of protection. I cannot find out, Mr. Speaker, a better refutation of this statement than in the fact of the mother country which since twenty years declared in favour of free trade. I cannot find out a better disproof of this statement than the fact that on the other side of the line, at the last election, the McKinley tariff was set aside by the people in favour of a more moderate form of protection, of a moderate free trade. The hon. member for Hochelaga referred to this so as to have this House believe that the protective system would last for ever. That was surely not the intent of Sir John A. Macdonald, the father of protection in 1878, as I will show in a little while. Following the practice carried out by the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Hochelaga has shown that the wealth and prosperity of the country, were shown by the public documents. I cannot see a better disproof of this statement than by reminding the hon. the Minister of Finance and the member for Hochelaga of a caricature published by a newspaper, "The Star," through which the Tory party used to make their elections in the province of Quebec, and which, hardly two months ago, represented Canada under the features of a handsome woman losing the best of her blood owing to the protective system. The hon. member for Hochelaga stated to us one of the great benefits of the National Policy had been the bringing in the country of \$2,000,000 worth of raw material. Surely the question is not how much raw material we import in this country, but—if I am not mistaken, by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) now before us—the question is what taxes the people paid for these \$2,000,000. The hon. member for Hochelaga has shown the difference between our imports and exports; he forgot, however, to state that what the National Policy aims at is to prevent the imports, and to decrease them in the interest of exports. The hon. gentleman gave us a portion of the history of the Conservative party. I was rather puzzled when I heard him quoting as one of the pages in the history of the Conservative party the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to refer to that page and to remind the House that, in 1873, the dark side was an enormous scandal, which caused the Conservative party to

lose the power which they now hold. They say the history of the Conservative party is written from north to south, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The history of that party not only contains the Pacific scandal, but the Conservative party was in the province of Quebec the cause of a national strife, since it was a religious war. You charged us, we the Liberals, with being atheists and Freemasons. And not satisfied with kindling among your compatriots the flames of the worst of all wars—a religious war—the Conservative party also wrote in the pages of their history the troubles of the Northwest and in Manitoba. A civil war after a religious war? Why? The history of the Conservative party for the last twenty-five years was but the repudiation of the policy of Sir George Etienne Cartier. For the last twenty-five years it steadily interfered, through the Federal authorities, with the powers of local legislatures. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle) referred to the speech we heard the other night; he referred to the statements of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to defend the hon. gentleman, who, as is well known, is well able to defend himself when he is assailed, and even to strike back new blows at his assailants. The hon. member for Hochelaga stated the hon. member for L'Islet was playing the part of one who destroys. It is rather the Government who are playing that part. Is it not a fact that with respect to the school question in Manitoba, where Catholics are no more entitled to their separate schools on account of the law enacted by the Greenway Government, is it not a fact that it is the Government here who are allowing these schools to be done away with? Mr. Speaker, allow me, although I do not see in his seat the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), to criticise some of his remarks. I come from a province essentially French and Catholic, and I can assert I am a French-Canadian and a Catholic. Well, when I heard the abusive language falling from the lips of the hon. gentleman which he used against the Hon. Mr. Mercier, I say a man ready to use such a language is unworthy of being a member of this House. After a Tory Lieutenant-Governor, by the most improper ways, and through the assistance of the hon. member for Centre Toronto, snatched the power from Mr. Mercier, they have boldness enough left to come here and boast of it. I say to the hon. gentleman he would not allow the same thing to be done in the English province of Ontario. There would not be a man there with impudence enough to jump over the constitution as they had the impudence to do in our province. However, to be frank, I must add I am not astonished to hear the hon. gentleman using such a language, for one thing I know, and that is he belongs to the fanatics of the class of Mr. McCarthy and others. The ancient Romans used, when they followed a

dead man to his last resting place, to have some one to mourn his loss and extol his kind acts and his virtues. The speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto reminded me of this moral feature of the Roman people. When the ministerial party is at the point of death, torn up by factions; when I see a prominent member of that party like the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asking for reforms of the tariff, it is then they use the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to extol the Conservative party for the putting in force of their fiscal policy. In by-gone days the French kings had at their court people who were intrusted with the duty of keeping the king in good humour, of occupying his mind agreeably; should I judge by the laughters with which the speech of the member for Centre Toronto was received by the Conservative members, I am led to believe that he played for his party the part which the fools played at the court of the French kings. Allow me to state, Mr. Speaker, I represent here not only an essentially agricultural county, but that there is in that county an industrial place, a town in which there are several manufacturing establishments. That town occupies a magnificent geographical position, the fact is there is not a town better situated to be found in the province of Quebec. Well, in what position is that town as regards the well-being of its inhabitants? Allow me to offer you the information I will give, for it is likely to convey a good idea of the results of the fiscal policy of the Government. But before going into this matter I wish to offer a few remarks with respect to the amendment now before the House. The question is whether we can vote for this amendment. The proposition offered to us asks for three things. The first part of this amendment states the present customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion. It is the first statement contained in this amendment, and those who are going to vote against this resolution will state by their vote that the tariff is not a heavy and unfair burden upon the classes which are the largest consumers in the Dominion. Is there a single member, is there a single, earnest man who will be willing to state the tariff we have is not a heavy burden upon the consumers belonging to the farming and working classes? The tariff is framed in an unjust and invidious way. To be satisfied of this, take the agricultural implements on which there is a duty of 35 per cent; the nails which are sold at two dollars a barrel in the United States and which you cannot procure here for less than three dollars and fifty cents. The seed drills on which a duty of 35 per cent is raised; the mowers on which there is also a duty of 35 per cent. The fact is there is a duty of from 30 to 45 per cent on all the implements which are used in farming. I will possibly be told that is in order to favour the manufacturer of agricultural implements. There exists in the city of Sorel

Mr. BRUNEAU

a manufacture of agricultural implements, one of the best situated there is in the province of Quebec. I refer to the manufacture of Messrs. Beauchemin; well, they have no need of the policy of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. The fact is there is not a single manufacturer in Sorel who is not opposed to the policy of the Government, and I am in a position to state they are ready to compete with the American manufacturers as concerns the manufacture of these agricultural implements. However, and notwithstanding that fact, the tariff raises a duty of from 35 to 40 per cent on these articles. And the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle) finds the tariff is not a heavy burden upon the class of consumers! As for the working class—it seems to me I have a right to speak in its behalf since I am one of its sons—do I need to mention how much it is taxed? The fact is the workingman is taxed from head to foot, from his hat down to his clothing and shoes; all these articles are imposed in an exorbitant way. If you add to that the illegitimate taxes of the Government of Quebec, the municipal and local taxes, the school taxes, the taxes paid by manufactures, I ask what a figure of taxes we cause the people to pay? Yet the results I have just mentioned were not to happen under the protective system with respect to the farmers. If the hon. member for Hochelaga had read the speech delivered by Sir John Macdonald on the 10th of March, 1876, he would have read the following words which I will quote to the House:—

Should it be shown to us that the adoption of this policy would be detrimental to our farmers, of course we ought not to adopt it.

And further on, he added:

No man is entitled to say that the farmers cannot live happily under the present tariff. But the question is this: whether they are not entitled, under the present circumstances, to a changing of the tariff so as to put them on an equal footing with their neighbours on the other side of the line.

I have, therefore, the right to draw from these data the conclusion that we ought to vote for the amendment now before us, because the customs tariff is a heavy and unjust burden upon the farming and working classes, which are the larger portion of the consumers of the Dominion. The second part of the resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright reads as follows:—

That the Customs tariff should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that on both sides of the House there is a consensus of opinion as to that point. What have we seen, in fact, since the beginning of this discussion? We have seen the hon. members for West Assiniboia, Richmond and Wolfe, North Simcoe, Durham, Compton, Muskoka, Frontenac, and last but not least, the hon. member for L'Islet, a former Conservative, declaring in favour of freer trade. We have seen more than that, Mr. Speaker; when a

freer trade is asked for, we hear a friend of the Government, the member for Hochelaga, advising the Government to continue the existing system in force in its entirety. The hon. gentleman put himself at variance with the Government themselves and their most prominent friends; with the Government who admitted the need of this claim by decreasing the duties on binding twine and coal oil, and pledged themselves to have these duties repealed at the next session and promised to appoint a committee charged with going over the country so as to make the changes our present position requires. Who is not aware that our trade with the United States has not decreased many millions since the adoption of the McKinley tariff? In spite of all that can be said and done, the English market may be good, a very good market for our cheese, our animals and some others of our produce; but the American market will always be our natural market for our hay, poultry, potatoes, eggs, horses and sheep. And at this very moment, if in the county I represent here, the farmers had not the advantage of the cheese factories, three-fourths of them would leave our rural districts. But all our farmers are not to take to making cheese, for that would bring about the same result as protection did, that is, they would surely be over-loaded. What do our farmers say? I think I am voicing their wishes to-night; they wish the barriers would be lowered down between Canada and the United States. They do not wish for an unrestricted free trade, but for a reciprocity treaty that would give them access to the American market. Let us approve, Mr. Speaker, of the policy of the Government with respect to the treaty just concluded by them with France. Without being aware of its clauses, I say beforehand that we ought, all of us on both sides of the House, to approve of this treaty which the Canadian Government has just concluded with the assistance of the Imperial Government. But to come back to the discussion, brought up in this House, I am surely not expecting that the amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright to the motion of the Minister of Finance will be agreed to by this House. I am not to be surprised at that, for every time we have been asking the assistance of the party now in power for a greater sum of freer trade, we have been met by a refusal. In 1882, the Hon. Edward Blake brought up the trade question in this House. He claimed the right for the Dominion to make his own treaties of commerce. We then saw the hon. the Minister of Public Works voting for that motion, while last year he voted against it. We saw the Hon. Mr. Coursol, then member for Montreal East, voting for the motion of Mr. Blake; Mr. Houde, member for Maskinonge and editor of "Le Monde" voting for it; but since 1882, in 1889, in 1891, we have seen the bulk of the then ministerial party voting against every resolution having

for its effect to give to the Dominion a larger sum of freedom of trade. Thirdly, the amendment now before the House implies the following proposition:—

That the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered.

I cannot well see how the hon. members on the other side could vote against this third part of the resolution. They claim every day they are realizing economies in the administration of public affairs. They, the Conservatives, are the great saving men of the country! They contend they incur no debts. We have, it is true, a debt which amounts to over \$240,000,000. We pay on that debt over \$8,000,000 interest annually. The administration of public affairs exceeds \$35,000,000 annually. We are asking for a little economy. And how will they answer to us? They will answer by the vote, and show under the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. I assert, without fear, that for a young country like ours, for a country which only has 5,000,000 of inhabitants, the cost of administration is surely too large. Look at the United States. The cost of administration there amounts to about \$5.50 per head, while here it exceeds \$7. The amendment asks that economies be realized in a judicious way. I may be allowed to suggest certain reforms in the administration of our public affairs. The Intercolonial Railway entails an enormous cost to the country. Every year the management of this road is figured up by a deficit. If the Government, who are essentially protectionist, would only follow my advice, they would cause the revenue to come in a little more freely, and favour somewhat less the merchants of the lower provinces. In the various departments there are economies to be realized. I think that of the Public Works is the one in which reforms are more needed. I regret I do not see the hon. the Minister of Public Works in his seat, for I have in my county one of the largest sources of patronage in the province of Quebec. There are in Sorel three or four hundred employees of the Government. The Government rent for \$1,200 a year a magnificent ground; and all the works that concern the navigation and the deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec are carried out at Sorel. I will have a few questions to put to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet). I told him privately what should be done; he knows he ought to change the existing state of affairs in Sorel, for he cannot but be aware that economies are urgently called for in the county of Richelieu. They could grant a somewhat smaller sum on political patronage and obtain the appointment of a French correspondent, who should answer to the requests made to the Experimental Farm by the farmers of the province of Quebec. I state again those who are going to vote against the amendment brought before the House by the hon. member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), will proclaim that the taxes do not bear heavily upon the people, that the Canadian people should not be granted the freest possible trade when the contrary is stated by the Government themselves. Finally, they will state there is no need for economies. I may state that from a purely political stand-point, this amendment is altogether awkward. On the 10th March, 1876, Sir John Macdonald said his amendment was awkward from a political point of view, because it indicated to the Government the remedy they should apply to the condition of the country. From that same point of view, the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford is likewise awkward. But we are not here to talk politics from a party stand-point, but to perform our duty as patriots and Canadians. One would say the Conservative party are afraid of going back to 1876, 1877 and 1878. They forget to recall what was to be the result of the famous panacea of Sir John Macdonald. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle) told us it had realized the expectations of the Conservatives. It is, perhaps, true so far as they are concerned, but that policy never gave the results which true Canadians who love their country first and last expected from it. What were to be the immediate results of the protective system so much boasted of by our opponents? In the first place, it was to decrease the emigration of our fellow-countrymen to the United States. Then, it was going to increase and develop the national industries and especially to favour the farming classes by putting them on an equal footing with the Americans. They especially pledged themselves to that result for the Canadian farmers. Mr. Speaker, what do we find to-day? The emigration, especially that of the French-Canadians has not decreased. To ascertain that fact, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) sent, during last summer, commissioners into a great many parishes of the province of Quebec. The figures collected by these were published on the 20th August. What did "La Minerve," the chief mouth-piece of the Conservatives in the province of Quebec, say? It said:

So that the lists of the "Canadien" only show that there is no emigration. It is a La Palisse's truth. But they by no means show that emigration is the fault of the Government. Our contemporary has enough intellectual capacity to understand that. Is it due to a want of honesty and fairness?

It is La Palisse's truth, so the "Minerve" said. However it is a truth denied by the ministerial party. It is a truth denied by the member for Hochelaga all through his speech. The hon. member for L'Islet is also referred to and characterized as an intelligent man. It is a good showing for our colleague. That editorial of "La Minerve" is the formal condemnation of the ministerial party, for it puts to light a truth persistently denied here. "La Minerve" which, after its

Mr. BRUNEAU.

chiefs, formerly proclaimed that the emigration of the French-Canadians to the United States was due to the policy of the Mackenzie Government, now says it is no fault of the present Government if the Canadians leave their country. They have, therefore, two weights and two measures. But, it is, it seems, a matter of character and temperament, according at least to the hon. member for Hochelaga. We were told that emigration was particularly going on from the rural districts to the cities and it was due to a natural cause. The hon. gentleman claimed as a glorious thing for the Conservative party the fact that protection was depopulating the rural districts to the advantage of the cities. I represent, Mr. Speaker, a rural county, but I represent also a city, and I do not want a policy which results in the depopulating of the rural parishes to the advantage of the inhabitants of cities. But I will quote figures which will show that the hon. member for Hochelaga made a statement which is altogether ungrounded. In 1876, we were told that if the French-Canadians were going to the United States, it was the fault of the Mackenzie Government, that if that emigration was so large, it was due to their ruinous policy. How is it, they said, that in so young a country as ours is, a country having so many, so large and so varied resources, magnificent fisheries, with our lakes and rivers offering splendid means of communication to the trade and facilities of transportation for the industrial produce, how is it that so rich and so young a country should see its population decreasing and its people going to the United States? They imputed that as a crime to the Liberal Government. After twenty years, an increase is ascertained in this tide of emigration, and as a refutation we are given the same argument the Liberal party formerly used and we are told it is no fault of the Government nor their fiscal policy. I contend a Government whose administration of public affairs is not conducted so as to keep in the country its own people is not a government having a good fiscal policy. Here, Mr. Speaker, I must go into certain detailed figures, which I am compelled to take from the last census. However, I must say I use these figures with the utmost caution. I think it my duty to state, from my seat in this House, the census is an outrageous falsehood. The figures I will quote have reference to the county of Richelieu, and I may say that as concerns that county, returns are given in the census which are far from being favourable to the policy of the Government. According to the census of 1881, the population of the province of Quebec was 1,324,810. According to the census of 1891, the population was 1,632,679. During the ten years between 1871 and 1881, the population increased 18.97 per cent, while during the decade between 1881 and 1891, the population in the province of Quebec only increased 11.74 per cent, which is a falling off of 7.23 per cent in the single pro-

vince of Quebec. Nevertheless, bulletin No. 4 of the last census, devoted to the province of Quebec, states, page 9 :

That the increase of population in Quebec province has not been so great as was anticipated is partly due to the difference in the method of counting the people. To prevent the indiscriminate counting of absentees a time limit was introduced for the first time in the recent census. The application of this limit restricted the enumerators to taking only those persons whose absence from the Dominion or the province was really temporary.

The first striking thing in the above quotation, is this census bulletin establishes a deception acknowledged by the ministerial party as to the result in the province of Quebec. And, after that, they will come and say to us, when their own officers, paid for the purpose of enlarging the figures, are compelled to acknowledge there is a distinction for the province of Quebec, they will come and say to us there is no emigration. How would it be, then, if the census had been better taken? It is said the only persons who were temporarily away from Canada were mentioned. I deny "in toto" this statement. I could give to the House names which appear in the census—but they are afraid to give names, as was seen when we asked for the names of the 128 manufacturers in Sorel. I can assert positively, the names of parties for a long time away from Sorel appear in the census. I am not making these statements for the purpose of disparaging the country; but I merely want the truth to be known. I want to speak out my mind. I am not acting as a political party man; but, satisfied my county is not prosperous, feeling we are undergoing a commercial depression, due to the fiscal policy of the Government. I insist upon stating to them what are its causes and where the remedy lies. Among the parishes in Richelieu county which remained stationary, or whose population decreased, I will mention the following for the edification of the Government:—

	Pop. in 1881.	Pop. in 1891.
Saint-Marcel	1,330	1,169
Saint-Ours Parish	1,804	1,654
Saint-Pierre de Sorel	877	492
Saint-Robert	2,126	1,879
Saint-Roch	1,020	1,045
Sainte-Victoire	1,550	1,532

These figures are taken from the census; I am not giving our own data. The parish of St. Robert experienced a decrease of 247 souls, although it is in the neighbourhood of a city which has 128 manufactures, seventy houses are closed in that parish. During last summer and autumn, twenty-seven families left from there for the United States, and according to the information communicated to me, I can assert this as the exact truth. Let information be taken from other political men in my county, even Conservatives, and they will state this to be most scrupulously accurate. In the face of these figures, which prove the disastrous effects of the present tariff, have

I not the right to repeat to the Government what Augustus said to Varus after his defeat: "Varus, Varus, give me back my legions." Yes, give us, give us back our expatriated population. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have in the province of Quebec given instances of a rapid growth of population. "Plant Gascons, they take root everywhere" was the saying of Henry the IV. What would he not have said of the French-Canadians had he known us? What would he not have said, seeing that after being separated from the mother country for 125 years, without any assistance from France, left to our own resources, to our own vitality, we have grown from 70,000 in 1760, to a figure now exceeding 2,000,000 French-Canadians, including those of our compatriots who are in the United States. "Plant Gascons, they take root everywhere." I beg I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to give the following information: The author of the "Guide Francais des Etats-Unis," Mr. de Bonnechose, lately made public the fact—and it was not contradicted—that we had in the American states over 900,000 of our French-Canadian compatriots. And they come and say that protection, which was to decrease emigration, has not increased it! Well, I am not of that opinion. In the face of the large emigration from my county, of the large emigration that leaves my native city, I say the existing fiscal system is defective and that of absolute necessity there must be a readjustment of the tariff. And I am not taking that stand from my own observations only. But, as late as Sunday last, one of the leaders of the Conservative party in the county of Richelieu, said to me: "Of absolute necessity there must be a reform of the tariff." Well, then, on Sunday last, I met a Conservative, not one of the stripe of the member for Hochelaga, who objects to any change in the tariff, but one like the member for Frontenac, who has at least the courage of his convictions and states in plain words he will vote with the Opposition against the fiscal policy of the Government. Protection, then, has not decreased emigration. Has it developed our industries in the way they assert on the other side of the House? Let us again open the census; and, I may say, that with respect to manufactures, it is even more outrageously false than with respect to population. The clear object of the Government was, through the census, to extol the beneficial effects of the protective system. They thought they could say after ten years of that system: See of what immense advantage it was to the country! In order to promote the zeal of the enumerators, instead of giving them three cents for each name entered in the census as manufacturers, they were given twenty cents. They accordingly sent accounts, in proportion, to the Government. I am not at all astonished after that, to see Mr. Johnson striking up, in bulletin No. 12, which has a special reference to manufactures, pages 14 and 15, a general

hosanna in praise of the benefits of protection, the victory song of the Conservative party. Here is what he says :

REMARKS.

The increase in the value of products of our manufacturing establishments, as represented by the urban population, is \$117,000,000, while in population the increase is 381,968.

The increase in the rural districts in the value of manufactured products is forty-eight and seven-tenths million dollars, and the increase in population, 125,901.

Thus the urban population has increased its output by \$306 per each head of its increase in numbers, while the rural population has increased its output by \$386 per head of its increase in numbers.

It is plain, therefore, that both the rural and the urban districts have made great advances in manufacturing, and that the experience of the past ten years is that cities, towns and villages from 1,500 inhabitants up, villages with population below 1,500, and the strictly rural districts have all secured manufacturing developments. The cities have not grown in manufacturing at the expense of the towns and villages, nor the urban population at the expense of the rural population. The development has been very generally diffused.

Here is what says Mr. Johnson, who directed the operations of the census. Now, I absolutely deny such a statement, and I state in presence of the Government it is the falsest ever made with respect to the census. I am not a philosopher, for it looks as if, according to the hon. member for Hochelaga, thinkers alone were in favour of freer trade, but I may say the conclusions reached in this bulletin are false, and more so as far as my county is concerned. I know that one cannot draw a general conclusion from a particular fact, but I will give calculations which will show that this census is an immense humbug and an outrageous falsehood. The census of 1881, established there was in Sorel fifty-one industrial establishments. Now, in 1891, I am ashamed to make the statement, for it is not true, but the census states there is a hundred and twenty-eight manufactures, with a capital of \$475,802 and 670 persons employed. The wages paid are estimated to \$188,849. The cost of the raw materials is \$299,173 and the value of products \$755,745. I have no intention, I loudly proclaim it, to slight the city where I live. Far from me is the idea of disparaging the place where I live, but it is a notorious and publicly known fact that we have not a hundred and twenty-eight manufactures in the city of Sorel. And if I deny "in toto" this statement of the census, it is because of the endeavours made through these figures, to mislead the country as to the results of the fiscal policy of the Government. We have two hundred houses closed in Sorel, and the value of the property has decreased 50 per cent. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, to show the truth of this statement, that I declined to buy for \$2,600 a property which had cost over \$6,000. In the district of Montreal, Berthier has, according to the census of 1891, thirty-one manufactures, with a capital valued at \$145,000, 163 persons employed, paying wages to the

Mr. BRUNEAU.

amount of \$55,320, using raw materials valued at \$102,655, and turning out products to the value of \$223,540. Now, let any one go to Berthier and look for these thirty-one manufactures. I now take the city of Nicolet, which is not very far distant from Sorel and which every one knows. Nicolet is entered as having ninety manufactures, according to this famous census. These ninety manufactures have a capital of \$413,865, employed 368 persons, receiving \$81,886 in wages. The cost of the raw materials is \$182,174 and the value of products \$337,911. These figures are false; they are known to be false, and yet they are published because they go to show the country is prosperous, and it is supposed there will be found, to a certain extent, people who will believe in their accuracy. I challenge the Minister to show there is in the localities referred to by me the number of manufactures mentioned in the census. This afternoon, they declined to give us, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) and myself, in answer to questions, the names of the manufactures of these localities. Why? Because they could not give us the names of the owners of bona fide and really industrial establishments. It is a well known fact that our labouring classes in Sorel are unemployed, and the Government alone keeps there a political shop.

Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains). Indeed! indeed!

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman says: Indeed! indeed! I should like to see him in the midst of our labouring population of Sorel, now without work nor bread, and crying out: Indeed! indeed! I urge him to come down at the next election.

Mr. GIROUARD. (Translation.) We will be there.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I urge him to come down to Sorel and count the 128 manufactures. I will be there likewise, and I specially invite him to come and repeat what the hon. Minister of Public Works stated on the 4th January, 1892, that the labourers of Sorel who were willing to work had their three meals a day. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the following point, that is, that population has decreased and that it still decreases. Although there is no work, yet the Government stated to me the other day, in answer to a question, they were to prevent the fishing of soft fish between the 15th of April and the 1st July. That will be a means to drive out of the counties of Richelieu, Berthier and several other places, a numerous class of people who could only live on that fishing. After giving us protection, you give us prohibition. Opposite Sorel is a beautiful locality, Berthier. In 1881, it had a population of 2,156 souls, and in 1891, thanks to the fiscal policy of the Government, that population had fallen to 1,537 souls, a decrease of

519. Yet Berthier has, they say, thirty-one manufactures and Sorel 128. This decrease of population is sufficient to show these figures are false. In order to encourage the building of manufactures we voted, in Sorel and Berther, certain bonuses. In spite of that, during the last ten years, thanks to the protective system, the following manufactures have ceased existing: A shoe factory, to which the city of Sorel paid a bonus of \$15,000 and for which the citizens subscribed \$30,000; a furniture, sash and door factory, managed by Mr. Prevost, and which paid annually wages to the amount of several thousand dollars, also ceased existing. An other furniture factory had the same fate. A manufacturer of engines and boilers, Mr. Bellerose, has also vanished. A tobacco factory, also went down; five or six in all. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the people are unanimous in asking, there as elsewhere, a radical reform of the fiscal policy of the Government. They ask that the tariff be re-adjusted in a moderate way. It is all very well to say the country is prosperous, that the Government carries the by-elections—we know the cause of these electoral fortunes—and as I am one of those who honestly speak out their mind before the people and the House, no fear will prevent me from pointing out the causes of these victories which they so much boast of. In my opinion the Conservative party carried the elections in 1882 by the means of the gerrymander; in 1887, through the Franchise Act, which was an unqualified iniquity and the means of interfering with the powers of the local legislatures. That Franchise Bill placed a weapon in the hands of our opponents, but it is also the cause of a large increase in the public expenditure. In the election of 1891 they promised reciprocity to the farmers for the purpose of raising up obstacles and preventing us from having the true reciprocity we want. Because you were afraid to disallow the law relating to the Manitoba schools, you promised to the clergy of the province of Quebec that you would interfere in favour of our co-religionists, should the courts decide against them, and you did nothing of the kind. You will not do it, and you inquire from the courts whether you have a right to do justice to those who are sufferers through this law. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything more ridiculous than the stand taken by the Government? Yes, we have a right to interfere—

Mr. SPEAKER. I don't see what relation there is between the Manitoba School question and the subject under discussion.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, I have a right to refer to that question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I don't see any relation between the Manitoba School question and the tariff.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation). At all events, that question is one of the causes why we suffer through the existing tariff. In concluding these remarks, I beg to state I will vote for the amendment now before the House for three reasons: In the first place, because I want a decrease of the taxes which bear so heavily on the people. In the second place, because I am in favour of a greater sum of commercial freedom. I want new outlets for our produce. In the third place, because I want a rigid economy in the administration of public affairs. I should like the people to be happy and prosperous, not always remaining the subjects of Her Majesty, as stated by Mr. Blake. I should like to see realized the splendid idea brought forth by the Fathers of Confederation.

Mr. CAMERON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE TARIFF DEBATE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and on the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto, have the precedence over all other business on Monday next at 8 o'clock, p. m.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say that to-morrow I propose to take up the Supplementary Estimates for this year, as there are certain expenditures that are urgent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Tuesday, the 7th of March next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to move for the following changes in the Committees:

That Mr. Frémont's name be substituted for that of Mr. Rinfret on the Railway Committee, that Mr.

Rinfret's name be substituted for that of Mr. Frémont on the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and that Mr. Tarte and Mr. Belley be added to the Committees on Public Accounts and Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company and to change the name of the company to the St. Lawrence Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Maritime Manufacturing Company, Limited.—(Mr. Stairs.)

SUPPLY—OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House to a matter of public concern, to which my attention was directed by a telegram which I received yesterday from Halifax, as follows:—

Canada fast royal mail steamer arrived at 9 a.m. this morning—13 days 20 hours 59 minutes from Liverpool direct.

My informant does not give the name of the steamer, but I telegraphed to Halifax and learned that it was the "Mongolian," of the Allan line. Estimating the distance from Liverpool to Halifax to be 2,400 miles, the rate of speed—if you can call it speed—or the run of the walk—I do not know which would best apply—the average mileage rate of this subsidized Canadian mail steamer would be $7\frac{1}{4}$ miles per hour. I do not intend to make a speech, being physically unable to do so today, but I think it is important this matter should be brought to the consideration of the Government, and especially the hon. Postmaster-General. We all feel that the present Atlantic mail service is eminently unsatisfactory. Just a few words as regards the freight service of these steamers. This steamer sailed into a Canadian port and discharged her mails and passengers, and she then left that Canadian port and proceeded to the foreign port of Portland, where she disbursed a large amount of money in the discharging and loading of her cargo, and all the other expense incidental to a terminal port. At the Canadian port at which she touched, we had our Canadian railway and numbers of men in the city of Halifax, who, at this dull season, would have been very glad to have earned the money disbursed in the loading and unloading of that ship. Under our present system we are subsidizing a line of steamers which is unsatisfactory as regards the carrying of the mails, and which makes its

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

principal disbursements in an American port, to the detriment of our own Canadian port. For some years past we have heard frequently of a fast Atlantic mail service. Canada has the best transcontinental railway service on the continent. On the Pacific Ocean we have the best mail steam-ship service, and I think we should renew our efforts to secure an efficient and first-class Atlantic mail service. We all share the disappointment which the Government must feel, that the efforts the Government has made to secure an efficient mail service have not been more successful, and my object in bringing the matter so publicly to the attention of the House is to urge the Government to renew their efforts to secure a satisfactory Atlantic mail service.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The telegram which the hon. gentleman has read to the House will form the subject of inquiry as to the delay in the transmission of the mails by the "Mongolian." It is quite apparent, from the telegram, that some mishap has occurred to the steamer, and I shall be glad, when I find out what the nature of it was, to give the hon. gentleman the information. As regards his views concerning the necessity of a fast steam-ship service, they are shared by the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is aware, because he referred to it a moment ago, that it is now five or six years since the Minister of Finance promised us a fast mail service within a short time. If I remember aright, he said that within a very few months from the time he spoke, we would have a mail service equal to the best now crossing the ocean. The hon. gentleman says that the efforts of the Government have not been crowned with success. We are all aware of that; but I would like to know from the hon. gentleman who, we know, is an authority on these matters, what he thinks of the objections made to the Canadian route? I have heard it stated again and again that it was not possible to obtain a fast service over that route on account of the dangers to navigation. I do not pretend to be an authority on these matters, or to understand them. I would hope that these statements are not true. But I have heard them made so many times that I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether he believes we could have a service over the Canadian route equal to that over the American route.

Mr. KENNY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has done me the honour to ask my opinion. I do not know exactly to what portion of the Atlantic route he refers—

Mr. LAURIER. The Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. KENNY. My individual opinion is, that if we put on a line of fast Atlantic mail steamers, desiring that they shall run with

the regularity of a ferry. I think that they should sail from a non-tidal port in England to a non-tidal port in Canada—that they should sail to and from the same ports all the year round—that these steamers should ply between the selected port in England and Halifax. That is my opinion. I may be slightly in advance of the public opinion of Canada on this point; but I think the day will soon come when, if a fast line of steamers is established, the correctness of my opinion will be generally recognized. I do not think it is any breach of faith on my part to say that some years ago such was the opinion of gentlemen who were largely interested in the railway system of Canada. I recognize that their views have changed as regards running to Halifax all the year round. I think they are as anxious as ever they were that a first-class Atlantic steam-ship service should be established, but I imagine that when it became necessary to apply to the Government of Canada for a large subsidy, the influence of the St. Lawrence was against that portion of the project which made Halifax the terminal port all the year round. I am not familiar with the St. Lawrence route. On one occasion, the last time I crossed the Atlantic, I sailed from Quebec purposely in order to inform myself, and I realized that there are difficulties in the navigation of that portion of the route which do not exist if we go to other Canadian ports.

Mr. WELSH. I have listened attentively to the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), and I quite agree that it is possible to have a fast line equal to any line running out of the United States if we will establish the terminus in a non-tidal port, and no doubt exists in my mind that Halifax is the best port in the Dominion to run this line from. I do not think the Government will ever be able to make a contract for a fast line to run by the other route. The navigation of the Strait of Belle Isle and the Gulf of St. Lawrence at certain seasons of the year is attended with difficulties and uncertainties; but from Halifax, the service can be carried on almost like a ferry, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) remarked. I think the idea of getting a fast line to compete with the New York line by running from Montreal and to convey mails and passengers will not be the best. I have crossed the Atlantic some hundred times; I have taken the route by the Strait of Belle Isle and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, also the route round the coast to Halifax and that to New York, and there is no doubt that there are only certain ports from which this line can be run, and I think the best of these is Halifax.

Mr. HAZEN. I trust this question—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friends opposite seem to applaud even before I begin.

Mr. LAURIER. Patriotism.

Mr. HAZEN. I am glad that what I have to say meets with their approval. I was going to say, when my friends on the other side anticipated me with their applause, that I trust that when this question of a fast Atlantic service comes to be considered, the claims and advantages of the port of St. John will not be overlooked.

Mr. WELSH. Tell us about the fog.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend asks about the fog. On a previous occasion I took the opportunity to point out to my hon. friends, and to demonstrate by proof that could not be denied, that the idea of fog in the Bay of Fundy had been exaggerated to a very large extent, that the returns show that insurance rates from the port of St. John were lower than from the ports on the St. Lawrence, and that statistics show that, after all, there was very little fog, not enough to affect practical navigation. But my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) always likes to chaff us about the fog. If he were to spend some time in St. John, he would come to a different conclusion. I rose only to say that the claims of St. John as an ocean port ought not to be overlooked. While I do not want to say a word against Halifax, it must be borne in mind that St. John is 277 miles further to the west than Halifax, and that water carriage has advantage in the matter of expense over land carriage. The harbour of St. John is easily accessible and safe. No wrecks have occurred in St. John harbour. The wrecks that have occurred outside, and have been charged against the Bay of Fundy, are wrecks that have happened on the coast of Nova Scotia. The harbour is open to navigation all the year round, and is clear of ice, being the only port north of Hatteras that is free of ice at all times. The city of St. John, with commendable enterprise, is providing ample wharf accommodation. In this work a quarter of a million dollars is being spent. I trust that when the matter comes up for practical consideration, the Ministry will give fair consideration to the claims and advantages which St. John offers. To my mind, as a port for receiving freight and for shipping freight from Canada to Britain in the winter season, it offers advantages over every port in Canada, because of its nearness to the west and because it is open at all times, added to the advantages which it will now possess of having wharf accommodation for a very large trade.

Mr. FORBES. While Halifax and St. John have their claims, and while each is entitled to consideration as the chief port for Atlantic steamers, I wish to call attention to the port of Louisburg in Cape Breton as, of all ports on the Atlantic, the most suitable in every respect. It is nearer to the east, as St. John is nearer to the west. It is cheaper to carry by water than by rail, it is true, but just now some of the most enterprising capitalists in North America are investing their

money at Louisburg and are going to build a line of railway from the Strait of Canso to that port. There is going to be the great depot for coal in North America along the Atlantic coast. I trust these things will be taken into consideration when this matter is more practically discussed by the Government. I trust they will not do anything to prevent the consideration of the claims which Louisburg presents as the most advantageous port to be chosen. St. John has its peculiarity. It is further away from the centre than Halifax, and Halifax is still further away than Louisburg. Louisburg is free from ice all the year round, it is easily accessible, it has notable historical associations, and is in every respect entitled to consideration at the hands of the House and the Government as the Canadian port for steamers between England and Canada.

Mr. HEARN. It is not my intention to trespass on the attention of the House by making any reference to the fitness of one Canadian port over another for a better Atlantic service between the mother country and the Dominion. I believe that, at this particular stage, no good result will follow in entering into a discussion on this subject. However, the question being before the House, I avail myself of the opportunity to say that, in common with the great majority of the House, I have full confidence that the Government will do what will be most beneficial to the Dominion as a whole when the matter comes before them for decision. Some of these little out-of-the-way ports, that hon. members have spoken of, compared with the old port of Quebec, have but a mushroom history. I have full confidence that the Government of the day will weigh fairly the claims of the respective ports, and that, in doing so, the claims of Quebec will not be overlooked. There can be but little difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to which port on this side of the Atlantic ought to be selected as the port for the fast Atlantic service between Europe and Canada.

Mr. GILLMOR. There is another port in the Maritime provinces on the Atlantic seaboard, besides St. John and Halifax. My young friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) urges as an argument in favour of that city, that it is nearer to Montreal and the west than Halifax, and, therefore, the most desirable port. Well, now, St. Andrews is forty miles nearer the west than St. John, and some 300 miles nearer than Halifax, and it is one of the best ports on the Atlantic coast. Further than that, the enterprising inhabitants of St. Andrews started a railroad before St. John or Halifax ever thought of one. I may say here that neither St. John nor Halifax ever did much for railways out of their own pocket; they always depended upon the public chest for their railways, and for almost everything else. More than forty years ago the enterprising citizens of St.

Mr. FORBES.

Andrews started a railway from that town to Quebec, and they now have a railroad that was entirely built through their own private enterprise, without ever costing the Dominion of Canada anything. St. Andrews is the nearest winter port to Montreal and Ottawa and the west, and it is the best winter port, there is no doubt about it. Those who have been there know its advantages. Of course it is not so big a place as Halifax or St. John, but they are both on the decline, they are going down, and St. Andrews is growing. Now, I will read a few words from a slip that I have here, with reference to the port of St. Andrews:

First, the port of St. Andrews is the nearest Canadian port on the Atlantic to Montreal and the North-west, being forty miles nearer Montreal than the port of St. John, and nearly 300 miles nearer than Halifax. It is fifty miles nearer the ocean than St. John and sixty miles nearer Great Britain than Portland, Me. This nearness to the business heart of Canada will tend greatly to reduce the cost of freight, by making the railway haul shorter. It also obviates the tolls at the cantilever bridge, St. John.

Second, it is a commodious port, with an abundant depth of water for the largest vessel afloat: well sheltered, and with excellent opportunities for erecting deep water wharfs at little cost. Admiral Owen, who made a survey of the port for the Imperial Government, has said of it that "there is no port within my knowledge better adapted by nature than St. Andrews for being made a mercantile port with extensive advantages and facilities, and, in short, what Liverpool has been made as a mercantile port at an incredible expense, this point of our colonies has every advantage to adapt it for, and which might be made fully available at trifling cost." Commander Campbell, commodore of the Beaver Line fleet, thus places himself on record:—"There can be no doubt that St. Andrews, both from its geographical position and from the natural advantages of a fine, commodious land-locked harbour, is certainly equal, if not superior to any port in the Dominion, as the natural winter port."

Now, Mr. Speaker, neither my hon. friend from St. John nor my hon. friend from Halifax, can point to any authorities like these in favour of their ports. It is mere local preference on their part. I have the report of admirals and other skilful men, in favour of the port of St. Andrews. I believe both the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister have been at St. Andrews, and know something about that port. They have spent their summers there, enjoying themselves, and I have no doubt when they were there they promised the people to give this matter favourable consideration. I have heard those gentlemen very highly spoken of by some of the people. The Prime Minister, I have heard, enjoyed frequent boating excursions about the bay and harbour. He was wise in employing a good Liberal as boatman. I hope he paid him liberally. I have no doubt that he enjoyed the beautiful bay, which is equal, if not superior, to the Bay of Naples, as it is surrounded by lofty mountains and sheltered from the winds in every quarter. On the whole, there is no port on the Atlantic coast like St. Andrews for a winter port. Its na-

tural advantages cannot be ignored, and I am sure we shall have it.

Mr. FLINT. I rise, not to advocate the claims of the port of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, as I do not take the position that it has any very strong claims to be the winter port; but I desire to call attention to the very inadequate grounds which, I think, my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Hearn) has given for his strong expressions of confidence in the Government in regard to its attitude upon the winter port question. If confidence is a plant of slow growth, I presume that on that ground alone my hon. friend would have a reason for allowing that plant to grow in his bosom, for certainly the settlement of this question has been a long time growing towards fruition in the minds of the Government. I think it has been before the House of Commons and the country for the last twelve or fifteen years, and now we are at the end of this long period, and we see these counter-claims made in favour of various localities. I very much regret that the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) is not present to-day to advocate the claims of his port, because I believe he could make out a claim fully as strong as that made in favour of St. Andrews by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The port of Shelburne is, probably, one of the finest on the Atlantic coast, or in the world. It has every facility and convenience that could possibly be desired in a winter port for the steamers of the Dominion of Canada trading with Europe. Of course, it has this disadvantage, that it has not yet railway connection with the Intercolonial Railway system and other railway systems of the Dominion of Canada; but I would like to inform the House that a movement is now on foot which gives great promise of success, that in a very short time, long before the Government will have decided this question finally, at any rate, Shelburne will have railway connection with Halifax and the Nova Scotia railway systems, and with the Western Counties Railway, at Yarmouth, and thus be in a position to put in its claim as a winter port. I desire to forestall the discussion in 1895 on this subject, by here putting in a sort of preliminary claim for the port of Shelburne. I have no doubt the Government will continue to take advantage of the various claims put forth here from Quebec, Montreal, Louisburg, Halifax, St. John and St. Andrews to postpone a decision on this most important question. It is not for us on this side of the House to give the Government advice. They have taken advantage, and will continue to take advantage of the division of sentiment among their supporters, and postpone what must be for them an evil day when they decide this question. I think, until they finally resolve on some port in the Bay of Fundy or on the Atlantic coast, they should give the old port

of Halifax much more favourable consideration than they have so far. Halifax, it seems to me, until the question is finally decided, certainly has strong claims, indeed strong presumptive claims to the support of the Government, so far as regards subsidies towards a winter port. As has been pointed out by the hon. members for Halifax, who have sat on both sides of the House almost since the inception of this question, that port possesses all the desiderata for a winter port. We have there a large city, a magnificent harbour, every facility for loading and unloading vessels, and facilities for intercommunication with other portions of the province, and the whole trend of trade from the larger portion of the eastern part of Canada is in that direction. I think the Government instead of placing those interests against each other, should do more for Halifax than they have done in this regard. From time to time we hear intimations that steps are to be taken towards increasing the rapidity of steam-ship communication with the mother country, and, while I am not yet convinced that it will pay this country to subsidize, at an enormous cost, a steam-ship line to compete in speed with the great lines running to New York, yet steps could well be taken to subsidize a line of steamers of a speed greatly exceeding those we possess at the present time. I hope the Government will not much longer play off one interest against another, but will soon settle the question, and let it pass out from among those questions which arise every year or two, and more strongly than they should do at the time of the general elections, when each community is persuaded, with more or less seductive intimation, that it will receive the Government's bribe. I shall be safe in stating that those gentlemen who have the good fortune to be present in this House half a dozen years hence, will hear a similar discussion to that indulged in to-day, and that the representatives of St. John, Louisburg, Shelburne, St. Andrews and Halifax will place before the House the various merits of those ports, and every effort will be made to impress on the Government the superior accommodation each port offers as the winter port of Canada.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not rise to prolong this discussion. I am glad to find that the doubts and fears expressed by the leader of the Opposition in regard to this matter seem to be illfounded, because we have not only heard of one port, but of a great many ports that are admirably fitted for the purpose to which the hon. member for Halifax has referred. We find there are a great many ports here from which we could carry on a fast service with the mother country in a very admirable manner, if we can believe the statements made by hon. gentlemen in this House. What I wish to say is simply this, that I do sincerely hope the Government will

turn their earnest attention to this matter. I entirely agree with the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for Halifax in regard to it. It is a most unfortunate circumstance that we should be in the position of having such a magnificent service across this country, and of having the very finest service across the Pacific, and yet of having a miserable service across the Atlantic. That link in our great service between the mother country and the east, which one would suppose would be the link first constructed, and constructed in the most perfect way, is the most weak, and is in a condition which is little short of disgraceful to the Dominion. I am quite sure in thus speaking I voice the feelings of the large majority of the people in western Ontario. The attention of the people there was very strongly drawn to this matter by the speech recently delivered at the Board of Trade banquet at Toronto, by Mr. Van Horne. It is admitted by every one, I think, no matter what may be the political opinions he entertains, that Mr. Van Horne as a practical business man has not his superior on this continent, and he has distinctly laid down in the most explicit terms his belief that we are able to have an Atlantic service of such a character as actually to take a large part of the trade now being carried to New York for this continent. He has stated that we can land our passengers in New York by way of Quebec twenty-four hours sooner than they can be landed in New York direct by steamers sailing to that port.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) During how many months can that be done?

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of the summer months. Mr. Van Horne says that during the winter months we cannot make so great a difference in time, but we can make a sufficient difference, as he expresses it, "to take the trade." Under these circumstances, it is the bounden duty of the Government to strain every effort to secure such a service as it is within the power of this country to obtain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have been unable to learn from the debate what object this country has to gain by accepting the proposition to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. It may be important to some parties to carry the traffic of the United Kingdom to China and Japan across this continent. I do not know that the Canadian people have any special interest in that matter. It may be a matter of very great importance to secure the landing of passengers in New York twenty-four hours earlier; but I do not know what the Canadian people have to gain by doing so. I am expressing no opinion on the subject, but I am simply expressing my own inability to see in what way, from any statement that has been made, the Canadian people have anything to gain by subsidizing a line of steamers to land passengers in New York, by way of a Canadian port, twenty-four hours sooner than they would reach there by

Mr. McNEILL.

a line of steamers sailing direct to New York. If the hon. gentleman can point out in what way that is going to be advantageous to us, I dare say he will do so. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has stated that the service between Canada and the United Kingdom is less satisfactory than the service across the continent, or the service across the Pacific Ocean. That may be so, but one would suppose that was a matter which would interest the people of the United Kingdom quite as much as it would interest the people of Canada, because it is the goods and the inhabitants of the United Kingdom that are to be carried by this fast line of steamers. How is it that the United Kingdom have not taken the interest which the hon. gentleman himself takes in the enterprise? How is it that a matter which must certainly concern them, even more than it possibly can concern any portion of the people of Canada, has not received the attention and support of the people of the United Kingdom? If the hon. gentleman looks at the traffic, he will see that this route has a very strong competitor in the Suez Canal route, and the hon. gentleman will have to show the people of the United Kingdom, and the people of Canada, that they have a special interest in diverting the traffic from that route to the present route. If he can show in what way we are to gain largely by that, then I have no doubt whatever he will be able to enlist a good many people in favour of the views which he has expressed. But this is in a large degree a question of dollars and cents, and in what way it is to bring dollars and cents to the people of this country it is important to establish this before the hon. gentleman or any other who takes his view will be able to enlist the active sympathy and support of the people of Canada in its behalf. I do not know whether or not we have any special interest in undertaking to secure the transit of passengers and goods across the Atlantic, in four or five days. I am unable to see myself in anything that has been said what we are to gain by the project, and until that fact is established, I do not think that the hon. gentleman will be able to get the people of Ontario, at all events, to take a very active interest in making a very large charge upon the resources of this country to secure the adoption of any such enterprise.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of very considerable concern to the people who live in the province of Ontario, as it is to those who reside in the other parts of the Dominion, that this fast Atlantic service should be brought into being at as early a date as possible. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked: wherein would there be any advantage to the people of Canada in having this route established? I can point him to the city of Portland, Me., which is almost entirely built with Canadian money, expended in the handling of Canadian freight on the steamers plying to that city. Were the city of Portland, or

the city of Boston, to be located on our Canadian sea-board, consider of what immense importance that would be in supplying a demand for labour and a market for our produce. I care not whether our port be Quebec, Montreal, St. John, Halifax, St. Andrews or Louisburg, so long as we have the Canadian trade going to one of these ports, the money which is expended for the handling of freight, and for wages, and in a thousand and one different ways, would be paid out to the Canadian people. Were this the case, our friends of the Opposition would be robbed of one of their strongest arguments, that the bone and sinew of the Maritime provinces and of the other provinces of the Dominion, our young men and our young women, are forced to leave Canada to seek a livelihood in Boston, Portland or New York. Not only would this service be an advantage to the people of the Maritime provinces, but we in Ontario would find extra employment for our young men along the lines of railways, and at the seaports, and our farmers would have a much larger market in the Maritime provinces for the consumption of their products. Look at the matter from any point of view you may; from the advantages of this rapid service, or from a point of view of building up a national spirit, I am satisfied that it is in the interests of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific to have our own Canadian seaports built up with Canadian money.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am somewhat amazed to hear the statement made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) in advocating a line of steamers between this country and England. One would imagine, to listen to the statement by that hon. gentleman, that if that were accomplished trade would be established; but at a meeting held in the town of Paisley, in his own county, he described the state of trade in the old country in the following terms: A falling trade; crumbling industries, dying agriculture, penury and want, and a swarming population. To-day, however, he advocates very strongly the establishment of a fast line of steamers with what he describes as a decaying country. What is the use of establishing a line of steamers at an enormous expense to carry a trade that does not exist. At all events, by advocating such a measure now, the hon. gentleman apologizes for the libel he cast upon the old country in the erroneous and fallacious statements that he has made in reference to its agricultural and commercial interests. For my own part I believe that the Government should go slowly in a matter of this kind. We have not got \$750,000 a year to throw away upon a fast line of steamers, and even if we had, there are a thousand ways in which we could use it to the better advantage of the people of Canada than by establishing this fast line. Why, what is this fast line for? To carry letters? What signifies it whether a business man's letters can cross the ocean in five or in ten days? Every one knows

that now the business between Canada and the old country is not done by letter; it is done by cable. You do not sell any flour or any other goods to the old country by letter. It is too slow. Five days is away behind the times, and you must conduct your business by using the Atlantic cable. It is therefore of little consequence whether our letters go across the ocean in five days or in eight days. There is another consideration, and that is, that in establishing a line of steamers for that purpose they must make such a high rate of speed that they would be unable to carry any freight, and consequently the only advantage we could possibly derive would be that our mails and our passengers would be taken from a Canadian port. Does it make any difference to the people crossing the ocean whether they sail from New York or Boston or from Montreal or Halifax? It would be all very nice for Halifax or St. John, that the people of this country should contribute \$750,000 a year to enable these gentlemen who wish to cross the ocean for pleasure or business to sail from a Canadian port; but I say that the great masses of the people of this country are not interested in this subject, and I think it would be well for the Government to go slowly, and consider wisely and well before they make an investment of \$750,000 a year for this purpose.

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this subject, suggested by the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has expressed a doubt as to the service that would be rendered to Canada by the transportation through our territory of passengers from Europe to the Orient. If the hon. gentleman was acquainted with the progress that has been made in the province of British Columbia, he would realize that the travel to and from Australia, China and Japan, through that province, has been particularly beneficial; those travellers as a rule are a wealthy class, who are at all times open to investments. Those who have passed through British Columbia have realized the great advantages which that province offers for the investment of capital, and I know that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested by them there, notwithstanding the fact that that travel has been small because we have not a fast Atlantic line, and connections have to be made via New York, so that the Canadian Pacific has to divide the travel with the other transcontinental roads. With a fast Atlantic line, Canada would have the greater part of this travel, and I am satisfied that as a result the amount of money invested would be greatly increased. With regard to the section of country from which the hon. gentleman comes, I do not know what its attractions are. It is quite possible that it does not offer the same inducements to people passing through to invest as are offered by the North-west and British Columbia, but a fast Atlantic service is something that would

be of the greatest advantage to the western portion of this Dominion.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I am sorry that I cannot advocate the advantages of Toronto as a winter port; I should like very much to do so if I could. But I would like to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). I was very much surprised at the statement he made to the effect that it made no difference whether the passage across the Atlantic were long or short. The hon. gentleman cannot have crossed the Atlantic many times, or he would quite appreciate the advantage of having the passage made in as few days as possible. I am sure that this country would be greatly benefited, every portion of it, by a fast Atlantic service. I do not think the hon. gentleman can have considered how important it would be to Canada to have a large stream of travel passing through the country. I think it is very much to be regretted that we have so long deferred the establishment of a fast Atlantic service. We knew that when our merchants from Toronto, Montreal, or the members of the Government want to cross the Atlantic rapidly, they have to go by way of New York. For these reasons, I think it is quite time that we had a fast service of our own, and I have no doubt that the establishment of such a service would have the effect of very largely diverting the stream of travel from the ports of New York and Boston to the ports of Canada. I am quite satisfied that every part of the Dominion would realize the benefit of it, and I for my part am quite prepared to back up the Government in any reasonable expenditure that may be necessary for the purpose of establishing such a service.

VICTORIA, B.C., MARINE HOSPITAL.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to a matter of great importance to the province of British Columbia, and one that concerns the veracity of my hon. colleague and myself. My attention has been drawn to an article that appears in the Victoria "Daily Colonist," purporting to be an interview held between the correspondent of that paper and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the Marine Hospital at Victoria. I will not read the whole interview, but I hope that the House will allow me to read from it a few extracts upon which I wish to speak. The article states:

Mr. Tupper replied to the interrogation as follows:—Unfortunately, the statements concerning works in British Columbia in charge of the Federal authorities which have been brought to my notice through the press on many occasions have often been so greatly exaggerated that it is difficult to treat them always with that attention that more careful representations would command. I am not aware, nor is there any evidence in my possession to show that the Marine Hospital at Victoria is in a disgraceful condition.

Mr. BARNARD.

He also said:

So far as the expenditure of public money is concerned, I know no part of Canada which has received more attention in this respect in proportion to its population than British Columbia. Personally, I am not induced by hard criticisms to favour expenditure; neither will I be the more disinclined to do my duty to that important portion of the country on that account; but it is regrettable, according to my own experience, that the greater effort I make to keep pace with the growth and importance of the commerce of Victoria, and the larger the appropriations for that purpose, the more angry becomes the criticisms of the Government's policy and of this department in particular. I notice that Col. Prior joined in the attack on my department. I think, therefore, it is only fair that I should add to his remarks this significant statement, that the agent of my department at Victoria furnishes a report which is in complete contradiction of what was said at the meeting. This agent was recommended to me by Mr. Earle and Col. Prior, and they have never seen fit to send me the slightest hint as to the existence of the grievance upon which Col. Prior dwelt, as reported in the "Colonist."

Now, Sir, it is a most painful duty I have to perform to-day, in bringing this matter before the House, because the hon. gentleman in question is a personal friend of mine, and I trust he always will be, as I am proud to have his friendship. Not only that, but he is absent from his seat to-day, and I feel that it is almost unfair for me to say anything when he is not here to return the attack; for I know that he is a hard hitter, and he would reply to me if he were here. I have the greatest respect for his undoubted ability and executive skill; but I feel that if I did not bring this matter forward, I should be open to the charge of neglecting my duty to my constituents. Therefore, I wish to protest most emphatically against the language made use of by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to my province. The hon. Minister must have known—I do not see how he could help knowing—that my hon. colleague and myself had repeatedly brought before his department the unsatisfactory condition of the Marine Hospital at Victoria. It was most unsatisfactory, and we went several times to see the Minister and also the Deputy Minister; and I must say that I consider that the action of the hon. gentleman, as shown in this interview, of trying to shift the responsibility from his own shoulders to the shoulders of my hon. colleague and myself, was, to say the least of it, for one in his high position, most undignified. Not only have we placed this matter before the hon. gentleman, but the press of the province and also the British Columbia Board of Trade have brought it to the notice of his department, the former by leading articles, and the latter by resolutions passed and forwarded to the department. I contend that representations from such sources are well worthy of the consideration of the hon. Minister or of any other Minister, and I do not think he had a right to make the insinuations that he did. He states that his agent out there had reported

differently from the statements made by the press and the Board of Trade. Well, Sir, I think that the members of Parliament for Victoria, as well as the press of Victoria and the officers of the British Columbia Board of Trade are just as worthy of credence from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a Government agent, and I repeat here, and I say it truthfully, that the affairs in connection with the marine hospital in Victoria have been carried on in the most parsimonious manner, in a manner very short of disgraceful, and this, notwithstanding that the Government have been in receipt of large sums collected as hospital fees from the ships entering our ports. Sir, the province of British Columbia does not now, and never did, approach the Department of Marine or any other department as a mendicant. We simply wish to get what we consider our fair dues and just treatment, such as is meted out to other portions of this Dominion. The Minister also states that the more the Government gave that province, the more criticism his department got from the press and people. Well, Sir, all I can say is this, if the hon. gentleman can see any large sum that he has given to the Marine Hospital, or, I might say, to almost anything else in British Columbia from his department, he must see through very strong magnifying glasses, for I do not believe a more cheeseparing policy could have been pursued towards that province than has been pursued by the hon. gentleman's department. If the province only paid a small amount into the Dominion treasury, I could well understand his policy, but what are the facts? The people of British Columbia pay the sum of \$16.95 per head, in Customs and Excise dues alone, against \$5.70 per head in Ontario, \$3.75 in Nova Scotia, and \$5.92 per head, taking the average of the Dominion; or they pay \$11.07 per annum more than the average tax-payer does in the whole Dominion. Taking those circumstances into consideration, I think we have a just right to expect a decent expenditure not only from the Department of Marine but also from all other departments. The Minister of Marine seems to think that a member of Parliament has no right to take objection to any action which he or his deputy may adopt. I cannot agree with him. Not only that—it may be impertinence on my part to say so—but I consider that an ordinary member of Parliament has a perfect right to expect common courtesy from another member of Parliament, either in correspondence or personal interview, even if that other does hold the high position of a Minister of the Crown. As I have said, it has given me pain to bring this matter up, but I felt that I must not let my own personal feelings interfere with my official duties to my constituents. I feel personally certain that if the Minister of Marine will only look thoroughly into the matter, he will find that my colleague and myself have simply done our duty to our constituents in bringing this matter before him, and also

that he would have done his duty, had he attended to the representations made, not only by my colleague and myself, but by the members of the Board of Trade of British Columbia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that what has attracted the attention of the hon. gentleman is a statement in the press, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made to a representative of the press, intimating that the information he had received from his officers did not justify the strictures which had been made with regard to the condition of the Marine Hospital. I do not know, nor am I able to ascertain at this moment, in order to meet what the hon. gentleman has said, what the facts were in connection with the complaint or what the complaint itself was, because, while the hon. gentleman was good enough to intimate to me that he would make this matter the subject of observation before the House went into Supply, he only gave me that notice after three o'clock when it was impossible for me to send to the department for any information. I am perfectly certain that, whatever the facts may be as regards the condition of the Marine Hospital, if the Minister of Marine were here himself, he could give explanations which would justify what he said to the press, and satisfy, I am sure, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) who has just spoken. The words of the extract which the hon. gentleman read, as they fell upon my ear, did not, I think, justify the hon. gentleman in stating that the Minister of Marine had either shifted the responsibility for the state of affairs in the Marine Hospital to his officers, or been guilty of making insinuations as regards the accuracy of the two hon. gentlemen who represent Victoria. On the contrary, the statement made in the press was directed against the strong language used at the meeting of the Board of Trade; and with respect to those very strong statements, such as the statement that the hospital was in a very disgraceful condition, the Minister cites the report of his officer, with whom he had communication after the condition of the hospital has been brought to his attention by the hon. members for Victoria; and I understand that the report of his officer indicates that the state of the hospital was not such as to justify the strong statements I have referred to and which my colleague had in view. I do not understand at all, that to quote the report of the officer of one's department, concerning an institution in a part of the country, which it was impossible for the Minister to have visited since the complaints were made, is at all insinuating that what was stated by the representatives of that locality was contrary, untruthful, or disingenuous. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), that he and every member of Parliament is entitled to the utmost courtesy in the transaction of business with Ministers of the Crown; and I think we are

justified in concluding, from what the hon. gentleman said in the early part of his observations that that courtesy has existed between the Minister of Marine and himself, because he states that he is personally on the most friendly terms with my colleague, and was good enough to compliment my hon. colleague on the way he administered his department generally. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken altogether in the view he takes of the language the Minister of Marine used, and is certainly mistaken in supposing that the Minister made insinuations with regard to the hon. gentleman and his colleague, or was guilty of any neglect of the rule which obliges courtesy between Ministers and their fellow-members in this House. As regards what the hon. member has said with respect to the revenue and the expenditure in British Columbia, that is a subject we can discuss when it comes more properly before the House, but, in the meantime, it seems to me to be beside this question, because, if the Marine Hospital is shown to be inefficiently managed—much less in the state in which it was described by some of the speakers at the Board of Trade meeting and some of the press—it would not be a question as to what revenue the people of British Columbia contribute or what money they receive for public purposes, but it would be the duty of the Government and the Minister in charge of the department to make provision for putting the hospital in a complete state of efficiency. At the same time, I beg to assure the hon. gentleman that the Minister of Marine cannot have intended what the hon. gentleman supposes he did; and, in so far as I am concerned, it seems to me really impossible to draw that conclusion from the language used. I shall communicate, however, with the Minister of Marine at once with regard to the subject, and will make inquiry in the department with the view, perhaps, of drawing the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject later.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is extremely to be regretted that we should have these daily manifestations of trouble in the family. I have sat in this House for many years, and have until this session observed the utmost unanimity on the floor of the House in public, whatever discord there may have been behind the scenes; but for some inexplicable reason, the ties of the past seem to have become loosened, and public business is daily being impeded through hon. gentlemen here being compelled, in justice to themselves and the country, to express their reasons for not being able to give that hearty support to the Administration which they formerly gave, and were sent here to give it. As a result, what do we find? We find that the Administration, having endeavoured to rehabilitate itself—increased in numbers, but perhaps not in talent—we find that Administration to-day losing grip on the House and country, sparring for time, and public busi-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

ness at a standstill. Now, I can understand how it is, that the Government to-day fails to be able to respond to the needs of the country and legislate for existing needs, but asks for a year's time, while the country is suffering, in order that these family feuds may be settled in private, and that they may be able to present a united front. They stand before the country paralyzed, unable to command apparently a working majority, in order to give effect to the will of the people. Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that of the hon. gentlemen who are now at the back of the Government, there is not to be found a majority having the courage to back up legislation such as the country demands.

An hon. MEMBER. Try it.

Mr. MULOCK. Try it! The Government have confessed that they are afraid to present legislation dealing with the evils of the country. They have stated in their own address that they are afraid to deal with these evils. They have by their action prayed for God's sake to be allowed time to make up their mind, and the men who have caused them to do it are these gentlemen who stand up and declare that there should be reform in the tariff, and that the Government must deal with it; and the Government is crushed between two forces—the combines on the one hand, and an aroused people on the other. They stand, as I said before, paralyzed, sparring for time, unable to move forward, and afraid to stand still.

THE HERCHMER INVESTIGATION.

Mr. DAVIN. As I see my hon. friend the President of the Council (Mr. Ives) in his place, I should like to ask him if he has brought down the report of Mr. Justice Wetmore, on his investigation into the charges against Commissioner Herchmer?

Mr. IVES. I may say to my hon. friend that I shall have much pleasure in laying the papers on the Table in the course of next week. I am bringing down not only the report, but also the evidence and exhibits.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of management—To pay Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co., and Messrs. Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co., $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent commission on amount of bonds and stock inscribed for the sinking funds of the Guaranteed Loans from 1868 to 31st December, 1892. \$44,274 01

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Upon what ground is this payment demanded? I was under the impression that these things had been met from year to year as the sinking fund investments were made. How do you come to require payment for all the time, for some twenty-three years?

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend will see from reading the item, it arises from the fact that, although under the terms of the contract the agents had the right to charge $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent commission on sinking funds, that is for both kinds of loans, it appears that at the time of the transfer they had accumulated a balance, because they had not charged the $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on guaranteed loans. They had charged it only on the unguaranteed loans. Consequently this charge remains over. They should really have charged it up every year or half year and been paid. The reason they did not do it, possibly, was this: that if the agency had remained with them they would have had 1 per cent commission which they would have charged if they had negotiated the redeeming loan. But as the transfer took place, not having that, they brought the matter up for discussion and for payment. The question was referred to the Department of Justice and properly looked into, and there is no doubt whatever about the validity of the claim and the justice of payment, and it is to square accounts that this item is put in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I follow the hon. gentleman rightly, this \$44,000 would be, as one might say, a sort of fine on the transfer of our account, and ought to be debited to the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. In one sense that is true, but, fortunately, we have a compensation. Whereas we would have paid to the old agents 1 per cent on the negotiation of the last redemption loan, we shall have paid the new agent only $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. I had a calculation made by the officers of the department, and on this transaction we save \$8,000. So it is not so bad as it looks at first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Always presuming we get as good terms.

Mr. FOSTER. The commission is the same whether we get good terms or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that is presuming that we get as good terms for the loans. That is altogether hypothetical, but the payment is a fixed fact. Of course, if the money is due to the Barings and the Glyns, as from what the hon. gentleman says, it seems to be, and, as, I have no doubt, after the explanation of the hon. gentleman has given, it is, there can be no objection made to paying it. But I think it will add, more or less, to the doubt that already exists in the mind of many as to whether we are really making anything out of the transaction or not.

Mr. FOSTER. We have already got some return, and I think there need be no doubt as to the wisdom of the transfer.

To pay for services and disbursements in connection with the transfer of the financial agency in London.....\$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. That is for certain expenses in connection with making the transfer from the old to the new agents. I was in London myself for a month and arranged the matter, but I could not stay there until the end of the year, and the transfer of the books and accounts had to take place, and it had necessarily to be made by a neutral party. So I engaged the services of Mr. Thomas Skinner, who was well acquainted with both the old agents and the new, and who was "persona grata" to both of them. I asked him to attend to all the minutiae and details of the transfer. The whole of this amount is not for the payment of Mr. Skinner; part of it is for expenses of books, and so on. For instance, the stock books, as I think I mentioned before, had been paid for by the agents, and were really their own personal property. We thought it was necessary they should belong to us, and I authorized Mr. Skinner to pay the agents for the books. Then, there are certain expenses for advertising and other services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the sum paid the actual cost of the books?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, only the actual cost.

Civil Government—Department of Secretary of State—To pay salary of C. T. DeLanaudière as a second class clerk from 1st July, 1892. \$1,112 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this? Was this officer not provided for in the Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. He was not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it a new office?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not a new office. Mr. DeLanaudière was appointed by Order in Council, but he was left out and this is to correct the error.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then this is virtually a new appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. No; he was appointed by Order in Council and served in the office for some time, but was omitted from the Estimates last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the date of his appointment?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My recollection is that it was about a year ago, but the Finance Minister thinks it was longer than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did he come to be brought in as a second-class clerk at once?

Mr. FOSTER. In this way: When Mr. Chapleau was Secretary of State, his former private secretary, Mr. Tache, resigned and left the service. Mr. DeLanaudière was brought in as private secretary to Mr. Chap-

leau and was appointed as second class clerk, and remained in the service up to the end of the year for which there was an appropriation, but in last year's Estimates, that is the Estimates for the current year, his salary was dropped out.

Mr. LAURIER. But there must have been an appropriation for a second class clerk for the position occupied by Mr. Taché.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but the amount was dropped out of the current year's Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is this gentleman? He was only a year in the service, as I understand, and was made a second class clerk. A man who has been in the service for a reasonable length of time, of course, is sometimes promoted a little more rapidly if he happens to be a Minister's private secretary, and I think there is some special provision for that. But as I understand, this gentleman was just brought into the service for one year, and then placed at a salary of over \$1,000. Now, what special qualifications had he to warrant this departure from the ordinary rule of the Civil Service?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Before his promotion he was appointed permanently, in the first place, as second class clerk, after he had been for a number of years a temporary clerk. He was for some time in my department. I think he has been in the service of the Government altogether about eight years, and is very efficient.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand Mr. De Lanaudière took the place formerly occupied by Mr. Taché, who was provided for in the general Estimates. When Mr. Taché resigned, Mr. DeLanaudière was promoted to the position, therefore he must have been paid out of the Estimates of that year; he was paid under the salary of Mr. Taché. As Mr. Taché went out, Mr. DeLanaudière came in, and this salary was continued. I do not understand why we should take another appropriation for that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is wrong. As Mr. Taché stepped out, Mr. DeLanaudière stepped in, at a salary of \$1,100, and he was paid out of the appropriation for a second class clerk for 1891-92, until the end of that year. Mr. Taché having stepped out, when the Estimates were made up for the current year, the appropriation for a second class clerk was dropped. It was merely an omission, and this is to remedy the omission.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long did he discharge the duties of private secretary to Mr. Chapleau?

Mr. FOSTER. Until Mr. Chapleau's retirement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor-General's Report that he only drew the sum of \$11 altogether as private secretary, for seven days' service last year.

Mr. FOSTER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the payment which the hon. member refers to is the payment to the 1st of July, and for some time afterwards he continued to perform the duties of private secretary to the Secretary of State, until the Secretary of State became Minister of Customs, and then he was not continued as private secretary, but remained in the department, and this is to make provision for his salary as clerk in the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears from the account that he was appointed on the 8th January, a year ago, and during the first half year of his service he only served seven days as private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get the Order in Council and show when he was appointed.

Department of Trade and Commerce—To provide for the salary of the Deputy Minister from 1st January, 1893..... \$1,600

Mr. LAURIER. Before we are called upon to pay this item, I think we should have some information as to the organization of this department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will remember we discussed that question pretty fully on the main Estimates; we had two hours discussion on it. Surely my hon. friend is not so insatiable for information as to wish to have it twice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We spent two hours in trying to get information, but the result was eminently unsatisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. The demand is sometimes greater than the supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was particularly requested to give us some idea what on earth the Deputy Minister would have to do in looking after these three or four parties—one second class clerk, one third class clerk, one messenger; I suppose the Minister will look after his private secretary himself. I really do not see for the life of me why there should be a Deputy Minister for this particular office unless it be for the charitable and benevolent purpose of providing for some gentleman for the time being who cannot be very conveniently dismissed. But waiving the question as to whether we are going to get any good from the creation of these very numerous Cabinet Ministers, I must say that I have always understood that the work of a Deputy Minister was such that he was expected to look after a large department, and we were assured that this department would not grow. I do not see how the Deputy Minister can profitably be employed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, perhaps, the department will grow in this sense, that duties which now belong to other departments will be transferred to this, and the officers who have assisted in the discharge of

those duties in the other departments, will be transferred to this. We do not expect it will grow in the sense of new additions to the service; but there will be various branches established in the Department of Trade and Commerce, for matters such as those connected with steam-ship subsidies, the regulation of contracts for such, and things of that kind, the supervision of commercial agencies, the matter of statistics which relate to trade and commerce, and all the matters connected with the enlargement of trade, and correspondence upon that subject, matters connected with the administration of the relations between the Chambers of Commerce and the Government, harbour boards, harbour commissioners and all matters of that kind, will naturally be relegated to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and a staff will have to be provided for that department. It is the intention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that these officers shall be gathered, as I have stated, from the other departments, where these duties are now performed, according as these matters are under his care. It is impossible for us, at the present time, to give the House in detail a statement of what duties will be relegated to that department, considering that only a little over a month elapsed between the establishment of the Ministry of Trade and Commerce and the opening of Parliament. But the Minister has many scores of references to him from the Council of matters connected with trade, and these require the attention of a Deputy Minister. This is to make provision for such clerkships as will be filled, I take it, by transfers from other departments, but they must be payable out of the Civil Government vote from this department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will a Deputy Minister be continued in the office of each one of the Controllers as well as in the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the Act provides the contrary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have Commissioners instead of those.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act on the subject provides that there shall be a Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce. They provide that the salaries of the existing Deputy Ministers of Inland Revenue and of Customs shall continue to the incumbents as long as they remain in office, but that, when vacancies occur in the offices of the Deputy Ministers in those departments, there shall be Commissioners instead.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What will be the salaries of the Commissioners?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act provides that the salaries shall be \$2,800.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What will be the fixed charges entailed by the appointment of the

two Controllers; what additional officers will be required in the department?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will be secretaries. There were two secretaries, and there will be three for the future.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And there will also be two Commissioners?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The gentlemen who fill the offices of Commissioners were in the department before. It will not be necessary to appoint any new officer to fill the position. If a Commissioner were appointed from the outside at any time, he would take the place of some officer in the department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are there not Commissioners, and is there not also a Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No one takes the place of the Deputy Minister, I presume?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; his duties will be performed by a Commissioner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At the same salary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; at \$2,800. He has not yet been appointed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do the Deputy Ministers and the Commissioners take precedence over the Controllers? What is the order of precedence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is to be found in the Parliamentary Hand-book, it is in the latter part of the book, and the hon. gentleman will perhaps look at it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Controllers were not in existence when the Hand-book was published, and we should like to have the ruling of the Government when there is no written constitution to guide us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will turn up the table for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, and he will find the deputies have no precedence.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance on a previous occasion intimated that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would endeavour to gather statistics with respect to interprovincial trade. This has been looked upon as a matter of some moment, and it was intimated that the Minister would prepare statistics in regard to such trade. What course does the Minister of Commerce intend to adopt with respect to the collection of those statistics?

Mr. FOSTER. That I cannot tell. It is for the Minister of Commerce, who is now considering the question, to think out and recommend what steps he considers best to adopt, and to submit his proposal for the consideration of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. One feature that is extremely objectionable in regard to this new department, as well as the Department of Agriculture, is, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in this House. Undoubtedly, if this department is going to be of interest and value to the Dominion, and to commerce generally, the Minister should be in this House, prepared to answer questions and information. It is also desirable that the Minister of Agriculture should be here. Such a department is of vital importance to the country, and yet the Minister is in the Senate, and not within the reach of representatives of the people. With respect to inter-provincial trade, it is unquestionably a matter of considerable interest. It is highly desirable that accurate statistics should be prepared in order that hon. members may be able to estimate the extent of that trade, and be able to more closely gather the amount of and value of manufactures consumed in the Dominion. We should thereby be able to judge more accurately the effects of the National Policy, and the amount of goods manufactured and used within the Dominion. My only reason for asking this question is, to ascertain if any general course has been outlined by the Government in regard to it. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce been merely appointed to perform duties decided upon by himself and without any discretion being left to the Cabinet? Has he been given no instruction, and is he not following any general line of instructions? The Minister of Finance has stated that it has been left to himself to prepare statistics with respect to interprovincial trade. Have the Government given no instructions?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that; the hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. gentleman stated, in reply to my question, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was only beginning to consider in what way he would gather those statistics. Have the Government instructed him to adopt his own course, without giving him an idea as to what course he should follow?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government does not give ideas as to how a Minister shall conduct an investigation and arrive at certain conclusions to submit to Council. I stated also that the Minister was engaged in studying the question, and that after he had studied the question, he would submit his plans to the Government. The Government would then have a chance of advising with him, and of suggesting, if need be, any additions or extensions, as is always done. The hon. gentleman left out one-half of what I stated—that the Minister was conducting his investigation, and preparing his plan to submit to Council.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the necessity of creating the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce had impressed itself strongly on

Mr. FOSTER.

members of the Cabinet, they would have been able undoubtedly to have given the Minister a concise view of the duties that would necessarily devolve upon him. It is quite clear that no necessity for the creation of the office existed. The duties were performed by another department, and this Department of Trade and Commerce was brought into existence, not through absolute necessity for it pressing itself upon the Government, but rather for the purpose of getting the Government out of a political difficulty. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has been placed in office, and given a roving commission. He, therefore, goes to work as he pleases, and he gets up anything in the way of statistics as suits himself, and so far as the Government are concerned, no regular instructions have been given to him.

Mr. LISTER. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce any control over the Controllers?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The two Controllers are to exercise their duties and manage the departments under the general supervision of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. As regards control, there is none. As regards the policy of each department, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is the medium of communication between the department and Council, and makes the reports and so forth.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under the old system, when there had been appeals in reference to seizures and other matters, the final determination was with the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue. Will that power now be with the Controllers or with the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be with the Controllers.

Mr. LISTER. Then, as I understand it, the duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is merely to make communication between the Controllers and the other members of the Cabinet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that. He is the medium of communication, of course, because reports to Council have to be made by a Minister of the Crown. What I intended to express was: that as regards the policy on which these departments are arranged, for instance with regard to tariff changes and excise, revenue changes, and the general administration by the two sets of officers for Excise and Customs—in all matters of that kind, the Controllers will consult with him, and advise with him, and he has the general supervision with regard to these matters, and matters of policy.

Mr. LISTER. Is the patronage of the department in the hands of the Controllers or in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The patronage of each department is in the hands of the Controller, who is the head of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has no practical control over the department that he formerly used to preside over.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What position does the Controller occupy? Is he entitled to deal with the various questions that come before him as fully as the Minister of Customs in former days did, or is he under any special supervision? Has he got the right, for instance, to settle claims?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Controller disposes of these as effectually as the Minister did before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, the policy which is announced by the Finance Minister in the Budget speech has not been thoroughly matured. The Government have not yet matured the plans upon which they will conduct these tours throughout the country in order to find out from the manufacturers their needs and their requirements. That is not under the control of the Government, but under the control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he has not communicated the plan upon which he is going to obtain this information. How does the Minister of Finance know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to decide upon taking this course, if he has not yet considered it? What is the medium of communication between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when the Finance Minister tells us to-day, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not yet matured his scheme? We should have the fullest information on this before the House is asked to vote the estimates for this department.

Mr. LISTER. I want to know exactly what the position of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is? As I understand, his first duty is to consult with his colleagues as to the trade policy of the Government, and I understood the Minister of Finance to say that his next duty would be to gather statistics relating to the trade of the country. Now, is that all that he is expected to do, and has it been decided that that is a portion of his duty?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say it would be his next duty. I happened, the other day, to mention the fact that we had not as full statistics of our trade as it was desirable we should have, and I ventured to express the hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would take that matter up, and devise some method for obtaining this valuable information. I know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is looking into that matter, but I did not say it was his "next" duty.

Mr. LISTER. Is it a part of his duty at all?

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me it is a part of his duty.

Mr. LISTER. Then, that has not been decided upon yet, as you say you "hope" he will get statistics of the interprovincial trade, and, so far as we know, his only duty is to consult with the Government and decide upon the fiscal policy. It seems to me that you have appointed a Minister to discharge a duty without deciding what that duty is to be. It looks to me as if the Government have been creating offices merely for the purpose of making places for certain of their friends.

Mr. FLINT. It does seem to me that my friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) is very obtuse. I should think he could gather easily from the statements that have been made, that it is the principal duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to find out what his duties are. I would like to ask the Government if they have considered the advisability of amalgamating the business of the two departments in places where the revenue from Customs and Excise is small? It seems to me, from an examination of the Auditor-General's Report, and from other sources of information, that there are places in Canada where the officers of the internal revenue have very little to do, and have necessarily small salaries, and one man who, perhaps, might be otherwise better employed, is struggling along on a low salary, while, perhaps, the Customs officers in the same locality, with abundant leisure on their hands, are being paid large salaries. Of course in large cities, where the collections are large in both of these departments, there is plenty for both departments to do; but there are some small places in which the offices might be amalgamated. I think that this might be one of the subjects which the Minister of Trade and Commerce could deal with. I shall not mention any particular case in this connection, but I have in my mind several places where the suggestion which I make could be carried out with very great advantage to the Government and the persons themselves.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend is perfectly correct. He has mentioned two very important lines of duty which devolve on the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and equally on every Minister of the Crown. The first is to find out what his duties are, and it takes a Minister a little time to find out that. The second is to practice economy in the management of public affairs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the first Minister has quite accurately stated the facts of the case. I am sure that he has no difficulty at all in determining what his duties are, and I dare say that the hon. Minister of Finance has equally clear conceptions as to what his duties are. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce was appointed to hold a certain position without having any very

definite duties attached to it, but with the hope that by and by he will grow moss; that is about the position of things. Now, I see theoretically what it is proposed shall be the relations between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Controllers; but when you undertake to state accurately what those relations are in fact, and not simply in principle, then a very great deal of difficulty arises. The administrative work, properly so-called, necessarily devolves upon the two Controllers. With that administrative work the Minister of Trade and Commerce will have nothing to do. With the general policy affecting Customs and internal taxation, the Minister may have something to do; but if you allow, as my hon. friend from Lambton suggested, and as I understand the Minister to say, that the policy of the Government with regard to taxation is to fall to his lot, then it seems to me that the real functions of the Minister of Finance will be entirely swept away. I supposed that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would have duties somewhat similar to those of the President of the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom; but I do not precisely see what special functions the Government propose at present to assign to him. What are to be his duties? The duties of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue were almost precisely the same as those which now devolve upon the two Controllers—very little beyond them; and the policy regarding Customs and Excise taxes was largely dealt with by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, in the very nature of things, must continue to deal with those subjects still; but, that being so, it seems to me that there is nothing remaining for the Minister of Trade and Commerce as a Cabinet Minister to do. The hon. First Minister has spoken of the collection of statistics. That is simply an administrative work, which may be undertaken by a chief clerk in a department. The commercial agents appointed abroad, the hon. gentleman says, will be under the control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Well, I understand that is to be simply a certain amount of patronage to be placed in the hands of the Minister, separate from the patronage of the Controllers, and which now belongs to some other Minister, and nothing more; no large question of public policy can grow out of that matter. It does seem to me that the arrangement that existed prior to the bringing into force of the Act which so long remained a dead letter on the Statute-book, was an arrangement better suited to our circumstances than the one which the hon. gentleman has brought into operation. So far as I can see, nothing relating to matters of public policy, which are under the control of the Administration in their capacity as advisers of the Crown, can for a long time to come fall to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, apart from the two subor-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).]

dinate positions politically under his control, that of Controller of Customs and Controller of Inland Revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact is, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is a Past Grand Master, and the Controller is the existing Grand Master.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the Minister tell us what the new Department of Trade and Commerce will cost, including the head and all the new appointees who are necessary?

Mr. FOSTER. The Estimates will inform my hon. friend. Provision is made for a Deputy Minister, a second class clerk, a third class clerk, a stenographer and a messenger. It is also provided:

That in case of the transfer to this department of any officers or clerks whose salaries have been provided for in the estimates of any other department whether inside or outside service, the amount provided shall be available for the payment of the said salaries by this department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What becomes of the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. FOSTER. That is provided for in the last clause that I have read.

Mr. FLINT. That is under the Department of Agriculture, is it not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the Bureau of Statistics has never been established yet. There is an Act authorizing it, but the Act has never been brought into force.

Mr. FLINT. I mean the statistician.

Mr. FOSTER. He is in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FLINT. I suppose, from the tenor of the observations of the hon. Minister, that in time his work might be transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, which I think would certainly be an improvement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there any necessity of continuing the statistician, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to be virtually the statistician?

Mr. FOSTER. He will be kept at work.

Mr. LAURIER. In whose department?

Mr FOSTER. Where he is at present.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce will collect the statistics which he has been collecting.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not say that. It may be desirable in some respects, as the hon. member for Yarmouth says, that the statistics should be assigned to the Department of Trade and Commerce, where they naturally belong. That question has not yet been settled. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has been charged with various duties from day to day by Council making reference to him; but the scheme to be detailed for his department must be by Order in Council,

or it may need legislation. That certainly requires experience before it can be formulated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the statistics are taken from the Department of Agriculture and placed under the control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Immigration is also taken from the former department and put under the control of the Minister of the Interior, what remains for the Minister of Agriculture?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will still be Patents, and Copyrights, and Agriculture and Quarantine.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to retain Quarantine, and separate it from Immigration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then the Government are going to have two sets of statistics, one by the statistician and the other by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce to go around with the Minister of Finance? or is it the Minister of Finance and the two Controllers who are to go on this expedition? We want to know all about this wonderful progress of the members of that troupe, so that we may know how to receive them. We ought to know in what order it is going to turn out, and in what garb we ought to meet them.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go down to your county we will give you notice.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the appointment of the hon. gentleman as Minister of Trade and Commerce is simply pensioning him off for the rest of his life at a salary of \$8,000 per year. He might just as well have been put on the superannuation list, had that been possible. After all the inquiries made from this side as to what his duties are to be, we cannot obtain a distinct answer. In the first place he has to gather information as he thinks best, and in whatever way he may think fit. He is to have a Deputy-Minister, and a number of clerks and a private secretary, and he has a seat in the Senate. Of course, it would be very ungracious to turn him out of harness altogether like an old horse, to die on the roadside. There must be some provision made for him. He has rendered very faithful service to his party, while in the House, and his family have all been provided for—his sons, and his grandsons, and sons-in-law. All are drawing good salaries. One son enjoys a magnificent position as Collector of Customs in Victoria at \$2,000 a year. Another son is in another position in Dakota, drawing a good salary, but I do not know what he is doing there for us. It would be too bad to turn out the political hack and let him wander around to die on the roadside. This creation of new offices is an injustice to the people, in view of our present expenditure of \$37,500,000 a year. No doubt the Controller of Customs

wanted to get a position, and no doubt the party at his back wanted him installed in some place. You could not put two men into the one place, and so to suit all parties, this new departure was taken of putting into force an Act which lay a dead letter on the Statute-book for five years. That Act was brought into existence, as a tempting invitation to followers of the Government, to which they might look forward. It was held out to them as furnishing a prospect of positions in store for them. It was allowed to slumber during five years, and would not have been brought into use now were there not so many individuals pressing their services on the country in the shape of Ministers of the Crown. In order to quietly get over the difficulty surrounding the disposal of these different positions, these new offices were promised. We heard the rumour of their creation during the summer in the public press, and we heard of the various applicants. One man was kicking so vigorously, so the hon. member for Grey said, that he sprained himself and had to go to New York to get cured. I do not know how hard the Controller of Customs kicked, but he has been provided for. There is only one man evidently who did not kick as vigorously as the rest, the man for London, and he was turned out. No place could be found for him; but I think they might have made him Minister of the National Policy. They sent him virtually to Chicago politically, and, indeed, he has been practically Chicagoed. They could not shake the other gentleman whom they sent to the Senate, but had to make a place for him. I say it is unjust to the people, under the present stringent condition of affairs, to thus increase our annual expenditure for the sake of providing a resting place for the balance of his days for an old man who has drawn a salary year after year far in excess of the value of the services he ever rendered to the country, and who was a willing and pliant tool always ready to swallow anything in the interests of the party. They could not get rid of him, and so he was made Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the Senate, with full liberty to make of the position anything he liked, and to make any report he liked. It would have been better to have sent him over to London to assist Sir Charles Tupper in performing the duties of High Commissioner. He could have been named Assistant High Commissioner. It may be intended, however, that he shall devote his time and attention to gathering statistics, in order to bolster up the National Policy, and possibly one of his duties will be to visit in the Red Parlour the millionaires which that policy has created. He may be very serviceable in gathering the commissions, for the purpose of carrying on politics in the future, as they have been in the past. Before the committee was asked to sanction the establishment of this Minister of Trade and Commerce, we should have had a distinct, clear outline of his duties, and we should have also had some evidence from

past years of the necessity of creating that office. Nothing has been brought to the eye of the House to at all justify the establishment of this new department. But the fact that the statute under which this office was created lay a dead letter for five years, proves, conclusively, that there was no necessity for it, and that it was only put into effect for the purpose of helping the Government out of a difficulty. It is quite clear that the whole thing was got up, not for the purpose of benefiting the trade of the country, not because the trade of the country required such an officer, but just because the Government had not sufficient positions to divide among the contending divisions of the party; and they established the office in order to find a resting place for an old chief, who was, undoubtedly, a willing and pliant tool for many years, and pension him off for the balance of his life at a cost of \$8,000 to the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg to say a word or two on the subject of the observations the committee have just listened to. We who have our seats in this House are accustomed to be attacked and referred to in terms, which, at times, are offensive, and which we reply to or not, according as their importance seems to necessitate a reply or not. But when an hon. gentleman makes the most insulting observations which he has made with reference to an old public servant—a person who has been an active and respected member of this House, and who is still a Minister, but is not present or in a position to take part in the debates of this House—I feel that, not on his behalf, but on account of the character of the House, it is necessary to call attention to the unworthy nature of those insults. Any person in this country may well be regarded as not worthy of reply who would style the present Minister of Trade and Commerce an old horse turned out to pasture. I am proud to say that, after fifteen years of public service as a Minister of the Crown, in which he administered the most laborious department in the public service, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is, to-day, capable of administering any department in the Government as is any member of this House. And I trust that I shall be able to say that of him for many years to come. I need not remind the House that observations of that character would not have been made if the Minister of Trade and Commerce were here, because if there is any man who is able and willing to take his own part and against whom statements of that kind would be powerless and impotent, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is the man. We have given him, not on account of political exigencies, but for the public good, we firmly believe, one of the most important departments in the whole Government, a department which is immediately connected with every branch of business carried on in this country.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Six years ago the policy was settled in this House, and settled, I think, with only one dissenting voice, that it was desirable to create such a department. The First Minister of the day did not think it expedient or had not the full opportunity of bringing that Act into operation, but when the opportunity was given by the complete reorganization of the Government, we felt that we had the mandate of Parliament, as well as the authority of Parliament, to create that department, and we created it, believing that the Ministry of Trade and Commerce must be, as it now is in this country and as it is in many other countries, not only one of the most important departments of the Government, as I have said, but one of the most useful. And the hon. gentleman's statements with regard to the Minister, a man in the full vigour of life, a man who has had an honourable career in this branch of Parliament, and is leader of the co-ordinate branch, the Senate, are made simply because something like six weeks have elapsed since the creation of the department and we have not yet laid on the Table a detailed list of the duties which are to devolve upon him. I think the same objection could be raised with regard to every department of the Government. With regard to my department as Minister of Justice, the Act which creates the department and which defines my duties is a mere skeleton and there has never been presented to this House, and I believe the Government has never been asked to present, a full list of the duties which devolve upon me and which I have to discharge, and which would tax the energy of any man if he undertake to discharge them fully. The duties imposed upon the Minister will increase as this department grows from day to day, if that department is efficiently managed, as the Department of Trade and Commerce will be. It would be impossible to expect a draughtsman, however skilled, to sit down and draw up an Act to describe, in advance of experience and observation, the duties the Minister will have to perform. We know from the history of departments of trade and commerce in other countries what they embrace. They embrace all matters of inquiry and of policy in relation to trade and commerce, as I mentioned a few moments ago. I think the objection that we are not able to state in detail everything that will consume the business hours of the Minister is a most unreasonable one, and that observations which stigmatize the hon. gentleman as an old political hack, a man who, as I say, acted well his part in life, and has borne an honourable part and has won for himself credit in this House, of which he was long a member, these observations, if not unworthy of the gentleman who made them, are unworthy of being listened to in this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not going to allow even the First Minister to misrepresent

me. In the discussion of a question with regard to the appointment of a Minister of Trade and Commerce, I pointed out the reasons why I, as well as other gentlemen on this side of the House thought it was unnecessary, altogether, that that department should have been created, and the gentleman who is now Minister of Trade and Commerce given the position he holds. I pointed out that the statute under which that office was created was in existence for six years before hon. gentlemen opposite thought of using it for the purpose of creating a Department of Trade and Commerce. I pointed out the fact that they had pressing upon them the claims of a number of their own men for positions in the Cabinet, which the First Minister has not denied. We know from the public prints, and it was heralded everywhere, that a number of men were pressing their services upon the Government, that the old men they could not get rid of, while the new men wanted their places. And, in order to provide a resting place for the then Minister of Customs, they had brought into existence this Department of Trade and Commerce. I said, with regard to him, that they could not turn him out, like an old horse, to die. Nor could they. I did not compare him to an old horse, but I said that, in order to get the position for the men who were pressing to get into the Cabinet, they had to make this provision for him. These are the remarks I made. With regard to anything I said about the Minister I would say it as willingly and frankly before his face. I never go behind men's backs to say what I am afraid to say to their faces. I say he has been one of the most pronounced Tory partisans that ever sat in this House. That has been his record in parliamentary life from the beginning. And he was always willing and ready to take a partisan advantage, a petty advantage, if he could get it. He has done it more than once on the floor of this House. He has now gone to the Senate to take the place they have assigned him to. But I do not think he is rendering service to this country, or is likely to do so, in the capacity which he now fills.

Mr. MULOCK. I was going to ask the Ministers if they could not give us at least some little outline of the duties of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. You are now asking an appropriation for quite a staff, and we know that this is only the commencement. The country has not increased in trade to warrant this expenditure. You have now three new Ministers, and I do not know how many new civil servants in addition. This increase in the staff can only be warranted on the assumption that there has been an increase in the business in the country. So far as we know, this is simply a division of the work; you are simply taking from one department to give to another. The duties that were formerly discharged by the Minister of Customs are

divided amongst three. That seems to me to be all it amounts to. If there is to be this redistribution of the work there should be a redistribution of the staff. I think it is the duty of the House to inquire why the Government is asking for the appointment in connection with this department of a deputy-head, a second class clerk, a third class clerk, a private secretary and a messenger. And this is a mere beginning. Next year half a dozen different officials will probably be appointed. I want to know why you do not utilize those who are already there to discharge these duties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was going to say that I suppose something else must have attracted the hon. gentleman's attention when I made my explanation, but he will find it in "Hansard" more fully than I can repeat it from memory. It was given in answer to the request that I should give an outline of what the duties of the department are to be. As regards the clerkships and staff generally, I did assure him that we expected the department would not be manned by the appointment of new officers to the Civil Service, but that according as duties are transferred from other departments to the Department of Trade and Commerce, it is intended that some of the officers of those other departments who now attend to the work falling under those duties, will be transferred to fill up these clerkships which we ask Parliament to create now.

Mr. MULOCK. If that is the case, why take a vote of money for new appointments, as you are doing here?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see we must do that. If an officer is transferred from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the Department of Trade and Commerce, he can no longer be carried on the pay-roll of the Marine and Fisheries; he must be on the Estimates of the Civil Government for the Department of Trade and Commerce, in which he discharges his duties, and the Auditor would not be justified in paying him, if he found he was really an officer of Trade and Commerce, out of the moneys voted for Marine and Fisheries; and we have a paragraph here contemplating such transfer.

Mr. MULOCK. A paragraph like that would deal with the whole case, instead of our voting the money. To follow the illustration of the Minister of Justice, if there is money voted for that clerkship in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if, for some reason in the public interest, the clerk filling that office is transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, that one salary would lapse if there was a new assigned salary voted. But it is not necessary to vote duplicate salaries, all that would be necessary would be to provide that in the case of the Department of Trade and Commerce, if any officer filling some other position were trans-

ferred to this department, the salary assigned to him in his other position, would follow him into the new department. But I am afraid that whatever may be the hopes of the Minister—and I am, of course, inclined to accept his statement as his present candid intention—I think he will find himself in this position when the House adjourns: He will have got two sets of salaries voted, one set to be drawn by the present incumbents, and this new set will be a prize to new applicants for office, and you will not be able simply to transfer, but will make new appointments, and thus the money voted nominally as simply a duplicate vote, will turn out to be, in effect, a disbursement and an additional permanent charge. Now, if there is to be no increase in numbers, why not do away with this vote, in numbers, why not do away with this vote, transfer the salaries voted to other departments when the officers in those departments are transferred to this?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that would be a very irregular way of organizing a department, and I think Parliament and the public would have reason to expect that the Public Accounts and the public estimates should show what the staff estimates have been, and what the staff in any department is, so that Parliament and the public may know from time to time what is being voted for that department, and know what the whole expense of that department is.

Mr. MULOCK. I will conclude my remarks with this statement: I understand the Minister to say to the committee now, that in asking for this vote for additional clerks, it is merely to get over the point he made before, namely, that in the case of the transfer of clerks, the law at present does not allow the salary voted to them in their other position to follow them into this department, and that, therefore, if these salaries are drawn there will be corresponding lapses in the departments from which these clerks are to be drawn. Is that the position?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is my belief. I cannot say that the votes will be used simply for that purpose. It may be found necessary that new appointments should be made. I cannot give any pledge in advance. That is the policy of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that is all I can say.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This arrangement in regard to the Cabinet, I think, will not be satisfactory to the people engaged in trade. Now, it appears from the explanation we have received that we have the Department of Customs under the control of the Controller of Customs, we have the Department of Inland Revenue under the control of the Controller of Inland Revenue, and we have a Minister of Trade and Commerce whose duty apparently is to collect statistics. As to the policy that shall govern trade, whether to restrict or to make it freer, whatever the

Mr. MULOCK.

policy may be in reference to that subject—and that is one of the most vital things that this House has to deal with—it is relegated to the Department of Customs, and the Controller of Customs has no office in the Cabinet. While he is attached to the Ministry, he has no office in the Cabinet. He can say no word inside the Privy Council chamber as to what policy should regulate trade. The Controller of Inland Revenue is not a member of the Cabinet; although he is at the head of that department which regulates trade in connection with all those matters over which he has charge, yet he has no position in the Cabinet. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has no voice as to who shall be appointed in the Customs Department, or as to who shall be appointed in the Inland Revenue Department. I think it does not require a very powerful argument to show you that this is a very unsatisfactory arrangement. Any person who has ever given any consideration to questions of trade or questions of commerce, cannot but be struck with the very anomalous position in which the great trade interests of this country are now placed. Those in charge of trade are outside the Cabinet, they have no voice in shaping the policy that shall govern trade. The position is a most anomalous one, and I do not think it should continue. I think it is a position that will greatly alarm the trade interests of this country. If the Controller of Inland Revenue were a member of the Government, I for one, would say that the interests of that very important department would be well conducted under his charge. I would not say a single word against him, I believe he is competent. I believe he is able, but when he is not present in the Cabinet councils to make known his views, to lay down a policy that shall govern the department over which he presides—and I believe he will ably preside over it—I say it is an anomalous state of affairs, and I do not think it requires a lawyer to see the very unsatisfactory condition in which the trade of this country will be placed. I think I can appeal with confidence to the First Minister to look into this subject, and to see how anomalous the position is, and how dangerous it is liable to become. I think the people who are engaged in trade have much reason to feel great alarm at the condition in which their interests are now placed, and the position they hold in this new Cabinet. Never since Confederation have the interests of trade been placed in the precarious position in which they are now placed. I have nothing to say against the Controllers, I have no contention with men in politics, it is with measures that I quarrel; and I say that the interests of this country imperatively demand that the great and important interests of trade and commerce should be under the charge of men who have some voice in the councils of the nation. I think it is a very anomalous position, and this House should consider, and the Government

should well consider, what course they are going to take. Then as to the transfer of the Minister of Customs to the Senate, why one is sent over there and another is left, we do not understand on this side of the House. Perhaps it is none of our business, except so far as it relates to the public interest, why one Minister is taken away and another is left. Could there not be another department created in which the late Minister of Agriculture could get some place? Has he not been as true and as faithful as the Minister who has been transferred to the Senate? Has he not in every contingency and in every emergency defended the councils and the policy of the party? Why, he was about the only man in the Cabinet that earned the title of "Honest John." Is this the reason that he is taken and the other sent up higher? In his speech delivered the other day before the Rifle Association, he said the first information he had that he was to be transferred to the Senate, was when His Excellency said to him, "Cherub, come up higher." It was not the First Minister, but His Excellency who spoke those words. I presume His Excellency thought that his seat was sliding away from him, and so he took him to a place where seats are not required. You know pretty well, Mr. Chairman, that cherubs have no bodies; their wings are attached to their ears. Probably the short ears formed the reason why he was transferred to the Senate. I suppose the Government is run on a religious basis—one is taken, and the other is left, one is given a salary and the salary of the other is taken away. There are other matters that everybody can take notice of in connection with the formation of the Government, and we have a right to speak of these, if fair-play is not administered. This is not altogether a domestic matter. Although we sit on the opposition side of the House we always take a deep interest in hon. gentlemen opposite. We wish to know why those who have borne the burden and heat of the day are not allowed to come to the front. We know many members who had much greater experience than the members of the present Government; there are many men who would add solidity and dignity to the Government as it is constituted to-day, and we have a right to say this, as we think so. We do not want to be offensive. There are certain questions that perhaps it is not well to discuss; but it is very well understood by hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House that there are hon. members here who are worthy men, men of character and ability, who have been passed over, while others who are just starting in parliamentary life and knowledge of parliamentary government, are added to the Council. Why is it? That is a question it would take a philosopher to answer.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. McKay.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Automatic Telephone and Electric Company of Canada.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Secretary, Controller of the Inland Revenue..... \$325

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the Inland Revenue Department, I call the Controller's attention to the fact that Charles Curless, chief preventive officer, has a salary of \$1,200 a year, and that last year he drew nearly \$500 as share of seizures, and in addition to that \$3,999.68 for travelling expenses. This appears to be an enormous sum for one man to draw for travelling expenses, and I should like some explanation of it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I did not expect that I would be asked anything in connection with the expenses of Mr. Curless in connection with this vote in the Supplementary Estimates. When the main Estimates are reached, I will be prepared to give the hon. gentleman any information he desires regarding Mr. Curless' travelling expenses. I may say that Mr. Curless is the chief inspector, and is constantly travelling all over the country, making seizures, when necessary, for violation of the regulation regarding tobacco, and his travelling expenses in that connection would be very large. I will be able to give the hon. gentleman full information about it later.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to do that. My reason for bringing the matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman was, that he might have an opportunity of explaining it later. \$10.75 a day travelling expenses for every day in the year seems to be an enormous sum.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will obtain all information about the matter, and give it to the House when the main Estimates are before us.

Privy Council office—Extra Clerks. \$355

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances of this vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Those are temporary clerks in connection with the Privy Council. They are persons whom, I believe,

have a great deal of experience and more than usual skill in the work they have to do. The most of them are over the age for passing the Civil Service examination or for permanent employment. Under the circumstances they are continued in the service of the department and paid out of the civil government contingencies of the department. But the ruling of the Auditor-General is that such persons cannot be continuously employed, but must for at least two months after the examination cease to be employed, and be then taken on again, and this vote is to pay them for that period during which they cannot, in his judgment, be paid out of civil government contingencies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are these gentlemen all employed in the Privy Council office all the year around?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is Mr. DeBrisay one of the clerks?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. At present he is employed as sessional clerk, but the amount that he receives as such is deducted out of his pay as clerk in the office of the Privy Council.

Exchequer Court \$1,725

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of this vote \$200 is required to provide for the half-year's salary of a third class clerk, who was found necessary in consequence of the increased work of the department. He is required to attend at the counter, and wait on persons who go there, as well as to do type-writing and some shorthand work in the department. Then, \$1,500 is required to meet contingencies for the publication of Admiralty rules and otherwise. A new code of rules has been prepared, and the intention is to publish and distribute a large edition. There is \$25 to provide for the increment of the registrar's salary as a chief clerk, at the rate of \$50 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It strikes me that the amount provided for the publication of the Admiralty rules is very large.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it must include some other item, as the rules which I have seen would cost, I should think, about 25 cents each. We propose to send a considerable edition to each registrar for distribution among the gentlemen in practice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will do all that is necessary in that regard, but I cannot avoid calling attention to that amount, which seems to me outrageous, unless it includes some other expenditure. I must ask him to look into it, and get an explanation from the gentleman who prepared these estimates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will undertake that that amount will not be spent in the

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

printing of the Admiralty rules alone. The words "and otherwise" indicate that the item includes some other contingencies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not want to appear factious in stopping the Estimates, but it looks as if something were covered up in this phrase "and otherwise" that ought to be explained to the House. It strikes me that a couple of hundred dollars would cover the publication of the rules.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should think \$500 would cover it. I am not in a position to say what the words "and otherwise" include, but if the House will not trust me, I will strike out the \$1,000, and put the item on the Supplementary Estimates for next year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am willing to trust the hon. gentleman, but I think it is rather trifling with the committee to ask us to pass such a vote for the publication of the rules when it really cannot cost one-fifth of that amount. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman let the vote stand until he finds what the gentleman who prepared these estimates proposed to spend this money for.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let it stand.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary--
To provide for the salary of a carriage-maker instructor, omitted from general Estimates..... \$600

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In passing the main Estimates for next year the committee voted the salary of a trade instructor in the wheelwright business. He was appointed during last year, and this is to provide for his salary until the main Estimates come in force. I explained to the committee that the warden thought it useful that a gang of convicts should be placed under a trade instructor of this kind, because a great many repairs were required to be done to farm vehicles, etc., for which money is being paid out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to provide for carriage making at St. Vincent de Paul?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it appears to me that it is hardly necessary to appoint an instructor for the purpose of having the carriages on the farm repaired. What quantity of land is there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a pretty large farm. The work will include the repairing of all kinds of farm implements, wagons, wheelbarrows, and so on. The warden explained that we paid for that work now nearly as much as the farm instructor will cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to be a carriage instructor, a man who would be able to educate the convicts in that industry.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would be more correctly described as a wheelwright, and the intention is, in the first place, to use this instructor in teaching a gang of convicts to repair the implements used on the farm, but if they have any spare time, they will make wheelbarrows for sale and articles of that kind.

Dorchester Penitentiary—To provide for the salary of a baker instructor, from 11th November, 1892, to 30th June, 1893, at \$600 per annum..... \$378 34

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had no paid baker there for something like four years. When our former baker died, there was a convict there who was very skilled, and who baked very good bread, but his time is nearly up, and it is necessary that we should have a salaried man.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should fancy that you would be able to get a head-baker from one of the other penitentiaries, which would be better than hiring one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have just one baker in each penitentiary, and have none to spare. He, of course, employs a number of the convicts.

To compensate ex-Guard Will Hutchinson for superintending construction of the fence around Dorchester Penitentiary..... \$200

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is an ordinary guard, who, after a very long period of very creditable service, has been, I am sorry to say, completely disabled by very severe illness, which is likely to result in his death in a very short time, and he is in exceedingly poor circumstances. Two years ago the necessity was very great for a wall or fence around the prison, and, for some time, the House voted a sum of money to build a stone wall; but, on the representations of the warden that it would involve a very large sum, and that the work would be more economically done by building a wooden fence, I gave authority to make the attempt. The result was that the pickets were got in the immediate vicinity, I think many on our own property, and, by the skill of this guard, and convict labour, the entire prison premises were inclosed with a very substantial fence at a very small cost, under \$2,000. The fence is eight or nine feet high, very substantially built, answers all purposes and was put up with great skill and economy. I thought, under the circumstances, I might, with fairness, ask this gratuity to the guard who was the means of accomplishing the work, and who is about to leave us under these distressing circumstances.

To cover amount expended for French Translation between the 9th July, 1892, and 25th January, 1893..... \$2,600

Mr. SPEAKER. This is to pay extra French translators. Owing to the length of last session, the work was much increased, and, year after year, the work is increasing, as can be seen by the volumes of departmental reports, and, in addition, the present session having been called earlier than usual and the recess being shorter, necessitated extra help to complete the work of last session in due time. We must bear in mind also that the permanent staff remains the same in number as it was twenty-five years ago, when the work was very much less than at present. The translators, during recess, are paid by the page.

To cover amount expended in completion of the Official Debates of 1892..... \$15,000

Mr. SPEAKER. The sum of \$40,000 was asked for, for the current year ending 30th June, 1893. Out of that there has been expended, up to the 1st of January, in connection with the work of the session of 1892, the sum of \$14,992. It will be observed that would leave us only \$25,000 out of the whole vote of last year, and it is to make up the \$15,000 practically, which was expended up to the 1st of January, that we are asking this supplementary estimate. The details are as follows:—Salaries of reporting staff, from 1st of January to 1st of June, \$8,500; translators, \$10,000; compiling French index, \$200; amanuenses, \$3,200; printing, binding, paper, etc., \$16,500; miscellaneous, \$300. Total, \$38,700.

To provide additional amount required for sessional messengers for Session of 1893 (revote in part)..... \$2,039 50

Mr. SPEAKER. This sum which is asked for sessional messengers arises in this way: Near the end of last session a vote was taken for the amount we estimated would be necessary to cover the cost for sessional messengers up to the 30th June. That vote, however, was put into the year 1892-93 and was paid out of this year's appropriation. By some oversight on the part of the accountant, the sum of \$1,116.50 of the vote of 1891-92 was allowed to lapse. Therefore, of this amount of \$2,039.50 asked for to pay sessional messengers, \$1,116 is a revote, and the balance is accounted for by the fact that the session lasted nine days beyond the 30th of June, and we were obliged to pay the messengers for these nine days out of the appropriation for this year.

Library of Parliament—Contingencies—To provide for the payment of extra indemnity granted by Order in Council of the 7th July last to the following sessional messengers for services during the Session of 1892, viz. :—
Joseph Lafontaine..... \$90
Thomas W. Hodgins. 90
\$180

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How do these parties come to be especially entitled to \$90 apiece ?

Mr. FOSTER. On account of the length of the session

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But surely all other messengers would be entitled to the same. Did these two attend any special election ?

Mr. SPEAKER. A special vote is taken each year for these messengers in the library. I think the amount provided last year was only \$250, and I think an additional \$90 was necessary in order to make up their full pay at the rate of \$2.50, which is the rate at which sessional messengers are paid. I speak subject to correction, because this matter does not come under my immediate supervision.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are not these messengers always provided for by the Library Committee ? Or who does settle the amount of their salary ?

Mr. SPEAKER. A special vote is taken each year for these two extra messengers. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates of this year he will find a sum providing for these messengers, who are extra messengers employed only during the session, and my recollection, which is borne out from the information I get, is that the amount provided last year was \$90 less than would be sufficient to pay them at the rate of \$2.50 a day.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the meaning of "O. in C. of the 7th July" ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the order under which their rate of payment is fixed, and, as the Speaker says, this vote, together with what they were formerly paid, will give them the rate of pay they formerly received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There must be a reason for this Order in Council granting them this special allowance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only reason for the Order in Council was that the appropriation was not enough to pay them at the regular rate. I fancy at the time the vote was taken for their payment it was thought the pay was too much, but it was afterwards ascertained that it was the regular rate at which sessional messengers were paid.

To provide funds for the payment of the salaries (during 100 days) of two extra sessional messengers for services during the session of 1893, at \$2.50 per day.

Mr. CASEY. Why do we need two more this year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. These are the same two messengers, and the same provision is being made for them for the session of 1893.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Statutes—Printing, binding and distribution of the Criminal Code..... \$2,600

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Code distributed free among all classes of the community ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is distributed free only to justices of the peace and officers having criminal jurisdiction, and members of Parliament. The rest are sold.

Mr. CASEY. What is it sold at ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman ; the Queen's Printer fixes the rate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose you did not put Judge Taschereau's letter in as an appendix ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He has published that himself.

Franchise Act—Further amount required for printing Voters Lists (Governor-General's warrant). \$18,000

Mr. CASEY. Are the lists finally completed ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I am moved to ask that because of the very remarkable delay in finishing and distributing the list. I only got the lists for my constituency about the end of the year, considerably more than a year after the Court of Revision had concluded, and I thought if that delay had taken place there, there might have been similar delay elsewhere and that the lists might not be finished yet. It seems strange that these lists could not be printed and distributed to persons entitled to have them until the next revision is due. I think the delay requires some explanation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister state what the cost is as compared with the amount paid for like printing when it was done by outside firms ? We are now printing at the Printing Bureau ; can the hon. gentleman tell whether it is costing the country less than formerly ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is costing far less, but I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact figures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman certain that these lists have been distributed ? I cannot say that mine were never sent, but certainly I have never seen them. Have we to apply for the lists, or are they sent ?

Mr. SPEAKER. One copy is sent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To the member ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Is the Minister in charge of this item, or to which Minister should we look for information ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Secretary of State has charge. We will let the item stand. The Secretary of State will be here in a few moments.

To reimburse Judge Wilkinson,
revising officer for Northumber-
land County, N. B., for
posting lists \$124 05

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The facts about this are these: The old law, before the last revision, required the posting of the preliminary lists, &c. I am not absolutely certain what the change was, but the posting of one list was dispensed with by an amendment to the Act. The judge overlooked that fact, and employed officials to go and post up lists in various parts of the riding. The Auditor-General refused to pay it, on the ground that the service was unnecessary. In the meantime he had actually incurred the expense, and this is simply to reimburse him on the ground that he had made a mistake.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman think that is right—to allow such an expenditure of public money? Looked at *prima facie*, it certainly indicates a sad absence of knowledge and of information which he certainly ought to possess. He acted in direct violation of the law, and it shows either crass ignorance or crass negligence. He should either have posted himself on the law—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He posted the lists.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; but he was not posted on the law. I do not think myself there is any ground on which this could be justified. This judge simply incurred an expense of over \$100, which he had no right at all to incur, and which the law did not justify. We might as well pay any other judge, or any other official, for services he performed, not only without the sanction of the law, but in direct violation of the law, because the law was passed to prevent this very expense from being incurred. It was talked about enough in Parliament, and talked about enough in the press, and if the judge had exercised a reasonable diligence in acquainting himself with the law, he should have known that this expense was not to be incurred, and that Parliament was providing against its being incurred. Personally, I do not feel satisfied to vote the money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman asked me if I thought it was a proper expenditure. No, I do not. I would not authorize it by any means whatever; but the judge explained away the mistake, and convinced us that he was in good faith and had made a slip. Of course, he ought not to be paid for that; but this is simply to reimburse him the money he had to pay out to his officials for doing the work. It is not due to him, but it is a kind of payment that one would make to an officer or servant of his own

who, acting in good faith, incurred an expense through error, and you would not see suffer for that.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not see how he could have been acting in good faith. He was there to administer the law, and if he did not choose to inform himself as to what the law was, the very law which he was bound to administer, there was no excuse for him. He has been guilty of a dereliction of duty—for that is what it amounts to—and if anybody has suffered in consequence, the country is not responsible. I cannot see on what ground the judge can urge good faith here. He might urge the plea of negligence, but if he did not choose to read the statute under such circumstances at all, to say that he acted in good faith, is to use a misnomer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is arguing as if the judge neglected to take some precaution that the law ordered: he argues as if the judge neglected something, and that if anybody had suffered in consequence, he could have a recourse against the judge. As a matter of fact it turns out that the judge took an extra precaution that Parliament had dispensed with.

Mr. LAURIER. That is to say, he did not read the law.

Mr. CASEY. It looks rather suspicious when these officials of the Government do not take the trouble to read the law in regard to a matter which affects their own pockets.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He took too much trouble.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it was unpardonable in the judge. If this was a matter of an ordinary law which had not been talked about in Parliament and discussed in the press, it is conceivable that it might have escaped his notice. I would not be hypercritical in the matter, nor inclined to force it too much. If it was an ordinary case of negligence I would say: There is no use being too harsh, he wanted to act rightly and he made a mistake. But here is a matter that was talked about from the time the session began; nearly everybody in the House talked about it, and everybody in the country talked about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what puzzled him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The newspapers talked about it, and it was the one subject upon which there was unanimity of expression, that the expenses were disgraceful and should be cut down. So far as my recollection serves me, when the Bill was introduced it went through without a dissenting voice, because there was one direction in which the expenses might be cut down. Now, it is all very well for him to say that he did not read the newspapers, nor the debates of the House, nor the law, and therefore he incurred

the expense and we should become godfathers to his ignorance, his culpable ignorance. I say there is no excuse for him whatever, and the fact that he is the only judge in the whole Dominion who made the mistake, is rather against him than for him, because it shows that out of 200 or 300 men he stood alone. Either he must have been culpably ignorant or culpably careless. I do not know the gentleman myself, but I do not think this is a precedent that the House ought to endorse.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The alternative should be that he should either lose it himself, or the Government should lose it for keeping such a law in the Statute-book.

Mr. EDGAR. I see that the salary that gentleman received for his services, amounted to \$618.06, besides \$46 for travelling expenses. Now, I think that gentleman cannot complain if he has to lose this amount.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That includes disbursements for his clerk.

Mr. EDGAR. He made that bargain himself, and we are not responsible for it. I think a revising officer should certainly know the Franchise Act. He is not like an ignorant man, and he had not the slightest excuse for being ignorant of the law. I think it is a bad precedent, and I think the penalty that he inflicted upon himself ought to be allowed to remain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If we are to be asked to vote this money, some other reason than that given by the leader of the Government should be advanced. It is not fair to ask this committee to vote \$100 or \$200 on the ground that a revising officer is ignorant of the law or careless in the performance of his duties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman must not ask for reasons that do not exist. I have stated the only reason that did exist: The judge made a mistake and took action that was unnecessary. It is now proposed to vote him the money he is out of pocket. Inquiry has shown that the amount of his allowance is something under \$400, and of course out of his allowance he has to pay his clerk and incidental expenses. This is not an unreasonable vote, and it is for only a very small sum.

Mr. LAURIER. It is most important that all the judges should understand that it is intolerable that they should administer the law without taking the trouble to read it. If they act so carelessly, they should be called upon to pay for any errors committed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why should the House mete out different treatment to a judge from that extended to any other individual. If any other person made a mistake from not understanding his business or duty, and thereby incurred expense, I am quite sure the Government would not come down and ask that a sum of money be voted to repay him. It

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

is only because this man happens to be a judge that the Government propose to pay him for the mistake he committed, a most careless and stupid mistake, and he should suffer the consequences thereof. It has been shown that his salary is over \$600, outside of travelling expenses, which was certainly adequate compensation for the work performed, and if this judge were allowed to bear the expense in this case it would prove a lesson for the future to the judges that when they enter upon the performance of duties connected with the administration of law, they should take care to read the law. I think the committee should not pass an item of this kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is to be regretted that Parliament should be asked to ratify payments of this class. It is the first instance in which an error has been committed by a judge and afterwards brought before this House to rectify. If the judge made a mistake, he should bear the consequences. I quite agree with the contention of my leader and by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). If the judge did not thoroughly post himself before he proceeded to perform the duties of his office and thereby blundered, he should pay any cost himself. If anything of this kind occurred in the case of a county judge, no such allowance as this would be asked. We should treat a revising officer the same as a judge, for he acts as a judge, and is supposed to know the law. I am informed, however, that this gentleman is a judge. If he were only a revising officer, he might probably be granted some consideration, but he is a judge, and of course he is supposed to know the law. He cannot therefore plead ignorance, otherwise he is not fit to be a judge.

Mr. LAURIER. That judge, I am sure, in the course of his judicial career has many a time condemned a prisoner who had unwittingly committed a violation of the law, and in passing sentence, no doubt told him: "I am very sorry for you; but every man is presumed to know the law." Yet here is a judge who has to administer the law, and confesses that he did not read over the law that he was to administer, and he now seeks to be recouped for money improperly spent. This action is intolerable.

Mr. EDGAR. This judge is also revising officer in Restigouche, and receives \$618 in connection with the office, and as revising officer in Northumberland, he receives more than \$310, besides travelling expenses. This judge must have an extraordinary idea of the law and Parliament, or he would not send in such an account. He must have known perfectly well as a lawyer that the bill could not be taxed, and to send in such a preposterous and improper and indecent account and ask it to be paid was an exceedingly reprehensible proceeding, and certainly showed poor taste on his part. The judge could not have known the law apparently, because he

did not seem to have posted the list in Restigouche, while he did so in Northumberland.

Committee divided : Yeas, 42 ; Nays, 15.

Further amount required for Census and Statistics (Governor-General's warrant) \$2,652

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this item is voted, I wish to call attention to the very extraordinary doctrine laid down recently in this House. We are not, apparently, according to the Minister of Finance and some other members of the Government, to be permitted to know the names on that wonderful list of industrial establishments that have been enumerated in the census. I gave the hon. gentleman some nights ago a list of about 1,000 industrial establishments in ten towns and villages, which I should like extremely to be allowed to identify ; but judging from the statement on the floor of this House, it is part of the programme of the Government to regard the information about industrial establishments, even in the town of Caughnawaga, as a State secret, to be religiously guarded, for fear, I suppose, that some of the hon. gentlemen on this side might destroy these industrial establishments. I cannot conceive no possible course more calculated to bring the entire census returns into disrepute from first to last, than the refusal to give the information which is asked for by hon. gentlemen on this side. We have very good ground for doubting the accuracy of these statements as to industrial establishments, and before we are asked to vote money for census statistics we certainly ought to know the details, whenever any question of that kind arises, of where these so-called industrial establishments are, and what they consist of. I happen to know extremely well some of these towns, and I cannot conceive it possible in what shape or form from 80 to 130 industrial establishments of any reasonable magnitude can be said to exist in villages of 3,000 and 4,000 souls. If there be any such rule as the hon. gentleman speaks of, it should be abrogated at once. I find it utterly impossible to conceive any sound, legitimate reason why the information that was asked for as to the details of these industrial establishments should not be most cheerfully given. I cannot conceive any possible ground for treating such things as a matter on which secrecy should be observed. I trust the hon. the Finance Minister will be able to give to this House some satisfactory explanation of the statement which was made yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say about it is, that the census of last year, as well as every preceding census of Canada, and I believe the census of every other country, are taken under certain regulations, and the regulations which have obtained in Canada for all the different decennial periods have been nearly the same as now in regard to this matter. The enumerators have been sworn, and business men when they give the details of their business

to these enumerators do it on the understanding that these are sworn officials, and that the names of the persons will not be given. There are very good reasons, I dare say, for that, and I think they can suggest themselves to any person who thinks it over. If my hon. friend looks back to the debates on preceding censuses, he will find that if the same question has been brought up at all it has been treated in the same way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not at all acquiesce in the reasoning, and if that has been the rule, which I am willing to suppose the hon. gentleman has correctly stated, there is every reason why it should be abrogated. It is of very great importance to the people of this country to know whether these census returns, more particularly the records of industrial establishments, are worth the paper they are written on or not. We have ample experience in dealing with statistics furnished by the Government, and notably with statistics regarding the Immigration Department, of the extreme uncertainty, to use a very mild word, attaching to the statistical reports made officially by the Government. In this particular case there is the strongest reason—not, perhaps, for demanding full particulars as to capital, etc., but there is the very strongest reason for demanding to know what are, and where are these industrial establishments. What earthly harm can it do to us. I should like the Minister to explain, to have it known, that a man has an industrial establishment. That is all the information that was asked for. No hon. gentleman on this side of the House asked for information as to the capital invested or the details of a man's business. There could possibly be something to be said pro and con as to the desirability of making that known, but as to giving a list of the industrial establishments, existing in each town, I must confess that it seems to me, not merely the most absurd pedantry on the part of the Government to refuse it, but it seems to me the best calculated means to destroy faith in the census statistics which are laid on the Table by the hon. gentleman. I may tell him here, speaking in my place and on my responsibility, that in two or three of these towns which I know, I find it utterly impossible to understand how, under any conceivable circumstances, the lists of establishments such as are stated in the census to exist could have been brought together. Now, Sir, it is a matter of very great practical importance that we should know how far these so-called industrial establishments have any real existence or place of being. The hon. gentleman and his friends are making a great portion of their argument in defence of their policy on the ground that there had been a great increase of industrial establishments, that there are a great number of persons employed this year more than were employed ten years ago, and when we desire to test these things, when we ask for the simplest

information about them, we are told that these are State secrets and cannot be revealed. With all due respect to the hon. Minister, I do not think that a more flimsy excuse was ever offered. I am willing to grant that he may reserve some of the details as to capital and such matters, but that there should be any just reason for refusing the information as to what these industrial establishments are, I confess myself utterly unable to understand.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is altogether too late in discussing this question. The time to discuss the principle upon which a census should be taken and the regulations which should govern it, is at the time that the appropriation is being made to take the census. But, if regulations have been in force year after year, and decade after decade, with the consent and evidently with the approbation of Parliament,—because it has not been questioned, and I never heard of any objection being taken to these,—but if after that has been done and the census has been taken, and men have been approached and have given information on the faith of these regulations, it is quite too late for my hon. friend to wish to break the compact that has been made. He may think that the reasons are not good enough, and his reasoning may be perfectly correct, and he may convince this House that such is the case; but he may convince the House five thousand times over, and the House would not break faith in regard to information taken under regulations which were known to the persons who gave the information when the census was taken. The argument of my hon. friend might be very good at a time when we were approaching the decennial period and when we were discussing the question as to what principle the census should be taken on; but I think my hon. friend is too late to take the objection now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so. The only point as to which there is any force in the hon. gentleman's contention that the information should be reserved, applies to these other matters which I said I did not propose to press. I cannot understand that there is anything on earth in the oath administered to these census enumerators, to prevent us from knowing what the industrial establishments are. I cannot conceive how any possible compact can be said to exist between the men who own certain industrial establishments, and the census enumerators, which forbids us to know what these establishments are. The hon. gentleman is pushing the argument to a perfect absurdity. We do not ask even for the names. We merely ask for a list of what they were, and the hon. gentleman will state this later on, I fancy, or his enumerators will, when the details are brought down. He surely ought to be able to give the details now, so that before we are asked to vote further large sums of money for the census, we may have some ap-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

proximate idea of whether we have got value for our money or not.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not voting a very large sum. There will be another vote to finish up the census, and in the meantime I will look this matter up and see just how far the schedules will allow us to go in giving information. My hon. friend made his request a great deal narrower at the last than at the first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; that was the request made by my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not now ask for the names of the persons. All he requests is the names of the different industries.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman forgets the question put to him not later than yesterday. It was not as to the amount of capital invested; but simply as to the names of the persons engaged in manufacturing in the village of Montmagny.

Mr. FOSTER. That is different from the names of the industries.

Mr. LAURIER. To-day the hon. gentleman will not give even the names of the industries. One day he refuses one thing, and the next day he refuses another thing; he will not give the information. So far as my memory goes, the instructions given to the enumerators were never brought down to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether they were or not. I dare say they were. If they were not, it would be because they were not asked for. Now, my hon. friend knows that the question of what information can be brought down must be based upon what those instructions were. He would not assert that the instructions should be violated. He might find fault with the instructions themselves; he might say that they were not such instructions as should be given; that is a thing to be debated when the instructions are issued; but whatever faith was pledged to be kept with the people who gave us the information we must keep, and whatever information can be given consistent with those instructions the Government will be happy to give.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman was not so happy yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. Just as happy.

Mr. LAURIER. He refused to give the information as to the towns of Montmagny and Sorel. It was always supposed that these instructions were based upon common sense, and common sense would support a portion of the hon. gentleman's contention, but not the other portion. If he says that the manufacturers will object to the publication of the amount of their capital that I can understand; but certainly no manufacturer can have any objection to his name being given as that of one engaged in such and such an industry at such and such a place. There is no reason

possible why the name of any manufacturer and the nature of his business should not be given to the world. On the contrary, he will court the publication of that information, and when the hon. gentleman tells us, as he did yesterday, that he cannot bring down such information, I say he has no reason whatever to support him.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the answer yesterday because it was the departmental answer.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman cannot throw the responsibility on the department. He is at the head of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. My information is that the instructions on which the census was based does not permit the names of the persons to be given and consequently I cannot promise them. I promise, however, that any information that the instructions permit will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. These instructions must be interpreted by common sense—

Mr. FOSTER. It depends on whose common sense.

Mr. CASEY. No matter what the instructions may be. The evident reason for the limitation was that nothing should be made public that could injure the person giving the information. As my hon. friend points out, publicity can certainly do no harm to those who are conducting industries of any kind. It often happens that a reporter accompanied by a photographer visits a country town, and goes around not only to all the manufacturers but to the shops of the town, and gives photographs and glowing descriptions of them; and the manufacturers, these conductors of infant industries whom the Minister is so anxious not to injure by having their names and pictures of their establishments published in the Saturday supplement. Does the hon. gentleman think, then, that it would do them any harm to have their names given to this House and published in "Hansard"? He knows that it cannot do them harm, but must do them good by calling public attention to them. I never before heard any objection to the names of manufacturers being given. Whatever the instructions may have been, I say that a common sense interpretation of these instructions must lead one to see that it would be only doing a favour to these people instead of an injury to advertise their names as widely as possible. We have had no information whatever so far as to what constitutes an industry. Can the hon. Minister tell me whether the instructions state what constitutes an industry?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether they do or not. I imagine they do.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not know what the instructions state. He has sent out enumerators to find how many industries there are in each town and village, and after

making speeches and boasting about the number of industries, he confesses to the House that he does not know whether the instructions given to those enumerators tell them what to class as an industry and what not. If one of those enumerators came across a tinker sitting by the road side, with two or three old broken kettles, a few ship-wrecked umbrellas, broken baskets, cane-seated chairs and things of that sort that he was mending, around him, it would be quite open to the enumerator, so far as the Minister of Finance is able to tell us to-night, to put down this old tinker and umbrella-mender as a manufacturer, and count him in to swell the list of the triumphs of the National Policy. I think it is rather disgraceful on the part of the Government not to be able to tell us even that much—not to be able to tell us even what the enumerators were directed to count as an industry. Then we have to remember that these enumerators were paid extra for every infant industry they discovered. They were paid a comparatively large sum for taking note of every industrial establishment and the number of people employed in it, so that it was to their interest to find as many industries as possible. Pay a man so much for every industry he finds, and he will find a good many. No doubt every blacksmith, even working without an assistant, was put down as a manufacturer. If he turned out one wheelbarrow a year he would be reckoned as a manufacturing industry. It is to get to the bottom of all this humbug that we want to get at the names of the persons classed as manufacturers. In the city of St. Thomas there are 294 establishments recorded in the census; and everybody who knows anything about that town knows that that is an absurd number, unless the enumerator counted amongst them every seamstress and tailor and so on. If we are to make comparisons with previous censuses, we require to know what were called industries in the former ones and what are called industries in the present census.

Mr. LISTER. Judging from my own county and my own town, I may say that if the census represents the industries throughout the country with the same exaggeration as it has represented them in the town from which I come, it is not to be wondered at that the returns should show an enormous increase in the manufacturing industries of the country. I think, speaking from recollection, that the census returns show that there are 117 manufacturers in the town of Sarnia, and I may say that that is one of the very few towns in the Dominion which has grown very much in population during the last ten years. Its population had grown from something like 3,500 in 1881, to 7,000 in 1891; and the census returns show that we have in that town 117 factories. I may tell the House that the only factories there that I know anything at all of, and I have lived there for nearly forty years, are three

flour mills, two breweries, two sash factories, one furniture factory, two wagon factories, one agricultural implement factory, one stove foundry, one woollen factory, one hub and spoke factory, making fifteen altogether. If, as my hon. friend who has just preceded me states, every person who has a tin shop, or a little shop for making boots and shoes by himself, is taken into account, the number would be increased quite considerably; but, even with that, I doubt if it would be possible at all to find the number of factories stated in the census. I may say to the hon. gentleman that all these factories, with the exception of the hub and spoke factory, the agricultural implement factory, the stove foundry, the furniture factory and one flour mill, were in existence prior to the National Policy. One of the men, who was a manufacturer of wagons and carriages, and had been in business there for upwards of thirty years, at the time that this policy came into force, was induced by the promises of great profits that that policy would give him, to put all his money into the extension of his business. For three or four years his business grew, and his profits apparently grew proportionately; but, as in every instance of this kind, the moment production overtook consumption, then the crash came, and this man, who had put all his earnings into enlarging his business, found, after a few years, that all his capital had been lost, all the earnings of a lifetime swept away, and he failed. Induced likewise by the profits that this policy would give, two men started a hub and spoke factory, one of the largest in the Dominion. They went on for a few years, and the same fate recently overtook them, and they are now bankrupt. Every dollar of their earnings made in another town, and made after they came to the town in which I live, has been swept away. This delightful policy induced the people of my own town to invest some \$80,000 in the erection of agricultural implement works. That was, I think, in 1882. In 1890 the concern went down, the \$80,000 invested were lost, and \$20,000 besides, and that whole institution, which cost, to erect it and put the machinery in, something like \$40,000, sold for the magnificent sum of \$6,500, and has been running ever since with very few men. This has been the history, I venture to say, of nearly all the manufacturing industries throughout Ontario. You can go to London, where, a few years ago, shortly after this policy was introduced, you saw a dozen factories; to-day no person can pass through that city without noticing the smokeless chimnies and silent machinery. The industries have failed, and all that is left is a few credulous men, who invested their money under the promise of the great profits this policy was going to bring. As I stated in the first place, if the census returns throughout the country are as unreliable as those of my own town, they are entirely

Mr. LISTER.

fallacious, and do not represent at all the industrial interests of this country. They have been made for the purpose of swelling the number of establishments and enabling the Government to say that, under this grand policy, which, I have no hesitation in saying, has impoverished the great mass of the country, has had some success. Only those men who have been able to form themselves into combines, for the purpose of limiting production and raising prices, have been able to succeed at all.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me a moment. I stated last night that my anxiety in taking up these Estimates at this time was to have them put through because of the necessary expenditures for which I had not taken Governor-General's warrant in some cases (though I would have been warranted in doing it) because I thought Parliament was close to session and we would get the supplies. Now, all this argument can come up just as well on the main Estimates, in fact a great deal better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This item had better stand in that case. You have got the money by the Governor-General's warrant.

Mr. FOSTER. We might as well pass the whole. As I said, the debate can come as well on the main Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is really important, as the hon. gentleman will see.

Mr. FOSTER. If there was no other item on which it could come up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman that he had better bring down the instructions as to this matter under Governor-General's warrant and allow the item to stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the instructions will be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I wish to call attention to the fact that there seems to be an entire misapprehension on the part of the Department of Agriculture regarding the Census Act. When these census bulletins were published, I attended the department myself at the instance of the mayor and council of the city I have the honour to represent. They had asked me to obtain from the department the particulars of the census returns with respect to that city. I was then told it was not open to the departmental officers to give me these particulars. That was a very great disappointment to the mayor and council of the city I represent, and, when I returned to the House, in conversation with my hon. friend from King's N.S. (Mr.

Borden), who, I regret to see, is not here to-night, I mentioned this fact and the regret I felt in common with the officers of the city. He told me he was not surprised, because he had applied for and received returns of some cities in his riding, and had ascertained that they were altogether inaccurate and false, and it was not until he had told the department that these were false that, as he understood, they refused to give returns for other cities. I regret that he is not here to-night, as he would be prepared to give the House the circumstances of the falsity of the returns to which I refer. I rise, however, merely to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that, so far as I am able to understand the Census Act, his department was acting entirely without warrant in withholding these details when asked for. The Census Act which authorizes the expenditure of this money and the taking of the census, does not authorize them to withhold the information from Parliament. On the contrary, as I understand the Act, its genius and spirit would lead me to believe that the full information was to be given to the House. After providing generally that the census should be taken and that the details should be such as the Governor-General, by proclamation, shall direct it, providing, 'inter alia :'

Each census shall be so taken as to ascertain, with the utmost possible accuracy in regard to the various territorial divisions of the country—their population and the classification thereof state and resources of the agricultural, fishing, lumbering, mining, mechanical, manufacturing, trading and other institutions thereof.

It goes on to declare how the commissioners and enumerators shall be appointed and what their duties shall be. Well, Sir, I fail to find, either in the duties of these enumerators, as they are called, or of the census commissioners, or the officers of the Department of Agriculture, that when these returns are made by the commissioners that the officers are authorized to keep this information. The oath is referred to in the fourteenth section, which says :

Every officer, census commissioner, enumerator and other person employed in the execution of this Act before entering upon his duties shall take and subscribe an oath binding him to the faithful and exact discharge of such duties.

But they are nowhere bound to keep secret the information which they obtain. I would gather, from the general reading of the Act, that, so far from being bound by oath to keep this information secret, if the department has assumed to bind them by such oath, it has gone beyond its power and has acted in contravention of the statute. The Act authorizes the officers and gives them very full power to enforce from the custodians of the public records all manner of information that may be required within the purview of the Act. They may enforce the giving of these returns by penalties, and it is provided that after they have got these returns and sent

them in, the Department of Agriculture shall prepare an abstract of these returns and tabular statements showing the result as fully and accurately as possible. The last section of the Act says :

A full report of all things done under this Act, and an account of all moneys expended under authority thereof, shall be laid before Parliament by the Minister of Agriculture within the first fifteen days of the next session thereof and of each session thereafter, until such time as all things required to be done under this Act in each decennial period have been fully completed.

I would like to submit to the Minister of Justice my opinion, at any rate, so far as I have been able to grasp the meaning of the Act, that there is nothing in it which can expressly or by implication justify the withholding of information from Parliament that has been gathered legally by the commissioner or enumerator. I can fully agree with what my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) has said, so far as my personal knowledge is concerned. I would characterize the returns in these census reports as laid before the House as farcical and ridiculous. I know pretty well how many factories and how many industries there are in Charlottetown, and I know that in this respect the census is wholly inaccurate. On reading the returns for Charlottetown I thought I must be living in the midst of a great manufacturing centre. The returns are farcical, ridiculous and absurd. I will not say that in this case they are quite so absurd as the Caughnawaga returns which have been referred to, but they are about on a par with the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). In the face of these returns, when one after another of the members of this House rises, and says that, so far as his own locality is concerned the returns are inaccurate and misleading, to tell us that we cannot get the information necessary to test the accuracy of the statements in the face of the Act, seems to indicate that instructions have been made by the Department of Agriculture at variance with the Census Act, and for the purpose of enabling the officers to withhold information which Parliament is fairly entitled to. We vote a very large sum of money for these census returns. It is a matter of interest, not to one party only, but to all parties, it is to the interest of commerce and manufactures, that these returns should be accurate. If not accurate they had better not be taken at all. The money is worse than wasted if we are to have only inaccurate returns. To have member after member rising in his place and telling us that, so far as the town he represents is concerned, returns are absurdly inaccurate, is calculated to throw discredit upon the whole census of Canada. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he has looked into the law on the matter and whether he agrees with me in the opinion that Parliament is entitled to full returns? As a matter of policy, it may be desirable for the Government to appeal to the House and say that, with regard to the amount of

money which is invested in manufactures by John Smith or James Brown, we do not deem it politic to lay that before the members of this House. But I think the House should have the means of testing these statements. The census returns show, for instance, that we have sixteen basket manufactories in Charlottetown. I do not believe there are three, and I would like to get the names of these parties so that I may verify that statement, and to tell me that I cannot get it seems to me to be unreasonable, unfair, and contrary to the statute. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look into that before the matter comes up again, so that we may thresh it out and discuss it fairly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will discuss it, and we will look into it. I have a distinct recollection that all the regulations under which the census was taken, including the schedules, were laid upon the Table of the House. There is no attempt to make the officers observe secrecy, there is no obligation imposed upon them of that kind. It is not necessarily the duty of the officers to see that before the enumerators give any details to the public—in fact I think the enumerators themselves ought not to give any details to the public—their schedules and their returns have to be compiled and examined; and in numbers of instances, what they have returned as industries, have been struck out of the class that ought to have been enumerated as industries, because they were simply private establishments. The impression I have on the subject is this: That the schedule which is offered to the citizens to fill up with the record of his family, their history, their origin, their religion, their ages and all that, or in the case of industrial establishments, which is offered to the manufacturer to fill up, contains an assurance that all information as regards the individual will not be disclosed, but only the general results. The general results are made public. When the census volumes are completed, all the classifications will be given, showing what these industries are, what is their nature, etc.

Mr. CASEY. The number of hands employed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, I fancy so, and any information of that kind which we can give Parliament in advance, we will do. All that we ask is that the information which we obtained under promise to the individual, will not be disclosed, so far as it concerns himself. If the information does not include the name of the person, it can be given. I think it will be found that in that respect the census is not in any sense peculiar, that the regulations are the same as have prevailed in taking every census of this country, and in the census taken in the United States and Great Britain; and that the standard of what should be known as industries is the same as the standard adopted in the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. FLINT. I desire to remark that the feature which most distinguishes this census is the general want of confidence which is felt by the public as to the correctness of the industrial returns. Now, there are large quantities of statistical matter furnished to the public by the Government which is not disputed; enormous quantities are quoted every day in the House and by the press from which deductions are made, and no person pretends to question the trustworthiness or genuineness of this information. But the instant we strike the census in regard to industrial establishments, I think it will be almost universally admitted that there is a large amount of incredulity, which arises not only from the knowledge of the persons themselves as to the communities in which they live, but from the appearance of the returns upon their face. Now, as to the town in which I live. We are very well satisfied there as to the general growth and progress of the community, and quite proud of it; but, at the same time, the industrial returns given for Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, are offensive to the people of that community for this reason, that either the returns of 1891 are grossly exaggerated, or the returns of 1881 are utterly contemptible. Now, to say that the enterprising and thriving town of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, only had fifteen industrial establishments in 1881 is to insult the intelligence of every person who knows anything about that community; and to say that it had 151 industrial establishments in 1891 is equally absurd.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The figures for 1881 are taken from that census.

Mr. FLINT. Yes, of course, and if some candid and responsible individual could have an opportunity of verifying these returns, he would see where the mistake occurred. There is a gross mistake, either in the census of 1881 or that of 1891, arising either through different instructions given to the enumerators, or to greater carelessness in one case or the other. The town of Yarmouth, so far as my knowledge goes, and the knowledge of those who have paid some attention to this subject, contains no more industrial establishments now than it did in 1881, although I am willing to admit that I think one or two industrial establishments have strengthened and developed, and probably have a larger output and employ more hands; but the number of establishments has not increased to any appreciable extent. If they have increased it must be in minor matters where one person is occupied in his own home, or in his own shop, in the manufacture of some kind of goods. Now, there is another return I would like to mention in regard to the town of Yarmouth, which also gives a very inaccurate idea as to its progress. The enumerator places that community, I think, as the highest in manufacturing development, during the last ten

years. in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now, this is utterly absurd. There has been no great increase in manufacturing industries in Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, neither has there been any great or alarming decrease. I will read a remark in Bulletin No. 12, which has been copied in a great many Conservative papers as illustrating the good effect of the National Policy in that portion of the province. It says :

Yarmouth, N.S., has made remarkable progress, having been, in 1881, one of the smallest per head in manufactures.

This is not correct. It was a fair average of all the communities in that province or in the Dominion, perhaps ahead of a large number :

In 1891 it reached a figure of 206 per head of the population, having at the same time increased 75 per cent in population.

Now, I can well understand that the statistician, or the department at Ottawa, taking the superficial figures in good faith, would not be in a position to see the incorrectness of that statement ; but any person upon the spot, familiar with the community, and in a position to understand how the error arose, would ascertain in a very few minutes how such an erroneous statement should appear in the bulletin. Now, I wish to point out that it is very desirable in the interests of a correct study of our industrial development, that there should be some method of verification of these particulars. I believe names have been asked for, but a very good study of the industrial progress could be made, and a very good means of verification could be made, even without giving names. If it should be said that within a certain community there was one woollen mill, or so many cotton mills, and so many other industrial establishments of each kind, without giving names ; then these could be verified. Now, the error arose with regard to Yarmouth in this way. I think that previous to 1891 the community had not been a municipality by itself, not an incorporated town, and the place had no legal existence as a town. It was simply called by courtesy the town of Yarmouth, but legally it was merely a certain number of polling sections. The statement as to its great growth, and having increased 75 per cent, arose from the erroneous counting of the various polling sections which subsequently went to make up the town of Yarmouth, and polling sections were added in or left out, which do not belong to the town of Yarmouth at all. I have here a statement showing that while the town of Yarmouth increased during the last ten years about 20 per cent, an increase which is very satisfactory, which about meets the general expectations, the statement in the bulletin that it increased 75 per cent, is entirely beyond the mark, owing to the want of knowledge of the local circumstances, which we could scarcely expect on the part

of the clerks up here, or whoever made up the statistics. I do not need to go into other matters, because the Minister has suggested that another opportunity will be given for going into details of that kind. But I think this is a fair illustration, coupled with the other complaints that have been made in the House and before the committee, that it is only fair to these various communities that there should be some means of verifying the rate of progress so as to discover where the error occurred. Any community is just as sensitive in regard to its position ten day, and I know no community likes to have years ago as it is in regard to its position to spread before the world that ten years ago it was far below the mark that every man knew it had reached, any more than it desires to be misrepresented in regard to its present position. So, if the Minister could discover some way in which, without being unfair as a matter of public policy, the figures could be submitted and the discrepancy ascertained, he would be conferring on the House and the country a great public service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this item should stand over. We should have the instructions given to the census commissioners, and with those in our hands, we could look into this matter with some degree of knowledge on both sides. I cannot conceive it possible that there should be any such restriction as the Minister of Finance appears to suggest. It seems to be contrary to all sound policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We thoroughly concur with hon. gentlemen opposite, that according to sound policy the enumerators or census commissioners should not be allowed to give information furnished by any one whom they had visited. Their duty was to collect information from the respective parties to whom they applied, and report that information to the department. So far, both sides of the House agree ; but we on this side of the House differ as to how far Parliament after the abstract has been made by the department, and its correctness has been challenged and disputed in this House, has the right to obtain details of the information. On some points we admit that it may not be desirable as a question of policy not to give the information. If a certain number of blacksmiths shops or carpenter shops were reported in a certain town, and this fact was known by the parliamentary representative to be incorrect, has he not the right to ask the names of the people carrying on those industries ? I contend there would be no breach of confidence and no injustice done when it was evident that a gross error and mistake had been committed. The question, then, is can Parliament obtain the names ? Is there any reason in the statute or on public policy prohibiting our obtaining the names of the different classes of the manufactures in

the respective towns so that we may be able to certify the accuracy of the returns.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman at present, for I prefer to answer him after I have seen the regulations. I think it would hardly be reasonable to ask that the item be allowed to stand, when there was no reason to suppose that this information would be called for on this item. The main sum for the taking of the census was voted with the information before the House, as I understand it. This is a supplementary vote, to cover an amount expended by Governor-General's warrant, and in the Estimates to come there will be another vote which will bring up this question.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman does not seem willing to give the information to which the House is entitled, and under the circumstances it seems to me that the item should stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We should not let the item stand for want of information which could not be expected to be called for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is perfectly reasonable to ask for this information on a vote for census and statistics. The contention is that the money voted has been so badly used that the information for which the money was paid is totally unreliable in every particular.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This item is for compilation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is for census and statistics.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not yet asked an explanation of the item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. I say that the statistics brought down are, in one of the most important particulars, with respect to certain towns and villages and also certain towns and villages known to many hon. gentlemen sitting beside me, are wholly and entirely inaccurate, and this is the time beyond all doubt to examine into the manner in which the money has been spent. The request made is strictly pertinent, especially after what the Minister of Finance has said and the First Minister has said. I do not desire to protract the discussion, but the hon. Minister of Finance should allow the item to stand and take up some other items. It cannot be said that any difficulty will arise if this course is adopted, because the Government have already drawn the amount on Governor-General's warrant, and it has been expended.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to be unreasonable he can be so, and force the Government to allow the item to stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is really a question which, I think, the hon. gentleman must admit, is a matter of very great

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

moment. It is a question of the very first moment with respect to the discussions that are at this moment going on, as to how far this particular portion of the statistics is correct, and especially after the hon. gentleman's refusal the other day to give the information and place the committee in possession of the instructions. If I had been aware that the Government had any idea of refusing the information asked for, I would not have allowed the item to stand without further discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman. I trust, will appreciate the force of the position. The hon. gentleman stated, in answer to a question, that he would not give the names of the manufacturers in certain cities and gave his reasons for refusing to do so. However, to-day, I understand that the hon. gentleman and the First Minister are not at all assured of the soundness of the position assumed by the Minister of Finance the other day. Under such circumstances we altogether dissent from the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. We hold that this House has the right to have the names of manufacturers enumerated in the census laid before it. The hon. gentleman a few moments ago gave a reason which seemed to be logical, name'y, that this objection should have been taken when the instructions were given to the enumerators. My impression is that the instructions were never brought down to Parliament. However, if the instructions were submitted and no objection was taken to them by the Opposition, the Government are entitled to the benefit of that argument, but at the present time I contend that the instructions were not brought down to the House. Under these circumstances, I hold we have a right to this information. The item should be allowed to stand, in order that it may be further discussed. But if the hon. gentleman maintains his position and declares he will not give us this information, he need not be surprised if we try to get it somewhere else.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no disposition not to give information. It is impossible to produce the instructions now, when we have not got them here and when the departments are shut up. I have told the hon. gentleman that the instructions would be brought down, and that there would be another item in which the same question would be brought up, and I told him I was anxious to get these Estimates passed.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will pardon me for saying that his answer is not fair at all. Yesterday, in answer to a regular question, he said that he would not bring down the information asked. This is the occasion for us to say that we are entitled to it, and that is why we think the item should be allowed to stand. The hon. gentleman will, I think, make more progress if he consents to this.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it stand.

For advance to be made from time to time on dairy products on Experimental Stations, to be refunded from sale of such products.....\$6,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I want some explanation of what was done with this money last year. I want to know what was the object of purchasing cheese in all the different provinces, where it was sent to, and also the results? I am under the impression that it is a false step for the Government to purchase cheese and send it off, for the simple reason that the Dominion of Canada stands the highest of any country in the British market for its cheese products. I do not think myself that the Dairy Commissioner will be increasing our credit on the cheese market by purchasing this cheese and sending it over. The trade is in the hands of some of the most experienced individuals who have been engaged in it ever since it commenced and they have done a good deal for the industry by going to the old country every year and placing their products on the market. I want some statement of what has become of the 50,000 or 60,000 pounds of cheese purchased last year, for which there is no account in the returns. I also find that there was some 22,000 pounds of butter sent from the different factories, and there is no return for this either.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wants all the information he has asked for, we might as well let this item stand, too. I cannot carry in my head, or in my pockets, the detailed transactions in butter and cheese for the whole year. I can explain what this vote is for, if that will be sufficient. This is wanted by the Dairy Commissioner for advances from time to time at the Experimental stations. He is not buying cheese, as I understand it, from Tom, Dick or Harry, but he buys it at the Experimental stations which are being carried on under the supervision of Professor Robertson. The farmers bring in their milk and an advance is given to the farmers, and the cheese and butter is sent by Professor Robertson to Great Britain. When he receives the returns from the sales, the proceeds, less the expenses, are distributed amongst the farmers, and this vote is to make advances until the money is distributed. Every dollar will be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I give notice that, when the main estimates are up, I shall require details as to the result of this butter and cheese in the British market. I find from the Report of the Professor of Dairying that it is represented there, that certain quantities of butter brought 23 and 24 and 25 cents per pound, but, according to the Auditor-General's Report, only 19 cents a pound was realized. I shall expect a full explanation of these matters later on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has certainly a perfect right to ask for the information, and I myself would like to hear it very much. I may say that the object for which the vote is being taken meets with my hearty approval, for one, I understand that Professor Robertson has been engaged to some extent in the Maritime provinces initiating the farmers there, in the method of making cheese, and carrying on their factories; and when he gets it started leaving it to themselves. They have to invest their money to start the factory, and he places a man in charge who shows how the business is carried on and then takes the cheese and sends it to the English market.

Mr. FOSTER. And that for one year only.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe the experiment is a good one. I am sure it is in the hands of an excellent man, and I know the results have been gratifying to the province from which I come. At the same time I think the information which the hon. gentleman seeks ought to be given on the main Estimates.

Annapolis and Digby Railway—
Construction \$2,200

Mr. FLINT. Is this the balance, or are there other accounts unsettled?

Mr. HAGGART. This is to pay Messrs. O'Neil & Campbell their final estimate of \$1,925, and also certain legal expenses.

Ste. Anne's Lock, &c.—To settle
with contractor for strengthening
old pier below lock.....\$1,116

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the contractor?

Mr. HAGGART. Messrs. Brewder & McNaughton were the contractors for strengthening the old pier. The total amount of work done as specified in the contract was \$29,917.52. The balance due them under their contract was paid in July last. In August, an account for \$4,609.35 was sent in by them to the department for alleged extra work. After careful inquiry, the department found that only \$1,115.52 was due to the contractors, nine out of the twelve items of their claims being disallowed. For some reason they refused to accept this amount, but finally they agreed to accept it in full; but the vote being lapsed, this vote is now taken to settle the matter.

The Franchise Act—Further
amount required for printing
Voters' Lists (Governor-Gen-
eral's warrant)..\$18,000

Mr. COSTIGAN. The vote of last year having lapsed, and the work having been carried on after the 30th June, a Governor-General's warrant for \$18,000 had to be taken to finish the work. With regard to the complaint about delay in getting out the voters' lists, I find on inquiry that they have been prepared and completed at as early a period if not earlier than formerly, and the whole time occupied in the work at the Printing

Bureau was a little over a month less than formerly, so that there has in reality been a saving.

Mr. LISTER. When were they completed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Quite recently.

Mr. LISTER. These are the lists for 1891, and this is 1893. Can the hon. gentleman tell the committee how much the revision cost—the printing and all other expenses?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can tell the hon. gentleman what it cost so far as the Printing Bureau is concerned—\$30,557.35.

Mr. LISTER. Was any portion of the lists printed outside of the Printing Bureau?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; that is what gave rise to a previous discussion in the House, and is one of the reasons for amending the law. Under the present Act, the revising officer gets the list from the Printing Bureau and compares it with the assessment roll. He makes lists of the names to be struck off and the names to be added, and of the corrections, and these lists are printed in the localities because they could not be printed in time if sent to the Bureau.

Mr. LISTER. Is that printing done by tender or is it just given by the department to such printing offices as the chief may think proper?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not given by tender, for there would not be time for that; but the accounts come before the Queen's Printer, who certifies to their correctness, and sees whether they are in accordance with the rates fixed.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to change that plan and have the whole work done by the Bureau?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is our intention, as will appear by a Bill of which I have given notice, to make some change, and, if that be found possible, to save the additional printing in the localities of these supplementary lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would not be possible to print the preliminary lists in time for revision by the judge. I want to call attention to the great delay in printing the final lists, as revised by the revising barrister. In Kent, the list for 1891 was finally revised by the revising barrister in the fall of 1891, but was not finally printed and distributed until December, 1892, over a year after the time it should have been distributed. I do not think there can be any reason for that great delay. In that county there was no election held, and it did not make any particular difference; but in some counties, notably East Elgin, where an election was held, the voters' lists were not received until three days before the time of polling. This caused great inconvenience. In future instructions should be given to the

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Bureau to show more promptness and despatch, and finish the printing within the time fixed by law.

Mr. PERRY (P.E.I.) How many copies is each member entitled to get? Last year I only got one copy and my colleague one. If any more are to be had, I would like to know where. I do not think that one is sufficient; and, if I wanted another copy tomorrow, I would not know where to go for it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not very familiar with the details of the department yet, but this point has been raised before and my recollection is that the law provides—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Four copies is it not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; he is to receive them from the revising officer, and he is supposed to pay for all he gets over the four copies to which he is entitled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman able to say whether the copies lately printed, just about finished now, I think, have been sent to the revising officer, and if not, will the hon. gentleman see that the proper officer does forward them, because some of us have never received our copies.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will make inquiries. I may say I feel considerable safety in speaking of the gentleman now in charge of the Bureau. From my personal acquaintance with him and from the observations I have had time to make of the working of the Bureau, I am satisfied that if there has been any delay, he is not at fault. He is most systematic and industrious, and he has the Bureau fully organized and everything seems to work satisfactorily. If there has been any delay it is not attributable to any want of knowledge or attention on the part of the gentleman who manages the Bureau. I will make inquiries about this matter and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. Minister pardon me if I ask whether he is aware that the revising officer of Queen's County, N.S., has left the Dominion of Canada and has gone to the Southern States, and whether the department or the Government intend to appoint his successor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If he is gone his successor will have to be appointed.

Mr. FORBES. He is gone. I know that, because he presented to the court in Florida a recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada setting forth his qualifications to be appointed a judge in Florida. So I suppose the Government must be aware that he is gone. I only want to know whether the Government intend to act upon the knowledge the Premier must have of his absence and appoint his successor, or whether they intend to combine the duties with those of the revising officer for Shelburne County, inasmuch as,

by the Gerrymander Act, they have made these two into one electoral division. I would like to know as soon as possible, and, if the hon. Minister can give me the information now, I should feel grateful.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know that the revising officer has gone from Queen's county. He did not need any letter of recommendation from me. My jurisdiction does not extend to Florida yet; but the Bill which my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, refers to contains a provision dealing with cases in which boundaries are altered under the redistribution of last session, and taking power to appoint revising officers for the new electoral districts.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me if I make another suggestion? That is as to the length of notice to be given by the revising officer to parties requiring them to furnish proof of their qualification. I might tell of cases in which that section has been grossly abused. The section requires notice to be given to the person whose name it is proposed to strike off, and the revising officer can call upon him to prove his qualification. A citizen questioning another's qualification must give a fortnight's notice; but the revising officer may give only two or three hours' notice, and sometimes it is absolutely impossible for a man to travel the distance to the place where the revising officer is holding his court in the time given, and I would ask the hon. Minister to take a note of the point and see if this section does not require amendment.

Cape Tormentine—to complete
payments on Contracts. \$13,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister was not in his place when this vote came up before. I would like him to state whether this amount is for the completion of the contract. Would he state also the price at which the work was let whether any extras have been allowed, what the total cost of the work will be to the country and whether it is completely finished and received from the hands of the contractor?

Mr. OUMET. The contract has been completed. The estimated cost was \$185,000. The final estimate amounts to only \$179,200. The amount already paid is \$166,000, and the balance of \$13,000 now asked for is to complete the payment to the contractor. Some additional work will have to be done, and in the main Estimates we ask for \$6,500 to complete the work and put it in order so as to bring the cars on the dock. This will be done at the beginning of the summer, and we hope that the whole wharf will be ready for navigation this season. From what we hear we expect that it will be fully utilized.

Mr. PERRY. I think that work was very much needed; but I want the Minister of Public Works and the Government to understand that on the opposite side, Cape Tra-

verse, in Prince Edward Island, is in great need of better accommodation for navigation. There was a large meeting in the fall which was attended by men of both parties, including members of the Local Government, and I happened to be there, as well as Senator Howlan, and my colleague, Mr. Yeo. Strong resolutions were passed in favour of obtaining a grant from the Government to extend the wharf and breakwater. In fact, the want of this accommodation prevents the proper use of the harbour. We have a railway from Emerald Junction, which runs daily winter and summer, but through want of the extension of the breakwater the value of the train is nullified. There is only four feet of water at the wharf. Several thousands of dollars have been spent at Cape Traverse, but what is the good so long as there is only four feet of water at the wharf? The Government must see how necessary it is to extend this breakwater or dredge the harbour. I had the honour of an interview with the Minister of Public Works, and he gave us to understand that he thought a good plan would be to dredge so that vessels drawing more than four feet could come to the breakwater. I hope that no delay will take place in this matter. The Government have some interest in the railway on the other side. At all events the branch railway from Emerald Junction to Cape Traverse is Government property, and this branch of railway is not getting its legitimate share of the traffic for want of shipping accommodation at Cape Traverse. I want to compliment my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways who paid a visit to Prince Edward Island last spring. I want to pay him a compliment, not for his generosity, but for his penuriousness in starving the Prince Edward Island Railroad.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot let the resolution go without more explanation. I want to know whether, in that \$13,000, there are any extras voted, or is this part of the original contract?

Mr. OUMET. This is part of the original contract, with the exception of a few allowances for works which were not included in the contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much?

Mr. OUMET. About \$5,000 extras; but as I mentioned to the hon. gentleman, the original estimate was \$185,000. The contract was on schedule rates, and some things have been dropped and some others have been included. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman will see that the extras did not exceed the amount of the estimate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My information does not enable me to criticise the amount of extras which the hon. gentleman has given this contractor. Whether they are too generous or too little, I do not know; but I want to get the facts so that those who do know

will be enabled to determine. I suppose that experts could be able to do that. Now, I want to call the attention of the House and of the hon. gentleman to the fact that they have incurred \$185,000 in building a wharf at Cape Traverse. It was justified, or attempted to be justified, only on the ground that that was to be one of the termini of the ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. As a matter of fact there is no attempt being made to establish that ferry. The hon. gentleman will remember that some years ago the Government came down and said that they were in earnest about the establishment of that ferry, and they spent \$250,000 in Prince Edward Island in building a branch line from Emerald to Cape Traverse. That branch line has been there ever since, doing very little good to anybody, involving the loss of a large amount of money annually, and it can really be of no use to the public until the wharf at Cape Traverse is finished. Now, the Department of Public Works and the Government generally are very seriously to blame in this matter. They are not attempting to do the slightest thing towards the completion of that ferry. They have spent \$250,000, which is the next thing to useless, in Prince Edward Island, in building that branch line from Emerald to Cape Traverse; and they have spent this \$185,000 in building a wharf at Cape Tormentine. The hon. gentleman tells us he is going to spend seven or eight thousand more, in doing—what? In building wharf accommodation at the end of the railway. For what? There is no ferry there, there can be no ferry there, there can be no use for this eight or ten thousand dollars you are going to spend, except so far as it may personally benefit the shareholders of the Sackville Railway. There is no earthly reason in the world for expending any more money on that wharf except for the personal benefit of those gentlemen; and I am sorry that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) is not in his place, who is the chief owner of that railway, so that he might give some explanation of this matter. Now, the hon. gentleman will see that the only excuse they could have given to Parliament at all for the expenditure of this enormous amount of money was that it was necessary to build the wharf on that side, and the wharf on the other side, in order to carry out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island; and the hon. gentleman is treating us, as my hon. friend from Prince county (Mr. Perry) has said, with contempt in the matter, because he is not taking the first step, so far as I know—and I have read his report—to construct the wharf on the Prince Edward Island side, and the two or three hundred thousand dollars he has spent is just thrown away unless he finishes that wharf. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, to-night, whether he proposes to take immediate steps for the construction of a wharf at Cape Traverse, so that a ferry may run

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

there in the summer months, at least, if it is found desirable to run it. If he is not going to do that how does he justify the expenditure of this money? The only way it can be justified was on the ground on which the House was first asked to vote the money, namely, that it was for the purpose of constructing a ferry which, to some extent, would carry out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island. Now, that object is thrown over apparently. The hon. gentleman has not as yet taken any steps to construct the ferry on the Island side, and the wharf, at a cost of \$185,000 on the Cape Tormentine side is a useless expenditure, except for the purposes of the shareholders of the Sackville Railway, of which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) is the chief shareholder, as I understand. Well, if this wharf is to be built, not in the interest of the people of Prince Edward Island, on whose behalf the money was originally asked, but in the interest of a supporter of the Government, let the public know it, let the people down there know it. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman to-night, and he must give me an answer before this estimate is passed, whether it is his intention to take steps to construct a wharf on the Island side, or whether he has satisfied himself that the wharf cannot be constructed, and is to be abandoned?

Mr. OUIMET. I was not the Minister of Public Works when this particular work was undertaken and I cannot question the correctness of the assertions of the hon. gentleman; but I may tell him that from what I know, and from what I saw, this wharf has not been built exclusively in order to serve as a ferry accommodation with Cape Traverse. It is not a natural harbour, true enough, but it is large enough for the ships that come there. If it had been built only to serve for a ferry, I do not think it was necessary to build it in its present shape.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly, it was for protection for the steamer that was supposed to ply from the railway on the Cape Traverse side to the Cape Tormentine side, and you had to build that wharf as a protection against the north-east storms.

Mr. OUIMET. My information is that when the wharf is completed, and when the cars can come to the end of the wharf, it is intended to have large shipments of lumber from that point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we are building that wharf for the purpose of enabling the owners of the Sackville Railway to ship lumber from there. Is that it?

Mr. OUIMET. No, the railway will carry lumber, and the people of New Brunswick will sell it, and both will be benefited by the wharf. The fact that Mr. Wood is president of that railway, is no reason why the people of New Brunswick should not have that

accommodation for shipping their lumber. The ferry question is another thing. The Sackville Railway, I understand, was built with the expectation that it would give the people of Prince Edward Island the shortest and best communication with the mainland. I presume that the branch of the Island railway to Cape Traverse was built with that expectation, and the present wharf was built for the same purpose; but on account of the delay in constructing the work, there has been every year an accumulation of sand, so much so that there is hardly sufficient water for a ferry to approach the wharf. Since the work has been carried to completion, communication has been opened with the Department of Railways, and a controversy has arisen as to the success of that ferry scheme. In that view, the Department of Public Works, having been informed by its engineers that \$30,000 would be required to construct a deep water wharf there, similar to that constructed at Cape Tormentine, with 15 feet at low water, has decided that it would be better to make an experiment before entering upon that large expenditure; and it is the intention of my department, acting with the Department of Railways, to carry out some dredging near the wharf at Cape Traverse, in order to temporarily make it available for a ferry, and to ascertain whether we will be justified in undertaking that further expenditure of \$30,000. I think I am perfectly justified in taking the position that before I recommend such a large expenditure, I must be assured by the Department of Railways that the expenditure will not be useless. If the ferry were abandoned after the first year, this large expenditure would have been made for almost nothing. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that it is better to spend a few dollars on this experiment rather than enter rashly on an outlay of \$30,000. If it were possible by dredging to secure ten or twelve feet of water so as to allow the ferry to come to the wharf without difficulty, the work would be carried out at once, in fact it would have been carried out already; but it cannot be done, because dredging would have to be carried on lower than the foundation of the wharf, and in a very short time the wharf would tumble into the cut. I hope hon. gentlemen will be satisfied that the intention of the department is to afford the people of Prince Edward Island all the benefits that the works already constructed can give them, without entering upon, I will not say an extravagant, but an improvident expenditure.

Mr. YEO. I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works how soon we may expect the dredging to be done at Cape Traverse. I was always under the impression that the pier or breakwater at Cape Tormentine was constructed for the purpose of extending trade between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and unless something is

done at Cape Traverse harbour, so far as that trade is concerned, it will prove entirely useless. I think different reports have been made to the Government by engineers sent to Cape Traverse as to the improvement of the harbour at that place. Some have recommended dredging, others an extension of the wharf, and others have recommended that a breakwater be constructed outside of the harbour. The country around Cape Traverse is a very fine one, a large amount of shipping is done there, irrespective of the passenger traffic, and if it is not the intention to make Cape Traverse a port of shipping, the expenditure on Cape Tormentine pier will be money almost thrown away, for I do not think it would be used very much except for the Island trade. Cape Tormentine is the nearest point to the Island, and directly opposite Cape Traverse, where if the harbour is improved there will ultimately be a large amount of traffic. I am sorry the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) is not in his place, for he well knows the very great necessity that exists of improving the harbour at Cape Traverse. My colleague and myself had an interview with the Minister of Public Works to-day, and he assured us that dredging would be done there, but he did not specify the kind of dredging. We have required this improvement for some years. Late in the autumn a large meeting was held there, attended by representatives of all shades of politics, and the meeting petitioned the Public Works Department, asking it to take steps at once to have the necessary harbour improvements carried out, and I hope the Minister will see that this is attended to at once. I do not know whether the vote that is being passed through committee includes the repairs to be made to Cape Tormentine breakwater, which, I understand, was somewhat damaged last year.

Mr. OUIMET. \$6,500 have been placed in the main Estimates for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not desire to find any fault with the head of the department for exercising any reasonable prudence before he enters upon a large expenditure. Incapacity, recklessness and extravagance have characterized the expenditures made by the department from the time this scheme was first mooted until now. Any sane man who considers the matter will say that the language I have used was not in any sense too strong. It was proposed to this House to expend a certain sum of money in carrying out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island by establishing a ferry between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. The Government came down to the House, and asked for a grant to build a railway on one side and construct wharves on the other side. What did they do? Before they had ascertained the proper data on which to found a judgment as to the length of the wharf required

to reach deep water, they let a contract and built a small wharf very much shorter than was required and also not exactly in the right place. Then Parliament voted \$250,000 or more in building a branch railway to go to the straits and unite the end of Mr. Wood's railway. The Government built a wharf at a cost of \$179,000, which cannot be justified in this House or the country, on any ground except that the Government were obliged to build it in order to carry out the terms of union. Now it appears that the whole structure was built as a feeder to the Sackville Railway. I do not think, with all the backing the hon. gentleman has in this House, if his statement was made that that was the only object in constructing the wharf, there are not a dozen men who would sacrifice their sense of duty and regard for purity to vote to expend such an enormous amount. If the hon. gentleman and his engineers informed this House that he cannot build a wharf on the other side so as to make the ferry pay, that he cannot extend the wharf further out, he is not justified in expending any money whatever on that wharf. \$175,000 are gone now, and the hon. gentleman's department, which, more than any other department, has been characterized for some years back by an absolute recklessness in expenditure; the hon. gentleman's department, over which he presides (although he himself is not responsible), is responsible for constructing that wharf at an enormous cost before they have had settled the point that the complement wharf on the other side could be built, and that they could supply sufficient water to float a steamer of proper size. \$250,000 to build a railway on one side, \$180,000 to build a railway on the other, and the wharf which is necessary to enable this railway to be of any use cannot be built. It displays a want of management, a recklessness and an extravagance which does not entitle the department to much weight when it makes a recommendation to this House. When the vote was taken in the first instance, the Government pledged themselves that there would be a branch wharf built on both sides, and they led the people of Prince Edward Island to believe so. We find in this matter, as in most other matters, where that unfortunate Island is concerned, that we have been cheated and deceived. I do not want the Minister to spend money recklessly, if he is not satisfied the wharf can be built, but I do urge that the hon. gentleman shall not abandon works which have already cost \$400,000 without making an effort to see if the result of this expenditure can be utilized. The department has thrown away \$400,000—\$200,000 of which will benefit specially the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), who is largely the owner of the Sackville road, and it appears to me from what the Minister says tonight that he recognizes that fact. He tells us that it will be a place for shipping lumber. They do not want artificial harbours for shipping lumber on that part of the New Brun-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

wick coast. The port of Shediac is not far away. They have shipped lumber there for years, and the hon. gentleman knows that you will not get a Norwegian vessel to go to this artificial harbour to load with lumber. That wharf was built simply as a protection for the steamer and for no other reason. I do not want to prejudge the hon. gentleman. I am willing to give him every reasonable time to consult his department before he discusses this matter again, for discuss it I will before the session is over, when I have the engineer's report before me. I can tell him that there are thousands of people who have been waiting year after year for some words from the department which will satisfy the hopes that have been held out to them that such a wharf would be built. If it cannot be built, then let the hon. gentleman come to the House and say so. Do not let the people be deceived any more. Let us know it, and let us stop spending money foolishly. But if it can be done for a reasonable sum of money, surely the hon. gentleman will not "lose the ship for a ha'porth of tar," and having spent \$400,000 already, \$25,000 should not stand in the way of his endeavouring to make that large expenditure useful. The hon. Minister of Public Works has an opportunity of earning for himself a name which his predecessor neither earned nor deserved in our part of the Dominion. We were treated by his predecessor with contempt. We were deceived year after year with promises in this House which never were fulfilled, and which, judging from the result, I am bound to say he never intended to fulfil. We have our breakwaters, our wharves, and our harbours in Prince Edward Island in the most abominable and disgraceful condition. I have had an opportunity of bringing one or two to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and I trust he will see to them. I trust the Minister will examine into the question. If there is a reasonable chance for the construction of a wharf which will enable that ferry to be carried out, when we have already spent \$400,000, we ought not to pause at \$25,000 in the completion of the work. I cannot compliment the department on the way this has been managed, and it looks very much to me, judging from the results, as if the interests of a certain hon. gentleman behind the Government were more kept in view than the interests of the public or of Prince Edward Island.

Toronto Drill Shed..... \$53,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much has been expended on that drill shed already?

Mr. OUIMET. It is to cost \$280,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was the value of the site given by the city?

Mr. OUIMET. We estimated it at \$100,000; but the people of Toronto considered it was worth \$150,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). \$280,000 for one drill shed and \$10,000 for another. Is that

the hon. gentleman's idea of impartiality? I think, perhaps, after what has been said about Cape Tormentine, I had better not go into that matter at present, but I will ask the hon. gentleman to keep these figures in mind.

Lieut. - Governor's Residence,
Regina..... \$3,913 47

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the total cost of this building?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost, including the furniture and linen, is \$50,502. The furniture cost about \$8,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the department any schedule of the work?

Mr. OUIMET. We had our own clerk of works there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is he?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Peters. All these accounts have since been inquired into. I may say that part of the expenditure is for furniture and linen, and part for wages paid to labourers. The principal reason why these accounts have been left behind has been that the expense had not been at the time regularly authorized by the department, and Mr. Peters took upon himself, at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor, to go into the expenditure without referring to the department. But since then all the items have been inquired into, and we have found that the works were necessary, the goods were furnished, and the labour for which wages were demanded was given.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is just as I expected, that this money was expended without any authority whatsoever, and now the country is called upon to pay it. The hon. gentleman says he has inquired into it. May I ask him what kind of an inquiry it was?

Mr. OUIMET. I sent one of the officers of the department, Mr. Ewart, to inquire into the whole subject in the summer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has he made a report in writing?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman bring down the report I have reasons for asking.

Mr. OUIMET. I will.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Our experience of taking charge of Government buildings when changes of governors take place is not such as we can be very proud of. There have been certain episodes in the history of Canada in relation to Rideau Hall which none of us care to dig up, and I hope that we shall not need to make any similar complaint with reference to Regina Government house. I suppose the hon. gentleman has a proper schedule in his department showing what we have got and what we have not got for this expenditure?

Mr. OUIMET. Inventories have been ordered of all the furniture there is in these buildings, and we have them in the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the inventory as to the Regina building is complete, showing everything we have paid for, and that it can be obtained if moved for.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Victoria, B.C., Drill Hall--local-
ity furnishing site free..... \$21,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the cost?

Mr. OUIMET. \$43,165.50.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was paid for the site?

Mr. OUIMET. Nothing. The locality furnished it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the deed is made out to the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman desires the information I will give it when we come to the item in the main Estimates for this same building. This is to pay for the contract now going on, as the appropriation of last year was insufficient to carry on the work continuously during the present year, and it was thought better not to suspend the work, but to go on with it, and to ask the House for an additional amount for the present year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not ask the question for the purpose of objecting to the expenditure. I have no doubt that Victoria is entitled to this building. But I ask it in order to call attention to the fact that we were given to understand that the rule that prevailed in regard to these buildings was that the Government would furnish an amount equal to that furnished by the municipality in which the building is erected; that this rule is not carried out by the department; that the department do not act by rule, but act in one way in one place and another way in another place. That being the case I think they ought to take the ground that they do so, instead of professing to be governed by a rule, when it is very evident that no rule guides them. Toronto has not given anything like half the cost of the building being constructed there. I presume that the site in Victoria does not cost as much as the building. In Halifax I do not know whether a site was given at all or not. While I say I do not take exception to the vote, I do take exception to the Government saying that they act by a rule in reference to this matter when that rule is not observed, in regard to the expenditure of public money on a force that is national in its character, and into which no local considerations should enter. I simply wish to emphasize these matters in order to convince this House that when I have spoken on several occasions under a sense of duty, I have not been speaking on a matter that was not

worthy of the attention of the House or the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not aware that the rule as laid down by the hon. gentleman has ever been laid down by me or any one else within my knowledge. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that all the different cities in the Dominion cannot stand on the same footing, from a military point of view. Take Halifax and Victoria, they cannot be looked at in the same light as an inland place like Brantford, which stands in no danger from invasion from the outside as do these places on the coast.

Minor Quarantine Stations—
to provide for additional accommodation and to recoup appropriations, repairs, furniture, etc. \$1,846 42

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see anything to be expended in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. OUIMET. In that amount there is a vote of \$1,000 for Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That will not go very far.

Repairs, Furniture, etc.—additional amount required \$35,000

Mr. OUIMET. This is a general vote. Last year I said I thought we might be able to reduce the expenditure to \$155,000, or \$40,000 less than the previous vote. This is for repairs, furniture, everything necessary for the buildings in Ottawa and even outside. The report of the Auditor-General will show that we spent last year \$152,000, and the year before \$193,000, and this year we require \$155,000.

Dredging, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick—additional amount required \$5,000

Mr. YEO. Is there any dredging to be done in Prince Edward Island during the coming season? It is impossible for one dredge to do all the work. I had the opportunity of presenting a petition to the Minister of Public Works a few days ago, asking that a harbour in Prince County, Victoria west, should be dredged. There is a pier at this place, upon which some work was done two years ago, and at the present time the pier is in very good repair. But, in consequence of a bank which has formed quite near the pier it is useless for want of a little dredging. But it seems to me that if we are to wait until the dredge completes the work in King's County we shall have to wait a long time. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to Malpeque Harbour. That is the most important harbour on the north side of Prince Edward Island, but a bank has formed near the entrance to that harbour. Last year a vessel grounded there and it was only with great difficulty she

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

was got off. She had a narrow escape of being wrecked and the lives of her crew lost. I would like the Minister to inform the committee when the work will be done at Cape Traverse, whether it will be during the present session or not. I do not know, but it seems to me that one dredge cannot do all the work that is wanted to be done in Prince Edward Island. But Victoria West and Malpeque Harbour require immediate attention.

Mr. OUIMET. I could not exactly tell the hon. gentleman the programme laid out for the dredge. She is now in Montague, in King's County. I am told that the dredge has not been in that county since 1883. The other gentleman has just suggested one reason why the work of the dredge is not rapid enough to meet the expectations of the people. A good deal of time is occupied in travelling from one point to another, fitting up and so on. She is now in Montague Harbour and probably afterwards will go to Cape Traverse. I cannot say where she will go then.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not given the real reason why these dredges do so little work. Has he got a return of the exact work done during the summer? This used to be placed in the report of the Department of Public Works, but I have not seen it lately. Under whose supervision are these dredges?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. McCorduck.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He does not live there; he goes there once or twice in the summer.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, the captain is on board and is responsible for the work. I shall furnish the hon. gentleman a statement of the work that has been done, but I may say that we cannot superintend the dredging done in the lower provinces as well as we can that done up here. And if we had a proper engineer attached to these dredges it perhaps would be better. Here is a statement of the amount of dredging that appears to the credit of the dredge "Prince Edward" Summerside—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman would rather give it to me privately I think it will serve every purpose.

Mr. OUIMET. There is nothing to hide.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not mean to say there is anything to hide. But the point is not one of general interest, but still, as I had made a remark which he might think undeserved, he might find it desirable to occupy the time of the House in reading these figures. If he thinks so, very well; I do not want to reflect improperly upon the captain.

Mr. OUIMET. I will give you the work of the "Prince Edward" in 1882. Prince County, 13,541 cubic yards; Queen's County, 3,243; Georgetown (Queen's County), 1,002; Sturgeon (King's County), 13,596.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman give the total of work done by other dredges?

Mr. OUIMET. I have the figures for the four dredges. The "New Dominion" moved a total of 54,000 cubic yards; the "Canada" 38,453; the "Prince Edward" 31,382; the "St. Lawrence" 24,763 and the "George Mackenzie" 39,165.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You would want to know if they were the same power and size?

Mr. FORBES. May I ask if the dredge was on the south shore of Nova Scotia?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. FORBES. Is there any likelihood of a dredge coming this year? The hon. gentleman speaks of no dredge having been in King's County since 1883. We have some very important harbours on the south side that have not had a dredge since 1873. Last year I presented a petition asking for dredging in the important harbour, or sub-harbour of Liverpool. This is exclusively used by fishermen, and at Liverpool, where it adjoins the harbour, is a bar which should be dredged out. There are places also in Shelburne County requiring attention.

Mr. OUIMET. It is not intended to send a dredge this year.

Mr. FORBES. Why?

Mr. OUIMET. We must do the work as well as we can. In order to dredge around the whole coast of Nova Scotia it would take a hundred dredges, I suppose.

Mr. FORBES. If we had 500 I think we would have enough, but in the meantime we could have much more satisfaction and the work I think could be fairly covered if we had two dredges. The dredge which properly belonged to the south shore of Nova Scotia, I was told last year, was lost; and there was a vote put in the Estimates for building a new dredge for the lake service. The Minister also told us that he intended to apply at the next session of Parliament for a vote to put on a new dredge for the south shore of Nova Scotia. Will he tell me what is his programme at present for the south shore of Nova Scotia?

Mr. OUIMET. This question would be better addressed to the Finance Minister, and I suppose he would answer that if the finances of the country could afford it, he would get another dredge.

New Dredging Plant—additional amount required..... \$10,900

Mr. OUIMET. This is to pay the balance of the building of a dredge which was authorized last year for the use of the ship channel. It was to build a new hull and put in two new boilers, and this amount is necessary to pay the balance of the contract entered into by the department last year.

Mr. FORBES. Is that to supply a dredge that has been lost?

Mr. OUIMET. No, it is an old dredge, the hull of which was ruined in the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. FORBES. Is it the intention of the department to supply the loss of the dredge for the south shore of Nova Scotia?

Mr. OUIMET. As I said to the hon. gentleman, our good intentions have no limit, but the resources of this country do not always allow us to carry out our good intentions.

Mr. FORBES. In other words, other parts of Canada are to be supplied before the south shore of Nova Scotia.

Mr. OUIMET. We are threatened with a reduction in the revenue.

Repairs to Wascana Dam, Regina, on condition that what is required in addition to put the dam in a state of thorough repair be contributed by the other parties interested, and that hereafter it be taken over and maintained at the cost of the municipality—additional amount required.. \$1,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the Government's liability in reference to this?

Mr. OUIMET. This dam was constructed originally by the Government of Canada to raise the water to be utilized by the town of Regina. The dam was in bad order, and in danger of being carried away to the damage of the surrounding country. The City Council of Regina entered into negotiations with the Government to have the dam placed in a proper state of repair. Last year the department offered to furnish \$3,500 towards repairing the dam if the city of Regina would take the responsibility of building the dam, and of maintaining it in the future. A vote of \$3,500 was given for that purpose. Negotiations were carried on with no success, the cost of repairs to the dam being much higher than we expected. A new agreement was entered into, that the Government should furnish \$5,000 towards rebuilding the dam, and on that condition the municipality undertook to pay for the balance of the rebuilding and to maintain it for ever. Under that arrangement the Government will have nothing to do with it in the future. We now ask for an additional sum of \$1,500 to complete the \$5,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But what is our interest in it as a country?

Mr. FOSTER. It was our water supply for public buildings and Mounted Police, and it is necessary to maintain it in our interest.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. (65) to amend the law respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: Many months ago my predecessor issued a circular to such persons whose opinions would be of value, to ascertain what amendments they might suggest in the Act, and from all the information we have had from revising barristers and others, it seems to be the general opinion that the revision could be simplified and the number of lists posted and printed to-day reduced. The list shall be revised by striking off the names from the original list, by drawing a pen through them and then making an additional list in writing of the names to be added. The original list with the names struck off and the additional list of names added shall be posted. In that way, we save the first printing of the supplementary list and a very considerable expense. This is done by the revising officer himself of his own motion, as at present. Then any man not a voter, may make a declaration for himself which will be received, but he cannot make a declaration for other persons except in the case of their absence. There are no changes in the duties of the revising officer, except in the districts affected by the Act passed for the redistribution of seats. Some time ago the time for receiving claims for names to be added was extended from the 1st to the 15th of August. That has been found to cause great inconvenience, because it shortens the time allowed the officers for completing their work too much. These are the principal changes.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no remarks to offer upon the provisions of the Bill at its present stage, but I must say that the Bill must bring to the House a very deep sense of disappointment. The hon. gentleman who was Secretary of State last year, now the Minister of Militia (Mr. Patterson, Huron), promised the House that there should be a thorough revision of the Franchise Act, and now this thorough revision is found to be simply some amendment of the Act dealing with the matter of making the lists. That is not what was promised, for it leaves the Act in every important respect as it is to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to say one word with respect to the amendment that has been introduced, more in the way of suggestion than in the way of criticism, in the hope that something may be done before this Bill is passed. So far as the province from which I come is concerned, every hon. member knows the expense and loss of time which the

candidates and the leading politicians on both sides are obliged to suffer in the preparation and revision of these lists. The intention of the law seems to me to be very plain that a large portion of the work shall be done by the revising officer, and done of his own mere motion, without throwing the onus and trouble upon the respective parties. Now, in my county, the revising officer does not put on any names at all of his own motion; he simply puts on the names, whether 100 or 1,000, which are set forth in declarations prepared in the proper form without any technical error. The language of the Act appears very plain to me, and if something could be done to compel the revising officers to carry out what seems to be the meaning of the law, it would be a great advantage. Take an ordinary city, such as I come from, one of 10,000 inhabitants. Hundreds and hundreds of the voters change from one ward to the other during the year. But if you do not apply to strike off every man from the ward he has left, and to put him on for the ward to which he has gone, the necessary changes are not made. The revising officer will not look over the city lists and put down the names, and thus a burden which is almost intolerable is thrown upon the candidates and their friends. Of course, the revising officer could not do it perfectly; some names would be left off. But these could be supplied by those who are watching the lists. The law seems plainly to declare that this is the duty of the revising officer, but the revising officer regards it differently, and consequently great labour is thrown upon the politicians on both sides, as well as great expense.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I confess I am disappointed with the synopsis which the Minister has given us of the Bill which he has introduced. I was in hopes that the Government would return to the condition of things that existed before the present Franchise Act was introduced and to the plan and policy which worked so satisfactorily during the first eighteen years of our Federal constitution. It seems to me that any preparation of the lists will fail to be satisfactory until that preparation is put into the hands of the people upon the ground. Both in England and in the United States, as well as in this country prior to the introduction of this Bill in 1885, the policy has been to allow the list to be prepared—I am speaking now not of the revision, but of the preparation of the list—by the people in the locality who know the various parties and who know who is and who is not qualified to be upon the list. Now, the persons naturally pointed to by the experience, the observation and the common sense of every member of the community for this work—I am speaking so far as the province of Ontario is concerned—are the municipal officers in each municipality. Why should the party named as the revising officer be the officer for the preparation of the lists?

Mr. OUMET.

In no other country is the revising officer the officer who prepares the list. The lists should be prepared by the officers of the municipality. There are the assessor, the reeve and the deputy-reeve of the different townships, towns and villages, who together know almost every individual who resides within that municipality and by whose knowledge the lists can be prepared without imposing any special duties in that respect upon the revising officers or upon the candidates on either side. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is to the interests of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to see that the lists first prepared are full and accurate, and that can only be done by having these lists in the first instance prepared by persons in the various municipalities which go to make up the constituency. I do not intend further to discuss this matter on the first reading of the Bill, but I confess my disappointment at the principle and plan on which the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have based the provisions of this Bill, because I certainly did expect, from the experience we have had during the past seven years, that they would have prepared a more satisfactory and a more inexpensive plan of preparing the lists than that which, during this period of time, has prevailed.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot help sharing the disappointment expressed by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me that we have not had a revision of the Franchise Act this year. The few changes in detail proposed by the Minister cannot be called in any sense a revision. Last session, undoubtedly, we were led to expect that the whole principle, as well as the machinery of the Act, would be looked into and something more easily workable and more economical laid before us this year. Hon. members on the Government side of the House must agree with those on this side that the Act as it stands, even with the trifling changes now proposed by the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan), involves immense expense in any constituency that is anything like a fighting constituency, where there is any pressing need of preparing a correct list. But I hope that before the second reading of the Bill, or perhaps after the second reading in committee, the hon. Minister will be prepared to go somewhat more into the real revision of the Act. There is one point to which I wish to call the Minister's attention, and which has been discussed a good deal in the press. I do not ask him to pronounce upon it now, and I do not intend to pronounce upon it myself at the present time. It has been urged that owing to the fact that we only revise our lists every second year, as a rule, the list used is often a very old one, generally a year, and sometimes two years old. There ought to be some provision for putting on the list names of electors who have become qualified since the last revision. It has been urged by many newspapers and public men that after the issue of a writ for an election, there should

be some means of registering those who have become qualified since the last revision of the list. I think this is a very serious matter for consideration; I think it is desirable this should be done if possible; and I would ask the Minister if he has already considered that proposal, and whether he has decided that nothing can be done in that line, or if he has not considered it, I would urge upon him to do so before the Bill comes up for discussion in the House. I have no doubt the Minister could contrive a way to have a supplemental registration within the last three weeks or so before the election, conducted with sufficient safe-guards against the registration of names who should not be put on the list. If this could be done, I think it would be a great advantage to the country, and would secure a more correct representation of the views of the people than can be secured upon a list one or two years old. The number of deaths that have occurred during that time, and the opportunities for personation thereby given, especially in cities, give force to what I am urging. When we remember what a large crop of young men become available as voters every year, and when we know that so many of these are left off and cannot exercise the franchise to which they have become entitled, as a matter of fact, and when we think of the feelings they must have, knowing that they are as well qualified to vote as many who are on the list, and better qualified than many who have lost their qualification in the meantime—we must admit this is a very serious question, and worthy the attention of the Minister in charge of the Bill, and of such other Ministers as he may choose to consult in the matter. I think it is quite within the ability of the Government to contrive a plan by which a supplemental list of this kind could be arranged between the issue of the writ and the date of holding the election.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SOUTH MIDDLESEX—VACANCY.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman for information with regard to the matter to which I called attention the other day, that is to say, the vacancy in the representation of South Middlesex. May I ask if the returning officer has been appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The returning officer has been appointed and the writ has been issued. Nomination day is on the 13th March.

PRIVILEGE—CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. WELSH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the House to an article in the "Free Press" of the 4th February inst., and to put myself in order, I move the adjournment of the House.

On the 4th February, the "Free Press" contained the following:—

Some months ago the Dominion Government passed an Order in Council agreeing to extend the time for the completion of the Chignecto Ship Railway, without forfeiture of the subsidy voted by Parliament in aid of the scheme, provided work on the railway is actually in progress on the 1st of July next, 1893, and the company establishes to the satisfaction of the Governor-General in Council that it has secured all the capital necessary fully to finish and equip the railway, docks and other works of the company in all respects according to the requirements of the contract. The company must therefore raise the necessary funds to complete the project before the 1st July next, when the extension granted some years ago will expire. The directors have issued preference bonds upon the railway to the amount of \$350,000, and hope to obtain the needed money by the sale of such bonds. They expect that the capitalists who have already invested money in the project will take up the new issue of bonds rather than see the work abandoned.

Well, if this is true, Mr. Speaker, I do not like it. Every extension of time, and every charter that has been granted to this railway, has been done with the sanction of Parliament; and on every occasion that this matter has been brought up there, has always been, from this side of the House at all events, and I think in the minds of a great many gentlemen on the other side of the House, an expression of dissatisfaction, seeing that this scheme had been approved of and supported by Parliament. This matter was brought up in 1888, when the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorized, be the 1st July, 1890, instead of the 1st July, 1889; also that the company may be accorded a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to 7 per cent per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.

There was considerable debate on that motion, and it was opposed by my hon. colleague and by many others, including Mr. Mitchell, the late Minister of Marine. I will not take up the time of the House by quoting the whole of the debate, but I will read an extract from the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper which, at this time, read like a theatrical performance. Among other things he said:

But I consider it the height of ingratitude on the part of the hon. member for Queen's to stand up here and oppose a measure which, if it is going to benefit one part of this Dominion more than another, will benefit the island on which he lives. Why, Sir, it will give to the great article of export of that island, potatoes, an increased value almost equal to the amount of duty that now meets them in the United States. It will enable the large fleets with which Captain Welsh is identified—if he will allow me to

Mr. WELSH.

use his name—to make two or three voyages between Charlottetown and Boston and New York, for every one that it can make as matters stand to-day.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, Sir, I am not attempting to offer to the House, on a question of this kind, my opinion in opposition to that of a gentleman who is perfectly familiar with navigation on the water; but that hon. gentleman has had no experience in navigating his ship on land.

Mr. WELSH. No, and I do not want to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is no authority on the question of taking his ship over-land for twenty miles. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) objects to this work.

And then he goes on. When I read those speeches, and the remarks that were made to sanction this wild-cat scheme, it reminds me of one of Baron Munchausen's yarns. I see some very strong opinions were expressed by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell and others. This has been going on for eight or nine years. If the time is extended much longer, there will be no ships left to pass over the railway, even assuming that it will be possible to carry them over. I have opposed this scheme ever since it was introduced into this House, with all my power. If the Government have extended the company's time by Order in Council, their action is not fair and honest to foreign capitalists. This scheme has always been ventilated on the floor of Parliament, and hon. members have had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it, and it is well this has been the case, because it has tended to inform foreign investors of the position in which the company stands before Parliament. I am within bounds in stating that the last discussion in this House was the means of saving foreign capitalists very large sums of money. I have denounced, and I denounce now this scheme and all such wild-cat schemes, such as the dead meat scheme, and the Chignecto Railway, as being the means of doing great injury to this Dominion, for, if foreign capitalists find such schemes have received the sanction of Parliament, and have been subsequently granted extensions of time and other privileges whereby to assist the companies in carrying out their schemes, the credit of Canada must severely suffer. I oppose this scheme now in order that my action throughout may be consistent. I repeat that I have always opposed it, that I oppose it still, and that this Parliament would do well to express its opinion on the matter, because if it does so, no doubt private foreign capital will save money as well as the tax-payers of the country, if the work should be completed, to the extent of \$3,000,000. When this subject was brought before the House last year, with a view to grant the company an extension of time, the Minister of Finance delivered a long speech, in which he embodied many statistics connected with the railway, including the quantity of mud and rock removed, and

grading done, statistics handed him, no doubt, by the engineer of the road. I have little faith in the engineers' reports. They remind me of an incident that used to happen in the old days when people crossed the line. It was always said that Neptune came on board and shaved the sailors. A man was laid over a long boat, filled with water, his eyes were bandaged and he was shaved. A man who stood by with a tar brush made him swear to this effect: "You will never eat black bread, if you can get white; you will never drink water, if you can get beer." An engineer has to pass through a somewhat similar experience before he receives his certificate, and he has to show that nothing is impossible to an engineer if money can be made thereby. My candid opinion is that the Government had better be careful how they extend the time to this company. I have already asked that a list of stockholders and shareholders be laid on the Table, and, although it was promised last year, it has not yet been brought down. I doubt very much if any man interested in shipping has a dollar invested in the railway. At all events I have done my duty, and I warn foreign capitalists, and I warn this Parliament, not to grant further favours to the company, and thus save the tax-payers of Canada \$3,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is rather hard on the engineers, and I must put in a little plea for them at the beginning of my remarks. The hon. gentleman is misinformed if his information leads him to believe that the Government has granted an extension of time to this company. That can only be done by Parliament. It is not necessary to go over the history of the arrangements made from time to time with the company, but my hon. friend will remember that, last year, after the reverses had taken place and difficulties had been met with in the financial market in raising the money by the company, and after an expenditure of between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 had been made on the work, and the company were within an expenditure of \$1,000,000 of completing it, gentlemen interested in the matter, as representing the stockholders, came from England, and, after a good deal of consultation, they came to Parliament, and Parliament made legal an arrangement whereby they should raise £350,000 on first preference mortgage bonds. That Bill passed through Parliament, and the representatives of the company took it with them, in order, if possible, to raise the amount necessary to complete the work. But in the making of that arrangement, a good deal of time was necessarily lost. The extension Parliament granted them runs to 1st July, 1893. They considered that, in consequence of those delays and difficulties, it would be impossible for them to make a fair market for their preference mortgage bonds, unless the Government could hold out

to them the possibility of an extension for one year from the 1st July, 1893. Under all the circumstances, and bearing in mind the fact that between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 of private capital had been already expended, and that the further outlay necessary does not exceed \$1,000,000, the Government agreed, by Order in Council, that if the company could satisfy the Government before the next session of Parliament that they had made satisfactory arrangements for raising the money, and if the works were then in progress, the Government would lay their case before Parliament and ask an extension of time of one year in which to complete the contract. These are the facts of the case, and I have stated all that has been done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do the Government propose to ask Parliament for that extension?

Mr. FOSTER. Not on present information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That being the case, I need not occupy the time of the House with any extended remarks on this important undertaking. There is no country in the world, I think, where Parliament should be so careful of lending its sanction to visionary and impracticable schemes as Canada should be at the present time. There is no country in the world possessing the vast undeveloped natural resources that this Dominion possesses to-day. We require, above all things, to attract foreign capital here. It would be foolish on the part of Parliament to lend its sanction to any scheme that is visionary and impracticable or wild-cat in character. There are large numbers of practical men in this House and of business men in the Maritime provinces who are acquainted with this scheme, and who consider it impracticable and visionary, and if Parliament, by repeating its sanction year after year to this scheme, by extending its charter, leads British capitalists to believe that, in the opinion of the great majority of the people who ought to know, the value of this scheme is valuable, and if as a consequence English capital is invested in it, Parliament is doing a great injury to Canada. We know very well that a few years ago the very fact that the Canadian High Commissioner, and a gentleman who was then a prominent Canadian statesman, allowed their names to be identified with the dead meat scheme, caused severe animadversion by members on both sides of the House. Why? It was because it was felt to be improper that the names of such gentlemen should be attached to schemes that were not prudent, practicable and reasonable. Now, I have never heard any man, other than the late Minister of Finance, who is now High Commissioner, rise in this House and state that he believed this scheme, to be a rational, a prudent or a reasonable scheme, or one from which those who invested their money in it, could ever hope for a fair

return. Therefore, we stand in this position, that every time we, as a Parliament, lend our name to the sanction of this scheme by extending the time for its completion, we are telling the English capitalists in so many words that we believe it to be a reasonable and prudent scheme, and invite them to put their money into it. If through our action English capitalists put their money into a scheme of this kind, what will be the result when our people lay before them any proper schemes, for the development of the great resources of Canada? They will say, Oh no; we cannot take your word; we cannot even rely upon the fact that the Parliament of Canada has sanctioned your scheme, because it has sanctioned other schemes which have turned out to be failures. Therefore, we ought not to proceed in a hap-hazard way in regard to this matter. Neither Parliament nor any individual member of Parliament should give their sanction to this scheme unless they are satisfied, either from the opinion of those who can speak authoritatively or from personal investigation, that it is a fair and reasonable scheme which they could recommend capitalists to put their money into.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that either of the hon. members for Queen's, P.E.I., have added anything to what they have already said in this House with reference to the Chignecto Ship Railway. But I think they would have done themselves more credit, if I may use the expression, if they had not taken this particular time to say what they have said. Both of these hon. gentlemen seem to have a great deal of care for the interests of foreign capitalists who put their money into Canadian enterprises.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. DICKEY. I understood the hon. member to express great fears that our endorsement of this work would result in a loss of credit, and would, therefore, render it difficult for us to raise capital again when we needed it. Well, Sir, if anything could render it impossible for Canadians to get money on the English markets, it would be that the great Dominion of Canada should undertake to plead the statute of limitations. The Dominion of Canada has made a grant in aid of this work; the time within which the work was to be completed was limited to a certain period; men go on and subscribe capital, and put three millions of dollars and a third in hard cash into the work; then comes an unexpected financial crisis, a crisis that has pulled down men of undoubted financial position in London, and paralyzed their enterprise; and because owing to their difficulties, they have allowed the time for the completion of the work to pass, this Government is invited to plead the statute of limitations, and refuse them the money it promised them. This is the means the hon. member for Queen's proposes for raising the credit of Canada in the English

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

money market. I cannot understand what the other hon. member's (Mr. Welsh's) objection to this railway is, whether that it will not carry ships or that it will not pay. I think an old sailor is something like an old lawyer, very conservative, and finds it difficult to get out of the old ruts. The hon. gentleman has been sailing wooden vessels all over the world, and he has come to the conclusion that a steamer cannot do useful work over this railway. The hon. gentleman has been so long away from the practical work of the sea that I am afraid I must take the judgment of others in this matter. The people who put their money into the work were not as visionary or as foolish as the hon. member imagines. He will excuse me saying that I think his judgment in this matter is biased by his political feeling.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Mr. DICKEY. The people who invested their money in this work did so on the advice of thoroughly competent men, who investigated the scheme and satisfied themselves as to its feasibility; and if the hon. member for Queen's sets up his judgment against the engineers who pronounced this scheme to be feasible, I think the House must come to the conclusion that he is biased by political feeling or by something else.

Mr. WELSH. I do not doubt the feasibility of building this railroad, and I did not object to the statements of any of the engineers.

Mr. DICKEY. Then I understand the hon. gentleman's objection to this scheme is that it will be a failure financially, because there will not be enough business for it. Sir, the Dominion of Canada has seen plenty of men like the hon. member for Queen's. I am old enough to remember when the business between Amherst and Halifax was carried on by stage coach; and I remember men like the hon. member who did not believe that the Intercolonial Railway would pay the cost of the axle grease on the wheels; but those men have learned to their sorrow that they were unable to estimate accurately the possibilities of the future development of this country. Now, what is the truth of this matter? This scheme, if the Government pays the subsidy, will be self-supporting for twenty years, and the hon. member for Queen's gets up here, and with the spirit of prophecy upon him, tells you that twenty years from now the conditions of trade in this country will be such that that road will not even then pay interest on the investment. The hon. gentleman undertakes to look a long way into the future, and I think there will be some hesitation in accepting his judgment on that point. I do not pretend to know anything about the trade matter myself. There is this, however, to be said: A weekly line of steamers runs between Charlottetown and Boston and does a good business. That line of steamers would certainly cross that isthmus if it were prac-

and I would like to know from the Minister of Finance, whether the shareholders and the existing mortgage bondholders of that company have already met and, by the proper majorities, approved of the new issue of these bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has no information on that point.

Mr. EDGAR. The Government has no information on that point, and it has still passed an Order in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has not extended the time, and that is a piece of information which is antecedent to, and necessary to, any attempt to extend the time.

Mr. EDGAR. I, perhaps, did not understand what the Order in Council meant. I understood it pledged the Government that they would recommend Parliament to extend the time further.

Mr. FOSTER. Under certain conditions.

Mr. EDGAR. What were the conditions?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already stated them. Satisfactory assurances should be given to the Government that the money had been raised for the purpose of finishing the work and that the works were in progress.

Mr. EDGAR. There was no information in the hands of the Government as to whether the shareholders or prior mortgagees have consented, or are likely to consent, to the new issue of bonds.

Mr. FOSTER. That took place after the Order in Council, if it took place at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw the attention of the House to what seems to be an inconvenient practice, resorted to during this session, of moving the adjournment of the House for the purpose of precipitating a discussion which would more properly come up under our rules and standing orders. On this point Sir Erskine May says:

The adjournment of the House had often been moved in putting questions, but such a course was generally reserved for occasions of urgency, and if otherwise used was met by the House with impatience and disfavour, and by grave remonstrances from the Chair. And, at length, the inconvenience became so serious, that the following standing order was made on the 27th of November, 1882:—

“That no motion for the adjournment of the House shall be made until all the questions on the Notice Paper have been disposed of, and no such motion shall be made before the Orders of the Day or Notices of Motion have been entered upon, except by leave of the House, unless a member rising in his place shall propose to move the adjournment, for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and not less than forty members shall thereupon rise in their places to support the motion, or unless if fewer than forty members and not less than ten shall thereupon rise in their places, the House shall, on a division, upon question put forthwith, determine whether such motion shall be made.”

Under our rules of course it is competent for any member to move the adjournment of the

Mr. EDGAR.

House; but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the inconvenience of that practice. Shall the hon. member have leave to withdraw the motion?

Motion withdrawn.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Bain, Soulanges.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Western Counties Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Yarmouth and Annapolis Railway Company.—(Mr. Flint.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company, and to change the name of the company to the St. Lawrence Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Maritime Manufacturing Company, Limited.—(Mr. Kenny, for Mr. Stairs.)

TWO-ROWED BARLEY.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. Landerkin) asked, What did the Government pay per bushel for the two-rowed barley, and from whom was it purchased?

Mr. FOSTER. It was purchased from Messrs. James Carter & Co., Farmers' Seed Merchants, London. The price paid was £3 sterling per quarter.

DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS BUOY SERVICE.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether it has come to the knowledge of the Government that all the buoys in the Annapolis River and Basin have been carried away by the drift ice this winter? Does the Government intend to take immediate steps towards replacing the same, so as to insure better protection for shipping in that vicinity? Was the last contract for keeping them in position done satisfactorily, and who was the contractor? What was the amount paid? Have any complaints been made about the absence of buoys in the winter months? Have there been any tenders by private parties belonging to Digby or Annapolis? Will the department advertise by public tender for replacing said buoys? Will the party tendering for lowest amount receive the contract; the Government being convinced that the sum is not too large and the contractor giving sufficient bonds for the fulfilment of contract?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The superintendent of lights, who was sent specially to Digby and Annapolis in connection with raising the buoys, has reported that they were placed in safety, and consequently were not carried away by drift ice. The answer to the second question is as follows:—The Government does not intend to place the buoys until next spring, as they would be carried away by drift ice. The answer to the third question is: A complaint was made showing that there was some dissatisfaction respecting the manner in which the buoy service was performed. The contractor was Mr. George E. Corbitt. The answer to the fourth question is: \$150 per annum. The answer to the fifth question is: No complaints have been made about the absence of buoys during the winter months. The answer to the sixth question is: Tenders were invited by public notice. Only one was received, which was considered too high, and therefore not accepted. The buoy service was offered to the former contractor for \$200, but he declined. He has since made two tenders which have not been accepted, as they were considered too high. The answer to the seventh question is: The department has been negotiating in order to have the buoy service done cheaply and efficiently as possible, and these negotiations are now pending. If the present negotiations are not completed, tenders will not be accepted unless the offer will be for a less amount than those already made. Sufficient bonds will be required in any case, if the contract is awarded.

STE. ANNE DE SOREL WHARF.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete, this year, the unfinished wharf located opposite the church of the parish of Ste. Anne de Sorel?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The department never attempted to build a wharf at the place mentioned; it is only an ice-guard, which is now complete by itself.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS.

Mr. DUGAS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause fresh exploratory geological surveys to be made in the northern portions of the county of Montcalm, with a view to promote the more active development of the various mines and minerals, such as iron and lime?

Mr. DALY. On page 39A of the Summary Report of the Director for 1891, it is stated:

The geology of the whole district, which comprises an area of about 4,000 square miles, in the counties of Berthier, Joliette, Maskinongé, Montcalm, Argenteuil and L'Assomption, has now been worked out, and it is hoped that the map will be ready this spring. Speaking generally, it will extend from Berthier to the east to Trembling Mountain on the west, and from Cypress Lake on the north to Lachute on the south.

The map is being prepared, but it is not considered desirable at present to extend the ex-

amination further north in these counties. Neither iron ore nor limestone could be at present profitably worked there, especially as they are abundant in the southern and more accessible portions of these counties, and are already largely worked.

CANADIAN INTERESTS IN HAWAII.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN asked, Whether the Government of Canada has communicated with the Imperial Government calling their attention to the interest Canada has in Hawaii not being absorbed in a foreign power, and requesting the Imperial authorities to safe-guard that interest in so far, at least, as telegraphic and steam-ship communication between Canada and Australasia is concerned?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have made no communication on this subject, other than by representations which took place some years ago on the subject of the importance to the British Empire of having points at which telegraphic communication can be assured and facilitated.

I.C.R.—FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. COLTER asked, What rate of freight is charged on the Intercolonial Railway for the carriage of hay and grain between Point Levis and all intermediate points and St. John and Halifax? Is there any distinction made in the rate of freight in the articles between that for local consumption and that for shipment abroad? Has the rate of freight on these articles been increased during the past year?

Mr. HAGGART. In carload lots of 20,000 pounds from Levis and intermediate stations between there and Rivière du Loup to St. John and Halifax, 16 cents per 100 pounds, and from Metapedia to St. John and Halifax, 14 cents per 100 pounds. The rates from other stations to St. John and Halifax are as follows:—

		Per 100 lbs.	
	Not exceeding 5 miles.....		3c.
Over	5 and not over 10 do.....		3½c.
do	10 do 15 do.....		4c.
do	15 do 20 do.....		4½c.
do	20 do 25 do.....		5c.
do	25 do 30 do.....		5½c.
do	30 do 35 do.....		6c.
do	35 do 40 do.....		6c.
do	40 do 45 do.....		6½c.
do	45 do 50 do.....		7c.
do	50 do 55 do.....		7½c.
do	55 do 60 do.....		7½c.
do	60 do 65 do.....		8c.
do	65 do 70 do.....		8c.
do	70 do 75 do.....		8c.
do	75 do 80 do.....		8c.
do	80 do 85 do.....		8½c.
do	85 do 90 do.....		8½c.
do	90 do 95 do.....		8½c.
do	95 do 100 do.....		9c.
do	100 do 105 do.....		9c.
do	105 do 110 do.....		9½c.
do	110 do 115 do.....		9½c.
do	115 do 120 do.....		10c.

				Per 100 lbs.					Per 100 lbs.
Over 120 and not over 125 miles				10c.	Over 150 and not over 155 miles				12c.
do 125	do	130	do	10½c.	do 155	do	160	do	12c.
do 130	do	135	do	10½c.	do 160	do	165	do	12½c.
do 135	do	140	do	11c.	do 165	do	170	do	12½c.
do 140	do	145	do	11c.	do 170	do	175	do	12½c.
do 145	do	150	do	11c.	do 175	do	180	do	12½c.
do 150	do	155	do	11c.	do 180	do	185	do	13c.
do 155	do	160	do	11½c.	do 185	do	190	do	13c.
do 160	do	165	do	12c.	do 190	do	195 ⁵	do	13c.
do 165	do	170	do	12c.	do 195	do	200	do	13c.
do 170	do	175	do	12c.	do 200	do	210	do	13c.
do 175	do	180	do	12c.	do 210	do	220	do	13c.
do 180	do	185	do	12½c.	do 220	do	230	do	13½c.
do 185	do	190	do	12½c.	do 230	do	240	do	13½c.
do 190	do	195	do	12½c.	do 240	do	250	do	13½c.
do 195	do	200	do	12½c.	do 250	do	260	do	13½c.
do 200	do	210	do	13c.	do 260	do	270	do	14c.
do 210	do	220	do	13c.	do 270	do	280	do	14½c.
do 220	do	230	do	13c.	do 280	do	290	do	14½c.
do 230	do	240	do	13½c.	do 290	do	300	do	15c.
do 240	do	250	do	13½c.	do 300	do	310	do	15½c.
do 250	do	260	do	13½c.	do 310	do	320	do	15½c.
do 260	do	270	do	14c.	do 320	do	330	do	16c.
do 270	do	280	do	14½c.	do 330	do	340	do	16c.
do 280	do	290	do	14½c.	do 340	do	350	do	16c.
do 290	do	300	do	14½c.	do 350	do	360	do	16½c.
do 300	do	310	do	15c.	do 360	do	370	do	17c.
do 310	do	320	do	15c.	do 370	do	380	do	17c.
do 320	do	330	do	15½c.	do 380	do	390	do	17c.
do 330	do	340	do	15½c.	do 390	do	400	do	17c.
do 340	do	350	do	15½c.	do 400	do	420	do	17c.
do 350	do	360	do	16c.	do 420	do	440	do	17c.
do 360	do	370	do	16c.	do 440	do	460	do	17½c.
do 370	do	380	do	16c.	do 460	do	480	do	17½c.
					do 480	do	500	do	18c.
					do 500	do	520	do	18c.
					do 520	do	540	do	18c.
					do 540	do	560	do	18½c.
					do 560	do	580	do	19c.
					do 580	do	600	do	19c.
					do 600	do	625	do	19½c.
					do 625	do	650	do	19½c.
					do 650	do	675	do	20c.
					do 675	do	700	do	21c.

When hay from any station on Intercolonial is shipped to Newfoundland, the West Indies or Great Britain a rebate on above rates of 10 per cent is allowed. The above rates have not been changed during the year. In carload lots of 20,000 pounds from Levis to St. John and Halifax, the rate of 8½ cents per 100 pounds, from intermediate points the rates are as follows:—

				Per 100 lbs.
Not exceeding 5 miles				3½c.
Over 5 and not over 10	do			4c.
do 10	do	15	do	4½c.
do 15	do	20	do	5c.
do 20	do	25	do	5½c.
do 25	do	30	do	6c.
do 30	do	35	do	6½c.
do 35	do	40	do	6½c.
do 40	do	45	do	7c.
do 45	do	50	do	7½c.
do 50	do	55	do	8c.
do 55	do	60	do	8½c.
do 60	do	65	do	9c.
do 65	do	70	do	9c.
do 70	do	75	do	9½c.
do 75	do	80	do	9½c.
do 80	do	85	do	10c.
do 85	do	90	do	10c.
do 90	do	95	do	10c.
do 95	do	100	do	10½c.
do 100	do	105	do	10½c.
do 105	do	110	do	11c.
do 110	do	115	do	11c.
do 115	do	120	do	11c.
do 120	do	125	do	11c.
do 125	do	130	do	11½c.
do 130	do	135	do	11½c.
do 135	do	140	do	11½c.
do 140	do	145	do	11½c.
do 145	do	150	do	11½c.

Mr. Haggart.

The through rates from Levis to Halifax and St. John were increased from 6½ cents per 100 pounds to 8½ cents per 100 pounds during the year. There was no change from intermediate stations.

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

Mr. SPROULE moved :

That it is expedient to reimpose the export duty on pine and spruce logs.

He said : I make this motion for the purpose of endeavouring to convince the Government and the House that it is important at the present time to have the export duty reimposed on pine and spruce logs. This is a question which last year was before the House for some time, and various arguments were adduced for and against placing an export duty on logs. Many hon. members who took part in the debate at that time have since, from information brought to their attention, materially changed their views, and I am glad to know to-day that we have in this House a number of members who opposed this proposition last year, and opposed it I believe conscientiously and honestly, but who since have become fully convinced that it

is most important in the interest, at least, of our part of Ontario that the duty on these logs should be reimposed, I might fairly ask what is the reason that we require a reimposition of that duty? We require it in the first place, because, under the present system, one of the important and valuable assets of our country, provided for us by nature, the forests of the country, which have realized for us a very large amount of money from year to year, and which have given employment to tens of thousands of our people, is being destroyed to-day at a very rapid rate, at such a rapid rate that if this process is allowed to continue for many years, that asset will disappear altogether. Now, some hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this House, notably the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) contend that our forests are so extensive that there is no danger of their being destroyed, and, to strengthen that contention, he has presented us with a calculation to which I should like to direct attention for a short time. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his place, because I should like him to hear the references I make to his argument. I think that not only the figures he gave, but the deductions he drew from them were most unfair, misleading and incorrect. With regard to the province of Ontario, he told the House that we had, in that province, 197,000 square miles of territory, of which the area under cultivation or occupation was about 20,000 square miles, and less than 10,000 square miles of timber limits had been sold since Confederation, making 30,000 square miles taken up out of the 197,000, leaving a balance of 167,000 square miles remaining unleased and unsold. Now, if the hon. gentleman wished to draw any inference from that statement, so far as I can see, it was this: that, whereas we have been cutting and selling our timber for many years past, up to the present time we have sold the right to cut timber on only 10,000 square miles, and that added to the settled territory amounts to only 20,000 square miles, so that all the balance must represent standing timber to-day, and, therefore, if it is cut only at the rate he specified, it must be a far distant day in the future when there will be any scarcity of timber in the province of Ontario. If the hon. gentleman did not wish his argument to lead to that conclusion, I cannot understand what other conclusion he intended to draw from it. I asked the hon. gentleman at the time whether he made any allowance for the area of water included in the province of Ontario. His reply was: There is water included in the timber limits sold as well as in the rest of the province. I asked him also whether he took into account the very large area covered by rocky and barren lands, where there is no standing timber of any account; but these he left out of his calculations. Now, I have looked into the question of the

area of the province for my own satisfaction. I have here Lovell's Gazetteer of British North America, and I find that Ontario has an area of 107,780 square miles, including an area of water of 27,000. There are, at the present time, about 25,000 square miles settled and largely under cultivation; but the thirty-two frontier counties of the province, which were settled many years ago, and which have, for years, been denuded of their timber, have an area of 46,608 square miles, which, added to the 27,000 square miles of water area, makes 73,608 square miles where no timber can be got. Then, taking the quantity of land under lease, I find, not as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said, that it amounts to less than 10,000 square miles, but that it amounts to within a small fraction of 20,000 square miles. Add that to the 73,608, and you get 93,608 square miles. Deduct this from 107,780 square miles, that Ontario contains, and you have 14,172 square miles left, a large proportion of which is water, and a large proportion of which is land on which timber does not grow, and which, therefore, cannot be taken into account when estimating how long our timber resources will last. Now, I find that my statement agrees in the main with information which was given on this subject last winter in the Provincial Legislature at Toronto. The question was raised there whether or not the timber was leaving the country too rapidly, and the Minister of Crown Lands gave some information on that subject which is of value to-day:

In one of the debates towards the closing of the session of the Ontario Legislature last month, in reply to a speech of Mr. Wood, member for Hastings, the Minister of Crown Lands made an important statement regarding the timber wealth of this province. The estimated mileage of unlicensed Crown timber lands be placed as follows: West of the Ottawa river and north-west of the limits sold in 1872, between 80° and 85° west, and extending north to 48th parallel of latitude, 24,000 square miles—

Now, you will see that this practically agrees with my calculation, and remember that he includes part of the disputed territory—

—between the Ottawa agency and berths sold in 1881, 540 square miles.

—640 square miles was sold only a few months ago, and, consequently, that must be left out of the calculation—

Averaging timber on this area at 1,000,000 feet to the mile, there were 24,000,000,000 feet. The late Col. Dennis estimated the timber in the disputed territory at 26,000,000,000, making a total of 50,000,000,000 feet. There were three years ago under license in Ontario about 19,000 square miles—

—although the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), to suit his purpose, made it less than 10,000—

—on which there was supposed to be 10,000,000,000 feet, which made a grand total of over 60,000,000,000 feet of timber still uncut in the possession of the province.

Now, I would like to draw attention to another subject of importance at the present time. What is the great source of drain upon our timber? It is the manufacture of lumber by the lumbermen of the western states in addition to the manufacture of our own lumbermen at home. According to his calculation, the Minister of Crown Lands contends that, including the disputed territory, where the timber resources seem to be largely mythical, there is only 60,000 million feet of timber remaining in the province, and of that the Ontario Government propose to reserve a portion which they will not allow to be cut. I find that, last year, lumbermen from the states of Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin cut not less than 8,934,000,000 feet at that rate. How long would it take those parties who are denuding our territories so rapidly and wasting and destroying our lumber to such an extent, to use up all our timber, in the event of their being allowed continued free access to our country? At the rate they have been going, it would only require a little over five years to clean out every stick of timber we have in that territory, according to the estimate of the Minister of Crown Lands in the province of Ontario. Yet we are told by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that we have timber there sufficient to last for generations to come, and that therefore the present generation need not concern itself about the depletion of forests in that country. So much for the contention of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). And I must say, on examining his contention critically, I have never seen an argument presented to this House, backed up with such unreliable figures as those given by the hon. gentleman. On the point as to whether our timber is not disappearing too rapidly, let me quote the "Canadian Lumberman" of the month of November last. Speaking with regard to the sales made by the Ontario Government, the "Lumberman" has the following article:—

In another column will be found a detailed account of the timber limits sold by the Ontario Government on the 13th ult. As in every former instance in which the Government have put stumpage up for auction, the amount of money realized exceeded the Government's expectations. Looked at from this point of view the sale was no doubt a great success, in the same way that each of the former sales was, at the time it was held, considered a success; but as each of the former sales has been so eclipsed in the matter of prices by the sale succeeding it as entirely to reverse this appearance, it is probable that the same will be the case again, and that the apparently large prices of to-day will look quite small in the near future.

Indeed, we look for this result with more certainty now than on former occasions for the reason that our pine timber resources, which a few years ago seemed so great that to attempt an accurate estimate of them was deemed too difficult an undertaking, have since then become reduced to such small proportions that the end of the whole supply in both Canada and the United States is now plainly within view.

Yet we are told by the hon. member for
Mr. SPROULE.

North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that we have a supply to last us for centuries.

While the United States Government has from time to time had estimates made of its total timber resources, nothing of the kind that we know of has ever been done on the part of the Dominion or Provincial Governments; at least, if any such statistics have been prepared their publication has been so limited, that we have never seen them. Now, however, as far as pine is concerned, there is scarcely any need of such action on the part of the Government, for the lumbermen have pierced so nearly through our pine forests with their operations that they have not only made short work of the estimating as far as they have gone, but have reached the point where daylight, so to speak, can be plainly seen showing through from the far side. In the province of Ontario, while the streams running into the Ottawa on the east have been operated up to their sources by the lumbermen of that district, these have been met at the summit by the western men following up the streams leading into the Georgian Bay. At the same time both Canadians and Americans have been busy on the north shore.

The Crown Lands Department has at this sale disposed of the last timber berths remaining to the Government in all this territory to a distance of some three or four miles north of Lake Nipissing. And not only is the whole of this section of country now in the hands of the operators, but it has been, with the exception of the last sold, very largely cut off: so much so that we do not believe there is now left 5 per cent of the pine timber which once stood upon it. To the north of this there is left nothing more than what may be termed the fringe of our once great pinery, and a very straggling fringe it is, containing little or no timber equal in size and quality to what has been cut, and only a small proportion of pine timber of any kind.

The pine is there nearing the northern limit of its growth, is decreasing in size, quality and quantity, and the greater part of the country is quite destitute of it. Of the once great Ontario pinery we feel safe in saying not 10 per cent remains.

The province of Quebec is still more depleted, and the great pine states of the Union, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota with an annual output to date of some 7,000,000,000 feet, have, we understand, scarcely got twice that quantity left now.

At the sales which took place, which was referred to in this article, 637 square miles of limits were sold. Before that 19,000 square miles were under lease, a large portion of which was denuded of its forests. That sale realized \$2,308,000, an amount which surprised many compared with the previous sales. What was the secret of this large amount being paid and what did it indicate? It indicated the growing scarcity of pine timber, not only in our country, but in the United States, and its increased value on that account. Pine timber has been going up so rapidly in value on the other side that men were able to pay to-day \$550,000 for limits, which a few years ago sold for \$73,000. This shows most plainly that our timber is being squandered far too rapidly. Then, again, the hon. member for North Norfolk holds that so plentiful is timber on the other side, that the Americans do not need ours. I have here some letters from the American trade written to the "Lumberman," which tell a different story. I take the last one, a letter to the "Canadian Lumberman" from Saginaw:

Your readers will be interested in various figures concerning American purchases of Canadian timber, that are passing current in different parts of the state. I give them as they come to me from a variety of sources without entering into a discussion of their import, if any special import or significance is to be attached to them.

The Bay City correspondent of a Chicago lumber journal, controverting the oft-repeated story that Michigan mills would soon come to a standstill for the want of logs to saw, has told us quite recently that "within the past year arrangements have been perfected whereby a vast quantity of timber, not tributary to the Saginaw River, is to be brought here to be manufactured," and that this includes deals that will "transfer 3,000,000,000 feet of Canadian timber to this river to be manufactured, a supply equal to a cut of 500,000,000 feet annually for six years." McKeon & Glover, a Bay City firm, and who rank among the largest loggers in the country, say that they banked 33,000,000 feet of logs in Georgian Bay waters last winter, and 25,000,000 feet of these will come to Saginaw. Their estimate is that 130,000,000 feet of Canada logs will come to the Saginaw river this season.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when it was stated that 200,000,000 of feet had crossed the waters of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay last year, said that it was a most exaggerated statement, and one not founded on fact. But here is one of their own men whose statement shows that the estimate of 130,000,000 of feet of logs will go to the Saginaw River alone. I may say that there are four or five places in the state of Michigan to which Canadian logs are being taken, Saginaw, Alpena, Sheboygan and Tawas. Each of these places draws its own quantity of logs, and this gentleman is speaking only of the quantity which goes to the Saginaw River—130,000,000 of feet—and we know that very large quantities were sent to the other places, and if you add to them what is known to have gone to Saginaw, I think it will be agreed that the estimate was below the mark instead of above it :

Isaac Bearinger, of Silby & Bearinger, another Michigan concern, says that his firm owns \$200,000 worth of logs in the Georgian Bay region. Other interests are represented by William Peters, who owns a mill at Bay City, and is believed last year to have purchased over 300,000,000 feet of Canada pine ; C. K. Eddy & Son own 400,000,000 feet there ; the Spanish River Lumber Co., of which E. T. Carrington, of Bay City, is president, owns over 200,000,000 feet ; J. W. Howry & Son have been operating in your territories for some years ; the Saginaw Lumber and Salt Company and the Emery Lumber Company are extensive operators ; the Messrs. Bliss, McClure and others, individually and collectively, are said to control not less than 1,500,000,000 feet of Canadian timber. These cases are outside of the two important transfers of the Dodge estate and Pattee & Perley, to United States capitalists, and mentioned in the *Lumberman* last month, and which represented investments, respectively, of \$750,000 and \$800,000.

Now this will give an idea of the quantities of our timber being taken over to be manufactured in the United States. I have here a computation made by a lumberman in the Georgian Bay, who has been extensively engaged in the business for many

years, and one who professes to be tolerably well posted as to what is going on in the lumber business. This is from the "Canada Lumberman :"

HURON.

James Moiles is one of the firm of Moiles Bros., lumbermen, whose mills are located at St. John's Island, in the north channel, Georgian Bay. Mr. Moiles has lumbered all over Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota and his opinions are worth listening to. He says : " Few people understand the extent to which the business of exporting logs from Canada has attained. While the export duties were in force Saginaw lumbermen were towing logs from the American side of Lake Superior as far west as Marquette and from Green Bay in Lake Michigan. These points are both further from Saginaw Bay than Georgian Bay is. The Menominee district on Green Bay is exhausted, and Saginaw dealers are consequently obliged to look to Lake Superior and Canada for their supplies.

The extent to which Canada is being drawn upon is shown by these figures : The Saginaw Lumber Company is putting in over 20,000,000 feet in the Spanish River ; Barringer, 15,000,000 ; Spanish River Lumber Company, for Folsom & Arnold, at Bay City, 17,000,000 ; Nelson, for his Cheboygan mill, 8,000,000 ; Park, Woods & Company, for AuSable, Mich., 15,000,000, and E. Hall, of Detroit, for his Bay City mill, 16,000,000. On the Mississauga River, Gilchrist, of Alpena, has let contracts for 80,000,000 to stock his mill, and Howry & Sons will take out 25,000,000. On the French River and Wahapite, there are heavy operators. The Emery Lumber Company are taking out over 50,000,000 for Tawas and Bay City ; Hart & Fisher are going to get out all the logs they can this winter, and next summer they will take out over 50,000,000 feet ; Captain Bliss will take from French River for his Saginaw mill 16,000,000, and the Moore Lumber Company, about 10,000,000. Further east, Wm. Peters will take out 17,000,000, and Merrill & Ring, about 12,000,000.

All these figures represent the quantity of logs being taken from Canadian limits to furnish work for American mills. But even this is not all, as I have not included the large quantity taken out by Canadian jobbers for American dealers. A prominent operator told a Saginaw audience not long ago that they would make the waves of Lake Huron smooth by the enormous rafts of Canadian pine towed over them, and the figures given justify the boast. A conservative estimate places the export of logs for the coming season at 400,000,000 feet, and the business has only fairly started.

And yet the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that the estimate that 400,000,000 feet will be taken across is an exaggeration that cannot be justified by any figures or by any knowledge we have at this time. I see, in addition to this, that the Saginaw Salt and Lumber Company has purchased 40,000,000 feet of selected logs from the Merrill-Ring Company to be cut on the Georgian Bay limits of this company. This shows the extent to which our forests in the Georgian Bay district are being depleted, and yet we are told that we should remain idle and allow this thing to go on, allow the Americans to come, almost as pirates, and take the timber from our country, timber that not only gives employment to our people and also brings back money to our people and spreads it abroad among workers in many

other lines, a very important matter at this time. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred, in his own peculiar style of criticism, to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) because he dared to say anything that disagrees with the interests of the hon. gentleman on this subject. I have here a few extracts from what he said and they show to what extent the hon. gentleman will go when his own interest is at stake or when some interest is at stake out of which he can possibly make some money. Speaking of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), he says :

The doctor knows more about pills than he does about that matter.

He goes on to repeat that two or three times, only in different language. I would like to tell the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), if he was here, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was sent here, not for the purpose of making up or administering pills, but for the purpose of looking after the interests of his own constituency as well as the wants of the people at large. And if the member for East Grey had the opportunity to administer pills to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that hon. member would think that the hon. member for East Grey knows more than he thinks he does about pills and about lumber, too. Then he says :

I will give him credit for sincerity, but I do not know how much common sense I would consider he possessed in this matter.

He goes on :

The lumber interests is a dangerous thing for medical men to trifle with. They had better confine themselves to their own business. The lumbermen who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in their business, prefer to attend to it themselves.

I agree with my hon. friend. The lumbermen do like to attend to their own business, but it happens that the interests of the lumbermen is sometimes also the interest of the Canadian farmer, sometimes the interest of the Canadian commercial men, and sometimes the interest of men in various lines who are practically outside the pale of lumbering operations. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that if a comparison was drawn between the weight that should be attached to arguments of hon. gentlemen in this House who have no connection with the lumbering business, but are only interested in looking after the interests of their own constituents, or the interests of the people of Canada, and the arguments on the other side advanced by men who are engaged in lumbering business, as the hon. member for North Norfolk has been for the last quarter of a century, nearly, engaged in it not only to the detriment of Canada, but coming here almost like pirates and swooping down upon the forests of Ontario, and taking off the logs to be manufactured over in Tonawanda, in the State of New York, where he is employing not only his own capital, but the

Mr. SPROULE.

capital of Americans who are engaged in the business with his brother there—as between these two classes of men, I would like to ask the people of Ontario to whose arguments they would attach the most weight. I would like to ask them whose arguments ought to have the most effect, those of men who are making money directly out of lumbering operations like the hon. gentleman that would be affected if the export duty was put on, or the arguments of men who have no connection with the business whatever, but are speaking from personal knowledge with regard to the injurious effects of the present system upon the people of their section of the country. I think the people of Ontario will agree that the men who have no interest in it are more likely to give an unprejudiced opinion, and they should give more weight to the arguments of such men than to those of men who are engaged in the industry in the United States, as the hon. member for North Norfolk has been for nearly twenty-five years. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman advances the argument he does, because he has his mill over in Tonawanda, and the laws of the United States will not allow Canadians to go over and work in that mill, nor will allow Canadian lumbermen to send their lumber to that market, if it is cut in Canada, and enjoy the advantages of the American market without the payment of \$1 a thousand duty upon lumber when it goes into that country, when he takes the logs there, and he has the advantages of coming into our Canadian forests and taking away our pine, the manufacture of which would give employment to Canadians at home, instead of which he takes it over there and gives employment to Americans in the state of New York. He has all these advantages, and therefore I do not wonder that he invariably argues in favour of keeping off that export duty put upon pine a few years ago. That is the position the hon. gentleman occupies, and the country should know it, and knowing it people will be able to estimate how much importance should be attached to his arguments when he speaks upon this question. Unfortunately he has a habit of speaking very strongly upon questions where his own self-interests are involved. We found him upon the same line with regard to reciprocal wrecking and towing. Where he had towing plant in Canadian waters he was very much against it, because competition from the American side would do him an injury. Now he is much against imposing an export duty, because if it was imposed, he would not have the freedom of our forests to supply his mills on the other side, and to give employment to men over there. Now, let us see how much timber is being cut in our country year by year. I find at the present time, according to an estimate made by a gentleman who was in the lumbering business, and who is a good autho-

rity, that there will be cut this season in the Ottawa valley and its tributaries about 428,000,000 feet of lumber. Now, there are in the woods to-day, engaged in the operation of getting out these logs, about 7,000 men; the getting out of these logs and running them down the streams will employ the 7,000 men for a period of six months. I find, according to this estimate, that there has been taken out of the western part of our province about 450,000,000 feet, or a little more than is being taken out in the eastern part, along the tributaries of the Ottawa. Now, if 7,000 men are employed to get logs out of the woods and prepare them for the mills, it is estimated that it will take about the same number of men to handle the lumber when it is being cut in the mills, to pile it, and afterwards take it to market. If that is correct, and I am giving the estimate of a lumberman who has been in the business for many years, you can readily understand how important it is to Ontario that we should obtain employment for 7,000 men in the Georgian Bay district during the six months of the summer season, instead of allowing our logs to go over into Michigan to give employment to men at Alpena, at Bay City, at Green Bay, in Michigan, and at Tonawanda, in New York. It is said that they will pay out for the labour of these men about \$1,000,000 for the six months. Now, if they pay out \$1,000,000, and the same number of men are employed, they will pay out about the same rate for the second six months; so I say it is taking away \$1,000,000 from Canada to be spent in the United States, which would otherwise be spent in Ontario if this lumber was worked up here and not in the state of Michigan. I give this as an evidence of how fast our territory has been depleted of its valuable lumber assets, taking out over 800,000,000 feet of lumber and timber from the east and the west of the province of Ontario alone. Then you will readily understand how far we are justified in interfering with a business that ought to be kept for our own people; one can readily see what it means to the Georgian Bay district, when it is considered that there is as much lumber going out in the shape of logs from that district as is being cut into lumber in the Ottawa valley and its tributaries. I have here a list of the lumbermen who are engaged in the Ottawa valley cutting lumber, and the estimate that is given for their output for the coming year, is as follows:—

J. R. Booth	75,000,000
Bronson and Weston	45,000,000
Perley and Pattee	40,000,000
Buell, Orr and Hurdman	35,000,000
McClymont	13,500,000
W. Mason and Son	10,000,000
McLachlin Bros., Arnprior	45,000,000
Gilmour and Hughson, Ironsides	30,000,000
W. C. Edwards, Rockland	40,000,000
Gillies and Co., Braeside	16,000,000
J. McLaren, Buckingham	15,000,000
Pembroke Lumber Co.	12,000,000
Canada Lumber Co., Carleton Place	25,000,000

R. & W. Conroy, Deschene ..	10,000,000
McCool Bros., Mattawa	8,000,000
McCracken and Co., Templeton	6,000,000
McLellan, Casselman	2,500,000

Total number feet of lumber 428,000,000

Now, these men, it is said, are taking out about 428,000,000 feet, and, as I have said already, it is estimated that there would be from 400,000,000 to 450,000,000 feet taken out around the Georgian Bay, in the shape of saw-logs, nearly all of which will be taken over to the United States to be sawn into lumber. Now, if we employ 7,000 men in these mills for six months of the summer season, to manufacture this lumber and to freight it to market. So you can imagine what injustice is done to the province of Ontario around Georgian Bay, where that number of men are deprived of the employment that they have in the Ottawa valley by virtue of the fact that the lumber is manufactured in our midst. I would like to ask the people of Ottawa and the people of Hull, if they stopped the operation of these mills to-day and stopped cutting this 428,000,000 feet of lumber, and suppose every one of these men either went idle or were sent down to Burlington, in the state of Vermont, where the lumber is shipped, and got employment there—I ask them to realize to what extent it would paralyze trade and commerce here in the city of Ottawa and in Hull and in the surrounding towns and villages, if these men were taken away. Yet that is what has been done in the province of Ontario around the Georgian Bay, by virtue of the policy that allows this lumber to be taken out in saw-logs, instead of being manufactured in our own country. Any hon. gentleman who understands the situation, must see for himself how it would paralyze trade in every line, if we took away employment that is being given to the labourers in these mills to-day in and around Ottawa. Yet that is exactly what is done up in the Georgian Bay district. We would have 7,000 men who might be employed during the summer season in these mills, who at present will not get a day's work, on account of allowing the Americans to take out our timber, because we do not put an export duty upon logs going out of the country. Now, the hon. member said we had no reason to complain, because they bring in as many logs from the United States into Canada as we send out. The hon. gentleman, as I said a moment ago, is unreliable in his figures. The hon. gentleman professed to get his figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns. I have taken the trouble to look up those returns, and I have the statistics before me, and I find they are entirely different from the figures given from the hon. gentleman. He said:

In the period extending from 1884 to 1890, the value of our export of logs was \$3,289,000, and the value of our imports of logs was \$8,468,000, and the balance of our imports in excess of our export of logs during that period was \$5,179,000.

He proceeded to say :

If we have imported over \$5,000,000 worth more than we have exported, why should these hon. gentlemen make a row about it? If we imported last year \$150,000 worth more than we exported, what reason was there for that statement made by the Finance Minister, which is unsettling one of the most important industries of the country?

He said further :

According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, down to the 30th June, 1892, our export of logs was to the value of \$798,000.

I find that instead of the figures being \$798,000 they are \$1,044,134. The hon. gentleman further said :

And our imports, including an estimate based upon the average of several years past, into New Brunswick, added to the imports given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, amounted to the value of \$951,000, or, in other words, we imported last year \$150,000 worth of logs in excess of the amount we exported.

Instead of the imports being \$951,000, they only amounted to the value of \$232,723. There is the difference between the correct figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns and those given by the hon. gentleman said to be from those returns from which he professed to quote. I will now institute a comparison. I take 1889. - We exported logs to the value of \$444,805, and we imported logs to the value of \$358,805. In 1890 we exported logs to the value of \$615,194, while we brought in logs to the value of \$256,100. Then the export duty was removed. What is the result? Next year we imported the value of \$615,320, of which \$412,224 worth came to Manitoba, and we exported the value of \$859,898. In 1892 we exported the value of \$1,044,134, and brought in only the value of \$232,723. These are the figures contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns. But the hon. gentleman says: If we make a calculation based on what is taken out of New Brunswick, the result is what I have given. What is the history of the logs taken out of New Brunswick? It must be remembered that the hon. gentleman used these figures last year and again this year. They were intended to mislead the House and the country into the belief that we brought as many logs from the United States free of export duty as we sent to the United States. The history of the New Brunswick matter was simply this: According to the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1846, the timber in the state of Maine, along the tributaries of the St. John River, was allowed to be brought into Canada, because it must be floated down the river to reach the markets of the world; and it is brought down by the Americans and manufactured at the mouth of the river and shipped to other countries. That is the privilege they enjoy. The third article of the treaty refers to this privilege :

That all the produce of the forest in logs, lumber, timber, boards, staves or shingles, or of agriculture, not being manufactured, grown on any of these parts of the state of Maine watered by the River St. John

Mr. SPROULE.

or its tributaries, shall have free access into and through the said river and its said tributaries, having their source within the state of Maine, to and from the seaport at the mouth of the said River St. John, and to and around the falls of said river, either by boats, rafts or other conveyance; that when within the province of New Brunswick the said produce shall be dealt with as if it were the produce of the said province.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wished to lead to this inference, that because the timber is brought into the province of New Brunswick the people of Canada receive the advantage of the employment given in manufacturing the lumber, and, therefore, it is equivalent to their giving employment to Americans in connection with the manufacture of a similar quantity of lumber brought in logs from this side. What I claim to be unfair is this: that the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the American regulations do not allow a single Canadian labourer to be employed in connection with the manufacture of this lumber in New Brunswick. Why? Because if it were manufactured by Canadians, it would be subject to the United States duty, and the United States make their Customs regulations such that no Canadian can be employed at that work. It is cut by Americans, towed by Americans and brought down the river by them, and the only advantage I can see that Canada enjoys is the sawdust left in the country after the lumber has been taken away. Why is it that the Americans will not allow the Canadians to cut it? The United States Government require that none but American citizens shall be employed, even when the logs are sawn in Canada, to entitle the lumber to free entry into the United States. The clause in the United States' Customs regulations reads as follows :—

The products of the forests of the state of Maine, upon the St. John River and its tributaries, owned by American citizens, and sawed or hewn in the province of New Brunswick by American citizens, the same being unmanufactured, in whole or in part, which is now admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty, shall continue to be so admitted under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time prescribe.

Under that regulation we as Canadians obtained no advantage from the importation and manufacture of logs in Canada, and the hon. gentleman, using that argument and including those figures in the quantity of lumber brought into this country, desired the inference to be drawn that I have indicated. His statement was calculated to mislead the people of this country, and I believe it was intended to mislead hon. members of this House, and I regret that an hon. gentleman of his standing and of his great parliamentary experience should have used such an unfair argument for the purpose of misleading the people in regard to this particular subject. We must, therefore, leave these figures relating to New Brunswick out of the consideration of the question, and we have the result I

have already given, that the Americans took over \$1,000,000 worth of Canadian logs last year, while we imported logs to the value of only \$232,000. The trade is increasing very rapidly each year. What is the evil done by reason of allowing these logs to be taken from Canada? It is the means of giving the Americans employment, which should be furnished to our people at home. The timber taken out of the Georgian Bay district has been the means of throwing thousands of people out of employment and furnishing employment to the people of Michigan, Wisconsin and New York, thus leaving our mills idle, instead of being fully employed as was the case formerly. Some people may say that our mills are employed to-day to their fullest capacity. That is not the case. The depletion of our forests prevents the settlement of the country. Our settlements are largely attributable to mills springing up in the lumber districts, in the Parry Sound and McKellar districts and around Georgian Bay, where mills were established and settlement rapidly followed, the farmers supplying the lumbermen with food products, the farmers, on the other hand, obtaining employment in lumbering operations during a portion of the year. When the timber has been cut down and rafted away in the log, there is no occasion for settlement taking place, because so soon as the logs are thrown into the water the labour is done, for they are towed over to Michigan, to the mills there. This system further destroys our market for flour, beef, pork, eggs, oats, hay, sleighs, harness, axes and other articles. Heretofore, when lumber was manufactured in the country, one of the best markets in the fall and summer was the Georgian Bay lumbering district. Our commercial men gathered beef and pork, butter, eggs, flour, hay and oats, and sent them up to the lumbering camps. They were kept supplied there not only during the winter, but during the summer, and their consumption afforded us a valuable market every year. Now, that market is largely destroyed in consequence of the Americans coming in and bringing their provisions with them. Some may say that they do not bring their provisions with them. To show that they do, I will read some clippings from American papers contained in a letter from Michigan to the "Canada Lumberman," and the instances here given may be added to from month to month, because in almost every issue of the "Lumberman" you will find similar cases cited:

The statement is made that 300 Alpena woodsmen will put in work in the Georgian Bay district this winter for Albert Pack, who, as you know, was one of the largest purchasers at the Ontario Government sale of 13th inst.

Culler & Savage, of Spring Lake, are owners of about 200,000,000 of pine stumpage along the Spanish River in Ontario, and will begin operating this season with one camp and will tow the logs to Cheboygan to be manufactured.

The labour market has seldom been in a better condition. The demand for experienced labour of all

kinds for work in the woods is brisk, and an insufficient number of men are offering their services. Wages are ranging from \$18 to \$28.

Merrill, Ring & Co. have shipped a large cargo of lumber utensils to be used in their logging operations in your country. Among the stuff are forty logging sleighs made by a local manufacturer, on which the duty of course will be a considerable item.

Here is one from the Alpena, Michigan, "Journal":

Mr. W. C. Simonson, land-looker for A. Pack, who had been over in Canada, and who spent some time in the camps in the Spanish River country, arrived home Saturday night. He reports everything in that vicinity as moving along nicely, and says that in the three camps there for Alpena parties there are about 120 Alpena men, all enjoying the best of health. They will put in there this season about twenty millions, which will be rafted to this city for sawing.

This shows that the Americans are giving to their own people employment which should be given to our people. I do not object to these men coming here and getting employment, so long as there is a demand for their labour; but I do object to Americans being allowed to cut down that timber and making employment to cease as soon as that timber is thrown into the water, so that our Canadians are not employed during the summer, and if they go to Michigan to help cut the timber taken away from their own country, they are sent back by the Alien Labour law. The result is that any of our people who wish to go there to find employment must become citizens of that country before they can get the employment that they ought to have at home. I believe the Ontario Government should make it a condition of sale of timber limits, that every stick of timber cut upon them should be manufactured in Ontario. If they did that, they would prevent these logs being taken out of Canada. Another way in which this injures us is that it cuts off the supply of lumber and lath for building purposes to the people of the Georgian Bay district. A few years ago, being engaged in building operations, I got most of my pine lumber from the Parry Sound district, and was able to lay down cull lumber at \$4 a thousand. A few years ago large quantities of this lumber were used by people in the northern district of the province. At the same time I could get pine laths at \$1.35 a thousand. What is the difference to-day? The worst cull lumber cannot be got in that district for less than \$9.25 a thousand, and laths cost \$2.50 per thousand. You can understand what this means to the people of that section, who are building largely from year to year, and who are obliged to depend on the Georgian Bay district largely for a supply of their pine lumber and lath. Mr. Foster, of Owen Sound, who had, a few years ago, several tugs, employing from forty to seventy-five men engaged in freighting lumber, does not tug a pound of this freight to-day, and he has been obliged to turn his attention to buying hardwood lumber for the United States market. I say that the farmers and the people of the

villages of that district are suffering seriously on account of the logs being taken to the United States instead of being cut in the country. If it were cut in Canada the suitable lumber for United States markets would still be sent to the United States and used there, but there would be a balance left for the use of the people living in the district. Then, it destroys the towns and villages of our country. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that the mills on the Georgian Bay are fully employed. I wonder if he thought of Midland, where there are four large mills lying idle which have not cut a board of lumber in the last two or three years, since the export duty was removed. Hon. gentlemen say that it is not on that account, but the gentlemen who own the mills say that it is. Not only are these mills lying idle, but over 300 men are thrown out of employment, and every hon. gentleman can understand what that means to the town. And all this is the result of taking the export duty off logs, which, but for that, would have been manufactured into lumber in Canada instead of in the United States. Then, it takes freight away from Canadians. We have our railways, our highways of commerce, and the men who own vessels, and it has taken employment from them and given it to Americans, because they bring over their own small tugs to tow away the rafts of logs, and take them to Alpena, Saginaw, Bay City, Cheboygan, and Tonawanda, where the hon. member for North Norfolk is engaged in business. You give the freighting to foreigners instead of keeping it for our own people. Last, but not least, it is destroying the fisheries of our country. It is a fact that the fishermen have recognized for a length of time, that the fisheries of the Georgian Bay are being destroyed, largely by the hauling of these great rafts of pine through the water. In stormy weather the agitation caused by the undulation of the waves causes the logs to rub together, and so the bark is rubbed off and settles down in large quantities to the bottom of the lake. Then the wash of the waters carries that towards the shore and it comes in contact with the nets of the fishermen and covers the ground where the fish are in the habit of spawning, compelling the fish to leave, and, according to fishermen, it is thus doing an immense injury, which they cannot estimate, to the fisheries of Lakes Huron and Superior and Georgian Bay. All this damage results from taking across the logs that ought to be cut in Canada. These are some of the reasons for putting on an extra duty and encouraging the sawing of these logs at home. The cardinal principle of the National Policy is the using in our own country of the raw material at our hands, so as to give employment to Canadian labour; but in this instance we are doing the very reverse. We are sending away the raw material, and thus providing labour for Americans instead of for Canadians. It may be said that the

Mr. SPROULE.

trees being cut down in Canada, the money in getting the logs out is spent here. That however, is only a portion of the expense, and apart from that, we sustain great loss from the operations as carried on now. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that none but those who had selfish interests at stake are in favour of the export duty. Does the hon. gentleman place in that category the Hon. Mr. Joly, of Quebec? I have here a speech of his on this question, and he owns, I am told, 100 square miles of limits in Canada. Mr. Joly says:

I cannot understand why there should be any doubt as to the wisdom of imposing an export duty on our logs. Many of those, who, with the hope of promoting their personal interest, advocated at one time its removal, are now in favour of its reimposition. But let us look at the question as it affects our country at large. In giving us our forest, Providence has given us a source of wealth which it is our duty to husband carefully and to turn to the best account. Is it possible that we Canadians should have so little manliness left as to tell our neighbours: "Come, cut down our trees, take them away, manufacture them at home and reap the golden harvest. We don't want it. We have got work enough to occupy us here." What would have become of England if she had invited the world to come and take away her coals and iron to manufacture them abroad? We ought to treasure our forests, but how much more ought we to treasure the youth of our country, leaving us every year by thousands to seek work in the United States. Shall we force those who still remain with us to leave us too by sending to our neighbours the raw material, the logs, in the manufacturing of which we can procure work for so many? Send away our logs to the States and our mill-hands must follow them.

That is exactly what is taking place in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion to-day. A great change of opinion has taken place on this question since last year. I found last year that nearly all the representatives of the Georgian Bay district were against the reimposition of the duty. Is that the case to-day? I am sorry that our debate is so arranged to-day that many will be prevented from speaking on this motion, who, I understand, intended to support it. I find that, not only have county councils unanimously passed resolutions advising the Government to reimpose the duty, but town and municipal councils have moved in the same direction, and the representatives from the district chiefly interested are almost unanimous to-day in favour of my motion. I regretted last year that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) could not see his way clear to support the reimposition of the duty, but I am satisfied that to-day he is thoroughly convinced of its necessity, judging by the speech the hon. gentleman made the other night. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is, I believe, also in favour of it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I regret very much that he is not, and I know that the hon. gentleman's own friends in the constituency he represents, regret it. The hon. member for

North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is, I think, with us, and if he were here, would say so. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Mason) is, I believe, also with us, and so is my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), as well as many other hon. gentlemen from different parts of the province. When such a rapid change has taken place in the sentiments of the representatives of the people, it must be clear to the Minister of Finance and his colleagues that there must be some substantial reason behind this change, and the facts and figures I have given show how injurious the free export is to the people of Ontario. We are told that if we impose a duty, the Americans will raise their tariff on lumber. Well, whether they do so or not, they must have our lumber, as the figures I have given indicate. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the Americans are substituting other woods for our pine timber; he said that they can buy white wood to-day at \$32 per thousand feet, when they have to pay \$45 per thousand feet for pine, and that consequently they are using white wood instead. Is not that the best evidence that our pine is getting scarce; and, as Canada is the nearest point available to the Americans for their supply of pine, they must get it from us, whether in the shape of sawn lumber or logs. When a Bill was brought before the American Congress asking that the duty be taken off lumber, the American lumbermen asked Mr. Bryan, of Nebraska, the introducer of the Bill, what it was he wanted. He said: I want free Canadian lumber. And they replied: Well, Mr. Bryan, if that is what you are after, we can soon give you all the free Canadian lumber you want, because we own the timber in Canada and there is no duty on saw-logs. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that if we put a duty on the logs, we will prevent the Americans getting their logs from our side, and they will raise the duty on our lumber. The very reverse is the case. While the general drift of the McKinley Bill was to raise the duty on everything from Canada, there was one notable exception, and that was lumber, which was reduced from \$2 to \$1. They must have our lumber, and are in favour of admitting it free. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) then said that if we allow the export of logs to continue free, Americans will come across and put up their mills in Canada. I think the very reverse will be the case, because as long as they can get logs over free they will keep their mills where they are. Their only object in raising the duty on our lumber, if we imposed an export duty on logs, would be to protect their own mills, and prevent their own people from putting up mills and sawing the logs on the Canadian side. To contend, as does the hon. member for North Norfolk, that if we allow the Americans the privilege of taking logs across free, and give that privilege stability, they will likely build their mills in Canada, is ridic-

ulous. What do the American people say? Mr. Weston, of Michigan, is reported to have said:

The Saginaw mills are running out of stock and they are looking to Georgian Bay for Canadian logs to cross the Huron Lake and keep their mills and men at work.

But he has answered: Oh, you cannot get the logs from over there free. Another prominent lumberman says: Do you think the Canadians would be fools enough to let you take their logs out of the country free? That would be robbing them of their raw material, and they would not let you rob them of their logs any more than we would, and no American would venture to propose such a thing. Yet we are letting them do it. They are robbing us of one of the assets of our country and taking the material over there to give employment to their own men, to keep their mills operating with this material which should be used to keep our own mills working. I hope the Government will, at the earliest possible date, reimpose the duty upon pine and spruce logs. The Americans give us little or no consideration. They charge us a dollar a thousand duty on pine lumber and yet have the privilege of coming in and taking logs from us free. If we take elm or other kinds of lumber over they charge us a heavy duty; they have reduced the duty only on one or two lines in return for the privilege which we are giving them. We had better save our own assets, we had better give employment to our own people, we had better keep the money spent in giving employment to the people on the other side of the line. Reimpose the export duty and make it high enough to compel the manufacture of the logs in Canada instead of in the state of Michigan and the state of New York, as is the case to-day.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is almost about six o'clock and it is hardly worth while to continue the discussion now, but I hope on another occasion to have an opportunity to state the reasons why I shall vote against the motion. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I must confess, Sir, that I approach this question with a good deal of diffidence, if not embarrassment. The question has been discussed for the past

fifteen years, and I regret to see that there is so great a divergence of opinion between parties on both sides of the House with respect to it. My hon. friend, the member for Gleggarry (Mr. McLennan) ably discussed this question a few nights ago. He proved conclusively that there was a tidal wave of population in all parts of this Dominion moving from the rural districts into the cities. He also proved conclusively that the same movement of population was to be seen in the United States. He proved also that the movement of population from the rural districts into the cities in the United States was larger in proportion to population than it was in Canada. I might go further and say that the movement of population from the rural districts does not respect the line which separates Canada from the United States. The movement is general. Sir, all over British North America. The youth in the agricultural districts who, by training and education qualify themselves to prosecute their vocation in cities, refuse to remain any longer in agricultural sections. The sons of farmers find that the farms are not sufficiently large to enable them all to remain upon those farms, and, as a general thing, when there are a number of sons living on a farm of say one or two hundred acres, all, possibly excepting one, decide at an early age that they will pursue some other business for a living. There is no man with any ordinary common sense who will come to the conclusion that because three or four sons leave the farm, the one who remains at home is worse off than if the others had remained with him. So that a decrease in the population in the rural districts is not by any means a sign that the people are not well off, that the people who remain at home are not better off than they would be if the rest of the family had remained with them. The tidal wave which moves from the rural districts into these cities generally moves in the direction of the larger cities and, before they decide on their departure from their homes, those who decide to go generally ascertain those cities in which they are most likely to find employment. In this way a large number of the emigrants from Canada to the United States may be accounted for, and it is idle to say that because such an exodus exists from the rural districts into the cities, therefore the agricultural districts are being ruined. The attention of the House has been already called to the fact that a large number of native-born British Americans live on the other side of the line. It is a fact which must be seriously considered. There is no one on either side of the House who can deny but an extraordinary number of native-born Canadians live on the other side of the line; but it is not fair to attribute that fact to the National Policy which has been pursued in this Dominion during the past decade. The native-born British North Americans resident in the United States in 1830 were only 2,227; in

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

1840, 31,627; in 1850, 147,711; in 1860, 240,970; in 1870, 493,463; in 1880, 717,153. Now, any person who will look upon the census of the United States from an ordinary, common-sense stand-point, must admit that the enumeration of foreign-born citizens is as nearly accurate as it can practically be. There is no reason why an enumerator would count any citizen of the United States as of any other nativity than that which the citizen would himself give. In 1880 we find that not less than 717,153 Canadians were resident in the United States; in other words, before the National Policy was adopted, three-quarters of a million of Canadians crossed the line. It is not, therefore, fair nor reasonable to attribute this exodus to the National Policy. In 1890, I am sorry to say, that number had increased to 980,000. These are facts which every statesman in Canada must look in the face. It is a serious fact that so large a number of native-born citizens have crossed the line; and it is unfortunate that Canadian statesmen should attempt to mislead the people to believe that the movement from the rural districts in Canada to the cities of North America has been owing to the National Policy pursued in the Dominion of Canada. The population of Ontario, in 1891, was 2,112,989; of Quebec, 1,488,586; of New Brunswick, 321,274; of Nova Scotia, 450,523; of Manitoba, 154,443; of Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, 67,554; of British Columbia, 92,765; of the unorganized territories, 32,168; or, a total of 4,829,411. I regret that the census taken in 1890 failed to enumerate the citizens of the United States by nativity. If that had been done, I could show exactly the proportion from each province who are now resident in the United States; therefore, I must go back to the census of 1881, when the enumeration was taken in the United States by nativity, and the residents in the United States from the several provinces were given in the census of that year. In 1891 the total population of old Canada, including Ontario and Quebec, was 3,285,954; New Brunswick, 321,233; Nova Scotia, 440,572; Prince Edward Island, 108,891. By the United States census, which I assume to be as nearly correct as possible in this respect, there were, from old Canada, 610,000 resident in the United States; from New Brunswick, 41,788; from Nova Scotia, 51,160; from Prince Edward Island, 7,537. So that hon. gentlemen will see that, of all the provinces, the largest exodus, up to 1880, when the National Policy was adopted, was from Ontario; next to it was the exodus from New Brunswick, being one-eighth; Nova Scotia next, being nearly one-ninth; Prince Edward Island, nearly one-fifteenth. There were, in round numbers, then, at least, 700,000 Canadians resident in the United States before the adoption of the National Policy. So that it is futile to at-

tempt to mislead the public to believe that the exodus from Canada has been owing to the National Policy. It is true that this large number left the country, and it is also true that out of the total population of Canada in 1891, which was 4,829,411, there were living in the United States, 980,000, which is one-fifth of the total population in round numbers. I submit, in all earnestness, therefore, that it becomes Canadian statesmen seriously to investigate the cause of this exodus from Canada, which largely existed before the adoption of the National Policy; and but for the National Policy. I claim, and firmly believe, that the exodus would have been at least a quarter of a million more during the last decade. We have in Canada serious difficulties to contend with to arrest the exodus. Those who left Canada years ago, it can not be denied, were, to a large extent, successful. It is true that many of them failed in the United States, as they would have failed in Canada; at the same time no reasonable person can deny but that a large proportion of those who left the British North American provinces were successful in the United States, and at least one-quarter of them, that is, in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million, made for themselves comfortable homes there, before the adoption of the National Policy, and they act for the United States as immigration agents, who are attracting their friends from every province of old Canada. If there be any way to arrest the tidal wave which moves from the rural districts all over North America to the cities, and from which Canada suffers largely in a loss of population, it must be done by adopting a policy which will retain as many as possible at home, in the face of the attractions which they find on the other side of the line. There can be no doubt, and no one who has travelled both countries over can fail to be satisfied, that in Canada the population of the rural districts from Cape Breton to Vancouver are more comfortably settled and in better circumstances than the average on the other side of the line, and it is futile to say that because they leave the agricultural districts, which are now pretty well settled, at least in the eastern provinces, therefore those who remain at home are any the worse off. I will allow the exodus to rest at this point. I now desire to call the attention of the House to some observations which were made by the senior member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies.) I intend to deal very lightly with the hon. gentleman, because, I frankly admit, that notwithstanding the delivery of that speech with a deal of force, I might say vehemence, if the language be carefully considered, he has made the most moderate speech on that side of the House against the National Policy; but I must call his attention to a statement he made, and which requires contradiction at my hands. He said:

Those who are now most strenuous in their support of the National Policy are those who have been

punished most severely by it. Of all places in the Dominion, Cape Breton has suffered perhaps the most. From that island there has been a greater percentage of exodus than from any other part of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It cannot be denied, and to-day the commercial atrophy which is prevalent all over the Maritime provinces is more prevalent in Cape Breton than anywhere else.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When I have finished, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to refute what I have said, not only by saying no, but by producing some evidence in support of his statement.

The contradiction at that time was very properly made by the senior member for Cape Breton, and I shall now produce evidence to convince the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that the statement he then made was not strictly accurate. The population of Cape Breton was, in 1881, 84,490; in 1891, 86,854, an increase of 2,346. The population of Prince Edward Island was, in 1881, 108,891; in 1891, 109,078, an increase of only 187. The increase in Cape Breton Island, therefore, exceeded that of Prince Edward Island by 2,269, notwithstanding the fact that the population of Prince Edward Island is somewhat larger than that of Cape Breton. I have already shown that the exodus from Prince Edward Island up to the present time has been less than from any other portion of this Dominion, and I now show that the exodus from Cape Breton has been less than that from Prince Edward Island, and therefore the exodus from Cape Breton has been less than from any other portion of this Dominion since the adoption of the National Policy. My hon. friend, I hope, will be satisfied with that explanation and proof. He made a further statement, and I am glad that to a certain extent he concurs with myself. On a former occasion I stated in a fanciful manner that if on brick was taken out of the National Policy edifice, the whole structure would fall. By that expression I meant, as my hon. friend from Queen's exactly knew, that if any of the principles underlying the National Policy should be violated, the whole policy would have to be abandoned. What occurred once may occur again. Some of the principles in the policy of 1871 were violated, and the whole policy fell to the ground, and the same result would follow. I have no doubt whatever, under similar circumstances. I do not mean to say that it is absolutely necessary to retain the existing tariff just where it is, but I still hold that all the principles underlying the National Policy, which had been fairly, fully and seriously considered before its adoption, must be maintained in their integrity. The hon. gentleman said:

I have a great deal of sympathy with those hon. members who object to the tariff being interfered with in detail. I think it as a whole ought to be sustained as a whole, or put down as a whole. I do not think it fair, to take for instance, coal oil and remove the duty from that, and to leave other duties

equally as bad and equally indefensible alone. I do not think it is fair to single out cottons, and remove the duty from that article, while equally indefensible duties are allowed to remain on other articles.

Mr. CAMERON. Nor to single out pork?

Mr. DAVIES. Nor pork, as the hon. gentleman says.

This shows clearly that any great industry in this Dominion must not be allowed to suffer under the National Policy, and if it be allowed to suffer, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) evidently will be with me when any such attempt is made. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) also, to a large extent, agrees with me. He said:

I presume, Sir, they will find the task a difficult one. It is like taking stones out of an arch, with the danger of bringing down the whole structure about their ears. The National Policy interests are so interwoven with one another, and so mutually dependent on one another, that one duty can scarcely be removed without affecting a great many industries, and when the Government proceed to the consideration of this question and attempt tariff reforms, we upon this side shall watch with a great deal of interest and curiosity the result of the experiment they may be disposed to make with reference to the reduction of duties.

Another authority on political questions, the Rev. Principal Grant, in the last number of the "Canadian Magazine," referring to the Premier's promise to lop the mouldering branch away, if any existed, says:

He will soon find that there are resolute men who consider it (the National Policy) the very ark of the covenant or keystone of the arch, and who are prepared to threaten anything and everything rather than consent to its being touched, much less lopped.

So that on the question of violating any of the principles of the National Policy I have three distinguished Canadians to agree with me. Having disposed of that branch of the subject, I shall now take into consideration what the National Policy itself really is, and what are the principles that underlie it. The first essential of a National Policy tariff, in my opinion, is that it shall produce a sufficient revenue to efficiently maintain the services for which the Dominion Government is held responsible. I think that every reasonable person in this Dominion will concede that an indirect tax on the people is preferable to direct taxation, and that a tariff policy should be adopted that will enable the Finance Minister to maintain all the services of this Dominion efficiently and well. The railways of this Dominion should be prosecuted and extended, and a revenue for that purpose must be raised in the manner which will press the most lightly upon the tax-payers. The canals of this Dominion must be maintained and, if necessary, extended. The public works of this Dominion must also be maintained, and facilities must be given north and south, east and west, for the distribution of the products of our various industries from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This cannot be efficiently done without a revenue, and I do seriously hope that the Government will not

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

go back on that part of the National Policy which has been promoting railway extension, enlargement of the canals, increase of the public works and other facilities for the distribution of the various products of this Dominion. It would be a mistaken policy to do that; and instead of urging upon them to curtail the expenditures, I would have no hesitation in urging them on to greater efforts to provide facilities for our surplus population to induce them to stay at home instead of going across the line. The tariff should, in my opinion, be so adjusted as to bear as lightly as possible on the poorer classes of this Dominion—the farmers, the fishermen, the miners, the mechanics and the labouring classes generally; and I have no hesitation in saying that, while the National Policy tariff, which produces a revenue as well, should be so adjusted as to bear lightly on the poorer classes, it should at the same time be so adjusted as to foster the various industries of this Dominion—the agricultural industries, the fishing industries, the mining industries and the manufacturing industries. It should be so adjusted as to encourage the building up of large cities within the Dominion itself, and the cities within the Dominion cannot be very materially enlarged, unless manufacturing industries are encouraged in these cities, and unless the cities are enlarged, the surplus population in the rural districts will move to the large cities on the other side of the line. It should be so adjusted as to create a healthy competition in the production of all articles which are useful and necessary to the poorer classes of this Dominion. By stimulating manufacturing industries in this Dominion, and thus creating a large supply of what is useful or necessary for our poorer classes, we shall bring the prices of all those articles down to the lowest possible figure consistent with a living profit to the manufacturers. It may be said, and it has been said, that the manufacturers are making millions; but on investigation, that will not be found to be true. When the National Policy was first adopted, those opposed to it lost no opportunity of trying to show that it would be injurious to the people of this country, by enumerating the large number of manufacturers who were bankrupt; but if the manufacturers were bankrupt in various industries, was it not because they were supplying the consumers of this Dominion with their wares at prices below the cost of production? It is true, when the National Policy was first adopted, a very large number of manufacturers more than were necessary were encouraged to supply the public wants in certain lines; but that will in a short time cure itself, and those only who can make a reasonable profit will survive. In this way the wares which are required for the use and comfort of our people will be placed in the hands of the consumers at a lower figure than would otherwise be possible. As a matter of fact, every person who will inquire into the

prices prevailing now all over the Dominion, from one end to the other, will find that all goods which are consumed by the poorer classes, are sold at from 15 to 25 per cent below the prices that prevailed before the adoption of the National Policy, and 15 to 25 per cent lower than they could possibly have been sold for, if the National Policy had not been adopted. The National Policy should be so adjusted as to prevent combines to enhance the prices of the necessaries of life, and it should also be so adjusted as to foster interprovincial trade; and unless a policy is adopted by the Parliament of this Dominion to foster interprovincial trade, in my humble opinion, it will be useless to expect Confederation to be a success. The National Policy, it must be admitted, has to a large extent encouraged interprovincial trade, and its continuance will undoubtedly largely increase that interprovincial trade. There is a special appeal made at present to the prejudices of the farmer. After the National Policy had got under way, an appeal was first made to the sympathies of the unfortunate manufacturers, who were becoming bankrupt. Then, when hon. gentlemen opposite found that the manufacturers who survived the keen competition, were doing fairly well, they shifted their position and endeavoured to enlist the sympathies of the fishermen. From the fishermen they went on to appeal to the sympathies of the miners; and all these appeals having failed, they now appeal most industriously, during this session and the last, to the prejudices of the farmer. I am the son of a farmer, and a farmer myself—an amateur farmer, I may say—and I say again that the poorer classes of farmers have been fairly well protected by the National Policy. It must not be forgotten that there are several classes of farmers in this Dominion. There are specialists who are anxious to secure cheap food for the lines of farming in which they themselves operate, and I must call the attention of this House to the fact that that class is only a very small class of the farmers of this Dominion. Those who go in for cattle-raising, horse-raising and hog-feeding, are specialists, who are most anxious that cheap food should be secured from abroad, to the prejudice and great injury of the far poorer classes of farmers, who are in the large majority. To a large extent, as I said in a former discussion, these specialists to whom I refer are manufacturers, in the same sense as the millers are manufacturers of the product of wheat. Now, I desire, Sir, to call your attention to the injury which the reduction of the tariff on the farm products of this Dominion would be to the farmers generally. I regret that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not present, because, during the discussion on this question, he maintained that the farmers are not protected; he pretended that, notwithstanding the duty of 75 cents per barrel on flour, that did not create any market for the farmers of this

Dominion. The duty on flour must be taken in connection with the protection to manufacturers. The best market for the wheat raised in this country is the home market, and if our farmers fail to secure the home market for their products, their business will be a precarious one. If my hon. friend is under the impression that taking off the duty of 75 cents per barrel and placing wheat on the free list, as hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do, is not injurious to the farmers of the North-west Territories and Ontario, I must tell him that he and I very materially differ in that respect. Let the duty be taken off wheat and flour, and the result would immediately follow, that the markets of the Maritime provinces would be supplied to the extent of at least 1,500,000 barrels of flour from the United States. In this manner, the producer of Manitoba and Ontario would lose the markets of the lower provinces. I do not mean to say that it would reduce the price of flour to any appreciable extent in the Maritime provinces; but I do mean to say that the immediate effect of putting flour and wheat on the free list would be the taking of at least \$6,000,000 out of the Maritime provinces into the United States, to pay for flour imported from that country. All that money would be put in circulation on the other side of the line, and it could hardly be expected to be returned under the existing tariff, to circulate in this Dominion within a reasonable period. It is, therefore, essential that the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west should have the markets of the Maritime provinces. The simple reason why flour from the United States would be largely imported into the Maritime provinces lies in this fact, that the freight would be lower, and to that extent the price of flour would be reduced in the Maritime provinces; but the difference would be so small, that silly indeed would be the Maritime province man who, with a head of common sense on his shoulders, would advocate a reduction of duty on flour, as long as the industries and interests in the Maritime provinces, such as those of the fisherman and the miner, are reasonably protected under the National Policy? They must be taken together. There is no reasonable man in this Dominion, who will view the question from an impartial point of view, but must admit that carrying the great products of the west to the east and those of the east as far as practicable west, and keeping the money in circulation within the Dominion, must be for the general advantage of the Dominion. And this is one of the great objects of the National Policy. I hear it often said, and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said in this House, that we have the markets of Great Britain free; but he must not forget that the farmers of Great Britain are protected nearly to as great an extent against outside products as are the farmers of Canada. The protection of the farmers of Canada against the imports of agricultural products

of the United States, does not alone consist in the tariff on flour and wheat. It consists as well in the cost of transportation, so that, if my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will take into consideration the cost of carriage, of wheat and flour to Liverpool, he will find that the English farmer is as well protected, to say the least, against the products of the United States and Canada in flour and wheat as the farmer in Canada is against the rest of the world. The wheat products consumed in Great Britain are largely supplied by the North-west Territories of this Dominion, the United States and Russia, and the rate of transportation from all these points will equal, or nearly equal, the protection which is given to the Canadian farmer by the tariff under the National Policy. The best customers that the farmers of this Dominion can possibly have, as I have already intimated, are the labouring classes, the mechanics, the fishermen, the miners, and the artisans of this Dominion. It is, therefore, in the interest of the farming classes to have these various industries protected and fostered, and it is in the interest of the fishermen, the miners, the mechanics and the labourers generally to have the farmers protected. It is the only hope for this Dominion to have the various industries so protected as to foster them. It must not be forgotten that the National Policy tariff is not essentially a protective tariff. The necessities of the revenue of this Dominion prevent us from having a purely protective tariff. If you impose a high duty on any product which is manufactured in this Dominion, it will prevent the importation of that article altogether, and therefore no revenue would accrue for that duty. There are several lines of goods manufactured in this country which are thus protected with a view to altogether preventing similar products coming from other countries. It is a wise policy which prevents, for instance, the shoddy made on the other side of the line, and, I might say, in Great Britain as well, from coming into competition with far superior articles manufactured in this Dominion; and when tweeds and cottons and other lines of goods are abundantly manufactured in this Dominion it is the duty of the Government to so protect them as to prevent the competition of any inferior class of goods which it would not be to the advantage of our people to have in the market at all. Now, Sir, having said so much on that branch of the National Policy I desire to investigate for a short time—and I hope the House will bear patiently with me—into another phase of the question, and that is as to who pays the tariff. There is great diversity of opinion as to who pays the tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if I am to believe their utterances in the House, have nearly unanimously come to the conclusion that the consumer pays the duty. Now, I differ from them on that point, and I believe I can prove that they themselves generally and severally differ from themselves. There is one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who goes so far as to say that Canadians occupy such a deplorable position in

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

this world of ours that they pay the duty on all articles imported from foreign countries, and not only that, but they occupy the very humiliating position also of being obliged to pay the duty on every article which is exported from this Dominion. Now I do not think it necessary to say anything more than merely to state the views expressed by that hon. gentleman to show what a silly position he occupies in the minds of the intelligent people of this Dominion. Flour is produced in Canada in abundance, largely in excess of the requirements of the consumers of this country, and flour is imported to a small extent into Canada. I would ask any reasonable man if the imposition of 75 cents a barrel makes the flour 75 cents a barrel dearer to the consumer of the Dominion? That position was taken by hon. gentlemen in this House in the presence of many who are here now; but it was so ridiculous that their constituencies elected them to remain at home. If flour is imported into this Dominion in the face of the fact that we produce a large quantity, more than is required for home consumption, the producers on the other side of the line and the carriers and the middlemen must lose the duty and divide that loss among themselves as best they can. The consumer does not contribute one cent, nor is one cent added to the cost of the flour. On the other hand, I may take an article which is not produced in the Dominion of Canada at all—tea. There is not a reasonable person on either side of the House but must admit that the duty on tea, which is not produced in Canada and does not therefore come in competition with a similar product in Canada where it is imported, is paid by the consumer. There may be some circumstances in which even that may not be true; but it must be admitted on all hands that as a general thing on articles which are not produced in Canada, and on which a duty is imposed, the consumer pays all the duty. I may take another line of goods, selecting one which is produced in Canada to one-half the extent necessary for the consumption of the people of the Dominion. On any such line of goods imported, I take it, the consumer would not be called upon to pay more than half the duty. My reason for coming to this conclusion is simply that such a line of goods imported from abroad would come in competition with the same line of goods produced or manufactured in Canada, so that the competition in Canada would so reduce the price that the manufacturer abroad and the carriers and the middlemen would have to divide the other half between them. So I am myself convinced that these are, to a large extent, the principles which may govern any intelligent person in deciding as to how much of the duty the consumers of Canada pay on goods which are imported into the Dominion. A good deal has been said on the duty on coal oil. It is known to every intelligent person in this Dominion that two-thirds of the coal oil used in Canada is manufactured within the Dominion itself, and the

other third is imported from the United States. There are some enthusiasts who are in favour of reducing the tariff on coal oil, who maintain that no person in Canada would use any Canadian oil, because it is of such inferior quality that it should be driven out of the market altogether. But those of us who use Canadian oil and American oil know that Canadian oil is produced in quality as good as the American oil, and that it will last even longer than the American oil. But the test on American oil prevents the importation into Canada of an inferior quality of oil, for the simple reason that it is more explosive. It would be a great misfortune to reduce that test so as to endanger those who use it on this side of the line and expose them to accidents which frequently occur in the United States from the explosive character of the oil manufactured there. But the discussion which occurred in the press, and the discussion which occurred in this Parliament, particularly, I am happy to say, has already had a very salutary effect upon the trade of oil from British Columbia, I believe, to Cape Breton. The cost of oil should not be so great as it was in various sections of this Dominion. It is a singular fact that in the country in which I reside we can purchase coal oil, Canadian and American, at a much lower figure than it is retailed in Ottawa, Montreal, or any other of the central cities of Canada. This is certainly not owing to the National Policy; it is owing, to some extent, I admit, to the keener competition between both oils in the Maritime provinces, and to a large extent it is due to the fact that in cities the grocers and retailers charge a larger profit on the oil than they do in the Maritime provinces. An excellent quality of Canadian oil and of American oil can be purchased in the Maritime provinces from 20 to 25 cents per gallon, equally as good as the oil which is retailed in the city of Ottawa for 30 and 35 cents. But the agitation which has existed in the country and the discussion which occurred in this House, have called public attention to the enormous profit charged by retailers in central Canada, particularly, and now the prices have largely come down. I hope that with oil, as with other articles which are imported from foreign countries, the production in Canada will largely regulate the price, and that the producers on the other side of the line and the middlemen will in that way be compelled to contribute towards the revenue in proportion to the quantity imported into the country, as they are doing in regard to other lines of goods. I wish now to call attention to the view which is generally entertained on the other side of the House in reference to the effect of the tariff. The hon. member for the south riding of Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says:

Now, just let me go over a few articles that we sent to the United States in 1892, giving in each case the number or quality, and the amount of duty that we had to pay to obtain access to that market for them:

Article.	Number or Quantity.	Duty Paid.
Horses	9,261	\$276,830
Eggs, doz	3,918,015	195,900
Sheep	290,074	217,611
Barley, bush	2,721,168	\$16,350
Wheat, bush	1,489,881	247,976
Hay, tons	67,068	268,268
Potatoes, bush	135,324	33,831
Pease, bush	527,912	211,164
Oats, bush	155,947	16,594
Apples, brls	16,995	12,746

Total duty paid \$2,296,771

Yet the hon. gentlemen tell us that the American market is not the best market for the Canadian farmer for these classes of products.

Now, if we pay tribute for the export of horses, eggs, sheep, barley, wheat, hay, potatoes, pease, oats and apples to the United States to the extent of \$2,296,771, on account of their tariff, would it not be very silly on the part of the Dominion Government, or of any Government, to admit the products of that country free of duty while they imposed such high duty on these products going from this country into the United States? The consumers do not always pay the duty. If the argument of my hon. friend from Huron be valid, the producers of horses, eggs, sheep, barley, wheat, hay, potatoes, pease, oats and apples in Canada paid the whole duty. If that argument be sound, then all the products imported from the United States into Canada pay a tribute to the Dominion treasury in the same manner. But I dissent from this view of it, as well as from the view that the consumer pays all the duty. If hon. gentlemen will only examine the lines of goods upon which duty is collected, they will find that the poorer classes in this Dominion contribute but a very small portion indeed of the revenue of this Dominion. I wish now to present a statement of the quantity and value of articles entered for consumption in the Dominion of Canada, showing, also, the duties collected thereon during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1892:

Articles.	Value.	Duty.
<i>Dutiable Goods.</i>	\$	\$ cts.
Ale, beer and porter	229,402	90,019 26
Animals, living	262,089	68,606 25
Books, periodicals and other printed matter, N.E.S.	1,223,404	246,932 79
Brass and manufactures of	463,182	123,587 33
Breadstuffs, viz.:		
Arrowroot, biscuit, rice, macaroni, bran, &c.	479,006	119,317 90
Grain of all kinds	956,004	139,105 30
Flour and meal of all kinds	387,682	60,072 88
Brooms and brushes	108,529	27,149 67

Articles.	Value.	Duty.	Articles.	Value.	Duty.
<i>Dutiable Goods—Con.</i>	\$	\$ cts.	<i>Dutiable Goods—Con.</i>	\$	\$ cts.
Bricks and tiles	81,495	25,201 85	Spirits and wines.....	1,483,955	2,172,695 61
Candles	32,905	8,194 93	Stone and manufactures		
Carriages	492,114	153,078 81	of.....	169,837	35,633 12
Carpets and squares,			Sugar of all kinds (see		
N.E.S.	143,881	35,970 25	also Free Goods)....	551,851	77,828 92
Cement	287,729	77,086 40	Molasses.....	814,421	70,277 92
Clocks and clock springs.	125,005	29,512 75	Sugar candy and con-		
Coal and coke (see also			fectionery.....	94,942	42,193 16
Free Goods).....	4,333,490	988,852 89	Tea (see also Free Goods)	82,599	8,265 00
Coffee	51,348	8,749 68	Tin and manufactures of	37,738	9,423 96
Copper and manufactures			Tobacco and manufac-		
of.....	269,712	37,391 03	tures of.....	270,661	270,427 65
Cordage of all kinds . . .	81,320	20,522 74	Turpentine, spirits of....	201,874	20,187 40
Cotton, manufactures of.	3,992,440	1,114,424 33	Varnish.....	77,436	27,122 29
Crapes of all kinds . . .	59,647	11,934 90	Vegetables.....	239,099	63,351 38
Drugs, dyes, chemicals			Watches and parts of....	397,543	60,189 70
and medicines.....	1,539,981	439,647 31	Wood and manufactures		
Earthenware and china..	748,810	250,022 46	of.....	1,142,102	315,606 99
Embroideries, not other-			Wool and manufactures		
wise provided for.....	154,613	46,389 30	of.....	10,341,309	3,095,562 34
Fancy goods	1,627,801	493,373 90	All other dutiable goods.	5,171,796	1,429,335 13
Fish and products of (see			Total, Dutiable Goods	69,160,737	20,550,473 53
also Free Goods).....	482,605	75,066 33			
Flax, hemp and jute,					
manufactures of.....	1,546,051	342,040 89			
Fruits and nuts, dried . .	996,193	340,513 78			
Fruits, green (see also					
Free Goods).....	1,072,508	175,755 15			
Furs and manufactures of	679,406	110,581 55			
Glass do	1,257,858	326,270 73			
Gloves and mitts	680,221	238,078 37			
Gold and silver, manu-					
factures of.....	261,471	72,264 23			
Gunpowder and other ex-					
plosives.....	136,171	43,600 97			
Gutta percha and India					
rubber, manufactures					
of.....	684,633	202,974 92			
Hats, caps and bonnets..	1,219,714	365,913 63			
Iron and steel, manufac-					
tures of	9,968,409	2,792,088 12			
Jewellery.....	288,584	57,717 29			
Lead and manufactures					
of.....	317,142	53,501 15			
Leather and manufac-					
tures of.....	1,091,213	231,215 30			
Marble and manufactures					
of.....	106,168	24,411 59			
Metal, composition and					
other.....	373,819	104,432 97			
Musical instruments....	412,894	115,392 48			
Oils, coal, kerosene and					
products of.....	494,004	417,125 90			
Oils, all other, N.E.S....	863,754	239,121 09			
Oil-cloth.....	216,129	80,524 82			
Packages	399,306	80,011 29			
Paints and colours.....	566,138	70,952 85			
Paper and manufactures					
of.....	1,216,486	411,617 92			
Pickles, sauces and capers					
of all kinds.....	111,148	42,981 91			
Printing presses.....	140,773	14,077 50			
Provisions, viz.:—Butter,	1,006,257	311,959 49			
cheese, lard and meats.					
Salt (see also Free Goods).	65,963	13,065 31			
Seeds and roots (see also					
Free Goods).....	477,754	47,931 84			
Ships and vessels, and re-					
pairs on	25,030	3,614 00			
Silk, manufactures of....	2,456,109	734,452 81			
Soap of all kinds.....	166,937	60,978 62			
Spices of all kinds	180,137	26,993 25			

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

If the argument of my hon. friend from Huron be valid, those who are obliged to find a market in Canada for all their lines of goods, pay all the duty. But that argument is not sound. Although I admit to a certain extent that the consumer pays the duty on goods such as are imported into the Dominion, I deny that they pay any duty imposed on flour, because flour is produced in Canada to a greater extent than the home market requires, and there are other articles similarly situated. And I hold that a very large proportion of the duty imposed on lines of goods imported into Canada is paid by the producers on the other side of the line, or in other countries, and by the carriers and middlemen, and that it reaches the hands of the consumers here at a lower figure, particularly when it comes into competition with similar products in our own country, than they could possibly be placed in our hands, even if manufactured within the Dominion itself. Our receipts from customs in 1891-92 were \$20,501,057; from excise, \$7,945,197; miscellaneous, \$8,475,715; or a total of \$36,921,871. It is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite that under commercial union, or under any other tariff policy suggested by them, the revenue of Canada would suffer to a very large extent; and voicing, I presume, the policy of the Opposition, the hon. member for North Norfolk says, in a speech delivered on this question a few nights ago:

But if we entered into an arrangement admitting every article from the United States free of duty and sacrificed the whole of the duties derived from American importations, we would be sacrificing \$8,000,000 annually of revenue. The question is, can that sum be made good without resort being had to direct taxation? I assert that it can. We would of course have to readjust our fiscal system. We would have to resort to certain lines of taxation that are purely revenue

taxes. We might put a duty on tea and coffee. Those duties are less objectionable than duties on the classes of goods produced in the country, because you thereby escape incidental taxation. The consumer pays for what is imported, and if there is nothing of the kind produced in the country, the article is not enhanced in price.

This is a most extraordinary position for any financier to take. The hon. gentleman says the consumers pays for what is imported, and if nothing of the kind is produced in the country, the article is not enhanced in price; therefore, if a duty of 10 cents per pound be imposed on tea, because it is not produced in the country, it will not be enhanced in price. There is no hon. member on either side of the House, there is no ten-year-old school-boy in any rural district in this Dominion, who would not contradict any such statement as that. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded to say :

We might impose a small duty on sugar, say one cent per pound, and I venture the assertion that sugar would be sold at only one-fifth of a cent per pound in advance of present prices, because there is now a duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound for the purpose of enabling the refiner to meet some competition without protection. A duty of one cent per pound would amount to \$3,000,000, and the consumer would get the advantage by the amount of the duty going into the treasury of the country, instead of into the pockets of the refiner. Then we might impose an income tax. That tax is resorted to in England.

This, then, is the counter-policy proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to the National Policy. Every hon. member from the Maritime provinces, who knows the effect such a tariff would have on tea, sugar, coffee, rice and molasses and other articles which are required by the poorer classes, by miners, fishermen and mechanics, and by the poorer classes of farmers, as well, must be aware that this would amount to the imposition of heavy duties, of which they would have to pay every cent. This view of the question was so completely answered by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech that for the purpose of shortening my remarks, I quote it from his own lips. The Minister said :

While on that point it may be just as well to make a statement in order to contrast the two policies, in order to meet to a certain extent, a statement which is often heard, that the system of taxation and the quantity of taxation as it bore upon certain classes, was less under the administration of our predecessors than under our own. Let me add this further statement : that we gained on coffee in 1892, \$7,177 ; but if the same duties had been paid upon the coffee consumed in this country last year as was placed upon coffee under the preceding Administration, instead of the people having paid \$7,177 they would have paid \$66,746. Duty on tea was last year paid to the amount of \$8,265. If the same rates of duty had been paid last year as was paid under the preceding Administration the country would have paid on the same consumption of tea \$1,266,233 instead of \$8,265. In the matter of rice, which is also the poor man's food, we paid last year \$80,762 ; but if the duties in vogue under the preceding Administration upon the article of rice had been paid last year, instead of that amount the people would have paid \$229,820. In sugar, as I have stated, the duty of 1893 was about \$77,000, whereas

under the rate of taxation existing under the preceding Administration, the duty paid would have been \$4,438,109. That is to say, on these four articles alone, coffee, tea, rice and sugar, the country paid last year \$172,462 ; under the rate of taxation, upon a similar consumption, of the preceding Administration, they would have paid \$6,905,000. Under the two rates of taxation the savings to the people in these articles alone was \$5,928,442. There is no dispute that in the case of every one of these articles every dollar of that taxation would have come out of the pockets of the consumer, because it is upon materials which are not grown in this country.

So that the policy suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, followed on those lines, would amount to \$6,900,000, or \$1.20 per head on the population of the Dominion. I now desire to refer to the amendment which is under the consideration of the House, which has been moved by the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) from Oxford :

That it be resolved that the present customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly on the great consuming classes of the Dominion and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sums required to meet the necessities of the Government, efficiently and economically administered.

The first statement in this resolution is not true. The National Policy does not bear heavily and unjustly on the consuming classes of this Dominion. It does not bear heavily and unjustly on the fishermen of this Dominion. It does not bear heavily or unjustly on the poorer class of farmers of this Dominion ; nor does it bear heavily or unjustly on the mechanics or artisans or labourers of this Dominion. When I see farmers' institutes and mechanics' institutes and other associations pretending to represent the poorer classes of farmers, or as a matter of fact the farmers of the Dominion, advocating the abolition or reduction of certain duties on certain lines of goods they consume, their action reflects seriously on their own position, and on the manner in which they represent the most important industry in this Dominion. They advocate the importation of free corn. Do they not know that free corn as food for animals comes into actual competition with the coarse grain produced in this Dominion ? There is no part of this Dominion which could more seriously suffer by the importation of such food for cattle than the Maritime provinces, say Quebec, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, and it would be disastrous to the best interests of the large majority of the farmers, of at least nine-tenths of the farmers of this Dominion, if the duty were abolished on corn, for the purpose of giving to manufacturers of beef and to hog-raisers generally, cheaper food for their own special line of products. The object of the National Policy is to develop our natural resources, to enlarge our manufacturing industries, and to keep as many of our people at home as possible. It is a regrettable fact that our people are leaving the country. It should not be heralded in this House so loudly, so longly and so

frequently as it is. Our people, every sensible person knows, have difficulties enough to contend with, without calling their attention to miseries which exist only in the prolific imagination of those who appeal to the prejudices of the people with the view of affecting the electorate at the next general election. But they will find hereafter, as they have found heretofore, that the rural classes of this Dominion are intelligent thinkers, and that they know that the mere fact of a large exodus from the rural districts does not prove that they are not in a better condition under the National Policy than they were under the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and than they would be under the policy foreshadowed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say frankly, from my own knowledge and experience in contact with people on the other side of the line, and it has been considerable, that the level-headed people there have no desire to annex Canada to the United States. They feel that they have already a sufficiently large territory to govern. They indeed begin to fear socialists and labour societies and similar institutions; the negro question is also unsettled, and they seriously fear that the time may come when they will be called upon to see to it that their territory is not curtailed. It would be silly nonsense to mislead the people on this side of the line to believe that the people of the United States are anxious to have Canada annexed. This may be the opinion of a few malcontents who left Canada, and who live on the other side of the line; it may be the opinion of those who have gone there and made places for themselves which reflect credit on the great country to the north whose nativity they claim. There is not an institution in the United States of any consequence in which a Canadian is unrepresented, and the prosperity which attended them before Canada adopted the National Policy has had the effect of attracting others to follow them. I might recount innumerable instances of the prosperity which attended people who left the eastern portions of Canada; the same might be said of those who left the western portion; and some of them may be under the impression that the fiscal policy of this country is detrimental to the best interests of the labouring classes and the poorer classes generally. They are a misguided people if they think so. I have no hesitation in saying, from my experience on both sides of the line, that, with a judicious National Policy adopted on this side, such as they have adopted, Canada will prosper in spite of any policy that our neighbours may adopt to the contrary; but if a policy similar to that which existed in this country between 1874 and 1878 be adopted, and a duty be reimposed on tea, sugar, molasses, rice and other articles which are essential, to some extent, to the poorer classes, there will be serious danger of more of our people

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

crossing the line. The object of the National Policy, therefore, should be to develop the manufacturing industries, the mining industries and all the other industries of this country, and to increase, as far as lies in our power, the consuming population of this Dominion so as to secure a market for the products of the soil within the Dominion itself. In my opinion, the only hope for this Dominion lies in the continuance of the National Policy on the lines on which it has been conducted since 1879, for the purpose of assuring our national industries that they will be permanently maintained; otherwise our people will flow in larger numbers to the other side of the line, and, while we are glad to see them prosper there, there is no Canadian but will be glad to pursue a policy which will retain, if not all, at least as many as possible, of them within the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any length; but I cannot permit myself to give a silent vote on this question. It is a duty I owe to my constituents to rise in my place, and, in a word or two, to record my protest against this National Policy which has pressed so heavily upon them, and which has done so much to foster and build up combines and monopolies to prey upon and impoverish our country. I am, therefore, strongly in favour of tariff reform, not simply one or two insignificant and trifling changes such as have been proposed by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but a substantial reduction of duties along the whole line on our cottons, woollens, agricultural implements, coal oil, iron, and everything required for daily use on the farm. If we want to see this country as prosperous as it should be, we should adopt the policy of freer trade, as far as we can, consistent with a tariff for revenue purposes. We should also adopt a policy of economy and retrenchment, cutting down expenditure all along the line, to as great an extent as would be compatible with the efficient carrying on of the public service of the country. The pruning-knife should be applied unsparingly to every unnecessary expenditure. We all know that the National Policy has signally failed to benefit the farmers. Not one of the many promises made to them under that iniquitous policy has ever been or ever can be fulfilled. They were told that it would give them a home market, better prices for their products, enhance the value of their property, check the exodus of our people, and make us prosperous and happy; but the result has been exactly the reverse in every particular. We know that we have to pay more for every article we require to purchase than we would have to pay under a revenue tariff, and the farmers do not get a single cent more for anything they have to sell. Their surplus products are all sold in foreign

markets. They have to depend on the foreign markets of Great Britain and the United States as before, and the prices there rule the market here. The farmers property has depreciated in value, in my own county at least 25 or 30 per cent. I do not say that is all due to the National Policy; but I do think the National Policy has contributed very largely to that result, because the farmer is getting less for his products under the present policy, the value of the land having depreciated. The exodus of our people goes on unchecked, not only unchecked, but increasing. Now, I do not wish to say that our farmers have not enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity, because that would not be strictly correct; but I do say that they are not so prosperous as they ought to be, considering their industry and frugality and the immense natural resources of the Dominion of Canada. They are not so prosperous as they would have been if less money had been wrung from their pockets by this policy. They are not even so prosperous as they were under the much-abused Mackenzie Administration, and the reason is obvious. We know that there has been a very large increase in the expenditure of this country. Under the Mackenzie Government the annual expenditure was only \$23,000,000 or \$24,000,000, that has been increased to \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000, and \$100,000,000 has been added to the net debt of the Dominion; but that is not all. Who can tell the untold millions which have gone into the pockets of the manufacturers, combinesters and monopolists? A very good authority, one of our leading papers, put it at \$20,000,000 annually. Whether it be more or less I cannot say, but that is sufficient to account for the depression and hard times, and for the feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction which prevails throughout the Dominion. The way in which these combines operate upon the people was very clearly pointed out a few evenings ago on the occasion of the debate on the binder twine. Now, that was only one combine, and we have a great many others that are preying upon the people, notably the cotton, iron, steel, agricultural implement, coal oil, woollen, stove and sugar combines. It will be remembered that, on that occasion, hon. gentlemen on both sides, notably the hon. member for Assiniboia West (Mr. Davin), pointed out how that combine had closed a number of factories at Lachute, St. John and Quebec, driven away their operators, crushed out all competition, and fleeced the farmers unmercifully for the benefit of the combines, not only in Canada but even in the United States. These are grave charges, very serious charges, and so far as I know they have not been denied; nay, more, I believe they cannot be denied. I know that at Lachute we had a large and prosperous cordage factory, which was doing a good business, giving employment to a very

considerable number of men, and of great benefit to the town and neighbourhood; but a little more than two years ago that factory was leased by the combines for the purpose of being closed. The rental, if I recollect right, \$7,500 per annum, was to be paid for twenty-one years, and a guardian was to be paid to take care of the factory. The factory was closed; the employees were forced to seek employment wherever they could get it—probably some of them have gone to swell the exodus—and the farmers were left to the tender mercies of the combine, and forced to pay such prices as the combine thought proper to demand. That was not all. The prosperity of the town was blighted by the act of the combine. It must have cost at least \$150,000, probably \$200,000, to close that factory and kill off competition. It is true, we still have the tall chimneys; but the fires are put out, the doors are closed, and the hum of industry is hushed and silenced for twenty-one years; and yet, strange to say, the Government still protects that combine to the extent of 12½ per cent. Now, I believe that is the natural result of protection. Some tell us it is a decayed and rotten branch. I do not think so. I think it is the ripe fruit of that upas-tree, and I believe the only remedy is free trade. The axe should be laid to the root of the tree, and the tree should be cut down, root and branch, without mercy. I think the present time is opportune to do this. We all know there is a strong public sentiment at present in favour of tariff reform. The press have been advocating it for months. The very atmosphere is laden with tariff reform. The people are expecting substantial relief and a lightening of the burdens which are oppressing them; but I fear they are doomed to disappointment. They are told that they must wait until to-morrow. If we look to the United States—and I think there is no treason in that—we see that there the farmers have risen in their might and cast their votes in favour of tariff reform. They, too, have suffered from protection perhaps quite as much as we; but they have determined to emancipate themselves from the tyranny and oppression of the monopolists. What has taken place there, I believe, will take place here. Our farmers have suffered long; but there is a limit to their forbearance. I believe there are indications even now that there is a storm of righteous indignation rising against the perpetrators of the iniquitous tax laws now imposed on the people which will sweep away the whole fabric of protection.

Mr. GILLIES. I, too, in common with my friends on this side of the House, ardently join in the congratulations extended to the Finance Minister on the masterful manner in which he has managed the financial affairs of this country since the time he assumed office, and also on the masterly exposition of the policy he has pursued in the course of that management. I

was considerably surprised a few evenings ago listening to the speech which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) addressed to this House. He arrogated to himself the right to speak for the whole of the Maritime provinces, and he particularly addressed himself to that portion of these provinces to which I belong. In the course of his remarks, he ventured to say that of all parts of the Dominion that which has suffered most from the effects of the National Policy is the Island of Cape Breton. Well, Sir, I was born and brought up in the Island of Cape Breton. All my life I have lived there, and I assume to be in a better position to say what is the condition of the people there than the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who, I doubt ever set foot on that Island. Now, I might almost dismiss him, Mr. Speaker, by saying that if all the parts of this wide Dominion are as well off as the Island of Cape Breton, then, indeed, there is no pity need be extended to them. I was amused at the violent tone in which he spoke while dwelling upon this point, the declamatory style he adopted, the volcanic character of his statements, the indignation he simulated, the white heat he worked himself into, when he denounced the National Policy, and said: Behold its effects upon Cape Breton! There was a time when matters were in a sadly depressed state upon that Island. Yes, there was a time when trade was paralyzed, when operatives and labourers were idle, unable to obtain employment, when destitution among the labouring classes was widespread, and when the cry of commercial war and financial embarrassment was heard throughout that land. But that was from 1874 to 1879, and during the period that hon. gentlemen opposite hold the helm of state. I may be pardoned if, for a few brief moments, I cast a retrospective glance over the National Policy since its introduction in 1878 and its effects upon the two great industries that we pursue most actively in Cape Breton, the mining and fishery industries. Now, if we look over the history of the National Policy since its introduction in 1878 and compare the two periods of time, first from the Confederation to 1878 and, second, from 1878 to the present time, we must admire the marked development and marked progress that have attended the operation of the National Policy since its inauguration by the party now in power. Before we do that it is necessary to refer to figures, and I am quite aware how dry and uninteresting figures must be to the House at this juncture of the debate, continuing as it has since the 14th of the present month. In 1878 the total railway mileage of this Dominion was only 6,143 miles. In 1891 we had 14,000 miles in operation. In 1878 the whole railway system of the Dominion of Canada earned only \$20,520,000; in 1890 the whole earnings of the railway system amounted to \$48,192,000, or considerably over one hundred per cent increase. In 1868, the year after the completion of the Confederacy of these provinces, the whole railway capital of the Dominion of Canada amounted to \$160,000,000. In the year 1891, the last year for which the statistics of the Dominion are available, the total railway capital had increased to the enormous sum of \$817,000,000, or an increase of over 500 per cent in twenty-three years. These figures are in themselves sufficient to show the healthy and wonderful progress of the Dominion as the earnings of the roads keep pace with the increased mileage and capital. Now, there is another test of the commercial advancement of a country, and that is the number of money orders that are issued within the country. In 1878, the last year of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, we had a total sum of money orders issued of \$7,130,000. But, in 1891, the sum of \$12,478,000 were issued, or an increase of something like 80 per cent. There is another test equally valuable and that is the position of the banks in 1878, as contrasted—not compared, but contrasted—with the position they occupied in 1891. In 1878, the year these gentlemen left the Treasury benches and were sent to the other side of the House, we find the total amount of bank notes in circulation to be \$19,351,000, but in 1891 the amount was swollen to the enormous sum of \$31,379,000. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will understand what this means. It means that business had become so greatly extended and so enormously developed that the sum of \$31,000,000 was required for business in 1891, when only \$19,000,000 was required to do that business thirteen years before. There is another test which is of equal authority with the one I have submitted to the House as showing the prosperity of the country, and that is the deposits made by the people, chiefly people of the working classes and artisans, in the banking institutions of the country, and, if we take that as a test, we shall see that the advance made was indeed of a marvellous character. In 1878 the total deposits in the commercial banks of the Dominion were \$71,400,000; in 1891 this had increased to \$149,431,000, or in other words, in 1878, for every man, woman and child in the Dominion there was an average deposit to the credit of the people in the banks of \$18; in the year 1891 the sum per head in the commercial banks of the country had increased to \$30. Another test, which is equally strong with this, and which I will give to the House as an additional reason that warrants me in saying that the prosperity of the country has gone on by leaps and bounds, is the deposits in the savings banks. In 1879 the total deposits in the savings banks were \$3,552,000; in 1891 these had increased \$21,738,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these facts show us how striking the progress of the country has been since the inauguration of the National Policy. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), when

Mr. GILLIES.

cent increase. In 1868, the year after the completion of the Confederacy of these provinces, the whole railway capital of the Dominion of Canada amounted to \$160,000,000. In the year 1891, the last year for which the statistics of the Dominion are available, the total railway capital had increased to the enormous sum of \$817,000,000, or an increase of over 500 per cent in twenty-three years. These figures are in themselves sufficient to show the healthy and wonderful progress of the Dominion as the earnings of the roads keep pace with the increased mileage and capital. Now, there is another test of the commercial advancement of a country, and that is the number of money orders that are issued within the country. In 1878, the last year of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, we had a total sum of money orders issued of \$7,130,000. But, in 1891, the sum of \$12,478,000 were issued, or an increase of something like 80 per cent. There is another test equally valuable and that is the position of the banks in 1878, as contrasted—not compared, but contrasted—with the position they occupied in 1891. In 1878, the year these gentlemen left the Treasury benches and were sent to the other side of the House, we find the total amount of bank notes in circulation to be \$19,351,000, but in 1891 the amount was swollen to the enormous sum of \$31,379,000. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will understand what this means. It means that business had become so greatly extended and so enormously developed that the sum of \$31,000,000 was required for business in 1891, when only \$19,000,000 was required to do that business thirteen years before. There is another test which is of equal authority with the one I have submitted to the House as showing the prosperity of the country, and that is the deposits made by the people, chiefly people of the working classes and artisans, in the banking institutions of the country, and, if we take that as a test, we shall see that the advance made was indeed of a marvellous character. In 1878 the total deposits in the commercial banks of the Dominion were \$71,400,000; in 1891 this had increased to \$149,431,000, or in other words, in 1878, for every man, woman and child in the Dominion there was an average deposit to the credit of the people in the banks of \$18; in the year 1891 the sum per head in the commercial banks of the country had increased to \$30. Another test, which is equally strong with this, and which I will give to the House as an additional reason that warrants me in saying that the prosperity of the country has gone on by leaps and bounds, is the deposits in the savings banks. In 1879 the total deposits in the savings banks were \$3,552,000; in 1891 these had increased \$21,738,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these facts show us how striking the progress of the country has been since the inauguration of the National Policy. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), when

addressing the House a few days ago, said the only test of the progress of the country was the increase of its population. At that time I differed with his views and said that was only one of the tests. If we search into the history of some of the countries of the world, some of which are semi-barbaric, while some others can hardly be said to have advanced even to a semi-civilized state, we shall find how wide from accuracy the hon. gentleman's standard of progress was of accuracy. If increase of population was the only sure test of development and growth and progress in a country, then China must be a great country, because we find that from 1736 to 1812, a period of seventy-six years, the population of China increased from 125,000,000 to 360,000,000, or almost 300 per cent. Her commerce was at a standstill, in fact it was nothing; her imports and exports were practically nil, but still her population had gone on to the extent I have shown. If my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was correct in the statement that increase of the population of the country was the true and only basis to estimate its progress, then China would be a marvellously progressive country. But we all know that the contrary is the fact. Let us take another instance of that kind, and I think it goes even further to demolish the accuracy of the standard he sets up. Take Tartary. From 1858 to 1885, we find the population of Tartary had increased from 1,295,000 to 5,327,000, or an increase of about, in 17 years, 350 per cent, showing that the increase in population of a country is not at all the true standard by which to judge of its advancement. Yet no one possessed of sanity—I will not say intelligence—will allege that Tartary is an ideal progressive country. It may suit the hon. member for Guysborough's views of progress, and is possibly his beau-ideal of a commercially great, civilized and refined community; if so, then his test standard of the progress of a country is a correct one. Take Russia, one of the most, financially and commercially, backward countries in the world, and we find that from 1858 to 1885 the population had increased from 59,000,000 to 81,000,000, or an increase of 37 per cent; yet no man with a knowledge of current history will say that Russia is a progressive country. Take Siberia. Probably our hon. friends opposite, who have been so long in Opposition, and in political exile, may have some knowledge, figuratively speaking, of that country. During the same period, Siberia increased from 2,936,000 to 4,314,000, or an increase of over 90 per cent. I quote these figures simply to show how far astray the hon. member for Guysborough was when he stated that the increase in population was the one true test of the advancement and development of a country, and that the country that does not show a large increase in its population is going headlong to ruin. But my hon. friend from Guysborough is accustomed

to sing out in this sort of a way. He went down to Cape Breton about a year ago with this tale of woe, with blood in his eye, and stale jokes in his mouth, and I leave it to himself to tell what the result of his mission was on that memorable occasion. For my part, I felt very grateful to that hon. gentleman for his campaign on that occasion. He was like the Arcadian of old, ready either to sing or to pray. He was ready to play a game of cards, or to preside over a prayer meeting; in fact, a many-sided sort of mock hero, but the intelligent people of Richmond taught him the lesson he deserved; his developed humptiousness was too transparent, and they would have none of himself, his silly jokes and meaningless political propagandism of woe and black despair. All he did in my county was to increase my majority from 101 to over 300. He hied himself hurriedly out of my county, and made an incursion into the county of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. McDonald), and what was the result there? The presence in this House of my hon. and stalwart friend from Victoria sufficiently answers the question. But we were in the unfortunate position that we could not get at him; the election courts dealt more generously by him than by us; if we had only had that opportunity, I do not think that we would be troubled this session by the stale jokes of the hon. member for Guysborough. But, Sir, no doubt we will meet him again, and the result will be reversed, and this House will be relieved of his dead weight and our province of a great humiliation. Now, Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I wish to give a few reasons why I think it would be wrong and inexpedient for any member in this House coming from the Maritime provinces, to vote for that amendment. I do not pretend to say that the National Policy is a sacred edifice, upon which we should not lay our hands in the way of amendments; and in this respect I differ from my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). In fact, he sticks to it so very closely that he is open to the charge of political heresy; because the Minister of Justice has openly declared that the mouldering branches will be lopped away. Now, the National Policy has been touched more than once since its introduction in 1878, and every time it was touched, I think it was improved. The National Policy was introduced at a time when the commerce of this country was at a frightfully low ebb. Conditions having changed, it has been found necessary to change the National Policy with them. For instance, the duty upon anthracite coal was abolished; still the National Policy stood. The duty upon sugar was abolished; still the National Policy stood. The duty upon binder twine and coal oil this year has been reduced by the Government; still the National Policy stands. We have amended

the tariff, as brought down in 1878, as the exigencies of commerce demanded from time to time, and if we continue to do so, in obedience to the requirements of the country, will we not be doing well? Will we not be acting upon the lines that inspired the Government when they inaugurated that policy? I cannot at all agree with the idea that has been expressed by one hon. gentleman, that if one brick is taken out of the National Policy, the whole edifice will crumble and fall. I think that is a mistaken idea, and it arises from a clinging desire to hold on to the National Policy in all its parts and details. This is not my idea. We must move with the country, the times and their ever varying changes, no matter how much the conditions of the country may have changed. Sir, I was very much pleased indeed to hear the announcement from the Finance Minister, that strict attention would be given, during the coming recess, to the necessary changes that may require to be made in the tariff. I hope these changes will not be made in an inconsiderate manner, nor without due regard to all existing interests, and in this respect it is well to make haste slowly. I am satisfied that after the Government have given the question that consideration it merits, during the recess, the changes which may be found necessary, will be proposed in the Budget next year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the National Policy, as it now exists, through the modifications that have been made, is a policy favourable to our fishermen and to our miners. If it were not so, I would not for a moment support that policy. I am here to do what is right by my constituents, and I am here to-night to support that policy, and it is because it has done well by them that I support it. Take, for instance, our fishing classes. There is not a single article used by them, if you except coal oil, that really pays a duty, and the duty upon this article has been lowered this year, to be followed by another decrease, I hope, next year. Their tea is free, their coffee is free, their sugar and salt are free. Their nets, their twines, their hooks and lines, their anchors and chains are as free as the air they breathe or the water they drink. Is not, therefore, the National Policy favourable to them as a class? Every article they consume, except coal oil, is free; and mind you, the strongest men on the other side of the House are for the retention of the duty on coal oil. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) will agree with that. I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to show any articles used by our fishermen which our hon. friends opposite would exempt from duty, if, unfortunately for the country, they should attain to power. I challenge them now to name any list of articles, or any article whatever. Hon. gentlemen may not be familiar with the importance and extent of the fishing industry in the Maritime provinces. In 1891 there were 678 vessels employed in that industry, with a tonnage of 25,623 tons and manned by

Mr. GILLIES.

5,184 men. That fleet was composed of vessels belonging to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. There were also 12,836 boats employed, manned by 24,105 men, all belonging to those three provinces I have named; or a total of 29,280 men employed in our fisheries. Every pair of boots and shoes, every hat and cap they wear, as well as many other articles are all manufactured in the Upper provinces. Take again our mines. In 1873, the last year of the Conservative Administration, the output of our coal mines was 811,000 tons; in 1879, the last year under administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to which their tariff applied, the output decreased to 688,000 tons. The National Policy then came into operation, and from that date until now the output has been steadily increasing, until in 1891 it had increased to 1,786,111 tons, or an increase, as compared with 1879, of over 250 per cent. Only hon. gentlemen who are fully familiar with the ramifications of that trade can understand what such a large output of coal really means. It means that it employs 5,324 skilled men and labourers, and supports 4,641 families, or a total population of 23,205. I quote from the return for the past year of the Nova Scotia Mines Office. Hon. gentlemen will observe from these figures that our fisheries support something like 30,000 people, a race of men whose—

March is on the ocean wave,
Whose home is on the deep.

Men who are engaged in a very precarious calling and entitled to the paternal protection of any Government. I do not care to which party we may belong, these are men who are entitled to the protection of the Government, and who have their nets and materials admitted free of duty, and thereby receive this protection from the Government, and for that reason they support candidates supporting this Government's paternal and protective policy. I am at a loss to know how hon. gentlemen opposite propose to run the business of this country under what they call free trade. As I take it, the business of this Dominion may be likened to that of a municipality, a certain amount of money is required to run the Government, just as in the same way a certain amount is needed to conduct the business of a municipality. Under the present system the Administration requires about \$36,000,000 with which to conduct its business. That amount is collected by the present Government in two ways. First, by revenue raised by taxation through the tariff, and, second, from other sources, which are sales of public lands, public works, post office and so on. From this source \$8,165,000 were received last year. If we adopt freer trade or unrestricted reciprocity we lose immediately the sum we obtain from the United States, which last year amounted to \$7,814,000. I should ask hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. mem-

ber for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), how they propose to make up that loss. The answer must be, by direct taxation. That would mean the imposition of a direct tax of \$1.60 per head on every man, woman and child in this Dominion. Does the hon. gentleman wish direct taxation to that extent to be imposed on the people of his own county? If so, then let him upon those lines be an advocate of unrestricted reciprocity. Or will it be proposed to reduce the public service? I should like to ask hon. gentlemen what service they propose to lop off? They cannot get clear of the interest of the public debt; that is as immutable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Not civil government, not surely the administration of justice, not mail subsidies and steamboat subventions, because hon. gentlemen opposite wish them to be increased. Certainly not subsidies to provinces, because \$4,000,000 must be provided. Certainly not North-west Mounted Police, not the Department of Indian Affairs, because hon. gentlemen opposite were the parties who entered into the treaties with the Indians, entailing an expenditure of almost \$1,000,000 a year, and indeed those treaties were framed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he was Minister of the Interior. All those services must be kept up, that we must obtain \$36,000,000 annually; and if this cannot be done by incidental taxation, it must be done by direct taxation. I prefer incidental taxation, as we have it now, as it bears lightly upon the poorer classes. But if reciprocity is the best thing for this country, how are we to secure it? Two parties are required to make a bargain. We have always been willing, as any person conversant with the history of our own times knows, to enter into reciprocity arrangements with our neighbours. The Treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the Americans, and they gave the necessary year's notice in 1865. That was the first step towards commercial unfriendliness on the part of the United States. In 1866 we sent three of our very best men in the Dominion of Canada down to Washington for the express purpose of attempting to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. These men were Sir Alexander Galt, Sir William P. Howland and the late Hon. Joseph Howe; and the United States refused every single overture made by them in favour of a reciprocity treaty.

Mr. FRASER. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. GILLIES. I am certainly in favour of reciprocity upon fair terms, and will do all in my power to bring it about.

Mr. FRASER. Another question: where is he going to make up that revenue?

Mr. GILLIES. What revenue?

Mr. FRASER. The revenue that is lost when you get reciprocity.

Mr. GILLIES. Where is it lost? Our

proposals for a treaty are specific, namely, in natural products. My hon. friend is not going to get clear in that way. My hon. friend shouts out for unrestricted reciprocity; but I have yet to learn, and I have not yet met the man in the Dominion of Canada who has learned, how this loss is to be made up by hon. gentlemen opposite. In fact, their own leader did not understand it, and he told them so very distinctly. I notice my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition smiles at this statement. When I mentioned their leader, I referred entirely to the late leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blake. But I think my hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition has his hands full now to explain how he will make up this deficiency. If he can do so, he will, I am sure, in a large measure, instruct and enlighten his followers, as he will certainly the country, for they know not nor has he ever explained how he can manage it. In 1869 there was a third attempt made to get reciprocity with the United States. At that time Sir John Rose, then Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada, went down to Washington, and on behalf of Canada endeavoured to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, but the Americans would not hear of it. The failure in the negotiation of a treaty did not rest with the Canadians; it took two to make the bargain; the Canadians were willing, while the Americans were unwilling, and so the negotiations fell through. In 1874 our hon. friends opposite suddenly found themselves in power and they tried their prentice hand at treaty making. They sent down one of the ablest men in their ranks, the Hon. George Brown, and he failed to negotiate a treaty. The fault did not rest with our hon. friends on the other side of the House. They did their best to obtain a treaty, but it took two parties to make a bargain; they were willing, the Americans were unwilling, and the negotiations fell through. If it was so easy to complete a reciprocity treaty with the Americans, why was it that they failed on that occasion? They were five years in power, and though they made the attempt honestly and earnestly enough immediately after coming into power, they failed most ignominiously; and simply because the Americans would not enter into negotiations with them. Then, there was our statutory offer of reciprocity on the Statute-book from 1879 until it was repealed in 1888, but no advantage was taken of it. In 1885 the Americans abrogated the treaty that had been formed a few years before. That was the sixth time they signified their unwillingness to have anything to do with us commercially. In 1887 Sir Charles Tupper went down to Washington and made an unrestricted offer of reciprocity. Our hon. friends opposite often confound that with an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, but the two are very different. Again, in 1887,

It will be in the memory of gentlemen in this House, a treaty was drawn up by Mr. Chamberlin, the British plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper representing Canada, and Mr. Bayard, representing the United States, and was submitted for ratification to the House of Commons of Great Britain, this House and the Senate of the United States. It was ratified here without a division; the same was done in the British Parliament; but the United States Senate threw it out, showing most conclusively that they did not want to have anything to do with us whatever. Surely this is abundant and conclusive evidence to show the willingness and desire of Canada to have fair and equitable commercial relations with our neighbours across the line. Since then there have been other instances of their unwillingness to have reciprocal relations with us; but I think these are sufficient to show that the fault has not been with either of the Governments in power on this side of the line. The Liberals did their best to obtain a treaty, and the Conservative Government have done their best; but it takes two to make a bargain, and, the Americans being unwilling, the negotiations upon every occasion fell through. Now, I do not wish to weary the House, because this debate has already grown to a wearisome length. In Canada we have a great country. Its vast extent, its inland seas, its great people, all conduce to make it a grand nation. We have boundless prairies, over 3,000,000 square miles in extent. We have towering forests of immense value, we have all the economic mineral wealth that a great northern country requires. We have a complete system of navigation from the head of Lake Superior to the sea, a distance of 2,500 miles. We have the country peopled by three of the greatest races on which the sun has ever shone, the Saxon, the Norman and the Celt, are girdled together in the great belt of this Dominion; and if we continue to develop the country on the lines we have pursued since the introduction of the National Policy, Canada will become the great nation she is destined by Providence to become, that is, one of the finest on this earth. To bring this about is our great mission here, and when we shall have passed to that great home to which we are all so fast hastening, let our children be able to point with pride to the record in this respect we have left behind.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, many of the statistical portions of the speech which has just been addressed to the House seem very much like so many pages taken from the Statistical Year Book, compiled under the direction of the Government statistician. They are not particularly discriminating, nor do they at all go to prove that the National Policy or any particular portion of the National Policy is responsible for the apparent growth and prosperity in-

Mr. GILLIES.

dicated by them. They have become so familiar and have been repeated at such great length in this House and in the country that I am beginning to believe that the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House actually believe that they represent the growth and development of the country to be caused solely by the present tariff. Any person who carefully studies and considers economic questions must be aware that into all these particulars a large number and a great variety of elements must enter. Is it not the utmost absurdity to say that because the railway mileage, for instance, has largely increased during the last fifteen years, that increase is solely to be attributed to the tariff policy of the present Administration, which was inaugurated in 1879? We ought to be candid in matters of this kind. No matter how biassed the hon. gentlemen opposite may be in favour of the policy on which they base their political existence, they ought to be willing to admit that some other elements must enter into the progress of the country in all these directions. The railway mileage, it is true, has enormously increased, and some portion of it may have been affected favourably by the policy of the present administration; but any one who knows the history of the country must be fully aware that the elements which went to make the basis of railway extension existed long anterior to the introduction of the National Policy, and were largely developed under the Liberal régime, so that the way was fully prepared for the enormous development, in that particular at any rate, without any reference whatever to the taxation policy of the country. The principal increase in railway mileage has been that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now that great work was strenuously urged and ardently supported by Parliament and the country during the whole Liberal régime. Just here allow me to remark that our friends take too much credit to themselves and the National Policy in the comprehensive scope which, when it suits their purposes, they see fit to give that policy. The Minister of Finance and those who follow him pretend that the National Policy is not merely a tariff policy but a railway policy; they pretend that it embraces the various movements which have been undertaken by this Government towards the extension of interprovincial trade. Well, we know that, with the exception of the protective features of the tariff, all the other features now boasted of existed before this Government came into power, and must necessarily exist under any authority which undertakes to govern the country. Railway extension, interprovincial communication, and the development of our various lines of external and internal commerce, is a common heritage, a necessity which must fall on both political parties, and which I challenge hon. gentlemen on the other side to show were not fully

carried out and earnestly pressed forward in every direction by the Liberals, when they governed the country. Do we not find ourselves taunted with the fact that during the Liberal regime the national debt increased something like \$8,000,000 per annum? Are we not charged with that increase because we were carrying out honestly and earnestly the policy, which was in a great degree the policy of both parties, that of extending our railway system and developing the Northwest, as well as carrying on public works for the benefit of the people of the Maritime provinces? Therefore, when our hon. friends opposite attribute all the elements of development and progress of the country to the National Policy they are trifling with the intelligence of the people, and are assuming that which they have no right to assume as their special prerogative and sole results of their policy. The only thing in which, in a large and general degree, the policy hon. gentlemen opposite differs from the policy of the Liberal party is the protective features of the tariff. I listened with a great deal of care and interest to the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen supporting the Administration who have just closed their arguments; and while I congratulate them upon the ability they have displayed, I must also congratulate them upon the careful manner in which they have avoided almost every reference to tariff reform. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) said it was a subject that required great delicacy of approach, and I noticed he approached it with such delicacy that he never came near it at all. He quoted statistics of many years back, showing, as I said before, a very pleasing indication of progress in various directions. Another distinction should, in fairness and candour, be made by those who aspire to secure the ear of the people. They ought to discriminate between the general progress made in any direction, and that portion which might be attributed to the tariff policy of the country. From the Finance Minister down, they have referred to the savings banks and the indications of progress made in that particular. Now, while there has been development in this branch, I think it is altogether going too far to assume that this indicates something so extraordinary, so abnormal, so generous in its proportions that it points to a complete and triumphant success of the tariff policy of the Administration. While the increased deposits in the Dominion savings banks and the Post Office savings banks represent the growth of a disposition on the part of large numbers of the people to deposit their savings there, it does not indicate any very enormous development of wealth among the working classes and among what we call the medium classes throughout the country. Those who are not conversant with statistics refer to the savings of the people. They say: "Look at \$40,000,000 in the Government savings banks," which the people recognize as

the most solid security they can have. They seem to imagine it is something very extraordinary and great; but it is not so. The savings of our people, while showing certain progress in this direction, are really small in proportion to their numbers and resources, and considering the security given by the Government guarantee. I notice that the Dominion statistician, whether through inadvertence or dishonesty, omitted to give that information which might be furnished as to the savings in other countries, so that we might be able to draw comparisons and measure our own progress by that of others. We have \$40,000,000 in the Government savings banks. The little state of Maine, with a population something over 600,000, has \$47,000,000 in the savings banks of that state—in banks which are private property and not guaranteed by the state. 600,000 people in the state of Maine have \$47,000,000 deposited in their savings banks, and Maine is not the most prosperous state in the Union. Yet in this state there are more deposits in the savings banks than there are in the savings banks of the whole Dominion, with its population of 5,000,000. Yet our friends opposite, in and out of season, are always pointing to the enormous deposits in the savings banks, as indicating some great virtue in the taxation policy of the Government in making people rich. As this is an interesting subject, I will give a few statistics of the bank circulation, comparing our own with the neighbouring Republic, in order that we may somewhat diminish the proud and boastful spirit which is encouraged too much in this House, a spirit which is removed from the true spirit of progress, and which we ought to modify if we desire people to understand that while they have been fairly successful and have much to be thankful for, yet they can look abroad and see what other states, in their industry and economic progress, have accomplished. New Hampshire, with a population of 376,530, a smaller population than the province of Nova Scotia, has \$69,531,024 in the savings banks, and the 5,000,000 of people in Canada have \$40,000,000. Vermont has \$21,620,303 in the savings banks. Massachusetts, with a population half that of the Dominion, and with its enormous banking system, which absorbs an immense proportion of the savings of the people, still has in the states savings banks, not guaranteed by the state, \$353,592,937, and the Dominion of Canada, with twice its population, has 40,000,000 only. Rhode Island has \$63,719,491; Connecticut has \$116,406,675; New York, \$574,669,972; New Jersey, \$32,462,603; Pennsylvania, \$62,150,893; Maryland, \$38,916,597, and California, \$114,164,523. I have selected those states which have the largest deposits. Now we come to bank deposits, and here let me say that I am aware that I lay myself open to the attack which is made upon us all from the other side of the House, when we venture to give comparative figures to show that our

neighbours are not in the position constantly represented by hon. gentlemen opposite—they declare that we are puffing the United States of America, that we are unpatriotic in decrying our own country. Yet it seems very popular and very satisfactory to our friends on the other side, to select such portions of the statistical information which is given, as will show that the national prosperity of the United States is not advancing. The banking deposits of Canada are very large, and they are referred to here in almost every discussion with a great deal of satisfaction, and so far as these figures indicate happiness, business progress, industry, the hon. members on this side of the House most cordially join in the pride with which they are quoted. We are glad to notice evidences of growth and development in Canada, as indicated by the savings banks deposits, or in any other way. Yet at the same time, great as they may be, we may look across the line and see that, notwithstanding that we have a population which, I think it would be safe to say, possess a higher average of those qualities which go to make a wealthy nation, we find that in our banks, apart from savings banks, we have \$153,625,426, while the United States has a total deposit in their banks of \$2,410,196,739. Reducing this to the average per capita, we find that the people of the United States have on the average about 100 per cent more of ordinary bank deposits than we have in this country. What the real significance of that may be I am not competent, and I presume there are many others in this House not competent, from lack of financial knowledge, to judge accurately. But, at the same time, taking a superficial view of the picture, we shall be safe in saying that if the United States has \$16 per capita on the average of ordinary bank deposits, and the Dominion of Canada has only \$8 per capita, we have an example of prosperity which shows that we have not attained the highest attainable point, an example which we should emulate and strive to equal before we boast so inordinately of the position we have attained. The position of the Dominion is very fair compared with other portions of the world, but it has not yet reached the extraordinary stage of development which should lead us to believe there is nothing higher to be attained. I desire to state, while referring to the subject of savings banks deposits, that it is a question which has attracted great attention, and that I have some further data with regard to it. The savings banks deposits of the United States per head are \$25; in the Dominion of Canada, \$8. And you must bear in mind that in the United States there are enormous masses of the population that have no savings bank deposits to speak of at all, as, for instance, in the southern states, and some other parts of the country. The average per head in the state of Maine is \$72.30; in Massachusetts, \$113; in Maryland, \$37.50. The

Mr. FLINT.

United Kingdom, of course, has a population differing very largely from our own, both in the higher and in the lower classes, the lines of cleavage between the rich and poor being much more distinctly marked than they are in this country. And yet the United Kingdom has in the savings banks an average of \$8.72 per head, as against \$8.15 per head in Canada. New South Wales has an average of \$110.30; Victoria, \$88.81; Tasmania, \$74.60. Taking the aggregate of seven Australian colonies with a population of 3,463,535, we find that in their savings banks they have \$75,400,000, while Canada, with a population of 1,000,000 more has deposits of but \$40,000,000. The average per head in the Australian colonies is \$21.75, and in Canada, \$8.15. I think these figures may give us food for reflection, and may show that while the Dominion of Canada has a large amount of deposits, yet, in proportion to the natural resources of the country, in proportion to the population of the country and its character for industry, sobriety and economy, it has not yet attained that measure of prosperity, as indicated by the savings banks deposits that should be entirely satisfactory. I shall not occupy your time by running over a large number of matters which were referred to by the previous speakers which were a little out of the ordinary line of discussion, in connection with the Budget, but I must say I was somewhat amused by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) and his allusion to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). Of course it is an old political gag to refer to the counties in which the orators on the other side made speeches and to show the effect they had in increasing the majorities against their friends, but I think those who are acquainted with my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) must realize that he is a doughty opponent and is a very comfortable assistant to have at the time of an election. And, if there was any gain in the vote of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), we can attribute it not to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and his speeches, but to the boodle bag which was represented by some other members and which he had at his back in that campaign to assist him to overcome the efforts of my hon. friend from Guysborough. I will not here discourse upon the arguments which Government candidates in these degenerate times can employ to upset completely the most glowing periods and the most eloquent arguments of an Opposition orator. I regret it very much. It seems unfortunate and distressing to those who hope well for this country, but it is too true, that with the prerogatives of the Crown dragged in the dust by the candidates and by the Ministers of the Crown, with the promises of Government assistance which are placed before the constituencies in times of election, the Opposition candidate, no matter what his eloquence, or his integrity, or the strength of his position, logically or constitutionally, is

very apt to be overborne by the pictures presented of immediate personal gain and profit held out by the Government candidates and by Ministers of the Crown. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who preceded me upon the opposite side, took up the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and made some comments upon it. He read the resolution, taking up the first clause :

The present customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion.

The hon. gentleman denies the correctness of that statement. Now, I think a careful perusal of the very thorough and exhaustive remarks which have been made upon this side of the House since the beginning of this discussion, would disprove the strong negative made by that hon. gentleman. But I need not repeat the observations made upon this side in order to refute the point taken by that speaker ; I need only refer to the admissions of the Finance Minister himself that there is unrest, there is dissatisfaction, there is complaint, in the various portions of the country. I need not allude to the attitude of at least three-quarters of a dozen of the ablest representatives of the people from that side of the House, who have moved resolutions in this House, or have placed them upon the Order Paper, looking to a change in the tariff, and to the removal of what they, at any rate, call burdens upon the people and upon the industries of the Dominion. I will go further than that, and refer to authorities which are superior, even, to the Finance Minister himself, speaking as Finance Minister, and superior to the members of this House, speaking from their places : I will refer to the protests of the people themselves, of those who know better than lawyers, and physicians, and even merchants, can know, exactly where the shoe pinches, the exact evils they are endeavouring to overcome, and the difficulties they meet with in their struggle with the conditions of life in this country. I think there is a line somewhere in one of the poems of Rudyard Kipling, in which he says :

The toad beneath the harrow knows
Exactly where each tooth point goes ;
The butterfly upon the road
Preaches contentment to the toad.

And so our Cabinet Ministers preach to the people contentment and happiness ; they tell them they are prosperous and that they are getting rich so fast that they are discontented with the rapidity with which they are making money, and they call attention to these startling statistical statements. But the people themselves know better than those who thus endeavour to instruct them as to "where the tooth point goes." I need scarcely refer to the petitions which have been piled upon the Table of this House,

presented by one or two of the most distinguished members of the Government party. I will read a few lines from some of them, signed by twenty or thirty thousand of the practical farmers, mechanics and representatives of industry in this country, attacking the position of affairs under the tariff so ardently supported by hon. gentlemen opposite. The other day there was a petition presented to the House signed by 13,577 people, who said, among other things :

The agricultural interests of this country are not in as prosperous a condition as we would desire ; that tariff legislation, for the purpose of assisting the manufacturing industries of the country, has been taken advantage of by such manufacturing industries as unduly to enhance the prices of many such articles as are indispensably necessary to the farmers in carrying on the business in which they are engaged.

This language has been penned and sent here by friends, or persons friendly, to the present Administration, and they have placed upon record in very guarded words that the present tariff presses unduly upon the farmers and enhances the prices of many articles necessary for them in carrying on their business. Another petition has been presented signed by over 14,000 of those classes of people who know what they are talking about, stating :

That the farmers and labourers are the great producers of wealth of this country ; that the farmers and labourers are not in as prosperous a condition as we would desire ; that they are materially affected by the prices of the manufactures and commercial commodities of this country.

And so they proceed to arraign the tariff policy of the present Administration. We also find in the press of the day reports of resolutions passed by the various farmers' institutes throughout Ontario, the boards of trade in our large cities, the city councils, particularly of Kingston, and the Conservative clubs in the various portions of the country, all confirming the arguments which have been placed before the House by gentlemen on this side during several years past, as to the manner in which this tariff presses unduly upon the farming classes, upon the labouring classes and upon the fishermen. The Conservative Club at Winnipeg has placed upon record, as reported in the Montreal "Witness" :

That while giving the Dominion Government our loyal and enthusiastic support, yet this association will hail with delight such a reduction in the tariff as would tend to lighten the burdens upon the farmers and the residents of the country, and also introduce stringent legislation to dissolve combines and trusts, declaring them illegal.

If time permitted, and it was at all necessary, I could quote an enormous mass of testimony from various classes as to the pressure of the tariff upon a great many of the people of this Dominion, and all this at the termination of a period of nearly fifteen years of the policy so loudly vaunted upon the other side. This is the fruition of the hopes that were held out to the people when this policy

was placed upon the Statute-book. Now, we find that instead of prosperity, instead of abounding happiness, instead of general contentment, there is unrest and discontent, and protests from almost every portion of the country, with the manner in which this policy has crushed the people and prevented their natural and legitimate development. We all remember the promises which heralded the introduction of this policy, and the manner in which they have been fulfilled. We had promises that it would reduce importation, and it did appear, looking at the matter superficially, as if the imports might be reduced, and as if the balance of trade would be turned, as they call it, in favour of this country. Yet when we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last five years we find that the balance of trade is heavier, to a very large degree, against the Dominion, than it was during the five years of which they bitterly complained when they were in Opposition. The average balance of trade against us was \$20,000,000 for the five years subsequent to Confederation; but the average balance of trade against the Dominion during the last five years in the hey-day of the National Policy, has been still larger by one or two million dollars. They promised that taxation would not be increased; that promise has been signally falsified. Taxation has been enormously increased. They promised us, if we would permit them to increase still further the tariff upon iron manufactures, that a great impetus would be given to the iron industry. Well, we have added one or two million dollars per annum to the taxation of the people of the country, coming directly from the taxation of iron and iron goods, and the bonus given to this industry. Yet, the industry itself has actually declined. None of those glowing promises, which were held out, either as to the opening up of new markets, as to the introduction of a larger population, or as to a general improvement in the condition of the people, have been fulfilled, while in addition to the enormous taxation that has been paid into the Treasury directly every industry has been handicapped and burdened by the extra price of iron and iron materials which were necessary in carrying on those trades to advantage. The Minister of Finance made one or two statements, which although a little apart from the line I have been discussing, I think are of sufficient importance to refer to merely as an incident in this discussion and as a caution to his supporters not to rely too implicitly on his statement, at least in one particular. The hon. gentleman stated in regard to the total increase of expenditure last year, that we paid for a session of 219 days \$1,262,000, while for the preceding year, although there was a longer session, we paid for 155 days \$596,000, and in several instances in the later portions of his speech, he attributed, by inference, at least, to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the responsibility for an increase in the expenditure for legislation.

Mr. FLINT.

In the first place, I presume the Minister of Finance has on his mind so many important matters that he has relied on some one else to give him the figures, and the person who gave him the figures was misled in some way which I cannot account for. Last year, instead of 21½ days, there were only 137 days constituting the session; instead of the expenditure being greater than that of the previous session, it was actually less. Any person, by looking at the returns, can see how this occurred. The previous session lasted into the new financial year, and a large sum of the expenditure for the session of the previous year was charged, as a mere matter of book-keeping, to the succeeding year, which made it appear that the session of 1892 actually covered a longer period than 1891, although the time consumed was much shorter. If the account was carefully balanced for each session by itself, it would be found that last session cost less than the session before by \$414,000 and that the session was much shorter. I think any candid gentleman will agree with me, that, while it is the duty of the Opposition to insist that every question before the House shall be fully debated, and it is not open to the Government to charge them with unduly lengthening the session if they choose to debate important subjects, yet, when the session is lengthened by the act of the Government, it is highly improper to charge the Opposition with being the cause of lengthening the session. The most important matter brought before the House last session was the Criminal Law Bill, a very lengthy and extensive measure. The House did not go into committee on the Bill until the eighty-fourth day of the session, and it was almost the only important Government measure that was brought down. The Redistribution of Seats Bill was introduced sixty-six days after the opening of the session, and the second reading took place on the ninety-eighth day, and the debate on that Bill was very brief. So I think it was unfair, as well as incorrect, to charge the Opposition with being the cause of any increase whatever in the length of the session, even supposing my hon. friend had not made the mistake as to the length. The progress of the country has been alluded to, and there has been progress made. We are gratified with the progress recorded. Why should there not be progress in a country having such vast resources? The fact that the country has made substantial progress in some directions, notwithstanding the burdens of the tariff, is a tribute to the wealth of the country, to the character, intelligence, sobriety, honesty and industry of its people, and it augurs well for its future, if more correct economic conditions can be brought about, to enable the people to develop their resources naturally and properly, without giving undue influence and opportunity for making money to the classes against the masses. It is a complaint, even among hon. gentlemen supporting the Ad-

ministration, that millionaires and mortgages are increasing—millionaires, stimulated, strengthened and encouraged in their position by the false political economy of the Administration and its supporters, and mortgages which the people are compelled to place upon their properties and their goods, in order to keep themselves afloat, waiting for the coming of better days. Not only were we promised at the inauguration of the policy of this Administration, that our import trade would be decreased, and it was not decreased, but it was intimated that an enormous interprovincial trade would be brought about, which would do very much to promote the prosperity of the country. I regret that we have no means provided for measuring the amount of interprovincial trade. It must, however, be very large. But this country, with its resources, composed of its natural resources mainly, cannot build itself up to wealth and prosperity by any interprovincial trade, no matter how large it may be. We cannot get rich by swapping jackknives with each other. We may make the conditions of life more agreeable, we may build up a harmonious and brotherly feeling throughout the provinces, but the sources of wealth of this country are its great natural resources, and outside of this country we must carry our products and bring back the products of other countries in exchange to promote real progress. Our wealth does not consist in cash and bullion in bank vaults and in the hands of private individuals; our prosperity rests upon our trade and profitable enterprise with the peoples of other countries. What has sustained us through these years, notwithstanding the imposition of enormous taxes, but our export trade? Yet hon. gentlemen have the hardihood to say that the National Policy has greatly increased our export trade. I am willing to candidly admit that in some ways the Government may on some occasions smooth the way for this interchange, but, in a large and general sense, our export trade depends, first, on the resources of the country, and also on the blessings of Providence, by which those resources may be utilized, by which those resources may be made profitable, and upon circumstances entirely outside of this country, on prices abroad, and on the creation abroad of a large market for our people, thus affording them a profitable exchange. The export trade of a country like ours is as completely independent of the internal economy of the Government as anything can possibly be; and it is by the enormous exports with which we have been blessed that we are able to pay for our imports and to pay the heavy duties which the Government has laid upon them. For our splendid export trade, which has done so much for the prosperity of the country and so much to relieve it of its distresses, we are grateful, not to the policy of the Administration, but to these blessings of Providence which will yet enable the people of this country to survive all other disasters

which this policy may bring upon them. The hon. Finance Minister, throughout the whole of his speech, claimed a great deal of credit for a reduction of taxation; and if a reduction of taxation is a thing to boast about, if it is, as he himself stated in other words, simply a lessening of the burdens on the people, then would it not have been an equally good thing for the people to have been saved from this enormous taxation by the adoption of a policy that would have accomplished that end. When the National Policy was inaugurated, it was stated on the hustings by leading statesmen of the day that the taxation would not be increased, but that it would be readjusted to bear more lightly on the consuming classes, and to foster to a larger extent than it has done the industries of the country. But the taxation was increased to an enormous extent, and the extent of taxation represents an enormous burden placed on the country in favour of the manufacturers. The hon. Minister congratulated the country on a reduction of the taxation by 76 cents a head, almost wholly by the removal of the taxes from sugar; and he was artful enough, in showing this advantage, to select certain years for purposes of comparison. He selected, to compare with 1892, the years 1882, 1883, 1887 and 1889. But I contend that that is not a scientific nor an accurate manner in which to make comparisons as to the rate of taxation or as to the real burden of taxation. Our resources vary so greatly from year to year that I think a series of years should always be taken, if we are to measure our progress upwards or downwards. If we take the five years, from 1869 to 1873, when we had a revenue tariff, we find that the average Customs taxation per head was \$3.14, while for the five years, from 1883 to 1887, it was \$4.60 per head. For the ten years, from 1869 to 1878, it was \$3.29 per head, while for the ten years, from 1883 to 1892, it was \$4.68 per head. For the five years of the Liberal Administration, from 1874 to 1878, the average was \$3.44 per head, while during the last five years, from 1888 to 1892 it was \$4.77 per head. The average for 1892 was larger than that of 1890, that of 1885, that of 1886 and about the same as that of 1881. Consequently there is not much to boast of, and next year may show an altogether different story. But taking the average, we find that the customs taxation per head for 1892 represents an increase of \$1.12 over that of 1878. The percentage of duty on goods dutiable and free from 1869 to 1873, representing an era of revenue tariff, was \$12.30, whereas from 1883 to 1892, the era of protective tariff, it was \$19.88 per head. The amount of duty paid by the people between 1888 and 1892 was \$22,808,144 per annum; from 1883 to 1887 it was \$20,477,732, showing that during the last five years, notwithstanding the abolition of the duty on sugar, the yearly increase has been \$2,231,000 in customs taxation alone. Look at the Liberal period of

1874 to 1878, which averaged in customs duties \$13,592,104, less than the yearly average of the last five years by \$9,216,040. The total customs duty collected during the five years of the Liberal Administration was \$67,960,523, against \$114,040,723 during the last five years, or an increase of \$46,080,200. But taking customs and excise together, to tell the whole story of the enormous increase in the burdens of taxation on the people of the country, and we find the yearly average during the Liberal Administration to have been \$18,997,668, while the yearly average from 1888 to 1892 was \$29,827,662, an increase in these five years over those of the Mackenzie Administration of over \$54,000,000, representing a total excess of taxation in the thirteen years of the protective tariff of \$106,189,967; and yet we are informed that this tariff does not represent any increase of burden on the people of the country. I am very gratified, and I presume the people of the country are very gratified, at the reduction of taxation on sugar. Let us see the effect of that reduction, as showing how the removal of an enormous burden affects the comfort and the happiness and the welfare of the people. The quantity of sugar imported into the country in 1891 was 197,163,919 pounds, on which was paid a duty of \$3,138,894. The duty was practically removed, and there was then imported 345,418,485 lbs. of sugar. If we had time to go over the whole period of the sugar duties, we should obtain some conception of the amount of which the people have been deprived by the enormous taxation on that article. It conduced to their comfort and happiness, and the cheapness and economy of living, to have this important article made free. How much more would it have contributed to their happiness and welfare if during the whole thirteen years of this high tariff policy the duty had been wholly removed or greatly reduced. The enormously increased consumption is due to the reduced price to consumers, caused partly by the reduction of the duty and partly by improvements in the methods of manufacture and development of the industry. This must have afforded the people a large amount of happiness and comfort growing out of these improved conditions. And in many particulars, even if the duties had been decreased, perhaps the revenue of the country might not have been so greatly affected. To give one illustration: We find that between 1874 and 1878 we introduced 536,886,314 pounds of sugar, which was valued at \$26,427,930. During the years from 1887 to 1891 the amount consumed very largely increased, but the value was about the same, showing that the cost of sugar had largely decreased, owing to the circumstances to which I have referred. 997,256,703 pounds of sugar, valued at \$26,045,635 were imported, but the duty upon practically the same value of sugar was, in the first period, \$11,115,507; and, in the second pe-

Mr. FLINT.

riod, \$16,267,027, showing an increase of duty upon the same value of sugar of over \$5,000,000 levied upon the consuming sections of the country. And yet we are taught, by inference at any rate, that somewhat the same results would not accrue to these classes, if the burdens on other articles of ordinary use and consumption were removed. If the burdens were reduced, the consumption would be greater, and the revenue, while not so much increased, would not bear so heavily on the people; and if the burdens were completely taken away, the people would consume larger quantities, because they could buy more cheaply. The whole question, however, resolves itself substantially into this: the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as contrasted with the policy of the Administration. The policy of the Government is substantially to continue the National Policy—to retain the features of our present tariff indefinitely—because no one supposes that our Finance Minister will not be controlled by the parties who are supporting him now, and whose support depends on his retention of a high tariff. The policy of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is supported not only by members on this side, but by some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side as well. We take the ground that the present tariff bears heavily and unjustly on the consuming classes, and ought to be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered. I need not dwell upon the false line of argument so frequently taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, in charging that we are advocates of free trade for the Dominion. A large portion of the Liberal party believe in free trade, as a reasonable and natural condition of things, if we could possibly have it; but the term "free trade," as used in this discussion, ought always to be considered to mean simply that system of trade which does not tax any commodities for the benefit of any privileged classes or individuals, but taxes them solely for the benefit of the whole community, as represented by the public treasury. Free trade or the introduction of all commodities absolutely free from any tax would be impossible in any country; and to call attention to the difficulties of revenue, as if that has anything to do with the position taken by hon. gentlemen on this side, is entirely aside from any rational or practical discussion of financial matters. It is in the direction of freer trade that we are moving, and the whole history of the Liberal party, during its term of office, and when in opposition, shows that they have been always in favour of the freest possible trade that could be obtained by our people, having regard to the revenue requirements of the country. There never was a time when the Liberal

party did not recognize the importance of preserving our revenue, and of having such a revenue as would meet all the needs and requirements of the country. But those needs and requirements alone should be the ground and basis on which taxation should be levied, and no portion of taxation should be taken from the people for the purpose of assisting any one class or individual to attain wealth at the expense of another. The causes of the discontent which exists today were faithfully pointed out when this National Policy was inaugurated, and afterwards on every opportunity given the Liberal party placed itself on record in the Journals of the House. In April, 1879, Mr. Mackenzie introduced a resolution setting forth :

That, while this House is prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service and the maintenance of the public credit, it regards the scheme now under consideration as calculated to distribute unequally, and therefore unjustly, the burdens of taxation ; to desist capital from its natural and most profitable employment, to benefit special classes at the expense of the whole community—tend towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this continent, and to create an antagonism between the commercial policy of the Empire and that of Canada, that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored.

That resolution is in the same spirit as the one now before the House. Throughout the whole history of these discussions, we find placed before us proposition after proposition of the Liberal party looking to revenue reform, looking to wider extension of trade with our neighbours to the south, looking to obtaining larger markets for the people. This leads us to consider the question of reciprocity. The records of the Liberal party and the Conservative party on that question have been before the people of Canada for a long time. I will not go over the whole history, but I think its concluding chapters are among the most melancholy which any loyal and high-spirited Canadian could possibly conceive. We were promised certainly, if anything ever was promised, that the National Policy would bring about reciprocity with the United States. Our interests commercially are intimately connected with the people of that country. We have an enormous amount of resources, which they require and will take from us at a profitable rate of exchange. We require many of their products, and an interchange mutually profitable would develop an enormous trade between the two countries to our benefit in almost every direction. There has consequently always been a desire on the part of the Liberal party for reciprocity with the United States, and a pretension on the part of the Government and their supporters of a desire equally strong. At any rate the first resolution moved in 1878 in favour of the National Policy directly, was by Sir John Macdonald, in which he stated that the tariff should be readjusted "in

the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours that will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade." Now, the tariff policy of the Government was to produce reciprocity of trade. That tariff policy has been adhered to for fourteen years, and the door is closed more strongly against us than ever before by the action of this very Government. The door has been closed against all reciprocity of trade and the reasons are very few and very simple. In the first place the Government has not been sincere, has not been candid, has not been courteous to the neighbouring Republic in its treatment of this important question. Every election that has been held in this country since the accession to power of gentlemen opposite has been in a great degree run upon false pretenses. I shall not go over the ground of the first election or the promises held out to the people that reciprocity would be secured. But the second election was said to be held for the direct purpose of establishing the National Policy, as hundreds of millions of foreign capital were waiting for investment in this country as soon as a National Policy was known to be finally established. The Government came back with a substantial majority ; but the enormous influx of capital never took place, and was not expected by them to take place. The people were deceived on every hustings into believing that these millions were only awaiting a result favourable to the Government in the election in order to come in and build up the industries of this Dominion. But the last election, sprung upon the people, was certainly the climax of official dishonesty and humiliation to the people of this country, who hoped and expected of the Government at any rate such proper appreciation of their position as would prevent them from stooping to anything unfair or dishonourable. The reasons given for the appeal to the people were stated in the official organ of the party, and thus spread throughout the country by every Government official organ and by every Government speaker. They were that negotiations had been going on with the United States and that :

If the negotiations are to result in a treaty which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient that the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people, rather than with a moribund House.

They were very anxious to deal with a new House in order to have the treaty which they were negotiating, or the legislation necessary to carry the treaty into effect, supported in the new legislature. The organ went on to say :

It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after March 4th, the date on which the life of the present government expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the question of the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries. This delegation will visit the United States capital,

it is said, as the result of a friendly suggestion from Washington.

Here we have a statement in the Government organ, the "Empire," taken as an inspired statement by the parties supporting the Administration, no person in the country being in a position to contradict it, that Canada had been invited to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. We knew nothing of the intrigues, the solicitation, or pressure brought to bear upon the United States to get them to give their acquiescence to authorize the Canadian commissioners to go to Washington. But it was sprung on the people that Canada had been invited to discuss reciprocity, because the Government knew that if there was one thing the people ardently desired it was closer trade relations with the United States, and so they placed themselves on record on that occasion as agreeing in their burning zeal for trade relations with the United States with the party that confronted them. They had the additional advantage, as it was supposed, taking the word of their organ and their speakers, of having an official position and of being invited to prepare a treaty upon such a basis as might be agreed upon. The High Commissioner hurried over from England and very improperly hurled himself with all his enormous energy and great ability into that campaign, and in that famous speech in Toronto which opened the campaign, with a great deal of dash and enthusiasm, he inspired his followers with the idea that they were about to secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States. After defining his position, the High Commissioner in that speech on the 18th of February, said it was monstrous for anybody to say that he had not been the ardent friend of reciprocal arrangements with the United States. He went on :

I say, Sir, that the means of obtaining fair reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States would be utterly defeated, if the party who were now professing to carry out a thing they knew to be an utter delusion, could obtain power. But, Sir, with my right hon. friend sustained, as he will be, when he goes down on the 4th March to Washington, in response to the invitation received from the United States, of which I am able to speak personally (applause), when he goes down there, strengthened by the electors of Canada, then, I say, the prospects are very good indeed.

Here was a cool, deliberate statement of a leading statesman of the country, a man of enormous strength of will representing the Government as fully as the Prime Minister represented the country, declaring that they would go to Washington in response to an invitation received from the United States. Mark the sequel. The elections were over and the same High Commissioner in a different tone now writes to his chief of the interview with Mr. Blaine, and says :

Mr. Blaine also said that he did not agree with the references which had been made by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, during the elections, as to what had taken place concerning the

Mr. FLINT.

initiation of the proposed informal discussion between the Dominion and the United States representatives. The invitation, Mr. Blaine contended, had come from Sir Julian.

He wrote further :

I told Mr. Blaine that I wished at the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, in reference to the initiation of the negotiation regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries—that I believe it arose from the negotiations which had recently taken place between the United States and Newfoundland and the desire expressed by Canada to be included in any arrangement such as had been understood to have been contemplated by the United States and Newfoundland, and that upon that being communicated to him by Sir Julian Pauncefote, he had expressed his willingness to open negotiations for reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States.

I said that the fact that he had expressed his readiness to receive the representations that Canada wished to make would show that he was quite open to consider that question.

And so this humiliating episode passed over. The Government of Canada officially stated that which was not true. They had intrigued, caucused, begged and negotiated for an unofficial interview and that had been assented to by the United States in the person of Mr. Blaine. Yet the people of the country were made to believe the contrary, and did not know until after the election that they had received no invitation from the United States and that they had merely forced this matter in order that they might have some cry on which to go to the country. When the delegates, subsequently, after several postponements of the debate or conference upon the subject of reciprocity, were prepared again to meet the Government at Washington, the Secretary of State was obliged to beg in advance that the subject might not become public as it had before. This promise was given. But they had no great reason for publicity as no election was pending and no publicity was given further than that given in this House, and that has been very inadequate. It is much to be regretted that we have not yet seen an official statement of the interview between our Government and the Government of the United States in regard to reciprocity on the last occasion on which our commissioners went to Washington. When that report comes down we will be in a position to judge as to the correctness of the recollections of that episode as between our own Ministers and the Ministers of the United States. At present, suffice it to say, there is a discrepancy, there is an assertion from one side and a denial from the other, which, taken in connection with the false representations made by our Ministers at the time of the elections, leave us in a very doubtful position as to the correctness of any statement that may be made by our own Ministers. We find that the Minister of Finance, in his statement of the interview, gives Parliament an altogether different impres-

sion of the attitude of the Government of the United States from that given by the official statement from the other side of the line. The terms and conditions upon which a reciprocity treaty could be negotiated are stated in a different manner by each of these high contracting parties. Who are we to accept? Are we to accept an administration which has once before been obliged, through its mouth-piece, to admit that it had inaccurately represented the state of affairs previous to the elections; or are we to admit that statements directly opposite to those of our own Ministers are correct? Now, this point has been reached; all parties in this country profess to be eager for a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The Liberal party have placed upon record that they are willing to enter into negotiations for a treaty without restriction as to the articles which shall be admitted to and fro free of duty between that country and our own. It is a gross misrepresentation to state the attitude of the Liberal party as it has been frequently stated in this discussion, that because they favour the opening up of the whole question, unrestricted as to the articles which shall enter into the negotiations, in order that we may be perfectly free to discuss the whole question upon terms fair and honourable, having full regard to our tariff and revenue requirements—I say it is absurd to state that the Liberal party is in favour of so emasculating, of so destroying our opportunities for obtaining a revenue, that we must raise it by direct taxation. We contend that there are ample means left for raising a revenue after agreeing upon a treaty admitting natural products as well as manufactured goods to and fro between the two countries, that we are bound to preserve, and will preserve, ample verge and room for raising all the revenues required for carrying on the services of this country efficiently and economically. But an insuperable barrier has been raised by our own Ministry, by our own Government, against the formation of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, by their persistent assertion of a principle which I, at any rate, and a large number of the Liberal party, think to be unfounded as a matter of political economy, and to be unnecessary as a matter of patriotism, namely, that we shall not in any degree, or in the slightest extent, discriminate against Great Britain. I believe we are as free to discriminate against Great Britain as we are free to discriminate against any other country, and that it is to assert an uneconomic principle and a financial slavery to the mother country, to say that we are not to arrange our financial affairs, that we are not to regulate our tariffs in the interest of Canada instead of in the interest of the mother country. I believe the interests of Canada should be paramount to the interests of any other country. Is it reasonable to suppose that because we admit the principle that the interests of Canada must be paramount,

and that we shall be perfectly free to arrange a treaty without reference, in the first place, to the interests of Great Britain, that we must necessarily ignore the interests of Great Britain, that we must necessarily arrange a tariff antagonistic to Great Britain? I say it is a libel upon the loyalty of the Liberal party, it is a libel upon the good sense of the Liberal party, it is a libel upon their desire for the welfare of this country, to suppose that they would enter into such a treaty as would endanger the interests of Great Britain with regard to its trade with Canada. We are as proud of the motherland and as satisfied with her care and protection over us, as regards her fleet and her army, and as regards her Imperial position, as gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House. We have as high a regard for the interest of the mother country as they have. But in doing so, we take the position that we should regulate the fiscal affairs of Canada primarily with reference to the interest of the consumers and of the manufacturers of this country. Our first duty is to the people of Canada; our second duty is to the people of the mother country, and having kept in view our close political, social and commercial relations, is it reasonable to suppose that when the Canadian commissioners sit down with the commissioners of the United States to arrange a treaty by which the natural products shall be admitted backwards and forwards between the two countries free of duty, and by which certain manufactured products shall also be admitted free of duty, that wherever it may be to our interests and not particularly antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain, we shall not, to a certain extent, discriminate against Great Britain? The policy of discrimination as regards the mother country has never been frowned upon as a principle; it is only when we came to apply it to details that there has been here and there an objection. The principle of discrimination has been assumed in our treaties with foreign countries, and the principle once admitted, it only requires patriotic men, sensible men, to arrange such a treaty as will meet the interests of the people of Canada and satisfy the strict demands of the people of the mother country. I desire, before closing, to refer to an episode which occurred in an earlier portion of the debate in which my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), was attacked by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). My hon. friend from Queen's had referred to the influence of the National Policy upon the Maritime provinces, and its failure to build up prosperity in those provinces. This failure is so conspicuous that I am surprised that an hon. gentleman from the centre of Ontario should have undertaken to contradict the position which he assumed. The hon. member for Centre Toronto made some extraordinary statements and misrepresentations of the position taken by my hon. friend. He said that my hon. friend had attributed the decline

of the shipping interests of the Maritime provinces to the National Policy, and then he proceeded to argue that that depression was caused by other considerations entirely. Now, I will read from the remarks of my hon. friend from Queen's on this point:

The hon. gentleman stated that we ought to be proud, and that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon the marvellous increase in the shipping of this Dominion, that there had been such an enormous increase in the tonnage of the shipping to carry off the produce of this Dominion. So far, so good. There has, no doubt, been an increase; but is it an increase upon which we ought to congratulate ourselves? Let us examine the figures and see. In 1873 the registered shipping of this Dominion was 1,073,718 tons; in 1878 it had reached high-water mark, and was 1,333,015 tons, being an increase of 259,297 tons in those five years.

Then he proceeded to show the falling off in the tonnage of the shipping of the Dominion, and of the loss that accrued thereby to the people of the Dominion, more particularly to the people of the Maritime provinces, who were the principal owners of the tonnage, and he said, not that the tonnage had fallen off in consequence of the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite had said that the National Policy had increased enormously the value of the shipping interest and increased the welfare of the people of the Maritime provinces in that direction, which was not correct. But the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) made the most amusing statement in contradiction of the position assumed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and as it may mislead some of his bucolic friends in Ontario during future elections, I will correct it here, so that both he and those who read his speech may obtain the benefit of further information. The hon. gentleman said that the falling off in shipping was caused by circumstances over which the Government had no control. I am amused to notice that whenever there is a decrease in prices, or in commodities, or in any direction whatever, hon. gentlemen opposite denounce the idea that the Government could possibly have any control over such matter. If the export trade had fallen off, it would have been argued that it could not be laid to protection. When the export trade increased and the quantity of our grain shipped was large, and good prices were obtained, hon. gentlemen opposite congratulated themselves that they had done it all. So when shipping increased, they claimed it was a result of the National Policy; but if it fell off, or, in fact, if any other trade declined, then hon. gentlemen opposite shifted the burdens from themselves, and laid it on economic causes entirely beyond their control. In order to give an illustration of the alarming decline in shipping on account of the depression in which shipping interests of the Maritime provinces have been subjected to, the hon. member for Centre Toronto sent out to the reading-room for the Montreal "Witness," in order to call the attention of the House to some statistics

MR. FLINT.

that had caught his eagle eye. He invited the House to look at the great falling off in shipping. He said there are 80,000 steamships tied to the docks in different parts of the world. Then the hon. gentleman went on to enlarge in his own way on the subject, and offered amusing observations in regard to shipping. So soon as those figures caught my ear, I was satisfied that the hon. gentleman was labouring under a mistake, and that he had been led into error owing to his ignorance of the subject. When we know that instead of 80,000 steam vessels laid up, there are only 20,000 steam-ships in the world, we can see the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's position. I did not see the original article, but I presumed it mentioned 80,000 tons, which would represent about 40 vessels, which did not show so very great depression in the shipping interest. I conclude my remarks at the point at which the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Cameron) commenced, and that is the census and the exodus. That is a subject which hon. gentlemen opposite generally evade. It is a subject which hon. gentlemen opposite display a wonderful amount of ingenuity in explaining away. The hon. member for Richmond comforted himself for our small increase in population by the fact that China, Russia, Siberia and Tartary had had large increases in population, but they were very poor and distressed countries, suffering from a great many troubles which Canada, we trust, will never suffer from. It is true that China has increased enormously in population, and also that there is a great deal of poverty in that country. It is true that Siberia and Russia occupy the same position. But my hon. friend will recollect that all these countries are protectionist countries; that if China is suffering from poverty and all that goes with poverty, and if Russia is suffering from famine and poverty, it is not for want of a higher protectionist tariff policy. They are suffering to a large degree, I think, from the very fact that they had deliberately shut themselves out from communication with the world, and from those softening influences with which the freest possible trade would surround them, and introducing with it all the elements of civilization, and those other elements of education and culture which go to make a country happy and prosperous. But when we come to this Dominion, hon. gentlemen explain the decrease as shown in the census by intimating that the Government, as usual, had no control over the movement of population. The Government promised that they would stop the exodus. They pointed out that the exodus was one of the alarming features of the condition of affairs between 1874 and 1878, when the depression was general throughout the world, and Canada felt the effect of that depression to a very large extent. The exodus was to be stopped, and great benefit was to accrue to

RR

the country from the National Policy. But the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has discussed the subject and endeavoured to show—I have not time to follow all his figures—that there was a great exodus between 1874 and 1878. Although he did not go so far as to minimize the exodus during the last ten years, yet he dwelt with special emphasis on the exodus from 1874 to 1878. I will quote to the hon. gentleman and to his friends the statements made by a gentleman who is as well acquainted as any one with the facts of the alleged exodus during that period. I refer to the evidence taken by a committee of the House in 1878 upon this subject, when Mr. John Lowe gave evidence. After giving the figures of the immigration into this country, and other particulars with respect to the growth and population in Canada during the previous five years, he made this statement :

It will be noticed from the percentage of decline that Canada has suffered far less from diminution in the number of emigrants than the United States, and also that the diminution of the emigration to Canada is much less than that of the emigration from Great Britain. This may be taken as a proof that we have obtained considerable numbers of emigrants from the United States.

During that period our emigration had fallen off less than emigration to the United States, and the figures can only be explained by an emigration into Canada from the United States. Later on during the same examination we find this statement. The question is:

Have you any means of ascertaining the extent of the exodus of our people to the United States, or elsewhere?

Mr. Lowe answered :

We have no means of obtaining a record of emigration from the country. The Statistical Bureau of Washington give some figures, but I do not know how they obtain them. I do not think there is now any exodus of our people to the labour markets of the United States. It is clear, from the reports published in the newspapers, that there has been little demand for labour there since the depression commenced in 1873. I read in a newspaper only the other day a report of a meeting of unemployed labourers in Boston, in which statements were made giving a much worse account than anything we have had in Canada. There is besides the ascertained fact which I have already stated of a very large emigration from the United States to Canada.

Q. I suppose those are immigrants who have come into Canada by way of New York and the Suspension Bridge?—A. No; about 6,400 immigrants from Europe came by the Suspension Bridge. It is believed those from the United States are to a great extent returned Canadians.

And so we find that although there was then a strong depression prevailing through the country, the balance of emigration was in favour of Canada. This careful and competent statistician of that day was of the opinion that owing to the depression that existed in the United States the balance on the whole was in favour of Canada; and this coming from an expert in that department,

with a full knowledge of the facts, certainly should be received as the best evidence that could be given. At any rate, there is one thing certain, that whatever may be the cause, the exodus to the United States has increased instead of diminishing during the whole period of the National Policy; and although there was for a time a certain amount of prosperity in the Dominion, yet it did not present sufficient attractions to retain our young people here, and the country lost an enormous number of its population and we have not had that growth and progress not only which we had during the previous ten years, but which we had a right to expect, even in the view we take of it on this side of the House, from the National Policy. The Maritime provinces have progressed less than the neighbouring states of New England, and if we follow the line of demarcation between Canada and the United States any where we find that in every instance where we institute a comparison the growth of population has been strongly in favour of the United States, and this in face of a policy which its advocates promised would stop the exodus. And so, after all these years, we are brought face to face with conditions which demand the immediate action of Parliament in reforming the tariff so as to lift the burdens from consumers, in extending and widening our trade and in affording the people better opportunities of exchanging their products with their neighbours. But we are confronted with the alternative of a roving commission, disturbing trade, coming to no definite conclusion, open to the suspicion of making improper bargains in secret with privileged classes who have so far been chartered to fatten on the welfare of the community. This is given us as an alternative to that immediate action which Parliament should take for the relief of the people. But if Parliament should take the action demanded, take prompt and vigorous action, in a very short time all the evils which are lamented and complained of from one end of the country to the other would be removed, and our people would start out on the career of unexampled prosperity which Providence has placed within our reach, but of which unfortunately man in his blind and foolish courses, has attempted and almost succeeded in depriving us.

Mr. CHESLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rising for the first time in this House to make a few observations on the subject under discussion, I know and feel that the liberal measure of indulgence so freely accorded to new members will be extended to me on this occasion. I shall not at this late hour of the night, and after the lengthened discussion which we have heard, attempt to make anything like a lengthy speech. No matter how much I might desire to say on this question, I feel that the whole subject has been so thoroughly gone over and has been so completely thrashed out by the various speakers, that there is really nothing new to be said upon

it. Therefore I shall make but very few remarks touching the question that has been discussed here for the past two weeks. Before doing so, I feel, Mr. Speaker, as though I should congratulate the hon. the Minister of Finance upon the speech he made in this House on the 14th day of this month. I have had the pleasure on many occasions of listening to the hon. gentleman, not only in this House but outside of this House, and, if my judgment is correct and my memory serves me aright, I have no recollection of any occasion on which I have heard the hon. gentleman make as able an effort as he did here on the 14th day of this month. I was proud of the man, and proud of the province that produces such men, especially when I remember that of the eight men who have occupied the position of Finance Minister since Confederation the small provinces down by the sea have given this Dominion four, two from New Brunswick and two from Nova Scotia. I might go further at this moment, and say that the little province of Nova Scotia has given to Canada her Premier. It is a source of gratification and pride to me to be able to look back and remember the large element of not only moderately able men, but men of decided ability which those provinces have sent here, who have since Confederation occupied seats on the Treasury benches of this House. I feel in saying this that I am simply stating what is entirely true as a matter of history. Now, Sir, prior to the delivery of the Budget speech in this House, several motions were placed upon the Order Paper having for their object the reduction of the duties on several articles, such as binder twine, agricultural implements, barbed wire and coal oil. I listened to the discussions on these questions as attentively as I could. I listened to the various arguments that were advanced for the reduction of the duties on those articles and the arguments advanced in favour of retaining the duties; and as the discussion went on I felt, and the further it went the stronger I felt, that the province of Ontario was the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and that there was nobody in the Dominion of Canada but the Ontario farmers—no classes deserving of any consideration at the hands of this House or at the hands of the Government in dealing with the tariff, other than the poor, down-trodden and oppressed farmers of the province of Ontario. Now, Sir, while I felt that the conclusion I had reached at the time was entirely correct, as the debate went on I changed my mind, and I have almost come to the conclusion now that the province of Ontario is the whole earth, if not the whole, very nearly the whole, and that there are no people on this globe but the down-trodden farmers of Ontario. While travelling through that great and rich province, I have seen nothing but prosperity on every hand. I have seen well cultivated fields, splendid houses and buildings, and evidences of prosperity on

Mr. CHESLEY.

every hand, and when I heard the discussion with reference to these people in this Parliament I was more than surprised. However, the question presents itself to me in another form, and that is this: While these people are anxious that the duties should be reduced on all articles which the Ontario farmer uses in the production of his crop, they are quite satisfied that the duties imposed on all articles which he produces and which enter into consumption in other industries should be retained. They are anxious that the Ontario farmer should be protected and given the entire market of Canada. Take this illustration. Take the great lumber industry of this country, which has to pay a heavy duty on flour, beef and pork, and which consumes large quantities of these articles in the production of lumber. These articles are supplied very largely by the Ontario farmer. Are the Ontario farmers willing to have the duties reduced on them, or do they wish these duties to remain so that they may continue to control the entire Canadian market? It is not fair to the people engaged in the great lumbering industry that they should be obliged to buy their supplies from the Ontario farmer, and then have to go out into the markets of the world, where the law of supply and demand obtains to sell their products. That is the condition which is to be imposed upon us at the will of the Ontario farmers. Are there any other industries deserving the support of Parliament? I say there are. There are the great toiling masses of this Dominion. We have them with us in the shape of the men who go into the lumber camps, and we have our artisans, and our sailors, and all these toiling classes, who consume the farmers' products. These all buy your flour. You feed us entirely in the Maritime provinces, and yet you insist on the duty remaining on these products of yours, in order that our markets may be monopolized by you, while at the same time you want all the duties on the articles which you have to use in order to produce your crop remitted, such as the duties on agricultural implements, barbed wire and binder twine. This discussion has led me to the conclusion that the wisdom of the Government in deciding that during recess they will get all the information they can, with a view of dealing with this question in a fair and equitable manner—not from the point of view of the farmers alone, but from that of every class of the community—and come to Parliament with a measure during next session, cannot be doubted. We have in the Maritime provinces an industry which I consider next in importance to agriculture, the greatest industry we have in the Dominion. I refer to the lumber industry. All the articles that enter into the lumberman's camp are heavily taxed. The food which the lumbermen consume is heavily taxed. I am not objecting to that at present, but only arguing that it would be inconsistent on the part of this Parliament to take one set of duties off and allow the others to remain. I would like

to ask hon. gentlemen who argue the other way, what is the difference between the farmer and the lumberman, from the point of view of production? The lumberman, after he supplies home demand, has to go into the foreign market with his products, where he must enter into competition with the products of all other countries, and where the law of supply and demand regulates the prices. Why should the farmers not be subject to the same conditions? And any system of legislation that will place them in a different position from other people is not fair to all classes in the community. I was more than pleased the other night when I heard the Minister of Finance declare that his Government was committed to the policy of reciprocity if such a policy could be secured on fair and honourable terms. I have always been in favour of a policy of reciprocity. I believe it would be a great advantage to this country, and the great republic to the south, and if I have been a strong supporter of the National Policy ever since it was inaugurated, I have been so because we could not help ourselves. I never had any hope, so long as the Republican party remained in power, of our being able to negotiate a policy of reciprocity with the United States. These gentlemen, whether they were right or wrong, succeeded in keeping themselves in office for many years on the cry, at any rate, that the protective tariff protected the labouring men of the country; that their system of protection kept these men from being reduced to a condition of pauperism such as existed among the same classes on the other side of the Atlantic. The majority of the people accepted that statement and voted to keep that party in power; and so long as that party could get in power and carry the country on that condition of things, just so long would they stick to it. In addition to that, they saw the country prosperous, its railway system extended from one end to the other, its wealth increasing, and they attributed that to the protective policy, and, whether right or wrong, they were not going to make any change. But there must be an end to everything. At the last general election they went to the country more fairly and squarely on the trade policy in that election than they ever did before, and as a natural result they got badly beaten. I think that the success of the Democrats at that election, if it teaches anything, teaches that the people came to the conclusion, that when they are obliged to go to a foreign market with the products of the soil and the mines and everything they have to sell, and compete against the producers of other countries, they should be allowed to buy what they require for their own necessities under the same conditions. I may be entirely mistaken, but that is the way it strikes my mind, and I do hope that when the new administration in the United States comes into power, there will be a disposition on the part of the

American Government to have a fair treaty of reciprocity with the Dominion. I believe such a treaty will be of immense advantage to both countries. We used in the Maritime provinces to have the markets of the New England States for our lumber, lime, potatoes, agricultural products and coal, and it would be an immense advantage to us and increase the output of these articles very materially, and give an impetus to the coasting trade of these provinces, if we had such a treaty, and I was pleased when the Finance Minister made the statement that the Government stood committed to a policy of that kind, provided that the treaty could be got on fair and honourable terms. If such a treaty can be had I am prepared to support the party in getting in. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House very much longer this evening. It is very late. I do not know what I can say in reference to the National Policy or the trade question that I have not already said that would be new or interesting to the House. The whole thing has been threshed out. On one side figures have been given showing that the National Policy has ruined the country, while on the other side figures have been given showing that it has been a boon. We know the value of the statements made by extremists on either side, and for my part I do not take a great deal of stock in them. It matters little how eloquently they are put. I have my own opinion of these matters. There has been much said on this question; it has been placed before us in every shape, form and fashion. I have wondered at the ingenuity with which the matter has been spoken about for the last two weeks; I have wondered at the ingenuity of men, and the way they have treated the tariff question and the exodus, and the National Policy, and the blue ruin, and the country going to the dogs, and we all getting poor, until I have sometimes wondered if there was anybody left in the country at all. I am sure I listened to the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and I really do not know what he was talking about; I would be much surprised to know that the hon. gentleman himself understood what he was talking about. His figures were mixed up, without head or tail, top or bottom, and, to make the matter worse, they were presented in such a way that I could not make anything of them. Under these circumstances, it is little or no use for any man to stand up here to talk to empty benches, or to people who have no interest in him if he has nothing new to say. The question has been threshed out, and has been presented to the country in every shape. I thank you for the very kind hearing you have given me in this my first attempt at speech-making. Had I spoken at an earlier stage I might have said something of interest, but others have said these things ahead of me, and I feel that I am out of the race at this stage of the debate. On some other occasion I hope I may get into harness

before the debate has been robbed of its glory.

Mr. PERRY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we must go on a little longer. The idea is to close this debate to-morrow night. That would be impossible unless we agree to stay a little longer to-night. I think the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry) had better make his speech.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to make a remark in regard to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Chesley). I undertook to lay before the House some facts and figures, but I could not give my hon. friend from St. John the capacity to understand them.

Mr. LAURIER. We can close the debate to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. All right; you are the men to close it.

Mr. LAURIER. I should say so.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 o'clock a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th February, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the Dominion of Canada, for year ending 30th June, 1892, with a partial report for services during six months ending 31st December, 1892.—(Mr. Costigan.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Bill (No. 67) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Frémont.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Mr. CHESLEY.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—PRECEDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Government business have precedence on Thursdays, after questions put by members, for the remainder of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit to the hon. gentleman that it seems to me this motion is altogether premature. If he will look at the Order Paper he will see that there are a very large number of Notices of Motion and of Bills, and if hereafter private members will only have two days in the week at their disposal, it is manifest that a great many of these Orders will have to stand over until another session. If I may be permitted to refer to a rumour which is floating about, I understand that we are to be deprived at an early date of the presence of the hon. gentleman, who is to extend his services to another sphere. Under such circumstances, I would have no objection, and I am sure the House will readily agree, that the Government should have Thursday of this week, so as to allow the hon. gentleman further opportunity to dispose of those matters with which he may be more intimately connected.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would be very glad to make such an arrangement as the hon. gentleman proposes, if it looked to taking Thursday as a Government day within any definite period. We are accustomed to hear a remonstrance against the first attempt to take a day, always, and we generally yield where there is a strong expression of a desire to have it continued for another week. I should be willing, if the House preferred, that we should take Thursday of this week, and leave Thursday of next week open to private members as usual, provided we agreed that after that it should be taken as a Government day.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman will take Thursday of this week, there will be no objection. But even after that, it will be premature for the Government to take Thursdays for the remainder of the time. After we have seen what progress we have made next week, we will see whether the Government ought to take the day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to accept that suggestion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the First Minister that it might be convenient to arrange that all those motions which are absolutely unopposed, and on which there will be no discussion, should be allowed to pass without questioning.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can agree at any time to let the unopposed motions pass.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the motion is amended so that Government business have

precedence on Thursday, the 2nd March, after questions put by members.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the attention of the hon. gentleman to a rumour which has spread through the public press, that an Order in Council has been passed referring the Manitoba school question to the Supreme Court. I would ask the hon. gentleman if that is the case, and if so, if he will lay this Order before the House at once?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An Order has been passed referring the decision of the Governor in Council to me, with certain preliminary questions connected with the subject, so that a case may be stated for the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada. The Order in Council will be laid on the Table to-morrow. However, I ought to mention that the Order itself does not state the case, but invites the Government of Manitoba and the counsel for the petitioners to confer with the Government as to the form of the case and the nature of the questions which ought to be included.

THE CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inquire if the instructions given to the census commissioners have yet been laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. They have not, but I have made a requisition to have them down soon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister referred the other day, as reasons for not disclosing the information, that certain parties were sworn to secrecy. Will the hon. Minister state on what authority that obligation of secrecy has been imposed upon certain officers connected with the census, and for what reasons?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. member refers to me, he is mistaken in attributing that argument to me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it was to the Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the form of the affidavits will accompany the instructions.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring down the instructions and forms of affidavits, and all papers in connection with the matter that can be brought down, to-morrow, and the hon. gentleman will see what there is to be seen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I asked the hon. gentleman to state on what authority this obligation of secrecy was imposed. Will that

be communicated as well, or will the hon. gentleman state that now?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot state that now.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the Minister of Finance say if the papers he will lay on the Table in connection with the census will show what authority the Government had for withholding information as to the details of the census?

Mr. FOSTER. I said I would lay on the Table the instructions under which the census enumerators did their work, which will give that information.

Mr. MULLOCK. I understand the Government to take the ground that the census enumerators are not at liberty, and that the Government is not at liberty, to disclose details, and that there is some oath of secrecy that prevents even the Government from making that information public. If so, I think the House ought to have that information. There does not appear to be anything in the law warranting such an attitude. I presume they have got a new law which is not on the Statute-book.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the Government if they are ready to-day to give us any idea of the tenor of the treaty with France, or if they are prepared to lay that treaty upon the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We expect to be able to lay that treaty on the Table at the end of the week.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask the Government when we may expect to have the papers connected with the Caron Commission, the evidence in which was laid before the House some time ago, in order to be printed? When may we expect to have that printed for distribution among the members? It seems to me it has taken a very long time to get it ready.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know, I am sure. That is not a matter we have under our control. I will make inquiry, and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. EDGAR. One of the Government departments has the printing under its control.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am under the impression that it is just about ready; but I will be able to speak more definitely to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways

and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. PERRY. Allow me to congratulate the House that the end of the debate which has occupied two weeks is in sight. Let me also congratulate the Government on that fact, for if the debate was continued a few days longer the Minister of Finance would not have a majority to carry his motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. Hon. members on this side of the House have made no attack on the tariff in detail; they have attacked the National Policy as a whole, and they are prepared to stand by the position they have taken in that regard. Some hon. gentlemen opposite are, however, willing to attack one article and another article of the tariff. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is not, however, willing to attack the National Policy structure in any particular. The hon. gentleman declares that if one item is attacked, the whole structure may fall. I do not understand how he reconciles this view with the view adopted by his leader, who appears to be willing to take two bricks out of the structure. Let me tell the hon. member for Inverness that when those bricks are removed he had better be some distance away, otherwise the whole structure may fall on him. It will be interesting to know how hon. gentlemen opposite will make their speeches and votes harmonize; they must reconcile their votes and their acts with their constituents. The hon. member for Inverness stated that the farmers, including the poorer classes of farmers, are well protected under the National Policy. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by protection to the farmer. I am not very well acquainted with the hon. gentleman's county, although I travelled over it a few years ago, but I know how the farmers are protected in Prince Edward Island, and I suppose the farmers receive the same protection in Inverness as in Prince county. I find, on referring to the returns, that the farmers are protected on agricultural machinery to the extent of 35 per cent. The farmers of Inverness probably have not much farm machinery, including haycutters and binders, but in Prince Edward Island such is not the case. There we have more farming implements and machinery than any other portion of Canada with the same population, and this machinery is protected by a duty of 35 per cent. I find also that the ordinary stoneware used by the poorer classes is protected by 35 per cent. Forks and hay rakes, which are used by farmers, to which the hon. gentleman refers, are also protected by 35 per cent. I find also that the richer classes are better off than the poorer classes in this regard, for china and silver and gold plate, used by the rich, are only protected to the extent of 30 and 20 per cent respectively. That, I suppose, is the protection meted out for the benefit

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

of the farmers, to which the hon. member for Inverness refers. Jewellery is only protected to the extent of 25 per cent, while spades and shovels, used by farmers and labourers, are protected by a duty of 46 per cent. Forks and hay rakes, which are used by the poorer classes, and are not used by lawyers, merchants or doctors, or even by the hon. member himself during many years, are protected by 33 per cent. Hay-knives that cost \$3.15 each pay a duty of \$2.59, which is equal to 79 per cent. That is the protection meted out to the farmers, and yet the hon. gentleman declares that under the National Policy the farmers are well protected. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in this view. I do not intend to detain the House by entering into statistics, for in discussing hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars it is quite easy to go astray. The hon. member for Inverness, the Minister of Finance, and the supporters of the Government all declare that we must have a National Policy, and that the country cannot do without the large revenue. Let hon. members look for one moment at what is done with the revenue. I find that last year the advertising and printing in Conservative newspapers in Canada cost \$236,975. The public have a right to know why this large amount was paid to those papers. The Montreal "Gazette," for example, received last year \$17,376. I suppose there is a reason for that expenditure. I presume the owner of that paper is a supporter of the Government, and that it is necessary to subsidize that organ. The Monoton "Times" received \$12,271. The Halifax "Herald," another good Tory paper, received \$9,505. The St. John "Sun," another good Tory sheet, obtained \$13,875. The Quebec "Chronicle" received \$4,277, and at the bottom of the page I find, Regina "Leader," \$4,512. The total payments amounted to \$236,975, this sum being paid to these and other newspapers throughout Canada, all being Tory newspapers, no doubt. It is interesting to take the newspapers of Prince Edward Island, and inquire how the Tory press has been subsidized there. We find that the Charlottetown "Examiner" received last year for advertising \$147. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very small amount for a newspaper in Prince Edward Island which is the Government mouthpiece in that province. The "Examiner" also got for advertising, last year, \$1,184.50, which is a little better. The Charlottetown "Herald," another Tory paper, got, for printing and advertising, \$885; and the Summerside "Journal," another Tory paper, received \$1,118.85; or the Tory papers of that province got altogether, last year, \$4,035.65, which is 75 per cent of the amount that the Government is willing to spend in repairing, and, I may say, building the wharfs and piers around the whole coast of Prince Edward Island. The Tory press of

the province got, for printing and publishing, last year. 75 per cent of the whole amount expended for repairing the wharfs and piers of the province. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, told us that he saw the necessity for changing the tariff, that the National Policy, under the present tariff, was not a success, that it was sick, and that it was condemned by the tax-payers of Canada. We find that the feeling against the National Policy has spread among the supporters of the Government in this House. We find hon. gentlemen on the opposite side joining with members on this side of the House in urging strenuously the removal of the duty on binder twine. We find them willing to wipe off the duty on coal oil, and the duty on corn; but, Mr. Speaker, as I said awhile ago, to my mind that is an unfair way of attacking the National Policy piecemeal. Why not attack the whole National Policy? I believe the country is ripe to receive a sweeping change in the whole National Policy, but my friend the Minister of Finance says: We will follow a policy of procrastination, we will follow a policy of to-morrow; let the National Policy stand the sickness for another twelve months, and at the end of twelve months we will try to apply a remedy. I can tell the hon. gentleman, and he knows it himself, that the note of warning has already been sounded in the country, and that he will be obliged to reform the National Policy, perhaps more than he thinks he will. I find that the manager of the "Empire" has already sent out his circulars in reference to this matter. The manager of the "Empire," the mouthpiece of the Government, published in Toronto, why, a child of the Government, a paper that is nursed by the Government, a paper that feeds on the Government pap; I find that the manager of the "Empire" publishes—not in his own paper, because, I was going to say, he was too mean to do that; but he got some other paper to publish it, and what do we find in that circular? This circular, be it remembered, was not addressed to the tax-payers of Canada, but to the tax-gatherers of Canada, to the minority in Canada who live by becoming millionaires at the expense of the tax-payers. Mr. Creighton, the manager of the "Empire" says in his circular that it is not for publication, and he wants to keep the matter in the dark. That circular may have been promoted by the Minister of Finance, for all I know. However, I will not accuse him of having done so, but I have almost come to the conclusion that Mr. Creighton got his inspiration from high quarters. The circular is printed, I understand, and a blank is left for the name of the party to whom it is intended to be sent, as it is addressed generally to all the manufacturers in the country. It reads in this way:

TORONTO, Feb. 20, 1893.

DEAR SIR,—The recent defeat of the Republican party in the United States has precipitated a formidable agitation here for sweeping away the protection

our native industries have enjoyed for the past fourteen years, and which has done so much to build them up.

He insinuates here, or rather he says in plain words, that the National Policy has actually built up these industries, and that the manufacturers have made a fortune out of them, and he points to the fact that the defeat of the Republican party in the United States is a blow at the vital parts of this National Policy. It goes on to say:

The announcement of the Finance Minister has postponed legislative action of tariff matters until next session of the House, but the free trade agitation will now be carried on with redoubled vigour, and the intervening time will be the most critical for the National Policy that it has ever had to encounter.

There is a warning contained in this, and that is the part of the circular on which I almost come to the conclusion that it has been advised or dictated by the Finance Minister himself:

As you are aware, the "Empire" has during the past five years been fighting the battle of our industries against those who would smash them, and in the impending struggle will continue to do so.

He intends here to fight for the National Policy in the future as he has done in the past, and that policy, propounded by the manager of the "Empire," is, I suppose, the sentiment of the present Government. It is a policy not in the interests of the tax-payers of the country, but altogether in the interest of the tax-gatherers.

But that we may do so with greatest effect, we desire to have as great a knowledge of the condition of our various industries as it is possible to obtain.

He only wants to have information as to the industries. He does not want to know how the fishermen, the artisans, or the labourers, or how the farmers get on, but he is altogether anxious about how the monopolists are doing. He goes on further and says:

Will you kindly let me know, not for publication, but for information, in connection with the line you represent, whether a reduction in duty might be made without prejudicially affecting your business, or are you in a position to stand alone, as it is claimed our "infant industries" ought now to do? If the protection now afforded ought to remain as high as it is, briefly state reasons, and oblige,

Yours faithfully,

D. CREIGHTON.

He asks them, are they able to go on without protection? He is very anxious about that, but he does not want to know how the great majority of the people of this country, the farmers, the labourers and the fishermen are getting along now without protection, as they have got along in the past without it, while, at the same time, they have had to bear more than their share of the taxes. Now, Sir, that is like the Government asking Caesar to give judgment against Caesar, or asking Caesar to give an opinion in favour of Caesar. He is not asking the artisan or the farmer; he is merely asking the manu-

facturer. I presume that is the line of policy my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, intends to pursue after the close of this session. I suppose he intends to take a copy of this letter around with him, and address one to every manufacturer in Canada; and as a result, they will come down here in swarms, and I should not wonder if the Government would pay their expenses. Do you suppose that those people will give evidence before the Government in favour of the interests of the tax-payers of the country? No, they will merely advocate the interests of the tax-gatherers. The idea of the Government lowering the tariff or being in favour or freer trade with the United States or with any other country in the world is preposterous. I say that the Government dare not change their fiscal policy; they dare not touch the National Policy. It is impossible. Their masters, the combines, will not permit them to do it. Sir, they tremble before these magnates. They know that they are not able to stand as a Government without their assistance, and therefore the country need not suppose there will be any material change in the tariff of this country until they turn out—some people would say the rascals, but I do not go so far—these hon. gentlemen, and put a better Government in their place. There is no danger of the present Government touching the tariff. They are only gaining time, and I have no doubt that before next session comes they will dissolve this Parliament, in order to go before the people before the agitation gets too hot for them. They will not go to the country on the National Policy or on the question of trade relations with our neighbours, but they will bring in some side issue, and, assisted by the money bags and the influence of the Red Parlour, they will try to keep their seats. Now, I am sure that it is very hard for a poor man who is neither afraid nor ashamed to stand up in Parliament and call things by their right names, to carry on an election against the money bags of the Red Parlour and against all other influences that the Government can use to defeat him, such as their promises to spend millions on a tunnel or on the Chignecto Ship Railway. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that all these influences will not be used in the next election? Everybody knows that they have been used in the past, and that they will be used again. Why, Sir, we are told that in the neighbouring province of Quebec on one occasion twenty-four constituencies were bribed with the public money to support the Government. Will any one deny this? Have not these charges been made here; and have not the Government come to the rescue of the parties attacked, and whitewashed them? We have not yet been able to obtain a fair investigation of these charges, because the powers that be screen the attacking parties. They say, Oh, it is not right to attack a man who is high up in the world. No, it is no sin for such a man to spend \$125,000 to corrupt the

Mr. PERRY.

electors of this country. It would be a great sin for a poor man to steal a jackknife and then would have to spend a month or so in the penitentiary; but when these big men steal money by the thousands or the millions, nothing is done. But the country is waking up, and any one who says that Canada is not ripe to-day for free trade with the United States must be blind. I am not going to speak for Ontario or Quebec or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia; but I speak for Prince Edward Island, and I say that that little province is not able to stand the taxes imposed by the National Policy when her natural market is shut against her by the inaction or the narrow-mindedness of the present Government, and by their misrepresentations at Washington. We buy more farming implements in proportion to our population than any other portion of the Dominion, and the protective tariff obliges us to pay 35 per cent on them; and when the time of payment comes, where can we get the money? Where is the home market that was promised us? How can I sell my potatoes in Ontario or in Quebec? Where can I sell my lambs, my sheep, my eggs or my horses? I have to cross the line and go to the United States with them, and when I get there I find that my eggs, my horses and my sheep have to pay heavy duties before they can be sold. Even my poor little lamb, the innocent lamb, is taxed 75 cents, and the old sheep, the mother of that lamb, is taxed \$1.50. The result is that I have to sacrifice these things. This National Policy is a knife that cuts both ways; it compels us to pay in some cases about 200 per cent. For instance, on some cotton goods there is a specific duty as well as an ad valorem duty. Cottons which are worth 3½ cents a yard pay 1 cent a yard of duty, while cottons worth 12 cents a yard pay the same. Suppose a poor man who has only 50 cents wants to buy ten yards of cotton. He goes to a store and he finds some cotton as low as 5 cents a yard. Now, that 50 cents worth of cotton, which he has bought, is taxed 10 cents besides the ad valorem duty, whereas the richer man who buys cotton at 15 cents a yard or \$1.50 for ten yards is also taxed but 10 cents. Is not that discriminating against the poor man in favour of the rich man? Take the articles of coarse cloth, which is much worn by the labourers and farmers. That was taxed at one time 7½ cents, but now it is taxed 10 cents per pound. The poor man who buys 2½ yards to make a pair of pants, at perhaps only 50 cents per yard, has the same tax to pay as the man who buys a more expensive material, but of the same weight. Say the weight is 2½ pounds, that makes 25 cents which the poor man has to pay on \$1.25 worth of cloth, and the rich man who buys more expensive material, costing say \$6.25, pays but the same duty. Is not that discriminating against the poor man in favour of the rich? There is another reason why the Government require to im-

pose a high tariff. They require to do so in order to feed at the Government crib another class of people besides the labourers and farmers. The lawyers come in for a very good share. We find that Mr. O'Connor, of Ottawa, gets \$14,919. I do not know for what he gets it. We must be a very bad and treacherous people to require all this legal expenditure; or perhaps he earned this money by trying to find out whether the Liberals were disloyal to the old flag or not. Mr. Osler, of Toronto, got \$11,350. Mr. Robinson, of Montreal, got \$8,405. Mr. H. H. McDonald got \$6,700. Burns, Richey and Company, of Halifax, got \$6,405, and Mr. C. Robinson, of Toronto, got \$5,785. If the hon. members for Halifax and the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) were here, they might be able to tell us how these two last items were earned. Mr. J. A. McDonell, of Toronto, got \$2,027, and so on through the whole list, amounting to \$103,956, being the amount paid last year to lawyers throughout the Dominion, and nobody can tell for what. But the poor people know that they have to pay all that in order to enjoy the shade of the National Policy. A short while ago I was speaking of the amount paid for printing and publishing, and taking up the report of the Department of Public Works, I find that "L'Evenement," a Conservative paper published in the province of Quebec, and probably owned and inspired by a gentleman who has the honour of a seat in this House, contains an article, under that gentleman's name, printed in French, appealing to national prejudices. The writer of that article complains that while the Government paid \$236,925 last year for public printing, out of that the French papers of the province of Quebec only received \$6,063, whereas their proportion should have been \$59,253. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why he made that distinction, and why he exposed to the public gaze the fact that the Government have not acted fairly towards the French people. I would like to know why it was that the French people, if they were entitled to \$59,000, only got a little over \$6,000. The writer continues to say that out of \$103,951 paid last year to the lawyers, the French lawyers only received \$4,550, and the English-speaking lawyers \$99,405, although the lawful share of the French lawyers should have been \$26,000. Is it possible that the French-Canadian members of the House are going quietly to allow their compatriots to be robbed in this way? Is not the \$59,000 which they had a right to get their share of the tax paid by the French people of this country? Yet we do not hear one word from these gentlemen supporting the Government on that score. They are contented and take things as they come, but the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) who publishes "L'Evenement" in French, circulates it throughout the province in order to show that the French people are not getting their proper share of public patronage. But I must say that as we are a mixed popu-

lation, such appeals to national feeling are much to be deprecated and the sooner they are done away with the better. Let every man be a Nationalist and bring up his family according to the traditions of his fathers, but when we have to meet face to face in Parliament and in court and on the market squares and in the stores, we ought to meet in amity and drop those little jealousies and heart-burnings. I say, Sir, it is not right to raise feeling between the different classes making up the people of this Dominion. I contend that the population of Canada is likely to be a hardier people for being a mixed race than if they were all French, all Scotch or all Irish—aye, I will not except even the Irish or English. They will become a hardier people, a more thrifty people for being composed of different races, and nothing should be done to drive them apart, but everything should be done to bring them together. The only way to have all the different nationalities contented is to do justice to every one. But I am afraid that is not the motto of the present Government. The Government does not propose to do anything now to improve the condition of the country. My friend, the Finance Minister, is like a physician who says that the child is sick, that it requires medicine, that he has the medicine and knows how to administer it, but he will allow the child to be sick another twelve months before administering the medicine that will restore it to health. As I say, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I know and feel that, though the Government will do nothing to improve the condition of the people, yet they will have the face to go before the people and say: We are devoted to the public interest. But that would not be worse than in the last election. I do not know how it was in other provinces, but in the province of Prince Edward Island no candidate could have been returned from Prince Edward Island who was not in favour of free trade with the United States; unless he was a free trader as we understand it and in favour of extended trade relations with the United States. We know that the "Empire," the Government paper, the mouthpiece of the Government, in 1891 stated that it was absolutely necessary to have free trade with the United States, that the Government were in favour of it, that the delegates of the Government had gone to Washington and had made certain offers to the American people which seemed to suit the Americans pretty well. That is where the deception comes in. We were told at that time that they had offered reciprocity with the United States, and had offered to admit certain articles into Canada from that country free. But these delegates told us afterwards that the American people did not want that; they wanted to send to us free their manufactured articles, they wanted us to discriminate against Great Britain and to assimilate our tariff with theirs. We

know that these statements are contradicted by the highest authorities in the United States, and this has never been fairly denied or contradicted by the delegates who went to Washington in 1891. Sir, the American people are a shrewd people; they know very well that 99 cents will not make a dollar; they want to get 100 cents for a dollar, and I do not blame them, for I would like to do that myself, but very often I do not get it, particularly when dealing with this Government. I believe the offer made by these gentlemen who were appointed—though I think I am wrong in speaking of them that way, for I do not believe they ever were appointed in the regular way of such duties as they were to perform—the offer they made to Mr. Blaine or Mr. Foster or Mr. Harrison or whoever else was there, was that certain natural products from Canada should be allowed to enter the United States markets without duty. Articles were named, for instance: potatoes, barley, horses, lambs, sheep, mackerel, I suppose, and so on. When the American Government heard that offer, they said: No; that would be a one-sided policy; it would open our market for your products, while it would give us no chance of sending our products to you. Whoever heard of Canada importing potatoes from the United States? Whoever heard of Canada importing lambs, or sheep, or horses from the United States? Whoever heard of Canada importing mackerel from the United States? Why, Sir, it is ridiculous; it is too one-sided. I do not wonder at their not wanting to admit American manufactured articles free of duty, because that would be directly in opposition to the interests of their master, the protected manufacturers of this country. That is the fact, but in order to carry out the pretense, they must make it appear to the people as well as they can that they were sincere in their offers to the people of the United States. Now, Sir, a great deal has been said about the prosperity of this country, and I am not going to say much about that, but I want to say that it is not one-half as prosperous as we would wish it to be, or one-half as prosperous as it ought to be. If the Government had not a policy for the benefit of the few at the expense and ruin of the many, the country would be a hundred per cent better off. For instance, take Prince Edward Island; you will find to-day in that province, with its population of 109,000 people, that it is an easy matter to buy a million bushels of potatoes, and that after all that were squandered last fall—for I call it squandering it when they were sold as low as 16 cents a bushel—you can go there and buy potatoes at from 17 to 20 cents a bushel. Where is the home market that this great National Policy was to open to the people of this country? Sir, we cannot sell to the United States; that market is closed against us. We cannot send the potatoes across the Straits; the tunnel

Mr. PERRY.

is not yet built, though it was promised some time ago. It is not even commenced. I will not accuse the Government of not being sincere in this matter, but there is too great willingness on the part of the Government to keep the people in suspense and in misery by their promises. Though we have plenty of goods to send to the market, we cannot get rid of our surplus. Then we have the census returns which show the great prosperity in the Maritime provinces. Well, Sir, I find that in the province of Prince Edward Island, according to the census, there are 173 boot and shoe factories. Now, my hon. colleague on my left (Mr. Yeo), and my hon. friend who lives in Charlottetown, who are well acquainted all over the Island, know very well that there is only two boot and shoe factories in the whole Island, and that one is in Charlottetown, Goff Brothers, and one in Summerside, Mr. Fanning. Now, if these returns are so misleading in that particular case, how can we rely upon them in other cases? How can we rely upon them as respects population, as respects the amount of capital invested in industries? In the matter of shoe factories we see they have made a mistake of 171 out of 173. I know there are only two, unless the Government make out that every man who has a last, and a shoe hammer, and a peg awl, and a little wax, and a few pig's bristles, and a little twine, and who puts a patch on a boot, or makes a pair of moccasins, something like the examples of industries in Cagh-nawaga—they put that down as a boot and shoe factory. What I call a factory is an establishment employing a number of men who live by that industry, and there are only two such factories in the province of Prince Edward Island. I say it is deplorable to find such misleading statements in the census. Yet we see that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been taken out of the tax-payers of this country to pay for these unreliable and misleading returns. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) have shown that the population of Canada has not increased as it should have increased, and they have shown how many emigrants have been brought here at the expense of our people and have gone across the line. When the Government have been confronted with these facts they have admitted that the census returns were misleading. Now, if they believe that the census is not to be relied upon, let them ask for another vote of two or three hundred thousand dollars, and try and get an honest and accurate return of what the Dominion of Canada is worth in population and wealth. One gentleman opposite, I think the hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Gillies) had the effrontery, last night, to argue that the amount of deposits in the savings banks in Canada was a proof of the prosperity of the people. Why, Sir, we find that in the state of Massachusetts, with only half the population of the

R

Dominion of Canada, the people had eight times as much money in the savings banks as all the people of Canada. Is it any wonder when immigrants come over here and become acquainted with such facts, that they conclude to go across the lines? When they learn that our national debt is \$50 per head, and the national debt of the United States is only \$17 per head, is it any wonder that they refuse to stay here and go to swell the population of the United States? Perhaps the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) will tell me this argument is wrong, too. Well, if it is wrong it is based upon the census returns of population laid before Parliament by the Government of this country. Then we are told that a great many of our Canadian people are coming back from the United States. Well, it would be worth while to have honest statistics to show how many have really come back. We know very well that in the province of Quebec the exodus is something alarming. I know myself that in one parish the Roman Catholic church was deserted, because the parishioners had left and gone across to the United States; and there are a great many other parishes like that. We find that customs returns from the United States show that \$1,250,000 worth of goods were entered in the United States custom-houses belonging to Canadian emigrants, people who have been expatriated from this country, and have gone across the line. That may show a population of a thousand people, or two thousand people; but we want to know who they are, and how many there are. Are they old men? Are they old women, are they infants? No, they are the bone and sinew of this country; they are the people best qualified to build up this country. My hon. friend from Richmond tried to show that population was no sign of the wealth of a country. Well, if population is not a sign of wealth, all I can say is, God help the world. What goes to make the world but population? What good is capital without labour? Take five hundred million dollars and put it in a pile and never touch it; what good is it if there are no labourers whom you can employ with that money? Sir, I contend that without population a country is nothing. Who is it that takes up arms for the rights and liberties of any country but its population? I say that the population of a country is its greatest wealth; a population that increases in the natural way is the greatest blessing Providence can bestow upon a country, and so I say that the exodus of Canadian people across the border is more deplorable than pest, or cholera, or anything that destroys the people. Now, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, has told us that by not removing the duty on coal oil, but only removing the inspection fee, he has conferred a great boon on the Canadian people. Now, I contend that the taking off of the inspection fee will not materially reduce the price of oil to the consumers. Not long since I saw an

article in a Montreal newspaper, accompanied by a picture, showing the American housewife with three dimes in her hand going out to buy oil of a man who is passing. She bought three gallons of oil and had four cents left. The Canadian housewife went out with three dimes in her hand, and she came back with only one gallon and two cents left. According to the Montreal "Star," which, I believe, is a Tory paper, we have paid nearly 300 per cent more for coal oil than should have been paid. I believe that, notwithstanding the reduction proposed as regards inspection and other matters, the consumer will have to pay something over 200 per cent in excess of the proper price. This tax, I desire the House to understand, comes directly out of the poorer classes, because the rich do not use coal oil, but gas or electric light. Of course, those means of lighting are more convenient, but coal oil is absolutely necessary to the people of the country, especially the poorer classes. We were told a few years ago by the present Minister of Finance that these articles were luxuries. They are luxuries with a vengeance. Does the hon. gentleman mean to declare that we should go back 100 years and take cotton and melted lard and thus make a light? Does he mean to say that we should go back and use tallow candles by which to eat supper and read our prayer-book? Does he mean to say that we should go back to the time of the two-wheel cart, when we sat on the axle, instead of driving in the comfortable vehicles of to-day? The Minister of Finance will not come from his house to the Parliament buildings without taking a cab. It is a shame for an hon. gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Finance to cast a slur on the people. In his opinion anything is good enough for the people. In effect he says: "Do not walk on the carpet, for it is reserved for us; do not dare to sit in a cushioned chair, for that is reserved for us; do not dare to have a clock on your wall, for that is reserved for us; do not dare to have any accommodation beyond that suitable for an Indian. That is all the respect the hon. gentleman has for the people. These hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are installed in office, with salaries of \$7,000 and \$8,000 a year; they are living on the fat of the land, they are extracting money from the people in order to enable them to get their pay, and that is about all they care for. We have heard about changes of the tariff being made to-morrow, but I do not believe the Government intend to change the tariff. They are divided among themselves on this question. Some hon. members are in favour of taking the duty from corn, but are not in favour of any other changes. Then, those who are in favour of taking the duty from binding twine do not desire any other reduction, and the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who is not willing to take the duty from anything, nevertheless will vote with the Minister of Finance to re-

duce the duty on coal oil and binding twine. If his master proposed to remove the duty from corn, he would support him, as he would any proposal to lower the duty on cottons or stoneware. Even if he proposed to increase the duty on china and gold and silver plate, he would support the hon. gentleman. But if such a proposition came from the Opposition, he would vote against it, on the ground that it was an attack on the National Policy, notwithstanding the fact that I have no doubt the greater part of his constituents believe the National Policy is a curse to the country. That policy has undoubtedly enabled the Government to extract more money from the people than the proper needs of the Government require, and has enabled the Government to spend money extravagantly. No one can deny that money has been foolishly and extravagantly spent in the country, and also that it has been used for the purpose of bribing and corrupting certain portions of the electors. Any man who reads the history of this country must know that these are facts that cannot be ignored or refuted. If all reports be true, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) does not intend to run another election; perhaps he does not intend to return to his constituents, but is devoting his attention to another quarter. I admit that an hon. member who expects to go to the Senate may be excused for speaking in favour of the Government, even although it may be against the interests of his own people. He may vote with the Government and do all the Government want him to do, because when he is once appointed to the Senate he is independent of the votes of the people. I am opposed to gentlemen holding responsible portfolios being pitchforked into the Senate where they are above the criticism of the electors. Two important portfolios are now filled by members of the other Chamber, including that of Trade and Commerce. I have nothing to say against the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or against the manner in which he discharged the duties of Minister of Customs, or in regard to the manner in which he is discharging his present position of Minister of Trade and Commerce, but it is wrong in principle to take power from the electors by placing important Ministers in the Senate. Will any one tell me that it is proper that a Minister occupying a most important position in the Country should be in a Chamber where the members are not responsible to the people? Is that responsible government? George Cole, Joseph Howe and the other fathers of responsible government in the Maritime provinces would laugh to scorn such an idea, and, if they were permitted to stand in Parliament to-day, they would show the people that such action was contrary to the spirit of the constitution, and to the principle of responsible government, and that all important offices should be filled by men who are responsible to the people. If Ministers are

Mr. PERRY.

responsible to the people, a certain amount of control may be exercised over them. But the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) are quite opposed to this view. They think the Government is doing well, and always acts correctly. These hon. gentlemen, however, must remember that the storm has broken, that the indignation of the people has been aroused. In proof of this, I want nothing more than the fact that petitions already presented by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), contain over 30,000 signatures, I presume most of those of Conservatives, asking the Government to remodel the tariff. Is the opinion of these electors to be disregarded by the Government? We find that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not alone in his stand on this reform of the tariff, but that he is supported by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and many others. We heard the other day in this House the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin)—a county that I believe never returned a Liberal—we heard him express his dissatisfaction with the tariff, and he made no secret of it. He said that he was sick and tired of it, and that he would vote against the Government and for the amendment of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He told in no uncertain way what he was going to do, and in that respect he is unlike the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who spoke one way and voted the other way.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Oh, no.

Mr. PERRY. We have the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) all in favour of tariff reform, and we saw that the junior member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) felt very shaky on the question last night. He was trembling, and his clothes very nearly fell off him, he shook so much. He did not know exactly how he was going to vote. He told us that New Brunswick was in a state of starvation, and that free trade with the United States would be the making of that province, but at last he wound up by saying that he was willing to take the word of the Finance Minister about tariff reform. Well, he has got more faith in the Finance Minister than I have. I suppose my friend from St. John (Mr. Chesley) will be invited to meet the Finance Minister to discuss the tariff with him. I suppose he will get a card of invitation, and that very likely his expenses will be paid, and I hope he will have a good time. But let me ask him, will he tell the Minister of Finance that the fishermen and the farmers and the labourers in New Brunswick are suffering from over-taxation? Not a bit of it. I believe he will tell him that the industries of New Brunswick require protection, and that perhaps it would

be better to add a little more protection on for their benefit. That is the information the Finance Minister is seeking for, as we have seen from the circular addressed, not to the people of Canada, but to the manufacturers of Canada, by the manager of the "Empire," the pet paper of the Government, and a paper that is supported by the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to longer occupy the time of the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Go on.

Mr. PERRY. I know it is not very amusing for my friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). I did not intend to amuse him, but I thought I would give him a lesson and teach him something, or perhaps I might help him to get into the other Chamber. I hope he will be there before long, but I do not think it will be this year. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, speaking from a Prince Edward Island point of view, that the National Policy is fairly ruining that province. We were told that we were going to have a number of factories there, when the National Policy was inaugurated, and that the farmers would have a home market for their products, but these promises have all been falsified. I know a poor fisherman who lives near me and who caught eighty barrels of mackerel last year, and in order to send the fish to the States, he had to pay \$160 duty into the American treasury. In the face of such a fact as that, is it any wonder that the people of the Island want free trade with the United States and that the representatives are bound to support it? I believe we can have free trade with the United States, and I believe that under the Cleveland Administration, if the people of Canada return the Liberal party to power in Canada, we will soon see that happy day arrive when we shall be able to interchange our products free from the barriers which now exist.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of replying to my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry). A few evenings ago, when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was addressing the House, I was among those who listened with a good deal of attention to that hon. gentleman's remarks, and I was somewhat surprised to hear him make what I considered very extraordinary statements, statements so extraordinary that I thought it my duty at the time to interrupt him and to deny the accuracy of what he said. It is at that hon. gentleman's special request, that I am now about to address the House for a few minutes. He has already been answered at length by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), so that it is necessary for me to touch upon only one or two points to which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) referred. I will take the liberty of quoting to the House a few of his assertions:

The people had prospered under free trade or under the nearest approach of it possible under responsible government. * * *

The man in those days who would have ventured to stand up and announce himself a protectionist would have been hooted from the hustings. * * *

We have shown that people are leaving the country and that we are poverty-stricken as compared with what we were years ago. * * *

Of all places in the Dominion Cape Breton has suffered the most. From that island there has been a greater percentage of exodus than from any other part of the Dominion. * * *

The National Policy was withering up the country. * * *

I regret that the people are leaving the Maritime provinces in hordes, as if a plague was there. I regret more than that, that the only member of the House who can be found to cheer the statement is the hon. member from Cape Breton who sits opposite me. * * *

Throughout the whole Dominion, I do not suppose there was any section in which such great hopes were indulged at the inception of Confederation, or so many prophecies of brilliant times made as in the Maritime provinces, and I think if there is one thing both sides can agree upon, it is this, that so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, at any rate not one of those promises has been fulfilled, and not any province of the three has reached forward to a measurable distance of that prosperity which was predicted and hoped for when we unfortunately joined the Confederation.

It was when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) referred to the exodus from Cape Breton, and to what he said was the failure of the policy which the Government inaugurated in 1878, to carry out its promises, that I made the interruption, and that he asked me to give evidence to the House in support of my denial of his statements. The hon. gentleman regretted that I was the only member in the House who cheered when that extraordinary statement was made by him. My hon. friend knows very well that when he is pleading in court, and when his opponent makes a weak statement, that is the time he cheers, and I cheered for the same reason. I heard my hon. friend making statements that he could not support by any evidence whatever, in respect to the island of Cape Breton, and more especially the county that I have the honour to represent. My hon. friend made particular reference to the decline, or as he put it, the disappearance from the coasts of the Maritime provinces of the shipping which had been in existence previous to the inception of the National Policy or previous to Confederation. My hon. friend received a pretty complete answer from the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), who addressed the House after my hon. friend had taken his seat, and he also received a good deal of information on the same subject from my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he adopts the statement of the hon. member for Centre Toronto, that 80,000 steam-boats were tied up to the wharfs?

Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton). I do not. I have not inquired into the accuracy or the inaccuracy of that statement. But as my hon. friend invited me to give evidence to the House on this subject, more particularly with reference to the county that I have the honour to represent, I wish to call his attention and the attention of this House to the present condition of the shipping interest there, compared with what it was during the time of the Liberal Government. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that in the year 1873-74, the year in which the hon. gentleman's friends took charge of the Government of this country, the total number of arrivals of vessels in the ports of my county, principally in the ports of Sydney and North Sydney and the outports, was 938, with a tonnage of 242,357 tons, and manned with 7,823 men. After four years' Government by hon. gentlemen opposite that shipping had gone down to 654 vessels, with a tonnage of 68,774 tons, and only 2,158 men. In other words, when they left office the arrivals at those ports were only two-thirds of what they were when they took office, the tonnage only one-fourth, and the number of men only one-fourth. I have figures which show a similar result at other ports, but I will not weary the House by reading them. Now, let me compare these figures with the statistics of the shipping that entered those ports in the year 1891-92. I find that in that year there arrived in the ports of Sydney and North Sydney 732 vessels, with a tonnage of 189,403 tons, and with 6,557 men. Those vessels were entirely deep-sea-going ocean vessels, foreign and Canadian included. Let me explain to the House that in the year 1873-74, and up to the year 1879-80, the shipping at the outports was included in that of the principal ports of Sydney and North Sydney. But in 1891-92, in addition there arrived at the outports 1,052 ocean-going vessels, with a tonnage of 267,824 tons, and with 10,201 men. Now I come to the coasting trade, and I find that in 1891-92 1,680 coasters entered the ports of Sydney and North Sydney, and 1,101 entered the outports, making 2,681 vessels, with a tonnage of 261,163 tons, and with 15,304 men. The number of vessels departing from our ports is something similar. I find that the total departures of coasters in the same year are 2,768 vessels, with a tonnage of 242,818 tons, and with 14,287 men. Now, Mr. Speaker, the House will see the difference in the figures that I have just quoted; and I have confined myself to the county which I have the honour to represent, owing to the fact that my hon. friend asked me to produce evidence in support of my denial of the statements he made to the House, and I think that these figures show conclusively that the statements made by the hon. gentleman were entirely inaccurate, and such as would justify laughter on the part of anybody who knows the facts. Now, Sir, I come to another point. At the inception of the National Policy one of

Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton).

the great industries in which the people of Nova Scotia, and more particularly the people of my county, were interested, was the coal industry, and I may say that the large increase which has taken place in our shipping is an evidence of the development of that industry. But I propose, further, with the indulgence of the House, to give a statement showing the development of that industry since the inception of the National Policy—a development which the people in my part of the country attribute almost entirely to that policy. I wish to refer especially to two phases of that policy,—the protection given to that industry in the markets of Canada, and the protection given to manufacturers in Canada who consume a large quantity of this product. I find that in 1873, the year before the Liberal party came into power, the total sales of coal from the province of Nova Scotia was 811,106 tons, of which 96,762 were marketed in Nova Scotia, 32,611 in New Brunswick, 4,712 in Prince Edward Island, 80,213 in the province of Quebec, 206,747 in the United States, 35,895 in the West Indies, 6,976 in Europe, and 54,141 in Newfoundland. Now, after four years of Liberal government, under the policy which my hon. friend describes as the nearest approach to free trade, I find that the output of coal, instead of being increased, was reduced to 688,628 tons, showing a falling off of 122,478 tons in Nova Scotia during these four years. I find that in 1891, the last year for which I can find figures published in detail, the total output of these mines was 1,849,945 tons. Now, Sir, there appears to be a very big difference between the effect of this great free trade policy on this industry in my county, and the effect of the much-abused National Policy, under which a duty of 50 cents was imposed on foreign coal coming into the country. The difference between the effects of the two policies is just the difference between 688,638 tons and 1,849,945. Let us take another view. The total quantity of coal produced by Nova Scotia in the ten years from 1871 to 1880 was 7,317,430 tons, and during these ten years we had four years of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the present Administration, from 1881 to 1890, I find that our total production was 13,910,136 tons. Now my hon. friend and his friends opposite cannot, in my opinion, give this House a single argument to disprove these figures. They are the figures furnished by the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, and verified from year to year. It may be of importance to show where a market for this nearly 14,000,000 tons is found to-day. As I have pointed out already, we had only in Nova Scotia a market for 89,129 tons. We have now a market for 258,293 tons. We have in New Brunswick a market, not for 17,139 tons, as we had at that time, but a market for 44,005 tons. I am quoting now the figures with respect to the production in my own county, the county of Cape Breton, which has the greatest coal fields of the different

counties in which coal is found in Nova Scotia. In Prince Edward Island we have a market for 24,563 tons, where before we had only a market, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, for 6,547 tons. To the province of Quebec we send 528,394 tons, instead of only 44,410 tons, which we sent when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. In the United States the difference is smaller. We could not be expected to increase our market in the United States with their tariff of 75 cents a ton against us. When we were able to send coal free of duty to the United States, we had a market for some 400,000 tons; but the people of the United States, about the year 1867, imposed a duty of \$1.25 per ton on our coal. Some four or five years later they reduced the duty to 75 cents; but notwithstanding that reduction we have been unable to send coal to the United States market. The West Indies took 4,066 tons, and Newfoundland 106,935 tons. These are the places where we got our market for the production of our collieries in the island of Cape Breton, during the season of 1891, and, as I have said already, the figures show conclusively that the effect of the National Policy was not only to increase production but to enable us to get a more extensive market for our coal, and to enable our people to earn more money in that industry and have better returns for their year's work. As another evidence of the fact that the National Policy has encouraged the building up of industries in the province of Nova Scotia, I would just give the figures with respect to the industrial establishments, which figures have been spoken of so often by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In the province of Nova Scotia our industrial establishments in 1881 were 5,459 in number, and in 1891 we find them to be 10,372. The number of men employed in 1881 was 20,390, and in 1891 the number was 34,250. This does not seem to bear out the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that these industries have not been increased or improved in the province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made particular reference to the exodus, and was very ably answered by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). But I wish to point out the facts with respect to my own county. According to the census of 1881 we had a population of 31,258, but according to the last census our total population is 34,244, an increase of about 3,000, or nearly 10 per cent. Now, I think my hon. friend might have selected some other county to speak of and some other gentleman in this House to challenge to give contradiction of the statements he was making. When I was first elected to Parliament, in 1878—the Parliament of Nova Scotia—one of my first duties, as I recollect very distinctly, was to ask Parliament for aid for the starving miners in my county. The miners were reported to be in actual danger of starvation.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). When was that?

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). That was in the year 1878. I remember very distinctly that one of the first requests I made to my colleagues in the Provincial Government of that time was to provide some means by which the people engaged in the mining industry might be kept from starving.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was very kind of you.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). My hon. friend is a professional, and ought to know the propriety of a patient taking his medicine.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is a very happy suggestion, too.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). In addition to that fact, Mr. Speaker, a number of our coal operators in the county of Cape Breton, and I believe in the counties of Nova Scotia proper as well, owing to the depression that prevailed—and at this time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power—were not only unable to market their coal, not only unable to make the coal industry pay, but they were unable to pay the royalty imposed by the law of Nova Scotia. On behalf of a number of these operators, I spoke to my colleagues and begged them to give time for the payment of the royalty until the people could develop their mines with greater success than they were doing at that time, because if they had been forced to pay the royalty that had accumulated, the result must have been the closing down of the mines. To-day these mines are in a state of great prosperity. Instead of these operators losing money or making no money out of their investments, they are making a good profit, so good as to have attracted the attention of people from the south side of the boundary line, so that only a few months ago capitalists from the United States came and bought up all the mines within my county with a view of making large profits. They are not going to invest their money in our country with the view of losing it. After the test of the National Policy for that industry, some twelve years ago, these people see that it would be in their interest to invest their money in that industry. They came down, Sir, and bought up that industry; they bought it with the assistance of the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, with a view to making money out of it. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry), as well as many other hon. gentlemen on the other side of House, have repeated again and again the statement that the poor people were oppressed by the high taxation. I do not propose to go into that question; it has been gone into so fully by hon. gentlemen who preceded me that I consider it unnecessary to take up the time of the House in dealing with it at any length. But I am one who is in constant communication with the people in business and have been since I was able to do anything. I know the circumstances of the people to-day. I know what their circumstances were twenty

years ago, and I may say thirty years ago. I know, Sir, that there never was a time in the history of the country from which I come, within my knowledge, when the people were as comfortably circumstanced as they are to-day. I know there never was a time when these people could have bought the necessaries of life as cheaply as they can to-day; I know that, because I deal with these people and these people deal with me. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry), who has just addressed the House, made particular reference to the article of cotton. Sir, cotton can be bought to-day for one-half the price it commanded fifteen years ago. Sugar can be bought at less than one-half what it cost fifteen years ago. Tea that sold at 40 and 50 cents at that time can now be bought at 20 cents, 25 cents and 30 cents. I might go through the list of articles that enter into the consumption of the people, particularly of the poorer classes of people, the farmers and workingmen, to-day, and find that, as compared with the price fifteen or twenty years ago, there is a reduction of at least 50 per cent. My hon. friend has asked the question: Can we send potatoes to Ontario or Quebec? I say we can. I say that potatoes from the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are to-day on the tables of the people of Ottawa and Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER. And good potatoes, too.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Yes; as my hon. friend says, good ones, too. We have facilities for the transportation of these commodities to-day that we had not fifteen or twenty years ago. That is why we can send the products of our different industries to almost any part of Canada to-day where they may be wanted. We are able to send them because these facilities are placed at our disposal, which we could not expect to have had under the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, judging from the way they dealt with these matters and the effect upon our industries of their policy when in power. I do not wish to take up the time of the House; I do not propose to do so at any further length. There is nothing that I could say now but what has been already said from this side of the House, and, if hon. gentlemen opposite are not now satisfied with these statements, I presume there is nothing I could add that would satisfy them.

Mr. BECHARD. After having heard hon. gentlemen who sit on the ministerial benches, I am tempted to ask myself how it is I am not yet persuaded that this country is in a prosperous condition. We have heard that statement a great many times during this discussion. We had it first from high authority, in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session; we had it subsequently from the mouth of the Finance Minister himself when he made his financial statement, and we have had it many times from other hon. gentlemen. Now, Sir, since the beginning of this debate a flood of figures has been poured upon

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton).

us. Letters and telegrams containing the opinions of persons said to be competent in the matter have been read; numberless statistics have been quoted; the power of eloquence and argument has been largely made us of—in a word, nothing seems to have been forgotten that could justify the statement that this country is prosperous. This great effort in support of a once popular but now tottering policy is already before the country, where I am sure it will be received, not as in days gone by, by the cheers of popular sympathy, but with the cold indifference, if not the spontaneous reprobation, of a discontented people. We have now before us the net product of this renewed effort for the defence of a moribund policy, and when reduced to its real proportion, what does it amount to? Sir, it has been demonstrated in this debate by hon. gentlemen opposite that by virtue of the National Policy a village here, a town there, a city somewhere else, have a few more factories than they possessed before the initiation of that policy; that during the last decade they have somewhat increased their population; that the number of persons employed in manufactures is greater by 6,000 or 7,000, and, as the crowning piece of that structure, which seems to provoke the admiration of my hon. friends opposite, as if it were a monument of colossal proportions, they pointed to our manufacturers who are doing well, some of them exceedingly well, and are very prosperous, since they have had an opportunity of becoming millionaires during the short space of ten or twelve years, while the plague of emigration was decimating the population of this country. If it is true that some towns have increased their population, it is equally true that in other parts of the country, in some of the rural districts, the population has remained stationary, and in some others it has greatly decreased. That there is prosperity somewhere in this country, that there is prosperity with a small number, is a fact that no one will undertake to deny; but that the great mass of the people are to-day enjoying prosperity, is an assertion wholly at variance with the real state of things. Before you tell me that this country is prosperous, I want you to explain the cause of the exodus, which inflicts such an immense loss on this country. It is no explanation to say, as has been said, that Canadians do not migrate any more than do the American people themselves, that they only perform a natural act that is performed by Americans living in the northern parts of the United States, and who go to the western states and settle. Sir, those Americans who go to the western states know that they can find there cheaper and better farms than those they possess in the east, and where with smaller means they can settle in a better condition. But, Sir, those Americans who go to the west do not leave their country; it is for them simply a change of latitude, but not a change of country. We would be only too happy if we could see those who leave the old provinces

of the Dominion, take a western direction and settle in our western territories, for they would make the best settlers this country could desire. Their case would then be like that of the American people who go from the eastern to the western states; it would be for them, as for the Americans, simply a change of latitude, but not a change of country. But we all know that the greatest part of those who leave the old provinces of the Dominion, take the road to the United States. I do not charge the National Policy with being the principal cause of the exodus, but I do complain that it has not fulfilled the promises made by its promoters during the election campaign of 1878. Not only has it not brought back to Canada, as was promised, those of our countrymen who had emigrated, but it has been powerless even to stop the wave of emigration. Now, you may pile up figures upon figures, heap statistics upon statistics, as high as mountains; you will not thereby succeed in persuading men that they are prosperous, when they do not feel so. When people are content, they do not leave the country. Prosperity, as you well know, makes people contented, and a contented people do not emigrate. I can understand an emigration from the old countries of Europe, where the population is dense, where space is restricted, and where the labouring classes are comparatively poor—I say I can understand an emigration from such countries to this young continent of North America, enjoying the blessings of free institutions, containing almost unlimited space, and possessing inexhaustible sources of natural wealth. These are powerful inducements for the labouring classes of Europe to emigrate to this side of the Atlantic, but emigration from this new country of Canada, so richly endowed with natural advantages of all kinds, with a healthy climate, a fertile soil, with immense natural wealth, with great facilities for education, in a word, with all the advantages which accompany a high state of civilization; I say that emigration from such a country as ours, is a problem which I cannot understand and cannot explain, unless it be from a lack of sufficient development of the natural wealth of the country. When I look at the long and continued procession of my fellow-countrymen to a foreign land, I am irresistibly led to the conclusion that there is an absence of sufficient opportunity for the development of prosperity here. That emigration is not natural, it is entirely abnormal. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle), in a speech he delivered the other day, expressed an entirely different opinion on this subject. He said that the exodus was a natural fact, that the Canadian, I suppose he was particularly speaking of the French Canadian, is a traveller by nature, and that the principal cause of the exodus of our countrymen is due to their adventurous spirit. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the exodus were limited to young men,

I could understand that there might be some truth in the hon. gentleman's statement. We might, perhaps, say that they had inherited the adventurous and chivalrous character of those of our ancestors to whom we are indebted for the discovery of this country, those who were pioneers of civilization on this vast continent of North America. But when we see whole families leaving every year, by hundreds and by thousands, for a foreign land, I think it would be simply ridiculous to pretend that those people are actuated simply by a spirit of adventure. Those who go to the United States do not go to that country to run after adventures, but they go there because they find greater prosperity than prevails in this country, they go there to obtain more means and in order to place themselves in a position so that, after a few years, they may possibly be able to return to their native country. Canadians do not leave this country because they do not like it, for they prefer this to any other country. They are attached to it and to the home influences that surround their lives, and around which are woven their affections. It is with tears in their eyes and pangs in their breasts they await the moment when they are obliged to bid adieu to their homes, and leave their country for a foreign land. The hon. member for Hochelaga did not show much sympathy for those people, for he said in his speech that he would not be disposed to induce the Government to make any great sacrifices to secure their return. I deeply regretted to hear those words fall from the mouth of an hon. member of this House, and more especially from the mouth of a representative of the province of Quebec, and a French Canadian. I venture to say that, among the representatives of that province in this House, he is the only one who entertains such unpatriotic sentiments. For my part, I thank God I have not the misfortune to share those sentiments, and if I did I hope I would not be so unfortunate as to commit the indecency to give utterance to them. Sir, the work of bringing back the expatriated Canadians to this country is a most noble one, quite worthy of the serious attention and energetic efforts of the Canadian Government. A more patriotic task could not be undertaken, and any man who calls himself a patriot should be prepared to lend a helping hand in the accomplishment of that noble undertaking, for whilst, we expend every year large sums of money to bring to this country people from the old nations of Europe, I am afraid we do not offer the proper inducements to those who are our own countrymen who have emigrated to the United States, and who would prove the best class of settlers that could be procured for our country. The Minister of the Interior, in speaking of the exodus the other day, said, or at least was understood to say, that there

were only a few young professional men who left Canada for the United States. There is something true in that statement, but it is not the whole truth. It is quite true that a certain number of professional young men, after completing their studies here, seeing their profession crowded in Canada, leave this country and go to the United States; but if the exodus were limited to those few, certainly we would not see to-day about 1,000,000 native-born Canadians in the United States. The Minister also alluded to the fact that, within the last twenty-five or thirty years, the farmers of Ontario had progressed, that they had improved their habits of living, and each year increased their expenditure. The same observation might be applied to the farmers of the province of Quebec. They also have progressed, they build their houses in a more tasteful manner, they are more comfortable, their table is better, their clothes are richer, and their vehicles almost aristocratic. The farmers in Quebec, as well as in Ontario, have considerably modified their ways of farming: their methods have been improved, their implements are more perfect, consequently, their farms are more productive. They do more work than formerly, and they produce a great deal more in a stated time than previously, and at less expense than before they made these modern improvements. In this way they have increased their revenue, and during ordinarily good times, the farmers not only maintain their ground, but some of them make considerable savings. But they have, on the other hand, increased their expenditure. We all know that a bad crop is very damaging to the farmer, because he has only that resource, and when he is overtaken by a succession of bad crops, two or three years following he becomes indebted, and arrives at the conclusion that the time has come to leave the country and go to the United States. But what is wanted chiefly by the farmer is a good market, where he can obtain remunerative prices for his products. Even the good crop of 1891 did not bring much prosperity to the farmers of this country, because the prices were too low and were not remunerative. The effects of the McKinley tariff are severely felt by our farmers. The price of everything which they have to sell has decreased to a very large extent during the last two or three years. We all know that horses were largely exported from Canada to the United States before the McKinley Bill came into operation, but the price of horses is to-day only one-third of what it was two or three years ago, and their exports to that country has been reduced more than 60 per cent. The price of hay has decreased 25 or 30 per cent. The price of barley has also decreased in an enormous proportion, and the prices of poultry, eggs and of other articles which we used to export in large quantities, have decreased in some instances 33 per cent and in others 50 per cent. The same thing could be

Mr. BÉCHARD.

said in regard to all farm products, which find their best market in the United States, and the consequence is that with lower prices, the farmers cannot be prosperous and are consequently discontented at the present commercial policy of the Government. Reference has been made many times during the course of the debate to the reduced value of farm lands, and I can state here unhesitatingly, that in the part of the country in which I live, the value of farm lands has decreased by at least one-third. In fact, farms cannot be sold at all, because nobody wants to buy them. The present state of things cannot continue much longer without serious consequences to the country. It creates anxiety and discontent, and the Minister of Finance has himself admitted that there is in the country a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction. The hon. gentleman said that the Government is disposed to meet that feeling fairly. But what does he propose? He proposes to revise the tariff, but not at present. He says he will do so at next session of Parliament, when he has had time to gather sufficient information. I was glad to hear from the Finance Minister that he intended to revise the tariff, and to reduce the duties upon, we may presume, quite a number of articles amongst the goods which they consume; but I may tell the Finance Minister that whilst a proposal of this kind will be received with satisfaction by the country, it will not give entire satisfaction, and it will not be sufficient to content the people. Farmers would rather pay heavier duties and receive good prices for their products than pay light duties and receive prices which are not remunerative. Our farmers are industrious, sober and frugal; they ought to be successful, but they are in need of one of the principal elements of success in their industry, and that is a good market for the sale of their products. The British market is too remote from Canada to replace the American market for a large number of articles. The British market is good for only a part of the product of the Canadian farmer, and a large proportion of what he produces has its best market in the neighbouring Republic. It is idle to try to make the farmers believe that the American market can be replaced by the British market. Their eyes are opened, and they have had for years the experience which has taught them that the best market which can be obtained for a large portion of their products is to be found in the American Republic.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Finance Minister has told us that he would favour reciprocity with the United States, provided a reasonable reciprocity treaty could

be negotiated. Although, Sir, these words are somewhat vague, they indicate to a certain extent the kind of reciprocity which the hon. gentleman would favour. If it is such as he has vainly sought to obtain from the American Government, I am afraid that the Canadian farmers will have to wait for a long time before they receive the benefit of it. We all know that the hon. Minister is in favour of reciprocity in natural products. I have already said on a previous occasion, and I repeat it here to-day, that if the hon. gentleman would obtain such a reciprocity, the country at large would be satisfied; but the hon. gentleman himself knows from his own experience that such a limited reciprocity cannot be obtained from the Government of the United States. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister is hostile to any reciprocity in manufactured goods, because, he says, it would have the effect of sweeping away all our manufactories. But there are those, and I am among them, who believe quite the contrary. Speaking for myself and myself alone, I would go for a large measure of reciprocity with the United States, a measure of such a large character as to give it permanency, for I consider permanency to be one of the principal elements necessary to give to such a measure complete efficiency. If the American market were open permanently to Canadian products, I venture to say that within a short time you would see American capital flowing into Canada rapidly, to develop our natural resources, such as our mines, our forests and our great water-powers. I am confident that within a comparatively short period the state of manufacturing industry in Canada would be superior to that in the New England states, for we have natural facilities for manufacturing such as do not exist in that country. I know manufacturers in this country who hold this view. One of them, who is in business at Chambly, on the Richelieu River, who began business when a young man with small means, and who is to-day one of the most successful manufacturers in this country, has said to me on many occasions: "My mills are stopped during a certain length of time every year because the home market becomes crowded; but open to me the American market, and my mills will run the whole year long; in my line I fear no American competitor." Sir, I am convinced that this opinion is shared by a large number of our manufacturers, especially those who have been successful and whose industries are natural to this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are in this House and in the country those who are opposed to reciprocity in manufactured articles between Canada and the United States on the ground that it would involve discrimination against British goods. This is merely sentimental, although I must confess that it is an honourable and respectable sentiment. At the same time these gentlemen must not expect that the farmers and the other labouring classes of Canada will tamely consent to be

much longer the passive spectators of the comparatively great prosperity which exists on the other side of the American frontier, and be forever deprived of it, for the purpose of remaining the customers of a few British manufacturers. This would be exacting too much from their patriotism. Charity begins at home, and in this case as in many others the moral of self-interest will prevail over sentimental considerations, however respectable they may be. There are also those who are opposed to a large measure of free trade with the United States on the ground that it would lead to annexation. On this point I have already taken, and I still take direct issue with those hon. gentlemen. The lessons of the past in this respect must not be forgotten. We all know that those who started the annexation movement in 1849 had not in view any political object, but that their only purpose was to secure for this country improved commercial relations with the United States. As soon as the reciprocity treaty of 1854 had been negotiated all annexationist feeling vanished away. This is a case in which history would repeat itself, for those who are for annexation to-day are impelled only by the desire to secure to their country thereby better commercial relations with the United States. I hold, therefore, that a large measure, even the largest measure of reciprocity with the United States, so far from developing or encouraging an annexation feeling in this country, would have the effect of annihilating it. By reciprocity with the United States our people would obtain all they need or want. The annexationists would be satisfied, because the reason for annexation would no longer exist. Now, Sir, I tell the hon. gentleman, I tell the Government, I tell all friends of this country, that when my hon. friend from Lislet (Mr. Tarte), the other day, said in this House, speaking of the discontent now existing in this country with regard to our commercial relations with the United States, that if there was a plebiscite taken on this question to-day the result might cause great surprise, I fully concur in the opinion of my hon. friend. There are numerous men to-day in this country who would vote for annexation in order to secure the benefit of free commercial relations with the United States, if they thought they could not secure it otherwise. In the most loyal province of this Dominion, at least according to the boast of some hon. gentlemen on the other side, there is already a nucleus of annexationists who are organizing and recruiting. You may dismiss them from office, if you like, you may expel them from the country, if you can, according to the wish expressed by an hon. gentleman in this House a few days ago, but persecution will not annihilate the cause for which they are working. On the contrary, it will gain friends for it. The best policy to destroy that feeling is to obtain free trade in the largest measure between Canada and the United States;

but if we persist in the policy of restricting trade between this country and the American republic we may be sure that nothing can be done better calculated to develop the annexation feeling in this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by telling all parties in this House and the country, that if you want to keep this country a part of the British Empire, or as an independent nation in the future, you must take the means to make our people contented, in securing for them free trade with the United States. We require a share of that great trade which exists on the other side of the line, and which promotes prosperity throughout the length and breadth of that great country; there is the only means of removing the annexation feeling and of giving entire satisfaction to our people. The Government in negotiating such a treaty will have found at the same time the best means of stopping the tide of emigration from Canada to the other side of the frontier.

Mr. LAURIER. I promised yesterday to my hon. friends opposite that we should come to a division upon this question this evening. Therefore it will not be out of place if, at this stage, before we reach a conclusion, I should endeavour to review the situation and see exactly where we stand. When, the other day, the hon. member for South Oxford opened the debate on this side, he stated, and stated truly, that great and unusual this year had been the exception with which the Budget speech had been awaited, but that greater still had been the disappointment which followed. It would be a misnomer, however, to call the speech with which the Minister of Finance moved the House into Committee of Ways and Means, the Budget speech. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that it had none of the characteristics, none of the essentials of what we understand by a Budget speech. There was nothing in it of the financial condition of the country; there was nothing of the proposed expenditure for the coming year, and there was certainly no estimate whatever of the probable revenue. It was not a Budget speech, but a special plea. It was a carefully prepared apology for the National Policy, and when the hon. gentleman concluded by stating, that apart from two small modifications, no change would take place in the tariff, but that the people would have one year more to drink at the cup of the National Policy and taste to the dregs of its blessings, great was the disappointment, not only throughout the land, but even on the faces of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had begged and prayed the hon. gentleman that this cup might pass away from them. Indeed, so great, so loud and so persistent had been the demand for reform of the tariff, not only from all parts of the country, but even from the ranks of hon. gentlemen on the other side, that my hon. friend was forced to notice it,

Mr. BÉCHARD.

but he noticed it simply to say that he could not accede to it. He promised, however, that he would do so some time, perhaps next year—but he was not sure—but in the meantime he would cogitate, he would ponder, he would consider, he would inquire, and his inquiring, his considering, his pondering, might perhaps take shape in some definite form of action, at some indefinite time. In the meantime, the yoke of taxation is to remain as heavy as it was upon the shoulders of the people; in the meantime, the blessings of the National Policy are to weigh upon the people. What else was to be expected from the hon. gentleman? What else is to be expected from him in the future? Why, Sir, three-fourths of the speech of the hon. gentleman was devoted to the arduous task of convincing the people that they are prosperous. Rachel of old would not be consoled because her children were no more; and the people cannot be convinced because that prosperity, of which they hear so much, is not there. As to my hon. friend, I do not doubt his sincerity whatever. I am quite sure he believes the people are prosperous. I am quite sure that, by dint of repeating and again repeating that the people are prosperous, he has become the victim of his own preaching and has convinced himself of what he has failed to convince others, and if he is really sincere, as no doubt he is, in thinking that the people are prosperous, why should he make any change? It would be madness and folly for him to change a state of things which has brought about this prosperous condition of the people in which his own imagination delights. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk of prosperity, they argue much as James the Second did. According to Macaulay, you remember, James the Second commenced by asserting a proposition, and as often as wiser men showed him that it was erroneous, he asserted it again, conceiving that thereby he had dispelled all objections. It is very much the same with hon. gentlemen. They assume that the country is prosperous, and as often as wiser men endeavour to show them that their position is erroneous, they simply repeat that the country is prosperous. The fact that so many thousands of Canadians every year turn their backs on that prosperity gives them no concern whatever. They ignore the fact, or, if driven to the wall and forced to deal with it, they have the most ingenious theories to explain it away. On a former occasion, the Minister of Finance accounted for the exodus from this country by saying that there was a great movement of population from the east to the west. According to this theory, there must be, somewhere in the west, a centre of gravitation towards which the people of the east are fatally attracted. I will not discuss that theory. The ancients believed that on the Mediterranean Sea ships were fatally attracted to the whirlpool of Charybdis or the rocks of Scylla. But the ancients did not know what we know,

that there was such a thing as gravitation. Perhaps, after all, my hon. friend is another Sir Isaac Newton and has discovered some hidden law of nature. Gravitation is a thing which not only applies universally but there are many modifications of it. We know, for instance, that the waters of the ocean are attracted by powerful currents towards certain centres. In certain countries at certain periods of the year the wind blows in certain directions. And so perhaps, after all, there may be in the west a centre of gravitation which attracts the people from the east and unconsciously impels them to abandon their comfortable homes and all the wealth piled around them by the National Policy. Well, Sir, if we really have to battle against some unknown force of nature, in all conscience, in all justice, the National Policy must be held free from blame. If there is in the west some new centre of gravitation which attracts people from the east, it is all in vain that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and ministerial orators and newspapers vie with each other to paint the enchantments of the National Policy; people will go away from their homes, perhaps to have their fortunes shattered, as in the days of old ships were shattered on the rocks of Scylla. But my hon. friend, since he has given attention to that theory, must have observed that it does not apply uniformly upon this continent. It may be that south of the forty-fifth parallel the attraction is from east to west, but, Sir, this does not apply north of that line. North of the forty-fifth parallel, attraction is not from east to west, but from north to south. If the attraction was from east to west, we should have a displacement of population, but no loss, but actually we have a loss of about 1,000,000 people, who are attracted, not from east to west, but from north to south. And the hon. gentleman may have observed that his law of gravitation does not apply to all classes of the population; that one class is exempt from it—the recipients of ministerial favours, those who directly or indirectly live upon the public treasury. But those who work hard for a living, the tillers of the soil especially, upon those it is that this attraction acts. Consideration of these facts must convince my hon. friend that his theory is too fantastic for an assembly composed of men of average common sense. The hon. gentleman must admit, that if there is a movement of population, it is not due to some mysterious agency, but to the well-known law, exemplified in all ages, that when people are oppressed by the conditions under which they live, they will seek relief in emigration, whenever they can emigrate. It is an appalling condition of things when a young country like Canada, which could afford food and shelter for 100,000,000 of men, cannot keep its paltry population of 5,000,000. It is an appalling condition of things, but we are told by gentlemen opposite that there is an

offset to this, and we are asked to look at the wonderful development of our manufacturing industries under the National Policy. Well, Sir, here we become the prey of the statisticians of Canada. And the statisticians of Canada are a body of most positive men. For them there is nothing doubtful; they undertake to solve every problem that comes in their way. LaBiche, in one of his most amusing comedies, introduces a statistician, who is an enthusiast in his science, but who at least does not pretend to solve every problem with unimpeachable accuracy. He undertakes to calculate the number of widows who on a certain day cross the Pont Neuf. He very nearly reached perfection, yet not quite absolutely. He calculated that on the day in question the number of widows who passed over the bridge was—if I remember the figures—something like 967, and one doubtful. As to this one, he would not be precise in declaring whether she was a widow or not. He confessed his honest doubt. Our statisticians have no such doubts whatever. They have undertaken to calculate to the last cent what is the capital invested in our manufacturing industries, and according to their calculations the amount so invested is \$183,532,827, an increase, as they say, within the last ten years, of \$92,664,127. Now, the object of this, the impression sought to be conveyed by these figures, is that the national wealth of Canada is increased by \$92,000,000, a very large figure, I admit. But the statisticians of Canada have not told us what proportion of water there is in these stocks, nor have they told us what amount of money was really sunk in these investments. For it is a matter of notoriety that a very large proportion of the money which has been invested in manufacturing industries under the National Policy, has been absolutely sunk and lost. But the impression they seek to convey is, that the national wealth of Canada is greater than it was ten years ago by \$92,000,000, invested in the manufactures in this country. Sir, for my part, I have very great hesitation in accepting these figures. As we have seen, the Government refuse to give us the particulars of these census returns; every one has a right to feel doubtful as to whether we have been told the exact truth. But, Sir, even if we have the exact truth here, even if the national wealth is increased by \$92,000,000, invested in the manufacturing industries of Canada, I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the amount lost by the farmers in the depreciation of land far exceeds that amount. It cannot be disputed, Sir, that within the last ten years every farm in Canada has lost in value at least 25 per cent of its former value, perhaps 30 per cent, perhaps 40 per cent. This fact cannot be successfully disputed. Now, Sir, there are in Canada to-day 600,000 men engaged in agricultural pursuits. There are on this side of Lake Superior, at least, 500,000 farms. Now, in Ontario, as far as I

have been able to read the statistics of that province, the average value of farms is \$2,500. If the average value of these 500,000 farms is placed at \$2,000, and if there is a depreciation of, at least, 25 per cent, we have an actual cost to the farmers of Canada of not less than \$125,000,000, by which amount these men are poorer than they were ten years ago. Now, Sir, no one can dispute that that is an actual loss. My friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other day addressed himself to this view of the question and stated that the loss was not felt, after all, because very few farmers wanted to sell, and it is only the farmer who wishes to sell his farm that feels this loss. But if there is a depression in the price of land, if the loss on the price of farms is at least 25 per cent, as compared with ten years ago, what is the cause? There must be a cause for it. Sir, the cause of the farm decreasing in value is that the profits of the farm have decreased in amount. The capital of the farmer is not invested in bank stocks or railway securities, or other securities, but it is invested in his farm, in his land, and that capital is increased or decreased in value as the profits of the farm increase or decrease. Therefore, when, to-day, we find that the farms all around have decreased in value, we have also the fact that the farmers of Canada have been falling behind in the amount of their wealth. I know what will be the answer to this. I shall be told that this decrease in the value of farms is not to be attributed to the National Policy. I shall be told that it is not due to the National Policy, because the statement has already been made that there is a similar depreciation in the value of farm lands in the United States. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, a few days ago, laboured hard to prove that farms in the United States had depreciated in value as much as they have in Canada, that the farmers of the eastern states, instead of going forward, had actually retrograded. Sir, my hon. friend might have spared himself the labour of proving that statement, because I admit it. I admit fully that farmers in the United States are in the same condition as the farmers of Canada, and that their farms have depreciated in value like the farms of Canada; and I say to my hon. friend that, in making that statement, he has made the most powerful arraignment that ever was made of the National Policy. By that statement the National Policy stands condemned by its own friends, because it is an admission that the same cause has produced the same result in both countries. Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite: What is the National Policy? Is it anything else but a servile copy of the American tariff of protection? What was the cry upon which they went to the country in 1878? Was it not reciprocity of trade, or reciprocity of tariff? For fear that hon. gentlemen may have forgotten their own history, I will refresh their memory by a sen-

Mr. LAURIER.

tence extracted from the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald, delivered in Hamilton, in 1878:

I want the Canadians to say to the Americans: We will have free trade, fair trade, reciprocal trade, if you like; but if you will not have reciprocity in trade, we will not have reciprocity in tariff. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

This sentence of Sir John A. Macdonald was repeated by him in all his speeches, and echoed by all his followers in the press and throughout the country. Upon that cry they won, and, after they had won, as they could not obtain reciprocity, well, they adopted the American tariff. They proceeded after the manner of Chinese duellists. You know in China they have a peculiar code of honour. If a man receives an insult, he sends a challenge to the insulter, which is invariably accepted. But the parties do not meet on the ground. The insulted party disembowels himself with his own sword, and the insulter also plunges his own sword into his bowels; and so the injury is avenged by the death both of the insulted party and of the insulter. So did hon. gentlemen opposite; when they found they could not obtain reciprocity of trade, they adopted reciprocity of tariffs, that is to say, they punished the Americans by adopting their own tariff. At that time the Americans had the war tariff. They were taxing their people mercilessly, and our Government proceeded to adopt their tariff and tax our own people mercilessly likewise. The Americans were plucking the American goose, and our Government proceeded to pluck the Canadian gander. The American tariff was ruining American agriculture, and ever since the Canadian tariff has been ruining Canadian agriculture. Sir, it is well known to-day that agriculture is in a transient condition. The opening of new wheat fields in diverse parts of the world, the increased facilities for transport have revolutionized the price of cereals. You remember that when the National Policy was adopted in 1878 the price of wheat in Canada, on the average, was \$1 a bushel. The purpose of the National Policy, avowed, maintained, reiterated, was to raise the price of wheat to \$1.50. It is now 60 cents a bushel. It is at this time, when agriculture is less able to bear the burdens than ever, that the agriculturalist is loaded and overloaded by the policy of the Government. At this very moment when from causes over which, I admit, legislation has no control, the Government steps in and, by legislation, places upon the Canadian farmer an intolerable burden of taxation. Everything that he has in his house, in his barn, in his field, is subject to an innumerable list of taxation, and so, at this moment, when, from causes over which legislation has no control, the revenue of the farmer is decreasing, the Government steps in and increases his expenditure. The result is that at this moment agriculture is

more than ever deserted as an occupation ; and the further result is, that, to-day, apart from the new wheat fields, land is a drug in the market, and cannot find a purchaser. I have heard the question discussed in this House as to which of the two, the Canadian farmer or the American farmer, was in a better condition. Sir, I look upon this discussion as absolutely useless. The American farmer and the Canadian farmer have been treated in the same way, and the result has been the same ; save, perhaps, that the American farmer, having a much wider market, does not suffer so much. If you desire to know what is the fate of the American farmer, I cannot do better than quote to the House an article from the Chicago "Herald," published last summer during the presidential campaign. I select it from a series of most admirable articles which have since been published in pamphlet form. The editor says :

Thirty years of protective tariff taxation have reduced American agriculture to a position so ignoble that in some places it does not even retain its self-respect. A generation ago the American farmer was the proudest and most independent workingman on the earth. To-day he cannot persuade his own son to remain on the farm.

Very like Canada. The editor goes on to say :

It was the prosperity and independence of the American farmer that first excited the cupidity of protectionists. They wanted to rob him and they invented an excuse. They told him that he needed a home market, and that they would give it to him in return for the privilege of taxing him. When the home market swindle was exposed they beguiled him with the idea that they could and would share their protective tariff plunder with him, and, while going through the mockery of putting a tariff tax on foreign agricultural products, they took occasion to increase their own share of the plunder. The one was a pretence. The other was real and tangible. The home market confidence game has been laid bare in Pennsylvania and New England, the seats of the great tariff monopolies, where fine farms, once the homes of several generations of Americans, are now abandoned and cannot be sold for even the value of the buildings.

More and more like Canada. The editor goes on to say :

The protective tariff is a tax upon consumption. It rests upon nearly everything that the farmer uses or wears. It is on the lumber of his house, on the glass in his windows, on the implements with which he makes his crops, on his dishes, tinware, furniture and carpets, his cutlery and lamps, his clothing, his blankets and his harness. It enhances the price of nearly everything that he buys. It does not add a farthing to the value of anything that he has to sell.

Apart from the tax on lumber, it is absolutely like Canada. Sir, is it to be wondered at that in the year just elapsed, during the last presidential elections, the American farmers made a supreme effort to free themselves from the grasp of the octopus which, for so many years, has had them fast in its arms and has been feeding on the best of their blood. The American farmers joined all other classes, outside of the pro-

tected manufacturers, in a crusade against the voracious monster. Now, we were told a few days ago by an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House, that land has also depreciated in value in England. So it has ; but, Sir, the condition of land in England is not to be compared with the condition of land in America. Land in England has always been held as a monopoly by a privileged class. For centuries and centuries a privileged class had legislation in its own hands. It is only a few years since the advance of democratic ideas has displaced the source of power in England, and now it rests in the hands of the whole nation. And so long as that privileged class had it in its power to legislate, they did the best they could to enhance the value of their monopoly. What was the object of the corn laws ? Their object was simply to increase the price of land to the land-owners, and the chief reason which was advanced against the abolition of those laws was this, that it would decrease the price of land and lower the standard of the aristocracy. Undoubtedly of all men who defended the corn laws, the ablest was Lord Stanley, and, in the very last debate which took place in the House of Lords, when speaking of the rack-renting landlords of England and Ireland, he used this very significant language :

My Lords, these are the true aristocracy of the country. If you reduce these men in the scale of society, you will inflict an irretrievable and irreparable injury upon the country.

Lord Stanley was right, undoubtedly, if an aristocracy is indispensable to a nation. But such views we do not hold on this continent. On this continent we hold that all men are free and equal before the law, and that there should be no privileged class ; but the idea which underlies the language of Lord Stanley was, according to his view, true. Freedom of trade would endanger the fate of the aristocracy. At the time of the discussion of the corn laws the rental of land was \$12 per acre ; but the price of rental has been reduced until, after forty years of free trade, it is \$6 or thereabouts ; and this condition of things will go on. The price of land will continue to decline until it has reached its normal standard, just as in this country and in the United States, if we had freedom of trade, the price of land would increase to its normal standard, because in land as in everything else there is a normal standard which can be moved up or down by artificial causes for the benefit of a privileged class ; but so soon as these obstacles are removed the price will reach its normal standard, its own level, and its level is and always must be based on the relative profit that can be obtained by those who till the soil, and that is the only standard. I may remind the House of this, that when the National Policy was introduced in Parliament a mighty attempt was made to capture the farmers. It was represented to the farmers that they would be greatly bene-

fitted if such a policy were adopted. Of course the National Policy must increase the taxation of the farmers; but it was represented to them that they must submit to the increased taxation, because the higher duties would be the means of establishing in this country manufacturing industries which would afford a home market and increase prices for their products. Let me quote here a speech delivered by Sir John A. Macdonald, which was the text-book at that time of his party. Addressing a meeting of farmers at Bury, he said:

I tell the manufacturer unless he gives protection to the farmer, the farmer will not give protection to him. I say the same thing to the farmer. You must not grumble, if perhaps you have to pay a few cents more for anything we can produce in this country. You must not be hungering for strange markets to get goods at bankrupt, sacrifice prices. No; you must encourage manufactures at our own doors. Who are those artisans and skilled labourers to whom you must pay perhaps a few cents more for the produce of their lands? They are your brothers and sons, bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh, and in return for your giving only, perhaps, the real value to these men of their products, you have at home—at the next village—your reward, because you have purchasers for everything you can raise, not only for the larger crops, but for the egg that the hen drops, and the hen herself, God bless her.

How false this language sounds in view of actual facts? Where is the home market to-day? Where is the nearest village to which the farmer can take his eggs? Whether he takes his eggs to the nearest village or the nearest city he will be glad to get 10 cents a dozen for them, and he will not always be sure of getting that. The home market is a delusion which has long vanished into thin air; but what is not a delusion is the hard fact that remains to the farmer to-day, that though he has not a home market, though he cannot take his eggs to the next village, yet he has to pay a heavy tax on everything he buys; a tax upon his clothing, a tax on his cottons, a tax on his woollens, a tax on the iron he uses, a tax upon the sugar he eats, for though the farmer and the consumer no longer pays a tax into the treasury on sugar he still continues to pay a tax for the benefit of the sugar refineries of Canada. But I will undoubtedly be told: Granted that the National Policy has not benefited the farmers, surely you will not deny that it has developed several industries. I am free to admit that the National Policy has developed a few industries into monopolies, into suckers which extort inordinate profits from the people of Canada; but I question very much whether the National Policy has benefited the great body of manufacturers, the smaller manufacturers and those who have invested a small amount of capital in their own business, because it is obvious that the moment an article is taxed for the benefit of one special manufacturer that manufacturer is of course protected and benefited; but while one manufacturer may be so protected and benefited, two, five or ten manufacturers may be

Mr. LAURIER.

hampered by the tariff, because the articles produced by that one manufacturer may be the raw material of the two, five or ten others who have to use it and are hampered thereby. Take the iron duties. Everybody remembers the great flourish of trumpets with which Sir Charles Tupper introduced his policy with respect to pig iron, in 1887. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) a few days ago alluded to this subject, and I need not go over the same ground; but let me simply remark this: that at the time Sir Charles Tupper introduced his policy respecting pig iron, it was already protected by a duty of \$2 per ton and a bounty of \$1.50, and by his policy the bounty was increased after three years to \$2, and the duty was increased from that moment to \$4 per ton. So at that time we gave the producer in pig iron a bounty of \$2 per ton and a duty of \$4, and Sir Charles Tupper used—I believe my hon. friend quoted his language, but I will quote it again because these facts are instructive—these words:

Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. I say, Sir, that if there is anything in the National Policy, if we have not been all wrong from the very start, if the history of Canada shows that this National Policy has achieved for Canada what we said it would achieve,—and I have given the most abundant and irrefragable evidence on that point,—if there is any question on which there ought not to be any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman, it is that the application of the same sound policy which we have found so admirable and successful in relation to all other industries, will have the same result in regard to the great iron industry of this country.

Well, Sir, this language is simply ludicrous in the face of what followed afterwards—ludicrous is the word. I show to what extent a man of ability can go when he undertakes to talk protection, as Sir Charles Tupper undertook to talk it at that moment. Although the people of Canada have been saddled with enormous duties the result has been that the production of pig iron instead of increasing has decreased all along, and the result has been that, though we have not reaped any benefit such as Sir Charles Tupper promised, yet at the same time all the manufacturers who use iron, and they are legion in this country, have been hampered, and seriously hampered, by these duties, and if the Minister of Finance were to bring down to the House the petitions and memorials which I understand the Government have received against the duties on pig iron, they would open the eyes of hon. members of this House, for I have it on good authority that for a long time petitions have been sent in begging the Minister of Finance to remove the duties that have done no good to anybody, but have seriously hampered the iron trade. Well, Sir, what is at present the condition of the country? This question can be

looked upon from two different stand-points—from the stand-point of the Government, and from the stand-point of the people. The Government tell us that the country is prospering, but what do the people say? What is their opinion and what is their action? The people, Sir, one portion of them fly from that prosperity, and those who remain in the country are begging and petitioning the Government to free them from the National Policy. What is the conclusion to be derived from this state of things? The conclusion is: that taxation by whatever name you call it, taxation however you may disguise it, taxation is an evil which never can produce prosperity. It is an evil, and no good can come from evil. Taxation by whatever name you call it, whether disguised or undisguised, is always an abridgment of the rights of the citizen. It is a toll levied upon his earnings and upon his property. I know very well that taxation by Customs can be so arranged as to divert the proceeds from the public treasury and put it into the pockets of a few favoured individuals, and can therefore have a semblance of prosperity; but, Sir, that prosperity for the few, is always at the expense of the many. Freedom is the normal condition of trade, and freedom is the goal to which we are aspiring. That is the policy of this side of the House. I know very well, Sir, that we cannot for many years have freedom of trade, such as they have in England. I know that for many years we must raise our revenue by Customs duties, but I tell the Finance Minister, that the difference between him and us, is this: That whereas he forms his tariff for protection, and with revenue as merely an incident; we will frame our tariff, not for protection, but for revenue, and we will impede and interfere with freedom of trade only in so far as is absolutely necessary for the purposes of a revenue, and for nothing else. Sir, I stated on another occasion, and in another place, that during the last election in the United States, the people of that country had most emphatically decided for the principle of free trade. My hon. friend the Finance Minister, in opening this debate, challenged this statement, and not only challenged the statement, but actually denied it. He is strong at denying, I admit, but if he denies that the American people, at the last presidential election, practically decided in favour of freedom of trade, I am prepared to hear that the hon. gentleman will deny everything, that he will deny that there are twelve months in the year, that he will deny that the sun rises in the east and moves towards the west, or that he will deny that there is such a thing as an exodus. But, as the hon. gentleman is of a skeptic nature, I will endeavour to give him proof which ought to be sufficient in itself. I will quote to him from the platform adopted by the Democratic party at its last convention in Chicago. Here is how it reads:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and demand that the collection of such duties shall be limited to the necessities of the Government and honestly and economically administered.

Sir, denouncing protection has always seemed to me as promoting free trade. Does the hon. gentleman believe the reverse, or does he think differently? Well, if he does, let us go a step further. The hon. gentleman is aware that during the last election the question which was fought upon every hustings in the United States, the question which was discussed in every newspaper, was the merit of protection, on the one side, and the merit of free trade on the other. Is this not sufficient to convince my hon. friend?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, this is not sufficient, let us go a little further. The hon. gentleman is perhaps aware—I am sure he heard it, but if he heard it perhaps he will choose to forget—the hon. gentleman is perhaps aware that during last session of Congress the Democratic party in the House of Representatives organized a scheme whereby they circulated as their own literature, the whole of Henry George's book, "Protection or Free Trade," and there never was a stronger plea written in favour of free trade than that book contains. When the Democratic party in the House of Representatives went so far as to organize a scheme to circulate a whole book written in favour of free trade, will the hon. gentleman, in view of all that evidence, still believe that the issue which was fought at the polls during the last election was not an issue between freedom of trade and protection? If the hon. gentleman still denies that, I am prepared to believe, as I said a moment ago, that he will deny anything whatever. But, Sir, I know very well that, though the principle of free trade has triumphed in the United States—and perhaps this is the little stratagem which the hon. gentleman wants to employ upon this occasion, perhaps this is the refuge he wants to take for himself—I know very well, as well as the hon. gentleman knows, that, although the principle of free trade has been adopted in the United States, that freedom of trade will not be applied in the tariff this year, or next year, or the year after. I know that for a great many years to come, the American people will continue to levy their revenue by a Customs tariff, but I say this to the hon. gentleman: That henceforward, not only as long as the Democratic party are in power, (but I believe, also, that whenever the Republican party comes back to power), that no more shall revenue be levied for the purpose of protection, but that it shall be levied only for the purposes of a revenue, and for nothing else; because, as I have said to the hon.

gentleman, the tariff of protection has been denounced by the American people as a fraud and a robbery. Sir, I have stated, and I repeat it here, that our tariff is simply an imitation of the American tariff, and, as the American tariff was denounced, so now I denounce the Canadian tariff as a fraud. I denounce it as a robbery of the great majority of the Canadian people for the benefit of the few. I denounce it in the name of the thousands whom it has impoverished. I denounce it in the name of the thousands whom it has sent into exile, and I denounce it in the name of a long-suffering nation. Talk, Sir, of reforming the tariff! Gentlemen on the other side of the House expect that my hon. friend the Finance Minister will reform the tariff. Why, Sir, the Finance Minister cannot do it, because he will never dare to extirpate from it the vicious principle which is the bane and evil of it. I know what he will do. He will tinker his tariff; he will patch it; he will polish the surface of it so as to give it the appearance of reform, but as to any measure of reform in the tariff, it will, and must be as hollow as the fruit of the Dead Sea. Mr. Speaker, I come now to an objection which I have not heard in this House, but which is commencing to be circulated in the Government press. I have seen it stated in the ministerial press, not only in one paper, but in several, that the Liberals cannot be sincere in their policy of tariff reform. It is stated that they cannot be sincere when they profess to be in favour of alleviating the burdens which press upon the majority of the people, because, forsooth, only a few months ago, they wanted to assimilate the Canadian tariff to the American tariff, under the guise of unrestricted reciprocity. I denounce this statement as an absolute falsehood, and I defy any man, either in this House or out of it, to quote an expression from any Liberal that he ever attempted or wanted to assimilate the Canadian tariff to the American tariff. Nay, more, Sir, I defy any gentleman, in this House or out of it, to prove that the American authorities ever wanted to assimilate the Canadian tariff to the American tariff, as the price of unrestricted reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Who says "no." Is there any man in this House who will challenge my statement? Ministers have asserted it, I know, but let them bring the evidence. Let them bring the correspondence which they have in their own possession. If Ministers here made that statement, Ministers on the other side have said the very reverse; and since the correspondence has not been brought down, I for my part refuse to believe the statement. Talk, Sir, of assimilating the Canadian tariff to the American tariff. It would be very shocking, of course, to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have not hesitated to bring the whole body of the

Mr. LAURIER.

American tariff into our Statute-book—it would be very shocking to them if the Liberal party were now to assimilate the Canadian tariff to the American tariff in the few points in which there is still a discrepancy. They themselves can do it, and do it under the cloak of loyalty. Loyalty, Sir, is a cloak under which we know many things can be hidden, which, if viewed under the full light of day, would be odious and repellant; and this is, perhaps, the reason hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are always so fond of parading in that garment. But I say, Sir, without the least hesitation, that uniformity of tariffs is not at all essential to reciprocity. Of course, I fully admit that if there were between the American tariff and the Canadian tariff a great divergence in regard to some articles, reciprocity in those articles would be almost impossible. There are two reasons for that. The first is that if there were a great difference between the two tariffs in regard to some article, a similar article would be imported from abroad into the country having the lower tariff, with the view of smuggling it into the country with the higher tariff. There is another reason which I will state, and which will commend itself to hon. gentlemen opposite. If there were a great discrepancy between the tariffs in one article, the manufacturer in the country with the lower tariff would have a great advantage over the manufacturer in the country with the higher tariff. But let me say that we have always been in favour of reciprocity. No one would suppose, because we were in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, that if we could not obtain that we should not take anything else. Again and again we have said that if we could not obtain reciprocity along the whole line, unrestricted, unlimited, we should be willing to take reciprocity in natural products, or in natural products with manufactured articles included. But when we adopted the policy of unrestricted reciprocity in 1888, the tendency of the American tariff was a downward tendency. There were many indications of that. The first was the Message of President Cleveland, addressed to Congress in the fall of 1887, in which he had directly attacked the system of protection.

Mr. SPROULE. The McKinley Bill showed it more.

Mr. LAURIER. I will come to that. It is true, shortly afterwards a wave of protection passed over the United States, which resulted in the McKinley Bill; but the McKinley Bill was the last spasmodic effort of a system which was about to fall to pieces and which exists no more. The hon. gentleman knows that the McKinley Bill has been condemned in emphatic terms by the American people in the last election, and he knows that it will be repealed at the next session of Congress. He knows that the party now in power are not only in favour

of free trade as a general principle, but in particular are in favour of reciprocity with Canada. Now, Sir, of all the speeches I have listened to during this debate, there was one to which I listened with peculiar pleasure. That was the speech of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). It was almost a Liberal speech. It is true, it was still tainted with some Conservative heresy, but on the whole it was a very good speech; and when I listened to the hon. gentleman speaking as he did, it seemed to me that he was very much in the position of King Agrippa for the preaching of St. Paul, when he exclaimed: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." I presume that the hon. gentleman is almost a Christian—I mean Liberal; he is trying to lift his party up to a higher sphere; he is in favour of tariff reform; he is even in favour of reciprocity; and he said—I marked the sentence—that he hoped that the Government were also in favour of reciprocity. He hoped it; he was not sure; neither am I. I think they are not; but if they are, then they have an opportunity of getting reciprocity. They can have it. I stated a moment ago that the Democratic party were in favour of reciprocity with Canada. I have the proof in my hand, and I will give it to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is aware that one of the most important members of the Democratic party to-day in the United States is Mr. Campbell, the ex-governor of Ohio. In the month of December last Mr. Campbell delivered a speech on Staten Island, in which he referred to this very question of reciprocity with Canada. First of all, he referred to the policy of reciprocity put forward by the Republican party in the clause of the McKinley Bill, containing a standing offer of reciprocity to the tropical and semi-tropical countries of South America. Then Mr. Campbell spoke as follows:—

Reciprocity—the kind of reciprocity that that distinguished gentleman, Erastus Wiman, advocates, is something. That kind of reciprocity actually means something, because that means that you shall take the produce of Staten Island whether they be of the farm or of the workshop, and take them to some great country with which you have a large trade, like the provinces north of us, the Dominion of Canada, and exchange them freely for all the products of that country with equal freedom. If you had reciprocity, actual reciprocity with the nations of the world, what would you have?

A voice—"Free Trade."

A gentleman says "Free Trade," Why, it is no use for me to come all the way from Ohio to tell you anything about the situation as to reciprocity. There you have it in two words. If you had reciprocity it would simply mean that you could go down to the harbour of New York with anything you have, lay it on any vessel there and send it to any part of the earth and trade it for anything you wanted and bring those goods back and sell them whenever you pleased.

I sometimes give a definition of reciprocity which is a bit humorous, but which fits the case exactly. It is this: Maude and Claude are a couple of young people. There has been a great deal in the newspapers about reciprocity, and Maude is like most women. She has not bothered much about politics.

She had to get several new dresses this autumn and has been pretty busy generally, and she says: "Claude, I have been reading about reciprocity. Now, what is reciprocity?"

"Why," he says. "Don't you know? Now, if I kiss you and you kiss me back, that's reciprocity." To which she retorted that she always supposed it was something nice.

I am in favour of that kind of reciprocity between us and the country we trade with. If we are going to kiss them, we want to be kissed back a little in return, and when we pick out the girls we are going to kiss, instead of picking out the black ones of south America, I would pick out the white ones of Canada and Europe.

It's a matter of taste, and I believe that the Democrats would just as soon that it would be white.

Now, if my hon. friend will only persuade the hon. Minister of Finance to go back to Washington and offer his cheek for a chaste osculation, the thing will be done at once. But, Sir, it may be said to me: What is the use of having reciprocity, even in natural products, if the condition of the farmers in the United States is worse than the condition of our own farmers? I am sure that I need not give an answer to this question to my hon. friend from East Durham, because he is in favour of reciprocity; neither need I give it to my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), because he is in favour of reciprocity. But there may be some other gentlemen on the other side of the House who are of the opinion of a former President of the Council, Mr. Colby, who was against reciprocity even in natural products. The advantage we should have in reciprocity, even in natural products, would be this, that protection is one and the same thing on both sides of the line; and if we had free trade only in natural products, the condition of the farmers on one side and the condition of the farmers on the other would be benefited to that extent. But I know that besides the hon. member for East Durham and the hon. member for Richmond, there are many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are in favour of reciprocity; and if so, I am at a loss to understand the reason why they have always greeted the efforts of the Liberal party for reciprocity with such torrents of abuse. They have stated, again and again, that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation. My hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard), alluded to that this evening, and I can allude to it again. For my part, I never understood how unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation. Will any one tell me how it will? Will any one tell me how it is, that if the Canadian people were to have reciprocity with the United States, restricted or unrestricted, annexation would follow? If we had a commercial treaty with the States, whether restricted or unrestricted, the institutions of our country would continue just the same as they are to-day; the country would continue to be governed under the same British parliamentary system as it is to-day. Every man entitled to it would have a

vote as he has to-day. Therefore, how can it be said that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation? Is it to be supposed that if the Canadian people were to come in contact with the American people, our loyalty would fade away? Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that, even if we had closer trade relations with the Americans, the loyalty of the Canadian people would vanish into thin air? If hon. gentlemen opposite hold any such opinion, I hold that the much vaunted loyalty of the Conservative party is hollow and unreal, and is brought forward only to do service for party purposes and for nothing else. I have heard it stated many a time by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and in the press, that they find an argument for their contention in the letter of the Hon. Mr. Blake. Mr. Blake gave it as his opinion, and we hear it quoted from time to time on the floor of this House, that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to annexation. I discuss this question fairly, and I will quote the words of Mr. Blake:

The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the States, higher duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union.

But I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side, whether Mr. Blake did not, upon that occasion, confine himself simply to reciprocity? Did he not also give his opinion as to the National Policy?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Does any one deny it? I am surprised at the power of denial of some hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am surprised that there are gentlemen on the other side who will deny that Mr. Blake said also that the tendency of the National Policy was direct to annexation. Allow me to quote his words again:

The Canadian Conservative party has failed to accomplish the prediction of its promoters. Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians.

This is the language of Mr. Blake. Two years afterwards, we hear hon. gentlemen on the other side deny that Mr. Blake gave it as his opinion that the National Policy directly led to annexation. If you are, on the other side, against unrestricted reciprocity, because Mr. Blake said that it would lead to annexation, how is it that you still retain the National Policy, which, in the opinion of Mr. Blake, is bound to produce the very same result? Destroy the National Policy at once, put it away at once, because every moment, every day you keep it on the Statute-book, is another step taken towards annexation. There is, however, a more serious objection than this to unrestricted reciprocity. This objection of annexation I do not treat seriously. I do not affect to treat it seriously, I dismiss it altogether; but I say, without any

Mr. LAURIER.

hesitation, that there is more serious objection to unrestricted reciprocity, and that is the discrimination against England. This is an objection, which, for my part, I have always treated with respect. I respect the feeling of gentlemen on the other side, who from motive, which I will not discuss, would hesitate to discriminate against England; but I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that when they take up that question of discrimination against England, they are raising against reciprocity an objection which England long ago abandoned. My hon. friend beside me from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) proved the other day most conclusively, that in the Brown treaty England had abandoned that objection in the most formal manner. It is true that his statement was denied by gentlemen on the other side. It is true that they pretended to prove, by the language of Mr. Brown, that England had never abandoned its objection to discrimination. Well, that is a question we can discuss again. I grant that when Mr. Brown went to Washington, as plenipotentiary of the Canadian Government, to discuss reciprocity, he had it in his mind not to discriminate against England, and he kept that in his mind, not only at the outset, but throughout the whole negotiation. I will quote from his speech, delivered in the Senate in 1875:

I come now, hon. gentlemen, to the objections which have been urged against the treaty from such quarters as entitle them to formal answer. The first of these is the allegation that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain in favour of the United States. Nothing could be more unfounded than this. It was perfectly understood from the opening of the negotiations, that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States that was not also open with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment.

I am not surprised at this, and no one will be surprised at it, when I refer to the first proposal made by Mr. Brown and Sir Edward Thornton, his co-plenipotentiary, to the American commissioners. It was this:

In regard to the addition of certain classes of manufactures—said the British commissioner—to the free list under the old treaty, we reminded Mr. Fish, that the revenue of the Canadian Dominion was largely obtained from a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on manufactured goods, and that any articles made free in Canada under agreement with any foreign country must be made free to Great Britain.

Now, at the same time the English plenipotentiary gave a list to the American commissioners of the articles which they proposed should be included in the treaty. They were as follows:—

- Agricultural implements, to be defined.
- Extracts of bark for tanning purposes.
- Bath bricks; bricks for building purposes.
- Earth ochres, ground or unground.
- Hay; lime; malt.
- Manufactures of iron and steel, to be defined.
- Manufactures of iron or steel and wood jointly, to be defined.
- Manufactures of wood, to be defined.

Mineral and other oil.
Plaster, raw or calcined.
Salt and straw.

Stone, marble or granite, partly or wholly cut or wrought.

Now it is to be remarked that, with the exception of iron and steel, all these other articles were such as we did not import from England, so that there could be no competition from England, and, therefore, no discrimination. The only articles as to which there might be discrimination were the articles of iron and steel, and as to these, they were to be defined. Undoubtedly the British commissioners had it in their mind to define those articles, so that there should be no discrimination against England. But these propositions were not admitted by the American commissioners. So another was made and the following list was finally decided upon. Now, I am calling attention to the list which was finally included in the treaty :

Agricultural implements, all kinds.
Axes of all kinds.
Boots and shoes of leather.
Boot and shoe making machines.
Buffalo robes, dressed and trimmed.
Cotton grain bags ; cotton denims.
Cotton jeans, complete.
Cotton drillings, unbleached.
Cotton plaids ; cotton tickings.
Cottonades, unbleached.
Cabinetware and furniture or parts thereof.
Carriages, carts, wagons and other wheeled vehicles and sleighs or parts thereof.
Fire engines or parts thereof.
Felt covering for boilers.
Gutta percha belting and tubing.
Iron, bar, hoop, pig, puddled, rod, sheet or scrap.
Iron nails, spikes, bolts, tacks, brads or springs.
Iron castings.
India rubber belting and tubing.
Locomotives for railways or parts thereof.
Lead, sheet or pig.
Leather, sole or upper.
Leather, harness and saddlery.
Mill or factory or steam-boat fixed engines and machines or parts thereof.
Manufactures of marble, stone, slate or granite.
Manufactures of wood solely, or of wood nailed, bound, hinged or locked with metal materials.
Mangles, washing machines, wringing machines and drying machines or parts thereof.
Printing papers for newspapers.
Paper-making machines or parts thereof.
Printing type, presses and folders, paper cutters, ruling machines.
Page-numbering machines and stereotyping and electrotyping apparatus or parts thereof.
Refrigerators or parts thereof.
Railroad cars, carriages and trucks or parts thereof.
Satinets of wool and cotton.
Steam engines or parts thereof.
Steel, wrought or cast, and steel plates and rails.
Tin tubes and piping.
Tweeds, of wool solely.
Water wheel machines and apparatus or parts thereof.

Now, it is to be remarked that, whereas the first list submitted to the British commissioners, Mr. Brown and Sir Edward Thornton, contained no article (with the exception of iron and steel, which was to be defined) which

we imported from England, the latter list contains a large number of articles which we imported from England, such as cotton, iron, steel, woollen tweeds, &c. Now, Sir, after having read the statement of Mr. Brown, it seems that he had in his mind all the time that the Canadian Parliament would not discriminate against Great Britain in these articles, and that the same course would, undoubtedly, be followed in regard to the treaty of 1874, if it was passed and ratified as in the treaty of 1854, that is to say, all the articles in the treaty which we imported from England would be placed upon the free list when coming from Britain. But before the treaty was signed—when it was completed, but not signed—it was referred by the Canadian Government to Lord Derby, who referred it to the Board of Trade for its opinion upon the question of discrimination, and it is to this I refer the attention of the House. Let me first give the statement of Lord Derby :

Renewal of treaty of 1854 for twenty-one years, including the fisheries, with the addition of the free admission of salt, manufactures of wood, iron or steel articles, or of these jointly, agricultural implements and a few other trifling articles.

And here is the answer of the Board of Trade :

To this no objection can be taken, whatever criticism may have been made on the original reciprocity treaty, on the ground that Canada was setting up differential duties in favour of the United States, both against this country and countries with which we have most favoured nation treaties. No such objection can be taken now.

Now, Sir, that is the answer of the Board of Trade in 1874 : That if Canada entered into a treaty with the United States which included articles imported from England, there would be a discrimination against England, whereas in 1854 objections would have been taken, in 1874 the same objection would not have been taken. Why, Sir, England realized that Canada had progressed ; that Canada has interests distinct from England, and that Canada, having been given the power to govern itself, should be allowed to exercise that power in its entirety. And mark, Sir, the road that had been travelled from 1854 to 1874. In 1854 all the articles included in the treaty, and they were many, were placed upon the free list of Canada. The following are the articles included in the treaty of 1854 :—

Grain, flour and breadstuffs of all kinds.
Animals of all kinds.
Fresh, smoked and salted meats.
Cotton wool, seeds and vegetables.
Undried fruits, dried fruits.
Fish of all kinds.
Products of fish and of all other creatures living in the water.
Poultry, eggs.
Hides, furs, skins or tails undressed.
Stone or marble in its crude or unwrought state.
Slate.

Butter, cheese, tallow.
Lard, horns, manures.
Ores of metals of all kinds.
Coal.
Pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes.
Timber and lumber of all kinds, round hewed, sawed, unmanufactured in whole or in part.
Firewood.
Plants, shrubs, and trees.
Pelts, wool.
Fish oil.
Rice, broomcorn and bark.
Gypsum, ground or unground.
Hewn or wrought or unwrought burr or grindstones.
Dye stuffs.
Flax, hemp, and tow unmanufactured.
Unmanufactured tobacco.
Rags.

As soon as the treaty had been signed and completed and ratified by the Senate of the United States, and ratified by the Legislature of Canada, all these articles except one were placed upon the free list. That one article was dried fruits. Now, of all these articles which were placed upon the free list, and thus made free to Britain, we did not import from Britain any except one, that is coal. As to coal, there could be no discrimination against England to a large extent, for the reason that coal cannot come by vessel further than Montreal, and cannot come much in competition with American coal west of Montreal. And what was the reason dried fruits was not placed on the free list? Simply to discriminate in favour of the Americans. The Americans at that time produced dried fruits, and therefore we discriminated in their favour. It is true, we did not import dried fruits directly from England; but we did import them from Greece, with which country we had, at that time, a treaty on the most favoured nation basis, so that in 1854 England consented to our discriminating against nations with which she had treaties of commerce. In 1874 she consented to discriminate against her own goods. What is the objection raised by hon. gentlemen against reciprocity, limited or unlimited, when England herself has agreed and consented that Canada should discriminate against her if Canada found it to her advantage? Now, Sir, upon this question I cannot do better, I think, than quote to the House an article which I extract from a newspaper, an independent newspaper, the "Week," of Toronto. The "Week" speaks thus in its issue of the 27th January last:

But is free access to the markets of the United States attainable on any conditions which Canada could accept without sacrifice of duty or self-respect? Singularly enough, this is a question in regard to which we have directly contradictory testimony from the only two parties who are in a position to know. According to the version of the late conference given by Messrs. Blaine and Foster, the ex-Secretary, and the present Secretary, respectively, of the United States Government, the conditions offered were such as most persons would pronounce fair and reasonable, viz., that the list of goods to come under the treaty of reciprocity must include manufactures as well as natural products, and that the tariffs must be mutually preferential. This would have involved discrimination to a certain extent against the mother country in common with all other nations, but such discrimina-

Mr. LAURIER.

tion is of the very nature of reciprocity treaties and could not be objected to by Great Britain, who would be only too glad to see a revival of Canadian prosperity and progress upon such terms. On the other hand, according to the recollections of Sir John Thompson and our Mr. Foster, reciprocity was offered only on condition of Canada's adoption of the United States tariff, which is of course a very different matter. This matter should be fairly faced and discussed during the session, not so much to settle the question of correctness of memory, which would be a delicate and unprofitable business, as to pronounce upon the desirability of now taking the American representatives at their word, and seeking a renewal of negotiations on the lines which they have distinctly laid down. It is scarcely conceivable that the incoming Washington Administration will be less favourable to such an arrangement than the outgoing one. What attitude will our Government take, is one of the test questions.

Why, Sir, who does not know that if we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States the prosperity of Canada would be increased to a very large extent? Hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot dispute it, for they admit themselves to be in favour of reciprocity. Therefore, Sir, if our prosperity were increased, our purchasing power would be increased, and if England might suffer in one direction she would benefit still more in another direction, and, therefore, instead of injuring England, as is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite, we would actually confer a benefit on England, on Canada and on the United States as well. This is the reason why we are in favour of that policy. Sir, there is another question to which I want to allude, that is, an issue of fact which was raised the other day by my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who said that when the Government dissolved the House in 1891 they asserted to the people of Canada that they could and would obtain a reciprocity treaty for them with the United States. The hon. gentlemen opposite denied that; but, Sir, I wish now to affirm that every word spoken by my hon. friend from North Norfolk is true, and I affirm as a fact, to which I challenge the contradiction of the hon. gentleman, that when Parliament was dissolved in 1891 by His Excellency upon the advice of the Canadian Government, they did it under a false pretense in the eyes of the Canadian people and with deceit in their mouth, by stating to the people of Canada that they were induced to dissolve Parliament because they had received from Mr. Blaine and the American authorities an invitation to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Sir, the fact was that it was not Mr. Blaine or the American authorities who had sought for a conference with a view to reciprocity, but it was the Canadian Government who had sought for a conference at Washington with a view of obtaining a reciprocity treaty. Let me call the attention of the House to a state paper which was passed in the preceding month of December, and which was communicated to the press at the same time that the dissolution was announced. It was a Minute of Council, which read as follows:—

The Committee of the Privy Council having learned that the Honourable the Secretary of State for the United States had expressed to Her Majesty's Ministers at Washington his readiness to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty on a wide basis and particularly for the protection of the mackerel fisheries, and for the fisheries on inland waters, and had subsequently stated to Her Majesty's Minister his great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty, they desire to take the opportunity afforded by these intimations from Mr. Blaine of suggesting the expediency of taking early steps to adjust the various matters that have arisen and now exist, affecting the relations of Canada with the United States.

Now, Sir, you have it in plain language ; here is a state paper, a Minute of Council for which hon. gentlemen are responsible to this House, stating that it was Mr. Blaine who had invited a conference, that Mr. Blaine had manifested a great desire to have a reciprocity treaty. What was their object ? It was simply as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated a few days ago, in order to convey the impression to the Canadian people that they would obtain a reciprocity treaty. They desired to make the Canadian people believe that the Canadian Government could obtain a reciprocity treaty, and that Mr. Blaine had manifested a great desire to have such a treaty. Yet, Sir, far from this being the case, when these gentlemen attempted some months ago to have a reciprocity conference at Washington, before they could enter into negotiations, Mr. Blaine wanted an explanation as to the extraordinary position in which he had been placed in the eyes of the Canadian people. Before he consented to receive the Canadian delegation, he addressed a letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, in which he said :—

In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my Minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblies that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

Here we see Mr. Blaine protesting against the position in which he had been placed by the false representations which had been made to the Canadian public that he had sought for a reciprocity treaty. Now, Sir, upon this occasion, I put the question to the hon. gentleman: Which statement is true? Was it the statement of Mr. Blaine that it was not he who had sought for a conference, or was it the statement of hon. gentlemen that it was Mr. Blaine who had sought for a conference? Sir, upon this point we have the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper himself who went to Washington before he went to England, and going to Washington in order to have a conference, he was placed in the humiliating position that he had to confess that the impression which had been conveyed to the Canadian public was a false

impression. We have a letter of Sir Charles Tupper, addressed to the late Sir John A. Macdonald, explaining his interview with Mr. Blaine, in which he said :

I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen, in reference to the initiation of negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries.

The first thing which he had to do was to tell Mr. Blaine that what he had been stating in Canadian assemblies, that the impression which had been conveyed, was false, and he had to make a recantation before he could be heard. No man in the position of Mr. Blaine, having the respect, not only of his own nation, but the respect of himself, would have consented to treat with a man who had thus misrepresented him in the eyes of another nation, and so when the men who had made the false representation wished to treat with him at Washington, they first had to retract their statement. Now, I ask why was this humiliating falsehood resorted to? Simply to convey the impression to the Canadian people that the Canadian Minister could obtain a reciprocity treaty at Washington. Sir, this is the extent of the degradation to which a party can descend who wants to obtain power and retain it. We do not fight with such weapons. We have a legitimate ambition to obtain our share of public favour, but by such means we will never seek to raise ourselves. We will fight an honest and an open battle. Sir, power has no attraction for us if it has to be purchased at such a price, and at such a humiliation. Sir, the condition of the country is a grave one, but it is not a desperate one. That the people suffer is evidenced by their action, when, by thousands at a time, they leave the country for a foreign soil; by their action, when, by thousands they knock at the door of this Parliament in order to obtain redress from the position in which they find themselves. Sir, a remedy could easily be found if the Government would consent to listen, not to the voice of passion and greed, but to the voice of reason and justice; a remedy could be found in the decrease of taxation and in the extension of our market. Let the Canadian public, let the Canadian farmers and toilers be relieved from the load under which they are now groaning; leave them an open field for their energy and their courage, and at once all the discontent which now prevails in the land will disappear, and then, and not until then, will we enjoy in this country a satisfactory prosperity, substantial and real, and recognized by the people themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. An apology is certainly due to the House, after ten days of a long discussion upon this tariff policy, for asking it at this late period in the discussion to listen a second time to any remarks from myself. However, it becomes necessary that I should say a few words, not only in reply to my

hon. friend who has just sat down, but also in reply to several points which have been raised by hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the beginning of the debate until this time. Happily, I am not under obligation to occupy the attention of this House at very great length in that respect, for neither the cogency nor the novelty of the arguments which have been addressed to the House by hon. gentlemen opposite call for, in most cases, any lengthy reply; and I must also say that most of those arguments have been fully, fairly and completely met, not only many times before in this House, but during this present debate by hon. gentlemen who sit on this side. First, I wish to pay my respects for a few moments to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. My hon. friend has been going about the country sounding the praises and trumpeting the coming triumph of free trade. To-night his vaunted free trade with all its breadth of vision and majesty of thought has resolved itself into trade with one country, to the exclusion, by restrictions, of trade with every other in the world. Before his Toronto and Hamilton audiences he breathed the spirit of a wider atmosphere. He pointed to the battlefields of the United States, and he declared that there had been fought and won the second victory, not for "freedom of trade" as he haltingly tells us to-night, but for "free trade," and rising on the height and expanding on the breadth of that glorious victory for free trade in the United States, he unfolded the curtains of prophecy and declared that the third great country in the world to adopt free trade would be the Dominion of Canada. But to-night, Sir, my hon. friend talks small, very small, indeed. His vision is blinded to the wonderful commerce of Great Britain, his vision is blinded to the wonderful scope of a commercial world beyond the seas in every other country in the globe, and he is willing, for the sake of unrestricted free trade with the United States to raise a Chinese wall against Great Britain and every other country in the world. For in all his long speech to-night he used two paragraphs of argument in favour of free trade, and has not his whole speech been an apology for unrestricted reciprocity, upon which he has already met significant defeat and upon which he will receive significant defeat yet in the future? The hon. gentleman did several things to-night. He was pleasant and sometimes witty, but at no time very forceful in his remarks or his arguments, if I am able to judge. He told a very good story about King James, but he showed he did not properly appreciate it, because he made the application wrongly. He should have made the application to himself and his friends, who have brought up these theories year after year, from commercial union to continental free trade, and although the people have not agreed with them, although the people have rejected them, although the people have conclusively resolved against them by their votes, yet hon.

Mr. FOSTER.

gentlemen opposite, like King James, still declare that these exploded theories are the only true ones, and they still deploy them before the public view again and again. The hon. gentleman found fault with a new law of gravitation, which, he said, I have discovered, and he compared me to a second Newton. There must be, he says, according to my doctrine, some centre of attraction out in the west that draws people inevitably from the east towards the west. He said he did not believe that could be true, because the fact was that the people instead of going from east to west were going from north to south. I would advise my hon. friend to take a map and look along the lines of parallels of latitude running through Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick and the United States, and he will find two trends of emigration or transfer, from this country and from the eastern states. He will find a trend going pretty nearly due west, along the same zone, along pretty nearly the same lines of latitude; and he will find a trend going from north to south so far as these provinces are concerned and to the United States on the south of us. My hon. friend although he treated this in a light and airy way, and not at all, as I think, according to the merits of the subject, will find, if he deals fairly and honestly with it, that these trends are not fanciful, but they are real, that he cannot get rid of them by ridicule and by any pretended law of gravitation I have discovered or not discovered, for those two trends are absolutely fixed by two things,—land hunger, which takes people to the great prairies of the west, and employment hunger which takes them to the crowded factory towns to the south of us. If there are 1,000 people who go from Canada to the west, 999 of them go from land hunger; and if there are 1,000 who go from Canada to the factory towns to the south, 999 go for employment to towns where industries hum, and where the wheels of the factories resound from day to day. My hon. friend may make fun of my theory of gravitation so long as he pleases; these are, I think, common sense facts, which he and other people will have to face, and of which most people will admit the force and cogency at once. If that be true, he must not ridicule me because I have explained the movement of population upon these two principles, upon those two sets of facts. I think he will find them to be true, and the two lessons I gather from them are, that Canada lost in the early migration, because she had not a great west of her own where people could appease their land hunger; and that if she loses her population in the other direction to-day, it is because we have not had, and have not sufficient factories and industries in order to give employment to the people who hunger for employment. So much with regard to that point. The hon. gentleman, however, has found a scientific and philosophical reason, and it is this: People do not go west

R

because they hunger for land, nor do they go south because of want of employment in the cotton mills and factories as so many of his own countrymen do. Oh, no, there is another reason: They go west, and they go south, for this, and this alone; that in this country they are sadly oppressed, and they fly south and they fly west to the land of freedom, where there are no burdens, and where all conditions are light and happy and peaceful. Now, that may satisfy my hon. friend, and he may prefer that, to my science of gravitation, but I doubt if there are many sensible men who will agree with him in that explanation. The people are oppressed here! In what way? By taxes? Why, the hon. gentleman exploded his own theory, because he proved to his own satisfaction, and he must have proved it to the infinite discomfiture of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); he proved that the farmers in the United States of America, that the people of the United States, except the manufacturers, were ground down into dust and ashes by the fiscal policy of that country. Oppressed here because a moderate 30 per cent tariff is upon them; and they fly away where they can feel the lighter weight of a 60 per cent tariff! Oppressed here, where their direct taxes are light, and going there where they can have a lighter burden of three or four times the amount of direct taxation upon them! Why, my hon. friend must have taken leave of seriousness when he advanced an argument of that kind. Well, Sir, if he did not prove that this was true, to his own satisfaction, he evidently did prove to his own satisfaction that he told a witty and fanciful story, when he brought in that personage of old, who took up his time in counting 967 widows, and one doubtful one. What that may have had to do with the subject before us I cannot say, but I am bound to assert this: That if that solitary watcher had been my hon. friend who has just sat down, he would not have let that doubtful woman go until he had found out her exact status. The hon. gentleman hesitates to believe certain figures of the census. He is an eclectic, is my hon. friend. He takes up the Holy Bible, and he takes out one part of the doctrine and he says: That suits me: I believe in the divinity and inspiration of the Scriptures. He turns over another leaf. Ah, this does not suit him, and he says: I do not believe in the divinity or inspiration of the Scriptures. He takes up the census returns, and as he chants his doleful dirges about the exodus, and proves them from the census, ah, then the census is divinely inspired, and it is authoritatively correct. There can be no doubt about its accuracy at all then, but when he comes to the industries, compiled under the very same rules, by the very same set of people, published in the same printing office, and under the auspices of the same

Government, he declares that it is full of wickedness, and all hypocrisy, and he will not believe it at all. But my hon. friend cannot do that. As with the National Policy, which he talks about so often, and which he and his followers say must stand as a whole or go down as a whole, so it is with the census. It must stand as a whole or go down as a whole, and my hon. friend, according to the arguments which he uses, cannot simply take what suits him and leave what does not suit him. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we may have—the census states that we had—an increase of \$92,000,000 in the capital of industrial establishments; but he says we do not know how much was watered stock, we do not know how much had been sunk before. I suppose if he looks back to 1881 he can make the same remarks with regard to the census of that year. Standing up in 1881, and looking at the increased figure of the amount of investment in these industries, he could have said then: You do not know whether that is right or not, a good deal of that represents watered stock: it does not show what has been sunk before. Well, I think these things would probably be about even. If they hold in the case of the year 1891, they must hold with reference to the census of 1881, and, after all, the average deduction would be about fair. But the hon. gentleman has a wonderful theory. I think he must have learned it from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has lately picked up some wonderful phrases: Displacement of wealth is not the creation of wealth. I will come to that a little later. My hon. friend's theory is: That though there may be an increase in the industrial establishments, there has been a wonderful decrease in the value of farmers' lands. He says it is 25 per cent, taking it all through, and to his own satisfaction he states that there is a decrease of \$125,000,000 in the gross. He proves himself as observant and as particular in that respect as did the lone watcher for these 967 widows. He declares that the farmers have lost \$125,000,000, which more than overbalances this gain of \$92,000,000 for the manufacturers. Well, let me ask: Have the farmers' values decreased because the cotton mills and the sugar refineries, and the iron foundries, and other industries have been built up, have carried on certain establishments, paid certain wages, and thereby provided a market for the farmers' products, and added to his returns? Is that the reason? In other words, would the farmers' value in lands have advanced, or have been kept from this depreciation, if there had been no cotton mills and no iron foundries in this country? I think not. I think that you will find that in every town where there is an enterprising community they are anxious for the establishment of industries within the precincts of that town, and a town or city is alive to-day every time that a certain industry is looking

for a location. They give bonuses in order to get that industry within their limits. Why? Because they feel that if industries come, and capital builds them up, men and women are employed, and thereby the markets of the surrounding country are helped by the extra demand for the products of the soil. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that my hon. friend has committed a perfect non sequitur in that case. \$92,000,000 advance in the industrial capital invested; \$125,000,000, as he says, depreciation in farm values, and the one, he tells us, is the consequence of the other. Sir, if he is correct in what he says with reference to the \$125,000,000 depreciation, had we had no industries in this country, that \$125,000,000 might have been \$200,000,000. But, Sir, my hon. friend saw the weakness of his argument, and as he attempted to prove that this depression in farm values came from a protective tariff, so he logically was obliged to go on to show that the same thing took place in the United States. That was a hard and cruel task for my hon. friend. Where were his bowels of mercy? Even at that very moment, he looked straight into the eye of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, the other day, took hours to prove that the farmers of the United States were prosperous to a maximum, and that their lot was as happy and as peaceful as it could be. Here comes on my iconoclast friend to-night, and, without a shred of pity, without a single impulse of sympathy, he knocks to pieces the house which my hon. friend had erected, and declares that in the United States of America the farmers' lot is terrible. He read out the picture, as dark as Erebus, darker than the Shades, and yet may I put this statement to my hon. friend: That any time this last four years, at any time this last five years, while the culture of this ultra-protection in the United States was eating out the liver of the farmers, while that was the case, at any time within these five years, my hon. friend would have led the farmers of Canada into the very same conditions, and under the very same tariff. My hon. friend cannot deny that. Well, he saw that there was another flaw to his argument. Then he cited England, to which he declared his opponents would point where farm lands have depreciated. Now, there is no protection in England, and he could not give that reason for the depreciation there. The sequence of his argument would lead him inevitably to this: that if a lesser degree of protection in Canada destroys the farmers to a certain extent and if a larger degree of protection in the United States destroys them still more, where shall we find the paradise in which they do not suffer the same depreciation and destruction, but in which they are prosperous and happy? Evidently in a free trade country; and the hon. gentleman should have been able to point to the happy and prosperous lot of the farmers of Great Britain. He could not do it. If the

Mr. FOSTER.

farmers in the United States have had hard times, harder than we, and if our farmers have had hard times, yet, if you want to find the hardest of hard times, the most depressed of depressions, the most unhappy situation of agriculture, you have only to go to Great Britain, the home of free trade. But my hon. friend had to find a reason why his argument did not work there, and of all reasons he gave one which I should have supposed he would have been most careful to steer clear of. What is his argument? Land, he says, is all monopolised in England at least it used to be; the noblemen have got it; the aristocrats have made deer parks of it; they will not allow the land to go into cultivation; and what should be the effect? That the little land that does go into cultivation ought to rate at high values. That is the inevitable result of his argument; but the hon. gentleman says that these aristocrats gobble up the land and hold it for deer parks, and if a farmer has an acre of free land or land that he pays a rent for, these aristocrats carry their spiteful feeling so far that they grind him down with taxation. The argument will not work. The hon. gentleman showed how the rental price of land in England has diminished; but if he will read more on that subject, if he will go to England and travel there, he will find that to-day land owner after land owner offers to tenants their land without the rent of a single penny if they will only keep it in order and take care of it, and pay its tithes, and they cannot find farmers to take it even at that price. That is so; I know it to be true. Well, Sir, it is a favourite method of argument with hon. gentlemen opposite that when they cannot find real men to knock down they will set up straw men to knock them down; and so my hon. friend, having foundered on the argument in regard to the farm values, gravely declared that the National Policy had for its promoters men who held forth to the people that the National Policy would bring the price of wheat up to \$1.50 per bushel. Well, Sir, it may be that some misguided person in an exuberance of enthusiasm on the stump in a moment of weakness may have said it would do this. Hon. gentlemen opposite have their moments of weakness in that respect. I myself have heard them make some most astounding prophecies and promises, which have never been, and cannot be, fulfilled; but I am not going to say that because some few of them failed in that direction the whole party propaganda must absolutely rest or fall upon the fulfilment of those prophecies. Neither is it fair for my hon. friend to say, and he cannot put it forward seriously, that because some person said that the National Policy would make wheat go up to \$1.50 a bushel, therefore, the National Policy, not having done that, wheat not being at that price now, the National Policy is a failure and ought no longer to be sustained. Now, he declares openly, and he has done it often, that no legislation can increase the price of

wheat or other cereals. By the way, I must ask my hon. friend to take particular care of his new adherent, his youngest recruit, the hon. member for L'Islet. I had the curiosity to read that hon. member's card, which he issued to his constituency. He read it to us here the other night. What is the first line of it? The hon. gentleman pledges himself to have legislation introduced which shall raise the value of the farmers' products, and he also pledges himself that the hon. leader of the Opposition will leave two or three columns standing in the temple of the National Policy. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend if he has had an understanding with the hon. member for L'Islet? Did he really agree and authorize him to say he would introduce legislation to raise the value of the farmers' products? What are the columns that he is going to let stand in this temple of protection? I will leave that between my hon. friends. I have no doubt that they will come to an agreement before this session is over. But, Sir, how would free trade, suppose we had it to-day, increase the prices of the products of the farm? You say that the price of wheat is low to-day—why? Because the production of wheat in the world, measured by the demand, is greater in proportion, and consequently the price falls. Bring in free trade, and what is it going to do? Blast a certain portion of the wheat fields; make the quantity less, and thereby bring it closer to the demand, and thus raise the price? That is the only way it can be done. But my hon. friend may have had a fear of that, and so is not going to introduce free trade, but only unrestricted reciprocity. In that case I am afraid that the hon. gentleman would only fall on the horn of his own dilemma, for he declares that once protection is introduced down goes the value of land, while he promises the farmers that under unrestricted reciprocity, which means a higher protection and greater restriction than we have now, the value of land and land products will rise. Well, Sir, there was a vein running through my hon. friend's remark which is not a new one. It has been a sort of gospel on the part of all hon. gentlemen opposite. They have, as my hon. friend from Charlotte would say, "taken a great cant towards Bidy." They have "taken a cant" upon the line of solicitude for the farmer, and if there is one thing that they preach to-day it is the farmer's depressed condition, and they propose to be the only saviours of the farmer by means of the policy which they desire to bring in. Now, Sir, my hon. friend goes too far in his statement with reference to the farmers. He is too solicitous. The Liberal-Conservative party and the Liberal-Conservative Government know the farmers' condition as well as my hon. friend, and they do something for the farmers, while hon. gentlemen opposite merely talk about them, declaring them to be depressed, and pauperized, and drawing gorgeous pictures of what they would do for

them if they were only in power. Is it true that the farmers, as a class, are oppressed by taxation? It is not true. Is it true, as my hon. friend said to-night, that the farmer pays taxes on all that he eats, on all that he wears and on all he consumes? What folly that is, and I will show you why. The farmer requires wood to build his house and his barn. Does he pay a single cent of taxes on the wood in this country where we have a surplus with which to supply the wants of other countries? The farmer requires fuel to give him warmth after he has built his house, and, in nine cases out of ten, he uses the wood of the country as fuel. He cuts his wood in the winter, and brings it to his farm-yard, and keeps himself warm with it. Does he pay any tax on that wood? He uses coal, and every ounce of anthracite coal he uses, which is the coal most largely used for fuel purposes, is free of taxation; and in great portions of this country, bituminous coal lies at his very door, at first cost or almost free, for his taking it at the mouth of the pit. My hon. friend is wrong as regards fuel, and he is also wrong as regards food. It is absurd that we should have to meet an argument of that kind. What our people eat are the grains of this country, the best in the world, and of these we raise a surplus. What they eat are the meats of Canada, the best and firmest in the world, and of these, too, we have a surplus. Our people also consume our butter and cheese, and Canada can make cheese equal to that of the best cheese-producing country in the world, and butter equal to the best butter in the world. The eggs of the patient hen, so much derided by my hon. friend, are meat and food to the farmer, and great quantities are consumed by the labouring men. Is there any duty on those? So we might go through everything that the farmer eats. What does he pay a tax upon in the matter of food? He pays a tax on his mustard and allspice and cinnamon and cloves and things of that kind, and a few cents per quarter would represent the bulk of the duty he pays upon these, as far as his consumption goes. He pays infinitesimal duties on sugar the raw sugars having been made free; and, under the state of things which exists this year, he pays less for his sugar than he would if we had no National Policy. We have taken the farmer's food; let us consider his drinks. What drinks he ought to drink, according to my opinion, are free. His water, tea and coffee are free. If he desires to drink anything stronger—which is optional with himself—it is a luxury he takes, and he has to pay for it, and we will have a tax on that so long as Canada is a country. So my hon. friend must revise his dictum, as far as the food is concerned. The principal items of the farmer are the wood, the brick or the stone he uses in the construction of his buildings; the fuel he uses, the food he consumes, and, in all these particulars, which are the main items of his ne-

cessary expenditure, where is the country in which the farmer has so bountiful a supply at his own doors and at so small a cost? Go a little further, and consider his clothing. There is a large number of farmers in this country, whose ordinary clothing is made of the wool shorn from the sheep they themselves raise. The fleece is washed in the running brook, taken to the nearest carding mill, and the yarn is spun by his own wife, and woven on his own loom, or that of the factory near by, and the product is made into garments for himself and family. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are thus clothed, but my hon. friends do not see them. They are not in touch with the farmer. They keep all their eyes for the city people who dress in broad-cloth. They roam about the streets of the large towns and villages, and see only people who are dressed in tweeds. If they would get in touch with the people, would use their eyes and go among the working classes, and would visit the back settlements, they would find the gray home-spun coats and trousers made out of the wool shorn from the sheep the farmers themselves have raised and the wool of which was carded in the settlement. Go to your cottons, if you please, go to your woollens, if you wish, and I make the assertion here that the woollen and cotton staples, mostly used by our people as clothing, are, taking quality and price together, as reasonable in price as they are in any country in the world. Taking quality and price together, these goods, which are really serviceable for wear—not clayed cotton, not shoddy woollens or tweeds or the like—but, taking them for wear and quality and price, you will get them in Canada equal to any country in the world. Taking all things into consideration, the farmer pays the minimum of taxation; and I say to you that there is no country in the world where the farmer pays less taxation than he does in this country upon all those staple articles which go into the consumption of his daily life. We must look out as well for these gentlemen when they talk of the load of taxation. Taxation in this country is of different kinds. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that \$36,000,000 is what we wring in taxes from the pockets of the poor people of Canada. What a fraud that is as an argument—calling that taxation and making the people, who know no better in some cases because they are not learned in figures, believe that a straight tax of \$36,000,000 is taken out of them. That statement is not true. Of that amount \$10,000,000 is for liquors and tobacco, and no man would get up in this House or any other Anglo-Saxon House of Parliament and ask that these articles should be made free. So long as a revenue is needed, a revenue will be raised upon them. They are not necessities, but luxuries, and the man who

Mr. FOSTER

buys them buys them with the knowledge that he is paying into the revenue, and when he does, it is a voluntary and not an involuntary tax. Then there are \$8,500,000 of earnings in this country. Are you taxed when you put a letter in the post office box with a three-cent stamp on it, and get some person to carry it 5,000 miles for you? I think not; I think you are getting your service done, and paying very cheaply for it. Are you taxed when you buy your ticket and get on a railway, and are whirled from Levis to Halifax or St. John? I think not, for you get the cheapest travelling on the Intercolonial Railway that you can get anywhere. All that goes into these earnings. It is not taxation, but payment for a cheap service and a good service as well. Add these together and there are \$18,000,000. Add also the acknowledged luxuries, \$2,500,000, and you have \$20,000,000 of this which is not necessary taxation at all, which is either perfectly voluntary, or simply a cheap payment for good service. Now, that should be told. I hold that he is not a friend of his country, that he is an enemy of his country, who will, by keeping the truth from the people, raise discontent in the minds of the people—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—and, if there is any man in this House that ought to say “hear, hear” when I mention that, it is the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). For, if there is any man in this House who has roused so much discontent and has driven so many people out of the country as the hon. member for South Oxford has by those ingenious diatribes of his, I should like to know who he is. But, Sir, my hon. friend has a brand new gospel; he brought it out to-night. He is going to have a new order of things, a political millennium—all to himself, I am afraid. What does he say? The leader of a party, speaking in Opposition, rises in his place and in a loud voice and in a tone that can be heard from Cape Breton to British Columbia, proclaims the new evangel. What is it? “Taxation is an evil which never produces prosperity; it is an abridgment of every good citizen’s rights.” Now, my hon. friend’s duty is plain. He is the leader of a powerful party. Sometime in the by and by, may be the long by and by, he may get into power. But I want to impress this upon him, that when he gets into power he must practice the doctrine he preaches, and govern this country without placing upon the people, if he is true to his gospel, this evil which he declares never produced prosperity and which is an abridgment of every good citizen’s rights. Sir, that doctrine in a leader of the Government would be arrant foolishness, but in the mouth of an irresponsible leader of an Opposition it is a firebrand. It is a doctrine by which he hopes to win the

favour of people who know less about it than he does by inspiring them with the hope that when the Hon. Wilfred Laurier rules this country there will be no taxation at all, none of this evil, "which never produced prosperity and which is an abridgment of every good citizen's rights." Now, does my hon. friend seriously believe what he says, or does he speak on the spur of the moment—in a moment of weakness, perhaps?

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not have them on this side.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if my hon. friend will keep his wind-mills quiet—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One is enough.

Mr. FOSTER. One at a time. Well, Sir, my hon. friend when he emitted that aphorism, that wise saying must have been undergoing a peculiar process of absorption from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because my hon. friend from South Oxford, not once or twice or two hundred times, but two thousand times, has declared in this House and in the country that we cannot create prosperity by means of taxation. Why, he said the other night that the Minister of Finance might as well get up on a steeple and jump off and then try to hold himself up by his boot strap as to try to induce prosperity by means of taxation. Well, the Minister of Finance has too much regard for his own life to try such acrobatic feats as that, but that trick would not be a whit more absurd than the doctrine my hon. friend has announced. Suppose we go down to Nova Scotia, to the Basin of Minas, and see the muddy waters of the basin when the tide is in and notice afterwards, when the tide is out, the portion of land from which the water has retreated and which is covered with the stratum of fertilizing soil left there by the outgoing water. Suppose a municipality there says: Why, this is very valuable, or might be made so. Here is a tract of one thousand acres of land no one of us is able to reclaim it; but as a municipality we will raise a sum of money by taxing ourselves and we will build a dyke that will inclose this thousand acre tract. They do that; they pay the taxes for one year, for two years, for three years, for five years; they raise the money; they expend it; they battle with the waves; they make the dykes, and you go down there a year or two afterwards and see a thousand acres of the best soil in the world, with its waving grass that brings a perennial income over and above the taxes imposed to pay for this improvement. Yet my hon. friend says that taxation is an evil and an abridgment of every good citizen's rights, that you can never create prosperity by taxation. Maybe you cannot create prosperity or wealth by it, but you certainly bring the unused wealth, you certainly bring the national resources, formerly comparatively valueless, into a state or condition in

which they yield revenue, which could not be done without taxation. So it is with every state, with every country. When the North-west was not known; when it was a terra incognita to us, and we conceived the idea of buying it from the Hudson's Bay Company, and did buy it, and paid our \$1,600,000 and taxed the people for it, my hon. friend would have told us: You cannot produce wealth by means of taxation. But we paid the taxation to buy the North-west and by means of further taxation we opened it for settlement. But the thousands and millions of acres of fertile land which now and in the future lie open to the sunlight and the breeze with their golden crown of waving grain, will be a standing refutation of the theory that you never can produce wealth by means of taxation. But my hon. friend is not going to have any taxation; freedom, he says, is the goal. My hon. friend says that we must not talk of reforming the tariff, that it is idle for me to attempt it, that I dare not attempt it, that I dare not touch the principle. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to forget one thing, and that is, that there is a line of distinction between a principle and a detail of that principle, that there is a distinction between the tree and the twig on the tree. Suppose my hon. friend was a husbandman. He would go out into the orchard and find a beautiful fruit tree, and as he went up to it, would see some golden fruit upon it. But he would notice here a branch which was mouldering, to use a word which has come into vogue of late. He would find a sucker growth coming out from a part of the tree where it should not be allowed to grow. He would find a branch deformed and gnarly. My hon. friend is the kind of husbandman, who, if he went into the orchard and saw a tree of that kind would promptly take his little hatchet and cut the tree down. My hon. friend is not a good husbandman, consequently he would do that sort of thing, but the real husbandman would look at that tree and say: A fine tree; a good trunk and fair branches; still some mouldering branches and some growth that should not be there. And he would take a sharp knife and carefully cut off the deformities and would leave the tree more beautiful and capable of producing more fruit. This husbandman would enjoy thereafter the fruits of his skill, while the husbandman who would act as my hon. friend, would be cast by the owner into outer darkness, and condemned ever after to listen to the doleful wailings of a party who are commonly called in this country, Grits. My hon. friend says that it is false that they ever proposed an assimilation of the Canadian tariff to the United States tariff. Well, my hon. friend has a short memory. If I were to treat this argument with him as he treated the \$1.50-a-bushel-of-wheat argument I would convict him of insincerity at once; and I am not sure that I could not bring it very close home to him if I had here the notes and the speeches that

have been made. I will, however, admit this, that my hon. friend had sense enough to know from the first that that was the weak point, and the rock upon which the whole scheme would split, and he was very wary of speaking of it, or coming within touch of it. But my hon. friend cannot have read the American press, he cannot have read the utterances of American statesmen, if he does not know that almost without exception the press and statesmen of the United States have declared that any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity between this country and the United States, is impossible, except upon an assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries. I can give authority after authority, by the hour, for that statement. Everybody knows it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Produce one now.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to weary this House or insult its good sense by producing it; but if my hon. friend has a thirst for information, I will give him my book to-morrow, and he can read for an hour the opinions of the American statesmen and American newspapers in that direction, and in that direction alone.

Mr. CHARLTON. You ought to have come here prepared to verify your statements.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir, I will have something to do with that hon. gentleman before I get through. My hon. friend says that no Liberal has said so, that no United States adherent has said so. I have made my assertion with reference to that, and I invite him to examine the records to see whether it be not true. Well, my hon. friend was not satisfied to leave well enough alone. If he had left that point with the simple assertion that no Liberal had said that they would assimilate the tariffs, that no adherent of the United States had said so, it might have gone on the strength of his word. But my hon. friend went into the dangerous course for him of undertaking to reason, and the further he reasoned, the more effectually he destroyed his own contention. My hon. friend said—and there he touched the weak point at once—that if there was a little lower tariff in one country than in the other, the tendency would be to import goods from the country which had the lowest tariff and smuggle them into the country which had the higher tariff. Then my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who so valiantly denied the assimilation of tariff the other night, is on record as saying that it must be so, and that the United States people are not such arrant fools as to submit to a scheme of reciprocity in which there is not an assimilation of tariffs. My hon. friend has stated the weak point, and I invited him, as I have invited them again and again, to show to this House how they are going to arrange unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and discrimination against other countries, without an

Mr. FOSTER.

assimilation of tariffs. The hon. gentleman cannot do it, and there is not a level-headed man in the United States who has expressed himself on this subject, who is not in disagreement with him on that point. Well, Sir, my hon. friend has one strong adherent, a man of whom not much has been heard in United States politics, a Mr. Campbell, of Ohio. My hon. friend declared that Mr. Campbell was a host, and that Mr. Campbell had declared himself in favour of reciprocity; and he brought out a sheet of paper with a very long extract upon it, which he read to the House as Mr. Campbell's offer of reciprocity. What was it? It was an agreement between two foolish young people named Maude and Claude that they would kiss each other. Now, does my hon. friend know not that he is trifling with the question and trifling with this House when he declares that the Democratic party is going to give us, and is willing to give us, a reciprocity treaty upon the ground of a simple story told by Mr. Campbell with reference to Maude and Claude? My hon. friend has declared that the Democratic victory in the United States has been a victory for the freedom of the trade to this extent, that it is going to do away with all tariff for protection, and introduce a tariff for revenue alone. My hon. friend declared in the same breath that in Canada he was going to do away with all protection, and introduce a tariff for revenue. Now, when the United States gets down to a simple revenue basis, and my hon. friend gets Canada down to a simple revenue basis, where will be his basis for reciprocity between the two countries? My hon. friend says that unrestricted reciprocity does not lead to annexation. He knew that a trusted leader of his had declared himself in a different direction, and so he read to fortify himself a few words of what Mr. Blake said on one side, and a little more of what Mr. Blake said on the other. Mr. Blake's evidence is strong evidence whenever it can be quoted against my hon. friend, because in heart he was with the other side, their trusted leader for many a year; and when he was their leader every man of them fell down on his knees and worshipped the superior ability and acumen of Mr. Blake. If Mr. Blake, the trusted leader of the party had so to wrench party affiliations and go against the course of a lifetime, as to break with that party, if Mr. Blake's familiar, and chosen, and hot duty, for years was to rake, with his strong shot, the ranks of the Liberal-Conservative party, any bit of evidence that Mr. Blake gives against the Liberal-Conservative party is in the line of all his wishes, while every bit of evidence that he is forced to give against the party with which he was so long associated, is something wrenched from him unwillingly, and consequently of priceless value in comparison with the evidence given against the other side. Mr. Blake may have thought that the Conservative policy of protection would lead

to annexation; but he declared in language that admits no doubt, that unrestricted reciprocity would certainly lead to annexation. He said:

I see no plan for combining the two elements of permanency of the treaty and variability of tariffs, which does not involve a practical control of the latter (tariff) by the United States.

The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom would be towards political union.

Thus far my hon. friend read and then he stopped. But Mr. Blake went on to say:—

And the more successful the plan the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections and the trade and fiscal relations amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States; and of the greater isolation and divergency from Britain which it would produce; and also, and especially, through inconveniences experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty.

Our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be "looking to Washington."

The treaty once made the vantage ground it gave would naturally be used for the accomplishment of its ulterior purpose; and this political end would be a great factor in the consideration by the States of Canadian views upon changes in the joint tariff, or as to the maintenance or termination of the treaty.

The reorganization to which our neighbours look is, of course, the unification of the continent.

That is Mr. Blake's opinion with reference to the tendency of unrestricted reciprocity, and every sentence is an irresistible argument in that way. Mr. Blake went on to say:

Without assured permanence some Conservative predictions of evil, else fallacious, would come true: for our undeniable natural advantages in raw materials, labour, situation and facilities would be unnaturally handicapped.

No manufacturer, looking to the continental market, would fix or even enlarge his capital or business in the country of five millions at the risk of being cut off from the country of sixty-five millions.

Our neighbours, instead of engaging in manufactures here would take our markets with goods manufactured there.

And our raw materials, instead of being finished on the ground, would be exported to be finished abroad.

That is Mr. Blake's opinion, the opinion of a trusted leader of their own, a man who, because his party had taken up the fad of unrestricted reciprocity, was wrenched from his allegiance to that party, and obliged to give reluctant testimony, albeit strong testimony, against the fad and policy which they had adopted. But my hon. friend says that the strongest objection of all to the unrestricted reciprocity plan is discrimination. He admits that discrimination must be had, but he actually had the assurance to follow in the wake of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and base his argument that discrimination would be allowed—upon what? Upon the George Brown draft treaty, which, in 1874, was negotiated by him at Washington. Those three hon. gentlemen, one after

the other, have tried to give currency to an idea which is as false in fact as any thing can be, namely, that the draft of 1874 discriminated against Great Britain and that, too, with the consent and approbation of the British Government. I do not charge them with knowing it is false. What I charge them with is, that they who ought to know that it is false, declare that it is true, and on the assertion that no discrimination was either intended or permitted in that Draft Treaty, I stake my reputation as a public man in this country, and I am willing to stand by my statement, and those three gentlemen have either misunderstood or have misrepresented the whole thing. I ask the attention of this House while I prove it. Sir, it can be proved from a variety of circumstances: I am simply going to take the chain as I find it. I find that the treaty was negotiated in 1874; George Brown was the man who negotiated it; Alexander Mackenzie was the Premier of this country at the time. He himself signed the memorandum, outlining the nature of the reciprocity negotiations which were to be followed by George Brown. What does he say? After going over the other provisions, he says:

In the matter of reciprocal trade considered by itself, there is no reason to doubt that Canada would derive very great advantages from an extension of the list of articles named in article 3 of the former treaty, such as follows:—Manufactures in wood, agricultural implements, salt, mineral oils, bricks for building, bath-bricks, calcined plaster, burnt lime, manufactured articles not produced in or exported from England, ochres, ground or unground.

That was on 9th March in the memorandum which was to guide George Brown, and it expressly confined the list to manufactured articles not produced in or exported from England. Let us go on to the second step. The second step will be found in the Minute of Council, approved on 26th March, 1874, in which we find this passage—it must be remembered that at his time the United States were pressing for a manufactured list wider than that suggested:

Sir Edward Thornton's despatch to His Excellency the Governor-General of a late date, indicates a desire on the part of the United States to extend the list of articles named in the Treaty of 1854, so as to embrace the articles of the manufactures of the two countries. The Government of Canada will be willing to agree to such reciprocity—to include manufactures in wood, such as sashes, doors, blinds, pails, tubs, barrels, matches and various other articles of a like nature—agricultural implements, bath-bricks, bricks for building purposes, calcined gypsum or plaster lime, earth ochres, ground or unground, and generally, all manufactured articles not produced in or exported from Great Britain to this country, together with such other articles as the Imperial and Dominion Governments may mutually agree upon, or as may by mutual arrangement be entered at a fixed duty to be specified in the treaty. It is, however, understood that no proposition affecting the introduction of manufactured goods shall be finally determined upon prior to reference to the Imperial and Dominion Governments. As a natural production, salt may be added to the former free list.

The same careful desire was extended at this second stage of the proceedings to exclude articles in regard to which a discrimination was likely to occur in respect to Great Britain, and every precaution was taken afterwards that if this article were extended, it should only be after reference to the two Governments. The Order in Council goes on to say :

Mr. Brown will communicate this view to Sir Edward Thornton, accompanied with the representation that the Government of Canada do not propose any modification in matter of trade and commerce which would in any way injuriously affect Imperial interests.

That is another stage. On 23rd April, 1874, Earl Carnarvon signs a despatch to Earl Dufferin, in which he says :

After consultation with this department, Lord Derby sent a telegram to Sir E. Thornton, informing him that the proposed paper might be submitted to Mr. Fish, but that the proposals should not be made as being the result of the matured decision of Her Majesty's Government, but as preliminary only, and Sir E. Thornton was desired to explain this to Mr. Fish.

Further, this shows the spirit of the instructions, the actual instructions, the prudent care taken that those instructions should not be exceeded, the spirit of the instructions being that there should be no discrimination against Great Britain. That is one set of facts. Now, Sir, I wish to adduce another proof. I suppose the treaty itself may be taken as showing what the treaty means. I challenged my hon. friend the other day to read a single clause of that treaty which made it a condition of the treaty that the articles which were admitted free from the United States into Canada should not be admitted free to Great Britain or any other country. He could not read it, he cannot read it, because it is not in the treaty. But he attempted to make this argument, that although it was not in the treaty, yet it is common sense to believe that if they had made a treaty between each other, whereby certain articles were to come free into each country, with no other word or sentence qualifying it, that necessarily it must be confined to those two countries. The opposite is the exact truth. But I desire to carry the argument further. There is another article in the treaty which provides for a most-favoured nation treatment. Why do they insert most-favoured nation treatment, if the treaty itself gave the United States a preferential market, with a discrimination against Great Britain in regard to the articles mentioned, and which are set out in another article, which hon. gentlemen can read, and which I will not trouble the House by reading? It is an article providing that, if any more favourable considerations are given by the United States to a third country, or by Canada to any third country, the same shall be given by one country to the other.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman read the paragraph which he says provides a more-favoured nation clause with respect to articles named in the treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the clause, which is as follows:—

For the term mentioned in Article XIII no other or higher duty shall be imposed in the United States upon other articles not enumerated in said schedules, growth, produce or manufacture of Canada; or in Canada upon such other articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United States, than are respectively imposed upon like articles the growth, produce or manufacture of Great Britain or of any other country.

These two articles go together. The first one is explicit in saying that the two countries shall exchange certain products, and there is no article in the treaty which says there shall be a preferential treatment given to each other. And then the commerce between the two countries is extended on the same amicable line to articles which were not mentioned therein to provide for most favoured nation, but not preferential, terms to either one or the other. Now, Sir, my contention, so far, is this: That the spirit of the instructions all the way through was to prevent discrimination against Britain, and that, when a treaty is made, the treaty makes no mention of discrimination against Great Britain. Then I come to George Brown's testimony. George Brown ought to know as much about it as any other man. George Brown made that speech after all the schedules had been submitted, after the treaty had been completed as far as it was completed, and with full knowledge of the articles in the schedule, which he read in his speech only two minutes before. George Brown read the very schedule that my hon. friend read to-night, and then, after reading that, he expressed himself in this way, as to certain objections urged against the treaty.

The first of these objections which he referred to was that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain, and in favour of the United States.

He declared this objection to be unfounded, and proved it by saying :

It was perfectly understood from the opening negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States, which was not also free with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment.

Now, Sir, if George Brown had said that, after the first schedules had been handed in, there might have been some ground for the argument of the hon. gentleman; that he spoke about a subject that he was but half through with in the negotiations. But George Brown made the statement after the draft treaty had been concluded, and after he had just read to the Senate the very schedule of manufactured goods which my hon. friend read,

and George Brown distinctly states that it was never contemplated for a moment, and that actually no discrimination was allowed in that treaty against Great Britain. My hon. friend thought that he had lighted upon an argument which helped him out, and he read the report of the Board of Trade upon this draft treaty which had been submitted to it by Lord Derby. Lord Derby, who knew the whole tenor and spirit of all the negotiations, knew that assurances had been given to him by the Canadian Government that no discrimination should be allowed against Great Britain, and knew that every step in the work of that treaty-making had been under the direct supervision of that Imperial Government. The board of trade reported what? They reported that they found nothing against the treaty, as it was submitted. They did not mention discrimination. My hon. friend put that in as an aside afterwards, as though they had that in their minds, but the board of trade made that report upon the data of the schedules before them, and the promise that these articles mentioned in the schedules should be free to Great Britain as well as to Canada. But, Sir, if George Brown did not know anything about it, and if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition thinks he can asperse the character and veracity of the Hon. George Brown, who made as positive a statement as a man could make, and made it with all the knowledge of the facts; perhaps my hon. friend will allow that Lord Derby ought to know something about it. Well, Sir, at that very time, almost at that very moment, there was a fear in England that this treaty as regards this schedule was going to discriminate against Great Britain, and representatives of various trades headed a deputation to Lord Derby and waited on him, and expressed their fears, and implored his intervention in the matter, and what did Lord Derby say?

It was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to insist that British free trade should not be placed at a disadvantage as compared with other countries, in any treaty which might be entered into on behalf of the colonies; also to forbid the imposition of differential duties in favour of the United States as against Great Britain in any such treaty.

And he further assured the deputation:

That there was nothing in the proposed treaty to warrant the conclusion that the Canadian Government were in favour of such a discrimination.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the date?

Mr. FOSTER. 1874.

Mr. LAURIER. What month?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give you the month.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is important.

Mr. FOSTER. It is important. But, is the date more important than the substance of what is said?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, because it is important to know whether he made that statement before he referred the treaty with the schedule to the board of trade, and got the board of trade's answer that we could discriminate if we pleased, and the English Government would say nothing against it.

Mr. FOSTER. The board of trade never said that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And then his despatch following, in which he said, with the board of trade statement in his hand, that he approved of the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The board of trade never stated what my hon. friend asserted just now. My hon. friend is satisfied to crawl out of a very small hole, and the hole he proposes to crawl out of to-night is this: that because he cannot have the exact date and hour, upon which this utterance of Lord Derby was made, therefore, he impugns its accuracy with reference to this treaty. What did Lord Derby say? He assured the deputation:

That there was nothing in the proposed treaty to warrant the conclusion that the Canadian Government were in favour of discrimination.

He said, in addition, that:

It was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to insist that British trade should not be placed at a disadvantage, and also to forbid the imposition of differential duties in favour of the United States as against Great Britain in any such treaty.

And yet my hon. friend tries to get out of all that by asking me for the exact second in the exact hour, and the exact dot to which the minute hand or second hand of the clock pointed, when that statement was made. Well, as I have said before, there is no excuse for such dense ignorance in this matter. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated the other day that he had been discussing this question for fifteen years, and so also have other hon. gentlemen on the other side. If they are such poor students as not to know the facts, they are poor political leaders to whom to trust the interests of a party still less of a country. This has been frequently threshed out in the papers. We know that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie time and again gave the same assurance, and the Toronto "Mail," in discussing this matter, said:

We are authorized by the Hon. Alex. McKenzie to state that Mr. McDougall is entirely mistaken in stating that discrimination was suggested or proposed or permitted under the treaty of 1874.

Sir, I have done with that, after having made the argument, I again make the assertion: That no discrimination was intended or was made in that treaty. If my hon. friend has nothing better by which to recommend to the people the adoption of a scheme against which he declares discrimination to be the chief factor of objection, than a baseless

assertion like this, his case is lost, and he need not go to the country upon it. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made another statement the other night equally without foundation, in order to prove that discrimination on another occasion had been proposed. He declared that Sir John Macdonald, the political godfather of the Liberal-Conservative party, had sent Sir Alexander Galt, and three others, in 1865, down to Washington, and through them had offered to assimilate the Customs tariffs of the two countries, which he contended was parallel in principle and in details to what he and his friends propose to do under unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman made that statement along with the others, and it shows an equal lack of investigation and an equal lack of accuracy. I have before me exactly what was proposed, in a minute made in memorandum by Sir Alexander Galt and his confrères. It was when they were trying to have the treaty of 1854 extended, or something else put in its place. They went down, and they found the temper of the people at Washington against renewing the old reciprocity treaty. One of the strongest objections urged against its renewal was this: That, owing to peculiar internal taxes in the United States, the Americans insisted on a larger impost upon the articles which had formerly been in the treaty list in order to equalize the exchange between the two countries; and the proposition made by Sir Alexander Galt, and his confrères, was this:

The trade between the United States and the British provinces should, it is believed, under ordinary circumstances, be free in reference to their natural productions; but as internal taxes exceptionally exist in the United States, it is now proposed that the articles embraced in the free list of the reciprocity treaty should continue to be exchanged, subject only to such duties as may be equivalent to that internal taxation. It is suggested that both parties may add certain articles to those now in the said list.

If the foregoing points be satisfactorily arranged, Canada is willing to adjust her excise duties upon spirits, beer and tobacco, upon the best revenue standard which may be mutually adopted after full consideration of the subject; and if it be desired to treat any other articles in the same way, the disposition of the Canadian Government is to give every facility in their power to prevent illicit trade.

Memorandum "B" was given as an answer by the United States delegates. They give a list of the articles in the treaty of 1854, and upon all of them they put less or greater duties, which they desired Canada to pay in order to compensate for the disadvantage they claimed to be under on account of their internal taxation. In memorandum "G" which followed, Mr. Galt replied:

In reference to the memorandum received from the Committee on Ways and Means, the provincial delegates regret to be obliged to state that the proposals therein contained in regard to the commercial relations between the two countries are not such as they can recommend for the adoption of the respective legislatures. The imposts which it is proposed to lay

Mr. FOSTER.

upon the productions of the British provinces on their entry into the markets of the United States, are such as, in their opinion, will be in some cases prohibitory, and will certainly seriously interfere with the natural course of trade. These imposts are so much beyond what the delegates conceive to be an equivalent for the internal taxation of the United States, that they are reluctantly brought to the conclusion that the committee no longer desire the trade between the two countries to be carried on upon the principles of reciprocity. With the concurrence of the British Minister at Washington, they are therefore obliged respectfully to decline to enter into the engagement suggested in the memorandum.

That is all there is to that. It affords not the shadow of an argument in favour of discrimination, or in favour of assimilation of tariffs between the two countries. Now, Sir, I have exhausted my own patience, and I suppose the patience of the House, and yet there are two or three points which I feel I must touch upon. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, the other day, that the Government had asserted, when they went to the people in 1891, that they would certainly get a reciprocity treaty from the United States, and that on that assertion, which he declared had no foundation in fact, we had fooled and deceived the people, and gained the election. I am anxious for honest and fair debate in this House, and in my anxiety for it I gave my hon. friend a chance to retract the strength of that assertion, and I supposed he would like a man, say: Well, that was a little too strong; you did not actually assert that, but you left it to be implied. But my hon. friend would not take advantage of that opportunity, and not once, but twice or three times before he finished his speech, he declared that we had actually asserted that we would be certain to get a reciprocity treaty, and that we had carried the country on that cry. Now, I give my hon. friend another opportunity to retract that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. He will not do it. I am not surprised at that; but what does surprise me is that hon. gentlemen who sit beside him on the front benches will stand by him in his refusal to retract a statement which he did not prove and which he cannot prove. When he was asked to produce his authority, what did he quote? He quoted the Toronto "Empire." The Toronto "Empire" is not the Government. He had not stated that the Toronto "Empire" had declared thus and so. He had said that the Government had actually said so and so. But even when he read the extract from the Toronto "Empire," it appeared that the Toronto "Empire" did not say it; and he actually struggled through the whole extract without showing one single syllable or line which could bear out the assertion that he made. The hon. gentleman went on, afterwards, to declare that the draft treaty of 1874 was an actual and square discrimination on all fours with what was

proposed under unrestricted reciprocity. Sir John Thompson gave him an opportunity to take that back. He asked a certain question as to whether the Hon. George Brown had made a statement, by way of denial. But the hon. gentleman never answers a question squarely. He did not answer that; but he went off on a side shift. Now, Sir, there are two examples of an hon. gentleman choosing to argue against his opponents by actually falsifying the record, and when he was given an opportunity of putting himself right, utterly declining to put himself right. And he not only stated that in the face of members in this House who could judge of its falsity, but his speech goes out to the world, and it will be by and by, I suppose, printed in pamphlet form, as are all his speeches, and be sent out to a larger constituency, and men will read, and men will say the Canadian Government is a bad Government. Why? Because they declared in 1891, that they were certain to get a reciprocity treaty, they went to the people on this declaration and they did not get it; because they declared against discrimination and that the British Government is against discrimination, and yet, in 1874, discrimination was actually allowed and acceded to by Great Britain. And men will say, we cannot support a Government which can be guilty of such deceit as that. And when asked, why do you come to that conclusion, they will answer: Because Honest John Charlton said so, because Mr. Charlton is a Christian, because he is an elder of the Presbyterian Church, because he is a stickler for the Sabbath, because he is a man who pretends to great goodness, and is truly good, and John Charlton would not say this unless it were so. We will base our political action on what John Charlton says, because we believe in his honesty, I must say that that is a propaganda which ought not to be carried on—not as between parties, for I am not speaking now merely of parties—but as between the man and the people who read what the man says. My hon. friend is very much against the captain of a tug taking hold of a little string, and allowing the shrill whistle of his tug to rend the solemn stillness of the Sabbath morning. I would rather that he would rend the solemn stillness of the Sabbath morn, by letting the tug blow its horn 10,000 times, than that he would offend against the compact upon which society can alone be maintained—truth between man and man; and yet, Sir, if that captain of the tug told a lie to his mate, the minimum of wrong would be done. He would have sullied the purity of his own heart, he would have outraged the confidence of his neighbour; but these two would be the only ones concerned. But what is to be said of a public man who would make these utterances without any shadow of foundation, and who, when given a chance to take them back and set himself right, will not do it, but will spread them as propaganda

broad and wide throughout the country. That is not the kind of political warfare that ought to obtain. The hon. gentleman sitting near me, my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) erred in the same way, I am bound to say through ignorance, as no public man, especially one who proposes to be the leader of the Maritime provinces, ought to err. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) leaned towards me as he spoke; and in that melodramatic manner of his, so well known, always full of vehemence, whether there is anything behind it or not, deliberately accused me of falsifying the record. He reminds me of one of those instruments which, when wound up, cannot be stopped until it runs down and the last clanging note of which makes a greater noise and at greater speed than any preceding revolution. My hon. friend commenced, just after he was wound up, by saying: you said what was not so, but I do not accuse you of doing it wilfully, as you had a certain bias naturally in your own mind which came out in your statement, and, therefore, your statement is not quite correct. But before he got to the last he put it in plain language, and declared that the Minister of Finance had deliberately falsified the record. What record? My hon. friend talks of records. What records? He had in his hands a document. Presented where? To the American Senate. What was the document? A letter. From whom? Mr. Blaine. My hon. friend had before him the statement made a year ago in this House, on the authority of a Minister, in the presence of the two-fellow Ministers who went to Washington—a statement which is longer and fuller than that made by Mr. Blaine. He chose to ignore that evidence and to take the other as the sole record and the sole evidence. Does it make any intrinsic difference whether I made my statement in the privacy of my room and presented it in writing to the House, or whether I stated it in the Budget speech, as my report, made here as a responsible Minister of the Crown, weighing my words and making my statement, as I believed it to be true? What fairness was there in taking Mr. Blaine's letter as the only record, as if my statement were not equally a matter of record? The hon. gentleman in his speech said that Mr. Blaine in his letter included every single thing that took place. How did he know? He does not know. All the probabilities are against Mr. Blaine having written in that letter a record of every thing that took place. As a matter of fact, he did not write one-fifth part of what took place. He recorded no protocols; there were none. He simply placed a letter in the hands of the President, giving in a few sentences his recollection of the conference as bearing on the request of Congress and of what he should report. That was a record, and mine is equally a record, and a fuller and longer one than that. It is re-

served for a Canadian, and a person in Opposition, to declare the statement of a Canadian co-member false, and take without question the statement of Mr. Blaine!

Mr. CHARLTON. Do we understand the hon. gentleman to assert that the statement made by Mr. Blaine is false?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has risen in a very stately way and has intoned in a very grave voice, but he is altogether ahead of the record. If he will sit still, I will tell him.

Mr. CHARLTON. Say yes or no.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, I think the House will take it for granted that my hon. friend is wrong in saying that Blaine's letter detailed everything that took place. Does he still hold to that assertion? Again let me ask my hon. friend if he did not say that I probably might be a little misled from bias in my own direction. Am I alone human, and was Mr. Blaine alone superior to human frailty? Was there no humanity and bias in the Secretary of the United States, which might incline him to give a report in the line of his own wishes? Honestly and fairly, was he not as liable thereto as myself, and yet his statement is taken as a strictly unbiassed report and mine a falsification of the record, unworthy of credence. Now, my hon. friend put a question to me a little while ago, which I will answer, for he (Mr. Davies) said—I can read his words if he doubts me—that the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, emphatically denied Mr. Foster's statement. Will my hon. friend point out one sentence of Mr. Blaine's which denies one single statement made by me? Put the two records side by side. I say more than Mr. Blaine did; Mr. Blaine says less than I did. I said everything that Mr. Blaine said—I do not mean just in exactly the same language, but I treated every one of the points he treated—but he did not treat all of the points that I did. Mr. Blaine stated that the first proposal made was for reciprocity in natural products, with such extensions and qualifications as the altered circumstances required. I stated that; we agree in that point. Mr. Blaine stated that a list of manufactured articles was to be included along with that of natural products. I stated that the line must be in natural products and manufactures generally. There is a divergence, but that is all. Mr. Blaine stated that there must be discrimination against Great Britain: I stated there must be discrimination against Great Britain. In all these particulars we are exactly alike or we are very close together. For, the rest, I make statements and deal with subjects which Mr. Blaine does not touch, but which were discussed in the conference that took place, and discussed for some considerable time. Now, I ask my hon. friend, whether he has been quite fair to me in representing Mr. Blaine as having recorded

Mr. FOSTER.

all that took place, as giving the only record that should be relied upon, and refusing to take my statement as a record of the case, in refusing to look upon my statement as worthy of credence, at least, equally with that of Mr. Blaine. At least he should give me the credit that he felt disposed to give in the first part of his address, when he said that I had not wilfully misrepresented. I know that when the hon. gentleman reads what he has said and thinks over the matter, he will feel that he has been unfair to me in that respect, as no man should be to his fellow member, sitting opposite to him in the House of Commons, where all men are supposed to be gentlemen. Now, Sir, I have not one word or one syllable to retract of the statement I made last year on that point. I stand by it: I stand by it entirely; I stand by it without any mental reservation; I stand by it in the presence of my colleagues who were there with me. And I ask this House to judge of the sense of fairness of that hon. gentleman who can find the only authoritative statement on the part of the stranger and refuse all credence or credit for honesty to his fellow citizen and his fellow member. Now, Sir, I wish to say a word or two in closing, with reference to the general subject. I find that I have been kept close to the points which have been made to-night or recently, and that I have not touched the general points which I had hoped to deal with, which were made during the debate. I close with this simple thought, and I ask the attention of my fellow members on this side of the House, and I ask the attention of the country as well. These hon. gentlemen may not be very well agreed as to what they want, but they are perfectly agreed as to what they are against. When you come to sum up the expressions of the foremost men as to what they want there is a wide divergence of opinion among them. They agree as to their positive faith in very few principles, and in other respects there is a wide divergence. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) believes in unrestricted reciprocity; he wants access to the United States markets, and believes that it is the only salvation for Canada in the line of development and permanent prosperity. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is determined to devote his life to getting unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is less definite and precise. He has found out that it is the best sometimes not to say too much or say it too positively, so this time he harks back considerably, and he sums up his policy in this wonderfully positive and definite form: "We desire the broadest treaty possible consistent with the commercial and political independence of Canada." The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had a little good humoured chaff with me because, he said, I was indefinite in my statement; but he capped the climax of indefiniteness. He declared: "I

want the freest possible trade with the United States, consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries." He is much dissatisfied with me because I stated that I would do the best for the whole country. He determined to be very definite, and this is his definition. I can see my hon. friend going from this House and meeting a farmer, one of those depressed farmers of whom he speaks, and the farmer says: Mr. Paterson, you are just down from the Legislative halls. I know you are a very learned man, and a very famous politician; I know your keenness of vision and your breadth of comprehension. I want to know whether you are going to get me the market of the United States? And the hon. gentleman will satisfy the burning thirst of that poor, depressed farmer by saying: All I can tell you is that I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. Then he will meet one of those prosperous manufacturers of his own town, who will come to him with anxiety in his face, and say: Now, Mr. Paterson, what is to be the end of this matter: are we going to have reciprocity, and if we have it, as you say we must, are we to be mercilessly exposed to competition with the United States? And the good member will draw himself up to his full height and say: I cannot tell you whether it will be that way or not; but I can tell you my faith and creed—I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. And so he will satisfy every one of his constituents with that most definite and positive statement and, if in his town they do not put up a monument sacred to the great N. P., I am sure they will put up a monument sacred to the positive clearness and definite conception of the great W. P. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is the most conservative of all. He says he is not for revolution, he would not hurt an existing industry. He wants a custom revenue and would like to see the man who could be elected in any constituency on a policy of direct taxation. He wants no independence or annexation talk, and he thinks that man no friend of Canada who talks independence or annexation at this time. Yet he has sitting very closely to him a gentleman who has been talking independence in the last few months. And the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has two planks in his policy. One is that legislation should be had to increase the profits of the farmers—

Mr. TARTE. I never said or wrote anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. No; let me have a little conversation with my hon. friend. If my hon. friend will turn up the "Hansard" and look at the report of his speech, and if he will look at the manifesto that he read and which

he gave to his county, he will find these two statements in it, or else I cannot read French.

Mr. TARTE. Perhaps that is it.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps that is the reason. I will leave it to him. In that manifesto he said that he is going in for such legislation as will raise the value of the farmer's products, and that Mr. Laurier, if he comes into power, will leave two or three columns still standing in the temple of protection.

Mr. TARTE. I never wrote or never said anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it must be my bad French. I will look that up, and if I find I am wrong I will withdraw it with great pleasure. That is what my hon. friends say on the negative side. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to what these gentlemen say when they come to the positive side. Here there is no hesitation; there is no lack of definiteness. Their propaganda is plain and firm, and I want it to ring from one end to the other of this country. What is their propaganda? The hon. member for South Oxford says:

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous system of protection; I care not whether we cut its head off, or cut its tail off, or cut it in two in the middle—what I want to do is to destroy it.

There is no indefiniteness about that. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says:

Protection, Sir, notwithstanding all that may be said in favour of it, is neither more or less than a species of slavery. It is a system as indefensible, upon the broad principle of justice, as slavery. It is absolutely and unconditionally slavery.

That is plain; no round-about method in that. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) says:

We have been attacking this policy year after year. It is a cursed system, accursed of God and man. It must be cut down, and not allowed to cumber the ground.

And to make a long story short, the hon. leader of the Opposition declared to-night that his policy was the destruction of every vestige of protection, by bringing the tariff down to a simple revenue basis. Now, Sir, I am glad to have read these statements, and I am glad to have them so heartily applauded by hon. gentlemen opposite. They will not hereafter try to get away from these expressions of their opinions. Now, I ask my hon. friends in this House who believe in the principle of protection, but who may have some grievance now and then, and here and there, with the tariff; I ask them to weigh these assertions; for whatever the proposition that these gentlemen are putting before the House to-night for us to vote upon, it is with the spirit and the purpose of utterly destroying the principle of protection in this country. A man may have a grudge, may have an objection, to some parti-

cular excrescence upon the tariff; but he may be at the same time a firm believer in the principle of protection, and may wish to see it survive in this country. I warn such men as those in this House and in the country from playing into the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that their present proposition is a harmless one. By one way we have come up to our large commercial and industrial development in this country. We have in these last few years done wonders in the development of our industrial life. Strangers who come here, and people who study our history, acknowledge it frankly and freely. We who live in this country know the blessings that have come from this policy. It may be a fact that to-day there are excrescences upon this policy, that there are details which ought to be carefully examined, and which ought to be made right, that there are certain respects in which the tariff should be reformed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have cast a doubt upon the good faith of the Government in respect of honestly revising the tariff. I stand here to-night to say that what I stated in this regard was stated with the consent of all my colleagues, and in perfect good faith. I ask the country outside to watch carefully, and not be misled by any phrases that these gentlemen may use; but to understand that it is a struggle in which the existence of the principle of protection in this country is at stake. If hon. gentlemen opposite, having set the battle on these lines, push it to the front, and push it to the finish, this country may wake up some fine morning and find its industries destroyed, its factories closed, its employment of labour discontinued, and multiplied disasters coming upon many a section of this country from Cape Breton to British Columbia. In the proposition before us to-night they put it mildly. It is a little economy, a little revision, and a little of something else; but you must look at the motive that inspires them. A British sovereign held out in the hand and placed within your palm is a good thing. You can buy food and clothing with it; but the same British sovereign pressed tightly upon the opening of your wind-pipe will bring death, and bring it quickly. Outside of these assertions of ultimate purpose on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite the proposition before the House may combine features which are in themselves harmless, some of which may be right; but it is a coin which is meant to strangle the principle of protection and destroy it in this country. I ask hon. gentlemen to weigh carefully these matters; to weigh them when they come before the people; to have them put right upon every hustings, and in every assembly in this country, so that people may vote with their eyes open to the full consequences of their action; and if, after doing that, it be found that this battle, pressed to the finish, as it will be, results in a victory for the principle of free trade rather than protection, so be it:

Mr. FOSTER.

but I have a firm and abiding faith that the way to victory does not lie by that path.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I purpose to begin the few observations that I intend addressing to the House at this hour by some notice of the speech which the Minister of Finance has made in reply to my hon. friend, and to some other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. Finance Minister began his speech by informing the House that there was neither cogency nor novelty in the speech which was addressed to the House by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. The speech which the hon. gentleman himself has made in reply to my hon. friend shows that whatever that hon. gentleman may have said at the outset he felt, after all, that whether the speech had cogency or novelty it was one well calculated to seriously impress, not only the minds of the House, but the people of the country. Sir, the hon. gentleman informed the House that while my hon. friend had talked broadly in favour of the principles of free trade, after all, when his speech and the resolution came to be read, they simply meant reciprocity with the neighbouring republic, and a protective tariff against all the rest of the world. Sir, if the policy marked out by my hon. friend is of the character which the hon. gentleman described in the beginning of his speech this evening, it would not have been so strongly opposed by him. If hon. members will read the resolution on which the House will be called on to vote, it will be seen that it is directly in opposition to the views which the Minister of Finance attributed to the leader of the Opposition. We are not calling on the people of Canada, or on this House as representing the people, to impose a high tax against our trade with all the rest of mankind, in order that we may establish free and unrestricted trade with our neighbours to the south of us. We are asking for a reduction of taxation; we are asking for economy in the management of public affairs. We say that the government of this country may be carried on for a very much smaller sum than that now annually taken out of the pockets of the people for that purpose, and we further say that the taxation of the country should be reduced, and that Parliament should, with as great a degree of rapidity as circumstances will permit, approach to the principles of a revenue tariff. We ask that taxation shall be imposed on the people only to meet the necessities of the Government, and that large sums shall not be taken every year out of the pockets of those least able to contribute, in order that it may become the capital of men who are engaged in other industrial pursuits. The hon. gentleman undertook to give an account of the emigration from Canada to the United States. He said that the trend of emigration was westward with respect to the hunger for land, and southward in respect to seeking employment in the manufacturing

establishments of the United States. I will by and by refer to the fact that those same statements were made before hon. gentlemen reached the Treasury benches, and that views which were at that time expressed declared that if hon. gentlemen had an opportunity of adopting a policy, which was then designated the National Policy, they would put an end to emigration either southward or westward, and would adopt a policy that would not only retain the whole of our own population within the limits of Canada, but they would succeed in securing for this country a very large number of people, and a very large amount of capital now on the other side of the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman, in referring to emigration from Canada—for hon. gentlemen can no longer pursue the course they followed a few years ago, and deny there is any expatriation of the population of the country—undertook to account for it by saying that we had no western country open for this population to settle. But we have had the North-west since 1870; no less than twenty-three years have elapsed since that territory was acquired, and since we have been in possession of that country, nearly the whole of this emigration from Canada, which has so developed during the last twelve or fourteen years, has taken place; and so the House will see, if the hon. gentleman himself refuses to see, that that explanation will not account for the fact he has mentioned. Then the hon. gentleman said that the farmers of the United States were as badly off as those in Canada, and that the land-owners of the United Kingdom were even worse off, and he denied altogether the statement of my hon. friend as to the circumstances which led to this condition in the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman said that it may be true that lands have depreciated in value to the extent of 25 per cent, but he said the cotton mills have not been the occasion of this, that the taxes upon all products of manufacturing industry have not been the cause of this. I dissent from the observations of the hon. gentleman. I say that when the Government adopted a policy which takes a very large proportion of the earnings of the people out of their pockets, a part of which only finds its way into the public treasury, they produced a state of things which stimulated emigration from Canada, and which made 1,000,000 of our people citizens of the United States. The hon. gentleman said that the water the people drink is not taxed, that the wood growing in the forest is not taxed. It is fortunate for the country that the Minister of Finance has not carried his taxation that far. But if by such a policy large fortunes could have been placed in the pockets of a portion of the population, there is no doubt whatever that the same policy which has been adopted with respect to every other industry in the country would have been adopted with respect to the water that

runs and the wood of the forest that grows in the soil. In most countries where the principle of free trade is recognized, the discovery of rich mines is an advantage. It is the means of giving employment to the population, and affords an opportunity for the investment of capital; but according to the principle of the hon. gentleman, every discovery made of a natural mineral resource of the country becomes a misfortune to the people. It is an excuse for imposing an additional tax. How much better off would they have been if no iron mines could have been found in Nova Scotia? They would have escaped the enormous taxation at this time imposed on them; and I say the whole policy of the Minister of Finance has been this, that the discovery of new resources has been made an excuse for the imposition on the people of additional burdens. The hon. gentleman has referred to the condition of affairs in England, as if there was any analogy between the land of England and the land of this country. What was the condition of things in England? The policy of protection when it existed there was in the interest of the agriculturist. The country did not produce the quantity of food required; what was required for consumption was far in excess of what the country could produce. What was the result? A tax was imposed on every agricultural product brought in, and an additional price, by this artificial process, was put on the products of the land within the United Kingdom. The land was increased beyond its proper value, and of course when that system was changed, the land decreased in value, and improvements in the modes of intercourse between nations to-day and the diminution in the cost of transportation have produced a further depreciation in the value of land. If the hon. gentleman's theory were correct, the proper course for the people of the United Kingdom to adopt would be to re-establish the corn laws, to impose taxation on food, and they would by such a policy again increase the value of lands once more. That is the policy which the Minister of Finance has adopted, but it has not been adopted on this side of the Atlantic in the interests of the agricultural population, and what free trade did for the lands of the United Kingdom, protection is doing for the land in British North America. I have no doubt whatever as to that fact, and the Minister of Finance, by the policy he is adopting, is really diminishing the value of real estate in the older provinces of Canada. The hon. gentleman further said: We do not tax the agricultural population. Why, he said, the Opposition claim to be the friends of the farmer. So we are. We wish to adopt a policy, not conferring upon them any special advantage, but in the race for life we wish to give them an equal opportunity with persons engaged in other pursuits. That is what the hon. gentleman has denied them. He says there is no tax

upon the wood ; but there is a tax upon the axe with which the wood is cut ; there is a tax upon the harness of the horses which draw the wood from the forests, and there is a tax upon the sleigh upon which the wood is put. There is scarcely an article which is used in connection with agricultural pursuits which is not subject to a very heavy burden of taxation. The hon. gentleman has mentioned a number of things upon which he says the farmer is not taxed. But what are they ? They are the natural products of the farm. The hon. gentleman has told us how the farmers are clad. You would suppose almost that the farmer clothed himself with the fleece as it came from the sheep, without it even being woven or spun, or any other industry spent upon it beyond the mere shearing. The farmers may perhaps dress so down in the county which he represents ; but I fancy he will find that the agricultural population of the other portions of the Dominion are clad in quite another way, and that in proportion to their income, the farmers of Canada are quite as large consumers of imported goods as any other class, and that in proportion to their incomes they bear larger burdens than any other portion of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman told us that the burden of taxation is really very little. Why, he says : there is a tax upon tobacco and liquor, and we get \$10,000,000 in that way, and that tax you pay voluntarily, and you are not obliged to pay it. He also said that there were \$2,500,000 tax on luxuries ; but the people were not obliged to indulge in luxuries, and there were \$12,500,000 altogether for articles upon which we were not obliged to pay any tax. I think that a large majority, even of his supporters, will not agree with the hon. gentleman even in this matter. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, referring to one feature of taxation, said that taxation is an evil, and the Finance Minister looked upon that statement as a most extraordinary one, and as one which he had never heard before. It was a novel declaration in the field of political economy to the Finance Minister, and so the leader of the Opposition was dealt with as if he had been guilty of some sacrilege. Now I suppose that there is no difference to the man who pays the money whether \$10 are lost on the highway or whether they are taken for the purpose of taxation. He is personally that much worse off whatever way it is taken. If the taxes are applied wisely, he may derive, as a member of the community, some advantage from the taxation, but, so far as the individual is concerned, the assumption by every writer of political economy with which I am acquainted is that taxation is so much absolutely taken from the resources of the individual, and that he is, by the mere act of taxation, that much worse off than he would have been if no such tax had been imposed. So the rule is this : That the Government ought never to take more in the form of taxes from the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

pockets of the people than are required absolutely for the purposes of the state. The hon. gentleman takes a good deal more than that. He insists upon a policy of protection, and by a policy of protection you take many millions of dollars that never find their way into the public treasury. The hon. gentleman insists upon a tax upon sugar. He does not receive a dollar into the public treasury from that tax, but he takes a very large amount out of the pockets of the consumers of sugar, and puts it into the pockets of those who are engaged in refining sugar within the limits of Canada. So far as that is concerned, I have never been able to see in what way that contributes to the production of wealth. If the hon. gentleman, by that arrangement, succeeds in taking \$2,000,000 from the people of Canada, and puts that two millions in the hands of the sugar refiners, he is not adding a dollar to the wealth of the country. He has made many hundreds of thousands of people a little poorer, but he has made one manufacturing establishment a good deal wealthier. The principle which underlies that tax underlies every tax that is imposed for protective purposes. The Finance Minister says that my hon. friend beside me is wrong in saying that you cannot create property by taxation, and he undertakes to show how certain portions of the lands on the borders of the Bay of Fundy that are submerged by the tide, may be reclaimed and made valuable. I would call that, not taxation, but investment : That is land speculation. It is not an act of the Government. It is true that Government, like any individual, may engage in a speculation of that sort. It may be wise, or it may be otherwise, but whether it is wise or otherwise, it is, after all, not an act of Government, and it is not taxation in the proper sense. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the Hudson Bay Company's purchase. We obtained a large area of land to which the Hudson Bay Company made claim, and the hon. gentleman says we paid for that, and he calls that taxation. I say it is not taxation in the proper sense. It is simply a purchase by the Government for which an equivalent was received, just the same as if it had been made, by a private party. But let us take the tax of 40 per cent on cottons. The individual consumer pays this tax. The public do not get it, but there is no doubt the manufacturer gets it, and in proportion as you stimulate the manufacturer you have discouraged the consumer, and the hon. gentleman will see that this is taxation. It is a thing for which, from our point of view, there is no justification whatever. Our resolution is against that policy. It is against the policy of continuing to levy money from the great mass of the population for the benefit of the few. Mr. Hallam, in his work on the Middle Ages, tells of a man who lived in luxury in some point on the Rhine, and no one knew just where his income came

from; but he points to the fact that five roads met at his castle, and that a great many wealthy persons travelled in that direction, and so the matter was easily explained and understood. Now the Finance Minister has adopted a policy something like that. He stands where the roads meet: he interferes with commerce; he levies tribute upon the commerce, not for the purpose of encouraging trade, but for the purpose of hindering it. Now, Sir, our resolution does not point to any violent or extraordinary or sudden change. We ask that the Parliament of this country, which claims to represent the people, shall put itself on the right way, and begin its journey in the right direction, in order that it may progress in the right direction as fast as the circumstances of the country will permit. The hon. gentleman said they were not now engaged in interfering with the policy of protection. No, Sir, that policy is to be upheld. The hon. gentleman's speech to-night must, I think, have satisfied everybody that the course taken by the Government during the last fifteen years, is a course which they intend to persist in, and that whatever inclination they may have had to depart from that course, they have been sufficiently stimulated of late to adhere to it; and he states that they will be engaged in lopping off the mouldering branches and cutting off the suckers, as he calls them. What these suckers are, he did not say; but I suppose that articles on which there is a duty of 40 or 50 per cent might come under that designation; and if he proposes to cut out all the suckers from the industries of this country, he will have before him the task of uprooting almost everything that has been planted under the auspices of the Government since the adoption of this policy. The hon. gentleman told us that in the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty it was proposed that there should be an assimilation of tariffs. The hon. gentleman also referred to the interviews which he had with Mr. Blaine. Now, Sir, I have read the interviews with Mr. Blaine and Mr. Foster, and Mr. Blaine says that he never insisted on an assimilation of tariffs, that he did not propose anything of the sort, did not desire it, did not think it was in the interest of the two countries. But the hon. gentleman refers to it as if he himself had not been personally informed that no such thing was insisted upon or was regarded as a necessary condition of a wide measure of reciprocity with the neighbouring republic. The hon. gentleman also refers to the statement of Mr. Blake, and he says that the views expressed by Mr. Blake are conclusive so far as they point against the Opposition, but that Mr. Blake's views as to the tendency of protection are of no value whatever. Well, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman is guilty of the very thing he complains of, unfairly complains of, in my hon. friend in quoting the census. My hon. friend took the census returns so far as they pointed against the Government as conclusive

evidence of the condition of things, because the Government would not make or secure, under the instructions they had given, a return that would be detrimental to themselves. In so far as these census returns told against the Administration, they told against them in a less marked degree than, taken by a neutral body, they would be likely to do. Now, I have just this to say about Mr. Blake's criticism; it was the one point which I think was altogether overlooked in that document, that is, the influence of contentment produced by prosperity. If you have a prosperous population you will have a contented population, and if you have a contented population you will have a population altogether unfavourable and inimical to revolutionary projects; and so I think, so far from a reasonable and fair measure of reciprocity tending to produce political or revolutionary changes, if it contributed to the general prosperity of the country, as I think it would, it would have the very opposite effect. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has referred to an abortive treaty that was negotiated on behalf of Canada by Mr. George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton, and he referred to that treaty as if it were a treaty that conclusively established the fact that discrimination was not to exist against any of the products of the United Kingdom. There is no doubt of this, that there is no provision in that treaty in favour of discrimination. Nobody asserted that there was. That Mr. Brown did not desire discrimination at all, I know well. That Mr. Mackenzie did not desire that any article that was put on the free list so far as the United States were concerned should be put on the taxed list as between Canada and Great Britain, is, I think, also true. But the whole point is this, that there is nothing in that treaty that guards against the possibility of discrimination, and it was on that ground that it was made the subject of reference to the Colonial Secretary, and that the Colonial Secretary referred the matter to Lord Derby. Lord Derby expressed his own personal views, but as it was a matter relating to the Board of Trade more than to his department, he referred it to the Board of Trade, and the Board of Trade expressed the opinion that if those articles were made the subjects of taxation as between Canada and Great Britain, that was no ground for objecting to the treaty. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the instructions to the Governor-General, that before 1874 the Governor-General was not permitted to give his sanction to any measure in which discriminating duties were imposed; but after 1874 no such limitation existed, and a greater degree of freedom was allowed to the self-governing colonies than at any previous period. Now, I am not at this moment discussing the question whether discrimination as against Great Britain would be wise or not. I leave that altogether out

of consideration. I am calling the attention of the House to this fact, that by the declaration of the Board of Trade at the time that treaty was under negotiation it was shown that the Government of England was not prepared to intervene and prevent a treaty being consummated, because that treaty imposed a tax on English goods while it admitted American goods of the same character free. Every person must know that how far the English would be interested in a matter of that sort, apart from the Government, would depend on the articles that would be put upon the list. Everybody can see that to put on the free list agricultural implements, and a number of other articles that are manufactures of the United States, with discrimination against every other country, would not be a policy that would in the smallest degree interest either the people of the United Kingdom or the people of any other portion of Christendom. And, Sir, that is one of the objections I make to the course taken by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that when they had an opportunity of negotiating a treaty, they did not take the first step to see whether a treaty really could be negotiated that would be acceptable to the people of this country or not. Now, let me read the extract from the report of the Board of Trade again, which the Minister did not read, and which shows very clearly that, whatever opinions may be expressed, the British Government at that day were not prepared to interfere with the commercial policy adopted by Canada in its negotiations with the neighbouring republic:

They ask a renewal of the treaty of 1854 for twenty-one years, including the fisheries with the addition of the additional free admission of salt, manufactures of wood, iron or steel articles, or of these jointly, agricultural implements and a few other trifling articles. To this no objection can be taken, whatever criticisms may have been made on the original reciprocity treaty, on the ground that Canada was setting up differential duties in favour of the United States, both against this country and countries with which we have most favoured nation treaties.

This objection is not based on the assumption, as hon. gentlemen see, there is no such assumption in the treaty. That is not the ground, but it is that supposing the objection were true, it is no ground for objecting to the ratification of the treaty, for the extract continues:

No such objection can be taken now.

These words show that the Government, at that time, had departed altogether from the course they had hitherto followed. The hon. gentleman complained that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had stated that when the Ministers went to the country in 1891, they represented that they would certainly get a treaty of reciprocity with the neighbouring republic. Supposing such words were never used, what inference is to be drawn from what was done? Parliament was elected for five years. Parliament had not sat out its full term, and dissolution had

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

taken place. For what purpose? To fail in the negotiation of a treaty? Was it not assumed that the negotiations were to be successful? Did they not say that they did not want behind them a moribund Parliament? Why, Sir, it would no doubt have been logical, in better form, and more defensible, if the treaty had been first negotiated and an election then had to see whether the treaty met with the approval of the people or not. But before the negotiations were initiated, the proposal was to have an election for the purpose of having the support of the country in favour of the treaty. What was the issue then that the Government wished to make at the elections? It was: Are you ready to sustain us and bestow on us your confidence in order that we may negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the neighbouring republic? Then there was a further statement to which my hon. friend referred, and which has been referred to again and again, in this House and out of it, that the Government represented that these negotiations were initiated by Mr. Blaine and by his colleagues. I have just one word to say more on this subject before I leave it. The hon. gentleman has complained that his statement made in the House upon his return from Washington was not taken as conclusive. Well, I care not what may be the high character for veracity which the hon. gentleman possesses. I claim, on behalf of this Parliament, as a constitutional right belonging to both Houses, to be put in possession of what passed at these negotiations—to know what report was made to Her Majesty's Foreign Secretary or to the Governor-General—before being called upon to discuss this matter in the House. It was a most unconstitutional and most improper proceeding. It was such a proceeding as had never been adopted in the mother country, and when the hon. gentleman came before this House and made a statement, and asked us to accept that statement implicitly, he did what was unprecedented. He did what a treasurer would do if he were to say to his employers: Gentlemen, the state of your account is so and so, and you have such a balance on hand; you know I am an upright gentleman, of high personal integrity, but I kept no books and paid out your money. That is my recollection, and I want you to take my statement of the facts. I say it would be a preposterous proposition, and no matter what confidence you may have had in the man to whom you may have committed the trust, you would not for a moment entertain a proposition of that sort; and the Parliament of the country was wanting in its duty to the people when it permitted the Minister of Finance to make a statement of what passed at Washington, without laying on the Table, for the information of the House, the report that was made to the Foreign Secretary or the Governor-General. To show that the statement of the hon. gentleman, even to-night, is not in accord with that which was made at Washington, and to show the propriety of

having full information on the subject, and not simply the personal recollection of an hon. gentleman several months after, let me read an extract from the statement of the Secretary of the United States, Mr. Foster. He said :

During the reciprocity conference last winter, said Mr. Blaine did not state that in a reciprocity arrangement a uniform tariff would be necessary for both Canada and the United States, nor much less that it should be on the line of the United States tariff. He did ask that the schedule should not be confined to natural products.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, it was to be a schedule, and it was to contain a specific number of articles. It was not a demand on the part of the United States that every product of the industry of the United States should be put on that list. He asked that the schedule should not be confined to natural products, but should include a correct list of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States, and because of these conditions the negotiations were fruitless. I say again, until the hon. gentleman had entered on negotiations and had ascertained what manufactured products the United States desired to put on that list, he was in no position to say, assuming there were differential duties against the mother country, whether there would be anything really of that character or not, and so I say that the Government of Canada, in the representations they made at the elections and in the negotiations which took place last winter, have been guilty of a grave breach of duty to the people of this country, and on that ground alone should be censured by this House. I have a few things to say with regard to the census. The hon. gentleman has referred to the census, and complains that any doubt should be thrown upon its accuracy. Why, Sir, look at the returns that are made. If the hon. gentleman will look at the figures for the city of London, he will see it stated that there are upwards of 800 manufacturing establishments in that city. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman cannot find half that number. I believe this has been done : That every woman employed by a merchant tailor to make vests or pantaloons at home, that every one employed in a private house in whatever part of the city, is counted as a separate manufacturing establishment, and that the houses in which they live are charged against the capital invested in manufacturing industries in this country. That is my strong conviction. If that is so it is a gross fraud upon the people of this country. It renders these census returns utterly valueless, and this House will be wanting in its duty if it allows any extra-judicial or any extraordinary oath, unwarranted by the law or uncalled for by public policy, to intervene between it and the duties devolving upon it in behalf of the electors of this country. Sir, let me call the attention of the House to some figures given by the hon. gentleman himself to show how utterly valueless these statistics are. In the census of 1881 the wages paid by

manufacturing establishments is given at \$59,429,000, and the value of materials worked up in these factories at \$179,918,000, or \$239,347,000 paid for wages and material. Now, the capital employed is \$165,000,000, so you would have, to cover interest on capital and wear and tear of machinery and profits, about \$70,000,000, or 42½ per cent. Now mark this, that for every dollar of capital, \$1.05 of raw material is used in 12 months, and there were employed as labourers in the manufactories during that period 254,935 individuals. Now, I come to the return at the end of the next decade. In the census of 1891 it is stated that \$99,762,000 was paid as wages, and \$256,000,000 for material, or a total of \$355,745,000 for wages and material. Capital is represented at \$353,000,000, and profits, interest and repairs at \$119,710,000, or 32½ per cent. There are employed 367,935 hands. If the same number of hands were employed in proportion to the capital as in the previous decade, there would be 666,000, so it is perfectly clear there is some thing wrong. Then when you come to the raw material you have for 12 months, 60 cents worth of raw material worked for every dollar of capital invested, as against \$1.05 for the previous decade. Now, if you were to take the capital looking at the number of men employed as being in proportion to the number of hands employed, there would be \$238,000,000 instead of \$363,000,000, so there would be spurious stock of \$114,000,000. Now, I do not think that begins to represent the discrepancy between the actual state of things and the state of things as represented, because, if, as I infer from looking at the returns from various localities which I know, every individual employed by a manufacturing establishment and doing work at home is counted as a separate establishment, and the value of the house as part of the capital invested, it will, no doubt, account for this enormous increase of capital. This shows that the whole plan is purely misleading, that it is not honest, that it is not a fair report, and thus it is utterly impossible to form any idea approaching accuracy as to what amount of capital is used in manufacturing enterprises. Sir, it is represented here that there has been an actual increase in the capital invested of \$187,000,000, whereas if you were to take off the \$114,000,000 of clearly spurious stock or capital, the increase would be \$72,700,000, and I am perfectly sure from what I know—and I know many places in the west—that there is no such increase. Why, Sir, I will venture to say that the city of London, in the decade ending 1891, employed many hundreds of hands fewer and had many thousands of dollars less capital invested in manufacturing enterprises than in the previous decade. And the same is true of a great many other places in the west as well as the city of London. Now, Sir, I am not going at this late hour to take up the time of the House in discussing the statements which are worthless and misleading which

the hon gentleman has made. He undertook, by taking the year 1879 in one case and the year 1878 in another, to show how trade has grown during the past ten years. The hon. gentleman took the very highest amount in recent years and the lowest amount in the preceding period. Why, Sir, a statement of that sort has no value, there is no means of ascertaining what the progress of the country was from these figures, and if you go back to the year 1872, or 1873 or 1874, you will see that, leaving out the North-west, which was not counted in that period, every other province shows in recent periods a smaller trade than there was in the years which I have mentioned. And so the hon. gentleman has undertaken, by the manipulation of the Trade and Navigation Returns to show that a prosperity exists which has no existence in fact. Now, Sir, let me say I am in favour of the resolution which my hon. friend has moved. I think that it is time that the people of this country should be allowed to retain possession of their own property. You do not do that. Why, if the Government exercises the right of eminent domain and takes a man's property you give him some compensation, but when you put on a high protective tariff in order to interfere with foreign trade and restrict the markets of those who are obliged to find a market abroad and when you increase the price of the goods which the people are obliged to consume which are produced at home, you are taking from the pockets of the consuming population of this country millions of dollars for which nothing is given in return. You are appropriating one man's property and making a present of it to another. That is a business in which a government ought not to engage. Still, I admit, we have established industries in this country and any change should be made so as to produce as little disturbance as possible. But it is absolutely necessary that a change should take place, we should get out of the groove in which we have been working, by which property has been depreciated in value, by which population has been lost, and the energies of the people crippled, and leave every man in this country to be the architect of his own fortunes. Let each man judge as to the industry or business in which he shall engage. Let his success or his failure depend upon his diligence and attention to his business and do not undertake, by levying contributions upon thousands of people in this country, to enable the few to succeed without regard to their business ability, protecting them against the possibility of bankruptcy no matter how reckless they may be, no matter with how little judgment they may manage their business affairs. The sooner that we throw every man upon his own resources and give him an opportunity of becoming the architect of his own fortune, the sooner will we have entered upon the highway to prosperity. For these reasons I support cordially the resolution of my hon. friend. I am in favour of economy

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

in the conduct of the Government, I am in favour of the reduction of taxation. I am opposed to permitting a government to having anything like a surplus. I wish that they shall constantly carry on the affairs of this country under the pressure of scanty revenue, so as to put an end to profitless enterprises, and to prevent the waste of money upon public works and undertakings that can never do any thing else than impoverish the people of this country.

Mr. METCALFE. It is with no ordinary degree of trepidation that I rise to address this national assembly, knowing, as I do, that I am the successor, as the representative of Kingston, of the greatest statesman that Canada has yet produced. I remember at this time that that great statesman, who was the leader of the Conservative party in this country, was the father of the National Policy, or was in a great degree the promotor of that policy. I take great pleasure to-night in speaking a word in favour of that policy and against the amendment offered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I cannot regard this amendment as made with a desire to do good to the country. We know that the motive which prompts it is the same motive that would prompt the hon. member for South Oxford to offer a vote of want of confidence in this Government. Had he said that this Government does not deserve the support of the House, and put the question fairly and squarely in that way, then there would be some reason why we could give a fair vote upon it. But he has constructed this amendment in such a way that I have no hesitation in recording my vote against it. In order that there may be no mistake as to the grounds on which I was elected to this Parliament, I will read the short address which I spread among the electors in the city of Kingston :

MY DEAR SIR,—As the nominee of the Liberal-Conservatives of this city, I respectfully solicit your vote and influence to secure my return as your representative to the House of Commons of Canada. I have an abiding faith in the principle of Canada for the Canadian people as laid down by our departed chief, Sir John A. Macdonald. If elected, I shall do my utmost to support the policy of protection to native industries and national interests, and shall give unswerving loyalty to the perpetuation of British connection.

Now, Sir, I think I am only carrying out the policy outlined in that address, in recording my vote against this amendment. I oppose this amendment with all my heart. I can see no good that we can do by pulling down the National Policy. I believe that it has helped all classes of the people of Canada, and I think it will continue to help all classes. The Finance Minister to-night has clearly shown that our opponents are wrong, and that this Government is right on this question. If I were able, with a great deal more power, with a great deal more oratory, with a great deal more precision of utterance, to

speak on behalf of the National Policy, I would be delighted to do so ; but in a very feeble way I propose to consider, for a few moments, the features of the National Policy that I think are for the benefit of the Canadian people. Now, Sir, it cannot be truthfully denied that the National Policy, since its introduction, has deserved the support of this country. The hon. leader of the Opposition told us to-night that the National Policy needed an apology from the Government side of the House. I desire to say from my place in this House that the National Policy needs no apology at the hands of members of the Government or of those who support the Government. The National Policy finds its own vindication in the progress of the Canadian people. There is one portion of the history of Canada of late years that needs an apology, and that portion of our history is written in dark lines, from 1874 till 1878. Those were dark days in Canadian annals, when the destinies of Canada were in the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford and his friends. If anybody needs an apology, it is the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Opposition benches in this House. When we come to view the National Policy in its right light we find that it has the power to produce good for all classes of the people of Canada. They talk about cheap food. What good is cheap food if human labour is cheaper still ? It is no use for them to tell us what great things they are are going to do to make goods cheap for the Canadian people, when we know that the very slavery the hon. member for South Oxford spoke about, will be the result of their policy of free trade. At first they said they were going to have what they called commercial union. They tried that racket upon the people of the Dominion from one end of it to the other, and that got the grand bounce. Then they brought up another fad called unrestricted reciprocity, and they played their banjos throughout the country at all the political meetings, on that particular string. Then they got the go-by from the people, who would have nothing to do with them. Then they began to send their emissaries over to the United States, and many of them took trips themselves, and they got so mixed up that they hardly know whether they went there or not. Now, they have invented a new fad which they call freer trade. When they argue in this House one says free trade, another says freer trade, and a third, freest trade ; and between them all, if they could have their own way, the people of this country would have no trade at all. If you will let the people of Canada decide for themselves as to what they want, go and ask the men who are making this country, they are the boys who have seen hard times in the past, and they know who these Opposition gentlemen are, who are preaching free trade. I believe they will

stay there for the next twenty-five years, if they pursue their present policy.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. METCALFE. An hon. gentleman says "no"; but he has no reason to doubt my statement, if he speaks what is the truth in his heart. They are sure to stay there. Why do they not chip in, and become part of the party of progress, and assist in advancing the interests of the country, and become truly national ? Why are they on the Opposition benches now ? It is because they have been preaching sectionalism in every part of the country. The leader of the Opposition is a gentleman for whom I have great respect, and for whom I entertain very great regard. Any Conservative who sat in this House and heard the remarks he made after the death of our beloved leader, could not but look to him with veneration, respect and esteem for the remarks he made from his benevolent heart. I respect him in that regard, and I believe him to be generous and warm-hearted. But he appears to be suffering from a great delusion or an hallucination to-night. That is what is the matter with him. He is all right so far as natural attainments are concerned, but he has got on the wrong track. If that distinguished leader were to chip in with the right side of this House, what could he not do ? But instead of doing so, he is misleading the people into following him, and is endeavouring to convert members to join his side of the House. He came to Kingston not long ago, and everybody was in love with him. They said he was the nicest man they had seen for a long time, not excepting myself. I am not, however, a bit jealous ; but while he is truly a good man and means well, he has got into bad company, and is playing a bad political game. While I have great respect for that man, I have not as much respect for some hon. gentlemen who sit beside him. The hon. gentleman who comes from South Oxford has endeavoured to pump all the wormwood, gall, bitterness, rancour and venom, and everything that is bad into his followers, and when the leader of a party can be as good as he is under such circumstances, nature must have made him a very great man. The more you listen to him the more you are convinced that he is in the right place as the leader of the Opposition. He said very many funny things to-night, and it is singular when a man gets twisted on the wrong track what wrong statements he can make. He is like a man who belongs to a church who is a hypocrite, for he appears to act according to his light. He has spoken about the law of gravitation. There is enough common sense on the Government side to draw him over, if he will only put himself in the right way. When I was reading up the Baconian theory, I found :

The very law that moulds a tear
And bids it trickle from its source,
That law preserves the earth a sphere,
And guides the planets in their course.

I think the hon. gentleman should apply that to his political gravitation. I take it that the Opposition should act on broad principles, and not be misled by the fad, which they are at present trying to impose upon the people. As I have said, the ladies at Kingston were enthusiastic with respect to the leader of the Opposition; but what did they say regarding the member for South Oxford. They said: Get him down, he will ruin all that Mr. Laurier has done and all that he has said. If there is a man in Canada I understand it is the member for South Oxford. If there is a man in the ranks of gentlemen opposite that the Conservative party should bonus, it is that gentleman. Long live the member for South Oxford; long may he reign where he is on the benches of the Opposition, for I believe, and a great many Reformers believe, that he is an unfortunate individual for the party, and that if he could be transferred to some eminent position, such for example, as that of a judge in the land, or the governor of a province, the party would be delighted, even more than delighted. But bad as I think the hon. member for South Oxford is, there is another individual who comes from a northern portion of a county called the county of Wellington, who is even worse. I wish that hon. gentleman was here, for I do not like to say anything behind his back that I would not say before his face, and if he is within hearing of my voice, or if any page can bring him here, I should like him to come. If there is one principle that can be more clearly laid down in any deliberative body more than another, it is that certain respect should be extended towards our public men. In political warfare, as in everything else, there should be fair play shown. I listened the other evening to that hon. gentleman's remarks, and I thought for narrowness, for smallness, for contractedness, for everything that breathes the spirit of littleness, he was unequalled, and as a gentleman said of another individual: If half a dozen souls such as his could be put in the bladder of a flea they would have more room to wobble than a polywog in Lake Ontario. I believe that of the hon. gentleman. He is infinitesimally small, narrow and contracted, and in a parliament of boys he would not be fit to be their leader, so far as breadth of view is concerned. Imagine such a man a school-master. What would the boys learn of him? They would learn narrowness, not purity of thought. If the late Secretary of State had been present in the House, I do not think that hon. gentleman would have told him that he was all that was bad, all that was impure, all that was wicked and immoral as a public man. I believe he would have been afraid of the castigation that he would have received when that honourable and distinguished man would rise in his place and prove to him and to the House and the country, that he had been maliciously attacked. I read some remarks respecting the foes of George B. McLennan by an eminent writer in the United States, to this effect:

Mr. METCALFE.

The venom that chills and curdles the warm current in the heart of man is found only in creeping and cold blooded creatures; and the inveterate malignity that never forgets or forgives is found only in base and ignoble natures, whose aims are selfish—whose means are indirect, cowardly and treacherous.

I believe that no public man should rise in this assembly and give utterance to such a statement respecting one of the chief public men of Canada who now occupies the position of Lieutenant-Governor. He said: If the people had to deal with him, he ought to be placed behind prison bars, in the city in which I live. As that hon. gentleman is not here in his place to defend himself, I desire to state that he was tried in a fair constitutional manner and not a spot or blemish was found on him. He occupied a position as one of the Ministers and faithfully discharged the duties of his office, and it ill became the hon. member for North Wellington to rise in his place and attempt to make history, that would be quoted in all the papers of the United States, not so much against the individual statesman as against the public men of the Dominion of Canada. They will be apt to say, what kind of a place is Canada? They will say that in Canada there are nothing but rascals and every thing that is bad. If the hon. gentleman had been found guilty of any crime worthy of condemnation, he would never have been allowed to remain in his position as a Cabinet Minister. Would the Premier, who occupies the position of leading statesman in this country, submit to his retaining office; and I wonder that some of the friends of the hon. member for North Wellington did not stop an attack against one of our leading public men. If my remarks to-night have no further good than to suggest to that gentleman that in the future he should curtail his abuse, they will not have been in vain. I described his remarks as being abusive, because, perhaps, I would be unparliamentary if I called them slander, or perhaps still more unparliamentary if I called them political untruthfulness. However, I hope we shall hear no more of such language in this House in the future. I do not believe that any man should shield himself behind the privileges of this House to make a statement which is not true. Every man from his place in Parliament should state just what he would if he were at a town hall, or a street corner, or anywhere else addressing the people of this country, and he should strive on all occasions to tell the truth with regard to our public men. Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted to have the privilege of speaking on behalf of the National Policy. In 1874 and on to 1876 I was Chairman of one of the largest wards in the city of Kingston, and when that unfortunate revenue tariff policy, that Grit policy, that no-policy-at-all, that policy that was neither fish, flesh, fowl or good political red herring—but that drew a good many red herrings across the track, by going to other countries to get funds to keep things going as well as they could, and it

was a poor way they kept it going at that—during the years of that unfortunate policy I saw men, who used previous to that time get \$2.50 and \$3 a day, coming to me as chairman of one of the wards, and begging to get work at 70 cents a day to provide food for their starving families. Is that what the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) wants to bring us back to again by his revenue tariff. I can tell him that just as sure as the sun shone yesterday, if he gets into power, and if he adopts such a policy as that, he will bring the people of Canada back to the same unfortunate condition of things as we had during the five years his predecessor in the leadership of his party was in power. I can tell him that the United States will never go back to free trade. They dare not go back to free trade, and my hon. friend knows it. Whatever Government is in power will keep themselves as near the policy of protection as they can in order to retain the reins of Government. If the leader of the Opposition should ever get into power and should adopt a free trade policy he would not be long the Premier of Canada. One hon. gentleman called the National Policy a national poultice. Well, perhaps he was somewhat correct, because Canada was in such an unfortunate condition in 1878 that she wanted some kind of a poultice to draw away the ill effects of the bruises and cuts and hardships inflicted upon her by the policy of hon. gentlemen for the four years previous to 1878. I have, therefore, much pleasure in opposing the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no doubt that it is a motion of want of confidence, and any hon. gentleman who loves the Conservative party, any hon. gentleman who loves the interests of Canada, any hon. gentleman who loves the National Policy, any hon. gentleman who loves national sentiment, and who hates sectional sentiment, and any hon. gentleman who loves the advancement of his country and desires to secure for it a prominent place amongst the nations of the earth should vote down such an amendment. It is an amendment which is calculated only to pull down the institutions of our country, an amendment that is calculated, after mature consideration, on the part of the mover, to smash up the National Policy. No matter what they say, about the National Policy, no matter how the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may philosophize and tell you in his well drawn sentences and good English what a grand thing it would be to have free trade, and what a bad thing it would be to have the National Policy, we have the undeniable proof that the National Policy has built up this country and that the revenue tariff policy had ruined it. It was protection that built up the United States. It was protection that enabled them to pay their enormous debt so that when they got the award in the Alabama claims, they had so much money they did not know what to do with it. Was

it free trade that made the United States come forth in strength and vigor? No, it was protection; and we find that the people of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland are fast learning by experience that the policy of free trade among the protected nations of Europe is a fraud and a delusion and a snare. I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by again stating that I give my most hearty endorsement of the National Policy, and my most vigorous opposition to the amendment of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed to take up the time of the House at this late hour, but before this debate closes, I desire to have a little to say upon the question before the House. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Metcalfe) has extolled in glowing terms the great virtues of the National Policy, but he has not said one single word in its support. He deprecated the idea of speaking unkindly and in narrow-minded terms of other individuals, but his whole speech was upon these lines. He told us that the success of the National Policy was patent and required no apology, but before I get through I will endeavour to show that a very ample apology indeed is necessary for the National Policy. The only argument that he made at all in favour of his chosen policy was the old and worn out statement that from 1874 to 1878 a great depression existed in this country. A great depression did exist in this country then, but the same depression existed throughout the United States, and throughout the entire world, and could you blame little Canada for being depressed under such circumstances? Do you suppose for one moment that the Dominion of Canada was responsible for the depression that existed the world over at that time? Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the history of the National Policy? The record is that the leader of the Opposition in these years went back upon his own policy, that he went back on what he believed to be the truest interests of Canada, and because of the depression which existed at that time, he was enabled to introduce this scheme upon which to float into power. The claim of the hon. gentleman who just sat down, as to the relative love due to party and to country is well exemplified in the whole history of his party in this Dominion. It is true that some of them love their country, but they love their party much more. So far as I am concerned, I love my country first and my party afterwards, and I am willing to sacrifice any interests of my party for the good of my country in any case where my party does not advocate what I believe to be for the welfare of Canada. The hon. gentleman referred to cheap food, but said: What if human labour is still cheaper? I shall endeavour to show the House that under no system of protection is the wages of the labouring man enhanced. You may protect

certain favoured institutions, but what means have you of hindering the labour of the world from competing for the labour that there is to perform? If there is one master requiring a servant, and there are two servants seeking employment, the master will fix the rate of wages that he pays; but if there are two masters seeking one servant, and there is only one servant offering for employment, the servant will fix the rate of wages. It is perfectly absurd and nonsensical to contend for one moment that any system of protection enhances the value of labour. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke of the United States having been built up by protection. If there is one country in the world more than another that is suited to a protective system, it is the United States. It is a country having great breadth and depth, and a great variety of climate and resources. Can we compare Canada with the United States in that respect? no; we have a northern climate, and geographically and climatically things are against us. It is very unfair to base an argument on the fact that a country has existed for a certain length of time under a revenue tariff, and for a certain time under a system of protection, because there are other conditions that must enter into the consideration. To make a fair comparison, two countries would need to exist under the same condition of things at the same time. When the hon. gentleman speaks of protection having built up the United States, I would like to ask him what has built up Great Britain? I say it is her free trade policy that has built up Great Britain, and made her the greatest commercial and maritime country in the world. Now, I will not dwell at greater length on the remarks addressed to the House by my hon. friend on my left, and I will refer for a short time to the remarks that fell from the hon. Finance Minister. I am very glad to state that on one question we agree: I being a teetotaler, we agree on liquids; but as to solids we disagree entirely. Now, the hon. Finance Minister, in discussing the subject of farm lands, stated that in Great Britain farms were going begging for nothing at all—that a man could go and obtain possession of a farm simply for taking care of it, without any rental. With all due deference to the hon. Finance Minister, I cannot accept that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Scores of them.

Mr. EDWARDS. In a country like Great Britain, where agriculture is at a higher level than it is in any other country in the world, and where the farmers have at least the protection of the cost of freight in their favour, it is perfectly impossible that the condition of agriculture can have gone so low. The hon. Minister also asserted that it was contended on this side of the House that if our policy should prevail, farm products would be enhanced in value. No one on this side of the House contends anything of the kind; but we do contend that if the policy we advocate

Mr. EDWARDS.

shall prevail, the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, the fisherman and in fact every one engaged in developing the natural resources of this country, will be placed in a more favourable position to produce their products cheaply and be in a better condition to compete in the markets of the world for the sale of them. That is what we contend, and in that I think we are perfectly right. I also disagree with the Finance Minister, that a tax levied for any purpose at all is a source of enrichment. I deny that proposition entirely. There is only one source of productive wealth, and that is through the instrumentality of labour. Taxation never created wealth; speculation never created wealth; the interchange of commodities never created wealth; but the earth is the source of all wealth, and it is through the instrumentality of labour that all the wealth we have on the world's surface is produced. Now, I will not attempt to deal with the speech of the hon. Finance Minister any further than to say that in my opinion he is the most effective user of bad logic that I have ever heard in this Parliament. Now, I think that it is well that we have had this debate. I think the condition of the people of Canada is a very serious one, and all who are interested in the welfare of Canada should consider, and consider seriously, what our future is to be. As I stated before, we are peculiarly situated, with climatic and geographical conditions against us to some extent. Our position relatively to the United States is different from our position relatively to any other country in the world, from the fact that we border on that great country for some 4,000 miles. That freedom of trade on a large scale between the two countries would be beneficial to the people of this country. I have no kind of doubt; and in the event of a reciprocity treaty satisfactory to the people of this country not being obtained, there is one remedy which I would suggest as a free-trader—for I am not afraid to state here or in any other place that I am an out-and-out free-trader. At the same time, I recognize, as all other members do, our necessities; and as things are at present, I see no other way of raising our revenue than from excise and customs duties. But if finally we do not get such a reciprocity treaty with the people of the United States, my remedy would be to adopt free trade with the outside world, and while I do not believe that by any other means we could coerce that great nation, I believe that by that means we would. And why? Simply because we would be large importers and sellers to them of the products of other countries, and it would be for them to protect their own borders. Now, I have been here for a few years, and to the methods suggested by members on this side of the House, from time to time, in years past, in order to bring about a better condition of things in this country, the answer invariably was: you are traitors and annexationists. That charge seems to be dis-

sipated by the fact that upon the other side there is quite a number of gentlemen who now seem to hold the same views. Therefore, that argument is discontinued. As I have said, the National Policy was nothing more nor less than a political necessity. The Conservative party had governed the country for a good many years previous to 1874, and when they were out of power they had to devise some scheme by which they might be returned. A very great depression existed in the country at the time, and the people were prepared to accept any suggestion at all for a change; but now, after having had some fourteen years experience of the National Policy, they are just as desirous for a change back to their old friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Most decidedly they are. Speaking of the National Policy, I call it the irrational policy. It is not a policy that protects or promotes the production of the natural resources of the country. A policy which would be thoroughly national in its character is one which would first promote the interests and the welfare of the producers of the natural resources of the country. I am only going to take up three lines in the discussion I propose to make. I am not so familiar with the fisheries or the mining interests of our country, but am going to refer to our lumber interests, and also the position of the agriculturalists, and that of the labouring man. To show the importance of the lumber trade, which has already been discussed to some extent during this debate, I need only point to the capital invested in our saw-mills, and sash and door and moulding factories, which amounts alone to the sum of \$62,944,000. And that does not include the investments in limits, plant and materials of that kind, but refers simply to the saw mills and the factories. The annual wages paid amount to \$17,430,000; the annual product amounts to \$68,236,000; and the total exports of sawn lumber amounted to, in 1891, for that is the year with which I am dealing, to \$18,535,000. The exports to the United States amounted to \$10,086,000, to England, \$8,448,000. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in dealing with this question the other night, seemed to me to desire simply to make an attack upon the Ontario Government. That seemed to be the purpose for which the hon. gentleman made his speech, because one cannot come to any conclusion as to what the hon. gentleman's opinion was on the export duty question. He seemed to throw the whole onus of this matter upon the Ontario administration. So far as that is concerned, the province of Ontario, wherein this depletion of our forests which is spoken of exists, was treated at the time of Confederation just exactly as the other provinces were. The lands and the timber thereon were handed over to the province to ad-

minister for its own benefit. To show just how much the hon. gentleman knows of this subject, when speaking of the limits that were under license in the province of Ontario, he said that 4,500 miles were under license in the province, while the truth is that before Confederation 12,500 were under license in that province, and since Confederation 9,000 miles have been sold in that province; 6,600 miles are now under suspense, or limits have been cancelled, so that to-day some 15,000 miles are under license in Ontario. The total area of the province is 197,000 miles. The total surveyed portion of the province is 66,000 square miles, leaving 133,000 square miles unsurveyed. Making allowance of 13,000 square miles for water, there still remains in the province of Ontario, 120,000 square miles. Now, he desired to show that the Ontario government were not watchful of the interests of the people, and what means did he take of showing it? He made the statement that a short time ago McArthur Bros., of Toronto, had sold a limit for \$550,000, which had been purchased 15 years previously for \$75,000. He took the difference between \$75,000 and \$550,000, and multiplied by the number of square miles under license, and thus came to the conclusion that the province had lost \$30,000,000. Well, in the first place, he does not seem to understand the interest question. The purchaser had held these limits for 15 years, having bought them for \$75,000. In the meantime the interest would not have trebled, but it would have much more than doubled, the cost of the limit. He does not seem to understand that a great many men go to timber sales and buy limits for very much less than they can get for them. I can quote him instances of gentlemen attending limit sales and paying thirty, forty or fifty thousand dollars for limits that are not worth five cents. So this is simply a speculative matter. Now, I do not know whether this hon. gentleman desires to have the export duty on logs reimposed or not. I may refer to this matter because it was referred to by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. And I very much regret that he did refer to it. I think, considering the fact that a change of administration in the United States will take place within a few days, and, considering that that administration is favourable to the importation of lumber free, I think it was a very unfortunate matter, indeed, that the Finance Minister referred to the subject at all. I consider that in speaking as he did upon this subject he did a great injury, indeed, to the lumber interests of Canada. I do not say that he did it purposely or that he desires to injure the lumber trade of Canada. Like the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I suppose he must be forgiven for making the statement, as he does not seem to understand the lumber business. At the same time I consider that he has done the lumber trade of Canada millions of dollars of damage by making that statement. Now-

another hon. gentleman also discussed this question, and he desires to have the duty on saw logs reimposed for the reason that the present state of affairs leads to the destruction of our forests and the loss of a valuable asset. Now, Mr. Speaker, by what means do we lose that valuable asset? Before I get through I shall give good reasons for believing that we do not lose the asset at all. The same hon. gentleman stated that he did not think it proper to take the opinion upon this matter of men engaged in the trade; he thought it more desirable to take the opinion of men who do not understand the trade

Mr. SPROULE. That is entirely wrong. I made use of no such expression.

Mr. EDWARDS. So far as that is concerned, as I understand it, the Government of the province of Ontario are the guardians of that interest. The people of Ontario have declared time and again their confidence in the Administration which has under its care the timber limits of the province. I am opposed to the export duty on principle and also as a matter of justice to the buyers of timber limits, whether they come from the United States or from any other country. These gentlemen who advocate the export duty upon logs and who are the promoters of the National Policy of this country would regard it as a piece of barbarism if those countries from which we import our raw sugar and our raw cotton should impose an export duty upon these articles. And I consider that when an individual comes from the United States or any other country to our timber limit sales and bids upon our limits and buys them and thus enhances the value of the limits of the country, it would be barbarism not to allow him to take the material he has bought out of the country in the shape of logs, or timber or lumber or in any other way he pleases. Now, the same speaker does not believe that the admission of lumber into the United States free of duty would have the effect of causing the lumber to be manufactured in this country. Mr. Speaker, as a lumberman I believe it would have that effect. Why do I believe it? Because the taking of logs across the lake is a very hazardous business, a very hazardous business indeed. Moreover, it is a very expensive business and if we had free lumber it would be to the interests of those who are now taking the logs over to manufacture the lumber in this country. Now, there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, which is not well understood in this country and to which I desire to refer. A great many people believe that the cost of producing lumber in Michigan is far greater than in Canada. It is nothing of the kind. It costs three times as much to lay the logs down at the mill in Canada as to lay the logs down at the mills in Michigan. And why? Because of the proximity of the limits and because of their facilities for getting supplies into the limits. Now, I make the statement as a lumberman,

Mr. EDWARDS.

and as a lumberman understanding thoroughly this matter, that for some time, up to a year or two ago, the lumber trade of Canada suffered and suffered very seriously. It had a struggle for existence. The very moment that the duty on lumber going into the United States was lowered, we felt at once the beneficial effect, and we have felt the effect ever since. I sincerely hope that this matter will not be interfered with; but if it is, the effect will be to injure very seriously this great industry, the next largest industry in Canada to our agricultural industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will revert for a short time to what I consider the condition of the Canadian farmer under the so-called National Policy. The Finance Minister seems to think that it was a great blessing to the farmers of Canada because they were able to drink free water; they had no duty to pay on water, they had no duty to pay on fire-wood that they cut upon their own farms and put into their stoves. He also thought that it was a great blessing to the Canadian farmer that he had no duty to pay on the lumber that goes into the construction of his buildings. How absurd considering it is a product of which we produce a large surplus for export. I would like that hon. gentleman to turn his attention to the question of the imports that enter into consumption by the Canadian farmer, and that pay a very high rate of duty. The hon. gentleman does not want to touch that question, because it would affect his pet, the National Policy. The position of the Canadian farmer is identical with that of the Canadian lumbermen, with the exception of one item alone. The Canadian lumber industry, the second great producing source of wealth in this country, has no kind of protection at all. That industry desires no protection, but it does desire to have imports brought free from other countries that go into the production of lumber; it desires to be able to buy them as cheaply as they can be bought, in order that it may produce cheaply, and compete in the markets of the world with the products of other countries. The Canadian farmer desires exactly the same thing. To pretend that the Canadian farmer is protected, is a fallacy, is a statement that cannot be borne out by facts. I will admit that so far as pork is concerned, the Canadian farmer has some protection, but, Mr. Speaker, that is the only recompense he has for the innumerable things upon which he is taxed. For most of the articles that he produces, a market has to be found in foreign countries; therefore his products come into competition with the products of all other countries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. The longer hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," the longer they will have to stay here. I have not as great a facility for talking as some hon. gentlemen, but this question of the position of the farmer and the lumberman is one that I pretend to

understand, and I am going to discuss it if it takes five years.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the duty that was put upon pork?

Mr. EDWARDS. I consider that putting the duty upon pork is an insult to the intelligence of the farmers of Canada. Sir, if there is a class of men who are down-trodden, who are imposed upon, and who are robbed by the National Policy, it is the farmers of Canada. This pork duty is a sop that is thrown out to them, but it is no important measure of protection to them.

Mr. SPROULE. They will be satisfied with more of that kind of insults.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, let hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of this House have the manliness to adhere to the policy they have been following for the last fourteen years. Let them not shift about as they are now shifting about. Let them not make a pretense that they are going to do something for the farmers, but let them go to the people for their verdict, and all the boodle they can raise will not prevent them from being hurled from power. No, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Canada, the lumbermen of Canada, the fishermen of Canada, the miners of Canada, those who are engaged in producing the wealth of the country, and in developing its natural resources, have no recompense at all for the infamy that is imposed upon them through the instrumentality of the National Policy. Now, it is rather strange to listen to the arguments that are adduced from the other side. For instance, take wheat. There are those who pretend that the tariff on wheat enhances the value on that article to the farmers of Canada. As long as they have a surplus to export—and I hope that surplus will grow—the tariff will have no effect except a local effect, and I will show you how I think it has some local effect. For instance, if a farmer in Dakota has a quantity of wheat for sale, and one in Manitoba on the opposite side of the line has also wheat for sale, and they want to ship it to the east, if there is only one line of railway to carry that wheat to the lower provinces, in Canada, and there are two or three lines of railway by which it can be transported in the United States, we will say to the Boston market, the tariff then has some effect, because, by competition on the other side of the line in transit, wheat will be carried from the west to the east more cheaply than it can be carried on this side. The effect is that the man who sells the wheat may get more for it, but the man who produces the wheat does not get a fraction more; and that principle applies to all our agricultural products in the same way. When the question of transit comes into play, the tariff may have some effect; but, speaking in a general sense, the tariff has no effect. In my

opinion, the interests of the farmer and of the lumberman are identical. Each produces a surplus of products which have to find a market in foreign countries, and, therefore, the price is made abroad for the home product, I further believe that a protective tariff is nothing more than a robber's tariff. It is the meanest system of robbery that exists, and according to my understanding of it, I would no more join a high protective tariff party than I would unite myself with a party of highway robbers. What is the class they rob? Instead of benefiting the labouring men, whom they pretend to protect, that is the very class of individuals first robbed. Why? Because it is through the instrumentality of labour that all wealth is produced. I believe the labouring men of this country, as well as the lumbermen, farmers, fishermen and miners are awakening to the fact that a protective tariff is detrimental to them. What is commerce? Commerce is nothing more or less than the exchange of the products of labour. Any system that steps in between the producer and the consumer and demands tribute before an exchange of commodities can be made is a system of robbery. I am an out-and-out free trader. I recognize the fact that as far as the free traders can go to-day in any civilized country in the world, is to favour a revenue tariff. He cannot go further. But there is another great question that has to be settled, and that is the labour question. I honestly believe that before many years have passed this question will have to be settled. And why? It must be settled, because the producers of all wealth are going to demand their rights, and the only system under which they can obtain their rights is under a system of free trade; and I may be going further than my confrères will be willing to go, but, so far as I am concerned, I thoroughly and earnestly believe that the proper place from which to raise the revenue for carrying on the administration of the country is from the land, the source of all wealth. Those who advocate the single tax system to-day may be called faddists, but I believe it is a question that will very shortly have to seriously occupy the minds of those entrusted with the administration of the affairs of all civilized nations. I observe that the Minister of Finance is prepared to trim a little, and some of his followers are likewise prepared to trim to some extent. I wish to exempt from that category the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin). In expressing himself as he did, and in declaring that he would vote as he stated, he was simply carrying out a pledge given to his constituents at the time of his election, and so far as he is concerned, we have nothing to claim. It is said of politicians that they are a class of men who are looking round to see what the people will do for them. It is also said of statesmen that they are continually seeking what they can do for the people. I thoroughly believe that the Government party are now playing the part of politicians. They are prepared, if they ever

had any principles, to sacrifice those principles for the sake of catching the votes of the people of this country. They did not act as did the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who, when in power in 1878, stood by his principles, and accepted defeat. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any principles to-day, let them stand by those principles: let them advocate the National Policy, as they have done during the last 14 years, and let them take defeat at the next general election like men, as they are sure to meet it.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall delay the House, Sir, but a very short time while I explain the reasons for the vote I am about to give. As we have been so profuse in scientific and other illustrations this evening, let me say, before I go further, that I have read somewhere of mad men, that they reason correctly, but from false premises. I confess to you, Sir, that while listening to this debate, and seeking to learn from it as much as I could, I have sometimes felt as though some of my hon. colleagues in this House lay themselves open to the charge of temporary insanity. If you examine the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who moved the amendment, and if you examine the speeches of the members on both sides of the House, you will find them, at one time, contending that the Government are entitled to no credit for the prosperity of the country, and that at another time you will find them blaming a Minister for the want of prosperity. You will find this running through the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side, and through some of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen on the Government side you will find a major premise that a tariff can actually affect the prosperity of a country. Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposition that by a tariff alone, a Minister of Finance will keep a country back or advance it in prosperity, seems to me to be absurd upon the face of it. But no man can I suppose, be familiar with the history of the countries in Europe, or the history of the United States, or of this country, or the history of any given transaction in regard to the tariff, without saying that certainly a shortsighted Minister, a Minister incapable of taking a large view of the interests of the country with which he had to deal, might do serious injury to the prosperity of the country, and might hold it back. The speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edwards) shared the inconsistency that I have noticed as making up the web and woof of this debate throughout. At one time my hon. friend said he was a free trader out and out, and at another time he said—I took down his words—that he was only going to make gradual changes in the tariff. He told the hon. gentlemen who are now in the position of members of the Government, that they were highway robbers because of this tariff, and yet the highway robbery that is embodied in the tariff he would only change

Mr. EDWARDS.

very gradually, so that he would be a sort of graduated highway robber. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in the same way assured us that changes would only be made very gradual so that if the country is not prosperous, if the farmers are not prosperous, if the labouring men are not prosperous, and if the country is in the dreadful condition that according to some parts of his speech the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) thinks it to be, and if this precious National Policy is the cause of it all, even under these circumstances we are to have but very trifling changes in the tariff in case power should pass from the hands of the present holders of it to the hon. gentlemen opposite. Then, Sir, I ask what relief are we going to have from them? These remarks lead me to say that I regret very much to find ourselves here at the end of 15 years, going through the same debate precisely as we did at the beginning of that period. My hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, declared that my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) had pelted us with chestnuts, and although that speech of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) was, I think, one of the best he ever made in this House, still I fancy there were parts of it liable to the charge that the Minister of the Interior made against it. But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate feature about one side using chestnut missiles, is, that the other side is almost forced to reply with the same ammunition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Pea nuts.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says "pea nuts," but he has not yet spoken in this debate. I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a profitless discussion. We have had as I say 15 years of it. It took ten years to carry Troy. The Greeks stood before Troy for ten years, and at last they captured it. But for 15 years my hon. friends of the Opposition, led by men of great talent, first led by Mr. Mackenzie, then led by Mr. Blake who has carried his talents, his experience and his oratory across the Atlantic to do service in another part of the Empire because he could not agree with his political friends—and I will say this in passing that I am glad to see that he has distinguished himself, as I knew he would, in that arena—this party led by such able men, have failed to successfully attack the National Policy in 15 years. I heartily subscribe, I may say, to everything said by the member for Kingston (Mr. Metcalfe) with reference to the leader of the Opposition. We had Mr. Blake, a very able man, we had Mr. Mackenzie leading the attack on the National Policy, and they have sought by one means and another to assail it, but although it has been declared on the floor of this House to-night that the labouring men and the farmers are rising against that policy, that, Sir, is not the way I read the signs of the times. I say that after 15 years bartering against that policy, it stands to-day—

Mr. WELSH. Rotten.

Mr. DAVIN. No, not rotten.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mouldering.

Mr. DAVIN. No, not mouldering. It stands there to-day like a fortress that has been attacked and attacked again, but which still remains impregnable. I say that these hon. gentlemen utterly mistake the feeling of the country. I say that the feeling in the country at the present minute is this: Not National Policy or no National Policy; but the feeling is this: shall we retain any abuses that may have arisen under the National Policy, or shall we sweep them away? or to quote the language adopted from the chairman of the Toronto banquet by the Prime Minister, the question is, shall the mouldering branches remain there or be taken away. I believe, Sir, that there are some mouldering branches, and I believe they ought to be removed; and not only that, but I believe that they ought to be removed now. And I may say to hon. gentlemen who, like myself, support the Government, that there is nothing to prevent any private member doing whatever in him lies to amend or improve or add to or take from a tariff. It is done and recognized in England. I remember one occasion when Lord Russell was Prime Minister. I think it was Lord Naas, afterwards Lord Mayo, who moved an amendment to the tariff, and the Government was beaten; and Mr. Roebuck, who thought himself a great constitutionalist, asked if the Government were going to resign. Up rose Lord John Russell and said: Why should we resign? Matters of finance, taxation, customs duties, revenue and all matters of such a character deeply interest every member of the House, and the Government are bound to pay attention to what the members suggest. Mr. Gladstone, too, has allowed his tariffs to be altered; and the younger Pitt—though I do not want to go back so far—was defeated twice and altered his entire financial policy on one occasion without resigning. So that I consider that if there are any mouldering branches we ought to remove them. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance laid this down, that the Government would not give a measure of protection to any industry which will give it the opportunity of taking unduly from the pockets of the people by creating combines and monopolies and thus making itself a burden instead of a benefit to the country. Now, when my hon. friend lays that down and combines exist, and palpably exist, my hon. friend is in my opinion bound not to wait for a year, because enquiry cannot help him in this matter—there is the combine; it exists. Take for instance the cotton combine. I listened carefully to what the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said in regard to that combine, and the position that he laid down remains substantially unshaken. He laid it down with great ability, and it remains as unshaken in my opinion as the structure raised by the Finance Minister remained unshaken after

the hon. member for South Oxford had taken his seat. Therefore, I hold with that statement on "Hansard" from the Finance Minister, it is not a fit or proper thing to wait for a year before dealing with any combine or in regard to those things that are proved to be opposed to the purpose of the National Policy. In regard to these we are bound to act. Now, in regard to the motion before the House, it is to me a very extraordinary motion. On the face of it any one who is in favour of lopping away the mouldering branch, one would think, ought to be ready to vote for that motion. But look what it says:—

It be Resolved, That the present Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion.

Now, we shall have to read into that proposition, the language of the mover. It certainly is a fair doctrine that you must take the language of the mover of a motion to explain what he means by it; and what the hon. member for South Oxford means by it is this: that the National Policy is a fraud and delusion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend means the motion, I do not think it is carried yet. The hon. member for South Oxford declares that this National Policy is a fraud, and has caused a fearful want of prosperity which he really does not prove to exist. He then goes on to say:

And should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade.

Now, what is the meaning of that? We are told by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that only very slight or moderate changes are to be made. Therefore, if it is to be thoroughly reformed, they will be more than moderate changes. But, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was taken to task by the hon. member for South Brant because he had read this free trade. Well, I think the hon. Minister of Railways will be forgiven by the supporters of the hon. member for South Oxford, if I point out that knowing the condition of the hon. member for South Oxford, he would not believe his eyes that such bad grammar could emanate from him. Now, what is the meaning of that? Does it mean freer trade than the present tariff. If it means freer trade, he admits that on the whole that is a free tariff. There is his language: It is the comparative freer, that is, freer than free. Whichever way you look at it, it is a bungling clause, and I am not surprised that the Minister of Railways fell into the error he did. Mr. Gladstone, in one of his financial statements, I think it was the statement of 1858, used the phrase freer trade. That was perfectly logical in his mouth, because he was dealing with a tariff, in regard to which you might say that it

established free trade, and Mr. Gladstone wanted to make the trade freer; but where is the logic of the hon. member for South Oxford? In fact, looking at his speech, which I have carefully read, it is like many of his speeches that I have looked at, full of a curious allusiveness, and little scraps of learning brought in with an air of pedantry, so that he reminds me of a belated and bewildered pedagogue groping amid confused recollections of an erudition in which he was never at home. Now, take his third proposition in the motion:

And that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered.

Why, Sir, I suppose everybody would agree to that; but what is the meaning of it? Will any of us say that this Government are not seeking to administer the affairs of the country as economically and efficiently as their abilities will allow them? And their abilities are considerable. Very few of us would attempt to say—anyway. I would not—that that is not being done. The fact, it is an ill-digested motion intended to catch votes; and to catch votes for what? We must look, in the case of any motion like that, as my hon. friend from Kingston in his admirable maiden speech said, at its political bearing. It is not merely an economical motion, it is also a political motion, and I cannot vote for it unless I were prepared to vote want of confidence in the Government and confidence in the hypothetical government of hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am not prepared to vote want of confidence in these gentlemen; but if I were, I would hesitate long before I could vote confidence in the hypothetical government which would follow. Take the two leaders in this financial discussion. The present Finance Minister is, I think—this is my deliberate opinion—the best finance minister I have observed, since I have been observing politics in Canada; and he has this note of great ability, that he is advancing every year, so that the financial statement we got this time was in advance of last year's, as last year's was in advance of the previous years. Then take the hon. member for South Oxford. I am so far in accord with the Liberal party that I have no confidence in him whatever. So, Sir, taking the one Minister, I should hesitate before I would give my confidence to that hypothetical government. The leader of the Opposition I should not object to see in a government, with a different outfit of principles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, hon. gentlemen may laugh, but it is true in politics as in other things, that to be strong you must be sincere, and I say we cannot listen to the speeches of those hon. gentlemen without feeling that they are sincere indeed in this, that they want to win; but when it comes to studying their

Mr. DAVIN.

financial policy, sincerity does not seem to me to be their distinguishing characteristic. I will say this, that I should like if we could adopt the same system as that which prevails in the House of Commons in England, of having our financial statement made, not in the House, but in the Committee of Ways and Means, so that a friendly discussion and criticism of the Budget might be had. But we have got into a system of the Finance Minister making, not merely a financial statement but a warlike speech, and the consequence is that we have to discuss the finances of the country amid the heat and smoke and roar of political battle, which, of course, is not conducive to that dispassionate discussion which a financial statement requires. In the House of Commons in England, they are getting into our bad practice a little, but the principle is, as Mr Gladstone said the other day, that the discussion should be a dispassionate one, in committee of ways and means, where the Finance Minister would be able to explain across the table anything requiring explanation and be able to adopt suggestions rapidly made. However, we do these things differently in Canada, and I do not think we have improved on the system followed in the mother country. I suppose we shall go on, nevertheless, having the red rag shaken in the face of the bull and fighting to the end of the chapter. We have had pretty much the same fight for the last fourteen years. During that time, the mouse has gone over its little treadmill, the wheel has been turned in precisely the same way, and if we are to go on like this ten or fifteen years more, the country will be about as much instructed in the end as it is at present. I deprecate that system, and should prefer to see our financial statement dealt with differently; and if hon. gentlemen wish to have a vote of want of confidence proposed, let them propose it squarely. I shall vote against the amendment, because I am a believer in the National Policy, because I believe that policy is as strong to-day in the country as ever it was, and I shall vote against it because it is a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and I have explained that I am not ready to dispossess the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, and if I were, I do not see on the Opposition benches men whom I (Cartwright):

House divided on amendment (Sir Richard Cartwright):

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allen,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchar,.
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Calvin,

Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,

Campbell,	Macdonald (Huron),
Carroll,	McGregor,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McMillan (Huron),
Casey,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Mignault,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davies,	Présontaine,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sauborn,
Fauvel,	Scriven,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Fraser,	Tarte,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt,
Geoffrion,	Welsh,
Gibson,	Yeo.—72.
Gillmor,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams.	Leclair,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lépine.
Baird.	Lippé.
Baker.	Macdonald (Kings),
Barnard,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Belley.	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	Maclelan (York),
Boyd,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McCarthy.
Bryson,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Burnham,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cameron.	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McInerney,
Carignan,	McKay,
Carling,	McLean (Kings),
Carpenter,	McLennan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	MeLeod,
Carscallen,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Chesley.	McNeill,
Cleveland,	Madill,
Coatsworth,	Mara,
Cochrane,	Marshall,
Cockburn,	Metcalfé,
Corbould,	Miller,
Corby,	Mills (Annapolis),
Costigan,	Moncrieff,
Craig.	Montague.
Curran,	Northrup,
Daly.	O'Brien,
Davin.	Quimet,
Davis,	Patterson (Colchester),
Denison,	Patterson (Huron),
Desaulniers,	Pelletier,
Dickey,	Pope,
Dugas,	Pridham,
Dupont,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Earle,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Roome,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Fréchette,	Ross (Dundas),
Gillies,	Ross (Lisgar),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Ryckman,
Grandbois,	Simard,
Guillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Haggart,	Sproule,
Hazen,	Stairs,
Hearn.	Stevenson,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Temple,
Hughes,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Turcotte,
Ives,	Tyrwitt,
Jeannotte,	Wallace.
Jones,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Lachapelle,	Wilson,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville),
LaRivière,	Wood (Westmoreland).—126.

	PAIRS.	
<i>Ministerial.</i>		<i>Opposition.</i>
	Messieurs	

Masson,	Monet,
Weldon,	Borden,
Bergin,	Mills.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has not voted.

Mr. WELDON. I paired with the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden). I would have voted for the amendment.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means on the following resolutions :—

(In the Committee.)

1. RESOLVED, That it is expedient to amend the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 20, intituled: "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs,"—by repealing the item 184 under section 10 of the said Act,—and to provide otherwise by enacting the following rates of duty in lieu thereof :—

Twine for harvest binders, of hemp, jute, manila or sisal, and of manila and sisal mixed, twelve and one-half per cent *ad valorem*.

Rope, when imported for the manufacture of twine for harvest binders, ten per cent *ad valorem*.

2. RESOLVED, that it is expedient to further amend the said Act 53 Victoria, chapter 20, by repealing the item numbered 291, under section 11, and substituting the following in lieu thereof :—

Mining machinery imported prior to the sixteenth day of May, 1896, which is at the time of its importation of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Committee passes the first resolution, I wish to move that it is also expedient that the duty on barbed wire, agricultural implements and cottons should be reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot do that on this item.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move in amendment that binder twine be put upon the free list.

Amendment negatived. Yeas 49 ; Nays 78.)

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman had better report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had a long discussion ; the matter has been fully debated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there are some details upon which it is evident there will be a difference of opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. But there need be no debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There can't be any debate at this unearthly hour.

Resolution 1 agreed to.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish now to bring to the attention of this Committee a motion to the effect that the duties on barbed wire, agricultural implements and cottons should be reduced. The Finance Minister was not in

when I was addressing the House on the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I should like to call his attention—

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I don't know how we can dispense. Mr. Chairman, it may be late, but we are always talking about being Britons and following British precedents, and in England they will sit very late when the interests of the country demand it. I wish—

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry to call the hon. gentleman to order. The time to make this amendment is when the Speaker is in the Chair, and when he asks the House to debate the resolution.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.55 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EDUCATION AND DUAL LANGUAGE IN THE N. W. T.

Mr. DAVIN, in presenting petitions from certain residents of the North-west Territories, praying that the North-west Assembly be given control over educational matters, and asking for a repeal of the clause in the North-west Territories Act relating to the dual language, said: I may say that I have seen in the papers that the language of these petitions is attributed to me, as my own.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I have never expressed an opinion on the subject at all.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS—INSTRUCTIONS.

Mr. FOSTER. I said the other day that I would lay on the Table of the House a copy of the instructions to, and the oaths taken by, the census enumerators, and the schedules. I move that an Order of the House do issue for those papers, including copies of instructions to enumerators, the oaths taken by the enumerators, and the schedules.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that these instructions are laid on the Table for the first time?

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not able to say, but I will be able to answer the inquiry later.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. LEPINE (Translation) asked, What are the names of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, and what was the salary paid to each of them in 1892?

Mr. QUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state the names of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners are as follows:—Henry Bulmer, chairman of the commissioners; the Hon. Edward Murphy, Messrs. Victor Hudon, J. O. Villeneuve, Richard White, Hugh McLennan, H. Gould, James McShane and Andrew Allan. They received during the year fees to the amount of \$4,435.

SICK MARINERS' FUND.

Mr. LEPINE asked, 1. Have the shipping interests of Montreal made frequent complaints to the Government of the tax of 2 cents per ton per voyage, not to exceed 6 cents per ton per annum, levied on shipping by virtue of the Sick Mariners' Act (R.S.C., chapter 76) as being both unjust and impolitic? 2. Has the Government any precedent for the levy of a tax on shipping for hospital purposes in any part of the world other than Canada? 3. Have grants out of this taxation, aggregating some thirty or forty thousand dollars since Confederation, been made to two hospitals in Ontario, one at Kingston, the other at St. Catharines, although no tonnage tax is levied in that province? 4. Has not the levy of this tax of 6 cents per ton per season at Montreal; and elsewhere in the Dominion, brought about a levy by the United States of 15 cents per ton per annum by way of reprisals on Montreal tonnage trading with their ports? 5. Does not the Act of Congress imposing this retaliatory taxation (24 U.S. 81, sec. 11) contain a provision to the effect that whenever Canada ceases to levy her tax the United States will cease to impose? 6. Is the province of Ontario, besides being exempt from the Canadian tax, also, and because of this home exemption, exempted from the retaliatory tax of the United States? and do not these exemptions constitute a serious discrimination against the province of Quebec and in favour of the shipping trade of Ontario? 7. Is it the intention of the Government—(1) to accept this standing offer of the United States and thereby free Canadian tonnage from the retaliatory tax now levied in the ports of that country? and at the same time (2) to promote legislation which will afford tonnage in the province of Quebec the same immunity from taxation as presently exists in the ports of Ontario?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. A petition was received from a number interested in foreign and inland shipping. A resolution was passed by the Montreal Board of Trade and the Montreal Harbour Commissioners in support of the petition, and forwarded to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and a letter from Mr. D. A. Watt, all in favour of abolishing the sick mariners' dues at Montreal. 2. A tax on tonnage is imposed in the United States although not specially called hospital dues. Marine hospitals, however, are maintained out of tonnage dues collected from foreign shipping. Sailors belonging to foreign shipping applying for admission to the hospital, must have a guarantee that the sum of \$1 per diem will be paid for medical attendance, and this per diem amount must be paid when the seamen are discharged. 3. The sum of \$500 per annum has been paid to the hospital at St. Catharines by a vote of Parliament, and a similar sum to the hospital at Kingston, from 1868 to 1891. Since the latter date 90 cents per diem for each seaman receiving medical attendance has been paid. Under this arrangement the sum of \$108 was paid to the hospital at St. Catharines, and \$500 to the hospital at Kingston, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892. 4. The levy of 2 cents per ton, three times in each year, on vessels over 100 tons, and once in each year on vessels under 100 tons at Montreal and elsewhere in the Dominion, as well as river police dues of 3 cents per ton paid twice in each year on vessels of over 100 tons at the port of Quebec, has been the means of causing the United States to retain a tonnage duty imposed on all vessels from the province of Quebec and the Maritime provinces of Canada entering ports in the United States. The duty imposed in the United States on Maritime provinces' vessels and vessels from the province of Quebec does not exceed 15 cents per ton per annum. A duty is imposed upon European vessels with the exception of those from German ports, not exceeding 30 cents per annum. 5. The Act abolishing fees in the United States on American shipping, section 11, provides that the president shall suspend the collection of so much of the duty imposed on foreign vessels as shall exceed the amount collected on American vessels by a foreign country, and indicates the rates of tonnage duty, if any, to be collected under such suspension. 6. The province of Ontario is exempt from tonnage duty in the United States, as no sick mariners' dues or tax of this kind are collected in the province. Sick mariners' dues are collected in the Maritime provinces, Quebec and British Columbia. There is, consequently, a discrimination in favour of the province of Ontario. A circular, signed by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dated 10th June, 1891, was forwarded to the collectors of Customs at various ports in the province of Quebec and in the Maritime provinces. The circular was also sent to members of Parliament and shipping firms, requesting

them to give their opinions on the subject of the abolition of sick mariners' dues. About eighty replies to the circular were received. The preponderance of opinion was in favour of continuing the collection of sick and distressed mariners' dues, in the interests of seafaring men. 7. The Government is now considering the question of abolishing or retaining the sick mariners' tonnage dues; but no decision has yet been arrived at.

FORT GEORGE.

Mr. DENISON asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the Canadian Institute of Toronto, praying that steps be taken to preserve the old French stone magazine in Fort George said to be of La Salle's time? Did the Institute give any approximate estimate of the cost, and if so, what was it? Is it the intention of the Government to repair the magazine and otherwise preserve Fort George from further decay?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). A petition from the Canadian Institute at Toronto, transmitted through Col. Denison, was duly received on 12th September last, applying for a grant of money to repair the old stone magazine at Fort George, situated on the left bank of the Niagara River, at Queenston Heights. The receipt of the petition was duly acknowledged to Colonel Denison. In the petition it was stated that the sum of \$250 would be required to place the old magazine building in repair. It is the intention of the Government to repair the building, and take such other steps as may be requisite to preserve Fort George from further decay.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, What was the value (a) of the raw material, and (b) what was the output, according to the last census, of the cotton industries?

Mr. FOSTER. In cotton industries (census of 1891), the value of raw material was \$4,208,253; and the output, \$8,451,724.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, What was the value (a) of the raw material, and (b) what was the output, according to the last census, of the wool cloth manufacturing industries?

Mr. FOSTER. The value of raw material in wool cloth manufactures (census of 1891), was \$4,199,067; output, \$8,441,071.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, (a) What was the number, according to the last census, of wall paper-making establishments? (b) The number of employees therein? (c) The raw material? (d) The output?

Mr. FOSTER. In wallpaper-making (census of 1891), the number of industries reported was 4; employees reported, 139;

value of raw material, \$133,700; output, \$355,000.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, What was the value (a) of the raw material, and (b) what was the output, according to the last census, in the foundries and machine-working industries?

Mr. FOSTER. In foundries and machine works (census of 1891), the value of raw material was \$6,898,017; and the value of output, \$16,031,515.

CANADIAN AND AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. GUILLET asked, 1. What is the percentage of alloy in the Canadian silver coinage? 2. What is the percentage in the American silver coinage? 3. Is the Government aware that it is proposed to largely increase the coinage of American silver? 4. Is the Government aware that American silver currency containing less than 50 per cent silver is being introduced into Canada at par? 5. Is it the intention of the Government to take measures to prevent American silver from displacing our gold standard paper currency and much purer silver currency?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The percentage of alloy in Canadian silver is $7\frac{1}{2}$. 2. In American, 10 per cent. 3. No. 4. No. 5. The Revised Statutes, chapter 30 provides that no other silver, copper or bronze coins than those which Her Majesty causes to be struck for circulation in Canada or in some province thereof shall be a legal tender in Canada.

GARRISON GROUNDS, ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. FRASER asked, Has the Department of Militia received a memorial from the inhabitants of Annapolis, N.S., asking that the old Garrison grounds there should be placed in the hands of a commissioner or commissioners for the purpose of having the place reserved as a park and pleasure ground? What action does the department propose to take in reference to the prayer of the petition?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). A memorial from the inhabitants of Annapolis has been received by the Department of Militia and the receipt has been duly acknowledged. The prayer of the memorial that certain military grounds should be used as a park and pleasure grounds is now under consideration, with a view of meeting the wishes of the inhabitants as far as is consistent with the public interest.

LABOUR BUREAU.

Mr. McKAY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to bring into operation the Labour Bureau? If so, when?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is considering that question, and will present a report on it very shortly.

Mr. FOSTER.

MILITARY INTERCHANGES.

Mr. HUGHES asked, Is it the intention of the Government, with a view to enlisting the best class of Canadians, increasing the efficiency of both officers and men, fostering the national spirit and upbuilding and consolidating the British Empire, to take steps towards having successive annual or biennial exchanges between one of the permanent corps, batteries of Canadian artillery and companies of Canadian infantry from Canada, on the one hand, and a battery of Imperial artillery and company of infantry from Great Britain, Gibraltar or other "home" station, on the other?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). As soon as the House has placed at the disposal of the Department of Militia and Defence the funds necessary for carrying out the very important scheme, the matter will receive consideration.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.

Mr. CASEY asked, Will the Government lay upon the Table at an early date a copy of the instructions to the census enumerators as to the definition of a "factory" or "manufacturing industry," in respect of amount of output, number of hands employed, or otherwise? Also, a statement of the number of factories or "manufacturing industries" in each city and incorporated town in Canada having an output, in the census year, of between \$5,000 and \$10,000, \$10,000 and \$20,000, \$20,000 and \$50,000, \$50,000 and \$100,000, and over \$100,000 respectively? Also, the total number for the Dominion, classified as in the last question?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already laid on the Table of the House a copy of the instructions. With reference to the other two parts of the question, if my hon. friend will put it in the form of a motion for information it will be compiled and given to the House.

AGRICULTURE—LADOGA WHEAT AND TWO-ROWED BARLEY.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, 1. What sum of money has been spent by the Government in promoting the cultivation of two-rowed barley? 2. What sum of money has been spent in the cultivation of Ladoga wheat? 3. What was the result of the milling test made at Toronto a few months ago as to the merits of the said Ladoga wheat?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The total amount of money expended in promoting the cultivation of two-rowed barley was \$23,389.39. The returns from sales of barley amounted to \$16,201.99. The balance or net expenditure was \$7,187.40. 2. The total amount spent in the cultivation and distribution of Ladoga wheat was \$661.28, exclusive of the cultivation by the Experimental Farms, the proportion of which was not recorded. 3. The result of the

milling test of Ladoga wheat made at Toronto by Messrs. McLaughlin and Moore was as follows, in the terms of the conclusion of their report: "Good unfrosted Ladoga wheat, such as the lot we ground will make better flour than No. 2 regular Manitoba wheat, but not so good as No. 1 regular Manitoba." Full particulars respecting Ladoga wheat will be furnished in two or three days by a bulletin from the Experimental Farm.

OYSTER BEDS—LICENSE.

Mr. PERRY asked, How many grants of licenses of oyster-bed limits have been made in Prince county, P.E.I.? To whom made? What are the bounds and limits of each grant, and what is the term of years for which each of these limits has been made?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No licenses have yet been issued for oyster areas in Prince county. A schedule of all applications received and licenses issued in connection with oyster culture, will be found in Appendix No. 6 of the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1892.

FRENCH CANADIAN ADVOCATES.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT asked, 1. What are the names of all French-Canadian advocates, of the province of Quebec, employed by the Government, in the provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, since 1878? 2. The cases in which they were so employed? 3. The fees and expenses paid to each of them?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say from memory whether there are any such or not. It is very unusual to employ advocates or counsel outside of the province in which they are members of the bar, excepting in the case of the regular agent of the Department of Justice at Ottawa. I think that the hon. gentleman's question ought to be put as a motion for a return. It will involve inquiry, and will take some time to prepare the information. I am not, however, able to say whether the information exists or not.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS— MESSRS. TRUDEAU AND WHITE.

Mr. CARROLL asked, 1. What was the date of appointment of the late Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Toussaint Trudeau? 2. What was the date of appointment of William White, Deputy Postmaster-General? 3. What was the date of appointment of George Rivers White? Date of promotion? How often was he promoted? Has he passed the civil service examination? If so, the number of points obtained, and was it special or optional examination?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to first question, I find from the civil service list that Mr. Trudeau was first appointed to the service on the 13th of December, 1859.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the second and third questions, William White, Deputy Postmaster-General, was in the English civil service as a clerk in the General Post Office, from 19th of February, 1846, to the 1st of April, 1854, when he resigned and came to Canada. On 1st of December, 1854, he was appointed first-class clerk (money order office); on 21st February, 1861, he was promoted to be secretary; on 27th June, 1888, he was promoted to be Deputy Postmaster-General. George Rivers White was appointed a third-class clerk 1st July, 1873; on 1st July, 1883, he was promoted to a second-class clerkship; on 14th October, 1891, first-class. In June, 1883, he passed the examination for second-class; and in May, 1887, passed examination for first-class. The examinations passed were the ordinary promotion examinations in each case. The number of points are not given for the reason that heretofore they have been refused upon the ground that the examinations are not competitive.

FRASERVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. CARROLL asked, 1. What is the total amount expended to date on the Fraserville post office? 2. What is the amount of the claims filed for material furnished to contractor Lortie, and not paid for? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to pay the said claims, or some of them?

Mr. OUIMET. The total amount paid on account of the Fraserville post office to the 1st of March is \$19,867.94. The total amount of claims filed in the department against the contractors and still unpaid is \$9,854.92. The department has been informed that Mr. Lortie, the contractor, has been thrown into bankruptcy, and the balance that may be due to him will be remitted to the proper party to be distributed according to law among his creditors.

GALOPS RAPIDS CHANNEL.

Mr. REID moved for:

Return of the report or reports of plans and surveys of Galops Rapids channel, made by Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would have any objection to adding to that motion, "also copies of any charges that have been made to the department in connection with this work." I understand that some charges have been made about the work not being up to the specifications.

Mr. REID. I wish my motion to go as it is, without any addition.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I would ask that the motion stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

PIER AT YAMACHICHE.

Mr. DESAULNIERS moved for :

Copies of all correspondence in relation to the construction of the pier at Yamachiche.

He said : Mr. Speaker, two years ago, on the recommendation of the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), then the hon. Minister of Public Works, the amount of \$2,000 was voted by this House towards the construction of a pier at Yamachiche; in the county of St. Maurice. Nothing was done that year. Last year, on the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, now in office, the same amount was revoted. I must offer my best thanks to the hon. Minister for that kindness in regard to my county. But now, and that is very important, nothing at all was done on these works, except this : notices were published in many French and English newspapers, and the contract was given to a gentleman of the city of Three Rivers. That gentleman wrote to me some days ago that he had asked the department for plans and had received no answer. Here is a copy of his letter :

THREE RIVERS, 15th February, 1893.

In reply to your letter which I have just received, I beg to inform you that I have written to the department at Ottawa, to get the plans and a copy of the contract, and at this very moment I have received no news from them. Please tell to the department that plans and a copy of the contract must be sent to me beforehand.

Yours truly,
F. A. VERRÉT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to speak against my party here, but I want to read the following official letters concerning the construction of that pier at Yamachiche. During the last session I received the following letter :—

OTTAWA, 11th February, 1892.

SIR,—I have just received your letter of the 30th concerning Yamachiche.

The plans and estimates prepared by the chief engineer for this work were laid before Mr. Ouimet last week. I think the few words we have said to him on this subject will be sufficient to enable him to give you a proper answer when you speak to him about it.

Yours truly,
A. GOBEIL,
Deputy Minister of Public Works.

In the same year, at the date hereinafter mentioned, I received the following letter :—

OTTAWA, 23rd September, 1892.

SIR,—Referring to your letter of the 5th instant, by which you ask that the works on the pier at Yamachiche be commenced, I am directed to inform you that the plans and specifications for these works are in course of preparation.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
D. A. MACPHERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. MULOCK.

On the 5th of January last, the hon. Minister himself wrote to me, as follows :—

I have the pleasure to inform you that the contract for the pier at Yamachiche has been given and that the works will begin at once.

J. A. OUIMET.

And subsequently, the 16th February, this note was sent to me :

On my return to the office, I found your note concerning the Yamachiche plans, and I saw Mr. Coste who will send these plans to-day to Mr. Verret, the contractor. The plans could not have been sent before to-day, because they had not yet been signed by the Minister.

A. GOBEIL.

I make these remarks, not to blame the hon. Minister himself, but to inform my constituents that it was through no fault on my part that the delay has taken place in the construction of that pier. I hope this work will be commenced and finished soon, at least before the expiration of the present Parliament.

Mr. OUIMET. There is no objection to bringing down all the papers the hon. gentleman asks for. I have listened very carefully to his remarks, and I do not know if he intends to throw any blame upon myself or the employees of my department. I know we have done the best we could to complete the pier, which is wanted. The delay has been because of difficulties in the way of preparing the plans, and because the engineers, in making their reports, stated that the price of the pier would be too high for the usefulness of it. The wharf is now under contract, and I hope it will be completed at an early day.

CIVIL SERVICE—SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. McMULLEN moved :

That inasmuch as in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the gross amount of the annual expenditure of the Dominion should be reduced and the drain on the people's resources thereby be stopped, it is expedient to repeal the Act providing for the superannuation of civil servants.

He said : Upon several occasions I have drawn the attention of this House to the enormous expenditure and the evidences of extravagance connected with the administration of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. I am glad to notice that it is the intention of the Government this year to make considerable changes in the direction of bringing the Act more within the fund that will be provided by the contribution of the civil servants than has been the case in the past. Still, I contend that in the present condition of the Civil Service and with all the opportunities and privileges of insuring their lives and the great advantages now offered by insurance companies, a system of superannuation of this kind is quite unnecessary, more particularly in view of past results and of the

abuses that have attended the administration of the Act from its inception to the present time. I think these things clearly point to the necessity of the total abolition of this system. There is no necessity whatever that it should have a further existence in this Dominion. I believe if the question of the continuation of the superannuation system was left to a vote of the civil servants of this country, they would almost unanimously decide in opposition to its continuance. It has been abused in the past, and men have been superannuated, not because they sought superannuation, but merely because the place was coveted by some other person who brought influence to bear upon the Government in favour of superannuating the incumbent, in order that he might get the position; and we have to-day the ridiculous exhibition of between 500 and 600 superannuated civil servants in this Dominion, a great many of them in the prime of life. Now, in order to bring this whole question before the House and the country, I will give to the House a statement of all superannuations, from year to year, from 1881 down to the present time :

1881—Return laid on the Table of the House on the 15th February, 1882, for year ending 31st December, 1881 :

79 retired at a cost of \$30,431 78
Gratuities 3,225 00

Annual cost afterwards \$27,207 78

1882—Return brought down the 20th February, 1883, for year ending 31st December, 1882 :

74 retired at a cost of \$39,991 51
Gratuities 5,529 02

Annual payment \$34,392 49

1883—Return brought down 21st January, 1884 :

64 retired at a cost of \$32,376 54
Gratuities 3,151 66

Net annual loss \$29,224 88
17 superannuated under 55 years old.
10 under 50 years old.
7 under 40 years old.

1884—Return brought down 3rd February, 1885, to 31st December, 1884 :

53 retired, total cost 24,309 95
Gratuities 2,310 26

\$21,999 69
15 superannuated under 55 years old.
11 under 50 years old.
8 under 45 years old.

1885—Return brought down 1st March, 1886, for year ending 31st December, 1885 :

49 retired, total cost \$20,928 65
Gratuities 2,568 03

Net annual payment \$18,360 62
19 superannuated under 55 years old.
12 under 50 years old.
8 under 45 years old.

1886—Return brought down 1st April, 1887, to 31st December, 1886 :

38 retired under the Act \$17,145 61
Gratuities 1,064 43

Net annual loss \$16,081 18
8 superannuated under 55 years old.
6 under 50 years old.

1887, to 31st December—Return brought down 5th March, 1888 :

62 retired under the Act, total cost \$33,560 61
Gratuities 4,811 73

Net cost, annually \$28,748 88
15 superannuated under 55 years old.
14 under age of 50 years old.
9 under age of 45 years old.

1888, to 31st December—Return brought down 4th February, 1890 :

65 retired under Act—
Total cost \$29,003 42
Gratuity 1,452 91

Net annual loss \$27,550 51
20 superannuated under 55 years old.
15 under 50 years old.
9 under 45 years old.

1889, to 31st December—Return brought down 29th January, 1890 :

81 retired under the Act—
Total cost \$36,913 87
Gratuities 3,924 42

Net annual loss \$32,989 45
17 superannuated under 55 years old.
9 under 50 years old.
7 under 45 years old.

1890—Return brought down 11th May, 1891 :

37 retired under Act—
Total cost \$16,646 75
Gratuity 1,159 98

Net annual loss \$15,486 77
11 superannuated under 55 years old.
8 under 50 years old. 7 under 45 years old.

1891, to 31st December—Return brought down 7th March, 1892 :

65 retired under the Act—
Total cost \$40,095 20
Gratuity 1,995 79

Net annual loss \$38,099 41
16 superannuated under 55 years old.
10 under 50 years old. 5 under 45 years old.

1893—Returns brought down 8th February, 1893, to 31st December, 1892 :

Gratuities 4,825 27
67 retired under the Act—
Total cost \$37,514 80
Gratuities \$ 4,825 27

Net annual loss \$32,689 53
Total amount contributed by the 425 persons on the superannuated list, as per return

presented to the House on 20th April, 1886, \$69,585.36. Average sum paid by each during the time they were in the service, as per same return, \$163.73. Average sum drawn, \$2,681.38.

AMOUNT added to gross sum paid out each year from 1881 to 1892 :

1881	Amount added by superannuations...	\$ 30,431	78
1882	do do do	39,921	51
1883	do do do	32,376	54
1884	do do do	24,309	95
1885	do do do	20,928	65
1886	do do do	17,145	61
1887	do do do	33,560	61
1888	do do do	29,003	42
1889	do do do	36,913	87
1890	do do do	16,646	75
1891	do do do	40,095	20
1892	do do do	37,514	80
		<u>358,848</u>	<u>69</u>

149 men superannuated under 55
103 do do 50
71 do do 45

Gross Receipts during twelve years from 1881 to 1892 :

1881	Amount paid in by civil servants...	\$ 44,995	80
1882	do do do	46,426	39
1883	do do do	46,372	03
1884	do do do	51,882	21
1885	do do do	52,701	33
1886	do do do	57,075	43
1887	do do do	62,600	96
1888	do do do	62,967	43
1889	do do do	63,031	46
1890	do do do	61,513	05
1891	do do do	62,824	60
1892	do do do	63,862	76
		<u>676,253</u>	<u>45</u>

AMOUNT paid out under the Act for twelve years from 1881 to 1892, inclusive :

1881	Amount paid under Act...	\$ 143,708	75
1882	do do	160,319	95
1883	do do	186,236	67
1884	do do	192,692	70
1885	do do	203,636	21
1886	do do	205,455	43
1887	do do	202,285	85
1888	do do	212,743	73
1889	do do	218,933	65
1890	do do	241,764	66
1891	do do	241,110	49
1892	do do	253,439	88
		<u>2,462,327</u>	<u>97</u>

Amount paid in..... 676,253 55

Net loss 1,786,074 42

In order to give the House some idea of the sums that a number of those individuals have drawn, and also the sums they have paid in, I will read a carefully prepared table of the names of those who have drawn the largest amounts. These are all names that were on the list in 1886, and I added to the amounts drawn by them up to that date the further amounts drawn to 30th June, 1892. I will give the gross amounts drawn up to the present year, as follows :—

Mr. McMULLEN.

Officers on Superannuation List.	Date of Superannuation.	Amount paid by each to Fund.	Amount paid to each to 30th June, 1892.
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Agnew, W.	Oct. 1, '78.	141 87	7,791 00
Ahearn, W.	Sep. 1, '76.	113 64	6,718 52
Amos, J. S.	Apr. 1, '84.	302 50	4,804 38
Ashe, E. D.	May 1, '83.	458 00	8,492 84
Bell, R.	Dec. 1, '79.	343 23	8,720 25
Bennett, P.	July 1, '76.	180 00	6,816 84
Benoit, U.	July 1, '79.	239 14	7,644 66
Braun, F.	June 1, '82.	670 00	7,840 00
Cary, A.	Oct. 1, '75.	255 99	10,468 08
Clute, J. S.	July 1, '78.	109 91	5,566 21
Cruse, T.	Nov. 1, '78.	396 00	11,980 50
Dickson, G. P.	Dec. 1, '80.	525 05	13,761 00
Futvoye, Geo.	Jan. 11, '75.	420 00	38,018 93
Godard, Nomis.	Feb. 1, '80.	550 83	20,020 00
Godin, L.	Mar. 1, '74.	29 58	3,991 74
Hall, John	Aug. 1, '77.	138 67	6,481 59
Hayden, E. C.	July 1, '73.	122 00	17,471 04
Hinsworth, J. A.	Mar. 1, '80.	367 50	13,838 00
Inglis, R.	July 1, '81.	348 30	8,007 48
Jenkins, C. W.	July 1, '82.	459 00	9,000 00
Jordan, F. G.	Jan. 1, '83.	361 16	9,309 48
Kidd, John	June 1, '82.	576 58	15,670 00
Kimber, R.	May 1, '85.	275 71	18,004 00
King, J. W.	July 1, '75.	240 00	10,007 00
Knight, T. F.	Nov. 1, '73.	199 22	6,696 00
LaCroix, Henry.	Aug. 1, '77.	80 00	10,069 00
Langton, John.	Aug. 1, '78.	847 00	37,803 00
Lee, Jos. J.	Mar. 1, '71.	26 68	7,014 00
Leprohon, J. P.	June 1, '82.	466 00	14,518 00
Leslie, Joseph.	Feb. 13, '79.	584 34	32,777 00
LeSueur, Peter.	Nov. 1, '77.	487 42	15,070 00
Lindsay, Alex.	Jan. 1, '76.	216 00	12,925 00
Lowden, H. B.	Apr. 1, '76.	49 21	4,141 00
Marter, W. J. B.	Aug. 1, '79.	52 25	7,233 00
Meredith, E. A.	Nov. 1, '78.	639 25	34,440 00
McCrae, W.	Nov. 1, '74.	121 79	7,623 00
McRae, W. H.	Sep. 1, '73.	140 12	9,513 00
Passon, F. M.	May 19, '79.	69 33	20,149 00
Paulin, H. B.	May 1, '82.	460 93	12,810 00
Piche, E. U.	Feb. 14, '79.	204 75	5,351 00
Patrick, Alfred.	Dec. 1, '80.	27,568 00
Pouliott, J.	Feb. 1, '73.	32 00	2,761 68
Prendergast, J.	June 1, '72.	54 40	7,546 53
Purcell, J.	Nov. 1, '77.	118 01	4,277 00
Quinn, F.	Sep. 1, '74.	125 00	3,120 00
Ramney, G. W.	July 15, '73.	83 56	6,765 85
Reid, A.	July 1, '73.	7,226 60
Romaine, C. E.	Aug. 1, '79.	476 09	8,772 90
Rubige, J. P.	July 1, '71.	96 00	34,322 00
Russell, L.	July 1, '84.	632 33	12,399 00
Schryer, O.	Nov. 1, '73.	72 07	5,891 00
Scott, F. G.	Mar. 1, '71.	37 33	8,124 00
Small, W. H.	Feb. 1, '79.	185 17	8,124 00
Taché, J. C.	July 1, '88.	8,960 00
Vincent, O.	Apr. 1, '72.	8,368 00
Wilson, H. D.	May 1, '75.	95 76	5,991 00
Woodgate, A.	July 1, '75.	324 00	23,780 00
Wylde, C.	Sep. 1, '78.	215 93	6,916 00

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear from the statements which I have presented and which have been carefully prepared from the records laid before Parliament, that the manner in which the superannuation system has been abused in this country for the last twelve years, has seriously drawn upon the resources of the people in order to meet these

extravagances. The idea of our contributing to the livelihood of some 550 civil servants retired at a loss, for twelve years, of one million and three-quarters dollars to the people of this country, clearly shows that the Act has been grossly abused. Had the Act been allowed to remain on the Statute-book as it was at its inception, and making the deductions from the officers which was originally provided for, we would not have to-day the exhibition which was shown by the statement I have given. But during the time of the Hon. Mr. Tilley as Minister of Finance the deductions from civil servants for the Superannuation Fund were cut down 50 per cent, and on the other hand, a great many people were superannuated, not because they sought superannuation, but because their places were wanted for friends of the Government, who brought influence to bear to remove the incumbents from office so that they might be installed in their positions. I could give several cases of this kind. You have the case of Mr. Shakespeare, who was appointed postmaster in Victoria, and the superannuation of Mr. Wallace, the previous postmaster, much against his will. You have the cases in Toronto where postmasters have been superannuated once or twice within the last twelve years in order to make room for others who have pressed their services on the Government, and you have the case of the postmaster of Montreal, who was superannuated a short time ago in order to make place for Mr. Dansereau, who gets about \$4,000 a year, while the previous postmaster is drawing something like \$2,000 a year. So you can go through the Government offices from the Atlantic to the Pacific and you can see evidences of the extravagances perpetrated for the purpose of meeting the urgent appeals of political friends, whereby we have the exhibition we have to-day of about 550 civil servants superannuated, and living on the country at an expense of \$250,000 per year. The hon. Finance Minister is bringing in a Bill for the purpose of changing the system, but I contend that the whole system should be wiped out. There is no necessity whatever for its continuance, seeing that members of the civil service have every opportunity like other people to insure their lives. This system was adopted in imitation of the English system, which was introduced at a time when the privileges and advantages of life insurance were not so generally known or enjoyed as they are to-day, and in England the people are slow to part with customs and institutions which have been in existence for many years. But I am satisfied that in England the superannuation system has not been abused to the extent that it has been in this country. If it had been, the indignation of the people would no doubt have risen against it. From information that I have obtained, I believe the members of our Civil Service themselves would be glad to see the Act repealed, because

a deduction is made on their salaries each year towards the fund, and in many cases the really efficient and faithful servants who labour long and efficiently and eventually die in the service get no advantage whatever from the Act. It is only the drones or the men who are removed to suit the convenience of the Government who reap the advantage of the system. If the system were not in existence the Government would not have at their hands the power to force men out of the service, and abuse that power as they have done from year to year. When I state that we have to-day on the superannuation list no less than 149 men who have been retired under the age of 55 years, 103 who have been retired under the age of 50, and 71 who have been retired under the age of 45 within the last twelve years, these facts of themselves are, I think, clear evidence that the Act has been grossly abused. Now, I contend that the Government should wipe out the whole system, and make some arrangement with those now on the list, and give them to understand that they must in future provide for themselves. In the next place, I contend that there is no class in the country better paid than the Civil Service. The average salary of our civil servants is above the average salary of bank clerks, school teachers, ministers or any other class in this country; and when that is the case, on what ground can any person plead that we should continue the system? Now, I challenge any person to contradict the statements I have presented to this House, carefully gathered from the records of Parliament from year to year, showing the operation of the system for the last twelve years, and in the face of these facts, I think it must be admitted that the whole system should be abolished at once. The labouring classes, the farming community, the pioneers of this country who have come in and waged war with the forests and turned them into fertile fields, men who have become old and gray and decrepit, are obliged to provide for themselves in their old age, and if they do not do so they must die in the ditch or go to the poor-house; and I want to know if these men are not entitled to more consideration at the hands of this House than a lot of civil servants who are well paid and who go to their offices at 9.30 and leave at 4? I say it is an outrage upon the struggling masses of this country that they should have been compelled to pay nearly \$2,000,000 in the past twelve years for the purpose of providing retiring allowances for these people for the rest of their lives. I had not an opportunity of presenting these facts at the time the hon. Finance Minister brought in his Bill. I do not know whether he will take much notice of them; but when his Bill comes up for discussion again, I hope that a motion will be made to abolish the whole system and leave the Civil Service to provide for themselves, and

thus relieve the people of this country of the heavy drain to which they are subjected under the operations of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has opened up the discussion with a view to bringing this subject to the attention of the House to-day. The whole subject will necessarily be discussed on the Bill which I have introduced and I would suggest to my hon. friend not to press his motion, after the information he has given, but to allow the discussion to be taken up again on the Bill, when it will be carried on with something more of a practical purpose than it can be at the present time under an abstract resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This will be very practical if it is carried.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the suggestion is a fair one. The subject will come up again on the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Meantime, it is understood that the hon. gentleman does not contradict my hon. friend's figures, some of which are remarkable enough to call for the attention of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not understood at all. No doubt these figures will be brought up at an opportune time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope at that time the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give some fair explanation of the figures which my hon. friend quoted, because if he be correct in stating that 70 people under the age of 45 have been superannuated, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the Superannuation Act has been most grossly abused; and whatever may be said of the theory of the measure, when it comes to be so abused very few indeed, I think, can honestly defend it.

Motion withdrawn.

CENTRAL ONTARIO RAILWAY CO.

Mr. CORBY moved for :

Copies of all communications, memorials, &c., addressed to His Excellency in Council, to the Dominion Government or any member thereof, since 1888, urging the granting of a federal subsidy to the Central Ontario Railway Company to enable that company to extend its line from Coe Hill northward.

He said: In moving for this information, I do so as the railway in question passes through my constituency, and through the county of Hastings. We are anxious that this company should extend its line from its terminus, now at Coe Hill, in the northern and mineral part of Hastings, which will develop large timber resources; and it is asking from the Dominion Parliament a revote of \$3,200 per mile, and an extra subsidy of \$2,800 per mile, for twenty miles, from Coe Hill to the village of Bancroft. I might say that this company has constructed, and has now in operation, 115 miles between Picton and Coe Hill, at a

Mr. McMULLEN.

cost of nearly \$2,000,000. It has shown its good faith by expending that large sum without any assistance from the Dominion Parliament. I might say that for part of the road running from Trenton to Picton, the company received from the Ontario Government, and the municipalities through which the road passes, \$155,000; but for the road from Trenton to Coe Hill, a distance of 72 miles, it has not received \$1 in the way of subsidy from the Dominion or Ontario Parliaments. The company desires to extend its line, later on, from the village of Bancroft, via Maynooth, to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the neighbourhood of Mattawa, which will give a through line by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Sudbury. This line cost will in the neighbourhood of \$15,000 per mile, and will shorten the distance between Trenton and Sudbury, or Sudbury, via the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, by 150 miles. Iron ore can be shipped from Sudbury, via Trenton, there put on steam-barges, and then conveyed to Charlotte, at a cost of 25 cents per ton; or, in other words, it will cost to take the ore to Charlotte about 25 cents per ton, and in the neighbourhood of 75 cents per ton to Cleveland. The company will thus be able to carry the ore to these two points, and return cargoes of coal can be brought back at about the same rate. We have unlimited water power at the town of Trenton to operate an electric plant for the separation of the iron ore from the rock, thereby making a large saving in the shipping of ore from Trenton to Charlotte or Cleveland. We expect, when the Cleveland Administration comes into power that they will take off the duty on iron ore, and if they should, I see no reason why we ought not to have smelting works and rolling mills in the town of Trenton. I might say that, at the present moment, the Americans are experimenting with electricity in order to discover a means of smelting by that process. Should they discover that process, we have an unlimited water power by means of which we could operate large smelting works and rolling mills. I might state that I have a report here from Mr. T. L. Bolger, Civil Engineer and Provincial Land Surveyor, on that portion of the country from Coe Hill to the village of Bancroft. His report is as follows:—

To the Directors of the
Central Ontario Railway.

I beg to report as follows:—

SIRS,—Since making my last report and while definitely locating the line from Coe Hill to Bancroft, a distance of some seventeen miles, I found the disturbance of magnetic needle caused by the presence of magnetic iron ore so great for most of that distance as to render the needle useless; in many places the variation was as much as twenty to thirty degrees from the true course.

In fact, ore appears to be present all over the district and distinct veins are known to exist for many miles beyond.

The quantity of iron along not only this portion of the line; but, in fact, along the greater portion of the

line to be built, is so great that it would be difficult to convey any definite idea by representing the amount in figures.

Fortunately the amount of hardwood adapted to the manufacture of charcoal is scarcely less abundant. Maple and birch are found all along the whole of the proposed line.

The birch, it is safe to say, would be inexhaustible for fifty years to come.

The ore and the fuel are here directly together, and iron of a very superior quality ought to be produced very cheaply.

Yours truly,
(Signed) T. B. BOLGER,
C.E. & P.L.S.

I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any length with regard to this question, and I will conclude my few remarks by expressing the hope that the Government will grant the application of this company for a revote of \$3,200 per mile, and an extra grant of \$2,800 per mile, for twenty miles. This company is also anxious to extend its line from its terminus in the town of Pléton to the Bay shore, and there connect with the steamers plying in the Bay of Quinté. I am satisfied that if this line be built, it will develop large mineral resources in the county of Hastings, and also large and valuable resources of hardwood timber, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant this subsidy.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the construction of the railway to which my hon. friend (Mr. Corby) has just referred is a matter of deep interest to the constituency I have the honour to represent. I think it incumbent upon me, therefore, to second the resolution he has presented, which I do with great pleasure, and also to urge upon the Government the necessity for the proposed extension. As has already been stated, the construction of the road will open up one of the largest and most valuable mineral deposits in Canada. There are very large deposits of iron ore, gold ore, mica and other valuable minerals now lying idle for the want of transportation facilities such as would be furnished by the building of this road. That district has other great resources, including valuable timber, such as oak, ash, maple and other hard woods, which, under present circumstances, are not floatable on the stream, cannot be got to market, and are logged and burned on the ground. The people of that district have already shown enterprise in the development of their industries, one of the principal of which is still in its infancy, the cattle industry. When I tell you, Sir, that the few cheese factories already established in the section referred to have to haul their product in wagons over a very rough road, a distance of thirty and forty miles in order to reach a railway, and have to drive the cattle they design to sell a like distance, I am certain that no hon. gentleman in this House will oppose the assistance asked for. I think it was in 1885 the Government granted a bonus of \$3,200 a mile to this very road. For some reason, known only, I presume, to the

owners of the railway, this was allowed to lapse, but we ask now, what we confidently expect, a renewal of this grant and an additional grant of \$2,800 per mile to encourage the building of this road and to give these people railway facilities which are necessary almost for their existence. I ought also to add that the railway, which it is now desired to extend, has been built and operated by private capital from Trenton to Coe Hill, a distance of 74 miles, and has not, as yet, received aid from either this or the Ontario Government, and I trust the usual sum per mile may be given us at this session in order that my constituents may receive the benefit of transportation facilities so necessary for their welfare and so necessary to place them on an even footing with other sections of the country.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved for :

Return of any correspondence which may have taken place between the Government and any of the railway companies which have received public lands in aid of railway construction, in reference to the prices at which these lands are held and as to the steps taken by these companies to fulfil their trust by securing the early settlement of the lands so granted.

I am not going to detain the House at this moment with any lengthened observations upon the motion which I have put upon the Paper. I think that motion is important in itself and that it calls for the very careful consideration of members of the House, especially of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. We know, Sir, that when we entered upon the policy of aiding railway companies in the construction of railways by grants of land, especially in the outlying territories of the country, this was done, not as an end in itself at all, but as a means for securing the settlement of those lands which were granted. I have always been of opinion that it was a mistake not to fix a maximum price for these lands so as to exercise some control over the colonization of the country. But, Sir, there can be no doubt whatever of this fact, that the country would never have thought for one moment of making these appropriations and aiding in the construction of railways, but for the purpose of securing the colonization and settlement of the country through which the roads run. Now, I think, Sir, that, while it is important that railway companies should be allowed to secure to themselves fair compensation out of the lands which have been so appropriated subordinate to the very important trust that has been imposed upon these corporations. There can be no doubt that where the railway company receives a large grant of land, embracing hundreds of thousands of acres, with the view to the construction of a road, they receive these lands upon the express condition that they shall procure settlement and that the road shall furnish facilities for

the colonization of these lands. Now, Sir, I do not know how far the Government have undertaken to exercise a supervision over the prices put upon these lands, or the efforts made by corporations to secure their colonization and settlement. That the Government have such control, I think, will admit of no question. It would be a monstrous proposition to say that once the company acquired these lands it may fix a very high price upon them, a price so high that none of the lands would be brought into the market, and that the Government or public lands, which are everywhere interspersed through these railway grants, alone should be settled up. Of course, Sir, where every alternate section of the country is reserved by the public, and especially where the lands so reserved are offered gratuitously for settlement, the chances for settlement of the public lands will immediately precede the settlement of those belonging to the company. But, Sir, this fact is to be borne in mind, that where alternate sections of land are interspersed among lands belonging to the state that are already settled, very many settlers would prefer to purchase these alternate sections rather than go at a greater distance from settlements that have already been established. I know that one of the objections that is frequently made by persons who go into the North-west, one of the reasons given in many cases of the abandonment of lands that had already been taken up, has been the large unsettled spaces which make anything like a continuous and dense settlement well nigh impossible. The settler is not likely to go where the number of his neighbours is so few that churches cannot well be maintained or public schools established. In order that you may have contiguous settlement, the land must be held at something like a reasonable price. Now, I am bringing no charge against any railway corporation that has received public lands. I have stated principles, which may have been strictly conformed to, and I prefer to state them rather in advance of any information that may be given, because I will, I think, satisfy everybody that I am not making those statements with the view of censuring any corporation, or making charges against any of the parties who have received those lands. I hope the Government have not been indifferent with regard to this subject. I hope that the correspondence which I move for, actually exists, and that the interest of the Government has been active and continuous, that the correspondence will disclose that fact, and that proper steps are being taken to secure the continuous colonization and settlement of land fit for settlement throughout our North-west Territories. Sir, it seems to me, and I think it must seem to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the progress of colonization and the settlement of the country have been very far from satisfactory. Every hon. gentleman on that side of the House, as well as on this, ad-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

mits that the country is well adapted for settlement, that there are large areas of fertile land upon which the settler will be able to make a living, as well as on any other prairie section of the continent. That being so, it is important to inquire why the progress of settlement in that country, especially with the railway facilities that exist at the present day, has not been more rapid than it has been for several years past. I trust that the Government will be able to bring down the correspondence, that they will do so at a very early day, and that the House will have an opportunity of considering what has taken place, what the policy has been, how far supervision has been exercised, and whether any objection has been made to that supervision. I think that when we have that correspondence the House will be in a better position to consider the subject, and to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure a more rapid colonization and settlement of the country than have taken place in the years that are past.

Mr. DALY. In reference to the motion that has been made by the hon. gentleman, I only hope that he will not feel greatly disappointed when the returns are brought down; because to my knowledge I do not think that any amount of correspondence exists between the Government and the different railway companies that have received land subsidies from the Government in aid of those railways. I do not know, from my experience in reference to the corporations that have built lines of railways through Manitoba and the North-west Territories, that it would have been necessary for the Government to urge these different companies to place the price of their lands at such a valuation as would admit of a rapid settlement of that country; nor do I think that it is reasonable to suppose that those railway companies, who are, of course, mainly interested in the sale of their lands and the settlement of that country, would place the price of their land at such a figure as would lead to the results which the hon. gentleman has indicated. Now, the average price of lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by the Manitoba and North-western Railway in Manitoba, is from \$2 to \$6 per acre. I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman that the Canadian Pacific Railway has sold a very large quantity of land during the past season in the south-western portion of Manitoba, at figures running from \$2 to \$6 per acre. The Government price of land to-day is \$3 an acre; and the hon. gentleman will understand that if the average value of lands held by those companies is placed at from \$2 to \$6 an acre, according to situation, and according to proximity to market, that valuation is not a high one. That same state of facts exists in the North-west Territories. The lines of railway that have been constructed there, the Regina and Long Lake, as it is commonly called, the Edmonton Branch, run-

ning from Calgary to Edmonton, and the Galt Railway, are selling their lands also at from \$2 to \$6 an acre. These lands are sold upon the most reasonable terms. The terms upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway sells its lands, are in ten annual payments, that is, a payment down, and nine deferred payments, with interest at 6 per cent per annum. The same policy has been adopted by the other lines of railway; and the best evidence that can be given that the people are satisfied with these prices, is the fact that the purchasers, according to the returns I laid upon the Table the other day, with the names and location of purchasers from the Canadian Pacific Railway during the last year, are mainly residents in the province of Manitoba and of the North-west Territories, men who have a good knowledge of the value of lands, and consequently do not think that the prices placed upon them were too high. I hope that some correspondence may be found, and I have no doubt that it will indicate to the hon. gentleman and to the House that so far as the Government is concerned, not only the present Government, but those that have preceded it, have had in view the fact that the railway companies should not conduct their operations entirely with a view to returning a dividend to the shareholders, but that having received these land subsidies from the Government, they should be instrumental in peopling that country. I am glad to be able to state for the information of the hon. gentleman and the House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Manitoba and North-western, and the other companies have made great efforts in connection with immigration. They have agents in Great Britain and in continental Europe, and are supplementing the efforts of the Government in every direction to bring people to that country. I am glad to be able to say that since I have had charge of the department, I have met with a cordial support from the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other corporations who have built railways in that country. They are giving the Government every support in our endeavour to bring immigrants to this country, and I may take this occasion to state now that from the reports we are receiving daily from our agents in Great Britain and in Europe, there is every indication of a large immigration to Canada this year. I may say in conclusion that so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Manitoba and North-western, the Long Lake and Regina, the Calgary and Edmonton, and the Galt system of railways, are concerned, I have found in my correspondence with those gentlemen, and in meeting the officers of those different lines of railways, that they seem to be actuated by one motive, and that is to assist the Government in every way they possibly can to people our western plains.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to inquire, whether the Government have received from the various railway companies

returns of lands sold or settled each year, and whether such returns can be brought down?

Mr. DALY. So far as my knowledge goes, I think it is only compulsory on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make such return. The return from that company I laid on the Table of the House within fifteen days of the opening of Parliament, in accordance with the provisions of the Act. No doubt, I shall be able to obtain the information which the hon. gentleman desires. If the statute requires that other railway companies shall make similar returns, they will be obtained. If the statute does not require such returns to be made, I will endeavour to have returns prepared.

Motion agreed to.

SUGAR DUTIES.

Mr. LANGEЛИER moved :

That it is expedient and to the interest of the great bulk of consumers, to admit free of duty all foreign sugars, whether raw or refined.

He said : I do not expect that this motion, of which I gave notice some time ago, will be carried, in view of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget speech. On that occasion he stated that the only changes proposed to be made by the Government in the duties at the present time were as regard binding twine and coal oil. I desire, however, to avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the Government to an important question. The hon. gentleman stated that he would avail himself of the vacation, in which to study the question of the general effects of the tariff; and there is one article of importation which requires even more attention than coal oil, and that is the article of sugar. Two years ago the Government made a change in the tariff in regard to sugar. It was then stated that the change was to abolish all duties on raw sugar. Every one, however, knows that this is not correct, that the duties have not been abolished on all kinds of sugar, but only on sugar not exceeding No. 14 Dutch standard. Hon. members will remember that at the time I exhibited several samples of sugar, many which were tasted by hon. members—raw sugars produced in Jamaica. They had been sent to me by a friend, who had them from a member of the leading sugar firm in Jamaica, Messrs. Lascelles, DeMarco & Co. Those gentlemen, observing by the newspapers that the Government had introduced resolutions to abolish duties on raw sugars, thought they would introduce their sugars into this country, and they proposed to make large shipments to Canada. When those gentlemen arrived here and exhibited their samples of sugar to the Customs authorities, they were told that they could not be admitted free of duty, and that they would have to pay a duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, which is the duty now levied on the manufactured

article. They at once stated that they could not pay the duty, as the sugar was not refined, but was only manufactured with greater care than sugars produced in the Spanish West Indies. The Customs authorities told them, however, that one sample was No. 16 and another No. 18 Dutch standard, and, under our tariff, the duty has to be levied on all grades over No. 14 Dutch standard. I am told by a gentleman intimately acquainted with the question, that sugar under No. 14 is in such a condition that it cannot be consumed, but must be handled by the refiner. What has been the result? We see the result in the figures given by the Minister of Finance from the Trade and Navigation Returns. Very little sugar was imported last year in a refined state, only 8,500,000 pounds, or not 3 per cent of the whole quantity of sugar imported paid any duty which would go into the public treasury. Practically all the sugar imported has been imported in such a state that it had to pass through the hands of the refiners, and the refiners, of course, increased the price of sugar by the amount of the duty. The effect of the present tariff is to shut out, almost completely, as shown by the official returns, all kinds of sugar which can be consumed as imported, and to compel the consumers of sugars in this country to take all their sugars from the refiners. The result has been that the importations, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, were 345,000,000 pounds last year, that paid a duty of nearly \$3,000,000, which went, not into the public Treasury, but into the hands of the refiners, the handful of refiners we have in this country. The Minister of Finance and his friends on the Government side have, several times, boasted that they have given the people of this country a free breakfast table, because they have abolished the duties on tea and coffee. Sugar, however, is a more important article for the breakfast table than either tea or coffee.

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is a great mistake.

Mr. LANGELIER. I take the figures respecting the quantity of tea imported—I do not refer to coffee, of which a small quantity is imported. A very large quantity of tea was imported last year, and yet the whole value of the tea imports reached only one-third of the value of the sugar imports. The value of the sugar imported was over \$9,000,000, while the value of the tea imported was only \$3,500,000. These figures show that sugar is much more important on the breakfast table of the consumer than either tea or coffee; and if it is so desirable to give to the people, and especially to the labouring classes, a free breakfast table, sugar should be made as free as tea or coffee. Why this is not done can be gathered from the remarks made by me a few moments ago. There is no one interested in maintaining the duties on tea and coffee, but the sugar

Mr. LANGELIER.

refiners, who have great influence with the Government, are interested in maintaining the duties on sugar, because they give them the opportunity of taking \$3,000,000 from the consumers of the country. The consumption of sugar, last year, was 70 pounds per head. The Minister of Finance said that each person in this country consumed, last year, at least 70 pounds, which gives 58 cents tax which each individual pays, not into the public treasury, but to the sugar refiners. I hold, therefore, that, in the revision of the tariff, which is going to take place next year, the Government should not forget to deal with sugar. If they do not think proper to abolish altogether the duty, which they might, perhaps, find difficult, it would be to the advantage of the consumers to impose only the American tariff. I am informed that, under that tariff, the United States admit free all sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard. I hope the Government will find it possible, if not to abolish completely the duty on sugar, at least to place sugars not exceeding No. 16 Dutch standard on the free list.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman who has made this motion has informed the House that the effect of the present duty on raw sugars is to put \$3,000,000 a year into the treasuries of the sugar refiners of Canada. I have to congratulate him upon the great stride he has made in his calculations. In previous years we have heard from the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the amount computed at \$2,000,000, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who is a more reliable authority on the sugar question than the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), placed it at \$600,000 a year. I think it will be a gratification for the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion, and who is so anxious that the consumers of Canada should not pay any excessive price for their sugar, to hear, that the average price of sugar refined in Canada during the past year has been lower than that of the similar article in the United States of America. The hon. gentleman expresses very great anxiety on behalf of the consumers, and he has instituted a comparison between the per capita quantity of sugar used and the quantity of tea used; at least I think that was the hon. gentleman's argument. I need hardly remind him that when his friends were in power, and controlled the public affairs of this Dominion, they did not show any very great anxiety for the consumers of Canada in the matter of the sugar duty, or the duties on tea and coffee, because the hon. gentleman will remember that during the Liberal regime, tea and coffee, which are now free, and raw sugar under No. 14 Dutch standard, which is also free, were then subject to a considerable duty. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to say of his own personal

knowledge that the sugar refiners of Canada made \$3,000,000 during the past year. I assure him that such was not the case. I am interested in a sugar refinery in the city of Halifax, and I can tell him that the result of the year's business for us has been: that we made one and a half per cent on the amount of capital which is invested in that refinery. If I compute that amount on the original cost of that refinery, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the profits for the year did not amount to one per cent. I think he will recognize that that is not an excessive return for the capital invested. As a matter of fact, the institution to which I refer paid a dividend of 6 per cent upon a very reduced capital, but even that amount of money was not all earned during the past year. In order that we may bring this question to a practical test, and in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may have no excuse for reiterating these wild statements to the effect that \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 were made by the Canadian sugar refiners during the past year, I have ascertained from those engaged in the business—I speak of the Halifax refinery—that the average price of granulated sugar refined in Canada sold last year was 4½ cents per pound. Most of the sugar refined by that institution was imported from the Island of Cuba. It tested 96, and it cost 3¼ cents per pound, a difference of ¼ of a cent between the prices of the raw and the refined, of about 75 cents per 100 pounds. In the previous debates which have taken place on the sugar question, hon. gentlemen opposite computed that it cost 60 cents per 100 pounds to change the raw into refined sugar. If to that 60 cents we add the difference in the test between raw, and the granulated sugar, we find it is equal to 12 pounds, we have as the cost of manufacturing, and the difference in the test, an average of 72 cents. If you deduct that from the 75 cents, and then compute the quantities of sugar imported into Canada, hon. gentlemen will see that there was no such sum of money as they have stated made by the sugar refiners of the Dominion. We all recognize that this motion is simply an attack upon the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite in their wildest attacks upon that policy, have seldom contended that the full amount of duty has been paid by the consumers. In this particular instance, the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laugel) has simply said that we have imported so much raw sugar, and that amount, estimated at eight-tenths of a cent per pound, amounts to so much, and that consequently that amount was made by the refiners. The hon. gentleman will, I trust, permit me to tell him that the practical experience of those engaged in the business is entirely different, and in the case of one of these refineries, that in the city of Halifax with which I am connected, I know that no such rate of profit was realized. I

trust, in view of the fact, that he will recognize that he is labouring under some very great mistake. It was contended in previous years, although the hon. gentleman did not raise the contention this year, that the consequence of the difference existing between the Canadian tariff and that of the United States, resulted in the fact that the Canadian consumer would pay more for sugar than the American consumer. He has pointed out to the House that under the American tariff you can import sugars under 16 Dutch standard, and that instead of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, as in Canada, the duty there is five-tenths of a cent per pound. It will be a gratification to the hon. gentleman, and I am sure it will be a gratification to all hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, to know, that their predictions have not been verified, and that instead of the Canadian consumer during the past year paying more for his sugar, as a matter of fact, he has paid less than the American consumer. The average price for granulated sugar in Canada has been about \$4.12½ per 100 pounds, while the average price in the United States for granulated sugar during the past year has been about \$4.42½ per 100 pounds, showing that granulated sugar has been selling lower in Canada than in the United States. The hon. gentleman's contention was that the price of sugar to the consumer was increased by the full amount of duty. I have shown the hon. gentleman from figures which cannot be disproved, that, when he computes the cost of manufacturing, the price of raw sugar, the price at which the granulated has been sold, and the difference in test, and if he will carefully make that calculation, he will realize that no such sum as he stated was made by the Canadian refiners. I think he will recognize that he has been misinformed when he states that the people of Canada have had \$3,000,000 added to the price of their sugar in consequence of the present tariff.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have only one word to say in reply to the hon. gentleman. He stated that the figures I gave do not agree with those given last year by the hon. member for South Oxford, and the hon. member for South Brant. It is quite evident that they could not agree, because the figures of my hon. friends were based upon the consumption of the previous year, whereas mine were based on the consumption of last year, which was nearly double that of the previous year; and that immense increase of consumption shows what a reduction of the tariff on an article of such large consumption as sugar means to the people. Then the hon. gentleman in comparing the price in Canada with the price in the United States, speaks of the average price during the year; but it is possible to prove almost anything by means of averages. That is not the way to show the difference in price. If the price of sugar was lower in the United States than

it was in this country, how can he explain that only such a very small quantity, almost a ridiculous quantity, of refined sugar has been imported into this country from the United States or from any other country?

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me. I said that refined sugar was cheaper in Canada than it was in the United States.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman says that the refiners do not make large profits. Then why does he not agree with me in proposing the abolition of the duty? The treasury gets nothing at all from the duty; the returns from sugar during the past year have been almost nothing; and if the refiners make no profit, why should we retain the duty on sugar at all? That is the best argument in favour of the motion that has been presented to the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are accustomed every session to hear those gentlemen who are interested in the National Policy defend the provisions of the tariff that apply to themselves. The hon. gentleman has on former occasions attempted to justify the duty on sugar. Even before the duty was reduced last year, he sought to make this House and the country believe that the people of Canada were under a lasting obligation to the refiners of this country for supplying them with sugar at such very low prices; but since the duty has been reduced to eight-tenths of a cent a pound they are getting it much cheaper than before. The hon. gentleman fought very vigorously for the continuance of the old duty, but now, after the duty has been reduced, he says the refiners have made no money. Well, they have had all the necessary protection, and if they do not make money there must be a screw loose somewhere. It is not because the people of this country get their sugar at lower prices than they ought to, so that there must be some other reason. According to the figures given by the hon. Finance Minister, 350,000,000 pounds of sugar were consumed in this country last year, and on that quantity the duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound would give the hon. gentleman and those interested with him in the refining business \$2,800,000; and if they have not made that much money, the hon. gentleman would have us believe that it is owing to their magnanimous desire to supply sugar to the consumers at a lower price than the duty would enable them to charge. Now, we would like to have the evidence of that. The hon. gentleman says that the Canadian people get their sugar at a lower price than the Americans. We know that there has been a combine in sugar in the United States; but why has the hon. gentleman said nothing of the price of sugar in England? Why has he not tried to prove that the Canadian refiners were selling sugar to the people more cheaply than they could have imported refined sugar from England? Will he dare to say that? But it suited him to quote

Mr. LANGELIER.

the American price only. We know perfectly well that everywhere along the border the price of sugar is less on the American side than on the Canadian side. We know that it is smuggled into Canada in considerable quantities on that account. We know that in order to give the hon. gentleman and those associated with him in the refining of sugar the entire control of the Canadian market, the Government provided that no sugar above 14 Dutch standard should be admitted into Canada free. Had they admitted sugar up to 16 Dutch standard, the poorer classes of this country would have got their sugar duty free. The hon. Finance Minister said that the Government were giving the country a free breakfast table, but that was not the case. The fact is that the hon. gentleman and those interested with him have been enabled to pocket the amount of the duty. He has tried to show that the price of sugar during the past year has been lower in Canada than in the United States. We do not wish to confine ourselves to the United States in making comparisons. We wish him to compare the price here with the price in a country where sugar is on the basis of free trade; and if the hon. gentleman does that, he will hardly say that without the duty the people could not import sugar as cheaply as it has been sold in Canada. If that is so, I would like him to give evidence to show that the refiners did not get the advantage of the duty. They certainly must have pocketed the duty, because their prices charged are as high as they can extract from the consumers and compete with the imported sugar. Every gentleman in this House connected with the combine is prepared to cry poverty, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who sits to his right, and who is head of the cordage combine, is prepared to state that that combine is not making money, but has been getting poorer instead of richer, and I dare say a great many of the other combines, which have been making money in this country, would be quite ready to make a similar statement.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has found fault with me in striking an average, for the purpose of comparing sugar in Canada with that in the United States. If he will tell me any more accurate way of reaching a conclusion, I shall be very glad to oblige him by making a calculation in that way. I thought the way I took was the fairest and the usual way: that of averaging the price during the year. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in basing his calculation on the increased quantity of sugar consumed during the year, and in stating that the quantity is nearly doubled. The fact is that sugar is so low that the consumption of it very materially increased. As regards the remarks made by the last speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak the second time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman would go to a town in western Canada on the border he would find he could purchase one-third more sugar in the United States for the same amount of money than he can in Canada.

Mr. KENNY. I do not know that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, as my hon. friend opposite has said, the hon. gentleman is quite prepared to deny that he could obtain the same grade cheaper in the United States than in Canada, and, of course, all these gentlemen who are fattening on the public are prepared, on the shortest notice, to declare that we can get it just as cheap here. Then why not double the duties and get it for nothing? That is the proper way to deal with this question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an extreme view.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is an extremely logical deduction from the statement of the hon. gentleman. We know that these combinesters cannot always exact the uttermost pound of flesh. We know that they are prepared on all occasions to get the whole of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, which a generous Government gives them for the purpose of keeping their various refineries in profitable operation. But just so long as the various duties exist, just so long will these gentlemen make use of their opportunities, as far as they dare. It is not always prudent or practicable for them to take the entire amount out of the duty, which the Government, misusing its power as trustees of the people, practically steals from the pockets of the general public for the purpose of pensioning these particular members of the Red Parlour. It is perfectly well known to all who have paid attention to the subject that in this washing of sugar an extremely small number of hands are employed. Turning to our own census returns, I find that on an imaginary manufactured product of about \$10,000,000 worth, which, I think, is the sum put down as manufactured goods by the refiners, the total number of hands employed was 723 in order to manufacture the quantity of sugar we consume. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly correct in saying that, if you strike an average, it will not turn out that the entire amount has been exacted; but is none the less correct, as my hon. friend has stated, that if the circumstances of the market favour them, the Government of Canada has put it in the power of the refiners to exact eight-tenths of a cent per pound on the whole 334,000,000 pounds which they refine. Circumstances may prevent them from getting the whole of those \$3,000,000, and that is the reason why, the other evening, in discussing this question, I put the amount, not at \$3,000,000, as I might justly have done, but at \$2,000,000, which, I think, is about the tax inflicted on the people of Canada at this moment through the instrumentality of the present tariff. The fact of the matter is, I do not care what the

price may be in the United States; but I know that there are men in Canada who would be prepared, if they had perfect freedom of trade, to lay down sugar, of quite as good quality as that which the refiners furnish us with, for at least half a cent, probably six-tenths of a cent per pound cheaper than the price at which it is now sold in Canada, and if you want to get a true measure of the amount taken out of the pockets of the people, you will find that it is perhaps not quite \$3,000,000, but about \$2,000,000 per annum. Our trade returns show that we have received about \$80,000 of revenue from sugar compared with \$2,000,000 divided between my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and Mr. Senator Drummond, the chairman of the Conservative Association for the propagation of true doctrines in the province of Quebec, and more especially in the district of Montreal. We know perfectly well what is the reason this is allowed to continue.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing: 1. What is the total sum spent by the Government since Confederation in each province of the Dominion on the public works, classified as (1) harbours, piers and breakwaters, (2) improvements of rivers, and (3) dredging and dredges. 2e How much of the sum so spent in the province of Quebec was expended on works within the Harbour of Montreal. 3. (1) How much money the Government has loaned to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec towards the construction of the new harbour works in that city; and (2) what amount of interest, derived from the revenue of the said works, have the Harbour Commissioners paid to the Government in respect of the interest due on the said loans; and (3) how many years' interest, if any, are in arrears. 4. (1) How much money the Government has lent to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal towards the construction of harbour works in that city; and (2) how much interest is due thereon.—(Mr. Lévesque.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers or Orders in Council relating to the superannuation or retirement of Mr. Trudeau, late Deputy of the Minister of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Copies of all documents, correspondence and Orders in Council existing in the Departments of Railways and Canals and Justice, in relation to the claim of Hormisdas Martial for compensation for damages resulting from serious injuries incurred by him while working for the Government at the repairing of the Chambly Canal at St. John's, in 1886; also copies of the enquête had at Montreal before Judge Burbidge, and of his judgment dismissing the petition of right on the ground of prescription.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of all accounts, letters, receipts and other documents in relation to the claim of Charles I. Labrie, of Lévis, for professional service in connection with expropriation, during the construction of the St. Charles Branch.—(Mr. Frémont.)

Copies of all correspondence, between any of the Judges of the Supreme Court, or the Provincial Superior Courts and the Department of Justice, concerning the Criminal Code, previous and subsequent to the passage of the same.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Correspondence, petitions and papers that are in the possession of the Government relating to the disallowance of Chapter 1 of the Acts of Nova Scotia dated 1892, "An Act to amend and consolidate the

Acts relating to Mines and Minerals," including any petition of David McKeen, Esq., M.P., and others, in respect of the said Act.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of petitions from County Councils and other municipal corporations asking that railways under Dominion control be compelled to build culverts on natural watercourses crossing their lines, and correspondence relating thereto.—(Mr. Casey.)

Correspondence and reports in reference to alleged irregularities occurring in the post office at Kempville from the 1st January, 1890, to date.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence and petitions asking for a change in the post office at St. Sebastien, in the county of Beauce; and of the report of the Post Office Inspector in relation thereto.—(Mr. Godbout.)

Statement showing all payments made for the deepening of the River du Loup; the persons to whom such payments were made; the prices paid in each case for the several works; the amounts received by each person.—(Mr. Guay.)

Copies of all letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Government or any member thereof and the late English Financial Agents of Canada in London and the Bank of Montreal in reference to the recent change of agency at London.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence, inspectors' reports, petitions and papers respecting the establishment of a new post office at Rougemont, or respecting the location of the post office at that place.—(Mr. Borden.)

Copies of all reports, documents, maps, manuscripts and correspondence in relation to exploring expeditions heretofore made to James' Bay and Hudson Bay.—(Mr. Joncas.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Quebec Board of Trade, respecting the appointment of a fishery officer in the place of Mr. W. H. Whitely, for the Bonne Espérance Division, from Checatca to Blancs Sablons.—(Mr. Joncas.)

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 56) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Cameron, for Mr. McInerey.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Bill (No. 67) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steam-ship Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion, for Mr. Frémont.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the motions were called to-day, I was engaged, and overlooked, for the moment, to make the motion respecting the Order in Council in regard to the Manitoba question which I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

promised to lay on the Table, but, with the consent of the House, I would move:

That the copy of a report of a special minute of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor-General in Council on the 22nd February last, be printed, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise electors who have taken bribes.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WELDON. It is suggested that to change this section to make the sixty days run from the election, rather than from the publication in the "Canada Gazette" of the receipt by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the return of the writ, would be bringing the section more into conformity with the Controverted Elections Act. Therefore, I would ask that the clause read as follows:—"Whenever, within sixty days after the date on which an election is held," and so on; and also that the word "voter" be substituted for "elector" in all the subsections.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this clause will give rise to a great many inquiries. After an election, rumours are always floating about, and one tells another that bribery has prevailed, that such and such a thing has taken place, and on the strength of those reports, a man may file a petition, honestly believing it to be correct. I believe he ought to file some kind of a declaration when a protest is entered, because we find that many turn out to be erroneous after the court has examined them.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think, in a matter of this importance, where the existing machinery is so widely departed from, and new machinery is adopted, and where the House is asked, and, in fact, to some extent, has adopted a principle at variance with that which now exists, the House should have some intimation from the Government how far this Bill meets with their approval. It is not a matter of minor importance, like the amendment to a private Bill; it is an amendment of one of the most important Bills on the Statute-book. I question whether it is entirely desirable that such a Bill, although introduced by a private member, should be entirely left to his guidance; and I think the House ought to know how far the Government are disposed to facilitate the Bill, and approve of its principle. For my own part, I must say that I am not in thorough accord with the principle of the Bill, but I do not know that this is the proper time to discuss it. The Bill was read a second time very hastily, and at that time I think the majority of the House imagined that we would have heard some expression

of opinion from the leader of the Government as to the principle involved in the Bill. We propose here to punish those who receive bribes, whereas we do not take any cognizance of, or propose to punish, those who are, by a long odds, the more guilty, those who are administering the bribes. In an ordinary constituency there will be found a number of very poor men, men who are subjected to temptation by their richer neighbours, and who, sometimes, no doubt, weaken and succumb to the temptations which their richer neighbours place before them. My humble judgment is, that the man who is most to blame is the man who lines his pockets with five, ten, twenty, or thirty thousand dollars, and goes in for the purpose of debauching a constituency; and the poor, unfortunate man, who, in the excitement of the moment, is seduced into accepting a five dollar note, is not one-half as guilty as the scoundrel, who, for the purpose of debauching a constituency, takes in a large amount of money and bribes the electors. The House is concerned at the present time in passing a very severe measure to punish the poor fellow who accepts a small bribe, while it is ignoring absolutely its duty to punish the man who offers the bribe. It has seemed to me, in the little time I have had to give to the consideration of the Bill and the existing law, that if the existing law is defective—and I think, owing to the decisions of some of the judges, it is defective—our duty would rather lie in the direction of strengthening the existing law, than in introducing a new and novel procedure. For instance, supposing a petition is filed after an election against the return of a candidate, and some hundred or more cases of bribery and corruption are given as particulars. If the defendant goes into court and coolly acknowledges, or if his counsel acknowledges, that he has lately discovered that one man whom he has to acknowledge under the law as an agent, has unwittingly been a party to what is in strict law a breach of the election law, the election is at once voided, and the judge at once stays his hand and refuses to go into the other charges. He says: It has been confessed that a breach of the law has taken place, a breach of the law which, according to a strict legal construction, voids the election, and, therefore, I will stay my hand and receive no more evidence. That has been the decision in a celebrated Ontario case, and has been followed in a great many others by most of the judges, I think, throughout the Dominion. Now, it has always seemed to me that that decision struck at the very root and object of the Controverted Elections Act. The Controverted Elections Act not only provided for an investigation into the cases of bribery which were put in issue by being placed in the particulars, and into the examination of those cases, in as far as a breach of the law voided the particular election complained of; but the law went on to declare that the judges should

go on and ascertain whether there was a general system of bribery in the constituency, and report to Parliament. But this object is practically avoided by the judge who decides that when one case of corruption is proven, the election is annulled. It appears to me that the law is defective, and ought to be amended in this respect, that even if one case is proven which voids the election, the judge should go on and hear all the cases in which evidence can be given, so that it may be ascertained whether there has been a general system of bribery and corruption. I am speaking now entirely for myself. I have not communicated with my friends, nor do I know how far they are in unison with me. But speaking entirely for myself, I say that this Bill does not meet with my approval at all, because it strikes a blow at the man who, of all others, is the more innocent, and allows the more guilty to escape. I cannot divest myself of the idea which is prevalent in this country, whether based upon the truth or not, that at every election there are a large number of men who deliberately go into a constituency with a large amount of money and debauch that constituency. To say that these men should go scot free, while the poor devil who receives a dollar is to be hounded down and punished, singled out as if he was the only culprit, does not appear to me to be legislating exactly upon those lines of justice and fair-play which should control the legislation of this Parliament. I submit these views to the House, and I think it is right to ask that before we go further with the Bill the committee should hear from the leader of the Government how far the principle of the Bill meets with the approval of the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. Minister who introduced the Bill explained it in a way that I thought was very forcible, and as the views he put forward on the second reading were not in any way challenged, there was no further discussion, and I did not consider it necessary on the part of the Government to express any view respecting it. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), however, desires to know what my opinion is, I beg to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am entirely in sympathy with the hon. gentleman's Bill, and approve of its principle. I think the principle is a sound one, and it seems to me what the hon. member for Queen's has said merely amounts to this after all, that there may be another offence in connection with elections not embraced in this Bill. That may be an excellent reason why we should seek further amendments to our election law, but I think this Bill takes up one very prominent vice connected with elections, and undertakes to deal with it, in an entirely new way. It is true, and it remains to be seen whether the Bill, when passed, will be anything more than an experiment or not. But I agree with the introducer of the Bill that the ex-

periment is well worth trying. I do not agree with the view presented by the hon. member for Queen's about the more prominent vice being that of the person who offers bribes. From any experience I have had in observing election petitions, I am inclined to be led to the conclusion that there are not many cases in which persons go into counties with large sums of money and offer bribes to electors, but that the case is very common of large numbers of persons in a constituency standing off and in the most bold manner demanding that they shall be bribed before they take any part in the election. There are constituencies in which, it is said, that year after year there are districts which, during election periods, are put down by candidates on both sides, as requiring so much money in order to get the vote of the people out, and that whole classes of persons like those, sometimes whole communities, require to be dealt with in a very drastic way. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill explained to the committee that our present procedure fails to meet cases of this kind. When an election case breaks down, either from the circumstance which the hon. member for Queen's has just mentioned, of a single case of bribery having been proved and the trial therefore coming abruptly to a conclusion, or when the actual condition of the constituency fails for any other reason to be brought to the notice of the judge, there is practically no procedure by which an inquiry could be prosecuted, and if there were no petition at all, there would be no opportunity for an inquiry. What the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) proposes is that there shall be a procedure by which twenty persons can come forward voluntarily at their own expense and risk and undertake to institute an inquiry into corrupt practices which have prevailed at the election, notwithstanding the candidates themselves and their friends, it may be, do not think it worth while to present a petition for the purpose of preventing the return. My hon. friend thinks that under these circumstances an effort would frequently be made to purge the constituency, as he expresses it, and put down that which is a crime against the rights and privileges of Parliament, as well as the representative rights of the people themselves, and it seems to me he should be aided in doing that. The Bill aims at carrying out that object and endeavouring to accomplish that result, even though there should be other results that should be aimed at also.

Mr. LANGELIER. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, that it is very undesirable to punish the poor man who receives a bribe and not punish the rich man who bribes him. Both these results should be secured. Every one is aware, who has an experience at elections, that a great deal of bribery takes place that is not reached by

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

election petitions. The rules for the trial of election cases are very strictly followed, by the judges of our province, and in consequence it is sometimes difficult to reach the real truth in connection with bribery. When elections are protested there are some times one hundred cases which do not appear to have much foundation for them, and they cannot be pressed unless they are entered in the particulars. I do not know the practice in other provinces, but Quebec judges are very strict in confining the parties to the particulars. Very often the parties do not know exactly whether this man or that man has been guilty of bribery, and the truth is elicited only in the course of the investigation, or at all events it is only possible then to fix the charge on a certain party. These charges must be contained in the particulars. After a certain time, however, amendments to particulars are not allowed. I remember very well a case in which, after the trial had proceeded one or two days, amendments of particulars was refused, even although a most gross act of bribery could be proved. The case was connected with the county of Kamouraska, and after two days a gross case of bribery came to light. The parties had been screened, and the case was not brought forward because it might implicate some of the parties. I remember the particulars of the case very well, because I acted for the defendant. When the case was opened out completely, the parties came forward and filed affidavits stating that a gross case of bribery had been committed during the election. The judge would, however, not allow the particulars to be amended; I am not saying the judge was wrong, for he was only following the practice of that province. The judge decided that the application came too late, that the parties knew the facts long before the trial took place; and in fact it was well known that they did not want the facts to come to light until the last possible moment, and so a gross briber was left unpunished, and could not be reached by the trial. Machinery such as is proposed in the present Bill would prove very effective in certain places with which I am acquainted. I know of a parish in the neighbourhood of Quebec, where it is publicly stated that there is only one elector who does not offer to sell his vote. He is well known, and he is known as the man who does not sell himself at the election. If we could reach the people in such a parish—and there are very few parishes of that kind in Quebec—great good would be done. I could name the parish, for it is well known throughout the district of Quebec. We should punish under this law not only parties who bribe, but parties who offer themselves to be bribed. That is the greatest pest at elections—people coming to election agents and offering to be bribed, on the plea that travelling expenses or other expenditure are required. I think the mere asking of money

should be punished as an act of bribery. In committee the Bill might be further amended so as to still more effectually prevent bribery at elections.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think we are called upon to discriminate between the wrong-doing of the briber or bribee. This is a Bill to deal with one class of offence, and if there is another class, it can also be dealt with. At present we are dealing with the question as to how to administer a great public trust. The franchise is a trust, and if the electors do not guard it, they should not continue to enjoy it. This measure is in order to get discovery in the first place, and the law at present is radically defective in that regard. The only machinery by which discovery may be secured now is cumbersome, and practically a dead letter. Whether this may be the best measure we can have or not I cannot say at present, but I approve of the spirit of it, as I approve of any measure that has for its object purifying the electorate and guarding the interests of the people. I have not studied the Bill, and I feel free to offer amendments in committee on it. I believe the time has arrived when the electors who do not guard this trust, ought to be taught that the franchise is the gift of free men, so long as they make a proper use of it, but that, so soon as they abuse it, it becomes a danger to the state, and they should not have the benefit of it.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I have already given my opinion on a Bill not altogether similar to this one, but referring, however, to amendments to the Electoral Act, which Bill was not read a second time. I think that Bill was still better than the one under consideration. The present Bill aims at giving electors power to ask for an inquiry, at fishing for cases of bribery any one of them might suppose to exist. It would entail a large expenditure, an expenditure of two or three thousand dollars in some cases. The Bill states that twenty-five electors or more, should they have any reason to believe that bribery prevailed, might ask for an inquiry. And what reasons will they have to believe that bribery prevailed? They will always have some, particularly if they are twenty-five followers of the defeated candidate. They will always have reason to believe their candidate was only defeated owing to bribery cases. Well, the commissioner will have to go on the spot—he will be compelled to go—and there give notices; he will summon a certain number of witnesses. How many will he summon? Twenty-five, thirty or five hundred? Now, who is going to pay all these costs? Is it the candidate, or the member against whom this inquiry is held. They would be ruined right off. Since I have been here two amendments to the Electoral Act were brought up; the object of these amendments is good, I confess—it is to prevent bribery.

Of course, the hon. gentlemen will never say they are the parties who give bribes; it is always the fault of the electors. Well, in my opinion, the electors are less guilty than we are. That must be admitted. It must be admitted that if some of them take bribes, it is because we offer them advantages.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) It is no pleasure for all that.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) And we go further. We say to them—to those especially whom you cannot rely upon: "Do not trouble yourselves; keep at home; they will come and fetch you in a carriage; there will be supplies." I repeat that here, because that is what happens, and it is, perhaps, the best way to carry elections. If we punish the electors only, we are wrong. Let both be punished, the elector and the candidate. I stated already, and I state once more, that bribery is effected through canvassing from door to door. In public meetings bribery is impossible. The canvassing is done by the candidate himself or his agents. They go in a house, and we know what happens then. Well, in my judgment, a simple amendment to the Electoral Act stating in substance: "Any candidate who, either personally, or by his agents, will canvass or try to canvass the electors, will be guilty of a bribery case sufficient to have the election annulled," would be the best means to cause bribery to disappear. The candidate would not canvass personally nor allow canvassing to be done. For, when a man allows himself to be put in nomination, it is with the hope of carrying the election and avoiding a contestation. Coming back to the Bill now before us, I say that either in its whole, or taken section by section, it is infeasible. I am, perhaps, going a little far, but it seems to me it is contrary to the principles of the English law to have a commission appointed to fish for evidence, in order to find out guilty parties. It is something extraordinary, that will be found in no English statute. I will not further extend my remarks, for the Bill was well discussed; but I beg, Mr. Chairman, to move that the Committee rise.

Motion agreed to (Yeas, 33; Nays, 30), and Committee rose.

DUTY ON BINDER TWINE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock:

That it is expedient to place binding twine on the free list.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend now to speak at any length upon this matter, for it has been fully threshed out both on the motion itself and in the debate on the Budget. But, since the original motion was made, some circumstances have happened which somewhat change the aspect of the proposition. For example, the

Government have since reduced the duty on binder twine from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent, and that is a concession so far as it goes. Since this motion was introduced, a Mr. Morris, connected with the Consumers' Cordage Company, has been good enough to give his views to the country, and he gives now as the only reason why twine should not be placed on the free list: That the American farmers' harvest, terminating before the Canadian harvest, Canada would be a slaughter market for the surplus stock of the United States. I turned up the evidence given by Mr. Morris before a committee of this House in 1888, and I find that when he was examined in the month of May in that year, he stated that he had been a member of a combine for the manufacture of cordage in Canada; he manufactured about one-third of the whole output for the year; and in answer to a question, he stated that at that time, namely, in the month of May, he had sold the whole of his output for the year. Therefore, according to the custom of the trade, in 1888 at least one-third of the product of the Canadian mills was sold by the manufacturers early in the year. It would seem, therefore, that, when he gave his evidence here, it was not the custom of the consumers of binding twine to postpone obtaining their supplies until after the American harvest. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are good reasons why this motion should be adopted. You will remember, Sir, that it was established by incontrovertible evidence, under the hand of the Cordage Company itself, that it was the second largest manufactory of its kind in the world, that it had practically unlimited capital and was not in need of protection in Canada. There has not been a single argument advanced why this company is in need of protection now. It has all the capital that it can require; it has the ramifications of its business well established; it is established in the midst of the consumers; and no one has yet stated that it cannot manufacture binding twine as cheaply as the same article is manufactured elsewhere. Therefore, not a single argument has been advanced in favour of the maintenance of the protection of the binding twine except this one, that our market, being a week or two later than the American market, stands a chance of being made a slaughter market for the American output. If that is the worst that can happen, I ask how is the Canadian farmer going to be prejudiced by getting his binding twine cheaper than the Canadian manufacturer can turn it out? The bugbear put before us is that the Canadian farmer may get his binding twine cheaper than the American farmer. Now, when the manufacturers in Canada, having succeeded in inducing the Government to give them a high protection, abuse their advantage and combine against the people, I hold that they have no longer any claim upon Parliament for protection, and that that protection should

Mr. MULLOCK.

be wiped out. The wiping out of the duty should act as a deterrent against the formation of such combinations. You cannot conceive of a company having more disinterested itself to consideration at the hands of Parliament than the company that now pleads with us for protection. I think all will agree with me that when industries combine in our midst to take advantage of an artificial state of trade, caused by a protective tariff, and unite, not for the common good, but in order to obtain illegitimate gains from the people, that protection should be withdrawn, for two reasons. It should be withdrawn as a matter of right; it should be withdrawn because it is due to the people that they should not be at the mercy of an unjust combination; it should be withdrawn also as a deterrent to evil-doers—to others inclined to do the same. Now, Sir, we have had it on incontrovertible evidence that the Canadian combine has acted in the way I have mentioned; and if you stop at a half measure, giving it still some reward, you are, in fact, offering a premium for the repetition of such works. Now, what has this company caused to be done? It has extracted for some years more than it ought from the farmers of Canada, and it has compelled the farmers of Canada to unite for self-protection—to collect a large capital and establish a factory in Brantford. A short time ago a deputation from the Patrons of Industry waited on the Government; I was present, and we had it on the evidence of some of the officers of that association that some persons intimately connected with the organization had invested something like \$100,000 in plant and buildings in order to manufacture binding twine to enable the farmers thereby to escape from the bondage of the Consumers Cordage Company. This monopoly has also compelled the Government of Ontario to expend a considerable amount of public money in the purchase of plant to manufacture this article, and in like manner we have had it announced by the First Minister that the Government of Canada have been obliged to take steps in a similar direction. We have had this combination taking possession of a large number of independent industries that were in full healthy existence in Canada. It first leased them, then bought them up, and closed up some of them; it runs a few others; and it having thus brought the consumers within its grasp and paralyzed the trade, a large amount of public money is necessarily expended in the endeavour to escape from the monopoly. That being the case, the Parliament of Canada cannot, on the present occasion, administer a more wholesome rebuke to all persons and combinations inclined to conspire in this way against the public good than by withdrawing the protection which is artificially thrown around this industry. Regardless altogether of the question of protection and free trade, I think every person must

concede this one proposition, that when a number of people in the same trade combine against the public good, they have declared war against the people, and it is the duty of the people to protect themselves and, if possible, to render that combination inoperative for the future. This particular combination, having, as it were, put itself outside the pale of parliamentary protection, is now, I think, entitled to be left to conduct its industry as best it may, and I trust that it will be able, as I believe it is, to conduct it profitably still. The House is also bound to teach others that there is but one way in which they can hope to continue to enjoy such protection as Parliament gives, that is, not to abuse that protection. For these reasons, I hope, the House will see its way to adopt the motion which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. LISTER. I know no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the farmers of Canada should be taxed more than the farmers of the United States upon binding twine they require to use for the purpose of harvesting their crops. Coming, as I do, from the frontier, I have perhaps a better opportunity than most hon. gentlemen in this House of comparing the existing prices on the two sides of the line; and I can state that in the city of Port Huron, within three-quarters of a mile of the town of Sarnia, binding twine of the best quality is selling at 8 cents a pound, while in the town of Sarnia the very same quality is sold at 10 cents a pound, or a difference of 24 per cent, or 1 per cent less than the protection afforded by the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, there can be no real reason for continuing any duty upon binding twine. We know perfectly well that only a few months ago the concerns engaged in this business in Canada were owned by an American syndicate or combination. It is a matter of actual knowledge that an American concern, which was carrying on that business in Canada, undersold the Canadian institutions, and the result was that a cordage company of the United States succeeded in acquiring all the cordage factories in the Dominion. Those gentlemen thus acquired the power of limiting the production, and, by so doing, they were enabled to take full advantage of the tariff. The result of all this was that a few gentlemen in Halifax have become, within the last few years, very wealthy indeed. Commencing with a very small business, they enlarged the factories from year to year, and succeeded in amassing great wealth. How has that been done? It has been done by the Act of this Legislature, which says, in effect, that the farmers of this country shall pay into the pockets of this combine 24 cents upon every dollar's worth of twine which they buy. Why should the farmers of this country pay more for their binder twine than the farmers of the United States? It cannot be asserted that this industry requires any tariff protection, when it is borne in mind that the

binder twine manufacturers here can purchase the raw material as cheaply as can the American manufacturers. It cannot be gainsaid that the manufacturers of this country can procure machinery equally as good as those of the factories in the United States, and it will not be said that they cannot procure as skilful workmen as any to be had in the United States. Then, so far as this manufacturing interest is concerned, the manufacturers on both sides of the line are upon terms of perfect equality, and in a position to compete with each other on equal terms, so that our factories ought to be able to furnish twine as cheaply as those of the United States. Why should this particular industry be bolstered and nursed by a protective policy? We know that the manufacture of twine is the smallest portion of its business. We know that the manufacture of cordage is its principal business, and the manufacture of binder twine only an incident of it. We know that the Government of this country, feeling that this tax is a burden upon the people, feeling, no doubt, that these manufacturers were extracting from the people greater profits than they had a right to exact, felt it to be their duty to reduce that tax by convict labour, and the nominal reason given was that it required employment for our convicts. But I venture to assert that the real reason was to allay, if possible, the discontent pervading the farming community of Canada. They held out to the people that, at all events, this particular factory in the penitentiary would be able to reduce the price of this commodity, through the competition thus created against our protected manufacturers. That, to a certain extent, was done also by the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, and we find, as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) told us, that, in order to protect themselves against the exorbitant demand of the binding twine manufacturers, a number of farmers subscribed \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting a factory in Brantford. We know that they built that factory. We know that they are turning out binder twine, and we know that those farmers have told the Government and the country at large that they want no protection, but are able to compete with any factory on the continent. That being the case, why should the Government continue to keep on this article a tariff which is so offensive to the great majority of the people of this country. We find that the farmers of the lower provinces get their twine for nothing. Their twine is free, and the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton told us the other night that almost everything the fishermen of Cape Breton require to use is free, but, while boasting of that, he refused to accord to other portions of the Dominion privileges which that particular section of his enjoys. But this binder twine industry is not really the worst of the industries bred by the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, if one thing can be

worse and more inexcusable than any other, it is the duty the Government have placed upon the wall-paper used by the farmers of this country. When I tell you, Sir, that wall-paper can be purchased in Buffalo for $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents a roll, and that the duty on that is $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents a roll, you will understand how iniquitous is the tariff. 130 per cent is charged on the wall-paper used by the great majority of the people; but, as you go up to the finer qualities, the duty is reduced to an ad valorem of 35 per cent. So that while the labouring classes, while the toilers of this country have to pay 130 per cent on their wall-paper, the richer classes are only required to pay 35 per cent on the quality they use. Go through the tariff as you will, and you meet the same unjust discrimination against the poor in favour of the rich. Take the item of nails. In the United States the quality of nails used by the farmers generally, namely, wire nails, can be purchased for \$1.50 per keg, and the duty upon this is $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, so that the duty is equal to the cost of the nails. I may tell you, Sir, that in Port Huron these nails are sold readily at \$1.50 per keg of 100 pounds, while in Sarnia they are sold at \$2.90 or 10 cents under the tariff fixed by those hon. gentlemen. Go through the whole tariff if you will, and you will find that it bears with great hardness upon the labouring classes, while it bears with great lightness on the richer classes. That portion of the community best fitted to bear taxation is let off easily, while the class least fitted to bear it is most heavily taxed. There can be no excuse for refusing to take the duty off binder twine. Four-fifths of the people of this country demand that it be taken off. Petitions have poured into this House signed by thousands and thousands of farmers who beg and pray that this Parliament, in its power and might, shall relieve them of this tax amongst others indicated in those petitions. We will not be responsive to the voice of the people unless we yield to their reasonable demand, which I think is one of the most reasonable that has ever been made to this House.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. You would naturally think that, after the vote of last night, which gave hon. gentlemen opposite such a black eye, they would not venture to bring up this trade question again, at least this session. As a farmer, I should be wanting in that true manhood that characterizes the farmers of this country did I not raise my voice on this question. Perhaps these gentlemen who criticise this duty never sat on a binder for five minutes; many of them perhaps never saw a binder except from looking through the windows of a parlour car or from the hurricane deck of a fine steamer; and when they get up here and discuss the question of binder twine, a question that interests the farmer and the farmer alone, it shows me that they are not looking after the interests of the

Mr. LISTER.

farmer; but they are looking after their own political interests, and, Mr. Speaker, until they can prove that the American farmer pays less for his twine than the Canadian farmer does, they have no case, and I say now, and I defy contradiction, that they have not and they cannot prove on the floor of this House or outside that the Canadian farmer pays more for his binder twine than the American farmer does. I set forth this matter before the House last year, and the statements I then made have never been contradicted. For ten years the American farmer, compared with the Canadian farmer has paid $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent more for his binding twine. Consequently, I say, and I say squarely and above board, that in this respect the Canadian farmer has no grievance. I can prove now, and I defy contradiction, that the Canadian farmer last year got his twine at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound cheaper and of better quality. I want to know what case these gentlemen can make out of this turmoil. For my part, as a farmer using the twine, I cannot understand why they should create this turmoil. I am sure my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) talked binder twine in my riding, and we gave him such a black eye that I should have thought he would never mention it again. I think the Government, of which I am proud to be a follower, has shown its good nature by yielding and taking one-half of the policy of the Opposition. In my riding the Goliaths of the party of gentlemen opposite were present to carry on the war against me, and they discussed this question in every part of the riding; and binder twine increased my majority. Now, the hon. members of this Government have been blessed with a little of the milk of human kindness, and they have met them half way, and so they have left them only half a ball of binder twine to harp upon. If the old Baldwin Reformers of this country could revisit the earth and look upon the shattered fragments of their policy there would be such a shaking of dry bones as has not been heard of since the days of Joshua. The doctor smiles. I am glad I have pleased him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very easily pleased.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this binder twine question, that, so far as I am concerned I am tired of it. As a farmer I am sorry the Government touched it at all. I have a better opinion of the farmers of this country than to think they are going to be biassed by a few pounds of binder twine. I know the farmers of this country, and I know the advantages they receive from the National Policy. I know that the farmers of this country are not narrow-minded. The farmers of this country know that they are protected on beef, flour, pork and corn, to five times the value—aye, twenty times the value—of the binder twine, and I think I can speak with confidence that the farmers of this country do not thank the

Government for this change. As a farmer, I am ready to stand alone rather than break into the National Policy. I am a National Policy man, you all know it. I will stand or fall by the National Policy. I know that it means the national existence of our country. I have said that before in this House; so far as I am concerned, I would never touch it; still I am pleased that our Government has yielded to the wishes of the few, because I think it is the few, for I know the people in my riding are not satisfied with the change; but they have met the few half way, and I say: Well done for the Government. I said last year that if it was the last vote I was ever to give I would support this Government; and I may say so with all the greatest emphasis after having heard the remarks of gentlemen opposite. The last time I addressed the House and went into this binder twine question, and as the National Policy has been assailed, I think, perhaps, I had better refer to that address. I made a speech that was full of facts, which no man has dared to attempt to confute, which no man can confute. I have the figures and I can give them under oath, if necessary. However, after I took my seat the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) took me to task, and I think I had better at once set the hon. gentleman's troubled mind at rest. He said I came to the House as a supporter of Sir John Macdonald, and that, for his part, he was not bound to any party. I will only ask the members of this House to judge of the hon. gentleman's actions, and I think they will easily come to the conclusion as to which side of this House he belongs. Now, I think it was very unkind of the hon. gentleman to come up to my riding to canvass against his brother farmer. I think, if he is a true farmer, he ought to come up and help his farmer friend. I recollect the first time I ever saw the hon. gentleman there. There had been a few \$10 American bills found in our town previous to the election, and I was on my way up street—stories have been the rule in this debate, and I may tell this, it is a true story—I was on my way up street, hunting for a detective, after I had heard about these American bills. I saw the hon. gentleman amongst a crowd of the faithful on the sidewalk, and being on the lookout for new comers—they were numerous at that time—I did not hurry by. The hon. gentleman said: "What's that luikin' at me?" and they told him, "That's the Tory candidate," and the hon. gentleman said: "Where is the meeting? lets us get at him," but some of his friends said to him: "You had better have tea before you tackle him; he is an old-timer." They had tea and went up to the meeting. The hon. gentleman talked National Policy, horses and cattle, sheep and lambs, woollens and flax, tweeds and blankets, and he gied this Government an awfu' go'n' over. And after all the scandal he could heap upon the Conservative party, the National Policy, represented by your humble servant, still

lives. Now, with regard to the remark that the hon. gentleman made about me, I wish to set myself right before this House. If ever there was an honour conferred upon me in this House, it was in the statement that I came here as supporter of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. I am proud that I was a follower of that grand old chief, Canada's greatest son. There was another Sir John who came next, and I am proud to say that I followed him while he stood on the same principles as the old chief did. Now, we have another Sir John, who is called Sir John the Third, and while he follows up the National Policy and the national dignity of this country, and the national dignity of this House, he is going to have my undivided support. Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of binder twine, I propose to prove conclusively that the Canadian farmer gets his binder twine cheaper than the American farmer; consequently the Opposition have no grounds for making all this turmoil throughout the country. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) said it was cheaper in the United States than it was in Canada. Will you bear with me while I read some letters from manufacturers in the United States, and other manufacturers in Canada by which I will prove conclusively that the Canadian farmer buys his twine cheaper than the American farmer? Sir, it has been my duty, as a public man, having been assailed as a farmer, and having fought an election upon this question—it became my duty to give this matter a study, for I am in dead earnest about this thing. I do not believe the farmers of Canada are so foolish as to throw away their national existence for a ball of binder twine, or ten balls of binder twine. I will first read what the farmers of my county think about this question:

LINDSAY, January 16th, 1892.

At a meeting of the Ops Liberal Conservative Association held last Saturday, the following motion was carried unanimously:—

This man, Johnson Ellis, is one of the best men we have in our county. He can poll more votes than any other man in our county. He is very popular, is as good a farmer as we have, has been a member of the council for many years, and could be reeve if he wished to run.—

Moved by Johnston Ellis, Esq., seconded by George Smith, Esq., that this meeting heartily endorse and approve of the course pursued by Mr. Fairbairn during his term in Parliament, and as farmers and farmers of the township of Ops (over 150 present) we approve of his vote and speech in the House of Commons, on the binder-twine question, and for the loyal and undivided support which he has given the National Policy during the last session of Parliament, he is deserving of the support of all the farmers in South Victoria, in returning him to Parliament, and that this meeting pledge Mr. Fairbairn to use every lawful means to secure his election in the coming campaign, —carried unanimously.

(Sgd.) JAMES McLEAN,
Chairman.

That is what our farmers said about it. I can give you hundreds of testimonials from our county in the same direction. Now, I will go on and read correspondence that I have received from different points in the United States and in Canada.

LA FAYETTE, Ind., Jan., 26th, 1893.

Replying to your letter of the 27th instant, addressed to Mr. Todd, asking for ruling retail prices on binder twine for the season of 1892, will say that we have sold white sisal for 10 cents, standard for 11 cents, and 600 feet manilla for 12½ cents.

These prices are subject to slight fluctuation in favour of spot cash customers.

Yours truly,
JAMIESON BROS.

CEDAR RAPIDS, Ia., Jan. 28th, 1893.

Yours of the 27th received, in regard to the price of twine to the consumer by the retail dealer, that is something that is very hard to get at as there is such a variation of prices, as those that bought early in the fall of course got a very low price on twine and those who bought later in the season paid more. As usual among the retail dealers, those that bought at a low price, thought they had a snap on it and in many instances cut the prices in order to hurt their competitors. We think as near as we can give the ruling price on twine was: sisal, 10 cents, standard, 10½ cents, standard manila about 11 cents, manila 12 cents, and pure manila from 13 to 15 cents.

Yours truly,
HAMILTON BROS.

CHADWICK, ILL., Jan. 29th, 1893.

In reply to yours of the 27th instant, concerning the retail price of twine in 1892, would say:

Sisal...	10 cts. early.	11 cts. later.
Standard...	11 do	12 do
Manila mixed	11 do	13 do
Pure manila	14 do	15 do

These figures of course varied some, but were about the standard price of the different grades throughout the country.

Yours truly,
MILLER, SMITH & Co.

PEORIA, ILL., Jan. 30th, 1893.

The retail dealers in this city last season sold twine at about the following prices. One dealer, being in very poor standing, asked as follows:—

Sisal.....	10 cents.
Standard manila.....	12 to 12½ cents.

Another dealer asked for:—
Standard..... 10½ cents.

Another dealer asked for:—
Standard..... 10½ to 10¾ cents.
Standard manila..... 11½ to 12 cents.

Very truly yours,
LUTHY & CO.,
By D. W. VOORHEES, Jun.,
Vice-Pres.

GERMANTOWN, WIS., Jan. 27th, 1893.

Have sold your manila to my customers at 12 cents; sisal at 9½ cents; Plymouth manila at 14 cents; ½ N. Z. and ½ manila at 13 cents; 9-10th N. Z. and 1-10th manila at 10½ cents.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) PH. G. BUERRWÄECHTER.
Mr. FAIRBAIRN.

SIoux FALLS, S.D., Jan. 30th, 1893.

Replying to yours of the 27th inst., I would say that the average retail price on binder twine in this city was as follows:—

Sisal.....	10½ cents.
Standard.....	11 cents.
Standard manilla.....	13 cents.
Pure manilla.....	14 cents.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) O. S. SWENSON.

VALLEY CITY, NORTH DAKOTA, 29th Jan., 1893.

In answer to your letter of 27th January, in reference to prices paid by consumers of binding twine for the year 1892, will say:

Pure manila.....	15 cents.
Standard manila.....	13½ "
Standard.....	12 "
Sisal.....	10½ "

The above are brands used here, and prices paid by consumers.

Yours respectfully,
A. H. GRAY.

PORT HOPE, 6th Feb., 1893.

I sold silver composite twine last season at 8 cents, less 5 per cent discount wholesale. Farmers in this district bought silver composite at from 7½ to 8 cents cash and 8½ cents credit. Please send me your latest cordage price list and oblige

Yours truly,
THOS. CARSON.

TORONTO, 6th Feb., 1893.

In answer to your telegraph we sold the farmers:—

Crown brand.....	10½ cents.
Red cap brand.....	11½ "
Blue ribbon.....	12½ "

We sent you an advertisement of Feaker & Runians Bampton, quoting, I think:—

Crown brand.....	9½ cents.
Red cap.....	10.60 "
Blue ribbon.....	11.50 "

We did not quote prices to the Patrons of Industry.
Yours,

THOS MERIDITH & CO.

LUCAS, Ont., Feb. 2nd, 1893.

Your message to hand, and in reply—twine was sold retail to farmers as follows:—

Crown brand.....	10½ cts.
Red cap.....	11½ "
Blue ribbon.....	12½ "

To Patrons of Industry as follows:—

Crown brand.....	10½ cts.
Red cap.....	11½ "
Blue ribbon.....	12½ "

Less 5 per cent discount; netting, \$9.97½, \$10.92½, \$11.37½.

Those are the prices sold by us which we can confirm under oath if required, and we know that in all cases when the Patrons bought a quantity that the above was the price paid, and in many cases they got it in small lots as low as fifty pounds in each purchase at same price.

Yours respectfully,
W. & C. STANLEY.

BRAMPTON, Feb. 6th, 1893.

In reply to yours of this date, re our retail prices of binder twine to the farmers in our section of the country for the season of 1892, were as follows:—

Composite silver	7½ cts. per lb.
Crown brand	9½ “
Red cap	10.65 “
Blue ribbon	11.70 “
Blue cap	11.70 “

We made no difference in price to the Patrons of Industry, the above price was alike to all farmers.

Yours truly,
PEAKER & RUNIANS.

American prices to farmers, season 1892.

La Fayette, Ind.	10 to 12½ cts.
Cedar Rapids, Ia.	10 to 15
Chadwick, Ill.	10 to 15
Peoria, Ill.	10 to 12½
S. Germantown, Wis.	9 to 14
Sioux Falls, S. Dakota.	10½ to 14
Valley City, N. Dakota ...	10½ to 15

The lowest prices above were for pure sisal.

Canadian prices to farmers, season 1892.

Lucan, Ont.	9.97½ to 12½ cts.
Toronto	10½ to 12½
Brampton, Ont.	9½ to 11½

The lowest Canadian prices were for twine containing a portion of manila, and therefore, better than the lowest American.

Silver composite twine was sold as follows:—

Port Hope	7½ to 8½ cts.
Brampton	7½

These are figures which hon. gentlemen opposite will not attempt to prove untrue, and until they are proved to be untrue, hon. gentlemen opposite have no case before the country on which to make an appeal to the farmers. My opinion as a farmer, and as one acquainted with machinery is that the best twine is the cheapest. I am sorry the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not in his seat to-night, because I desire to refer to the kind of twine I found used in the North-west Territories when I visited that country and was driven over it by the kind and social people living there. One fact that struck me forcibly was the presence of sheaves in the fields. In that country, during harvest time, there are only two men to do four men's work, and everybody appears to be over-burdened with work, so every sheaf left in the field in consequence of bad twine or defective machinery is never garnered, but is allowed to remain to rot. I remember driving through the country and noticing these sheaves, and I passed these remarks to Mr. Bell, of Indian Head: "How is it, Mr. Bell, that you have so few sheaves in your field compared with the farmers around you?" His reply was: "I have learned the lesson to use good Halifax twine, and it pays me best. I never expected to see you, although I read your speech; I want to shake by the hand one who is educating the farmers to use the best twine and save the crops in the field and not waste them." Mr. Bell took me into his store-house and showed me sample balls manufactured in this country

and in the United States—not many in this country—and he said: "I will give 25 cents per pound for Halifax twine rather than use any of these other twines. We are selling our wheat for 72 cents per bushel, and the loss of twenty-six sheaves would pay for the binding twine for a day's reaping, and I know it pays me to get the best binding twine, and the only place where I have found it is at the Halifax factory." We had a striking lesson taught the farmers in our county. After reading speeches delivered in Parliament on this question, our farmers sent to the other side for their binding twine. It might have proved satisfactory if it had not rained, and if the grasshoppers had not got at it. It was ingeniously made by some mechanical process, there being sisal in the centre, covered with tar. That portion of the twine which did not come apart, owing to the rain, was destroyed by grasshoppers; and I can assure Mr. Stairs that our farmers will not go for their twine to American manufacturers again. I was on the farm of a neighbour while thrashing was going on. He had a binder of the same make as my own, the maker was a good Reformer, and he had great trouble with it. The boys blamed the machine, and said it served the farmer right, when a Tory bought his binder from a Grit, he got a good one and a Grit got a bad one. They never thought of the quality of the twine; but when the rain came and the grasshoppers got at it, the people thought there was something wrong about the twine. Every one knows that the knotter is an intricate part of the mechanism in connection with the binder. No matter how skilfully the machine is made, if good twine is not used, the knotter is liable to get out of order. I have been told by machine manufacturers, that they have had more difficulty with respect to binding twine than to any portion of their machinery, and that in nine cases out of ten, the farmer improperly blames the machine instead of the inferior twine which he is using. So far as regards myself, it matters little to me, as a farmer, what the Government do in this matter. As a farmer I would rather they did not touch the duty at all, but as they have touched it, I think they went far enough with it, and I am satisfied so far as I am concerned. It is my opinion that if the Government of Canada had offered a premium for the best binder twine, they could get into the Canadian market, they would be doing more for the farmers than they have done by knocking off 12 per cent of the duty. I am satisfied of that from my experience in the North-west, where I saw so much waste because of the bad American twine used there. I may state that I have got good satisfaction from the twine supplied by the Halifax company, and it would in my opinion be a great benefit, if no inferior qualities of twine were allowed to be sold. I know that the Government in this matter believe that they were acting in the best in-

terests of the farmers, and they have done very well, but I hope they will not go any further, because if they did, there would be the risk of the Americans coming in here, and after doing up our Canadian manufacturers, place an inferior article on the market which would be detrimental to the interests of the farming community. I was rather pleased to hear my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) congratulate the Government the other day on the step they had taken on this matter. I am afraid, however, that he found the policy of the Government was not favourable to his party, and I believe he was speaking more in the interest of his party than in the interests of the farmer. As a farmer, I repudiate the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the great farming community of this country. We heard the assertion of the hon. member for Prince county (Mr. Perry), who told us that we were as badly off now as we were 100 years ago, and that we were denied privileges to-day which we enjoyed at that time. I can refer back to my school days, much less than 100 years ago, when we had to walk three miles through an unbroken forest to school, sit on a saw log, with a hewn plank for a desk, and an open fire at the end of the room. We can look around with pride and pleasure to-day and see the marked progress of our Canadian people. To-day we have more money invested in schools in Canada than is invested in any country, of the same population, under the sun. We have more money invested in churches, and we have more money invested in charitable institutions, relatively speaking, than any country in the world. There is no hunger amongst us. Everybody who will work can have plenty to eat, and let me say that there is more sin, more want, and more hunger in one city in the western states than there is in the entire of this fair Dominion of Canada. We can compete man for man, and woman for woman, with any other people on the face of the earth. What are hon. gentlemen opposite grumbling about? Why we have more wealth on this continent according to population than there is in any other country on the face of God's earth. There is among our people in Canada more happiness, more true piety, more true charity, and less want than in any other country. If you gentlemen opposite were honest, if you would do as you should do, you would bow your head in submission to Almighty God for the blessings we enjoy in this country. It would become you more as Christians, and it would become you better as politicians, and better as statesmen, to do this than to talk about blue ruin. Why, you would have something to live for, and when the time came you would have something to die for. Hon. gentlemen opposite have occupied two weeks, and spent the money of the country in the Budget debate, and then they got so sacrificed last night that there was scarcely one of them left. I would forgive hon. gentlemen oppo-

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.

site for that, but when they pickled their policy down to binding twine, I cannot forgive them for that. Be Canadians; be proud of your country, which is the right arm of the greatest Empire in the world. We have a right to be the proudest people in the world, and we should stand by the old flag of England, which is the emblem, by land and by sea, of civil and religious liberty, and the truest religious liberty in the world, too. There are some good Canadians I know on the opposite side of the House, and if we could only get them over to this side we would make men of them. Let me say in conclusion, that as a farmer, I hope the Government will not any more interfere with the duty on twine. I may say that I am prepared to stand by the third Sir John, as well as I stood by the first Sir John, and I will stand by the National Policy, too. Hon. gentlemen opposite make little of the National Policy, but I tell them that the National Policy is the national existence of this fair Dominion of ours. You talk about free trade, about continental free trade, about commercial union, about tariff reform. I have fought my opponents on all these policies, but in my last election I only had to fight them on the duty of binding twine. I expect the next time to have to fight them on half the duty on binding twine, and to knock them out on the first round.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, this question has received a good deal of attention from the House and the country. It would appear from the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that there has been no demand for the reduction of the duty on binder twine. The hon. gentleman is scarcely satisfied with the Government for having taken some of the duty off; he would have been better satisfied had it remained as it was. He forgets that while in other industries many of those things which are the raw materials of the manufacturers are allowed to come in duty free, binder twine, which is a raw material of the farmers, is taxed, and on what ground he justifies that, I cannot understand. He tells us that he is a farmer; but I think, if you examine his speech closely, you will find that he is a politician first and a farmer afterwards. Otherwise he would not allow the farmers to submit to a duty which is oppressive, unfair and inequitable. The hon. gentleman told us that he went to school, and consequently he is a reading gentleman. It is a wonder, then, he has not seen in the newspapers of the day the demand which has been made in all portions of this country for a reduction of the duty on binder twine. It is a general demand on the part of the farming community made through their papers, through the Patrons of Industry, through the farmers' institutes, through the Dairymen's Association. From all these official bodies memorials have come to the Government asking that this duty be taken off. A deputation from the Patrons

of Industry waited on the Government the other day with that object in view. It is singular, indeed, that all those farmers did not know their own business, and are sending deputations to Ottawa which they know will not do them any good. It is singular indeed that all these farmers would take these steps if they did not feel that in this duty they had a grievance which they desired to have redressed. Now, in the North-west there is a great demand for the removal of this duty. I saw the other day in the "Regina Leader" a report of a meeting which shows clearly how anxious and how alive the people in the North-west are on this subject. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has had to listen to the wishes of the people in his constituency and in the great North-west in favour of the reduction of the duties on other articles. I see by this report in the "Regina Leader" that a meeting was held at Craven Valley, at which the hon. member was present; and in order to show you the earnest feeling of the people there on this subject, I will read what they did at that meeting. It would appear that in the North-west the hon. member for West Assiniboia is an extra-judicial member of the Cabinet. He is not a controller; he is not the Minister of the Interior; probably he is what might be termed the Minister of the Exterior, and the people appeal to him to come to their rescue and relieve them of this unjust and cruel tax. Here is what happened:

Mr. Hoskins moved that this memorial be signed by all present and be handed to Mr. Davin to send to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. Sutton seconded the motion, which was carried *nem con.*

Mr. Hoskins then moved that a similar memorial be sent to Mr. Davin to transmit to Mr. VanHorne, which, being seconded by Mr. Sutton, was carried.

Mr. Davin spoke at some length, saying that he would do all in his power.

Mr. Henty moved, and Mr. Wylie seconded, that a vote of thanks be given to Mr. Davin for his kindness in coming out to that meeting.—Carried.

Mr. Seed said if it would be appropriate at that general meeting, he would move a vote of confidence in Mr. Davin. (Cheers.)

Mr. George McNeice seconded the motion, which was carried amid applause.

Mr. Davin addressed the meeting on politics and was well received. He condemned the duty on binder twine.

Mr. Russell said the farmers on the prairie wanted the duty off barbed wire and all kinds of cotton.

Here is the part I wish to draw the attention of the House to:

Mr. Davin said he would consider it, and hurried away to the team. As he drove away the yeomen of the valley raised "three cheers for Davin."

Now, you see, that the North-west members who formerly opposed taking the duty off binder twine, have been obliged to come to the House this session and ask for a reduction in the duty. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that every farmers' institute in Ontario and in other provinces has petitioned

the Government for a reduction of the duty. I understand also that every branch of the Patrons of Industry has asked that binder twine be put on the free list. The Grand Lodge of the Patrons of Industry yesterday at Toronto unanimously passed a motion to the same effect. The Dairymen's Association passed a similar resolution. Now, it is a singular thing that those gentlemen who use this commodity do not know what they are talking about, or do not know what they want. It would appear from what the hon. gentleman says that the farmers would sooner pay a higher price for their binder twine than get it at a cheaper rate. I do not think the farmers or any other class of people would regard that as a common-sense proposition. They desire to get their commodities as cheaply as they possibly can. It is necessary for them to do that because the price of grain runs so very low at this time, and every impost on the farmer or upon any other class of the community that is not necessary for the maintenance of a revenue is not desirable and should be discontinued. It is time that the Government realized this fact. We know that the most influential, the most deserving and the most industrious class of people we have in Canada are the farmers, and when they come and memorialize the Government to put on the free list the binder twine which they use in binding their grain, it would be a very easy matter for the Government to yield to their request, seeing that they do not derive much revenue from this duty, but are keeping it on merely to oblige a few people who are manufacturing this article. The hon. member for South Victoria spoke of the good quality of the twine supplied by the Halifax factory. I am very glad to hear of that. It would seem very singular if we should learn that that hon. gentleman was an agent for that factory, seeing the kindly manner in which he has spoken of its product. It might be just possible that it would not cost the hon. gentleman anything for his binder twine for next season.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh! Shame, shame!

Mr. LANDERKIN. Such things as that might possibly occur.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not the slightest am not like the hon. gentleman. I do not want the Government to put the duty back so as to make the price of binder twine higher. I do not think that the hon. gentleman would ask the Government to impose a duty on sugar again in order to make sugar higher.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I pay for what I buy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not the slightest doubt about that, and when you have a farm, you will find out that the Government will make you pay. The Government can always get something out of the farmers, and that

is the reason they oppress them. They are a class of men who are permanently located and have a visible means of support, but because they are in that position, I do not know that it is a proper policy for the Government to tax them more than they do other people. I do not think that the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn), when he reads his speech and revises it, will fail to revise it very thoroughly, and to knock a large measure of tariff reform out of that speech. I do not think he will leave it in its original shape. I do not think that, as a farmer, he will agitate for the classes of the community. I would advise the Government to deal out the farmers and every other class the same measure, and put them on the same platform, and then the farmers and everybody else will be satisfied; but I do not think that any class in the community has a right to be taxed for the benefit of any other class. That is the reason why I oppose this tariff from top to bottom. It distributes the burdens unequally by taking money out of the pockets of one class and putting it into the pockets of another. It is an unequal and unjust distribution of the wealth of the people. That is one reason why I oppose it and shall continue to oppose it. I do not oppose it in the interest of one or another class, but in the interest of all the people. There may be people who will stand up and endorse high tariff as beneficial, but I do not approve of that system and will not support it in this House or elsewhere. I say that this duty is vexatious, that it is not just to the farmer. I do not see how any one can reconcile it with justice, that the fishermen should get the twine that they use in their nets free of duty when the farmers have to pay a duty on the twine they use. Why take the duty off the twine used by the fishermen and impose it on that used by the farmer?

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. There is not a pound of fishermen's cord manufactured in Canada, and that is why the fishermen get theirs free. If the hon. gentleman knows what he is talking about, he will admit this. It is not the same thing at all. There is as much difference between the two as there is between binder twine and woollen yarn.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think that excuse will hold water. If protection is good for the one class, it is good for the other. If free trade is good for the one, it is good for the other. The hon. gentleman has let himself down very hardly. He advocates free trade for the fishermen. Well, if it is a good thing for the fishermen, why is it not for the farmers. I hope the Government will reconsider this matter before the end of the session, and put binder twine on the free list, especially as they derive very little revenue from the duty. In doing so, they will meet the wishes of the farmer, as manifested in their various institutes and orders, and

Mr. LANDERKIN.

in their memorials and petitions to the Government.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I rise to a point of order. I am a farmer, and not an agent, although the hon. gentleman has accused me of being an agent. He has also stated that I am likely to get my binder twine for nothing on account of the speech I have delivered. As far as I am individually concerned, I hope I will, but I never expected to do so, and I have always paid for what I have got, and to make a gross insinuation and charge of this kind against a gentleman who has risen to express his honest convictions is discreditable to this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite have neither the figures nor the ability to confute the arguments on this side in favour of the National Policy, and so they resort to the expedient of striking a man below the belt; and when an hon. gentleman does that, I have a perfect right to rise and resent the insult. If I were allowed to tell some of the stories which this hon. gentleman circulated against me, when he came into the campaign against me in South Victoria, I could perhaps make him blush.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I only said that I hoped the hon. gentleman would get his binder twine free; but if that does not please him, I hope he will not.

Mr. CAMERON. I would not trespass on the time of the House at this stage, had not my hon. friend, who has just taken his seat, complained that the fisherman gets his twines and his nets free of duty, and had he not, on this ground, appealed to the prejudices of the farmers of the west, who have to pay a duty on binder twine. I beg to call my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that if there is any class in this Dominion whose industry is highly protected it is the farming class. Their wheat, their flour, their cheese, their butter, their pork, their beef and all their grains are protected; but where is the protection of the fishermen? Their products are not protected, because the fishermen of Newfoundland, who are the greatest competitors of the fishermen of the Maritime provinces, are allowed free access to our markets. It ill becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to appeal to the prejudices of the farmers of the west against the best consumers they have for their products. It matters but little to the consumers of this Dominion whether it is the Patrons of Industry or the wire-pullers among the politicians of the west who mislead the farmers into believing that their interests are not protected under the National Policy. If they will be deluded into believing that their interests are neglected and led to disturb the National Policy under which they are prospering, they will be the greatest sufferers, and it only requires a little reflection on their part on the condition of things between 1867 and 1879, when their products were not protected to convince them of that fact. If

the duty be taken off binder twine, and everything else which the farmer consumes, then why not take the duty off flour, off wheat, off pork, off corn, and everything else which comes into consumption in the eastern part of the province?

Mr. FORBES. Why don't you, then?

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) feels a little uneasy at what I am saying, because, when a question of this kind arises, he does not seem to have the courage of his conviction. Those who are favourable to the National Policy are favourable to it because they want to balance the interests in this Dominion, east and west, in such a manner as to interchange trade and create a market for all the products which this Dominion affords. And I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said before, that if that fails, then, in my opinion, Confederation must fail. The farmers, as I have already said, are more protected, and I say it is not the opinion of the farmers of the west, or else I mistake the intelligence of that class, that binder twine should be permitted to come into Canada free of duty. It has been proven by those who use it that it can be purchased in Canada cheaper than on the other side of the line. It is manufactured in Halifax, Brantford, and the Central Prison, Toronto. It is offered for sale at 9 cents per pound. There are two reasons why binder twine should be protected. First, because we want a good quality of binder twine. It stands to reason that if American twine is allowed to come in free of duty, they will send the poorer article manufactured on the other side into the Canadian market, which would injuriously affect the farmers of this Dominion. Another reason is, that if there is any article on which the manufacturers on the other side of the line, the middlemen and the carriers pay the duty, dividing it amongst themselves, that article is binder twine; because in the Dominion it is manufactured to a greater extent than is required for the supply of the market. If any comes from the other side of the line, it must come at the expense of those who manufacture, or sell, or carry it, in exactly the same manner as flour, from the other side of the line. Flour is not one cent per barrel dearer to the consumers of the Dominion because of the duty. Such is the state of trade in all lines produced within the Dominion in excess of the market. Until our friends opposite prove that binder twine is dearer in the Dominion on account of the duty, they should not be appealing to the prejudices of the farmers of the west, because there is not the shadow of a doubt—and a few years may convince the farmers of the fact—that there is no class in the Dominion that will lose so much by the repeal of the National Policy as the farmers of the west.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has made particular reference to the member for Queen's, N.S.,

therefore, I feel it my duty to make a few remarks on this occasion. He says that free twine and nets are an offset to free Newfoundland fish coming into the Maritime provinces. In other words my hon. friend holds that the Maritime provinces' fishermen, who have a large surplus of their catch, are injured in the home market by the imported Newfoundland fish, and, therefore, they have a right to free twine and nets. If ever there was a ridiculous argument addressed to this assembly, it is that of my hon. friend. He says that the farmers of the west are protected by having the fishermen of the Maritime provinces secured to them as a market; in other words, the fishermen of the Maritime provinces must pay a higher price for what they use for the benefit of the farmers of the west. These fishermen must seek a foreign market for all their surplus product, and, having free twine and nets, they are supposed to pay more than they otherwise would for these protected products furnished by the farmers of the west. If that kind of thing is good for one class of industry, it is good for another, and the fishermen, lumbermen, miners and shipbuilders, should not be obliged to pay higher prices for what they use. The hon. gentleman said the farmers' wheat, flour, cheese, pork and beef are all protected, and that the farmers have a large market in the fishermen for their surplus of these products. But he must know, if he has studied the tariff that every barrel of beef or pork the fisherman uses for deep-sea fishing, is taken out of bond without duty at all. Therefore, his argument must fall to the ground. The fishermen are granted the special privilege of importing their beef and pork from foreign markets, and they get the greater part of it from the United States, whose producers can sell cheaper in the Maritime provinces, perhaps because they have less land carriage, and freight is less than by rail from the west. In other words, the fisherman of Nova Scotia gets his beef and flour cheaper than the lumberman and miner, because the present Government dare not tax them on those articles. They would be hurled from power by the free vote of the independent fishermen of the Maritime provinces. The fishermen of Nova Scotia are taxed heavily enough on everything they use in their daily living, and in other respects they are the only free trade independent party in the Dominion of Canada. They suffer not so much as other industries from the National Policy, except that it has the direct effect of keeping them out of the foreign markets, where they must sell their surplus in competition with the world. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat should study more fully the questions upon which he speaks, and the interests affected before he cares to put himself upon record. Had he studied the matter more fully, the fishermen would not thank him for saying that the fishermen, who cannot be protected under the National Policy,

are made the slaughter-market to sell the surplus of the products of the west, at a price artificially enhanced. What offset have they got? None at all, and they are limited in markets for the sale of their surplus products. My hon. friend says that on binder twine coming from the United States into Canada, the producers, middlemen and carriers must pay the duty, and, therefore the duty has no effect in raising the price of binder twine. It seems to me a child's argument for the hon. gentleman to give himse dixit against the statements of thirteen to fifteen thousand farmers of the Northwest, and the older provinces of Canada, who have put themselves on record by petitions against this tax. I am not going to presume upon the indulgence of this House by discussing the merits of this tax. I shall simply say that I feel well justified in voting in favour of taking off the tax on binder twine for the benefit of the farmers of Canada, for two reasons. First, that the farmers themselves have come to Parliament in a body and have asked that it be removed in toto; second, and this is a more convincing argument, that the Government themselves have seen the folly of the tax and have taken off half of it. Surely, if half a loaf is good for a starving man, a whole loaf will be better. Why not remove it, then, all at one blow? If it is better that the upas-tree should be cut down entirely rather than its deleterious effects should be spread broadcast over the land, why not apply the axe to the root of the tree, and hew it down at once? For these reasons I shall vote in favour of the motion asking the Government to remove the duty entirely from binder twine.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has evinced a warm interest on behalf of the poor fishermen down in that country, and he endeavours to take my hon. friend to task because he was generous enough to say that the National Policy is a tax for the purpose of raising a revenue, which we cannot do without; and, therefore, he, as a Maritime province member, believes that it should be distributed as equitably as possible over the whole country, among the farmers and fishermen alike. He goes on to say that while the fisherman has some consideration shown him, because the cord which he uses is free of duty, therefore he is entitled to bear a share in some other line, and that other line is the pork, and the flour, and the food that we send them from the west. Now, it is rather strange to see these hon. gentlemen evince such an interest in behalf of the fishermen to-day, when they had not a word to say in behalf of these same fishermen when, a few years ago, their friends were in power and taxed them to the extent of 17½ per cent upon their nets, and their food, and their pork, and everything else; but to-day they are ready to condemn a Conservative Government, who have given a

Mr. FORBES.

greater consideration to these poor fishermen, than they previously enjoyed, and reduced their taxation in other lines as much as possible. I do not think the hon. gentleman can take credit to himself for accomplishing much in this House, when he endeavoured to criticise what the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) said, to the effect that this tax ought to be equitably distributed all over the country. Now, there is another thing in which the fishermen receive a substantial advantage that the people of Ontario do not—they have the fishery award bounty distributed to them every year. It is true that is something which arose out of a dispute between this country and the United States as to the violation of fishery laws, which brought back a large amount of money to Canada, and that money was set apart for the benefit of the fishermen, and is distributed to them every year. Therefore, in all fairness, I think I may claim that the fishermen are dealt liberally with. I am somewhat surprised at the attack which the hon. gentlemen made to-night. They seemed to evince a burning desire to do something for the agriculturists of the country. But if I correctly interpret their aim, I should say it is not so much a burning desire to help the poor farmer as it is to make an attack upon the National Policy. The National Policy is a bugbear which, whenever it is put up before any of them, always raises their temper to an unusual degree. This is one way that they can endeavour to create sympathy amongst the farmers and make them believe that they are dealt unfairly with. They have taken up this idea for the purpose of endeavouring to convince the farmer that the Government is somehow or other doing an injustice to them, and if they can accomplish their object in making the farmers believe this, it may bring the farmers round to their side. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) was one of the first to jump into the breach in defence of his friend who made this motion. I thought it was very strange that that hon. gentleman sat so silent the other day, when the question of the duty on coal oil was before this House, a duty which, according to the calculation of the hon. member's friends on that side of the House, was 150 per cent; and yet he sat silent, when the farmers were labouring under this burden, paying this extra tax, and did not open his mouth in their defence or attempt to have the tax reduced. I think we need not look far for the reason of his silence, when we remember that he represents a district of country where coal oil is produced, and, if I am correctly informed, he is largely interested in the trade himself. He has no desire for the farmers' welfare then. He is willing they should pay 150 per cent duty on coal oil, but when it comes down to an article on which they only pay 12½ per cent duty, and that for the purpose of raising a revenue, then he has a new-born zeal for the farmers that was never

displayed up to that time. I think it is not creditable to the hon. member for West Lambton that he can only find his voice when the farmers are taxed 12½ per cent, but, on the other hand, when they are taxed, according to the calculation of his own friends, 150 per cent, then he has nothing to say. I do not think that the farmers will give him very much credit for sincerity. Now, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), who made this motion, I am bound to assume, is anxious to do something for the farmers; at least he says that he is anxious to do something for the farmers, and I suppose the reason is because they have votes. I might be charitable enough to suppose that because he is a farmer, he knows the heavy burdens under which they are labouring, and from self-interest, if from no other motive, he asks the Government to take off this tax entirely, because it is a burden that he cannot bear. But knowing that he is a millionaire, I do not think he is very much oppressed with that burden. If I remember rightly that hon. gentleman, a few years ago, gave information to the Committee on Agriculture, that one of the most profitable lines in which the farmers could engage to-day was planting their farms with walnuts, as he had done; for he told us that he had planted ten barrels of them, and they matured from eighteen to twenty-five years. Surely that burden cannot be a heavy one for him, and I cannot understand how he can object to pay this duty upon binder twine when he needs so small a quantity of it to harvest his walnut trees. Therefore, I am bound to assume that his motive is a good one; but I rather fear it is for the purpose of convincing the farmers of North York that he is anxious to do something for them; that he is their friend, and in return for his efforts in their behalf he will expect them to support him at the polls when the proper time comes. Now, as I said before, the first aim of the National Policy is to raise a revenue, and it is only fair that this revenue tax should be distributed over the people of the country as equitably as possible. If the farmer on this item pays a duty of 12½ per cent, it is the lowest duty that is paid upon any line of goods that is brought into the country, so far as I know. Take my hon. friend from North York, with his broadcloth on his back; he paid at least 45 per cent on that, and the farmer will not grumble at it. I think the farmers will be fair enough to admit that if our city friend pays 45 per cent upon what he uses, they will be willing to bear their share of the burden by paying 12½ per cent upon binder twine. Now, then, how much do the farmers pay upon this item of binder twine, is a fair question for inquiry. I know a little about farming, because I happen to have been running a farm for some years. I know a little about the prices, and I know something about what is paid by farmers in my county for binding twine. He says that this duty

is very high. The fact is that the duty amounts to about 2 cents per acre. If there are practical farmers in this House I am sure they will bear me out in that, they know about the amount of binder twine that is used for an acre of grain. I took the trouble last year, when my grain was being cut, to find out what it cost. I found that binder twine was sold at 10½ cents a pound, and there was used a little less than 2 pounds an acre. If it takes a little less than 2 pounds to the acre, and there is only 12½ per cent on that binder twine, and if it can be bought at wholesale prices at less than 9 cents a pound, then the duty only amounts to about 2 cents an acre. The average farmer who is cultivating a 100 acres, has rarely more than 50 acres of crop, and a share of that is in pease, potatoes, turnips and other vegetables, for which he does not require binding twine. But even if he required binding twine for every acre of it, it would cost him only \$1 for the amount he used upon that 50 acres of crop. Now, that is not an awful burden which bears upon the farmer.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that this tax will only cost the farmer \$1 a year. He means, of course, the extra price caused by their paying a duty. Will he say on what principle he defends the proposition that any industry can tax the farmers even \$1?

Mr. SPROULE. Upon the principle that we must raise a revenue; upon the principle on which the hon. gentleman and his friends taxed the farmers 17½ per cent on sugar to raise a revenue; upon the principle that his own friends taxed their tea to raise a revenue; upon the principle that they were obliged to tax everything, even the necessaries of life which the farmers consumed, for the purpose of raising a revenue. That is how I defend it. So long as the revenue must be raised, and this is the easiest way in which it can be raised, and the way in which the smallest burden is cast on the farming community, then I stand by the principle of raising a revenue in this way, because I think it is in the interest of the farmers. The hon. gentleman told us that many farmers asked for this change, including the Patrons of Industry. If by asking the farmers can save money, I do not blame them for making the request. If I could avoid paying money in a similar way, I would be likely to ask it. I do not therefore blame the farmers for asking that reduction in the tariff; but when it is explained that this represents a small share of the cost of the Government of the country, they will be willing to pay 12½ per cent duty on binding twine, and not grumble about it. Any farmer who owns 100 acres of land, and only raises 50 acres of crop on which he uses binder twine, he will only pay \$1, and the average farmer does not bind 30 acres of crop, some not more than 20 acres, but if he cultivated every acre and used bind-

ing twine, it would only cost him \$1 for the whole duty, and when he understands this he will not grumble about paying that small sum. The Government have lowered the duty for the purpose of satisfying, as far as possible, the demand that has come from that large representative class. But the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite have been booming this subject for all it is worth among the farmers, and endeavouring to create a very strong impression that there is great injustice done to the farmers because any duty is imposed on binding twine, and in order to convince the farmers that this is the case. Mr. Mowat is putting in machinery at the Central Prison in Toronto for the purpose of manufacturing this twine. What is the explanation? They are going through the country telling the farmers that they are paying heavy burdens in the shape of increased cost of binding twine on account of the duty being imposed. But although they have put in machinery and obtained their labour free of cost, the Provincial Government cannot turn out the finished product for less than 9 cents per pound wholesale, if I am correctly informed, although manufacturers sell it for less than 9 cents, because it is sold in my county at 10½ cents, and every retailer must have a profit of 1 cent or 1½ cents per pound. That represents only 15 per cent profit on the goods, and no merchant will carry goods and sell them at a less profit than 25 per cent. So there is no strong ground for contending that the farmer is paying a heavy duty on binding twine to-day. I do not question the right of any party to establish a factory to turn out binding twine, but it is unfair to men who have invested their capital in that industry that the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite should establish a manufactory at Central Prison in Toronto. I hold that this manufactory will never be a success there. Why? Because in that manufacture, as in the manufacture of every other article, skilled labour is required, and the convicts there are under terms of sentence not exceeding two years. If you employ those convicts who are only under sentence of one year or even two years, they are unable to work a sufficient length of time to learn the business and work at it long before their terms of sentence will expire. It is said they are selling it at 9 cents a pound. Now, by selling it at that price they will be doing no better for the farmers than the manufacturers are at present doing, even with a "combine" among them—and I do not defend the "combine"—and notwithstanding the injurious effects of the combine and the fact that the penitentiary will have labour free of cost, the statement is made that it will not be able to produce twine at any lower price than it is manufactured to-day. Accordingly, farmers could not receive very much benefit from it, and if that were the case, the farmers would not receive much benefit even if the Government removed the whole duty.

Mr. SPROULE.

But I hold that the farmers are prepared to bear their fair share of the burdens respecting the government of this country with any other class. When the farmers remember that we have taken the taxes from tea and sugar and reduced the tax on salt, and, in fact, reduced the taxes on all the necessaries of life, on which hon. gentlemen opposite were obliged to impose taxes when they were in power, I believe they will admit that no great injury is done if they are called on to pay a small duty on binding twine and thus contribute to the revenue of the country. What was the total amount of the duty collected on binding twine last year? According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the amount was \$42,741. That was certainly not a large sum for the farmers of the country to pay, and when they understand, as they will understand at the close of this debate, the situation fairly, they will admit they are not paying a very exorbitant duty. They will not give very much credit to hon. gentlemen opposite who are endeavouring to convince them that they are burdened by this duty, and have not a word to say in their defence, but grieve regarding the payment of 12½ per cent tax on binding twine, and they will come to the conclusion that there are other people in the world than hon. gentlemen opposite who are interested in their welfare.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchar, d,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Campbell,
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies,
Dawson,
Devlin,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,

Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Mignault,
Monet,
Mulock,
Perry,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt,
Yeo.—51.

NAVS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boyle,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,

Kenny,
Lachapelle,
LaRivière,
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougall (Cape Breton),

Carling.
Carpenter.
Caron (Sir Adolphe).
Carscallen.
Chesley.
Coatsworth.
Cochrane.
Cockburn.
Corby.
Costigan.
Curran.
Daly.
Denison.
Desaulniers.
Dickey.
Dugas.
Dupont.
Dyer.
Earle.
Fairbairn.
Ferguson (Renfrew).
Foster.
Fréchet.
Gillies.
Girouard (Two Mountains).
Grandbois.
Guillet.
Haggart.
Hazen.
Henderson.
Hughes.
Ingram.
Ives.
Jeannotte.
Kaulbach.

McKay.
McLean (King's).
McLennan.
McLeod.
Madill.
Mara.
Metcalf.
Miller.
Moncrieff.
Montague.
Northrup.
Ouimet.
Patterson (Colchester).
Patterson (Huron).
Pope.
Pridham.
Prior.
Putnam.
Reid.
Ross (Dundas).
Ross (Lisgar).
Ryckman.
Smith (Ontario).
Sproule.
Taylor.
Temple.
Thompson (Sir John).
Tureotte.
Tyrwhitt.
Wallace.
White (Cardwell).
White (Shelburne).
Wilson.
Wood (Brockville).—91.

PAIRS: *Opposition.*

Ministerial.
Craig.
Courbould.
Hearn.
Marshall.

Carroll.
Edgar.
Fremont.
Edwards.

Motion negatived.

THE DUTY ON CORN.

Mr. POPE moved :

That it is expedient to place corn on the free list.

House divided :

YEAS:
Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth).
Beauséuil.
Béchar.
Beith.
Bernier.
Bourassa.
Bowman.
Brodeur.
Campbell.
Casey.
Choquette.
Christie.
Davies.
Dawson.
Devlin.
Fauvel.
Featherston.
Flint.
Forbes.
Gibson.
Godbout.
Grieve.
Guay.
Landerkin.
Langelier.

Laurier.
Lavergne.
Leduc.
Legris.
Lister.
Livingstone.
Lowell.
McCarthy.
McMillan (Huron).
McMullen.
Mignault.
Monet.
Mulock.
Perry.
Pope.
Proulx.
Rinfret.
Rowand.
Sanborn.
Semple.
Sutherland.
Temple.
Vaillancourt.
White (Shelburne).
Yeo.—50.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges).
Baker.
Barnard.
Belley.
Bennett.
Bergeron.

Jeannotte.
Kenny.
Lachapelle.
LaRivière.
Leclair.
Lippé.

Bergin.
Boyle.
Burnham.
Cameron.
Cargill.
Carling.
Carpenter.
Caron (Sir Adolphe).
Carscallen.
Chesley.
Coatsworth.
Cochrane.
Cockburn.
Colter.
Corby.
Costigan.
Curran.
Daly.
Denison.
Desaulniers.
Dickey.
Dugas.
Dupont.
Dyer.
Earle.
Fairbairn.
Ferguson (Renfrew).
Foster.
Fréchet.
Gillies.
Girouard (Two Mountains).
Grandbois.
Guillet.
Haggart.
Hazen.
Henderson.
Hughes.
Ingram.
Ives.

Macdonald (Algoma).
Mackintosh.
McLean (York).
McAlister.
McDonald (Assiniboia).
McDougall (Cape Breton).
McGregor.
McKay.
McLean (King's).
McLennan.
McLeod.
Madill.
Mara.
Metcalf.
Miller.
Moncrieff.
Montague.
Northrup.
Ouimet.
Patterson (Colchester).
Patterson (Huron).
Pridham.
Prior.
Putnam.
Reid.
Ross (Dundas).
Ross (Lisgar).
Ryckman.
Smith (Ontario).
Sproule.
Stairs.
Taylor.
Thompson (Sir John).
Tureotte.
Tyrwhitt.
Wallace.
White (Cardwell).
Wilson.
Wood (Brockville).—91.

PAIRS: *For.* *Against.*

Edwards.
Carroll.
Fremont.
Edgar.

Marshall.
Craig.
Hearn.
Corbould.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) have not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for King's in the House, and did he hear the question put ?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I did not hear the question put.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Lanark hear the question put ?

Mr. ROSAMOND. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. The name of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Temple) appears on both sides of the division list. Did the hon. member intend to vote for or against the motion ?

Mr. TEMPLE. I am for the motion. Mr. Speaker.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to further amend the Electoral Franchise Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that this Bill ought to be read a second time and incorporated in the general Bill on the subject which is before the House in the name

of my colleague the Secretary of State. Therefore, I propose that the second reading shall be carried, but that the House shall only go into committee on the general Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) further to amend chapter 135 of the revised statutes respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Mr. Lavergne.)

Bill (No. 30) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. Belley.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

Mr. WELDON moved :

That Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise electors who have taken bribes, be placed again on the Orders of the Day on Monday next for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House divides on the question, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question, which I asked him when the House was in committee, but which, owing to the fact that the division was shortly afterwards taken, he did not answer. So far as this Bill goes, I have no objection to it whatever. My objection was based entirely on the fact, that it stopped short at an important point, my objection was wholly that the Bill punished those who accepted bribes by depriving them of a civil right, while it did not allow an investigation into that which I consider the most important matter that can be referred to a commission for inquiry. It did not allow the judges to inquire where the money came from that was used as bribes, or who it was who offered to give bribes. It appears to me that if a commission, composed of judges, is to issue to inquire into bribery within a certain district and find out the individuals who have received bribes, it should be competent for them, and it should be their duty, too, to inquire from whom bribes were received, and from whom the money came. If I had received an assurance from the hon. gentleman that he would be prepared to consider, in a kindly spirit, amendments in that direc-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

tion, I would not have opposed the Bill, because I am with him in his desire to suppress bribery and corruption, and it was because he seemed to stop short at the point where he should have gone on that I was opposed to this Bill in committee. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if he has any objection, in case the Bill goes into committee, to extend its clauses so that the judges who are entitled to make investigation shall go further, and when it is proved that there are ten, twenty or a hundred men who have received bribes, endeavour to ascertain from whom they received them and from whom the funds came. If my views were adopted, not only the men who received bribes would be disqualified, but those who furnished the money, and the agents through whose hands the money passed, would also be disqualified from the exercise of any civil responsibility and the holding of any office under the Crown.

Mr. WELDON. The motion of my hon. friend from L'Assomption last night was so great a surprise that the Bill was out of committee before I was fairly aware what the effect of the hon. gentleman's speech was. My understanding of French is not so quick that I was able to ascertain whether the hon. gentleman was supporting or opposing the Bill, and I had scarcely ascertained from an hon. friend near me the purport of the hon. gentleman's remarks when the motion was carried that the committee rise. I intended to answer the question of the hon. member for Queen's. The Bill in no way alters the existing law. It strikes down no part of the criminal law and takes no power to punish men who are guilty of bribery. The man who is guilty of giving bribes to-day can be proved guilty of a criminal offence and be subject to severe punishment. This Bill does not interfere with that provision of the law. But my hon. friend from Queen's to-day does not take the position he occupied last night. I understood his position last night was this: that the Bill in depriving the bribee of the right to vote should have gone farther and have also deprived the briber of the same rights. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that change; and, to be frank with the hon. gentleman, I must admit that the Bill as first drafted was in that direction, but, after consultation with some friends, I drew the Bill in its present form, for I arrived at the conclusion that such a feature would not be logical, for there is no evidence that the bribe-giver is not an intelligent voter, although he is a criminal and punishable as such. Although it may be shown that he is a bad man, it is by no means established that he is not competent in the exercise of his own vote. If this Bill were to become law, the people deprived of their votes are the bribe-takers who, like children, are unable intelligently to exercise the franchise, while the giver of bribes can be dealt with under the criminal law; and I assure the

hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that his suggestion is altogether alien to the purposes of the Bill. His idea is undoubtedly a very excellent and admirable idea, but one altogether alien to my purpose, and it would be like mixing two subjects as incompatible as oil and water to accept his suggestion. I assure my hon. friend that if he will bring in a Bill this session or next session perfecting the existing law in the direction he points out he will have one unflinching supporter at all costs on this side of the House, and that would be the member for Albert. My hon. friend's idea is, however, a different one altogether from mine. This Bill, as I tried to explain on the second reading, does not aim to punish, although as a consequence the briber loses his vote, but the principle of the Bill is that a man who sells his vote is like a child, and to protect the State must, for a time, be deprived of his vote. That is the one idea I had in drafting the Bill, and I strictly adhere to it; but, if the House comes to the conclusion that the other idea expressed by the hon. member for Queen's should be embodied in the Bill, and that the bribe-giver shall be disfranchised as well as the bribe-taker, I shall be happy to accept the amendment. It does not follow that the man who gives a bribe does not take care of his own vote, whereas the man who sells his vote is like a child in a position of trust. I hope the hon. member for Queen's will see the point, and I again assure him that if he will move in the direction he has indicated either this year or next year, and I hold myself answerable for what I say, he will have one hearty and cordial supporter in perfecting legislation in the direction he has indicated.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I myself, yesterday evening, when this Bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole, moved that the committee should rise without reporting. I gave some of the reasons that led me to make that motion. I cannot help saying there seems to be a desire to introduce into this country what there was formerly in certain countries of Europe—I refer to the inquisition. They are not satisfied with a law by which an election can be protested and annulled for a single case of bribery; I say they are not satisfied with that; they want to go further by trying to bring about the adoption of an extraordinary law. It is well known there are in this House some gentlemen who never indulge in bribery, still it does not prevent their election being protested and their having to pay useless costs. Under the existing law, a single case of bribery is sufficient to have an election annulled and the man disqualified who took a bribe for his vote, the same as he who gave it to him. However, that is not sufficient, and we want some persons who, purer, more honest, more scrupulous than all the rest, aim at preventing bribery by infeasible means. I cannot accept the

idea of creating in our midst a court of inquisition going all over the counties and fishing for bribery cases, not to ascertain whether such and such individuals charged with corruption are really guilty, but to ascertain whether there were bribery cases. Those who are in favour of this measure intend, therefore, to fish for bribery cases and nothing else. I say it is contrary to the very principle of the English law. The object of the Bill they are asking to revive is that two or three commissioners should be appointed with a good salary, and wander from place to place, accompanied by a secretary, himself liberally paid, to do what? To ascertain whether there were bribery cases. Suppose these bribery commissioners, installed in a county or a parish, and proceeding to their inquiry, do not find a single bribery case? Well, they will go elsewhere, I suppose, and the candidate will be forced to follow them, accompanied by his counsel, in order that there should not be perjuries to make him appear guilty when he is not. You see to what trouble and expenditure such a law would expose those who indulge in politics. It must not be supposed that bribery alone could have a member returned. What I am aware of, and what I can state, is that in the province of Quebec there is not much bribery effected, for the reason that we are not able to afford it. We are not as wealthy as in Ontario, where people can spend some \$30,000 during an election. Our means are rather short to allow us to go so far. Those who are in a position to expend such sums as these might well not be apprehensive as to the expenditure such a commission of inquiry would entail for them; but we, of the province of Quebec, are not in such circumstances. I understand the statute relating to controverted elections. Such as it now exists is sufficient to prevent or punish the bribery cases that may happen. The Bill of the hon. member (Mr. Weldon) aims at nothing short of having this House state that in future there will be a court of inquisition charged with making inquiries so as to find out bribery cases. The law which disqualifies a member for a single bribery case seems to me stringent enough. What more then do they want? Is the subject of the Bill to create places for friends? If such is the case, at the expense of whom will that be? Is it not true it will be either at the expense of the candidate or candidates, either at the expense of one or more electors? It is not fair. As I stated a moment ago, the member or candidate who can afford to spend, without ruining himself, \$30,000 to have himself returned, will always find the means to get through all this some way or other. But the party who can only afford to spend some \$500 or \$600 to cover all the expenses of his election, which is not a large sum, will not be able to bear all these additional costs of the court it is desirable to create by this Bill. I fancy they do not want to fully and unjustly ruin those who meddle in politics;

however, it is the result that will be reached should such a measure be put into the Statute-book. I would repeat, as I already stated during a previous sitting, the object of this Bill is good, since it is to prevent bribery. Every one regrets, and I myself above all, that there should be bribery during election times; every one would like to have elections as pure and honest as possible; it is a general desire, I know, and it is admitted by every one, but the more the existing law will be changed, the more it will be cut, allow me to use the word, the more it will be parcelled out, the more they will add to it amendment after amendment, change after change, the more it will be made unintelligible, and the more, therefore, we will depart from the object in view. For these reasons—and I do not think it my duty to further extend these remarks now—I think the hon. member would do better not to urge the adoption of his motion.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Forbes.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Drummond County Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Cleveland.)

Bill (No. 73) further to amend the Northwest Territories Representation Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

VACANCY IN VAUDREUIL.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the matter of the election appeal for the electoral district of Vaudreuil, by which the appeal was dismissed and the judgment of the trial judges, voiding the election, confirmed. In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said district.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 72) further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the Bill be read the first time.

Mr. HAZEN. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill makes a very slight change in the present law. It is simply to remove the restriction under the present Act against British subjects who may desire

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

to come up for examination to obtain certificates as masters or mates of vessels. That is the whole object of the Bill.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the House for a few moments to this Bill, in order that it may be discussed at greater length later on. I am pleased to see that the hon. gentleman is introducing an amendment to our navigation laws, but I may say, on behalf of the seafaring people and ship-owners of the Maritime provinces, that it is not broad enough to satisfy them. At the present time, the people engaged in this business are considerably disturbed on account of the existing laws bearing on these matters. Already 25 per cent of our shipping is missed from the register. A few years ago the Maritime provinces owned more shipping than the entire tonnage of the rest of the Dominion, and St. John, N.B., in its best days, had some 280,000 tons of registered shipping. We have to acknowledge the loss of nearly one-half of that, which has disappeared from our register books and which perhaps will not be restored. We wish now to go into the matter and to make some inquiry as to what caused this decline, and to discover whether there is any remedy. Of course, in considering the matter, it is fair to acknowledge that there has been a revolution in the ocean carrying trade of the world. I refer to the change from wood to iron in the construction of ships, and from sailing to steam as a means of propulsion. This revolution has almost completely vanquished the splendid fleet of wooden ships that Canada once possessed and which played so important a part in the commerce of the world. A few of the ports of the Dominion appear to have recognized the change and prepared themselves to meet it by adopting steam. Montreal, I think, has to a large extent supplied herself with steam power and a few of the other ports have also done the same. In addition to the foreign-going ships, we have enjoyed a large and prosperous trade in the coastwise carrying, the West India and the South America trade, in which are engaged a class of wooden vessels which have so far withstood the encroachments of iron and steam, and I have always hoped and believed that this class of vessels might be spared from the wreck of our once great marine interests. I do believe that it is yet possible that this fleet can be saved. Now, Sir, in prosecuting that business, we are not allowed immunity from competition. Our neighbours to the south of us own and control many millions of tons of like vessels, perhaps the greatest and best coastwise fleet ever known to the world, and we are in close competition with them. They are prosecuting the business with great vigour, and we notice with alarm that their fleet is increasing, while ours is declining. The people of the Maritime provinces say that that decline is largely due to the inequality of the restrictions and navigation

regulations in force in the two countries, and for a few moments I will ask the attention of the House while I briefly review these regulations. I will take up the first one which the Minister has dealt with, that relating to masters and mates. Our coastwise vessels are required to have certificated masters and certificated mates. In the United States all that a master requires is American citizenship and the goodwill of the owner to appoint him. The mate may be anybody whom the master or the owner sees fit to appoint. Those who are not in the business may say that there cannot be any trouble in getting certificated masters and mates, but there is. The men who make the best masters and mates are those who go to sea early in life, so that they do not get advantages of an education. But they become familiar with the sea, they learn the business, and they contend that they do not require a theoretical knowledge of the science of navigation. They say that their business of handling vessels lies chiefly along the North American coasts, through fogs in the summer and snows-torms in winter, and that the science of navigation is of no benefit to them. They navigate their vessels by means of their coast chart and their soundings, and as a matter of fact they do learn to guide their vessels with great safety. They start from their place of departure, and thread their course through currents and counter-currents, with head winds and fair winds, and reach the port of their destination with a certainty that is remarkable. Well, Sir, as these men show good habits and efficiency, they look for advancement; they ask to be made masters of vessels; but they say, "We cannot pass the technical examination, and if you cannot give us charge of a vessel, we shall have to take charge of an American vessel, which we can get readily. So that the Canadian owner is either forced to part with his well-trained man, or invest his money entirely in American vessels. Then, with regard to mates, we find that the number of applicants at the examinations grows less and less every year, and the Canadian vessel owner and manager finds that he cannot get certified mates when he wants them. If a man is able to take a mate's certificate, he is able to take a master's, and he wants a master's pay; and he is dilatory about taking any other position or about going upon a vessel under another master. Now, with regard to the question of pilotage, the American coastwise vessels prosecute their business freely; they enter any port from Maine to Mexico free from the burden of compulsory pilotage, while our vessels are subjected to that burden. There is no question relating to shipping over which there has been more controversy of an acrimonious character than this question of compulsory pilotage; and while I speak on behalf of vessel-owners, far be it from me to say anything against pilots as a body of men. I believe them to be brave and noble men,

who have rendered splendid service in guiding stranger ships to our ports and in giving them safe departure from our shores. But the home port men contend that they require to know the coast within the pilotage limits just as much as the pilots do. They spend their time on board of a schooner and with a certificated master and a certificated mate; and while understanding their business, they say it is a burden and a hardship for them to pay the demands of compulsory pilotage every time they enter port in prosecuting their regular business. If you come to consider the matter from their stand-point, you will find that the system is very burdensome. They really do know the coasts, and they know their business, and many of them would scorn to have a pilot on their vessel. In times of storm they say they cannot get a pilot, and then they have to take care of their vessels themselves; but on a fine day, when everything bids fair, the pilot comes out and waves his red flag, takes charge of the vessel and then it is subject to pilotage dues. They contend that the coastwise vessel is compelled to pay five times the pilotage proportionately that any other class of vessel has to pay; and if you inquire, you will find that they are telling the truth. Pilotage at our ports bears very unevenly on the smaller vessels. I will give you an instance. A ship owner some time ago showed me a memorandum of two pilotage bills which he had got in the port of St. John. One was for a steamer of 2,000 tons burden, and the other for a schooner of 218 tons burden. They were both spoken in the same pilotage limit. The steamer cleared with 2,500,000 spruce deals and the schooner with 270,000 spruce deals; but the steamer, with ten times the cargo, had to pay the pilotage funds some \$70, and the schooner \$40. Now, the steamer required the pilot, and while the schooner did not ask for a pilot, it was compelled to pay. On the other side, it is contended that the compulsory pilotage system must be kept up because the pilots must have their living. Well, that appears to be a weak argument. I think the law of supply and demand would soon regulate that. The compulsory pilotage seems to be a mere relic of barbarism. If a man wants a pilot, let him get one. That is the argument of men engaged in this trade, and it appears to be almost unanswerable. If you wish to satisfy yourself as to that, make inquiry at those ports where compulsory pilotage does not exist or where it has been in part abolished. I believe that in the port of Quebec vessel owners have been relieved to the extent of 250 tons, while in the United States the system has been abolished. If we have to determine between the extinction of the pilot and the extinction of the vessel, it would appear to be the safer plan to let the pilot be extinguished. Again, it is said that the demand for pilots does not exist to-day as it did in earlier days. Hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars all along the coasts have been expended in establishing

beacons and buoys and lighthouses to guide the mariner into his port of safety. Charts are everywhere to be had, showing the exact depth of water, and the mariner is better skilled than he used to be, so that the dangers which formerly existed do not exist to-day. Everything points to-day to the necessity of compulsory pilotage disappearing, especially in countries like this. I will now take up the deck-load clause. In the United States, the people with whom we have to compete, have no deck-load law. We have one now which is in part applied to our coastwise vessels. These vessels go to South America with a full deck-load; but are restricted from going to the West Indies similarly loaded. The American master loads his vessel according to his judgment. He takes on board whatever he thinks is safe, and then can get his clearance at any American port. In the Dominion, however, when the 1st of October arrives, the Canadian master has to observe the deck-load regulation. He cannot put lumber on deck higher than six inches above the rail, even though he has not the full quantity of boards the merchant wishes to ship. There is an inconsistency and an absurdity in allowing a vessel to go to Newfoundland or South America, even as far as Cape Horn, with a full deck load, and yet though she has to pass the West India Islands, she cannot stop at those islands. One or the other must be wrong. If a vessel can go to South America, surely she can go to Bermuda. So great is the inconsistency that the shippers are clamouring for its remedy. In addition to this, we have a load-line threatened. It is an old saying that it is time enough to bid the old gent good day when you meet him; but I can almost hear the sound of his feet, and I think I am justified in dealing with the matter. In the United States such a thing as a load-line has never been dreamt of; but I believe it is now proposed that we shall adopt a load-line for the Dominion or be subject to the British load-line. If we have to choose between the two, I would say by all means submit to the British load-line. From all I can learn, there is not one redeeming feature with reference to the proposed load-line, as applied to our small tonnage. It means, if applied to them, a loss of from 10 to 20 per cent upon our best coastwise vessels, while it means the extinction of our small ones. When it comes to be applied to all that class known as the wood-boat schooners, and others engaged in carrying lumber to American ports, as a matter of fact, these vessels load almost level with the water, and follow the coast for safety, taking advantage of the harbours to shelter them from storms, and I am prepared to say that the ratio of loss among that class is smaller than in any other engaged on the Atlantic coast. If a load-line is to be adopted to apply to that class of vessels the risk will have to be put on the covering-board, and there is no set of tables to allow the ordinary cargo to be

Mr. BAIRD.

carried that I have seen that can be applied to these vessels and preserve them from extinction.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you prefer the British load-line?

Mr. BAIRD. Because very few of our vessels will put themselves in the way of having that brand of inequality on their side. I speak of it as a brand of inequality, because, when they carry that to the ends of their days, the loss will be so great it will leave a brand so that the vessel will be almost unsaleable in the markets of the world. Few of our vessels prosecute the same business that they did eight or ten years ago, of carrying deals to British ports and then loading coal or railroad iron for Rosario or other ports in the Argentine Republic. Steamers now carry those across, and then the cargoes are transferred into lighters. It appears that all the British legislation is aimed directly at what we call our popular vessels—the broad-beamed, shallow-draft vessels. We have to contend with bars of sand thrown up by action of the sea all along the coasts of North and South America, so that a vessel of 500 tons, drawing only 10 feet of water is worth 20 per cent more than a vessel of the same dead-weight capacity drawing 12 feet. Every inducement is given us to keep that class of vessels in use; but if you put a load-line upon them you will destroy their usefulness. We always use them deeply submerged. Mr. Plimsoll has heard of this, and he appears to report things in a desperate condition; but I can assure you, Sir, that he labours under a great mistake. These people prosecute their business with as much safety and prudence as any other class, and their ratio of loss is as light as that of any other class.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about insurance?

Mr. BAIRD. I am prepared to say that the underwriters make no discrimination whatever, whether the vessel be narrow or deep, or whether she is broad and shoal-draft. Nearly all the United States vessels are built with that special end in view, of getting through the shallow waters, and carrying their full freight to its destination. This is what gives them a special value. Now, the proposals on behalf of the shipping men, which I would like to lay before Parliament and the Government, are these: that coastwise vessels should have certificated masters, but not certificated mates. In reference to compulsory pilotage, I can only speak of the port of St. John. Other members may speak for their ports. It is the imperative demand of the people of St. John that they should be relieved of compulsory pilotage up to 250 tons, while actually engaged in the coastwise trade. Surely their demand is not unreasonable. With regard to the deck-load law, I would suggest that the deck load to the West Indies be made to correspond with that of South

America, and with reference to the load-line I would say, make no legislation whatever. If it is not the intention of the Imperial Parliament to take charge of our vessels, and actually force this load-line upon others than those which enter their ports, let them remain as they are. Give no load-line, because there is none that can be made satisfactory to our people for coastwise vessels. In dealing with this, I would ask the House not to look upon it as a sectional question, or as legislation simply for the benefit of the Maritime provinces. It is not in the interests of the east or the west alone, but concerns men from the centre as well as down by the sea. It is a national question. I am speaking on behalf of the merchant marine of Canada, not those interested in St. John alone, but in every part of the Dominion. A country appears to have no real standing at all unless it is known on the seas. The history of the past shows that all countries have miserably perished, in the commercial sense, as great states, when their ships no longer were found on the highways of the sea. We are desirous still to be found on the sea: but if the strong arm of this industry is to be strangled by burdensome regulations, it is not unreasonable for us to ask that the Government should relax these regulations and give our ship-owners the liberty they ask. We are not asking for money. The shipping interests have never come before the Government, like other industries, asking for money. That is something unheard of on their part, and I respect them highly for it. They have never had any protection except the slight rebate of 60 cents per ton on the iron used in the construction of ships. As a class, they have been harshly legislated against, and have borne their heavy burdens without complaint; and when they ask for liberties of this kind, it would come hard to their minds if they were refused. This is the first time these things have been fairly before the House, and I trust they will receive reasonable consideration from hon. gentlemen on both sides. So now, I think, I have placed these things as fairly and squarely before you as I possibly could, and, if you look them over, you will find them pretty true, for a parliamentary statement. If you are not satisfied that they are generally correct, then I would ask, if it would not be reasonable that a commission should issue to inquire into these things, to find out whether our shipping is declining and whether these restrictions these navigation laws, bear heavily upon us. If you have doubts about the matter, let the commission issue. But by all means do not let the matter stop here. Let us have some amendment, let us give some relief to these men who are crying out for relief. It is not fair or reasonable that we should stand by and look on in mere unavailing regret while this industry is declining. I trust you will not consider me too urgent

or impertinent if I ask that something ought to be done, and that at once.

Mr. WELSH. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. gentleman's remarks on the shipping interests of the Dominion, and I quite agree with him on every point, and quite approve of his remarks. But it seems to me I can see several difficulties in the way of the application of a remedy. If a remedy can be devised I shall be glad to support it. The hon. gentleman is quite right in reference to the decrease of our shipping and in saying that we have to compete not only with Americans, but also with foreigners of all kinds, Swedes, Danes and Russians, and it has come to this, that of our lumber-carrying trade from New Brunswick for Europe, nine-tenths is carried by foreigners. They sail without any restrictions to load line or fittings, while we are bound by certain rules and regulations, under the arrangement made by the Dominion of Canada with the Imperial Government. Suppose one of our ships takes a cargo of lumber out, before she can clear from a British port she is subject to inspection by the Board of Trade, and, even if she is classed A1 with us, before she can clear with a cargo for South America or the West Indies, she will have to arrange her load-line and boats. Also as to pilotage, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, but there may be a question how we are going to remedy this without making fish of one and flesh of the other. As to the certificates of masters and mates also, I think the hon. gentleman is quite right, but I do not see how we can make a change for the better without departing from the rules laid down by the Dominion law that Colonial ships shall have certified masters and mates. In the coasting trade, I understand, the rule does not apply; you can carry a cargo from one British port to another without a certified master. But in going down to the West Indies, you must have a certified master and, as my hon. friend remarks, it is very difficult at all times to get masters and mates. I have known vessels to be detained for a week or ten days and then obliged to send away to another port to bring in master and mate. That is a great drawback to the West India trade. I approve of everything the hon. gentleman has said; his remarks do him great credit, showing, as they do, that he has considered this matter very closely. If there is a remedy I shall be glad to hear it, and to support it when it is proposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to interpose in this debate, and not being a practical merchant do not intend to follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Queen's, N.B. I was much pleased to hear the remarks that he, as a practical man, has made, because they bear out the statements I have made on previous occasions based upon the

figures of the Trade and Navigation Returns and other statistics. I am glad he has endorsed these statements, because many hon. gentlemen seem to think I made the statements from a party stand-point, and that I had a malicious pleasure in making them. The hon. gentleman told you to-day that there is no use blinking the fact that our wooden shipping is being paralyzed, and that to-day we do not take the position among the commercial nations of the world that we ought to take. I made a statement the other day, in discussing this matter, that though there appeared to be an increase in the tonnage of vessels to and from Canada, an examination of the figures would disclose the fact that, so far as Canadian bottoms were concerned, there has been no increase at all, that the surplus exports of Canada are carried by foreigners and that the profits of carriage are made by them. Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that statement was made from a party stand-point. I shall be glad to join with the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) if he can find a means of removing the restrictions from our vessels or a means by which any onus or burden can be withdrawn without doing injustice to the seamen. I quite agree that this is a question which should be above party politics. But the moment a statement is made with reference to the shipping interests, there are some gentlemen who know nothing about it, who deem it necessary to rush in and, as they think, score a point by contradicting the statements made. When I gave a statement of the terribly depressed condition of our shipping in the Maritime provinces and the immense losses that had been suffered, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) must needs attempt to show that I was speaking of a subject I knew nothing about and made the statement that 80,000 steam-ships tied up at the wharfs of the world.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, Sir, we are not going to discuss these matters, but to call his attention to the fact that there are not 80,000 steam-ships in the world altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have drawn the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he must not carry on this discussion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to do it.

Mr. HAZEN. I desire to say a word before the motion is declared carried. This discussion is upon a subject which is of very great importance to this country. It arises on a Bill introduced by the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) concerning the examinations of masters and mates. A few days ago I found the following paragraph in a St. John paper :—

FALLING OFF IN MASTERS AND MATES.—A great falling off is reported in the number of persons coming
Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

up for examination for masters and mates' certificates before the marine examiners. Where the board used to sit at least once a month and have all the way from six to twelve applicants, now they do not have to sit more than once in two months, and the number of applicants is less than one-half.

One of the troubles is that in the Canadian Act dealing with the subject there is a provision that no certificate shall be granted to any master or mate who has not been domiciled in Canada for three years, or has not served for three years on a vessel registered in Canada. That applies even to British subjects, and to show how partially it applies in many cases, I can illustrate by what occurred not very long ago when an American vessel owned in St. John, belonging to Mr. Howard Troop, was destroyed by fire, or lost in some way. Having every confidence in the master, Mr. Troop wanted to put him on board another ship, but found he could not do so because he did not have the necessary certificate. He naturally thought, as this man was a British subject, that all he would have to do was to go to St. John and pass an examination before the board there. When he came to St. John he found he was not eligible for an examination; and so Mr. Troop had to send him to Liverpool to pass an examination, and when he came back Mr. Troop put him on one of his vessels in St. John. This clearly shows that the domiciliation clause in our Act, which I presume was placed there with some intention of giving special protection to our own Canadian seamen, does not protect them at all, as a certificate granted in Great Britain, or a certificate granted in almost any colony of the Empire, has just the same effect in Canada as a certificate has granted under our Canadian law. The Dominion of Canada was the first colony which was granted the right of issuing certificates. Since that time the privilege has been extended to New Zealand, New South Wales, Malta, South Australia, Tasmania, Bengal, Newfoundland, Bombay and Queensland; but, with the exception of Canada, none of those colonies have a domiciliation clause in their Act; neither do they require applicants for certificates to serve any length of time in vessels registered in the colonies. It will thus be seen that in this respect the law in Canada is exceptional. While it was intended, I think, originally, specially to protect our own seamen, it will be seen that at the present time it really works to the disadvantage of our own seamen, and to the disadvantage of those who own our vessels and who control our tonnage. Now, the Bill introduced by the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries provides that in the case of a British subject who has served, I think, for three years on any vessel, that service will be sufficient to enable him to get a certificate in Canada. But it is very doubtful if that goes far enough, even, because shipping men sometimes find it difficult to get British subjects or Canadians to take command of their vessels, in many cases be-

ing forced, I believe—the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., will correct me, if I am not right—to employ Norwegian sailors, who are in most cases very excellent men, and other foreign subjects. Now, there is an impression amongst shipping men that the Act should be made to extend to them, and if, though not British subjects, they have served for three years on any British vessel, they should be entitled to get their certificate here in Canada just the same as any Canadian or any other British subject. Now, it is evident, I think, from what I have said, that it is time an amendment was made to this Act, and I trust when the Bill gets into committee that it will be carefully considered by this House, and that an amendment will be framed and adopted that will remedy the evil that is complained of by our shipping men at present. With regard to the pilotage question, which my hon. friend from Queen's has referred to, of course it seems absurd that the owner of a coaster, which does not carry passengers, should have to employ a pilot whether he wants to or not, though his own captain, in many cases, perhaps in the majority of cases, is quite as well able to make his way through the waters in which he sails, as any pilot is. It must be borne in mind, however, that it is contended by owners of shipping that a certain number of pilots are required in every port, that no port is an efficient port without pilots, and no port is thoroughly equipped for shipping, no port is thoroughly safe, unless it possesses a certain number of well-trained pilots, who have made a study of the gales, and the tides and the currents, and know all about navigation in the waters they navigate, in order that when strange ships come to port, they may be there to bring in these ships in safety. I think it is a proposition which can not be disputed, that no port is efficient unless it has a number of trained pilots. Now, let us go a little further. Would it be possible, for instance, in a port like that of St. John, unless there was some sort of compulsory pilotage law, to maintain and pay a corps of trained pilots year after year, as they are maintained at the present time? My learned friend from Queen's thinks it is possible. There are many shipping men who hold that view; but it seems to me that is a branch of the subject that should be very carefully looked into before we come to a settlement on this matter. Now, pilots possess, it seems to me, certain rights. Speaking specially with regard to the port of St. John, these men have been brought up and trained to this business, they understand it, they have had to pass a certain examination, they have had to study for the purpose of passing these examinations, and have had to get certificates. They have to provide themselves with pilot boats and with the necessary outfit; therefore, from their stand-point, they have certain rights, which, to some extent, ought to be protected. In saying this I do not

mean that the owner of a coaster that simply plys along the Atlantic coast—vessels not over 125 tons are exempted from pilotage—I do not mean to say that from that rate up to 250 tons they should be compelled to pay pilotage, whether they want to or not. It may be there is a great deal of force in the contention of the hon. member for Queen's, that the large iron vessels, the foreign vessels, if I may call them so—I mean those that are not owned in the port—pay, as a rule, much less pilotage proportionately than small vessels which never require the services of a pilot, which are owned in the port, and, in proportion to their tonnage, pay a much higher rate than large iron vessels, which carry thousands of feet more deals every voyage they make. This question must be carefully looked into, and if the rates are not fair, they should be made so. We have also to consider whether a step should be taken which could, in any event, make it possible for a port to be left without the services of some trained men who could be called upon in an emergency to take charge of a ship whose master does not know the waters he is navigating. With regard to the load-line question, as I understand it, that matter is not within the control of this Parliament. The British Act of several years ago provided for the making of a load-line, and the representative of this country in London, Sir Charles Tupper, made representations to the Imperial Board of Trade, and accordingly the Act was amended so as to provide that if any self-governing colony of the Empire enacted laws for the placing of the load-line along similar lines and on similar principles to those that prevailed in the British Act, such Colonial Act would be taken by the Imperial Board of Trade as sufficient. It will be remembered that this Parliament enacted a load-line Act, but exception has been taken to it, as I understand, by the officers of the Board of Trade in Great Britain, and the matter is still in abeyance. It does seem absurd that in our vessels, which have deeper holds and better capacity for carrying dead weight in every way, the load-line should be marked in the same way as it is marked upon iron vessels in Great Britain. If that is done, it must work a great deal of injury eventually to our trade. But, as I said before, that is a matter with which this Parliament, unfortunately, cannot deal, and that being the case, it is for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to communicate with our High Commissioner in London and ask him to represent to the Board of Trade in Great Britain how necessary it is, in dealing with Canadian shipping, that they should deal with this load-line matter in a way that will not result injuriously to our interests.

Mr. KENNY. In common with other hon. members I listened with great interest to the very instructive speech made by the hon.

member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) in regard to the Atlantic coasting shipping of the Dominion. We recognize that the hon. member for Queen's is a competent authority, that there is no man in the Maritime provinces who is more familiar with the Atlantic coasting trade than my hon. friend. He has proved that fact conclusively and to the satisfaction of members of this House to-day. I quite agree with my hon. friend that in that coasting trade, competing as we are with the Americans, it is absolutely necessary, if we are to be successful in that competition, that our coasting vessels should not be hampered by any unwise legislation. My hon. friend has pointed out that in the American coasting trade it is not necessary that the mates of vessels engaged in that trade should possess certificates. I know from my own personal experience that in Halifax our West India vessels have been detained for some time owing to the fact that the owners could not procure mates who had certificates. On some occasions the owners were so embarrassed that they telegraphed to the Minister of Marine at Ottawa, asking him to grant special permission to allow their vessels to clear without a certified mate. The Minister replied that he had no jurisdiction in such matters, that Parliament had enacted the law, and it was his duty to carry it out. I know as regards those vessels which are engaged in the coasting trade, and when I say coasting trade I would extend the term to the West India trade, that if we are to compete successfully with the Americans, our vessels must have the same privileges which our American competitors enjoy. We must remember, too, that there is a great change going on in the shipping of the world, and nobody knows it better than the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), who is a practical mariner, and this change is not confined to the ocean trade, but also is observable in the coasting trade, and to-day raw materials like coal and pig iron are transported along the American coast by barges towed by steamers, very similar to the manner in which grain is transported across our inland lakes. It would be a very great hardship if those barges were subjected to compulsory pilotage.

Mr. HAZEN. That is so.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend from St. John says that at the present moment those vessels are subjected to that restriction. I am afraid such is the case, and I think that restriction should be removed. I agree, therefore, with the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), that in the coasting trade it is not necessary that the mates of those vessels should possess certificates. So far as regards our ocean ships, I think the mates should possess certificates. I believe it is very desirable that our young men who take to the sea and engage in that calling should be qualified for the positions which they may be

Mr. KENNY.

called upon to fill, and be as well qualified as their competitors, be they English or foreigners. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) referred to the paralyzed condition of the shipping of the Maritime provinces. You, Mr. Speaker, reminded him that it was not proper to refer to a previous debate, but the hon. gentleman said to-day that at the present moment there was general paralysis in the shipping industry of this Dominion, and he was inclined to attribute that condition to the policy of the present Government, or at all events that was the insinuation, and I think he dated this paralysis from about 1878. My hon. friend objected to a remark made in a former debate by the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) because he was not an expert in shipping matters. I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that my hon. friend, when he spoke so authoritatively, must pose as an authority in such matters, and being engaged in the shipping business myself, and having one or two idle ships in different parts of the world, I shall be very much obliged if the hon. gentleman, as a mere matter of charity, will inform me of any place where shipping is not depressed to-day. Let me tell him that I am interested in a ship that has been idle in San Francisco since February 24, 1892. Only to-day one of my friends engaged in shipping came to me to ask what he was to do with a ship he had waiting for orders at Anjier. There is great depression to-day in shipping in the distant east as well as in the west. With such an extraordinary, unparalleled condition of depression, the owners of ships do not know what to do. I think even the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) would hardly blame the National Policy for the fact that a vessel has been idle in San Francisco for over a year, and another Canadian ship cannot find employment at Anjier, but probably in the constituency in which the hon. gentleman lives, he may induce, if not now, at the next general election, some of his friends to place this great depression which exists in shipping, and which we all recognize and deplore and some of us feel very sensitively, at the door of the National Policy. The reduction in the tonnage of our Canadian wooden ships—my hon. friend knows it, and I think he should have stated it to the House—is due to the extreme competition of steam vessels, and to-day iron sailing ships have replaced wooden sailing ships, for it must be remembered that the only ships ever built in the Maritime provinces have been wooden vessels. That is another argument in favour of the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), that we should more jealously guard the trade that is left to our wooden ships, the coasting trade. Yesterday's Order Paper bristled with motions attacking the National Policy as regards sugar, iron, binder twine, everything we can manufacture in our country is assailed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I stated what is a palpable fact, which I think even

the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) will not contradict, that the depression in shipping is owing to the fact that we cannot build iron ships in this Dominion, not at least on the Atlantic coast; and we never shall be able to build them until we develop our iron industry, and we can only do that under the National Policy, under a protective tariff, in the same manner in which the iron industry of every country in the world, including England and the United States, has been developed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will show how the iron industry is protected in England?

Mr. KENNY. The iron industry was protected in England to the extent of \$10, \$20 and \$30 per ton in the early days.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When?

Mr. KENNY. In the initial stages of the development of the iron industry in England, and England to-day would hardly have attained the supremacy she occupies as a great manufacturing country, the basis of which is the iron industry, if she had not protected her iron industry in its initial stages. That is the answer I have to make to the hon. gentleman's remarks. It is not necessary to travel across the ocean for examples of the beneficial effect of protection on the iron trade, if we will only look south. We are told sometimes that these hon. gentlemen opposite look to the United States for the sign by which they shall conquer, and if my hon. friend will look to the policy of the United States in reference to this matter, he will find that under protection, the iron industries have developed enormously and that they are now building iron ships in the United States. Now, one or two words with regard to the Pilotage Act. I am aware that the Pilot Commissioners of Halifax sent to the hon. Minister of Marine a recommendation that Canadian vessels engaged in the coasting trade should be exempt from pilotage. As I understand the present Act, it only exempts vessels of 120 tons or under, and I understood from my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Baird) that he recommends that this exemption should be extended to vessels of 250 tons. I hardly think it would be possible for us to make a separate law for each port, but that it would have to come under a general Act, so that I understand, the exemption of vessels of 250 tons would meet the views of my hon. friend. In making such a radical change in the Pilotage law due consideration would have to be given to its effect on our pilots, and some fair arrangement should be made on behalf of the men who have been for so many years engaged as pilots in our ports, as it would not be possible for them to revert abruptly to other occupations.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was very much pleased with the speech of the hon. member for

Queen's (Mr. Baird). I am not very familiar with the subject of this discussion, but formerly I had something to do with vessels, and it occurs to me that his suggestions are worthy of consideration. His remarks were delivered in a tone free from politics, and I think my genial friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) would have done well if he had followed his example. I was delighted to hear a discussion in which there was no talk of the National Policy, and no protection. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Baird) does not want any protection. I agree with him that the kind of protection the shipping wants is for the Government to allow owners of coast vessels to do their own business in their own way, and as they best know how to do it. With regard to the protection of shipping and iron industries in England, my reading of history is, that the British Government did undertake to protect her shipping over 100 years ago, and they protected it so much that they would not allow their colonial ships to do anything, the result of which was that they got into a fight and got a thrashing. That was the result of protection, and the English Government have been wiser ever since. I believe, what my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Baird) suggests is, that the people in New Brunswick should be allowed to build the kind of ships they can build there now, and that they should be allowed to compete on equal terms with their neighbours on the other side of the line. Our people now invest in schooners, because the American vessels have the preference in the trade, and therefore they are making money which our small vessels are not. It has occurred to me during this debate that we are looking now with our mind's eye towards the great Atlantic; whereas all the time in the past we have been looking to the west, as though the whole Dominion and all its interests were settled in the great prairie. I want that our people should be allowed to build their ships and sail them in their own way, and make money, and the reason that my hon. friend's vessels do not get enough to do now is because commerce is declining. It ought not to be so, and I trust it will not long continue to be so. I want to see our ships built by our own mechanics. I want to see our ships manned by our own seamen, I want to see our ships loaded with the products of our own soil, and I want to see them make money under these circumstances. If we had the commerce that we ought to have, our seafaring people ought to make a good living. I am sorry for my friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that, like other ship-owners, his ship is lying idle in San Francisco. I do not understand why a maritime people, I do not understand why men with the energy of Canadians, and I do not understand why men with that force of character, and with the means that we ought to have, cannot keep pace with the times, in shipping. Perhaps the trouble is that shipping is overdone, that there is too

much of it for the business of the world, and if such is the case it cannot be helped. The suggestions made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) are sound, and the Government should pay attention to them. I do not believe that it is necessary for the masters of these coasting vessels to have certificates. Education is always good, and navigation is good, but it is quite impossible for these young men who go as boys to sea to get it. I know, however, that they are very competent mariners, and that the science of navigation is not at all needed in order to do the coasting trade successfully. In my opinion it is absurd that vessels should not be allowed to go to the West India Islands under the same deck-load laws as they go to South America. I believe that the maritime interests of the county I represent would assent to every proposition made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird). I trust, in conclusion, that the Government will give due consideration to what has been said.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker. I am sure that every one interested in the coasting trade of the Maritime provinces will be glad that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) has brought this matter to the attention of the House. There is no hon. gentleman in the House, as his speech has shown, who is more conversant with the subject, and I am sure that the remarks he has made will have great weight, not only with those who come from the Maritime provinces, but with those who represent the other provinces, and who desire to see every branch of trade in every section of the Dominion develop to the greatest extent possible. I do not intend to lengthen the discussion, because I cannot better express my opinions than by endorsing what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Baird) has said. I wish, however, to emphasize one point to which he directed the attention of the House, and that is, the question of requiring certificates from the mates of our vessels going to the United States ports and the West Indies. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that in the city of St. John it has caused great inconvenience and expense to the owners of this class of vessels. I desire to say from my experience that while it may be oppressive to them in large ports like St. John, it is far more oppressive in the outports. I have known cases of vessels loaded at the outports for the West Indies, for which there has been the greatest difficulty to obtain certificated mates. Indeed, it is quite impossible to obtain them at the outports, and in some cases the owners are obliged at great expense and at considerable delay to send to the city of St. John for a mate. It will be readily seen that while our shipping labours under this disadvantage, the profits of the trade must be seriously interfered with. I hope that the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take this question into his serious consideration, and remove

Mr. GILLMOR.

the disability under which this class of shipping now labours. I quite endorse, too, what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the regulations governing the deck loads of our vessels going to the West Indies. It seems to be absurd that a vessel loading for the West Indies is not permitted even to carry as large a deck load as a vessel going on a longer voyage to South America. However, I do not wish to enlarge upon that point. I also endorse the observations of the hon. gentleman on the question of compulsory pilotage, but it is not necessary for me to detain the House by repeating the arguments which have been so well presented to it already.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say a few words on the question before the House. In Great Britain previous to 1854 there were no restrictions on either masters or mates. Prior to that year they were not required to have certificates; but after the Act came into force all who had occupied positions as masters or mates in the merchant shipping of Great Britain were granted certificates of service, and from that time to the present every master and mate has had to pass an examination of competency before the Marine Board. At the present time there is no restriction upon the coasting trade of Great Britain or Ireland, and the Dominion Government should not place any more restrictions upon our merchant marine than Great Britain imposes on hers. Therefore I hope the Minister of Marine will see his way to abolish the system from our coasting trade, including even the West Indian trade. Regarding harbour dues, in my native town the custom was when a vessel arrived light, to charge her only half the harbour and pilotage dues. The system of a harbour line or draught of water line seems to be a very unfair one, because if a vessel is flat-bottomed, she has a great advantage over one of a different construction. If harbour dues or pilotage dues are to be continued, the tonnage of the vessel should be the basis of the charge, and when a vessel comes into port wind-bound or without a cargo there should be a scale of charges accordingly. That is the custom in Great Britain, and I do not think we should treat our shippers differently. Now, my hon. friend from Halifax wanted to bring the National Policy into this discussion.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did it.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, you continued it. Now, I wish to say that when I came to this country in 1870 the village of Port Dalhousie and the city of St. Catharines in the county I have the honour to represent were thriving places, famous for their shipbuilding; but I am sorry to say that in both those places the grass is growing where the ships used to be built. One reason for that is that the Government have imposed a duty of 35 per cent on everything that may be imported for the repairing of a vessel, while a vessel ready-made and manned by foreign seamen can

be brought in free. The result is that instead of the work being done along the line of the Welland Canal, as it formerly was, it is done at Buffalo, where iron can be got at cost. In this way the duty drives the work of repairing out of the country as well as stops the shipbuilding. Therefore I hope the Minister in charge will take this matter into his consideration, and adopt some of the suggestions which have been made this afternoon. If pilotage and harbour dues are to be imposed on ship-owners, they should be fixed on a sliding scale, as is done in Great Britain, and a vessel without a cargo should be charged according to her tonnage and not according to her draught of water. Any person who understands shipbuilding, which I happened to learn in my young days, knows that the draught of a vessel may be diminished or increased according to its construction, and the owner of the vessel should not be put to any disadvantage on this account.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have listened with much interest and attention to the remarks which emanated from the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), and I fully endorse his views. I represent a county which has a shipping port of no small importance, and I have found that the same grievance to which the hon. member for Queen's has given expression has been complained of by ship owners and masters in the port of Lunenburg. I fully agree with our hon. friend that mates should have the privilege he asks for them, and that it is an advantage to ship owners cannot be disputed, for I have known numberless instances of vessels having to remain in port for weeks because mates could not be had on account of the restrictions imposed upon them. If mates can sail coastwise without restriction, even to the United States, why not be allowed to sail to the West Indies. With regard to the load-line, I fully endorse the hon. gentleman's views. I cannot see why we should be restricted in the way we are, when vessels going to South America are permitted to load as they please. Regarding the port dues of vessels, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the limit should be 250 tons for coastwise vessels instead of the limit of 120 tons. We find the inconvenience very considerable in visiting the port of Halifax with some of our vessels, whereas if that restriction were removed, it would be more satisfactory. With regard to the remark made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that trade is paralyzed. I am pleased to inform the hon. gentleman that the trade and shipping, and the tonnage of the port of Lunenburg and in the county which I have the honour to represent, shows no diminution, but, on the contrary, shows an increase, and that trade has been steadily increasing from year to year. Last year the number of vessels built within the county exceeded thirty, and this year, I

am inclined to believe, the number will be no less but probably greater. I am glad indeed this matter has been brought up and so ably commented upon by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) and I hope it will receive the consideration of this House.

Mr. CHESLEY. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) has placed this matter before the House in a very fair and reasonable way. With regard to the law requiring certificates from the masters and mates, that has always seemed to me, instead of a protection, just the reverse. Under that law, no matter how capable a man may be and how good an examination he may pass, unless he can show that he has had three years' service in a Canadian vessel, or has been domiciled in Canada for three years, he cannot obtain a certificate; and the result is that, instead of complying with these conditions of service or domicile, he will leave the country and seek employment elsewhere. The effect of the Act in that particular has therefore been to deprive Canada of the service of some of the best men we might have obtained as masters and mates, and the object of the Act, the protection of Canadians as masters and mates, is thereby defeated. I would like to see the law so altered that any man qualified, no matter whether he has lived in the country or not, should, on passing the required examination, be at once granted a certificate without further trouble or expense. With regard to the compulsory pilotage question, a good deal may be said on both sides. While it is a burden perhaps and a hardship to require our small coasting vessels to employ pilots, the fact still remains that it is necessary that every shipping port should have a complete system of pilotage in the interest of the business of that port. That being the case, the question we have to deal with is what exemptions we should make, while maintaining the system; and I have no doubt that the Act could be so amended as to meet the difficulty. Another question referred to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) is the deck-load line. The men engaged in the coasting business of this country build their vessels to suit that trade; some are built drawing a light draught and others drawing a greater draught, and the construction of the two kinds is entirely different. A load-line applicable to one class of vessels would affect the value of another class very materially, and I cannot see why any system of legislation should be had which will, when carried out, damage the carrying capacity of any one class of vessels. Now that this question has been so well debated, I hope it will be taken up and considered in all its aspects, and that what is considered a great encumbrance will be removed from this important business. We all know that the coasting trade and shipping business generally is in a very depressed condition. The

coasting trade is one we ought especially to foster. I hope, now that the question has been brought before Parliament, that every means of inquiry will be used and every effort made to relieve this important business of some of the burdens it now carries.

Motion agreed to.

GEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CARSCALLEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a change in the management or personnel of the officials of the Geological Department, during the present year? Is it the intention of the Government to establish a branch of the Geological Department during the present year that will attend particularly to mineralogy and mining operations, in order to aid in the development of our mineral resources? Do the Government intend to establish an assay branch in connection with such department?

Mr. DALY. There appears to be no reason for making any changes at present, either in the management or personnel of the Geological Department, and the Government has no intention of doing so. The documents, circulars and reports which I will furnish the hon. member will probably suffice to show the hon. member that there is, and has been for several years, a division or branch of the Geological Department such as he refers to. There is also an assay and chemical branch, as is shown by the numerous assays and analyses, the results of which are published in the reports of the survey every year.

FISH HATCHERIES AT MILTON AND BEDFORD.

Mr. FORBES asked, Why the fish hatcheries at Milton, N.S., and at Bedford, Halifax county, have been closed? Whether it is the intention of the Government to re-establish said hatcheries? What results have followed from said hatcheries; and whether any, and what irregularities have led to the closing of said hatcheries?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. There is no fish hatchery at Milton, Queen's county, Nova Scotia. There is a small shed cheaply constructed as a subsidiary building, in which a few eggs may be transferred from the Bedford hatchery just previous to their hatching into fry. This building is only used for—say, five or six weeks during the year, and will in all probability be used again this year, if circumstances will admit. 2. The Bedford hatchery, Nova Scotia, is not closed, as a large number of salmon, salmon trout and whitefish eggs will be hatched in it the coming spring, and the fry distributed in several of the waters of Nova Scotia. 3. The results from the Bedford hatchery have been satisfactory, as shown by the reports from many of the fishery officers and guardians of that province. 4. No irregularities have led to the closing up of the Bedford hatchery, or the subsidiary

Mr. CHESLEY.

building at Milton. Some difficulties have arisen in the collecting of full supplies of salmon eggs for the Bedford hatchery. The necessary provision to overcome this difficulty in the future is now under consideration of the Government.

ALLEGED COTTON COMBINATIONS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, In view of the very important statement made in this House on the 17th of February, by the hon. member for West Ontario, regarding the combinations formed by the cotton manufacturers of Canada, and in view of the promise of the First Minister last session, as follows: "If it were established, as the hon. gentleman seems to assert, that the tariff was the means of enabling such a company to act oppressively to the consumers, it would certainly not very long remain so." what action do the Government intend to take?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government intend to make careful inquiry as to the accuracy of the important statement which was made to the House on the 17th February last by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), but information at present before the Government leads to the conclusion that the statement was made on erroneous information.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Monday, 6th March, after Questions to be put by Members.

He said: I beg to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government fully appreciate the courtesy and good-will which has induced members of the House to agree to the Government taking to-day for the transaction of Government business, and to facilitate otherwise the transactions of the matters which are on Government Orders, although we are unfortunate enough to have lost the greater part of the afternoon in the discussion upon the first reading of the first Bill on the Paper for introduction. I ask an extension of the same kindness on the part of the House to enable us to take Monday next. If I were to believe, Sir, statements which I see in the press—and I do not always believe statements I see in the press—an hon. member of this House, who is not in his place, and whose absence I regret, has made the statement for publication that owing to rumours which have found their way into the press he has reason to believe that my duty will call me elsewhere before many days, and that he intends to take care that I shall not slip away until an important question relating to educational affairs in Manitoba receives treatment at his hands in this House. I beg to say, Sir, with reference to that statement, that the Government ask the House to take Monday for Government Orders, with a view to giving that gentleman an opportunity of mak-

ing any statement he has to make or bringing forward any business in connection with that subject. An opportunity will be given him on that day if he wishes to avail himself of it.

Mr. LAURIER. I presume I know the hon. gentleman to whom the First Minister alluded, though he has not named him. I do not see the hon. member in his seat. At all events I understand from the statement of the First Minister now that on Monday the House will be moved into Committee of Supply so as to offer the hon. gentleman an opportunity of bringing up that question of Manitoba schools, if he so chooses.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS CASE.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask whether it is the intention of the Government to bring down, and have printed the last Minute of the Privy Council with reference to the Schools Act? I find in the papers that have been printed the document ends with the Order of the 29th December last. I understood from the First Minister that since that time a further Minute or Order in Council has been made, and I understood the hon. gentleman to say also that he proposed to bring that Order down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was brought down yesterday and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—THE DUTY ON COAL OIL.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to a few remarks as reported in "Hansard" made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) last night. Speaking to the question then before the House, the hon. member undertook to reproach me for not taking what he considered a stand upon the question of the reduction of the duty on oil, and he goes on to say in the course of his observations:

If I am correctly informed, he is largely interested in the trade himself. He has no desire for the farmers' welfare, then. He is willing they should pay 150 per cent duty on coal oil, but when it comes down to an article on which they pay 12½ per cent duty, and that for the purpose of raising a revenue, then he has a new-born zeal for the farmers that was never displayed up to that time.

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had for eleven years, directly or indirectly, remotely or nearly, any interest of any kind in oil lands or in the oil trade in any way. I desire, furthermore, to say that I was not in favour, and am not in favour of the farmers of this country paying 150 per cent duty upon coal oil. I think it ought not to be necessary for a member of this House to rise and make this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LISTER. I shall certainly take another opportunity of referring to that hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I certainly accept—

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman has a personal explanation to make he cannot enter into a discussion.

PRIVILEGE—DIVISION ON CORN DUTY.

Mr. TEMPLE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege with reference to my vote last night. I thought last night from the merriment of some hon. gentlemen, that they had been out to dinner, but that is not the case now. I desire to say that the resolution presented by the hon. gentleman from Compton (Mr. Pope) had my sympathy, and I voted in favour of it; and when I told you, Mr. Speaker, that things were mixed up a little around here—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman's vote has been recorded in the Votes and Proceedings as he intimated that he intended to give it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman is complaining that he did not fully exercise his privilege.

Mr. TEMPLE. What I want to explain to the House is this, that at the second vote I did not vote at all. It was a mistake of the clerk, not a mistake of mine; therefore, I do not think I should be accused of voting three or four times, although I would be perfectly willing to do so. I wish to say further, that I think the clerk was not altogether to blame in this case, because sometimes he cannot tell whether hon. gentlemen wish to vote or not. I think when hon. gentlemen vote they should stand up so that the clerk can see them, instead of merely bobbing their heads.

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA AT FOREIGN CAPITOLS.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance, to whom I have given private notice, whether he will be prepared shortly to state the result of his communication with the Administration in England as to the resolution that was passed last session on the motion I had the honour to make, and which ultimately was amended by one of the Ministers to read as follows:—

That it is expedient that communications be opened with Her Majesty's Government in order to bring about such fuller representation of Canadian interests at Washington and at the Capitols of other countries in which such representation may be found desirable as may be consistent with the proper relations which should exist between Great Britain and Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to my hon. friend I may say, that according to the tenor

of that resolution. Sir John Abbott and myself, when in London, had several conferences with the Colonial and Foreign Offices. We were received very kindly by Lord Roseberry, and the subject was fully discussed between us. My impression as a result of these conversations is that serious difficulties seem to be in the way of Canada having representatives at foreign capitols with ambassadorial or ministerial functions, arising out of a variety of considerations, some of which were touched last year when we were discussing the question here. My impression, also, is that the Foreign Office and the Government will be willing to facilitate in any way a full representation of Canada's interest, through their Minister at any of these capitols, and further, would be willing to act in every possible way so as to give a Canadian agent or unofficial representative, whatever advantages could possibly be given through the Embassy, or by the Minister representing Great Britain in that country.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand from the hon. gentleman that no communication has been made to the Imperial Government with regard to the resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe?

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend may understand is in the line of what I have said, that Sir John Abbott and myself had personal conferences with the Colonial and Foreign Offices when we were in London; but as yet no official written communications have passed.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me there is a dereliction of duty on the part of the Government in making no official communication, when a vote of the House had been passed ordering the Government to take such steps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we have had evidences enough of the importance of having communications on these extremely serious questions, put down in writing, to avoid misunderstanding on both sides. The hon. gentleman is aware that in other important negotiations there is a direct conflict of testimony between himself and the officers of another state.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite unfounded, however.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite well founded, in my judgment.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is in a position to give the House any more information with respect to the French treaty which is alleged to have been signed by the Canadian Commissioner in Paris. I have had a number of communications from gentlemen in the lobster and other lines of business, who are interested

Mr. FOSTER.

in the French trade, pressing for information. It is important that they should get the information, so that they may make arrangements with respect to this trade at the earliest possible date. The newspaper press contains unauthorized statements of the contents of the treaty, which may be very misleading; and it is in the interest of the commercial public that the hon. gentleman should make known at the earliest moment, the provisions of this treaty. It has been signed over a fortnight.

Mr. FOSTER. The First Minister stated the other day that a copy of the treaty would be laid on the Table in the latter part of this week, and certain other papers I am anxious to lay on the Table along with it, are now being prepared. I hope they will be ready to-morrow, if not, they will be ready the first of next week. I desire, when laying the treaty on the Table, to make a short statement. We may expect it the first of next week.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to call attention to the reason for the first section. The boundary line of the province of Ontario has been altered since the district of Nipissing was established, and the Bill, as introduced last year, did not extend the limits in accordance with the new boundary line. I am informed by the law clerk, by whom the Bill has been prepared, that the boundaries named in the Bill, in so far as they are named, are taken from the Ontario statute, and otherwise, that is to say, as regards the new boundary of the province itself, he has followed the line closely as it can be traced on the map, in accordance with the description contained in the Imperial statute as to the boundaries of Ontario. I desire to amend the clause by inserting at the end, a few words which were accidentally omitted in drafting the Bill, and which are in the present Act, namely:

And the said electoral district of Nipissing shall also include that part of the district of Algoma, bounded by a line running along the western boundary of the townships of Long and McGiverin, and then northerly along the western boundary to a point intersecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Ridout Station, then to the northern boundary of the province of Ontario.

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. Was New Edinburgh a portion of the new electoral district before ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is simply adding the words: "and shall return two members."

Mr. CHARLTON. Then New Edinburgh was not included before

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not under the Act of last session.

On section 3,

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the reason for this clause ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It refers to unorganized territory east of the river; in the Act, it reads west.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I would like to ask the First Minister whether it is the intention to introduce a section into this Bill re-defining the distribution of seats in Toronto. The hon. Minister promised last session that he might do it, and I think it would be a very opportune time for him to do it now and to assimilate the electoral divisions to the new municipal divisions of the city.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not remember what occurred last year, but I suppose that what I said was that it could be done at any time. It is a subject that has not been considered in drafting this Bill. We intended to avoid as much as possible any matter of controversy and simply to correct errors of description which occurred in drafting the Bill of last year.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I do not think it would involve any party controversy. It would make the electoral divisions of the city much simpler if we took as a basis the present municipal divisions. Under the old system there were thirteen wards in Toronto, but now there are only six.

Mr. OUIMET moved a section respecting the description of the electoral division of St. Hyacinthe. He said: The description of the county of St. Hyacinthe remained as it was according to the original establishment of the county in 1864, but since then the parish of Ste. Marie de Madeleine has added a certain part of the parish of St. John Baptiste, and it is in order to include about twenty farmers there that the amendment is moved. As it is now these farmers are in no county.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) The reasons just given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) in support of his motion are perfectly true. The changes made by the motion are only a matter of detail; they were rendered necessary in order to allow a certain number of electors of the parish of St. Jean-Baptiste to exercise their right of vote, which they would be deprived of should the law remain as it is. These electors are

included in the parish of Ste. Marie Madeleine. It was formed with part of those of La Presentation, St. Charles and St. Damase, in the county of St. Hyacinthe and with a slight portion of the parish of St. Jean-Baptiste. Were not the change effected just introduced into the law, or were not a new enumeration of the parishes included in the county of St. Hyacinthe inserted into the statute, twenty-five electors at least would be deprived of their right of vote. I had the honour to hand over to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) a petition signed by the interested electors, and asking for this change in the law. I fully approve of the amendment just made. I would add that through this change the limits of the county of St. Hyacinthe will be, as regards the House of Commons, exactly the same as those for the Local House.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. First Minister could state when we may expect to have laid on the Table the copyright papers which he promised some time ago. He told us that a despatch had recently been received from England, and I think that we should have all the information which the Government proposes to bring down, as I think the House should have something to say on the subject during the session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I shall be able to lay them on the Table next week. If I am able to make a more definite statement, I will inform the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—NOVA SCOTIA COAL MINES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, two or three times during this session, by a side-wind, the attention of the House has been called for a moment to the fact that some unusual legislation has recently been enacted in the province of Nova Scotia with respect to the coal mines of that province. It was a curious incident that directed the attention of Parliament, and through Parliament the attention of the press and the country, to one phase of the question. I will not say it is a phase of no importance, but certainly it is a phase with which this Parliament has nothing in the world to do; that is, the relation of the legislation in question to the safety of the North Atlantic and West India squadron. There was a possibility that in case of a long war at some future day, this fleet would

be cut off from access to the coal supply in Nova Scotia. I have nothing to say to-night in addition to what I have already said on that matter, more than this, that we have taken all the steps that were possible to us, not as members of Parliament, but as citizens of the country, to transmit to Lord Roseberry, in the constitutional way, the Mines Act, a copy of the lease, which contains the terms given to the company recently organized in Nova Scotia, a copy of the old lease, which sets forth the condition of the mining laws heretofore, and a copy of the charter, which embodies the powers of the company; and we accept the views expressed by several of our friends across the House, that after the Imperial authorities have been acquainted with the facts, it would be pure impertinence and nonsense for us to go any further. We may be sure, therefore, that the Imperial authorities—the Foreign Secretary, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Lords of the Admiralty—are very well able to take care of their own concerns, when their attention is called to the facts. Coming to the real question, Sir, there can be no doubt, judging by what I myself heard and saw before I left my home in Halifax to attend my duties in Parliament, judging by what I have read during the past three weeks in the papers of the province, judging by the telegrams I have received daily, and the enormous amount of correspondence that I have had from the lower provinces, that the question of the recent coal legislation in Nova Scotia is one of the deepest interest to public men. In a few weeks, when the question will be fully mastered, it will be one of deeper interest to the people of the lower provinces generally, than any question that has arisen since the union of the British provinces. The condition of public opinion in those provinces, so far as I could learn while among the people, and so far as I have been able to learn since from the telegrams and letters that I have received, is this. There are some who think that the laws enacted by the Nova Scotia Legislature are capable of great good; that they are capable of bringing about and are likely to bring about an enormous development of the coal measures of Nova Scotia; that they are likely to build up our cities in the eastern part of that province, and to give us a growth of population at considerable distances from the coal measures by reason of the trade that will stimulate; and that they will develop a large carrying trade; and that opinion is shared by a large number of the leading men of the province. On the other hand, the view is held that by the large powers given to the great corporation which now controls more than half the coal mines of that province, and for the lack of the customary checks and guards, those powers are capable of being used in a very different way; and that, seeing that they are subject to but one check and control for the unprecedented term of 100 years, these great

Mr. WELDON.

powers, if not in our day or lifetime, in the lifetime of our children or our grandchildren, may be used so far as to bring harm and disaster upon the country. Besides these two classes, which are, collectively, but few in number, there is a much larger class who are standing in a dazed attitude, who have never seen the old or the new mining leases, who have never read the charter, who are not acquainted with the mining laws of Nova Scotia, or with the history of these laws, and who, for the life of them, do not know whether the Local Government is right in its contention, or whether right is on the side of the opposition thereto, but are waiting all the while under the shadow of a great fear. The question is not well understood; it is very complicated; it is mixed up with questions of fact and law; the literature of it takes, not hours, but days to intelligently study and master. Only those who have gone through the mining laws of Nova Scotia from first to last, and taken days, and even weeks to the study, have a certain knowledge of the question. The length, the number of the documents, the complexity of the Mining Act—all make it necessary that he who undertakes to speak on this question shall be free to trespass on the attention of his hearers, and speak with some deliberation and length; otherwise, he cannot put before the House the information he has gathered on the subject. Having had the very great advantage of living in the city of Halifax, the centre of interest in this matter, of hearing some of the debates in the Legislature, of reading the daily papers supporting and opposing the Government, or having daily controversy and dispute with those who hold strong opinions, one way or the other, and having followed the question as well as I was able to do, I deem it my duty to try and put before Parliament and the country—especially the people of the Maritime provinces, who can most quickly be reached by means of speeches made in this House—the opinion I have been led to entertain from my work and study. No intelligent man can have any doubt that the franchise, put in the hands of the one great company which is now controlling the coal measures of the county of Cape Breton—including something more than one-half the coal areas of the province—will enable that monopoly, provided they have bought the mines with judicious economy, provided they have not paid too high prices for their properties, and will not have to pay dividends on too large a capital, to produce coal more cheaply than could individual miners. And in the matter of the transport of Cape Breton coal to Lake Ontario, to supply the city of Toronto, and also the city of Hamilton, no doubt these gentlemen, with their schemes, will be able to considerably reduce the cost of transport. They claim that, with the larger capital they are putting in the mines and the economy which naturally follows a united management they will be able to carry coal to Montreal at a cost of from 75

to 80 cents per ton, which, compared with the present rates, will mean a saving of from 55 to 60 cents per ton in the matter of transport. Then, they say it costs from 23 to 25 cents on an average to take the coal at Montreal out of the barge and put it into the car; but they claim that by means of the advantages to be gained by bringing the cars and the barges nearer together, they will be able to cut that cost down by 12 to 15 cents; and I have not heard any practical men challenge the substantial soundness of these figures. Everybody must know that by handling a business under one controlling intelligence, a great saving must be effected in production slightly, in transport enormously, in terminal facilities appreciably. If the new company are content with the present price of coal, they will be able to make money very rapidly at a cost to no one, but as a reward of their own vigour and brains and management; and no one should wish them ill in carrying out a scheme of so much hope and so much promise. I shall not take up the time of the House in making any lengthy statement of facts although it will make the case clearer if I make a brief statement of the mining laws of Nova Scotia. As long ago as 1826, Nova Scotia was blighted by a monopoly of coal. The king of that day gave to his brother a lease of the mines in the eastern part of the province for sixty years, and this improvident spendthrift, the Duke of York, becoming hard-up for money, mortgaged those mines to a London jeweller. If I had the skill in phrasing of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I could show how this nobleman turned the black diamonds of Nova Scotia into glistening white diamonds, and hung them about the neck of one of those fair and frail ladies who drove into chronic embarrassment several of the sons of George the Third. Those who then got control of the mines, like dogs in a manger, would neither work them nor allow others to work them, and for twenty or thirty years the mines remained unproductive. At one time this state of things gave rise to something like a civil war in Nova Scotia, and troops had to be sent down there to keep the peace. About thirty years ago the province rose in its might and broke the monopoly, calling to its help Sir Adams Archibald, whose long, useful and noble life ended but a few short weeks ago. Sir Adams went to London, and the Hon. J. W. Johnstone went with him, and they succeeded in breaking that lease and freeing the coal measures of that province. The last generation of Nova Scotians knew something about monopoly. They wrestled with it. They were staggered by it and broke it. Some of us fear that this generation of Nova Scotians are again plunging into that condition against which their forefathers struggled so vigorously, and from which they were freed by the good laws of Sir Adams Archibald, and Judge Johnstone, and Joseph Howe, and Sir William

Young—able men of whom Nova Scotians are proud, and who were as worthy men as any the North American provinces have ever produced. Those men took care, as the Mining Acts will show, while they offered fair inducements to capitalists and reasonable safety and security to the money invested, to protect, in every way possible, the public interests. They would not allow one person to have too large an area; they would not allow him to lease more than one mile, but afterwards enlarged the area to two miles; they would not allow too long leases, but terminated them all at the end of twenty years, with the right of renewal subject to this provision that the Legislature, if any of the powers given were abused, could step in and cancel or amend the lease. They took care also to keep control of the royalty, which, I admit, was a dangerous power as against the mining people and investors, because I think it was an unfair threat to keep hanging over the heads of people, who put in their money, this right of raising the royalty at any session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not at the end of the term that the royalty could be raised?

Mr. WELDON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not during the period of the lease?

Mr. WELDON. The law had passed through three stages. I shall read the statute in a moment which gave them the right to alter the royalty at any year. That was the law in 1892. In the third place there was the right of taxing, which the province held and that, to be sure, was a reserved power, by means of which these people could be kept in check. Again, there was a provision that if the holder of a lease wished to assign his privilege he had to apply for license to do so, had to get the Government's permit, so that these privileges could not be handed over from A to B without the revision of the executive. Again, it was one of the terms in the old lease and another safeguard against abuse that the lease was forfeitable on any one of a large number of conditions. These, then, speaking generally—I will be more specific in a moment—were the rules that Johnson and Ritchie and Young, all lawyers of the last generation, thought it fair in the public interest to throw around the great coal property of Nova Scotia. For they knew that in all the old provinces of British North America they alone had the coal. They knew though they could not foresee all that has happened, that there must hereafter be a greatly increased demand for coal. In making these laws they held the doctrine that coal was a public property, and in granting the land they would not grant the coal, because they held it would be a great power

to prevent abuse if the public could have an undoubted control of the coal. Does not the experience of the last year, does not the experience of the last two years, does not the run of events in the states opposite us, in New York, in Maryland, in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, prove that our fathers were right? Does not the spectacle we see there give us warning? We see these commonwealths being oppressed by coal combines and using every device in their power to break the control of the combine. We see them resorting to all sorts of measures fixing maximum prices here, establishing a tribunal there, compelling coal peddlers to take out licenses in the third state, cancelling leases in the fourth, in a fifth appealing to courts to dissolve combinations with the railway companies, and all with the end of striking a blow at monopolies and keeping them within bounds. Here we have evidences of a people struggling as best they can in the absence of remedies which the wisdom of our forefathers has put in our hands to deal with such dangers. Now for the new laws, one passed in 1892 and two others during the late sitting of the Legislature in this year of grace, 1893. I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to the charter of the Dominion Coal Company, and I do not know that it differs very greatly from some charters that are occasionally—I will not say smuggled—but carried quickly through our committee. It is a peculiar charter, however, and a very injudicious one. There are one or two features of this charter to which I will call the attention of the House. Clause 2, paragraph (a) of the charter of this company which is called the Dominion Coal Company, takes power to mine, quarry, and work coal and other mines. They have wide powers. In paragraph (b) they take power, for instance, to purchase a railway like the Intercolonial Railway. It says: "to purchase, alter and maintain railways." Paragraph (k) in the same clause gives them power to sell out to another company or to buy from another company. Clause 5 says: "Aliens, whether resident in the province or elsewhere, as well as British subjects, may be directors." This clause which is in conflict with our company's Act, clause 9, says: "The annual meeting of shareholders may be held in such place or places within or without the province as may be decided upon." So the meeting may be held in Boston or in Pittsburg. Clause 13 says: "It shall be lawful for a company to enter into an agreement to purchase, lease or acquire coal, iron or other mines." I call the attention of the House to that section which gives them power to buy and control other mines if they can find owners who are willing to sell. Clause 14 says: "The debentures are payable in Nova Scotia or elsewhere, as may be decided upon." Some clauses are in conflict with our policy in this Parliament as declared by our Acts in reference to this class of companies. The document to

Mr. WELDON.

which I now ask the attention of the House is the lease. The lease given to this company will stagger those members of the House who have not been reading the Nova Scotia or New Brunswick papers, and have not read the text of that document. I think it will be a genuine surprise to them to find that in Nova Scotia a political leader of the experience and undoubted ability of the leader of the Legislature of that province should have put his name to an agreement of this character. I am reading from "An Act for the further Encouragement of Coal Mining," which validates the lease to the so-called Whitney syndicate. And, to make my statement clear, I think it will be fair as I go along point after point to read the text of the old lease and the text of the new lease on the same subject-matter to show in what respect the safeguards established in the last generation have been abandoned by the public men of Nova Scotia to-day. I indicated the number of checks upon mining leases to guard against monopoly and extortion, one that a lease must not cover more than so much territory, another that the lessee's control shall not last more than twenty years. Another that the royalty shall be under the control of the provinces. Fourth, that the province shall have control of taxation. Fifth, that when an interest is assigned the assignee shall come and get leave from the Executive. Sixth, conditions of forfeiture. Let us take these one after the other and see what changes have lately been made in these respects. As to area, the old law was that one man or one corporation should not have more than one square mile. Subsequently that was enlarged so that one man or corporation could hold two square miles, and in some extraordinary and special cases, five square miles. Under the present law the Dominion Coal Company can have all the coal measures in the county of Cape Breton, a radical departure in policy. It is within the knowledge of all of us that they have practically acquired all the coal mines of value or of any considerable importance in the county of Cape Breton. As to the point of time, the old laws declared that a lease should hold for twenty years with the conditional right of renewal. I would like to read the section in the old law on that point: "To have and to hold the said mines during the full term of twenty years. And if the said lessee shall, six months before the expiration of the term hereby demised, give notice of his intention to renew the said lease for a period of twenty years, then the said lessee shall be entitled to a renewal thereof upon the same terms, conditions and covenants as are contained in these presents or as prescribed by chapter 7, Revised Statutes, or by any Act that may be passed by the Legislature of the province, and in like manner to a second and third renewal of twenty years each." So that the right of renewal was conditional.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you consider that would increase the royalty ?

Mr. WELDON. I will not speak about the royalty. There is a special section dealing with the royalty. They could do almost anything under that, however, in the way of dealing with a new danger. If there was a combine they could provide against it. They could do anything they pleased to keep these people in check, if they thought they were abusing their powers. Now, under the new lease it is not so. I will read the clause in the new lease.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman kindly read the first clause, giving the names of the directors of the new company ?

Mr. WELDON. I think I can remember them. Mr. Henry M. Whitney is one, Henry F. Dimock, Hugh McLennan, F. S. Pearson, W. B. Ross, Sir Donald Smith, W. C. Van Horne, Alfred Winsor and Robert Winsor, are the others.

Mr. DEVLIN. And Mr. McKeen ?

Mr. WELDON. No ; he is the manager. I was speaking before my hon. friend from the county of Ottawa put his question, of the terms in the old lease which said that the lessees should hold for twenty years, with a qualified right of removal. The new lease runs :

To have and to hold the said beds of coal, areas, mines, powers for and during and until the full end and term of ninety-nine years, to commence and be computed from the first day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two.

It is only fair to those who argue against me, to say that they contend the old lease was for eighty years, because there were three terms of renewal. I think it is clear this provision says it is a twenty-year lease, with the qualified right of renewal, as against ninety-nine years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think you said they had a right to renew.

Mr. WELDON. I said a qualified right of renewal, in the sense that the Legislature can step in and enact any checks they like. On the question of royalty the old lease had this clause :

Provided that the Legislature shall be at liberty to increase, diminish, or otherwise change the royalty.

The new lease puts in a clause that the Legislature cannot alter the royalty for 99 years. The royalty now is 12½ cents, last year it was 7½.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman say it was 10 cents ?

Mr. WELDON. It is a mere matter of detail. I think I told my hon. friend that for some years it had been 7½ cents on run of mine ; last year it was made 10 cents. I will read the section of the Mines Act which fixes the duty at 10 cents, section 117, clause 9 :

Ten cents on every ton of 2,240 pounds of coal.

That is the law of 1892. In the old lease the Government had power to alter the royalty. In the new lease they have no such power. I do not press that as a weak point, had the term of the lease been short. I am with the coalmen on this point. I think they had a right to some fixity of royalty for some stated term, and that it is hardly fair to keep their heads under this impending sword all the time. Others may differ with me, but I am inclined to think that was reasonable. On this question of royalty, I shall refer to a fact, taking particular care to express no opinion of my own in this matter. Mr. McKeen, Mr. McLennan and the rest of the coalmen complain bitterly that Mr. Fielding was guilty of a breach of faith, so much so that they sent petitions up here, as I have learned, asking for the disallowance of this Act which we are asking to have amended, but not on the same grounds. They complain that in Mr. Fielding's Bill of 1892 something was wrong, that it was practically a breach of faith, and they ask to have that Bill disallowed. I moved yesterday for the papers, I have not got them yet, and cannot speak certainly on this phase of the subject. Mr. McKeen and the coalmen say that the real reason for the House amending the law, was Mr. Fielding's breach of faith. I am careful not to say that, but they say it. The reason given by the new syndicate why they have covenanted in this way to take themselves absolutely for 100 years out of the control of the Nova Scotia Legislature, is that Mr. Fielding, was guilty of a breach of faith. That alarmed them. I am only giving the reasons which these gentlemen give to justify these most extraordinary contracts and documents which take corporations absolutely out of the control of the Legislature of Nova Scotia for a hundred years. They say they could not trust the Legislature. They also say that not only was the changing of royalties contrary to what Mr. Fielding's Government said he would do, but the Legislature kept tinkering with the mining laws in such a way as to keep the coalmen perpetually in terror, altering the conditions, and jumping on them, and threatening the forfeiture of their lease. I do not know whether that is true, whether it is a fair attack on the Fielding Administration or not. I have no opinion on this to give, but it is part of my argument to say that that is the reason why Mr. McKeen and these gentlemen have been pressing the Government for twelve months to disallow the Bill up to the day when this new company bought them out, and then they called off their dogs and asked the Government not to disallow this Bill. On the next

point in the old lease, I can find no clause that says a word about taxation; therefore, there is, on the part of the province, no abandonment of the right to tax these corporations.

Mr. FLINT. The Premier of Nova Scotia stated in his speech that there can be no other taxation except a royalty, but the power of municipal taxation was left.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend did not understand me. I said that in the old lease there was nothing said about taxation; therefore, the common law right of taxation was still left to the Legislature. In the new lease at page 6, clause 4 reads as follows:—

That the royalties and payments hereby reserved shall, and the same are hereby declared to be in lieu of all provincial burdens or taxes already imposed or taxed, or to be hereafter taxed.

My hon. friend from Yarmouth was quite correct in saying that this phrase was cleared up during the course of the debate in the last session of the Legislature, by the interpretation being given that the company has immunity from provincial taxes, but not immunity from county or city taxes, and the credit for that restriction, and I must say it in common fairness, was due to the leader of the Opposition, who took that point and forced the Government to reconsider the matter and go back to Council; and he carried his point and secured this great protection for the county of Cape Breton, and the school sections thereof, that this corporation shall pay such taxes as may be imposed. Let the Opposition have the credit of carrying that very important amendment. I desire now to refer to the assignment of the lease. The old lease runs as follows—I am reading from page 2:—

And the said lessee shall not hereafter, during the term hereby granted, assign, transfer or set over the premises hereby granted, or any part thereof, to any person or persons whomsoever without the license, consent or approbation of Our Sovereign Lady the Queen.

By these provisions, if an assignment took place and any apprehensions were entertained that matters were going wrong and that the coal measures were being grabbed by some agency that meant mischief, there was the right of control, a very valuable right indeed to be held in reserve, and indicating the care with which the instrument was drawn. Look at the new lease, page 6, and hon. members will find clause 5 as follows:—

And the said lessor further covenants and agrees to and with the said lessee, if the said lessee during the pendency of his demise sells, assigns, transfers, hands over or otherwise parts with the premises hereby demised, the said lessor will grant unto the said lessee any necessary license, and will secure the ratification of the Governor in Council thereto.

This provision guarantees that they can make an assignment without it being necessary to go back to the Executive for power to assign. I desire now to contrast the terms of the two documents in regard to the matter of forfeit-

Mr. WELDON.

ure. I desire to read from page 3, which contains the most remarkable and dangerous clause in the Bill—I am now referring to the forfeiture clause in the new lease. In the old lease the safeguards were abundant. I will read the whole clause of the old lease as to forfeiture, this being the most important of the whole:

Provided always, and it is hereby agreed and declared, and the said lessee, his executors, administrators accept this grant or demise under condition, that in case any fault shall be made by the said lessee in keeping such book or books of account or in delivery of affidavits as aforesaid payment of the said rents or royalties hereby reserved, or in laying before the Commissioner of Public Works and Mines of the said province such account or accounts in writing or in keeping and having forthcoming, as aforesaid, such plan or plans, or if the said lessee, executors shall at any time or times hereafter assign, transfer or set over or otherwise part with the premises hereby granted, or any part or parcel thereof, or with the said term or any part thereof, or this lease, to any person or persons whomsoever, for the term above granted without the license consent and approbation or rectification of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen, her heirs, shall not continue the bona fide and effectual working of the said mines, shall not open or work, or shall not strengthen and secure, or shall not ventilate or drain the mines opened in a skilful, workmanlike and scientific manner as aforesaid, then the present letters patent shall be utterly null and void the contrary thereof in these presents notwithstanding.

That is to say, that under the old lease the lessees might forfeit the lease for breach of a number of conditions. The corresponding clause in the new lease will be found on page 7, and I will read the remarkable words:

Nor shall this instrument, nor any, nor all the rights, powers, or privileges herein granted, be adjudged or become forfeited, or null or void, on any ground other than the non-payment of the royalty or rental as hereinbefore set out, and then only in such manner as hereinbefore stated.

One clause more and I have done with this instrument, and it is clause 9; and I desire to say, on behalf of Mr. Fielding, who is responsible for the lease, that he is a journalist, and not a lawyer, a fact which hon. gentlemen will gather on reading the terms of this clause:

And that any legislation of the province of Nova Scotia now or hereafter to be enacted during the pendency of this lease at variance with the provisions of the said agreement shall not be held to modify or diminish any of the rights, powers or privileges herein granted unto the said lessee, its successors or assigns.

That is to say, that the Legislature of a British province undertakes to tie up succeeding Legislatures for 100 years, and declare that the Legislature shall not, for that period, amend or alter the Acts of 1892-93. Of course the Legislature cannot exercise such power.

Mr. LISTER. Not amend the lease by any Act?

Mr. WELDON. We know they cannot bind future Legislatures in strict law, but what improvidence and incapacity to include such terms in an instrument, and

what eagerness on the part of the Boston syndicate to demand such extreme terms. Does it not justify the opinion that the syndicate were able to twist Mr. Fielding like a glove round their finger, and does it not indicate great haste on the part of Mr. Fielding to secure the royalty of 12½ cents instead of the old royalty of 10 cents per ton, so that he forgot everything else. He was in such haste to get his exchequer full that he would not delay placing his name to that document, for there never should have been such terms in the instrument. These, Mr. Speaker, are the franchises of the Dominion Coal Company. The coal barons, to borrow a term which the hon. member for South Oxford is in the habit of using, with this charter and lease and with the Act, to which I have not yet referred, can go back to their entrenchments, can fill the moat with water, can pull up the drawbridge and let down the portcullis and bar the castle door. How can you storm their stronghold? What can you do for the period of 99 years? Cannot they defy you? Have you any way to bring them to reason in case they use their powers oppressively? I have many friends among the members of the Whitney syndicate, men whom I know very well and with whom I have had very many and very friendly discussions, not once or twice, but many times, and we have been able to talk over this matter very freely. Some of them are owners of large coal properties, and have made money. At least one of them is an officer of the new company, and is no doubt paid a large salary, because he is an able and capable man. I am reminded that we have two such friends. I wish them both well and great success. As regards our friend, Mr. McKeen, we all wish him well. I have heard how he took enormous risks in developing his coal property in Cape Breton within the past twelve years, and when his coal property was earning nothing, by sticking to his guns and faithfully prosecuting his enterprise he worked his way through, and I do not begrudge him, nor does any hon. member in this House begrudge him the good fortune that has overtaken him. We can therefore talk freely and in a friendly way with these gentlemen. But they say: You and your friends are needlessly alarmed, you are haunted by a spectre, a bogey. Your apprehensions are childish. They say: We will confine ourselves to Cape Breton, and there will be the coal measures of the counties of Cumberland, Pictou and Inverness to protect you against the oppression of a monopoly. We say these are words of promise. The syndicate make them by word of mouth, but they will not take the responsibility of embodying them in writing, for when the leader of the Opposition in the Nova Scotia Legislature asked the Government to put in the charter a clause covering this point, they scornfully rejected the amendment. They say again: We mean business. I believe they do. They say: We are going to put in

money and work these mines in good faith. But why, then, will they not put this undertaking in writing; why do they not restore the old clause which says that the lessees shall bona fide and effectually work these mines or forfeit their lease? For my part, I have no doubt that it is their present intention to work the mines; but why do they not allay apprehension as regards the future? An amendment in that direction was proposed and scornfully voted down in the Legislature. Again they say: We are most respectable men. Who denies it? Then they say there are Canadian directors on the board, such as Sir Donald A. Smith. We know it. Then they say there are Canadian gentlemen of wealth and responsibility such as Mr. Hugh McLennan. Who challenges that fact? We know those are names synonymous of all that is worthy. But we know very well, for they tell us so frankly, that they do not hold half the stock, and therefore cannot control it. If this company should use their franchise unfairly, then the Canadian directors, if living, and we sincerely hope they may live long, will do all that is possible to prevent such action, but undoubtedly if they should find themselves placed between the devil and the deep sea, they will sell their stock and go out of the company. They cannot, of course, control it. They are old men, and while we hope they will live long, they cannot live 99 years, nor the half of that term, and after their day danger may come, and danger is likely to come. They say again, and I referred to that a moment ago: We had to contract ourselves out of the control of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, because we had tried these gentlemen since 1886, and they have broken faith with us, until capital became panicky and until capital was inclined to withdraw from Cape Breton. We who believe we are doing our best to fight this question on behalf of the coal consumers of our province made an answer to that declaration. We prepared a memorandum which was drafted by my colleague from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and myself, and it was what we considered an excellent business proposal. I should have said that the coal company covenant in Articles III and IV in the early part of the lease to work the mine, to drain the mine, to shove it up, to ventilate it, to allow the inspector to go down, and to show the plans; but in the forfeiture clause, there is no penalty provided for neglect to do these, and the trouble is: how can you get at them if they so neglect. Perhaps, it may be said: You can resort to any action for damages, but let me ask: how can you assess damages? Practically, is that much of a remedy? Practising lawyers know well that an action for damages is almost a useless remedy in such a case as this would be. This forfeiture clause in the old lease extended to the 'non bona fide' working of the mine, and that clause I have read. The proposal which we made to some leading members of the new syndicate; and to which I

have referred, was in substance, this : Whenever the Legislature of Nova Scotia by joint Address declares that the Dominion Coal Company has broken its covenants, or unduly enhanced the price of coal to the Canadian consumer, then, this declaration should be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, to whom we in this Parliament would give the mandate to hear and try, and if the court found that those people had broken their covenants or unduly enhanced prices, that they should be subject to the penalty, for a serious offence, of forfeiture of the lease, and for a minor offence, of a money fine. What could be fairer than that proposal? It was an offer to leave the syndicate with these powers, to give them that lease, to give them that charter unamended; but to subject them to this reference to the Supreme Court under certain conditions, and we all know that that would have protected them from any frivolous or vexatious attacks. You cannot get the Legislature of a province to jump upon a coal company like this, unless there is a very strong feeling throughout the province that they have acted unfairly, and even then, should the Legislature decide that, our proposal was to put the question of their behaviour before the highest tribunal in the country. As reasonable men they should say yes to this proposal. This would protect them from the caprice of the Legislature. My Speaker, we are also assured that the other provinces cannot be hurt by these Nova Scotia laws. We are also told that we could not suffer in New Brunswick, that they could not suffer in Prince Edward Island, and that the people could not suffer down the St. Lawrence, because the Dominion Parliament had in its tariff an instrument that would protect the consumers. They told us that the Dominion Parliament could knock off the 60 cents duty on soft coal and let it come in from other countries. That is a good answer at the present time. The control of the tariff is an adequate protection against great extortion today. It is an adequate protection unless and until these people could make a reasonably strong combine with the coal interests in two points; in West Virginia and Pennsylvania. These are the two coal districts whose coal comes to tidewater, and which can send coal to the lower provinces. Before Virginia and Pennsylvania coal could come into New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, even with the duty off, coal would go up; to a moderate degree—opinions differ as to how far—but at all events it would not increase to an oppressive degree. But it is possible to perfect a combine between the Nova Scotia interests on the one hand, and the Virginia and Pennsylvania interests on the other; if the coal interests in these districts stand together and fix prices, then we would be helplessly at their mercy, and we would have no remedy until the Welsh or Scotch coal came to Canada. We may be told that coal from Great Britain comes

Mr. WELDON.

in sometimes. It does come here in small quantities, lumber vessels bring it in ballast, but not a tenth part of what is sufficient to supply the demand. If there was a large demand for this coal from Great Britain of course you would have to pay commercial rates of freight which would be very much higher than the rates on the quantity which comes as ballast, and you would still be at the mercy of the coal combine. Another argument I heard advanced a great many times in this House, in favour of this coal deal is: that business was stagnant in Cape Breton, that something was wanted to brighten it up, and that coal mining there had been a failure. I do not think that is a fair statement. I looked up the Nova Scotia journals, and I can give you the approximate figures for the quantity of coal mined. I find that for the last fifty years the coal production has practically doubled in every succeeding decade. In the last decade some 14,000,000 tons of coal were mined, in the decade before 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 tons, in the decade before that, 4,000,000 tons, and in the decade before that again about 2,000,000 tons. During the decade in which we are now running we would have about 30,000,000 tons of coal mined, at the old rate of growth, and that while not a very rapid growth of the industry, is at all events not a discouraging growth. I may say that in the last ten years the rate of growth has been above the average. The outlook for the country was not discouraging, and when we know that in two or three years we will have fourteen feet of clear water from Montreal to Lake Ontario, the present coal operators, looking to the future, might have themselves undertaken to increase their output, to diminish the expenses, and to supply the demand. What was more reasonable than that they should together make a sort of a mild combine or combination, and build these big barges for their own trade. Why could not they send their own coal up to Lake Ontario and save the 60 cents a ton in transport, and the 20 cents a ton in terminal facilities, and 15 cents a ton in the cost of handling, and put that money in their own pockets under the old law? Why could not they do that under the old twenty-year term lease. We would all be glad to see them make money, and we would also see that we had the old safeguards to keep us from extortion? The answer to what I am saying now is given by my friends here who believe in this coal deal, and who approve of it. They say: That there can be no soft coal combine to control the coal in any appreciable degree in the United States. I do not believe that. There are some 19,000,000 or 20,000,000 people in North America, north of the Potomac, and east of the Alleghanies, including the people of the eastern provinces of Canada, which are largely consumers of coal, and practically the coal measures from which these people must get their supplies are from

West Virginia and Pennsylvania and Nova Scotia. It may be said that other states of the Union have enormous coal supplies. So they have. But they are not within range; they are too far off; freights would be too high and coal would be too dear to enable the people on the Atlantic seaboard to take their supplies of coal from these remote areas. We cannot hope to see any relief from Alabama with its enormous output of coal; nor from Arkansas with a small output, nor from Colorado with a larger output than all Nova Scotia, nor from Georgia, nor from the Indian Territories, nor from Kansas, nor from Kentucky, nor from Montana, nor from New Mexico, nor from Tennessee. We can put these states out of mind for the purpose of considering the coal supply of the lower provinces and the New England states. I say that the 20,000,000 people on the Atlantic seaboard north of the Potomac River must get their coal from Nova Scotia and the coal deposits of Pennsylvania and West Virginia; and any man who will look at the mining map of the continent, as I have done, with the assistance of some mining experts, will find the case made strong and clear. I have some very striking figures here, issued by the United States Geological Survey, of the Department of the Interior at Washington, under the authority of Mr. Parker, and they will show you that more than 80 per cent of the output of West Virginia is in five counties which are all compacted together, and it is no great trick to form a combine there. It does not require more than one-eighth of the money that Mr. McLeod, and the gentlemen associated with him required to form the hard coal combine in eastern Pennsylvania, and it is more than likely that within twelve months such a combine will be formed. It is a much greater task to form a soft coal combine in western Pennsylvania, where there is a larger area. But there 80 per cent of the output is to be found in seven counties, which lie side by side. So that a man of brains and money, like Jay Gould, or Mr. McLeod, with ability for organization, would not find it a much harder thing to consummate a combine of the soft coal in western Pennsylvania than it has been to form a combine of the hard coal in eastern Pennsylvania; and when that is accomplished, what will be the position of the poor people of the Maritime provinces and the lower St. Lawrence? That combine, when it is formed, will have power to put up the price of coal to a point where coal from Great Britain will come in to our relief. If they put the price up 50 cents a ton, it will cause a drop in the value of the stocks of every manufacturing concern in the Maritime provinces. If they put it up a dollar a ton, they will shut up half the factories in New Brunswick where coal is used for power. These people need not hold out to us the delusive hope that there will not be an in-

crease in the price. With the enormous powers that the combine will possess, with a commercial instinct, why would they not put up the price, and make what money they could? We have had some experience of that. I am older than I used to be, and I am slower to believe than I used to be. I used to trust the assurance of the amiable men in these combines. I do not trust them now. They held out hopes which I afterwards found to be illusory, and now I am slow to believe their assurances. I wish to call the attention of this Parliament to the experience of our neighbours in the state of New York with some of the gentlemen who made similar representations. They were forming a combine there in hard coal, and what did these combinesters say? They said: Oh, we do not intend to put up the price; we have no idea of doing that. What we propose to do is to cut down the cost of production, lessen the cost of transport, and effect economies in terminal facilities, commissions, etc., and make our money in that way. Now, let me show you what the New York Legislature within one year afterwards said about that combine." These gentlemen were profuse in their promises a year ago, that they would not raise the price to the consumers, but by means of consolidation they would economize the cost of production, transport and sale, and make profit in that way." They have made no such economies. They have made money by the much simpler device of increasing the price. I have also here the report of a committee at Washington which grappled with the same difficulty. That committee, and the whole Congress of the United States, on behalf of the people of the United States, gave their ear to the cry of the oppressed poor of the city of New York, and of other cities, against the cruelty of this combine; and even such papers as the New York "Tribune," and the New York "Herald" joined the complaint. But I am not now reading from the New York "Tribune" nor the New York "Herald," but from the report of Congress which came into my hands the week before last; and what does that report say? I ought to read the whole ten pages of the report; it is only regard for the patience of the House that prevents me. This report to Congress is, from beginning to end, an indictment of the men, who had promised to rely for their profits on economies which they would effect, but who did nothing but turn the screw and put up the price. That is how they made their money. But there are, in the report, one or two striking things having a special bearing upon the present case, that I will read. They point out that where three or four strong institutions are working at the one industry, the power of the one which is strongest—although it may not have the half of the whole property—will control them

all. And that is the very thing we have to fear. They say that although six railway companies were mining coal in the anthracite region of the Schuylkill and Lehigh valleys, the strongest of those was the Reading Railroad system, which only carried 40 per cent of the whole anthracite output to tidewater. Nevertheless that company was the controlling factor of fixing the price of coal on the Atlantic seaboard. This is what they say :

By this arrangement the Philadelphia and Reading controls at least 40 per cent of the anthracite coal going to tidewater, and becomes an important and dominating factor in determining not only the output, but the price of the product.

Now, if the combine that carried 40 per cent could dominate all the other people, in the same business, how much more could Mr. Whitney and his colleagues, who control more than 60 per cent of the magnificent coal area of Nova Scotia, regulate the price here, aided by this perfect abandonment of all guards against extortion and cupidity. My hon. friend beside me from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says you cannot guard against cupidity. I say you must. We have seen enough suffering in these ten years, as the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) developed so clearly in his committee a few years ago. We have seen enough of the oppression and cruelty of the combines, and so we must profit by what we have seen and not abandon our legislative guards against the cupidity and power of these corporations. I differ from my hon. friend from Halifax. This report goes on to explain how they worked the thing, how they perfected the combine, how they squeezed out the weaker mines. To those mine owners who would not sell out they refused to furnish cars, or if they did afterwards furnish cars, they, who were both miners and carriers and who were bound by the Interstate Commission to treat all alike in freight charges, charged such heavy freight on the carriage of coal as to leave nothing for the miner. As regards the companies in the ring itself, who owned both mines and railroads, the freight charged was a mere matter of book-keeping. If they sold their coal at New York at \$4.50 per ton it mattered nothing what proportion they credited to the mines, and what to the railway, as the railway owned the mines. But they took care to credit the railway with the bulk of earnings. What became of the independent people who were outside the combine? They, too; had to sell at \$4.50 in New York. They had to carry their coal over the combines' railway, and if the combines charged them freight at \$4 per ton that only left these people 50 cents for their coal. They were consequently starved, and squeezed out, and were glad to sell. It is reported here by this committee that this ring actually charged for carrying coal nearly twice as much as they charged for carrying grain and cotton, although the latter is a much higher class

Mr. WELDON.

of freight. What fairness and reason was there in that? On its face, is not that an oppressive and tyrannical exercise of power? I need not read further. That record is the strongest indictment that can be given against these gentlemen. They come with smooth words in their mouths; but we know how much we ought to trust them. You may say that we have no combine. I do not know. The charge has been made frequently in the papers that the Reading people have formed a combine with Mr. Whitney, and that charge has been steadily denied. At first I thought that was a bogey, a pure guess, founded on no reason, and that the facts were as Mr. McKeen and others had explained them to us. I thought at first that Mr. Whitney had started this scheme against an anticipated rise of price in Pennsylvania. Very likely it was so; but it seems to me that when Mr. Whitney opened negotiations with Mr. Fielding he found the Nova Scotia Premier was a mere child in his hands. Mr. Whitney soon saw that by giving a 12½ cents royalty to Nova Scotia he could get whatever terms he asked for. He was a street car owner—a coal king he might be. He says to himself—thanks to this benevolent young Nova Scotian: I have such powers in Nova Scotia that the coal and railway kings must now reckon with me. I will stand in with Mr. McLeod of the Reading and Mr. Van Horne of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will take the responsibility of saying that I have received within the last two days a confidential telegram, saying that on the 7th, 8th and 9th of last December, Mr. Van Horne, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. McLeod of the Reading system, and Mr. Whitney, of the Boston Tramway system, were known to be together in Boston. On the 8th December a telegram was sent to Mr. Fielding from Mr. Whitney: "Come on; we want to talk over things with our friends." And shortly after this the combine was perfected. I have no reason for drawing any conclusion, but this coincidence gives rise to the strong suspicion that Messrs. VanHorne and McLeod assisted at the birth of this combine. It is hard, in the face of it, to take those two facts, without having the suspicion that the Reading people were in the background. It may be that our friends here knew nothing about it. "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamed of in your philosophy." There are more things going on in the minds of Mr. Whitney and Mr. McLeod and Mr. Van Horne, than even our friends from Halifax and Cape Breton know of. Mr. Speaker, what is their last solace? They say that the Legislature of Nova Scotia can regulate the price. Can they? I have respect for the Legislature of Nova Scotia. In times past, that has been a body of which the people were proud. I say not one word against it to-day. But I cannot shut my eyes to the history of this

continent. I know what has gone on in the way of lobbies in the legislature south of the line; and my fear is, if we look to the future that the influence of the lobby, which up to this hour, happily, has been a foreign institution, may hereafter extend to this country and settle in some of our provincial capitals. And then, if it does, the power which it had at Albany, New Orleans, and Harrisburgh, and I think I may say, without recklessness, in Washington, may also assert itself there. If the coal lobby, and the railway lobby, and other lobbies, come to this country and settle in our provincial capitals we may not, in the future—and we must look ahead a hundred years—find that protection in those legislatures, even if they have the powers claimed for them, which we will need. I think I have tired the House a good deal, and before I have done will enliven it by referring to some most interesting facts, which I discovered a day or two ago, on reading extracts from the famous Colton letters. These letters were left by Colton to his wife, and stolen from that lady's desk by some thief, and put into the hands of some Congressmen. These letters were written by a famous millionaire to his agent in Washington. To those members who have not read them, there are some extracts which will be interesting, as to the methods and instruments by which a coal and railway lobby does its work. I will read extracts from those famous Colton letters. Here is one signed by this many millionaire and arch lobbyist at Washington, C. P. Huntington. The Scott referred to is Tom Scott, of the Pennsylvania railroad:

Scott is prepared to pay or promise to pay a large sum of money to pass his bill, but I do not think he can pass it, although I think this coming session of Congress will be composed of the hungriest set of men that ever got together, and that the devil only knows what they will do.

Then it seemed there had been a congressman from California giving them some trouble.

I notice that you say of _____ he is a wild hog; don't let him come back to Washington, but as the House is to be largely Democratic it would be well to beat him with a Democrat. But I would defeat him anyway, and if he gets the nomination put up another Democrat and run against him and in that way elect a Republican. Beat him.

Yours truly,

C. P. HUNTINGTON.

This is Mr. Collis P. Huntington, the famous lobbyist and millionaire. That is the way these gentlemen interest themselves in the politics of their country. In the investigation before a committee of Congress which took place it came out that there were five millions that had been spent by the Union Pacific Railway for which they had no vouchers. They were pressed to say where that money had gone and the answer given was very curious. I quote from volume VII., page 3701, of the report of the Commissioners

of the Pacific Railway. This is what they say to the gentlemen quizzing them:

Most of the money (\$4,818,355.07) was expended, no doubt, to prevent Congress and the departments from robbing us of our property.

Again I refer to the battle between the Union Pacific and the Pennsylvania people. Page 3704 of the same volume is a letter to Mr. Colton:

All the members in the House from California are doing first-rate except _____, and he is a damned hog anyway, you cannot fix him.

On the next page there is a letter:

Scott is working mostly among the commercial men. He switched Senator _____, of _____ and _____ of _____ this week, but you know they can be switched back with proper arguments when they are wanted.

He says again on page 3707:

With \$200,000 I can pass our Bill.

One of the members asked him: Do you mean to say that the members of Congress are purchasable? And he answered, that he would be very sorry to say that. "It would be a strange thing, however, if, out of three or four hundred men there was not more than one that was unworthy." And then follows a remark painful coming from such a man: "Eighteen hundred years ago the best man that ever lived selected twelve men and 16⅔ per cent of them were 'short weight.'" I need not tire the House, but I will give one last quotation. After this man had gone through it all he wrote a letter. It sounds like a chapter from Ecclesiastes written by Solomon after he had sounded the depths of sensuality and self-indulgence. Writing like an old broken wretched roué he pens these last letters in Ecclesiastes. This man's letter sounds like it. It is written from New York:

I returned from Washington last night and I am as near used up as ever I was in my life before. I am spending my last winter at Washington. As I feel, I would not spend another for all the property we all have. * * * It is very distasteful

C. P. HUNTINGTON.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the record of fraud brought to light of one gigantic lobby and our apprehension is that it would be an evil day for this country if, unfortunately, the powers of some of these concerns should fall into the hands of these gentlemen. I say gladly that gentlemen now representing the people are incapable of such rascality, but we should take care that when our children and grandchildren appear upon the stage of life such powers should not exist to corrupt the Legislature. We know that in Washington coal lobbies are the most wealthy, the boldest and most unscrupulous. I have heard American after American familiar with Washington life, say that the coal lobbies were notoriously so. I do not think I need to dwell upon that. Here is Mr. Bryce's book, the work of a warm friend of the United States. I do not know

where you will find such a description of the lobby as Professor Bryce gives in his book the American Commonwealth. I do not think it necessary to read all he says. It is a dark picture, relieved only here and there by flashes of lurid, glaring humour. I will read only one passage to the House. He is dealing with a very abnormal condition of things, when the carpet-baggers were in power in the south during the reconstruction period. He says some states are corrupt and some are not. He names those that are corrupt and those that are not.

But the lowest point was reached in some of the southern states shortly after the war when, the negroes having received the suffrage, the white inhabitants were still excluded as rebels, and the executive government was conducted by northern carpet-baggers under the protection of federal troops. In some states the treasury was pillaged; huge state debts were run up; negroes voted farms to themselves; all kinds of robbery and jobbery went on unchecked. South Carolina, for instance, was a perfect Tartarus of corruption, as much below the hades of Illinois or Missouri, as the heaven of ideal purity is above the ordinary earth of Boston and Westminster. In its legislature, there was an old darkey, jet black and with venerable white hair, a Methodist preacher and influential among his brother-statesmen, who kept a stall for legislation, where he dealt in statutes at prices varying from \$100 to \$400.

Well, Mr. Speaker, should this evil of the lobby come to this country we cannot rely too much upon the strength in days to come of these local legislatures to protect us. And thus I come to my last point, that is that if there is no other protection we must protect ourselves. They can raise the price of coal, so I have argued and so I believe. They have the power to oppress us. There are no local remedies that I can discover. Have we any remedies in our own hands that are really useful and effective? We call this the Dominion of Canada, and "Dominion" surely means control. As the Fathers of Confederation said, they were framing a Union with a stronger central power than that of the republic to the south. The republic had just issued from the throes of civil war, and every student of politics said that the weakness of their system was that there was no strength in the national authority. The fathers of Confederation said they were going to give stronger control to the central authority in this new union in the north. I can find that in the debates on Confederation. I have here one citation and I think I can show the same thing was reiterated time after time. The point was taken clearly by Sir George Cartier in the controversy between him and the leader of the French-speaking Liberals. And the point was made, as I remember well hearing these debates as a boy. The lawyers in our province one after another told us that the federal authority was to be made stronger than it was in the United States. The source of strength is in this article of the Constitution which I will ask the liberty

Mr. WELDON.

to read. Section 56 of the British North America Act says:

Where the Lieutenant-Governor assents to a bill in the Queen's name, he shall by the first convenient opportunity, send an authentic copy of the Act to the Governor-General, and if the Governor-General in Council, in one year after receipt thereof, thinks fit to disallow the Act, such disallowance being signified by the Lieutenant-Governor, by speech or message to the Legislature, shall annul the Act from and after the day of such signification.

That section was not put there for fun. There is a section which gives this federal executive of Canada control and supervision over all the laws of all the provinces of Canada. I grant you it is a dangerous power, it is a power that must be carefully and sparingly used. Different lawyers in time past have had different theories as to what was the lawful and proper use of this power. I suppose it is not wrong for a young lawyer to give his opinion, if only because it is his duty, and has been for years, to study this class of questions as well as he could, and we have come to the conclusion that it is not wise to disallow an Act because it is ultra vires. The Attorney-General of Ontario says, for instance, an Act is intra vires; the Minister of Justice of the Dominion declares that it is ultra vires. What right has one or the other to decide that controversy to which they are parties? It is the practice in this country now to refer such questions to the courts, unless the Minister of Justice thinks the Bill has been passed by inadvertence, so to speak, and then he will call the attention of the Attorney-General of the province thereto, and if the Attorney-General adheres to his position and insists upon it, the practice in our day, and I think it a sound practice, is to refer the question to the courts. But how if the province has acted contrary to its own interests? Then it must be allowed to go wrong; the constitution guarantees its right to go wrong, as Mr. Blake has happily said. It would be an act of impertinence for us to interfere and disallow the Act. She has the liberty of error, as Mr. Blake said, she is the judge, and we are not the court of appeal. But in the third case where a province has gone well within her powers, where she has passed laws which oppress and hurt other provinces, then we have a right to step in. If we can make out a strong case to show that the province of Nova Scotia has given power to people to hurt, and cripple, or injure other provinces, or the whole Dominion, then I say that not only may we exercise this power, but we must do so: Otherwise we are no Dominion, we are just a loose group of provinces. There must be a sovereign control, there must be a central control, and if it is not exercised in that case, in Heaven's name, when can it be exercised? There is, under section 56, the power of which we have heard so often, and if it is not to be exercised in the

case of ultra vires, if it is not to be exercised where we have a province legislating to its own hurt, then what case is left this Parliament to interfere? It ought to be exercised where a province, in pursuing its undoubted powers, in dealing with her own property, has hurt neighbouring provinces. Now, I think the whole question is: Can we make a case to show that Nova Scotia, under the laws of this year and last year, has hurt us in New Brunswick, or in the other provinces? Now, coal differs from all other public properties. It is not like Crown lands or forests. Consider the facts of geography. We need not fill our heads with cobwebs. We know that in those four provinces there is only one province that has coal. Coal is local, lumber is everywhere. Coal is vital to your mills, to your hearths, to your forges, to your factories. The poor in all cities want coal. It is indispensable to a degree that nothing else in this country is indispensable. Upon those two facts, that coal is local, and yet indispensable, I base my argument that it differs from everything else in this country. It is local and vital to every industry and many a family in all the provinces. Therefore, I say you cannot answer me by bringing up the case of Crown lands or Crown timber. The cases are not parallel. So I say that if we can make out a case that New Brunswick is hurt, New Brunswick has a right to come here and ask this great Dominion Parliament to control a little province who may endeavour to fill her coffers with revenues wrung out of the people of the sister province. I live in Nova Scotia. I am delighted to find that Mr. Fielding is filling his treasury, and, of course, as a good citizen, we are all glad to see the exchequer full. I do not desire to utter one word that will give breath and spirit of hostility to the province in which I live, and where I earn my living. Heaven forbid that I should do so. But as a public man I speak here for another province, one of whose counties I represent. It is my duty to do so. I am speaking for those around me, men more thoughtful and more able than I am, who are profoundly alarmed at this transaction. I am not speaking now from a party point of view. Has not this country four times—in 1878, 1882, 1887 and in 1891—pronounced in favour of a policy that gives protection and a stimulus to manufacturing industries? What in the world ever induced the lower provinces to take up with a protective policy? Only one consideration. We knew that in these coal measures of Nova Scotia there was buried the sunlight, as Dr. Dawson said, of pre-historic summers, a tremendous power, that men would bring up to the surface and set free, to drive the wheels of our factories. If we had had no coal, how unwise it would have been for us in the lower provinces to advocate a National Policy.

And now, what right, in common fairness to the neighbouring province, has Nova Scotia to strike down, as she has power to do, those interests in the neighbouring province, by putting it in the power of a combine to raise heavily the price of coal? This country has paid \$50,000,000 to build the Intercolonial Railway, and I congratulate the Minister of Railways in the success which has accompanied his policy of economy and retrenchment in the management of that road. Now, if this combine is able to put up the price of coal \$1 a ton, it means a loss of \$200,000 to the country on this railway, which uses 200,000 tons of coal a year. I think the great mass of people who burn coal—those who burn wood have protection, but many in the cities cannot get wood except at inordinately high prices—have a right to protection. I am proud here in this august chamber to plead for the poor. I am proud to remember here that many of us are children of men who supported their families with the labour of their own hands. Many of us know now, although we did not know then, the pathetic economies of our parents to give their children better chances in life than they ever had. We are a poor recreant crew indeed if our hearts do not go with the classes from which we sprung. The few who are rich can always take care of themselves. I have no feeling of envy to those who, by their strength of will, by their activity and intelligence, can make great fortunes; but I have a bitter feeling of hostility to those who corrupt the electorate and legislatures to get an undue power, an opportunity to plunder the great mass of the people. It is because I am apprehensive that something like that will happen hereafter, that I now speak as I do. It is because I feel that we may fall into the hands of those who will do just exactly as we have seen great combines do in other places. I turn now to a legal phase of the question. I have under my hand several authorities to show that the power of disallowance must be exercised, when wrong or hurt is done to the general welfare. Sir John A. Macdonald, in his report in 1868, which has been quoted by Mr. Blake and by Sir John Thompson, in the 4th paragraph thereof, in deciding whether any Acts of a provincial legislature should be disallowed, said:

The Government must consider whether it affects the interests of the whole Dominion.

In paragraph 5 he says:

The power of disallowance should be exercised with great caution, and only in cases where the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand.

In paragraph 8 he speaks of this power being exercised, where measures are prejudicial to the general interests of the Dominion. The argument was pressed upon their lordships, the Judicial Committee, that they should do in England what Chief Justice Marshall

did in the Supreme Court of the United States—that they themselves should protect the federal authority. They cited a judgment of that famous jurist in the case of *McCulloch* against the Bank of Maryland. It was proved how he protected the federal authority. That relief given by the judicial authority in Washington must in Canada be given by the interposition of the federal executive. That is the sum and substance of my argument on that point. The case I am quoting is the *Bank of Toronto vs. Lambe*. Here is the last sentence. Speaking about the Dominion Constitution, their lordships said:

At the same time it provides for the federated provinces, a carefully balanced constitution under which no one of the parts can pass laws for itself except under the control of the whole acting through the Governor-General.

If the Prime Minister were not here I would say that I have kept the clearest opinion, although entirely in the line of the opinions I have quoted, to the last. The most valuable statement of the law is contained in two reports made by Sir John Thompson as Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice laid down this proportion that "in deciding whether any Acts of a Provincial Legislature be disallowed, the Government must consider whether it effects the interest of the whole Dominion or not," intimating that where an Act could not be disallowed on the ground that it was ultra vires, it could be disallowed on the ground that it affected injuriously the general policy of the Government. Again, the Minister of Justice, when dealing with a Manitoba statute declared "the power of disallowance should be exercised with great caution, and only in cases where the law or the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demanded it," as "being prejudicial to the general interest of the Dominion." I think in those two sentences and the citations I have made from the earlier reports, the House will find the sum and substance of my legal argument in that regard. The case of Manitoba was not unlike this case. There was no doubt as to the power of Manitoba to do what she liked with her land and money. She had taken them to build her railways, which she had power to do under the Constitution. The British North America Act, section 92, clause 10, paragraph A, undoubtedly gave her the power, but the Minister of Justice decided that, although she had this power, it was contrary to the policy of the Dominion to let her build that railway, running in that direction, and therefore the Provincial Act was disallowed. Take another case, that of a province which had undoubtedly the right to pass laws regarding its public credit and which passed such a law, but in the opinion of the Governor-General and his advisers it was harmful to the general credit of Canada. It was contended in regard to that provincial statute that the Dominion as a whole could not allow a province

Mr. WELDON.

to repudiate any part of its debt, because it would smirch the reputation of the country, and as the Dominion has \$200,000,000 of money borrowed in London, we could not afford to have any part of our people repudiating their debts. Although the Act passed was wholly within the competency of the Legislature, it being against the public credit, the Federal authorities asked that it be amended, and if that had not been done they were prepared to insist on its disallowance. In conclusion it will be asked, what suggestion have you to offer? Admitting that this province has the power to pass such legislation as may be the means of oppressing the people and crippling and even destroying their industries, we ask the Federal authorities for protection and for relief. What a singular fact it is in the history of our province that at the very hour and the very year in which the people are fighting in Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and elsewhere, combines in coal and railways that are grinding the face of the poor and oppressing the common people, the British people in the north, blind and deaf to what is going on so near to them, are abandoning the old guarantee. Here is a new danger looming up in enormous proportions, and yet our people are blind and deaf, and are willing to abandon the old safeguard that the wisdom and foresight of their fathers gave them in this regard. It is no use to say that if these concessions are abused we will take them away. I have heard that argument used, I have heard it mentioned in the corridors of this House—that after we have given the company those vast franchises, we will take them away if they abuse their powers. But they will use their powers, and they are paying money for the right to use them. It is useless to talk of the company abusing its powers if they are simply doing what they have bought power to do. This will be more clearly the case after discussions in the Legislature in the press and in Parliament, during which it was pointed out that the company had those powers; they would be even the more entitled to claim that they possess those powers if it had been openly and notoriously stated thus and so, and it would be impossible ten years hence to say: those are their rights, but instead of using them, they are abusing them. It was pointed out in the newspapers and in our Provincial Legislature that the powers were capable of being used in the way I have indicated. The company will be able to say: We have paid our money for that power, and it would be a breach of faith to take away our rights. I do not know how you could ask English people hereafter to tear up the charter. The most objectionable law remains yet to be pointed out. By the Act of 1892, Mr. Fielding took more advanced ground, and took power by Order in Council to lease all coal lands in Nova Scotia, if the owners were willing to sell, to one person, if it were thought proper, and for 1,000 years, if such was thought proper, at a

royalty of 10 cents per ton, the purchaser having perfect immunity from taxation. I refer to section 156 of the Mining Act of 1892, under which power is taken to throw all the outstanding coal measures of Inverness, Pictou and Cumberland into the hands of the Whitney syndicate, if thought proper, for a royalty of 10 cents per ton and for a period of 1,000 years. It is not fair to answer: You should not presume that they will abuse their powers. I am driven to the conclusion by current events that they will abuse their powers. Word comes that another combination is seeking some portion of these coal lands, and there is a public alarm as to what the terms of the other agreement and settlement are. So there is no hope and no comfort to be drawn from these considerations. The agreement with the Whitney syndicate will last for 100 years. We who are here in this House to-night playing our little parts on the stage of public life will have passed away, and as Cardinal Wolsey said, we shall be forgotten and sleep in dull cold marble, and no more mention will be made of us and another generation will come. The youngest child born to any member of this House who lies at its mother's breast to-night will grow up and grow old and die, and still that company will enjoy its powers, and we shall have no legal right to break its charter. What right have we to take away our children's inheritance and birthright? What right has this generation to reach out its dead hand through the 20th century? In common fairness, what right have we? And if we are to deal with this matter, and if we are to have an amendment to section 156 of this law of 1892, it must be before the 4th of August next, because the Bill was received by the Secretary of State on the 4th August last. If no amendment is made it will be perfectly within the right of Mr. Fielding, by Order in Council, to let the Whitney Syndicate or any other have these areas of coal for as long a time as he likes, with entire immunity from taxation. Such an arrangement never comes again before the Government for revision. You cannot get at them for 100 years, or for as long as they choose to give this power to this other syndicate. This is our last chance, and, therefore, if I never make another speech in this House, I avail myself of the opportunity to say on this question, that I, at least, who was in Halifax when this bargain was made, who have given the best study I could to it, and spent weeks in considering it, that I believe it to be—and I wish to see my words go to the country—a measure capable of great mischief and likely, in the time to come, to do great mischief to the Canadian people.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, before this question is taken up by the legal members of the House—because I recognize that it is a matter with which the lawyers can deal more ably than the lay members—I wish, as a simple business man, to say a few words

on the matter now under the consideration of the House. I always listen with the very greatest attention and the greatest possible respect to every word that falls from my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). I recognize, as, in fact, all members of this House recognize, his singleness of purpose, and the strong sense of duty which actuates him in all his conduct in this Parliament. He has referred to the advantage of living in the city of Halifax, and I can say that numerous as are the advantages of residence in that favoured city, one of them is the fact that amongst its residents is my friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), and, as a representative of that community, I think it is only due to him that I should pay to him this tribute of my respect. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this question is largely a legal one, and it would be a very great act of indiscretion, it would be indeed, an impropriety for me, to attempt to deal with that aspect of the case. I must leave that to hon. gentlemen learned in the law. I have the greatest possible respect for the lawyers. I know very well that we could not get on in this House without them. I know that, individually, if we are in trouble and in difficulty, we appeal to them, and we always find them sympathetic and we always find them ready to share our last dollar with us. My hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), in his opening remarks, told us that in viewing this coal question from an Imperial standpoint, he would not make any lengthy reference to that aspect of the case in this House, but that he and other gentlemen had considered it their duty to lay their views in that respect before the representative of Her Majesty in this country. I share with these gentlemen the earnest desire which we, as Canadians all feel—for we are proud to belong to the British Empire—that nothing should be done in Canada that would, in the slightest degree, injure Imperial interests. From the first I never felt anxious in that regard, for it is my belief that if Mr. Whitney and his associates went to Wales to-morrow and had the money, and could make satisfactory arrangements with the great coal owners, it would be possible for them to acquire every mine in Wales and Great Britain. Therefore, if that is a possibility, as I believe it to be, I think we may have no anxiety as to Imperial interests in this matter. My hon. friend says that, in the interests of the other provinces of the Dominion, we should interfere with this recent coal Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, but my hon. friend himself admits that he must make out a very strong case before this Government would be warranted in interfering in provincial matters. Let me briefly point out to the House what I consider to be the condition of the coal property of the province of Nova Scotia. When Nova Scotia joined with the other provinces to help to form this great and grand Dominion of ours, certain assets of that province

were transferred to the Dominion of Canada, and certain assets were retained by the province itself for provincial purposes, and amongst these assets were the coal mines. Therefore, I contend that the coal fields are the property of the province of Nova Scotia, that the Legislature of Nova Scotia has a perfect right to deal with them as it may see fit, and that in that matter the Government of the Dominion has no right to interfere. Mr. Speaker, the Act of the province of Nova Scotia may have been a very bad piece of provincial legislation. It may result unfavourably to the interests of the province, but that is a matter for the province to deal with, and that is a matter for which the present Government of that province will be held to account when it next appeals to the people. As a matter of fact, without saying one word in favour of that legislation, I cannot ignore the fact that both branches of the Legislature of Nova Scotia—the lower House by a very large majority and the upper House without a division—approved of this legislation. The Lieutenant-Governor of the province has also given his assent to it, and now my worthy and esteemed friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) says: "Oh, there is a possibility, even a strong probability, of this legislation becoming injurious to the neighbouring province of New Brunswick, and, therefore, the Federal Government should interfere in this domestic matter in Nova Scotia. My hon. friend has given this matter very careful consideration, and I am sure that, having heard so much of this question in this House and out of it, hon. members who take an interest in all that appertains to the welfare of the different provinces, will be glad to have had the explanation of his views. I candidly admit that I have not had the opportunity nor the time to read all these long legal documents to which my friend referred, and if I had had, possibly I would not have understood them. I have no doubt, at all events, that I would not be able to appreciate them as a lawyer would; but all the same I am not in a dazed condition on the question, to use my friend's phraseology. I admit that there are possibilities of this coal legislation acting injuriously and unfavourably to the province of Nova Scotia, and if we were to conjure up all possible evils that might happen we might spend a long time in proving to our satisfaction, that it must undoubtedly and inevitably result injuriously to the province. My hon. friend has referred to the year 1878, when a policy was inaugurated in this country which I had always supposed aimed at the greatest possible development of our industrial and natural resources. I think that the acquisition of something like \$7,500,000 of capital, which is to be used in the development of the coal mines of one portion of this Dominion, will carry out the policy and can hardly result injuriously to adjoining provinces. My hon. friend imagines that the peo-

Mr. KENNY.

ple who have invested this large sum of money may invest other large sums in other coal properties in the province of Nova Scotia. Well, Sir, I read to-day in one of the Toronto papers that it is rumoured that another company has been formed—call it what you like, a combine or an association—for the purpose of acquiring other coal properties in Nova Scotia, and we know very well that in these large investments of capital, in its own defence capital is frequently driven to make further investments. But we must not imagine that it will necessarily follow that all these arrangements are going to result injuriously to the people of Nova Scotia, or the people of the adjoining province of New Brunswick. As regards the leases and the forfeiture clauses, I would not attempt, as I have said, to discuss them merely from the bold legal point of view. I am disposed to a great extent to view them from the commercial aspect, and when I find men investing so large a sum of money as \$7,500,000, bargaining to pay to the province of Nova Scotia the sum of \$125,000 a year as royalty, and binding themselves also to pay 6 per cent interest on \$3,000,000 and 8 per cent interest on another \$3,000,000, I do not think the owners of that property, who have to pay the interest on their bonds, are likely to keep the property idle. My hon. friend's apprehension is that they will unduly increase the price of coal, and I think that is really his only apprehension. My hon. friend referred to the cupidity and extortion which are possible under this arrangement, and he finds especial fault that the old form of lease which existed in the province of Nova Scotia has been abandoned, and that the province has given this new company a lease for 99 years. Now, my hon. friend knows full well that it would not be possible for us to legislate as to the price of coal for 99 years. Why, to-day we are bothered with the question of the price of coal in England and the price in the United States with bi-metallism and the appreciation of gold and the depreciation of silver, and these questions must be considered in our legislation. I therefore think that we must look at all these matters as commercial men look at any venture into which they embark. There is a certain amount of faith necessary, and we must assume that where capital is invested to the extent that it is in this instance it will be employed in the development of the enterprise. My hon. friend has himself pointed out that by improved methods, greater business ability, economy of transportation, and so forth, a large profit will inure to the owners of this enterprise without at all increasing the price of coal. I infer from his argument that without advancing the price of coal one cent a ton, a large profit will accrue to them from the changed methods of conducting their business. That argument alone, I think, would have warranted the enterprise. My hon. friend has mentioned in the course of his speech that the Government of

the province of Nova Scotia, by the manner in which it annoyed and irritated the coal owners of that province, induced this coal combine to demand longer leases. Well, that may be; but my hon. friend must also remember that two-thirds of the capital of the company comes from a foreign country, where the people are not in the habit of dealing with short leases, where no combination of men will invest their money in coal property without acquiring the fee-simple; and I do not believe it would be possible to obtain a large amount of money in the United States for investment in coal enterprises in Canada on short leases. The answer of American capitalists would be that the money could not be obtained on any such terms.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman excuse me asking him a question? If I understood the hon. gentleman who brought this matter up, the leases in existence were for 80 years, and the present lease is for 99 years, so that the extension is only for 19 years. Is that correct?

Mr. WELDON. When the hon. gentleman looks at the lease he will see that it answers that question. It is but a 20-year lease, and the right of renewal is by no means absolute. At the end of the 20 years the Legislature may step in and make whatever alterations in the terms it likes.

Mr. KENNY As I said before, this may be a bad piece of provincial legislation. It may have been unwise for Mr. Fielding to advise the Legislature which he leads to make this arrangement. I do not want to go into the merits of the question; but we must remember that under any circumstances these leases will lapse if \$125,000 is not paid into the treasury of Nova Scotia every year, and that under the old lease, if I understand them aright, the only financial penalty imposed upon those who did not work the mines was that they had to pay \$30 a year on every square mile, and they might lose their lease. But, as a matter of fact, I think myself the practice in Nova Scotia has been that the leases, under those circumstances, were not forfeited. The alarm of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) then is principally as regards the price of coal, and he has referred to the fact that the leases might be forfeited under the old leases, while it is possible that could not be done under the new leases. And he also mentioned that this company has on its board of direction, four Canadians. I think it is a matter of notoriety that at least one-third of the capital of the company is held by Canadians, and he says truly, that while it is in the hands to-day of gentlemen whom we respect and regard very highly, and in whom we all have every confidence, it is quite possible that that stock will change hands. In fact, it is a moral certainty that it will change hands. It is quite as likely that the control of the company will pass into Canadian hands as go anywhere else. My friend showed very

poetically what might happen to our children's children as regards the acquisition of this property. In all human probability our children's children, as Canadians, will very likely control and own the whole property. I have no intention to attempt arguing the legal aspect of this case. I only, as a representative of Nova Scotia in this Legislature, wish to express the opinion—and I do so in all deference to my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon)—that this is a matter with which we have nothing to do here. It is a matter which pertains solely to the province of Nova Scotia, and on which the Legislature of that province has already emphatically spoken.

Mr. McKAY. This question has been so exhaustively and ably discussed by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that anything I can say will probably have very little effect one way or the other. Nevertheless, this matter has been spoken of as one affecting the Maritime provinces and the province of Quebec almost entirely. I look beyond that, and I consider that it is, if not a national question, certainly one, the importance of which extends beyond these two provinces to Ontario. Although these gentlemen may raise the price of soft coal in the Maritime provinces and Quebec, these provinces have their relief, because, as has been explained by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), when the price reaches beyond a certain limit, they can import British coal. From this relief, however, the province of Ontario is entirely debarred. We are entirely at the mercy of the miners and coal companies of western Pennsylvania and Virginia, and cannot get our coal from any other source. We have felt in our province how seriously the combine in anthracite coal affected the price. We saw how clever manipulators, by forming a combine, raised the price of coal, and although that combine is now apparently burst, still I notice it has strength enough left to decide that the prices will remain as they are. We have seen how possible it was for these men: McLeod of the Reading Coal Company—an apparently small concern at first, but which gradually extended and embraced all the people interested in coal—succeeded in controlling the market. And it is quite possible that a combine may be organized in soft coal. It is possible for the soft coal mine owners and the railways interested in the carriage of that coal, to form a combine such as was formed in hard coal. Rumours have been floating about for the past two or three weeks that such a combine is in contemplation between the West Virginia and the Pennsylvania coal mine owners, and experience has shown that there is nothing in the United States laws to prevent such a combination from being formed. The gigantic combination of the Standard Oil Company is an illustration of the facility of one syndicate to obtain control of large

areas and rule the market, for the company gathered together interests much more widely diffused than the soft coal interests. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) thinks that relief could be got by this Government knocking off the duty, but we found that that mode did not answer in the case of hard coal. This Government knocked off the duty, and their action had no material effect on the price. It did not lower the price one iota, and if it had any effect it must have been to put 60 cents a ton into the pockets of railway companies or dealers. I believe it is the duty of the Government to do everything in its power to prevent the coal combine being formed. It is possible that Nova Scotia has the right to deal with its coal fields just as Ontario has the right to deal with its timber and mineral wealth; but if there be any means by which this Government may protect the public it would be advisable for the Government to use those means. I am speaking more now as an Ontario man, representing a province which this matter may in the future seriously affect, and I hope that what has been said by the hon. gentlemen who spoke so magnificently on this question will have the effect of inducing our Government to take some action.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must endorse all that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has said, not only as to the zeal, but as to the perfect sincerity of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) in bringing this subject to the notice of the House, and I do so the more heartily because what the hon. gentleman has said here he has urged in other places with equal force and earnestness. I am not able to agree with the hon. gentleman, although I am prepared to admit that in some respects he has made out a strong case against the measure which he complains of. The hon. gentleman started with the admission, to which, however, he did not give sufficient force in the subsequent argument, that the property which is dealt with under the statute about which he makes complaint, is the property of the province of Nova Scotia. Now, there can be no doubt upon that subject, and I wish to read the section of the British North America Act which makes it the property of the province, for the purpose of showing, that the hon. gentleman, while admitting the fact, has not given full credit for the force of that fact. At the time of the union of the provinces in 1867, the value and position of these coal lands and all this mining property was as well understood. I suppose, in all the British North American provinces as it is to-day. It related to a matter of familiar history to every child in Nova Scotia. The minerals of the province, the coal deposits of the province, as the hon. gentleman has stated, were granted to the creditors of the Duke of York. For the purpose of realizing from these deposits, they formed an organization known as the General Mining Association, and not a pound of coal could be raised in the province without the consent of that association, as owners in fee simple of these mineral beds. I think I am correct in saying "in fee simple"; at any rate, it was practically that. The terms upon which the province long ago, about forty years ago, obtained re-lease of the rights of the General Mining Association were, at the time of the union of the provinces, perfectly well known. Among other rights, the association obtained the right to keep the properties they had discovered and opened and worked, and they re-leased to the province of Nova Scotia, to be part of the public domain, all rights to the other coal areas. In 1867 one of the problems which arose for the consideration of those who were promoting the scheme of union, was the disposition of that valuable property. I suppose all what the hon. member has urged upon the House to-night, as to the interests of every province of Canada, present and future, in the supply of coal, must have been foreseen. There must certainly have been present to the minds of those who framed the scheme of union, the future interest—using the word interest in its widest sense—which every province of the coming Dominion would have in the development of these mines and in the production of coal at a rate which would make manufactories numerous throughout the country, and cause the various industries dependent on steam to be developed without an excessive burden arising from an increase in the price of coal. With full view, as we must presume, of all the interests concerned, it was deliberately laid down, not that these coal deposits, of such special value as the hon. gentleman has stated, of such great importance to the future welfare of the united provinces, should be the property of the Dominion of Canada, that they should be given to the province. The provision of the British North America Act, section 109, is as follows:—

All lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the union and all sums then due and payable for such lands, mines, minerals or royalties shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise, subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof and to any interests other than that of the province in the same.

Now, while the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) admitted this, he insisted that, although that property belongs to Nova Scotia, she should not be permitted to do with it what she pleases, but, in parting with it, the terms of her bargain must be revised by all the other provinces of Canada. I must say, while I admit the force of the case the hon. gentleman has made against the providence of the bargain which is embodied in the Acts of Nova Scotia, I am not prepared to admit for my province, that her property is her's only to sell on terms which the other provinces of Canada approve. Now,

Mr. MCKAY.

tion, and not a pound of coal could be raised in the province without the consent of that association, as owners in fee simple of these mineral beds. I think I am correct in saying "in fee simple"; at any rate, it was practically that. The terms upon which the province long ago, about forty years ago, obtained re-lease of the rights of the General Mining Association were, at the time of the union of the provinces, perfectly well known. Among other rights, the association obtained the right to keep the properties they had discovered and opened and worked, and they re-leased to the province of Nova Scotia, to be part of the public domain, all rights to the other coal areas. In 1867 one of the problems which arose for the consideration of those who were promoting the scheme of union, was the disposition of that valuable property. I suppose all what the hon. member has urged upon the House to-night, as to the interests of every province of Canada, present and future, in the supply of coal, must have been foreseen. There must certainly have been present to the minds of those who framed the scheme of union, the future interest—using the word interest in its widest sense—which every province of the coming Dominion would have in the development of these mines and in the production of coal at a rate which would make manufactories numerous throughout the country, and cause the various industries dependent on steam to be developed without an excessive burden arising from an increase in the price of coal. With full view, as we must presume, of all the interests concerned, it was deliberately laid down, not that these coal deposits, of such special value as the hon. gentleman has stated, of such great importance to the future welfare of the united provinces, should be the property of the Dominion of Canada, that they should be given to the province. The provision of the British North America Act, section 109, is as follows:—

All lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the union and all sums then due and payable for such lands, mines, minerals or royalties shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise, subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof and to any interests other than that of the province in the same.

Now, while the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) admitted this, he insisted that, although that property belongs to Nova Scotia, she should not be permitted to do with it what she pleases, but, in parting with it, the terms of her bargain must be revised by all the other provinces of Canada. I must say, while I admit the force of the case the hon. gentleman has made against the providence of the bargain which is embodied in the Acts of Nova Scotia, I am not prepared to admit for my province, that her property is her's only to sell on terms which the other provinces of Canada approve. Now,

Sir, we have a perfect right, the hon. gentleman contends, to revise every statute of the province relating to mines and minerals, lest a bargain be made which will tend to increase the price of coal. The other provinces, then, have the right to insist that the coal lands shall be sold on terms which suit the other provinces, in order that the price of coal may not be enhanced to those provinces. Notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman claims that coal is a peculiar commodity, he must logically claim the right to revise the bargains which the province of Ontario makes with regard to her timber limits, and those which every province makes with regard to public lands. The hon. gentleman's contention is, that coal is an article of such prime necessity that the coal areas ought to be controlled by some sovereign authority. If so, why were not the coal lands made the property of the sovereign authority? Surely that point must have been quite as well understood in 1867 as we understand it to-night, and if the province of Nova Scotia was fortunate enough to acquire mineral properties of peculiar value, we are not, therefore, to refuse her the use of the assets which the framers of the Constitution gave her twenty-six years ago. Nova Scotia was peculiarly unfortunate if the assets allowed to her in order that she might carry on the public services which were placed under her control, and for the management of which she was to be responsible, such a species of property, that she must be controlled by the other provinces every time she wished to bring it into the market. Now, my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) has presented such a case with regard to the providence of the bargain as might properly be urged if the Act which he seeks to have disallowed were a Bill before this House and upon which we had to vote. I must confess that the argument he made against the Act would incline me very strongly to vote against it, if it were a Bill before this House: at any rate, would urge me to vote against it, until I heard the points answered which the hon. gentleman made as against the providence of the bargain. But he is not asking us to refuse to pass a Bill before us for disposing of a valuable piece of property, but to disallow a statute which one of the provinces has made for the disposal of its own property. Now, it seems to me that in presenting his argument upon that subject, admitting the force of the logic and the wealth of eloquence with which he illustrated the argument, he has, after all, simply put this case before the House, and I shall ask the House to consider whether he has done anything more—that the bargain which he seeks to have disallowed here is one which contains great possibilities of good and great possibilities of evil, both for the province and for the rest of Canada. What are the possibilities of good? The hon. gentleman, with perfect candor, has admitted them. He admits that coal is a valuable asset of the province, and he admits that the Provincial Government has

parted with the property under terms which, will greatly aid the provincial treasury. He admits, further, that the bargain which he condemns will probably increase coal development by diminishing the cost of its production; that it will economize the management of this industry, now carried on by several distinct companies; that it will apply improved methods of shipment, that it will reduce the charges of mining as well as the charges of management; and that it will in every way lessen the cost of output in order that coal may reach the market at a much lower price than it does now. Surely these are great advantages; they are great advantages to the Provincial Government and to the people of the province, not only as affording increased markets, but as stimulating a productive industry in which great numbers of people in that province find employment, and as putting it in the power of the new company to sell its coal at a lower price than companies now operating can sell it for. The hon. gentleman has admitted, therefore, a great deal when he has admitted the possibilities for good which this legislation contains. He has brought before us in very startling terms the possibilities for evil which it contains. But if it is simply, as I have supposed it to be, a case presented to the House for disallowance of a statute which is clearly within the powers of the province to pass a statute which relates to the property of the province, and not to a dollar's worth of property of any other province; if it is a case simply of a bargain made within the provincial powers by a province for its own benefit, containing great possibilities of good as well as possibilities for evil, I submit he has presented a case in which the Provincial Legislature ought not to be controlled by the power of disallowance. Surely, if the matter is within provincial power, if it may be a very beneficial scheme for the people of this province, I may ask this House, who, in the nature of things, and who, according to the spirit of the Constitution, is the best judge to decide upon the question of the fitness of that legislation? The people of Nova Scotia have selected a set of gentlemen to conduct the affairs of that province, the most important of which are affairs connected with this very provincial property; the people selected a set of gentlemen to deal with this property to dispose of it in this way, selected a body of gentlemen in whom some of us have not confidence; but they selected them by an overwhelming majority, and we may fairly be called on to admit from every indication, whether from the popular vote or the vote of each branch of the Legislature, that the men who passed this Act are the constitutional representatives of that province. Now, it seems to me that the argument is conclusive against this Government interfering, for the hon. gentleman has not presented any different case from that which I have stated, namely, a case of legislation *intra vires*, and of legislation which may be

good, and still has possibilities of evil in it. Although I think one might stop there, I cannot refrain from going into the allusions which the hon. gentleman has made as to the possibilities of evil in this bargain. While I repeat that the bargain is one which does not meet with my approval as a citizen of that province—as I am proud to say I am—I think it is one that binds me, when it is made by a perfectly constitutional authority, acting as I have stated, not only within its powers, but with reference to the property of the province itself. The hon. gentleman feels that this ought to be disallowed in the interest of the other portions of the Dominion of Canada, even though it be beneficial to the province of Nova Scotia itself. Now, I beg to say that in my humble opinion, as to the matter of property, the other people of Canada have no interest in the question whatever. I am using the term "interest" in its narrow meaning, as indicating proprietorship. An interest they have, as everybody in every corner in the Dominion has an interest, in the propriety of the legislation in the most distant province in it; but as to a proprietary interest, there is only one province and only one set of people that have any interest here, and I humbly submit that the other portions of this Dominion have no right to call into exercise the powers of disallowance against a provincial statute of that character, simply because they do not approve of its policy, or fear that the provincial property is being parted with on terms that may inflict some inconvenience upon them. To that kind of argument I think the answer is that twenty-six years ago these provinces made their bargain, and the people of the province of Nova Scotia undertook to carry on the duties, and responsibilities, and burdens of Provincial Government on the faith of that bargain. If the other provinces once gave up the control of that property you have no right to resume control over it, or to revise the terms on which it was sold or leased, than you have to re-vest yourselves with the property itself, and declare, contrary to the terms of the British North America Act, that the minerals belong to Canada and not to Nova Scotia. Now, there are many circumstances connected with this bargain which the hon. gentleman is right. I think, in apprehending will fill with alarm a great many people outside the province, as well as within it, with regard to the possibilities of the increased price of this valuable production; but when one reflects upon that, one realizes that they are only the ordinary incidents of a large transaction in such property. The danger is not from the investment of foreign capital in the province, or the control which foreign capital may exercise. From the hour when the terms of the bargain with the Duke of York's creditors were broken, down to the present time, it may be said in general terms that the mineral production of that province, as regards coal, gold and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

other minerals, has been the result of American capital and enterprise. If at any time American capital had been withdrawn from any of the mines in that province, they would have been practically closed. We have done our best in that province to attract American capital; but everybody knows that so far from that being deemed by any political party, or any individual, a detriment to the province, it was regarded as one of the greatest advantages that could be procured that foreign capital and enterprise should come in and unlock our treasures. But the hon. gentleman is inclined to think that this company, in consequence of the amount of capital it controls and the extent of the property it has purchased, is more likely to take the attitude of a combination than any of the previous companies. I do not agree with that reason. If the hon. gentleman will turn his attention to the history of trusts and combinations in the United States, the country of all others in which they have most flourished, he will find that as a rule the most of them have been opened by companies forming trusts and combinations among themselves. What the hon. gentleman fears with respect to this particular company and this organization was quite as possible and quite as much in the interest of the coal owners all along as it was in the interest of this particular concern. The duration of the lease is another circumstance which excites alarm in many minds, and it may be a circumstance indicating improvidence in making the bargain. But I am not prepared to admit that the case on this point is conclusive at any rate, when I remember that in some of the greatest coal producing countries in the world it is not a question of 99 years, it is not a question of giving title for a period which will outlast the youngest child at its mother's breast to-day, as the hon. gentleman said, but for all time the title in those mineral lands is given. So it is in the United States, and so it is in some portions of this country, for in the greater portion of our North-west Territories the well-established practice under the authority of this Parliament has been not to convey the coal areas under the limited tenure which prevailed in Nova Scotia, but to give patents in fee simple for lands known to contain coal and to give them at exceedingly moderate prices. It is true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that the province has parted with its right to increase the royalty upon the coal. I doubt very much whether that would be an effective and advantageous remedy for the province to have in its hand. An increase of royalty would almost certainly increase the price of coal. It may also depress the industry itself and so decrease the employment and output at the mines. But let us do the province justice, whether the administration of its affairs is in the hands of Liberals or Conservatives; let us do it the justice to say that time after time during the last twenty

years, not only the province itself but the coal owners likewise, have made representations to the Federal Government to the effect that they would be willing that we should assume the proprietary interest and give the province, in lieu thereof, a substantial or fair equivalent. We have never felt it was the proper thing for us to revise the terms of Confederation to that extent, to take from the province the property which was given to it at the time of union and undertake to provide for its services in another way. The province has never looked upon the royalty otherwise than as a means of replenishing a treasury which needs the money to carry on its local services from day to day. The reasonableness of a provision against an increase of the royalty is apparent when we consider one or two facts with respect to it. The first is that the royalty had already reached a sum of ten cents per ton, which was pretty burdensome on the coal owners as we can judge from the fact that upon the out-put in the province of Nova Scotia upwards of \$100,000 per year is obtained from the royalty. By this bargain the royalty is increased to 12½ cents per ton, and there was some reason, I think, on the part of those who were purchasing the mining property with a view to large operations for insisting that, for the term of their lease, that rate of royalty should not be revised. To revise it would not only diminish their profits, but as I have said, it could result only either in a decrease of production or an increase in the price of coal. With respect to the former right of the province to revise the royalty from time to time on the expiration of leases, this must be borne in mind: that while those leases have run a great many years and have occasionally been renewed as they expired, never in any case, I think, I am speaking from memory only, until the recent expiration of them, when the needs of the province seemed to demand a larger revenue, has that clause in the lease been availed of by the province to increase the impost on the production of coal. These circumstances seem to me to some extent, I do not say entirely, to destroy the force of the hon. gentleman's objection to the scheme itself, but I merely mention them, not for the purpose of insisting by any means that they do so, but only as points that occur to us here, who have not had the full opportunity of considering the matter which members of the Nova Scotia Legislature possessed. They seem to weaken the force of the hon. gentleman's case as presented to the House, and his claim for redress by disallowance on the ground that the legislation affects the burdens and interests of other provinces of Canada. But even if the hon. gentleman were able to prove that the case in that respect is full of danger, I repeat, what I said at the outset, that the hon. gentleman has made a case against the providence of the Act, but he has made a case

which is rather for the consideration of those who had the power and responsibility of passing the Act. I do not think as at present advised, that it would be our duty to present to His Excellency, advice that this legislation should be disallowed. Notwithstanding that, I give the hon. gentleman credit for the great zeal with which he has entered into the subject, and which is a zeal I know purely in the public welfare.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I very deeply regret that my hon. friend the First Minister has not been able to make a different reply to the magnificent speech which was delivered by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). I thought, as I listened to that calm, convincing and very conclusive presentation of the case that my hon. friend the First Minister would have been sufficiently impressed by it to have been able to make a different answer from the one he has made to-night. I understand that the ground upon which he refuses to interfere may be divided into two parts—in the first place, that the case is not strong enough, and in the next place, that however strong the case may be, he would not be justified in interfering, because the property is the property of the province. My hon. friend admitted that the case would have been sufficiently strong at all events to have made him oppose the passage of any such Bill through this House; but he said that my hon. friend from Albert had stated that there was a possibility of good in this measure as well as a possibility of evil, and on that ground he considered that it was not reasonable to ask for disallowance, or rather an amendment of the Act in question. My hon. friend from Albert said that there was a possibility of good in this measure, but he pointed out also that experience on the other side of the line had proved that although the possibility of good existed, that possibility did not become effective. He pointed out that the operation of these great monopolies in the United States had been in the very opposite direction; and I think we have good reason to believe that when this enormous combine is controlled by people from the other side of the line, who have been in the habit of carrying out their policy as we know they have carried it out there, we have good reason to fear that the same result will be experienced here. A possibility of evil, Mr. Speaker, is there—it has not been denied by any one—not only a great possibility, but a great probability of evil; and my hon. friend simply asks that the possibility of good in this measure may be secured to us—that the good may be secured and the evil avoided. He simply asks that the Government of Nova Scotia may be induced so to deal with this measure as to avoid the evil which they can avoid, and give us the benefit of the good. He asks that the measure should be so amended by representa-

tions made to the Nova Scotia Government, that if the Legislature of Nova Scotia deems that those powers which have been conferred on this company are improperly or tyrannically used, that Legislature itself shall be able to refer the matter to the highest tribunal in this country to say whether or not those powers are being abused. If that could be done there would be no possibility of evil, and whatever good there was in the measure would accrue to the people of Nova Scotia. This is an unheard-of transaction in Canada. Every lease which has been granted to any corporation mining coal in Canada has been guarded in the public interest by certain conditions of the greatest importance; but in the lease which has been granted to this enormous foreign syndicate, we find that every one of these safe-guards has been virtually struck out. They have all been placed in the lease, but whereas in every other case heretofore the violation of any one of those conditions voided the lease, when we come to the penal clause of this lease we find it deliberately enacted that the violation of these conditions which have hitherto so carefully guarded in the public interest shall not void the lease.

Mr. AMYOT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him, what about sales instead of leases, as in the province of Quebec? Immense areas of land there are not only leased but sold.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not speaking of lands. I am speaking of those safe-guards which it has been considered necessary in the public interest to throw around this thing coal, which is the very life of the manufacturing industries of this country; and when my hon. friend the First Minister says that at the time of Confederation the coal was given to the province of Nova Scotia, and it was given, although it was known by those who entered into the bargain of Confederation that it was of so great importance, and that had it been intended that we should interfere with that and guard it as something separate, it would not have been given to the province of Nova Scotia—when he asks, why it was given in that case, and why it was that it was not reserved for the Dominion, I say: The reason why it was considered safe to give it to the province was that we have it in our power under the constitution to control the province in the use of it. I understand that there is no question of law involved in this matter at all; I would not venture to speak upon it if it were a question of law. It is admitted that we have the power to disallow if we please. Then it is a mere question of policy, on which every member of this House has a right to form an opinion, as to whether the power which we undoubtedly possess by law should be exercised in this case. If that be right, and I presume that is undeniable, it then simply comes to be a question as to whether the case is strong enough to justify interference by us.

Mr. McNEILL.

It has been shown that this commodity, which is essential to the industries of this country, and the great bulk of which lies in the Maritime provinces, has been handed over bodily to this syndicate to do with it as they please, without let or hindrance, for ninety-nine years, so that they are given the power to put their hands on the throat of every industry, at all events east of Montreal. If that does not make a sufficiently strong case for the interference of this House, it is almost impossible to make a case strong enough to justify such interference. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) does not pause there. He goes further and shows that not only will these people, who now own two-thirds of the coal measures in Nova Scotia, practically, in all probability, control all the coal measures in the Maritime provinces, and thus have at their mercy every industry east of Montreal, but there is every reason to believe they will be able to enter into an arrangement with the people who supply coal to Ontario, by means of which they will run up the price in that province also. So that not only will the manufacturing industries east of Montreal be at the mercy of this foreign syndicate, and those other foreign corporations whom they may call into their assistance, but the manufacturing interests of Ontario may be also, in a very short time, at their mercy. If that is not a sufficiently grave state of affairs to warrant the interference of this House, I do not know when a serious and grave case has been made out.

Mr. AMYOT. Before the hon. gentleman closes his speech, I wish to tell him that he did not understand my interruption. I did not speak of extent of land alone, but of extent of land including mines. The DeLery Gold Mining Company purchased from the Government an immense extent of land. It is gold mining and not coal, but they have not thought of carrying that for the future, because they have sold it entirely.

Mr. McNEILL. I was speaking of coal.

Mr. FRASER. I would not, perhaps, have addressed the House after the lucid exposition given of the whole question by the Minister of Justice—which I think ought to be a quietus on this discussion—had not the hon. gentleman who has just sat down made reference to certain matters, in which reference he was not correct. I do not charge the hon. gentleman of being wilfully incorrect, for no doubt he got his information from somebody else. In the first place, he says that two-thirds of the coal areas of Nova Scotia are owned by that company. That is not correct. Not more than half of the areas now worked are owned by it. There are large areas both in Inverness, Victoria and Richmond which are not worked, and consequently are not included.

Mr. McNEILL. My authority for the statement I have made is the hon. member

for Pictou (Mr. McDougall), who, I think, is as good an expert on coal matters as anyone in this House, and he tells me very positively that at least two-thirds of the known coal areas in Nova Scotia are controlled now by this company.

Mr. FRASER. I stated that no doubt the hon. gentleman was quoting what he had heard, but that his information is not correct. If it were necessary to add anything to what the Minister of Justice has said, it does seem to me very strange that hon. gentlemen who voted last night to keep up a combine should talk so much now against a combine, and that only an anticipated combine, and draw a tearful picture of what might happen in the future. I did admire, Sir, the wealth of imagery of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and could not help being impressed by the picture he so skilfully depicted. But I was bound to think that the picture was not in keeping with several votes that hon. gentleman has given in this House. It is very easy, when an interest particularly appeals to a man, perhaps selfishly, to raise a cry of alarm concerning what is likely to happen; but let us look at the facts, so far as this syndicate is concerned. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that it is a matter of some importance that \$7,500,000 should go to the province of Nova Scotia. I regret much that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has spoken about the Provincial Secretary as if he had been swindled by Mr. Whitney. If the hon. gentleman had read the correspondence which took place between Mr. Fielding and Mr. Whitney, he would have known that Mr. Fielding was the first man to approach Mr. Whitney in this matter, and would not have said what he did. Let it not be forgotten so far as this particular syndicate is concerned, that they will have to pay, whether they mine or not, to the Government of Nova Scotia \$122,000 per year, and if you add to that the interest of \$7,500,000, you will have \$500,000, which that company must raise in some way if they do not mine. Is it not a good thing that that much money should be invested in the province of Nova Scotia? Mr. Fielding, in the interests of the people of Nova Scotia, was the first to see, upon the suggestions made to him by friends in Nova Scotia, that this was a good arrangement. Now, I am not going to put my own opinion against that of a gentleman whose opinion on this question is worth a great deal more than mine. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has spoken, and so have a large number of the best men of Nova Scotia. I hold a letter from Mr. Graham Fraser, who, I think, will be taken as the best authority in Nova Scotia on this question, being a gentleman who has done more to develop the iron industry of that province than anybody else. What does he think about it? He says that he

believes that the Boston capitalists invested their money on business principles, and that their scheme was a very good thing for the province. Mr. Fraser is interested in manufactures all over Canada, and it is therefore of the greatest importance to him that he should obtain his coal at the cheapest possible rate. Let it not be forgotten that half the coal in Nova Scotia is not mined by the syndicate to-day. All the mines in Pictou and Cumberland are worked by other companies outside of this company altogether. Are we to assume that because the mines of Cape Breton come under this syndicate these others are to be wiped out altogether? How are you going to prevent these men, even without the legislation against which such a cry is raised, from purchasing these properties if they will? It is feasible in Nova Scotia for one company to get a transfer of a lease from any other company, and that was never objected to by the Government except on one condition, and that was that a royalty had to be paid before the transfer would be assented to.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman will not say that the Government always claimed control, and that they could use control if danger threatened.

Mr. FRASER. I do not know what the Government claim; but I know that if this company had bought properties from other parties in Cape Breton the transfers could have been made without any interference by the Government, provided the royalties were paid. I regret the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) speaking about Mr. Whitney having Mr. Fielding by the throat. Those who know Mr. Fielding know that he is not the man to be taken by the throat, either by Mr. Whitney or by any other man.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman. I spoke of Mr. Whitney taking Mr. Fielding around his finger like a glove.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman did not say that, at least that was my impression of what he said.

Mr. WELDON. Let the hon. gentleman refer to "Hansard;" he will see what I said.

Mr. FRASER. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman may have used both. In any case, I want to inform the House generally, many members here do not need to be informed, that Mr. Fielding is not that kind of man, and, if the hon. gentleman thinks that Mr. Whitney can use Mr. Fielding in the way he mentions, he is mistaken. I regret that a person from Nova Scotia should speak of Mr. Fielding in that way, because the people of Nova Scotia know that as a business man or in his devotion to the interests of his province, Nova Scotia never had a better Premier than Mr. Fielding, and even opponents have written to express their approval. So far

as the question of municipal taxation is concerned, the hon. member is wrong, Mr. Speaker, about the leader of the Opposition being the means of calling attention to this question. When he introduced his Bill, and before Mr. Cahan had said anything upon the subject, Mr. Fielding announced that Mr. Whitney had objected to the royalty on the ground that in the United States they were not accustomed to royalties, but when they bought a mine bought it outright. It was pointed out to him that the several states, though they did not charge royalties, had a state tax, so that in this respect the two were equal. Mr. Fielding stated that he pointed out clearly to Mr. Whitney that there were municipalities in the province whose revenues were raised by a tax upon local properties, and that the Legislature would not undertake to exempt him from such taxation, but that he must pay such tax as was levied upon him for municipal purposes. To this Mr. Whitney agreed.

Mr. WELDON. What Mr. Fielding says confirms what I stated. No doubt he meant that municipalities should be allowed to tax this property; but his instrument was drawn so badly that it did not provide that. It was amended at the instance of the leader of the Opposition; I know that, because I was consulted legally at the time. I do not blame Mr. Fielding; he is not a lawyer, and is not blameworthy for such an error.

Mr. FRASER. But he knows as much as some lawyers, and he had very good advice.

Mr. WELDON. Very bad advice on that point.

Mr. FRASER. That may be a matter of opinion. But I want to state that the very thing to which Mr. Cahan referred, had been arranged for by Mr. Fielding and agreed to by Mr. Whitney before Mr. Cahan mentioned it. I think the hon. gentleman was not as frank as he usually is, when he spoke of the twenty-year lease. It is a lease for twenty years, with the option of renewal; so that it is for all practical purposes a lease for eighty years. The lease now under discussion is for a period of ninety-nine years, with power in the Government at the end of that time to terminate it. More than that, this company has to pay 12½ cents upon every ton of coal mined, whereas every other man who holds a lease now or hereafter, pays only 10 cents. The hon. gentleman says this is to be a combine, but that could hardly be, seeing that it starts out with this disadvantage. Mr. Fraser, speaking of the matter, makes a statement, I think, of very considerable importance. He says that Mr. Fielding is quite right in making a long lease with the Boston syndicate, and that when he was in London trying to raise capital upon their iron mines, Sir Charles Tupper told him that the difficulty which stood in the way of mining enterprises was, that the Government could increase the royalties and that this

Mr. FRASER.

difficulty he could readily understand. Here is a business man who spoke from practical experience. Capitalists are not going to invest in a matter which depends on the whim of the Government; it must be a business transaction. So that all the coal lands already working in Nova Scotia, in Pictou county and Cumberland county, and all the mines that will be opened hereafter, have advantages, as compared with this syndicate. And how is it this syndicate has any advantage? Simply, as the hon. gentleman himself said, because they can mine cheaper and carry cheaper, and, as the hon. Minister of Justice said, the people of Ontario and Quebec are going to get coal cheaper than before. I do not know myself so much about the combines, or what they are capable of, as the hon. gentleman has learned from his study. But I do not give much credence to the letters to which he has referred. I think I can remember, though I was not a member of the House at the time, that certain letters written by a member of Parliament here about what he had done with regard to other members, who distinctly denied what was said, and declared that their accuser was lying. I do know that there is, unfortunately, corruption in the United States. I am not sure but there may be corruption here. But I do not believe all those who are floating these schemes say. I do not believe that all the money has been advanced and spent that they say has been advanced and spent. So far as coal is concerned, it is a commodity required by all, and the Creator has placed enough of it under the ground for the wants of His creatures, and as each generation comes forward, it will be found that there is enough of this good gift to supply them all. I know that in several places in Nova Scotia there are indications of other coal mines than those already discovered. Now, there is another point outside of that, namely, the provincial point. I thank the Minister of Justice for giving, in no uncertain manner, his idea of what provincial rights are in this respect. If there were certain mines in Ontario, and the people of that province thought fit to legislate as Nova Scotia has been doing with regard to its minerals, I would be very sorry indeed if the people of Nova Scotia should attempt to interfere on the ground that possibly the price of coal might be raised a little. There is one way of killing a combine to which the hon. member referred. Given a state of things where an article is free, I do not fear combines very much. It is only when they are assisted by legislation that circumstances are favourable to combines. But give to any particular article which men produce, a free field over the world, and you will find that people will not be troubled with combines with respect to it. If there were a combine in coal the ships of the hon. member for Halifax would soon find ready work in carrying cargoes from Nova Scotia to the south, and bringing back coal.

There is another point. I have not the honour of an acquaintance with any of these gentlemen, except the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith), who is one of the directors of that company; but I do know that out of the nine directors, four of them are Canadians. I do know that over a quarter of a million dollars in this company were taken in less than two days in the city of Halifax. Now, that looks as if the people of Halifax had money, and as if they were not afraid to invest it in this company. That is a good sign. But how can it be possible that this company alone, unless they purchase—and they are excluded from purchasing any where except in the county of Cape Breton—

Mr. WELDON. That is not true.

Mr. FRASER. That is the way I read it.

Mr. WELDON. Read the charter.

Mr. FRASER. I may be wrong, but as I understand it, it refers to the county of Cape Breton and to the island of Cape Breton. Now, I do not say but that this company can extend their operations, I do not say but that they can extend themselves all over the province, that they may eventually buy up every coal mine in Nova Scotia. There is nothing to prevent them doing it now, and there never has been. The law gives them the same chance now that they always had, and how are you going to prevent it? Certainly, not by stopping this particular transaction. It may be necessary to say that one company shall not own more than a certain area; but are you going to hamper trade in that way, or are you going to parcel it out among a certain number? Everybody knows the improvements that have been made in coal mining which makes it impossible to conduct these operations now as they were conducted formerly. I can remember when a coal mine was worked near New Glasgow and when there was just one horse to raise the coal about 200 feet. That method has passed away. Even the methods now pursued in some of the mines of Cape Breton and Pictou County, although very good, must give place to the larger and improved operations. But it is a matter of surprise to me that, for the first time, this question has now been raised about the Americans coming in and investing their capital here. On this point I will read from a letter I have received from a friend:

Our mines have been largely owned by Americans for many years. Mr. McKeen's company, which is selling to the syndicate, was largely an American company. Other American companies operated in Cape Breton several years ago. Some party got up a combine, and obtained possession of all the coal mines in Pictou County except the Drummond.

That I know. Every mine in the county of Pictou, except one, is owned by one corporation, and curiously enough, the head office of that company is in the city of New York to-day, and has been for years. Neither res-

pect for the Empire nor anything else, brought the hon. member for Albert forward to speak about American combines controlling the mines in Pictou County. But because his province is making a good bargain, he has raised this point. I give the hon. member for Albert credit for being honest in his opposition to this bargain, and glad am I that he has contributed to-night to the literature of this country one of the finest efforts against combines that I have ever heard. He almost gave us a text book against combines, and has told us what we should do against monopolies in this country. But he did not say a word when all the mines in Pictou County except one, which was owned largely in the city of Montreal, went into that American combine, whose president lives in the city of New York, and does all the business there, and only comes down once a year to the mines. Surely there was just as much danger to the county of Pictou at that time as there is now. I am glad that this matter is now set at rest. I believe that the bargain is a good one for the people of Nova Scotia and for the Dominion of Canada. As was well said by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), you cannot bring \$7,500,000 into any part of Canada without the whole country feeling a pulsation from one end to the other. I am glad this discussion has brought out this declaration from the Minister of Justice as to provincial rights. The matter is settled now, and these gentlemen will go to work. We will have the money invested, and well invested. I fear no combination, nor am I afraid but that my children or grandchildren will be able to grapple with any question of that kind when it arrives. Fortunes change hands so quickly, operations are carried on with such lightning speed to-day, that posterity can look after itself and will do so. The hon. member for Halifax referred to the upper House of the Nova Scotia Legislature, composed in part of Conservatives, who ratified this measure. In the upper House are such men as the Hon. Dr. Parker, a life-long Conservative, and the Hon. Robert Boak, an independent man of means, and these men have approved of the measure. There was objection in the lower House, but in the upper House, where criticism might be expected, not a word was said. For myself, though I do not understand so much about this transaction, perhaps, as others, I am willing, when those legislators have so acted, to accept their verdict that the measure is a wise one, especially when the best information I can obtain from gentlemen who have given the question consideration, leads me to the conclusion that the measure is a good one. I hope the matter is now settled, and that the operations will be as successful as I believe they will be under this new company which was organized in the United States, for I believe this enterprise will do more than anything else in reviving and increasing the coal trade and developing

our trade, not only with Canada, but with the United States, bearing in its train the advantages which must always follow the investment of capital from outside—new trade and increased prosperity. The Government of Nova Scotia will also be relieved from any possibility of being compelled to impose direct taxation on the people, and they will be able to build roads and bridges and give additional sums for educational purposes and do the work of the province better than before, by reason of this transaction carried out by Mr. Fielding, and which is described as a business-like transaction, and one of the best ever made in Nova Scotia. I trust, therefore, there will be no interference whatever, either from outside or inside, with this Act, by the only power that could interfere, namely, the Dominion Government, and that this matter is now settled, and that we shall have peace.

Sir DONALD SMITH. It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to say anything on the question now before the House, but it has been suggested to me that did I remain altogether silent, my position, and that of the Canadian gentlemen with whom I have the honour to be associated in what is called the coal deal, might be misunderstood. I am not in the habit, I hope, of wearying this House with many words, and it is certainly not my intention to do so now. I wish to say only, that this matter of the coal deal, this Dominion Coal Company, is purely a matter of business. Those who held a number of mines in Cape Breton were working them apart, and it was thought that it would be very much better that they should join together: there would be very great economy effected in doing so. Some of those mines were worked with appliances not at all equal to what is required in the present day in coal mining. Notwithstanding that, they made a fair return for the money embarked in them, and I will say frankly, with respect to the particular mine with which I myself and my friends were concerned, that we received a very handsome dividend, having divided this last year 10 per cent. At a time when consols are at 2 or 2½, we look upon that as a very fair return. But we felt that by joining hands we could do a very great deal better—not that we wish to have more than 10 per cent, but that we would be glad to have it continued to ourselves and to those who might come after us, and we felt that by uniting we could work far more economically, and so the better assure that this dividend would be permanent. It would not, however, have been very prudent for the few people who were interested in the mines to have taken upon themselves the burden of furnishing all the additional capital required for this purpose, so we looked around, and we found in Boston good and energetic men, with ample means, who would be glad to join with us in the enterprise. With them we came to an understanding to form a company

Mr. FRASER.

organized under the laws of Canada, and they as well as we are subject of course to the laws of Canada, in regard to all property held within the Dominion. It has been said that this company might be a danger to the Dominion. With all the care that we gave to the subject, narrowly looking into it in every way, we did not see that it could be so, and how is it possible that any such danger should arise simply because we have a few American gentlemen in this company, who certainly hold a large interest in it, while at the same time the holding of Canadians in it is also very material.

Mr. WELDON. Not a majority.

Sir DONALD SMITH. A sufficiently substantial interest in it to assure that no unfairness could be done towards Canada in any respect.

Mr. WELDON. I do not wish to be understood as having made a misstatement, as I appear to have done, in view of the hon. gentleman's statement. My information was that the members of the company representing Canadian interests all told were decidedly below one-half. Does the hon. gentleman say that they represent more than one-half.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I have not cared to say whether they represent one-half or one-third, but I did say that the Canadian interest is of a substantial character, that Canadian stockholders will have a very material influence in the administration of the company. Does the hon. gentleman from Albert think that those gentlemen who are Canadians, I hope equally as good Canadians as himself, men who are not less devoted to the interests of their country, and not less loyal to their Sovereign and to the Empire than is the hon. gentleman himself, would have entered into this transaction if they had considered there would be any danger to Canada in doing so? Does he believe we would have bartered their independence, their interest in Canada, or our privilege of being citizens of this Dominion for any amount of money? No. It was purely a business transaction, and I desire to say that it is so looked upon, not only by those who are Canadians but by those Americans, men of high honour and integrity, who are also connected with it. How could there possibly be any danger? It has been said, as I have seen stated in the newspapers, that England might be at war with Russia or other foreign power, and that these people might then treacherously shut up the mines or render them unworkable; in other words, would sell themselves to the enemy. Could there be anything more ridiculous than such an idea, how could this be carried out while this corporation must work under the laws of Canada? I desire to say no more on this subject than this: That my Canadian friends who

are connected with this undertaking would have had nothing to do with it, had they considered that they were acting otherwise than as good subjects of Her Majesty and good Canadians. In everything they have done, they have done it simply as a business transaction and with the assurance that from their actions no danger or detriment could arise to Canada or the Empire.

STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN.

Mr. FORBES. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the Government a matter of very considerable importance to the shore counties of the province of Nova Scotia, as well as to the county and city of St. John. I refer to the steam communication between ports of Halifax and St. John and intermediate ports. The history of the service is within the recollection of the Government, and of many members in this House. As far back as 1871, the Federal Government granted a subsidy of \$10,000 a year to aid a steam service along the south shore of Nova Scotia, between Halifax and St. John, touching at intermediate ports. From that year down to 1887 inclusive, the subsidy of \$10,000 was granted for that purpose. Steamers were first put upon that route by Mr. F. W. Fishwick, a citizen of Halifax. He built up the service to such a large extent that quite a large trade was developed, and the citizens were very well satisfied with it. In 1888 the subsidy was reduced to \$7,500, for what reason does not appear upon the records of Parliament, and I do not know accurately. In 1889, that subsidy was further cut down to \$5,000, and in 1891 it was reduced to \$4,000. Last year it was increased to \$5,000, and this year I do not know what the Government intend to appropriate for it. I do know, however, that the steamship company managing that service has ordered the closing of their warehouses, and has given its agents notice that it will discontinue the steamers unless a larger subsidy is granted. On account of a letter received from the manager of that company on the 18th of February, and on account of letters received by other members of the House, the members for Shelburne (Mr. White), St. John (Messrs. Chesley and Hazen), and Digby (Mr. Bowers), and myself, waited upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and impressed upon him the necessity of increasing the subsidy, and he promised to bring the matter under the consideration of the Government. To-day, I am in receipt of a telegram, which reads as follows:—

LIVERPOOL, N.S., March 1.

Urge on Government the following unanimous resolution, passed at meeting yesterday:—That the Dominion Government be requested, in granting further subsidies for coastal service, to insist on steamer having satisfactory speed, not less than 12 knots, and for such service to grant the old rate of subsidy—\$10,000.

(Sd.) SECRETARY OF MEETING.

I know that the wish of the citizens of Liverpool expressed in that telegram, is joined by the citizens of the counties of Shelburne, Yarmouth and Lunenburg, as well as the cities of Halifax and St. John, and the Government should, I believe, immediately act upon the request here made. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) represented to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the discontinuance of this service would mean an annual loss of \$35,000 to the city of St. John, and I can well believe that a larger amount than that would be lost to the city of Halifax. In the case of the counties of Queen's and Shelburne, which are non-railroad counties, they have learned to depend entirely upon this service. Except by coach, they have no other means of communicating with the outside counties, and with the centres of commerce in the province and in the Dominion. I would most earnestly urge upon the Government the necessity of giving this matter immediate consideration, and to notify the company, or else ask for tenders for an other service unless the present company give us a better boat than they have had on the route for the last few years. It is necessary that we should have that service continued and that we should know it at as early a date as possible so as not to disturb trade or stop traffic. I understand that the company now performing the service lost last year \$5,000 not including charges for wharfage, agencies, clerks, printing, &c., which would bring the total loss up to about \$10,000 for the year. Part of their loss accrues from the fact that the missing link between Digby and Annapolis was completed, thus diverting a portion of the trade of the western counties from the sea route along the shore to Halifax. In addition to that, one or two local lines of steamers have been subsidized from Barrington west to Yarmouth, and from Lunenburg east to Halifax. Both of these local lines have to a certain extent infringed upon the trade of this main shore service, and I fancy that would, in some degree, account for the loss to the company. Nevertheless I urge upon the Government that this condition of affairs simply strengthens the rights of Queen's and Shelburne and that these counties, which have not had their just share in the railway subsidies granted by Parliament, should be amply provided with steam communication. When we, in the counties of Shelburne and Queen's, get our just proportion for railway subsidies, and have our lines in operation, I can say on behalf of the citizens of these counties, that they will not then demand from the Government such a subsidy as is now necessary for these steamers. I know that I will be supported in this demand by the members from the shore counties, and especially by the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Chesley). I trust that the Government will give the full subsidy of \$10,000 this year. I would also suggest that the Government should by some means so arrange the subsidy as to compel the com-

pany to put a better boat on the service than we have had for the last few years. If this is done the citizens of the shore counties will be deeply grateful. I again urge upon the Government to give their earnest and immediate consideration to this matter.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Inasmuch as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, in company with the hon. members for St. John and myself, have lately waited upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and pressed upon him the necessity of increasing the subsidy to these boats; and that Mr. Baker, the manager and principal owner of the boats, has since visited Ottawa, and that in company with the hon. members for Halifax and St. John and myself, have had another interview with the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Commerce in respect to this matter. I think it is hardly necessary for me to take up the time of the House by recapitulating the various arguments we then advanced. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) says that the counties of Queen's and Shelburne would perhaps suffer more from the doing away with these boats than any other counties. These two counties are without railway accommodation, and if this boat is taken off, the shore would be without steam communication of any kind, east or west. The subsidies having been reduced and the traffic having decreased somewhat, these steamers are not running at present, so that these counties, as well as other places along the shore, are without necessary communication between St. John and Halifax. We would all be extremely glad if the Government would take this matter into consideration, and comply with the request made by hon. members of this House who are interested. There is one thing, however, in which I hardly agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes). He has read a telegram from which it appears that at the meeting held in Liverpool the people desired a boat on the route that would make at least 12 knots an hour. Now, while we should all be delighted to have a better and more speedy boat than we have at present, we fear that if such a condition were imposed, with even the increased subsidy, which I trust the Government will grant, the result may be that we shall have no boat at all. I am satisfied that the company which has put these boats on the route would not go to the expense of building or purchasing any other boats than those they have now; and while the "City of St. John" is not the best boat in the world, or the boat that we should exactly like to have, at the same time we should be willing to put up with that accommodation until the time arrives, which I hope is not far distant, when we shall obtain the benefit of the railway accommodation which has been given to all the rest of the province of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FORBES.

(In the Committee.)

Exchequer Court \$1,500

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was asked to explain this item, and this memorandum from the Registrar of the Exchequer Court will do so.

With reference to my demand for additional contingencies to the amount of \$1,500, I beg leave to state on your suggestion that my contingencies for the current year are \$4,000, that up to date I have expended nearly \$3,000, that the judge informs me that his travelling expenses during this fiscal year will amount to \$900, that the expenses of the sheriff, constables, reporters and type-writers in connection with recent cases, have already cost \$604.70, but I have smaller accounts outstanding and more cases to be tried. I anticipate the cost of printing the Admiralty Rules will be about \$600 or \$700. I will have to pay the salary of Mr. Clarke, and the running office expenses, such as printing, stationery, &c., from the contingencies down to June, 1893. Mr. Clarke is an officer who is employed to do temporary work in the Exchequer Court, until a third class clerk is appointed. I beg to state that I shall not be able to meet the expenses of the office during the present fiscal year without an additional sum of \$1,500, and even then being very careful. I might also add that part of these expenses paid out of my contingencies, such as reporting evidence and copying, are recouped to the Government in the form of law stamps, and form part of the revenue when I get paid by the parties. I might mention that some of these accounts are outstanding for six months or over, but I generally get paid them on taxation for costs. Part of the amount will be recouped to meet the contingencies which are, according to me, most judicious and reasonable.

Retiring allowance to Constable

Martin Murphy \$752 55

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Police Constable Murphy, who is 63 years of age, resigned from the Dominion Police Force on November last, after fifteen years' service, having been appointed on November 8th, 1877. He was rendered incapable of further duty by reason of injuries received from a fall while on duty, and the vote is required to recoup the police appropriation for 1892-93, from which the amount has been paid. This was an item which could not be foreseen, and it was paid under the ordinary circumstances, namely, a month's pay for each year's service up to ten years, and a half a month's pay for each succeeding year.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 3rd, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) to make further provisions respecting grants of land to members of the

militia force on active service in the North-west—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Patterson, Huron.)

Bill (No. 75) to amend the law relating to holidays—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 76) to correct a clerical error in the Bank Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 77) to further amend the Act to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

REPORT.

Annual report of the Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police for 1892.—(Mr. Ives.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Sir, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a rather curious letter which I find in the Montreal "Gazette" of this date over the signature of an hon. member of the other House. I am not going to inflict the whole of it on the House; I will just call attention to one charge which is made against me there. The hon. gentleman declares:

All the refineries in Canada, says Sir Richard Cartwright, according to the report of his speech in the Montreal "Herald," employ only 223 men.

Now, Sir, as the hon. gentleman who made that statement had, in common with all the other members of the upper House, the most ample opportunity of getting access to our "Hansard," he might have taken the trouble to read there what I did say. What I did say was not that they employed 223, but that they employed 723 to manufacture a product of about \$10,000,000 worth, and I said that I was referring to our census returns for 1881, the only ones I had giving the information in detail, which census returns I hold in my hand. In 1881 the value of the total product of the sugar refineries was \$9,627,000, tolerably close to \$10,000,000, and the number of hands employed is stated to be 723. Now, the census returns for 1881 may be utterly incorrect; that is the affair of hon. gentlemen opposite; but that is what I stated, and not what our worthy friend the Senator imagines, on the strength of a newspaper report, that I did state. Now, I do not care one straw what Mr. Senator Drummond or any other gentleman concerned in that business may care about this—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask for order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I am in order in stating this.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that the House adjourn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The adjournment of the House is moved, and before that motion is put I desire to say that I regard the conduct of the hon. Senator, who has access to our "Hansard," and who without taking the trouble to read what is said in this House, indicts a letter to the newspapers complaining grievously of a statement which the slightest research on his part would have shown him was not made by me, is not calculated to increase the respect that we ought to have for members of the upper House.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to inquire if the returning officer has been appointed for the county of Vaudreuil?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He has not.

Mr. LAURIER. When will he be appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Early next week.

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to call the hon. First Minister's attention to this paragraph which I have read in the newspapers:

An Order in Council has been passed prohibiting employees of the Post Office Department from seeking election to any municipal position in future.

Can the hon. gentleman inform us if such an Order in Council has been passed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an Order in Council on that subject relating to one of the departments, I think the Post Office Department. Whether it applies to all the employees or not I am not certain, but the attention required of employees in becoming candidates for municipal office would, in the opinion of the head of the department, involve the occupation of a portion of their time which is required for the public service.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no observation to offer as to the policy. It may be all right. I do not express approval or disapproval of it at this moment. But as it is a matter of some importance, perhaps the hon. gentleman would bring down the Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 23) respecting witnesses and evidence.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The committee last year passed the clause not making the

witnesses compellable, but simply making them competent. I propose to call attention to any changes that have been made in the preparation of the Bill this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the change is in the right direction and will support it.

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the proviso. It seems to me that the privilege of the husband or the wife, as the case may be, is the privilege of the other party. It should not only be that the husband is not compelled to state confidential communications which passed between him and his wife, but should not be allowed to do so. The privilege is not that of the witness, but of the person who makes the communication in good faith, under the secrecy of marital relations.

Mr. TISDALE. Before we even get that far, I would like to understand the state of the Imperial measure at present.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They merely introduced the Bill from time to time. Three Bills have passed the House of Lords, but have not yet been enacted.

Mr. LISTER. Why is it that since last session the hon. gentleman has made up his mind that the husband or the wife should be a compellable witness?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have always held the view that a witness should not only be competent, but compellable. Any person competent to be a witness ought to be compellable. The only reason why we admit them is to ascertain the truth, and on that ground they should be compellable. I have taken the liberty, therefore, of departing from the Bill as drafted by the committee which had charge of the subject, not because in any respect I am wanting in deference to their views, but in order that the whole question might be opened again, especially as there was a strong difference of opinion among the members of the committee.

Mr. LISTER. Does not the hon. gentleman think that when he is making the accused a witness for himself the accused stands in a different position from that of any other witness? It ought to be a matter of discretion, as far as he is concerned, whether he goes into the witness box or not. I understand the reason for making every person not a party to a trial a competent as well as a compellable witness; but there are grave reasons why a person charged with an offence should not be a compellable witness. To force a man, charged with an offence, to give evidence, is to compel him to manufacture an excuse, in the hope that the statement he makes may acquit him of the charge. In other words, we force him to become guilty of perjury. If innocent, he will go into the box himself. I am not aware that in England or any British colony there is any such law as this in existence. I have always favoured the statute enabling a person ac-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

cused of crime to be a witness, for the reason that the evidence he may give will tend, at all events, whether entirely true or not, to throw light on the subject under investigation, and such a law has been adopted in many states of the Union. In the States, where it has become law, the accused is made a competent witness. It is his privilege to go into the box or remain out, and if he does not become a witness the law provides that that shall not be referred to by the counsel or judge, or taken into account by the jury. No reference is allowed to be made to the fact that the prisoner did not take advantage of the law which permits him to be a witness. I think we are going too far in this connection altogether. We are forcing a man, if guilty, to commit perjury, in the hope that he may be acquitted. If innocent, he will go in of his own accord.

Mr. TISDALE. I would be inclined, from my experience, to consent to a compromise by making this law applicable to all offences punishable only by fine, in the first instance. In Ontario, for some years, the law as to a number of petty offences was construed to establish that the parties to the offence were not only competent but compellable witnesses; but that construction was set aside on appeal. That reading of the law, however, worked well in this minor class of offences. I agree with the Minister of Justice that the sole object of evidence is to elicit the truth; but, at the same time, in the case of serious crimes, there is much to be said in favour of the contention of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that by compelling the accused to be a witness we compel him, if guilty, to perjure himself. I am free to say that I am halting between the two opinions, and would advise our going part of the way by allowing our courts to have some experience of this change in the case of smaller offences before going the whole distance. I would suggest that we should make the clause apply simply to witnesses in the case of offences punishable, in the first instance, by fine only.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we ought not to make the accused a compellable witness in any case, whether the offence be light or serious. I think we are going a long way, longer than, in my judgment, we ought to go, in making the party a competent witness. There are some things to be said in favour of his competency, but there is a good deal to be said against it. But I can see nothing to be said in making one charged with a crime a compellable witness. I would mention this fact with regard to the lighter offences, to which my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale) referred. These offences are very often committed by boys associated together, and not realizing the discreditable character of their act until it is done. Their minds are not matured, their judgments are not yet properly formed, and often the escape of such a boy—and

many a magistrate of good sense will permit such to escape—gives him an opportunity to conduct himself with propriety for the rest of his life. One of the most serious shocks that he receives is the full realization of the character of the act he has committed. Take a boy of that sort, who has, from association and excitement, done some wrongful act, and compel him to give testimony; why his sense of manliness will compel him to disclose the facts as they are, thus assuring his conviction upon his own testimony. But the one who is far more unscrupulous, who possesses, in his mental constitution, the incipient characteristics of crime, would escape upon his own testimony. And so I think, even in respect of the minor offences, the law is better as it is than it would be if such a person were made a compellable witness. Take the case of those charged with more serious offences. You put such a person in the witness box, and, if he testifies against himself, his testimony will be accepted, but, if he testifies in his own favour, it will make no impression upon the jury in the face of the crime with which he is charged, where it is a serious offence and the punishment is very great, and there is a very strong and powerful motive for regarding the statement of what is not true as a less serious evil than the possible consequences of this conviction. I think, therefore, on every ground from which the matter may be viewed, it is important that this rule should not be adopted, and that in no instance should the person charged with the crime be a compellable witness.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Chairman, I have had some considerable experience in the practice of criminal law, and I know that it is a very important law which we are now discussing. There are two principles upon which the criminal evidence may proceed. In one country, when a crime has been committed, the law says: "A crime has been committed and you are suspected, but we will not ask you any questions." In other countries, where such a crime has been committed, the law says: "You are suspected, and we will put questions to you." Now, which is the best way to reach the truth and find the guilty party? That is the question before us. I do not see why we, in this country, should not try what England is now trying to establish—the right of saying to the man suspected: "You shall answer our questions; at nine o'clock there was a fire, where were you?" It is all very well to say that a man may be excited and so on when submitted to an examination, but if he was not the guilty party, he will have the chance to show where he was at the time the crime was committed. In France they have followed that rule for a long time, and it has given such satisfaction that, in England, the best criminal authorities want to adopt the same rule in their country. But they find themselves stopped by a wall, and that wall is the old idea, the

old prejudice against any change. I say let us benefit by the example of those who have better laws of evidence, let us benefit by the experience of other people. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says that we should adopt only one-half of the measure, and that we can learn by experience whether it is a good measure or not. The answer is that this Parliament will exist next year and the year following and so on, and, if the law works badly after we have adopted it, we can change it. But if we want to try, as an experiment here, a system which has been found good in other countries, let us take the measure as a whole, and try it manfully and truly. I believe it is in the interest of justice that a change should be made. If a person is guilty, why should we give him a chance to escape? If he is not guilty, let us give him a chance to establish it by his own evidence. I want the laws of the country to be in favour of the society as well as of the individual. I want justice to be done and the criminals found out and punished. I think if a man has committed a crime he is not worthy of being protected by a statute which prevents the officers from asking questions of such a nature as to establish his culpability. Under these circumstances, I believe we might, with wisdom, adopt this law which has been long in force in other parts of the world.

Mr. LISTER. Where?

Mr. AMYOT. In France, for many years past.

Mr. LISTER. No.

Mr. AMYOT. Those who say "no" do not know the criminal system of France.

Mr. LISTER. The party is not sworn.

Mr. AMYOT. Do not swear the accused. I would prefer he should not be sworn. I speak of the principle of questioning the accused party. If the majority of this House insists upon the party being sworn, we must accept it. But if the proposal is made that he should not be sworn, I would vote for the amendment. I believe that the suspected party should be subjected to question as to his whereabouts, his actions, and the surrounding circumstances of the crime. I believe that is a correct principle, and my humble experience leads me to believe that it could be applied with advantage.

Mr. LANGELIER. I cannot bring myself to believe that the Government will insist upon this clause, compelling a person charged with a crime to be a witness against himself. The hon. gentleman from Bellechase (Mr. Amyot) has just spoken of the system that exists in France. The system that exists in France is not at all the one which is proposed to be introduced by this Bill. Even in France the accused is not

compelled to be a witness against himself, but he may be interrogated. I have seen that system practised in France, and it is one of the worst features of the criminal system of that country, and those who are best acquainted with it protest most strongly against it. Let me give a case which came under my notice when I was living in France, as a student. A poor woman was charged with murdering her child. She was questioned by the presiding judge, according to the system which is allowed by the French law, but not under oath. She might have declined to answer. But the poor woman was ignorant, and she was very weak, and very timid. The result was that she answered at once that she had killed the child. Five years afterwards, it was proven that the child had been killed by a servant girl, and that the mother had nothing to do with the crime. They released her, of course, and they asked her: Why did you admit that you had killed your child when you were innocent? Her answer was: I did not understand. I was frightened by the judge when he commenced to interrogate me, and I thought I had better admit at once that I had killed the child. This is not a single instance. The same thing may happen on many occasions. It would be the re-establishment of the tribunal of the inquisition. Nobody denies that in France the system of interrogating the accused was a very unjust remnant of the old institution of the Spanish and the French inquisitions, which themselves were one of the worst remnants of the criminal system of Rome. This Bill proposes to introduce into Canada the system of interrogating the accused by the judge, which is now condemned by every criminalist of renown in France. Indeed, the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce something here that is worse than what has existed in France, and is now condemned by every criminalist of repute in France. The result would be that if the accused is weak and disposed to yield easily he will be condemned, whether guilty or not, on his own testimony: he will admit that he is guilty. If a very hardened criminal comes before the judge, he will perjure himself. I fear this proposition would lead to the greatest amount of perjury that would ever be seen in this country. I think this portion of the Bill should be withdrawn. Furthermore, I see a contradiction in the two clauses. It is a most extraordinary thing to say, in the clause we are now dealing with, that you may compel the accused to be a witness against himself; and in the next clause, where a man is not accused, to say he cannot be compelled to incriminate himself. To compel a man, when he is under a charge, to criminate himself, and, when he is not accused, to say that he cannot be compelled to criminate himself, is, to my mind, a contradiction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)— I regret to say that I differ in toto from several of my hon.

Mr. LANGELIER.

friends who have addressed the committee. I cannot fail to remember that this is not the first time this question has been debated in this House. I gathered from the discussion which took place here some years ago that a large proportion of the legal talent of the House was in support of this necessary amendment in the law of criminal evidence. Now, my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said that he had great respect for age and tradition, and he rather liked to hang on to them as long as possible. Well, the hon. gentleman is sufficiently well versed in the law of the land to know that age and traditions, with regard to criminal prosecutions, are not such as should form the basis of our legislation to-day. That part of the English law which is most reprehensible and the least to be followed, is the old law with reference to criminal prosecutions. We have gone on getting clear of that year after year. It has been a slow process to overcome the conservatism which eminently marks the legal profession above all others. But the object which we should have in view, the elucidation of the truth, has at last prevailed in England, and it remains to a British colony to hear objections raised which have been raised and successfully answered in the English House of Commons. One would suppose that if tradition, and the arguments which could be adduced from tradition, were to govern anywhere, they would prevail in England. What has been the fact? The most brilliant common-sense lawyer in the age, as he was termed, the late Lord Bramwell, introduced his Bill several times into the House of Lords, and, if my memory serves me right, carried it through the House of Lords time and again, although it has not yet passed the House of Commons. On what grounds did he, above all others, recommend it? There was not a gentleman standing in the House of Lords who had as much experience in the trial of criminal cases as Lord Bramwell; and he gave it as his opinion, after many years of experience on the bench, that this was one of the most important amendments and one of the most desirable that could be introduced. Now, my hon. friend behind me says, if you introduce this law making the accused a compellable witness, you will open the door to a great deal of perjury. My hon. friend knows well that that argument was advanced against every change that has been made in the law of evidence from the first. Why, some of us are old enough, almost, to remember when an interested party could not give evidence in a civil cause, when he was the only man who knew anything about the case at all. Well, Sir, after many years of revolt against the conservatism which exists in the profession, common sense triumphed, and that absurd restriction was removed. To-day a plaintiff, or defendant even, if he is the most in-

interested party, can go into a court of justice and give evidence in amounts involving ten, twenty, or a hundred thousand dollars, and nobody disputes his right to give evidence in so far as he may be interested. It is a fair question for a jury or judge to say what weight should be given to his testimony. So that branch of the law in civil cases has been entirely altered. So when the English law relating to breaches of promise of marriage was introduced some years ago there was a provision that the parties to the suit should not testify; but it was found to work so badly that that restriction was removed, and the parties to a breach of promise case allowed to give evidence. Then the English law relating to divorce was introduced, and that contained, in accordance with ancient tradition, a provision that the parties to the divorce suit could not give evidence. A few years' practice served to show how ridiculous that was, and it was also removed. Now, I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that if he watches the trend of English criminal legislation in reference to evidence, he will see that all the later legislation is in the direction of this Bill. Take the English Explosives Act passed a few years ago. That contained provisions of this very character, that it should be competent for a person charged under the English Explosives Act to go into court and give evidence. Some of my hon. friends are attacking the whole clause, and question whether we should make the accused either a competent or compellable witness; others restrict their opinion as to whether the accused should be a compellable witness. I am prepared to advocate both. Under the English Explosives Act the accused is a competent witness, which I think is in the interest of justice. I suppose many hon. gentlemen in this House know that this principle prevails in prosecutions in other cases which are brought in criminal courts. Take the case of rape, where a woman goes into the witness box and charges a man with that crime. She gives her version of the story, while the only man in the world who ought to be in a position to state the facts, is incompetent to testify, and a clapper is put upon his mouth, and he is told to hold his tongue whilst his life and everything valuable to him is being sworn away.

An hon. MEMBER. Make him a competent witness.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When Mr. Plimsoll introduced his Act a few years ago about load-lines, it provided for prosecutions being brought against parties and introduced this same principle. In the Canada Temperance Act, you make a party a competent witness, but you fail to make him a compellable one; or rather, you made him a competent and compellable one, but you did not put in a provision, which is in this Act, that the party should not be excused from answering

any question, whether tending to criminate or not, and the result was that that clause became in that Act a dead letter. The judges ruled that although he was a competent and compellable witness, he was to be excused from answering any questions tending to criminate himself. The result was that the whole thing failed. But I approve of this Bill, because it not only makes him a competent and compellable witness, but it goes further and provides that the clause shall not be ineffective, in the sense that a man shall not be able to escape from answering a question, although it may tend to criminate him. Take cases of assault. This Parliament, with almost unanimous consent, has provided that a man who is tried for an assault, shall be as competent a witness as the prosecutor who puts him into the box; and he ought to be. I think it is a monstrous thing to say that the man, above all others, who knows the facts, should have his mouth closed and should not be able to give evidence. What do you do next? You say that if a crime is committed in the presence of the man's wife, the woman shall not be allowed to go into the box and be compelled to tell the truth. It is in the interest of justice, however, that crime should be punished, and that such parties should give evidence. No fear need be entertained that undue weight would be attached to their testimony. If such a witness did not tell the truth, the court and the jury would be present and would hear the evidence, and it would be sifted. But the trend of modern legislation has always been in this direction. I submit that if the House of Lords, after full discussion by a majority of eminent jurists, such as Lord Cranborne, affirmed the principle of this Bill, we should not occupy the position that we are more conservative than the House of Lords, and that we fear danger from such legislation when those experienced statesmen and jurists tell us that such apprehensions are unfounded. This is the position taken by the House of Lords time and again. I am not quite sure whether such a principle was adopted by the House of Commons, but I think such was the case. I remember when the late member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) introduced a Bill embodying this principle, which passed its second reading and was referred to a committee, and I am, therefore, surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should now take such strong grounds against this Bill. So far as regards the propriety of making such persons competent witnesses, there was no dissenting voice. History has shown that the parties who know most about the occurrences should be admitted as competent and compellable witnesses. The only danger is that such a change in the law might promote perjury, but that objection has been answered by our experience in regard to civil matters and quasi-criminal matters, which shows that it is not desirable, from the fear of perjury taking place, to prevent those who best know the facts from testifying. This is in the in-

terest of the accused himself. It is not legislation against the accused, but in the interest of the accused, and in the interest of the only class of accused persons with whom we should have sympathy, namely, accused parties who are innocent. You place such a party in the box and you allow the prosecutor to say what he likes, and at the same time you shut the mouth of the accused and declare that you will convict him without allowing him to tell his own story. They have made such witnesses competent all over the United States, and the result of experience there has been that the change has worked in the interest of justice. I am fully in accord with this proposed change. It does not extend too far, and it is fairly well surrounded with prudent provisions to prevent injustice being done, and while an accused is compelled to answer questions, no proceedings can be instituted against him for any statement made by him. I hold that the wife of an accused party, who knows all about the facts, should of course be competent to testify. Such a proceeding is consistent with common sense, and it is in harmony with the experience I have had in criminal courts.

Mr. CURRAN. The argument of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), I think, goes against the principle of examining the accused at all, either as a competent or compellable witness. In so far as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is concerned, his idea, I think, cannot be maintained for one instant: that if it be a good thing to make a witness competent and compellable in small matters, it would be a bad thing to make him both competent and compellable in matters of great importance. I entertained for many years the opinion that has been expressed here to-day by the hon. member for Quebec. No doubt, from the training I had received and the experience I had acquired in the defence of parties brought before the criminal courts, I was against the introduction of that part of the law which made witnesses competent. But I cannot see why we should not go the whole length, since we are disposed to go the length of making a witness a competent witness, because if any accused person should refuse to go into the box and give evidence in his own behalf, when charged in a court of justice, it would be impossible, the jury and the general public being aware that he is competent to give evidence in his own behalf, that his omission should not prejudice his case, whether a man abstain from going into the witness box from nervousness or fear that he would be unable to stand the test of cross-examination. We know there are a great many people, very honest and straightforward, who are very poor witnesses indeed, and who especially under the effect of the charges that have been preferred against them, are often worse witnesses than they would be under ordinary circumstances, if they were giving

testimony on behalf of or against somebody else. As you have already determined to make these witnesses competent, they should be made compellable. Let us either take this step or do away with what we resolved to do, after the long discussion that took place year after year, when the minority finally gave in to the views of the majority, the overwhelming majority of legal gentlemen, speaking from their experience and reading, expressing the opinion that they should make such witnesses competent. If a man, being competent to give evidence, should refrain from doing so, whatever cause might prevent him entering the box, it would do him more harm than if he entered it. A judge might not comment on the fact, but the jury would be prejudiced against, perhaps, an innocent man. It has been stated that it is contrary to the principle of the law in the province of Quebec. But if there is any law in which changes have been made with respect to the giving of testimony, it is in our old French law. During the time I have been at the bar myself, there have been a number of changes in regard to the competency of witnesses to give testimony. We have eliminated from our law many prohibitions which existed thirty or forty years ago, and experience has taught us that, whatever may have been the cause that induced such legislation in days gone by, we have done right in making the changes we have made in our civil law with respect to the competency of persons to give testimony. It is very true, that the objections here made have a great deal of weight in the minds of many, especially the objection that such a change would be liable to cause many persons to perjure themselves, when forced into the witness box. But the same practice prevails in civil matters. We never find a person brought up to give evidence against himself in civil matters who will absolutely agree with the other party. There is always a difference and a marked difference, but not such a difference as that the court and jury may not be enlightened by what is brought before them. Again, the hon. member for Quebec said he remembers cases, and there are several of them in France, where, because the parties were examined, as they are examined there, they have given answers which they did not intend to give. We need not go to France for that. I have seen persons plead guilty at a preliminary examination, who did not know the consequences of the expressions they were uttering. They did not know they were charged with a serious offence, and they meant to plead guilty to some minor offence. I hardly consider that what the hon. gentleman has said in that respect, is any answer to the argument made by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). As I said in opening my remarks, I am confident of this: That we should either allow the law to remain as it is, or if we make the accused competent witnesses, or we should go the full

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

length, that, being competent, they should be compellable.

Mr. LISTER. The speech of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was a strong argument in favour of making a prisoner a competent witness in a criminal case. My hon. friend spoke in pathetic terms of the unfortunate position of a man, or his wife, who, perhaps, was the only one who knew all the circumstances, being prevented from entering the witness box. But my hon. friend will remember that there is no attempt on my part to prevent a prisoner from going into the witness box if he thinks proper. We all agree that that principle is correct, and we all agree that his wife should have the right to testify if she thinks proper. What we complain of is: That we abandon, so to speak, the tradition of a thousand years, and that we remove, at one stroke, all the tenderness, and care, and thoughtfulness, that the law throws around a man to be tried. No other English-speaking colony in the world has passed such a law as this, which says to the prisoner: Guilty or innocent, we can compel you to go into the witness box and testify. If this law is passed, the temptation to commit perjury is so great that there will be an epidemic of perjury in this country which has never been seen before, not excepting the days when the Scott Act was in force. Such a law as this was never previously introduced into this House. The law that was introduced during the past ten years, session after session, was a law making it permissible for the accused to testify on his own behalf. No person, that I ever heard, ever argued that a person accused should be compelled to go into the witness box; but it was contended that he should have the option and right to do so. If you compel him to testify, you are placing a criminal law upon the Statute-book that does not exist in England, or in any one of her colonies; and when my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says you are following the English law, I think, perhaps, he is unconsciously making a mistake. Section 4 would indicate that it comes from 16 and 17 Vic., chap. 83, but I would point out to the House that only the latter part of section 4 is taken from section 16 and 17 Vic.; that is, that a woman shall not be compelled to disclose a communication made to her husband, or by her husband to her. This law now proposed is a novel one, and is untried. We who have given attention to the practice of law know that the rule has ever been in England that a man is assumed to be innocent until he is proven to be guilty. The law throws around him that protection which this Bill proposes to remove. Another rule is, that a man shall not be bound or compelled to incriminate himself, which applies to all witnesses now, but we say that we shall make a distinction, and that we shall say to a witness: You shall not be bound to incriminate yourself, but you must

incriminate yourself or else you must commit perjury. Is that a fair position in which to place the accused? In the United States they have a law making an accused person a competent witness for himself; it was his privilege to go into the witness box or not. I have some acquaintance with legal gentlemen on the other side of the line, and I have yet to hear that that law has not worked remarkably well, at all events in the state of Michigan. As I said before, for the purpose of protecting and keeping the old rule, as far as possible, in force, neither counsel nor judge is allowed to refer to the fact that the accused has not gone into the witness box to testify. But my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Curran) would lead us to believe that the mere fact of the accused not going into the witness box is sufficient to justify a jury in inferring that a man was guilty, because he had not sworn he was innocent. I think the House should not take this step. I think we should first say that we will give a man the right to testify in his own behalf, and we will remove what is a relic of barbarism, namely, that a man should not be allowed to tell his own story. We should first say that we will give him a right to testify, but we should not force him to convict himself, or commit the great crime of perjury. I believe that making the accused a competent witness, without compelling him to testify, would accomplish the object of law-reformers for the last fifty years. Try that principle before you take the bold step of forcing a person, accused of crime, to testify against himself.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. the Solicitor-General, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), hardly understood my proposition, or neither of them would have advanced the arguments which they did. They stated that it was not good logic to apply this law to a smaller offence, if it were not applied to a more serious one. They omitted to consider that my proposition was simply an application of the present law in civil cases to criminal cases. Our present law makes every man in a civil suit competent and compellable as a witness, and my proposition was to make this law applicable to offences punishable by a money fine. I am advancing nothing new in that. It is the application of the principle that our present civil law recognizes. My proposition was to make offences, punishable in the first instance by fines, come within this Act.

Mr. CURRAN. Why stop there?

Mr. TISDALE. I will tell you. I say that such a rule would not put the prisoner on the horns of a dilemma between convicting himself or committing perjury. My proposition is simply to carry out the principle which our legislation has already recognized, that is, that in cases involving money matters the parties interested shall be competent and compellable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have you not gone further than that in cases of offences against females ?

Mr. TISDALE. We may have gone further in some cases ; but I am speaking of this Act, and it is not illogical for me to say that we should make our law consistent by providing that in a case which is only a matter of pounds, shillings and pence, that is, where the offence is punishable simply by a fine, the law should be applicable just as in civil cases. Coming to the other branch of the subject, I quite agree with the hon. member for Queen's, that the trend of modern legislation with regard to evidence has been in the direction in which the Bill goes ; but I think we should have great regard for the ancient traditions to which I have referred. We are asked to do what no legislative body, British or foreign, under free institutions, has yet done. Not a single state in the Union has gone so far. In the state of New York, I think to the present day the prisoner is simply allowed to make a statement, not under oath. It is optional with him to do it or not, and the court cannot question him in regard to the statement he chooses to make. It is wholly a matter of privilege, in recognition of the old British rule on which our criminal institutions are founded, that a man is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. Therefore, I think we should pause before we go the length proposed, and my proposition is simply to make the law consistent by including all cases which are simply matters of dollars and cents, and not go beyond what the actual experience of judges and magistrates shows to be safe. I admit that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has the best of the argument ; logically, it is almost unanswerable, when he says that the tribunal should be the best judge of everybody's capacity to tell the truth ; but experience teaches us that we should never lose sight of those old principles which have been evolved in British courts of justice, and not change them too rapidly. Therefore, while I am quite prepared to go the length of making these persons competent witnesses, I would not go the length of making them compellable.

Mr. MULOCK. There are two distinct principles involved in this clause. One is as to the admissibility of the evidence of the accused himself ; the other is as to the extent to which the wife or the husband of the accused may be compellable or competent to give evidence. With regard to the latter, it seems as if the proviso contemplated throwing some safeguard around the husband or the wife ; but I hardly think it reaches the end aimed at. We will assume that the husband is the accused. It says that the wife shall not be compellable to give evidence of admissions made by her husband to her during coverture ; but if she takes advantage of the privilege when a question is put to her, the practical effect is to produce an impression of guilt. Therefore, the saving

Mr. TISDALE.

clause is a dead letter. When she is asked if her husband has made certain admissions to her, and she says : " I claim the privilege of the Act," what effect is that going to have on the jury ? You must either prejudice the case or else compel her to abandon the privilege. So that I think we are face to face with the main question, whether under any circumstances the wife should testify on admissions made to her during coverture. I am opposed to that feature of the Bill. I think we make a mistake in interfering in the slightest degree in the communications between husband and wife, or in the trust and confidence that they repose in each other. It is a radical departure, and I think that feature of this Bill ought to be omitted. Referring to the previous section 3, which has been declared carried, if the object of it is to make an accused person competent and a compellable witness in the case in which he is being tried, the clause does not, I think, meet the case. According to the section he is only competent in a case of actual crime. If that means a case in which he has been found guilty, he is not a witness.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the object. We are merely putting into this Bill the existing law on that point, that interest in the proceedings or previous crime, for instance a conviction of perjury, will not affect the competency of a witness. It is the old principle that interest or crime does not disqualify, which is reaffirmed by this Bill, in order that this Bill may contain all our statute law on the subject of evidence. I think the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is mistaken as to this not having been adopted in any English-speaking colony or the United States, because I find in the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1892, that in any case proceeding before a justice of the peace, mayor, or police magistrate, the defendant or the wife or husband of the defendant may be compelled to give evidence.

Mr. LISTER. That relates only to minor offences.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were all the subjects within the jurisdiction of the Legislature. I do not see the logic in saying that for minor offences there shall be one law and for graver offences there shall be another. It would be a great anomaly to say that the defendant, in case of assault, should be competent, but that in a case in which he is defending his life he shall not be allowed to give evidence in his own behalf.

Mr. MULOCK. What good is the evidence of a person on trial for life ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That depends entirely on the way in which he gives his evidence, on the way it is supported by other evidence and on the way it is supported by circumstances. I admit that if we take, as jurors sometimes do, one piece of evidence to be as good as another, the law will be futile,

and so will any law on the subject of evidence. I admit it requires greater direction and discretion the moment we open wider the door to the admission of any kind of testimony, but the evidence of a person accused of a capital offence may be conclusive, as indicating how the crime was committed by another than himself, or how it was homicide by misadventure or in self-defence. His evidence may be so supported by circumstances, or so connected with other testimony, or so consistent with the testimony of the prosecution, as to lead absolutely to the conviction in the mind of the tribunal that he is innocent. Or if it be simply a bald assertion of his innocence or a denial of the other witnesses, it may be absolutely worthless; but we will give him the benefit of it, whether it weighs much or little, and we will also give the administration of justice the benefit. So that when it comes to the question whether he is to be compellable or not in graver offences, surely, in the investigation of graver offences, the needs of justice are greater than in trivial offences, and the argument stronger. As to the proviso being different in this respect, that the testimony of husband or wife ought to be inadmissible, as regards statements made during the marital relation, I would suggest that an hon. gentleman should draft an amendment, and test the sense of the committee on that point before we take a vote on the main clause, because the main question is with regard to the witness being compellable.

Mr. LISTER. Suppose the Crown does not call a witness and the witness does not offer himself, does the hon. gentleman think that ought to be a subject of comment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In that case comment would not amount to very much, because there would be an obvious answer. When the counsel for the Crown comments on the fact that the accused did not go into the box, the answer would be: why did you not put him in? I know that in some of the Bills introduced on this subject, comment is not allowed on the omission of the accused to avail himself of his right to give evidence. But I do not see that any one need be so very much afraid of the comments of counsel. The jurors are not often persuaded by what one counsel argues or infers, and his arguments and inferences are subject to revision by the judge. If it is a fact that, owing to the particular circumstances of the case, an inference can be fairly drawn, I do not see why the jurors should not be reminded of it.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not know that I have very much to say on the general question, except that I feel this is a very important matter, introducing a very radical change in the system of criminal evidence. I do not think that we ought to do it too hastily or upon mere theory. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) that any interest would be served by making a witness competent only and not compellable.

It seems to me that all the temptation to commit perjury is put upon him when you allow him to go into the box and testify in his own behalf. If he is going to commit perjury at all, the opportunity of supporting his own case will give him all the temptation possible. With regard to his being compellable, I can scarcely imagine a case where the Crown officer would take such an extreme position as to call in the prisoner in the hope of getting anything out of him leading to conviction. Practically, it seems to me that the matter will remain as it is. If the Crown can make a case out of the prisoner's mouth when he becomes a witness on his own behalf, it will rely on that, but will not call in the prisoner as his witness. I sympathize with the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) in his view with regard to husband and wife. That seems to me a more radical provision than the other. It is of extreme importance that the family should be preserved in every respect. I think it is of importance equal to that of the detection of crime that absolute faith should remain in the sacredness of domestic confidence. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) that it would not be wise for us to allow the wife or the husband to go upon the witness stand at all with regard to the crime of the other. This introduces another element altogether, it introduces another principle. If this clause is adopted we are disturbing the relation which is at the very foundation of society; we are introducing an element of restraint and unrest there. Even if a woman has married a criminal, they have their family around them, and, so far as their domestic life is concerned, it should not be overshadowed by the man's crime. I think the House should pause before it makes a husband or wife a compellable or even a competent witness with regard to accusations against the other.

Mr. TISDALE. I move that section 4 be amended to read as follows:—

Every person charged with an offence shall be a competent and compellable witness, whether the person so charged is so charged solely or jointly with any other person.

And so on. That removes the reference to husband and wife from the clause.

Mr. McLEOD. For my part I had a strong opinion before this debate and I confess that that opinion is unchanged. I do not believe in making a person charged with a crime a compellable witness. I think we have gone far enough even when we make him a competent witness. I listened to the address of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and, if his view is correct, it is useless to make the accused a compellable witness. I hold that it is the duty of the Crown to make out a case against the prisoner before he is convicted, and if the prisoner desires to become a witness, this Act should give him that permission. This is in accord with the general legislation of

other countries, and I think we ought not go beyond. I think it would be wise to follow the section approved by the committee last year:

(a.) A person so charged shall not be called as a witness in pursuance of this Act, without his consent;

(b.) The wife or husband of the person charged shall not be called as a witness in pursuance of this Act, without the consent of the person so charged, save that where a man is charged under any of the provisions of the Criminal Code of 1892, specified in Schedule 8 of this Act, his wife may be called as a witness without his consent.

I think that covers the question with reference to the wife, and as to the general section, I think that "compellable" should be struck out.

Mr. FRASER. I think, with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), we ought to be very careful about invading the sacredness of the domestic relation. The effort to compel the wife or husband to give the facts would not bring anything like as much good to the community as it would evil to the household. As the hon. gentleman says, the household is the foundation of all society, and it is useless to talk about protecting society if the household, which is its foundation, is not protected. But I agree with the Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson) that parties themselves should be not only competent but compellable. From having taken part in a fair number of criminal cases I am led to this conclusion. I have known as many innocent parties suffer as guilty parties escape under the present system. You will often find it impossible to detect crime by the present mode of administering the law, and you will find it possible, under the present system, to have innocent parties found guilty. There can be no harm to an honest man in permitting him to go into the box and give his testimony and in getting all the testimony that he can give. Very often, as every criminal lawyer knows, small circumstances decide the case—the position of the man at a particular time and many other things, and often a few words of explanation from the person accused of crime would explain the whole matter.

Mr. LISTER. Would not that be covered if he was made a competent witness?

Mr. FRASER. It might be up to that point, but there are many circumstances in his favour which are interpreted as against him when he does not give his evidence as would be accepted against him when he does give his evidence. You want both; you want him to be competent and you want him to be compellable, in order that the public may find out whether he is the guilty party or not. He is also guarded by his own counsel. There is very little fear of his counsel producing him if he is a criminal, or one who by his evidence will convict himself. But the public, I think, have certain rights also, and, while I agree with one of the hon. members,

Mr. McLEOD.

who stated that the Crown would not be likely to call him, unless they could gain by it, still the power the Crown would have of compelling him to give evidence would lead the accused, through his counsel, or even without a counsel, to plead guilty when otherwise he would raise a defence. Everything considered, I believe, and I came to the conclusion years ago, that this should be the law. No injustice could be done to honest men, and great injustice may be done to the public without this protection.

Mr. AMYOT. Question.

Mr. TISDALE. I want to make my amendment understood. I want to strike out of the section such words as will leave it to provide that neither husband nor wife can be either competent or compellable in criminal cases against each other.

Mr. AMYOT. We understand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not in favour of that, for one.

Mr. AMYOT. We understand that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose I may state my reasons against it. This is one of the most important provisions we have ever been asked to vote on in Parliament, and I think we may well take time to discuss and understand it. I admit the force of the argument of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). I think there is a good deal in it. But we must remember that, in the interest of the accused party, it may be desirable and necessary that he should be allowed the benefit of his wife's testimony. Under this clause, though she may be the one witness competent to prove his innocence, you will not allow her to testify. Is that fair or reasonable? If you make the man himself competent and compellable, why not extend the same right and responsibility to his wife?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proposition in amendment made by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) goes farther than the objection raised by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). The hon. gentleman proposes merely that conversations between husband and wife shall be privileged, but the amendment makes both husband and wife incompetent to testify for or against each other. Why? Because there is the marriage tie and the interest and affection. But why should we make this law when the accused himself is competent? If the accused, for instance, is in danger of being hanged he has more interest than his wife, and, if the question of interest is to weigh, there is more reason for excluding his testimony than for excluding hers. But let us consider how many cases there are. My hon. friend from Queen's mentioned one of them, the case of a wife proving an alibi. There may be many others, in which mitigating circumstances are to be proved to

save a man's life and exonerating circumstances, as well. A man is accused, for instance, of murder, and the defence is, that a criminal assault was being committed upon his wife, and he interfered to save her life or honour; and yet she is not allowed to testify in this case. The husband goes into the box himself, although he has a greater interest, because his life is in jeopardy, but he is not allowed to corroborate his statement by the person whose life or honour he was interfering to protect. So in the case where the object is to reduce the charge to one of manslaughter. He may be competent to prove a violent assault, which provoked a murderous attack from which the victim dies. In all these circumstances, it is false philosophy to say that we respect family relations so much that we would rather allow an innocent man to suffer death than allow family secrets to be disclosed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can understand how you can take an innocent party and compel him to be a witness, but how are you going to compel the guilty party to testify? Do you propose to say that if he absolutely refuses to give testimony, he is to be held guilty? Are you going to adopt the old rule that prevailed at one time, where a party might refuse to plead? How is the law to be enforced? You put a man on trial for his life. If he is convicted, that means death, or it may be fourteen years in the penitentiary, and he may come to the conclusion that he is not likely to be convicted if he refuses to testify. Now, how do you propose to deal with that question in such a case? It seems to me that you are bound to consider the difficulties in the way, in undertaking to make such a rule, as well as to see what the rule would amount to, if it were to be applied in every case. I am unable myself to see how such a rule is to be enforced, unless you are to make the punishment for violation of the rule even greater than the punishment that is attached to the offence of which he is accused.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Justice has supposed a case where an assault was committed upon a woman, and her husband kills the assailant in defence of her honour, and perhaps, her life. He says he ought to be a witness for the purpose of proving the offence and that he committed it in defence of his wife. But we know, as a matter of fact, that domestic relations are not always of the best character. Suppose a wife, instead of being a witness to exonerate her husband, should become a witness for the purpose of securing his conviction. There are two sides to this question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The family relations, under these circumstances, are not worth protecting.

Mr. LISTER. There might be great motives for getting rid of family relations under these circumstances.

Mr. TISDALE moved that clause 4 be struck off and replaced by the following:—

Every person charged with an offence shall be a competent and compellable witness, whether the person so charged is charged solely or jointly with any other person.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Norfolk went further than I proposed it should go. All that I suggested was, that the communications and disclosures made between husband and wife should be privileged communications. Therefore, I move to strike out the word "compellable" and substitute the word "competent." The effect of this will be, that neither husband or wife will be a competent witness about disclosures made by either to the other.

Mr. TISDALE. I move in amendment to the amendment: "provided, however, that no husband or wife shall be compellable to give evidence against the other."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That does not quite answer the same purpose. My hon. friend wants to provide that if the wife is willing to become a witness, she shall not be competent to disclose what her husband said. But that amendment only says she shall not be compelled to give evidence. She may want to give evidence, but she may not want to be examined about private conversations.

Mr. TISDALE. I submit this proposition to the committee because they have decided against a broader one, that she shall not be compellable. Perhaps, we can put it in one amendment—neither to disclose communications, nor to give evidence even of facts. My previous amendment was, that they could not be called to testify against each other; my second proposition is, that they shall not be compelled. That will answer the objections of the Minister of Justice to my previous amendment, that while they are both competent, they shall not either of them be compellable.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a distinction between what a man does and what a man says. All that I am proposing now, is to place no restraint upon the right of a husband and wife, and the freedom of a husband and wife to communicate with each other, and to prevent the admission that one makes to another being taken as evidence. The proviso purports to protect the husband or wife, as the case may be, but practically it amounts to no protection. The proviso says they shall not be compellable. That concedes the principle I aim at; but practically it does not, because, when a woman is in the witness box and a question is put to her as to what her husband has said, she may claim the privilege of the proviso, and claim it in the presence of the court and jury. This is tantamount to producing an impression of

guilt, although it is possible there may be explanations, and that if she went on to tell the whole story she might produce a different impression. She is compelled by circumstance, she is put in a false position by the act itself at the trial. I say you are pretending to give her protection that you are practically denying her. You are making it unsafe for husband and wife to talk to each other. I, therefore, move to strike out the word "compellable" in the 17th and 19th lines, and to substitute therefor the word "competent."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TISDALE moved that the following words be added to section 4:—

Provided no wife or husband of the accused shall be called as a witness against the accused, without the consent of such accused.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 20; nays, 21.

Mr. LISTER moved that the words "and compellable" in the 15th line be struck out.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 20; nays, 27.

On section 5.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand this clause applies to all criminal proceedings and all witnesses in such proceedings. So there would be a different rule prevailing with regard to cross-examination in criminal and civil proceedings. If a prisoner were to call in his defence a witness who was guilty of violation of the Scott Act, the prosecuting counsel might ask him if he had not sold liquor, and he might be compelled to admit that he had; or in the case of other witnesses, they might be compelled to admit that they were guilty of crimes that had never been proved against them, and which they never had the opportunity of defending. Such a person, although he might have been guilty of a violation of the law such as I have indicated, might be competent to give valuable testimony. It appears to me that this is an entirely new feature of the law, and I do not at present see why the change should be carried out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The change proposed is necessary to make the law of evidence conformable to the previous section. Although we have provided that a man shall be competent to be called in his own behalf, he is nevertheless, unless we pass a section like this, entitled to protection against questions which would tend to criminate him. The next point raised by my hon. friend is as to whether in cross-examination such a person should be asked questions which might criminate him. This provision does not change the law of evidence as regards relevancy.

Mr. DICKEY. Does not the Minister of Justice think that all purposes would be served by a provision being inserted that a witness under such circumstances should not claim any privilege in regard to criminating himself? The character of a witness is

Mr. MULOCK.

relevant, and it is possible to discredit, if this section is allowed to stand, a witness out of his own mouth by proving that he has been guilty of an offence which is unknown to any one except himself. It seems to me that you will, without any good end that I can see, subject every man who comes into a witness box in a criminal suit, to all sorts of questions with regard to any possible violation of law that he may have committed. I think it would be relevant to the character of the witness which the other side adduced, and therefore there cannot be any objection to it on the ground of relevancy. I think it would be better to confine it to a witness who was called, or who offers himself in his own behalf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, as I understand, appreciates the necessity for the clause.

Mr. DICKEY. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the only point is whether in cross-examination you should be allowed to go into the history of the witness, and examine him on matters irrelevant to the issue. Supposing a man was called, and counsel, for motives which were not commendatory, chose to ask him questions on matters foreign to the issue, but which tend to damage his character, it is questionable under this clause whether he should have the privilege to answer.

Mr. TISDALE. My hon. friend (Mr. Dickey) has no objection to the clause as it stands in regard to the parties to the suit. The point he makes, and which is worthy of consideration, although I cannot say I agree with him now, is, that persons who are called as witnesses can be cross-examined in regard to wholly irrelevant matters, the distinction being that counsel are bound by their answers, whereas, of course, in case of parties to the suit, they are not bound to the same extent.

Mr. FRASER. There is a good deal in what the member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) said. The clause shows that the questions may be of a varied character, covering almost any crime a witness may have been guilty of. The clause might not be a very great hardship when a competent judge presided, because I can see he would not permit other than relative questions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But it says "no persons shall be excused."

Mr. FRASER. Even in view of that I am sure a competent judge would decide against irrelevant evidence.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I do not see that this clause alters the nature of a question that may be put to a witness. At present the witness may shelter himself from answering, on the ground that he may incriminate himself, and this clause merely prevents that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At present, as my hon. friend has just said, a question may be put to a witness as to whether he stole a horse or not, and he is not obliged to answer. This clause goes the length in the interest of justice, of compelling him to answer in order to see what kind of a witness he is, and whether his testimony is worthy of credence; but it saves him from the consequences of answering, because it says that the admission shall not be given in evidence afterwards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The only change made is, that a person is compelled to give evidence that would incriminate himself, but he cannot be incriminated by so doing. Amongst writers on the subject on evidence, it is a question whether there ought to be such liberty in cross-examination with the view of ascertaining the credibility of a witness. I think that in a great many cases—I do not say among men of eminence at the bar it is so—but in a great many cases a person is cross-examined with regard to acts in his past life, not with a view of getting the evidence or testing his credibility, but with a view of wounding his sensibilities because he has come into court as a witness. It always seemed to me that there was more mischief than advantage from such latitude being allowed in cross-examination. This clause, although it protects the party from its admission, rather extends the existing rule than limits it.

Mr. DICKEY. I think there would be reluctance on the part of a witness to come into court, who might not be of good character, but whose evidence on a certain point might be credible, if this clause were adopted. I propose to amend the clause by striking out the proviso. That carries out the preceding clause, but it does not affect the other witnesses who are called in criminal cases.

Mr. TISDALE. That will not remedy the present abuses which exist, and they are great. At present a man may refuse to answer and cannot be compelled if he says that the question may tend to incriminate him. That is one of the most important questions in the law of evidence that we have, and I believe that it should be amended so that witnesses shall not hide themselves behind a subterfuge of that kind. The amendment is so broad that it will only tend to perpetuate the present state of things in this regard.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no more controverted question in the law of evidence, I suppose, than the one which the hon. gentleman has just raised. There is a great deal of difference of opinion on the question. My own experience disposes me to coincide with the view expressed by my hon. friend who has moved the amendment, that many witnesses whose characters for years have been irreproachable have been subjected to cruel torture in cross-examination. I understood that this clause was not intended to alter the general law of evidence, but that

it is inserted for the purpose of making effective the provisions of sections 3 and 4. That being the case, I am disposed to favour the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Even if the amendment is adopted, I do not see why the proviso should be left out.

Mr. DICKEY. I am satisfied with the proviso.

Mr. MULLOCK. I hardly think the clause is open to the criticism which has just been made by the hon. member for Queen's. He says that a witness may be subjected to exquisite torture by reference to his past life.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was speaking with reference to cross-examination.

Mr. MULLOCK. But the section says that the witness shall not be excused from answering any question simply because the answer may leave him open to a criminal or civil prosecution. If a witness has committed a crime of which he has not yet paid the penalty to society, I do not think he should be relieved of answering simply because it might result in putting him in that position. I think that is all the more reason why he should be compelled to answer.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. It is not an uncommon thing to find a witness in a criminal proceeding protecting himself from answering a question by stating that the answer would tend to criminate him. For example, a witness is asked a certain question which has nothing to do with the offence which is being tried. The question may be a fishing question, or it may be put with the object of discrediting the witness, and the witness says, "I refuse to answer on the ground that the answer will criminate me. I, for my part, would not object to his having that protection in regard to matters other than the offence which is being tried. But if he were asked, for instance: "Did you not know that this man was going to commit this crime before he committed it?" I do not think he should be protected from answering that on the same ground. I think he should be compelled to answer, and the section might be amended in that respect. But that is as far as we should go. To allow a witness to be asked questions about all the offences of which he might have been guilty from his childhood up, and to make use of his answers as a foundation for indictments against him, would, I think, be going too far.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was fully the intention of the draughtsmen and the committee to make the section go beyond the scope which my hon. friend has just suggested. When one realizes the extent of the protection which a witness now enjoys, I think one is driven to the conclusion that it is too great. How often have we seen a witness claim immunity from answering a question on the ground

that the answer might tend to criminate him; and he is not bound to tell why it may tend to criminate him. If he is asked what he was doing at a certain hour of the night, he may say that the answer would tend to criminate him. How often have we seen persons believed to be accessories to a crime giving their testimony very adroitly, and upon cross-examination parrying questions with the answer that if they answered it they would tend to criminate them; and so their carefully prepared story is guarded from cross-examination. It seems to me that the protection afforded in the proviso, that the evidence given shall not be available in any criminal proceeding thereafter taken against the witness, we give him as much protection as he is entitled to.

Mr. McLEOD. I think that this section goes too far. Its object, of course, is to make sections 3 and 4 effective, but the accused should not be bound to suffer examination on every crime he may have committed, or may have been supposed to commit during his life.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would be very willing to support the amendment which practically confines the operation of this section to the person who will give evidence under the preceding section. It leaves the law as it stands with respect to other witnesses to-day, and merely gives effect to the provision we have already asserted that the person charged with the offence or the wife or husband may be competent to give evidence. In that sense I am prepared to support the amendment, that no person shall be excused from answering any question material to the issue being tried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment now before the House is as follows:—

No person giving evidence under the preceding section, shall be excused from answering any question material to the issue upon the ground, &c.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. McINERNEY. Section 5 provides that no evidence so given shall be used against such person in any criminal proceeding. Should not the person be also relieved in case of any civil proceeding?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I take it for granted that we cannot bar a civil action, that we have not jurisdiction for that. We can only deal with the evidence given in a criminal case and with the use of that evidence in any criminal proceeding. It is upon that principle that we do not undertake to protect him in any civil proceeding.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Supposing a man claims that the answer to a question will have a direct tendency to degrade his character? It has not been decided affirmatively or the other way that he can refuse to answer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that has been decided negatively.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think so. It is purely in the clouds yet. I do not think there has been any express decision one way or the other. The books treat it as a point in question yet.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I understand this section, the object of it is a very good one. But who is to decide in what way the witness shall make his evidence intelligible?

Mr. MULOCK. The court would supply an interpreter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By inherent power?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The clause seems to me defective. The witness seems to be made the judge as to the manner in which he shall give his testimony.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The persons who receive the evidence are to decide. If it is not intelligible it does not reach their understanding. This is the way it is expressed by Stephen, who proposed that it should be the law, and some of the Ontario judges have called attention to the necessity for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The intention is excellent, but I was in doubt about the construction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are deaf mutes who can write and no doubt they would be allowed to write their evidence. There are some who are both blind and deaf, and I suppose some form of questions could be devised to bring out their evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand. As the law of England now stands it does not understand evidence given by signs. You introduce a very desirable amendment, providing that the witness who is not able to speak shall be allowed to make himself intelligible in any way he can. But how will you secure that end without in some way giving the court power to carry it out?

On section 7,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the thirty-sixth line the words "now forms part of Canada" should be amended so as to read, "now forms, or may hereafter form, part of Canada." I move that that amendment be made.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This clause is taken from the Revised Statutes of Ontario, and I wish to call attention to some parts of it. It makes any record or proceeding before any justice of the peace in any province in Canada, evidence in any other part of Canada. I do not know but that this provision might be a very serious thing in a

criminal case. I do not object to the record of any court, but it is questionable whether a proceeding before a justice of the peace simply should be evidence when signed by the justice of the peace.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that this does not make it evidence. It only points to the way in which it can be proved.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; it does not make it evident in itself, but it dispenses with any necessity of proof that the person is a justice of the peace, or that it is his signature attached to it. We know that in courts of record where they have seals, the very affixing of seals is considered to be sufficient evidence that the document is an authorized one. I call attention to the fact that in some parts of the Dominion, some justices of the peace are, to say the least of it, uneducated men, and I am not quite sure that they are exactly of that class that would entitle a memorandum signed by them to be received in criminal cases—because we must remember that is what this is. In criminal cases it is proposed to dispense with the necessity of proof that the person really holds the position he purports holding, and that it is his signature.

It being six o'clock, the committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. La Rivière.)

Bill (No. 13) to give effect to an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Corporation of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 57) to amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to The Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Ocean Accident Corporation.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill No. (46) to incorporate the Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill No. 23) respecting witnesses and evidence.

(In the Committee.)

On section 16,

Mr. MULOCK. I find that this is not a literal transcript of the corresponding clause in the Revised Statutes. There a copy of the "Canada Gazette" is simply made prima facie evidence, whereas this makes it absolute evidence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the effect is the same; but I have no objection to leaving it as it is in the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MULOCK. The fact that it varies is sure to be argued as a reason that it means something else.

On section 19,

Mr. LISTER. I think the section ought to fix the time of the notice. In the province of Ontario the usual time is ten days, and if copies of documents are to be used as evidence the other side should be apprised of the fact and given sufficient time to ascertain whether the copies to be used are copies of genuine documents or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the limit in most of the provinces is ten days. It was left to the judge to fix the time, in order to allow some latitude in the event of the documents having to be sent long distances.

Mr. MULOCK. The very reason the Minister states renders it unwise to fix any limit. For instance, the trial might be in British Columbia, and the documents wanted might be in Ottawa.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will provide that the time shall be not less than ten days.

On section 21,

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to make that clause clear. I would suggest this amendment:

Evidence of the service of any warrant, summons or other document may be made by a return of the same in writing under oath, either of office or taken before a justice of the peace.

This is the law at present in Quebec in civil matters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that the clause be altered in this way to meet the wish of the hon. gentleman:

In all proceedings over which the Parliament of Canada has legislative authority the laws of evidence in force in the province in which proceedings are taken, include the laws of proof of service of any warrant, summons, subpoena or other document, &c.

Mr. AMYOT. That amendment will meet the difficulty.

On section 23,

Mr. LISTER. This is changing the law considerably. By allowing the person to take oath or make an affirmation at his option, he will do the latter, and there are many people who would not make a false statement under oath but who would not hesitate to do so in an affirmation. Unless the party has conscientious scruples to taking an oath, I think he should be compelled to do so. Otherwise you might as well not make the oath necessary at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You desire to provide for an objection on conscientious grounds?

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that clause 25 be amended so as to read:

If a person called or desiring to give evidence objects on grounds of conscientious scruples to take the oath or is objected to as incompetent to take the oath, &c.

Motion agreed to.

On section 24,

Mr. LISTER. As to that clause, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the objection to clause 23 holds here also. If a man refuses to be sworn he makes himself liable to contempt or punishment by the court. I do not think he ought to be relieved from the duty he owes of taking an oath by simply saying, I will make an affirmation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You want the same words repeated here.

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved to insert the words "on grounds of conscientious scruples."

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add a clause that this Act shall come into force on the 1st July, 1893, so as to give plenty of time for it to be understood. I move that the clause be added.

Motion agreed to.

On schedule A,

Mr. MULLOCK. I was going to suggest to the Minister that it would be advisable to add to the declaration. While the law says that a declaration has the force of an affidavit and that any one guilty of making a false declaration is liable for perjury, the declarants do not appear to know that. Thus declarations are made with great laxity because there is nothing to warn the declarant that he is really taking oath, and I believe it would be advisable to add some words like these, I, A. B., do solemnly declare that," &c., "and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing this to be true, and knowing that this declaration is

Mr. AMYOT.

of the same force and effect as if made under oath." This would call his attention to his responsibility.

Motion agreed to; and Bill, as amended, reported.

SUPPLY—CONSTITUTION OF THE CABINET.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring before the notice of this House a matter which, I think, deserves to be considered and discussed by the House. We have had of late a great deal of discussion on the matter of tariff reform, and we have had a great deal of interest manifested over the discussion of that question. The question which I propose is an important one; it has reference to a reform in the Cabinet. I do not know but there is room for a reform there, and probably it is about as much needed as is tariff reform. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that we have the largest Cabinet at the present time we ever had in Canada—I refer to numbers. I think we have three or four more in the Cabinet now than we ever had, and it is on that subject I propose to take up the attention of the House for a short time. You will remember, Sir, that in 1887 a Bill was introduced into this House, proposing to abolish the Department of Inland Revenue and the Customs Department, and to appoint a Minister of Trade and Commerce. The abolition of the two offices removed the members from the Cabinet so soon as that Bill was brought into force by the Governor in Council. I propose to inquire for a moment into the causes that lead to the introduction of that Bill, and also the Bill giving the Government power to appoint a Solicitor-General. I think, Sir, that on inquiring into these matters it will be found that it was not from a pressing demand from the country; it was not by reason of petitions that were sent in from the people; it was not by reason of any pressure arising from the tax-payers of this country, that these offices were made or contemplated. If you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, for a moment I will draw your attention to the fact that a short time before the year 1887, one Cabinet Minister suddenly resigned his seat in the Cabinet one evening, and he was restored the next evening. The resignation was withdrawn. You will also remember that another Cabinet Minister sought to put a pressure upon the Government so that he might more readily get his hands into the treasury of this country, and you will remember that it was after this occurred that these positions were created. Sometimes you hear that the end justifies the means. It is possible that the political exigencies that arose in connection with these matters at that time caused the then Premier of Canada, and the present Premier of Canada, who in-

roduced the Bill relating to the Solicitor-General, to introduce these Bills, and to leave them in a quiescent state until an emergency arose, so that they might be able to keep in harmony and subjection the subordinate members of the party and Cabinet. It does appear that that was the reason for the introduction of this Bill. The First Minister could state, if he saw fit, whether that was the reason that compelled him at that time to introduce a Bill empowering him, when the Governor in Council saw fit, to give force and effect to the Bill by appointing a Solicitor-General in that department. While proceeding in this inquiry you are almost forced to believe that the reasons that led to this legislation were political reasons. Neither the constitution, the circumstances nor the conditions of the country demanded that you should have a Solicitor-General, that you should have a Controller of Inland Revenue, that you should have a Controller of Customs, that you should have a Minister of Trade and Commerce. The public interest did not demand it; but in order to keep in harmony these discordant elements, this was to hang over their heads like the sword of Damocles to keep them in subjection if possible. Any one who will read the letters of the late Prime Minister to Mr. McGreevy, in the year 1884, will learn the difficulties that the Premier had in controlling his followers, and the difficulties that threatened to submerge the Government. These difficulties did not appear to arise on public issues or public questions. The Premier indicated the causes of the difficulty, and they were not of a public character. These things led up to the creation of these offices, led up to the creation of this large Cabinet, larger in numbers than any Cabinet that we have ever had in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, if you will look for a moment at the large increase of the expenditure for civil government you will be surprised that at a time like the present, when commerce is depressed, when agricultural products are low, when our markets are limited, when our ordinary debt has increased, when our ordinary expenditure has increased, and when the expenditure in connection with civil government has grown at such an alarming pace—it was a time like this, of all others since Confederation the most unfortunate, that the Government chose to revive these Acts, and appoint heads to the departments that was constituted by the proclamation. It is a matter of great astonishment to myself, that the Government should be so neglectful in obeying the wishes of the people and should so disregard their wishes as to add an alarming amount to the cost of civil government by the creation of these offices, unnecessary and uncalled for by any public requirements, demanded exclusively by reason of political exigencies. In 1868 we expended for civil government \$594,441; in 1884, \$1,084,417; in 1890, \$1,308,846. That is the money required in order to maintain the several departments of the state. What

addition will be made to the expenditure by reason of the creation of these new offices, it is difficult to determine. I am not in a position, nor is the House in a position, I presume, to know what additional cost will be involved in consequence of these additional appointments. The holders of these offices will have their staffs, including secretaries; and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, although he has no department, is to have a deputy-head and also first-class clerks and other clerks in the department, although he really has no department to govern. I cannot understand the reason why the First Minister was unable to resist the importunities of supporters and pressure from without, and allow so many to get in. Why did he not have the same amount of firmness that other Ministers have possessed, and resist the encroachments of those who were behind him and who were thrusting themselves in every conceivable way upon him, which efforts resulted in the issue of the proclamation causing these additions to the Cabinet at a time the least propitious of any time in this country since Confederation? I admit, that if times were flourishing, if the census returns showed that our country was growing in population, this action might be condoned; but under present circumstances, with the results manifested by the census returns, with the heavy expenditure for civil government, I am surprised that the First Minister was not able to resist those encroachments and preserve the Cabinet, so far as it was numerically constituted under his predecessor. Undoubtedly, the people were very much astonished when the proclamation was issued and they heard of the alarming increase in the members of the Government. In fact, they did not know but that before long every man on the Government side of the House would be in the Cabinet, or at least hold some Government position. The people were very much interested in this question. Many of the people in the west did not believe the reports were true. The First Minister went to Toronto, and all his Cabinet went with him. It was said that he went there in order to reply to a speech made by the leader of the Opposition, and the First Minister took all his Cabinet with him in order to reply effectually to that speech. This wonderful combination met in Toronto. We have a cartoon in room No. 16, showing the combination. The cartoon represents the Cabinet in its proper light, with the dissolving shades and colours. There is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, he who was once the rightful heir to the succession of King William, and whose colours were very pronounced and very orange; but in the cartoon they have lost their lustre. Probably, owing to the fact that they have lost their lustre, he has been sent to grass in order to see if he can get some colour again. Then the Controller was brought in to fill this vacuum, which so much needed to be filled. The colours that adorn him are more pro-

nounced and of a livelier hue. I do not know how long they are going to remain a striking hue. Then, in regard to the First Minister, the green colour in his case is wholly fading; he does not preserve the rich, deep colour he possessed when he first came in, but his Solicitor-General has it to perfection. There is no vegetation in his own country so green. In that cartoon you see the happy combination forming the Cabinet, and there are the end men, too. How well they seem to be adapted to carry on in peace and harmony the great material interests of this country. Another important matter is the reconciliation of faction, and I presume the Premier found it important, if he was going, not only to be at the head of the Government, but remain there. Look at the manner in which the trade affairs of the country are to be managed by this Government. Here we have the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has not a voice in the affairs of this House; in fact, he has no voice in anything, so far as we know; he has no duties arranged to perform, and, no doubt, he will be willing for this condition to remain so long as his salary is continued. The Controller of Customs is not in the Cabinet, neither is the Controller of Inland Revenue. They have no voice in deciding the great trade question. It must be patent to every member of the Government, and to every man out of the Government, that this is an anomalous state of affairs, and in the interests of the country our trade matters should not be allowed to remain in this condition. Does it not appear that the former Government's position in regard to trade matters was a more logical one than it is under the present arrangement? I think it must appear clear to every one that the general interests of this country are in a very peculiar position. The attention of business people of all classes should be drawn to the manner in which this Government is now formed. Just imagine that there is not behind the First Minister a single Cabinet officer in the ranks who is a business man. The great lumbering interest he has none to represent, the great mining interest he has none to represent, the great agricultural interest he has none to represent, the great commercial interest he has none to represent, the great shipping interest, there is none to represent. All these interests, vital to the people of Canada are ignored in the formation of this Cabinet. Certainly among seventeen members of a Ministry there should be a place found for a representative of these large classes. It does not require that a lawyer should preside over every department. A few are not lawyers, it is true, but it is a singular thing that there are no men with business instincts qualified to fill any department of State. Every department is filled with lawyers or professional men in some capacity or other, and scarcely is a business man to be found in the Cabinet. That is a serious matter for the people of this country to consider. AN-

MR. LANDERKIN.

other thing is, that those who preside over the important departments of trade, in order that they should not understand what the Government are doing, were left outside the door. They could go and sit on the stool outside the door while the Government were discussing tariff changes, but the Government would not allow them in, I understand, to take part in their deliberations. Now, Sir, in examining the number of Cabinet Ministers to be found in other countries, it will strike everybody that this addition to the number of Ministers in Canada was an unwarranted abuse of power; an abuse of the prerogative which the Government should not have attempted at this particular time in our history. There are more Ministers in Canada than are to be found in almost any other country in the world, no matter what the population may be. In order to satisfy the House on this question, I have prepared a list from the best sources of information that I can find and I believe it will be found correct. The Argentine Republic, with a population of over 4,000,000, has five Cabinet Ministers; Austro-Hungary, with a population of over 41,000,000, has nine Cabinet Ministers; Belgium, with a population of 6,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Brazil, with a population of 14,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Chili, with a population of over 2,000,000, has six Cabinet Ministers; Denmark, with a population of over 2,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Ecuador, with a population of nearly 2,000,000, has four Cabinet Ministers; France, with a population of 38,000,000, has ten Cabinet Ministers; the German Empire, with a population of 49,000,000, has twelve Cabinet Ministers; Greece, with a population of over 2,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Italy, with a population of over 30,000,000, has eleven Cabinet Ministers; Mexico, with a population of over 11,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Persia, with a population of 9,000,000, has nineteen Cabinet Ministers. It will be noticed, Mr. Speaker, that our Government have closely imitated Persia, which is under the Mahommedan Koran, as there the Shah has eight Ministers without portfolio. That is one means by which they cheer those in Persia, who have no portfolio, and who are outside the door. They are told that they can find relief in the Koran. Peru, with a population of 3,000,000, has five Cabinet Ministers; the Netherlands, with a population of 4,500,000, has eight Cabinet Ministers; Portugal, with a population of nearly 5,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Roumania, with a population of 5,500,000, has nine Cabinet Ministers; Servia, with a population of over 2,000,000, has eight Cabinet Ministers; Siam, with a population of 6,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Spain, with a population of 17,500,000, has only nine Cabinet Ministers; Sweden, with a population of nearly 5,000,000, has ten Cabinet Ministers; Switzerland, with a population of nearly 3,000,000, has seven Cabinet Ministers; Turkey, with a population of 39,000,000, has only six Cabinet Ministers; the United States, with a population of 62,000,000, has only eight Cab-

inet Ministers; China, with a population of 402,000,000, has only six Cabinet Ministers; Japan, with a population of over 40,000,000, has only twelve Cabinet Ministers; Russia, with a population of 113,000,000, has only twelve Cabinet Ministers; the United Kingdom, with a population of over 37,000,000, has seventeen Cabinet Ministers; Ceylon, with a population of over 3,000,000, has five Cabinet Ministers; India, with a population of 220,000,000, has ten Cabinet Ministers; but Canada, with a population of 4,829,411, has fourteen Cabinet Ministers, and three stipendiaries or accessories; in all, seventeen.

Mr. AMYOT. What is the total?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The gentleman from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) wants to find out what the total is. I will give it to him; but I hope the hon. gentleman won't bolt until I tell him. Here it is. We have eight Provincial Governors and the Governor-General; nine Governors in all. We have nine Parliaments, consisting of nine representative bodies and five Senates; fifty-four Cabinet Ministers and over 700 legislators, of whom the member from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is one. That is about the total in Canada. We pay \$121,000 a year for Governors, exclusive of the cost of housing them, and \$202 a year for Cabinet Ministers.

An hon. MEMBER. \$202,000?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, yes, \$202,000 a year, for Cabinet Ministers, they would not be satisfied with \$202. We pay in all \$1,195,037 for legislators and their belongings. If Great Britain in proportion to her population had as many legislators as we have in Canada, 5,000 statesmen would have to be provided for at every meeting of Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that this question was of sufficient importance to be brought before Parliament. The Cabinet have a little to do with the destiny of this country. Thank heaven, it is only a little. They cannot make times any better, but they can make times a little worse; that is about what a Cabinet can do. They say they cannot increase our prosperity. When they were in Opposition they could do nearly all these things; but as soon as they got into power they found that it was impossible for any Government to do anything to relieve the depression that prevailed in the country. Before they got into power they could increase the price of wheat, the price of eggs and the price of barley.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Raise the hen and set her.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, but as soon as they got in prices went down, and they said there was no use of talking, everybody knew that a Government could not do anything like that. They could not raise the prices, but they were bound to keep in force the policy that kept them down. This is a question that deserves the serious consideration of this House. It is a matter of great

moment to this House and this country. If political exigencies are to be the causes for increases in the Cabinet, we ought to know it. If the great interests of the country are to be neglected in order that people may be forced into the Cabinet, though we had too many before this Government was formed, we ought to know it. It was one of the mistakes of Confederation that we had so many, and it is a greater mistake now to say that if one man has a certain colour of necktie, or another man has a certain badge, he is entitled to a seat in the Cabinet, no matter what his qualifications may be, and no matter how great industrial interests of this country may be neglected, while gentlemen who are qualified to make the Cabinet a business Cabinet, which would be alive to the commercial and agricultural interests of this country are passed over because they have not got the necessary pass-word.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire, nor do I feel able to answer the hon. member, but I want to reply to the personal attack that he has made upon me. He said that he hoped that I would not bolt before the end of his speech. He thought it would be for me a thunderbolt. He may be mistaken. I consider parties as a partnership. At a certain moment in 1885 I was dissatisfied for some reasons with my party. Those reasons may have disappeared, and they have disappeared.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That war is over.

Mr. AMYOT. Hold on; if the hon. member finds it too hot, we will send for some cold water for him. I joined the partnership which was fighting the battle which I believed in; but when I found that there were in the partnership a great many men who travelled over the country like donkey shows, when I found them trying to discover crimes committed by their opponents, without any policy of their own, and when I found that their brothers of the province of Quebec were driving my province to ruin, while the objections I had to my old party had gone, I left that partnership and returned to my old friends. There are some honourable and respectable men in the hon. gentleman's party—some serious men, but there are a great many who spend their time trying to invent all sorts of new crimes, of stories to injure the reputation of other men, instead of looking seriously after the interests of the country, actuated only by spite against the adverse party. The hon. gentleman speaks of China with 300,000,000 people led by twenty men. Does he think that any intelligent man in the country will believe that twenty men would be able to govern successfully 300,000,000? He speaks of countries at the equator. Does he know how those countries, and countries such as China and Japan, are ruled? Does he want to bring their political constitutions here? He has spent about an hour of the time of the parliament, costing, perhaps, \$1,000, for what

benefit? Simply to act as if we were in a circus, where a man, with bonnet on his head, and wonderful with his fists and legs, gives an exhibition. Well, Mr Speaker, there will be no bolt nor thunderbolt in his speech. The hon. gentleman has attacked me here. But whenever I am attacked, I hope God will give me force to express my sentiments. He may attack me in the press or in my county, but I hope I shall be able to give him an answer; and when the time comes to make a comparison between the two parties, I will undertake the work. But one of the reasons I left the party of the hon. gentleman was because there were too many like him in it.

THE CENSUS RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take any part in the fray which has been so gallantly maintained by the martial gentleman behind me and my medical friend. But before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House to the instructions to the census commissioners which were lately laid on the Table. So far as I am able to discover in looking over them, I can see no reason whatever for the allegation made some time ago that any compact had been entered into with the manufacturers of Canada which would preclude us from having information as to the character of the several industrial establishments in the different towns and cities, the names of the proprietors or the number of hands they employ. As regards the capital employed, that is a mere matter of public policy. Although I can see no reason myself why it should not be given, it may be alleged that some persons would object to see that disclosed. But as for refusing the information as to the character of certain industrial establishments and the names of their proprietors, I can only say that I can discover nothing whatever in the manual of the third census of Canada, or the various forms of oaths which have been administered to our officers, at all to warrant the Government in refusing that information. I trust, therefore, and I think it will be found conducive to the expedition of public business, that no further obstacle shall be put in the way of the members of this House obtaining the information to which they are entitled in that regard. I may add that if there be one thing more than another which would be calculated to throw just suspicion on the accuracy of these same census returns, it would be persistence in that denial. I am not on the present occasion going to make any formal motion on the subject or occupy the time of the House further; but I trust that when this question comes up again, as it very shortly will, the members of the Government will reconsider the refusal they made a few days ago, and will put the House, as the House has a right to be, in full possession of all the details which we have demanded.

Mr. AMYOT.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the Finance Minister can tell the House now to what extent he thinks he would be justified in giving details of the census. A few days ago the matter was under discussion, and some of the organs of the party opposite had ventured to advise the Government upon the matter, and, if they decide to follow such advice, they will give a portion, at least, of the details asked for. For example, how can there be any public interest why the country should not know the gross number of industries, the gross number of persons employed, the gross amounts of capital involved, the gross output, and the gross amount of wages? There is no use in making motions on the subject, if the Government have shut their foot down against giving any such information at all.

Mr. FOSTER. When information was asked the other day as to the names of manufacturers in certain towns, I read to the House the information which was sent to me from the department, prepared by the deputy of the department. The answer which was sent to me was as follows:—

The information in the census schedules was obtained by sworn enumerators, on the understanding that nothing but general statistical records should be published. No names or particulars can therefore be communicated.

Now, as I was not the Minister of that department, and not personally conversant with the modus operandi in any way, I took that as the sense of the instructions and of the law from which the instructions were founded, and so gave it to the House. Afterwards the question was asked as to whether the law would carry out to the full that principle, and it seems to be certain that there is nothing in the law to prevent certain portions of that information asked for from being given. In accordance with that answer, I did not give the names and was justified, from that information, in not doing so. Afterwards, when the question was discussed, the House will remember that I gave no reasons for not giving the names, because I did not know the reasons that existed in the department, and I could not find any for myself. I said, however, that I would look into the question and have the instructions brought down, and I did that, and I think I ought to read, in justice to the deputy of the department, a memo. which he sent me, and which shows, at least, that the custom of the department has been entirely in that way, in connection with the censuses which have been hitherto taken. He says:

Before taking the first decennial census of the Dominion in 1871 the instructions, principles and systems of census taking in other countries, were made a subject of very special study in the department. The practice of other countries in relation to the privacy of the informations obtained was specially considered, and the policy was settled, in so far as it could be by the department, that all personal particulars obtained by the enumerators must be held to

be absolutely confidential, as a condition precedent to being able to obtain such information.

In a printed circular signed by the then Minister the following statement was published :

"That the information given by individuals to enumerators will never be, in any way, or in any circumstances, divulged. The enumerators and all census officers act under oath; and they are strictly bound to secrecy.

"That the aggregate results only will be made known."

This understanding, which has since been uniformly acted on, was communicated to everybody connected with census taking and published as widely as possible through the newspapers, through clergymen, and by all other available means, as the basis on which alone the information necessary for the census could be obtained. The oaths of the employees bound them to the observance of these instructions.

Applications to the department for personal details of information from the census schedules have been continuous and numerous. But the uniform answer given was that no personal information nor any other than statistical results could be furnished.

As respects giving the names of manufacturers in any particular town or village the parties themselves might not probably consider such to be any disadvantage, but on the contrary an advertisement. The same remark applies to other informations which have been asked to be furnished from the census schedules, but always declined on the ground that if discretion as respects giving any personal information contained in them is admitted, then that which it is the object of the census to elicit cannot be at all obtained.

A verification of facts in relation to the manufacturers in any village or town, could be made by other means than the publishing of the names.

The office has always held that the names in a schedule were personal information.

It will be found that the letter of the instructions scarcely goes so far as to prevent the names of persons from being given. There was this view to be considered. Although no written instructions were given, the census enumerators and commissioners have found that people are sensitive in giving information, which might, in any manner, become known to competitors in their business, or be used by prying persons to find out their affairs, and they have to be assured that the strictest privacy consistent with the tabulation of the general results will be the rule with reference to their business. And the enumerators are sworn not to divulge the information but simply to give it to their superior officers, so that it may be carried back to the department and there tabulated as to general results. Something more than that was given, in that the people were personally assured that, under instructions of the department, and under the principle upon which all censuses have been taken in Canada, the details of their business will in no respect be given; that is, that the names of persons and the particular details of their business will not be communicated to any one who asks for it. That is the rule in the United States, and in all those places where censuses are taken, the gross results only are given without the names. Our own plan is the same as theirs, perhaps a little wider, and the general

results only are tabulated and names not given. Now, I believe it is true that before the last census was taken the instructions were not laid on the Table; they were not asked for. But it is also true that in 1871 all the papers were published—the instructions and the forms used—as an appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1870, which was laid before Parliament. It would appear, therefore, that there is nothing in the instructions, either verbal or written, which would preclude the giving of the names of persons who own and carry on industrial establishments, and I can see no reason—and I think it would be difficult to find a valid reason—why the names of persons who carry on these establishments should be withheld. When we go further than that to details of the business which a person carries on under his own name, I think we approach ground where there is very good reason why it should be withheld. Great difficulty has been experienced in the case of persons carrying on a single industry. I mean one which in the tabulations is not united with any others carrying on a similar industry, so that by referring to the tabulations the details of his business can be learned, which would not be the case where the figures respecting several industries form items in the total. In these cases it was found that several were very loath to give the details asked for because they were by themselves and the figures would give information as to the details of their single business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the hon. gentleman, having looked into the matter, is willing to give the names and descriptions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I see no objection.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The number of employees?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is very important, because the instructions, it seems to me, are calculated to lead to just such a course as I mentioned a few evenings ago. An industrial establishment is thus defined:

An industrial establishment is a place where one or several persons are employed in manufacturing, altering, making up or changing from one shape into another, materials for sale, use or consumption, quite irrespective of the amount of capital employed or of the products turned out.

And so a merchant tailor and the women or girls who sew for him at their homes are reported as separate manufacturing establishments. These women employ nobody; they are employed. And so we have in such a case five or six times as many persons who are reported as manufacturers as are actually engaged in the business. I believe also, Sir, that it will be found, if the facts can be ascertained, that the houses in which these people live are returned as capital invested in manufacturing enterprises, and that this course was adopted generally in 1891 for

the first time, and so you have, I have no doubt, millions and tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, reported as invested in manufacturing enterprises that are nothing of the sort.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I ought to correct my hon. friend, if he means to say that a different method was followed as to the enumeration of these industries in 1891 from that followed in previous decennial periods. He is mistaken, if he says so; the same system was carried out and on the same basis.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I say this instruction was calculated to produce that sort of return. I do not know whether it is the first time it has been used or not, but I believe that the course which I have mentioned was adopted in 1891 almost universally for the first time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you are mistaken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What could be more preposterous or what can render the statistics less valuable than the fact that a merchant tailor who employs perhaps twenty parties to sew for him, fifteen of them work in their own houses, should not be reported as one establishment, but as sixteen establishments, each woman working at her own house being reported as a separate manufacturing establishment, and the assessed value of the house as capital invested in manufacturing business.

Mr. LISTER. Were the enumerators paid 15 cents for every industry they discovered?

Mr. FOSTER. A schedule of payment was arranged. I have not the paper which shows what it was, but it was laid upon the Table, whatever it was.

Mr. LISTER. Were the enumerators paid by the day?

Mr. FOSTER. The enumerators were paid, I think, by the number of people they took, and, as to the enumeration of industries, I think they had an allowance based upon the number of industries, but whether it was so much for every separate industry, or so much for every certain number, I cannot now say.

Mr. LISTER. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what the census of 1881 may be, this census is altogether misleading and erroneous. I stated the other night, and I repeat it, that, according to the census returns, there are 117 manufacturing establishments in the town of Sarnia. I have no hesitation at all in asserting that there is no such number in that town. Now, one of the enumerators of the hon. gentleman has written to the newspaper stating how it was in the county of Essex. I refer to enumerator White. He says:

The method adopted by the Government in gathering its facts as to the condition of the Canadian industries, was faulty. They were gathered more for the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

purpose of bolstering up the National Policy than to show Canadians their true condition. They paid a bonus to assist fraud. For every industry discovered the census enumerators were paid a bonus of fifteen cents. Consequently there was no trouble to find flourishing industries in Canada. Every saw-filer, milliner, dressmaker, watch tinker, lock mender, &c., was considered as having an industrial establishment—for census purposes. In one township, which could be named, the enumerators made nearly every farm house an industrial establishment, because the farmers' wives and daughters knitted socks or made straw braid. Each had a number of employees, had a considerable amount of capital invested, and the product was amazingly valuable. Being the commissioner for that census district, I wrote to Ottawa, pointing out the character of the return, and asked if it was satisfactory to the Government, which, I believed, wanted to ascertain the bottom tracts with regard to Canadian industrial establishments. The gentleman to whom the Governor-General referred to as being so able and painstaking, Mr. George Johnson, promptly replied that the returns were all right. I have inquired in other places and find that almost every place where a man or a woman worked, was set down as an industrial establishment. Such is the character of the figures upon which the Governor-General and the Premier rely to prove that there is a vastly greater number of people employed in industrial establishments to-day, than there were ten years ago. It is an audacious fraud.

Now, that is a letter written by Mr. White, of the county of Essex, a gentleman well known in that section of the county, a reliable man and an old citizen of that place, born there. He gives to the country, by this letter, a statement of how the enumeration was made in the county of Essex. I believe, Sir, if the returns are brought down, it will be found, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated, that wherever a person was working by the piece for a tailor, milliner or any other industry in that way, doing work at his or her own residence that person was returned as an industrial establishment and the assessed value of the residence as capital invested in manufacturing. If such is the case, and I have no hesitation at all in saying that I believe it is the case as regards the town from which I come, then the census of 1891 was made purposely to bolster up the so-called National Policy, and it does not give the slightest idea of the real condition of the industrial establishments of this country, either as to the amount invested, or as to the wages paid, or as to the individuals who are engaged in the industries of this country. I am aware that the statistician, Mr. Johnson, says that so far as the county of Essex is concerned, he erased from the returns made by that enumerator, the names of the farmers' wives who are said to have been carrying on the industry of making straw-hats and knitting socks. But we have the statement made by this enumerator that he stated the fact to Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Johnson replied to him that the manner of his enumeration was right. If such is the case, then the census is wrong, and this Parliament of the country has the right to know whether this is a real record of the

condition of affairs in this country, or whether it is a record made for the purpose of giving the country a false impression as to the condition of things. The Minister states now, as I understand him, that he has no objection to bringing down to the House the names of the parties carrying on these industries, and the character of the industry which they carry on. I do not think myself that it would be proper for the Government to give the amount of capital invested, or that they should give other information that a person engaged in business would not like to have made public. But I cannot see, and I never could see, that there was any objection to giving the names of the individual and the character of the business in which he was engaged. If the Minister does that, I will be content, so far as I am concerned, and I think that is all he can fairly be asked for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand from the Minister that when he gives the names of the several parties employed in the different industries that we have moved for, he will, also, in the same return, give the number of hands employed by these respective parties? Will that be part of the information brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has been misled by a statement published by one of the enumerators. It may be possible that that enumerator, for the purpose of earning his 15 cents, as he avows, put in a great many establishments as industries which were not industries as described in the schedule. That appears to be a fact, and the fraud which he attempted to commit, and which he avows in that communication, was promptly corrected in the computation of the census, and schedule after schedule was thrown out when the returns were finally compiled.

Mr. LISTER. I think I stated when I spoke that Mr. Johnson had given the explanation that these names had not been stricken from the list; but the statement made by this enumerator is that he informed Mr. Johnson as to the character of the enumeration, and that Mr. Johnson replied that it was all right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is contradicted by Mr. Johnson.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident that the system of collecting statistics in the county referred to by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has been followed out in other constituencies as well. I fancy that the system has been the same in all the counties, in all the towns and cities, because I find in the town I come from, or the town that is adjacent to my constituency, the number of industrial establishments is placed at 61. Now, I am familiar with all the industrial establishments in that town, and know of what I speak, and I am perfectly confident

that there are not to be found in that town to-day more than 20, at the outside, of establishments that can properly be classed as industrial, so that the enumerators there have increased the number from 20 to 61. I may say that in 1881, according to the census returns, the number of establishments was given as 48. Now, any one who knows anything at all about that town knows that the National Policy has done nothing, at all events, for the town of Dundas. We find there now half the number of industrial establishments which we had in 1881. That fact cannot be gainsaid by anybody who knows anything about the history of the town. Therefore, I must come to the conclusion that the system which has been referred to by others who have spoken on this subject has been carried out in all the constituencies, and that the instruction to the parties who took the census must have been of this character, or these enumerators would not have all followed the same course. I think the information asked for is such as this House ought to be in possession of, that we may be able to ascertain whether any reliability at all is to be placed upon the returns made by these enumerators. So far as I know personally, I do not think they can be relied upon as being at all accurate or correct in any particular whatever.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand the Minister of Finance to say that question had been asked from the statistician himself with reference to the names of the parties in the different towns, and that under the idea that they were not at liberty to divulge them, this information, at all events, had been declined. Did I understand the Minister correctly?

Mr. FOSTER. That is what Mr. Lowe says in his memorandum.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, as I understand the Minister, now he takes the view that it is not necessary to withhold that; but he is willing to give the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to ask: Will the secrecy be observed now in the department upon a personal request, or will members be at liberty to ask now, preferring their request, which the Minister of Finance said the department was at liberty to give, and that it was not necessary to go through the form of moving in the House?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be better that information with reference to the census of that character should be asked for in the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought it would take time.

Mr. FOSTER. When the census itself is fully published, the details of the census are given, and that would answer for every person. That would seem to be the more regular way. But if a member wishes for any information he can move for it in the

House, and it will be brought down just as in reference to every other department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not understand from the Minister that when the census was published the details and names of individuals would be in any published statement.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will it be given in answer to questions, as was requested of the Minister the other day, or would a formal return have to be moved for? If so, it would be difficult to get the information this session.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is a motion which does not involve too much work.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dominion Steamers—To meet unforeseen expenses in connection with repairs for steamers "Lansdowne," "Newfield" and "Quadra".....\$30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did these unforeseen expenses occur?

Mr. FOSTER. They are mainly due to an accident to the "Quadra," which went ashore at Queen Charlotte Islands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was there a court-martial held?

Mr. FOSTER. There was an inquiry held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the result?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the commander was exonerated from blame.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the cause of the disaster?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The statement I have received from the department is to this effect: In the spring of 1892, decayed timber being found in the "Lansdowne," it was decided that she required immediate repairs. These repairs, together with putting in a new pump, cost \$6,515. In September, 1892, the "Newfield" was driven on shore in a gale of wind; the cost of repairs was \$16,500. The "Quadra" when in Behring Sea ran on an unknown rock. The cost of taking her off the reef and docking her was \$8,170.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that large amounts have been spent in providing supplies for the crews and in coaling vessels. No less than \$1,080 were spent for coal for the "Lansdowne," \$1,304 for the "Newfield" and \$5,923 for the "Quadra." What length of time were these vessels severally engaged?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at this moment. In regard to the supplies, I may say that they are furnished, so far as possible by tender. If the hon. gentleman desires particular information, I can bring down the details.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will notice that in the case of the "Druid" and "Lansdowne" there has been expended for provisions \$3,451. We cannot judge whether this is a fair expense, unless we know the number of days the vessel was on service. I also observe an item of \$544 for cleaning vessels. What were the crew doing meanwhile? I observe further that for the "Lansdowne" there was paid \$128 for wharfage at St. John. How did the Government come to pay that amount?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If this information is required, I can bring it down to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman furnish all this information on the main Estimates?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; I will try and get the information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We want fairly full information; where these steamers were repaired, the name of the party who had the contract, was it done by contract or day's work and other details. It might be that the steamer has not been repaired at the proper quarters.

Further amount required for Fishery Protection Service\$ 9,000

Mr. COSTIGAN. The memorandum from the Deputy-Minister in this case says that the above amount is to meet the balance of expenditure in connection with the fishery protection steamers and vessels to 30th June, 1893, including repairs to the steamer "Acadian," estimate at \$2,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a great pity that the memorandum does not give the information in full; in fact it is no information at all. We are told where \$2,000 has been spent, but there is no explanation of the other \$7,000. The departmental memorandum should be very much more accurate than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Particularly when the Minister is absent, the Deputy-Minister ought certainly to be here and in a position to supply the acting Minister with the requisite information. We do not expect that the Secretary of State should be familiar with the details of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. If there is any member of the Cabinet who ought to be familiar with the department it is the Minister of Finance, who was once at its head. The custom that the Deputy-Minister should be here when these items are under consideration ought not to be departed from unless the Minister is very conversant with the affairs himself.

Mr. COSTIGAN. So far as the regular Estimates are concerned, I knew the deputy would be here, and I would have asked him to be here to-night, if I thought the explanations would not be satisfactory to the House.

I can obtain all the information required on the main Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The departmental report gives a very fair account of the condition of these vessels, and I would gather from it that they were not in need of these extensive repairs?

Fishery Intelligence Bureau \$422.50

Mr. COSTIGAN. The above sum is required for reporting to the Intelligence Bureau the movements of the fishing fleet during the season.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is the system pursued?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Not only are the movements of the fleet reported, but the movements of the fish are sent from one point to another. It is very useful and valuable service.

Mr. BOWERS. I remember last year seeing accounts in the daily papers about where the fish would be and where bait could be obtained. I think it is a very useful service and I would like it should be extended, so that we might have the benefit of it at the extremity of Digby County.

To pay Mr. Isaac Newton for loss sustained in defending a suit brought against him by an American company \$379.26

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Isaac Newton was granted a license to fish in Dart Harbour, Grand Manan. An American company, who own the harbour, contended that they owned the fisheries, as well, and brought an action against Newton, which he defended and won. Under the circumstances, the Government is asked to pay the actual costs of the suit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If he won the case, how is it that the Government have to pay the costs?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be found that he was not able to collect them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should like to know whether we paid the costs on both sides?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, no.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We only pay such costs as this man had to pay.

Mr. McMULLEN. What firm of lawyers were engaged in the case?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will get the names.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the bill of costs taxed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no doubt it was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman know the name of the American company?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not. I will get the name and also the names of the lawyers engaged in the case.

International Fisheries Commission, United States and Canada. \$1,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is this?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understand that a commission has been appointed to try and arrange with the United States authorities for some common regulations, and perhaps legislation with regard to certain fisheries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under the arrangement made last year with the United States, it was proposed to take mutual measures for the protection of fish life, for the propagation of fish and for close seasons in contiguous waters; and the proposition which the United States made, subsequent to the acceptance of our proposal, was that, instead of signing a convention containing these particulars, a joint inquiry should be first made by an expert appointed by each country. Mr. Wakeham was appointed by us, and Professor Mendenhall by the Washington authorities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are they doing?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are holding their first meeting in Washington, where they are going to inquire into the whole subject—for instance, the possibility of restricting purse-seining and into the question of mutual regulations for close seasons on the rivers and lakes along the boundary line.

To pay J. Johnston for services in connection with the preparation of Maps for Report of Commissioner of North-west Mounted Police \$85

Mr. McMULLEN. Under what circumstances did it become necessary for this gentleman to be engaged in this way?

Mr. IVES. He is the geographer of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary there?

Mr. IVES. He is a chief clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is one of the items I think which should be objected to. It is another instance of men getting a respectable salary being paid extra simply because they are asked to do something out of the usual routine. No ordinary business man would entertain a claim of that kind. Here are civil servants respectably paid and by no means overworked, who, when asked to do some little thing for some other department or out of their usual routine, demand additional pay. This thing has gone altogether too far, and it is an outrage that we should have some 400 or 500 civil servants here, who, not content with the pay they receive, are always on the alert for an excuse to make some extra claim.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was the work performed during the ordinary office hours?

Mr. IVES. My hon. friend will see that in the first place, this map is very useful and important, inasmuch as it indicates, among other things, the North-west Mounted Police stations and all that. Of course, if we employed a competent man not in the department to do this work we would have to pay him a very large sum, and, by getting the work done in this way, we save money. Whether it was done by Mr. Johnson in his regular office hours, I cannot say; but, no doubt he had permission of the head of the department, and I presume it was done after office hours.

Mr. McMULLEN. Whether it was done after office hours or not, I still hold that we ought not to be called upon to pass such items as this for extra work, especially knowing, as we do, that the men have very often spare hours, during office hours, when they are not employed.

To repair lock-gate valves and painting locks Nos. 2 and 3, Lachine Canal.....\$ 1,450

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there a staff of men employed along the canal and paid by the day or is the work done by contract?

Mr. HAGGART. All this work is done by contract, and sometimes we have to contract for the labour. Everything possible is done by contract. Even when we do it ourselves, we advertise for tenders for the supply of men and horses.

Rideau Canal—To provide five electric lights at Ottawa.....\$375

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that a heavy rate, \$75 per light? I should suppose that where light is supplied by water-power we ought to get it for less.

Mr. HAGGART. This is the lowest we can get it for, and we only use it for nine months in the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems rather an extravagant rate, and I do not suppose you want it for more than nine months.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; it is a matter of precaution more than anything else. There have been some very serious accidents, and some drownings, through the want of light around the basin, and the department thought it their duty to put up lights.

Mr. McMULLEN. What power has each light?

Mr. HAGGART. They are arc lights.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about \$1 a night?

Mr. HAGGART. About 75 cents.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is very high. In the west we could get such lights for very much less than that.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a low price, from 20 to 25 cents a night for a light. They charge the city of Ottawa, I think, 30 cents a night.

Beauharnois Canal—To pay salaries of two electricians and one ferry-man \$1,346

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The electricians seem to be cheaper than the light. What are the particulars of this?

Mr. HAGGART. One is paid \$50 a month, or \$600 a year, and the other \$40 a month.

Chambly Canal—To pay salaries and contingencies. \$1,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the details of this?

Mr. HAGGART. One assistant electrician at \$45 a month, one carbon and battery man \$40 a month, and one lamp lighter at St. John's, at 25 cents per day. St. John's Light Company an increase of \$50 and a few contingencies, stationery supplies, binding and so on, electric supplies and sundries.

Miscellaneous—To pay a gratuity of two months' salary to the widow of H. H. Killaly, engineer in charge of Rapide Plat Canal. \$416.66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection at all to this item, but I would like to inquire if Mr. Killaly was a contributor to the superannuation fund.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think he was. He was resident engineer on the upper part of the Lachine Canal from 1876 to 1885, when he was appointed resident engineer on the Rapide Plat Canal and the western half of the Cornwall Canal, which position he held until his death in 1882. I think it is the custom of the department to pay these gratuities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not objecting at all to the vote; I think it has always been done in such cases, but I was inquiring merely if Mr. Killaly had contributed to the superannuation fund.

Mr. HAGGART. I think not; he was not a permanent employee of the Government.

Government of the North-west Territories—Amount required for the working expenses of well-boring machines, piping, &c..... \$2,500

Mr. DALY. This amount is required to supply boring machines in a portion of the North-west Territories near a station called Langenburg, on the Manitoba and North-western Railway, where there is a large German settlement. Unfortunately, they have not been able to get water, though they have made many efforts, and the matter was represented to the department by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories and the chairman of the committee, Mr. Haul-

tain, and they had not sufficient money in their estimate to provide this sum. When the matter was first represented to the department I sent up Mr. Carstens, the German interpreter, and he made investigation. He found that the people were really suffering for the want of water, and they told him that unless they could have assistance they would have to leave the territories. Consequently we found it a matter of absolute necessity to provide the machinery and piping to secure for these people the water they required for their animals and for domestic purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What depth will you have to go?

Mr. DALY. We cannot tell.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are you sure to get the water?

Mr. DALY. Yes; we are sure to get it. I was going to say that they have got water by digging, but not in sufficient quantity to supply their cattle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not a little unfortunate that settlements should be allowed to be formed of foreign immigrants, as I understand this is mostly, in a section where water can be obtained only by these means?

Mr. DALY. It is a most extraordinary thing. This is one of the most beautiful countries in the North-west Territories. There is wood and prairie and one would think that the place would make a perfect home for settlers. But there is that one thing wanted. If you were to go to that locality you would choose it out of thousands and thousands of acres, but, strange to say, there is this want of water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any reports as to the general results of these borings? I do not object to a reasonable amount being expended in making borings, either to procure water or test generally the formation in various parts of the North-west, but I would like to know if any formal report has been made to the Government showing what has been done, a report which would give us the results achieved by these experiments in comparatively small compass.

Mr. DALY. The only real experiment tried is at Deloraine. The hon. gentleman will recollect that matter was before the House on a previous occasion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was rather expensive.

Mr. DALY. We have not had the result expected. We have sunk 1,850 feet. It will be impossible to report this session, but I hope to report at an early date next session, though the result has not been what we expected. This is in a different section of the country from the one referred to in

this item. The result at Deloraine has not been satisfactory, because they did not commence in the right way. The pipe they commenced with was too small and they have had many difficulties to contend with. I hope at an early day next session to lay before the House a statement showing the results of the experiments made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is an artesian well, is it?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. In what locality is this money to be spent in the North-west?

Mr. DALY. This \$2,500 is to be spent at or near Landenburg, on the Manitoba and North-western Railway. It is exclusively for that purpose. It is in the North-west Territories.

Further amount required to meet expenses connected with the Lieutenant Governor's office \$3,700

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This does appear to me to be a very great piece of extravagance. We have spent an awful amount for this Lieutenant-Governor's accommodation in past years, and very full explanation ought to be given to the committee before this vote is passed.

Mr. DALY. The item of \$2,700 is made up as follows: Travelling expenses, \$1,500; caretaker and messenger at Government House, \$1,500.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Travelling expenses are provided for elsewhere.

Mr. DALY. Light and fuel at Government House, \$700. The explanation furnished to me is as follows: Reference is requested to the memorandum accompanying this item in the Estimates for 1893-94. The vote for 1892-93 was \$500. There has been paid against this item the expense of a trip to Ottawa, in September last, when His Honour went down at the request of the Minister of the Interior to confer with the Government on North-west matters immediately after the prorogation of the Legislative Assembly. The Secretary of the Lieutenant-Governor also visited Ottawa last spring at the request of the Minister of the Interior, when the North-west estimates were under consideration by the Government during the session of Parliament. The expenses of these trips amounted to \$523.88. Further travelling expenses were incurred on official business by His Honour and secretary for which there is a charge of \$561. It is submitted that the necessary travelling expenses for the remainder of the year must, in all probability, be not less than for the first half of the year, and therefore a supplementary vote of \$1,500 is required to complete the service of the current year. The expense is fully explained in the memoranda accompanying the item in the Estimates of 1893-94. It appears that the estimate for caretaker and messenger at Government House was made

for the first year of the occupation of Government House by the Lieutenant-Governor at Regina, and it was wholly experimental as to the cost of fuel and the cost of taking care of the building. The amount was not properly ascertained, and the expense has actually exceeded the amount provided by the main Estimates by the sum required here.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears from the Auditor-General's Report last year that the cost of the trip of the Lieutenant-Governor was \$357.43. He drew altogether last year for travelling expenses, \$2,262.14. Now, it appears to me to be an extravagant expense. I do not believe that this committee should consent to keep a Lieutenant-Governor dancing around from post to post at the expense of this country. If he was wanted in Ottawa, that might be pardonable. I cannot understand how the sum of \$357 could have been spent by the Lieutenant-Governor on his trip from the North-west to Ottawa. We cannot object to have him travel in a manner befitting his position, but I do not think it is at all necessary that he should have spent this sum on his trip from Regina to Ottawa and back again. As the Minister has said he came down at the request of the Minister of the Interior, could the hon. gentleman say whether he travelled in a special car, or how was it that he paid such a large amount on this trip? He will find the item in the Auditor-General's Report, D-165.

Mr. DALY. I cannot say whether His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor travelled in a special car. All I can say is that the expense was incurred, and the vouchers have been sent into the Auditor-General, and the item is exactly as it appears in the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is perfectly disgraceful that this country should pay for the travelling expenses of Lieutenant-Governors. I would like to know why he has to travel. I can understand that a Premier might have to travel to Ottawa once or twice a year. But he is Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west, and he has his Council and his Premier there, and all he has to do is to carry on automatically as it were, the Government of the country under the direction and by the advice of his Council. These pleasure trips which he takes to Banff and to Winnipeg, and to Ottawa, paid for at the expense of the country, are unpardonable, and I do not think this House should sanction them. Suppose the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick wants to take a trip to Boston or to come up to Ottawa. He can travel if he likes, and if he gets leave of absence; but was it ever heard before that this Parliament was to pay his travelling expenses? I do not see on what principle we are to pay them. What business has he to bring him here? If he was required to come here on North-west business, and was summoned to Ottawa at the request of the Government, well,

Mr. DALY.

and good. But here he takes trips to Banff Springs, to Edmonton, and to Winnipeg. The Lieutenant-Governor's private secretary also travels, and we pay for him. He does not live where the Governor lives. He is a law student in Winnipeg, and this country has to pay him six or seven hundred dollars a year under the miserable subterfuge that he is private secretary to the Lieutenant-Governor, when it is well known that he is not. It is well known that he is a young man living in Winnipeg, learning his profession, and is now a practising barrister there, and yet he is receiving \$600 or \$700 a year nominally as the Lieutenant-Governor's secretary. So far as I have been able to understand the expenses connected with the Government House of the North-west, they are reprehensibly extravagant. There is no excuse for them whatever. We are laying down a principle here now which, of course, all subsequent Lieutenant-Governors will adopt. They will say: Why, the House of Commons has sanctioned the expense of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west in making these trips whenever he chooses to go, here and there, travelling about in style at great expense. The thing has been done before, and if Lieutenant-Governors of the North-west can do that the Lieutenant-Governors of all the provinces can do the same thing. I cannot see for the life of me why he should come here at all. I can understand that the Premier, or the chief official in that North-west government, may have to consult with the Government of the day, but what has the Lieutenant-Governor got to do with coming here? He has got to do just what he is advised to do, to stay at headquarters, as others have got to do. But when he goes away, taking pleasure trips, he ought to pay for them out of his own pocket. But this coming down to the Parliament of Canada and asking us to supplement the princely salary paid to him for his pleasure trips is unpardonable. In addition we have paid to the Government House an amount for furnishing it—and which will come up for discussion soon—that is enormous. I want to know why he should come here at all at the public expense, or why he should leave his headquarters at all. The thing is ridiculous.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Would the Minister of the Interior inform us of the name of the private secretary of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west?

Mr. DALY. I cannot recollect his Christian name, but he is a son of the Lieutenant-Governor. Royal is his name.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We are paying a sum to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories for his private secretary, and this young man, as I understand, is not employed as secretary at all. He is living in Winnipeg and studying law there. This is a worse case than we had from the Railway Department some years ago, when

it was shown that an officer of the department had a son attending a medical college at Toronto, while, at the same time, he was receiving \$600 per year from this country. In this case, we are paying a salary to the son of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, although that young man does not act as secretary, but is either studying or practising law in Winnipeg. I consider this is a fraud on the country, and I do not think Parliament should be called on to vote money for any such purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister give the House the contents of the communication sent to the Lieutenant-Governor asking him to come down, or the reasons why he was required to come here?

Mr. DALY. I cannot give the contents of the communication, but hon. gentlemen will remember there was an embroglio at that period in the history of the territories, and it apparently was necessary, or my predecessor thought so, that the Lieutenant-Governor should be invited to come here for the purpose of consulting with him respecting the condition of affairs. He was summoned, and came to Ottawa. I think it was really necessary that he should come here. The hon. member for Queen's considers it highly reprehensible that the Lieutenant-Governor should travel over the territories and not remain in Regina; but he apparently forgets that the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories does not occupy a position exactly similar to a Lieutenant-Governor of one of the older provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think he does.

Mr. DALY. I could not conceive of a Lieutenant-Governor wanting to leave Halifax and go to Boston. I would rather stay in Halifax for years than go to Boston, for the advantages of the former are entirely superior.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish the hon. gentleman would convert the Nova Scotians to that view.

Mr. DALY. We have been doing so. The Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories occupies a peculiar position, one entirely different from that occupied by any other Lieutenant-Governor. He is the executive officer representing the Dominion Government. He is responsible for the expenditure, and it is necessary that he should visit different portions in order to obtain information with respect to the proper conduct of affairs in the Territories. The people there do not possess responsible government in the full sense of the term, and it is necessary that the Lieutenant-Governor should be in touch with the people. I am not here for the purpose of excusing these visits made by him, because I consider they were performed in the best interest of the people of the country, and it is absolutely necessary, when we consider the fact that for many years

the population of the Territories was changing, and that emigrants from different portions of Europe are coming in, and they should look forward to a visit from the official representative, as is the Lieutenant-Governor of the Government of Canada. Mr. Dewdney, who preceded Mr. Royal, visited different portions of the country, and these visits to the different settlements were looked forward to by the settlers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object to the expenditure incurred by the Lieutenant-Governor when he visited Ottawa at the invitation of the Government. It is quite sufficient if he came here at the request of the Government, and I shall not cavil as to his expenditure. I, however, call attention to the fact that expenditures incurred under the old system of the Government under Mr. Dewdney are no longer desirable, and cannot be made now. The North-west has responsible government in all particulars. Nearly every freedom and responsibility enjoyed by the people of other provinces are now enjoyed by the Territories under the North-west Act. The Lieutenant-Governor's duties are defined, and are similar to those of the Lieutenant-Governors of the older provinces. He has a council and a chief officer—I do not know whether he is called a premier or not. We vote the money, and the Council of the North-west and the Government of the North-west are responsible for its expenditure, and not the Lieutenant-Governor. It is absurd to say that the Lieutenant-Governor can usurp special functions: the Premier is responsible for the expenditure, and the Lieutenant-Governor is not. It was all very well for Mr. Dewdney to travel up and down the territories, for he concentrated the power of the Government largely in himself. All that, however, has changed. We have the North-west Territories Act, which defines the rights of the Lieutenant-Governor, and he has no more right to travel through the country, in state, than has the Governor of Ontario and Nova Scotia. The item to which I object is that of \$1,500 for travelling expenses. I am discussing the principle that is established, for I feel that if Parliament passed this vote for Mr. Royal, a similar vote will have to be passed for all Lieutenant-Governors. I observe that he visited Banff, made two or three trips to Edmonton, one trip to Winnipeg, and came down to Ottawa. The Lieutenant-Governor should have made those trips at his own expense. I object to the principle involved in such payment as being a wrong and dangerous principle. I notice such expenses are increasing every year, and if they are passed by this House in silence, they will still further increase. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba does not travel through the country, and while the Lieutenant-Governors of some of the other provinces travel, they do not ask the Dominion Government to pay their expenses.

Mr. DALY. Will the hon. gentleman be satisfied if I inform him that the vote for travelling expenses for the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west is, in the main Estimates, only \$500.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is His Honour here now at the request of the Government?

Mr. DALY. He was here at the request of the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As the Minister has informed us that it is necessary for the Lieutenant-Governor to visit the different settlements, His Honour must have made many reports to the Government. Has the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west reported to the Government here?

Mr. DALY. I regret that my report has not yet been laid on the Table, but when it is presented hon. gentlemen will be satisfied that the Lieutenant-Governor does report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this \$1,500 is to pay for travelling expenses already incurred.

Mr. DALY. Already incurred, or will be incurred up to the end of the present fiscal year. There is no precedent in that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have taken a vote of \$500 in the main Estimates for travelling expenses, and you are now asking \$1,500, which amounts to \$2,000 a year for travelling. If hon. gentlemen are prepared to vote that in silence, I am not for one. I protest against the Lieutenant-Governor incurring travelling expenses and charging them to this Government. I know that the North-west Territories have a Council and that the money must be spent under advice of this Council. I am aware that the Lieutenant-Governor dismissed one Council and installed another, but he soon had to recall his old advisers. I think he must have misunderstood the principles of the power he exercises there, but I will not discuss that now. In my opinion, he holds no other position than that of a Lieutenant-Governor in a regularly constituted province, so far as his duties and responsibilities are concerned. He has a gentleman under whose advice he acts and under whose advice he must act, and he can only spend money under the advice of his Premier. He cannot spend one dollar of the money we vote here, without the advice of his Council. I will undertake to say, from the little experience I have had in this House, that if we vote the money now for these travelling expenses, we will establish a precedent that we will not get out of in a hurry.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman forgets, as I tried to explain, that the Lieutenant-Governor does not occupy the same position as the Lieutenant-Governor of any other province. Prior to the time when there was a dissolution of the House which the hon. gentleman refers to, the money voted by this

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Parliament was placed to the credit of the Lieutenant-Governor and Mr. Haultain, and payments were made by joint cheque of these two gentlemen. You will see, from this one fact, that he does not occupy the same position as another Lieutenant-Governor does. No other Lieutenant-Governor has the money voted by this Parliament, placed to his joint account with the leader of the Council. There is no responsible Government in the North-west Territories, the same as we have in the older provinces. The Lieutenant-Governor is a Federal officer and he is responsible to me, as Minister of the Interior. He is simply an officer of my Department, and every dollar that this Parliament votes, the Auditor-General requires him to be responsible to this Parliament for, and to sign these cheques and to provide the necessary vouchers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With all due respect, I do not think the hon. gentleman has described the position of the Lieutenant-Governor accurately with respect to his powers under the Act or with respect to the Council, whose advice he is bound to act on. The amended North-west Territories Act, which we passed in 1891, provides, amongst other things, that the Legislative Assembly shall have exclusive power to pass ordinances for:

The expenditure of Territorial funds, and such balances of any portions of any moneys appropriated by Parliament for the Territories as the Lieutenant-Governor is authorized to expend by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly or any committee thereof.

So that the money is voted by us and is spent by the authority of the Legislative Assembly. Under the advice of the Executive Council of that Assembly the Governor has to act, just as the Governors of the other provinces have to act on the advice of their Executive Council. It is perfectly true, as a matter of book-keeping, that this Parliament, which votes the money, and the Auditor-General, who looks after the expenditure, requires the certificate of the Lieutenant-Governor, in addition to the certificate of the local Auditor, that the money has been spent as it has been appropriated; but I will hazard this assertion, and I am sure the Minister of the Interior will agree with me, that the Lieutenant-Governor, as such, has no more power than I have to expend one dollar of the money which we vote. He has got to expend that money as it is voted by the Legislative Assembly, on the advice of the Legislative Assembly or a committee thereof. If he usurps or claims to exercise a power beyond that, he is acting in controvension of this statute. I enter my solemn protest against the Lieutenant-Governor of that territory seeking to expend moneys obtained from this Parliament, the expenditure of which is not authorized and not allowed to any other Lieutenant-Governor. The idea of his travelling around at the public expense and asking this Parliament to vote him money! Once

we establish the principle, we will have to go on year after year and carry it out. I submit that it is perfectly plain under the law, that the expenditure of every dollar of money that we vote can only be made when it is authorized and as and how it is authorized on the advice of the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories. He has no more right to spend this \$1,500 than any Lieutenant-Governor in any other province. I shall test the House at a future stage upon this, if the Minister persists in asking us to vote it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The view which the hon. gentleman takes of the Lieutenant-Governor's constitutional position is not quite correct, I think, as he will learn when I explain how the moneys are disposed of. The hon. gentleman is basing his view of the Lieutenant-Governor's powers on the powers of his Council and the wording of the statute. He will see that the provision in that statute does not extend to all the moneys which are voted by this Parliament to the North-west Territories; but only extends to such sums of money as Parliament places at the disposal of the North-west Assembly or a committee thereof. Practically, as describing the present state of affairs, the hon. gentleman is correct, because we are arranging to vote the money in such a way as to place it at the disposal of the North-west Assembly itself, so that the council shall be practically a responsible executive so far as that money is concerned; and for that reason, the Minister proposes to change the status of the Lieutenant-Governor as regards his travelling expenses and allowances and so forth. The point of difference between my hon. friend and myself as to the condition of things hitherto, arises from the way in which the money has been voted. The money has been placed at the disposal of the Governor-General of Canada in Council and not at the disposal of the North-west Assembly. When the Supply Act is passed, the practice has been for the money under each department to be placed at the disposal of that department, and neither the Lieutenant-Governor nor the North-west Assembly have had the disposition of the money so far, excepting perhaps, a small lump sum. But generally speaking, the money voted here was placed at the disposal of the Department of the Interior, and the Governor of the North-west Territories was simply authorized by the head of the Department of the Interior to expend it for this work or that work according to the appropriations. The North-west Assembly has at its disposal, and always has had, the territorial revenue, consisting chiefly of license fees, fees for permits, ferry fees, fines and forfeitures, and things of that kind, amounting not to very much, though latterly, I think to about \$30,000, in consequence of the license fees having been somewhat increased. These

funds are expended by him on the advice of his council; but his obligation to expend federal moneys on the advice of his council depends on the way in which the money is voted by this Parliament. Since the last Supply Act, it has been our object, as far as possible, to place the expenditure of the money at the disposal of the North-west Assembly, for two or three reasons. In the first place, it enlarges to some extent the powers and autonomy of the territorial government, making it more in the line of a responsible government, and in the second place, it relieves the Lieutenant-Governor of the duty of supervising these expenditures personally, as he has hitherto done under the instructions of the Minister of the Interior; and further than that, it has the advantage of making the expenditure more elastic for territorial purposes than if it had to be itemized for the information of this House before being voted. That has been the wish of the Assembly, and it seemed a very reasonable wish, and one that would simplify the expenditure of the money; and the position occupied by the Lieutenant-Governor down to a very recent period has been, and it is our policy that it will be, very much in that line.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Substantially what the hon. gentleman says is the same as I have attempted to state to the committee. I understand that by the statute we have relegated to the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories exclusive powers to make regulations for the expenditure, first, of the Territorial funds, and, secondly, of a portion of the moneys appropriated by Parliament for the Territories, and the Lieutenant-Governor is authorised to expend it by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly. We have heretofore indicated the purposes for which those funds should be expended, and within that indication the North-west Assembly provide for the expenditure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is, since last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I perfectly understand that, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is wise to give the North-west Assembly more power over the expenditure of money, this Parliament voting it in a lump sum instead of attempting to exercise functions which can be better exercised by the Assembly. There is no doubt that from year to year we shall have to give that Assembly larger powers. That is all right, but it does not touch the point we are discussing at all, namely, what right that Lieutenant-Governor has to incur large expenditures of the public money of Canada for travelling about the country.

Mr. FLINT. I was certainly under the impression, when the North-west Territories Bill was last before the House, that the responsibility of discussing these items would,

for the future disappear from this House. It was urged that it was very desirable that all matters of a local character should be attended to by the Local Assembly, though the funds were supplied from the treasury of the Dominion; and I was surprised to find that that idea had not yet been carried into effect, and that this committee has still the responsibility of deciding upon an enormous variety of local services as to which it is impossible we can inform ourselves and as to which we must take the statement of the Minister of the Interior that they are all correct. I gather from the observations of the Minister of Justice, however, that henceforward this responsibility will probably not rest upon this committee, and I am certain that it would be a great relief to those who are in the habit of taking part in these discussions, if that should be the case. I agree with the observations made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island in regard to the Governor of the North-west Territories making those extensive demands on the Dominion in the way of travelling expenses, and I join with him in a protest against them, in the hope that in the future they will not be taken as a precedent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the Minister at liberty to state what particular business the Governor was summoned down upon this time? It is the second time within the year.

Mr. DALY. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman's question just now, but I will do so on the main Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state to the committee what the balance of this vote is for? \$1,500 is appropriated to defray the Lieutenant-Governor's travelling expenses in addition to the normal vote of \$500 in the main Estimates.

Mr. DALY. I regret that I have not the explanation of the other items here. They should have accompanied the brief that I have, but they are not here. There will be an item similar to this for fuel and care-taking of Government House, in the main Estimates, and I will undertake to make the statement then. As I explained to the hon. gentleman before, last year was the first year the Lieutenant-Governor occupied Government House, and he could not really ascertain at that time what the cost of providing fuel for the establishment would be. Since then the actual expenditure has been made and the vouchers have been produced, and the \$700 for light and fuel was actually expended for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman will be in a position at the same time to make a statement with respect to the expenditure for furnishing Government House.

Mr. DALY. That is not in my department. The hon. gentleman has asked that of Mr. FLINT.

the Minister of Public Works, who promised to furnish it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Public Works is not in his place, and I will take the opportunity, when the Estimates come up, of asking for an explanation with regard to the total cost of the furniture for Government House in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman include in the \$196,000 the amount voted for the indemnity of members of the North-west Assembly?

Mr. DALY. That is included.

Mr. DEVLIN. How many sessions of that Legislature were held last year?

Mr. DALY. Two.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understand there were three.

Mr. DALY. I do not think the three would come within the twelve months.

Mr. DEVLIN. I was told that three were held, and that each session was very short and very little work was done. The members drew their \$500 for each session, which would make \$1,500 within the year.

Mr. DALY. They drew their indemnity. There is nothing in the Act against their drawing it. If my hon. friend were out on the western prairie, and he had the same ideas there that these gentlemen have of the freedom of the Legislature, the sessions might be longer.

Mr. DEVLIN. It would be well perhaps to remedy the Act so as to prevent the multiplication of sessions, otherwise these gentlemen might hold seven or eight in the year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The three sessions were for two years.

Mr. DALY. They have had an intimation to that effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not want to run the thing too fine; but if the statement of my hon. friend is correct, that there were three sessions held within twelve months, for which the members got \$500 each, I consider that rather steep, in view of the fact that we have sometimes to sit here six months, away from our homes, and only get \$1,000.

Mr. DALY. I do not think they were held with any idea of drawing the indemnity. There are very few of the members to whom the \$500 is so important a consideration. The hon. gentleman is conversant with what has been reported in the press, and he knows the peculiar circumstances under which these sessions were held. This matter of extra sessions was discussed, and they have had an intimation that it is not expected this will occur again.

Mr. DEVLIN. How much do they spend altogether?

Mr. DALY. I think their Estimates last year amounted to \$191,000.

Mr. DEVLIN. It takes them three sessions to decide how to spend that.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman has read the papers he will see that in having these extra sessions the members were not actuated by mercenary motives, and he is hardly fair in attributing such motives to them.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any one who has followed the proceedings up there cannot fail to be persuaded that Governor Royal is largely responsible for the extra sessions. He interfered considerably in the exercise of the duties of these representatives, and has been dancing down here to Ottawa and back in consequence of this continuous quarrel between them and him. He is possibly here now in connection with these difficulties. I do not wish to saddle the Minister of the Interior with the responsibility of his expenditure, but I believe we are establishing a precedent, if we pass this item, that will be made the basis of a continuance of this kind of thing. I have come to the conclusion, after being in this Chamber for eight or ten years, that Manitoba and the North-west Territories think the resources of this Dominion are inexhaustible, and that they ought to get all the money they can out of us, and I do not think we ought to encourage expenditure in this way, to meet the travelling expenses of the Lieutenant-Governor going up and down to Banff Springs and coming to Ottawa two or three times a year. If it is necessary that the Lieutenant-Governor should come here or go to Banff the money should be voted in the shape of an additional sum, given to the North-west Council, out of which they should pay the Lieutenant-Governor if they chose. We are placing the Lieutenant-Governor beyond the reach of the representatives of the North-west who are directly responsible to the people, and who ought to have the expenditure of the money in connection with the Governor's travelling expenses. This puts him in the position of being able to go up and down to Banff Springs and to come to Ottawa when he chooses, independent of his constitutional advisers.

Mr. LISTER. Does the \$191,000 cover the Governor's salary as well as all other expenses connected with the territorial Legislature?

Mr. DALY. No; that sum is voted in a lump. It is not itemized; but in the main Estimates the hon. gentleman will see how it is divided.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am a little anxious to know the cause of Governor Royal's business here at present.

Mr. FOSTER. You might address to him a personal inquiry.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; the Minister has told us that Governor Royal is responsi-

ble to him, and it must be something very important that brings him here, because I am persuaded that the head of the Interior Department is able to carry on an official correspondence with credit to himself, and I am also confident that any correspondence from Governor Royal would be no discredit to that gentleman. I therefore think that the business must be of a very delicate nature, when it could not be transacted through official correspondence. Are the subjects to be discussed so delicate that it would not do to put them on paper, which might be asked for and submitted to the House? I might say on behalf of Governor Royal that while exception may be taken to these trips, if the Government have requested him to come they must bear the onus.

Mr. DALY. Did the hon. gentleman understand me to say that he was summoned here?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. DALY. I did not intend to convey that meaning; but said I would give to the hon. gentleman, when the main Estimates came up, the reasons for the Governor's coming here. I do not know that there are any matters between me and him that could not be conducted by correspondence; but there are other reasons, no doubt, and I will be able to give a satisfactory explanation to the hon. gentleman when the item comes up on the main Estimates. I may say that Governor Royal was not summoned by me.

Mr. FLINT. I venture the suggestion that this House ought to have a formal statement of the character of the difficulties between the Lieutenant-Governor and his Council in the North-west Assembly, in order that the House may understand officially the nature of the duties and the manner in which it is proposed they should be settled. Either the Lieutenant-Governor is responsible to that Assembly or his advisers are responsible to the Assembly, or the responsibility rests here through the Minister of the Interior. I do not think this House ought to be obliged to rely upon information gathered from the press or from private sources as to these difficulties; but Parliament ought to be taken fully into the confidence of the Government so that we may legislate in connection with the North-west Territories, and in regard to any amendments that may hereafter be suggested to the North-west Territories constitution, with a full knowledge of the facts and the idea that the Minister of Justice and the Government have as to the best method of settling difficulties and preventing their recurrence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not aware of any difficulties between the Lieutenant-Governor and the committee. The committee, as I explained at the time the change of committee was made, is simply a committee of finance. They failed, I believe, to secure a majority of the Chamber, and

retired; and at a by-election which subsequently took place, they regained the majority and resumed office, and I am not aware at this moment any difficulties whatever between His Honour and the committee.

Mr. FLINT. Then I presume the responsibility of the committee was fully recognized, both by the Lieutenant-Governor and by this Government, in matters of finance?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In matters of finance—yes.

Mr. LISTER. There was a difficulty between the Governor and his Council, there can be no doubt of that, if we may put any trust in the public press of the country—an unseemly difficulty—one side claiming the right to expend public moneys without the consent of his Council, and even against their will, and the other side denying that authority. The whole system of the Government of the North-west appears to me to be not in accordance with our modern ideas of Government. It reminds one to a great extent of the old days of the family compact. The people, while they have a sort of representative government have not had conferred upon them the real powers of a body of that kind. I think the Government should recognize at once that the time has come when the North-west Territories should have confided to them the exclusive right of legislation locally the same as other provinces of the Dominion. If the population is not sufficient to justify the raising of sufficient revenue to govern the country under a Provincial Government a larger subsidy could be granted to the territories for some years. But it does seem to me to be a comedy, in a sense, to call that a Legislature, to call the responsible advisers of His Excellency a mere committee and to have the powers of government so divided between His Honour and the members of this committee. The system should be one thing or the other. It is a hermaphrodite institution as it is now. If the people of the North-west are sufficiently intelligent to entitle them to representative institutions, those institutions should be granted them at once. Let the territories govern themselves and the unseemly difficulties between the Governor and his Council and Legislature will disappear. Throwing upon them the responsibilities of the Government, the machine will work as smoothly as in any other province. Take all the North-west together, and there is a very considerable population, more, I venture to say, than Manitoba had when it was granted responsible government. I can see no reason why the territories of the North-west should be continued in the position in which they now are as to their legislative power. So far as Governor Royal is concerned, he has made many visits to the older provinces, and whether those were made at the request of the chief of the department over whom my hon. friend presides I am unable to say, but there is one thing certain,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

that these trips have been very expensive and numerous. I do not suppose that coming down to the city of Ottawa and going back to Regina is a very expensive trip, but we have here a very considerable amount granted to this gentleman for travelling expenses. It may be that this allowance is looked upon by him as we talk about the Governor-General's expenses here, as supplementing a salary which may not be sufficient for the position he occupies. I do not think Governor Royal has a right to come down at the expense of the Government unless his presence is required by the chief of the Department of the Interior. If my hon. friend can say that on every occasion when he has come down and his expenses have been charged to this country he has come at the request of the Government, then of course his expenses ought to be paid. But if he is summering it, making a trip down for the good of his health and the amount is charged to the country, then it is fair his charge should be criticised if not entirely rejected and he allowed to travel at his own expense. But the hon. gentleman has told us that he will give us full details, so I shall say nothing further at this time.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would ask the hon. Minister, when he is bringing down the details, to furnish us with a memorandum of the date of the opening and closing of each session of the Legislature.

Mr. LISTER. That question of the Legislature is a very important one. No doubt people up there are wealthy and the representatives do not meet to get the \$500 allowance. But possibly that may not be an absolutely accurate statement, still I do not think there is any necessity for the Legislature meeting three times in fifteen months, when in the provinces the Legislatures meet only once a year, while the opinion of many people is that once in two years would be sufficient for the requirements of the country.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec.
Grant to assist the following
overdrawn accounts under the
authority of an Order in
Council, dated September,
1892:—Indian Land Management
Fund; province of Quebec
Indian Fund; Indian
School Fund..... \$19,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do these come to be overdrawn?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does not the hon. gentleman think it is about time to go to bed?

Mr. FOSTER. Finish these Estimates. We can't get at them for another fortnight. Preferential trade will be on next week, and some of these services are starving.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman asked me for an explanation of that item of \$19,000. The hon. members from South Oxford and Queen's will recollect the discussion in the House last year in reference to the Land Management Fund. The matter was taken

up by the hon. member for Bothwell. This fund, together with the Quebec Fund and the Indian Poor Fund, it was alleged, had been expended for purposes other than were contemplated by the law, and the consequence was that large over drafts were made upon these funds, which amount to \$1,250,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you speaking now of the three funds, or of the Indian Fund ?

Mr. DALY. The three funds combined. It was alleged that they had been used for purposes other than those originally contemplated. The consequence was, that there was a deficit, and the attention of the Government was called to it about two years ago. The matter being of consequence, it was referred to a sub-committee of the Privy Council, and all the figures were gone into and investigated by the Deputy-Minister of Finance and the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs. A report was made by the sub-committee to Council, and the conclusion arrived at was, that there was a liability upon the part of the Government for this fund, that it would have to be repaired and that the best way out of the difficulty was to pay it by annual instalments, the first instalment being \$19,000 for the year 1892-93. The interest that the Government had been paying on this fund of \$1,250,000, was at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. It was recommended by the sub-committee that the rate of interest should be reduced to 3½ per cent; and, although we are voting this \$19,000 and it looks as if that was the amount we were contributing towards the reduction of that fund this year, the interest on the \$1,250,000, is deducted from this amount; that is, we will not be expending the whole \$19,000; we are expending that amount less the difference between 4 per cent on the \$1,250,000 and the 3½ per cent. Then, next year we will vote a smaller amount, and so on from year to year, until we repay back to this Land Management Fund, the Quebec Fund and the Indian Poor Fund all the moneys that have been used in times past for purposes other than those originally contemplated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the total amount of that ?

Mr. DALY. I would rather give you that on the main Estimates. It is the same item exactly.

Mr. LISTER. Was there any deficiency in the Ontario Indian Fund ?

Mr. DALY. No. The Land Management Fund had reference to Ontario, as well as to the other provinces. The sum of \$1,250,000 is made up of all the provinces.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that, but before the main Estimate comes before us, we ought to have the results of this investigation laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. The Order in Council takes it all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that on the Trust Fund of the Indians in the hands of the Government, the interest has been reduced from 4 per cent to 3½ per cent during the present year ?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When did it commence ?

Mr. DALY. That was a suggestion made by the sub-committee of the Privy Council. Without looking at the Order in Council, my recollection is that it commences on the 1st of July next.

To provide for the payment to Mr. W. A. Mott of the amount of his account for legal services in connection with prosecutions for sale of liquor to Indians, of Restigouche, Que., these Indians having no funds of their own... \$100

Mr. FAUVEL. Will the Minister kindly explain that item ?

Mr. DALY. The only explanation I can give the hon. gentleman is that given in the item itself. These Indians have no funds of their own.

Mr. FAUVEL. Could not the Government have recouped themselves for this expense from the parties who sold the liquor ?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. This appears to be a large sum for prosecution in connection with selling liquor. I cannot understand how this bill was adjusted. Was it a taxed account ? Who is this Mr. Mott ? Is he the law partner of the hon. member sitting with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. McAlister) ?

Mr. DALY. There was an appeal in this matter, and, of course, the costs amounted to considerably more than the ordinary prosecution. The explanation can be given by the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister).

Mr. McALISTER. As Mr. Mott is my partner, it may seem that I have some interest in that item. When I was up here in 1891, a year ago last summer, the Indian agent at New Richmond, Mr. Poirier, I think, entered an action against some parties in the town of Campbellton for selling liquor to Indians, and he employed Mr. Mott. A fine was imposed, and they appealed. On some technicality the fines were set aside, and consequently no money was collected from the parties fined. Mr. Mott went to Fredericton when the case was up on appeal and argued it. The Court of Appeal was divided, three to two, and the verdict was set aside; consequently, no fines were collected. But I have no interest in the matter, directly or indirectly. In fact, the first knowledge I had of it, was seeing this item in the Estimates.

Mr. DALY. I may say, in addition, that the amount was allowed and fixed by the Department of Justice, after Mr. Mott's bill was taxed.

To pay moiety of the cost of erecting a bridge over the Goulais River in the Batchewana district..... \$2,261 41

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a little information?

Mr. DALY. This bridge is in Algona, and the other half of the cost is to be paid by the Ontario Government. That is in accordance with an arrangement entered into with the Ontario Government as far back as 1878. The old bridge was rotten, and had to be repaired, and this arrangement was entered into by which the Dominion Government paid one-half the costs and the Ontario Government the other half.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the North American Canal Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Adams.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Judges of the Sessions of the Peace for the cities of Quebec and Montreal, in the province of Quebec.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

REPORT.

Report of the Secretary of State, for the year ending the 31st December, 1892.—(Mr. Costigan.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— REPLY TO ADDRESS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with thanks the Address you have loyally adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session, and I rely with confidence on

Mr. McALISTER.

the assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 3rd March, 1893.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WELDON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the "Daily Transcript," published in New Brunswick, John T. Hawke, being editor and proprietor, of Thursday, the 2nd of March, entitled, "How Dr. Weldon was elected." I would not have referred to this article, knowing the paper so well as I do, were it not that the "Ottawa Citizen," a most respectable paper, saw fit, this morning, to call attention thereto in its editorial columns. I desire to say that this article, which appears in the editorial columns of that paper, and the word "contributed" appears at the head of it, contains a series of statements of facts, and, I think, some innuendoes and suggestions, and I desire to say that if any statement therein, or any insinuation drawn from that article, or any innuendo contained in it, imputes to me that I knew or favoured or connived at bribery, before my election in 1887, during the same or after, or before my election in 1891, during the same or after, that such statement, such innuendoes, such suggestions, are absolutely false. It might be said by my friends here, why take up the time of the House to make this denial since, if that article is untrue and defamatory, you have your civil remedy? My answer to that proper question is that against this very paper, last year, which had made a false charge against me, I did bring an action, and had the case tried by a jury of seven, of whom five were Liberals, and got my verdict, but I have not yet got my money. I think, therefore, my civil remedy as against Mr. Hawke would be of very little service.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before you pass to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call attention to a matter of some importance, to which the attention of the leader of the Government was called in the early part of the session, and that is the appointment of the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. Attention was called to that matter at an early period of the session, and I do not think any definite answer was given by the Government as to whether the appointment was to be made at an early day from that time. I think it was generally conceded that it was impolitic that the 'status quo,' as it then existed, should be continued, and I would like to ask the Government whether any appointment has been made to that office or any appointment is to be made before the Premier leaves for England? If we

have not a satisfactory answer that it is to be made, I shall deem it my duty, owing to the gravity of the situation, in my opinion, to call the attention of the House to it in a more formal manner; and, in the meantime, I will ask the hon. gentleman whether the vacancy has been filled in a constitutional manner, or whether the present incumbent is to be allowed to continue in the office as he has been for some time past?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No appointment has been made, and I did not intend that it should be inferred from what I said, when the matter was mentioned in the House last, that we intended immediately to make the appointment. I am not able to say that the appointment will be made before I leave, if I should have to leave, because that must necessarily be within the next three days.

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a question of less moment, but of some importance also, the appointment of a returning officer for Vaudreuil.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would rather not answer that to-day if the hon. gentleman will consent.

Mr. LAURIER. Is this question of such moment that the Government cannot come to a decision early?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I will let the hon. gentleman know a little later in the week.

Mr. LAURIER. I would expect an answer to-morrow.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 41), to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Drummond County Railway Company.—(Mr. Cleveland.)

Bill (No. 77) further to amend the Act to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

DETECTIVE SKEFFINGTON.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. Have the Government received complaints as

to the conduct of Detective Skeffington, employed on the Intercolonial Railway, or otherwise? 2. Has his dismissal been asked by Mr. Stevenson, traffic manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, for cause; or by any other leading official of the said railway? 3. If so, what course do the Government intend to take in the matter?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say the Government have received no complaints as to the conduct of Detective Skeffington, either from Mr. Stevenson, traffic manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other leading official of that road.

I. C. R.—TENDERS FOR FENCING.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. What are the names of the persons who tendered for the construction of fencing on the Intercolonial, in 1893, between Campbellton and Levis? 2. What are the prices asked by the party or parties to whom the contracts were awarded, and what are the names of the said parties?

Mr. HAGGART. The following are the names of the persons who tendered for the construction of fencing on the Intercolonial Railway in 1893, between Campbellton and Levis:—J. Calhoun, Sumner & Co., Edward Crossman, H. Boulay, C. Armstrong, C. A. Blondeau. In reply to the second question, the names and figures are: Ed. Crossman, from Campbellton to Ste. Flavie, 46 cents per rod for 5-barb wire and woven wire; Sumner & Co., Rimouski to Rivière du Loup, 46 cents per rod, 5-barb wire and woven wire; Sumner & Co., Rivière du Loup to Levis, 46 cents per rod, 5-barb wire and woven wire.

W. A. SHEPARD.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Is Mr. W. A. Shepard in the employment of the Government as immigration agent, or otherwise? If so, since when, and at what salary?

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that Mr. W. A. Shepard is not in the employment of the Government, but was for some years paid the sum of \$200 per annum for distributing through his employment agencies in the United States immigration pamphlets published by the Government of Canada.

INSPECTION OF ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANIES.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to redeem the promise made in the early part of this session by the Controller of Inland Revenue, to introduce a Bill for the inspection of electric light companies, similar to that now in force regarding gas companies?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In answer to the hon. member, I beg to say that it is not the

intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the inspection of electric light companies, as was intimated, but not promised in some remarks made in the early part of the session.

NEWFOUNDLAND—LICENSE FEES.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Has the Government of Canada taken any action, by process of law, or otherwise, to obtain a refund of the license fee improperly exacted by the Government of Newfoundland from Canadian fishermen during the season of 1890 and 1891? If so, what has been the results?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government has instituted suits through the Department of Justice to recover the license fees exacted by the Government of Newfoundland on Canadian vessels during the season of 1890.

THE MODUS VIVENDI.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Is it the intention of the Government of Canada to extend the modus vivendi between Great Britain and the United States, as respects the granting of privileges to American fishermen to use our Canadian fisheries on the Atlantic coast? If so, for what period?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that under the provisions of the Statute 55-56 Vic., chap. 3, "An Act respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States," an Order in Council was passed 17th January, 1893, authorizing the issue of modus vivendi licenses during the season of 1893.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL—TOLLS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is it the intention of the Government to recoup the owners of Canadian shipping the amounts paid as tolls at the Sault Ste. Marie canal?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that that matter is under the consideration of the Government.

SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Who is the Deputy Supervisor of Cullers at Three Rivers? How many commissioned cullers are employed in connection with the office at Three Rivers? What is the salary of the Deputy Supervisor, and what were the total receipts and expenditure of that office during the past three years?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Deputy Supervisor of Cullers at Three Rivers is T. Malone, jr. He is also a commissioned culler. T. Malone, sr., was appointed a commissioned culler for Three Rivers last year. The receipts for 1889-90 were \$94.21; expenditure, \$871.25; for the year 1890-91, receipts none; expenditure, \$844.50; for the year 1891-92, receipts, \$122.32; expenditure, \$1,172.18.

Mr. Wood (Brockville).

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to the following evidence in the Report of the Civil Service Commission at page 484:—

4503. Taking the first permanent clerk in the secretary branch, are you aware that your predecessor reported the necessity of his appointment on account of the absence of a law clerk in the department?—I am not aware of it.

4504. What duties does he perform?—He does not do any work now.

4505. Does he get his pay?—Yes.

4506. At what time does he get down in the morning?—I think at 10 o'clock.

4507. Does he sign the attendance book?—No.

4508. Would you be surprised to hear that very often he does not get down till 11?—No.

4509. He came to you at \$1,800 a year?—Yes.

4510. When he left the other department he had only \$1,400?—Yes. I think the Order in Council said he was to be promoted to the maximum of the class on being exchanged.

4511. On account of the special qualifications he could bring to the department and the absence of a law clerk?—I do not know anything at all, except what I have heard confidentially as to his translation to the department. I was law clerk at the time.

4512. You were secretary at the time?—No, I was law clerk at the time, and I remained there. Mr. Baillaigé was so good to me that I remained there until I was appointed secretary, and when I was promoted I found another man to take my place, who is there now and does the work.

Who is the clerk referred to? Is he still in that department? Is he still out of work? Does he still draw his pay, and if so, how much per year?

Mr. OUIMET. In reply to the first question the answer is, yes. The name of the clerk referred to is J. P. Macpherson; he is still in the department. To the question: Is he still out of work? the answer is, no. His salary is \$1,800 a year, and he is drawing it.

MAIL CONTRACT, NEW RICHMOND AND GRAND CASCAPEDIA.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, What is the amount paid the contractor for carrying the mails between New Richmond and Grand Cascapedia post offices, in the county of Bonaventure? How many tenders were received by the Post Office Department for this service? Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that the amount paid for this service is \$80. This contract was a renewal of the previous one on the same terms and conditions, consequently the notices inviting tenders were withdrawn and the tenders not considered.

EXCISE DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, 1. What was the amount paid during the past fiscal year for the collection of excise duty on tobacco?

2. What was the amount paid during that year for the stamps required on tobacco ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). 1. The work of the excise staff being interchangeable as between the supervision of distilleries, breweries, malt houses, bonded factories and tobacco factories, it is quite impossible to determine the proportion chargeable against each class of duties specifically. The whole cost of excise work may be placed at say 4¼ to 5 per cent of the accruing revenue. 2. The cost of stamps used upon tobacco and cigars actually excised during the year can only be obtained by an examination of the monthly return of every manufacturer under license. An officer has been detailed to prepare a statement in this way, but the labour involved will require a delay of two

or three days in giving a definite reply. Meantime it may be stated that the amount actually expended upon stamps last year was as shown on page 47 of the annual report for 1891-92, \$37,067.61. This included an account of some \$17,000 for a large stock of stamps taken over from the British North America Bank Note Company at the expiration of their contract, as it was not known to whom the next contract would be awarded. The average cost of stamping tobaccos and cigars, may, however, be approximately ascertained by taking the aggregate expenditure for stamps during the preceding five years (excepting the \$17,000 above referred to) and the aggregate revenues from tobacco and cigars, excise and customs, and dividing one into the other. These figures give the following result:—

STATEMENT showing the amount of Revenue and Expenditure on account of Tobacco and Cigars for the last five years ended 30th June, 1892, and the percentage represented by the cost of Stamps for each year.

Year.	Excise revenue.		Customs revenue.		Total revenue.		Expenditure for stamps.	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1887-88	2,294,608	51	233,833	25	2,528,441	76	21,660	57
1888-89	2,403,693	57	282,686	90	2,686,380	47	25,053	15
1889-90	2,499,831	91	295,599	39	2,795,431	30	22,674	26
1890-91	2,542,166	97	326,735	65	2,868,902	62	25,895	87
1891-92	3,076,170	50	270,427	65	3,346,598	15	20,067	61
	12,817,471	46	1,409,282	84	14,225,754	30	115,351	46

By these figures it will be seen that the cost of stamps has averaged four-fifths of one per cent upon the revenue collected during that term.

QUEBEC JUDICIARY.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, 1. Have the Government appointed a judge of the Superior Court, at Montreal, to succeed Mr. Justice Wurtele? 2. If not, why have the Government not as yet made the said appointment; and is it their intention to do so at an early date? 3. Are the Government aware that the Provincial Legislature has just provided for the appointment of two circuit court judges at Montreal? 4. If so, is it the intention of the Government to make the said appointment this year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No judge has been appointed in succession to Mr. Justice Wurtele. The Government would prefer to have a conference with the Government at Quebec before making any further judicial appointments, as the judicial system is in course of revision in that province, and the Attorney-General at Quebec has indicated that he will take an early opportunity of seeing myself, or some other member of the Government, in connection with this matter. The

Government are not aware that the Provincial Legislature has just provided for the appointment of two circuit court judges.

FRENCH CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government have had cognizance of the numerous articles by Mr. L. Z. Joncas, M.P. for Gaspé, published by L'Événement, Quebec, in reference to the unequal distribution of patronage of all kinds, as between the English and French elements in this country? If so, is it their purpose to put an end to a state of things so unjust to the French element?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If any such inequality should at any time be found to exist in the service, the Government will remedy it.

COTTON AND OTHER INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. What was the capital invested in the cotton industries? (a) How much in land? (b) How much in buildings? (c) How much in machinery and tools? (d) How much in working capital? 2. The number of hands employed? 3. The amount of wages paid? 4. The same in regard to the wool cloth industries? 5. The same in regard to the foundries and

machine works? 6 The same in regard to the rolling mills; and also (a) The value of the raw material? (b) The value of the output?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. Capital invested in cotton industries, \$13,208,121; divided as follows:—(a) land, \$376,980; (b) buildings, \$2,884,348; (c) machinery, &c., \$6,468,719; (d) working capital, \$3,478,074; total, \$13,208,121. 2. Number of hands employed, 8,502. 3. Amount of wages paid, \$2,102,603. 4. Woollen returns by census (1891)—Capital invested in woollen industries, \$9,365,158, divided as follows:—(a) land, \$637,450; (b) buildings, \$1,532,077; (c) machinery, &c., \$3,088,683; (d) working capital, \$4,106,948; total, \$9,365,158—number of hands employed, 7,470; amount of wages paid, \$1,941,483. 5. Foundries and machine shops, returns by census (1891)—Capital invested, \$14,396,503; divided as follows:—(a) land, \$1,714,356; (b) buildings, \$2,427,735; (c) machinery \$2,613,432; (d) working capital, \$7,640,980; total, \$14,396,503—number of hands employed, 12,604; amount of wages paid, \$5,122,257. 6. Rolling mills, returns by census (1891)—Capital invested in woollen industries, \$9,365,158; (a) land, \$78,500; (b) buildings, \$78,000; (c) machinery and tools, \$265,000; (d) working capital, \$595,000; total, \$1,016,500—number of hands employed, 831; amount of wages paid, \$335,000; raw material used, \$575,000; value of output, \$1,750,000.

DEPUTY-MINISTER OF INTERIOR.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, Has the Government passed an Order in Council reinstating Mr. Burgess as Deputy-Minister of the Interior? If so, when was the Order passed?

Mr. DALY. No such Order has been passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 23) respecting Witnesses and Evidence.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SUPPLY—SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) The question I am about to consider is of such importance, I do not feel justified in trying immediately to convey my views in the English language, on account of my imperfect knowledge of that language. However, after making in the French language the observations I have to make, I will ask the House to allow me to say a few words in the English language. But before proceeding further, I beg leave to offer a personal explanation. I was not in my seat the other day when the Prime Minister called the attention of the House to the telegram published in a newspaper, in which

Mr. McCARTHY.

I was made to say I would take care that the First Minister did not skip to England before compelling him to express his views on the Manitoba school question before Parliament. We all know the hon. the First Minister is bound to go to Europe for the fulfilment of an important public mission, with respect to which we ought, all of us, to wish him a full measure of success. I certainly did not use such language. I merely said I would give him an opportunity, as it was my duty to do in the public interest, to explain his position before he would start for Europe. Mr. Speaker, the question I am now considering is of such consequence as to escape the notice of no one. I pray that in considering it, I may be able to rise head, shoulders and heart above all national and religious prejudices. We are all citizens of the same country. We are all British subjects; we have all the same title to the protection of the laws; we have all the same interest in the maintenance of the law and in a fair construction of our constitutional charter. Whether we are Catholics or Protestants, we are all equal before the law, and before the throne of our sovereign. These elementary truths and these elementary principles regarding the liberty of the subject do not seem to have been understood for a certain time, or at least if they had been understood, it appears as if they had not been applied with equal justice to all. One who was not conversant with our political history would not suspect that after numerous changes—which had not brought to us peace and harmony—in 1867 we had made a compact that was a compromise by which we thought we had settled all our religious and national dissensions. One would not have supposed either that as far back as 1863 the separate school question had been settled so far as the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were concerned, and that in 1867, this settlement which took place was not only confirmed, but extended to the other provinces where there were minorities to protect. It is interesting now to read anew the numerous promises made by the authors of the Federal compact and of which we had a right to expect the full realization. I might be allowed, in the first place, to refer to a man for whom I have had the greatest admiration, and who was for a long time the leader of the French Conservative party in the province of Quebec; I refer to Sir George Etienne Cartier. What did he say:

Now, when we were united together, if union were attained, we would form a political nationality with which neither national origin, nor the religion of any individual would interfere. It was lamented by some that we had had this diversity of races, and hopes were expressed that this distinctive feature would cease. The idea of unity of races was utopian—it was not possible. Distinction of this kind would always exist. Dissimilarity, in fact, appeared to be the order of the physical world and of the moral world, as well as in the political world, but with regard to the objections based on this fact, to the effect that a great nation could not be formed because Lower Canada

was in great part French and Catholic, and Upper Canada was British and Protestant, and the lower provinces were mixed, it was futile and worthless in the extreme. Look, for instance, at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it was by three great races. (Hear, hear.) Had the diversity of races impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England?

And further on :

In our own federation, we have Catholics and Protestants, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen ; and each of them, by his efforts and his successes, will add to the prosperity and glory of our new Confederation. We are of different races, not to fight each other, but in order to jointly work for our own well-being. We cannot cause by law the different races to disappear, but I am persuaded the Anglo-Canadians and the French-Canadians will realize their position with respect to one another. Placed alongside, like large families, their contact will cause a sound spirit of emulation. The diversity of races will contribute, believe me, to the common prosperity. The difficulty, it would be said, would be to deal fairly by the minority. In Upper Canada the Catholics would find themselves in a minority, in Lower Canada the Protestants would be in a minority, while the lower provinces were divided. Under such circumstances, would any one pretend that either local or general Governments would sanction any injustice? What would be the consequence, even supposing any such things were attempted by one of the local Governments? It would be censured everywhere. Whether it came from Upper Canada or from Lower Canada, any attempt to deprive the minority of their rights would be at once thwarted.

These words, which were then to be prophetic, are very important to read anew now, and I call to them the special attention of the French members of the Cabinet who represent us here presently. But there was another man who, at that time, held a very prominent position in the country, and represented the English minority in the province of Quebec, Sir A. T. Galt. What did he say himself :

Let us trust, that this machinery, however faulty it may be, will yet under Providence open up for this country a happy career ; while at the same time the House must not forget that it will for ever remove the great and crying evil and dissensions which have existed in Canada for the last ten years, and which threatened to plunge the country into the most disastrous and lamentable state of discord and confusion. Is not this last consideration sufficient by itself to induce the House to favour of the measure?

There was another man who held a special, but very powerful position at that time. I refer to Mr. George Brown, who has been, as we all know, a long and strenuous opponent of the separate school system. He had made a fight that holds a great place in the history of the country by his appeals to passions and prejudices. For a long time, the French and Catholic minority had to face his repeated attacks. What was Mr. Brown saying ?

But I am told that when acquiescing to this principle of putting local matters under the control of local Governments, an exception was made as regards common schools. Now, the section that gave rise to this complaint reads thus :

“ Education shall be left to the local Governments, excepting the rights and privileges which minorities, Catholic or Protestant, in both Canadas, shall enjoy

with respect to their separate schools, at the time of union.”

Notwithstanding these promises of harmony and peace, notwithstanding these solemn pledges we are again face to face with a crisis that might become as violent and dangerous as that of thirty years ago. Who is responsible for the deplorable state of affairs we now see ? Who is responsible for the present crisis ? To the eyes of one who inspires himself by what is written in a certain press which is presumed to represent the views of our English fellow-countrymen, to the eyes of those who only read these papers, the minority would be guilty of the crisis to which I refer. We, French-Canadians, we, Catholics of the Dominion, were represented by the Toronto “ Mail ” and the Winnipeg “ Tribune ” as preparing to invade Canada, no more nor less ; as determined to impose to the Protestants the clerical domination which, they say, exists in the province of Quebec : as preparing to impose to that gallant province of the west the Jesuitical system to which they say we are submitted in the province of Quebec. I am happy the electors of the county of L'Islet should have given me a mandate, so that I could come here and protest against the imputations to which my race is subjected. No, we are not a people subjected to any regime likely to make us unworthy of being free citizens, living under a free constitution. We are not the slaves of the clergy and we do not wish to impose to our English compatriots a regime which we would not bear ourselves at home. We love liberty as much as any other race. I would add that in the province of Quebec there is a strong push towards true liberty, stronger perhaps than in any other province of our country. Those who represent us as a set of men without will, as men without any other will than that of the priest, the beadle, or the bell-ringer of the parish, know nothing about us, that I can assert to you, Mr. Speaker. The newspapers, the names of which I have just mentioned, and some others, had recourse to these tactics in order to prejudice the public sentiment against us, against all that is French and Catholic, and when we reproach them with this deplorable course, they answer that it is in the writings of our press they find the vindication of their attacks. These writings which they oppose to us as the starting point of these unfair and slanderous attacks are from writers without any responsibility and mandate whatever, who never were entitled to voice public sentiment in our province. Those papers who are unfriendly to us published the most unlikely things on our account. And no one protested ; there was not a single English newspaper to be found that thought it its duty not only to defend us, but even to put before its public an expression of our views. I am willing to admit, Mr. Speaker, that there are in our province, as elsewhere, retrogressive elements. But I should like to know where is the province in the Dominion,

where is the country where there are no such elements? I should like also to know if we are the only people who had to contend occasionally against attempts at religious domination? I remember, when I was proceeding hand-in-hand with my hon. friends opposite, we had occasionally to oppose the interference of the Protestant clergy. In our province, there were members of the clergy who possibly went astray. Those of the members of our clergy who were in that case have ignored the spirit that now prevails in the church. I would ask to those who are not blinded by fanaticism whether it is not true that Catholics and Protestants alike are one in proclaiming that the head of the Catholic world presently is one of the most liberal-minded statesmen of the day? If, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are free English citizens, if we understand our institutions as I am happy to proclaim it here, I say you have no right to trample down a race that is well worth another. If we are so unjustly accused, some public men amongst us who hold a prominent position in the Government of the country are perhaps responsible for it. For instance, I read a speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in the county of Terrebonne. He spoke then—and I hope he will avail himself of this opportunity to disown this language—not as a man responsible to this Parliament, but as a man ready to throw away his responsibility and to follow preferably the direction of the bishops on this school question. Here is the language he used in this instance, according to a newspaper that is used to telling the truth, especially when reporting Ministers' speeches. I read in the "Minerve" of the 10th January, 1893:

With a Prime Minister like Sir John Thompson this question (referring to the school question) is in good hands. Sir John is known for his talents, for his spirit of fair-play, and his broad views, and he will do. I am sure, anything that is possible to give justice to every one, according to his right. Moreover, what is the use of such an agitation as the Liberals are trying to raise on this question? Have we not to guide us in this matter, in which religion is specially interested, our bishops, and the leaders of the church?

I contend that a Minister responsible to a parliament composed of free men, of Protestants and Catholics, has no right to use such a language. This language is well apt to stir up and accumulate against us the already too numerous prejudices we had to contend with. But after all, it may be that the hon. the Minister of Public Works was only having recourse to a political manoeuvre, for I know him well enough to be aware that in his inner soul, he is a liberal-minded man. However, the more the hon. gentleman thought what he said, the more guilty he was in saying it. I wish to protest, in the strongest possible terms, against the false imputations hurled against us. I wish also to protest against the part we are made to play; I wish to protest against the ideas

Mr. TARTE.

attributed to me particularly. I have read in the "Mail," for I am a constant reader of that paper, words to the following effect: Mr. Tarte, after getting assured of the support of the priests in the county of L'Islet, has taken the lead in the school question. The Winnipeg "Tribune" also stated:

There must be an equality of rights amongst all the members of the Confederation; and when the time of action comes on this question any attempt of encroachment will be met by a strong resistance from Parliament.

So far as I am personally concerned, I can inform you, Mr. Speaker, in all truth as well as in all justice for the members of the clergy of the county of L'Islet who voted against me, that during the last election, I tried to get their respect, but that I could not get their sympathies. All the priests who went to the polls to vote registered their votes against me. I think there were two or three who were not unfriendly to me; but, in compliance, as to that, to orders received from Rome and to orders received from their bishops, they abstained from voting. I am not, therefore, coming here to represent, with respect to that question, the wishes, less still the orders of the priests of the county of L'Islet, nor the orders of the bishops. I, here, as a political man, responsible to this House, assert the right of all races to the preservation of the constitutional charter; and I think I am voicing the feeling of right-thinking people, whatever their religious belief may be, when I state that in the present circumstances, we ought to be united in asserting these rights, once for all. I have stated, moreover, from the inception of this question in the political arena, that it was not a religious question, but that it was above all a constitutional question, a question of justice to the French element. I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the Dominion Parliament would do, should the Quebec Legislature, where the majority is Catholic, abolish one of these days the separate school system which it now enjoys? I ask for an answer from those who will address the House after me during this debate. But the answer is already at hand. Should ever the Quebec Legislature forget itself to the extent of suffering itself to be led to such a fault, Parliament would not hesitate for a single moment; it would not call on the Crown to interfere; it would invoke the constitutional charter; or rather, it would not be compelled to go that far; for if such a law was passed at Quebec it would immediately be vetoed. We are on the same footing as all the other races; but I regret to say so—and I state it openly—we are not treated like the other races. In fact, is there a clearer law than that of 1870 with respect to the French language in the first instance, and then with respect to the schools? Section 23rd of the Act of 1870, reads thus:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of the

Legislature and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process, in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under the British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the province. The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages.

And the Act concerning schools was just as clear. However, the Legislature of the province of Manitoba passed the laws of which we are complaining, and they were not vetoed. The Minister of Justice made a special report in reference to the law concerning the French language, in which he said: We will not disallow this law, but will leave it to those for whom it is a cause of complaint the task of carrying the case before the courts of justice. The hon. Minister, who is well informed in parliamentary law, could not find in the political history of the world such an instance, such a precedent. The Government are the guardians of the laws and they failed in their duty when not causing them to be respected. Unfortunately, their policy was modelled since on the one they adopted then. They began by failing in their duty, but the elections of 1891 were near at hand; they well knew they were not fairly treating the Catholic minority; they wished at the same time not to lose the important vote of the Catholics—we are nearly 2,000,000 of Catholics in this country. Without the Catholic vote, no Government could keep in power. On the other hand, the Government were anxious not to lose the Protestant vote. They had, therefore, recourse to the clever tactics of the to-morrows. Then began that series of negotiations without any precedent in our parliamentary history. The Hon. Mr. Chapleau, Secretary of State, was entrusted with the task of conferring with Archbishop Taché—then sick in the Grey Nuns' Hospital, at Montreal. With the authorization of the First Minister for the time being, he went and saw Archbishop Taché in Montreal and represented to him the difficulties of the political situation of the Ministry. Archbishop Taché said to him: But if we wait, if we yield, I will, perhaps, be again the victim of duperies like those of which I was already the victim in the past. I was told—I do not assert it positively, for the hon. Minister is in his seat and he will contradict me if I am not speaking the truth—I was told that the hon. Minister of Public Works also shared in these negotiations. At all events, they were conducted by the hon. Secretary of State at that time. Private and formal pledges were then given. But Archbishop Taché would not rely on these private engagements, formal as they were. He wanted the Government to pledge themselves as Government. It was represented to him that elections were at hand, and that he must know there was in the Conservative party an element hard to control and one which required to be kept fair with, more than they do now—I refer to the hon.

member for North Simcoe and those who follow him. There were still hopes that he would be brought back to the fold; and, as a matter of fact, the doors were twice opened to him. The Government, through those who conducted the negotiations, pledged themselves to make public formal promises that would solemnly confirm the private pledges then given.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) If the hon. member will allow me to interrupt him, I would ask him to kindly make clearer the language he used, by saying whether I was the party he wished to point out when he referred to the Minister of Public Works as having shared in the negotiations.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) When I referred to the Minister of Public Works, I intended to mention the hon. member, who was not a Minister at that time.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Well, then, I must tell him I had nothing whatever to do with the supposed negotiations which he says took place between Mr. Chapleau and Archbishop Taché; and I must add that the hon. member for L'Islet very likely speaks without any authorization whatever from Mr. Chapleau. If Mr. Chapleau negotiated, as he says, with His Grace Archbishop Taché, Mr. Chapleau being under oath bound to keep secrets what should have taken place in these negotiations, I do not think he reported to the member for L'Islet what happened between them.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I will have you observe, Mr. Speaker, I asserted nothing positively; I said I had been informed of what I have just stated. But I am ready to give credit to the hon. Minister for his denial. So far as Mr. Chapleau is concerned, I can assure you he did no piece of indiscretion with me. And in order to make the hon. Minister easy, I will state to him that I obtained my information from other sources.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In justice to Mr. Chapleau, the hon. member ought to state from what source he obtained these informations.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) These interruptions, Mr. Speaker, only result in throwing light on the discussion. I assert that the report dated 21st March, of the hon. Minister of Justice, which became the report of the Governor-General in Council, was the signal and confirmation of the private pledges then given and made public by this document. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has just mentioned the name of Mr. Chapleau. It is well not to forget that Mr. Chapleau was since made Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, and that when he renounced to public life as Minister he delivered a speech that contains important statements, amongst others those in connection with the question now brought up. In bidding adieu to the electors of Terrebonne, he made use

of a language that has a great import in this debate, language that he also made use of in Hochelaga, in the presence of the hon. Minister of Public Works, on the occasion of the putting in nomination of Mr. Lachapelle. Here are his words, which I quote from a report published in "La Presse":

I do not know, and I cannot tell you what the Government will do to settle this question, which is more annoying than difficult; but I can say that we are anxious to follow that fruitful and excellent policy of conciliation and good-will which has given to our country progress, success, tranquillity and order. If the Government does not meet in Parliament with that spirit of tolerance which the Church admits nowadays under every form, to which Christianity adapted it; if the old provinces who have organized Confederation refuse to draw their inspiration from the source which gave them their existence; if on behalf of "equal rights" equality and liberty of conscience are refused to those who claim it, it will then be just as well to call all things in question again and to begin anew the discussion of the terms of Union. We shall be unable to produce a great nation out of the heterogenous elements of our provinces, without guaranteeing to the minorities all their rights, privileges and immunities, without which these minorities would never have accepted the compact which constitutes the Confederation.

Here is the political will of one of the old members of the Government who made the promises I referred to, of the Government who are now backing down and who ought to consider as an honour to fulfil them to the letter. But, Mr. Speaker, Archbishop Taché hardly restrained himself about making his views known as to the pledges then given. He wrote in the papers. He sent important documents to the Governor-General in Council. Moreover, he must have addressed himself to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, to the representatives of the French element in the Cabinet, and I think I am not mistaken in stating he did so. Now, in his writings and in these documents, Archbishop Taché did not restrain himself in speaking out his mind. And what did he say in a letter I now hold in my hand? On the 20th August, 1892, he wrote, amongst other things, as follows:—

You ask me my views as to the remedy to be applied to our evils. I have none to suggest to you, for the very simple reason that I am under the painful conviction that my opinion will not weigh for much in the political balances in which our destiny is weighed. I can, nevertheless, tell you that I have heard of the idea of having an explanatory law which would establish, in a clear and positive manner, that the intention of the Legislature in passing the Manitoba Act, was to guarantee to us our separate schools. About that intention I have not the shadow of a doubt. It is for that reason that, even after the decision of the Privy Council, I say that the constitution is shamefully violated, and that if a remedy is not applied to the evil, the Federal power will have one more neglect, one more shame to its credit. The object was to give us a share of the lands set apart for the schools of Manitoba. The lands were to be administered by the Federal power, and when those lands were reserved for school purposes we had our separate schools; and evidently the intention of the Legislature could not have been to deprive the Catholics of their legitimate share in that public domain. If the two million

Mr. TARTE.

Catholics in Canada are of no account, well and good; but as we count for something, I suppose this idea of giving us the benefit of the lands administered at Ottawa, had entered the thought of some one. As to the instruction to be given to the newspapers, I would resume it in two words, energy and perseverance. This cannot mean disintegration of the Dominion, annexation to the United States, civil war or anything like that; it would mean, in my estimation, that we should take every constitutional means in our power to resist a tyranny which will go on increasing by success. Sir John Thompson has pledged himself officially and publically; others have done the same thing privately but solemnly. Let all do their duty. Let the press and the population sustain them. We will then be strong, but we shall become weak in the end if our newspapers cry out loudly, and if those cries, as has happened in other cases, end by a servile submission to the will of our adversaries.

I assert here that Mr. Chapleau is the man who, on behalf of the Administration of which he was a member, went and solemnly made these promises. I leave the last words I have read to the meditations of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière).

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman give the name of the party who received that letter from Archbishop Taché?

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I would not object to giving it privately to the hon. gentleman, but I would not like to put it before the House, for the letter was sent to a man who is not in active public life. I would not like to give the name without being authorized by him.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) And when the member for Provencher will have the name, will he be entitled to give it to those who will ask him for it?

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) In that case, it would be just as well to give it to the House; the moment it will be everybody's secret, it will be equally that of my hon. friend from Bellechase (Mr. Amyot). The hon. member for the city of Three Rivers held at that time a prominent position in the country. He was the official leader of the French race. In this momentous question his responsibility is great. I do not put him in the case with a desire to be disagreeable to him, surely not, but I mention his name, in order that if I was misled, if no promises were made, no understanding arrived at as to this school question, we might at least know it. The Archbishop of St. Boniface, who took the initiative in this important matter, asserts positively that promises were made. I am aware that the Hon. Mr. Chapleau went and conferred with him in Montreal. If all these circumstances have no meaning, upon what shall we rely? What is the meaning of the report made by the hon. the Minister of Justice and which is that of the Governor-General in Council? I contend the Government admitted fully and formally the right of the Catholic minority to remedial legislation should not the judicial proceedings then pending be decided according to the views of

the minority. I know they object to us, that the Privy Council decided the question and that there is no more recourse. The hon. the Minister of Justice is one of the best informed men of the country as to constitutional law; he is a superior man in point of constitutional matters. We have all admired and frequently cheered the eloquent speeches he has delivered in the past, the weighty opinions with which he endowed our legislation. In making this report with all the care he could bring to it, he intended saying something. The courts of the province of Manitoba had just decided that the Catholic minority was not affected by Mr. Greenway's legislation. I will observe that the French version of the report of the Minister of Justice states: "Appeal was 'confirmed' and the case is now pending before the 'Superior' Court." The true sentence should be: "Appeal was taken and the case is now pending before the Supreme Court of Canada." But let us see what is stated in the report of the hon. the Minister of Justice:

Proceedings in appeal were taken and the case is now pending before the Supreme Court of Canada where, in all likelihood, it will be heard in the course of next month. If the appeal should be successful, these Acts will be annulled by judicial decision, and the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba will receive protection and redress. The Acts purporting to be repealed will remain in operation, and those whose views have been represented by a majority in the Legislature cannot but recognize that the matter has been disposed of with due regard to the constitutional rights of the province. If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act" with relation to the other provinces. Those subsections contain in effect the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces, and are obviously those under which the Constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed, if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal powers should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority, against any Act or decision of the Legislature of the provincial or any provincial authority affecting "any right or privilege" of the said minority in connection with public education.

Respectfully submitted.

Nothing can be plainer than these words. The Government formally pledged themselves not to be bound by the judicial decisions that might be rendered. Their action merely consisted in saying to the Catholic minority: There are now legal proceedings pending; we call upon you, in the interest of peace and harmony, which we all of us ought to desire, we call upon you to wait till final decisions are rendered. If they should be against you, if the courts decide that under the law you cannot obtain redress, then the Governor in Council, the Queen, whose authorized representatives we are, will interfere. One must not mingle together, as they seem

to have done too long on the other side of the House, the judicial branch and the governmental branch. Courts of justice have duties to perform, and the Government have their own. They are the guardians of the rights of all, especially of the minorities. And, in this case, if the report of the Minister of Justice was not an immense fraud, if he did not intend to deliberately deceive—and I decline to believe that—there must be a sanction, and what is this sanction? This I would inquire from the hon. Minister of Justice: Does he believe that the Catholic minority would have accepted an arrangement under which the Government would have said: We pledge ourselves, and pledge yourselves, you Catholic minority, to abide by the decision of the courts? No, never. The Ministers must not forget that besides them there are some amongst us who know how things happened. The hon. the Minister of Justice knows that Archbishop Taché was told: If the courts should decide against you the Government will interfere. The decision of the Privy Council applied to a litigation in which we took no part. My Catholic colleagues of the province of Quebec and myself, who have an immense interest in this matter, took no part whatever in this Barrett suit. Our petitions were there, they were not taken into consideration. And why? Because, as usual, the Government was inspired by the desire to cause no commotion. We, therefore, had to wait. The courts of justice decided legal questions; and on what points? On a law passed by the Canadian Parliament, the Privy Council decided against us, and let it be said by the way, it looks as if the case had been very imperfectly argued. The Privy Council decided that the rights of the minority were not sufficiently determined in the constitutional law passed by the House of Commons of Canada. They stated these rights were not sufficiently clear for their Lordships to legally maintain them. Can it be true, Mr. Speaker, that because the Parliament of Canada were unable to find a correct term to define the rights of the minority, this minority would have to be crushed and trampled under foot? Can it be true that the Crown in Canada has gone that far, that it should avail itself of a clause improperly drawn up to disregard and overlook the rights of the minority? I do not believe it, I decline to believe it still. I have done, for the time being, Mr. Speaker, with the report of the hon. the Minister of Justice, to which he should stick. My testimony will perhaps not be worth much in his appreciation, but my friends who are around me are aware that if there is a man for whom more than another I have the greatest respect, he is that man. His great learning, his uprightness, his high character always were the object of my admiration. Well, it will be one of my disappointments, one of the deceptions of my political life, should I see him untrue to the promises on

which the Catholics had relied, on which the representatives of the minority had equally relied. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to recall in as few words as possible the causes that led to the legislation of 1870, so far as Manitoba is concerned. The Hudson Bay Company, the House will remember, had sold without consulting the people their rights to the territory that now forms that province, to the Imperial Government, who subsequently transferred them to the Dominion Government for £300,000 sterling. It is important to state here that at that time the majority in the territories of Manitoba was composed of Catholics. The census taken in 1871 gave 6,247 Catholics against 5,716 Protestants. The people, so to say, irrespective of their origin or religious belief, stated they were dissatisfied with the negotiations that had been conducted, and the French population, who had very special interests to safeguard, united to resist, even by force, to the coming in of Lieutenant-Governor McDougall. Archbishop Taché, of St. Boniface, was away in mission to Rome attending the ecumenical council which was then being held. The Canadian authorities, very uneasy about the turn things were taking, entered in communication with Archbishop Taché and induced him to come immediately and give his assistance, so desirable and so much desired by every one. Sir John A. Macdonald, as soon as Archbishop Taché arrived, sent him a letter of which I make the following quotation. This letter was published in the official documents; it is under date 16th January, 1870 :

In case a delegation is appointed to proceed to Ottawa, you can assure them they will be kindly received and their suggestions fully considered; their expenses coming here and returning and while staying in Ottawa will be defrayed by us.

When at Red River, Archbishop Taché had much difficulty in persuading the people and the Provincial Government, who had assumed power during his absence of the good faith of the Canadian authorities. They complained they had been often deceived by the Dominion Government—and, history in hand, we might say they were right in showing distrust as they did. Finally, an understanding was arrived at, and those delegates were appointed to settle the difficulty that had arisen. Messrs. Black, Scott and Ritchot came to Ottawa, and after lengthy negotiations they came to an understanding. A bill or list of rights prepared by the delegates was submitted by them to the Government, who accepted it. Of this bill of rights, I will read section 7, which is as follows :—

That the schools be separate, and public moneys for schools be distributed among the different denominations, in proportion to their respective population, according to the system of the province of Quebec.

As I stated, the majority was then composed of Catholics and it is therefore for the protection of the Protestant minority that these reasons were taken. With these facts in

Mr. TARTE.

view, with the laws in view that were passed by the Manitoba Legislature, under which a separate school system was established, a system that lasted 20 years, I should ask how it is that public men should put in doubt the existence of the rights of the minority? It is to my mind a real mystery to see that with such plain facts in view, they should think of applying to the courts, to ascertain what? To ascertain that of which we were the witnesses during 20 years. If the school legislation of 1871 in the province of Manitoba was not consistent with the letter and spirit of the constitution of that province, it ought to have been disallowed by the Federal authorities, and, however, they did nothing of the kind. If this little province of Manitoba, which we created financially and otherwise, is to prevail over the Parliament of Canada, if it can pass unjust laws which this Parliament has no power to remedy, how is it that the legislation of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario should be subject to the Federal disallowance, as are the other provinces? Should that be the case, Manitoba would be the only province that should prevail over the Canadian Parliament and as to which we could exercise no control here. I regret to state that the Ministers are responsible for what is now going on. Had they taken a stand worthy of true statesmen, had they said, constitution in hand: Here is a province that wants to prevail over the Parliament of Canada: we will see to it, as it is our duty to do it, by the exercise of the authority with which we are invested by the law: should the Government have taken that position, the excitement would immediately have died out. Unfortunately, they did nothing of the kind. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because the minority was not the only one that applied to the Ministers. A certain element was causing threats to be heard. They thought they could quiet the Catholic and French minority by a policy of procrastination. They thought the French-Canadians would keep silent and that with governmental patronage they could easily bring them into line again. They thought the French-Canadians would bow down and would allow their rights to be violated without raising their voice, that they would give in *cunctis* more and always. They thought the French-Canadians would not apply to Parliament in order to attain redress for their grievances and the justice to which they have a right. They thought they would not dare to make a long fight. As to that, I am sure, they were mistaken. I am somewhat aware of the feeling in the province of Quebec, and when I refer to the province of Quebec, I not only refer to the French province of Quebec. We will make an appeal, not only to the French-Canadians, but also to the liberal-minded men of the other provinces. We will ask them whether, because we are the minority, we have not rights equal to theirs? One would think that this school question never was settled anywhere. Why! it was

settled thirty years ago. It was one of the bases of the Federal compact. Am I to be told that if it had not been formally settled, the Federal compact would have taken place? Where is the public man who would dare to say that if the separate school system had not been settled, the union would have been completed? But they always oppose us, the judgment of the Privy Council. I am quite willing to bow to the legal knowledge of their Lordships of the Privy Council; but the province of Manitoba was not willing, for its part, to bow so low. For, prior to the judgment of the Privy Council being rendered, the House will remember that the newspapers of that province, that the Ministers of that province openly stated they would take it into account if it should be against them. That is of recent history. We will certainly not show ourselves bad citizens, as a number of them were determined to do. We wish to respect, to the fullest extent possible, that learned decision; but we say it does not apply to the case. We state, however, that the Government had pledged themselves if this decision should be against us, to interfere governmentally, so to speak. But, however, the judgment of the Privy Council does not apply to subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act. I had hoped, until lately, that the Minister of Justice would hasten to do justice—I will not say he had not the courage—but he had not the political authority to do it. This subsection reads thus:

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant and Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The Government determined to do something. After pledging themselves to interfere governmentally, they decided to constitute themselves a court of justice. I leave it to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) whose writings in the "Canadian Magazine" we have all read with interest—to settle his judicial accounts with his faithful and loyal friend the Minister of Justice. But we, who are not clever men in the construction of the judicial decisions of their English Lordships, we think we somewhat know at least what our rights are under the constitutional charter of the country. I say, therefore, that even were the judgment of the Privy Council right in law—and we might for a moment take it as such—the governmental interference would remain under the subsection I have just quoted. It is useless to further press the question of law. But I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what is the actual meaning of the persistency with which they decline to interfere. What is the true situation? We are a French minority, who en-

deavoured to remain loyal to the British institutions and who defended them, when necessary, with as much energy and courage than any other race. However, we feel indeed—and I voice the feelings of my colleagues by openly stating it here—we feel indeed that, without having deserved it, we are led to destruction. The French language was abolished in a province we had opened to civilization. What wrong were we doing with that French language, which, in spite of all, I believe to be the finest in the world? What wrong were we doing, unless it should be perhaps an expenditure of some few thousand dollars for the distribution of the official literature to the French inhabitants of the province and for allowing them to plead before the courts of justice in their native language? They could address the legislature in the language that was familiar to them, and they abolished it. The Parliament of Canada was not moved by that gross encroachment. Where is the political man who will contend that the Manitoba Legislature had a right to abolish the French language? The Manitoba Legislature, to use a word uttered by Mr. Gladstone in relation to Home Rule, had been incapacitated. Nevertheless, the Government did not interfere, and after the abolition of the language, during the same session, the abolition of the schools. They prevent us from speaking the French language in the Legislature and they do not want it to be taught in the schools. In a word they say to us: We are two against one; we abolish your language, not because you have no rights, but because we are stronger than you. After Manitoba came the Territories. I will be told that the French population there are not numerous. It is true, Mr. Speaker, but the less numerous a population, the more sacred ought to be their rights. And I say to the Government of the province of Manitoba, as I say to the Government whose members I see at this moment before me: You are not acting as British statesmen; you are breaking traditions that ought to be dear to you above all things. Mr. Speaker, while I pity in their failings the statesmen of my country, I owe it to my duty to mention to them an example, which, I hope, will cause them to cogitate and will give them the courage of which, so far, they seem to have been wanting. In 1890, there was a talk about depriving part of the population of the Island of Malta of the right they had to speak their own language, the Italian language. And what took place in that case? Mr. Gladstone, leader of the Opposition in England, in an address before the Liberal Club, of London, used the following language:—

But, in the meantime, there has been raised a most curious group of questions in connection with Malta. And do not let us suppose that because Malta is a small country the questions arising there are on that account unimportant. I am not speaking of political or military dangers in regard to the British possession of

Malta, which danger I do not believe, but I am speaking, gentlemen, of my desire—and I am certain that it is a desire that all share—that where, through the course of circumstances, we are led to an occupation of an island, the natives of which are not precisely united with ourselves in uniformity of religion or in the bonds of races, if we are to hold that island by the power of England, we are under an obligation that it shall be held with every consideration for the wants and the wishes of the inhabitants, and with the most earnest desire to win and to retain their affection. I am sorry to say that from the very limited information given us in the shape of a little parliamentary paper giving us an account of a certain embassy of Sir Lintorn Simmons to Rome—a very great novelty in British history—there are a number of questions raised on which I cannot pretend—I have not proper information—to lay before you definite conclusions, or to supply you with complete information; but I would point out to you that those are topics of the utmost importance, and which will demand a vigilant observation and watchfulness in the future; and though the year is probably too far gone for very effective discussion of these Maltese questions at the present moment, yet, in the coming session, in all likelihood, they will call for a good deal of attention, and may give rise to free utterances or important judgments in the House of Commons. Now, one of the points is this: There appears to be a purpose promoted by British authority in Malta for something like the disestablishment of the Italian language. There appears to be a desire—I will not say the evidence is demonstrative, but still in the manner in which the question is brought forward, there seems to be a desire to a great extent to substitute the British for the Italian language in Malta. Well, I am opposed to any such substitution. I think—and my mind goes back to the case of Wales—that there is nothing in the world that the Welsh would so vividly resent as any officious attempt to change the language of their country, and, gentlemen, they are perfectly right. The union between a nation and its language, the union between a small people like Wales and its language, is a due, and affectionate union; it is bound up with all its traditions; and when we went into Malta we engaged to respect their traditions, and attempt no policy, I do not care where it began. I believe it began in some former time, but we have evidence before us now, which induces me to say that in my opinion the Maltese have been sacredly promised the preservation of their language and institutions, and are entitled to claim, amongst the very first elements of that promise, that we shall pay due respects to the customs established among them and inherited from their forefathers, which are bound up with all their ideas, and which, above all, they wish to retain.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if our political men had the respect for vested rights which Mr. Gladstone urges them to have by these words, we would not be exposed to be deprived of the rights that were solemnly guaranteed to us. The speech of Mr. Gladstone which I have just quoted was delivered on the 20th July, 1890. A few days afterwards, on the 16th August, Mr. Balfour, speaking in the House of Commons and replying very specially to the words I have just quoted, repelled with some passion, so to say, the imputation hurled at the British Administration, that of wanting to commit an injustice prejudicial to a weak minority. This language, which I quote below, I offer it to the cogitations of those who make such false charges against us:

I have to tell you on my part that whether the accusation be made by way of categorical charge or
Mr. TARTE.

whether it be made by way of obscure insinuation, it is absolutely and totally without foundation. (Cheers.) The idea that this Government or any Government should sacrifice the rights of any minority in any part of Her Majesty's Dominions, and above all should sacrifice the rights of a Protestant majority (cheers), is surely so utterly absurd, so contradictory, so alien to what is known of the character of every one of Her Majesty's present advisers, that it is not necessary for me now, to traverse the accusation of which it is hard to say, whether is more monstrous or more ridiculous.

But, Mr. Speaker, are we committing ourselves to such injustice in that province of Quebec which is so much slandered; in that province given to the command of the clergy; in that province so much imbued with religious bigotry, are we acting as the majority of the province of Manitoba are acting towards the Catholic minority? Mr. Speaker, the population of the province of Quebec numbers now 1,488,535 inhabitants; of this number there are 1,291,709 Catholics and 196,826 Protestants. The Protestant population, therefore, represent only thirteen and $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, while the Catholic population form eighty-six and $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the whole population; that is to say, the same proportion in which both elements stand in the province of Manitoba. Well, of the grants for educational purposes, the Protestant minority now receive nearly thirty per cent, while they are only entitled to thirteen and a-half per cent. And we have not, so far, protested. We persevere without the least hesitation in this liberal policy towards the Protestant minority while our coreligionists are ill-treated in Manitoba. The grants made to High Schools (Catholic and Protestant), including what Normal Schools receive, amount to \$123,344. Of this the Catholics are given \$89,433 and the Protestants \$33,911; that is to say, the Catholics who are entitled to 86 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or to over $\frac{3}{4}$ of the total grant, only receive 72 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or less than $\frac{3}{4}$; while the Protestants who in reality are only entitled to less than a seventh, receive 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or more than a fourth. In proportion to the population, the Catholics ought to receive \$106,253 and the Protestants \$17,091, a difference of \$16,820 in favour of the Protestants. As regards "common schools" the apportionment of the grant by the Department of Public Instruction is made in proportion to the population, and the commissioners or trustees in each municipality distribute the amounts they receive in proportion to the number of children from seven to fourteen years old there are in each district. 255,627 pupils follow the schools of the province of Quebec; it is 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the whole population. There are 5,291 schools of all kinds, which is a school for each 256 inhabitants, and in the province of Ontario, where the population numbers 1,923,228 inhabitants, there are in all 5,316 schools, that is to say, a school for each 361 inhabitants. Mr. Speaker, we hear the political men say, and we read in the newspapers which are the principal mouth-pieces of the English population, that we wish to build up here a great

people. The history of the world in hand, I would like to be shown a single nationality that ever rose to any extent of power and prosperity by inspiring itself with a spirit of hatred and discord. We are now discussing one of the most momentous questions public men in our country had ever to discuss for the last forty years. After a solemn compact, after arrangements were accepted by the majority guaranteeing the rights of the minority, without any notice being given, without any regard for the negotiations which took place, these guarantees are thrown aside which protected the rights of the minority. And they would have us believe that Parliament is powerless to do justice to those who suffer! If the British Crown in Canada should wish to perpetuate its domination by crushing down a minority,—and I am happy to still believe that that is not the case—I hope, and expect that the disinterested public men, foreign to the passions of the moment, to the narrow dissensions, will know how to do their duty. We might say to those who intend to tyrannize over the minority, that our people are behind us, as you might have yours behind you to support you. The day when the rights of the minority will be no more guaranteed by the laws, the day when public sentiment will be no more in favour of the preservation of these guarantees, will be an ill-fated day for Canada, it will be a day of immense disappointment to those who believe we can build up a great empire on this land of America. The bishops are made parties in this discussion and some people hide themselves behind them and take shelter under their authority. I am one of those who believe, Mr. Speaker, that the least the names of the bishops will be mixed with politics, the better it will be.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Archbishop Taché amongst others.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Archbishop Taché took the initiative with respect to this school question and the direction he gave to it is not, it must be admitted, the best thing he did for his fame. I am not used to flattering, but, on the contrary, I am used to speaking out my whole mind. He interposed, not as bishop, but as a simple citizen, at least I hope so; for, as bishop, were his episcopal prestige to bear the responsibility of the deceptions we have experienced, he would much suffer by it in the eyes of history. Archbishop Taché, like the other bishops to-day, are not sufficiently equipped—I regret to say so—are not politically equipped to a sufficient extent, to negotiate with the men now in power. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) interrupted me; I am going to recall to his mind an incident he knows as well as I do. At the time of the investigation, in connection with the amnesty, in 1874, Archbishop Taché came and swore before a committee of this House that Sir John A. Macdonald and the hon. Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works, had made formal promises to him. Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hec-

tor Langevin went before the same committee and swore they had never made any promises. Archbishop Taché, I state it again, should not have allowed himself to be caught by the fallacious promises made to him. But we are told: "You should not speak of Archbishop Taché." Archbishop Taché wrote letters, he wrote pamphlets on the situation. And the hon. member for Provencher will especially remember one of those letters in which he was told that, on this very question, he was wanting in the duties he had to perform.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) I challenge the hon. member to prove that I ever received such a letter from Archbishop Taché.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I refer to a letter published in his own paper. Does the hon. member deny the authenticity of the hon. member deny the authenticity of the

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) No; I am not denying the authenticity of the letter published in the newspaper "Le Manitoba" in relation to local affairs, but I say it has no reference whatever to what is going on here.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I cannot read this letter which the Archbishop wrote, because I have not got it here; but I pledge myself to have it read before this House before this discussion is over. In that letter, Archbishop Taché charges him, no more nor less, with having deserted the cause of the Catholics. Since you are using this bishop as a bulwark, let us settle accounts. I say the Government deceived Archbishop Taché. I say the hon. member for Provencher never complied, I do not say with the orders, but with the wishes of Archbishop Taché. I have here dreadful letters against him.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Read, read!

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Let the hon. member for Bellechasse allow me to say what I have to say; he should not play beforehand the part of the devil's slave. This incident settled, I come back to the responsibility they wish the bishops to bear. The Government had solemnly pledged themselves to protect the French and Catholic minority. The French members of the Cabinet, especially, brought to bear upon the bishops the influence of their exalted position, so as to bring them to consent to delays. The courts decided against this minority, whose natural protectors they are, but whose interests they neglect. And they now say: But it is the bishops who are responsible; we follow the advice of the bishops. Mr. Speaker, this is not the truth. The Ministry have no right to use the language used by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. How could the bishops approve of the attitude of the present Government when it implies a perfect renunciation of our rights, when it is an attitude of deceit and dupery, and after the strong language often used by Archbishop Taché, and which he caused his colleagues to use? On page 2 of the official documents is a

petition signed by all the bishops, except Bishop Cleary, who, it appears, declined to sign it. He seems to have said: If I should sign I would go to the end: if I should sign it means that we would have to throw the Government down, should they not comply with our demand. I do not give this information positively. I give it for what it is worth.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) There is a fact I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman. I understood that Bishop Cleary declined to sign the document because the question of the French language was part of it, and he did not like to favour the thing.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) So Bishop Cleary would not sign the petition of his colleagues because he was adverse to the French language?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) It is the information I have. You give your information for what it is worth: I give mine likewise.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Well, if that is the case, I regret that Bishop Cleary, who is an educated man, should not know the language of Bossuet, who, as bishop, was surely his equal. In this petition, signed by the bishops, under the significant date of the 16th March, 1891, I read the following:

That these laws are contrary to the assurances given, on behalf of Her Majesty, to the population of Manitoba, at the time of the negotiations which led to that province entering into the Dominion.

I would ask whether it is possible that bishops taking such an attitude, and using such strong language could now approve of the course of the Government which is but giving the lie to the assurances given to the population of Manitoba? But here is another language used by Archbishop Taché, and on this occasion I see that he received the powerful support of the hon. Senator Girard, and of my hon. friend the member for Provencher. In his letter sent to the Governor-General in Council, under date of 7th April, 1890, he said, *inter alia*:

Previous to and at the time of the Union there existed by practice, in the territory that now forms the province of Manitoba, a system of denominational schools. The preservation of this system was made part of the conditions of the Union through clause 7 of the bill of rights, upon which was based the negotiation of the said Union.

And at page 70 of the official documents, we further find the following. Archbishop Taché, writing to the Governor-General in Council, on the 12th April, 1890, states:

I started after receiving these instructions, and I arrived at St. Boniface on the 7th March, 1870. I communicated to the dissatisfied people the assurances I had received, and I showed them the documents above quoted. That had much to do in dispelling apprehensions and restoring confidence. The deputation, which had been delayed, was finally decided upon, and the delegates appointed several weeks pre-

Mr. TARTE.

viously received again their commission. They went to Ottawa, opened negotiations with the Federal authorities, and these negotiations had such a result that, on the 3rd May, 1870, Sir John Young cabled to Lord Granville: "Negotiations with delegates satisfactorily closed." The negotiations provided that religious or separate schools would be guaranteed to the minority of the new province of Manitoba, and the French language was so formally acknowledged that it was decided it would be officially used both in the Parliament and in the courts of Manitoba.

He concluded his letter with these words:

I consider the laws just passed by the Manitoba Legislature for the purpose of abolishing the Catholic schools and the official use of the French language as an unwarranted violation of the promises made previous to and in order to obtain the coming of the province into the Dominion.

Archbishop Taché then expected that the Federal Government would not allow these laws to be put in force, for he added:

I consider that these laws deal a fatal blow to the very constitution of the province. They are prejudicial to some of the interests that are most dear to a portion of the loyal subjects of Her Majesty. If they are allowed to be put in force, they will be a cause of irritation, they will destroy the harmony that now exists in the country and leave the population under the painful and dangerous impression that they were cruelly deceived, and that, because they are a minority, they are left without protection, and that in spite of the promises made twenty years ago by the immediate representative of Her Majesty: "Justice will be done at all events."

Archbishop Taché again signed, another time, a document sent to the Governor-General in Council. This document was signed by himself and by Messrs. Jos. Messier, of St. Boniface; F. A. Bernier, now senator; Mr. Girard, at that time senator; Mr. A. A. LaRivière, M.P.; M. L. A. Prudhomme, James A. Prendergast, Roger Marion and 4257 other persons. In this document, these gentlemen, some of whom appear now to be satisfied, the member for Provencher amongst others, stated:

Never, since that legislation until the last session of the Legislative Assembly, was any attempt made to encroach upon the rights of the Roman Catholics confirmed as above mentioned; but, during this last session, statutes were passed (33 Vic., chap. 37 and 38) which resulted in utterly depriving the Roman Catholics of their separation in point of education; in blending their schools with those of the Protestant denominations; and in compelling all the members of the community, whether Roman Catholics or Protestants, to share by means of taxes in the maintaining of so-called public schools, which in reality are but the continuation of Protestant schools.

In the face of all these past protestations, I ask how the bishops could now declare themselves satisfied? They are slandered, I fear. What is the policy of the administration? We were told the Ministers would sit as a judicial committee. After this deliberation, what result have they come to? Did they act? Now, they thus sat to ascertain that they could not act as a judicial committee, but that it was necessary to refer the matter for judgment to the courts.

The Government, who sat as a judicial committee and must have profusely examined the question, ought now to be ready to make an honest and clear statement. Now, I ask them through the hon. the Minister of Justice, who will address the House following when the Supreme Court will have after me, to state the course they intend fol- rendered judgment. Are the Government ready to act should the courts give them the right to interfere? That is what we wish to know: that is what we must know. But, Mr. Speaker, they will not make such a state- ment. The Government have but one policy, that of putting off till next day, of resorting to delays, of seeking to escape the ministerial responsibility. It is a censurable and criminal manoeuvre not only from the point of view of the minority who are now suffering, but also from the point of view of the general interests and the most dear to the country. In another occasion the Government allowed public sentiment to go a dangerous way, they did not give the direction they should have given to that sentiment, and the Ministers perceived too late they had increased the mischief by not taking a well defined and firm position.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) The Riel affair that was.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I protest against the idea of making the bishops res- ponsible for the failings of the men in power. Through their want of political experience, they are not in a position to negotiate on a par with the Ministers. We have come to this pass, Mr. Speaker, that we are asking our- selves what they intend to do with us. In all the mouth-pieces of the English public senti- ment we are denounced as dangerous men, as a servile set enslaved to the clergy, and, I regret to say it, there is not to be found in the whole English press of the country—the "Globe" included—there is not to be found one single newspaper willing, not to take our defence, but even to put our case as it is be- fore its readers. I throw aside party ties and I call upon the Government to preserve the rights confessedly granted to the minority by the constitutional charter, which must be sacred to all, to state the Legislature of the province of Manitoba abolished without any right the separate school system that was guaranteed to the minority by the constitu- tional law. Is it not a fact that should Mani- toba have had a right to act as it did, Onta- rio has just as sure a right to abolish its separate schools?

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think hon. gentlemen of the House might keep order while a speech is being delivered in French. I am sitting very close to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), yet it is with difficulty that I can hear what he is saying, because of the want of order. We have rights in this House. We have a right to speak French

here, and even if hon. gentlemen cannot understand it, at least they ought to give those who do understand an opportunity to hear what is said.

Mr. TARTE. I have been listening to debates for fifteen years, and I know that hon. gentlemen talk among themselves while speeches are being delivered. I do not feel that I have been treated with any discourtesy, and I do not complain.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman's friends have been constantly complaining, and I think I have only done my duty in calling attention to the matter.

Mr. McNEILL. It is difficult for hon. members to listen attentively to what they do not understand.

Mr. TARTE. Difficult as it may be, after the words that have just been uttered, I am not sorry that I made up my mind to speak in my native language. I have a right to speak French here. I have decided to do so, and I do not regret it. We have rights here that are worthy of being pre- served, and I intend to maintain them strong- ly. I know it does not please every one, but I know also, that there are many able men in the world for whom French is a very interesting language indeed.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) As stated by Archbishop Taché, the rights guaranteed to the minority, should things continue that way, will be destroyed one after the other in the near future. It is our duty to defend them and to take every possible means offered to us by the law and constitution to preserve them inviolate. We are represented as being adverse to reforms and improvements, we are charged with being retrograde. I oppose these charges, as I already stated, with all possible energy. Our only wish is that a principle of equal justice to all be applied; that the compacts, the agreements made be respected by both parties. The Confedera- tion was a compromise between the majority and the minority and the compromise must not be broken without our being consulted. In point of education we also wish for some reforms, and if you think we are opposed to improvements in these matters as well as in others, you are greatly mistaken. In the very province of Quebec we are making great endeavours to obtain and promote re- forms. But I will ask you, the Protestant majority, if you think you have a right to enforce reforms upon us, the Catholic mi- nority? If you want to deal the cards anew, allow me to use that word, let us deal them; but you will not deal them alone. I want to be in the game. I think it would be better, in the interest of all, to take into good ac- count the fact that we are a minority willing to respect the rights of others, but also will- ing that its rights should be respected. I very often read in the "Mail" that the French-Canadian countryman is a man void

of intelligence. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the "Mail," as well as some members of this House, ought indeed to learn the French language and do me the pleasure of coming and spending some few weeks in the county of L'Islet. I would show them a class of men who have not many superiors. I have travelled; I have seen England and France. I know England well. Well! I say without fear the French-Canadian farmer or artisan is a man who has got a right to look up, as much so as any European farmer or artisan. No doubt we have improvements to make. We do not deny that. We wish to follow the path of progress; but we do not want to be led with a rein. And I think the majority, however powerful it may be, could never come to that. We want but our rights, but we want them all. The French language has been abolished in Manitoba; I call upon the Minister of Justice to state to us, in a few moments, whether the Government of that province had the right to do that. Separate schools were abolished; they had no right to abolish them. And they screen themselves behind mean legal subtleties, so as not to do justice to us! Well, Mr. Speaker, we have still the public sentiment to which we already appealed in the past. Indeed, when Sir John A. Macdonald fought against a majority in the province of Ontario in order that justice be done to my race and to the Catholic minority, he immortalized himself: he acquired some claims to the great fame that will survive him; I ask his successors that they should remain worthy of him. I ask them what they are now doing with the traditions of the Conservative party. Some of us are taunted with having left the ranks of the Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, there is not a question of principle as to which that party did not recant these last years. They wanted us to follow men, instead of being faithful to principles, we declined to make such a sacrifice; and, thank God, if our efforts were not always crowned with success, history will proclaim that we acted like men of conviction and courage. Before quite crushing us down, they will have yet much work to do. We will go before the people with this question. I would be willing to go to-morrow in the province of Ontario, before any English audience, and inquire from the old friends of Sir John A. Macdonald, to the Tories who are represented here, but who did not keep the traditions of the old leader they followed so long, whether they wish that Confederation should last. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a member of the Imperial Federation League of which I was myself a member—and I am not ashamed of it, for I am a loyal subject of the Queen, for I understood that Federation to mean the preservation of the great Empire over which the sun never sets. The hon. gentleman wishes to preserve the integrity of the Empire—and yet he wants to make outcasts of a third of our people. It is a peculiar

Mr. TARTE.

way to build up the British power on this continent. Let us well be understood. Mr. Speaker, we are willing, in Manitoba as elsewhere to acquiesce in reforms; but we want our consent to be asked for. Let no one come and charge us with a desire to perpetuate abuses. There are among the English members of this House friends of mine who understand what I mean. I again state that we have no desire to perpetuate any abuse, but we merely ask not to be taken by the throat. It is not asking too much. If Confederation is to be maintained, if we are to form a people, it can only be maintained and we can only be a people, by having respect for one another. I asserted, in another circumstance that there was such discontent in my province that should there be a plebiscite to-day, one would be surprised at the number of people who would declare for annexation. My assertion was discussed in the press of the country. I wish to repeat it, not as a threat, but in order that there should be no disappointments later on. My compatriots who number a million in the United States are not treated there with the feeling of contempt we are shown here. They have become American subjects, at least quite a number of them. They respect the laws and they are respected by the American people who gave them such a liberal hospitality. They respect the laws and the laws protect them. Here we respect the laws and we are deprived of our rights by the courts of justice. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Government to restore order and equilibrium in the country; but let it not be thought that the agitation will be dropped, on the contrary we are now laying its foundations. We will fight to the end for the preservation of our rights. Mark it, nothing is stronger than men fighting in defence of their rights. Do not forget, moreover, that the British Crown bears that proud motto, "Dieu et mon droit." With these words, we can proudly look up and claim in this country justice and liberty from those who know what justice and liberty are. Mr. Speaker, there is not a day passes but we are slandered, we are made the objects of most undeserved reproaches, we are charged with resisting the Privy Council. Yet, I have often read in the "Mail" that the province of Manitoba, that loyal province after the manner of our opponents would not acquiesce to a policy of interference and that we ought, so they say, to give in. We are entitled to the respect of those who surround us; we have a right to require that anywhere in Canada the constitution be respected, and we ask you to see that that constitution be not torn, put into pieces and isolated with impunity. We are abused, and yet what have we done? When have we encroached on the rights of your people? In our province of Quebec, for which they have such contempt, how many English Protestant members do we return, where we could return men

of our race. I wish to make no threats by referring to this matter; no, for my only object is to state a fact. In many counties, we are represented by Protestants, while we could return Catholics. We simply do that for the preservation of the peace in this country we wish to see happy, wealthy and prosperous. Why should not our tolerance be followed elsewhere? It must not be thought that these evidences of patience, of tolerance ought always and in every case to come from the same side. On this continent of America, it will be well never to forget it, there is much space where we could find protection and where our rights would not be assailed. I am, and I state it openly, in favour of the integrity of the Empire, I wish that not a single portion of that great Empire should be detached from it. I am loyal to the Queen, but above all I profess to be loyal to the rights of my race. I am loyal to the valuable liberties guaranteed to my compatriots, who are slandered by all the English-Canadian press, of which not a paper, I state it again, "Globe" first and "Empire" last, would put our case before the people who read them. All the great English press made it a study to slander us systematically. When we see the Government making themselves the accomplices of our detractors, the time has come indeed for us to look up, to close our ranks, to stand side by side and to begin again, if necessary, the fights so gallantly stood, in days of yore, by our ancestors. Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time the French language was abolished in violation of our rights. In the early days after the conquest, an attempt was made to deprive us of the right of using our own language, but the latter was soon restored. We then made a gallant fight for our rights and when we were refused justice here, we were heard at Westminster. We met there men who took our defence and succeeded in bringing about the triumph of our cause. Should justice not be done to us now, why should not we go again to the foot of the Throne and have our just claims heard? There is no reason that could prevent us from making that pilgrimage which our fathers courageously undertook and which led them to the conquest of the political and other liberties that are so dear to us. I would ask the French Ministers: What have you done with the inheritance which was left to you? I do not see the hon. the Minister of Public Works in his seat, but the Postmaster-General is here, I would ask him what he has done for the protection of our fellow-countrymen? I would ask the French Ministers what they have done with the rights of our compatriots of the west? In this discussion, our attention ought to be fixed on a question of justice and on nothing else. Let them not try and screen themselves behind trifling pretexts. What was done in the province of Manitoba affects the vital principles of our race. What have these Ministers done with the inheritance that was left to them, what have they done for its protection since their accession to

power? The French language was abolished in Manitoba; they are seeking to abolish it now in the North-west Territories. The Catholic schools were abolished and instead of taking a firm stand, worthy of true statesmen, they refer the question to the courts of justice. I understood, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture went into the Government, they had pledged themselves, to the groups who support them, to require justice from the Government. They have done nothing, they will bear before the province of Quebec the heavy responsibility of their weakness and their failure! If they think there is time yet to come to the assistance of those who suffer persecution, we offer them our help, we hold out our hands to them, with disinterestedness. If they should be willing to act like men and fulfil their duty, I can assure them they would have the assistance of my friends on this side of the House, at least of my friends, the members of the province of Quebec. I am not making this statement without being sure my words are sanctioned. As for us, it is not a question of party, it is a question of principle, a question of justice. Our race has rights equal to those of the other races and we want these rights to be acknowledged and respected. I move:

That all the words after "That" in the main motion be erased, and the following substituted: - "That this House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and in assuming to be possessed of the judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility."

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

After Recess.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In rising to speak on this question, I do not intend to follow my hon. friend through all the stages of his remarks, but I may have, perhaps, to recall to this House the history of the question, as that history is more or less connected with the motion now before us. You all remember, especially the oldest members of this House, what took place before Confederation, during the existence of the Parliament of United Canada. You all remember the great fights which then took place on the floor, not only of this House, but of the House that sat alternately in Kingston and Quebec. In those days, the two provinces composing then the united provinces of Canada, the province of Upper and the province of Lower Canada, were battling for supremacy, and at the time of the Union, one of them, the province of Quebec, was much the larger in population. But by the Act of Union both were put on the same footing as regards representation on the floor of the Legislative Assembly. Later on, when the province of Upper Canada increased in pop-

ulation, the question of representation by population was agitated. That question and the question of separate schools were the questions which, in fact, brought about the Confederation of the provinces now composing the Dominion. It was thought at the time that, in order to do away with those adverse questions, a union of all the provinces was most desirable, and this gave rise to the idea of calling together all the provinces then forming British North America. When this union took place, this very question which we have been discussing to-night, the question of education, was one of the most delicate that had to be dealt with; and in reading over the British North America Act, it is easily seen that the understanding arrived at in 1862, or thereabouts, with regard to education, was maintained. The spirit of the constitution was certainly, and is certainly in favour of establishing, wherever it was not in existence, and of maintaining wherever it did exist, the system of separate schools. So much was that the case, that in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where separate schools were in existence under the law, they were specifically mentioned and maintained, and a general clause was embodied in the British North America Act, providing that in each province where a system of separate schools existed before the Union, or was thereafter established, such system should be maintained, and that whenever the local authorities or Legislatures or Governments would do anything at all prejudicially affecting the minority, an appeal would lie to the Federal Government or Parliament. That is the essence and spirit of our constitution. Later on, after the union of the fore-named provinces, other provinces were taken in, and at that time the province of Manitoba, being a part and parcel of the North-west Territories, which had been acquired in the meantime, was organized. At the time of that organization, as has been said by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), a deputation was sent down here to Ottawa by the local authorities in Manitoba for the time being. This deputation came here; a bill of rights was presented to the Federal Government, and it was upon that bill of rights that the Manitoba Act was framed. In that bill of rights, a copy of which I placed before this House some two years ago, the question of education, as well as the question of language, was provided for, and the Manitoba Act generally was in accordance with the provisions of the bill of rights. In the Local Legislature this question of education, based on a similar system to that in existence in Ontario and Quebec, was so well understood that immediately that Legislature was assembled, at its very first session an Education Act was passed which declared that there should be a system of separate schools. That law remained in existence, amended from time to time, but remaining the same in principle, until 1890.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

when it was repealed at the instigation of the present Government of Manitoba. Before proceeding further upon that point I will remind this House of a little part of the history of our Local Legislature, which I had the honour, some years ago, to bring before the attention of the members then present. We had in Manitoba, as there is to-day in Quebec and in some of the lower provinces, two Houses, a Legislative Assembly and a Legislative Council. It was thought, during the Mackenzie regime, by some of the members here and by Mr. Mackenzie himself, that the Upper House might be abolished. I know it has always been one of the principles of members now on the left side of the Speaker to do away with Upper Houses. With their democratic views these gentlemen do not appreciate the value of Upper Houses. Therefore, when the province was trying to get better terms—in fact, the province was in need of better terms, and was then applying for them—one of the conditions upon which these better terms were granted was that the Upper House should be abolished. Upon the return of the delegation that had been sent to Ottawa to negotiate these better terms, a meeting of the House was called, and a proposition was made to abolish our Legislative Council. I must remind you, as has been already stated by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), that at the time of our entering Confederation, the French and Roman Catholic population of Manitoba was in the large majority, and therefore, anything provided in the Manitoba Act for the protection of minorities was in reality for the protection of the English-speaking and Protestant minority. In the Legislative Council four members were Roman Catholic and only three Protestants, that being in proportion to the population at the time. The Roman Catholics formed only one-half the number of members of the Lower House. Therefore, the only guarantee the Roman Catholics had for the maintenance of the immunities they possessed was that they had a majority in the Legislative Council. When this proposition came to abolish the Legislative Council, which was their only safeguard, a debate took place; and there, Sir, the most solemn pledges were given by the Protestant members of the House that never should the Catholic or the French population of Manitoba have cause to regret voting away the Legislative Council. I have here, Sir, the remarks made by some of the members at the time. Here are the remarks of one English-speaking and Protestant member:

There were some questions of settlement which made calls upon the hearts of the French people and he would assure them that notwithstanding the movement of the member for Kildonan—

Who was opposed to the French at the time.—the English members would not recklessly deal with these if the French representatives were sufficiently patriotic to support the measure before the House. They would recognize their generosity and not forget it.

Another member, Mr. Cornish, who was at one time Mayor of the city of London, Ont., and late Mayor of the city of Winnipeg, stated that never would the French or Roman Catholic people have to regret the vote to abolish the only safeguard they had at the time—to control the legislation of Manitoba. Well, Sir, it was only about ten years afterwards when—I will not say a leader of a party, I will not say a demagogue, because it was only by reason of deceiving promises that that man could get into power—all these pledges were disregarded. We had peace before that; we never had trouble between the two sections of the people; but when the Greenway Government was inaugurated differences arose. And I regret to say that the Liberal press of Quebec, because Mr. Greenway happened to be a so-called Liberal in politics, rejoiced when this man came into power. They rejoiced; they praised him; they lauded him to the skies; and to-day what do they do? They blame the Government of the Dominion for not crushing this man; and, Mr. Speaker, what kind of legislation did they pass? I will never blame a man for holding opinions that may differ from my own. I believe in separate schools; but I cannot blame another member of this House, or even the lowest citizen, for having an opinion that may be opposed to mine. I respect his opinion as I want my own to be respected. At the same time, Sir, there is a way of carrying out a principle; but, Sir, that way is not robbery. The Manitoba School Act of 1890 was nothing else but a piece of robbery. We had in Manitoba before, as I said, an Act that was giving satisfaction to everybody. Under that Act there was a board of education composed of two sections, one Roman Catholic, the other Protestant. That board formed a body by itself, and its president was none less than the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Rupert's Land of the English Church. There sat at that board clergymen of all denominations, not excepting Roman Catholics. In fact, His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface was simply a private member of that board, under the presidency of the Right Rev. Bishop of Rupert's Land. I have had the honour myself of being a member of that board, and I can state that nothing in the least unpleasant ever happened before that board. Everything was discussed openly and frankly, and we never had any trouble in administering the public schools of Manitoba. Well, Sir, there were Roman Catholic school districts and Protestant school districts. The former were separate schools in a sense, but they were in reality public schools. The Act was a public Act. We had Roman Catholic school trustees and Protestant school trustees. Each section of the board of education had control of the schools under its management. Now, what was the result of the legislation of which we complain to-day? The result was that the Roman Catholic section of the board of education was suppressed. The

members of the Protestant board of education were appointed a sort of advisory board. All the Roman Catholic school districts were wiped out; all the Roman Catholic trustees were dismissed; the funds that belonged to the Roman Catholic section of the board of education, some \$14,000, were taken away from them and handed over to the other section. All the properties belonging to the Roman Catholics, the houses they had built with their own money, the books and other things they had bought with their own money—because never in the province of Manitoba was a cent taken from the Protestants to contribute to the Roman Catholics, or vice versa; the Act never called for that—those properties, grounds, school-houses, books, maps, everything were, under the provisions of that Act, to be taken away from the Roman Catholics and handed over to the Protestant school trustees, who, by the Act, became the trustees for the public schools. The programme of teaching has never been changed an iota. What was the programme of the Protestant schools before is still the programme of the public schools to-day. They have to take everything from us; they may have their own schools as well as our own. Sir, do you think that after being treated in such a way, we do not deserve praise for the admirable patience we have shown? Do you think that after being robbed, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, we should not expect a little more sympathy than has been shown us so far? It is no wonder that I should agree with my hon. friend from L'Islet, to a certain extent, in the statement of what has taken place, but not in the remedy he suggests. I will not go again over the legal view of the case, but it may, perhaps, be well for me to call attention to one point that seems to me to have been overlooked by the hon. gentleman who spoke before me. When this trouble began the first action that was taken in regard to this question of the schools and the dual language, was taken by the Catholic section of the board of education, who sent to the Governor in Council a memorial calling attention to the fact of the passing of the act of the Local Legislature, and praying the Government to exercise their power of veto over that legislation. My hon. friend from L'Islet seems to attach some blame to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface for interfering with this matter. I may say by way of explanation that whatever has been done in Manitoba by the National Congress, or by private individuals, was done by their own free will, and not under clerical or other influence whatever. We have our opinions about the school question and the dual language, although my hon. friend from L'Islet in one part of his speech seemed to blame us for having joined with His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface.

Mr. TARTE. I never blamed you.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I understood the hon. member to say that His Grace the Archbishop

of St. Boniface had taken the initiative in this question, and that it is not what he has done the best—"ce n'est pas ce qu'il a fait de mieux." Well, I was going to say that after that legislation was enacted a meeting of all the Roman Catholics of Manitoba was called at St. Boniface, on 24th of June, 1899. Delegates were invited from each of the parishes. At that meeting a national congress was organized, and as an outcome thereof an executive committee has ever since been in existence in Manitoba, and that executive committee is composed entirely of laymen, acting entirely independent of any other influence. The last petition that was sent, entitled "A Petition from the National Congress," comes from that organization. Therefore, when we are accused of acting under the direction of the hierarchy, as the Winnipeg "Tribune" often asserts, the accusation is false, because we are not acting under any such influence. We understand this question, and as fathers of families, we have a deep interest in the welfare of our children, and in a proper education being given to them. The first action that was expected from the Government was naturally a disallowance. But while we desire this disallowance, it is a fact, as has been stated by my hon. friend from L'Islet, that the local government of Manitoba openly stated that if the acts were disallowed the Local Legislature would be called together and the same legislation would be re-enacted.

Mr. TARTE. Disallowed again.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As the hon. gentleman says, it might be disallowed again. Then it might be re-enacted again.

Mr. TARTE. And disallowed again.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes; and it might be necessary to engage the hon. member for L'Islet to attend to this disallowance matter. At the same time our school affairs and public affairs would have been thrown into a state of chaos without there being any remedy to apply. It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to speak of making a bold defence, of showing a feather in one's cap, but when we are in a minority, as we are in the province of Manitoba, we are not always inclined to press the fighting side of the case. Without giving away our rights, without renouncing what we claim to be our rights, we left the matter in the hands of the Government. We sent in a petition, asking the Government to do what the law prescribes, and asking that they consider our petition as an appeal, as is provided by the British North America Act. It has been thrown out at us that the Privy Council in England has decided adversely to one of our claims, namely, the claim under the Manitoba Act that we had schools in existence by law and by practice, at least by practice, in the province of Manitoba. That was the case put before the Privy Council, and the Privy Council, after a unanimous decision

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

of the Supreme Court of Canada, and I may say a right one too, had been rendered otherwise, decided that the words "by practice" did not protect the schools that were in existence in the province of Manitoba prior to Confederation. The Roman Catholic schools, the English Church schools, the Presbyterian schools that existed years and years were not recognized. Well, Sir, we have left at our disposal the British North America Act. That Act is broader than the Manitoba Act itself, it applies to all the provinces, and we have a perfect right to look upon it as part and parcel of our constitution. That Act says, "In any province where a system of separate schools existed before the entry of that province into Confederation, or was thereafter established, that system shall come within the provisions of appeal, if the minority has some reason to complain of unfair treatment by the majority." That point was not settled by the Privy Council; it was not brought before the Privy Council. We have had schools established in Manitoba since the province has been in existence. I have told you, Mr. Speaker, that in 1871 a Separate School Act was passed, which was amended from time to time and re-enacted and continued until 1890, when it was set aside as I have stated. So that during nineteen years we had in Manitoba separate schools established by law, that is to say since our entrance into Confederation. Therefore, under the British North America Act we are fully protected, and as that same clause provides for an appeal to be made to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, that appeal has been made and is now before the Government for consideration. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that though all these proceedings are taking place, that though we are looking for redress, yet nothing whatever has been done after consultation with us. We have been driven through all these proceedings, and should the legal part or side of the question be decided adversely to our case, we shall then make our claim under its political side, and we shall continue making that claim until we get justice. The hon. member for L'Islet has stated that this is not in his mind a party question. No, it is not in my mind either a party question. It is a question that concerns the whole of this House, it is a question that should be considered by this House in a calm and just manner, and I know when the time comes for the House to deal with it finally—if the House should have to do so—it will be so considered. But if the hon. gentleman was in earnest in stating that he does not consider this to be a party question, he would not bring it before this House in a party spirit, as he has done to-day. If it is not a party question, why did he not bring forward a direct and straightforward motion? Why did he not in his motion announce his principle? What is the motion

now before the House? It is nothing else than a mountain in labour bringing forth a mouse. I was expecting to hear after all the hon. gentleman had said in favour of those poor Manitobans, after posing as their champion, as he has done, after thundering in both languages for so long a time, a motion that would have expressed something. No; but I know what his object is. He wants to make political capital out of this question. He wants the report to be circulated in his province: I am your champion, I dared to bring this question forward and tell the House the facts. But at the same time he wants to have a following; and there are a certain number of hon. gentlemen sitting to the left of you, Mr. Speaker, who would not vote for his motion if he embodied in it the real principles he professes to hold. He has accused the members sitting on the Treasury benches of being too careful in telling the House what they are going to do, while he himself comes forward with a motion that means nothing. The members of the Government have their oath of office to respect, they have the responsibilities of their position to guard, and they must obtain permission of His Excellency before they can come here and announce a policy, in fact they have to be in possession of the question before they can decide on it, while the hon. member for L'Islet has no responsibility except with regard to a few votes he obtained in L'Islet. Is it usual when a case is brought before a court to commence by accusing the judges, before they have rendered judgment and even before the case is pleaded? and yet that is what is being done to-day. The Government have decided that they will consult the Supreme Court as to whether they have the right to hear the appeal, and that is being made now. Why do they take that action? Just because the Hon. Edward Blake two or three years ago submitted a motion, which was adopted by this House, setting forth that all such questions where constitutional points are involved, should be referred to the Supreme Court, before either the Government or this House should be called upon to decide as to their merits. That is exactly what the Government are doing to-day. The suggestion came from the Opposition side of the House, and it had the support of the whole House. Every one present voted or acquiesced in that suggestion made by Mr. Blake, and right or wrong it is the law to-day. I may say that I am submitting to the inevitable. If the Government had not followed this course, I suppose their action would be attacked before the same court. They want to find out beforehand whether they will be supported if they interfere in this case: at least if they hear the appeal now before them. I let the Government choose their own course, and, unlike the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) I shall only blame them when I am satisfied that they

have done wrong. We can afford to wait. We have said that we are going to fight this case in a constitutional way, by constitutional means, and we shall abide by our decision in that respect. I am exceedingly sorry to have heard the remarks of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) about the clergy interfering in politics, about the letter of the archbishop, about matters that are of a private nature, and should not be spoken of in this House. I have lots of private letters myself, my pockets are full of them, but I shall not commit the indiscretion of reading private letters here, which would be a flat contradiction to some remarks made by the hon. member with reference to bishops and archbishops. We have been expecting this debate for the past three weeks, and certain papers were full of the programme that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) had traced out for himself. I took up "La Patrie," of the 1st of March, and I found the following in it:—

Yesterday a journalist from Ottawa had an interview with Mr. I. Tarte, member for L'Islet, to ask him when he would open fire, in relation to the Manitoba school question. "On Monday" answered Mr. Tarte "I have resolved to bring this question up in debate before Sir John Thompson has a chance to go away to Paris. I want to force the Premier to define the position of the Government in this matter. Sir John is bound by his report of 1891, which contains certain things that the public do not seem to know. I have facts to reveal to the House and they will have to answer me. There are not only promises made by the Minister of Justice in his report, but there are other promises made by the Prime Minister privately. You will have some fun before this question is settled."

These are the concluding words: You will have some fun before this question is settled. And this man dares to come before this House to bring up such an important question after stating that we should have some fun before it was settled. I have listened to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) during five or six hours that he spoke, and I have yet to see what fun we have had. If fun there was, he has kept it to himself. I have a high opinion for the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) as a writer, but I think he lacks what is necessary for a ship going through the seas; he wants a rudder, I believe. This hon. gentleman has belonged to all the political parties, past, present, and, I may say, future, in this Dominion of Canada. And, after having acquired some experience, and after securing little inner secrets right and left, he comes to this House once every two sessions and tells us lots of stories. At one time he came here with a long requisition against a venerated member of this House with the object of ruining his reputation, and he said: I come here as a Conservative, and I come to make this denunciation because I want to make my party purer, by driving away from its ranks some that are not worthy of being there; and the result was that he himself was the first man to be out of the Conservative party.

Mr. TARTE. That is a strong argument.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Just as strong as some of those you have adduced in this case.

Mr. MONET. It is a funny argument.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I suppose you do not appreciate it very much. I shall conclude my remarks with a little piece of history. It has no connection with my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). It is a Fenian document. Every one knows that in former days there was such an institution as the Fenians existing across the boundary, and there were a few of them in this country, but very few. In 1871, I was on my way to Fort Garry, as Winnipeg was then called, and, on my way up, going through Minnesota and Dakota, I came across what was called a Fenian army, which had gone up that way in order to take possession of the Red River Valley, and to organize a Fenian Republic there. I just happen to have in my hand a document that has never been published before and which is nothing less than the constitution of the Fenian Republic that was to be started in Manitoba, after possession would have been taken by that army, commanded by General O'Neil, and General Donnelly, and some other generals. In fact, I must tell you that there were in that army a great many more officers than privates. I have the original of this constitution in my possession; it is dated the 15th day of December, 1871, and was signed by these great officers. It has reference to the organization of a Government. My object in reading this is to call your attention, or at least to attract your curiosity, to the existence of such an organization which threatened to take away part of our splendid Dominion of Canada, and also to tell the House that in those days when there was no connection between east and west, when there was no possibility, perhaps, of bringing up and putting in the field an army, within a given space of time, had it not been for the French Half-breeds of Manitoba—and the Roman Catholics of Manitoba were then in a great majority—had it not been for those Half-breeds who ran to the front to defend the boundary, and to repel that invasion, though I do not believe it would have been successful, we do not know what troubles we would have had, and what expenses would have been brought upon this Dominion in order to subdue that invasion. I do not call it an insurrection, because nobody in the province sided with it or accorded in the views of those engaged in it. This historical document is as follows:—

Whereas the people of Rupert's Land, known as Rupert's Land and North-western Territory, through their agent Wm. B. O'Donoghue, have invited the assistance and co-operation of the friends of liberty in America to aid them in regaining their independence of which they have been deprived, by the false representation of the English and Canadian Governments and:

Mr. LARIVIERE.

Whereas Wm. B. O'Donoghue, John O'Neill, Thomas Curley, Felix O'Byrne, John J. Donnelly, and others, have in answer to the call of the said people of Rupert's Land, and organized an expedition having for its object to assist in the deliverance of the people of Rupert's Land, and from English or Canadian rule and the establishment of a Republican form of government instead, and:

Whereas, we the oversaid Wm. B. O'Donoghue, John O'Neill, Thomas Curley, Felix O'Byrne, John J. Donnelly, and others, are now preparing to set the aforesaid expedition in motion and feel that for the purpose of effectually carrying out the object of such expedition a temporary government is necessary.

Now therefore, we the aforesaid Wm. B. O'Donoghue, John O'Neill, Thomas Curley, Felix O'Byrne and John J. Donnelly, in the name and in behalf of the people of Rupert's Land and the emigrants who now take part or may hereafter take part in the said expedition, do hereby agree each for himself and for those whom he represents to be governed by the following compact which shall have all the force and power of a government *de facto* until such time as the condition of the struggle about to be commenced will admit of the people exercising *their free will* in the selection of a permanent government for the country aforesaid.

ARTICLE I.

The governing body shall consist of a President, and Council of ten members, five of whom shall be selected from amongst the emigrants and five from amongst the people of Rupert's Land.

ARTICLE II.

The President shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties of chief executive officer of the government.

He shall have power to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Council such civil officers of the government as in his judgment, are necessary to assist him in the execution of the laws, collection of revenues, etc. The President shall have power to remove all civil officers for cause. The President shall have power to commission the officers of the Army and Navy upon the recommendation of the Military Council. The President shall have power to appoint the Council of which he shall be a member *ex officio* and shall preside at all its meetings. The President shall have power to fill all vacancies which occur in the Council by and with the advice and consent of that body.

ARTICLE III.

The vice-president shall upon denomination of the president be elected by the Council from amongst its number, and in case of the death, impeachment or inability of the President to act shall perform the duties and exercise the powers of the President.

ARTICLE IV.

The Council shall elect a Secretary, Serjeant-at-Arms and such other officers as shall be deemed necessary.

The Council shall have power to raise revenue, levy taxes, and exercise all the powers and perform all the duties of a legislative body.

The members of the Council shall hold office during the time this compact shall remain in effect unless removed by impeachment and conviction of high crimes and misdemeanours.

Whenever, in the judgment of the Council it is desirable to add to its number, the Council shall have power to declare vacancies equal to the addition which shall be deemed necessary, which vacancies shall be filled in the manner described in Article III, section IV.

The Council shall remain in perpetual session, but may be called together at any time by the President.

The Council shall have power to try all persons, who may be charged with crimes against the authority of the Government.

The Council shall have power to pass sentence upon all the persons convicted by that body of crime against the Government.

The Council shall have power to try all cases of impeachment and remove from office all persons convicted of high crimes and misdemeanours.

The Council when sitting as a court shall have power to elect its chairman.

ARTICLE V.

The President, Vice-President and members of the Council may be impeached and upon conviction of high crimes and misdemeanours shall be removed from office.

ARTICLE VI.

A complaint, in writing, of three members of the Council shall be deemed sufficient to impeach the President, Vice-President or any member of the Council and the complaint in writing of any citizen shall be sufficient cause to bring another citizen before the Bar of the House for trial.

ARTICLE VII.

The President and Vice-President shall hold office during the time this compact shall remain in force or until their successors shall have been chosen.

ARTICLE VIII.

A General-in-Chief, with the rank of Major-General shall be immediately appointed by the President and he shall have command of the Army and Navy of Rupert's Land, etc.

ARTICLE IX.

The President shall immediately appoint Brigadier-Generals who shall be assigned to duty by the General-in-Chief.

ARTICLE X.

The General-in-Chief and the three officers next in rank to him shall constitute a Military Council, which shall have full powers to decide and carry into effect all military plans and movements, and to which shall be referred all matters of a purely military nature.

The President shall be a member of this Council *ex officio* and shall preside at all its meetings when he is present.

The Military Council shall elect a recorder whose duty it will be to keep a record of all the business transacted by that body.

ARTICLE XI.

Officers of the Army and Navy shall not be dismissed from the service except by the sentence of a general court-martial.

ARTICLE XII.

The army regulations of the United States shall be and are hereby adopted for the Government of the army of Rupert's Land, and so far as the same may be applicable thereto.

ARTICLE XIII.

Cushing's Manual shall be and is hereby adopted as authority upon all subjects of debate in the Council.

ARTICLE XIV.

William Bernard O'Donoghue is hereby declared President to fill the office created by this compact.

ARTICLE XV.

This compact cannot be altered or amended without the unanimous consent of all the persons thereto.

ARTICLE XVI.

The undersigned parties to this compact hereby agree, each with the other jointly and severally, to carry out to the full extent of their ability the object set forth in the foregoing agreement, and to hereby firmly bind themselves not to withdraw from the said compact until it shall terminate by limitation or mutual consent.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and affixed our seals the fifteenth day of September, Anno Domini, eighteen hundred and seventy-one—1871.

[L.S.]
[L.S.]
[L.S.]
[L.S.]
[L.S.]
[L.S.]

W. B. O'DONOGHUE.
JOHN O'NEILL,
THOS. CURLEY.
F. O'BYRNE,
J. J. DONELLY.
J. C. KENNEDY.

I shall not detain the House any longer on this question raised by the hon. member for L'Islet. I must say, that, under the circumstances, I think that his championship in the interests of those he pretends to defend is uncalled for, and therefore I am compelled to oppose it, because I do not think this question ought to have been brought up as a party question, but should have been left to be dealt with on its merits, on its well-defined principles, by all members of the House, as, in their best judgment, it should be dealt with, so as to render justice wherever justice should be rendered.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that my hon. friend who has just taken his seat should have complained that the hon. member for L'Islet had disappointed us. He chided the hon. member for L'Islet with having promised us a good deal of fun and surprise, and while it may be possible that the fun was wanting, the surprise was given in a manner I never saw before paralleled in this House, by the extreme and striking contrast between the speech of five hours' length and the resolution which followed. It was perfectly obvious to every one that the speech was dictated by one person and the resolution drawn by another, and that the two minds had never agreed on any part of the policy. The hon. gentleman insisted, at considerable length, that his compatriots in Manitoba had been unjustly treated with regard to their language. The resolution which he has submitted to the House contains not one word upon that subject. The hon. gentleman made the most forcible part of his argument and the most forcible part of his attack, on the ground that the Acts of 1890 ought to have been disallowed. Upon that subject he spoke about an hour, but I look in vain in the four corners of his resolution to find the subject of disallowance mentioned at all. He entreated the House not to come to a vote upon the Manitoba question until the Government should candidly declare what it intends to do, should the courts of the country decide that the Government have power to do anything, and yet the hon. gentleman himself is the only one so far who has asked a vote or proposed to put a resolution to the House. The hon. gentleman

above all things declared that he approached this subject not in a party spirit, and entreated the House to come to its decision in a calm and judicial manner, and the only point of his resolution is a censure upon the Government for having treated it in a judicial spirit. In stating, as briefly as I can, the policy which the Government has to propose with regard to this question, I am conscious that I shall have to trespass upon the forbearance of the House, because to many of us it is not a new subject, and it is a tedious one, involving many details which some of us are very familiar with, and which others, perhaps, care very little about. The question arises, in the first place, under the ninety-third section of the British North America Act, which defines the provincial powers with regard to the subject of education. We have been so frequently told within the last few months that the vital question involved in the consideration of this subject is the rights of the provinces, we have been so repeatedly told in every quarter of the country that there exists in the policy of the Government a scheme for throttling a province, for depriving a province of its rights, for trespassing upon the undoubted powers of a province, that I must, at the risk of repeating what is very familiar, ask the House to listen, for a moment, to what the definition of provincial powers with regard to the subject of education is. The popular impression sought to be intensified by the controversy which has taken place in regard to this question, is that the subject of education is exclusively one of provincial concern. But taking the British North America Act—and I will consider by and by what the difference between that Act and the Manitoba Act is with regard to education—taking, for convenience, the British North America Act, first, I find that by the ninety-third section, while the powers with regard to education are given the provinces, there are most important limitations by which this whole controversy is to be decided. The first of those limitations is that :

Nothing in any law which a province may pass shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any persons have by law in the province at the Union.

I take it that the principle is well settled now and well agreed upon by both parties in this country, as well as by lawyers and tribunals of justice, that that provision, that qualification, nullifies any Act of a provincial legislature which conflicts with it, and that the legislature of a province, while, to a great extent, its powers are exclusive with regard to education, steps beyond its power and enacts a void enactment when it enacts a law which prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons had by law in any province at the time of the Union. Then there is a special provision with regard to the provinces of Upper

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

and Lower Canada, and there is then this provision, on which the appeal has come to us:

Where in any province a system of Separate or Dissident Schools exist by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant and Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

And the final subsection in that section is that :

In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

Now, the province of Manitoba commenced existence in 1870, and the first question which arises in connection with the rights of the minority in that province depends for its solution on the condition of education in that province at that time. It was apparent to everybody then, inasmuch as the residents in that country had no fixed system of law, certainly no system of educational law, that there was no system of separate or dissentient schools existing by law at the Union, or, in other words, at the formation of the province. In consequence of that, this Parliament, in passing the Manitoba Act, in framing it for the Imperial Parliament to pass, provided that the same privilege should be given where separate schools existed by law or by practice at the time of the Union. So we had it distinctly provided by the constitution of Manitoba in 1870, that if a system of separate or dissentient schools existed either by law or by practice at the time of that Union it would be beyond the power of the Provincial Legislature to impair the rights of the class of persons who controlled those schools or enjoyed them. Now, Sir, in 1871, the year following the organization of the provinces, a public schools system was adopted for the province, including within its provisions not only what is generally known as a system of public schools, but providing liberally and fully for a system of separate schools within that province, and for twenty years that statute, with various modifications tending to its more efficient execution, existed on the Statute-book of that country and was carried on and operated continuously. By the two statutes of 1890, which are complained of, that system of both public and separate schools which had existed for over twenty years was cut up root and branch, and a number of persons connected with the minority in that province immediately petitioned the Governor in Council for redress under the

provisions of the subsection which I have cited. There were something like eight or ten petitions presented, and every one claimed this position of things—that the right which the Roman Catholic minority held at the time of the creation of the province had been invaded, and that for that reason the statute was ultra vires of the Provincial Legislature and void. They all stood upon that principle, but they asked for various kinds of remedies. One of these petitions, the one which came from the Separate School Board or the Roman Catholic School Board I think it was called, asked that in consequence of that grievance the Acts should be disallowed. Every one of the others asked, not that the Act should be disallowed, but that we should give redress by hearing an appeal under the provisions of subsection 3, of section 93, of the British North America Act, of the corresponding provisions of the Manitoba Act. Now, Sir, these petitions came before His Excellency in Council, and the next step in the history of these proceedings was the report which was made in 1891, by myself, and approved in the month of April. Now the position which the report took, and which the Government took, with regard to the prayer for disallowance was this: that, inasmuch as the contention made in these petitions, and on which the prayer for disallowance was based, was that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority in a system of separate, dissentient schools existing at the time of the formation of the province, had been interfered with, the Act was ultra vires of the Provincial Legislature and null and void, it was our duty, or the duty of some one we will say for the present, to ascertain whether the Acts of 1890, of which disallowance was sought, did interfere with the system of separate and dissentient schools existing by law or by practice at the time of the Union. The principle had been well settled in this Legislature time and again that no statute regarding education passed by a province ought to be destroyed by disallowance. On the contrary, if it were ultra vires of the Legislature, that fact ought to be ascertained and established by judicial decision. I shall refer in a few moments to the precedents by which that was well laid down and well established. But it was obviously, from start to finish, a principle which would commend itself to the common sense of any Government and any Legislature. Why should we, by the exercise of the strong hand of disallowance, destroy a provincial statute on the ground that it was null and void, and thus invoke an immediate conflict with the Provincial Legislature upon a subject and for a reason which could be dealt with by a tribunal in which the people of the province would have confidence, when they might not have confidence in the executive of the country, actuated, as it might appear to be, by political motives or religious sympathy? We therefore said, as regards the prayer for disallowance on the ground of the Act being “ultra vires”—and no other ground, I repeat, was put forward in any of

the petitions—that that was a fact which ought to be decided by the courts of the country. Sir, we were in this position, that, inasmuch as the Manitoba Act differed from the British North America Act in allowing these rights to be proved and established by practice before the Union, we had questions of fact involved in the inquiry as well as questions of law. And, for the purpose of getting these questions before the courts for decision, a suit was brought by a citizen in the city of Winnipeg, who claimed that he ought not to be subjected to taxation under the Acts of 1890, because they were “ultra vires” of the Legislature as having interfered with the system of separate and dissentient schools existing at the time of the Union. Now, Sir, that suit went on from time to time, and was decided in the year 1892. I desire to call the attention of this House to the precedents by which our course in that respect was justified. I have seen it stated that we were guilty of some wrong-doing in thus sustaining a suit for the purpose of trying a question of that kind. I deny that we were guilty of any wrong-doing in that particular. We were endeavouring to ascertain the exact rights of the minority, as existing at the time of the Union. We were endeavouring to ascertain just what those rights were in respect of which our protection was being claimed. In 1890 our policy was stated in this House, it was stated in debate here that this suit was being carried on for the purpose of having that question determined. In 1891, in the month of May, I was asked a question by Mr. Watson, then the member for Marquette, as to this litigation, and I answered the question in my place in the House. In May, 1892, the question was asked what sum we had paid out in connection with the litigation, and the House was then informed what the sum was; and so from step to step the House was well informed of the policy of the Government, what we were doing and how we were trying to arrive at a judicial determination of those questions. I mention that, by the way, to show that this is not a question which has developed lately or on which the information has been given to the House recently. The facts were made known to the House from session to session, every session during which the litigation was pending. Now, Sir, to come to another point with regard to the precedents which were established upon that subject, I desire to call the attention of the House to what was done with regard to the New Brunswick school case. A complaint came from the province of New Brunswick to the effect that the repeal of a parish school Act, which had existed years before the Union, had prejudicially affected the rights of the minority with regard to education, and that the repealing Act was, therefore, ultra vires of the Provincial Legislature. That question came before this House; it came on a motion favouring the disallowance of the repealing Act; and I assert at

the beginning of my comments upon that precedent, that this House deliberately laid down the principle that the question ought not to be settled by the power of disallowance, but it ought to be determined by a judicial decision of the courts, obtained at the instance of the Government from the highest tribunal of the Empire. A resolution was offered by my hon. friend the present Secretary of State; and he stated the case of his fellow-countrymen and his co-religionists on that occasion, and asked this House to adopt the resolution favouring the disallowance of that Act before the time for disallowance had expired. It is important to observe the grounds for the opinion of the leading men of both parties upon the policy that ought to be pursued in such cases; and I shall take for the present, the statements which were uttered by the leading statesman of the province of Quebec, from which the hon. member for L'Islet comes, a man of venerated name, and of the highest position in this country, Sir George Cartier. The view which he put forward then, representing, surely, as fully as the hon. member for L'Islet does, the people of that great province of Quebec, was this:

No doubt the mover was actuated by the best possible motives, but if all the wording of the address were correct, even the fate of the Catholic minority of Quebec would have to be decided by the Dominion Parliament. The clauses of the Act of Confederation had been drawn up after the most mature deliberation, and with every regard to the delicacy of the question. The address tended to place the rights of the Catholics of the Dominion in the hands of a Protestant majority. Was that right? Was that wise? The Protestants of Lower Canada had no cause for complaint, and never would have so long as the Catholic majority were actuated by their present liberal sentiments; but if the motion was right with regard to the Catholic majority of New Brunswick, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada might come and say "repeal the last education law passed in Quebec."

The report goes on to say:

The proposition involved in the motion for the address was not correct. He went on to say that the law was unjust and caused great uneasiness among the Catholics of Canada, and might produce great mischief, and therefore they prayed for the disallowance of the bill. If this was affirmed, the principle must be extended to other provinces, and as a Catholic of Lower Canada, he could not assent to it."

Again, he quoted the clause giving jurisdiction of matters of education to the Local Legislature:

He had pressed this at the time of Confederation, because he wanted the power to be enjoyed by Quebec. There were conditions that no right enjoyed at Confederation should be interfered with, and that the privileges enjoyed by the Catholics in Ontario should be extended to the Protestants of Quebec; and that any system of separate schools should be maintained. In case of infraction of the latter condition, there was an appeal to the Governor in Council, and this was because it would not have been right to submit the Catholic minority of Quebec to the Protestant majority of the Dominion Parliament; whereas an appeal to the Governor in Council must be settled in the

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

spirit of justice with regard to the interests of both parties.

I commend especially the closing words of that paragraph of Sir George Cartier's speech to those gentlemen who are in sympathy with the motion condemning the Government for having undertaken to assume judicial functions with regard to this question, a passage in which that statesman declared that this was not a question to be decided by the force of numbers, but was to be settled in a spirit of justice with regard to the interests of both parties. Now, Sir, I propose to show you that that view was concurred in fully by gentlemen of the other political party. The Hon. Mr. Blake is reported thus:

He quoted provisions giving Parliament the right to make remedial laws when necessary, and this, he maintained, could be done, although twelve months had elapsed.

Finally, the last amendment which was moved, and which was carried in this House, was a resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, by which it was decided that this question, instead of being disposed of by the rough and ready method of disallowance, was to be left to the courts, and in the first place the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown was to be obtained, and, if possible, the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council:

This House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exists; and this House deems it expedient that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, and if possible, the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be obtained as to the right of the New Brunswick Legislature to make such change in the school law as to deprive the Roman Catholics of the privileges they enjoyed at the time of the Union in respect to religious education in the common schools, with the view of ascertaining whether the case comes within the terms of the 4th subsection of the 93rd clause of the British North America Act of 1867, which authorizes the Parliament of Canada to enact remedial laws for the due execution of the provision respecting education in said Act.

Now, Sir, I need hardly remind the members who were in the House at that period, what the result of that application to the law officers was. There was no provision then by which the Government could have the case carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Her Majesty's Government did not think that it should be referred there, but they obtained the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, and that opinion was to the effect that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority, although, perhaps, their schools had been sustained by public grants from time to time before the Union, had not been established by law at the time of the Union, and therefore, were not within the saving terms of the section which made an Act interfering with those rights "ultra vires" of

the Legislature. Then there was a case in 1877 coming from the province of Prince Edward Island, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and the conclusion at which they arrived with regard to that subject was precisely to the same effect, that the Act complained of by the Roman Catholic minority of the province, was not to be interfered with by disallowance. That case was obviously parallel to the New Brunswick case as to the want of sanction of law, for the privileges which Roman Catholics enjoyed at the time of the Union, and therefore the repealing Act was declared to be "intra vires" of the Provincial Legislature, and not to be interfered with. The complaint of the Roman Catholic minority of Prince Edward Island was as strong as the complaint from the province of Manitoba. Now, coming down to the terms of our report on the petitions, and the terms of that report have been criticised to-night by the hon. member for L'Islet in most extraordinary and unwarranted language—I shall ask the House to consider what the terms of that report are. There were the two sets of petitions to be reported upon, the petition that asked for disallowance on the ground that the rights of the minority existing by law or practice at the time of Union had been invaded; and the much more numerous set which declared that even though the Acts were not "ultra vires," on account of its invading the rights existing at the time of Union, they were subject to an appeal to the Governor in Council on the ground that they invaded rights which Roman Catholics had acquired under the Educational Act of 1871, in that province. We said in answer to those petitions, and the substance and effect of the report which has been so strongly commented on by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) was this: Cease the application for disallowance as regards those statutes of 1890 as being "ultra vires;" that question ought to be left to the courts and when the courts have decided on that question, if they have decided that the Acts are "intra vires" of the Legislature and therefore valid and effectual, the time will have come for His Excellency to take up the other set of petitions and consider whether any, and if so what remedy shall be given to the minority of that province, by way of appeal asserted under subsection 43 of the British North America Act. That was precisely what the report said. That is precisely the tenor, the effect, the language of the report itself, and the section which the hon. member for L'Islet has read as the basis of a most extraordinary charge against the Government, a charge which he stated in coarser language a little while ago, but which was strong enough to-night, is simply this:

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under sub-

section 2 and 3 of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act," in relation to the other provinces.

I defy any fair-minded man to read that report and arrive at any other conclusion than this, that His Excellency was informed that those petitions were of two classes; one claiming disallowance, and one of them asserting, in claiming disallowance, that the Acts were "ultra vires." My report said: "Lay them aside until this litigation is determined. There is no occasion for disallowance in the meantime, because, if the Acts are "ultra vires," they do not need to be disallowed; if they are "intra vires," they should not be disallowed. Lay aside, until the conclusion of that litigation the petitions which ask that remedial legislation shall be given, because the first question to be ascertained is whether these Acts have any force at all. If they have no force, no remedial legislation is necessary and no appeal should be carried forward; when we ascertain that these statutes of 1890, which are complained of, are legal and operative, it will be time enough then to consider that set of petitions which claim remedial legislation and redress." And yet the hon. gentleman has declared in this House that we have there most solemnly promised to give remedial legislation, and the hon. gentleman has at some time, I think, gone so far as to assert that we have induced the representative of the Crown to make a pledge which has not been redeemed and which places us in the position of having violated the Royal word. I repeat that by no fair construction whatever can any man assert that the report contains any promise whatever for remedial legislation or pledges the Crown to any action on those petitions whatever. It may well be, and I do not want to assert the contrary, or have the contrary implied from what I am saying now, that there is a strong claim for remedial legislation; but I say that the report was silent on that question, except to intimate to His Excellency that the time had not come for taking it up. While dealing with that report, both as to the way we treated that question and as to the question of administration, I desire to make some observations as to what the hon. member for L'Islet has said to-day with respect to negotiations with a prelate in Manitoba. In the first place, I wish to repeat the hon. gentleman's expression, because I am pretty confident I have it right, but I wish to be perfectly sure. He said that Sir John Macdonald would have disallowed the law if Archbishop Taché had insisted on that course. I have the best reason for knowing, and I do know, that there is not a fragment of foundation for that statement, and that after the precedents which had been established in the case of New Brunswick and followed in the case of Prince Edward Island, and after the discussion which had taken place in this House in 1890, to which I shall

have to call the attention of the House more particularly in a few moments, there was no member of this Government who would have agreed to the disallowance of these education statutes, there was no member of the Government, who, under any circumstances, would have followed any other policy than that of asserting what the legal rights of the province were and what the duties of His Excellency and his Council were with respect to the appeal that had been asserted. The hon. member has stated that Mr. Chapleau, who is no longer our colleague, was sent to Archbishop Taché, delegated to go there to promise him remedial legislation. I deny that Mr. Chapleau or any other minister or any other agent or any living person was sent or delegated or authorized by the Government of Canada to go on any such mission. I deny that any such promise was made by the Government, and that any person whatever was authorized to make any such promise. The hon. gentleman has stated that Archbishop Taché was deceived. The hon. gentleman has stated that Archbishop Taché was unwilling to accept Mr. Chapleau's assurance, and the elections being urgent and it being necessary to secure the good will of that prelate, His Grace insisted on some official promise, and therefore my report was penned, making this so-called official promise. I have pointed out just now that it makes nothing of the kind; but a significant circumstance against the hon. gentleman's theory is this, that the report was not penned until weeks after the general election was over and not submitted to His Excellency until April, 1891. We who were colleagues of Mr. Chapleau and must have known of any such proposition, must have known of it in order to be bound by it, have heard to-night that assertion for the first time, although it has been insinuated in various quarters before. I deny that in any respect Archbishop Taché was deceived. I admit that His Grace would have been personally gratified if we could have seen our way clear to the disallowance of those statutes which he considers exceedingly oppressive to his people; but His Grace knew just as well as we did, the folly of exercising disallowance in such a case. He knew, just as well as we knew, that not only, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. LaRivière) has said, would the Local Legislature have re-enacted the disallowed statute, but they would have made an appeal to the people of the province on the ground that their autonomy had been violated. They would have raised an agitation deeper and stronger than that which has existed unfortunately for the last year or two. They would have appealed with every probability of success to the people of that province in that struggle to sustain the Education Acts of 1890. There would have been no legal decision to back us, to create respect in the minds of the people of the province for the action of the Federal executive. And in the meantime what would have become of

the Roman Catholic schools of the province? His Grace was wise enough and possessed sufficient experience to know that the power of disallowance, while looking like a strong and ready remedy would be weak and inoperative as regards giving any effective redress for the grievances under which His Grace and his people were suffering. I say, therefore, that, from first to last, there is no foundation whatever for the statement that His Grace was deceived, that His Grace was misled, that His Grace was used for political purposes. I gave the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) credit for sincerity in his assertion, which sounded strangely to me, that his report contained an absolute promise of remedial legislation, or was so understood by the minority in the province of Manitoba, because he told us afterwards the reason which prompted that interpretation of the report. He had heard the story: That we had promised the Archbishop of St. Boniface that if he did not press for disallowance we would carry on the suit to have the Act nullified; that if we failed in that we would give him remedial legislation; and that His Grace, not satisfied with that, had demanded an official promise; and the hon. member thought he saw here, what he otherwise would not have dreamed of seeing, between the lines or in the words of that report, a distinct promise that a certain course would be taken after the decision on the validity of the statute. As I said a few minutes ago, we adopted the policy of testing the validity of these two Acts of 1890, and, as I have stated, we were following then the precedent which was established in regard to New Brunswick. Some hon. member may ask me whether the decision in the case of New Brunswick was not enough, and why should we again move to litigate with regard to the same question as to Manitoba? The reason is, because the rights of the minority in the two provinces rested on different statutes. If they had had the same statute in New Brunswick as they had in Manitoba, the minority might have prevailed, but the New Brunswick minority had to show that their rights had been established by law, and the Manitoban minority only had to show that their rights had been established by law, and the Manitoban minority had only to show that those rights existed in practice. There was a mixed question of law, and fact, and the question was submitted, as everybody knows, to the courts of the country with varying success, until it came here, and the Supreme Court of Canada pronounced against the validity of these Acts, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council reversed that decision and declared these Acts to be "intra vires." I wish to call the attention of the House to the state of the Supreme Court Acts of that time. We have now an amended provision in this Act, by which a question of law relating to education, involving questions of fact also, shall be submitted to the Supreme

Court of Canada for determination, and that court may take evidence upon the question of fact, as well as hear arguments upon the question of law. At the time of which I speak, the Supreme Court Act was not so framed, and, therefore, the litigation had to begin at the beginning, begin before a judge of first instance in the province of Manitoba in order that evidence might be taken to establish what rights the Roman Catholic minority of the province enjoyed by practice at the time of the Union. The course that was pursued in that case, Mr. Speaker, was not different from that which was pursued in the case of New Brunswick; and, again, in this respect, that in the New Brunswick case, by a vote of this House, the House provided the expenses for carrying on that litigation. It has been said that, in recommending that course to be pursued with regard to the claims of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, my course was inconsistent with that which I pursued in another case. I wish to dwell on that for a moment or two, for although it has not been mentioned by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), I am quite conscious that this question is not a question upon which the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) expresses the only view in opposition to the Government. I believe that other views will find expression before the termination of this debate, and it would have gratified me very much indeed if I could have heard these views expressed before I addressed the House, feeling, as I am sure, that they will essentially differ from those of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), although, perhaps, in accordance with the resolution which my hon. friend moved, it would have been perhaps, not reasonable for me to expect that that would be possible. Three or four years ago a citizen of this country approached His Excellency by petition, claiming that an Act which had excited a great deal of feeling in this country, known as the Jesuits Estates Act, of the province of Quebec, should be referred to the courts for determination as regards its validity. That application was declined, and declined on my advice, and when I state the ground on which it was so declined, I will state the distinction between that case and the present one. It was declined on the ground that we should only avail ourselves of that provision of the Supreme Court Act which entitled us to ask the opinion and instruction of the court when some duty in relation to the challenged Act devolved upon His Excellency or upon His Excellency's officers. It was held that it was not for His Excellency to submit an academic question to the court, as regards the validity of an Act with which His Excellency had no particular concern, but that if His Excellency had a duty to discharge, or if his officers required instruction, it would be a proper function to submit the case for adjudication. In that case, the time for disallowance had expired, but announce-

ment had been made that the Act would not be disallowed, and the proposition of Mr. Graham, the petitioner, was, simply that for the purpose of gratifying curiosity, or for the purpose of satisfying doubts in the public mind, the Act should be sent to the courts for adjudication. The words in which the whole ground is put on which that application of his was refused, appear in this passage of my report:

As to this the following considerations are respectfully submitted: The provision which confers that power on Your Excellency was undoubtedly intended to enable the Governor-General to obtain an opinion from the Supreme Court of Canada in relation to some orders which his Government might be called on to make, or in relation to some action which his officers might be called on to adopt. For the guidance of Your Excellency or of your officers the provision may be a valuable one, but used as a means of solving legal problems in which the Government of Canada has no direct concern, however much they may interest or excite the public mind, as the petitioner seems to propose, or used to compel an adjudication on private rights and interests, it would be perverted, the undersigned humbly submits, into an arbitrary and inquisitorial power, anticipating and interfering with the ordinary course of justice.

What was the difference between that and this Manitoba case? Simply this: that we have two sets of petitions here claiming that His Excellency should hear the appeal, and should give remedial legislation to the minority, and it was necessary before he should come to the hearing of that appeal, or be advised as to the rights of the petitioners to have remedial legislation, that he should know whether these Acts were valid or invalid; whether they required remedial legislation, or whether the statutes against which the minority appealed were simply worthless paper. But at another phase in that discussion with regard to the Jesuit Estates Act, we did approach a period when an appeal was about to be asserted, and when the necessity of adjudication by His Excellency in Council would have come. Late in the day, long after the time for disallowance had expired, the president of the Protestant School Board of the province of Quebec, asserted the appeal to His Excellency under this very subsection. I have no hesitation in saying that if the appellants had come forward, as we invited them to do, a case would have been stated at their instance, if they so desired, for the opinion of the courts of the country. We named a day on which they and their counsel should be heard; they asked that that appointment should be postponed to a later day; their request was complied with; and, in the meantime, they made application to the executive of the province of Quebec, got their redress there and abandoned the appeal here. So far, I claim, there was nothing that was inconsistent with the action of the Federal Government of that period in the course we adopted in referring the validity of the Manitoba School Acts of 1890 to the courts for decision. I am sorry

to find, Sir, that in some minds there is likewise an impression that our action in thus promoting litigation in order to obtain a decision of that question involved a want of impartiality on the part of us who were eventually to decide the question. I submit that that impression must disappear on a second glance at the subject. We had no other method at that time, in consequence of the state of the Supreme Court Act, than to promote litigation, before, as I said, a judge of first instance, to have the evidence taken, and to have the case eventually carried to the highest court of appeal in the Empire; and we were far from being influenced by any desire to assail the province or its legislation. We had simply the duty devolving upon us of getting a legal determination of the constitutional rights of the educational minority in that province. Now, Sir, the case, as is well known, resulted in a complete decision of that question by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But the question which went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the litigation from first to last, was upon the subject of the validity of the statutes complained of. The question as to the rights which the minority of the province might have in an application by way of appeal to the Governor-General for redress, had nothing to do with the questions which were decided there, and the litigation had nothing to do with it. There are strong expressions in the judgment itself. There are strong expressions, for example, that no right or privilege of the Roman Catholic minority was affected by the legislation of 1890; but the judges are careful to show, by the whole language of their report, that those expressions refer to rights existing at the time of the Union; and indeed it was unnecessary for them to make that plain—although they have made it so—because they could decide upon nothing else, and their decision would have been obiter in so far as it extended to any other question than the one before them. The impression exists, and has been assiduously cultivated in the public mind, that the words of the decision of the Privy Council are so sweeping that it denies that any rights acquired even after the Union were invaded; but I repeat that not only nothing of the kind is to be gathered from the judgment itself, but that it would be absolutely perverting the judgment to say that the Judicial Committee decided on a question which was not before them, and on which they had heard no argument and no evidence. The language which the decision contains is this:

The result of the controversy is of serious moment to the province of Manitoba, and a matter apparently of deep interest throughout the Dominion. But in its legal aspect the question lies in a very narrow compass. The duty of this board is simply to determine as a matter of law whether, according to the true construction of the Manitoba Act, 1870, having regard to the state of things which existed in Manitoba at

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

the time of the Union, the provincial legislature has or has not exceeded its powers in passing the Public Schools Act, 1890.

Again, Sir, in order to show clearly what the question was that was before them, and that it did not extend to any inquiry as to the rights of the minority by reason of the legislation of 1871, establishing separate schools in that province, but was confined to the question as to the existence of rights at the time of the Union, the decision goes on to say:

Such being the main provisions of the Public Schools Act, 1890, their lordships have to determine whether that Act prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the union. Notwithstanding the Public Schools Act, 1890, Roman Catholics and members of every other religious body in Manitoba are free to establish schools throughout the province; they are free to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary subscriptions; they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school. No special advantage other than the advantage of a free education in schools conducted under public management is held out to those who do attend. But then it is said that it is impossible for Roman Catholics, or for members of the Church of England (if their views are correctly represented by the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who has given evidence in Logan's case) to send their children to public schools where the education is not superintended and directed by the authorities of their church, and that therefore Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England who are taxed for public schools, and at the same time feel themselves compelled to support their own schools, are in a less favourable position than those who can take advantage of the free education provided by the Act of 1890. That may be so. But what right or privilege is violated or prejudicially affected by the law? It is not the law that is in fault; it is owing to religious convictions, which everybody must respect, and to the teaching of their church that the Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England find themselves unable to partake of advantages which the law offers to law alike.

And then further down:

They (their Lordships) doubt whether it is permissible to refer to the course of legislation between 1871 and 1890, as a means of throwing light on the previous practice or on the construction of the saving clause in the Manitoba Act.

There the principle is most distinctly laid down that even for the purpose of throwing light on the state of affairs which existed at the time of the Union, it was not competent to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to consider what the legislation in 1871 and downwards was. But when that decision was pronounced the Roman Catholic minority came to His Excellency in Council and said: That question of "ultra vires" has been disposed of; that request of ours for disallowance or redress on the ground that the Acts were "ultra vires" is disposed of, and the time indicated by your report has come for considering the appeal which we asserted in 1890, and which we reassert now. And it was under these

circumstances that the policy of the Government was framed which is under trial in this House to-night. Now, it is necessary for me, in order to justify that policy, to call the attention of the House to the question which arises with regard to the remedial legislation which is claimed by that appeal. In the first place, I have read to the House what the terms of the British North America Act are which give the appeal. The terms of the statute of Manitoba are different—considerably different in the words which seem to affect this question of right acquired after the Union by the Roman Catholic minority, and I propose to call the attention of the House to them for the purpose of convincing the House, if I shall be able to do so, that there are still grave questions of law affecting the second branch of the inquiry, and questions which require judicial determination just as much as the first set. Now, Sir, the language of the Manitoba Act and the language of the British North America Act are different in this material respect: that the British North America Act, applicable, of course, to all the other provinces, contains this provision, that:

Where, in any province, a system of separate and dissentient schools exists by law at the time of the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The words which are there, if they are applicable to Manitoba, according to the contention of the minority, completely suit their case, because they say that the expression "or is thereafter established by the Legislature" preserves the system which they established under the Act of 1871, giving separate schools, and that, therefore, they have the right to assert their appeal to have that system subsequently established by law protected, even though the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council determined that they had no redress by reason of rights which existed at the time of the Union. We find, however, that the terms of the Manitoba Act are as follows:—

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice at the time of the Union.

The Manitoba Act does not contain the provision in favour of an appeal where a system of separate or dissentient schools has been thereafter established—that is, after the Union. Now, one important question which arises at the threshold, therefore, of the appeal, is whether the appellants are able to avail themselves of the terms of the British North America Act, when they have provisions in the Manitoba Act of a different character relating to the same subject. There is a general enactment in the Manitoba Act, that,

except where provision is otherwise made, the terms of the British North America Act should extend to that province. I do not mean to say that the terms of the British North America Act do not extend, but it is warmly contended that no provision exists, with regard to Manitoba, for the protection of the system of separate or dissentient schools, created by the Legislature after the Union. That is a most important question, one fully open to argument, and a question upon which, I may say, the judges who heard the case of Barrett differed in opinion. Then, again, it was urged before us by counsel for the appellants, that they did not need to avail themselves of the terms of the British North America Act preserving any system of separate schools created after the Union, because the terms of their own Act, notwithstanding the omission of these words, are wide enough to cover the case. Well, then there were developed in the course of the argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council other important questions as well. One of them was that the system of separate schools, which was established by the Act of 1871 in Manitoba, was not a system of separate or dissentient schools within the terms of that section of the British North America Act. Another question, and one I dare say we shall hear contended for, one which has been abundantly contended for in the press, is the statement, in which I am not able to agree, for the reasons I have given, that the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council covers the case and prevents an appeal, just as it establishes the validity of the Acts of 1890 of the province of Manitoba. Then there is the question as to the power of His Excellency to grant the orders which are asked for by the petitioners. They ask for remedial legislation, but they ask for remedial legislation by their later petitions in a specific form. They ask that the province of Manitoba shall be ordered to re-enact certain enactments, they ask certain exemptions, and make various specific applications, as to our power to grant which there may well be question, and there certainly would be argument. Now then, let me ask the House to consider what the obvious duty and the plain common-sense way of proceeding was, as regards these questions. We had to face then, of course, as regards the public, as we have to face now, the suspicion on the part of some, that we are trying to get round the decision of the Privy Council in some way. We have to face, on the other hand, the suspicion, the contention raised by our opponents, that we are endeavouring to get time by promoting litigation and leading the appellants a dance through the courts. But we had it perfectly apparent to us, that if we were to deal sincerely and honestly with this question, these legal points must be determined before any action could be taken, as regards remedial legislation; if it

was to be taken. Because let no man in this House hide from himself the fact that these legal questions will inevitably come before the courts, whether they are sent there by the Government or not, and if we were to do as the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) wishes us to do, if we were to make the order for remedial legislation, and invite this House to pass a statute upon that subject, every word of that statute, every act, every proceeding, every word of our order, every taxation, every right, every appointment under it, would be liable to be challenged on the ground that these legal questions lying at the root had been disregarded by us, or improperly determined by us, and that we had no jurisdiction in the premises at all. What condition should we then have put this country in, if, in dealing with this difficult and delicate Manitoba question, we had made such remedial orders; had asked this House to pass remedial legislation, and, after all that had been done, it was found we had simply bungled our work. The province would laugh at us and defy us and disregard our authority, and it would be established definitely by the courts that all we had tried to do to relieve the grievances of the minority in Manitoba was a mere nullity? We would simply have thrown the province into confusion and made hostility between the two classes greater than it was before. Those who are in favour of remedial legislation fear the result of another appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and who say to us, if not in the language used to-night, in language used elsewhere and implied here to-night: "You are sending us before an unfriendly court, which ruled against us once already"—these must remember that that is the tribunal which eventually must decide, whether it decides first or last, and it is a question of policy, prudence and principle, whether we shall not have this question settled and out of our way, or whether we shall promote confusion and disaster and disgrace to ourselves by endeavouring to interfere in matters over which perhaps, it will be found we have no control. One set of persons, therefore, contend, as did my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) this afternoon and evening, that it was our duty, without inquiry, without precaution, without having got these legal questions out of the way, to have given remedial legislation, while on the other hand, another section opposed to our policy contend, with greater vehemence still, that our duty was to have dismissed the appeal at the outset and taken no action whatever in regard to it. I would ask if we could reasonably be expected to adopt that course of throwing out the petition, without any determination as to whether the petitioners had wrongs to be redressed or not? Would it be reasonable that we should throw out the petition simply of our own motion, when, by the terms of the sections with regard to education which I have read, if the minorities in the provinces have rights, we

are constituted the guardians and trustees of those rights, and are bound not to regard simply the wish and the desire of the majority," and are protectors, not of the majority, but of the minority. Sir, it was our absolute duty, in our judgment, to obtain a judicial determination of the questions in the interest of both parties, and especially in the interest of peace and good government in the province of Manitoba. I desire now, at the risk of wearying the House a little, to call attention to what was done here upon that subject in the year 1890. The existence of this very Manitoba difficulty, this very stage of it, was brought to the notice of the House by the Hon. Mr. Blake, and he moved a resolution which, in 1891, after he had left, was embodied in a statute, enabling us to refer such questions as this to the determination of the court. Let me read a few of the remarks of Mr. Blake with regard to that subject, because they are as cogent and as pertinent to this very case as if they were uttered upon this floor this very night. I read this first passage to show that Mr. Blake had in his mind this very difficulty in regard to Manitoba, and that he put it forward as one of the reasons for adopting the resolution which he had moved:

I would say that recent current and impending events have combined to convince me that it is important in the public interest that this proposition should receive attention during this session.

In another place he says:

Yet, Sir, no legislature or executive can, any more than any private individual, act at all without considering, and in a sense deciding for itself the legality of its acts, and so in some sort entering upon the judicial department, but not upon the domain of the judicial power, because our opinion that our acts are valid does not make them so, their validity depends upon the decision of the judicial authority and upon that alone.

I commend that to the consideration of those gentlemen on both sides of this question who undertake to say we have usurped judicial power—an unwarrantable conclusion, as I shall ask the House to declare, on the report upon which that criticism is founded, one that was not sanctioned in 1890, when Mr. Blake used almost the same language contained in the report that in coming to a judgment upon this question we were to a certain extent "entering upon the judicial department, but not upon the domain of the judicial power." The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) in the latter part of his speech, challenged the propriety of our course and the consistency of it, when he declared that in one part of the report we were declaring that our functions were judicial and at the same time, instead of exercising judicial functions we were referring the question to the judges. That is precisely what Mr. Blake explained when he declared that we were entering upon the judicial department, but not upon the domain of judicial power. That is a distinction which the critics of that part of the report have not considered and which

I think they will do well to consider if they desire to do justice to the Government in this matter, instead of making a party advantage out of it, which I am sure many of them do not desire to do. Mr. Blake went on to say :

There can be no doubt that the absolute union of these departments—

that is of the executive, the legislative and the judicial—

Is neither more or less than absolute despotism.

He is calling attention to the functions which would be exercised by a Government and Parliament deciding upon legal questions affecting the rights of others without a judicial determination of them, and he says that to do so would be absolute despotism. He goes on :

United in one hand, I care not whether it be the hand of an autocrat or the hand of a council, the power of legislation, the power of interpretation, and the power of administration, and you make the most absolute despot that is conceivable. The separation therefore, the degree to which without over weakening or over complicating the action of the machine, you can separate them, marks the degree to which, in this aspect of a constitutional system, you have attained perfection.

He goes on to say :

The first of the two cases to which I allude is that in which the proposal comes before the Executive, to disallow an Act of a Provincial Legislature on the ground that that Act is *ultra vires*. If it be so, the Act is void ; and I think I may say, that it is now generally agreed that void Acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the courts. It is yet, and I think with sound reason, contended, that cases of great general inconvenience or involving difficulty, delay, or the impossibility of a resort to law, may justify the policy of disallowance, even in cases in which the Act is *ultra vires*, and therefore void. In that view there would arise two questions, the question of policy, and the question of legality, because, the question of legality leaves untouched the question of policy. If the Act be void, shall it be disallowed or no ? The other case to which my motion alludes, is that of the educational appeal, which arises under section 93 of the Constitutional Act, and under the analogous provision of the Manitoba Constitutional Act. Under these clauses a limited power to make educational laws is granted to a province, provided, amongst other things, that nothing therein contained shall prejudicially affect any right, or privilege, with respect to denominational schools which any of the provinces had by law, or, in the case of Manitoba, by practice at the Union. There is another class of restrictions, which I do not in terms touch here, but to which, in cases in which an appeal is raised upon them, my observations would equally apply. This limitation upon the power of a province is made more effectual by a special provision giving an appeal to the Executive from any Act or decision of the Provincial Legislature or authorities affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in relation to education, and when also in case of the non-execution by the province of the decision of the Executive, this Parliament may make remedial laws for the purpose of affecting that decision. Those members who have long been here will well remember the New Brunswick school case, which was agitated for many years, and in the course of which agitation I hoped that some political aspects of that

and of analogous questions were finally settled—settled, at all events, for the party with which I acted, and for the humble individual who is now addressing you. I regard it as settled, for myself at any rate, first of all, that as a question of policy—

And I commend this to the consideration of the hon. member for L'Islet—

there shall be no disallowance of educational legislation, for the reason that, in the opinion of this Parliament, some other or different policy than that which the province has thought fit to adopt would be better. I hold it to be settled, in the second place, that no Address to the Crown shall be passed by this Parliament asking for a change of the Constitutional Act as affecting any province, against the will of that province in this particular ; and I hold it to be settled, perhaps obviously, from these two propositions, that the only questions which can practically arise within our domain are such questions as may be raised under section 93 and the analogous section of the Manitoba Act by way of appeal. The events which took place in connection with the New Brunswick school case afford, at all events to myself, a strong proof of the expediency of what I now propose. Let me enforce the three or four propositions I have stated by a brief reference to the votes upon that occasion. In part those votes were taken when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, in part they were taken when the Liberal Party were in power, the first stage in the transaction occurred when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and in May, 1872, I voted with the majority of the House against a motion to regret that the New Brunswick school law had not been disallowed by the Government, to which I was opposed, although I was and so expressed myself, of the opinion that some of the changes which had been made by that Provincial law were harsh changes. At the same time, I seconded a motion, which fortunately also prevailed.

Then he cites the resolution of Mr. Mackenzie :

That this House desirous to express, deems it expedient that the opinion of the law officers in England, and if possible of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be obtained as to the right of the New Brunswick Legislature to make such changes in the school law as deprived Roman Catholics of the privileges which they enjoyed at the Union, in respect of religious education in the common schools, with a view of ascertaining whether the case comes within the terms of subsection 4 of section 93 of of the British North America Act of 1867, which authorized the Parliament of Canada to enact remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions respecting education in the said Act.

He goes on to say :

At that time I need hardly remind the House, there was no Supreme Court in existence. The advice of the law officers was obtained, and it was, as it had been before, and I am afraid, if I may judge by a notice on the paper, it has been since, not perhaps very satisfactory ; and there was no approach apparently to the Judicial Committee. In the end we had to get up a suit some way or other, about some assessment or other, in order to obtain, by a clumsy and expensive process, a judicial decision, not reached for some years afterwards, of the question involved and stated in the motion which I have just read.

He said later on :

That the legislation which was the subject of agitation was in some particulars harsh, and might better have been otherwise. Now, sir, in the exercise of this power of disallowance by the Government, political

questions will arise, or at any rate they may arise. Questions of policy may present themselves, that is questions of expediency, of convenience, of the public interest, of the spirit of constitution or of the form of legislation. All these are clearly, exclusively for the executive and legislative departments of the Government. They are for the political department, but it is equally clear that when in order to determine your course you must find whether a particular Act is *ultra* or *intra vires*, you are engaging in a legal and a judicial function.

I ask the House again to observe that expression, which is almost the one adopted in this report, and the one censured by the resolution now on the Table of the House. Mr. Blake declared that in exercising that jurisdiction as to the Act being "*ultra vires*" or "*intra vires*," we were engaging in a legal and judicial function.

What do you do—you proceed to interpret the Constitutional Act and to declare its meaning; you proceed to interpret the Provincial Act under consideration and to declare its meaning; you proceed to compare the two statutes so interpreted and declared, and you proceed, finally to conclude whether the law conflicts with, or transcends the powers which are conferred upon the Legislature which passed it. Nothing that can be stated partakes more exclusively of the character of a legal operation than that which I have just now described. Again, when you deal with the appellate clauses, as, for example, in the case of Manitoba, the very case which is now in a sense pending, as to whether recent legislation be within the limits of the rights of the Provincial Legislature, and whether any relief is due under the appellate clause to those who claim, you have a legal question, or rather, in this case, a mixed question of law and of fact, which circumstance it was that induced me to interject the word "*fact*" in my motion, conscious as I was that it was only on the rarest occasions that any references of that description would be necessary. It seemed to me that, in this particular instance, I was pressed with an example which may arise. Now, what is the process to be gone through with in order to reach a conclusion? The first is that very question of fact, or mixed question of law and fact. You have to find whether any class of the population had by law or practice any right, at the time of the Union; and, if so, what right or privilege had they with respect to denominational schools. Secondly, if so, you have to find whether that law or privilege has been affected, and how it has been affected, by the legislation complained of; and thirdly, if so, you have to find what legislative action is required to redress the wrong. The first two questions at any rate are legal and not political at all. I aver that in the decision of all legal questions, it is important that the political executive should not, more than can be avoided, arrogate to itself judicial powers; and that when, in the discharge of its political duties, it is called upon to deal with legal questions, it ought to have that power surrounded by such solemnity and importance as may be thought expedient. It should, I say, have the power to call in aid the judicial department in order to arrive at a correct solution. The decision that an Act is *ultra vires*, and its consequent disallowance by the Executive is peculiar in practice to ourselves. It does not exist in the great example of the Republic to the south of us at all.

Not to weary the House too much, I forbear to read from that report a great deal more in the same line, establishing in the first place that, in dealing with questions of this character—and hon. gentlemen will see,
Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

if they read that speech, by many other passages which I have marked, that the argument of Mr Blake is quite as applicable to what should be done with regard to an appeal as with regard to questions of "*ultra vires*" or "*intra vires*," and that, not only is his principle applicable to the second class of questions, as well as to the first, but his express language and argument apply more to the solution of questions arising with regard to the determination of the rights of minorities asserted on appeal, than to the mere decision of whether the statute is "*ultra vires*" or "*intra vires*." Sir, that resolution was accepted by the leader of the House, Sir John A. Macdonald, in the spirit in which it was put forward by Mr. Blake, and Sir John took pains to declare that, while the terms of that resolution, taken alone, might seem to be ambiguous, he accepted it in the sense in which it was put forward in the lucid argument by which Mr. Blake had supported it in the House; and he expressed the hope, that in subsequently framing a statute we would be guided by the argument which Mr. Blake had advanced, as well as by the words of his resolution. Well, that resolution passed this House unanimously, and I humbly submit that, after the passage of the resolution, we had the mandate of this Parliament in dealing with any question that might arise by way of appeal as to an educational statute being "*ultra vires*," or as to a claim for remedial legislation; we had the mandate of the House that all such questions, so far as they involved disputes as to law or fact, should be sent to the courts for determination; and it is because we have obeyed that mandate of this House, obtained at the instance of the leader of the Opposition at that time, acquiesced in by the leader of the Government, that we are assailed by the terms of this resolution to-night, terms which conflict with the expression used by Mr. Blake in his speech, and with the speech by which Sir John A. Macdonald declared that he adhered to this principle. I submit that, not only may we claim that we have the mandate of this House, but we may claim to have the mandate of the whole Parliament on this subject, for in the following session we amended the Supreme Court Act in this way, adopting the very language of Mr. Blake's resolution. We placed thus among the subjects which the court should investigate and have power to determine:

Important questions of law or fact touching provincial legislation, or the appellate jurisdiction as to educational matters vested in the Governor in Council by the British North America Act, 1867, or by any other Act or law, or touching the constitutionality of any legislation of the Parliament of Canada, or touching any other matter with reference to which he sees fit to exercise his power, may be referred by the Governor in Council to the Supreme Court for hearing or consideration, and the court shall thereupon hear and consider the same.

So that, by the very text of that statute, His

Excellency is given power to refer, not only questions connected with the constitutionality of these Acts of 1890, which are complained of, but all questions of law or fact which arise with regard to an appeal under section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, or any other Act or law of a like character. Then, there is a provision inserted for the first time, that :

The court shall certify to the Governor in Council for his information, its opinion on questions so referred, with the reasons therefor, which shall be given in like manner as in the case of a judgment upon an appeal to the said court.

And there is a provision which enables the decision of the court in any such case to be treated as a final judgment, so that there may be an appeal from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I claim that the machinery which we have used here, of sending this question to the courts, was adopted for the purpose by this Act, because Mr. Blake avowed that he put it forward to meet this very educational question, which had arisen in the province of Manitoba; and yet, Sir, the assault which has been made upon us to-night, is for having followed the very terms of that resolution carried in this House, and of a statute of this Parliament passed no longer ago than 1891. There has been a great deal said about an expression which is used in the report, and about which, I humbly conceive, there has been either a complete misapprehension or a great deal of hypercriticism, and the misapprehension or hypercriticism finds its way into the language of this amendment, which reads :

That, Mr. Speaker, do not now leave the chair, but that the House resolves its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and in assuming to be possessed of judicial functions conflicting with their duty as the constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to law, and, if now acquiesced in, will be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

I might fairly call the attention of the House at some length to the origin and source of this particular provision in our Constitution providing for an appeal to the Governor-General in Council. I will do so very briefly, because, if I were to dwell on it, the public, at all events, if not this House, might suppose that we were making a technical defence with regard to those words which are contained in the report and which are censured in this resolution, whereas our defence is not in that line at all. But, in passing, I may refer to the fact, that in constitutions of recent years there is no analogous provision, that I have been able to find, constituting the Governor-General in Council a tribunal of appeal from a provincial authority, with power to make decisions, and placing power and jurisdiction in the Federal Parliament to carry out any decision which may be disobeyed by the provincial authorities. But in early times, in

times which preceded the period when responsible government assumed full strength, that was well known in all the provinces of Canada at least, for in nearly all was there a judicial power vested in the Governor in Council; the Council formed a court of appeal with respect to many subjects; and it had power to issue writs of error. As late as 1873, a statute of Prince Edward Island recognized—it was subsequently ascertained that it was passed under a mistaken assumption of the law—the existence of jurisdiction in the Governor in Council as a legal tribunal. At one time, of course, Parliaments themselves were courts of law. Subsequently, the executive authority exercised that jurisdiction, and latterly the two jurisdictions have grown apart as people became conscious of the principle which Mr. Blake has explained so well in the speech which I have just quoted, conscious that a union in one hand of the executive, the legislative and the judicial authority, constituted the greatest despotism that any country could possess, while the separation of these functions was the best guarantee of constitutional freedom. However, that is only by the way. What I wish to call attention to is the extraordinary manner in which our report has been misinterpreted, the report of the sub-committee with respect to this question. This was our observation :

With respect to the functions that devolve upon Your Excellency's advisers, with regard to this appeal the application came before Your Excellency's advisers in a manner different from the applications which are ordinarily made under the constitution to Your Excellency in Council.

Surely the functions which devolve on His Excellency under this clause of the constitution are not only peculiar to this constitution, not only exceedingly difficult and delicate to exercise, but they are different from any other functions given to the executive by the terms of the British North America Act. In the opinion of His Excellency's advisers the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of political character or involving political action on the part of His advisers. That has been put forward, and is put forward in this resolution, as showing that we are endeavouring to free from political responsibility the executive who should be responsible in regard to what advice we may give. It means nothing of the kind; it would be nonsense if it conveyed anything of that kind. I will show the House what interpretation it does fairly bear, and what interpretation was intended by those who framed it. The report reads :

It is to be dealt with by Your Excellency in Council regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools and without the political action of any of the members of Your Excellency's Council being considered as pledged by the fact of the appeal being entertained and heard. If the contention of the petitioners be correct, that such an appeal can be sustained, the inquiry will be rather of a judicial than

of a political character. The sub-committee have so treated it in hearing counsel, and in permitting their only meeting to be open to the public.

Out of that has come all this criticism that we are claiming to be possessed of judicial functions, conflicting with our duties as constitutional advisers of the Crown, that this is an assumption wholly unknown to law, and if now acquiesced in will entirely subvert the principle of ministerial responsibility. The expression that our functions with respect to this appeal are judicial rather than political, is not said of our functions with respect to the whole appeal; but the report states that at this stage, and in regard to simply hearing the appeal our functions are judicial rather than political. That assertion is based on these grounds: That a special duty is devolved on His Excellency's advisers by that section of the British North America Act, different altogether from the functions which are exercised otherwise, and we use an expression, the expression judicial, which almost every paragraph of Mr. Blake's speech of 1890 applies to those who sitting in the executive have to deal with questions of that kind. The same expression was used, or a similar one, in the House to-night, when we were asked to come to the consideration of the subject, not in a party spirit, but in a spirit of judicial fairness. Time and time again in considering questions involving the rights of members or the rights of persons who have stood at our bar or who were to be affected by our decision, I have heard the leaders of both sides declare that the investigation ought not to be approached with political and party spirit, as the House was exercising judicial functions in dealing with the questions before it, and in committees of the House the term is used when people are summoned and interrogated, and personal rights are to be affected by the decision. The functions which devolve under that clause of the constitution on the executive are judicial rather than political in this sense; not by any means, however, let me promise, in the sense that we are free from responsibility for any act or word, not by any means in the sense that we are judges, not by any means in the sense that we are a court of justice, but in the sense which applies to men who are dealing not with matters in which they can exercise a personal preference and a personal choice, or in which they can be guided by the sense of what is best for the party, or by the sense of what is best for other interests of the country, or by a sense even of what is best for the country as a whole, but in ascertaining the rights of others, not what is best for the majority but as to the rights of the minority. We are required by the terms of the British North America Act to give a decision; that decision is to be communicated to the province; if the province disregard our decision, this House has jurisdiction to make an enactment to enforce that decision. I am using the very

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

words of the Act, and was it straining a point to use the metaphor which refers to the judicial rather than the political authority with respect to all these questions? Why, Sir, a politician advising His Excellency in ordinary matters is bound to give his personal predilections weight; is bound to give his personal and private opinions for the benefit of his colleagues and for the benefit of His Excellency. He is bound to do what is best for the interests of the country as a whole. He is bound to consult the welfare of the majority, if the interests of the majority and the minority cannot be reconciled; but with regard to the questions which come up in this appeal, that course of action has to be reversed, and while, as I admit, we are perfectly responsible for everything we have done and will be perfectly responsible for everything which we will do, we have to be guided in some degree, at least, by the judicial rather than by the political sense in ascertaining what the rights were of those who appeal, and how they should be dealt with, because those rights are entrusted to our safe keeping by the constitution. Now then, let me inquire for a moment whether this is anything unusual. I have already referred the House to expressions which are used when we come to deal with rights, with property, with the rights of individual members of this House, and with the rights of constituencies. Every time such questions come up the House is invited, and properly invited, to come to the determination of these questions in a judicial spirit, and to deal with them judicially, whether we always succeed in doing so or not. When this question with regard to the separate schools of Manitoba came before the council, everybody knows that there sat there men strongly in favour of separate schools, and every one knows that there sat there men opposed to separate schools. Was the private and personal opinion as to whether there should be separate schools or not, to govern members of the executive thus sitting? Would those who are opposed to separate schools have done right in leaving their seats in council and walking out, on the ground that separate schools were against their conscience? No, Sir; they had the duty devolving upon them, at least to hear the appeal, and that duty was not a political duty; but it took to a very great extent of the character of a judicial duty, and so they have heard the appeal in so far as it has progressed now. Surely it was not out of place at least to use the metaphor which refers to the judicial authority for the purpose of explaining to the public that we were not sitting there in the exercise of our ordinary duties; but sitting there in discharge of a peculiar duty, in respect to which the rights of other people were dependent upon our action. That Sir, is the only foundation for the extraordinary motion with which the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) concluded a speech upon different matters altogether; a motion which

declares that we have assumed judicial functions, and that that is entirely inconsistent with ministerial responsibilities. Sir, I do not hesitate to affirm as my belief and as true constitutional doctrine, that for everything a Minister does he is responsible to Parliament as well as to the people. If a Minister is called upon to decide a case between two parties just as we were called upon here to decide a case between two classes of the community; if he has to decide upon the rights of property of a man who is before the Council, just as we had here to decide upon a claim to the school property and the school moneys of Catholic sections and of Protestant sections, the Minister is responsible to the House for every step he takes and all he can claim is the forbearance and charitable judgment of the House, in view of the delicate functions he is obliged to perform in that regard. That is the only claim we make here. We claim, not the charity, but the fair consideration of the House in view of the difficult and delicate functions we had to discharge on a question irritating large bodies of the people, and entering to some extent into their religious privileges, their religious beliefs, and their religious practices. Now, let me call the attention of the House to some classes of questions, which we are now told are not of a judicial character at all, and as to which it is said that to recognize them as in any sense judicial would be subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility. I will take one illustration; but there are many. We have duties devolving upon us by Act of Parliament as members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and although we sit there as Ministers, we sit discharging precisely the functions which are exercised in other places by judges, and which are judicial rather than political. We had to deal with a case in that Committee some four or five years ago, in which the rights of a province seemed to be involved. A railway constructed under the authority of the Manitoba Government claimed the right to cross a railway constructed by the Federal Government, and the constitutional question was raised as to their right to force a connection with a railway which was under the authority of this Parliament by the terms of our statute. We did, with regard to that, just what we are doing here with regard to the Manitoba educational question. It was then the Manitoba Railway question now it is the Manitoba Educational question, and what we did was to submit to His Excellency that he should lay before the court a case upon which the rights of all parties concerned should be decided before we made any rule, or before we made any decision. We might have pursued the course recommended by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). We might have made an order for the crossing; we might have put bodies of armed men in motion for the purpose of effecting the crossing; we might have left the crossing difficulty to be decided afterwards; but every man,

when the dispute was over, admitted that we took the safer course; that we avoided confusion and perhaps bloodshed; at any rate, that we avoided confusion and heart-burnings. We submitted the question of the rights of the parties to the courts first, and acted on the decision which we procured from the courts. I admit, Sir, that with regard even to that question that we were subject to ministerial responsibility, and that it was the perfect right of any member of this House, while that case was in progress, to move a resolution declaring that we should not submit it to the courts, or declaring, after it came from the courts, that we should have evaded the instructions of the courts, or acted on the authority which the courts said we had. Therefore, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, I disclaim in the strongest manner any attempt to evade ministerial responsibility, and I again assert that the criticism which is contained in this resolution and which is made elsewhere, is a criticism which carves words and splits hairs, and that the metaphor which we did use, and which related to a judicial rather than a political subject, was fully justified by the language used in this House in 1890, when the principle on which we were acting was adopted. There occurred to my memory this moment an observation which was used in this House a few days ago, with regard to the office of Lieutenant-Governor. A leading member of the House, challenging the propriety of our action with regard to the tenure of office of a Lieutenant-Governor in one of the provinces, said that it detracted from the independence of his office, and that it was important that that independence of the office should be observed because the Lieutenant-Governor was a quasi-judicial officer acting as between parties. The expression was perhaps an appropriate one, in that case; but not half as appropriate as was the allusion to the judicial authority and the judicial function in this report of the sub-committee. In passing now, Mr. Speaker, as I think I may, from the terms of this report of the sub-committee, I wish to make one observation in regard to the allusion which the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) made to one of our late colleagues. He referred to his having gone into retreat, and making an analogy, I suppose in his own mind, between his retirement from the political scene—to the demise which is to come to us all—the hon. member declared that Mr. Chapleau had made his last will, in a speech at Hochelaga some weeks before his retirement from the Government. I beg to say in answer to the playful allusion of the hon. member for L'Islet, that that last will is no good because we have a later one, the name of Mr. Chapleau is appended to this very report which is made the subject of censure by the hon. member for L'Islet. For the purpose of asking the forbearance of the House as to our treatment

of this question—not the forbearance of the House exactly, but the fair and impartial judgment of the House, as distinguished from the bias which we sometimes feel in regard to matters in which the fate of the Government is involved. I want to ask the House to consider the gravity and delicacy of the position in which we are placed. I mean in which this country is placed; I mean in which this Parliament is placed, as well as in which the executive is placed with regard to this religious and educational question in the province of Manitoba. Let us look for a few moments at a country with a somewhat analogous constitution alongside of us; let us inquire how long the wonderful union between the states in the United States of America would have lasted if the statesmen of that country, the governors and presidents of that country, had acted on the impulsive notions of the hon. member for L'Islet, and had torn up State Acts and Federal Acts by the power of veto. That subject has been well investigated, and the great author who has treated of "The American Commonwealth" has made some observations upon the feature of the constitution which gives to the judiciary such control over legislation as to questions of "ultra vires" and "intra vires." Speaking of the apparent difficulty of working such a system, in which the judiciary surmounts for certain purposes the executive, he says:

It is nevertheless true that there is no part of the American system which reflects more credit on its authors or has worked better in practice. It has had the advantage of relegating questions not only intricate and delegate, but peculiarly liable to excite political passions, to the cool, dry atmosphere of judicial determination. The relations of the central federal power to the states, and the amount of authority which Congress and the President are respectively intitled to exercise, have been the most permanently grave questions in American history, with which nearly every other political problem has become entangled. If they had been left to be settled by Congress, itself an interested party, or by any dealing between Congress and the state legislatures, the dangers of a conflict would have been extreme, and instead of one civil war there might have been several. But the universal respect felt for the Constitution, a respect which grows the longer it stands, has disposed men to defer to any decision which seems honestly and logically to unfold the meaning of its terms. In obeying such a decision they are obeying, not the judges, but the people who enacted the constitution. To have foreseen that the power of interpreting the Federal Constitution and statutes, and determining whether or no State Constitutions and statutes transgress federal provisions, would be sufficient to prevent struggles between the National Government and the State Governments, required great insight and great faith in the soundness and power of a principle. While the constitution was being framed the suggestion was made, and for a time seemed likely to be adopted, that a veto on the Acts of State Legislatures should be conferred upon the Federal Congress. Discussion revealed the objections to such a plan. Its introduction would have offended the sentiment of the States, always jealous of their autonomy; its exercise would have provoked collisions with them. The disallowance of a State

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

statute, even if it did really offend against the Federal constitution, would have seemed a political move, to be resented by a political counter move. And the veto would often have been pronounced before it could have been ascertained exactly how the State statute would work, sometimes, perhaps, pronounced in cases where the statute was neither pernicious in itself nor opposed to the Federal constitution. But by the action of the courts the self-love of the States is not wounded, and the decision annulling their laws is nothing but a tribute to the superior authority of that supreme enactment to which they were themselves parties, and which they may themselves desire to see enforced against another State on some not remote occasion.

Precisely the same is the case, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the province of Manitoba. To have disallowed, after the decisions of this Parliament on the cases of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, would have created a feeling of great uneasiness throughout this country. Why, Sir, the very dread that her educational powers are intended to be assailed out of religious sympathy on the part of some of us, or from political hostility to the Government and Legislature of the day in Manitoba by some of us—the very suspicion that we intended to interfere with her rights caused an outcry in Manitoba, and all the Dominion has been filled with the cries of her alarm. When the questions which surround her case have been decided by the courts, there will be no suspicion on the part of that province that either from religious or political antipathy or sympathy her legislation has been interfered with or her rights invaded; and when the hon. member for L'Islet challenges me, as he surely had no right to challenge me, to state in advance what the policy of the Government would be if such and so should happen, I tell him that the answer I can give him now and the answer I shall be able to give him, if that event should happen, would be this, that the province of Manitoba is a constitutional province, and that whether it be in the hands of legislators opposed to us or in the hands of legislators in sympathy with us, we have every reason to believe and to rest assured that she will obey the dictates of the highest tribunals in this Empire as to what the constitution is, regardless of consequences, regardless even of the displeasure of the majority if the decision should be against the majority; and that, so far as the disposal of this appeal is concerned at any rate, the minority must bow to that decision, and the Federal executive will advise His Excellency accordingly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night it seems hardly fitting that I should rise to occupy the time of the House; but on a question which affects my province so deeply as this one does I feel it my duty to say a few words. I have listened with great attention to what has been said by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and I have tried to follow him as closely as possible.

Unfortunately my very imperfect knowledge of the French language rendered the early part of his speech rather unintelligible to me; but I take for granted that when he spoke in English he gave the substance of what he had already said in his own language, and if that is the case, I may say that, although I followed him as closely as possible, I did not hear a single argument advanced which would justify me in voting for his amendment. I say this deliberately, and, notwithstanding the fact that to a certain extent I sympathize with my hon. friend, I sympathize with him in his feeling of indignation at the way in which the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the province of Manitoba were treated with regard to the separate schools. I sympathize with him because I know that whatever we may think as to the advisability of maintaining the system of separate schools or establishing a system of national schools in Manitoba, the manner in which the separate school system was abolished was barbarous, brutal and butcherly. I believe, as has been explained by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), that the proceedings taken by the Local Government of Manitoba to enforce and carry out the School Act were such as to give the impression that it was their intention to add insult to injury, and to outrage in every way in their power the feelings of the Roman Catholic minority of the province from which I come. I also sympathize with my hon. friend in wishing that the Government of Canada had seen fit to deal with this question on their own responsibility, and not again refer it to the courts. But here the sympathy between us ends; and when we come to the question of the manner in which this important matter ought to have been dealt with by the Government of Canada, our views are as wide as the poles asunder. For, while he regrets that the Government did not disallow or veto the provincial legislation of 1890 or 1891, within the year within which the power of disallowance may be exercised, and while he now says that the Government of Canada should come to this House and ask for remedial legislation, which would have for effect the removing of the injury under which he believes the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba to be suffering, I consider that any interference with provincial legislation by the exercise of the power of disallowance would be a usurpation of the rights of the province to which I belong, and so far am I from wishing that anything in the shape of remedial legislation should take place, that my wish is that the Government should declare openly to this House and the country that the matter, having been referred to the courts for decision, and having been carried from the courts of Manitoba to the Supreme Court of the Dominion and from the Supreme Court of the Dominion to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest court of appeal

to which British colonists can go, and that court having decided that the Provincial Legislature acted within its rights in passing the Act in question, that judgment should be considered final and binding and this local School Act upheld. As I have already said, I agree with my hon. friend in wishing that the Government should take a firm stand in this matter, and decide it without reference to the courts; but after listening to the speech of my hon. friend the First Minister, the very able speech which he has just delivered, I am almost afraid that the very fact of my hon. friend from L'Islet and myself being ready to jump to a hasty conclusion and form an off-hand judgment on a matter of this importance, is simply a sign that neither of us is cut out for a Cabinet Minister. And I am not inclined to cavil at, much less censure, the course of the Government for taking every step they are allowed by our constitution to determine what their legal rights are, and also what are the rights of the minority, under the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, for this is a question which excites interest, not only in Manitoba, but from one end of Canada to the other—yes, from Cape Breton to Vancouver—and it is moreover a question particularly calculated to stir the passions of which the human mind is capable. Let us view the situation for a moment, and you will find that it bears me out in what I say. You will see on the one side a body of men in this House and in the country whose views are very similar to those expressed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and who consider the Manitoba School Act an insult to their church, an injury to their co-religionists in the province of Manitoba, and a breach of the agreement, express or implied, which was entered into at the time provincial rights were given to Manitoba, and even of the understanding under which the province of Quebec, then Lower Canada, entered into Confederation. These gentlemen naturally enough are determined to leave no stone unturned to have this injury redressed, this insult wiped out, by means of remedial legislation in this House, which shall in some way render null and void this most objectional Act from their stand-point. On the other hand, you see a body of men in this House, and a vast number in the country, who are opposed to any interference with provincial legislation, and who are equally determined as the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and his friends. These gentlemen, although acting together, standing shoulder to shoulder, to resist any attack upon this Manitoba School Act, may be very properly divided into two classes. One who are opposed to interference, because they believe that this Act, having been decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to be "intra vires" of the Provincial Legislature, cannot be interfered with without a breach of the Constitution and a gross interference with provincial rights. Another class care compara-

tively little whether provincial rights are interfered with or not, but approve of the system of national and are opposed to the system of separate schools, and do not desire to see the national schools now established in Manitoba interfered with in any way. I may say there is perhaps a third class, composed of men like myself, who are opposed to interference on both grounds; and for myself, I can only say that so strongly do I feel on this question, that I am ready to oppose to the best of my ability any attempt to interfere with the Manitoba School Act, or similar legislation from any other province. And if necessary, strong party man as I am, I am ready to carry my proposition so far, for the time being, as to throw party ties to the winds and vote want of confidence in the Government I was elected to support, and of whose general policy I most heartily approve. I do not know that there is very much more for me to say after the very able speech we have heard from the head of the Government, and which, I think, effectually disposed of the claim of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), that the Government is attempting to shirk its responsibility to the House and the country by claiming to exercise purely judicial functions. I think the First Minister's explanation on that point is clear and decided, and there are few men in this House or country who, after hearing or reading that speech, will not understand perfectly the position the Government have taken and feel it is one which is justified by the circumstances of the case. We know that the Government cannot shirk the responsibility as advisers of His Excellency the Governor-General, which they are bound to shoulder. In this case, however, there is no attempt to do anything of that kind. In this case, there are legal points to be tested—points as to what rights the Roman Catholics of Manitoba have under the Manitoba Act and the ninety-third section of the the British North America Act, and it has to be decided whether, under the Manitoba Act, there is a right of appeal to the Governor-General in Council for remedial legislation. It has also to be decided whether Manitoba can in any way take advantage of the British North America Act, or whether the provisions relating to educational matters in the Manitoba Act cut out that province from the older Act by which the other provinces are governed. That is a question which has to be decided, and I am certain after having heard the First Minister, that no reasonable man can fail to feel, whatever his opinion may be as to the right or wrong of the Manitoba School Act, that the Government have acted in an impartial manner in referring this matter to the courts. I am sorry that, as I sympathize with my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) to a certain extent, I cannot vote for his amendment. But I do not wish him to be too much disappointed at that. I hope he

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).

will keep up his courage and try again, and I can promise him now that, if it is decided that the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba have the right to appeal to the Governor in Council for remedial legislation, and if the Governor in Council decides to grant that remedial legislation, if he, the hon. member for L'Islet, will then move a vote of censure upon the Government, I will be very glad to second it.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— TREATY WITH FRANCE.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, an agreement entered into between Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the President of the French Republic, regulating the commercial relations between Canada and France in respect of customs tariffs.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 6th March, 1893.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Canadian Gas Association.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Chilliwhack Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the British Columbia Dock Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 90) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill proposes to extend to bribers certain penalties now applicable only to bribers and also to reach another class of bribers—persons who bet on elections.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE U.S.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, the accompanying papers relating to the Conference held at Washington in February, 1892, between the delegates of the Canadian Government and the Secretary of State of the United States upon the several subjects therein mentioned.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 7th March, 1893.

SUPPLY—SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. Tarte in amendment thereto.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the discussion which was commenced yesterday on the subject of the Manitoba school law, it will not be necessary for me to detail at any very great length or to recapitulate the history in connection with the measure which was so very fully given to the House last night by the hon. First Minister in his very able and full statement of the subject. I, however, have just to ask the House to recollect the dates in connection with the Bill and with the history of separate school legislation in the province of Manitoba. The Manitoba Act, as we all know, was passed more than twenty years ago and by it the constitution which that province enjoys was conferred upon it and a certain enactment was made with regard to the subject of education. That enactment, as was pointed out, is not in the same terms as the corresponding law to be found in the British North America Act, but, for some reason or another which I do not know and certainly am not able to offer any explanation about, the terms, or limitations rather, with regard to education which apply to other provinces of the Dominion do not apply to the province of Manitoba. It is true that after that constitution was conferred and very early indeed in the history of the province, a Separate School Bill was passed, the population at that time being pretty evenly divided, though by no

means a large population, between the two classes speaking generally, that is to say, between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants. And, in carrying out in the power which the Provincial Legislature had, that Legislature passed a Separate School law which, subject to changes and modifications, remained in force until the year 1890, when the Separate School law was repealed and the Public Schools Act was passed, thus giving rise to a good deal of discussion and controversy, not merely in Manitoba, but in all parts of the Dominion. The Act that I now speak of and as to which this motion refers was passed in 1890. It was sent very shortly afterwards and reached Ottawa somewhere in the month of April in the same year. The period for the disallowance of that Act, therefore, expired in the month of April, 1891. Very promptly after the Act came here, almost contemporaneously, petitions were sent and applications made, one for the disallowance of the Act, from the Roman Catholic School Board, which had been, in point of fact, dispensed with by the new Act, and others from various parties in the province, members of the Local Legislature and others, who claimed that the Act was in contravention of the powers of the province and ought to be dealt with by the Governor-General in Council, but not stating specifically whether it was to be dealt with by power of disallowance or by other power supposed to be conferred upon the Government in the special case of matters relating to education. No action appears to have been taken upon these until the 21st March, in the following year. When I say no action appears to have been taken, I mean no action appears to have been taken by the Governor-General in Council or by the Government, with reference to the prayer of these petitions, either as to disallowance or as to the other action sought for, namely, the change of the law, if it could be changed, under the power of appeal. But we know that early in the year 1890 proceedings were taken in the province of Manitoba in the name of one Barrett for the purpose of invoking the opinion of the courts as to whether the Act which had been passed was or was not within the power of the Legislature, and whether, in point of fact, it was to govern for time to come. That proceeding was instituted, as I say, somewhere in the year 1890, I believe in September of that year. Now, it may not be known to all the members of this House, in point of fact, it may not be known to many of them, that the litigation was not merely paid for by the Government of this country—that we do know—but that the litigation was, in point of fact, promoted, instituted and carried on nominally in the name of this man Barrett, who was competent, of course, as being a citizen of Winnipeg, to invoke the opinion of the court as to the legality of the by-law that was passed by the city of Winnipeg; but in reality by the Government of this Dominion, as was frankly enough stated by the First Minister in his speech to us last

night. It is not unimportant to bear that in mind when we come to consider the attitude which the Government has now assumed. It is not at all, as it appears to me, unnecessary for us to be very careful in considering the wish of the Government now to take the position of a judicial body, when we know that this same Government was the Government which promoted the litigation against the constitutionality of the Act of the province. It can hardly be expected in reason that the province that is now summoned to the bar of justice to answer for its legislation, can have very great confidence in the justice of the decision that may be come to by this judicial body, if it is a judicial body, when it is known to all the members of the Government and of the legislative body of that province, that it was this Government who not merely, as I say, paid for the litigation against the validity of the Act of the province, but, in point of fact, promoted that litigation, stirred it up, carried it on, retained counsel, and naturally became more or less interested in the success of the proceeding which had thus been instituted. Well, when the question had to be dealt with by the Government within the year's time, the report was made which has been referred to very fully, the report of the 21st March; and for my part I have no reason to find fault with that report in so far as it did not disallow the Act of the province. I have no sympathy at all with the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, who, as I understand his argument, thinks that the Provincial Act ought to have been disallowed. On the contrary, I am exceedingly glad indeed to hear the clear, emphatic and definite statement proceeding from the First Minister that the Government never thought of disallowing it, because it was a matter beyond the reach of ministerial responsibility, so to speak, and in view of the precedent of the New Brunswick school law, which occupied the attention of this Parliament for several years from 1872 onwards, the decision with regard to which had been accepted by the late Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, who was then at the head of the Government, and was fully accepted by the present Prime Minister, that the Act respecting education in that province ought not to be disallowed. If I offer any criticism at all with regard to that report, it is to point out that the report does not, in very definite and clear language, lay that rule down. We have it stated on the floor of Parliament, but we do not find it so stated in the report. Therefore I do not at all wonder that gentlemen who take the view of my hon. friend who moved this amendment, may feel a little disappointed at the course of events. I think one reading that report would naturally conclude that while the Government refused to disallow, while the Government, rather, did not disallow, and allowed the time to elapse within which the Government here had authority to disallow, they held out hopes that if the Act in the end should turn out to be a constitutional Act, an Act

Mr. McCARTHY.

within the power of the province to pass remedial legislation in some form or another, which would in effect carry out the desire of those who objected to the Act, would be given effect to by the Government here under the other clause of the Manitoba Act. I say, therefore, that I do not wonder that the view was taken—though I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that it is not to be found within the four corners of the document; it is certainly not expressly promised; and reading the document through, reading the argument of the Minister of Justice upon the subject in which he points out that the questions were twofold (because the third was eliminated), one being the question of fact as to whether the minority had, prior to the Union, any special privilege, and the other being one of law, as to whether that privilege, if it existed, had been violated by the Public School Act of 1890—I say that reading the argument, and reading the conclusion, I am not at all surprised that those who desired to see this law nullified, have been disappointed at the course of events. On the legal controversy, the document goes on to say:

Should it result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, quoted in the earlier part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the British North America Act in relation to other provinces. Those subsections contain in effect the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces and are obviously those under which the constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal power should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority against any act of decision of the Legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of any such minority in relation to education.

So that all I would say about it is, that I regret that the Minister did not in this report state as emphatically as he did upon the floor of the House, that the Act could not be disallowed and would not be disallowed, as being one of those dealing with the subject of education, leaving the other portion of the report of the Minister thought fit to draw it, in the terms in which I have just read it to the House. I think that observation is justified, when one refers back to the terms of the report of Sir John A. Macdonald with reference to the New Brunswick School Law. That report was made on the 22nd January, 1872, and in that report Sir John Macdonald said:

Now, the Provincial Legislatures have exclusive powers to make laws in relation to education, subject to the provisions of the 93rd clause of the British North America Act. Those provisions apply exclusively to denominational, separate or dissentient schools; they do not in any way affect or lessen the power of such Provincial Legislatures to pass laws respecting the general educational system of the pro-

vince. The Act complained of is an Act relating to common schools, and the Acts repealed by it apply to parish, grammar, superior and common schools. No reference is made in them to separate, dissentient or denominational schools, and the undersigned does not, on examination, find that any statute of the province exists establishing such special schools. It may be that the Act in question may operate unfavourably on the Catholics or on other religious denominations, and if so it is for such religious bodies to appeal to the Provincial Legislature which has the sole power to grant redress.

Now, these were the terms in which, in 1872, Sir John A. Macdonald dealt with an application similar in character, made with reference to the school law of New Brunswick, and all I say is, that I regret that the report with reference to this school law of Manitoba was not equally explicit and emphatic in its terms; but we have it now, at all events, on the floor of Parliament, and we have it from both sides of the House, I take it—at all events, Mr. Blake, who spoke in 1890 on the subject, speaking for himself and, he believed, for the bulk of his fellow-members of his own political persuasion, stated it for himself and on their behalf; and we have it now on this side of the House from the First Minister, on behalf of the Government, that legislation with respect to education is not to be vetoed or disallowed. We now come to the next proceeding, and I desire to make good my statement with respect to the manner in which the litigation was promoted by the Government of the Dominion. A question arose as to the retainer given to Sir Horace Davey, who, being an eminent counsel, was retained no less than three times with respect to the Manitoba school matter. He was retained in the first place by the Dominion, in the second place by the province of Manitoba, and in the third place by the city of Winnipeg; and when he was called on to accept a brief, the point arose to which retainer he was bound to accept. Was it to be the brief of the Dominion, the brief of the province, or the brief of the city of Winnipeg. In England questions of this kind are settled by the Attorney-General, and they are settled after a good deal of formality; and we have it here that this question was settled after a statement of the facts of the case on behalf of both parties, and I propose now to read to the House the letter of Mr. Justice Sedgewick, then Deputy-Minister of Justice, who states the facts within his own knowledge—in point of fact, he was the actor with respect to the institution of this litigation. He wrote this letter, on 4th January, 1892, to the solicitors in London, Messrs. Bompas, Bischoff & Co., who were acting for Mr. Barrett:

OTTAWA, 4th January, 1892.

SIRS,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th ultimo, and to state as therein requested the facts in reference to the Dominion Government's connection with the case of the City of Winnipeg *vs.* Barrett.

Shortly after the passing of the Manitoba School Act, the Canadian Government was petitioned from many quarters for its disallowance, and remonstrances

coming to the Government from His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, who exercises his ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the late Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, as well as Sir John Thompson, gave assurances that the Dominion Government would under take the expense of any litigation necessary to have the constitutionality of the Act tested in the courts, and I was personally authorized by both Ministers to do everything that was necessary with that end in view. On the 10th September, 1890, I proceeded to Winnipeg and placed myself in consultation with Messrs. Ewart & Brophy, who were the solicitors of Archbishop Taché, with a view of coming to a conclusion as to the most feasible way of commencing our attack. We thereupon determined upon the course which was subsequently followed. Mr. Barrett, the plaintiff in the action, being a nominal plaintiff, and I undertaking verbally that all expenses in the matter would be borne by the Government. Mr. Barrett was asked to allow his name to be used as a nominal plaintiff, I guaranteeing him all possible indemnity. Upon my return to Ottawa on November 4th, 1890, I confirmed in writing my instructions in the matter, a copy of which letter to Messrs. Ewart & Brophy being herewith inclosed.

I may further state that the Dominion Government have already paid Messrs. Ewart & Brophy's costs as well as a fee of \$600 to Hon. S. H. Blake, who argued the case before the Supreme Court of Canada.

I do not know that I can give you a fuller statement than the foregoing. There can be no doubt of the fact that Mr. Barrett, in so far as he had anything to do with the institution of the proceedings, was the agent of the Dominion Government, and not an independent litigant on his own account.

I may add that Messrs. Ewart & Brophy have rendered their account as solicitors and counsel to the Dominion Government only.

I have the honour to be, sirs,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) R. SEDGEWICK,
Deputy Min. of Justice.

I think that fully bears out the statement I made, that this litigation was actually instituted and promoted, not by any person on his own account, but by an agent, as he was called, of the Dominion Government. We come now to the proceeding which finally led to the decision of the Privy Council, and that determination, as the House knows, was reached about the last day of July last year. It was then finally determined that the decision of the courts of the province of Manitoba, which were in favour of the law and of its constitutionality, was right, and that the decision of the Supreme Court, although unanimous, was erroneous, and the law was held to be constitutional. Shortly after that the proceedings were renewed, in pursuance of the promise that was held out by the Minister of Justice in his report of March 21st. That report certainly did state most distinctly that if at the end it should be found that the law was *intra vires* and constitutional, then would be the time for His Excellency's advisers to consider the petitions which had been preferred under the provisions of the Manitoba Act; and accordingly various petitions were presented during the last year, and ultimately one was presented on which the investigation took place. Let me state briefly the

history of these proceedings. I think I am right, Sir, that, until the month of November last, no person ever dreamt that clause 93 of the British North America Act had an application at all to the province of Manitoba. It never was suggested in the early papers, it never was spoken of until in the end of October by a petition sent in by Mr. Ewart, as counsel for the petitioners, it was suggested that that clause of the British North America Act had some bearing, or might have some bearing upon the Manitoba Act, and the Manitoba school question under that Act. It was upon this last petition that the report of the sub-committee, to whom the matter had been referred by Council, containing as it did all the papers that had been referred to in the former reports, was arrived at. There was, therefore, a sitting some time in September or October, I am not quite sure, but the date is here, at which the parties were invited to attend and endeavour to point out or assist the sub-committee in pointing out the form in which this appeal should be made. This meeting was attended on behalf of the petitioners by Mr. Ewart; it was not attended, I think, at this stage by any representative of the Government of Manitoba, and that Government had not, I think, received any notice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am corrected as to that, and it seems that the Government of Manitoba had at that time notice, but they were not represented.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg your pardon; I am not sure that they had notice.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is my recollection of the facts, that they had not notice. Later on there was a sub-committee meeting, at which these questions were to be considered. Among the questions which the sub-committee regarded as preliminary are the following:—

1. Whether this appeal is such an appeal as is contemplated by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

2. Whether the grounds set forth in the petitions are such as may be the subject of appeal under either of the subsections above referred to.

3. Whether the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in any way bears on the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the Union have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890 before referred to.

4. Whether subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba.

5. Whether Your Excellency in Council has power to grant such orders as are asked for by the petitioner, assuming the material facts to be as stated in the petition.

6. Whether the Acts of Manitoba passed before the session of 1890 conferred on the minority a "right or privilege with respect to education," within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, or established "a system of separate or dissen-

Mr. McCARTHY.

tient schools," within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, and if so, whether the two Acts of 1890, complained of, affect "the right or privilege" of the minority in such a manner as to warrant the present appeal.

These were the questions which the sub-committee recommended should be submitted for consideration, and an appointment was made to hear argument as to the form or substance of these questions. It may be well now to call attention to the prayer of the petition. It may be well to see what it is the petitioners are desiring to do, now that the constitutionality of the Act has been fully established. That will be found in the return which has been brought down, and without troubling the House to read it all, I will read the fourth prayer of the petition. It is as follows:—

4. That it may be declared that to Your Excellency the Governor-General in Council it seems requisite that the provisions of the statutes in force in the province of Manitoba prior to the passage of the said Acts should be re-enacted, in so far, at least, as may be necessary to secure to the Roman Catholics in the said province the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support these schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes, to secure to them their proportionate share of any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education, and to relieve such members of the Roman Catholic Church as contribute to such Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools; or that the said Acts of 1890 should be so modified or amended as to effect such purposes.

The House will see from this that what is now sought is to accomplish by another means the destruction of the Public School Act of the province of Manitoba. The first educational Act of Manitoba was a Separate School Act, and the Act of 1890 did away with separate schools, and established a public school system. That Act of 1890 was held to be *intra vires*, to be within the powers of the Legislature of that province. No public schools have been in existence now since 1890. This petition, and the hearing which is now pending upon this petition, is for the purpose of destroying or of nullifying in another way the School Act which was passed in 1890. So that, although the province has been held to have power to pass that law, although it is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province to pass—subject, of course, to the restrictions which I will deal with later on—it is now sought in this way to destroy the effect of that enactment and to compel the province to enact such modifications and changes as would, in point of fact, restore the school system, as amended, based on the Act of 1871, and so to do away with the Public School Act of 1890. It is well to bear that in mind. It is well to understand exactly what it is that is pending before the Government of this country, because, without clearly keeping that before us, we may be misled by statements and we may think it a matter of very trifling moment or importance as to whether

or not, under the powers of the statute, anything really serious is meant or intended. Now, it will be clearly seen upon one of these petitions, and more especially upon the last petition to which I have made reference, that two hearings have already taken place, not any hearing yet upon the merits, it is true, but one as to the form in which the question should be discussed, and the second as to the form of the questions which ought to be considered. The last thing that has been done—and that brings to a close the narration which I thought it necessary to make before I offered a few observations on the policy or line of conduct of the Government—the last Minute that we have is brought down here in a supplementary return. It says :

The Committee of the Privy Council, having considered the arguments advanced by Mr. Ewart on behalf of the petitioners in Manitoba who have requested redress from Your Excellency with respect to certain statutes of that province relating to education, are of opinion that the important questions of law which were suggested in the report of the sub-committee to whom said petitioners were referred should be authoritatively settled before the appeal which has been asserted by said petitions be further proceeded with.

Well, I am not concerned here in the least in any desire to see these Acts destroyed or annulled ; but I cannot help, in passing, to make this remark : That it does appear very extraordinary, and must appear so to those who take an opposite view and who think that these Acts should be destroyed in one form or another, that although in 1891 it seemed quite plain to the Minister of Justice that the time would come for the consideration of these questions as to the constitutionality of the Act so passed, it does seem strange, that here in 1893 we have a report that the Government do not yet know whether they have power to take these petitions into consideration or not. As I say, I am not anxious to see or to assist in the destruction of the legislation of the province, but one cannot help feeling that those who relied upon whatever promises were given one way or the other—and in regard to that promise which, perhaps, has not seen the light of day—should seem disappointed at the course now taken. That there was some secret communication, I think was abundantly plain. In point of fact, we know from the letter of Mr. Sedgewick, that promises were made to the archbishop that the expenses of the litigation should be borne by this Dominion. Now, I do not find any record of any bargain or agreement of that kind, but in pursuance of that, although there is no Minute or Order or report of any kind brought down bearing on it, the litigation was promoted and the suit was carried on really by the Dominion Government, in the name of this man Barrett. I want, in the first place, to make it perfectly plain and clear, that I do not go with my hon. friend who moved this resolution (Mr. Tarte), in censuring, or desir-

ing in any way to censure the Government for not vetoing the School Act of 1890. I want it to be perfectly clear, that my only quarrel and fault, if I have any, and it is but of a very trifling nature, is, that the report did not specifically state and make it abundantly clear for all time to come, that the school legislation of the province was perfectly free from the exercise of the veto power. Neither do I quarrel with the rights of the parties to petition. That certainly is a right which under the statute, and more especially under the report of the Minister of Justice in 1891, the present Prime Minister, they had a perfect privilege to exercise. No person can find fault with the minority in Manitoba for having exercised their power and their right to petition. Under the statute conferring a Constitution on the province of Manitoba, and under the British North America Act, if they thought that could have any application to their case, no person, I say, can blame them. But what I do find fault with, and what I do complain of, and what enables me to support the first part of this resolution, is, that the Government, with a full knowledge of all the facts of this case, knowing the facts, because they were ascertained in the trial of the cause, knowing the law, because there are a series of Acts with reference to education passed by the province of Manitoba, and there is also an Act of this Parliament, confirmed afterwards by an Imperial enactment ; knowing all these facts, there being nothing to be discovered and nothing to be brought out, I say that Government ought, in my humble judgment, to have refused to entertain this appeal, and they ought to have at once determined upon the constitutionality of the Act of Manitoba, confirmed, as it had been, by the highest tribunal in the Empire. The law giving to the provinces, and giving to this province, exclusive jurisdiction over the subject-matter of education, and the School Act having been in force from the period of its passage in 1890 up to the present time, the Government, instead of practically allowing the institution and the carrying on of this appeal, ought to have declined to grant the relief. Now, is there any reason why they should not have done so ? I am not going at the moment to deal with the question of the judicial functions of the Government. But assuming, as I hope to be able to show, that this matter must be dealt with as a matter of policy, as a political matter, and not as a judicial matter, that it must be dealt with, as all other matters are, by the Government, of this Dominion, subject to the responsibility of Ministers of Parliament, I want to know why this question could not have been as well settled in the month of September last, when this petition was presented ? I want to know why the Government, instead of encouraging this litigation, instead of promoting this feud in the province, instead of keeping alive this unfortunate contention about the

right of the minority in the province of Manitoba, should not at once and for all time have said: We cannot, under these circumstances, interfere, and we will not interfere? Now, taking that view, although I should have preferred that it had been expressed on the face of the resolution, and that the vote which I propose to give in support of the resolution, had not been left open to any doubt, I cannot help saying that I agree with this portion of the resolution:

That this House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question.

But I want it to be understood that I do so, not because the Act was not disallowed, but because, after all the litigation, after all the difficulty which the province has had in maintaining its rights against the power of the Dominion, this Government—and, Sir, I want to say here, speaking on my full responsibility as a member of this House—that I think it was not a seemly act on their part—undertook to assail the constitutionality of an Act of a province. I do not know, Sir, on what principle that can be justified. We have enough to do to maintain the constitutionality of our own Acts; and I do not know on what principle the Government of this country can turn around on a province and fee counsel and promote litigation in order to have a provincial law declared beyond the powers of that province. I say I object to that; and although it has been said to me that I have sat in this House and voted moneys for that purpose, that is not strictly correct. This case differs from the precedents, and it shows how dangerous those precedents are. We know, with regard to the New Brunswick school law, that great sympathy for the minority in that province was expressed in this House by members on both sides. It was called a harsh law. Hon. gentlemen who come from New Brunswick, and who know the working of that law, are in a better position to tell whether it is a harsh law or not than I am. But, so far as I know anything of the working of that law, I believe that it is not a proper term to apply to it.

Mr. WELDON. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. And I am glad to hear, by the applause which I meet with from a member from New Brunswick, that that is really the case. But, Sir, we were anxious, as we always are here, to shove the responsibility from our own shoulders and to place it somewhere else, and, while this Parliament said: We will not interfere with the New Brunswick school law, which we recognize as a matter peculiarly of local concern and peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the province to deal with, we will ask the province to reconsider its harsh law; and a resolution to that effect was carried. Not satisfied with that, on another occasion, a subsequent one, I believe, we

Mr. McCARTHY.

even went so far as to appeal to the Colonial Office in Downing Street to intervene on behalf of the minority in New Brunswick, and to ask the Legislature to repeal the obnoxious law. Then, not satisfied with that, a sum of money was placed in our Estimates to bear the expense of the minority in the matter. And from this precedent the Government have sought, without express authority—there was express authority in that case—to carry on this litigation; and they, of course, announced, as it had to be announced when the vote was taken, that money had been spent in that way, and, as it were, asked the approval of Parliament of the act of so spending it. I am glad to have had this opportunity of making that statement, and I trust that I am right in the conclusion that that kind of thing will not occur again. If a law is really so oppressive, surely the people whom it oppresses can take means to test its constitutionality. If the law is not worth contesting in court, it cannot be so very bad after all, and we are only stirring up and keeping up feuds and contentions by furnishing the sinews of war, as in this case, under the pretense that the Government wants to know what its responsibility is. Well, Sir, there was no great difficulty in ascertaining that. The Government knew, from the New Brunswick precedent, that there was no possibility, as the hon. the First Minister stated last night, of disallowing this law. If there was not, I fail to see what the Government wanted to know about it. What difference did it make to the Government whether the law was 'intra vires' or 'ultra vires'—whether it ought to remain on the Statute-book or not? If the Government desired to act under the power of appeal which has been invoked, they could just as well have done so before the case went to the Privy Council as afterwards. If the minority could call on the Governor in Council, under the power of that appeal, to give redress to the minority, it appears to me that that redress might as well have been given then as three or four years afterwards, when the new system in Manitoba was in full operation, and when all the properties that had belonged to the minority had passed out of their hands and become the property of the majority. Can you imagine a remedial law of this Parliament that could restore the school law of 1871? Can you imagine the confusion that it would create? All that could have been avoided, if the question had been acted upon within the year, though I agree that there is no limit of time applying to this constitutional provision. Then, looking for a moment at the substance of the measure, why should the Government of this Dominion have encouraged and undertaken this appeal? Remember, I do not object to the parties appealing; but when the appeal came, if the facts and the law were known—as the facts were known, and the law was there to be read—it was just as easy to determine then

whether the appeal should be allowed as at a later date. But what is the question to be determined? Why, Sir, it is the vexed question of separate schools. It is the question whether the province of Manitoba with a population of 150,000 or 160,000, of whom not more than 20,000 are Roman Catholics, is to have imposed upon it, against its will, a separate school system. That is the question. We do not impose it, we cannot impose it on the province of Prince Edward Island; we do not impose it, we cannot impose it on the province of New Brunswick, or on the province of Nova Scotia, or on the province of British Columbia. Why should this Government, as a matter of policy, who are, after all, merely a committee of this House to carry out the behests of the majority of the representatives of the people—why should they entertain for one moment—because it is not a new matter—the question of the propriety of insisting against the will of a province that it must have separate schools—because that is the substance of the prayer of this petition. Now, that is a matter of policy; it is a matter which has been debated in this country for years and years; it is a matter on which, I venture to say, more, perhaps, than on any other, the people of this country have made up their minds. Take, if you like, the province of Ontario, and I venture to say that the great majority, three-fourths of the people there, are against the separate school system, and, if they had the power, would do away with it to-morrow. And, in the other provinces where there is no limitation upon the powers of the people in the matters of education, we have the best evidence that the people do not want the separate school system, for in none of them has it been established, and in the province of New Brunswick a system has been put in force which completely negatives the view that the people of that province desired separate schools. Then is it not a curious thing—and what is the explanation of it?—that while the representatives here from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and all the other provinces, including the province from which I have the honour to come, are against separate schools, we seek to impose them on this province of Manitoba, and encourage an appeal, and, if I do not misunderstand the language used last night, if we have the power we are going to enforce separate schools on that province against its will. So that, as a matter of policy, as a matter which, after all, must be decided on principles such as I have vaguely endeavoured to set forth, it is, in my humble judgment, a poor policy, an unfortunate policy, that the Government should entertain for one moment the question here—I am not dealing now with the judicial functions which I will have to speak of later—as to the propriety of enforcing separate schools upon that province. Now, I dare say the great majority of this House will agree in these views. But yet, because the representation of that province

here is not very large, and because the province does not appear, by its representatives in this House to be very urgent against this imposition—because of these reasons the rest of us do not feel that we have any great concern to interfere. It makes a great difference, of course, whose ox is gored, and we are not particular, seeing it is merely the province of Manitoba that is to have separate schools, although from any one of the provinces from which the majority of members come in this House, there would be a great outcry if the majority of this House attempted to interfere with the schools of that province and insisted on separate schools being forced on it. Passing from that branch of the question, let me come to the other, which is, perhaps, of equal, if not greater importance. We have had here put forward by the Government in a very formal shape, a view of their duty under this School Act, which, to me, certainly appears extraordinary, which is unprecedented, and which, I venture to say, is not constitutional. We find it stated, in the 93rd section of the British North America Act, that :

An appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The word "appeal" in that clause, and the word "decision" in the subsequent clause, are the terms upon which, as I understand it, the First Minister has arrived at the conclusion that the matter is to be treated, not as an ordinary matter coming before the Cabinet or before the Privy Council, but, to say the least of it, in a quasi judicial sense. I entirely and absolutely dissent from that view. I think nothing more dangerous, nothing more subversive of the principles of our constitution, could be tolerated than that the Cabinet of the Dominion should assume to act, in this or any other matter, as a judicial body. The Privy Council are the advisers of His Excellency, the executive authority rests with the Crown and its representatives here, but under our law it is widely, and has been for years, dating back perhaps to centuries, held that for every act of the Executive, his advisers must be responsible. Now, we have the advisers of His Excellency assuming, not on the floor of this House certainly that they are not responsible, but assuming to act as judges, assuming to act in a judicial capacity; and I venture to say that, if they are acting in a judicial capacity, no more unjust conclusion could be drawn than that they should be held responsible for what they may do in that capacity. What does the report say :

The application comes before Your Excellency in a manner differing from applications which are ordinarily made under the constitution to Your Excellency in Council. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of a political character or involving political action on the part of Your Excellency's advisers. ¶ It

is to be dealt with by Your Excellency in Council regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools, and without the political views of any of the members of Your Excellency's Council being considered as pledged by the fact of the appeal being entertained and heard. If the contention of the petitioners be correct, that such an appeal can be sustained, the inquiry will be rather of a judicial than of a political character.

Now, the First Minister said last night that to speak of this motion as advising the usurping of judicial functions was hypercritical and not warranted by a fair reading of the passage. But I am at a loss to understand or follow that line of thought. Surely there is a difference, and a marked difference, drawn by this report, between the ordinary actions of the Privy Council and its particular action which they are called upon to take under the Manitoba School Act; and the difference consists in this, that whereas in the one case there is undoubted ministerial responsibility, whereas in the one case there is an act in a political capacity—and we know what that means—there is, in the other, under this Manitoba clause, the contention that the Government are not to act in their political character, that the members of the Administration are not to be pledged by the advice that they give, and that the inquiry is to be judicial rather than political. Well, I do not understand the meaning of terms, I do not understand the English language, if there is not a marked distinction drawn between the ordinary acts of the Government and the particular line which they are to take in carrying out the behests of the minority. I think that a careful reading—and I endeavoured to listen as attentively as I could to the very able speech of the First Minister last night in justifying his course—will bear out the conclusion I draw. The Minister spoke, for instance, of the necessity of deciding this matter on grounds of right and wrong, which would actuate a court of law, and not on grounds of public policy. Now, it may be just as well to draw the distinction, if I can, between what is political and what is judicial, because when we come clearly to ascertain the distinction between a political act and a judicial act, it will be perfectly manifest that the Government are, perhaps, proposing to consider this appeal, if in the end they do consider it at all, from a judicial and not from a political point of view. Mr. Blake, speaking of this subject in the speech to which so much reference was made last night, used this language, and I think I may adopt it with reference to the political question :

When it is a question of expediency, of convenience, of the public interest, of the spirit of the constitution, all these are clearly, exclusively for the Executive and Legislature, that is for the political department of the Government.

On the other hand what is a judicial act? I do not deny,—we all know, that almost no act of the Government can be carried on
Mr. McCARTHY.

without the consideration of the law or without, I suppose, in most cases reference being made to the Department of Justice to ascertain what the law is. In that sense advice is given. But I would not speak of that as being a judicial act but simply acting according to the law as it was understood by the advisers of the Crown. But when we speak of the judicial act, we mean the right to have a question determined and tried irrespective altogether of mere expediency, irrespective altogether of what would be best for the majority or the minority or any other section of the people, but upon strict legal grounds of right and wrong. And if I grasp properly the reasoning of the hon. First Minister last night, that was in substance the view put before the House, that the Government were to be the guardian of the rights of the minority, the Government were to decide if the minority's rights were invaded. For himself, he thought they had grievances at all events, and there ought to be in some way or shape a remedy for these grievances. I may state now, that I desire to dissociate the conclusion which may be arrived at from the abstract constitutional question as to whether the Government is right in taking this course. What is it the Government proposes to do? Plainly do they propose by their ruling to endow their committee with judicial functions? Sir, they propose to restore the Star Chamber and to establish its work in Canada. The Star Chamber was King's Council, which arrogated to itself judicial functions and decided and disposed of matters on judicial grounds. Let me see, Sir, if I can prove that by an extract or two from Professor Dicey's work on the Privy Council. Speaking of the Star Chamber he says this :

The Court of Star Chamber is, as may be seen from the records, the council meeting in the Starred Chamber, that is, in all probability in a room the ceiling of which was adorned with stars.

We did hear of the historic scene which took place in our Council chamber, so it was spoken of by the organ of the Government, in which my friend the President of the Council (Mr. Ives) presided, and all the members of the Privy Council were present, the Solicitor-General sitting as an assessor. This argument was heard in the Council Chamber—and it will be remembered that the Star Chamber got its name because its meetings were held in one of the Council rooms, "the ceiling of which was adorned with stars." A little later Professor Dicey says :

But soon afterwards its powers merged in the general authority of the Council of Star Chamber. That this should have happened is less strange than it at first appears. All the business of the council was transacted through committees, which were, as occasion required, differently modelled.

And here we have a further analogy, because this business was inaugurated by a

committee just as the Star Chamber inaugurated its business. They assigned part of their own judicial duties to a committee. The distinction may not hold in the next paragraph which I propose to read :

The part taken by the King was no empty formality. On one occasion James presided for five days, seated on a chair high above the rest, and terminated the case by pronouncing a sentence, of which, if the annalist is to be believed, the wisdom surpassed that of any judgment before uttered from an English tribunal.

I think that may be applicable to this report. It may, perhaps, compare favourably with the utterance of any English tribunal and in that respect only is there an analogy between the passage and the matter I am dealing with. On page 117 Professor Dicey says :

The Council stands forth as at the same moment powerless and powerful. In its dealings with the Crown it is utterly weak, for it has lost every element of independence. In its dealings with the people it is irresistibly strong, for it combines every element of authority. The ablest administrators of the day are its members.

My hon. friends can take that to themselves and I read it with great pleasure as embodying—

Mr. FOSTER. You do not make the application.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend the Finance Minister says I do not make the application; he has hardly given me time. On page 121 we find :

Government by Parliament and Government by the Star Chamber were incompatible, though, perhaps, no one perceived them to be so, at the time of James's accession.

Let me read another extract which seems to be a little more applicable :

Ten years after this examination took place the long Parliament met. Its first measure was to pass the Act 16, Car. I., cap. 10. This statute abolished the Star Chamber and did away with those judicial powers which the policy of a century and a half had grouped around the Council. With the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber vanished the power of these tribunals which, under the names of Councils of the North, of the West, had initiated the tyranny and increased the influence of the Privy Council.

And finally, with reference to this Star Chamber, which I hope is not to be made permanent in our midst :

Among institutions at once powerful, hateful, and full of interest, the Court of Star Chamber occupies no mean position.

I think I have proved what I said, that the Star Chamber was the Council arrogating to itself judicial functions, and I think we have restored here in Canada for the first time in many years, the Star Chamber abolished by the long Parliament just before the days of Cromwell. If that is a correct view of the position of the Government at that time, I want to go a step further and see what the consequences are. Is this a

court exercising judicial functions or not? If it is, Sir, undoubtedly it ought to be prohibited. Undoubtedly the province of Manitoba cannot be expected to submit to the judicial decision of my hon. friend the First Minister, whose deputy started Mr. Barrett to litigate, paid the costs of the litigation and continued its interest in the case until the day of its termination. I would like to know if it is possible that any judge of the land could occupy the position which the hon. First Minister says he occupies—trying this matter judicially, when he has been an active promoter of the litigation against the province from its first step.

Mr. MULOCK. The plaintiff, in fact.

Mr. McCARTHY. The plaintiff, in fact, as my hon. friend from North York says. Now, is that possible? If so, the Queen's Bench ought to have some proceeding to remove these proceedings. The Queen's Bench, I suppose, cannot dissolve the Cabinet, but the Court of Queen's Bench exercises jurisdiction over every other court, no matter how high, even the Privy Council itself. So the Queen's Bench ought to remove these proceedings from the present Cabinet. But, I think, under all the circumstances, the contention can hardly be borne out. When you reason it out, you see the absurdity of their claiming judicial functions. Now, on the other hand, what is to be said of the meaning of the Act of Parliament, because if that Act of Parliament has conferred judicial functions, although we may not be very well satisfied with it, we must, of course, bow to the law. We are a law-abiding people, and if, under the terms of that enactment, the Cabinet of this country does exercise judicial functions and has a right to consider matters of education, we must bow to the law. But is that the proper reading of the Act? I would like to ask the House to allow me to read the view of the Attorney-General of England upon that word "appeal," when stating his argument before the Privy Council last July. A good deal of discussion took place before the Judicial Committee as to the meaning of this subsection 2, and so much impressed were the Judicial Committee at first—and I want to correct a mistake made by Mr. Ewart with reference to that before I close—so much impressed were the Judicial Committee with the terms of this section, that they called upon the Attorney-General to answer the argument which they had induced Sir Horace Davey to make against the power of the court to deal with the matter at all. The Attorney-General, in the course of his argument, used these words :

This is why I thought, unintentionally, my learned friend had overlooked the distinction between the language of subsection 1 and subsection 2. The word "appeal" is misleading. It is an appeal in the nature of asking for other legislation, asking the Dominion Parliament or the Dominion Government

to do something which the Legislature of the province have not done.

That, I think, is the proper definition. It is not an appeal, it is a request to the Dominion Parliament, by the machinery which is here provided, to pass an Act, in a proper case, which the Local Legislature has not done, not an appeal at all, the word "appeal" raising, of course, at once the suggestion of the idea in the mind of a lawyer, possibly, that there is an appeal in the ordinary sense. But we must remember that the Government sit here under the terms of the British North America Act, to which, for a moment, on this subject, I would refer. Section 11 says :

There shall be a council to aid and advise in the government of Canada, to be styled the Queen's Privy Council for Canada ; and all the persons who are to be members of that Council shall be from time to time chosen and summoned by the Governor-General and sworn in as Privy Councillors, and members thereof may from time to time be removed by the Governor-General.

That provides for the appointment and removal of Privy Councillors. Again, section 13 enacts as follows :—

The provisions of this Act referring to the Governor-General in Council shall be construed as referring to the Governor-General acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

Now, that is a general enactment in the British North America Act. Then we come to this particular clause, which says :

An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act—

And so on. Interpreted by section 13, it means :

The provisions of this Act, referring to the Governor-General in Council, shall be construed as referring to the Governor-General acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council in Canada.

No exception is made, no different words are used in this case from any other. The enactment is to be construed with reference to the section to which I have just drawn attention. Then, what are the laws that we are to pass ? We have power to pass laws :

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Let me go back for a moment to trace the machinery, assuming there is an appeal. The minority make an application to the Governor in Council ; they ask, on the best case they are able to present, that the Governor in Council shall pass a remedial order, or shall direct the passage of remedial legislation. That order, of course, does not change matters, the law still remains unaffected. The province may or may not obey it. If the province does not obey the direction of the Privy Council—and after all, the Privy Council is merely a representative body of this House—if that order is not obeyed, then Parliament here has power in that particular

Mr. McCARTHY.

case, and for that particular purpose, and, so far as may be necessary, to carry out that view, to pass the remedial legislation which the Cabinet or the committee of Parliament has already thought ought to be passed in a case of that kind. Why should that, therefore, be dealt with as a judicial power ? Why should that be dealt with unlike any other power ? When the New Brunswick Act came up for disallowance, the question of intra vires and ultra vires had to be considered, and when that question was passed upon, then the question of policy had to be considered ; and when a Bill is allowed here under this Act, the same questions arise. First, there is the question as to whether there is a power to act ; next, there is the question as to whether it is right, politically speaking—I mean politically speaking in the wider sense—whether it is right and proper that the Act should be passed, or that the order should be passed, and it comes back, first and last, to being an ordinary exercise of the powers of the Executive, and the authority should be exercised just in that way. Now, I have a word to say with regard to the general question of that Act. I mentioned in the early part of my observations that it never occurred, until the month of November last, or October, to any one to suggest that the British North America Act had anything at all to do with the provincial constitution. It was after this petition had been presented, after the petition had been acted upon, that Mr. Ewart asked leave to present a supplementary petition, in which, for the first time, the contention is made that a clause of the British North America Act has some application and some bearing on this question. Now, I venture to say that it is a most extraordinary circumstance that this School Act should have run the gauntlet of all the courts of Manitoba, should have gone through the Supreme Court here, and gone to the Privy Council, and that no person ever suggested that the British North America Act had any application to it at all. I was concerned in the argument of the case in London—I had nothing to do with it before—and it never occurred to any of the lawyers who were engaged in the case pro and con, that any other Act had anything to do with it, or that any enactment had to be considered, except the one relating to the province, namely, section 22. When we come to read it, is there a shadow of doubt about it ? It is a legal question, it is true, but it is so simple that there is not a layman in the House who, when he reads the statute, can have any doubt at all about it. What does it say :

In and for the province, the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject to and according to the following provisions.

Then follow provisions 1, 2 and 3. Now, if you incorporate any portion of the British North America Act, or of the section relating to education, which is section 93, why you are

making another law ; you are not expounding the law, because you are saying that "in and for the province said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education subject to the following provisions," and "to the provisions of the 93rd section of the British North America Act as well." It is perfectly clear, it seems to me, so clear that I do not wonder that no person ever suggested the point until last November, when Mr. Ewart raised it for the first time. The Act says that the power shall rest with the province exclusively to make laws with regard to education, subject to the following provisions, 1, 2 and 3, and how you can read into that law other provisions which are to be found in another statute, limiting, or controlling, or affecting, or regulating in any way the authority of the Legislature, passes my comprehension. But that is the contention, that is one of the questions that is to be submitted to the Supreme Court. Now, on the other question, I admit there is some difficulty. It is very curiously worded ; it is worded so strangely that I doubt very much if it means anything at all. The Privy Council have already determined that clause 1 is meaningless. Clause 1 says :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege in respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the time of Union.

It never was contended that they had any "by law." Now the Privy Council has decided that they had not any privilege "by practice," and so the whole first section falls for lack of something to act on. We come now to clause 3, which reads :

An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

What does that mean ? Coming after the first section, Mr. Blake evidently thought, in the long speech which he made, and from which the Minister of Justice read extracts to the House last night, that it had reference to the first clause. I think the First Minister, quite unintentionally, no doubt, misread Mr. Blake's argument with respect to empowering the courts to pronounce on this question. Certainly Mr. Blake did say that he was induced to move in this matter—and remember he spoke on 29th April, 1890, within one month after the school law had been passed—on account of difficulties that he saw were cropping up by reason of the school law, and he pointed out, what is no doubt perfectly correct and clear, and what was afterwards made manifest by the First Minister in his report, that in this particular case a question of fact would have to be dealt with, and therefore he said that while such a case was not likely often to occur, it was likely to occur with respect to this Act. What Mr. Blake was dealing with was the very question which the Privy Council determined.

There was a contest as to whether the Act was *ultra vires* or *intra vires*. That contest turned on the question whether or not a minority, or the class of persons who were complaining, had any right or privilege by practice. It was known they had no right or privilege by law ; but the question whether they had one by practice was one which could only be determined in the ordinary way in which questions of fact are tried. So Mr. Blake, dealing with this question, provided in the resolution which he moved, and which was accepted unanimously by the House :

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

He proceeded to explain at considerable length what he intended to provide by that. He said :

I regard it as settled, for myself at any rate, first of all, that, as a question of policy, there shall be no disallowance of educational legislation for the mere reason that, in the opinion of this Parliament, some other or different policy than that which the Government has thought fit to adopt would be a better policy. Are we proposing to do in a roundabout way what we all agreed should not be done directly ? Far better would it have been if this Parliament or Government had disallowed the Act within the year than in four years afterwards to be trying in a circuitous method to destroy its effect, and virtually to repeal it ; because you do repeal it. If you enact, in the words of the petition, that there are to be separate schools, that the minority are to have a portion of the school grant—if you decree that, you do indirectly, or rather you do pretty directly, only in a roundabout way, what we have settled for years past, ever since the New Brunswick School Act came under discussion, that we would not interfere with it at all. Mr. Blake deals with the resolution which the First Minister read to the House last night, and finally he says :

Now, Sir, in the exercise of this policy of disallowance by the Government, political questions will, or at any rate may, probably always arise. Questions of policy may present themselves, that is questions of expediency, of convenience, of the public interest, of the spirit of the constitution or of the form of legislation. All these are clearly exclusively for the executive and legislative, that is, for the political department of the Government. But it is equally clear, that when in order to determine your course you must find whether a particular Act is *ultra* or *intra vires* you are discharging a legal and a judicial function. What do you do ? You proceed to interpret the Constitutional Act, and to declare its meaning ; you proceed to interpret the Provincial Act under consideration and to declare its meaning ; you proceed to compare the two statutes so interpreted and declared ; and you proceed, finally, to conclude whether or not the law conflicts with, or transcends the powers which are conferred upon the legislature which passed it.

If I might be permitted to criticise so great a master of the language as Mr. Blake is, I would venture to say that that is not performing a judicial function. I venture to think that it is forming a legal conclusion, which the law officers of England are constantly forming for the advice of the Government, and sometimes for the advice of colonial Governments, and which the Minister of Justice does as the adviser of the Government of which he is a member. It is not a judicial decision; but it is the expression of opinions on which the Crown has to act, in the absence of any other method, of determining what is the law with respect to any particular case. Mr. Blake proceeds to say:

Nothing that can be conceived partakes more exclusively of the character of a legal and judicial operation than what I have just now described.

No doubt it is legal; whether it is judicial or not, is another matter. He continued:

Again, when you act on the appellate educational clauses; as, for example, in the case of Manitoba, the very case which is now in a sense pending as to whether recent legislation be within the limits of the rights of the Provincial Legislature,—

I desire to call attention to this language.

—and whether any relief is due under the appellate clause to those who claim it, you have a legal question, or rather in this case a mixed question of law and of fact, which circumstance it was that induced me to insert the word “fact” in my motion, conscious as I was that it was only on the rarest occasion that any references of that description would be necessary. Yet it seems to me that, in this particular instance, I was constrained to provide for an emergency which may arise. Now, what is the process to be gone through in order to reach a conclusion? The first involves that very question of fact, or rather a mixed question of law and fact.

The very language of the report of the Minister of Justice:

You have to find whether any class of the population had by law or practice at the time of the Union any, and if so, what right or privilege with respect to denominational schools. Secondly, if so, you have to find whether that right or privilege has been affected, and how it has been affected, by the legislation complained of; and, thirdly, if so, you have to find what legislative action is required to redress the wrong.

The first two questions, at any rate, are legal and not at all political. That is, first, whether the fact exists, which we now know does not exist, that is whether they had any right or privilege; and, second, which is an important question, whether the law had contravened any right which any class of the people had at the time of the Union. This has been determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr. Blake further said:

Now, I aver that in the decision of all legal questions it is important that the political executive should not, more than can be avoided, arrogate to itself judicial powers; and that when, in the discharge of its political duties, it is called upon to deal with legal question, it ought to have the power in cases of solemnity and importance, where it may be thought expedi-

Mr. McCARTHY.

ent so to do, to call in aid the judicial department in order to arrive at a correct solution.

Nobody objects to that, no person can object to that. I may just state here that if I did not object to the policy of dealing with this question at all, I would not very much object to the Government fortifying their position in the way indicated in order to make sure of the ground they stand on. But if the Government are not going to interfere—and I believe, with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), that the majority of this House will not sanction any interference—I would like to know for what purpose we put the academic question? What is the object; what is the meaning of it? If, in the end, there is to be no interference, what is the object of all this? Can we not settle it now, just as well as two years hence, when all this litigation is over, when this case has gone to the Supreme Court, and then from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, and when the Privy Council determined that the Government have some powers or some rights and have construed the statute for them, what better off will we be then? What more can be known then than is known to-day, with reference to the propriety, the policy, the expediency and the convenience of acting upon these powers, and of setting aside the legislation of the province? Surely now is the time to consider the question. Surely now is the time to determine whether the powers of the Government will be acted upon. If the Government will frankly say to the House that they have determined—and the Minister of Justice came very near it last night, not quite, perhaps, but near it—if the hon. Minister of Justice will frankly say, that if he has the power, he proposes to pass a remedial order, then we will know where we stand. If, on the other hand, the remedial order is not to be passed, whether there is power or not, I do not know that we ought to invite litigation between these parties in order to determine a purely academic question. Now, I do not propose to trouble the House by reading any more of Mr. Blake's speech. Probably members who take an interest in this matter will consult it for themselves. A good deal of it was read last night, and I have read an extract or two from it myself, but I venture to say, that what Mr. Blake was dealing with and what he was thinking of, was not the question that the hon. the First Minister now proposes to submit to the Supreme Court. Such questions, I believe, never entered into his mind at all. He was thinking of the question of the disallowance of the Act; the question as to what position the Executive would be in when called upon to determine whether there ought to be such disallowance, and he referred to the fact as to whether there was a privilege on the part of any class of persons in the province. It was a question of fact, and would have to be determined before the question of law was raised. That was what Mr.

Blake was dealing with. At the same time I do not pretend to say that the statute passed in the subsequent session, in obedience, or in deference to that resolution, is not quite wide enough to admit of these conclusions. But whether the occasion is sufficiently solemn within the view of Mr. Blake is quite another matter, and I will not quibble about that. I desire to take my stand firmly, and I ask the House to consider whether an ounce of prevention now is not better than a pound of cure in the future. Let the matter be stopped now at once, if it is to be stopped. If not, taking the view of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), in his very admirable address last night, what follows? Suppose the House now sanctions the Government submitting this question to the courts, what would follow? Take the concluding observations of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), who says:

I will vote against any Government which attempts to interfere with the rights of my province.

Well, he sanctions, in the meantime, the action of the Government in inviting this litigation, calling upon his province to appear at the bar of justice, calling upon it to litigate this question in the Supreme Court, and calling upon it to assist in the determination as to whether these questions ought or ought not to be dealt with by the Government. I ask the House to say that this is the time to intervene and to stop it. Mr. Speaker, I think I have made good the position which I proposed to make good at the beginning, namely: That this is a political question, and that it is not a legal question in that sense. That no question of this kind can be determined without calling upon my hon. friend the First Minister to advise as to the legal course, I am free to admit; but after all said and done, when the report from the Department of Justice comes down, the Council have to determine upon the policy and expediency of the question, as a political act, and they have to take the full responsibility for that political act, and to be responsible to this House and to the country for it.

An hon. MEMBER. So they do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Some hon. member says, "So they do." I will point out that they have not done so. I will point out that the gentlemen who went back to their constituents for re-election last fall, pursued exactly the opposite course, and that they sheltered themselves under this quasi-judicial tribunal; their position as judges, and not as Ministers of the Crown, and when my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) was asked, what he would do for his province, his answer was, that he was a judge. I am going to see whether I am right in that contention or not. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works here. The hon. gentleman, in his capacity as Minister of the

Crown, proceeded to address a body of electors at a by-election, and he was naturally asked as to the question of the day, the Manitoba school question. In one province, I think, if I know the feelings of the people, they are as fixed and as determined as they ever were, that there should be no interference with the Manitoba School Act, and in another province they seem to be very anxious that there should be interference.

Mr. OUIMET. We stand at both ends of the stick.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. And so it was, of course, a very ingenious contrivance of the Minister of Public Works—though I am not at liberty to suggest that was the object of it—to slide over for at least three months, when this burning question was consuming the public mind, by being able to say: We are judges, we are not Ministers, we are not responsible, we are judges, and we have no opinion on this matter, one way or the other. Now, is that hypercritical? Is that hair-splitting? Let me see whether the language of the Minister of Public Works justifies what I have said in that regard. I will now read from a report of the nomination proceedings for the county of Soulanges, at Coteau Landing, where the Minister of Public Works was present:

Mr. Ouimet, who spoke next, announced that Sir John was now the First Minister of Canada.

At which statement, very naturally, there was very great applause.

The Conservative party, Mr. Ouimet declared, was the first in the country to consent to a Catholic chief.

Again there was applause.

The Conservative party was the party of progress and liberty.

He then referred to the trade question, which I will omit for the present, and I will pass on to what he said about the Manitoba school question. He said on that question:

That the Government did not come to any decision on the question, and he declined to make any declaration as he would be one of the judges in the case.

Now, I do not think I can be accused of hair-splitting, when we have the Minister telling the people here: I cannot tell you anything about the matter, because I am one of the judges in the case. Again:

But he added, the Government's past policy was a guarantee of the future.

Mr. OUIMET. I might be a judge.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend looks forward to be a judge, but I object to his anticipating that at present. He continued to say:

The interests of the Catholics would not be sacrificed if the constitution could prevent it, and if the rights which were sought were protected by the constitution, the Government would endeavour to act in such a manner as to render justice to all, without hurting the susceptibility of any class.

Now, that is considerably the policy of this Government in more matters than one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a good policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a capital policy, but I am afraid that they are getting between the devil and the deep sea here.

Mr. BERGIN. Why, that is exactly your position. There is where you are at this moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid that my hon. friend must characterize himself in that way, for I am sitting as close to him as I can. I will go across the deep sea next, and see what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition said on this subject:

Mr. Laurier, who was warmly received, expressed disappointment at Mr. Ouimet's speech.

Well, I do not think he ought to have done that.

He expected that Mr. Ouimet would have made an explicit statement on behalf of the Government. But to his surprise he had simply indulged in generalities. His declaration on the Manitoba school question was far from satisfactory, and would give little hope to the minority of Manitoba.

Now, you see the curious impression that prevailed. Reading what the hon. Minister of Public Works said, I came to the conclusion that the Government had determined to give relief to the minority if the constitution would allow it. That is what he stated in terms: If the constitution permits it, if there is power under the Manitoba Act, or under the corresponding sections of the British North America Act, the minority will have their grievance redressed. But the language used was so vague that the hon. leader of the Opposition thought it unsatisfactory; and we can all see that it would have been much more proper if the hon. Minister of Public Works had been frank with the people, and had stated exactly what the Government intended to do. Then, the hon. leader of the Opposition goes on to say:

He warned his hearers not to place too much confidence in Mr. Ouimet's promises, as the Government had failed to do its duty in the Riel matter, and might do so again. Mr. Laurier did not indicate his line of policy on the Manitoba school question.

Well, I am in hopes that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition may do so before this debate closes. I hope that he will not imitate this side of the House, but that he will get down to practical issues, and not content himself with mere bald generalities. But the whole history of this meeting at Coteau Landing is not yet told. I now summon, as a witness, the hon. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bergeron). He came to town that evening. He was present at the nomination at Coteau Landing. He gave a dramatic description of the speeches, and I think he ought to be summoned by the House to repeat it—I know I shall fail to do justice to it:

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. Bergeron gave a dramatic description of their speeches this evening in the rotunda of the Russell. Mr. Ouimet spoke of the Manitoba school question. He said that he was in the position of a judge, and could say nothing about how the question would be decided. He could only say that the Ministers would deal with the question as patriots should. Mr. Laurier then told Mr. Ouimet that the question was one of Government policy, and demanded that Mr. Ouimet state how it was to be dealt with. "I am only one of fourteen Ministers," said Mr. Ouimet, "and I hear that we are to have three younger brothers, making seventeen in all.

I believe the younger members of the family have since arrived.

"If I could speak it would only be as one out of seventeen. Mr. Laurier has been a minister himself and knows that. But with him to-day the case is different. He is, sole and alone, the leader of the Opposition. Let him declare his policy on the Manitoba school question."

That is shifting the burden of proof with a vengeance.

Mr. Laurier did not reply to this, but when he met Mr. Ouimet at the railway station, after the meeting, said to him: "I must congratulate you on your skill in walking upon razors." Mr. Ouimet replied: "Well, we both did pretty well. Neither of us said anything."

Mr. BERGERON. I may tell my hon. friend that I was not at the nomination at Coteau Landing at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not surprised at that dramatic rendering of what took place, for it rather indicates that the hon. gentleman was drawing very largely on his imagination, though he was not very far from the truth after all. Now, I just pause here for one moment to point out that the hon. Minister told us so boldly here last night that this Government were responsible for all that they had done in connection with this question—that whether it was a local question or a political question, the Government assumed full responsibility for it; and yet one of the leading members of the Administration goes to Coteau Landing during an election, when the people had a right to know, and declines that responsibility, and congratulates himself that he has not said anything at all on the subject. Now, my hon. friend here who is in the Cabinet as the special representative of the interests of Manitoba, and who certainly must know what a burning question this is in his province,—

Mr. DALY. Yes, and who made it so?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will answer that just in a moment, when I conclude the present sentence—I have no objection to taking any responsibility that rests upon me in connection with it.

Mr. DALY. Neither have I.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman knows that it is such a burning question as to have induced the hon. member who spoke here last night, strong party man as he is, to say that he would vote against any Government that attempted to interfere with the

school law of the province of Manitoba in any shape or form. My hon. friend, when he reached Winnipeg on his way back for re-election, was interviewed, with this result:

Do you anticipate a contest?—No.

Well, they may try and make the school question a bone of contention?—That was sufficiently threshed out at the last election and during my campaign I placed myself on record concerning that question.

Have you anything to say concerning it now?—My mouth is of necessity closed, for I am in exactly the same position as a judge before whom a case is being tried: and appeal from the Roman Catholics is, as it were, 'sub judice,' and I am one of the judges, for I have taken Mr. Dewdney's place on the Sub-Committee of the Executive Council to whom Archbishop Tache's appeal was referred. Under these circumstances it should be obvious that I can say nothing.

Mr. BERGIN. Of course he had not heard the evidence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why, there was no evidence to be heard.

Mr. BERGIN. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the evidence had been heard in the case.

Mr. BERGIN. The argument had not been heard at that time, nor the evidence either.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend knows that the matter of fact had been determined, that is, that the minority and no other class of persons had any claim or privilege as to schools prior to the union.

Mr. BERGIN. That is your interpretation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Now, I have shown that this is more than a joke. I think I have shown that during the last three or four months, before the meeting of the House, where Ministers or their followers said anything, those who were particularly interested in the question said that they could not speak upon it, because it was not to be dealt with as a political subject, but was to be dealt with by the Government as a judicial body. Therefore I support with great heartiness the latter part of the resolution, because, in my judgment, it describes with perfect fairness and appropriateness the conduct of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question. I would have preferred that the first part of the resolution expressing disapproval at the action of the Government, had been put upon the ground that I have stated. I do not disapprove of the course of the Government in not disallowing the Act, but because they have interfered after the constitutionality of the Act was determined. But, coming to a later part of the resolution, which reads:

And in assuming to be possessed of judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

Every word of that is true. The Government have assumed judicial functions. This is

wholly unknown to the law, and, if acquiesced in now, we cannot blame ourselves hereafter if the Government also assumes judicial functions in other matters, and claim that they are not to be responsible to Parliament, because that irresponsibility necessarily follows. Take the position of the Minister of Interior (Mr. Daly). He is not allowed to consider this matter from the point of view of the interests of his province, he is not allowed to consider this question from the stand-point of the public weal at all, but is bound to go to the consideration of it merely with reference to the rights of the minority who are appealing, it is said, for justice. I am speaking of the people as a whole. I am speaking of the Dominion as a whole. We are all interested in this question. We are interested in its being settled with and done with. But how is it to be disposed of, if my hon. friend here is to take the position, which he does take, of being a judge? and how, in common fairness and decency to him, is he to be censured by his constituency, or any other public body, for an Act which his conscience compels him to do in a judicial capacity. That cannot be. Therefore the difference between acting in the capacity I speak of, and in the capacity of a responsible Government, is so plain and manifest that I do not think there is any serious doubt as to what the proper course of this House should be. The British constitution has very clearly marked and defined the distinction between these various departments which are necessary to the proper carrying on the Government. Reading from Mr. Bagehot's book, page 2, I find he says:

First, it is laid down as a principle of English polity, that in it the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers, are divided; that each is intrusted to a different person or set of persons, that no one of these can at all interfere with the work of the other.

Now, that is the general principle underlying the British constitution, that the executive, the legislative and the judicial powers are distinct and separate. And my hon. friend the Minister of Justice read from Mr. Blake, last night, a sentence which I venture again to trouble the House with. It is the sentence in which Mr. Blake speaks of the union of the powers as constituting a despotism. He says:

Now, Sir, the general opinion that the executive, the legislative and the judicial departments of the Government ought to be, so far as practicable, separate and apart, is one held by many of the most eminent constitutional authorities as the fundamental principle.

There can be no doubt that the absolute union of these departments is neither more nor less than absolute despotism. Unite in one hand, I care not whether it be the hand of an autocrat or the hand of a council, the power of legislation, the power of interpretation, and the power of administration, and you make the most absolute despot that is conceivable.

Now, we have here the power of the executive, and to that the Government are now adding the judicial power. They have not yet quite accomplished the third attribute of the Gov-

ernment, and therefore they cannot be said to occupy the position of the most perfect despot, which Mr. Blake pictures, but they are going on in that direction, and I think it is wise and prudent that we should intervene and interpose the view of this Parliament, that the judicial power shall not be arrogated by the political executive of this country. I have only one further observation to make. It is asked, what practical difference does it make? I hear in the lobbies it is whispered that the Government are not going to interfere with the Manitoba Act. I hear it stated that this reference to the Supreme Court, this asking of these questions, this delaying the matter in this way, from day to day and from year to year, is merely to escape from the difficulty; and is what is called politics. I hear, on the other hand, other gentlemen say that they are quite confident the Government are going to interfere. I should certainly judge, and I give the First Minister credit for sincerity, that if the Government have the power to interfere, so far as the First Minister's authority goes, they propose to interfere. From what he said last night, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion. Reading between the lines—he did not exactly put it in words—but reading between the lines, he did speak of the grievances the minority had to complain of, he did speak of the power which is vested in the Council to redress those grievances, and he did say it would be unfortunate if that power was exercised in a bungling way, so that afterwards there would be reason to regret that the exercise of that power had ever been attempted. That indicated, on his part, a strong feeling that the minority ought to be protected, and ought to have remedial legislation; but I submit that it is a practical question with us here and now. I do submit that now is the time for us to determine whether or not we shall have this interference of the Government, and I do ask the House to come to a conclusion, one way or the other, on this question as to whether this interference will be tolerated, because such interference can only lead to trouble between the Dominion and one of its greatest provinces. In that province of Manitoba we have had frequent disallowance, as it is; we have stretched the authority of the veto power to its utmost limit. That province is a long way from the centre of Government, and I do not hesitate to say that it would at this moment, be a dangerous attempt, and that the irritating influence of this proceeding are calculated to do very great mischief indeed. The province is put in the position of a legislative body which has committed some wrong. The province is called upon to come here and answer for that wrong. The province was called upon to come here; and, in a sullen mood, it declined to appear. It declined to recognize the central power, it declined to pay any attention to these *ex parte* proceedings—*ex parte*, not by reason of not having full notice, but because the province will not submit, in any event, to

Mr. McCARTHY.

the intervention and control, in matters of legislation, of this Parliament or the executive of this Parliament. Under these circumstances, is it wise or right that the strained relations existing between what I believe to be a great province, which ere long will be one of the greatest in the Dominion—a province on which we are spending all our energy in order to fill up a province into which we are promised, under the influence of the new Minister of the Interior, representing it, that additional energy will be infused in order to promote its welfare—is it for the sake of avoiding the ministerial responsibility which would follow the dealing frankly with the people of this country, and saying whether or not the Government are prepared to at once refuse to interfere with what could not be interfered with elsewhere,—is it for that sake, that the welfare of this great portion of the Dominion, and, in that sense, the welfare of the Dominion itself, is to be jeopardized? I trust and hope that the better sense of this House will, on this occasion and when the opportunity is offered, bear in mind the great responsibility which rests on every member of the House, and will not treat this as a mere matter of detail, as a matter of no consequence, as a mere matter which ought not to influence, in the slightest degree, the feelings of any gentleman who has a seat here, but, on the contrary, will bear in mind that, upon the vote they may cast on this occasion, may, to a very great extent, depend the welfare of the Dominion at large.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend following the hon. gentleman who has just sat down through the different portions of his argument, though I must say that, in his way of thinking, he has made a very important and a very weighty speech. But I think that, as a representative, perhaps the oldest representative here except one, I should express my views about this question which has been raised by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) who has just taken his seat, has stated that we cannot impose separate schools on Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Well, that is not a new thing, because when the conference took place in London for the Confederation of these provinces, the question arose there whether we should not give all these three provinces the same system of separate schools as we had, and as we still have, in the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec. And we were unanimous in saying that we were not there to make laws for the different provinces, but to take the laws of the different provinces and apply them in the affairs to which they had been applied by their different Legislatures. And, therefore, though the pressure was very great and the reasons given in certain cases very strong, we could not do it, we did not do it, and the Confederation took place with a

clause in the British North America Act which reads as follows. It is the third subsection of the ninety-third clause :

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union,—

Which was the case in Ontario and Quebec.

—or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province,—

That was to apply to the three provinces that were federated with Ontario and Quebec.

—an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision—

And so on. So that, Mr. Speaker, by this section we provided not only for the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which kept their separate schools as they had established them previous to Confederation, but also for the three provinces should they wish to have a system of separate schools afterwards. Should they decide to establish a system of separate schools, those separate schools were to be in the same position as similar schools in Ontario and Quebec, and the system could not be changed or altered except at the will of the people interested in such schools. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman says this, he may not know what I stated about the conference at London, but what I state is exactly the fact. Now, the hon. gentleman in all his argument has stated, or it was understood, that our object is to impose separate schools upon Manitoba. I, for one, have no such intention, and I do not think others have. If the province has established separate schools, or if the province had, by law or practice, separate schools previous to the Act of 1870, the Manitoba Act, then the separate schools should be maintained and should exist, as it was the free will of the people that they should be there. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman considers that in that province there is only one section of the people who have rights—the majority, the Protestant majority, who are opposed to separate schools—and that we who favour separate schools should not be considered by this House or by the Government. The Act of 1870, the Manitoba Act, provides specially for a case of this kind. It says :

In and for the province, the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions.—

The three sections which follow have been read several times and I do not intend to read them more than is necessary for my argument. It should be noted that it is clearly provided that—

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the Union.

The hon. gentleman says there was no law, therefore the words "by law" should not

apply, and that they are mere surplusage. But he says the question of practice is another thing and that it has been decided against finally by the Privy Council in England. Therefore he goes on and speaks of the appeal under the next subsection and says that evidently these things are there as a dead letter. He did not use those words, but that is the meaning of his argument; therefore, the laws passed in 1871, 1873 and 1875 are not to be considered. The hon. gentleman says that the reference in the law of 1870 to rights under the law must refer to laws passed previous to that Act. And he goes further and says (I think I took down his words) "until November last it never occurred to any one that subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act could apply to Manitoba." Under the British North America Act there were the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island coming in afterwards. The hon. gentleman might, perhaps, have quoted, when speaking of the Manitoba Act, the second section of that Act, which says :

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

Well, this is certainly a strong reason, which I have no doubt, convinced the sub-committee of the Privy Council when they sent their report to the Council, which was adopted on the 29th December, 1892, and in which they say that among the questions which the sub-committee regarded as preliminary was the following :—

Whether subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba.

Well, that clause certainly is a strong reason why the Ministers who had this matter under their consideration, should have taken this into their consideration at that time, and should have made the report they did, that is to say, that they desired to know whether that third subsection of the 93rd section of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba. The hon. gentleman who preceded me has given strength to that opinion, when he said just now, after discussing the two first subsections of the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act: Oh, well that is the same as blank paper, it is useless, it is of no effect. Well, if it is of no effect, it does not apply even to the law or practice that existed in the province at the time of the Union; and then "a fortiori" the third section of the 93rd section of the

British North America Act should apply when we read the second section of the Manitoba Act, which says :

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council—

That is to say, to put the Act in force—

—shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba.

Well, that cannot be varied by the Manitoba Act, when the hon. gentleman says himself that it is of no effect ; therefore, in the Manitoba Act this question of schools was not provided for as intended by the British North America Act, and this second section of the Manitoba Act itself. But, Mr. Speaker, the Act of 1870 was passed and accepted by the people, and afterwards the Legislature passed three other Acts in 1871, 1873 and 1875. The first Act was "An Act to Establish a System of Education in the Province of Manitoba," and was passed on the 3rd May, 1871. That Act constituted a Board of Education, under which they appointed a superintendent and secretary, and the Act superintended the meetings of the board, the quorum, the calling of the meetings, the chairman, duties of the board, appointment of the superintendent, &c. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint not less than ten or more than fourteen persons to be a Board of Education, of whom one-half shall be Protestants and the other half Catholics.

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint one of the Protestant members of the board to be superintendent of Protestant schools, and one of the Catholic members to be superintendent of Catholic schools, and the two superintendents shall be joint secretaries of the board.

Well, later on, in 1873, on the 8th March, they amended the Act to establish a system of education in that province. It is provided under these amendments that the duty of the board of education shall be to alter and subdivide, with the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, any school district established by this Act. It is the duty of each section of the board to have under its control and management the schools of the section, the examination or licensing of teachers, the selection of books, maps and globes :

Provided always, that in the case of books having reference to religion and morals, such selection by the Catholic section of the board shall be subject to the approval of the competent religious authorities.

Well, two years afterwards, on the 14th May, 1875, the Act was amended again, and the hon. gentleman will see how that was done :

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Within six months after the passing of this Act the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint, to form and constitute the Board of Education for the province of Manitoba, not exceeding twenty-one persons, twelve of whom shall be Protestants and nine Roman Catholics, who shall hold office for three years, being, however, eligible for reappointment, or if a lesser number be appointed, the same relative proportion of Protestants and Catholics shall be observed, and until such appointment shall take place, the members of the present Board of Education shall continue in office, and any vacancy occurring in such council from any cause, shall from time to time be filled by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

The council was to be composed of two committees, one Protestant and one Roman Catholic. Then the Legislative appropriation was to be divided between them :

The number of such children in the Protestant and Catholic districts respectively being aggregated as regard each of said faiths.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that system of education was in force in 1871, modified in 1873, and completed in 1875. That was after the Manitoba Act had been passed, and this legislation was enacted under that Act. In 1883 Parliament passed what is called the Dominion Lands Act. Section 23 of the Revised Statutes is as follows :—

Sections 11 and 29 in every surveyed township throughout the extent of the Dominion lands, are hereby set apart as an endowment for purposes of education, and shall be designated school lands ; and they are hereby withdrawn from the operation of the clauses of this Act, which relate to the sale of Dominion lands and to homestead rights therein ; and no right to purchase or to obtain homestead entry shall be recognized in connection with the said sections, or any part of them.

Section 24 is as follows :—

The schools lands shall be administered under the direction of the Governor in Council.

Subsection 3 of section 25 says :

All moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands shall be invested in securities of Canada, to form a school fund, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, shall be paid annually to the Government of the province or territory within which such lands are situated, towards the support of public schools therein ; and moneys so paid shall be distributed for that purpose by the Government of such province or territory in such manner as it deems expedient.

The Government which proposed that law was the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, of which I was a member. At that time, 1883, the three Acts I have mentioned as giving the system of separate schools to Manitoba were in force and were the laws of that province. We had there separate schools, and the common schools or Protestant schools, were there established by law. We gave those lands, not for the benefit of one set of schools, but for the schools of the whole province. What happened under these two Acts of 1890 ? Was it that the separate schools were to have no interest in those lands ? The interest received from those lands was not to go to the separate schools, nor

was it to go to the common schools alone. That was not the intention of the Government or Parliament. I know that the Government would never have committed an injury on a large portion of the population of Manitoba by handing over the lands to only one section of the community. The reason why we did not give the capital to the province, but only the interest, was because we feared that the people would expend that capital when the province possessed a small population, and when the wants of the larger population in later days were felt, the money would have been expended that should have gone to support the schools of the province. And, therefore, we kept the capital, and gave the interest for school purposes. But let it be remembered that the interest was not to be given only to one section, but was to be devoted for the purposes of all the schools, the separate schools as well as the common schools. The hon. gentleman stated that the Government has said they were judges, and therefore that it was a judicial decision they were to give. I do not know what is the meaning of that word in the mouth of some Ministers when stated verbally or in writing; but I know that it was a regular practice with members of Sir John Macdonald's Government, when a question was put to them on any subject as to the decision of the Council respecting it, to say that they could not speak of it as they were judges and were bound under their oath to be silent. The word judge is not limited to a judge on the bench; but in the case of the Government, were men who were judges in all matters that came before us. No doubt that is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite. During the twenty-five years I was a Minister of the Crown that was the manner we answered questions of that kind, not only in regard to the school question, but in regard to other important questions. The hon. gentleman says that the Ministers are acting as judges, and they are required to give a judicial decision. Why? Because by the Order in Council, 29th December, 1892, they had decided to refer a number of legal questions to the judges of the Supreme Court. The hon. gentleman admits that members of the Government may and should consult the Minister of Justice, and he has asked several questions in regard to the law in this regard. I believe that the advice of the Minister of Justice—I speak generally and not of this Minister of Justice only—would not be so satisfactory to a province such as Manitoba, as would be an opinion given by the judges of the Supreme Court. That was no reason for saying that because those judges were to be consulted, the decision should be in one or other direction. When the opinion is received by the Minister of Justice, the political action on the part of the Government begins, and it is for them then to decide whether the complaint made by the minority has any substantial foundation and whether remedial measures should be applied or not. If it should be decided that subsection 3 of sec-

tion 93 of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba, it gave another complexion to the case. It presented the case in a different way, and the Government would be called upon to decide whether the system of education that has been given and accepted by Manitoba, by its own Legislature in 1871, 1873 and 1875, is such a system of education as is provided for by the third subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act. I do not intend to detain the House longer, because I am aware that several hon. gentlemen intend to speak on this question, and I do not wish to follow the hon. gentleman all through his very able speech. I trust the House will afford me a few minutes to enable me to point out the singularity in comparing this resolution of the hon. member from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), with the end of an article entitled "The Manitoba Public School Law, by Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., M.P.," who, I suppose, is the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Comparing the resolution, as I said, with the end of that article published in the "Canadian Magazine," we find that the article states as follows:—

Manitoba has had but scant courtesy and but little consideration at the hands of the Government of Canada. Her railway legislation was vetoed so persistently that her people were driven to the verge of rebellion.

The hon. gentleman stated that in his address this afternoon.

These acts, if unwise and harsh, were at least within the lines of the Constitution. But the attacks now launched against her exclusive right to manage her educational system is fraught with perilous consequences to the Dominion; and for the initial steps that the Government at Ottawa have taken to accomplish that end it should be held to strict account, or Parliament will lamentably fail in its duty; and the pretence that the Cabinet acts as a judicial tribunal and not as political advisers of the Crown should meet with the contempt and condemnation it invites at the hands of the representatives of the people.

Now let me read the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Tarte), and we will find a somewhat wonderful similarity between it and the extract from this article, written by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy):

This House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and in assuming to be possessed of the judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

The resolution is not only the same idea as the concluding words of the article, but it is couched in nearly the same terms, and it appears to me that the motion would have been a great deal better in the hands of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) than in the hands of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr.

Tarte). One would think that before making their speeches, and before this question came up, they had put their heads together, and that one hon. member said to the other: Well, if you take my motion I will support it, and you can make your speech. I do not say that such was done; but it looks a little like it. At all events, the resolution would have been a great deal better in the hands of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who has supported it in such a strong speech. It is remarkable how the two hon. gentlemen have arranged to make both ends meet. The one is for separate schools, and condemns the Government very strongly because they have not vetoed the Bill as he thinks they should do, while the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. McCarthy) is strongly against separate schools; but he finds reasons for condemning the Government and supporting the latter part of the resolution of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). That is somewhat strange. I suppose that the first part of the resolution was intended for the hon. gentleman for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and the last portion intended for the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I thank the House for hearing me, and I will resume my seat to allow the question to be discussed by other hon. gentlemen.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea that I shall be able to add very much, if anything, to the exceedingly able, exhaustive, and admirable effort of the Prime Minister delivered last night, when he dealt with this question in a manner which I think must carry conviction to the minds of those who heard him, as well as those who have read his remarks throughout the country to-day. We have had, however, some statements made by speakers on both sides of the House to which I think it my duty to refer. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has stated that he takes exception to the position which the Government have assumed on this question, not only in the present circumstances, but from the very initiation of the proceedings. We have that hon. gentleman, not only taking that exception in this House, but we have him as an essayist in the "Canadian Magazine," speaking, no doubt, on behalf of those whom he believes he represents in this country, holding up the conduct of the First Minister as something that would reflect no discredit on a Richelieu or a Machiavelli, and something that revives the best days of the schoolmen. And while we have that hon. gentleman telling us that the conduct of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Government is worthy of every execration, as doing injustice to the Protestant majority of Manitoba, and as destroying the rights of that province, we have, on the other hand, the gentleman from

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

whom he has just received in this House the baptism of political regeneration, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), telling us that the conduct of the Government is not at all what the hon. gentleman who is going to vote with him on his amendment has described it, but that it is an outrage on the Catholic minority in Manitoba, for which the Catholics throughout the length and breadth of this land should stand up and denounce the Government. We were told by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) last night, that it had been stated that this House and the country were to have a good deal of fun in the course of this debate, and he stated that the promise had not been fulfilled. Well, my hon. friend should not have spoken too soon. The spectacle which was presented to this House to-day was certainly humorous, if it was disappointing to the admirers of the hon. member for North Simcoe. The spectacle that has been presented by these two gentlemen, one administering fire and brimstone to the people of the province of Quebec, and the other giving all his fire and his violence and his denunciatory language to the other section of the community—the spectacle of these two gentlemen sailing in the same boat, under two flags, if you will, but, at all events, both armed with the same pattern of knife under their long cloaks, with which to stab the Prime Minister in the back, was a spectacle which must have afforded some fun to those people who think that politics make strange bedfellows and cause extremes to meet. They must have had some fun at the spectacle displayed by the hon. member for L'Islet when leading to the altar his new convert to receive his political baptism. But, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to deal with some of the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe, whom I am sorry not to see in his place to-night, I have one or two observations to make with regard to the speech of the mover of this resolution. As has been said, and there is probably where the fun comes in, the tail did not exactly suit the dog in this matter. After the long speech which the hon. gentleman made, there was something humorously disappointing in the amendment which he proposed. For the purpose of discrediting the Conservative party in this country and making them appear unfriendly to the race to which he belongs and to the creed to which we both belong, he went where? Why, he went back to ante-Confederation days, and quoted the speeches on Confederation, in order to find out what was the intention of the Legislature and the public men of those days with regard to this question of schools in Manitoba, instead of going to the Manitoba Act itself, and he endeavoured to show that it was the intention of this Parliament to grant separate schools to Manitoba. I say that he should have referred to the debates that took place on the Manitoba Act itself; but he did not do that, because it would not have justified his position. It would have shown

that the people whom he has associated himself with were opposed to granting that right to the minority of the province of Manitoba, and that they supported a motion which was made in this House to eliminate from the Manitoba Act the clauses referring to education. Mr. Speaker, it is of some interest to look back at that period. When we remember what was going on, what interest was centred, not merely on this question, but on a variety of other questions; when we remember, not merely the political rancour, but the personal rancour that existed among the public men of that day, who fought out their battles on the floor of this House; when we remember the disputes between Mr. McDougall and Mr. Howe, we know that these things naturally absorbed a great deal of attention, but at the same time they do not prevent us from seeing what position those who were the principal actors in those scenes took on this question, and what was the intention of this Parliament at that time. Why, Sir, the Hon. Mr. McDougall, well known as a leading light in the Liberal party, spoke on more than one occasion. He said:

He should also propose to strike out the 20th clause relating to the separate schools. They had better see what provisions the Local Parliament might make with regard to this question, after which the Governor-General might exercise the veto power. He opposed the clause as inapplicable to the country and as suggestive of a state of things which it should be preferable not to suppose to exist.

Well, that is very good reading for those who contend for separate schools, but it is not very good reading for those who go about proclaiming that the Liberal party is liberal in something else besides name. On the public hustings and in places where they are not bound by their utterances, they are all liberality in words; but when it comes to acts, the true sympathies of their hearts are manifested, and in this instance they did not belie their record. Mr. Thomas Ferguson replied to Mr. McDougall at that time, in such sense as to show what was the intention of the Legislature. He said:

As for the hon. member for North Lanark, the whole country knew his political reputation was irretrievably ruined, that while he was in the Government he was willing to do anything that might be necessary to keep him there, and had become the biggest Tory of the whole of them. (Laughter.) Why, the hon. gentleman spoke of separate schools as if they were something horrible to contemplate; but if his memory served him aright, the hon. gentleman while in the Government had voted for separate schools in this country.

The hon. gentleman spoke of separate schools as something horrible to contemplate, and, if his memory served him right, the hon. gentleman, while in the Government, had voted for separate schools in this country, thereby carrying out the same idea as to what was the intention of the Legislature at the time. This debate went on, and a few days afterwards Mr. McDougall made another speech on the subject, when this matter came up

again in the course of discussion on the Manitoba Act. He said:

The effect of the clause, if not struck out, would be to fix laws which the Local Legislature could not alter in future, and that it would be better to leave the matter to local authorities to decide, as in the other provinces. He quite agreed with his hon. friend in giving the same powers to this province as the others, and it was for that reason that he desired to strike out the clause.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER referred to the manner in which the Red River country had been settled, and grants of land which had been made to the clergy for the purposes of education.

Mr. MACKENZIE was prepared to leave the matter to be settled exclusively by the Local Legislature. The British North America Act gave all the protection necessary for minorities; and local authorities understood their own local wants better than the General Legislature. It was his earnest desire to avoid introducing into the new province these detrimental discussions which had operated so unhappily on their own country, and therefore hoped the amendment would be carried.

This was the amendment which was moved by the Hon. Mr. Oliver, who moved that the education clause be struck out altogether. I think, leaving altogether aside the tendencies of the different political parties of that time, that we have a pretty clear idea from the debate as to what the intention of Parliament then was. And we had, in the decision of the Privy Council in England, an illustration of how very badly they carried out what they intended to do. However, before leaving this branch of the subject, I will say, that surely no man in this or any other country will hold the present Prime Minister or his governmental colleagues responsible for the legislation enacted at that particular date. What we are bound to do, is to stand by the constitution, as it was interpreted by the highest court of the land, and give to each class of persons their civil rights under the constitution. We are bound to abide by that constitution and nothing else. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in his observations this afternoon, made several points. First of all, he said that the appeal should be thrown out, as the question had been finally settled by the judgment of the Privy Council, and was beyond all further interference. He laid down the doctrine, that although the Government was bound to receive the petition of their Lordships, and those who sided with them, it was the duty of the Government, without further ceremony, to throw that petition out the very moment it was received. He said, secondly, that it was a most remarkable thing—and he reasserted this statement over and over again—that the question of the application of section 93 of the Manitoba Act never had been raised, and not only never had been raised, but never had been thought of, until last November, when it was raised upon a petition presented by Mr Ewart to the Government. He said it had not been raised in the first court, nor in the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba. It had not been raised

before the Supreme Court of Canada, and neither had it been raised before the Privy Council. Now, my idea is, that we can be able to show, by testimony which the hon. gentleman will not controvert, that, whilst the constitutionality of the Act, so far as the ultra vires question is concerned, was settled by the Privy Council, that alone was settled. I shall be able to show, that on the second point he was wrong, and manifestly wrong; and I think he showed this himself this afternoon, when he attempted to prove from the words of Mr. Blake, that Mr. Blake did not intend to convey the meaning which was given those words by the Minister of Justice last night. I think he showed that when he felt compelled to take issue with that greater master of English, Mr. Blake himself, and sought to make an argument out of the mouth of that hon. gentleman, and then had to quarrel with his own quotation. He said that this Government was shirking their responsibility, that they were endeavouring to put upon other shoulders the burden which rested on their own, and which they should not hesitate to assume. Finally, he wound up with an appeal on behalf of poor Manitoba, on account of the treatment that province had received from the Dominion Government. But he forgot that he himself had supported the Government of Sir John Macdonald during all that time. However, it is my intention to deal with the subject as briefly as the importance of the subject will allow, and to confine myself as much as possible to the legal aspect of the case and the pros and cons which naturally present themselves, and which have been presented by such able advocates as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by writers in the press in Quebec and Ontario and elsewhere, all holding different views and maintaining those views with great ability; and I shall ask the House, if the Government, in view of those contentions and all those difficulties which have been presented, have not taken a wise course in asking the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada; and I am confident, that after I shall have read the few remarks and quotations I have before me, I shall, at all events, have in doing so thrown a little more light on this subject and enabled hon. members to take a wider and more extensive view than they otherwise might do, if they were not placed in possession of those quotations. What was the question that was brought up in the court in Manitoba? It was simply a question by a Mr. Barrett, by which he claimed that two by-laws of the city of Winnipeg were null and void. And the reason why he claimed that these by-laws were null and void—the two being virtually one, because one was merely amending the other to make it workable—is stated in the following words, which covered the whole of his complaint from beginning to end:—

Because the effect of the by-law is that one rate is levied upon all Protestant and Roman Catholic

Mr. CURRAN.

ratepayers in order to raise the amount mentioned in said by-law, and the effect is to diminish the tax upon Protestant ratepayers and to increase the tax upon Catholic ratepayers.

That is the question as put in the complaint of Mr. Barrett, when he prayed for a rule from the court. Mr. Justice Killam summed up the contention in these words:

The contention of the applicant is that the old law is still in force, and that the amounts of these estimates should have been levied separately upon Protestant and Roman Catholic ratepayers. The argument for this view is based upon a claim that the Public Schools Act of 1890 is "ultra vires" of the Provincial Legislature, and that the repeal of the former statutes was intended to operate only for the purpose of substituting the one system for the other, and should be deemed inoperative. It is sufficient, however, for present purposes to consider whether it was "intra vires" of the Legislature to establish such a system of schools as is provided by the new Act, and to authorize the raising of money for their support by a general assessment upon the property of all, irrespective of religious belief, and without providing for the support of separate schools for any class.

Now, that was the claim as laid before the court by Mr. Barrett and the statement by Mr. Justice Killam. It is entirely needless for me, after the speeches that have been delivered here narrating the whole facts, to enter into any lengthy statement with regard to the petitions that were sent in. But the Minister of Justice reported upon the Manitoba legislation, and advised His Excellency to reply as follows to these petitions. After setting forth the facts and the ground of complaint, judgment having been rendered, he said:

The Court has practically decided, with one dissentient opinion, that the Acts now under review do not "prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools" which Roman Catholics had by "practice at the time of the Union," or in brief, that the non-existence, at that time, of a system of public schools and the consequent exemption from taxation for the support of public schools and the consequent freedom to establish and support separate and "denominational" schools did not constitute a "right or privilege" "by practice" which these Acts took away.

An appeal has been asserted and the case is now before the Supreme Court of Canada, where it will, in all probability, be heard in the course of next month.

If the appeal should be successful these Acts will be annulled by judicial decision, the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba will receive protection and redress. The Acts purporting to be repealed will remain in operation, and those whose views have been represented by a majority of the Legislature cannot but recognize that the matter has been disposed of with due regard to the constitutional rights of the province.

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsection (2) and (3) of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act" quoted in the early part of this report and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act," in relation to the other provinces.

And just here I will say that it must be gratifying that, despite the natural feeling and desire that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) might have to agree with the mover of this resolution, when he said that in the statement made by the Minister of Justice that there was a strong promise or a promise of any kind, he says he is not surprised that those gentlemen who feel disappointed with the Minister of Justice should say and claim that there is such a promise contained in these words, but that he himself is obliged to admit that there is no such promise and no words that can be held to give such a promise. The Minister of Justice goes on :

Those subsections contain in effect the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces and are obviously those under which the constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal powers should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority against any Act or decision of the Legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting "any right or privilege" of any such minority "in relation to education."

And in all these different clauses the words are put between inverted commas, showing exactly where the application is in regard to particular cases. Now, the decision of the Privy Council sustained the view taken by the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba. The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court was overruled. The decision of the Privy Council in England was to the effect that the Manitoba Schools Act was "intra vires," and that the province had not exceeded its power in passing that Act. I shall just read the heading of the holding, as it is given here :

According to the true construction of the Constitutional Act of Manitoba, 1870, 33 Vict., chap. 3 (Dominion Statute), having regard to the state of things which existed in Manitoba at the date thereof, the legislature of that province did not exceed its powers in passing the Public School Act, 1890.

Section 22 of the Act of 1870 authorizes the Provincial Legislature exclusively to make laws in relation to education so as not to "prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have, by law or practice in the province at the Union."

Held, that the Act of 1890, which abolished the denominational system of public education established by law since the Union, but which did not compel the attendance of any child at a public school, or confer any advantage in respect of attendance other than that of free education, and at the same time left each denomination free to establish, maintain, and conduct its own schools, did not contravene the above proviso ; and that accordingly certain by-laws of a municipal corporation which authorized assessments under the Act were valid.

Now, in the face of that judgment, delivered by the highest court in the country, a sub-committee of the Privy Council was appointed, and that sub-committee was composed of the following persons:—Sir John Thompson, Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Hon. J.

A. Chapleau and Hon. T. M. Daly. The sub-committee reported as follows:—

The sub-committee are of opinion that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is conclusive as to the rights with regard to denominational schools which the Roman Catholics had at the time of the Union, and as to the bearing thereon of the statutes complained of, and Your Excellency is not, therefore, in the opinion of the sub-committee, properly called upon to hear an appeal based on those grounds. That judgment is as binding on Your Excellency as it is on any of the parties to the litigation, and, therefore, if redress is sought on account of the state of affairs existing in the province at the time of the Union, it must be sought elsewhere and by other means than by way of appeal under the sections of the British North America Act and of the Manitoba Act, which are relied on by the petitioners as sustaining this appeal.

That is to say, that despite all these statements which have been attributed to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, now Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, as to his going about from post to pillar, stating this, that and the other thing, that he signed, with his own hand, that solemn declaration to the Governor-General, telling him that he was bound by the decision of the Privy Council in England just as the humblest citizen in any part of the Empire would be bound by it. The four gentlemen who made that report concurred in it, and it was concurred in by the whole Cabinet, and every man with the most elementary knowledge of the principles that govern us, knows just as well as those gentlemen, that every citizen in this country is bound by it ; Governments are bound by it as well as governors and legislators, and the people at large. Then they go on to say :

The two Acts of 1890 which are complained of, must, according to the opinion of the sub-committee, be regarded as within the powers of the Legislature of Manitoba ; but it remains to be considered whether the report should be entertained and heard, as an appeal against the statutes which were alleged to have encroached on rights and privileges with regard to denominational schools, which were acquired by any class of persons, not at the time of the Union, but "after the Union."

Therefore, the decision rendered in the case rested upon the status of Catholics at the time of Union, or prior to the Union, and it could not go beyond that in any shape or form. Now, I come to answer, at this juncture, the statement of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the case put before the Privy Council, the case lodged and carried there by Mr. Barrett, covered the whole question ; it covered simply what was set forth and specified in the complaint read to this House a few moments ago. In the Privy Council, during the argument, a question was raised by those who appeared on behalf of the Catholic minority, and they argued that sections 178 and 179 of the Manitoba School Law were confiscatory. Those sections read as follows:—

178. In cases where, before the coming into force of this Act, Catholic school districts have been established,

covering the same territory as any Protestant school district, and such Protestant school district has incurred indebtedness, the Department of Education shall cause an inquiry to be made as to the amount of the indebtedness of such Protestant school district and the amount of its assets. Such of the assets as consist of property shall be valued on the basis of their actual value at the time of the coming into force of this Act. In case the amount of the indebtedness exceeds the amount of the assets, then all the property assessed in the year 1889, to supporters of such Catholic school districts, shall be exempt from any taxation for the purpose of paying the principal and interest of an amount of the indebtedness of such school district equal to the difference between its indebtedness and assets. Such exemption shall continue only so long as such property is owned by the person to whom the same was assessed as owner in the year 1889.

179. In cases where, before the coming into force of this Act, Catholic school districts have been established as in the next preceding section mentioned, such Catholic school districts shall, upon the coming into force of this Act, cease to exist, and all the assets of such Catholic school districts shall belong to, and all the liabilities thereof be paid by the public school district. In case the liabilities of any such Catholic school district exceed its assets then the difference shall be deducted from the amount to be allowed as an exemption, as provided in the next preceding section. In case the assets of any such Catholic school district exceeds its liabilities, the difference shall be added to the amount to be allowed as an exemption, as provided in the next preceding section.

Well, we all know what the effect of such legislation is, it is at least expropriation; we all know how religiously legislators have guarded the interests of property, how special statutes have been passed in order to operate expropriation, and how the private property of citizens or a corporation is jealously guarded by the law. Well, we had this enactment, made, apparently, without prior legislation or anything of that kind, to authorize the putting into effect of any such legislation, and the counsel for the Catholic minority, before their Lordships, set up an argument that the school law should be set aside because these particular sections, made in so sweeping a manner, were "ultra vires": that there was no law to authorize them; that no law authorized the province of Manitoba to stretch out its hand and say: "We take the property of Mr. A. and we hand it over to Mr. B. unceremoniously, and simply by our own free will and motion." This argument was apparently having some effect, when a gentleman on the other side arose and said:

I desire in the first place to point out that the clauses which have been referred to as confiscating clauses, do not fairly bear the meaning which the learned Attorney General has given them.

The learned Attorney-General, speaking for the Catholic minority, merely used words that had been used by one of the judges in the Supreme Court, and was carrying out the idea which had been emitted there. Continuing his argument he said:

I refer to clause 178 and 179, which transfer, it is true, the then existing Roman Catholic schools and all their property to the public schools. I think they

Mr. CURRAN.

can be justified on public grounds and as just and fair in view of the whole scheme of legislation. But it is not sufficient to point out that Barrett has no right to complain; he had no interest in any school which has been confiscated, if they were confiscated; he has no right to come and complain of anything more than the imposition of the tax. It is the bye-law of the municipality which he applied to quash and it is the bye-law which has in effect been quashed by a judgment of the Supreme Court. Now it might well be, though I do not concede that it is so, that sections 178 and 179 in transferring the property of the Roman Catholics were in contravention and in prejudice of their particular rights in respect of schools. But who is to complain of that? Not Mr. Barrett: his complaint, and the only complaint, is that he objects to a bye-law which imposes a tax upon him, because under the taxing clause of the Act it is *ultra vires*, and as to that alone.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who stood up here to-day and stated that the whole question had been decided, that this judgment of the Supreme Court had wiped out everything, is the very gentleman who contended for quite a different thing before the Privy Council in England, and I have just given his own argument and his own words, taken from the verbatim report of his speech on that occasion. Now, the judgment I submit was as to the meaning of the words, "by practice." The decision arrived at was that the Legislature had not exceeded its authority in passing a general Act of Education. That has been decided for all time to come. Neither this Government nor any other power in the Dominion can interfere with the Public School Act of Manitoba. Some persons contend there is no room for any appeal now, as did the hon. gentleman who spoke last, but whose speech was in a different sense from that which he delivered before the Privy Council. Mr. Ewart's argument shows how very complicated the question really is. He has abandoned his claim that there should be an attempt made to interfere with the judgment of the Privy Council. In his factum, which is one of very great ability, he allows that question to go as having been settled once for all. The sub-committee of our own Privy Council, to which I have referred, closed their report to His Excellency as follows:—

Among the questions which the sub-committee regard as preliminary are the following:—

(1.) Whether this appeal is such an appeal as is contemplated by subsection 3, of section 93, of the British North America Act or by subsection 2, of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

(2.) Whether the grounds set forth in the petitions are such as may be the subject of appeal under either of the subsections above referred to.

(3.) Whether the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in any way bears on the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the Union have been interfered with by the two Statutes of 1890 before referred to.

(4.) Whether subsection 3, of section 93, of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba.

(5.) Whether Your Excellency in Council has power to grant such orders, as are asked for by the petitioner, assuming the material facts to be as stated in the petition.

(6.) Whether the Acts of Manitoba passed before the Session of 1890, conferred on the minority a "right or privilege with respect to Education," within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, or established "a system of separate or dissentient schools," within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, and if so, whether the two Acts of 1890, complained of, affect "the right or privilege" of the minority in such a manner as to warrant the present appeal.

Mr. Ewart contending that there is a right of appeal replies to the oft-repeated argument. The whole question has been divided by the Privy Council as follows:—

It has been said, that inasmuch as the English Privy Council has passed upon this matter, that is, and ought to be the end of it. It seems to me, however, that that is only the end of the matter so far as one of the subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is concerned, and that the other two subsections have not been proceeded upon at all, but present an alternative course, or rather a course for an alternative case, with reference to education in that province. The first subsection of section 22 of the Act in question plainly, to my mind, deals with *ultra vires* cases. The second and third subsections deal with *intra vires* cases.

I wish to give a few points with reference to this which seem to me to make it not only obvious but perfectly conclusive. If the appeal which has just been decided adversely to the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba had been determined the other way, if it had been held that the Act was *ultra vires* then, I fancy it is quite clear there would have been no appeal. Why? Because the Act having been held to be *ultra vires*, there is really no Act at all; because there is nothing to appeal from. Then if it be said that having been held to be *intra vires*, there is no appeal—there is no appeal at all. There can be no appeal in *ultra vires* cases, because clearly there is nothing to appeal from. And if there is no appeal when the Act is *intra vires*, then these sections mean nothing, and there is no appeal at all.

There is this further, that in case of an appeal being entertained by the Governor, Parliament may be called upon to pass remedial legislation. Now, suppose for a moment that the Act has been declared *ultra vires*, and that we appealed, could we have asked Parliament to make remedial law? Parliament would simply have said there is no statute, therefore, there is nothing to remedy. A remedial law clearly can only be passed in case the law is *intra vires*.

This is apparently strong ground, and it may be well to dispose of the pretension of Mr. Ewart before taking up other views—

That there is this distinction between subsections 1 and 2, seems to me also to be borne out by a comparison which will show that the conditions requisite for an appeal, are in every respect different from those under which an Act will be *ultra vires*.

Let us take in the first place the terms "prejudicially affect," in the first subsection, and "affecting any right or privilege" in the second subsection. To make the Act *ultra vires*, it must "prejudicially affect" some right or privilege of some class of persons. That is, in order that the Act should be *ultra vires* it ought to prejudice some right. In the second subsection, however, it is not necessary that we should demonstrate that such Act has "prejudicially affected us" in order to give a right of appeal. It may have helped us, but not helped us in the same measure in which it

has helped others. Or while being on the whole beneficial it may contain some unfair provision. If it prejudicially affected us, then it would be *ultra vires*, but if it only "affected" us, then it would be a case in which the legislation would not be *ultra vires*, but simply one for appeal to the Governor in Council. Lord Watson of the British Privy Council pointed out this distinction in the recent argument.

But according to the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) this afternoon, for he used the same words, practically, he said it had been held by the Privy Council in England, that the words of the section by practice had been heard to mean nothing at all, that it offered the minority no protection, that they were in the same position as if no such provision had existed, and in the hon. gentleman's opinion very probably the other section meant nothing more. Mr. Ewart went on to discuss another branch of the subject, and he said:

Let us next compare the words "any class of persons" in the first subsection, with the words "Protestant or Roman Catholic Minority" in the second subsection, and we shall see at once that it was intended to deal with different things in the different subsections. To make a law *ultra vires* it is sufficient that it prejudicially affects the rights of "any class or of any persons," which by the judgment of the full Court of Manitoba has been held to include Episcopalians; and if it includes Episcopalians, there is no doubt it would include Presbyterians. But under the second subsection, the Presbyterians and Episcopalians, could not complain except as a part of a Protestant minority. Episcopalians might complain that an Act was *ultra vires*, and so take proceedings, as they did, under the first subsection, but inasmuch as the Protestants are not in a minority in the province, they could not appeal under the second subsection.

The third parallelism between these two subsections, or rather the lack of it, is to be found in the words "at the Union" in the one and "right or privilege," without any limitation, in the second subsection. It is quite sufficient to make a law *ultra vires* that it should interfere with some right which any class of persons had at the time at the Union, but under the second subsection you will observe that the rights to be interfered with are not limited to those which existed at the Union, but merely those which affect "any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education," whenever it exists, or however it may arise. I see it argued that that right or privilege must have existed at the time of the Union. I find no such statement in the second subsection. On the contrary, I find that the words "at the Union," which appear in the first subsection are omitted from the second; and by a well-known canon of construction, we must give some effect to the difference in the language.

Mr. Ewart went on to say:

Another contrast between these two subsections is to be found in the use of the words "with respect to denominational schools," the first subsection and the words "in relation to education," in the second subsection. The second is very much wider than the first. To render the Act *ultra vires*, it must affect some right or privilege with reference to schools, with reference to the system or to their management or control or something of that kind, but under the wider clause while the Act may not be *ultra vires*, because it does not affect the schools, yet inasmuch as some detail relative to education is affected a case will be presented for appeal to the Governor-General

in Council. It may be a question relating merely to text books or to religious exercises or a thousand and one of the administrative details in reference to education which might not properly come within the term "denominational schools." This is a distinction which the Privy Council in England recognized, a distinction which not only was greatly debated before them, but found favour with them.

My last quotation from Mr. Ewart is as follows :—

It has been said that the second subsection of the Manitoba Act, is less wide than subsection 3 of clause 93 of the British North America Act, of part of which it is a copy. If the 3rd subsection of clause 93 of the British North America Act applied to Manitoba (and perhaps it does) unquestionably there would be the right of appeal; but it is said our second subsection is more limited. The 3rd subsection of clause 93 of the British North America Act provides that "where, in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law, at the Union, or is thereafter established by the Legislature" an appeal shall lie. Our statute is general, and does not limit the appeal to either of these two cases. It commences, "An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council." This is much wider than the British North America Act. That Act limits the appeal to two cases, one in which there was a separate system prior to the Union, and the other to a separate system after the Union. I repeat that ours is the wider clause for it is not limited in any way. With us an appeal would lie, although no separate system was in force, either before or after the Union. Supposing the first few lines had been left out of the British North America Act and it had simply said "An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council," &c., then I fancy there would have been an appeal from the province of New Brunswick. New Brunswick had not a separate school system previous to the Union and has not established one since, therefore there is no appeal under the British North America Act; but if the limiting words were taken away from that section clearly there would be an appeal. So I say there is no limitation in the case of appeals under the Manitoba Act although there is under the British North America Act. If the section in the Manitoba Act varies from the British North America Act, I say it is varied by being made wider, we need not care whether the British North America Act applies to us or not.

This presses us to the consideration: Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act apply? One of the contentions which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) made this afternoon, was that until the month of November last, after the case had gone through, as he said, every one of the courts, after it had been tried in the first instance in Manitoba, after it had been heard in the Supreme Court, and after it had been argued before the Privy Council only then, he said, was this question raised. He said that it was a brand new question that it never had been heard before November, and he was astonished that any such contention had been made. Let me deal with that for a moment. There is a great deal of difference of opinion on the subject, as to whether this subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba. I have read to the House the contentions of Mr. Ewart, and these contentions are worthy of consideration. He argues

Mr. CURRAN.

out his point with a great deal of ability and skill, and the judges all through agreed that the Manitoba Act, is even wider in its scope than the British North America Act. But, Mr. Speaker, would you believe, that this question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) says was never thought of, or never dreamed of until the month of November, was actually pronounced upon by Judge Killam in the very first judgment rendered in Manitoba. Not only that, but it was argued throughout in every court, and the hon. gentleman himself must have heard the matter discussed before the Privy Council. Surely he must have forgotten that he took part in the discussion. Here is what Judge Killam said:

And here, I must say with reference to an argument that the third subsection of the 93rd section of the original Act is one applicable to the whole of the provinces of the Dominion, and therefore, by the terms of the second section of the Manitoba Act, to be read in the latter Act, in addition to the 22nd section of the latter, that this 22nd section gives power to the Legislature to make laws in relation to education, subject and according to certain provisions, and that if the reading into the Act of any portion of the original 93rd section would involve either an extension or a limitation of the powers of the Provincial Legislature beyond those fixed by the terms of this 22nd section, there would be an inconsistency with the Manitoba Act, which is excluded by the express terms of its second section. The course of the legislation and the meaning of the first statute, are of the greatest importance in interpreting the second, but I cannot consider any portion of the 93rd section of the former to be incorporated into the second Act.

The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) said that this question was never brought up before last November, and that was one of the mainstays of his argument this afternoon, but here we have actually a judgment on it by the court of first instance in Manitoba. We have the statement per contra of the judges of the Privy Council on this very point that was decided by Mr. Justice Killam, and to show this I will read from the judgment delivered by their lordships in that court aforesaid. On page 452 of the Law Reports of the House of Lords:

Subsections 1, 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, differ but slightly from the corresponding subsections of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867. The only important difference is that in the Manitoba Act, in subsection 1, the words "by law" are followed by the words "or practice" which do not occur in the corresponding passage in the British North America Act, 1867.

Therefore, we have the Lords of the Privy Council stating that the smallest possible difference exists between the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, that one law is equal to the other in value, that the slightness of difference does not affect either one or the other, one giving as much power as the other to the Governor-General in Council, and that the only distinction that exists between these two statutes is, that the words "by law" in the British North America Act are followed by the words "or prac-

“*tice*” in the corresponding section of the Manitoba Act. Have we the right to pretend as against Judge Killam that the British North America Act does apply in its educational section and clause to the province of Manitoba. That is a disputed question. It is one which is well worthy of consideration, and one which, no doubt, the Privy Council felt it very difficult to decide. But, Sir, Lord Watson was strongly of the opinion that section 3 of the British North America Act did apply to Manitoba. Sir Horace Davey argued for Manitoba in this connection :

I have not troubled your Lordships with that argument. I think it is quite clear, saying so only as Counsel of course, or that it is reasonably clear that the provisions of the 22nd section do over-ride and prevent the application of the provisions of the 93rd section of the British North America Act. I should think that is reasonably clear. It does not matter very much.

Here was an argument before the Privy Council on this subject, and views are expressed on it which are worthy of consideration ; but what will be thought of my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), who wakes up here to-day and tells us that this point was never dreamt of until the month of November last. Sir Horace Davey concluded his argument by saying it did not matter very much ; but now it seems to matter a great deal. We have a very serious question on hand in it, and it is one of the subjects which the Government are entitled to refer to the Supreme Court. It is right that they should ask the Supreme Court with this question before them, if they have the power to entertain any such appeal as is now made by the minority of Manitoba. Now, with reference to another point in the argument before the Privy Council, in which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) took part. Lord Watson said :

I think there is some considerable question. I do not think that is a clear point at all that section 3 does not apply.

Mr. McCARTHY—I was treating it for the moment as clear because all the judges below have taken that view.

The hon. gentleman was mistaken there, because Judge Dubuc did not take that view for one. He continued :

Mr. McCARTHY—The assumption, of course, in support of it not applying is that the rest of 93 has been applied in its own language, not of course, my lord, in express terms.

Lord SHAND—It is very difficult to run the two sections into each other in regard to Manitoba.

Lord WATSON—If they were to do what they have not done, there might be a question for establishing separate schools.

Mr. McCARTHY—With great deference, it has always been thought that section 2 was to be in substitution for subsection 3, and it is contended on the other side that the appeal is more on section 2 than it is on section 3.

Lord SHAND—I understand in the case where separate schools were introduced, the person sub-

scribing to those schools got rid of the Public School Act.

Mr. McCARTHY—Just so, and then became liable to a separate school rate. He could not, however, free himself from contribution to the educational fund, but he subscribed to one fund instead of another.

Lord WATSON—Section 3 is really included in section 3 of the Manitoba Act.

Mr. McCARTHY—Sections 3 and 4 are the identical sections. Your Lordship will find that on page 4 of the record in parallel columns.

Lord WATSON—Assuming that they had done what they had powers to—the constitution of Manitoba, I mean—if they were establishing separate and dissentient schools, a system of separate or dissentient schools, then their acts with regard to these schools might come under section 3.

Mr. McCARTHY—That is what I was venturing to contend would not be done.

And this is the subject that was never touched until last November. Now, Lord Watson again says :

The important words we have to consider are “*or practice*” in the Act of Manitoba. I think it comes to a very narrow point. I think they bear that the intention of that was to adopt the clause of the Act of 1867, which, as it stood, was inapplicable to Manitoba, to the necessities and requirements of Manitoba, to give them the benefit of the same legislation. I am clearly of opinion that the Act of 1867 was, as far as possible, intended, as regards all civil rights, including educational matters, to place all the provinces of the Dominion as nearly as possible on the same footing as circumstances permitted. As I said before, I am not indicating an opinion. The language may tie you down, but I think it was intended to establish that uniformity, and I think it will be necessary to consider the suggestion whether it was the intention of the Legislature with regard to denominational schools in Manitoba, to handicap them in a way that they are not handicapped elsewhere.

Now, in the face of all these different contentions, is it not wise and proper for the Government to obtain the very best counsel that can be obtained ? Is it not an act of prudence and an act of statesmanship ? This House by a solemn resolution stated what should be done under such circumstances, and every member of this House who was here in 1890 was responsible for the passing of that resolution, and every one who was here in the second session, when that resolution was incorporated in the Supreme Court Act, also became responsible for it ; and to tell us now that the Government should turn their back on all that and ignore the solemn mandate of this House and the legislation that is upon our statute-books—why, it is simply an absurdity which I am surprised that any man who values his reputation should for one single instant contend for before an intelligent public. Now, with reference to the right of appeal, we have the strongest arguments in the mouth of the counsel for the province of Manitoba before the Privy Council. In his argument there Sir Horace Davey said :

Now here the exclusive right to make laws in relation to education is vested in the Provincial Legislature, but there are certain restrictions imposed on

the Provincial Legislature. Then an appeal is given to the Governor-General in Council to say where or how far any Act of the Provincial Legislature which is expressly mentioned in the Manitoba Act, getting rid of the ambiguity in the General Act—the former Act—how far any Act in the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba does or does not infringe the rights reserved and the privileges of the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority as the case may be. Well, if that is so, it is obvious that this being a right or privilege which is reserved by the Act itself to the Roman Catholic minority, and in case it is infringed an appeal being given—the Act has provided within its own four corners a remedy for an infringement of the right or privilege which it has created by the Act itself, and therefore, it would seem that this Act of Parliament, being an Act relating to education, is an Act which *prima facie* falls within the jurisdiction of the Manitoba Legislature, but then the question whether it has complied with these provisos and restrictions which are imposed upon the right to legislate arises, and that is the question which the statute which imposed those provisos and restrictions has given an appeal to the Governor-General.

Lord Watson, speaking on the point, said :

The first part of the subsection seems to imply the function of the Governor-General to watch the progress of legislation on educational subjects.

Sir HORACE DAVEY—Yes, that is so.

Lord WATSON—It may be to suggest to them that they shall amend their law if he thinks that law does not comply with the general feeling.

Sir HORACE DAVEY—The Legislature might comply with the requisite decision or award of the Governor-General, but if they do not, then I submit.

Lord SHAND—There would be no mandamus if the Governor-General were to hold that this is an Act which does affect the Roman Catholic minority.

Sir HORACE DAVEY—Then they appeal on it.

Lord SHAND—I do not see there is any appeal—it would be final on this matter.

Sir HORACE DAVEY—The Provincial Legislature would then have to repeal the Act.

Lord SHAND—Would not deliverance of judgment by the Governor-General be a repeal of the Act?

Sir HORACE DAVEY—I do not suppose your Lordship's decision would repeal the Act, it remains in the Statute-book.

Lord SHAND—Yes, it would be a bad Act.

Lord MACNAGHTEN—Does the Dominion Parliament have to comply—suppose the Governor-General directed remedial legislation are the Dominion Council bound to comply with it?

Sir HORACE DAVEY—I do not know, my Lord.

Lord WATSON—The Governor-General has power to set in motion. There is an end of it.

Lord MORRIS—Are they bound to do it?

Sir HORACE DAVEY—We are getting within the apices of constitutional laws. I do not see any obligation, of course there is no obligation, on a legislature to pass a particular Act or not.

Lord MORRIS—They would not if the opinion of the majority was different from the decision that the Governor-General came to, of course they would not pass an Act. What would happen then.

Sir HORACE DAVEY—It is easy of course to put an illustration, but supposing your Lordships came to the conclusion either that this Legislation was beyond the powers of the Manitoba Legislature and wanted amending to bring it within its power, and the Governor-General came to the conclusion in Council

that it was within their powers, then it is easy to suggest the difficulty in which people would be placed. Of course your Lordships decision is only a decision in the particular circumstances that that particular by-law is bad. That is all your Lordships decision will be and then an expression of opinion from your Lordships is usually considered as sufficient, but it would remain that your Lordships had declared the by-law bad, because the Public Schools Act exceeded the jurisdiction of Parliament, and the Governor-General may have determined that the bye-law is good, because in his opinion it does not exceed the powers. It appears to me that there are good grounds or at any rate very serious grounds to be considered for saying that under this particular section the intention was to invest in the Governor-General and the Dominion Parliament the protection of the rights of the minority, which were intended to be given by means of the section, and that the Act in question, being within the general description of Acts, which are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature, has provided the means in this particular case, for confirming the Act to an Educational Act, and making it subject to the restrictions and provisions in question, and that, therefore, on general principles, there is no appeal. There can be no appeal and the Act must be considered a good Act until the particular tribunal provided by the Act, namely, the Governor-General, has pronounced upon its unconstitutionality. I have stated the point to your Lordships, and I confess, if I am at liberty to express my own opinion, that it seems a point deserving of grave consideration.

Thus, those gentlemen, at the argument, speaking for Manitoba, contended that there was no power in the Privy Council to deal with this matter at all, but that it was entirely in the hands of the Governor-General in Council. The hon. gentleman went on to say :

The Governor-General has taken the view of subsections 2 and 3, which I submit to your Lordships, is the right view, namely, that he has the right of entertaining the appeal and considering the application upon the merits, and that when the application has been considered by him upon the merits, it will be for the Dominion Parliament to decide whether they will give effect to any alteration.

Lord MORRIS.—That is, that although the action of the Provincial Legislature might be legal, still it might be so oppressive that the Governor would redress it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Yes, I contend that subsections 2 and 3 do not depend on *ultra vires* at all. Subsections 2 and 3 depend upon the Protestant or Catholic minority being able to make a case before the Governor-General on petition that other legislation is required.

Lord WATSON—Observations rather suggest themselves to my mind in this matter in your favour, and they are these: section 22 of the Manitoba Act of 1870 does not merely stand upon a Dominion Act, but it stands upon an Imperial Statute.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—It was a Dominion Act, assented to.

Lord WATSON—It has the same effect as an Act of the British Legislature. Then when you come to subsection 3, the Governor-General has made a determination, and suppose he induces the Parliament of Canada to make a remedial law in that direction, that remedial law is to be for the due execution of the provisions of this section. The Dominion Parliament can only come in to make remedial laws for the due execution of this very section; would it not be open to challenge.

Mr. CURRAN.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Quite possibly open to challenge; but my point is that if I can show it is *ultra vires* for this purpose, I am entitled to assume that there is nothing to make valid an *ultra vires* Provincial Act of Parliament.

Lord WATSON—The right to determine whether the province has exceeded its powers or not is one thing; but undoubtedly what is contemplated here is not cases of excess of power by the Provincial Legislature, but cases where, acting within their power, they have not done what the minority thought justice

Now, I have done making those quotations from the arguments before, and the expressions of judges in the Privy Council, and we come to the consideration as to whether, in view of all these different and conflicting authorities, the Government have not adopted a wise course. What is their position? They have to face those who say that the Privy Council of the United Kingdom has decided distinctly that the Governor-General of Canada has no longer any power. They have, in the second place, to meet those who say that he has the power, and that the only point actually decided is the point raised of "*ultra vires*." Then we have Mr. Ewart telling us that we should go further still. He says:

The main question then is, has the Governor-General in Council any right to interfere? If he has, and a remedial order is made, Parliament will make a remedial law, and the courts will then say whether that law is good or not. If there was no right to interfere the law will be held *ultra vires*. It will only be good if the constitution permits its passage.

Thus we are met with the opinion of a gentleman, who, with all his ability, to use a homely phrase, puts the cart before the horse, by telling us that we ought not to ascertain first, whether we are right or not, but should without hesitation adopt remedial measures and ask Parliament to pass them, and then let the courts decide whether this Parliament had passed laws it had no right to pass. Supposing the courts should say to us: You have been wasting your time, and the money of the public in passing legislation you had no right to pass, what a humiliating and unjustifiable position the Government of Canada would be in. Is that not another and a clinching reason why the course adopted by the Government should be approved? Why, even the counsel of the minority admits that if we pass this legislation now, without waiting to find out our authority, we may be tripped up and find that we have exceeded our rights; and I think that the minority who have acted with so much discretion in the past, will not ask this Parliament and Government to pass legislation which they themselves say may be upset by the courts of justice at a later period, as being outside our power to enact in any manner or form. Well, the Government have decided to bring this matter before the Supreme Court of Canada. I think that course will be approved by the vast majority of the people. We have been told that the country is in an intense

state of excitement over this question. We are told that the province of Manitoba is boiling over with excitement, and that the province of Quebec is in the same condition. True, I know that in the province of Quebec there are persons who are endeavouring, with all their might, to work up an agitation, but the people of that province have been burnt already, and, like burnt children, they dread the fire. It is not so very long ago since an agitation was set on foot from one end of that province to the other, and the people led to believe that they had been trampled upon. It is not so very long ago since the word which fell so often from the lips of the mover of the resolution last night "*ecrase*" was echoed and re-echoed throughout every district in that province. It is not so very long ago since the people were told that one of their compatriots had been basely murdered, and on the strength of that cry and that agitation the Liberal party gained office. They climbed into power by means of the gallows tree, but no sooner had they achieved their end than they turned their backs upon that tender victim, whose woes they had so graphically and eloquently depicted. No sooner were they safely seated on the Treasury benches than they forgot him and his family, and did not think it worth their while to do the first act towards vindicating those principles, which, they said, were so vital to the privileges and glories of the French-Canadian race. They became too intent in the work of plundering the Provincial Treasury to think of the man, or the family of the man whose downfall had been the source of their success; and, at last, an indignant people drove them ignominiously from power. I say, therefore, that the fiery appeals now made will be made in vain, because these same people have made similar appeals in the past, and because they have shown themselves to be miserable traffickers in everything holy and sacred, and so disgusted everybody that they can never hope to regain the people's confidence. There is no excitement in the province of Quebec, but there is legitimate anxiety on the part of the people to see that justice be done to every section of the community, and I will merely say this, in reply to attacks on the Minister of Justice, that, in this matter, long before there was any question of this position being taken, in discussing the question of the interpretation of the statutes, the very self-same doctrine was laid down by him in a remarkable debate, where in reply to the argument of Mr. Blake, as will be found in "*Hansard*," of 1890, vol. 2, page 3,159, the Minister of Justice said:

We have passed such amendments oftentimes to make a law clear, oftentimes to remove doubts which the decision of an inferior and oftentimes incompetent tribunal has attached to a statute. In such a case we have the remedy which the hon. gentleman has suggested, of declaring that the original meaning of the Act was otherwise. This is a pretty bold step for Parliament to take, and a step it very rarely takes, of

declaring the meaning of a law the meaning of which has come into controversy, because in so doing the Parliament assumes to a certain extent judicial functions, and declares that which is usually left to the courts to declare.

That is to say he took the position then that he takes now. And this position assumed then by the Minister of Justice, when he was far removed from the present question, shows what has been the fixed and predominating idea as to where the proper interpretation of statutes should be sought. Now, we have had quite a long discussion as to the meaning of the words uttered by the Hon. Edward Blake in the course of the debate upon the famous resolution of 1890. I think the speech in question must recommend itself to every right thinking man in this community. On page 4084 he moved as follows:—

To leave out all the words after "That" and insert the following:—"It is expedient to provide means whereby, on solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance, or of the appellate power as to educational legislation, important questions of law or fact may be referred by the executive to a high judicial tribunal for hearing and consideration, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented and that a reasoned opinion may be obtained for the information of the Executive."

He goes on, after discussing his proposition, generally:

The other class to which my motion alludes is that of the educational appeal, which arises under section 93 of the Constitutional Act, and under the analogous provision of the Manitoba Constitutional Act. Under these clauses a limited power to make educational laws is granted to a province, provided, amongst other things, that nothing therein contained shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any of the provinces had by law, or, in the case of Manitoba, by practice, at the Union. There is another class of restrictions which I do not in terms touch here, but to which, in cases in which an appeal is raised upon them, my observations would equally apply. This limitation upon the power of a province is made more effectual by a special provision giving an appeal to the Dominion Executive from any Act or decision of the Provincial Legislature or authorities affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in relation to education; and whereby also, in case of the non-execution by the province of the decision of the Executive, this Parliament may make remedial laws for the purpose of effectuating that decision.

He says, speaking of his own policy, that no Address to the Crown shall be passed by this Parliament asking for a change of the Constitutional Act as affecting any province, at any rate against the will of that province in this particular:

"And I hold it to be settled, thirdly, indeed, it follows obviously from these two propositions, that the only questions which can practically arise within our domain are such as may be raised by way of appeal, under section 93, and the analogous section of the Manitoba Act.

At another point he continues:

Now, Sir, in the exercise of this power of disallowance by the Government, political questions will, or at any
Mr. CURRAN.

rate, may probably always arise. Questions of policy may present themselves, that is questions of expediency, of convenience, of the public interest, of the spirit of the constitution, or of the form of legislation. All these are clearly exclusively for the executive and legislative, that is for the political departments of the Government. But it is equally clear, that when in order to determine your course you must find whether a particular act is *ultra* or *intra vires*. you are discharging a legal and judicial function. What do you do? You proceed to interpret the Constitutional Act, and to declare its meaning; you proceed to interpret the Provincial Act under consideration, and to declare its meaning; you proceed to compare the two statutes so interpreted and declared; and you proceed, finally, to conclude whether or not the law conflicts with, or transcends the powers which are conferred upon the Legislature which passed it. Nothing that can be conceived partakes more exclusively of the character of a legal and judicial operation than what I have just now described. Again, when you act upon the appellate educational clauses; as, for example, in the case of Manitoba, the very case which is now in a sense pending, as to whether recent legislation be within the limits of the rights of the Provincial Legislature, and whether any relief is due under the appellate clause to those who claim it, you have a legal question, or rather, in this case, a mixed question of law and of fact; which circumstance it was induced me to insert the word "fact" in my motion, conscious I was that it was only on the rarest occasions that any references of that description would be necessary. Yet it seemed to me that, in this particular instance, I was constrained to provide for an emergency which may arise.

Therefore he made this speech I have quoted with the special object of meeting this Manitoba school question which he said then was looming up in the distance. He says, in winding up his arguments:

My own opinion is, that whenever, in opposition to the continued view of a Provincial Executive and Legislature, it is contemplated by the Dominion Executive to disallow a Provincial Act because it is *ultra vires*, there ought to be a reference; and also that there ought to be a reference in certain cases where the condition of public opinion renders expedient a solution of legal problems, dissociated from those elements of passion and expediency which are, rightly or wrongly, too often attributed to the action of political bodies. And again, I for my part would recommend such a reference in all cases of educational appeal—cases which necessarily evoke the feelings to which I have alluded, and to one of which, I am frank to say, my present action is only due.

But, Sir, besides the great positive gain of obtaining the best guidance, there are other, and, in my opinion, not unimportant gains besides. Ours is a popular Government; and when burning questions arise inflaming the public mind, when agitation is rife as to the political action of the Executive or the Legislature—which action is to be based on legal questions, obviously beyond the grasp of the people at large;—when the people are on such questions provided by cries of creed and race, then I maintain that a great public good is attainable by the submission of such legal questions to legal tribunals, with all the customary securities for a sound judgment; and whose decisions—passionless and dignified, accepted by each of us as binding in our own affairs involving fortune, freedom, honour, life itself—are most likely to be accepted by us all in questions of public concern.

And, Sir, how was this question treated; how was it accepted by this House, or rather by the last Parliament, which included many

of the present members? The Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, leader of the Government, said, and this is the answer I give to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he talks about shirking responsibility on the part of the Government:

When I first read the hon. gentleman's resolution hastily, it occurred to me, as I dare say it occurred to many hon. gentlemen who hear me now, that it was an advance towards the American system, and proposed to transfer the responsibility of the Ministry of the day to a judicial tribunal; but on scanning the resolution in its carefully prepared terms, that impression was dissipated, and I saw that the principal object of the resolution, as I read it, is that the questions submitted by the executive to the judicial tribunal should be enforced, sustained and presented to Parliament, to the public and to the Crown by the fact of this legal decision having been given.

The executive is not relieved from any responsibility because of my answer being given by the tribunal. If the executive were to be relieved from any such responsibility, I should consider that a fatal blot in the proposition of my hon. friend. I believe in responsible government. I believe in the responsibility of the executive. But the answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the Government. The Government may dissent from that decision, and it may be their duty to do so if they differ from the conclusion to which the court has come. There is another point in regard to which the court must be guarded in the measure which will be introduced—not this session but, I hope, next session—based on this resolution, and that is, that the answer, whatever it may be, should be considered in the nature of a judgment so far as to allow of an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Now, we had this statement, this formal, solemn statement made before this House and this country by the late Sir John Macdonald in connection with this matter, and we have the assertion made by the Minister of Justice last night in his place in this House that, though this reference had been made and this opinion obtained the Government of the day did not propose to shirk its responsibility. They have judicial or quasi-judicial duties to perform, and I am not going to haggle with the hon. member, as to the words he may use to attempt to draw the line where law ends and facts begin or where policy touches upon judicial right. There is hardly a question settled that does not involve these considerations. But whatever they may involve, whatever the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada or, if it should be carried to the Privy Council, whatever the decision there, if they act upon it they act upon it with their full responsibility to the people directly for their act. They do not and they cannot shirk that responsibility. They have no desire to do so, and, Mr. Speaker, the whole sum and substance of this debate so far, the whole of the explanation made here to-day reveals simply this that a combination has been made, a partnership has been formed, the lion and the lamb are lying down together. I do not know which is the lion or which is the lamb exactly. The hon. gentleman from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has

spoken of the Government being between the devil and the deep sea. I do not know in this case who is the devil or who the guardian of the ocean wave. But there is one thing perfectly certain—the Government have adopted the course which commends itself to the good, sound common sense of those who have a right to be considered the guiding spirits of the people. We are asked, what was the use of obtaining this decision if there is not going to be remedial legislation? The Prime Minister of to-day did not wait to come before this House to give his answer. He took the earliest opportunity at the meeting in the city of Toronto, and he laid down there the doctrine which he and his colleagues are prepared to stand or fall by. That is to say, that the constitution of this country, the rights of the majority and the rights of the minority, the rights of the provinces and the rights of the people, whatever rights there are within the four corners of our constitution, this Government is prepared to give to whomsoever they are due. We are prepared to stand by the constitution. That is the answer we give to hon. gentlemen opposite, that is the information we give to this country, and we give it in good faith, fearlessly, knowing that the people of Canada like men to stand up frankly and speak out without hedging. But hon. gentlemen opposite who have no responsibility at all, say that it is not their place to indicate a policy. They would ask the sworn Minister of the Crown, in face of a crowd, to state what his Government were going to do, knowing at the moment that the man was sworn first of all to give his advice to the Governor-General. But those who are under no responsibility never stood out until to-day when we saw the hon. member for L'Islet and the hon. member for Simcoe sailing in the same boat, both animated by the same desire that animates all those hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec, who cheered so lustily their beloved friend from Simcoe to-day, and who are agreed only upon one aim—anything to beat Sir John Thompson and destroy his Government.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will begin with one of the last points made by the hon. gentleman and attend to it. He found fault because we introduced into this discussion subjects which had been debated a long time ago. He found fault, also, with the hon. Mr. Mercier, because that gentleman had spoken strongly, had felt strongly, against the execution of one of his countrymen, Louis Riel. I would like to ask the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) if he did not feel strongly on the same subject; if he did not speak strongly upon the same subject; if he did not himself, before he had become a deputy judge, when he was yet in private life, make a representation to the Government that Louis Riel must not be hanged?

Mr. CURRAN. Never.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will read the hon. gentleman's words. In a letter addressed about that time to the "Catholic Record," he said :

It is well known that the Quebec Conservative members urged the Government, with all might, to spare the life of Riel, if possible. I was one of those who did so.

It is quite possible the hon. member may not have sympathized altogether with the views entertained by Mr. Mercier in regard to this matter; but the fact remains that he was one of those who protested against that execution, and according to his own words, which I have just read, asked the Government to spare his life. Sir, the same opinion was entertained by many others in this country, that it was a wrong thing at that time to bring about the execution. But I will not dwell upon this subject. The hon. gentleman found it very strange indeed that to-day the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) should have as his associate in supporting the motion the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He forgot that while both the hon. gentlemen are making charges against the Government, the one makes the charge because the Government humbugged the Protestant people of Ontario; and the other makes the charge because the Government deceived and humbugged the Catholic people of the province of Quebec. Let me ask this hon. gentleman, what about his own associates? What has he been doing for years back in order to keep his party in power, if not appealing to a certain vote in the province of Quebec? Let me ask him, who finds it strange that these two gentlemen will vote together upon this question. If he turned to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) did he find him a strange associate? Does he find it against his conscience, as a prominent and distinguished Irish Catholic, to serve under the late Grand Master of the Orangemen of the Dominion, the Minister of Trade and Commerce? Does he find it against his conscience, does he find it hard to have as his new-born brother, the present Grand Master of the Orangemen of the Dominion of Canada? We can imagine what a happy family they are. Now, I am not going to defend the hon. member for North Simcoe, he does not require that I should defend him; and I have no doubt that if he found I was defending him, he would feel pretty much the same as O'Connell once felt when the London "Times" praised him, he thought it was time to examine his conscience. I was just speaking of the associates of the hon. gentleman. Did he forget the fact that one of his dearest associates— one upon whose support he relies the most now that he is at the door of the Cabinet— did he forget that that hon. gentleman, only yesterday, expressed, in a sense well understood by the House, his utter contempt for the language of a very great portion of the people who elected the Solicitor-General to this House? The hon. member for North

Mr. DEVLIN.

Bruce (Mr. McNeill) rose and said that it was hard for hon. gentlemen to listen to a language they could not understand, thus striving to throw contempt upon the French language. What an associate for the hon. member, and delighted he is to have him, too. Did he forget that during the past twenty years the hon. member for Simcoe was the trusted lieutenant of the very party of which he to-day is a member, that he was not only a lieutenant, but he was higher in the grade, he was president of the Conservative Association of the province of Quebec, and that his commission from his leader, no doubt, was to appeal to a certain section of the province of Ontario, while the late Minister of Public Works, the present member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) had for his mission to appeal to the people of the province of Quebec on different lines? What have we to do in this crisis? asks the Solicitor-General. And he answers: We have to stand by the Constitution. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me suppose that the Liberal party at this moment were in power, that the leader of the Opposition, under such circumstances, were the leader of the Government, and were to say: Let us stand by the Constitution. Would there be in this House, or for that matter, outside this House, one who would worry more strongly the leader of the Opposition than the same hon. member for Montreal Centre? What the people want to know is whether the hon. gentleman is going to stand by the rights of the minority in Manitoba, by those who are oppressed? You could not find on any platform in the province of Quebec a more violent agitator than the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), yet notwithstanding that fact, during the hour and a half during which he addressed this House he omitted to tell hon. members in what direction his sympathies incline. I should like to ask him if his sympathies are with the hon. member for Simcoe, or are they against the views held by that hon. gentleman? The hon. member for Montreal Centre says he is a judge. Let an election take place to-morrow and he will cease to be a judge, and he will again champion the cause with which he was allied before. I followed the hon. gentleman's speech closely, and apart from the attack he made on the late Premier of the province of Quebec and his Government, and the allegation that those gentlemen had trafficked in sacred things, I do not find, to tell the truth, much in the hon. gentleman's speech that requires an answer. In regard to his allegation that those hon. gentlemen trafficked in sacred things, I should like to ask him in what sacred things they trafficked. He further said that an indignant people arose in their might and drove them from power. What a wonderful memory my friend possesses. He appears to forget the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Agriculture, and occupies a seat

in the Senate. What was the reason which placed him there, if not to reward him for an act, which hon. gentlemen opposite, when the act happened to be against themselves, had condemned. It was not an indignant people that drove Mr. Mercier from power; it was an autocrat in the city of Quebec who drove him and his colleagues from office. I take more than ordinary interest in the Manitoba schools question because of my personal convictions on the subject, and because I have sympathy with the views entertained by a large majority of the people whom I represent. The first speech I delivered in this House some few years ago was in support of the views that I am advocating to-day. I held that the Catholics of Manitoba were entitled to their schools and I endeavoured to establish a case in their favour on that occasion. The whole question is a simple one in one sense of the term. The Catholics of Manitoba had, previous to the province entering Confederation, schools by practice, just as the Protestants of the province had their schools. When the new province entered Confederation the people were given the assurance by the Government that all their civil and religious rights would be protected and respected. The Government, in a letter which was read here yesterday by the hon. member for L'Islet, gave the assurance to Archbishop Taché that all such liberties would be respected. A good deal has been said to-day on the subject of the New Brunswick School law, and it was said there was an analogy between the two cases. I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. James Fisher, addressed to the people of Russell county, in Manitoba, which embodies excellent remarks on the New Brunswick case in 1872. He said:

I have already made casual reference to the action of Mr. Costigan in Parliament, in seeking to have the Act of 1871 disallowed. He made his motion in that direction in the Commons, in May, 1872, Sir John Macdonald being then in power. After several amendments had been moved and voted down, Mr. Colby, a leading Protestant Conservative representing a Quebec county, and now a member of the Dominion Government, moved an amendment in these words:

"That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province and hopes that it may be so modified at the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist."

This amendment was on the 29th May, 1872, carried by the decisive majority of 117 to 52, the leaders on both sides, if I mistake not, supporting it. I may explain that while in New Brunswick before the passing of the Act complained of, there were no denominational schools established by law, yet the educational authorities had been allowed to pass regulations which practically enabled Catholics to have denominational exercises in the public schools in the Catholic districts. Mr. Edward Blake in the course of the debate on the question used this language:

"Although the system of denominational schools was not actually established by law, still denomina-

tional teaching in the public schools was practically acknowledged, and he (Mr. Blake) deeply regretted the course pursued by the Legislature of New Brunswick in inserting in the new School Act a clause providing that every school under that Act shall be non-sectarian. He understood that there were large sections of New Brunswick where the people were exclusively Roman Catholics, and the elasticity of the old law allowed these communities to conduct their schools according to their own views. The change in the law as it operated upon the Roman Catholics was a harsh change and was not necessary to satisfy the scruples of Protestants."

The House of Commons by a vote of more than two to one declared its assent to these views of Mr. Blake. In other words, the Commons of Canada protested in the strongest terms against the action of the Legislature of New Brunswick in depriving Roman Catholics of privileges that they had practically enjoyed in the past, although they had no legal sanction for them. It was enough for the Parliament of the Dominion to know that for many years the minority had "in practice" at least, enjoyed these advantages, to move its members to protest thus earnestly against their being taken away.

But this was not the end of it. The matter came up once more in 1875, the Liberals being then in power. Mr. Costigan moved at this time, not for disallowance, but that the Queen be memorialized to amend the British North America Act so as to provide that the Catholics of New Brunswick should have the same rights in respect to separate schools as were enjoyed by the Catholics of Ontario and the Protestants of Quebec. To this motion an amendment was proposed by Mr. Cauchon, seconded by Mr. Blake, as follows:—

"That on the 29th May, 1872, the House of Commons adopted the following resolution [setting out the one already quoted]. That this House regrets that the hope expressed in said resolution has not been realized, and that an humble address be presented to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, embodying this resolution, and praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to use her influence with the Legislature of New Brunswick to procure such a modification of the said Act as shall remove such grounds of discontent."

This amendment was carried by the solid vote of 114 to 73. More than half of the minority voted against it, not because of want of sympathy with the complaints of the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick, but because it did not go far enough to meet such complaints. Mr. Costigan himself, as well as all the French Conservatives, voted against the amendment.

We complain of the manner in which the Government has been dealing with this question, and we are condemned for our action; but here is a gentleman who assails the Government of that day in the strongest possible manner; and to-day he has not a word to say, nor his colleague, the representative of Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), a word to say for those who have been denied and who have been deprived of those rights. At the last general election, it is well known that in the province of Quebec this was the question "par excellence" before the people. We were told by the supporters of the Government on every platform in the province that if the disallowance did not occur, at least justice would be meted out to the Catholics of the province of Manitoba, and that remedial legislation would be introduced. Nearly three years have

passed since then, and we find that we are only at the beginning of the question. It is said that previous to the last general election the Hon. Mr. Chapleau visited Monseigneur Taché in Montreal and made promises to him in the name of the Government. The hon. the Prime Minister denied that the other night, and he said that that hon. gentleman was not authorized by the Government, was not delegated by the Government, was not sent as a missionary by the Government in the name of the Government to Monseigneur Taché to make any special pledges in connection with this question; but, Sir, the question remains: Was he delegated by the late Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, to Monseigneur Taché? Is it not just possible that when Mr. Chapleau had that interview with Monseigneur Taché—an interview in which certainly promises were made in regard to remedial legislation—is it not just possible that Mr. Chapleau was sent by the late Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, and that Monseigneur Taché considered him as one authorized, and as one qualified in every way to give assurances on the part of the Government? At all events the Archbishop of Manitoba then accepted these assurances. Yesterday the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), whom I regret not to see in his seat to-night, spoke at considerable length, and in the latter portion of his speech he referred to a former Fenian movement. What special connection that had with the question before the House I cannot see, unless he felt desirous perhaps to in some way or another wound the feelings of the Irish Catholics in his province. He claimed in the course of his speech that Mr. Greenway was returned to power by means of bigotry, and he went on to say that Mr. Greenway was a Liberal, and had all the sympathy of the Liberals of the province of Quebec. I cannot speak for all the Liberals of the province of Quebec; but I know that this same charge was made in the county of Pontiac, last May, by Mr. Desjardins, who was then member of this House for L'Islet. He stated that the Liberals of the province of Quebec, and myself in particular, were in sympathy with Mr. Greenway, and when I pointed out to him that every time this question came up before Parliament I had spoken in support of the rights of the minorities, while he was silent and evidently afraid to express his views on it, he retorted that when he returned to the House this present session, that the people would find him a strong advocate and champion of the rights of Manitoba Catholics. Mr. Desjardins has since been called elsewhere for his reward. Now the same statement is repeated by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), and if all that is said be true he has already his commission and his reward in his pocket. I can tell that hon. gentleman that it was not only in this House that I expressed strong dissent from Mr. Greenway's

Mr. DEVLIN.

views on this question, but that in the month of October last I had the pleasure of delivering an address in the city of Winnipeg, and there, Liberal as I am, not only did I express my dissent from the action of Mr. Greenway, but I condemned that action in as strong terms, indeed in much stronger terms, than ever the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) used in respect to it. His attack last night—because it was a covert attack, and a sneer at the Irish people of the province of Manitoba, as well as of the Irish people of the Dominion generally—was perhaps intended to obtain the sympathy of the Controller of Customs. Perhaps it was done in order to get that hon. gentleman on his right side; but I do not think that that attack will in any way elevate him in the esteem of the Irish Catholics, who feel upon this very question of Catholic schools at least as warmly and at least as deeply as ever the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) did. Let it be borne in mind that the Irish Catholics in that province are numerous; that they take a deep interest in this question, and that they are, I will not say as strong, but much stronger advocates and much more sincere advocates of this very question than ever the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) was. In reply to the charge made a few moments ago by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), that we were using this question merely as a matter of agitation, I have this to say: When the Mackenzie Government was in power is it not a fact that the present Secretary of State almost hounded out of public life—I will not say almost, because he did succeed in doing so—the hon. gentleman who was during that regime Speaker of this House, because of the attitude he had taken in regard to the New Brunswick school question? And what was the attitude of Mr. Speaker Anglin and of the Liberals who were then in power? It was simply that they followed out a course which to-day would receive the approval of the present Government; and, Sir, there was not in the province of New Brunswick, there was not in the province of Quebec, there was not in any province of the Dominion a stronger agitator than this same Secretary of State, who made this very question his stock-in-trade during five years of that time. But of course in 1882 he entered the Government. He became a Minister. That question was set aside at once, and from 1882 up to this date I have never heard him make one reference in regard to that subject, and, Sir, from 1890 up to this moment, when the Manitoba school question has been before this Parliament and the people of the country he has been silent; yes, Sir, as silent as it is possible for man to be. It is true he did make a reference to the subject at a speech delivered a few months ago at a banquet in St. John, and that reference was: that he was not going to divulge the policy of the Government. We are now told that the Government has no policy on

this question as yet, that they have got to get their instructions from the Supreme Court before they will formulate a policy; but nevertheless the hon. gentleman stated at that time that he was not going to make known the policy of the Government. How wonderfully changed he is from the champion of other days. He is not going to tell us what he thinks. How wonderfully changed from the champion of 1871, of 1872 and of 1875, who stood up in this House and nobly—I am not ashamed to say it—and nobly and boldly championed the rights of his co-religionists in the province of Manitoba. He was the champion of every Catholic cause in those days, because in those days he was not in the Government; but to-day, when he enjoys the sweets of office, mum is the word—he is not going to divulge the policy of the Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Do not be too sure that I am going to be long mum.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, I am glad that the hon. gentleman is going to cut his silence short. It is about time for him to explain his attitude on this question. The country has been looking to the hon. gentleman, who was a champion in the days gone by, to come out again and champion the cause which he espoused, and by means of which he was carried into prominence and into public office. He says: Do not be too sure that he will be long mum. Does he mean to inspire anybody on this side with fear? It is with hope. Let us hope that he will come back to the course that he adopted long years ago, and followed out as strongly as any man ever did. Why, Sir, he was not only the champion of Catholic schools in the province of New Brunswick, but he had that question up in almost every province in the Dominion. Well, to-day when this matter is before the House will he stand up and tell us that the Catholics of Manitoba have his sympathy in this matter? Will he stand up in this House and tell us that the champion of former days will again take the crown and place it on his noble brow and say that the Catholics of Manitoba shall be properly championed, and that the schools of which they have been deprived shall be restored to them? Will he stand up in this House and say that sooner than see them deprived of those rights which are granted to them by the constitution of the country, which had been promised and assured to them, he will leave this Government? Not much. I can understand why he has not given perhaps as much attention to this subject as he might do. He has been engaged, no doubt, with the question of the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick; a question which he has to settle. But this school question is much more important, and is dear to the hearts of the Catholics of Manitoba. It is a matter which is not only engaging the attention of the Catholics of Manitoba, but is engaging the attention and the anxiety of nearly 2,000,000 of Catholics in

this Dominion. We were asked this afternoon by the hon. member for North Simcoe what right have the Government to force upon the people of Manitoba separate schools. I could retort by asking him what right have the Protestants of Manitoba to force upon the Catholics of Manitoba schools in which they do not believe, and to which in conscience they cannot send their children. Sir, we are told that the schools are non-sectarian—that they are not religious schools. I hold that they have no system of public schools in the province of Manitoba. I hold that they have simply a continuation of the Protestant schools; nothing else; and I can prove it very easily. I even go further, and say that in the province of Manitoba the very school buildings are at times used as Protestant chapels, and that the Catholics are required to contribute their taxes in support of those buildings. In this country, in which it is supposed there is no established church, the Catholics are obliged to contribute their taxes for the maintenance of buildings which are nothing short of Protestant chapels. A complaint was sent a short time ago to the Attorney-General of Manitoba in regard to this very matter—that in certain districts the school buildings were used simply as places of worship for the Protestants, and this was his reply:

Sir,—Your letter of the 6th instant to the Chief Clerk of the Department of Education, complaining that certain trustees of school districts allow their school houses to be used for religious services, has been referred to this Department. The control of the school houses is completely in the hands of the trustees. In the case you refer to I think you had better make your complaint to the trustees in question.

Now, that seems very reasonable, indeed, to refer the matter to the trustees themselves, but let us understand what trustees they might have to deal with. I do not say that all the trustees in Manitoba are alike, but I know that there must be, in that province, trustees who are not very favourable to the Catholics, for there is certainly a very strong and bitter feeling prevailing there. Why, it was only the other day that an Orange lodge in Manitoba, no doubt under the control of the Controller of Customs, the bosom friend and associate of the hon. Secretary of State, and the hon. member for Montreal Centre, passed this resolution:

That this Grand Lodge heartily sympathise with their Protestant brethren in Ireland on account of the threatened Home Rule affliction about to be imposed upon them by British or rather un-British statesmen; that we strongly protest against subjecting our fellow Protestants to the tyrannical and unscrupulous rule of Irish priesthood.

Let us imagine, for an instant, Catholics going to men of this persuasion who happen to be their trustees, and protesting against the school house being used for such purposes. Why, Sir, we might as well expect a fair decision from them, as we might expect from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, backed up as he is by the Controller of Customs, a fair decision in so far as the Catholic

school question of Manitoba is concerned. I have said that these schools are not public schools, that they are simply Protestant schools; and I say that it is a rule that Protestant instruction must be given in those schools. It was only a few weeks ago, on the 13th of January, that the following motion passed almost unanimously in the Anglican Synod then sitting in Winnipeg:—

Resolved, that while the synod would gladly see a larger measure of religious teaching in our schools than at present prevails, it trusts that every effort will be made, both by educational authorities and by the Christian public generally to render the existing regulations on the subject as widely operative and efficient as possible.

That, whatever changes in the school policy of this province may in future be required for a satisfactory solution of the educational problems with which, as a province, we have to deal, this synod stands pledged to resist to the utmost any attempt to secularize our public schools.

It would be quite possible, Mr. Speaker, to adduce other evidence, strong evidence, too, but I think that is sufficient to show that religious training and religious instruction is given in these very schools, and we Catholics are pronounced bigots, and are charged with intolerance, because, forsooth, we cannot see fit to contribute to the support, and to sanction the existence of these schools. I, for one, protest against this state of things. I, for one, in the name of, and having the same convictions as the 2,000,000 of Catholics in this country, protest against any such intolerance as this, that the Catholics in this Dominion shall be forced to contribute to the support of Protestant schools. The hon. member for North Simcoe to-day, although speaking very strongly, forgot to tell us that he himself, a short time ago, admitted the principle of separate schools. I do not know what object he has in speaking so severely against them to-day, when, a short time ago, he spoke in favour of the principles of separate schools; but, before giving what he said on the subject, let me give the views of some of the strongest advocates of what they are pleased to term, national schools, but which are not national schools in fact, but merely Protestant schools. The Rev. Dr. Gavin, in opposing the proposition to abolish separate schools, at the Equal Rights convention, of 1889, said:

Their Protestant brethren in Quebec had also in some sense the system of separate schools—

—In some sense—they have that system in the largest sense—

and they must take extreme care they did not take—ground that would be injurious to their brethren in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Lee, of Sherbrooke, speaking at the same convention, said:

If separate schools were taken from the Roman Catholics in Ontario, the majority in Quebec would demand that the Protestant schools be taken from the minority in that province. He did not think the convention could demand the abolition of separate

Mr. DEVLIN.

schools in this province and ask that they be retained in Quebec.

And Dr. Davidson said:

It is easy for you to say do away with separate schools—easy for you in your strong Protestant province of Ontario.

—The same thing could be said of Manitoba—

But as you are strong be merciful, and remember your weaker brethren in the province of Quebec. While we may blot out the 238 separate schools occupied by Roman Catholics in Ontario, you also desire to blot out the 980 separate schools occupied by Protestants in the province of Quebec.

And, further on, at the meeting of the synod of the Church of England, the Bishop of Rupert's Land said:

I would infinitely prefer that the Roman Catholic church should continue to have separate schools under satisfactory conditions for the state, to our schools being without religious instruction.

It is evident, then, from these quotations, that the sentiment against purely national and non-religious schools is strong. Now, Sir, even Mr. Hughes, I think a brother of the hon. gentleman sitting in this House, is in favour, if I mistake not, of separate schools too. He said, if the report in the "Mail" of his speech at the convention is correct:

So long as separate schools existed legally it would be impossible to interfere with them, but the citizens should demand that until a man objects, he should be ranked as a supporter of the public schools.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy's views were given in 1889. He said:

He endorsed all the things set forth in the platform of this association, especially that the separate school law was to be placed beyond question of doubt.

He was then a strong supporter of the separate school law. He continued:

The Roman Catholics had a right to separate schools, and he would not, for the present, raise his voice against that right guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

Strange to say, these were the views held by this gentleman then, and they were strong views, backed by leading divines both in the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. Now, I am prepared to admit that all the mischief in connection with this school question in the province of Manitoba is due to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He went to Manitoba some years ago, and delivered a speech in Portage la Prairie. He was then, if I mistake not, the president of the Conservative Association of the province of Ontario, and consequently in strong sympathy with his party. Sir, we need not only consider that, but, years ago, the hon. gentleman gave utterance to still stronger language than he has used to-day. He was a leading light in the party opposite, and, for such utterances, and for having endeavoured to promote strife, he

was not read out of the Conservative party. Speaking of the French Canadians, he said :

Do not we find the French to-day in the province of Quebec more French than they were when they were conquered by Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham? Do they mix with us, assimilate with us, inter-marry with us, read our literature or learn our laws? No; everything with them is conducted on a French model and while we may admire members of that race as individuals, yet as members of the body politic I say, they are the great danger to our confederacy.

That was the view he entertained of the French-Canadians, when he was a leader in the Conservative ranks, and, if I mistake not, in 1886 or 1887, during the campaign of that year, this speech was given out as campaign literature in the Conservative interest. I say to the hon. gentleman that you have no more right to impose a state school than you have to impose a state church. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who would ask Catholics to support a Protestant church. They would think such a demand unworthy of them, and I hold, in this matter of religious education, for education is intimately connected with our faith, we are bound to hold to that belief. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to-day said, why not settle this matter at once? That was our prayer in 1890. We came to the Government and asked them to settle this question, and have asked them repeatedly to do so ever since. Petition after petition was sent asking them to settle this question, and upon no good ground could these petitions be refused. Denominational schools, which gave rise to such a strong protest in Winnipeg, exist even in England and Scotland and in Ireland. The hon. member for Winnipeg said last night that the Act of Mr. Greenway was barbarous, cruel and oppressive. Now, how does he propose meting out justice, how does he propose to punish Mr. Greenway? He proposes to punish him in this way, by asking us to approve of everything Mr. Greenway did in connection with this matter, and warns the Government against interfering. I know perfectly well that there is a very strong feeling in the province of Manitoba on this question. I visited that province in the month of October and saw what was being done there. The so-called national schools, which are erected at the public expense, are certainly magnificent buildings. Both Catholics and Protestants contribute to their support. But are these schools frequented by Catholics at all? No. The Catholics also have their own schools, under the control of various committees and the Christian Brothers, and these schools are to-day acknowledged to be at least equal to the public schools. Now, as I have said, we had a perfect right to put this matter before the House. We do not believe in coercive legislation, and that is the kind of legislation which has been enacted in Manitoba. The Legislature of Manitoba has gone beyond—there can be no doubt about it—the limits

which were promised to Archbishop Taché in 1870, and the province of Manitoba has rendered it not only difficult but extremely unpleasant for Catholics to emigrate there and remain in that province. We asked the Minister of Public Works, who is also a champion, like the Secretary of State, to carry out the promise which he made that he would see that his colleagues in the Cabinet would show themselves patriots if the rights of Catholics in Manitoba were not respected. These are the gentlemen who were the champions in days gone by, who declared that no matter who would undertake to assail the rights of Roman Catholics in Manitoba or any other province they would find themselves met, not only by denunciations, but by the fiercest opposition that honest men could give. We have a right to ask them, who are not judges in this matter, but politicians, to see that the political constitution of the country shall be respected, and that the men who live in Manitoba to-day shall not, simply because they are Roman Catholics, be trampled upon, but shall receive the same measure of justice meted out to those of every other denomination. The French-Canadians are entitled to this respect, not only for their schools, but for their language which was abolished; they have a right to have restored to them those privileges which were promised to them and which were guaranteed to them and in respect to which they received such strong assurances

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have only a few words to say upon this question, Mr. Speaker. From the first I did not intend to make any long speech on the question; I did not think it was necessary. The only question, in my mind, was whether, as one who had given some evidence, perhaps, of equal value, and of as long standing as that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat of devotion to the cause of the minority, I should exercise my right to express my strong disapproval of and my strong protest against the motion moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) on this question. I have no objection that the hon. member for L'Islet should play second fiddle to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I have no objection to the hon. member for L'Islet joining hands with the member for North Simcoe in making any attack upon the Government of the day. We all understand, or ought to understand, what political tactics mean and what members of Parliament are entitled to resort to in a warfare of a legitimate character. But I protest against the member for L'Islet making use of a subject and a principle that ought to be dear to him and is dear to the people of his own province, to drag that principle in the mire in order to make the compact he has made in bringing this motion before the House. He made a speech, but he did not speak to this resolution. His remarks were not followed by the resolution which might have been expected of him. I

was glad to listen to the speech of the hon. gentleman. On many phases of the question he uttered sentiments that awakened sympathy in the hearts of many gentlemen, in fact, of every fair-minded man in the country. On some points I disagreed with him. He spoke of the rights of minorities in his own province and in the province of Manitoba; and he did more. He indicated that the usefulness of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition was gone, and that in the future it would be the hon. member for L'Islet to whom the minorities throughout this broad Dominion would look as leader in this question and as champion of their rights. And how is he going to fight this question out? He was going to appeal in the great province of Ontario to the old Tory party, to the Protestants of that province and appeal to their sense of justice and fair-play. But what is the meaning of his appeal? Where is the platform he has laid down and the policy he has foreshadowed on this subject? He expresses regret, and asks us to join in that expression, that the Government has followed the course it has followed in this matter. Does he say or does he ask this House to say that the Government ought to be condemned because they have not disallowed the Act or because they have not proposed any remedial legislation from his point of view? Not at all. His friend, the member for North Simcoe would not go that. It has been stated already, and very few in this House will doubt the accuracy of that. But we can understand it is such a resolution. The hon. member for North Simcoe has been most cruel to my hon. friend from L'Islet, because he has torn the mask from that resolution to-day. What does he say? Not one word about the speech of the hon. gentleman, not even the poor compliment of making a reference to the very clever speech of the hon. member for L'Islet, but his reference is to the resolution. He says it is not such a resolution as he would have moved. But we can understand it is such a resolution as he can accept in the hope of the support of the hon. gentleman from L'Islet and his new friends behind him. It is not such a resolution as fully gives expression to the views of the hon. member for North Simcoe, but it is a skeleton that is accepted by both. I can see the hon. member for North Simcoe with that skeleton, dressing it up to suit the tastes of those who accept the views the hon. gentleman wishes to express. But I would like to see my hon. friend from L'Islet go back to the county of L'Islet, or any of the other counties for which he undertakes to speak here to-night, and dress up that skeleton and make it acceptable there. No, Sir, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) well said that this agitation of the hon. member for L'Islet had brought forth a mouse. Even that poor little animal does not belong to the hon. member for L'Islet, it is the mouse of the hon. member for North Simcoe. We are asked—who are supposed

Mr. COSTIGAN.

to entertain feelings of sympathy with the minority in any part of this country on that or any other question—to pin ourselves by our votes to that resolution. I do not propose to do it. The hon. gentleman also made, perhaps, not an intentional misrepresentation, but he went rather in the line my young friend representing the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) followed up so well to-night. He opened up by leaving the impression from what he read of the speech of the hon. George Brown when this question was under discussion—when he and the Liberal party with whom he was, the hon. gentleman says he is now, associated, or who are now supporting him in this motion—that Mr. Brown's sympathies had been and were at that time with the principle of separate schools. That is true of that particular time, but not before, nor was it very prominent afterwards. The Bill of 1863 that gave separate schools to the province of Ontario was the Bill of the Conservative party, opposed and fought over every battlefield through the province of Ontario by the Liberal party, and by none more strongly than by the gentleman whose speech was quoted by the hon. member for L'Islet. And if he had quoted a few words further he would have found that justice had been done, so far as the question of separate schools were concerned, by the Hon. George Brown. He felt that it was a compromise, and gave his reasons for accepting it. After giving his reason, which the hon. gentleman read, Mr. Brown went further, and said:

I admit that from my point of view that is a blot on the scheme before the House.—

The scheme of Confederation was then before the House.

—It is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that have to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But surely, I for one have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of Union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the Bill of 1863.

There is a clear admission, there is the settlement of that disputed fact which has often been discussed in Ontario. The Conservatives recognized the justice of the case of the minority of Ontario, and they settled it in 1863. The friends of Confederation provided for a guarantee in the Confederation Act for the minority of Ontario as well as the minority of Quebec. However, I am not going to go over the grounds that have been so well covered already; but I wish to say that this motion now before the House deserves no consideration on the ground of its sympathy with the minority of Manitoba. I have been asked by the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin), who just addressed the House, whether I was going to remain silent, as I had been silent since 1882; and he said that before 1882 I was the champion of Catholic rights when a private member, that I rode into office on that question, and

that since I entered office I was silent and could not be heard from. Well, I am sorry to lose even the good opinion of my young friend from the county of Ottawa. I had entertained the hope that though he started off with a certain spirit of antagonism on his arrival here, he had thought better of it since, and was disposed to treat me more fairly. But to-night he did not treat me fairly; he imputed motives to me that he would not like to accept himself. To-night he treated me as one who was influenced entirely by personal interests, and intimated that I played the part of a demagogue. It is foreign to my nature to do so. I have convictions strong enough, and courage enough with my convictions, to act upon them, and I have too much pride in myself to stoop to play the part of a demagogue. The hon. gentleman also put another question. He wanted to know if I was now going to say a word to save the rights of the minority of Manitoba. How does he want me to save their rights? Is it by throwing their destiny into hands of hon. gentlemen with whom I find him associating now? I might make the mistake, if experience had not already taught me how dangerous it is to trust them. The hon. gentleman has forced me to go a little outside of the question, to give him my reasons why I do not place much trust in the gentlemen alongside him, and around him, upon this question. He accused me of having hounded the Hon. Mr. Anglin from my province on this very question, while I was playing the part of an agitator. I never hounded Mr. Anglin or any other man. I never came in contact with him, to have a dispute with him, except twice in my life. I did meet him in his own county, where I knew he would be elected by 600 of a majority, in order to contradict a statement and repudiate a charge of cowardice that had been made against me. That was not playing the part of a demagogue; it was the part of a man who was determined to face his enemies under any circumstances. I came in contact with him another time when he charged me in the House making use of an argument similar to the argument the hon. gentleman had used to-night—not personal to myself, but to my hon. friend the Solicitor-General. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa county made certain allusions to our association with gentlemen occupying positions in the Cabinet. He wondered how the Solicitor-General could be associated with the Controller of Customs, or with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He must also wonder how the Secretary of State could be in the same company, I suppose. Well, Sir, in this country, I hope that while there may be individual exceptions, and while there may be localities where narrow and contracted views are entertained—I hope and believe that people generally feel that the country is wide enough and there

is room enough for us all to live in; that in the business transactions of every-day life we do not stop to inquire whether a man is a Protestant or a Catholic, whether he is an Orangeman or a Freemason, or anything else. We look upon it as a matter of course that men holding different religious views may be in the same Cabinet. One of the reasons why I quarrelled—if you can call it a quarrel—with the hon. gentleman whom he named, and whom I would not now refer to if I had not been attacked, was akin to the very fact which the hon. gentleman now reproaches me with. He attacked me once some years ago in the House because I went into the county of East Hastings to say a word for an hon. member who was then running an election, who was on the same side of politics as myself, and who had shown his sympathy with me upon this very question, which has always so deeply interested my young friend from the county of Ottawa. I was charged with inconsistency in saying a word for an Orangeman. But I pointed out to the hon. gentleman at that time, to the amusement of the House, that he should not consider that inconsistent, because if he did he was equally inconsistent himself when he ran with King Coram, the head of the Orangemen, and went into an Orange hall at Piserinco and stood on the same platform with him. Now, there was nothing wrong in that; but if a Liberal Irishman can go and stand on a platform in an Orange hall, and under the banners and the paraphernalia of an Orange lodge, and appeal to their support, why should not I go and give my help to my friend, Mr. White, in East Hastings? So there is not so much in that argument as the hon. gentleman thinks. Now, I come back to give my reasons why I think the hon. gentleman should not expect me to place too much reliance upon the professions of his party on the school question. He went over the ground very carefully, and traced the history of what he was pleased to term my agitation on this question, and he brought it up to the time when I made my last motion in this House. But to make the story complete, I must mention that it was no part of a demagogue I was playing when, in 1873, I proposed a motion on that question, not such a skeleton as is this resolution here, but a fair and square test of the question, also indicating a remedy. I pressed it against the wishes of my political friends, regardless whom it hurt. A vote was taken upon it in 1873, and it was a vote for disallowance of the amendments that were passed in the meantime. Under the school law of 1872, in those sections where the Catholics were in a majority they still could free themselves from taxation, because the power of taxation rested with the ratepayers. While this question was pending, an Act was passed, making the legislation more oppressive; and in 1873 I came back again to Parliament. The Con-

servative Government were then in power. I know that, with very few exceptions, the Liberal party voted with me on that question. They voted on it clearly and distinctly, and Mr. Anglin could not tell me before the vote took place how many members would support our motion, while I could tell him how many votes in support of it from this side of the House. Not a vote was given from that side of the House, until a majority was shown against the Government, then we had the whole Liberal party with us, and we carried by thirty-five majority for disallowance. Sir John Macdonald resigned that year. The Liberal Government came into office. We expected, then, of course, that they would carry out the principle for which they had voted, and which they had been the means of having adopted. I thought the assurance given to Bishop Sweeney when he was here would be carried out, namely, that "We, the Liberals, can do nothing now but express sympathy, but if we were in power the whole matter would be settled in ten minutes." Well, those hon. gentlemen were then in power. Subsequently, I was asked to move in this matter. I was not silent; I declared I would do so. It appears to have made a difference with some hon. gentlemen who were then sitting on this side of the House, but it made no difference to me. Some hon. gentlemen, however, attacked me then as a demagogue, as a member who was endeavouring to embarrass the Liberal Government. I pursued my course as before. I can give the hon. gentleman some more history. The English-speaking members at that time called me into their rooms to consult me in regard to the motion I had on the paper. They congratulated me in the name of the Catholics of the Dominion for the action I had taken. They pledged themselves to me to vote against every amendment that might be moved as an obstacle to prevent my motion being submitted to the House, and they decided that it was their bounden duty to stand by my motion and carry it through. The debate continued during one or two days, and Thursday was fixed by the leader of the Government, Mr. Mackenzie, as the day on which a vote would be taken on the question. Thursday came. Mr. Anglin was Speaker of the House, and he could not afford any help to me. Mr. Renaud had been defeated, and I stood alone for my province. But the final fight came. We had a speech, I remember it well, from a gentleman who is not now in the House, and he made such a strong appeal that it had an effect on the Government of the day—he was a Protestant member, who has since passed away, by name, Mr. Gordon, but I forget the constituency he represented, a Liberal, and he was determined to support the motion as he had supported it when in Opposition. At that hour I could have carried the motion by twenty-one or twenty-five majority. The Government saw the

Mr. COSTIGAN.

position in which they were placed. Mr. Mackenzie moved the adjournment. I knew what that motion meant. The adjournment was followed next morning by a caucus, and without any explanation, those members who had pledged me their support told me they could support me no longer. I was called a demagogue for introducing that motion, and it was voted down in favour of an amendment which threw our case out of Parliament. And yet the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) says I used this question to get into office, and that I am silent now. I am not silent on this question. At the same time, I have no desire to take up these matters and make it unpleasant for my friends on the other side of the House. I fear no man living on this question. I can face any demagogue who ever would dare to raise this question up before my face, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to do so. So much in regard to the history of the New Brunswick school question. The hon. gentleman asked me if I had sympathy with the people of the North-west. I sympathize with them very deeply. My sympathy will, perhaps, go further, and prove more beneficial and efficacious than that of the mover of and the supporters of this resolution. If this resolution were carried, I can see difficulties in the way of the hon. member for L'Islet. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will get out of the difficulty very well; he will dress his skeleton to suit himself. Do those hon. gentlemen expect they will ever be questioned by their electors? Suppose the electors should ask the hon. member for Simcoe: How did you happen to defeat the Government on this question? His reply would be: Well, of course, I allowed the hon. member for L'Islet to make his speech, but, as regards the resolution itself, it was moulded to suit my views. Of course, the first part simply says:

That this House desires to express its dissatisfaction at the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba School question.

If the resolution stopped there it could easily be seen that there was very little inconsistency. They ventured a little further and said:

And in assuming to be possessed of judicial functions.

That, of course, is in harmony with the article written in the "Canadian Review," which the Solicitor-General quoted tonight. The resolution was perhaps cunningly framed, but I do not think it was framed in such a way as to be complimentary to the intelligence of this House. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that the resolution will be condemned by every man who has the slightest sympathy with the cause of the minority in the province of Manitoba. It may be justified by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he tells his constituents that he was obliged to water it down in order to

catch the hon. member for L'Islet and his friends, but the hon. member for L'Islet can never justify his action, and I question whether the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) will be able to defend his vote on the resolution which he intends to record to-night.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman did not reply to the charge I made. I asked him particularly in regard to the Manitoba school question.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. Before discussing the motion before the Chair, I wish to repudiate in the most formal terms the assertion made by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), and repeated by the Secretary of State, that the hon. member for North Simcoe had anything whatever to do with drawing the resolutions submitted from this side of the House. The motion had never been exhibited to the hon. member for Simcoe, he did not know anything about it until it was placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker and read by the hon. member for L'Islet in his place. It was known in this House that the hon. member for Simcoe had a motion of his own to propose, and it was a race between the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as to priority. Not only was this known in the House but all over the country, and it was referred to in three-quarters of the papers supporting the Government, and even in one of to-day's papers I find the following paragraph referring to the race between the hon. member for Simcoe and the hon. member for L'Islet :

It was five minutes to four when the Orders of the Day were reached. Mr. Dalton McCarthy and Mr. Tarte each had his eye fixed on Mr. Speaker, who calmly contemplating the lofty ceiling of the chamber and the moment the assistant clerk called "No. 21, House again in Committee of Supply," both the member from L'Islet and the member for North Simcoe started to rise. The member for L'Islet is the most active and sprang to his feet with the agility of a cat and called out "Mr. Speaker," before the member for North Simcoe had quite got into an erect position. He sank back calmly while Mr. Tarte held the floor and began rattling away in French, keeping up his speech until ten minutes to six when he started to repeat his speech in English, but Mr. Speaker thought it useless to commence a second speech at that hour so he called it six o'clock and left the Chair.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe, that we will never hear it any more pretended that the motion which is now in your hands has been prepared by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), with the assistance of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is a motion which had its origin in the facts which are known to the House from the papers which have been brought down by the Government. It is an original motion of my hon. friend, and in a few moments when I have dealt with some of the observations of the hon. Secretary of State, I will give the reasons why I am going to support it. The hon. Secretary of State has referred to a certain question which is perfectly well known to

me, not as a member of this House, but as a member for the press. When the New Brunswick School question was discussed in this House, I was the chief editor of the chief Catholic newspaper in the province of Quebec, "Le Nouveau Monde," which was published in the city of Montreal, and whose director was the Grand Vicar of the Bishop of Montreal, Mr. Lamarche. I was the political editor, and he was the director of the paper under the control of the Bishop of Montreal. The people of the province of Quebec at that time sympathized with the Catholics of New Brunswick, who had been deprived of their rights. When the school law was passed by the New Brunswick Legislature there was a great agitation in the province of Quebec, and we, the French and Catholics, stood up for the rights of the minority in the province of New Brunswick, as we are prepared to do now for the rights of the minority in Manitoba. The New Brunswick question was brought before the House by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan), now the Secretary of State, and in 1872 he moved a resolution asking for disallowance of the Act. There were several amendments and sub-amendments to the motion, and finally the question was referred to the law officers of the Crown to obtain their opinion, and also to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to obtain its opinion, if possible. The session was prorogued, and the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England was asked upon the question: whether the Catholics of the province of New Brunswick had any rights, under the law, to denominational schools. The opinion of the law officers of the Crown was that they had not. The session of 1873 opened, the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had not been obtained, and the question of disallowance again came before the House, and the present hon. Secretary of State moved the disallowance of the Bill. This motion was carried in the House by a very large majority against the Government. The House of Commons, including almost the whole Liberal party, declared that it was necessary, that it was good policy, that the Government should disallow the Act passed by the province of New Brunswick. The Government would not yield, but what were they doing in the meantime? They were communicating with the Catholic Bishops of Canada who were assembled at Quebec, and the Government obtained from the Bishops an order not to proceed further in the question, because they did not intend to push the Government any more in reference to it. And, Sir, the Hon. Mr. Masson, who later became a member of the Conservative Government, came to the Hon. Mr. Dorian, and told him, with tears in his eyes, that he could not push the Government any further in the matter. And at the same time I, as editor of the "Nouveau Monde," received a message from the Rev. Mr. Lamarche, the director of the paper, saying: "Stop agitating the question, because the Bishops will not

press the Government further." To-day the hon. Secretary of State pretends to express surprise, because some weeks or some months after, the Bishops of the whole country had desisted from resistance, and had decided not to push the Government further, because there was a change of Government and there was to be a change of policy. There is no justice in such a contention as that. I say that after the action taken by the Bishops in 1873, they had no right, neither in 1874 nor in 1875, when the Liberal Government was in power, to demand from the Liberal Government what they would not exact from the Conservative Government.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I desire to crave from this House its indulgence if I offer in my own vernacular tongue some remarks in explanation of the vote I am about to give. Owing to the somewhat lengthy nature of these observations, I feel I could not do full justice to the subject in trusting to my imperfect knowledge of the English language. The contention of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. La-Rivière), yesterday evening, as re-echoed in the speech of the hon. the Solicitor-General (Mr. Curran), this afternoon, was that we, on this side of the House, lack sincerity in the motion brought forward by the hon. member for L'Islet, and which is now under consideration. Our position is well and clearly defined, as I will endeavour to show in a few words. We hold, first, that the Catholics of the province of Manitoba have certain rights which have been outrageously infringed upon; secondly, that it was the bounden duty of the Government, on the receipt of the Greenway Acts, to quash and disallow them. That this power of disallowance may be exercised within the twelve months is admitted beyond dispute, nor can it be questioned, as this power is conferred by the Constitution on the Government of the Dominion. In the third place, we contend that the time for disallowance having once expired, it was the duty of the Government to enact such remedial laws as were calculated to redress the grievances complained of by the Catholics of Manitoba, instead of resorting to various shifts and subterfuges, now as in the past, to avoid dealing with the just claims of the latter. I say the Government are open to censure and condemnation by this House and by the country for the policy of deception they have pursued up to this day. I, for one, am ready to assume my own share of responsibility and to give my support to any Government whose first article shall be the redress of the wrongs inflicted upon Manitoba; on the same ground, I would pledge myself to support no Government whose programme would be to withhold from the Catholics of Manitoba the just treatment they are entitled to and which they are denied to-day. On the other hand, should the hon. the Minister of Justice pledge himself to adopt such remedial legislation as might be calculated to redress

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

the grievances complained of, in accordance with his report of the 21st March, 1891. I am ready, with a large number of my friends, from this side of the House, to lend him a loyal support, thus making up the loss of a few votes among his own friends, brought about by this honest course of action. Now, I beg to submit to this House and to the country a review of the history of the whole question. The better to understand the actual state of affairs, as well as the guilt of the Government, it will be necessary to go as far back as the origin of the rights so shamefully betrayed. Through the course of this historical review of the question, will necessarily occur many quotations, which, I venture to hope, will not tax too much the attention of the House. It is very material to the debate that the facts of the case should be grounded on good authorities. Prior to its being erected into a province, the territory of Manitoba formed a portion of Rupert's Land and justice was administered by the Hudson Bay Company through a governor and a council composed of leading citizens of the country. An almost boundless freedom prevailed everywhere, as the Hudson Bay Company only interfered with the citizen to the extent necessary to protect its commercial interests. The population included some thousand French and English half-breeds, a few hundred Indians, Catholic and Protestant, half civilized through religious agency. But whilst the political organization was still embryonic, not so with the religious organization, which was in full swing, having a bishop, and a clergy, nuns, convents, colleges and an hospital. They also had their primary schools wherein their children imbibed the rudiments of knowledge; the whole, under the control of the bishop. The means necessary for the support of these schools were supplied either by voluntary contributions from Catholics, or by monthly school fees or out of the funds of the church. The Protestants enjoyed an almost exactly similar organization, with bishop, ministers, churches, colleges, hospitals. Their schools were supported on the same principle as the Catholic schools. These schools were fully controlled by Protestants, just as Catholic schools were under the exclusive control of Catholics and entirely supported by them. There were to be found neither school laws, nor public schools properly so-called, nor grants or state subsidies in behalf of the schools. Let us hear the evidence given by Bishop Taché in the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, as taken from the Sessional Papers of 1891 (No. 63, pages 4 and 5):

1. That I have been a resident continuously of this country since 1845, a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, and as bishop thereof since the year 1850, and now am the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the said church, and I am personally aware of the truth of the matters herein alleged.

2. Prior to the passage of the Act of the Dominion of Canada passed in the 3rd year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, chapter 3, known as the "Manitoba Act," and prior to the Order in Council

issued in pursuance thereof, there existed in the territory now constituting the province of Manitoba a number of effective schools for children.

3. These schools were denominational schools, some of them, being regulated and controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and others by various Protestant denominations.

4. The means necessary for the support of the Roman Catholic schools were supplied to some extent by school fees paid by some of the parents of the children who attended the schools and the rest was paid out of the funds of the church, contributed by its members.

5. During the period referred to, Roman Catholics had no interest in or control over the schools of the Protestant denominations and the members of the Protestant denominations had no interest in or control over the schools of Roman Catholics. There were no public schools in the sense of State schools. The members of the Roman Catholic supported the schools of their own church for the benefit of Roman Catholic children and were not under the obligation to, and did not contribute to the support of any other schools.

6. In the matter of education therefore, during the period referred to, Roman Catholics were as a matter of custom and practice separate from the rest of the community, and their schools were all conducted according to the distinctive views and beliefs of Roman Catholics as herein set forth.

Two Protestant witnesses, one of whom, Mr. Polson, has been a resident of Winnipeg ever since 1840, and the other, Mr. John Sutherland, since 1837, bear witness to the same fact. In each of their affidavits it is stated in identical terms :

2. That schools which existed prior to the province of Manitoba entering Confederation were purely private schools and were not in any way subject to public control nor did they in any way receive public support.

3. No school taxes were collected by any authority prior to the province of Manitoba entering Confederation and there were no means by which any person could be forced by law to support any of said private schools. I think the only public revenue of any kind then collected was the customs duty, usually four per cent.

The utmost harmony had never ceased to prevail among the various elements constituting the local population, and was still prevailing in 1869, when the Canadian Government, after purchasing from the Hudson's Bay Company their rights to the territories, attempted to take possession of the country without any more regard for the rights of the people than if they had been part and parcel of the territory purchased from the Hudson Bay Company. In 1869, the Canadian Government, on the conclusion of their negotiations with the Hudson Bay Company, but prior to the annexation by the Imperial Government of Rupert's Land and the North-west Territories to Canada, caused to be adopted by Parliament a most extraordinary legislation for the civil government of the new country. Both executive and legislative powers were centred in the hands of a Lieutenant-Governor and a council appointed by the Federal Government and acting under instructions from the latter. The Government enacted a statute, intitled "An Act

for the temporary government of Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory when united with Canada," which altogether ignored, the very existence of a population, which had not been consulted as to their wants and their desires. Neither the bishops nor the influential men of the territories had been asked their mind about the new constitution, the main provisions of which read as follows :—

(2.) It shall be lawful for the Governor, by any order or orders to be by him from time to time made, with the advice of the Council (and subject to such conditions and restrictions as to him shall seem meet) to authorize and empower such officer as he may from time to time appoint as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, to make provision for the administration of justice therein, and generally to make, ordain and establish laws, institutions and ordinances, as may be necessary for the peace, order and good government of Her Majesty's subjects and others therein.

(3.) The Lieutenant-Governor shall administer the government under instructions from time to time given him by Order in Council.

4. The Governor may, with the advice of the Privy Council constitute, and appoint, by warrant under his sign manual a Council of not exceeding fifteen, nor less than seven persons to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the administration of affairs, with such powers as may be from time to time conferred upon them by Order in Council.

This was sheer spoliation of all the political, civil and religious rights of the population ; it was tantamount to depriving the inhabitants of their title of British subjects ; it was a virtual abolition of the laws, customs usages and institutions of the country ; it created a despotism so much the more dangerous that it would be wielded by strangers to the country. This extraordinary legislation was assented to on the 22nd June, 1869. It rapidly spread throughout the North-west, and aroused a feeling of terror which is easily understood. The new legislation, as you may see, levelled to the ground all local institutions and entrusted to a stranger, surrounded with strangers, unknown and very likely hostile to the people, with the care of legislating and creating institutions in behalf of a people the very desires, customs, needs and circumstances of whom they were utterly ignorant of. The people feared, on very just ground, lest their national and religious rights should be destroyed ; and lest the full liberty they had hitherto enjoyed should give place to the intolerable tyranny of a strange yoke. These apprehensions developed into a certainty when the news reached them of the appointment of the Hon. William McDougall as Lieutenant-Governor, a man known for his bigotry, who had never missed an occasion of ventilating his antipathy and hatred for the institutions of the province of Quebec, and who, on this ground, had become perfectly obnoxious to the French Catholic element of the country. The new potentate, accompanied by an armed force, was making ready for taking possession of the country, prior even to its being ad-

mitted into the Dominion of Canada. From that very moment the half-breeds resolved upon a very determined opposition, not through a spirit of rebellion, but with a view of safeguarding their rights and securing from Canada the official recognition of said rights. In a letter dated the 2nd November, 1869, addressed to Mr. D. Smith, one of the officers of the Hudson Bay Company, Governor McTavish gives the following evidence as to the grounds which actuated the half-breeds in their resistance :

There has been, during the autumn, considerable agitation among the Canadian half-breed population here regarding the government to be established here. They seem to have been fully, if not correctly, informed of how the government was to be composed, and they seemed to think that, from what was told, their interests would be overlooked and their religion interfered with.

I need not enter into further details as to the subsequent events. Let it suffice to say that Mr. McDougall was stopped at the frontier ; that the Half-breeds, after having respected the Hudson Bay Government, were forced by circumstances to form a provisional government ; that in February, 1870, a convention of delegates from all the French and English parishes met at Winnipeg to draw up the list of the rights the people of Red River required to be guaranteed previous to their entering into the Confederation ; that at such convention three delegates, Messrs. Ritchot, Black and Scott were authorized to negotiate with the Canadian Government, the Bill of Rights being the basis of negotiations ; that the Imperial Government forced the Canadian Government to enter into negotiations with the Half-breeds and to grant them the required guarantees as to their rights and privileges. Bishop Taché, who owes to his high ecclesiastical position and his long protracted residence in the North-west Territories, the paramount influence he enjoys among the people, left Rome at the instance of the Dominion Government and was entrusted with the difficult mission of pacifying the country, a task which he undertook with the most solemn pledges which His Lordship thus revives in the memorial addressed to Lord Stanley, Governor-General of Canada, on the 12th April, 1890 :

"I was in Rome at the time, and at the request of the Canadian authorities, I left the Ecumenical Council to come and help the pacification of the country. On my way home I spent a few days in Ottawa. I had the honour of several interviews with Sir John Young, then Governor-General, and with his ministers. I was repeatedly assured that the rights of the people of Red River would be fully guarded under the new regime ; that both Imperial and Federal authorities would never permit the new-comers in the country to encroach on the liberties of the old settlers ; that on the banks of the Red River, as well as on the banks of the St. Lawrence, the people would be at liberty to use their mother tongue, to practice their religion and to have their children brought up according to their views.

Equipped with these pledges, Bishop Taché proceeded to Winnipeg, held interviews with

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

the leaders of the insurrection who were finally prevailed upon to send delegates, as requested to do by the Federal authorities, who should proceed to Ottawa in order to debate the terms of admission of the territories into the Confederation. The delegates chosen were Messrs. Ritchot, Black and Scott, who left for Ottawa with credentials from the President of the Provisional Government of Assiniboia, and a Bill of the rights they were to secure from the Government in behalf of the people. This list, which included nineteen articles, was almost identically similar to that agreed upon in November, 1869, and submitted to Mr. McDougall. It included, among others, the following articles :

17. That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective populations, according to the system of the province of Quebec.

16. That both the English and French languages be common in the legislature and in the courts ; and that all public documents as well as acts of the legislature be published in both languages.

17. That the Lieutenant-Governor to be appointed for the provinces of the North-west be familiar with both the English and French languages.

18. That the Judge of the Supreme Court speak the English and French languages.

The whole list of rights was examined and discussed article by article, and here is what took place during the official negotiations when the articles concerning the separate schools and the French language were taken up for consideration, such as related by His Grace Archbishop Taché, in his letter of the 22nd December, 1889 :

The question of separate schools, as demanded in the seventh article of the List of Rights, was taken into consideration ; the delegates were promised that they would not only have the benefit of the provisions of the "British North America Act," but they might rest assured and might assure the people of the Red River that separate schools would be guaranteed to them.

The recognition of the use of the French language as an official language was conceded as expressed in the 16th article of the List of Rights, with the promise that attention would be paid to the demands of the 17th and 18th articles, as fact it has been done, if not completely, at least enough to satisfy the interested parties.

The Government and the delegates having finally agreed, the stipulations of the treaty were incorporated into the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was brought up before the House as a treaty and to which, consequently, no amendment was offered. The following are the provisions of the Manitoba Act respecting the national and religious rights of the French half-breeds :

Article 22.—In and for the province, the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

(2.) An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of the Legislature

of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

(3.) In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

Article 23.—Either the French or the English language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process, in or issuing from any court of Canada established under the British North America Act, 1867, or in any or from all or any of the courts of the province. The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages.

With a view to give effect to the pledge given the delegates that the Catholics of Manitoba would profit by the provisions of the British North America Act relating to separate schools, the Constitutional Act was made to apply to this province by the 2nd article of the Manitoba Act, as follows :

(2.) The provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or, by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

Now, the Constitutional Act includes under section 93, subsection 3, the following provision :

3. Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The Manitoba Act, consequently, was framed with a view to securing to the French element the full control of their schools. This view of the question is endorsed by the Hon. W. McDougall, who was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the settlement of this question; at the date of the 1st August, 1892, speaking of the judgment of the Privy Council which had just then been rendered, this gentleman said :

We certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whichever denomination might be in a minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools. You see the words "or practice" were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the difficulty which arose in New Brunswick, where separate

schools actually existed but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba. And then the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given to make assurance doubly sure.

This Act was assented to in May, 1870. It was spread broadcast throughout the province. Political agitation subsided, order was restored, because the people had been granted the guarantees they had petitioned for. When Governor Archibald repaired to Winnipeg, he found all the doors opened, and the warmest welcome from the hearts of all the inhabitants, and without any struggle, became the idol of the people. From the above well established historical facts, I gather : 1st. That the Half-breeds took up arms in 1869 and 1870 to secure the guarantee of their religious and national rights, that is to say, the right to the use of their own language, to the practice of their religion and the maintenance of their separate schools. 2nd. That Canada has entered officially into negotiations with them, and has granted them the guarantees asked for, not only for the present but also for the future, pledging the honour of the Crown to the effect that "both Imperial and Federal authorities would never permit the newcomers in the country to encroach on the liberties of the old settlers." 3rd. That the Canadian Government would not have entered into possession of these territories had not these pledges been given; in fact, were the "sine qua non" condition of the Union. 4th. That it is the bounden duty of the Imperial Government to see to it that these pledges, accepted in all good faith, be never violated. The new Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, who was well aware of all the Government's negotiations and pledges, set resolutely to work and to organize the new province. He sought the advice of the most influential citizens of Manitoba, caused writs to be issued for the elections, constituted the legislature and called together the Parliament. The new Parliament set the important task of laying the corner stone of a new social organization in accordance with the principles which had presided to the creation of the province, and of establishing the institutions best calculated to promote the happiness and the welfare of the people. Educational laws, viewed in this light, undoubtedly hold the first rank. In 1871, the Local Government brought up in the House a measure establishing a system of education and schools subsidized by the state, on the plan of the system introduced into the province of Quebec in 1869 by the Hon. Mr. Chauveau, the then Prime Minister of our province. This system consisted in the appointment of a board of public instructors, composed of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants, and divided into two sections, designated under the name of Catholic section and Protestant section, having respectively a superintendent of Catholic schools and a superintendent of Protestant schools. The province was divided into twelve Catholic districts and twelve Protestant districts, the ratepayers of which were

to choose three Catholic school trustees in each Catholic district and three Protestant school trustees in each Protestant district. The moneys received from the Catholic rate-payers were directly and exclusively applied to the benefit of the Catholic schools, and the moneys collected from the Protestant rate-payers were exclusively applied to the benefit of the Protestant schools. The money voted by the Legislative Assembly for educational purposes was divided in proportion to the school population of each district. Under no circumstances could a Protestant ratepayer be held to contribute to the support of the Catholic schools, nor a Catholic ratepayer to the support of Protestant schools. To make a long story short, the two religions were on a footing of perfect equality and given the full and exclusive control of their respective schools. There may have been later on, a few modifications as to the minor points of the system, but, on the whole, the principles remained untouched till the year 1890. It may be said that the promises made in 1870 have been fulfilled and honoured up to that fatal date of 1890, with which I have now to deal. I beg to be allowed to register here as a most important statement of the question, the results of the census of 1870, carried on under the auspices of Lieutenant-Governor Archibald in 1871, the total population was found to number 11,960 souls, thus subdivided :

Catholics.....	6,240
Protestants.....	5,720
Catholic majority.....	520

Although they were in a minority, the Protestants were allowed an equal share with Catholics in the distribution of the school grant, as well as in the number of school districts established under the statute. I now come, Mr. Speaker, to an epoch of civil omen in the history of our country; I have to deal with a brutal and tyrannical deed; I have to relate how the Catholic minority of Manitoba has been the object of a violent aggression from the Protestant majority. Justice, law, good faith, honour of the Crown solemnly pledged notwithstanding, the new comers did encroach on the liberties of the old settlers. Without any ground, without even the excuse of a single abuse or of the least inconvenience, the majority of the legislature of Manitoba have enacted a law by which the social edifice built up in 1870 is uprooted, all the Catholic schools are closed, and their property confiscated, separate school organization is swept away, and the full control of the schools is given over to the Provincial Governments. The Board of Public Instruction is abolished, and along with it disappear the two sections and the two superintendents. The separate school boards, respectively formed of Catholics and Protestants, give way to common school trustees; the moneys from the taxes paid by the Catholic and Protestant ratepayers are

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

no longer applied to the maintenance of Catholic and Protestant schools, respectively, but is engulfed in the common school fund. Religious teaching is proscribed from the schools which, heretofore denominational are, in the words of Archbishop Taché, in reality but a continuation of the Protestant schools. With a single stroke of the pen, the majority nullifies the results of the Half-breed uprising, the negotiations of the treaty concluded in 1870, and of the Manitoba Act. It gives the lie to the royal word, wrests violently from an important element of the population their most sacred rights, and robs them of the results and fruits of twenty years' labours and sacrifices. And the proof is found in the following clause of the Public School Act :—

179. In cases where, before the coming into force of this Act, Catholic school districts have been established as in the next preceding section mentioned, such Catholic school districts shall, upon the coming into force of this Act, cease to exist, and all the assets of such Catholic school districts shall belong to, and all liabilities thereof be paid by, the public school district.

History seldom offers examples of similar deeds of violence perpetrated by a majority on a minority. One should have to reach as far back as the religious wars of the Middle Ages to find a parallel. Vainly did the minority protest and appeal to justice, to good faith, to honour to public interest endangered by the struggles such action would give rise to. The majority remained unmoved, and the great wrong was perpetrated. Still, all was not apparently lost beyond redemption. Had not the Constitution set up, above aggressive provincial majorities in a more serene sphere, a higher power? Had not the Federal power been equipped by the Constitution with the proper means necessary to ensure protection to the rights of minorities? Could it be suspected for one moment that the sacredness of the pact of 1870 would not be respected even by its very promoters? Certainly not, answer with a common consent the Catholics of Manitoba. Let us apply for a remedy to the Federal Government to whose guardianship evolves the duty of protecting the rights of minorities; let us apply for redress to the Government who have pledged their word that they would never allow the new comers to molest us. In virtue of the British North America Act the Government have the power of disallowing, without exception, any legislation enacted by provincial legislatures, within the twelve months following the receipt of copy of said laws by the Secretary of State. If ever there was enacted an iniquitous law, calculated to trouble public peace, to sow into the minds of the people the seeds of discontent, and to shake Confederation to its very foundations, it was beyond doubt this law doing away with the separate schools. And if ever a Government were warranted in using their power of disallowance it was surely in the case of such a patent injustice. It was under

this belief that the Catholics sent up petition upon petition to the Governor-General in Council. The law abolishing the separate schools had been assented to on the 31st March 1890. On the 1st April, the members of the Catholic Committee of the Board of Public Instruction, headed by M. M. Taché, sent up a petition to the Federal Government, concluding as follows:—

The Catholic section of the Board of Education in and for the province of Manitoba, most respectfully and earnestly pray His Excellency the Governor-General in Council that said last mentioned Act be disallowed to all intents and purposes, and your petitioners will ever pray.

On the 26th April, Messrs. Girard, Senator, and LaRivière, M.P., added the following postscript to the above petition:

The undersigned, respectively members of the Senate and of the House of Commons, fully endorse the contents of the present memorial, and earnestly join in the prayer therein contained.

On the 12th April, Archbishop Taché wrote to the Governor-General to bring to his consideration the solemn undertakings of his predecessor, and urged him to interfere in the matter of a legislation which he thus characterises:

I consider the laws just enacted by the Legislature of Manitoba to abolish the Catholic schools and the official use of the French language as an unwarranted violation of the promises made before, and to secure the entry of this country into Confederation.

I consider such laws as a death-blow to the very constitution of this province. They are detrimental to some of the dearest interests of a portion of Her Majesty's most loyal subjects. If allowed to be put in force, they will be a cause of irritation, destroy the harmony which exists in the country and leave the people under the painful and dangerous impression that they have been cruelly deceived, and because a minority they are left without protection, and that against the promises made twenty years ago by the then immediate representative of Her Majesty: "Right shall be done in all cases."

I, therefore, most respectfully and most earnestly pray that Your Excellency, as the representative of our most beloved Queen, should take such steps that, in your wisdom, would seem the best remedy against the evils that the above-mentioned and recently enacted laws are preparing in this part of Her Majesty's domain.

One month later, another episcopal voice was heard, from the province of Quebec this time; it was the voice of a man who had the undoubted right to plead in favour of the victims of those unjust laws. Nobody ignores, Mr. Speaker, the important mission work carried on by Bishop Lafèche in the North-west Territories and Manitoba. During the space of fifteen or twenty years of a labourious life he has evangelized the Indian tribes of the Territories. On the 12th May, Bishop Lafèche wrote to the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), a letter in which he urged him to interfere, in the most pressing terms:

SIR.—The unjust law which the Manitoba Government have caused to be adopted against the Catholic

and French-speaking population of that province, abolishing separate schools and the official use of the French language went into force on the 1st May instant. The protests of the minority, so unworthily treated by this infamous law, have been laid before the Dominion Government in order to secure it disallowance and the protection guaranteed them under the Constitution. I trust the Government, of which you are a leading member, will lend a favourable ear to this appeal to its authority, and protect the rights of that minority by disallowing this Act, which has been characterized as persecution by Protestants themselves. The manliness with which you repelled a similar attempt in the North-west Territories, inspires me with confidence that you will not fail to take a firm stand in this case also. The Federal compact was evoked to maintain the abolition of separate schools in New Brunswick a few years ago, and nevertheless, the Catholic Ministers, who were then members of the Dominion Government, declared to the Bishops, that they were prepared to resign on that question, and it was only through respect for the autonomy of the provinces that that iniquitous law was then tolerated.

His Lordship winds up his letter by an appeal which has remained unanswered:

I am confident, therefore, that the Ministers charged with the care of our religious and national interests in the Dominion Government, will to-day exhibit the same firmness as their predecessors, and that they will succeed in convincing their colleagues that if they desire to maintain a good understanding between the divers races, and insure peace and stability of Confederation, they must do justice to the minority in Manitoba, and protect them against the iniquitous persecution inflicted on them by the majority at the instigation of a few fanatics.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman skips an important portion of the letter.

Mr. BEAUSOLIEL. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman will quote as much as he pleases when his turn comes.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Let him, at least, say so.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) This portion of the letter which the hon. gentleman refers to, bears on the New Brunswick school question, which has nothing to do with the Manitoba school law.

In my humble opinion, this is a far more serious matter than the Riel question, inasmuch as it involves a direct violation of sentiments dearest to the heart of man, his love for his native tongue and his religion.

Trusting that no Catholic French Canadian member of the Government will in the face of the country, take the responsibility of supporting a law so evidently unjust and hostile to our nationality.

I remain, etc.,
L. F., Bishop of Three Rivers.

We have just heard, Mr. Speaker, an eloquent, authorized and patriotic voice, rising up from our own midst, from the province of Quebec, and beseeching the French representatives in the Federal Government to do their duty and disallow the laws enacted by the Manitoba Legislature, such prayer being grounded on the two feelings the most deeply rooted up in the human heart: one's faith and language. In the month of June, 1890,

a convention of delegates representing all the Catholic centres of Manitoba met at St. Boniface, under the presidency of Senator Girard. They drew up a protest against the wicked laws which deprived the minority of their schools and of the use of their language. They then adopted a petition to be sent up to the Federal Government, concluding as follows:—

Therefore, your petitioners most respectfully and most earnestly pray that it may please Your Excellency in Council to disallow the said Act and adopt any other measure, or grant any such redress as may seem fit to Your Excellency in Council.

We have consequently four petitions, instead of one petition, as stated yesterday evening by the hon. the Minister of Justice. In the province of Quebec as in Manitoba the public voice was loud in claiming the disallowance not of the obnoxious legislation of the Greenway-Martin Cabinet. Why did not the Federal Government interfere, and wherefore did they not disallow this legislation? Their power of disallowance is established beyond a doubt and is not questioned. What was the point in question? A deed of unwarrantable aggression, an open violation of the treaty of 1870, and of the spirit, if not strictly of the letter of the Manitoba Act, had been perpetrated, and the consequence was that the public mind and peace were disturbed. The Government had but one course open to them; it was their duty to insure the respect due to the constitution and to protect the rights of the minorities. Could there ever be a clearer and more evident case for the Government to interfere. But, far from interfering, hardly did the Government acknowledge receipt of the very urging petitions which poured in, literally covered with signatures of bishops, priests, senators, members of the Commons, members of the Local Legislatures, and by thousands of Catholics. What happened from the 4th April, 1890, date of the first petition, to the 16th March, 1891, when the Government apparently determined upon a course of action? I am sorry to be under the necessity of stating such a fact; but I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that from that very moment, the Government had decided not to interfere in any way; that they only sought to find out the means through some intrigue, to conjure up the storm ready to burst down upon their heads, should an immediate reply be given. Sir John A. Macdonald had decided that general elections should take place about the beginning of 1891. The general elections were, at any cost, to be safely gone through, previous to giving a definite answer. Should the Conservative party be successful, the whole matter would be amicably settled; but, in case of reverse, it was good policy to let the Liberal party face the storm that would be raised by this much vexed question. There is a gap of some ten or eleven months between the presentation of the petitions and

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

the solution given and agreed upon in March, 1891. What took place during that lapse of time? Official papers are silent; but it is well known that incredible attempts were made to prevail upon Archbishop Taché and the other bishops to give up their claim for disallowance, under the pretense that such a measure would stir up a dangerous agitation, and to accept that, the case be referred to the tribunals before which, it was alleged, the Catholics were sure to obtain redress and justice. As the delay for disallowance is one year, Archbishop Taché determined upon resorting to law, and running the chances of a law-suit. In the month of October, 1891, a case—a test case—was brought up before the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, to have the school law declared unconstitutional. The case is known as the case of Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg. On the 24th November, judgment was rendered by two judges (Killam and Taylor) against one judge (Dubuc), dismissing the application to quash the by-laws of the city, and holding the law to be constitutional and valid. It is well known that after this first failure in the courts, the bishops applied again to the Government for disallowance of the law. They had experienced how dangerous it is to rely on the glorious uncertainty of the law. The Government, on the other side, insisted upon the case being appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. Archbishop Taché replied:

We shall, perhaps, have judgment given in our favour in the Supreme Court; we venture to hope so; but should, unfortunately, we not carry the cause, the delay for disallowance being expired, the evil would be without remedy.

It was then that the Government gave it to be understood that the evil would not be without redemption, on the ground that an appeal always lies to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of the Local Government which would prejudicially affect the rights and privileges of the minority as to educational matters. The Government pledged themselves to interfere, in case of a failure, and Archbishop Taché exacted that this pledge should be inserted in an official paper since made public, and that all the charges of the trial should be borne by the Government. These points being settled, Archbishop Taché no longer insisted upon the petitions asking for disallowance being taken into consideration. The proof of these negotiations is to be found in a letter from Archbishop Taché, quoted by the hon. member for L'Islet, in which His Grace says: "Sir John Thompson has pledged himself officially and publicly to give us redress and others have given private pledges none the less solemn." The proof is equally to be found in the immediate carrying out of the programme previously agreed upon. The elections went off, but without any hostile interference being offered by the bishops; the Government were upheld by a small majority

of twenty-five votes. Now, mark well what occurred: In the case of *Barrett vs. the city of Winnipeg*, judgment had been pronounced, on the 24th November, 1890, against the Catholics, and the matter was lying dormant since that time. The elections took place on the 5th March, 1891. On the 7th March, 1891, two days after the elections, the case of *Barrett* was entered in appeal to the Supreme Court. On the 16th March, Archbishop Taché sent in a new petition signed by all the bishops of the country, praying for, no longer the disallowance of the Greenway laws, but a remedial legislation. The conclusions of this petition read as follows:

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray Your Excellency in Council to afford a remedy to the pernicious legislation above mentioned, and that in the most efficacious and just way.

On the 21st March, the hon. the Minister of Justice reported on the last petition, as well as on the Greenway legislation, in which report, after analysing the Acts and recording the fact that the case having been brought up before the tribunals of the province, the court had decided in favour of the constitutionality of the Acts and that an appeal from that judgment had been asserted, headed:

If the appeal should be successful these Acts will be annulled by judicial decision; the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba will receive protection and redress. The acts purporting to be repealed will remain in operation, and those whose views have been represented by a majority of the legislature cannot but recognize that the matter has been disposed of with due regard to the constitutional rights of the province.

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections 2 and 3 and section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act" in relation to the other provinces.

Those subsections contain in effect the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces, and are obviously those under which the constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed, if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal powers should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority against any act or decision of the legislature of the province or of any provincial authority, affecting any "right or privilege" of any such minority "in relation to education."

Respectfully submitted.

JNO. S. D. THOMPSON,
Minister of Justice.

The delay for disallowance soon expired, and the only sure and efficacious means of redress at the disposal of Catholics was lost without redemption. There remained to the Catholics another sheet-anchor which was soon to be swept away. The judgment of the court in the case of *Barrett vs. the city of Winnipeg* reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada, was confirmed by the Privy Council of England. The consequence is that we are under a necessity of bowing to the legal fact

that the Catholics, at the time of the creation of the province of Manitoba, had no rights which the Protestant majority may be bound to respect. The Catholic population were thunderstruck by the judgment of the Privy Council of England. But, could not the appeal and the interference solemnly promised by the hon. Minister of Justice be resorted to by Catholics? Undoubtedly, said to themselves the Catholics of Manitoba, and we shall insist upon immediate action being taken. On the 20th September, 1892, the executive committee of the national convention, including the leading citizens of the province, the Hon. Mr. Bernier, senator, and the hon. member for Prevencher (Mr. LaRivière), taking the initiative, addressed a petition to the Federal Government, bringing to their remembrance the pledges given to Manitoba. The memorial winds up as follows:

That at a recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England having sustained the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, upholding the validity of the Acts aforesaid, your petitioners most respectfully represent that as intimated in said report of the hon. the Minister of Justice, the time has now come for your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act."

That your petitioners, notwithstanding such decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, still believe that their rights and privileges in relation to education have been prejudicially affected by said Acts of the Provincial Legislature.

Therefore, your petitioners most respectfully and most earnestly pray that it may please your Excellency in Council to take into consideration the petitions above referred to, and to grant the conclusions of said petitions and the relief and protection sought for by the same.

On the 31st October, 1892, Archbishop Taché and many other Catholics signed a petition asking for federal interference and detailing the rights they wished to see redressed, as follows:

4. That it may be declared that to your Excellency the Governor-General in Council, it seems requisite that the provisions of the statutes in force in the province of Manitoba prior to the passage of the said Acts should be re-enacted in so far at least as may be necessary to secure to the Roman Catholics in the said province the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support these schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes, to secure to them their proportionate share of any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education, and to relieve such members of the Roman Catholic Church as contribute to such Roman Catholic schools for all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools; or that the said Acts of 1890 should be so modified or amended as to affect such purposes.

Here is a demand in due form of law, drawn up in as explicit a form as possible. At last are the Government going to comply with the demands of the Catholics? Have we reached the last act of the play? No man in his senses would believe it and say: '*finita la comedia.*' This country is blessed with a Government composed of a group of men boasting of the most incongruous ideas, with-

out any principles in common, bound together by no other link than selfish interest, who cordially hate each other and continually spy into each other's actions. Sitting near devoted Catholics are to be found fanatical Orangemen who never condescend to meet half-way or make any concession. The hon. Prime Minister himself no longer knows which way to turn. Anxious not to fall out with his colleagues, no longer able to control them, he looks for some new scheme and some artifice which may enable him to keep his position without apparently buying it at the expense of the sacrifice of the most sacred and evident rights of his co-religionists. He seems at last to have discovered the much coveted subterfuge; but behold in what a fix, in what an inextricable position he finds himself. In March, 1891, he told the Catholics: Go to law. The Government will bear all the expenses of the lawsuit and you will carry the cause. Should you lose, appeal to the Government in virtue of subsections 2 and 3 of the Manitoba Act, and of subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act which are evidently those established by the Constitution for your protection—in which case we will come to your rescue. The Catholics have sued and lost. They now petition the Government for redress under the recited sections of the Constitutional Act and of the Manitoba Act. But quite a change has come on. That which was obvious in 1891, lacks evidence in 1893. That which was clear at that time is now obscure. The Government have many doubts which must be cleared up. Have the Catholics acquired rights or privileges in virtue of the educational laws passed by the Legislature in 1871, when the separate school system was established? Does subsection 3 of section 93 of the Constitutional Act apply to Manitoba? Are the Government invested with the right of hearing in appeal the Catholics and of coming to their rescue? So many questions as clear and limpid for the then Minister of Justice in the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, as they are obscure and insoluble for the now Prime Minister, ex-Minister of Justice. I would be charged with exaggeration, should not I quote in full the recommendations of a sub-committee of the Privy Council composed of Sir John Thompson and the Hon. Messrs. Bowell, Chapleau and Daly. The following are the conclusions of a report of this sub-committee approved of by the Privy Council and which has been laid before the House and distributed only a few days ago. Among the questions which the sub-committee regard as preliminary are the following:—

(1.) Whether this appeal is such an appeal as is contemplated by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

(2.) Whether the grounds set forth in the petitions are such as may be the subject of appeal under either of the subsections above referred to.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

(3.) Whether the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in any way bears on the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the Union have been interfered with by the two Statutes of 1890, before referred to.

(4.) Whether subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act applies to Manitoba.

(5.) Whether Your Excellency in Council has power to grant such orders as are asked for by the petitioner assuming the material facts to be as stated in the petition.

(6.) Whether the Acts of Manitoba passed before the Session of 1890, conferred on the minority a "right or privilege with respect to education," within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, or established "a system of separate or dissentient schools," within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, and if so, whether the two Acts of 1890, complained of, affect "the right or privilege" of the minority in such a manner as to warrant the present appeal.

Other questions of a like character may be suggested at the hearing and it may be desirable that arguments should be heard upon such preliminary points before any hearing shall take place on the merits of the appeal.

Accordingly, the sub-committee recommend that a date be fixed at which the petitioners or their counsel may be heard with regard to the appeal, and that the Government of Manitoba be invited to be represented at the hearing. But, willing as they are to hear the parties, the Ministers do not wish to pledge themselves to do right to the petitioners. What though they should be obliged to yield to evidence, and to acknowledge the existence of the right of appeal, and that the Catholics' complaint is well grounded? Here is another sample from this marvellous report of the sub-committee:

The application comes before Your Excellency in a manner differing from applications which are ordinarily made, under the Constitution, to Your Excellency in Council. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of a political character or involving political action on the part of Your Excellency's advisers. It is to be dealt with by Your Excellency in Council, regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools and without the political action of any of the members of Your Excellency's Council being considered as pledged by the fact of the appeal being entertained and heard. If the contention of the petitioners be correct that such an appeal can be sustained, the inquiry will be rather of a judicial than of a political character. The sub-committee have so treated it in hearing counsel, and in permitting their only meeting to be open to the public.

Who would ever imagine that the same man has penned the report of March, 1891, and that of the sub-committee of December, 1892. For it is quite evident, for all that, the hon. the Minister of Justice is the author of both reports. But let us proceed with the narrative of facts. On the 28th December the Executive Council approved of the plan of the sub-committee, had it sanctioned by the Governor-General, and fixed the date as the 21st January for hearing the counsel of the Catholics and those representing the Mani-

toba Government, on the famous questions suggested by the committee. As the session was to be opened on the 26th January, it was becoming that the Ministers should feign to settle the much vexed question. But the Government found out that they were going at too fast a rate, or else they were not competent judges. Shuddering at the responsibility assumed and at the necessity of declaring whether they were to interfere and redress the grievances of Manitoba, the Government retreated again, and fabricated a new subterfuge to cast on other shoulders the responsibility which was their own. On the 22nd February the Government, without any apparent cause, practically annul their decision of the 29th December, refuse to hear the appeal of the Catholics, and decide :

That the important questions of law which were suggested in the report of the sub-committee to whom said petitions were referred, should be authoritatively settled before the appeal which has been asserted by said petitions be further proceeded with.

Accordingly, order is given to prepare a factum, in the preparation of which the counsel for the Catholics and that for the Government of Manitoba should be invited to concur. Why this new falling back? Why this new change of tactics? The Act 54-55 Vic., chap. 25, provides for this reference, some one will say. Exactly so. But the sub-committee were perfectly aware of the existence of this law; the Privy Council did not either ignore it in the month of December, when they decided that the whole Cabinet should judge whether an appeal shall lie or not. I say the reason is this: The Government wish to temporize, to wear out the patience of Catholics, and, like Pontius Pilate, to wash their hands of the political crime about to be perpetrated. How far we are now from the splendid, magnificent promises of 1891! and what a disappointment the speech of the hon. the Prime Minister, yesterday evening, has proved for the House and for the country! I for one, Mr. Speaker, whilst I did not venture to hope that an energetic stand would be taken by the Government on the matter, still I did not expect that restrictions, subterfuges and shifts would be resorted to. Mr. Speaker, from a thorough search and study of all the facts and documents relating to this vexed question, I have reached the following conclusions: 1. That, as far back as 1890, the Federal Government had come to the decision of not interfering to redress the grievances of the Catholic minority of Manitoba. 2. That the Government have prevailed upon that minority not to resort to the only efficacious means of redress within their reach—the disallowance. 3. That the Government have reached this result through a promise of interference in virtue of the clauses which were declared obviously to apply to the actual case, while such promise was but a deceit, the Government having never intended to fulfil it. 4. That the actual reference

is sheer mockery, a means of procrastination, and of throwing on the shoulders of others the responsibility which is their own. 5. That the Government are in justice, honour and law bound to give a hearing to the minority, to do right to them, and restore to them the rights they have been unjustly deprived of—that is to say, to restore to them the control of their schools, their portion of the Government school grant, and the exemption from contributing to the support of Protestant schools. 6. That the Government are perfectly resolved not to interfere, not to grant an appeal, not to do right to the minority—which is evidenced by the caution the Ministers have taken to reserve their political liberty of action, should it happen to be found out that the appeal exists. 7. Whatever may be the opinion of the judges of the Supreme Court, let them pronounce unanimously or not in favour of the rights of appeal. One sure thing is, that will not be any interference, because with the present combination which governs us, there is no possible understanding on that ground. There are, in the Cabinet, men who would feel happy to do right, and to leave their name in history connected with a great act of reparation. But there is no single Minister ready to give up his portfolio and to immolate himself on the altar of duty. Not, so, however, with the hostile element in the Ministry. These will resist to the bitter end, under the pretense that they are not able nor willing nor desirous of wounding the just susceptibilities of the Protestant majority. Mr Speaker, they calumniate, they slander the Protestant majority. There are to be found, truly enough, certain elements essentially hostile to whatever bears the name of French Catholic. These are fairly represented in the Cabinet. But it is none the less true that the great body of the Protestant people love to give British fair-play; and that they are rather inclined to lend their help to the weak against the great, to the oppressed against the oppressor. I want no further proof of this than in the utterances of a man who has never been suspected of favouritism to Catholics, the Hon. William McDougall. On the day following the decision of the Privy Council of England, he thus unbosomed himself, on the 1st August, 1892, to an editor of the "Free Press," Ottawa:

What the Federal Parliament or Government will do I have no idea. If the Catholics of Manitoba refuse to accept the Greenway Act, and still maintain their own schools, they ought not to be taxed for the support of public schools.

I think public opinion even in Manitoba would justify the Federal Parliament in exercising its constitutional power to grant "remedial laws" to the extent of relieving separate school supporters of taxation for other schools.

Did not the Liberal party, as a whole, under the leadership of that great patriot and distinguished statesman, Sir Oliver Mowat, uphold and defend in 1890 the Ontario separate

schools? And did they not secure a valuable triumph on the Conservative opposition led in the paths of fanaticism by Mr. Meredith? Is there then no other end in view for a party but power, honour, patronage and money? A political party like a nation, lives on principles of justice and honour. A policy of expedients is short lived and leads to abysses. In this school question, the Government have resorted to nothing but artifices, intrigues, subterfuges and false pretenses. Their diplomacy triumphs over justice, right and honour. But this triumph will be of short duration. When the last act of this comic play is over, two millions of Catholics scattered throughout the Dominion will have at last their eyes opened. When the last deceitful gleams of hope which is still held out to them will have vanished away, then their anger will be terrible. We shall then enter into a period of agitation, the issue of which it is impossible to forecast. The secret history of the last ten months, from April, 1890, to March, 1891, shall one day be written, once the supreme sacrifice is over. They who will have fallen a victim to the intrigues of the Government, shall feel the necessity of vindicating their conduct, and of casting on the right parties frightful responsibilities. Unhappily, it will be too late; an irreparable wrong will have been done. It is dangerous to let the idea implant itself in the minds of the people that the Constitution is but a deceit and a fraud that it safeguards no right, and that in spite of its most obvious provisions force excels right, that the majority may with impunity tyrannize over the minority, not only in its material interests, but also in the most sacred rights of their conscience. Confederation could not long outlive such blows. Listen to the utterances of one of the leading members of this House, one of the members of the Government, when, on the 21st October, 1892, speaking with the full authority of a Crown Minister, the Hon. Mr. Chapleau thus addressed the electors of the county of Hochelaga:

I cannot say what the Government will do in order to settle this question, which is more irritating than difficult, but this is what I can tell you: We desire to follow up those splendid traditions of conciliation and cordial understanding which have given to our country such a great measure of success, progress and tranquillity. Now, if the Government is not met in Parliament with that spirit of tolerance which the church of to-day recognizes in all forms of christianity; if the old provinces which created the Confederation refuse to be inspired from those healthy sources which gave them existence and stability; if, in the name of equal rights, equal justice and liberty of conscience are refused to those who claim it, then it would be better to discuss the terms of Union anew, for a great nation cannot be created with the heterogeneous elements of our provinces, unless the rights, privileges and immunities are guaranteed to the minorities, and without which they would never have accepted the part which constituted the Canadian Confederation.

Such is, Mr. Speaker, the fatal issue which
Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

the country is led to by the Government: such the catastrophe towards which we are inevitably driven, unless this House and the country, and the electors consulted on the matter, once for all make up their minds that, in this Confederation of ours, equal rights must be secured to the best elements of the two greatest nations which ever lived. By this means shall we succeed in establishing the great nationality we all dream of, but which the Government seek to destroy, through their unjust policy towards the Catholics.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, if it were not that this question is a very important one and one that excites so much interest in the country, I would hesitate to rise at this late hour of the night. However, I will reassure the hon. gentlemen present by saying, that I have only a very few remarks to offer. I have no intention of discussing the question from the constitutional point of view. I have listened with great interest to all the speeches which have been delivered on this question. I have been very much pleased that the question has been discussed in so calm and deliberate a manner. Now, Sir, I propose, for a very few moments, to consider the amendment offered by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). I have read this amendment very carefully, and it seems to me to be very plausibly drawn. I was going to say, that, in my opinion, it is almost an unfair amendment. I say an unfair amendment, because men who have diametrically opposite opinions on this question, can vote for it. It is not an amendment that expresses any opinion on the main question at issue, at all. Now, Sir, what does this amendment express? I find that it says:

This House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question.

That is the first sentence of the amendment—expressing disapproval of the action of the Government. Now, I ask myself, why shall we express disapproval? From the amendment itself I could hardly tell. But, Sir, I listened carefully to the speech of the hon. member for L'Islet, and I found that the first reason why he wished to express disapproval of the action of the Government was because the Government did not disallow the Manitoba School Act. I think all who listened to his remarks will agree with me in that: he thought the Government should at once, when this measure was passed, have disallowed it. He considers it a very bad measure. He considers it a measure which oppresses a great many of the people in Manitoba, his co-religionists. Well, Sir, that was one reason; and the second reason is, because the Government did not at once, after the measure was pronounced "intra vires," pass remedial legislation. That, I suppose, is his real grievance. I do not know that he

could object very much to the Government for not having disallowed the measure, but having allowed it to go to the courts. I do not think any of us could object to that. But after this measure has been passed upon by the highest court of the Empire, and pronounced within the competence of the Manitoba Legislature, then the hon. member for L'Islet thinks the Government should at once pass legislation to override this law and to restore separate schools in Manitoba. Now, Sir, I have thought a great deal about this amendment. I was a little surprised to find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) supporting it. On some questions of this kind I have voted with him in the past; I have no doubt I shall vote with him again; but when I saw him associated in this matter with the hon. member for L'Islet, it caused me to hesitate and ask myself the reason of this association. Well, Sir, I could come to only one conclusion, when I saw the hon. member for North Simcoe, who, I may say, had been denounced by those with whom he will now vote, supporting an amendment moved by the hon. member for L'Islet, an amendment very indefinite, an amendment which he himself said he wished was stronger. I was a little surprised, and it caused me to look at this amendment more carefully. I have thought of it a good deal, as I have said; I have listened carefully to the speeches, and I have asked myself: Can I support this amendment? Well, Sir, the views of my constituents are, I suppose known to a good many members of this House. Rightly or wrongly—they think, rightly—they hold very strong views on what are known as equal rights. Mine is the only constituency in Ontario that sends an equal righter to the Ontario Legislature. Now, Sir, if I voted in a certain way on questions of this kind, I know that I should not represent my constituents properly. This is one of the questions on which I am bound to represent them properly. But, in thinking this matter over, I have asked myself: Can I support this amendment? Well, Sir, if the amendment had been moved in some other connection, if it had been moved, perhaps, by the hon. member for North Simcoe himself, and supported by him in the speech he delivered to-day, then I might have hesitated still more; but when the amendment has been moved, as it has been, by the hon. member for L'Islet, and when he tells us distinctly in his speech, that his reason for moving this amendment, expressing disapproval of the Government, is, first, because the Government did not disallow this School Act, and, secondly, because they did not pass remedial legislation, I have no hesitation whatever in voting against it. And, Sir, I am satisfied that, in doing this, I am representing my constituents properly and as they would wish me to represent them. Sir, what is the object of this amendment? I think it

has only one object in view. I do not think the object of this amendment is to procure justice, as the hon. member for L'Islet would call it, for the minority in Manitoba. Why, Sir, I know that that is not the object of the hon. member for North Simcoe. What is the object, then, when we find the amendment supported by men of such opposite views? It is not for me to judge of a man's motives; still, sometimes we cannot help doing this; and it does look to me as if in this case there is one object, and one only, that is, to embarrass the Government. Now, Sir, there are questions on which I might not support the Government; but, as I have stated, I have very good reasons in this case for doing so. Now, I find that the amendment says, that we must disapprove of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question. What has been the action of the Government on the question? First, with reference to disallowance, did they disallow this Act? I suppose, if they had disallowed it, the hon. member for L'Islet would not have moved this amendment, but the hon. member for North Simcoe might have done so. But, Sir, did they disallow this Act? We heard the plain and clear statement made by the hon. First Minister last night on this question, that not only did they not disallow this Act, but they had no intention at any time of disallowing it. The idea of disallowance was not entertained for a moment. Sir, in that respect, I am perfectly satisfied with their conduct, and, instead of blaming them or disapproving of their conduct, I heartily approve of it. Then, with reference to remedial legislation, what have they done? What are they condemned for doing? I find that they are condemned for:

Assuming to be possessed of judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

Well, I do not know that I exactly understand that long sentence. I suppose it would take a pretty good lawyer to tell us exactly what it means. I do not pretend to know what it means; but, after all, it does not frighten me at all. I am not frightened very much at the Government having assumed in this matter to be possessed of judicial functions. I am not frightened because a committee of the Privy Council heard petitions which were sent in by the minority in Manitoba on this question. Considering these petitions, considering the arguments offered why these petitions should be considered and why relief should be given, I am not at all alarmed because they did this, and because they did more, and, after considering this matter, decided to hand over this question to the Supreme Court for its opinion. Sir, I think they did perfectly right. For myself I am quite satisfied with what they have done; and if the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is not satisfied, I do not

think it is because the Government assumed judicial functions. In fact, I think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said he would not have blamed them so very much for assuming judicial functions, if their policy had been different, but what he did blame them for was their policy. I do not think the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) would have blamed them for assuming judicial functions, if their policy had been different. If their policy had been what he desired it to be, we would have heard nothing about their assuming judicial functions from him. If the Government had assumed judicial functions, and, after receiving and considering the petitions had decided that relief should be granted, and had recommended Parliament to pass an Act granting relief, we would not have had this amendment from the hon. member for L'Islet at all. On the other hand, if the Government had assumed judicial functions, in every sense of the word, and, after considering the petitions, had said there is no necessity for relief at all, the hon. member for North Simcoe would not vote for the amendment now before us. So that, after all, when these hon. gentlemen blame the Government for assuming judicial functions, they are only looking for something to blame the Government for on this question. The amendment says at the end :

Which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

I am not alarmed at that at all. I do not think the Government, if they wanted to get away from their responsibility, could do so. It is impossible for them to escape it, and no one knows that better than they. They cannot help being responsible to the members of this House for their conduct, and they are responsible further to the people for their conduct. In what way can they escape that responsibility? It would be no excuse, if they were doing something wrong, which this Parliament and the country disapproved of, for them to say, we were acting in a judicial capacity. I know that excuse would not satisfy my constituents, and I am sure it would not satisfy any other portion of the people. I do not believe that the Government have any intention of taking refuge in any such manner. Now, what is my attitude on this question? I am satisfied that the action of the Government was fair; but I am bound to say that if the Government should propose remedial legislation, I shall oppose them on that question, not only because my constituents feel that way, but because I feel that way myself. I am not going to argue that question, but think it is sufficient that I should state my position. I have no religious bigotry. As you all know I am a Protestant, but when I meet a man I never ask him whether he is a Catholic or a Protestant. That never enters my mind at all. If he is a gentleman, I am glad to meet him and associate with him. I have no religious bigotry, but at the same time I want to say that, while we have separate schools in On-

Mr. CRAIG.

tario, I know very little about them, and I think we would be just as well without them. I am not going to raise any cry about separate schools, but that is my feeling on that question, and I will tell you why. In the town where I live, the population of which is about 5,000, we have no separate schools. My children go to school with the other school children. Catholic and Protestant children go to the same school, I know of no difference, my children know of none, and you cannot tell the Catholics from the Protestants. I think that is a good thing, and I wish I could persuade my Catholic fellow-citizens in this country to agree with me. It is a good thing for us to have our boys and girls to grow up together in the one school. I do not suppose I can persuade my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens to adopt my view, but I believe they will in time see its advantage. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) said the public schools were not really public, but were Protestant schools. In that respect, I take issue with him entirely. I know that some people think there is not enough religion in our public schools.

Mr. DEVLIN. When I said the public schools were Protestant schools I referred to Manitoba.

Mr. CRAIG. I accept the correction. I am not acquainted with the schools there, and am speaking of Ontario just now, and, so far as the Ontario public schools are concerned, they are not Protestant schools in that sense of the word that any religion is taught in them at all. They are schools for secular education, I may say, entirely. We hear a good deal about the minority being oppressed. If the public schools in Manitoba are Protestant schools, I hope they will change that, but I am sure they are not.

Mr. TARTE. They are.

Mr. CRAIG. I hardly think they are.

Mr. TARTE. They are.

Mr. CRAIG. If they are, they ought to be secular schools.

Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. That is my idea of secular education. I hold that the state owes a secular education to all the children in the state, under our Constitution, but I hold, at the same time, that the state does not owe a religious education. Let that be given at home. We hear some parents talk about wanting their children to have religious education in the schools and they never get any at home. Let that education be given at church or at home. I may refer here to a matter which no doubt you are all acquainted with, and that is the question of separate schools in the United States. There are no separate schools there, but there has been a great agitation on that question. There are parochial schools there supported by the Catholic people themselves. Now, there has been a great deal of feeling on that question, just as much

as in this country, yet what does the Pope say concerning it. He says that where Catholics can sustain a good parochial school, let their children go there; but where they cannot, let the children go to the public schools, and he says let no parent be deprived of the sacraments or condemned in any way because their children go to the public schools. I agree with the Pope in this respect, and think that is good sound doctrine. I say the state owes a secular education, but not religious education. That is my view, and I know all will not agree with me on that point. I take the ground that if a state gives a secular education, of which the Catholics as well as Protestants take advantage, the minority are not oppressed at all. I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer. I think I have made myself clearly understood, and will only add this, that while it may be a dream in my mind, I look forward to the time when all the children will go to school together, when this religious bigotry shall have disappeared from our midst, and we shall recognize each other, not as Catholics or Protestants, but as citizens of one country.

Mr. AMYOT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the Order for the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go into Committee of Supply and the motion of Mr. Tarte in amendment thereto have precedence after questions to be put by members at the next sitting of this House this day.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ended 31st December, 1892.—(Mr. Daly.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 82) for the relief of Martha Ballantyne—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Gibson.)

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved that the first and second reports of the Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing be concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The first report, I think, involves a question of money matters.

Mr. BERGIN. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask my hon. friend to let that stand that it may be considered in connection with the Estimates.

Mr. BERGIN. I would ask leave to strike out of my motion the reference to the first report. I move that the second report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That as the time for presenting reports from Committees on Private Bills expires to-morrow, the same be extended until Thursday, the 23rd day of March inst.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the First Minister to what seems to me a very vicious practice, that is, that while we have regular rules of the House with regard to private legislation these rules are constantly violated. The frequency of the violation of these rules would indicate that perhaps the rules ought to be revised. I do not intend during this session to offer objection to the practice; but I would suggest that next session we ought to adopt other rules for private legislation and adhere to them more regularly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is quite evident that there is no utility in the rule if we persistently violate it, and I think we ought to relax somewhat the stringency of the rule and then stand by it.

Motion agreed to.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 92) to repeal certain sections of the Merchant Shipping Act relating to load-lines, so far as they affect ships registered in Canada. He said: I think the best explanation I can give will be to read the Bill that I propose to introduce. It says:

WHEREAS by section five hundred and forty-seven of the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom known as The Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, it is enacted that the legislative authority of any British possession shall have power by any Act or ordinance confirmed by Her Majesty in Council to repeal, wholly or in part, any provisions of the said Act relating to ships registered in such possession; and whereas by the Act of the said Parliament known as The Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—which, as is provided by section two thereof, is to be construed as one with The Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, and the Acts amending the same—certain provisions are made in sections twenty-six, twenty-seven and twenty-eight thereof with respect to the marking of load-lines upon British ships; and whereas by sections one and two of the Act of the said Parliament known as The Merchant Shipping Act, 1890, the provisions of the said sections twenty-six and twenty-seven are amended

in certain particulars: and whereas it is not desirable that the said sections twenty-six and twenty-seven, as so amended, or the regulations which have been or may be made by the Board of Trade thereunder, or the provisions of the said section twenty-eight, should apply to ships registered in Canada.

For these reasons the Bill is to repeal these sections, subject to the approval of Her Majesty, of course.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—PRECEDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to ask the permission of the House—which I admit must be unanimous—to move now the motion of which notice has been given, namely:

That Government Orders have precedence over all other business on Thursdays, including Thursday next, after Questions put by Members.

It looks to taking to-morrow and subsequent Thursdays as days for Government business. In the ordinary course, if we had adhered to the Orders of the Day, the Government notice of motion to this effect would not be reached to-day; therefore I ask the consent of the House to take it out of its usual course on the Order Paper and to make the motion now, for the reason that if we waited till it came up to-morrow it would create some confusion, as hon. members would like to know beforehand, perhaps, whether to-morrow will be taken by the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to this motion, but I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that, last week, the days devoted to private business were taken by the Government, and, this week again, both those days are taken from us. There are sixty-three notices of motion on the Order Paper, and twenty-one public Bills and orders, a large amount of business, it strikes me, and the Government are rather exacting in asking for Thursday of this week. I will suggest to the First Minister that it would only be fair to allow private members to take to-morrow, and then the Government might take Thursdays after this week.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to have to differ with my hon. friend. I agree with the hon. the First Minister in his proposition, but I am sure that the Government will give my hon. friend an opportunity to move those motions which stand in his name. I have not heard any complaints from other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, although I have taken special pains to ascertain the sense of the House on this side. I am sure the Government will readily agree to endeavour to give my hon. friend the opportunity he desires.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will still have every Wednesday of the session for private members, after dinner.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will still have Monday.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mondays are only available for notices of motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think no private member can hope to pass very much legislation at this period of the session. It may be necessary, perhaps, for some of them to explain their views upon certain public questions. I think the House has every desire now, on both sides, for a conclusion of the proceedings at a reasonably early date, and would favour the forwarding of public business even to the exclusion of business of a private character, which, in the opinion of many hon. gentlemen, no doubt, is important. I hope no hon. member will place any obstacle in the way of the advancement of public business.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not wish to place any obstacle; but the Government are taking Thursdays this session two weeks earlier than usual.

Mr. FOSTER. We are fully two weeks ahead this year.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is the office of postmaster in St. Thomas vacant? Has a petition been received by the Government asking that the appointment be made in said office, and does such petition ask that no appointment to such office shall be made which involves the opening of the electoral district of East Elgin?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To both the questions, the answer is, yes.

MAIL SERVICE ON THE CORNWALLIS VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Has the mail service been begun on the Cornwallis Valley Branch Railway? Who are employed to carry the mails between the railway stations and the respective post offices, and what is the remuneration in each case? Were public tenders invited in each case? Have contracts been made, and for what length of time? If public tenders were not invited, was any one authorized to negotiate with the parties employed? If so, who?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. Yes. 2. Between Lower Canard, Canard, Church Street, Port Williams, and the railway station, J. L. Bishop is contractor. Rate of pay, \$225 per annum. Between Saxony Street and Canard Siding, Charles Harris is contractor. Rate of pay, \$40 per annum. Between Canuing and railway station, J. B. Hennigar, is contractor. Rate of pay, \$75. Between Kingsport and railway station, A. G. McDonald is contractor. Rate of pay, \$60 per annum. Between Sheffield Mills and railway station, William Harris is contractor. Rate of pay, \$60 per annum. Between

Centreville and railway station. R. S. Thorpe is contractor. Rate of pay, \$50 per annum. 3. No. 4. Contractors have not been made. In each case the service is performed under temporary agreement. 4. Yes, the Post Office Inspector.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BANK OF MONTREAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to direct the attention of the Finance Minister to a return which was laid on the Table yesterday, regarding papers and correspondence with the Bank of Montreal and the financial agents. Apparently one paper has been omitted from them. I presume from a statement made in the House by the Finance Minister, that a formal memorandum of some kind was exchanged with the Bank of Montreal, touching the amount and extent of their advances. He will recollect I called attention to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman lay that paper on the Table, if there is one?

Mr. FOSTER. I would remind my hon. friend that that is not the subject of a memorandum; it was simply a verbal understanding between the bank and myself, as it was also in reference to the old agents, although the old agents, in answering my letter, mentioned that they had offered to put a million pounds at the credit of the Government. But I did not think it was best to have it form part of a memorandum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Don't you think it ought to be in writing, so important an arrangement as that?

JUDGESHIP OF PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the Premier whether he is in a position to state if the vacancy in the judgeship of Prince county has been filled?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The appointment has not gone through, but I think within the next two days it will be made, in view of the urgency of judicial business.

SUPPLY—SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. Tarte in amendment thereto.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, at this advanced stage of the debate, it is not to be expected that much that is new can be said. I will try, however, to follow the principal features in the speeches and the proposals

which have been made, and to set forth my humble way of thinking. I will read the following motion:—

Be it resolved, that the Government has failed in its duty; first, in not disallowing the statute passed by the Legislature of Manitoba abolishing French as one of the official languages; second, in not disallowing the statute of the same province abolishing the separate schools in the province of Manitoba; third, in not granting remedial laws, as it was in duty bound to do, immediately after the final decision of the courts declaring *intra vires* the said Manitoba statute abolishing the said separate schools.

You, Mr. Speaker, understand both the English and French languages. You have heard the elaborate speech or rather speeches of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). You have heard the hon. member affirm high principles, you have heard him relate facts and history, and the natural conclusion of his speech would have been, you will admit, with me, the motion I have read. His speech should have concluded by blaming the Government for not having disallowed the Bill of the Manitoba Legislature which abolished the French language. That should have been one of the features of his motion. Then his motion should have blamed the Government for not having disallowed the two Acts passed by the Manitoba Legislature abolishing the separate schools, and his motion should also have blamed the Government for not having immediately come to the rescue of the separate schools of Manitoba. That was the motion we expected, that was the child promised by the hon. gentleman. That was the dear, white little child, like an angel that was to come to lead the people. At the same time the motion should have expressed the aim of the new party which the hon. gentleman leads, of that new and strong party destined to sweep over the country and chase away fanaticism and bigotry and cause peace and liberty to reign over all. But instead of that motion, we find the following:—

This House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and in assuming to be possessed of judicial functions, conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law, and, if now acquiesced in, would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

There has been a substitution; this is not the child that was promised. The hon. gentleman gave a description of his child, including its colour, but when he laid it on the Table of the House we found it was not a white little angel, but a little monster, no more and no less from his point of view. Where is the cause of the substitution to be found, and who is the father of the child? We must find him. That little child was to come to take a large inheritance, to govern this great country; but the child brought forward to occupy this inheritance is a false child. We must find the father—how can we find him? When I heard the motion read, I said to myself: Have I not already seen something possessing the same shape, having a family resemblance?

Then the thought struck me that some hon. gentleman had been kind enough to send me a book or a pamphlet entitled the "Canadian Magazine," a very nice book and very well written, which contained an article written by Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., M.P., and I thought that perhaps I might find some features of resemblance in that article to the present motion, and I read the article again. On the first page I found these words :

For here we have an Act of the Provincial Legislature which has been passed with the approval of a great majority of the people interested—the inhabitants of Manitoba—after it had run the gauntlet of the law courts of the Dominion, and of the highest legal tribunal of the Empire, assailed by a procedure unknown to the law, and before unheard of.

Then I looked at the motion, and I found the words, "wholly unknown to the law." These were the very same terms, the very same words. There was the beginning of paternity I thought. Later on, I found this sentence :

To examine by what authority a new and hitherto unknown legal tribunal has unexpectedly manifested itself—and to consider with all the gravity and earnestness that such an inquiry demands, whether the role that the Privy Council is now engaged in playing is permitted by the Manitoba constitution, the British North America Act, or by any other law known to the British constitutional system.

Here were the words, "unknown legal tribunal." There was another feature of resemblance. Then, at page 8, I found these sentences :

These Acts, if unwise and harsh, were at least within the lines of the constitution. But the attack now launched against her exclusive right to manage her educational system, is fraught with perilous consequences to the Dominion.

The motion read : "Would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility." There was the same idea embodied in the article as appeared in the motion, and an assumption that the initiative was to be taken by the Government. Again, I read :

For the initial steps that the Government at Ottawa have taken to accomplish that end, it should be held to strict account, or Parliament will lamentably fail in its duty; and the pretense that the Cabinet acts as a judicial tribunal and not as political advisers of the Crown, should meet with the contempt and condemnation it invites at the hands of the representatives of the people.

In the motion, I found the words :

And in assuming to be possessed of judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers of the Crown.

When the features are alike and there is a general resemblance we arrive at a conclusion as to the parentage; and, although we were not present in the chamber where the motion was written, we can discern that the ideas of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) are embodied in the motion, and that they are entirely opposed to the views of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). The hon. member for L'Islet told the Government: You have not done enough for the separate
Mr. Amyot.

schools, you should do more to aid them. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said to the Government: You have no right to give the slightest aid to the schools. What does the motion say? It declares that the Government are blamable because they had no right to assume judicial functions, in regard to the school question. Judging by the speech of the hon. member for L'Islet, is he to be presumed to be the father?

Mr. TARTE. I am the father.

Mr. AMYOT. My hon. friend claims the paternity of that little monster and I will tell him why the presumption is against his pretension. If my hon. friend believes that by interrupting he will disturb me he is quite mistaken. I intend to say what I have to say and the more he interrupts me the more I will be severe.

Mr. BRODEUR. You are looking for the paternity of the child.

Mr. AMYOT. I am searching out the paternity of that little monster. I say it is entirely in conformity with the ideas contained in the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and it is essentially opposed to the idea of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). That hon. gentleman said in his speech that he wanted the Government to come to the rescue of the separate schools, but his motion tells the Government that they should not interfere any further, that they should come to a stop in the matter at once. Those were the very views expressed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is no fault of mine that the motion should be drawn in its present form. If the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has not written it, has not prepared it for the Table of the House, he has, at all events, written and prepared it in the article which he wrote during the present month, and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has evidently fed himself upon that book, and that is where the alliance comes in between the two. Now, what is the object of that motion? I picture the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the great city of Toronto, surrounded by Orangemen let us say, and receiving their acclamations for his course in this matter. He says to them, pointing to this motion: Look, gentlemen, at that new child brought up under my care. If I was not the father of it, I was, at least, the godfather, and look how I protected the rights of the majority in Manitoba. Look how I prevented that infernal Government from coming to the rescue of the Catholics and giving them protection. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) will come down to Lower Canada and will take another course and say, wrapped up in Mr. Tarte's speech: You owe me gratitude because I supported separate schools. That is very skilful, but would it not be more honourable and would it not be better

for the cause advocated by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), that he had brought down a motion stating really what he wants, and carrying with it responsibility on the part of every one who would vote for it? Why did he not state in his motion that it was the duty of the Government to come to the rescue of the separate schools in Manitoba, and, then, if the Government were overthrown, they would have been bound to act according to the motion. But as the motion stands now it carries no responsibility with it. On the contrary, if the present Government were overthrown and a new Government, led by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), or by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), came into power, they would say: We cannot do anything in this matter, because our motion said that we could not do anything. My hon. friend from L'Islet poses before the country as a protector of the Manitoba separate schools, but his very motion aims to prevent the Government doing anything in favour of the schools. And how about there being no reference at all to the French language? It entirely disappears from the motion. Who is the most opposed to the French language in this House, if not the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who has devoted his talents and energy in opposing the French language, and in persuading the population of Ontario and Manitoba that if French were spoken in Canada it would result in doing away with the British Crown on the continent of North America? It is rather a remarkable coincidence when we find the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) agreeing on this motion, that all reference to the French language is omitted. My hon. friend from L'Islet, with his ability and energy, which I admit, has taken the best possible opportunity to bring this matter before the House. He has spoken in favour of the language of that bishop which was to be compared very favourably with the language of a bishop of a Protestant religion, an allusion which I did not like. He has taken charge of the French language in this House, but when the time comes to practically bring the question before the House, the words "French language" disappear from his motion, and so the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) jumps up and supports the motion because there is no reference to the French language in it. That game is too plain and it can deceive nobody. Generally, when a member speaks in the House in favour of a proposition, he supports it by a motion in the same sense, but the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has not done that. Since the beginning of my political career, I have never seen a member advancing some proposition in his speech, and by his motion expressing a contrary view and sacrificing the interests he advocated. I say to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that I am sur-

prised that a man of his talents and spirit of enterprise should shield his motion behind a speech of the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). This attempt to catch votes by means of subterfuge will deceive neither the House nor the country. With the forbearance of the House, I shall now say a few words in reference to the veto. I ask myself: Why was not the law disallowed? Every one of the friends of the French language and of the French schools, would at first sight have been glad if the Manitoba School Law had been disallowed at once. But, Mr. Speaker, we all want to form a great nation on this continent. Some excited heads or hearts want annexation, some Imperial federation, but the mass of the calm-headed people, Liberals and Conservatives, led by the real and true chief of the Opposition, who I see before me, as well as those led by the Premier of this country, all desire to form one great people, composed of divers elements it is true, but having all the same aim and wishing all the same common prosperity and common liberty. Under these circumstances, was it better to disallow the Manitoba School Act, or to let it be declared unconstitutional by the courts? To disallow a law is to go against the principle of autonomy. We are all in favour of autonomy. Some years ago we members from the province of Quebec were glad that the principle of autonomy was applied to the question of the Jesuits' estates. We were glad to be protected by that rampart. We are free and masters in our province, as the people of all the other provinces are. That is the principle of autonomy. It is true, in matters of education, we push the principle of autonomy further than we do in most other cases. The principle of autonomy in matters of education means the liberty of each father of a family to bring up his children in the way he pleases, without the interference of the state, and it is only with his consent that you may aggregate the children together under the roof of a school house. But shall we for a single exception risk the whole system of autonomy? Now, every one was of the opinion that the law was clearly unconstitutional, and I will in a moment explain why. Everybody was sure that the law would be declared unconstitutional; the Government was sure; the Opposition was sure; we, the people, were all sure that the law would be declared unconstitutional. Was it not better to have a final decision, not due to the passion of party, nor to partisan influence or interest, but by the highest tribunal of the Empire, than to have disallowance by a Government? I think it was. That new aggregation of the people known as Confederation, I will compare to a boat, from which we have been thrown overboard suddenly, in spite of the arrangements. Is it better for us, the minority, to swim against the stream, or to land and wait our chance of going back in the boat? I think it is safer to wait on the

land, because a time will come when the people in the boat will want the people on shore to help them, and then peace will come again. Of course, we shall suffer in the meantime; but the Catholic church is in the habit of suffering. She was not born in the midst of flowers. She has been fighting her way with calm, without passion, during the centuries, and she is not afraid of the few enemies that live to-day and that will pass on to-morrow. The truth will remain, and the people will continue to worship their God in the way they please. They will not feel themselves obliged to worship their God in the way that pleases the hon. member for North Simcoe. Mr. Speaker, the law was not disallowed, and it was, I may say, the unanimous consent of the population. I will take the liberty of quoting the words written on the 4th instant, by an hon. Senator from Manitoba, the Hon. Mr. Bernier, in regard to the veto:

Because, after all, we may ask you all, where were you for the three years after the fight began? Where were those who are indicated to you to-day as our saviours? We asked for the disallowance in 1890. Where are the petitions supporting our demand? Who presented them?

He is perfectly right. Who has ever presented a petition from the inhabitants to the Government asking for a veto? Then, he says:

Is there a party that thought itself strong enough to obtain or to take the responsibility for that disallowance when the question could be constitutionally decided? The law in virtue of which our case is going to be submitted to the Supreme Court is the offspring of a suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Blake, one of the respected leaders of the Liberal party. That law was passed with the approbation of the whole House, and precisely in view of the question of the Manitoba schools. And to-day when this accusation of treason is thrown at us, simply because we do not cross to the Opposition benches, are we not allowed to ask what we could expect from that move? What promises have we? What guarantees are given us that our case would be settled according to our views, if the men in power to-day were forced to hand over to some others the reins of the Government? We are still to hear, on that point, any positive declaration from the Opposition through its chiefs.

Mr. Speaker, the Government, like the rest of the country, expected that the courts would declare the law unconstitutional. In Manitoba—I will not attribute it to any cause, everybody may judge for himself—the court was divided; but here in Ottawa, far from the scene where passions were raging, the court unanimously held that the law was unconstitutional. The case went to the Privy Council. I will take the liberty of quoting one or two sentences of the honourable Lords of the Privy Council. I will not repeat the law, as it has been read over and over again. The question was whether by law or by practice at the time of the union the Manitobans had the right to separate schools. Their Lordships declared first that by law they had none. That is true, I believe. Then they asked themselves:

Mr. AMYOT.

What was the state of things when Manitoba was admitted into the union? On this point there is no dispute. The practice which prevailed in Manitoba before the union is also a matter on which all parties are agreed.

That is to say, Mr. Speaker, that the parties before the Privy Council, both the plaintiffs and the defendants, admitted the state of things so far as the practice was concerned, and what was that state of things?

The statement on the subject by Archbishop Taché, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of St. Boniface, who has given evidence in Barrett's case, has been accepted as accurate and complete. "There existed," he says, "in the territory now constituting the province of Manitoba, a number of effective schools for children. These schools were denominational schools, some of them being regulated and controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and others by various Protestant denominations."

The means necessary for the support of the Roman Catholic schools were supplied to some extent by school fees paid by some of the parents of the children who attend the schools, and the rest was paid out of the funds of the church, contributed by its members.

During the period referred to, Roman Catholics had no interest in or control over the schools of the Protestant denominations, and the members of the Protestant denominations had no interest in or control over the schools of the Roman Catholics.

There were no public schools in the sense of State schools.

The members of the Roman Catholic Church supported the schools of their own church for the benefit of Roman Catholic children, and were not under obligation to, and did not contribute to the support of any other schools.

Under those circumstances, their Lordships said:

Such being the main provisions of the Public Schools Act, 1890, their Lordships have to determine whether that Act prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the Union.

So that their Lordships declared that, by practice, denominational schools existed, the Catholic schools being maintained by Catholics and the non-Catholic schools by Protestants. That was the state of things existing, "de facto," in 1870, and that it is admitted by their Lordships. But then, their Lordships, after admitting this, declared that the Manitoba Government had the right to take away the school-houses, the furniture, the books, the maps and everything from the Catholic denominational schools and transfer them over, not only to the public schools, but to schools where the children will be taught to despise the Catholic church. They have decided that the by-laws under which that is done are not contrary to the practice. Have we not a right to be astounded and to say that it must have been a cloudy and a foggy day in the great city of London when their Lordships came to that decision? Who could have foreseen such a decision? Can we hold the Government responsible for it? Can we say to the Government: You should have foreseen that the Privy Council, after admitting that the practice gave us denomi-

national schools, would take them away from us. Nobody could have foreseen such a judgment, and I, for one, will not hold the Government responsible. I will say, however, that the highest tribunal of the Empire has pronounced, and I accept their judgment as the law and will abide by it. It has been decided, according to my views, against common sense, but it has been decided, and I do submit. Before leaving that question, it will be as well to draw the attention of this House to another part of the judgment, which is most important for the future, because, if we accept one part we must accept the other. We must take the judgment as a whole. The court of the Privy Council is the infallible court. In other countries there are kings who are infallible, and some religious men who are infallible, but in our country, the highest court of justice is infallible. It must be looked upon as such. Well, then, what do they go on to say :

Notwithstanding the Public Schools Act, 1890, Roman Catholics and members of every other religious body in Manitoba are free to establish schools throughout the province: they are free to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary subscriptions: they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets, without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school. No special advantage other than the advantage of a free education in schools conducted under public management is held out to those who do attend.

I draw the attention of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whom I regret not to see in his seat, to that. He fights very hard against Roman Catholic schools, but there is the judgment of the highest tribunal of the Empire which says we are at liberty to maintain them as long as and in the way we please, and that we will never be compelled to send our children to other schools than those we choose. So that it remains a matter of money, purely and simply, and we may be sure of one thing, that, wherever a public school will not be given to us, we will have sufficient heart to make sacrifices and send our children elsewhere. The hon. gentleman will not be able, in spite of his efforts, to compel us to send our children to schools where they will be taught to despise and abandon the religion of their parents. We are in a free country, and while great advantages are taken from us, and great sacrifices imposed upon us, while we are forced to subscribe to schools, not common schools, but schools against our religion, we will not sacrifice the interests we have at heart and of which we have been given charge by Divine Providence. Now, in view of that decision of the Privy Council, what is the actual question actually at issue? The sub-committee of the Government, after having heard the interested parties, found themselves in presence of legal difficulties. It is true that, last night, those difficulties were finally judged by the hon. member for Berthier, who laughed at them, and said

they were not difficulties at all, but that the Government are embarrassed for nothing and should know the law better. I am not of his opinion, in spite of the respect I have for his legal attainments. The Government had doubts as to remedial legislation, but the godfather of the resolution is not troubled with doubt. He declares that the Government have no right to interfere. The seconder of the resolution pretends that the Government have such clear rights that they ought not to doubt for a moment. At all events the Government have proposed to refer to a tribunal the question of their right to interfere in any way, and to what extent. Are the Government wise in taking that course? In 1890 Mr. Blake made a magnificent speech, one of those speeches which are the admiration of England to-day, and he suggested that the question should be referred to a judicial tribunal. Sir John Macdonald accepted it, and the two Houses concurred, and, to-day, the Government says: We will apply that mode that has been advocated in advance by the best heads of the country. As you know, before the Privy Council only one question was discussed, the question of practice. The question was: Did the separate schools exist by practice before 1870? I will not take up the time of the House by a long discussion, but I will take the admissions of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself. In the article published over his name, on the first page, he says :

It will be remembered that the legality or constitutionality of the Act was impugned on this ground, that although, generally speaking, the Legislature of the province is endowed with power "exclusively" to "make laws in relation to education," it had violated the limitation imposed on its general authority in that by the Public School Act the right or privileges with respect to denominational schools which the Roman Catholics "had by practice" (it was not contended that any class of persons have any right or privilege "by law") in the province at the time of the union, had been prejudicially affected.

He puts between parentheses this, and I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to it. "(It was not contended that any class of persons had any right or privilege 'by law'.)" So the question of the effect of the Confederation Act was not brought before the Privy Council at all. In another place, page 5, the hon. gentleman says :

So far it will be observed, the only law under which redress was thought of, or the authority of which was invoked, was the Manitoba Act.

So there remained the question of the general Confederation Act. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Confederation Act applies to Manitoba. You find in the beginning of the Manitoba Act of 1870, as quoted, I think, by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), a clause which specially says that the Confederation Act shall apply to Manitoba, except when otherwise provided. If you look at the preamble of the Confederation Act what do you find :

Whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the Union of other parts of British North America.

So this Confederation Act applies not only to Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but it applies to every part of British North America which might thereafter become part of the Union. Then, starting from that principle, you take section 93 and subsection 3, and apply it to Manitoba, and you say: Whereas Manitoba, since its entry into Confederation, has passed laws establishing denominational schools, these laws now existing under the constitution cannot be done away with, without the consent of the minority there. Well, that is the question to be discussed: I know that if I were before a tribunal, opposed by men of the talents of those who antagonize my views, it would be hard for me, perhaps, to cause my ideas to prevail. But I contend still that the right exists. That is to be decided before the court. But suppose the Government should act upon the principle, and the courts should say later on: You were wrong, that clause does not apply; the special clause in the Manitoba Act does away with the reference to other provinces in the Confederation Act. In what position should we be then? It is wise, it is manly, it is far-seeing, to go before the tribunal at the start. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on the one hand, says: You should not go, and the hon. member for L'Islet, on the other hand, says: You should act immediately. Both are wrong, I think. The Government does the only thing possible under the circumstances, and follows the idea suggested by Mr. Blake, and seconded in the following year by Sir John Macdonald. But the hon. member for North Simcoe, who is in sympathy with the motion, contends that this action does away with ministerial responsibility. I think that there again he is wrong. If we will look at the discussion which took place when the Hon. Mr. Blake introduced his resolution on the 29th of April, 1890, he will see that Sir John Macdonald contended that ministerial responsibility still continued. Sir John said:

The Executive is not relieved from any responsibility because of my answer being given by the tribunal. If the Executive were to be relieved from any such responsibility, I should consider that a fatal blot in the proposition of my hon. friend. I believe in responsible government. I believe in the responsibility of the Executive. But the answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the Government. The Government may dissent from that decision, and it may be their duty to do so if they differ from the conclusion to which the court has come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for North Simcoe is not right in stating that this action takes away ministerial responsibility. But I will speak of that more fully in a moment. I am in favour of the course of the Government for another reason. It may surprise my hon. friends, but I believe in that reason, and I am not afraid

Mr. AMYOT.

to state it. It will give time: the Government will have more time to decide. Time is a great master; we often have laughed at the word "to-morrow," but there is a great deal of wisdom in "to-morrow." Those whose eagerness carries them through an affair in a rush, frequently end head first in the sand. Those who look before them and take time to consider are wiser, and generally reach a better conclusion. I believe, in these questions of religion and language which are apt to provoke fanaticism, passion and excitement, it is good to go slowly. We will see in a moment what might be gained by taking time. This does not minimize the other reasons I have for approving the Government's policy. I would blame the Government if they were going at once to the rescue of the schools without knowing whether or not they have a right to do so. Which of us, having a case to conduct before the courts, would refuse the hon. member for North Simcoe as our counsel or advocate? None. But he is of opinion that the Government have no right to appeal to the court, and if they were to accept that view, the Government could not act at all. The hon. member for North Simcoe gives us strong reasons in support of his view. But others do not share his opinion. A special Act has been passed based on special resolutions adopted by the whole House, providing for the very course the Government has taken. More than that, and in view of that, a special law has been passed based upon those special resolutions adopted by the whole House, providing for the very course the Government has adopted. If the Government did not adopt that course, I would say to them: You are wrong; I would blame them. The hon. member for North Simcoe opposes this course. He is afraid that, after all, something might come from it. I would like to speak to him, but he is not here. He was here at the beginning of my speech, but I suppose my language does not please him. I hope he will read it in the "Hansard." He says: Why impose separate schools upon Manitoba in spite of the people of that province? Well, Mr. Speaker, if a man buys a house and moves into it, owing the money for it, and the creditor comes to him and says, Will you kindly pay me, and he answers: Why pay you when I am so well settled in my house? Why impose separate schools? That is not the question. Why take away from the minority of Manitoba the schools which they have enjoyed, and which have been pledged to them? Is there anything like honour in the majority of Manitoba? Does that sentiment exist there? I am sure it does, and it would prevail were it not disturbed by the inflammatory speeches of the hon. member for North Simcoe and the Greenways and the Martins. What is the bargain? It is a mutual agreement to do something, and it binds both parties. Both parties are agreed that separate schools should exist

there. Why impose separate schools? he says. Rather he should say: Why, in spite of the honour of the population, in spite of the honour, I may say, of the Crown, why take away those schools? By what right? The right of the majority? Do not go on that way, because you will never succeed in establishing a great and flourishing people on the banks of the St. Lawrence. You have got a solemn written document. Never would that people have joined Confederation without that condition, and we, the people of Canada, are bound to come to their rescue; we are bound to get the bargain executed, and the law respected, and if we do not do it we are not worthy of the British Empire, we are not worthy of being called an enlightened, an intelligent and honest people. It is a regular robbery, and it is a theft in the name of law, by virtue of might. A law imposed by force is not binding on the conscience. Sir, the hon. member for Simcoe knows that, and he should help us to pacify feelings, instead of throwing oil on the fire. Let him take the responsibility of his words, and of his action. He will see after a few years, when the people of Canada will have become acquainted with these questions, that he has made a mistake. He will gather a few votes and a few cheers to-day, but justice is a sentiment which exists in all hearts, and as long as justice is not done, that sentiment will push the people on towards the execution of law, and finally justice is sure to triumph. Now, the hon. member for Simcoe has read from Mr. Blake's speech, and he has taken the liberty of criticising him. Between the two men, I hesitate not; I take the Hon. Mr. Blake as being a gentleman worthy of leading a great party, because he rightly understands and appreciates the rights of minorities. I leave to the Opposition the task of answering that part of the remarks of the member for Simcoe, because they are much more able to do so than I am. The hon. member says that Mr. Blake only spoke about disallowance, that is, as to whether a Bill was *ultra vires* or not. On this point I want to contradict the hon. member for Simcoe in the most absolute manner. I want to say to him that he deceived this House, not only with respect to facts which have taken place outside the House, but even with respect to the book which he had in his hand. If the House will kindly refer to the "Hansard" of 1890, page 4089, they will find that Mr. Blake spoke as follows, among other things:—

My own opinion is, that whenever, in opposition to the continued view of a Provincial Executive and Legislature, it is contemplated by the Dominion Executive to disallow a provincial Act because it is *ultra vires*, there ought to be a reference.

The hon. member for North Simcoe says that Mr. Blake spoke only of that. Immediately afterwards Mr. Blake says:

And also that there ought to be a reference in certain cases where the condition of public opinion

renders expedient a solution of legal problems, dissociated from those elements of passion and expediency which are, rightly or wrongly, too often attributed to the action of political bodies. And again, I, for my part would recommend such a reference in all cases of educational appeal—cases which necessarily evoke the feelings to which I have alluded, and to one of which, I am frank to say, my present motion is mainly due.

Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose we heard Mr. Blake speaking in this House at this moment, what would we hear him say?

For my part, I would recommend such a reference in all cases of educational appeal.

Now, I ask my hon. friends on the left: Have you any respect for the Hon. Mr. Blake? Have you any confidence in him? He tells you in this "Hansard," revised by himself:

I would recommend such a reference in all cases of educational appeal.

Will you refuse to hear his voice? My voice is nothing to you, the voice of the Government is nothing to you; but surely you will listen to Mr. Blake's voice, that great friend of minorities, who has left his country to go to the mother country to help a minority. He tells you that a tribunal should be called upon to decide all constitutional questions concerning schools; will you refuse to hear him, and will you now condemn the Government for doing just what Mr. Blake recommended? I hope you will not do Mr. Blake such an injustice. Now, the member for North Simcoe says: The Government has gone to court without any other precedent than the New Brunswick case. There, again, the hon. member for Simcoe was wrong, because there is a special law providing for that. I need not read it, it has been quoted, it is a standing order of this House that whenever this question occurs, that Government has a right to carry it before the tribunals. Now, as to the question of responsibility, I will only say that I consider that any act performed by the Government, or by a member of the Government, in his capacity as Minister, involves the responsibility of the whole Government. Suppose a Minister goes to church on Sunday and hears a sermon, forms an opinion, comes back, and causes his opinion to prevail in the Cabinet. He is not responsible for having gone to church, but for the act of the Ministry ensuing. A Minister is not able to do an act, to write a sentence, without being responsible. The Minister of Justice said that the Ministers were acting judicially in a certain matter. He is responsible for saying so. If the Ministers of the Cabinet, or a committee of the Cabinet, act as judges in a matter, and come to the conclusion that they will not decide certain questions from a partisan stand-point or in the interest of the party, but will act as judges, they are responsible for their action. And when they have decided, they are responsible for the decision they give. The

Ministers are constantly responsible. I cannot conceive that there is one moment of the day or night when the Ministers are not responsible. If they like to say that they will decide a question according to the rules of a game, such as billiards, they are responsible for that decision. The Minister of Public Works has been accused with having said, that in matters of education he would follow the advice of the bishop. He is responsible for his statement and for the way in which he acts on the subject of education. Let me say to the Minister of Public Works, that if the ideas of his bishop agree with the ideas of the Cabinet, I am very glad, and I shall go on supporting the hon. gentleman so long as he has my confidence. That is ministerial responsibility, and so long as any act of a Ministry is approved by the majority of the House, that Government rules the country. That position seems to me to be very clear. I, however, fail to understand that there is anything of a Star Chamber character in such a position. When the Government decide that they will refer a certain question to the courts, they do not shield themselves from responsibility. They openly refer the matter to the court; they are responsible for sending it there, and when the judgment comes from the court, they are responsible for the action they take in regard to it. If to-day we voted non-confidence in the Government for sending this question to the courts, they would fall. But there is no Star Chamber, nothing hidden in regard to this action. The Star-Chamber is rather, I think, the place where the motion was prepared. Of course, we shall never know it; but there was a Star Chamber at that time. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), last night, challenged the sincerity of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). I am very sorry he did so; we should never asperse the motives of our adversaries, but we should respect them. I know the hon. member for Ottawa is a very sincere man; he is a patriot and possesses talent, and he has a large future before him; and, therefore, he should respect the motives of his opponents and believe there may be some sincerity in other members, as well as in himself. As to the hon. gentleman's attack on the Secretary of State, I deplore it, and it would be better if he did not display all his ardour in fighting his own compatriots. There seems to be a certain desire among the young members of his race to cast accusations and reproaches at the old leaders, those who made the old fights. I hope he will not continue in that course. The hon. gentleman should try to protect, instead of attack, his compatriots. Last night, the question of the New Brunswick schools, which struggle was led by the Secretary of State, was brought before the House. I do not intend to enter into that question; I do not think it is time to write ancient history yet. But I say this, and I think I am correct as a matter of fact, that the bishops treated equally both political

Mr. AMYOT.

parties. In 1873 they had asked the Conservative party not to go on with the question, because there was a reference pending. In 1874 they made the same request to the Liberal party. In 1875, after the answer had come from London, the question was brought up by the Secretary of State, and he asked the support of those who had pledged their support before, members of the Liberal party, who were then in power; but that support was refused. I do not desire to go into the history of that question, for we have enough to deal with in our present trouble. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), last night, presented a very elaborate statement of facts. That part of his statement which was based on written documents, seemed to be correct; but the quotations were not complete, and so we cannot accept his history as entire. The hon. gentleman spoke of the role played by the bishops, but I will come to that question in a moment, when I refer to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). That hon. gentleman objects to the proposition of the Government. We have seen the terms of that proposition, and we understand the surrounding circumstances. But this is a question that concerns a whole province, and I ask the hon. member for L'Islet, in whose name he brings this question before the House? Where is his mandate? Has he obtained the authority of those parents residing in Manitoba who are directly interested? Is there one single father of a family in Manitoba who has written to the hon. member for L'Islet?

Mr. TARTE. Dozens of them.

Mr. AMYOT—asking him to bring this question before Parliament?

Mr. TARTE. Dozens of them.

Mr. AMYOT. Is there one priest, one bishop?

Mr. TARTE. Yes; again I say so.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman should bring forward his mandates, in order that we may know with whom we have to do.

Mr. TARTE. I can bring them.

Mr. AMYOT. Secret letters, private letters which he may have in his pocket, and which do not see the open light of day, are not very strong evidence. In dealing with this subject, which concerns a whole province, we must consult each other, and not suppose that the whole brains of the world are in one forehead. There may be other brains than those in the hon. gentleman's head. Somebody else may have the right to hold an opinion on this question. We are many French members in this House. We are many Catholic members in this House, and is it not a presumptuous thing on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), without consulting anybody, and without regard to circumstances, to bring this question be-

fore the House, and to bring it in such a manner as to be the death of his pretensions? I am entitled to ask him, in whose name does he come, with what authority, and whoever gave him a right to take a position upon this question which may perhaps compromise it forever? There is an incorporated church in Manitoba, and surely that church has some interest; there are some Protestants in Manitoba, and surely they have a right to be consulted, there are thousands of French-speaking people there, and surely they have a right to be heard. Without even having before us the printed decision of the Privy Council, we are asked to decide upon this point, and it is forced upon us by a man of talent, if you will, but by one who has no authority to bind us to anything. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), when speaking to his motion, thought fit to refer to our bishops. We have a cardinal and about eight bishops, but the hon. member said (using the French word) that they were not sufficiently equipped to meet the Ministers of the day. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against that language. We have not been in the habit of dragging our bishops that way before Parliament. I protest against that want of respect and deference to our bishops. We should leave our bishops alone. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) means by the word "équipé" that they have not enough brains to come here to meet the Ministers. It is too bad that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is not consulted by Rome about the choice of our bishops. It is too bad, indeed, that he is not called upon every morning and every night to give them advice, and to help the Holy Ghost. What shall become of the bishops when the hon. member disappears? Where will our bishops be, when, according to him, not one of them has brains enough to understand politics, and to meet the Ministers of the Crown? If the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) were not living our bishops would be nowhere. According to him they have no talent, no knowledge, no capacity of any kind. But he is there to guide them, and he is obliged to take his rod and come to this Parliament, before the Protestants, and give them strokes. I protest against that. I say that our bishops are men most learned, most intelligent, and most devoted to their country. They are wise. They do not want to fight with bayonets. They want constitutional resistance in case of grievance, and they appeal to the good sense and to the spirit of justice of the English population. They believe more in that for final success than in the open war which my hon. friend from L'Islet wants. I believe they are right. Can you find in the whole continent of North America a man more learned than the Cardinal Taschereau, of Quebec? Can the hon. gentleman find purer-minded men than Bishop Begin and Bishop Lebrecque? Can he find a more liberal-minded man than Bishop Racine? And what about Archbishop Fabre and Bishop Lafleche and all the others, bet-

ter men than whom do not live on the face of the earth? Yet the hon. gentleman brings these bishops before Parliament, and he says that they are not fit to meet the Ministers. I protest against that. It is an unnecessary insult. We may discuss these questions which he calls essentially and exclusively political without bringing in our bishops. We do not want to mix them up in politics. It is not right for the hon. gentleman to expose his bishops to hatred, or contempt, or discussion here. But, who can escape the wrath of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte)? He says that there are twelve or thirteen curés in his county, that ten of them voted against him, and that there were two or three in his favour, but they did not vote, in conformity with the orders from their bishops and from Rome. I tell the hon. gentleman that he ought to apologize to these priests. There is no order in the Catholic church, either from the bishops or from Rome, preventing them from voting. I tell him that he has committed an error and a blunder. He has insulted these men, accused them wrongly before Parliament, and he ought to apologize.

Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. AMYOT. I will.

Mr. TARTE. I have said, Sir, and it is true, that an order from Rome has come, forbidding the Roman Catholic clergy interfere in politics, and I say more that that, that there have been pastoral letters sent to every member of the Roman Catholic clergy advising them even not to vote at elections. I say still further, that at the last retreat in Quebec His Eminence, the Cardinal himself, advised all his priests there not to vote. I might say, while I am on my feet, that my hon. friend is quite wrong when he said I meant to insult our Catholic bishops.

Mr. AMYOT. I have here the words of the hon. gentleman, and I drew his attention to them when he spoke, but he insisted. He said in French, I translate :

All the curés that went to the poll to vote registered their votes against me.

That has nothing to do with speaking in the church, but it is a question of going to the poll and putting the ballot papers in the box.

I believe there were two or three who were not entirely opposed to me, but in conformity with the orders received from Rome and the orders received from the bishops they abstained from voting.

I say that this accusation from the member for L'Islet is based upon false statements of the facts. I say that there is no order in our church preventing the curés from voting. I say that the bishops advise our curés to vote whenever they believe that the ques-

tions at issue are important. Under these circumstances my hon. friend owes an apology for that accusation, and if he does not make it, let him take the consequences.

Mr. TARTE. I said the truth, and I say it again.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman spoke the other day. What I say is very clear and simple. The hon. gentleman had his day of pleasure the other day, and he was applauded very much because he was speaking against our priests.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Take it as it is. He was amusing his party—no, I will not say his party; but he was amusing some of his friends around him, because they have a spite against those priests, who were not for them. He said: Those priests, against the law of their church, against Rome, in spite of what they were told by their bishops, voted and voted against me; they have committed a crime in religion in so voting. Then the hon. gentleman was applauded—it was very nice. But I tell him, speaking as authoritatively as he can: You are wrong; find one decision of the church, or one letter of any bishop preventing the curés from voting. There is no such thing. Then, your accusation being wrong, you owe the bishops and priests an apology, and if you do not make that apology, you will have to bear the consequences.

Mr. TARTE. I have said what is perfectly true, and I say it again.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman has repeated in English:

There were no doubt two or three priests who were not hostile to me; but in deference to the wishes, I might say without being unfair, to the order of their bishop, they abstained from voting.

It is not exactly the same as in French; but still the idea is there. He wanted to make this accusation, that if the priests had not disobeyed the orders of Rome and of their bishops he would have had ten more of a majority. Well, I say that this accusation is not based upon the facts; and as it comes from a man of my religion against those priests, I say to him that he should make an apology immediately. A gentleman who makes a mistake is bound to apologize. It is because those curés are not here that he does not apologize. It is not fair to attack them when they are not here. If they were here he would not dare to say that they got an order from the bishops to vote against him; but he says it here because he has the protection of his party, and because a length of time will elapse before he meets those priests. Well, I think it was my duty to protest against this accusation, and I do it because I have hope that in the future such attacks against absentees will not be renewed. I differ a little

Mr. AMYOT.

from my hon. friend on the point that he affirmed very often, that the Manitoba school question is exclusively a constitutional question. In so far as this Parliament is concerned, it is certainly an exclusively constitutional question. But each of us brings his own idea and his own education to decide the question on its merits; so that it becomes to every one of us a politico-religious question. If it is only a constitutional question, how does the hon. gentleman bring in so often the name of Archbishop Taché? This is another indecency, against which I protest as a Catholic, and I am not afraid nor ashamed of affirming myself as such. I object, out of the respect I owe to our religious chiefs, to the habit of constantly bringing into the discussions before this House the names of our bishops and our priests. We should be able to discuss these questions on their merits, and leave our bishops and priests alone. We need not be constantly dragging their names before this Parliament. What idea do we give to the Protestant community when they see us always hanging to the robes of our priests and bishops? Why not let them alone, and discuss these questions with our compatriots without the admixture of the religious element? It is quite indecent. It is not necessary for the debate, it is not for the honour of my religion and I protest against it. I protest also against bringing into this debate private letters, of which we do not know whether they were written, or under what circumstances, whether in a state of health or illness, for what purpose, or to whom they were addressed. We do not know by whom they were written or the history of those letters. For my part, so long as the letter is not placed on the Table of the House, I deny its existence. So long as I do not know by whom it was signed or to whom it was addressed, and so long as I have not an opportunity of reading it all through, as in a court of justice, I will deny its existence. I ask any lawyer in this House, is it not true that in a court of justice, when you want to quote a document, you quote the whole of it and file it, or at least you communicate it to your adversary? Here is a gentleman who has his pocket filled with secrets. He goes to one party and gets a secret, and then he goes to another party and gets another secret, and he is always filled up with secrets. Occasionally he draws out one of those secrets, and reads it, and it has a terrible effect. Perhaps the bishops have allowed him to approach them, and he comes back with secrets from the bishops. Everywhere he gets secrets. Let this new party, which he intends to lead, beware not to give him too many secrets. He will spend his life collecting secrets, and then disclosing them. I would not have said that, but I was full of indignation when I saw that the hon. gentleman wanted to make a case before this Parliament, based upon a private letter of a bishop, when he durst not say to whom the

letter was addressed, so that we might have information from that party as to the circumstances under which it was written, and what it meant. I am sorry to be rather severe on that point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not want the permission of anybody to go on. I know what I have to say, and I will go on. The Hon. Mr. Chapleau was approached, too; I suppose there were secrets to be got from him. There were secrets received from the present Minister of Public Works. Happily the Minister was here, and those secrets vanished at once. Whenever we find a witness to those secrets they vanish. Now, my learned friend spoke of continuing the fight. He said we began it and we will go through with it, and he reminded us of the words of the "Mail," which wanted to smash Confederation to its original fragments. I will tell him this, and all those who think like him, that breaking Confederation is a thing we cannot do alone. And even suppose we could do it, would it be fair to the minority of Manitoba? Would it be fair to the minority of Ontario? Would it be fair to the minority of the North-west? Why, the hon. gentleman who comes into this world with a sacred mission to protect the French language and the Catholic religion, says, out of spite: Very well, since I cannot succeed, you, the Catholics and French of Manitoba, may do as you can, we will go away; we are well in the province of Quebec, we are masters there, we are the majority who rule there, we have the strength and money and everything, arrange as you can, we could not succeed in our pretensions and will leave you. Is that honourable, is that a continuation of the fight?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not think so. The hon. gentleman spoke to me about Riel. He said: You remember the Riel question. We began the Riel movement together, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and myself. He came to Bienville with me; he went on the Champ de Mars, and there he set to work. To overthrow the Government rely upon me, he said, it is not for nothing that I occupy the seat of Parent, the great editor of the "Canadien." He came to Ottawa shortly after that, and when back to Quebec, said: We must save the Ministers. But, I said, the object of the National party is specially for them to be punished. He wanted, however, to save them. If he puts the same persistence into his fight on this Manitoba school question, as he did in the Riel matter, we need not be afraid of his smashing Confederation into pieces. I ask the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), what does he offer better than what we have?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Justice.

Mr. AMYOT. Justice is a thing unknown to the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr.

Choquette). I ask, where is the remedy the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) proposes? He must have some remedy. I suppose he does not presume that we will overthrow the Government of our friends and our fiscal policy for nothing? Has he got something better than what we have to offer? If he has, it is certainly not in his motion. His motion says that the Government cannot do anything. What does he propose? Does he take us for men who do not understand the actual position? We have got a Government in which we have confidence, and he says to that Government: You cannot do anything for Manitoba. And then, in his speech, he says: We blame you because you do nothing; and he wants us to take that position. I say that a gentleman of his standing should, when he comes before the country agitating such a question, have some definite proposition to offer, but if he came with the motion that I read in the beginning of my speech, he would not carry, perhaps, ten votes in the House. That is the reason he and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) arranged together to carry some votes, in order to try and overturn the Government, but without benefiting Manitoba. Manitoba is only a pretext, and nothing else. I do not want to make this a party affair, but I am bound to ask this: Who was it that passed that law? It was Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin. That cannot be denied. Who can undo it? Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin. Who did they ask lately to join their Cabinet? It was one of the men of the Opposition, who used to sit at the left of the Speaker. Surely they cannot throw upon our party the responsibility. It seems to me as if the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) meant this. The Grits of Manitoba will spend their time in doing harm, and the Conservatives of Ottawa will spend their time undoing that or they will fall. That is a very extraordinary proposition. How can they make our party responsible for that legislation?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Which party?

Mr. AMYOT. Happily not the National party, for that is dead and buried. That was a fine party, but it was led into mud and corruption and dishonour by its chief. My hon. friend knows that, and whenever the time comes before this House or elsewhere to speak at length on that question, I will meet him or anybody else. I have never been a Liberal, I have been a Nationalist, and have been faithful to that party, but I am not bound to spend the rest of my life next to a coffin. Now, I will ask the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) if he is very sure that there is not a way of bringing this question to a better solution? I will draw his attention and that of this House to what is now going on in the United States. I will show this House that at present the Catholic church is entering into a

new phase with reference to the question of schools. Bishop Ireland, a most distinguished prelate, had conceived the idea that there was a way between the Catholics and Protestants of agreeing on common schools for both, so that the children of each might be educated in one school. But there was a terrible cry raised in the States. The cry of scandal was raised. His Holiness the Pope sent Monsignor Satolli, who looked into the matter, and seemed to think that Monsignor Ireland was right, and propositions were submitted by Mgr. Satolli to the conference of American bishops at New York. I will read two or three if the House will bear with me. He says, in the second paragraph :

When there is no Catholic school in the place, or when the one that exists is not sufficient to give to the young people a suitable education in conformity with their condition, the public schools may be used in conscience, provided the danger of perversion be overcome by prudent means and convenient precaution, but the decision in this matter must be left to the conscience and wisdom of the *ordinaire*.

That is going to be the state of things in the United States. They are going to agree there on the guarantee that the education shall be neutral, and shall not be against any creed. I will now read paragraph 5 :

We specially order that no person, bishop or priest, take the liberty which the Sovereign pontiff strictly forbids through the Sacred Congregation to order away by threats, either in fact or otherwise, as not worthy of the Sacraments, the people who would like to send their children to public schools. This order extends "a fortiori" to the children.

So the Pope forbids every one to prevent a man from sending his child to the public school. Now, I will read paragraph 9. I am sorry I have not it in English :

We must not blame, either in public or in private, the Catholic parents who send their sons and daughters to the private schools or to the public schools, academies established to give superior education and conducted by members of religious orders or by people in whom we have confidence. If the parents have sufficient care to provide the religious education, we must leave them the power of procuring otherwise the education suitable for their children.

Mr. Speaker, this indicates that we may come to some understanding, perhaps, with Manitoba. Time will tell. We do not give up any of our rights. I could not give up any rights; they are not mine alone. I think a gross wrong has been practised by Manitoba, and I protest, and will continue to protest, as long as that wrong is not remedied. But let us all join to promote calm consideration of the question, and to bring back harmony in this country. Let us all pull together in the same direction and with good-will to make the country united, prosperous and happy. I do not see the hon. member for L'Islet in his seat; another has escaped.

Mr. O'BRIEN. You have frightened him away.

Mr. AMYOT.

Mr. AMYOT. I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the amendment is a sacrifice of the French language. It denies the right of the Government to interfere, and so it gives up for the future any chance of having our separate schools in Manitoba, if we have only the remedies recognized by the hon. gentleman. I say we are wrong in our discussions here to always drag in the Catholic clergy. We should avoid it. I say the amendment is not prudent; it is calculated to foment hatred, fanaticism and passion. I say we are wrong when we disclose private communications, and I say that the hon. member for L'Islet, in order to catch a few votes for his motion has made an alliance with the hon. member for North Simcoe, which alliance they dare not admit before the public. And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that I will vote against the motion, because it is against the interests of the minority in Manitoba, and that any one who will read the question, as presented in the motion, will see that its effect is against the interests of the Manitoba schools and against the French language. For my part, I would rather wait until the wisdom of the old men of the country of every creed and nationality shall have an opportunity to extinguish the fires set by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and increased by Greenway and Martin, rather than follow the political action of my hon. friend from L'Islet, by which he sacrifices the very interests of which he has assumed charge.

Mr. WELDON. I wish to take a few minutes to give a reason for the vote I purpose giving on the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). That hon. member and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), have asked members of the House to express their disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question, and also to condemn the Government for having assumed judicial functions when they should not, thereby escaping their proper ministerial responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet. I am not prepared to disapprove the course of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question thus far. The reasons given by the hon. member who moved the amendment were several. He asked this House and the members thereof to express their disapproval of the Government—why? First, that the Government did not disallow the Manitoba school legislation. I am in favour of the Government's policy in that regard; I approve of their not disallowing the Bill, and in that matter I cannot agree with the hon. member for L'Islet. I think the Government did wisely in following the example set in the New Brunswick school case twenty-one years ago. The second reason given by the hon.

member is that the Government should have speedily given remedial legislation. I differ again from the hon. member as to the duty of the Government in this difficult and delicate matter, and do not hold that they should have acted "speedily." I think I am speaking the mind of every student in this House, whose duty it is most fully and frequently to inquire into the true meaning of the British North America Act, that, of all the clauses from the first to the last, there is not one that, for the twenty-seven years in which that Act has been in force, has so puzzled them to know what it does mean, and what it does not mean, and what power this Government and this Parliament have in connection with it, as section 93 of the British North America Act, or the cognate section of the Manitoba Act. I do not know from section 1 to section 146 a single section of the British North America Act that presents so many difficulties to students of constitutional law. And, therefore, so far from blaming the Government for not acting speedily, I highly approve of their course in calling to their help all the assistance they could get, in taking care to have a clear and authoritative interpretation of the constitution before committing themselves to any practical action. The third reason was put forth by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that the Government was to blame in promoting an attack upon the law of Manitoba. He stated in a very unfair way what the Government have done in this matter. If the Government did designedly make an attempt to coerce a province, to instigate an attack upon the statutes of any province for the purpose of destroying those statutes, then to be sure they are blameworthy. But so far, we have no evidence that that is what has taken place. If section 93 of the constitution, and section 22 of the Manitoba Act, are, as I acknowledge they are, exceptionally obscure, exceptionally difficult, and furthermore, if this whole question of separate schools in a country seven-twelfths of whom are Protestants and five-twelfths of whom are Catholics, is a question of great delicacy, which requires the most careful handling, then the Government were justified in proceeding with great caution. I do not know that there is from first to last in our history, any question which has required a more careful and delicate handling. The older members of this House know something of the religious quarrels which have taken place in the eastern provinces. In the province of Nova Scotia, about thirty-five years ago, there was open feud between the two parties which developed into the form of a feud between Protestants and Catholics. Who that knows anything of those difficulties, wants to see the baleful fires of religious strife lighted again in this country? "They jest at scars who never felt a wound." In my own province we have had bitter and acrimonious feelings stirred up on these ques-

tions, which all moderate men and good citizens have regretted. I think every reasonable man on both sides of the House must, above all other things, desire that this question be not blown into a flame again. Therefore, I say if the Government have spent money in putting this question before the courts, the money is well spent. If they have gone slowly, if they have seen on the horizon a threatening cloud charged with electricity, which would do damage if it were drawn into practical politics, then I say they have done wisely, they have done well, to spend money and move slowly and cautiously to avert anything like religious discord or religious war in this country. The hon. member for Simcoe says that he does not challenge the right of the Catholic minority in Manitoba to make an appeal to the Government in Council, but he does challenge the right of the Government to answer the appeal. How in the world are these two positions to be held at one and the same time? When the constitution provides that in questions like this an appeal shall lie with the Governor-General in Council, how can you say that, while the appellants have a right to appeal, the tribunal to which the appeal is made has no correlative duty to hear and decide such appeal? Is that a fair reading of a constitutional statute? I do not think that upon reflection the hon. member for North Simcoe himself will take the responsibility of adhering to that position. The Government had but one duty. It was happily stated by the Prime Minister at a banquet at Toronto, that one pole star should guide them in dealing with Manitoba's laws, that was, to stand by the Constitution. I do not know what star could more safely guide any responsible body of Ministers in dealing with a question of admittedly great complexity, obscurity and extreme delicacy. I pass, then, from the first part of the resolution to the second part. The pith and sting of this motion is in the second part, when he asks the House to condemn His Excellency's advisers because they have announced a new doctrine. The hon. gentleman says that they shield themselves behind the immunity of judges; that they can claim the right of silence that belongs to a judge, and escape thereby the responsibility, with its attendant punishment, that hangs over His Excellency's political advisers. The hon. member for Simcoe pressed that point with great vigour last night, and in a speech of very great force and ability, insisted that this is new doctrine. Mr. Speaker, with all the respect and deep regard which I have always entertained for the abilities of that hon. member, I say that this is no new doctrine in this country. It is no new doctrine in the mother country. The hon. member stated, in a tone and manner hardly befitting the gravity of the subject, that the doctrine had received its death blow in England, when the Long Parliament, in 1641, cut down the Star Chamber root

and branch. He did not carry his statement far enough. If the hon. member's allusion to the destruction of the Star Chamber meant anything, it meant this: That when the Act which destroyed the Star Chamber was put upon the Statute-book of England, the King's Council in England had lost its judicial power, that is, its right to sit as a court of justice. That is the hon. gentleman's position, and that position I deny. That statement I strongly controvert, and I say from that day to this, without a breakdown to this present reign of Queen Victoria, there has been no time in which the Privy Council of England has not possessed some considerable measure of judicial authority. The authority upon which the hon. member rested his Star Chamber argument was that of Professor Dicey. I will read from this book to show that after the abolition of the Star Chamber, the old Privy Council still possessed a measure of judicial authority. On page 144 Dicey says of the Act which abolished the Star Chamber:

The Act 16 Car. I, cap. 10, had taken away the council's extraordinary judicial powers; yet some regular judicial authority is still retained. It exercised the right of arresting and examining accused persons, whom it afterwards sent to the regular law courts. It constituted a court of appeal from the colonial and the ecclesiastical tribunals.

An authority which is much more full and emphatic on the same point is that of Lord Chancellor Selborne, who points out, in his book on the Privy Council, at page 20, that in the very first year after the restoration of Charles II., measures were taken to organize a sub-committee of the King in Council, which was to hear and determine appeals from the Island of Jersey, and the colonies then under the jurisdiction of the Crown. He showed that seven years later, in 1667, a new tribunal was carved out of the Government, larger than the last; the old tribunal consisted of five leading lawyers, and the new one of fourteen, with jurisdiction to hear appeals from Jersey, the Channel Islands, and all the outlying parts of the Empire. He points out again, at page 21, that another change was made, and that the Privy Council, for the purposes of, in part, of performing judicial work, resolved itself into four committees, one for foreign affairs, one for trade and plantations, which latter was a court of justice, pure and simple, making a report to the Queen, who gave judgment on their report. There was a body carved out of the Privy Council, not by statute, not having statutory jurisdiction, not having statutory authority, but created by Order in Council, as Lord Selborne points out, sitting as a court of justice. He says:

Fourteen councillors were nominated upon the committee for Trade and Plantations, of whom any three were to be a quorum. That committee was to have cognizance of all matters concerning His Majesty's Foreign Plantations and the Channel Islands, and also such matters as might properly belong to the

Mr. WELDON.

cognizance of the council board relating to Scotland or Ireland.

I will not weary the House by tracing the development of this judicial power of the Government. It is enough to say that, down to a recent day, the Committee for Trade and Plantations was a committee to whom appeals went from the courts in the old American colonies before the revolution, and from the other dependencies of the Empire. It is only in the reign of William IV. that the so-called Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was formally constituted into a court with regular procedure, by a statute. So that when the hon. member for North Simcoe stated, not, perhaps, in so many words, but by implication, that the judicial power had died out of the English Government by the abolition of the Star Chamber, he was making a statement which is in open conflict with the high authority of Professor Dicey, of Lord Selborne, and of Mr. Renton, in his book, "Appeal to Privy Council, 1888," who speaks to the same effect, and of Professor Horne, whose book is one of great authority, and who also speaks to the same effect. There is one other authority, that of Mr. Bagehot, from which I will quote, and I hope I am not doing the hon. member for Simcoe any injustice in reading this section. I am sorry the hon. member is not in his place to correct me if I have misapprehended his argument, when he yesterday read this sentence from Bagehot as sustaining his doctrine, an authority than which, I admit, there is none higher that I know of. The hon. gentleman quoted the strong words from Bagehot to show that in England there is complete separation between the judicial and executive functions of the Government. Here is the sentence the hon. member for Simcoe read:

It is laid down as a principle of English polity that in it the legislative, the executive and the judicial powers, are quite divided—that each is entrusted to a separate person or set of persons—that no one of these can at all interfere with the work of the other.

I understood when I heard those words read that that was the deliberate opinion of that great constitutional lawyer. I was surprised when I heard it, because his work is one with which I had some familiarity. This morning, when I had the first opportunity of obtaining the book, I found that the sentence before that one read as follows:—

There are two descriptions of the English Constitution which have exercised immense influence, but which are erroneous.

We all enjoyed very much the humorous description which the hon. member for Simcoe gave of his brother members of the House, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of the Interior. But, laying humour aside—and I believe we had it from yourself, Mr. Speaker, that a part of this was history, and a part of this was fiction—taking a more serious view of the charge, I say that if it be true that the Privy Council in the mother

country is a court of justice, if the British North America Act says, as it does, that our Constitution is similar in principle to that of the mother country, and when the Constitution Act gives an appeal to the Governor in Council we may well conclude that the Imperial Act knew it was giving appellant power to a body with judicial authority. Her Majesty's Ministers, therefore, were not only within their rights, but acting with common prudence when they refused to talk of the matter which was being deliberated on in Council? We know, as a matter of fact, that our Privy Council does discharge judicial duties. We need not talk about a Star Chamber. There are many Government decisions given, respecting which you may use the word judicial or quasi-judicial, or to use the words of the report, they that savour rather of the judicial than the political. We need not, however, be too nice about our terms. If the matter referring to the Manitoba schools were under the consideration of the Governor in Council, the Ministers were quite within their right in being guarded and careful as to their statements. I venture to express the opinion that if they had spoken differently and had disclosed the secrets of Council, both of those hon. gentlemen would have been blame-worthy. I began by saying, and I close by repeating the statement that the constitutional clauses dealing with this Manitoba School Bill are, in the highest degree, perplexing and difficult. It is not necessary for me to go on and expound them. I do not think any hon. gentleman is called on to go on and explain the legal view and weary the House by setting forth his own view. I will, however, with the indulgence of the House, call attention to those sections dealing with the province of Manitoba. Some persons say that the rights of Manitoba in this matter are governed by the British North America Act, and some say they are governed by the Manitoba Act. Some others say that the appellant can rely on both. They have so far relied on the Manitoba Act, which gives them a larger scope in testing the legality of the school law, because, under the Manitoba Act, clause 1 of section 22, they could attack the Manitoba school as being either against the law, or against the established practice at the date of the Union. When they were called upon to settle this question as to whether it was *intra vires* or *ultra vires*, they could throw themselves on the Manitoba Act, and they would clearly be within their rights in doing so. We next come to the second provision in section 22 of the Manitoba Act, which deals with an appeal to the Governor in Council, and it is said they can rely on that, or that if they choose to they can go back to the cognate section of the British North America Act. I do not know that it is necessary for me to give an opinion on this point. My own opinion, however, is, that it makes very little difference which of the two they rely

on. If I read the Manitoba Act correctly, clause 2, which deals with the appeal to the Governor-General in Council, is a wider clause than the cognate clause in the British North America Act, although many lawyers hold a contrary opinion. But on that very point the British North America Act gives the right to appeal, and grounds it on two conditions; first, where separate schools existed by law at the time of Union; and second, where such is hereafter established by the Legislature. What happened, when the remaining part of the section in the Imperial statute of 1867 is reproduced in the Imperial statute of 1871, for it is within the knowledge of the House that the Canada Act of 1870 was ratified by an Imperial statute of the next year, and so, for all intents and purposes, it becomes an Imperial Act as of 1870. The Imperial Parliament having made a declaration in 1870, and in 1867, and having reproduced in the Act of 1870 part of the words of the Act of 1867, the common rules of construction will tell us, that the parts not reproduced were deliberately omitted, and, if so, the power in the Act of 1871 is wider than that in the Act of 1867, for the appeal in the Act of 1867 was grounded on two conditions, while the appeal in the Act of 1871 was grounded on nothing, or, in other words, there were all possible grounds for the appeal to rest on. I hold, therefore, it is a matter of perfect indifference, in dealing with this phase of the subject, the right of appeal to the Governor in Council, whether it was the Manitoba Act or the British North America Act which gave the wider right of appeal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that the clauses relating to education are complete in the Act of 1871, or whether the clauses in the British North America Act are also applicable to Manitoba?

Mr. WELDON. From my point of view, it makes no difference, dealing with the question of the appeal to the Canadian Privy Council, and setting aside the question of the Act being *ultra vires*. In my judgment, clause 2 of the Manitoba Act is wider than clause 3 of the British North America Act—I refer to the cognate clause—because clause 3 of the British North America Act grounds the right of appeal on two sets of facts, and in the corresponding clause in the Manitoba Act nothing is set forth as the grounds, and, therefore, everything may be held to be the ground.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to know whether the hon. gentleman's legal opinion is, that there is any room for doubt that the clauses relating to education were confined to the Manitoba Act of 1870, or whether, in his opinion, the clause in the British North America Act was supplementary or complementary or an addition to the Act of 1870; because, if it is not so, what possible appeal

could lie, in view of the judgment of the Privy Council?

Mr. WELDON. This question is academic, from the point of view of the present discussion in this House. If we were dealing with the question as to whether it is "ultra vires," this question would be vital, but we have left behind the question as to whether it is "ultra vires," and the question is now as to an appeal to the Governor in Council. I am, therefore, not bound to express an opinion, because it is not customary to give an opinion on a question that is not vital. When we come to clause 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, there is a difficulty. In reading the first three lines of clause 3, every lawyer in the House who tries to construe them, will agree with me, that they are there by accident. They are a mechanical transposition of lines that appear in clause 4 of section 93 of the British North America Act, and which look back to clause 2 and are not capable of being constructed. Seeing that clause 2 of section 93 of the British North America Act was not reproduced in the provision of the section 22 of the Manitoba Act. I express that opinion after having given the matter due consideration. In my reading of the clause, I prefer to omit the first three lines and make clause 3 begin with the word "in," on the third line. Then there does not seem to be any very great difficulty. Of course, opinions differ on this point. Some persons think the question raised by the hon. member is a very difficult one. If such is the fact, there is more necessity for calling in the help of the court, in accordance with the policy of the Blake Act of 1891. The intention was, on these questions that arouse religious feeling, and where men cannot reason as in a white light, but have their minds perturbed by passion and feeling, that the Legislature should call the statute to its help in all difficulties quasi-judicial. Without saying more, Mr. Speaker, and for these reasons, I cannot vote for the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte).

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has taken all force out of his argument by the last few words of his address. He pointed to the difficulty of considering matters of this kind impartially in such a body as the Cabinet composed of advisers to His Excellency. He pointed out that Mr. Blake sought by his resolution, and this House had provided by the subsequent legislation founded on it, to remove from the political arena all questions that might give rise to religious excitement or feeling. He pointed out that Mr. Blake wished, that the Government wished, and that Parliament wished to attain that end by referring all legal questions to the Supreme Court, but he did not go on to tell the whole story. He did not give us the conclusion from that beginning, and that conclusion is: That legal questions requiring

Mr. WELDON.

judicial consideration, shall be left entirely to the Supreme Court, and that the Cabinet, as such, should not attempt to decide upon questions of a judicial or legal nature. The hon. gentleman also told us that the Privy Council of England had never lost its judicial attributes, and that they were in full force in this reign of Queen Victoria. Technically, and as a mere question of phraseology the hon. member is correct, that appeals are nominally made to Her Majesty in Council, from the colonial courts, as well as from the courts of the United Kingdom, yet let me ask: to what portion of Her Majesty's Privy Council are these appeals made? Does an appeal from the Supreme Court of Canada to Her Majesty in Council, go before Mr. Gladstone and his Cabinet? Not at all. I am astonished that a gentleman so learned in the law, that he has received the title of Doctor of Laws, should make such an egregious mistake as to refer to appeals to the Privy Council in England, as if it were something analogous to an appeal to the Governor in Council here. It must have been a mistake on the part of the hon. gentleman, because I cannot think that if he reflected on it for a moment, he would impose such an utterly misleading, incorrect, and absurd argument upon the House. He must have forgotten that the Committee of the Privy Council which hears appeals from the colonies, is composed of the Law Lords, and that none of the political members of the Cabinet, who are also members of the Privy Council, have anything to do with hearing these appeals. If the analogy were worth anything, the practice would have to be that Mr. Gladstone and his political colleagues had the right to hear appeals from Canada. To pretend that would be absurd, and, therefore, the argument which the hon. gentleman based upon the use of the name "Privy Council" (for that is all it amounts to) in connection with these appeals falls to the ground. It is not the Privy Council in England which hears the appeals, but a small committee of it, composed of those learned in the law who have previously occupied high judicial positions. The hon. gentleman stated that our Privy Council does discharge judicial functions, but he failed to prove it. Certain individual members of our Privy Council discharge functions which might be considered to some extent of a quasi-judicial character; such as the Minister of Agriculture hearing cases of patents, and the duties of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but these are all functions conferred on them by statute, and they do not arise out of the prerogative, from the fact that these gentlemen belong to the Privy Council. I am sorry the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is not now in his seat, because I wanted to seek information from him with regard to one statement he made. I understood him to say, that the Imperial Act of 1871 included clause 3 of the British North America Act which had been left out in our Manitoba Act of 1870.

and he argued from that, that the same broad right of appeal which existed under the British North America Act existed under the Manitoba Act. The hon. the Premier did not agree with that view in his address. He said that there was no provision in the Manitoba Act for an appeal of this kind, that if it came in at all it must come in under section 3 of the British North America Act, interpreted as applied to Manitoba, notwithstanding the fact that Manitoba had a supplementary Act of her own. After recess, I should like to hear the explanation of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) on that point.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Canada Carriage Company (Limited).—(Mr. Taylor.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Forbes.)

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Chilliwhack Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the British Columbia Dock Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

SUPPLY—SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair, Sir, I was referring to the fact that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) had quoted from the Imperial statutes, ratifying the Manitoba Act, as passed by this House, and I was under the impression, from what he said, that the general provisions embodied in section 33 has been re-enacted in that Imperial statute, as far as concerned Manitoba. I was sorry he was not in his place at the time, but met the hon. gentleman since, and understand from him that he did not make that statement, and so I have nothing further to say on that point. With regard to the general question before us, I must endorse most heartily one sentiment which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). In speaking of

the spirit with which we should approach this question, he laid down the very sound doctrine that we should do so in such a manner as not to awaken any religious prejudice or excite some of those feelings which, unfortunately, have already been awakened. I will pay the hon. gentleman the compliment of saying that he carried out that principle in his speech, and I shall try to follow his example. I cannot, however, say that that principle has been followed by all who have spoken on the subject. I do not know that it was followed either by the mover of the resolution itself or by his principal supporter on the other side of the House (Mr. McCarthy) or by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who spoke a little while ago. There was a little smack of religious feeling in all, and of racial animosity in the case of the latter gentleman, who showed an inclination to hit out in all directions, like the Irishman, wherever he saw a head convenient to hit at. He travelled from the religious belief of Roman Catholics, from their prejudices or principles, whichever you choose to call them, in relation to having their children attend public schools, to the formation of the National party and the undertaker's shop, where he sat beside a coffin and waited for somebody to bury it. All that is no part of the issue before the House, and I shall refrain in great degree from criticising the speeches made on either side of this question, for the reason that we are not called upon to vote on these speeches. I wish to confine myself as far as possible to the resolution which is before the House; to point out what that resolution means, in its plainest interpretation, and to state my own opinion as clearly as possible as to whether that resolution should be adopted or not. We have had a great deal of argument something in this line: Hon. gentlemen on that side have said, We rather agree with the wording of this resolution, but the speech of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who introduced it, was of such a nature that we cannot possibly vote for the resolution. Others have said in effect, as my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) did, that they had not so much fault to find with the wording of the resolution, but that they could not vote for it because the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) approved it. Now, that is all wide at the mark. No doubt the resolution lends itself to that mode of treatment. It is quite possible for anybody to say: I support this resolution for a very different reason from that of hon. gentlemen on the other side, or: I oppose this resolution because some hon. gentlemen on the other side has found a meaning in it which I do not like, and therefore, as he thinks, it means something I do not approve of, I cannot support it. Now, though this may seem at first sight a powerful argument to gentlemen who laid it before the House, I am satisfied that, when they come to see this

resolution in cold print after the session is over, and have to defend their vote in regard to it on some public platform, they will find out that the public will not consider the speeches which have been made on either side; that, in fact, the greater part of the public will not have read the speeches; but that the public at large will be well informed as to the wording of the motion itself and as to the actual meaning of the words therein set before the House to be voted upon. And I hope, therefore, we shall confine ourselves henceforth as far as possible to discussing the meaning of the resolution moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) without considering what reasons induced him to move it or what reasons induced the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to support it. We have to say "yes" or "no" to a certain form of words meaning a certain thing, and we have to say so, not in the ultra-judicial spirit which the Prime Minister assumes for himself and his colleagues sitting in council, and yet in a spirit of as great impartiality as we can assume for the occasion. Again, Mr. Speaker, there is another line of the argument to which I object. There has been a great deal of argument as to whether the Manitoba School Act abolishing the separate schools should ever have been passed or not. Now, Sir, that is not the question before the House at all. This debate is not concerned in the slightest degree with the justice, the constitutionality or the equity of the Manitoba School Act. It is not the School Act which is on trial at all; it is not the Manitoba Government which is on trial, nor the Legislature of Manitoba; it is the Government here at Ottawa, who have taken a certain course in regard to this question, and who are attacked by this resolution for the course which they have taken. It may be that the Manitoba School Act is just what it should have been, that it is just and constitutional and equitable. It may be, on the other hand, that it is oppressive and unjust, and a violation of the Constitution. But whatever be its nature, Mr. Speaker, that nature has nothing to do with the question now before the House. We are asked to condemn this Government, not for the defects of the Manitoba School Act, but because of the course which they themselves, as a Government, have taken in regard to it, and I, for one, cannot refrain from expressing my agreement with that first clause in the motion of my hon. friend from L'Islet, which expresses a general condemnation of the Government for their action in this regard. I do not condemn the Government because they refused to veto that School Act. I do not condemn them because they made a reference of the legal point in connection with the matter to the Supreme Court, nor do I condemn them, on the other hand, for the reason urged by my hon. friend from North Simcoe, that they should have told the petitioners in this case that there was no possible

Mr. CASEY.

relief for them under any circumstances. In this I differ entirely from my hon. friend from North Simcoe. I think the Government would have done an injustice had they told the petitioners: There is no chance at all for you: we will not look into the case and see if you have a right of appeal. I think it would have been highly improper for them to do so. We must remember that, though there is a large majority in Manitoba in favour of non-sectarian schools, there is still a minority, be it large or small, it matters not, a minority who think they have claims under the constitution to be heard in opposition to the School Act, and to obtain remedial legislation from this House if the Government see fit to sustain their claims. It makes no difference whether the minority be large or small, their rights are equally great. The rights of a minority of 1,000 are as great as those of a minority of 20,000, at which figure, I think, the hon. member for North Simcoe put the Catholic minority in Manitoba. I think it but right to say to these people: Come and discuss with us the question whether you have the right to appeal or not. I can approve the course of the Government so far. I can approve the course of the Government also, when they found they could not decide for themselves the legal question whether they should interfere or not, in appealing to the Supreme Court. I think any one who approved the resolution of 1890 moved by Mr. Blake and the Bill of 1891 putting it in statutory form must approve the reference of the legal point at issue to the Supreme Court. But, Sir, things that are done rightly may be done at the wrong time; things in themselves right may be done too late. I think the Government have been extremely dilatory in postponing the settlement of this constitutional question until three years have passed, until agitation, unrest and perhaps suffering has been caused to some people from the doubtful position of the law and the legal struggles that have gone on in regard to it. I think they showed a policy of postponement, of evasion, of shuffling off the question from time to time. I must condemn that sort of conduct. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) said there is a great deal of wisdom in "to-morrow." The Government seem to have been of the same opinion. They have been going on from to-morrow till to-morrow, in the hope that this question will at last take some such shape that they would not have to give any decision upon it, that they could shuffle off the whole question on the courts, and that the courts would finally say. Well, you have no room to act under the circumstances. I think that as soon as it was evident that the petitioners from Manitoba not only attacked the constitutionality of this law, but claimed relief in another shape, even if the law were constitutional, the Government should have set themselves to work at the earliest moment possible to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court on the subject,

it might all have been decided a year ago, at least. An Act providing for a reference to the Supreme Court was passed in 1891, and it was only on the 22nd of last month that a case was ordered to be prepared for the Supreme Court. The case is not even yet before the Supreme Court, I suppose, because it was only ordered to be prepared on the 22nd of February last, and I do not suppose it can have come before the judges even yet. I condemn them, then, for being dilatory, for being evasive, for being shuffling in that respect, in dealing with the question. I must condemn them, again, because they instituted, and afterwards sustained, litigation against an Act of the Provincial Government of Manitoba, tending to shear that Government of powers conferred upon it by the Constitution of the province. If the Act were "ultra vires," I think with my hon. friend from North Simcoe, it might have been left, as other Acts are left, to the parties interested who instituted the suit and carried it through. It is quite certain that the Catholic interest in that province is not so weak in itself nor so friendless in other parts of the Dominion, that there would have been any difficulty in procuring the necessary funds to bring a test case before the courts as to the constitutionality of the Act. I think the Government might have left that part of it alone, and devoted themselves to settling the other great constitutional question which concerned themselves, as to whether they had a right to hear an appeal in the matter, even if the Act itself were "intra vires." I can find no sort of precedent for the action of the Government in promoting this litigation, unless the case arising out of the settlement of what used to be called the disputed territory of Ontario, might be taken as a precedent. In that case, after a long litigation, it was decided that certain lands which were long in dispute, did belong to the province of Ontario. This Government, however, claimed that the timber and minerals on those lands did not belong to Ontario, but belonged to this Government, and proceeded to give licenses to cut timber upon the lands. The St. Catharines Milling Company, amongst others, went largely into the business, and cut a large amount of timber and took it away, in part. Litigation began, and the Dominion sustained the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company against the Government of Ontario; and my friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will be able to tell us probably how many thousand dollars were spent by the Government in sustaining that litigation. I think it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$70,000 or \$80,000; the hon. member for Simcoe must know very well what the amount was. In that case the Dominion claimed to possess property owned by the province; and, although it was attacking claims, which were afterwards found to be rights, of the Ontario Government, it was doing so in an ordinary way, just as one person might bring a suit against another to

settle their respective rights to a certain piece of land. I cannot say that I can find much fault with the payment of the law costs in that case by the Dominion Government, because they had a right to have their claims to that land investigated at public expense. But this case is altogether different. Here the Dominion is not a claimant at all. It is not a question of whether the Dominion or the Manitoba Government have a right to pass a certain law; it is a question as to whether the Manitoba Government had a right to pass it. The Dominion was not a party in the case. The Dominion made itself a party in the case, and spent a lot of money in trying to break up that autonomy which all the provinces claim. I condemn the Government, therefore, on that ground also; and for that reason still more than for the first, I agree with the first part of the resolution before the House. Then, there is no doubt at all that whatever words were used, whatever pledges were made, whether officially or non-officially, by Mr. Chapleau or anybody else, to the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, or to anybody else interested, there is no doubt that at the time of the elections in 1891, the impression had somehow been created amongst our friends in Quebec that the Government were ready, if this law appeared to be "intra vires," to do something or other to relieve their friends in the province of Manitoba. There is no doubt that impression was somehow created; the Government took advantage of it, and no doubt gained a great many votes thereby. We must charge them, therefore, with constructive deceit in this matter, if not with an outspoken misstatement of the truth. There is no doubt they created the impression, they profited by the impression, and they never had the courage to say what their intentions were upon the subject. Now, Sir, I think these are quite sufficient reasons for pronouncing a general condemnation upon the Government. But we are asked to pronounce, also, a special condemnation upon the Government because they propose to assume judicial attributes in dealing with this question, ultimately. The sub-committee of the Cabinet, first authorized to hear Mr. Ewart on behalf of the Catholic petitioners of Manitoba, reported that it was doubtful whether they could go further at present, than to advise that the question of whether an appeal could lie or not should first be referred to the Supreme Court. In reference to that point I must quote what was stated by the sub-committee. It has been quoted before, but it is almost impossible for me to say what I want to, without quoting it again:

The application comes before Your Excellency in a manner differing from applications which are ordinarily made, under the constitution, to Your Excellency in Council. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of a political character or involving political action on the part of Your Excellency's advisers. It is to be dealt with by Your Excellency in Council,

regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools, and without the political action of any of the members of Your Excellency's Council being considered as pledged by the fact of the appeal being entertained and heard.

Now, here are the words to which I wish to call particular attention:

If the contention of the petitioners be correct, that such an appeal can be sustained, the inquiry will be rather of a judicial than of a political character. The sub-committee have so treated it in hearing counsel, and in permitting their only meeting to be open to the public. It is apparent, that several other questions will arise, in addition to those which were discussed by counsel at that meeting, and the sub-committee advises that a date be fixed, at which the petitioners, or their counsel, may be heard with regard to the appeal, according to their first request.

Now, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Premier, speaking on this matter on Monday, only quoted the first part of the clause of the report. The hon. gentleman quoted the portion which stated that the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of a political character, but he did not quote the rest of the paragraph to the effect that if an appeal were allowed, the appeal would still be of a judicial nature. He led the House to understand that it was the intention of the sub-committee that only preliminary inquiries as to whether the appeal should be allowed or not were to be conducted judicially, and he said that after that stage it became a question of policy. That was not, however, the language of the report. This is a point on which I am wholly and entirely with the resolution before the House and in full sympathy with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. Premier quoted from Mr. Blake's speech in support of his resolution in 1890, and he seemed to be of the opinion that Mr. Blake's remarks strengthened his position. Again, I must re-read what has been quoted already:

Now, Sir, the general notion that the executive, the legislative and the judicial departments of Government ought to be so far as practicable separate and apart is one held by many of the most eminent constitutionalists as a fundamental principle. There can be no doubt that the absolute union of these departments is neither more nor less than absolute despotism. Unite in one hand, I care not whether it be the hand of an autocrat or the hand of a council, the power of legislation, the power of adjudication and the power of administration, and you make the most absolute despotism: that is conceivable.

The hon. Premier read those words as justifying a reference of a part of this case to the Supreme Court. It is almost impossible to imagine that he could not see the sophistry of applying Mr. Blake's remarks in justification of his own course. So far as a reference to the Supreme Court is concerned, the whole drift of Mr. Blake's speech and his resolution would justify that course. But what did Mr. Blake propose to refer? Simply all that required the decision of judicial minds and impartial judges. After that, what remains? Nothing but a question of

Mr. CASEY.

policy. After the Supreme Court has decided that this Government has a right to hear an appeal in regard to this Act, what is there requiring a judge to decide? What remains is purely and simply a question of policy. The Supreme Court says, you have the right to enact remedial legislation if you choose. The Government are called on, not as a court to decide any questions of facts or law, but they are called on as advisers of His Excellency to say what should be done under the circumstances, what it is politic to do, what in equity should be done, what it is morally right to do under the circumstances. That is not a question of law, it is a question for the consideration of Ministers as a Cabinet and not as a court. The hon. Premier tried to do away with the impression that the Government wish to shield itself behind a quasi-judicial decision, by asserting that they were responsible to the House for whatever they did in the matter, whether they sat judicially or as a Cabinet. In one sense that is true. It is certain that if this House was satisfied that the Government had decided contrary to law and justice, the opinion would be expressed, and the Government would be held responsible to the House. But that is not the kind of responsibility we want. We want to hold them responsible, not for their opinions, but for their acts, just as if they proposed any change in the tariff or any other law affecting the welfare of the people. We should be able to assail them, not as judges who have made a mistake in the law, but as servants of the Crown and servants of this Parliament, and as having done an act which neither Parliament nor the country wish to be done. The hon. Premier attempted to make it clear that he would be at the same time responsible and irresponsible, but his effort was too weak to impress the House. In regard to the policy as to whether if the Government have the power the Manitoba School Act should be nullified by remedial legislation or not, the Government are as well able to pronounce upon that question now as they will be after they have received the report of the Supreme Court in regard to it. They know as well now as they will a year hence, whether it would be right and proper to nullify that legislation. They are only waiting to hear whether they have the right to do so before they pronounce an opinion whether they will take that action or not. They do not need to hear any statement of fact or argument of counsel; it is a mere question of justice and morality as to whether the Act should be nullified or not. I am not going to give my opinion as to whether it should be or not, but the Government are in a position to give that opinion, and they can be fairly called upon to give it. The Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan) was challenged last night by the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin) to state whether he thought the Act should be nullified or not. The challenge was just and fair, because there is nothing

that can come before the Supreme Court upon the legal question that can affect the other question, namely, if the power exists to pass remedial legislation, should it be exercised? It is perfectly fair to ask the Government to state now, as well as later, where they stand on this question. But the Government feel it necessary to skulk behind some shadow of judicial authority in order to find some reason for postponement, and in the hope that the decision need never be announced publicly. No doubt they have made up their minds what to do, but they hope that Providence will spare them telling the public about it. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) made a statement to the effect that no policy was involved in the motion before the House, that it merely said that this House was unable to do anything under the circumstances, no matter what the rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba might be. He repeated that several times, and I am astonished that my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) did not contradict it. But any one who looks at the resolution can see for himself that it does not say anything of the kind. It does not say that nothing can be done, but it attacks the Government for having done nothing, and there is a very great difference between the two propositions. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) thinks the Government are to blame because nothing has been done, and the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) thinks the same thing, although, of course, from a different standpoint from that of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Again, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) approved of the course of the Government in this matter on the ground that if a man goes rashly in one direction he may come to grief. There is a great deal of truth in that and I have no doubt my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has found it so. He went forward rashly in one direction on one occasion, and then the opposite direction on another occasion, and, I believe, he does not find himself exactly comfortable in the political position in which he has placed himself. I leave him to the kind attentions of those who have been his political colleagues in the past, and that includes gentlemen on both sides of the House, because he has been the political colleague of both. In conclusion, I express the hope, with the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that this question shall be discussed henceforth, as it has not been altogether in the earlier stages of the debate, with that delicacy, with that dignity, and with that regard to religious feelings, and even prejudices, if we choose to look upon them as prejudices, which will remedy, if possible, the agitation which has unfortunately existed in the country already.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, there is a most suggestive lesson in the manner in which the Government and their supporters

have received the amendment which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). They oppose that amendment, and they attack it, but no reason or no ground for their opposition and their attack is to be found within the four corners of the amendment. The ground of their opposition arises from a fact which is ulterior to the motion itself. The whole ground of their opposition is, that the motion moved by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) received the support of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I need not tell the House, for everybody knows it, that between the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) there is nothing in common, except this one thing: The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is a courageous man, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a courageous man. The member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has convictions and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has convictions, and although their convictions are as wide apart as the antipodes, both have the courage of being true, each one to his own, and it is for this reason that each on this occasion is able from his own stand-point to assail this Government, which has neither courage nor convictions. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), believes that in this matter the Catholic minority of Manitoba ought to be protected in its ancient privilege. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) believes, on the contrary, that the legislative independence of Manitoba ought to be maintained inviolate. This is the question which the Government has to solve, and this is the question as to which, after three years or more, we have not been able to get an answer from them. That is the reason why the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who holds convictions on the one side, and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who holds convictions on the other side, are able upon this occasion to arraign this Government for their arrant cowardice. Sir, I say "arrant cowardice," and the expression is not at all too strong. You have heard the defence of the Government and their supporters, you have heard the speeches delivered by the members of the Government and their supporters, and if you read them over again, I defy any one to find in any of these speeches a single expression given as to the policy which the Government intend to pursue on this question. It may be worth while to review this discussion. The gentleman who opened the debate on the part of the Government was the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere), and if there is a man in this House, coming, as he does, from the province of Manitoba, representing the Catholic minority in that province; if there is a man who should have an opinion to express upon this occasion, that man is the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. La-

Riviere) whom I regret not to see in his place at this moment. But the hon. gentleman was neither fish nor flesh, and he spoke only to say that he had nothing to say. Next came in chronological order the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman certainly made a very able speech, but, Sir, the one point which made the ability of his speech so apparent was, that after having spoken for two hours he was able to escape without having told the House what his policy was. The First Minister certainly made a most skilful speech, skilful to the point of disingenuousness. The hon. gentleman hinted—he did not say—and the hint was taken as authority for an assertion by many of his supporters: he hinted that the motion now before the House was drawn by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Well, Sir, it is childish, it is almost beneath my dignity, to have to repeat here that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had absolutely nothing to do with the drawing of this amendment. Then, the hon. the First Minister, referring to the statement made by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), as to certain negotiations which were supposed to have taken place between this Government and His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, said, that the assertion was unfounded that Mr. Chapleau had been instructed by this Government, or had been empowered by this Government to negotiate with His Grace the Archbishop. Sir, I am quite ready to admit that Mr. Chapleau never was empowered by an instrument under the Great Seal of this Dominion, duly recorded in the Department of State, to negotiate with the Archbishop of St. Boniface; but I yet await the denegation that Mr. Chapleau, in the name of his colleagues, had several interviews with His Grace of St. Boniface, and that every one of these interviews was reported to the Prime Minister, and, I believe, even to the Minister of Justice. I might point out, in the speech of the hon. Prime Minister, references to several other statements of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) which were, I will not say, positively contradicted by him, but which were, to some extent contradicted—a happy medium between negation and affirmation. But I will pass these over, and come to the conclusion of the hon. gentleman's speech; and I regret that he is not now in his seat, because I could tell him that the concluding portion of his speech was spoken in language calculated to convey a false impression to the minds of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman concluded with some noble words with which I altogether agree. He stated that whatever should be the decision of the Supreme Court on the questions now referred to that tribunal, he was sure that the Government of Manitoba, whether it was in the hands of friends or of foes of the present Administration, would loyally submit to that decision. Sir, in that state-

Mr. LAURIER.

ment there was a false impression conveyed to the people, and the false impression was this, that the decision of this question finally rested with the courts and not with the Government. Sir, I am quite sure, indeed, that whatever that decision might be, the Government of Manitoba, whether in the hands of friends or of foes, would loyally abide by it. But everybody knows, and the hon. gentleman ought to have said so to the House, that whatever may be the decision of the Supreme Court upon this question, there will be nothing in it for the Government of Manitoba to submit to. Why, Sir, it is notorious that the question upon which the Supreme Court has now to decide is whether or not the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba. Suppose, then, that the Supreme Court decides in the negative; suppose it decides that this Government has not the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba? Then, Sir, of course there will be nothing that the Government of Manitoba will be called upon to submit to. Suppose, on the other hand, that the decision of the court is that this Government has power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba? Then, still there would be nothing that the Government of Manitoba would have to submit to. But then the responsibility would rest with the Government of coming to a decision on the question of interfering or not interfering with the legislation of Manitoba. And so, Sir, I say it was a false impression to convey to the people of this country that the decision of this question would finally rest with the Supreme Court, whereas, in one contingency, it must rest with this Government. Next, we heard from the Solicitor-General, who made a very long and laboured speech. He attempted to crush the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) under the weight of a mass of quotations which might have been very good in themselves, but which, in my estimation, had not the slightest relevancy to the question. But whether his quotations were or were not relevant to the question, the hon. gentleman concluded without telling us a word as to what was his own opinion upon the final merits of this question. Then, Sir, we had the hon. Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman, who is an old war-horse, warmed up at the recollection of the battles which he had fought in former times for separate schools in New Brunswick, but he grew cold the moment he came to the question of separate schools in Manitoba—so cold, indeed, that not a word passed his frozen lips on that question. Then, next in order we had my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig). My hon. friend looked upon the motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, most minutely. He examined it most critically, word for word, syllable by syllable; and, after having examined it from top to bottom, from bottom to top, from right to left, and from left to right, he concluded that he

could find nothing in it which he could support. The motion blames the Government for their conduct in this matter, but the hon. gentleman finds nothing at all to blame the Government for. On the contrary, he approves everything the Government have done. He approves especially the reference the Government have now made of this question to the Supreme Court. Then my hon. friend grew a little bolder; he warned the Government. Mind you, said he, you must not touch the legislation of Manitoba; you are not to interfere with the legislative independence of Manitoba. Well, does not my hon. friend perceive that the moment he comes to that conclusion, he passes the severest condemnation possible upon the conduct of the Government? Why, Sir, what is the question that is referred to the Supreme Court? The hon. gentleman tells us that he approves of that reference. If he approves the reference to the Supreme Court, does he forget that that reference is to decide whether or not the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba? If, in his opinion, the Government should not interfere with the legislation of Manitoba, why, in the name of common sense, should there be a reference to the Supreme Court at all? Not only should there not be a reference to the Supreme Court under such circumstances, but I say that the reference to the Supreme Court under such circumstances is most dangerous, because, if the Supreme Court should decide that the Government have the power to interfere with the legislation of Manitoba, and the Government should not obey the legal mandate which they themselves had sought, there would be a powerful and a rightful agitation in some parts of the country against the Government. Then, Sir, we had my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Well, Sir, whatever the faults of my hon. friend may be, no one, up to this moment, ever accused him of wanting in pluck. But for the first time in my life I have seen my hon. friend from Bellechasse sadly deficient in pluck to-day. He spoke for two hours and more, but he would not tell, after all, what his opinion was upon the question now at issue—whether the Catholic minority ought to be protected, or whether the legislative independence of Manitoba ought to be maintained inviolate. And last, we had my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). My hon. friend did not exactly apply himself to the question; but he gave us a doctrine which, in my estimation, was most extraordinary. Why, Sir, if I understood his speech aright, he said this: that we had all been labouring under a delusion, when we had supposed that the Star Chamber had been abolished by the English Parliament—he told us that there was still a vestige of the Star Chamber remaining in the Government of England, and remaining for the good of the Government and the people at large. Sir, in the whole conduct of

this Government with regard to this question, there has been shifting, most miserable shifting, to avoid coming to a decision. The question, after all, is a simple one. In 1890 the Legislature of Manitoba passed a law which the Roman Catholic minority deemed oppressive; that minority appealed to the Government against that law; their prayer has to be denied or has to be granted; this is the simple issue; and yet, Sir, one year, two years, three years have elapsed, and during those three years the Government have never dared yet to come to a decisive action—nay, to express a simple opinion. And, Sir, what is the reason? The reason is well known. The reason is not new; it is as old as the constitution itself. The reason is, that upon this occasion, as upon similar occasions, there is not in this Government the courage equal to the duty of the hour. The reason is, that upon this occasion, as upon many similar occasions, the hon. gentlemen, though they are now seventeen in number, do not find in themselves the manhood to deal with a difficult question. The question is a difficult one—I admit that it is surrounded with difficulties—because it is surrounded with passions, passions religious and national. The hon. gentleman from Winnipeg, the other day, stated, and stated truly, that this question is no longer a provincial one. It has passed beyond the limits of Manitoba; it has reached Ontario and it has reached Quebec. Already you hear the grumbling voice of Ontario, that the Legislature of Manitoba is not to be interfered with; and, on the other hand, you hear the threatening voice of Quebec, that the Roman Catholic minority is to be protected in all its rights. And between these contending passions of Protestants in Ontario and Catholics in Quebec, the Government dare not take action. Hesitating, halting, vacillating, they are tossed to and fro, afraid to act, afraid even to speak. Catholics, Protestants, Quebec, Ontario—Sir, I am not afraid of the passions of Catholics or Protestants; I am not afraid of the passions of Ontario or Quebec, if only the language of reason is spoken and heard. But, Sir, if this Government never speak the voice of reason; if this Government ever fail to appeal to the common sense and the large heart and sound judgment of the people; if by expedients and makeshifts they allow passion and bitterness to grow and swell the heart, the day will come when passion will break out in uncontrollable outburst, and when the voice of reason will be as powerless as if it were addressed to the surging waves of the ocean. Catholics, Protestants, Ontario, Quebec—these are, after all, the dread phantoms which have hitherto prevented the Government from acting. Sir, there is a nobler and higher ground. It may not be possible to solve this question without offending, to a large extent, extreme Protestants or extreme Catholics; but if the Government had been up to the duty of the hour, if they had striven

to screw their courage to the sticking point, they would have solved the question long ago, without shifting or equivocating, and would have then appealed to the strong patriotism and common sense of the people, appealed to all those, whether Protestants or Catholics, who take pride in the name of Canadian, who believe in the harmonious development of Canada; for, Sir, there is the supreme consideration—the supreme inspiration, Canada—Canada as a whole, Canada, our country, Canada—before which all other considerations must yield. Now, I affirm this at the outset. As I read the Constitution of this country, as I read the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act, I say that there is within the provisions of the Constitution, an appeal given to the minority in Manitoba—nay, given to the minority in all the provinces—to this Government whenever they feel oppressed by local legislation in the matter of education. It has been stated that this doctrine, which I now enunciate, is not compatible with the doctrine of provincial rights, of which the party to which I belong has always been the champion. Sir, I am to-day as firm a believer as I ever was in the doctrine of provincial rights. I take as much pride as ever I did in belonging to the great party which in the past carried that doctrine to a successful issue, an issue, indeed, so successful that we rank among the advocates of that doctrine to-day the most prominent of the men who opposed it in the past. And when the historian of the future shall refer to the first twenty years of Confederation, the brightest page he will have to record will be the page in which he will trace the efforts of the Liberal party to maintain inviolate and intact the liberties and independence of the Local Legislatures. And I am proud to say that among the names which shall be revered in the hearts of their countrymen, as the names of those who stood foremost in the fight, will be the names of Edward Blake and Oliver Mowat. The principle for which these men contended was that this Government has not the power to annul and set aside legislation or interfere with any Act passed by a Local Legislature within the purview of its own powers. It is that principle which impelled us to resist, as we did, the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Lefebvier for an act which was within the purview of his powers, and which, right or wrong, had been confirmed and approved by the people of the province of Quebec. This was the reason which made us resist and condemn the action of this Government, when they recklessly upset the legislation of Ontario in the matter known as the Streams Bill. It was the same principle which made us resist, as we did, the action of this Government, when they actually ruthlessly set aside the legislation of Manitoba in the matter of railway competition. And the crowning triumph of all, I am sure, was

Mr. LAURIER.

to hear, the other day, the Prime Minister quote with approval from the book of Professor Bryce on the American Commonwealth, the statement that the wisest provision in the Constitution of the United States was the one declaring that the central power had not the right to interfere with state legislation, but that all questions of conflicting powers between the states and the central Government were to be determined by judicial authority. I am sure the First Minister must have had in his mind then, and regretted with bitter sorrow, the occasions when he interfered with the independence of the Local Legislatures. I agree with the Prime Minister in this view, that it would have been wiser for the Fathers of Confederation to have adopted the American principle of absolute local independence. But such, after all, is not the principle which has been adopted. On the contrary, the principle of our Constitution is this: that while in all other matters the powers of the Local Legislature are almost independent, in the matter of education, a supervisory power has been given to this Government, in so far as separate schools are concerned. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), to-day, commenting upon section 93, stated, and stated very truly, that section 93, subsection 3 especially, is most abnormal and extraordinary. It has been read more than once, let us read it again:

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the Union, or is thereafter established by the Legislature of a province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

This is, I admit, a most extraordinary provision. Here it is stated that whenever, at the time of the Union, a system of separate schools exists in any province, an appeal shall be given to the minority to the central Government from any action of the Legislature which entitles them to ask redress. Not only that, but it is stated that though there may not be at the time of the Union a system of separate schools, if, after the Union a system of separate schools is established, then an appeal shall lie from the minority to the central Government, if the minority feel that they are being oppressed. If the Legislature establishes a system of separate schools, their legislative independence is inviolate, the Government will not have the right to interfere; but, if afterwards the Legislature attempt to interfere with this creature of their own power, immediately their action becomes revisable by this Government, and subject to interference. Now, Sir, it would be well to inquire what was the origin of this section. It is a most puzzling one. No one hitherto in this debate or for many years past, so far as my memory goes, has attempted to inquire and find out what was the origin of this clause. I contend,

and I will now endeavour by giving the history of this clause to support my contention, that the clause was introduced into the Confederation Act by Mr. Galt, now Sir A. T. Galt, who at that time was Finance Minister in the Government of Sir John Macdonald, and the representative of the Protestant minority of Quebec in that Government, and that it was introduced in the Act for the special protection of the Protestant minority of Quebec. Sir, I shall endeavour to make that clear, and I am sure I shall succeed; but I must ask the indulgence of the House, because it will be my duty to quote many long extracts from public documents. When the coalition Government was formed in 1864, to carry out the project of Confederation, the Protestant minority of Quebec had been for many years in the enjoyment of their separate schools; and I am proud to say here, as a Liberal, that this privilege was granted to them, not by the Legislature of United Canada, but by the Legislature of Lower Canada, at the time when Mr. Papineau held sovereign sway therein; and I am proud also to be able to say, and to be able to prove by ample testimony, that the privilege which had been granted by the French-Canadian majority in the old Lower Canada Legislature to the Protestants had always been most liberally maintained. In the debate on Confederation in 1865, Mr. Rose, subsequently Sir John Rose, used the following language:—

Now, we, the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have, was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the Union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the distribution of State funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority.

After the Union in 1841, the Protestant minority felt still more secure in the enjoyment of their schools, because in the Parliament of United Canada, the majority was of their own creed and race, and when the project for Confederation was under consideration the Protestant minority in Quebec felt some alarm at the prospect that they should be placed in the matter of education under the control of a majority, which in the past had proved liberal, it was true, but which would have the power of being the reverse of liberal. Therefore they were anxious, before the system of Confederation came into operation, to perfect their school laws so as to place them beyond the power of the Local Legislature of Quebec. The resolutions which were adopted by the conference at Quebec, and which were the basis of Confederation, contained a special article with regard to education. This was article 45, subsection 6. It placed under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures:

Education—saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the Union goes into operation.

Sir, it is quite clear that after the Union would come into effect the Protestant minority of Lower Canada would be secured in all the privileges which they had at that time in matters of education. Now, there were two things as to which the Protestant minority wanted to be secure: First, as to the proper distribution of Government moneys, in matters of education, and second, a Protestant board of education to manage their separate schools. Mr. Galt, who was then, as I said a moment ago, a member of the Government of Sir John Macdonald, the coalition Government, spoke on this question in the month of October, 1864, in an address to his constituents in the city of Sherbrooke. This is the language he made use of. I take this from the Montreal "Gazette" of 28th October, 1864:

He would now endeavour to speak somewhat fully as to one of the most important questions, perhaps the most important—that could be confined to the Legislature—the question of education. This was a question in which, in Lower Canada, they must all feel the greatest interest, and in respect to which more misapprehension might be supposed to exist in the minds, at any rate of the Protestant population, than in regard to anything else connected with the whole scheme of federation. It must be clear that a measure would not be favourably entertained by the minority of Lower Canada which would place the education of their children and the provision for their schools, wholly in the hands of a majority of a different faith. It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the Local Legislatures it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority.

Now, this applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied, and with equal force, to Upper Canada and the other provinces; for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Roman Catholic minority. The same privileges belong to the one of right here, as belonged to the other of right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

Now, Sir, I call the attention of the House to this language of Mr. Galt: "There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief." He continued:

It had been stipulated that the question was to be made subject to the rights and privileges which the minorities might have as to their separate and denominational schools. There had been grave difficulties surrounding the separate school question in Upper Canada, but they were all settled now, and with regard to the separate school system of Lower Canada, it was the determination of the Government to bring down a measure for the amendment of the school laws before the Confederation was allowed to go into force.

He made this statement because, as the clause was worded in the printed resolution, it would appear that the school law, as it at present existed, was to be con-

tinued. Attention had, however, been drawn in the Confederation to the fact that the school law, as it existed in Lower Canada, required amendment, but no action was taken there as to its alteration, because he hardly felt himself competent to draw up the amendments required; and it was far better that the mind of the British population of Lower Canada should be brought to bear on the subject, and that the Government might hear what they had to say, so that all the amendments required in the law might be made in a Bill to be submitted to Parliament.

Now, Sir, you see that the intention of the Government of that time, as expressed by Mr. Galt, was, before the scheme of Confederation came into operation, to perfect the school laws with regard to separate schools, so that the Protestant minority would be placed beyond the caprice or ill-will of the Local Legislature. In the session which followed, the session of 1865, in which the project of Confederation was debated, it had been accepted that this pledge given by Mr. Galt would be redeemed; that a Bill would be introduced to protect the Protestant minority. Such was not the case, however. Mr. Holton, who, as you know, was at that time one of the most prominent members of the Liberal party in Lower Canada, and certainly one of the most liberal men that ever sat in this Parliament, whose name, I am sure, will ever be dear to Liberals of all classes in this country—Mr. Holton, in the session of 1865, drew the attention of the Government to the fact that the promised amendments to the school law had not been brought down yet. On the 3rd February, 1865, Mr. Holton spoke on this question in these words:

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

That was the whole gist of the question then. The Government proposed to amend the school law and make a permanent settlement of that question:

The question he then desired to put was whether they intended to submit these amendments before they asked the House to pass finally upon the other scheme of Confederation, and, if so, to state when the House might look for that measure, as it would

Mr. LAURIER.

undoubtedly exercise very considerable influence upon the discussion of Confederation scheme, and probably in the last resort from several members from Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.)

I have stated here the reasons which impelled Mr. Holton to press upon the Government of the day this very question of education. Now, let me call attention to the answer which was given to Mr. Holton by the then Prime Minister, Mr. John A. Macdonald:

As to the school question, it had been announced by Hon. Mr. Galt, at Sherbrooke, that before Confederation took place, this Parliament would be asked to consider a measure which he hoped would be satisfactory to all classes of the community. There was a good deal of apprehension in Lower Canada on the part of the minority there, as to the possible effect of Confederation on their rights on the subject of education, and it was the intention of the Government, if Parliament approved the scheme of Confederation, to lay before the House this session, certain amendments to the school law, to operate as a sort of guarantee against any infringement by the majority of the rights of the minority in this matter.

So here you see again in this statement of Mr. John A. Macdonald, the same idea still prevailing, that the school law was to be amended so as to give a guarantee to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada that the moment the scheme of Confederation came into force, the Protestant minority would be secured in all the rights which they claimed, and that it would not be in the power of the Roman Catholic and French majority to deprive them of any of those rights. The session passed, however, without this proposed law being introduced; but in the following session of 1866, the last session of the old Parliament of Canada, a Bill was introduced by the Government, and this Bill was placed in the hands of the then Solicitor-General, the present member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin). I have it in my hand; it is too long to quote it in its entirety to the House; but the whole Bill showed that the policy which the Government had then in view was in effect to secure to the Protestant minority of Quebec what I stated a moment ago, a fair share of the public moneys for education, and a Protestant Board of Education to manage their own schools. Section 2 of the Bill reads as follows:—

The superior education will comprise the universities and the classical and industrial colleges or seminaries, and the provincial aid thereto as well as that for academies shall be annually divided between the Roman Catholic and Protestant institutions in proportion to the respective Roman Catholic and Protestant population according to the then last census.

Then section 92 enacted as follows, with regard to the Protestant Board of Education:—

12. Whenever four of the Protestant members of the Council of Public Instruction for Lower Canada shall be of opinion that the management of the Protestant schools should be distinct and separate from that of the Catholic schools, they may make known that opinion under their respective signatures to the Governor through the provincial secretary.

13. Within three months after the receipt of said opinion by the Governor, an Order in Council shall

be passed dividing the management of the schools in Lower Canada, and giving to the Protestant Deputy Superintendent of Education the management of the Protestant schools, in the same manner as they now are under the management of the Superintendent of Education.

Now, as you see, the promise of the Government made by Mr. Galt had been redeemed: the Government had introduced a Bill to secure at once to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada the management of their own schools. Then a most singular occurrence took place. Immediately after this Bill had been introduced, another Bill, similar in every particular, was introduced by the then member of the county of Russell (Mr. Robert Bell) for the province of Upper Canada. His Bill was an exact copy of the Bill presented by the Solicitor-General, the present member for Three Rivers, merely substituting the words "Upper Canada" for the words "Lower Canada." Then an occurrence took place which was still more singular. The representation from Upper Canada was opposed to a man to the Bill introduced by Mr. Bell. The Government could have carried it with the votes of the representation from Lower Canada; but the members for Lower Canada, who were ready to vote for the Bill giving protection to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, would not do so unless the same thing was done for the Catholics of Upper Canada by adopting Mr. Bell's Bill. So that the Government would have had to carry the Bill of Lower Canada with the majority of Upper Canada, and the Bill of Upper Canada with the majority of Lower Canada. Well, Mr. John A. Macdonald refrained from that course, he would not attempt it, and the consequence was that he withdrew the Bill, which was meant to secure to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada the rights and privileges which were contained in that Bill; and the further consequence was that Mr. Galt resigned as a member of the Government. The whole matter came up for discussion in the session of 1866, on August 7. Mr. John A. Macdonald explained the whole transaction which I have just summarized, and this is the language which he used:

They were fully convinced of the liberality of sentiment of the Lower Canada majority; there was no doubt as to the course of that majority upon the Bill; they were quite willing to concede to their Lower Canada fellow-subjects of British origin the privilege which it was designed to give them. But a similar Bill has been introduced by the member for Russell for Upper Canada giving to the Catholic majority of Upper Canada precisely the same privileges. The Government found beyond doubt that there would have been a very large majority from Upper Canada against that Bill. All the members from Upper Canada but himself, were prepared to vote against it. The Government had also found that there was a strong feeling, and a very natural feeling, among the Catholic majority of Lower Canada, that their co-religionists in the west ought to enjoy the same privileges as they were willing to give the Lower Canada minority, and therefore made a difficulty in the way of carrying the Government Bill, which by itself

would have passed with a large majority. Had this Bill been pushed, also, the singular spectacle of a Bill for Upper Canada being carried by Lower Canada, and a Bill for Lower Canada by Upper Canada votes would have been presented. This would have been a most unfortunate occurrence. They were not like ordinary Bills; if passed they would have been a fundamental part of the constitution of the country. It was not desirable, therefore, in the present position of affairs, that such a result should have been produced. * * * * * The minority in each section would have to throw themselves on the justice and generosity of the majority. * * * * * The hon. Minister of Finance, who had taken a very particular interest in this Bill, had felt it to be his duty to tender his resignation when his colleagues had come to the conclusion to drop the Bill, and his resignation was now in the hands of His Excellency. His hon. friend had been in an especial manner the guardian of the rights of the Lower Canada minority.

Now, Sir, I call the attention of the House to the concluding sentence in the speech of Sir John Macdonald:

The minority in each section would have to throw themselves on the justice and generosity of the majority.

The Protestant minority of Quebec would not be satisfied with that, but continued the agitation in order to obtain something more substantial than the generosity of their fellow-countrymen in the Legislature. The agitation was carried on, and it was carried on to a successful issue. In October the ministerial press announced that the Government had just appointed delegates to proceed to England to supervise the legislation which was to carry out the scheme of Confederation. It was announced that Mr. Galt, who in the August previous had resigned because he could not carry that Bill which he wanted for the Protestant minority of Quebec, had been asked to be one of the delegates, and had accepted. Naturally it was surmised that if Mr. Galt had accepted and had become a delegate he must have received from the Government of Canada some assurance that the proposition which he wanted to have brought into the Confederation scheme would be carried out. And this surmise was right, because on October 24 of that year, 1866, the Montreal "Gazette," which then as now was the organ of the Government, contained the following article:—

We have much pleasure in announcing that during the recent protracted sittings of the Cabinet at Ottawa, the subject of the position of the Lower Canada Education question was very fully considered. The Ministry were, we understand, desirous that Mr. Galt should be appointed as a delegate to represent the interests of the British population; but that gentleman felt that he could not accept unless he was assured as to the views of the Government on the points that so seriously concern his countrymen and co-religionists, and which so deeply rouse their feelings. We are informed that the Ministry entirely satisfied Mr. Galt of their determination to give practical effect to the pledges given in Parliament, and the gentleman has in consequence accepted the appointment of delegate for the express purpose of watching over these important interests as well as of lending his aid to the consummation of the measure of Confederation.

We feel that our Protestant friends may rest assured that the man who resigned the honours and emoluments of office on this question will not, as a delegate, be found wanting to his trust as their representative. And we hail with great satisfaction the approaching settlement of a question which might have been fraught with so much danger to the kindly and cordial relations which have of late so happily subsisted between the people of different races and creeds in Canada.

So that when Mr. Galt left for England the Protestant population of Canada were assured that their interests would be amply protected by the delegate whom they had in the person of Mr. Galt. The Bill, which has since become the British North America Act, was introduced in the Imperial Parliament in February, 1867. That Bill was published, not the law, let it be remembered, but the Bill was published in the Montreal "Gazette" on March 1 of the same year, as any hon. gentleman can see by looking at the records of that newspaper. The Bill as introduced is the Bill word for word which is now the British North America Act. Section 43, subsection 6, of the resolutions of the Quebec conference :

Education—showing the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools, at the time when the Union goes into operation.

became in the Bill the complicated section No. 93 of the British North America Act. All the provisions contained in subsections 1, 2 and 3 of section 93 were introduced by Mr. Galt for the special protection of the Protestant minority of Quebec. Now, Sir, I again call attention to this, that section 93 was introduced at the instance of Mr. Galt, and I am sure I could invoke the testimony of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), who was a co-delegate, but I need not do so as I have here written evidence in an article published on the following day, March 2, by the ministerial organ, the Montreal "Gazette," and I call the attention of the House to this article. The "Gazette" wrote as follows :—

Few questions have excited a more lively interest in this country than the education of children in public schools, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, the appropriation of taxation for that purpose. We need not repeat the particulars of the agitation on the subject, which commenced with the promulgation of the resolutions of the conference of Quebec, and resulted in Mr. Galt resigning his seat in the Cabinet. The short of the story is, all this led to an agreement on the part of the Canadian Government to advise Her Majesty's Ministers to insert in the Union Bill the provisions with which the public are, undoubtedly, already aware. That was the agreement to which we referred, in October last, as having been satisfactory to Mr. Galt, and on the strength of which he consented to become a delegate to London. The public may find in these provisions in the Bill the proof of the statement made by us, which some of our contemporaries, without any evidence, undertook to call in question.

Before the question of Confederation was mooted, the constant cry on the part of a portion of the Lower Canada Protestant minority was : Give us the same

Mr. LAURIER.

privileges as those enjoyed by the Upper Canada minority. Well, the Bill as it stands, in terms, provides that the minority in Lower Canada shall have precisely the same privileges as the minority in Upper Canada.

And, further, that the minorities in all the provinces shall have the right of appeal to the general Parliament.

The bill, in this form, undoubtedly, in our opinion, will become the fundamental law of the country, forming a part of its political constitution ; and that, as such, it must be accepted. It affords essential guarantees as well in immediate practice as in ultimate resort. The main thing required in immediate practice is that the moneys collected from the taxation of Protestants, shall, if required, be available for the support of separate schools. The right of appeal as an ultimate resort, will always operate the effect of affording a check. And the English-speaking Protestants of Lower Canada must not forget that their appeal will be to a preponderating majority of their own race and creed ; and it is probable that, if they get hurt, they will make their cry known. That is a characteristic of theirs. In the past, since the adoption of the principle known as the "double majority," shortly after the Union of 1841, by Mr. Baldwin and Sir L. H. Lafontaine, Lower Canada has been practically governed by the Lower Canada majority, and if Lord Carnarvon's Bill had contained no special provisions respecting the rights of minorities, our position in Lower Canada would scarcely, in point of fact, have been altered.

If we are not misinformed, Lord Carnarvon has received assurances, on high Protestant authority, that the Bill as it stands, contains sufficient guarantees for the Protestant interests of Lower Canada ; and that, in this respect, it is sufficiently satisfactory.

All the people who inhabit this country, French and English, Catholic and Protestant, must live together and continue to do so. It is in the highest public interest that they should do so in peace. And to this end it is in the highest degree important that there should be some ground of common understanding. If on the other hand we commence with a policy of distrust and jealousy, and mutual annoyance, God alone can tell, the frightful consequences to which it will be sure to lead. An eminent political writer has well set forth that religious liberty springs from the mixing together of diverse elements such as we have in Canada. Men, from living together ought to learn to respect even each others' prejudices ; and this is the very first principle of freedom. One of the most difficult of men's lessons is to learn, especially in matters of opinion based on prejudices, that their own geese are not swans.

Now, Sir, you have ample evidence that this extraordinary provision was introduced at the instance of the delegate of the Protestant minority of Lower Canada for the protection of that minority. Let me go a little further into the history of that question. Confederation came into being. The question of education again was agitated in Quebec, and the members who in the early days of Confederation represented in the Quebec Legislature the Protestant portion of the population, were eager to have introduced at once into the House the same Bill which had been introduced by Mr. Solicitor-General Langevin, in 1866, in the Old Parliament of Canada, and which for the reason I have stated had miscarried. In the session of 1869 of the Quebec Legislature, Mr. Carter, then member, if I remember aright, for Montreal Centre, moved for copies

of all correspondence between the Government of Quebec and that of the Dominion respecting education, and in support of his motion, Mr. Carter said :

His object in moving the present Address to His Excellency on a subject so important as that to which it refers, is to ascertain in an efficient manner, whether those charged with the responsible duty of carrying out our new constitution have taken any steps towards carrying out that provision of the Confederation Act, which declares that "all the powers, privileges, and duties at the Union, by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects." At the time the Confederation Act was under consideration, it was found necessary to adopt some provision to afford to the Protestant universities in the province of Quebec some guarantee that their rights and privileges in matters of education should be protected, and no statesman was more zealous and more energetic in accomplishing this object than the Hon. Mr. Galt, whose efforts were crowned with success by the introduction of the 2nd paragraph of the 93rd clause of our Confederation Act.

Mr. Carter only spoke of the second paragraph, but it is equally certain that Mr. Galt has also the merit of having introduced the whole of that clause. Upon that motion, Mr. Dunkin, who was then treasurer in Mr. Chauveau's Government, made the following remarks :

With regard to education, he had not the slightest doubt that that question will be settled in a manner satisfactory to both Protestants and Catholics. Still it would be impossible to enact a complete code of laws on that subject until they knew the state of their finances. A great difficulty to the settlement of this question formerly was the fact that if any changes were proposed for Lower Canada similar changes were demanded for Upper Canada. That difficulty had now been removed, and there was nothing to prevent the speedy settlement of the question.

Now, Sir, for the speedy settlement of that question the Protestant minority demanded a law similar to the Bill which had been introduced by Mr. Solicitor-General Langevin. In that very session of 1869, a similar Bill was introduced and carried, and it is to be found in the Statutes of the Legislature of Quebec, 32 Vic., chapter 16. I have given you a moment ago the provisions of the Bill introduced by Mr. Langevin, with regard to its main features ; that is to say, the distribution of the public moneys and the creation of a Protestant Board of Education. In this Act of 1869 the same provisions are to be found. I cite now from section 4, with regard to the distribution of moneys :

The total aid to universities, classical colleges, industrial colleges, academies and model schools, under the provision of chapter 15 of the consolidated statutes for Lower Canada, or of any other law that may be passed concerning superior education, shall in future be distributed between the totality of the Roman Catholic and of the Protestant institutions respectively, in the relative proportion of the respective Roman Catholic and Protestant populations of the province according to the then last census.

The provisions with regard to the Protestant Board of Education are to be found in sections 1 and 2. Section 1 enacts :

Within four months after the passing of this Act the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint, to form and constitute the Council of public instruction for the province of Quebec, together with the Minister of Public Instruction or Superintendent of Education for the province, as the case may be, for the time being, twenty-one persons, fourteen of whom shall be Roman Catholics and seven Protestants, and until such appointment shall take place the members of the present Council of public instruction shall continue in office.

Section 2 goes on to say :

The said Council so soon as reorganized under this Act shall resolve itself into two committees, the one consisting of the Roman Catholic and the other of the Protestant members thereof, and the matters and things which by law belong to the said Council shall be referred to the said committees respectively, in so far as they shall specially affect the interests of Roman Catholic and of Protestant education respectively, and in such manner and form as the whole shall from time to time be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Public Instruction or of the Superintendent of Education. The Minister of Public Instruction or Superintendent of Education, as the case may be, for the time being shall be a member ex-officio of each committee, but shall have right of voting only in the committee of the religious faith to which he shall belong.

So that, Sir, the Legislature of Quebec unanimously carried out faithfully, and put in the law, every feature of the Act which had been introduced in 1866 in the Old Parliament of Canada for the absolute protection and guarantee of the Protestant minority of that province. I think I have made it as clear as possible that section 93 of the British North American Act was enacted for the special security of the Protestant minority of Quebec. That section, as I said a moment ago, was introduced by Mr. Galt ; but Mr. Galt, as is well known, was not only an able financier, but he was certainly one of the most remarkable and broad-minded men of his generation. Mr. Galt was too great a man to introduce that provision into the law simply for the security of his own people, the Protestant minority of Quebec, without at the same time securing like privileges to all the other minorities of the other provinces. It is manifest from the words spoken yesterday by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin)—who can speak with authority on this subject since he was one of the delegates—the intention of the delegates to London was : that these securities, these guarantees, which had been devised by Mr. Galt, it is true for the Protestant minority in Quebec, should be extended to all minorities as well. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) tells us that, in his opinion, although this section may apply to Quebec, and may apply to Ontario, and perhaps to the older provinces of the Dominion, yet it should not apply to Manitoba. Well, Sir, I hope that my hon. friend on this occasion will not

take a narrow construction of the law, and I say for my part: that the law has to be construed in a generous and liberal spirit, and whatever privileges are guaranteed to one minority in a province I claim in the name of justice and fairness, for all minorities in all of the provinces. My hon. friend spoke yesterday as a lawyer, and perhaps, after all, his contention as a lawyer may be true that the Manitoba Act has limited the general Act. But it seems to me that he was successfully answered on this point yesterday by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), when that hon. gentleman called his attention to section 2 of the Manitoba Act. Section 2 of that Act enacts:

The provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or, by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

It seems to me that this very section has imported into the Manitoba Act the whole of section 93 of the British North America Act, and that the privileges which are there guaranteed to the Protestant minority of Quebec are ipso facto to be extended as well to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba. Now, Sir, what was the intention of the framers of the constitution on this point? Let us set aside Manitoba for a moment. Manifestly, Sir, the intention of the framers of the constitution was that whenever a law relating to education was passed in a province which had enjoyed a system of separate schools, which law the minority deemed oppressive, that minority should have the right to come before the Dominion Government—nay, before the Dominion Parliament—and claim justice—claim to be protected from that oppression. This is the construction I put upon that provision of the constitution. In my estimation no other construction can be put upon that provision of the law. What I want to know is the meaning of these words: "An appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council?" An appeal of what? An appeal against legislation which the minority deems oppressive. And for my part, Sir, I hold it as my deliberate opinion that by the constitution of this country, the Dominion Parliament have been entrusted with powers of supervision in matters of education over the local legislatures, and that whenever a minority feels oppressed, its privilege and its right is to come before the Dominion Government and lay its case before that Government. And, Sir, if there is an appeal, it follows as a consequence that the authority to which the appeal lies has the right to

Mr. LAURIER.

interfere. But, Sir, so strong am I in my conviction of provincial rights that I am bound to say at once that this privilege of appeal should not be exercised except for very cogent reasons, and this interference should not take place either, except for very, very cogent reasons—reasons implying such an abuse of power on the part of the local legislature as no man with a heart in his bosom would submit to. Now, Sir, I can easily conceive, in view of what has taken place of late, of such an abuse of power taking place. Suppose—it is hardly supposable, but suppose—that the Legislature of Quebec were to-morrow to abolish the system of separate schools in that province. As you know, we have in Quebec no schools but religious schools—Roman Catholic schools and Protestant schools. Suppose the Legislature of Quebec were to-morrow to abolish the system of separate schools existing there, so that the Protestant population would have either to send their children to the Roman Catholic schools or bring them up in ignorance or tax themselves a second time to establish schools of their own. Sir, if, under the circumstances, an appeal were brought to this Government, is there a man in this House who would not say at once to the Government: It is your bounden duty at once to interfere and make away with this obnoxious and tyrannical legislation? But, Sir, I shall be told, perhaps, by my hon. friend from North Simcoe that such a case is not supposable at all, because if the Legislature of Quebec were to attempt to abolish the separate schools in that province, that legislation would be null and void, because the Legislature has not the power to abolish the separate schools. That I grant; but I would call my hon. friend's attention to another supposition, which is quite supposable, though I hope it will never take place, and I am sure it will not, so long as the spirit of liberality which at present exists in the province of Quebec continues. But let me suppose this case. I have quoted to you the law which now prevails in Quebec—the law demanded by the Protestant population of that province, giving them a school board of their own. I have quoted to you the law whereby in 1869 two separate boards of education were organized, a Roman Catholic board and a Protestant board. The Roman Catholic board to-day is composed of seventeen members, nine Catholic laymen and all the Roman Catholic bishops of the province. Now, suppose that to-morrow the Legislature of Quebec were to abolish the Protestant school board. Then, by the effect of that law, the management of the Protestant schools would become vested in the Roman Catholic Board of the Council of Education, that is to say, practically in the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops. If such legislation were to be enacted by the Legislature of Quebec, is there a man to say that it would not be a

most infamous act of tyranny? Sir, if tomorrow such a law were enacted, the first thing that the Protestant population would do would be to come before this Government and ask this Government, in virtue of the powers vested in it by the Constitution, to abolish at once the obnoxious and tyrannical legislation. If the Protestant population were to come and represent to the Government that their schools, the Protestant schools, had been placed under the management of the Roman Catholic bishops of the province, I say that every man in this House, be he Protestant or Catholic, would at once call upon the Government to abolish the law and to pass the remedial legislation to the Protestant minority. Well, Sir, I claim that under the constitution as we have it, it is for such abuses of authority and power that this section 93 has been introduced. But I may, perhaps, be told that there is no parallel between what I have suggested and what has taken place in Manitoba. I may be told that the system of schools that has been introduced in Manitoba is not a system of Protestant schools, but a system of public schools. Sir, let me call the attention of the House to the complaint of the Roman Catholic population of Manitoba. My hon. friend from North Simcoe is aware that previous to the legislation of 1890, they had in Manitoba the same system of schools that we have in Quebec—religious schools, either Protestant or Catholic—and that in 1890 that system was abolished by law, to be replaced as it is said, by a system of public schools. Now, Sir, I will quote to the House the complaint of the Roman Catholic population of Manitoba, as it is contained in the petition sent to the Government by His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface:

To His Excellency the Governor-General in Council.

The humble petition of the undersigned, Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in the province of Manitoba, respectfully sheweth:

That two statutes—53 Vic., chap. 37 and 38—were passed in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to merge the Roman Catholic schools with those of the Protestant denominations, and to require all members of the community, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, to contribute through taxation to the support of what are therein called public schools, but which are in reality a continuation of the Protestant schools.

Sir, I heard the remark casually made yesterday in the House, that this statement was not true, and that the system of schools now prevailing in Manitoba was not a continuation of the Protestant system. I have looked over the whole blue-book, and all the correspondence brought down, and I fail to find any language there traversing that statement. It may or may not be true, but I deal with the case as I find it before the Government today. but if the statement is founded on fact which is made by His Grace Archbishop Taché, and which is repeated in all the petitions coming from the

Roman Catholics of Manitoba, that, under the guise of public schools, Protestant schools are being continued, and that Roman Catholic children are forced, under that law, to attend what are, in reality, Protestant schools, I say this—and let my words be heard by friend or foe, let them be published in the press throughout the length of the land—that the strongest case has been made for interference by this Government. If that statement be true, though my life as a political man should thereby be ended for ever, what I say now I shall be prepared to repeat, and would repeat on every platform in Ontario, every platform in Manitoba, nay, every Orange lodge throughout the land, that the Catholic minority has been subjected to a most infamous tyranny. This is the case as I find it. Now, these are the facts before this Government. There was the complaint made to gentlemen on the other side, there was the complaint made by the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, that, under the guise of public schools, their children were compelled to attend Protestant schools. I appeal to every man in this House, whether he be on this side or on the other side, I appeal to Catholic and Protestant alike, if this complaint be true, whether there is a man who will stand up and say that the Roman Catholics are to be subjected to that system. Let the hon. gentleman who is going to follow me in a moment, and speak in favour of the Government, let him, if that statement be true, say whether he is in favour of the Roman Catholics being subjected to that system. I would not hesitate, if the statement is true, to go ahead and plead the case of the Catholics in Winnipeg with the Government of Mr. Greenway himself, because, if there is such an outrageous state of things prevailing in the province of Manitoba, not a moment is to be lost in coming to the rescue of the oppressed minority. These are my sentiments. That is the position upon which I stand at this moment, and that is the reason why I arraign the Government as I do. There was the fact which they should have investigated, and to which they should have addressed themselves, but instead of investigating that fact, they tried every subterfuge in their power to delay investigation, because, if they studied the question they would have to come to a decision. I charge against the Government that they have resorted to every possible subterfuge in order to avoid coming to a decision. The first thing they did was to refer the matter to the courts of law—first to the courts of Manitoba, then to the Supreme Court, and then to the Privy Council. But, I may be told, surely you will not call this a subterfuge. Yes, I do call this a subterfuge, because of the manner in which it was done. I call it a subterfuge because the Government never intended that the decision should be final. The case was referred to judicial arbitration, and it is a primary rule that judicial arbitration is final to the contending parties. The parties who go before the

courts are to be bound by the award. Such is not the case in this matter. One of the parties was told it might go before the courts, and if there it failed, it could go before the Government, and the Government would hear its complaints. This was the language used by the Prime Minister, then Minister of Justice, in March, 1891 :

If the appeal should be successful these acts will be annulled by judicial decision, the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba will receive protection and redress. The acts purporting to be repealed will remain in operation, and those whose views have been represented by a majority of the Legislature cannot but recognize that the matter has been disposed of with due regard to the constitutional rights of the province.

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections (2) and (3) of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act," in relation to the other provinces.

As I said a moment ago, the two parties were told to go before the courts, but one was told, at the same time : If you fail, then come before us. The party to which that language was spoken was the Roman Catholic minority. Well, they went before the courts. They failed, and then they came before the Government, and instead of having their case dealt with, there was another subterfuge. This time the subterfuge was that the Government which had promised to deal with that case could no longer deal with it, because they were judges and had become a judicial tribunal. I will not enter into an argument as to this point, but cannot refrain from noticing the extraordinary doctrine laid down to-day by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). If I understood him aright, he said that the Government were endowed with judicial powers, that they could sit as a court, that this privilege still pertained to the Government of England, and he reviewed a quotation made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday. That hon. gentleman had read from Bagehot the following sentence :—

First, it is laid down as a principle of English polity, that in it the legislative, the executive and the judicial powers are divided, that each is entrusted to a different person or set of persons, that no one of these can at all interfere with the work of the other.

The hon. member for Albert said that this sentence should have been prefaced by the preceding sentence which governs it, and which is as follows :—

There are two descriptions of the English Constitution which have exercised immense influence, but which are erroneous.

According as the hon. gentleman read this sentence, it should read this way : that it is erroneous to say that the legislative, the executive and the judicial power are

Mr. LAURIER.

divided. But this is not at all the way the sentence should be read. It should be read in this way, that in England it is erroneous to say that the legislative and executive powers are divided. Bagehot only speaks of the legislative and executive powers. He speaks nowhere of the judicial power, and therefore the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon) misread completely the authority of Bagehot on this point. To make this more plain, I will give another quotation from Bagehot, which I find on page 78 :

The efficient secret of the English Constitution may be described as the close union, the nearly complete fusion of the executive and legislative powers. No doubt by the traditional theory, as it exists in all the books, the goodness of our Constitution consists in the entire separation of the legislative and executive authorities, but in truth its merit consists in their singular approximation.

This, Sir, is what the hon. gentleman completely failed to understand. He says that by practice and theory under British polity the executive and legislative powers are separated entirely. Bagehot says they are closely united and that the Government is simply a committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. WELDON. The word "judicial" is found in the fifth line of that paragraph.

Mr. LAURIER. It is indeed found in the fifth line. But surely, Sir, the hon. gentleman will not read a book and see in it only one word. The hon. gentleman knows that the whole chapter is devoted simply to the executive and legislative power and not at all to the judicial power.

Mr. WELDON. Oh, oh.

Mr. HAGGART. Read the following sentence.

Mr. LAURIER. No, I will not read the following sentence. I will quote the First Minister against my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). The First Minister in his speech the other day, repudiated the theory of judicial power put forth by the hon. gentleman, and contended that all along he was acting under ministerial responsibility. Sir, the hon. gentleman's argument was this—that even if he would he could not divest himself of ministerial responsibility. Sir, I know very well that the hon. gentleman and the Government could not divest themselves of ministerial responsibility in point of law, but, in point of fact they succeeded marvellously in freeing themselves from ministerial responsibility. Take the conduct of my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Interior ; when he was questioned he shielded himself behind his position as a judge at once, and thus he avoided ministerial responsibility in fact. He could not avoid that responsibility in point of law, but in point of fact he avoided it completely. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of the House to the extraordinary language in which this new doctrine, this new subterfuge to avoid responsibility is set down by the Prime Minister. This is the report

of the sub-committee, drawn up by the Prime Minister :

The application comes before Your Excellency in a manner differing from applications which are ordinarily made under the Constitution to your Excellency in Council. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of political character or involving political action on the part of Your Excellency's advisers. It is to be dealt with by Your Excellency in Council, regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools—

“Regardless of the personal views which Your Excellency's advisers may hold with regard to denominational schools.” How convenient that doctrine which permits the advisers of His Excellency to pocket at once their opinions and their emoluments !

—and without the political action of any of the members of Your Excellency's Council being considered as pledged by the fact of the appeal being entertained and heard. If the contention of the petitioners be correct, that such an appeal can be sustained the inquiry will be rather of a judicial than of a political character. The sub-committee have so treated it in hearing counsel, and in permitting their only meeting to be open to the public.

The sub-committee had permitted that their only meeting be open to the public. Then, Sir, the Government sat as a whole, and they sat with great dignity and solemnity as a court of justice. Sir, the country was thrilled with admiration when, on the 22nd of January, we heard of the proceedings of the new Star Chamber that we now have in Canada, as it was properly so designated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Let me read it again to the House :

At the Privy Council Chamber at Ottawa.

Present :—Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada.

Mr. Ewart appeared for the minority petitioners.

The President of the Council—A report—

It is now the President of the Council who speaks, the Chief Justice of the court :

—report of the sub-committee of the Council appointed to consider the petition of the minority in the province of Manitoba in reference to the school laws of that province recommended that Saturday, the 21st day of January, 1893, at the Chamber of the Privy Council at Ottawa, should be fixed for the hearing of the parties. This meeting is convened to hear argument on the points raised by the sub-committee of the Council on the appeal of the minority in the province of Manitoba on the question of schools. Mr. Ewart, are you ready ?

Mr. Ewart.—I am ready.

The President of the Council.—Do you require to have the report of the sub-committee read ?

Mr. Ewart.—I have been furnished with a copy.

The President of the Council.—Then you may proceed.

I need not, Sir, read to the House the argument of Mr. Ewart, but, while Mr. Ewart is proceeding to address the court, perhaps it may not be out of place if we review the court itself. At the end of the board was the Chief Justice, the President of the Council (Mr. Ives), a lawyer in his early days, with whom I have had the pleasure of arguing

many a case, but who, for the last ten years, I am sure, has not appeared inside a court-house. Then came the Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson), an able lawyer, as everybody admits, but who, from his connection with the case, as was pointed out by the hon. member for North Simcoe, was disqualified from sitting in the case and would have been disqualified in any court in the land, except this. Then there was the Solicitor-General (Mr. Curran), who was disqualified for the same reason. Then, Sir, came my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who also in his early days was a lawyer, but who has since distinguished himself as a banker, a politician and a soldier. Then came my hon. friend the Minister of Interior (Mr. Daly), who, I believe, up to some time ago, not very late, was a lawyer, but who, as he said himself on a former occasion in another place, is full of vim and vigour and would introduce politics even into municipal government.

Mr. DALY. It came out right, too.

Mr. MULOCK. You got your man licked.

Mr. DALY. We carried Toronto.

Mr. LAURIER. Then came my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood, Brockville), for years a successful lawyer, but absorbed of late in the intricacies of Excise duties on whiskey, beer and tobacco. Then there was the hon. the Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron), who, at one time, dabbled in law, as did most of us, but who won the cross he wears on his breast as a warrior and not as a lawyer. Then came my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Angers), who says that if he finds the constitution in his way he can jump over the constitution. Then came my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who has replaced by finance what he has forgotten about temperance. Then came the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Bowell), the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan), and the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), Mr. Carling and Mr. Smith, but as far as my knowledge goes these gentlemen have never distinguished themselves by their legal studies. Such was the court. And after Mr. Ewart had finished addressing them, again the President of the Council addressed the court and the public :

I will, said the President, read a letter that has been received from the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.

Then he read the letter in which the Lieutenant-Governor acknowledges the receipt of the invitation to his Government to be present and the letter of the Government of Manitoba stating that it would not appear before the court.

The President of the Council.—Does any one else desire to be heard ?

There being no reply, the President said : The Council will consult upon this subject and the public will please retire.

The public retired, Sir. And, as the Augurs of old, according to Cicero, never met without laughing, I can well imagine that these improvised judges, looking at each other, burst into a hearty laugh over the whole comedy. Because comedy it was, and this last reference to the Supreme Court was only a part of the programme, and while I say so, I will now give my own authority. We have had a history of the whole matter given by a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House on the other side, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). This gentleman, as we know, is a journalist, and is proprietor and editor of the Toronto "World," and there is a rumour afloat that between the "World" and the "Empire" there is rivalry as to which of them is nearer the ear of the Ministry. The "World" of 28th November last, contained a despatch from Ottawa as follows:—

Despatch from Ottawa.—Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P., of the Toronto "World," is here.

"What about the Manitoba school question?" was asked.

"As far as I can gather, the Manitoba school question is not to be a disturbing one, notwithstanding the predictions of many newspapers and politicians to the contrary. It will not get into Parliament this session, or the next. It is purely a matter of law and the interpretation of the Constitution, and as such it will be dealt with. As far as I am aware, Sir John Thompson has undertaken the duties of Prime Minister unpledged in regard to the Manitoba school question, and he will ask none of his colleagues to commit themselves in any way on that subject. It will be settled in time in the courts and not by the politicians."

That is not all. The previous day there had been another despatch sent to the "World" from Ottawa, which read as follows:—

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.—As was said above, Sir John approaches this question entirely unpledged. It is not a question that is likely to get into politics for some time to come, but on the contrary, it will immediately get into the court and have its settlement there. Manitoba and the sympathizers of Manitoba in Ontario need have no fear of that question. The Roman Catholics have come to the Government and claimed that it should step in and grant them remedial legislation. The Government have referred them to a committee of their own members to hear their argument. That committee will arrange to have the whole question, as to whether the Government can interfere or not, submitted to the Government sitting as something like an open court.

The gentleman who wrote that despatch was evidently well informed, as subsequent events have shown:

The Roman Catholics will be asked to establish a case, if they can, showing that such interference is constitutional. The province of Manitoba will be given an equal opportunity of answering and showing that it is not. The press and the public will be admitted to the arguments. The Government will then decide on, not whether they have the powers of interference or not, but whether they will remit the question to the Supreme Court for decision or not. The question may go no further than a decision, not even to submit the question to the court. All this will be

Mr. LAURIER.

done before Parliament meets. If the Government decide to submit the question to the court for a decision as to the powers of the Government and of Parliament to interfere, that will put the question for the time out of politics, and it will not be able to even be raised in Parliament in the coming session. If the court, in the course of a year, should decide that Parliament and the Government have the right to interfere, then the question comes back to politics, and Sir John Thompson and his party must take a stand. By that time, the question will be pretty well threshed out, and you will not find the Government disposed to interfere, even if they have the right. They are not going to make trouble for themselves and their party. Sir John Thompson, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, is unpledged publicly or privately in the matter, and he is not now going to pledge himself or his party on a question that cannot come up as a political issue for years. For the present, separate schools for Manitoba are impossible, and the Roman Catholics must accept it as such. This really relieves Sir John Thompson and his party of a troublesome question and gives him a free hand.

The Liberals, and especially Mr. Laurier, will be forced by the facts to agree with this line of action. He cannot blame the Catholics for claiming the right of intervention, if the Government possess it, and he cannot blame the Government for remitting the question to the Supreme Court for a determination whether the Government, under the laws and constitution, have the right.

Sir, I would not blame the Government for referring the matter to the Supreme Court if this reference is not to be, as a former one was, a makeshift, if it is to be genuine and efficient, as it ought to be; but I blame the Government now, if the reference is made, as it was, simply as a makeshift and nothing else; I blame the Government even now for not having done sooner what they should have done. I blame them for these long delays, which only add fuel to the bitterness which now exists. Sir, we know that these constant triflings with burning questions are fraught with danger; we know that thrice already these triflings with burning questions have produced such convulsions as almost to imperil the life of Confederation. On this occasion, after procrastination, after long delays, shifting of expedients, subterfuge, at last the Government will have to pronounce a decision, the population will by that time have been excited to such a pitch that the condition will be scarcely distinguishable from open rebellion to the law; and when that decision comes, whatever it may be, great disappointment is sure to result, and an impression will prevail that a great injustice has been done to a portion of Her Majesty's subjects.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Speaker, a good many of us would forget, and perhaps forgive, as I myself will do, the imputations and charges which have been hurled against us by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, if we thought that what he has said in the last sentences of his speech was the sincere expression of his conviction. He has said that if he was sure that the Government had not referred the question to the Supreme

Court only as a makeshift, that the action of the Government was bona fide, and that the Government would act in conformity with the decision of the Supreme Court, then he would refrain from blaming the Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, allow me to tell him in all sincerity that what we have done in the past is a guarantee that what we shall do in the future will be according to law and the Constitution as laid down by the tribunals of this country. Sir, the case has been so ably stated and expounded by the First Minister that it would not be reasonable, perhaps, for me to trespass on the indulgence of the House by repeating his arguments. I shall only reiterate that what we have done has been altogether according to the true spirit and letter of the Constitution and the law, in order to convince the people that we have nothing else in view, notwithstanding the agitation that has been created against us on both sides, but to act according to the Constitution and the laws, we have done our best to dispel prejudices, to teach the people that matters of religion, in questions concerning schools, they must remember that every British subject living in the Dominion of Canada has equal rights, and that, be they high or low, they must not only follow the law, but they have a right to invoke that law in order to be protected in their rights. We have followed in this matter, and I say so, although it may bring a smile on the face of my opponents, the old policy preached to us by the Grand Old Man during so many years in Canada, a policy that has made this country prosperous and happy so far, and that has allowed our party to sail safely through the great difficulties that the Liberals have placed in our way every time they had a chance to raise a religious issue, to set one province against another and to promote strife and prejudice in this country. We shall follow that same course, and I hope the country will be satisfied that, notwithstanding the union that has been effected within the last two days between the two extreme politicians in this House, the Conservative party is going to sail through this difficulty, and prove once more that the party is bound to establish here forever British institutions, British fair play, not McCarthy fair play, which is a kind of fair play that consists in strangling the claimant even before he has been heard, that sort of fair play which consists in saying to a man who comes to the foot of the throne with a grievance: You shall not be heard, you had better go home, because the majority of the people in your province are against you, and you might as well know now as later that you must renounce every right claimed by you. What were the different questions before us, and to the solution of which we have been addressing ourselves during the last year? I need not recite again the history of the legis-

lation of the Manitoba school question: I can only say this, that it was supposed when the Manitoba Act was passed in 1870, and not only supposed, but asserted and declared in Parliament at the time, that the intention of Parliament was to give the minority separate schools. It was so declared at the time, so much so that if hon. members refer to the debate that took place, they will see that Hon. William McDougall, who was a member of the House at the time, announced while the Bill was under consideration in committee, that on the third reading he would move an amendment to strike out that clause in the Act which established separate schools. He did not do so. Why, I do not know. But at the time it was expected and believed that the Act as framed was a guarantee that separate schools would be established and continue to exist in Manitoba. In 1871 an educational law was passed in that province enacting a system of separate schools, giving to Catholics, as well as to Protestants the absolute control and administration of their respective schools. That Act was amended several times, until in 1890, when Mr. Greenway got in power, with the assistance of the Catholic minority, the Legislature enacted a law by which separate schools were abolished, by which the Catholic section of the advisory board or Board of Education was abolished. By this Act all the property of the Catholic schools was given to public schools trustees, by which everything that belonged to the Catholic schools and for which they paid out of their own money was to belong to the public schools to which the Roman Catholics could not send their children. I may say at once that I do not desire to withhold my own opinion respecting the law, and I may say for myself that I am in favour of separate schools, that is to say, I am in favour of religious schools. I believe with great many people, Protestants as well as Catholics, that the basis of the education of children must be morality, and morality must be based on religion. I am of that opinion. Others hold different opinions. They will say, for example, that the children may learn religion in Sunday schools or in church. As a matter of fact, it is not so; and half of the population if they did not learn the elements and principles of religion in schools, would never know anything about them. Is it not a fact that what has caused the founding of that great modern institution, the Salvation Army, was the fact that among the poor people, and even among some of the best people, there were a great many who had never heard about religion. Is it not according to the ideas of this age that children should be instructed in everything by which they could be made good citizens, and the best way to make them good citizens is not only to teach them the three R's, but to teach them morality and religion as well? When that law was passed in Manitoba petitions were sent to the Government; one set

demanding the disallowance of the Act, on the ground that the Bill was "ultra vires," and the other set of petitions demanding that a remedy should be given to the minority whose rights were alleged to have been violated. The question of disallowance was first considered, and it was answered that according to the law passed in 1891, and according to the precedent established by different other Governments before, that it was advisable to refer the matter to a legal tribunal. That, Mr. Speaker, is the true doctrine in such matters. The question of constitutionality is a purely legal question, and as the leader of the Opposition has said, it is not fair, and it is still less advisable for the Government to decide these purely legal questions. The question was sent to the courts. I may say with the consent of the parties concerned in conformity with the principle that the law must be supreme, and the only way in which we can get people to submit to a decision adverse to their religious belief, is to have the law stated by a tribunal empowered by the Constitution of the country to state it. As I have said, I regret very much the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council declaring that at the time of the Union the Roman Catholics in Manitoba had no right to separate schools guaranteed by the law or practice. There is no doubt in my humble opinion that the intention was to establish separate schools, but this intention was not properly expressed in the Act, and it so happens that if the people were entitled to separate schools at the time of the Union, the law as it stood did not give them that guarantee. The Roman Catholics have submitted to that judgment and rightly so, and now they petition the Governor-General in Council, that inasmuch as since the time of the Union separate schools have been established, and as these separate schools have been abolished since by the legislation of 1890, they claim that their property has been taken away from them, and that, although the judgment of the Privy Council tells them they have a right to maintain their own private schools—and it is of some importance I think to mention that—yet that power to maintain their own private schools is taken away from them, because the legislation deprives them of the means of maintaining and continuing their school-houses. In my opinion the minority had a right to these schools because they had paid for them with their own money, and the Government have no right to take them away from them. It was really spoliation on the part of the Government to take these school-houses away from the Catholics. In the petition of the Catholics several questions of law are raised, and their opponents in the press and elsewhere answer that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has settled the whole question. This is the first question raised, and upon it the Governor-General in

Mr. OUIVET.

Council had to adjudicate. That is a question which cannot be settled without reading and studying very carefully all the proceedings that have taken place in the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, and without mastering the reasons upon which the Privy Council has rendered that decision. I say that this is a purely legal question. The second question that is disputed is the extent and the effect and the nature of the appeal which is given to the minority by the Manitoba Act. We have heard so many speeches on this question in the House that I need not say that there is a great variety of opinion, as to the extent and the effect of that appeal. I shall not discuss that question, neither shall I discuss the three legal questions which arise, as to whether subsections 3 and 4 of the 93rd section of the British North America Act are applicable to the province of Manitoba, and if they are applicable, what is the nature, extent and effect of that appeal, and what power does it give to the Governor-General in Council. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we have our own personal opinions on that question; but in a case of this kind, when prejudices and fanaticism, as I may say, have been raised and have clouded the whole question, if we laymen or fourth class lawyers, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said in the mimicking or funny part of his address, should undertake to sit as judges, and were to render a judgment, most probably he would be the first to challenge that judgment; and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the party that would lose its rights, or its pretended rights, would protest against the judgment; and then politics and politicians would step in and raise a dangerous agitation all through the country. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, if there is something that gives a guarantee to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, and to those who sympathise with them, it is the fact that this question is made a legal one, a judicial one, and not a political one. In politics the great rule is that the majority prevails, while before our courts the law is supreme, and it is interpreted without regard to the parties appealing. When the interpretation of the law is given, I should be very much mistaken, notwithstanding the appeals that have been made here by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and perhaps by people outside of this hon. House who sympathise with him, if that interpretation, as expressed by the Supreme Court, is not accepted, I will not say by every one, but by the great majority of the people of Canada, and even by the majority of the people of the province of Manitoba. We must not forget that this law, which has been characterized as infamous by the leader of the Opposition, has been enacted, not by our friends, but by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. If this motion were to pass, the Government would have to resign, and the country would

then be in the hands of the gentlemen on the opposite benches, and who would be their friends to help to give them a majority in order to carry on the Government of this country? They would be the Martins; they would be the Greenways; they would be all the fanatics of the different provinces. The Mercier regime would be resuscitated. Has he not already done enough harm to our province—to its honour, its dignity, its good fame and its financial reputation? Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the question now before the House is a question of law—a question of the interpretation of an Act. The Manitoba Act is a contract that has been entered into by the people of Manitoba and the people of this Dominion. This contract has been written down; it has been discussed; it has been sanctioned by the Governor-General; from here it has gone to England, and has been ratified there. That contract is the law between the parties, and it must for ever remain the law between them; and if that law is deficient, if it does not contain what the people of Manitoba expected, they have to submit to it all the same, and this Government are not going to impose their interpretation on that Act; they are not going to impose their view on the people of Manitoba. They are now applying for advice to the highest court of this country in regard to the interpretation of that law, and both parties will have to abide by the decision that will be rendered by the courts. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say what they like. They may prophesy as to what will be the conduct of this Government when the decision of this question is rendered by the Supreme Court, and may be by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, if the case should be carried to that high tribunal; but the Government will not deviate from the path which they have followed until to-day. They will adhere to the law; they will follow up the law to its full extent as interpreted by the tribunals of the country, and they have no fear of what will be the result. All the good citizens of this country will accept that decision and the Government will accept it and act upon it. The law must be supreme in this country, and must be meted out equally, and when we appeal to the good sense and loyalty of the people of Canada, and when we set at defiance the agitation which will be raised on both sides—on the side of the devil as well as on the side of the deep sea—it will be recognized that we are doing what is best for this country. I may say a few words in reply to one passage in the speech of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) attacking me for a speech I made at St. Jérôme. I am not responsible for what the newspapers report, and I shall tell this House the substance of what I said on that occasion. We were there with the expectation of having a contested election, and we expected to have to speak on behalf of our candidates and the Government. Unfortunately for the

gentlemen on the other side, although they had brought two young lawyers, and two pretty clever lawyers from Montreal, to examine the nomination paper, one fatal error had escaped their attention. The nomination paper was not signed and was accordingly rejected. Speaking to the electors, I said to them that no doubt the legal gentlemen who had been brought from Montreal would have told the Government how to interpret the law, and how Roman Catholics were expected to behave, whether as members of the Government or of the House. They would have taught us the true doctrines of religion on every one of these questions, and you would have been amazed by the amount of knowledge they would have exposed to you. These gentlemen know everything but how to draw a nomination paper. That is the kind of gentlemen who come here to teach us our religious duties, and I added that if there were some people who had been given the mission of preaching religion and teaching Catholics their duties, it would not be those blanc-becs, but those whom the church has sent us and established among us to teach religion, the bishops of the province. I said that I was ready to listen to the teachings of the bishops, but not to the teachings of these blanc-becs. Was there anything very extraordinary in that? I do not think the hon. gentleman will find it so very easy to give a proper explanation of what he has said about the bishops in this House, but this is his own business. The leader of the Opposition has exhibited a great knowledge of the constitutional history of this country, and explained to us that the third subsection of section 93 only applied to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the other old provinces. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) has given to us the true history of the addition of this third subsection to the 93rd section of the British North America Act. When the representatives of the four provinces were in London, there was an effort made to establish separate schools in all the provinces instead of limiting them to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. This was refused; but what was granted was that, if after the Union separate schools were established in the other provinces, the majority would not have the power to abolish them unless with the consent of the minority. And this will be protected by the same appeal. That is the reason why the section was altered so as to read: "Where, in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union, or is thereafter established." I do not intend to give an interpretation of the law, but, as I said, this question will be decided as to whether the subsection applies to the province of Manitoba or not. But, if it applies, decidedly the appeal will lie, and they will be entitled to a remedy. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition made another point, and it was the point on which he was most eloquent. He

said that it was infamous for the Government and the majority in Manitoba to establish not public schools, but Protestant schools, and he said: If such is the case I will rise in my might and tell all these people that they have passed an infamous law, and I will tell all the Protestants who will not demand the repeal and abolition of this infamous system of schools, that they are not true patriots, and, as to myself, I will protest by my vote, and otherwise, against this infamous system. This is one of the facts alleged in the petition filed by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, and, if this is established before the courts, then a question of law will arise, and one which has certainly not been adjudicated upon by the Privy Council when they decided that the Legislature of Manitoba had the right to establish neutral or non-sectarian or undenominational schools. If, under the pretext of establishing neutral schools, they have established Protestant schools, it is one of the questions of fact and law to be submitted to a tribunal, so that the Governor-General may be advised as to their consequences. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning, that the Government have always conducted themselves according to the law, and according to the precedents. I shall not cite the precedents, I shall only remind my countrymen of what was said by the great leader of the French Canadians, Sir George Etienne Cartier, when the New Brunswick school question was brought up before this hon. House. He warned them that they should abide by the law, that they should limit their claim to what was guaranteed to them by the Constitution. He warned them not to depart from that, or to leave to politics and political passions the protection of their rights. He warned them that the moment they consented to have the rights of the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick adjudicated upon according to the needs and circumstances of the political parties prevailing in the House, those rights would be in very great danger, and that, while we were fighting for the fictitious rights of others, our own rights would soon be disposed of by the majority in this House when that majority should happen to be unfriendly to us. I say that, under the circumstances, we should remind him of his warning, and not be carried away by the appeals of the leader of the Opposition. Sir George Etienne Cartier declared that the Liberals were great Catholics when it suited the needs of their party, but should they come into power, on these questions they would soon cease to be so devoted to the Roman Catholic religion and would soon give up the rights which they advocated for the time being as sacred, and what does history tell us? Not more than two years afterwards, in 1874, these gentlemen came into power. My hon. friend, the present Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan) moved his resolution calling upon the Government to carry out their promises. And what was the answer? The answer, Mr.

Mr. OUIMET.

Speaker, was that they could not go beyond the law, and that the law did not enable them to do anything for our co-religionists in the province of New Brunswick. Were they right? Were they wrong? I must say, Mr. Speaker, they were right, and I shall always remember with a great deal of pride that the first time I was a candidate for election for this hon. House, I endorsed the very position that Sir George Etienne Cartier had taken at that time, and, depending upon the good sense of the people, I was elected, and I have never had any reason to regret the position I took. But I know gentlemen opposite will say: How did you vote in 1874, on Mr. Costigan's motion? I will tell them, Mr. Speaker. I voted in favour of it; and I say that the motion made at the time by my hon. colleague was not made because he expected it would be carried, not because he depended, in any way, on the good faith of the Government, or the party then in power, but because it was important, by forcing them to a vote, to let the people of Quebec, as well as the other provinces, know how these people would swallow their promises after they had obtained what they aimed at, that is power. And we brought them to the vote. We brought them to a vote not only in 1878, but as early as 1875 on that question, by which the Conservative party, in 1872 and 1874, had been more injured in the province of Quebec than even by the Pacific Scandal, that party paid the penalty for having repudiated their doctrines and their promises of 1872. As soon as a county was open in 1874 we carried it, and the Conservatives carried county after county, because the people of Quebec had learned what confidence to place in the sincerity and good faith of the Liberal party. Later on, another question came up. In 1885 we had the celebrated Riel question. We know how that question carried Mr. Mercier into power in Quebec, we know how he was assisted by the whole Liberal party; we know all the promises they made. However, when the Liberals came into power in Quebec, they began to realize that "mon frère Riel" was after all not to be mentioned any more in respectable society, and that he whom they had held up before the people as a martyr of our race and our religion, was nothing but a renegade to both our race and our religion. We must take lessons from the past. We shall know how to deal with these questions, and we shall know that the only way by which a party can maintain itself before the people is by sincerity and good faith, by devotion to the law, devotion to the country and especially by a readiness to face any prejudice in order to follow what we think is right. On this question, I may say that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as I am acquainted with the opinion of my colleagues in the Government, we have treated it in the most conscientious manner, with the sole desire to do full justice, with

the sole desire, by teaching the people the real facts of the case, to alleviate prejudices on one side, and to prepare the people on the other side to make a sacrifice of their sympathy if the law proves to be such that they will have to do so. When we have to render an account of our conduct on this question, we shall, no doubt, have to stand between the devil and the deep sea. The devil and the deep sea have conspired to bring about a false impression on this question as regards the conduct of the Government, and also to create a false judgment on the case itself. They want to profit by every prejudice that has been raised on both sides in order to raise themselves to power, even though, by so doing, they will have to stifle the prayer and reject the claims of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party has gone triumphantly through a great many difficulties, some of which I have mentioned; it has gone through a great many difficult questions of race, of nationality and of creed; but, under the conduct of our late leader we have always come through them successfully, because we could always appeal to the good sense and the justice and fairness of the population. French Canadians and English Canadians will never forget that it is only by observing principles of moderation, fairness and justice that we can hope to build up in this country a prosperous and united people, enjoying the greatest possible amount of freedom and happiness.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to correct an opinion I have heard advanced in regard to this debate, that it is a waste of time. I take a very different view. It deals with a subject on which there is a great deal of misconception in the public mind. Sir, I believe that so serious, so grave, so grievous, even, are the dangers to Canada from circumstances connected with the question now before the House, that, if it were convenient, time would be well spent to have twice the sittings that we shall devote to this question, in order that the people might be enlightened as to the real issue on which they have to make up their minds. Both outside and even inside this House the issue is clouded, I am sorry to say. Instead of coming to the discussion of this question with reason untrammelled and undarkened, some of those who discuss it do so hampered, chained and manacled with prejudices, and darkened by all sorts of theories that will not bear examination, in regard now to the Act of Parliament, now to the petitions and how they have been dealt with, and now to the policy of the Government. Sir, I have tried conscientiously to come to a conclusion as to how I ought to vote on the question now before the House. Nearly every supporter I have in my constituency, I suppose ninety-five-hundredths of those who voted for me, take a strong view in favour of what, on the face of it, would seem to the

popular mind, to be advanced by this motion. I have presented petitions here, week after week, and I shall have others to present, stating what the views of those petitioners are in regard to education and other questions in the North-west, and indicating their strong opinion that the Manitoba School Act should not be interfered with. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? What it means is this: that, in the popular mind, there is an idea that the Government may, can, shall, will or would, in some way or other, strike a blow at the School Act of Manitoba. The motion we have before the House I will venture, often as it has been read before, to read again. It says:

That this House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government in dealing with the Manitoba school question.

That is the first clause. In regard to the resolution generally, let me say that we are sitting here on an affiliation case. In most affiliation cases that I have heard anything of, a child is sought to be palmed off on an unwilling father; but the converse here is the case, because you have a child, and you have a putative father anxious to claim it, but its likeness is so great to another supposed father, who does not deny the soft impeachment, the general impression of those who have to try the case, is, that the paternity, after all, does not belong to the one who desires it most. However, if the paternity of this motion of the hon. member for L'Islet is not to be laid at the door of the hon. member for Simcoe, all I have to say is that, in the language of the sacred writer, the member for North Simcoe has ploughed with the heifer of the member for L'Islet. I remember that Mr. Justice Maule, who was a man of a satirical turn of mind, when he wanted to express contempt for the learned judges sitting on either side of him, would say that he agreed with his learned brother, B, on the right, because of the reasons advanced by his learned brother, A, on the left. Sir, I am in a contrary position. I dissent from this resolution advanced by the hon. member for L'Islet, for reasons advanced by the hon. member for Simcoe, who supported the resolution. Well, Sir, to come to the first part. What does it mean? It means to one man that the Government is to be condemned because they do not disallow the Manitoba Act of 1890. It means to another man that the Government is to be condemned because of some action now going forward and supposed to menace the Act of 1890. In fact, the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet is a two-headed nightingale, and one head sings an orange tune, and the other head chants a quite opposite ditty. So, Sir, I think that the ambiguity of the first part of this resolution cannot commend itself to my approval. The second part is in these words:

In assuming to be possessed of judicial functions conflicting with their duty as constitutional advisers

of the Crown, which assumption is wholly unknown to the law,—

With that I will deal later on. The motion continues :

—and if now acquiesced in would be entirely subversive of the principle of ministerial responsibility.

Permit me, Sir, to deal for one moment with the way that the learned leader of the Opposition spoke on this question this evening. He ridiculed, as did the hon. member for Simcoe, the new Star Chamber in Canada. I say this : “manus haec inimica tyrannis !” There is a hand inimical to tyrants ; and if you can show me that any Conservative Government has established a Star Chamber, or anything like a Star Chamber, as known to history, then I shall oppose and fight against that Star Chamber and fight against that Government. But the fact is, and it reveals at once the farcical character, and, if I may use such a term, the tragical character of this discussion, that an hon. member in the standing of the hon. member for Simcoe, and an hon. member like the hon. gentleman who leads with such distinction a great party in this country, should stoop to the most violent rhetorical clap-trap, in order to make a point in a serious discussion. Now, Sir, the leader of the Opposition described with gusto this committee that heard these petitions and heard Mr. Ewart. I listened to that description, which was full of fervour ; but what argument there was in it or how the description of the hearing bore on the issue before the House, or how it could enlighten the House or the country or help anybody with an open mind and ready to be convinced, to come to a conclusion on this subject, I fail utterly to see.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. members may laugh and cheer, and I could have laughed and cheered myself ; but if I had laughed, the laughter would not have been entirely at the jokes made by the leader of the Opposition. We have—and I need not read them—these sections of the Manitoba Act and sections of the British North America Act, which provide for an appeal to the Governor in Council. The hon. member for Simcoe, last night, dwelt on the fact, that in the 11th and 13th sections of the British North America Act, the words “the Governor in Council” must mean the same thing as the “Governor in Council” in the 93rd section. But he drew no inference from the fact. What inference he meant the House to draw, I am still at a loss to know ; or how the fact that they mean one and the same thing in the three clauses, that is to say, the Governor-General in Council—how that in any way helps the assault he was making on the position of the Government, I do not understand. The sections provide for an appeal to the Governor in Council, an appeal under certain conditions and under

Mr. DAVIN.

certain limitations ; and the hon. gentleman quoted the Attorney-General of England, and, no doubt, he endorses the opinion, that this appeal does not mean an appeal such as would suggest itself to a lawyer's mind, but that what it means is this : that the governmental machinery described by the words “Governor in Council,” is to be asked by this appeal to ask Parliament to do certain things. I confess to you, Mr. Speaker, that high as my opinion is of the ability of my learned friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and ready as I should be to sit at his feet and learn of him, I fail utterly to be carried with him in his reasoning in regard to the significance of that word “appeal,” and in thinking over it since, I have failed to see that the word “appeal” ever meant or could mean simply that a “request” should be made. What an absurdity it would be for the Imperial Parliament to put in an elaborate clause with three or four sections in the Act, and for this House, in the Manitoba Act, to pass a clause with three sections in it, providing that an aggrieved minority in a given province should be able to ask Parliament to pass certain legislation. Why, there is not an humble individual in any part of this Dominion of Canada that has not the right to petition the Governor in Council, to ask Parliament to pass certain legislation. I therefore conclude that more is meant by the word “appeal,” and I will give you another reason. I have in my hand a Bill for the government of Ireland, brought in to the Imperial House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone last month. The 22nd and 23rd sections of that Bill provide that where now an appeal exists to the House of Lords that it shall be to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and section 23rd goes on to say :

If it appears to the Lord-Lieutenant or a Secretary of State expedient in the public interest that steps shall be taken for the speedy determination of the question whether any Irish Act or any provision thereof is beyond the powers of the Irish Legislature, he may represent the same to Her Majesty in Council, and thereupon the said question shall be forthwith referred to and heard and determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, constituted as if hearing an appeal from a court in Ireland.

2. Upon the hearing of the question such persons as seem to the Judicial Committee to be interested may be allowed to appear and be heard as parties to the case, and the decision of the Judicial Committee shall be given in like manner as if it were the decision of an appeal, the nature of the report or recommendation to Her Majesty stated in open court.

3. Nothing in this Act shall prejudice any other power of Her Majesty in Council to refer any question to the Judicial Committee or the right of any person to petition Her Majesty for such reference.

The argument that I build on this is : that the word “appeal” is used there in no more emphatic way, judging from the position of the surrounding words, than it is used in the British North America Act. I confess it would be very hard for me to take the dictum of any lawyer, be he ever so eminent, who

would tell me that in the British North America Act passed by the Imperial House of Commons, which is now dealing with this Home Rule Bill, in using the word "appeal," in view of the great grievances that might arise, that all they meant was that they should be able to make a request to the Governor in Council to put certain machinery in operation to ask Parliament to do certain things. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition quoted the "World" newspaper. The hon. gentleman is accustomed to deal at great length in this House on matters that cannot possibly have any effect on deciding the issue. He read a long extract; I suppose a very clever article from Ottawa by the correspondent of the "World." It was very interesting; it was very clever; but how does the opinion of the correspondent of the "World" in any way commit the Government, or how does it help the House to come to a decision on the subject with which we are at present charged? The leader of the Opposition went further, and he re-echoed what was said by the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last night, who stated that he did not blame the Government for referring this question to the Supreme Court. Now, the reference to the Supreme Court implies the very hearing of that appeal by the Governor in Council, which he says the Governor in Council ought to be stopped from entertaining. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) dwelt on the fact that the Government having paid to have this matter brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, was a party to the suit, so to speak, and was therefore not fit to hear the appeal, and he then said that a motion should be made in the Court of Queen's Bench to remove the appeal from the Governor in Council to a court that would be more competent and more impartial. Now, when the Manitoba Act was passed in 1890, and petitions came in here from those Catholics who thought they were aggrieved, could the Government hear those petitions then? I say that the Government could not hear these petitions until it found whether it really was in a position to take any action whatever in regard to the appeal, because if that Act was "ultra vires" of the Manitoba Legislature it fell to the ground, and there was no necessity for any action on the part of the Government. The Government, in taking steps to see whether or not the courts of the country, and ultimately the highest legal tribunal, should declare that the Act was "ultra vires" or "intra vires," took a course which, in my opinion, every sensible man should endorse. The moment the law was declared to be "intra vires," that moment the Governor in Council was in a position to hear the appeal under the British North America Act. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) rather astonished me by objecting to the conduct of the Government in this matter, and I will tell you why. He knows very well that it has become common for the

Government of this country to take the very course which he condemns, and in the celebrated case of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, I believe it was at the request of an eminent legal firm in Toronto, with which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not wholly unconnected, and I understand that it was at his request, too, the Government interfered. In looking at the Auditor-General's Report, I find the name of that firm, and, I think, my hon. friend's own name, down for money paid out by this Government in connection with that case. And why? Because it was desirable, in regard to the question raised between the Government of Ontario and the Government of this Dominion, that it should be settled as to their relative powers. Another case that occurs to me is the question of the appointment of Queen's Counsel. I have had some correspondence with Mr. Aemelius Irving on the subject of the Queen's Counsel appointed by the province, and I have been given to understand that it has been very much desired by Sir Oliver Mowat, that a case should be made out on that subject—that the Government should interfere there, as the Government have interfered in this case, in order to test the validity of these questions. I understand that there are also at the present moment questions affecting the fisheries, on which the Government are taking a similar course. My hon. friend from North Simcoe asked in this connection: Is it seemly that this Government of Canada should appear to assail a provincial Act? Why, Sir, here we have, in the provisions of this Government of Ireland Bill, arrangements made whereby the Secretary of State may test the question, whether an Act passed by the Irish Parliament is "ultra vires" or "intra vires." So that, in case this Bill passes and home rule becomes a "fait accompli," what will be the result? You may have an Act passed by the Irish Parliament which some minority in Ireland will be opposed to and will consider "ultra vires," and the Secretary of State and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland are empowered to test whether that Act is "ultra vires" or "intra vires." So that, when my hon. friend uses the word "assail," in regard to a provincial Act, he uses that word in a rhetorical sense. As a matter of fact, the Government are not assailing the Manitoba School Act of 1890. That Act remains still on the statute-book and is in full force, and no attempt has been made by this Government to do the least injury to it. What the Government have done, is to take steps to see what their position is in regard to the petitions presented to them by a minority of the people of Manitoba, who consider that they have grievances under certain legislation. Now, Sir, let us suppose that the Government had taken a different course. Let us suppose that, when these petitions came, the Government had said: We will not have anything to do with your petitions; we intend just to stick by that Act; we approve

of that Act. Why, what would have happened? Would you not have had a state of things, not only in Manitoba, but all over the Dominion of Canada, far more grievous than anything which has been hinted at by the hon. Minister of Public Works? Would you not have had every Roman Catholic in Canada feeling that a grievous wrong had been done to the Catholics of Manitoba, in not being allowed to make that appeal which, wisely or unwisely, the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act provided for? Let us suppose, I say, that the Government had refused to deal with the matter; let us suppose that they had said: We will wash our hands entirely of this question, as my hon. friend from Simcoe wants them to do. Any man who reads the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act, must conclude that the Governor in Council had certain powers in regard to an appeal. Does not the endowment of a power in a man or a body imply a duty to exercise that power, when any occasion for exercising it arises? If, therefore, the Government advise His Excellency, saying: It is true, these two Acts provide that you and your Council are to hear certain appeals, but we will regard this as a matter of policy; we do not think it good politics or good policy to interfere or to take cognizance of these persons' petitions for an appeal. Why, Sir, what would be said of a Governor-General who would tolerate such a Government, or what would be said of a Government that would be capable of an iniquity of that kind? Now, Mr. Speaker, it so happens that at the present moment in Austria questions of this kind are coming up; but I may say that they have been settled in Austria more peaceably and quietly than they have been settled on this continent. My fellow Protestants are in a great minority in Austria. We will suppose that an Act like this were passed in Austria, and that in the northern part of the country the Protestants were in precisely the same position as the Catholics are in Manitoba, and some of them said: We are not going to rebel against the Act that has been passed, but, under the Constitution under which we live, we are authorized to appeal against it, and the Government must hear our appeal. I am not arguing that the Manitoba minority are right in their contention, that the Government ought to upset this Act of 1890. Let it turn out, on inquiry, that they are entirely wrong and that no grievance exists; I do not care about that. They think that they have a grievance and that under this Act they have an appeal. What are you going to do with them? Are you going to take no cognizance of their appeal? Suppose it were done in Austria, and the correspondents were to flash it to London or to New York or to Toronto. In the "Mail," of Toronto, or the "Times," of London, you would have articles dwelling on the tyranny of the great Imperial House and the Legisla-

Mr. DAVIN.

ture that ruled at Vienna. I say, therefore, that the Government have done well. They have done the only thing, in fact, that they could do, in taking steps to see what their position was, whether this Act was "ultra vires" or "intra vires," and having found that it was "intra vires," then to take steps to hear the appeal. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from North Simcoe and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition talk of delays and dilly-dallying. Suppose there have been delays; I do not see any evidence showing that there have been any unnecessary delays; but suppose there have been delays, what harm has been done? Has any harm been done to the Protestants of Manitoba who believe in this school law? Has any harm been done to the Protestants of the rest of Canada who are strong advocates of public schools? That Act is in force in Manitoba to-day, and not a hair of its head, so to speak, has been touched. Therefore, the Protestants have suffered nothing. And let me ask the hon. member for L'Islet and the hon. leader of the Opposition, have the Catholics suffered severely? Why, to hear my hon. friend talk, you would think the Catholics in Manitoba were in a dreadfully oppressed condition. Let me tell you that the Catholic schools of Manitoba to-day are conducted on very much the same plan as they were before this legislation passed; and whatever may be the result, should this legislation stand ultimately and be not interfered with in the least, you will find, from the necessities of the case, from the peculiar location of the people in Manitoba, that all the separate schools will still be Catholic schools, where the children will continue to be educated by Catholic teachers, and the only difference will be that a state inspector will inspect the schools. That, I grant you, to the mind of a pious Catholic—and I am not going to say whether I would differ with him or not—may seem a serious thing; and, if it is a serious thing to him, it is a thing for us to not cavil at, but to respect. It is for us, consistently with our own views and our own conscientious convictions, to put ourselves in their place. I must confess that when I see people ready to rush in and pronounce off hand strong opinions on the subject of education, when I see the rigid conviction of people who believe that you have solved everything, when you have one system of public schools established in the country, and when I look at the results, I am deeply pained, and my national hope even loses much of its strength, because I say no man can have observed this country as closely as I have for the last twenty years, without coming to the conclusion, that, be the reason what it may, our system of education has great defects judging by the results. There are numbers of people who think there is nothing easier than to deal with this question of education. Some of my fellow Protestants are apt to talk as though the opinions of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics were nothing but prejudice, only

deserving your scorn. whereas there cannot be the least doubt in the mind of any enlightened man that what they feel is not so much prejudice, though they have prejudice as well as the rest of us, but the fear which every thoughtful man who looks on the educational field must feel that the scepticism, which is awake in the last part of the nineteenth century, may seize the mind of the child ere he has been sufficiently grounded in those principles of religion and morality on which high character must be built. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in assailing the character of the tribunal to which this appeal is to be made, declared that it was an *ex parte* tribunal, not because only one side had been summoned and would be heard, but because Manitoba had refused to come before it. I confess that I think the Government of Manitoba, in refusing to come before this tribunal, behaved very badly. It is a tribunal, not created by this Government, but by a solemn act of our own Parliament, and I do not think it is to the credit of a Government in a free country to refuse to come before such a tribunal, no matter what that Government may have thought of the propriety of that tribunal sitting in any given case. They should have come before the tribunal with counsel, if for no other reason than to state the reasons why they did not intend to appear in the case. In that connection let me point out what I promised to do at an earlier stage. A violent suggestion, an unjust suggestion and an untrue suggestion—though I do not of course mean that it was meant to be mendacious—was made by my hon. friend when he characterized this as a Star Chamber. The Star Chamber had certain features, which have made it infamous in history. In the first place, it sat with closed doors, in the next place, the accused was not brought face to face with his witnesses, and in the third place, no witnesses knew another witness. Everything was done in secrecy, and the accused was condemned and punished without having been confronted with the witnesses, or having had the opportunity of cross-examining them. What is the character of this Star Chamber of ours? Its very first meeting was held with open doors, and if the Government of Manitoba had come before it, we should have had the case tried; the pros and cons stated; all would have got into the papers, and everything would have been done above board and in the light of a free community, and yet this is the assembly described by my hon. friend with so much gusto as worthy of being characterized as a Star Chamber. My hon. friend says that the Government ought to stop now, but the question is not ripe. How could the Government stop now? It cannot unless it were to do a tyrannical act. It would have done that at first if it had refused to hear the appeal. There is nothing to be done but to let these appeals take their course, and I have shown that no harm can come to Protestants or Catholics

from allowing it to take its course. It goes before the Supreme Court where the leader of the Opposition does not object to see it. The Supreme Court, we will suppose, decides that the Governor-General in Council should hear the case on its merits, and the case on its merits comes before the Governor in Council. Suppose it is sent again to the Supreme Court and suppose the decision is against the contention of the minority in Manitoba? What then? There is an end of the business. But suppose the decision is in favour of the minority in Manitoba, what then? Then a mandate would be issued by the Government—they could do nothing else—to the Government of Manitoba to undo the legislation of 1890. The Government of Manitoba, I am quite certain, would refuse to obey. And what would be the result? It would come into this House. The Government could bring it into this House and this House would say whether or not the Act of 1890 could be interfered with or not. And, can any one doubt from what we know at the present moment of the complexion and temper of this House, if that question came into this House what would be the decision on the part of hon. members. At the present moment, we are dealing with what we have no jurisdiction to deal with. Suppose this motion of the hon. member were carried, what then? The Government, even if the present Government remains, could not give up its duty under the powers with which they are endowed. Suppose they left their seats and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) crossed the floor and made up a Ministry (I believe if he did I could, speaking from one of those benches, give almost as humorous a description of that Ministry as he gave of the present one) does any man suppose that the suggestions and advice and views of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would find more acceptance with my hon. friend or his Government than they find with my hon. friend the Prime Minister and his Government. Thus it is an idle question we are debating. But, as I said in my opening remarks, it is not an idle question from the other point of view, because I welcome anything that will tend to dispel the cloud of prejudice. I had almost said a harsher word, that hovers over this country and threatens to shed its pestilential dews upon it.

An hon. MEMBER. Time.

Mr. DAVIN. Who cries out time? Now, Sir, let me deal with another point. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a lawyer. He says there is no appeal. My friend Mr. Ewart is a lawyer, and a good lawyer, and he says there is an appeal, and I know that that is his conscientious conviction, and I have talked with him confidentially about the matter. If, taking two lawyers in this Dominion, one declares that there is an appeal and the other that there

is no appeal, is not that of itself, the fact that there is that difference of opinion, sufficient reason for referring this matter to a tribunal?

An hon. MEMBER. Time.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend will not hasten matters by crying time. I wish, for one moment to deal with the argument about Bagehot used by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier). Of course, I feel nervous when I deal with a great constitutional question and differ with my friend the hon. leader of the Opposition. But my hon. friend read the paragraph that was misquoted, of course, inadvertently, by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) pointed out the mistake. I have it here; "great minds," and so on, you know, and we both hit on it.

There are two descriptions of the English constitution which have exercised immense influence, but which are erroneous. First, it is laid down as a principle of the English polity that in it—

This was quoted by my hon. friend from North Simcoe.

—that in it the legislative, the executive and the judicial powers are quite divided.

And Bagehot says this is erroneous. But my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says that the hon. member for North Simcoe was quite correct, that Bagehot does not say that these views are erroneous. Bagehot was a great master of English expression, and he makes it perfectly clear to my poor mind that what he does say is that it was erroneous to say that the legislative, executive and judicial powers were quite divided. In other parts of the book he says the singular advantage, in some respects, of the British Constitution is that they have approximated. But my hon. friend says: The judicial power has nothing whatever to do with the legislative power of England. Well, Sir, here we have in this very Act, the Bill of Mr. Gladstone, an arrangement under which appeals from the courts of law in Ireland to the House of Lords are transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Why, Sir, the House of Lords itself sits as a judicial body. And yet my hon. friend impugns the accuracy of my hon. friend for Albert (Mr. Weldon) when he points out that Bagehot says the very opposite from what my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had declared he said. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have occupied the time of the House thus far for the purpose of giving to this House and my constituents, and of giving to the country, so far as my poor voice can reach it, my reasons for the vote that I shall give on this question. I say, Sir, that I disapprove entirely of the kind of motion we have at present before the House. It is like one of those faces that are occasionally seen drawn by skilful men; you look at it one way and it is the face of a man, and you

Mr. DAVIN.

look at it the other way and it is the face of a woman. Turn this motion one way and it has a Jesuit aspect; turn it the other way and it is all Orange.

Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says, "hear, hear," and he is a man of facile adhesion to any party. But the adhesion is no long cohesion, so how long he will be with me I really do not know. But, Sir, I was determined, though late the hour, that I would not give a silent vote on this question, in the hope that my poor voice, to some small extent, might tend to dispel the prejudice that gathers over this question. Mr. Speaker, we talk about the difficulties—and I am going to say something about the future of Canada for a moment, and I will speak about that future as enthusiastically as I can, whatever groans may come from the undertaker's nauts among members of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, the great difficulty we have to contend with in Canada is faction. The great difficulty is that our people are divided; they are shredded by senseless prejudice. These things are hindering the people of the country from being brought together and consolidated into a great people, such as in his enthusiastic moments the leader of the Opposition speaks of, and such as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) spoke of. What is this debate but an evidence that prejudice is dominant and domineering in Canada? Because in the speeches, whether spoken on the one side or the other, you hear notes that are intended for no other purpose than to reach the ears of prejudice. Now, here in Canada we have, as we often say, a magnificent country with boundless resources, its physical resources unimagined, almost, and unimaginable at this stage of our progress. We have a magnificent people, French, Irish, English, Scotch, capable of making Canadians a race of the very first order. But, Sir, unfortunately this division, these prejudices, this senseless distrust of each other, is a darkening power over this Canada of ours. I would to God that, whether by means of the action of this Parliament, or by means of the action of the press, probably still more powerful, we could come at no distant day to make Catholics and Protestants, Orangemen and Irish Catholics, so to feel that when they come to think of their country, come to think of the question before this House, and come to think of supporting men to come to this House, they would not dream of asking whether a man wears this or that badge, but: Is he fit for the position, is he a true son of Canada, is he faithful to this new country, is he fit to help her on in the march of progress? Then, before whatever shrine he bowed, or whatever badge he wore on certain occasions, give him support because of his loyalty and his love and his power to serve Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I hope the House will bear with me for a moment while I refer to a particular phase of this discussion which was started by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). He laid down in a way the record of the Conservative party on this question, and said that the Conservative party and Government were unworthy of support because of it. While he was speaking he only gave one side of the record of the Conservative party, and that was the reverse side. We heard the other side given by the leader of the House, and that altogether changed the view. He (Mr. Tarte) said that the Conservative party was guilty of many acts of omission and acts of commission; and yet, from the outline of the record of the Conservative party, as laid down by the leader of the House, it is evident that we have done everything that could be done in order to clear this case and get it in a fair way before the people of the country. Now, if the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) was honest in the position he has taken here, he should rather have supported the position of the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), because the member for Provencher is willing to trust the Government, and, indeed, expressed his indebtedness to the Government, because they have listened to every petition that has been presented, and because they are willing that this case shall be fully exploited as a question of law. But the member for L'Islet, when dealing with records, should have gone further in that regard. He should have given us the record of the Liberal party on this question. As he is of the Reform party now, and has neglected its record, I propose for a moment to try and find out what the record of the Liberal party is on this important question. To obtain that record I may have to quote from the Toronto "Globe." My paper, the Toronto "World" has been quoted here to-night by the leader of the Opposition, and I am prepared to stand by those quotations, and to vindicate everything that was said in them. I am only sorry, however, to say that I do not think that the leader of the Opposition will be able to endorse and vindicate what his own organ, the Toronto "Globe," has said on this matter. The judgment in the Manitoba school case was given by the Privy Council at the end of July last. On August 1st, the "Globe" had a leading article on that decision from which I will read you a couple of extracts:

It seems clear that he (the leader of the Government) meant to hold out to the Catholics a hope that in the event of an adverse decision in the courts, the aid of the Federal authority would be invoked. But it is difficult to see how these provisions are applicable to the present case. The courts have, in effect, declared that the legislation has not prejudicially affected any right or privilege of the minority; and there seems, therefore, to be no scope for the application of remedial laws. The matter will no doubt be discussed in the Federal Parliament, but we are disposed

to think that Manitoba may now be ranked among the provinces in which the question is settled.

That is a part of the Liberal record of the matter. Then the same article closes thus:

Bigotry and prejudice may enhance the difficulty, but they do not create it; it is inherent in every system of education, and can only be partially overcome by the exercise of the utmost patience and wisdom.

It is the Conservative party that proposes to exercise the "utmost patience and wisdom" in this matter. The next day, on August 2nd, the "Globe" had this remark:

What is to be gained by reopening the healing wound?

Who is opening the healing wound here, but the hon. member for L'Islet and the hon. leader of the Opposition?

But as we have already said, the courts have declared that the legislature has not prejudicially affected any right or privilege of the minority, and, therefore, that there is no wrong to be remedied.

And further on:

The present Ministry would hardly be willing to come down to Parliament with a proposal to reimpose the system upon Manitoba against the will of an overwhelming majority of its people, and it is morally certain that Parliament would not sanction such a proposal.

Yet the leader of the Opposition is to-night asking Parliament to sanction such a proposal:

The politicians, whether from expediency or from higher motives, are disposed, in questions which involve race and religion, to act upon the maxim *quies non movet*. Any member might of course precipitate a discussion by a motion, but nothing would come of it save the renewal of religious and racial passion and prejudice. On the other hand the adversaries of separate schools have no right to preach patience to the representatives of the "lost cause" in Manitoba, unless they are ready to exercise the virtue of charity and generosity.

The next day the same paper said:

The people of Manitoba are not bound by his promise.

That is, the promise of the leader of the Government.

We ask the friends of separate schools whether it would not be the part of wisdom and patriotism to abandon an agitation which cannot possibly have any other result than defeat and the renewal of sectarian strife.

Yet, to-night the leader of the Opposition is practically urging that such strife be continued. On August 4th the same paper stated:

The conflict is now ended.

And further on:

No Ministry at Ottawa would dare to go to the House with a proposition that the decision of the highest court in the Empire, and the will of Manitoba, plainly expressed in her elections, should be practically set aside. In the third place, there is not the least doubt that two-thirds of the members of the

House of Commons, from considerations of political safety, if from no higher motives, would reject such a proposal if made. Let the first step be taken toward the imposition of the separate school system upon Manitoba, and there need be no fear but that the voice of the country will make itself heard.

On August 5th, the same paper states :

It is obvious that there are cases in which such a reference to the Supreme Court would be exceedingly useful. * * * * * We do not see, however, that these reasons apply in the present case * * * * * in any case the opinion of the Supreme Court will be only advisory, and will not relieve the Governor-General in Council, or in other words, the ministry, from the responsibility of making a decision ; while Parliament will be perfectly free to decline to enact the so-called remedial laws.

Then a few days later, when a statement appeared in the newspapers that perhaps the Government would consent to a scheme to divert a portion of the school lands of Manitoba towards the support of Catholic separate schools, the "Globe" said :

The Federal Ministers make a fatal mistake if they imagine that this expedient would promote peace and harmony. It would array almost the entire population of Manitoba in a solid mass against the Federal power, and if we know the temper of the people of Ontario, they would assuredly be found shoulder to shoulder with the upholders of provincial autonomy. In fact, so certain, is it where their sympathies would be that we doubt whether the most servile follower of the Government would risk his political life in an Ontario constituency by sanctioning such an arrangement.

And finally, on 15th August, the same paper said :

The cable despatches announce that the constitutionality of the Manitoba laws abolishing separate schools had been upheld ; but there was still a supposition that the judgment of the British Court, unlike that of the Queen's Bench of Manitoba, might have left some room for the operation of remedial laws. The judgment which we publish in full to-day, gives no ground for that supposition. No suggestion is made here that the ordinary tribunals of the country are not competent to deal with the whole case, or that it was intended that the provisions in question should give the Governor-General in Council a supplementary jurisdiction to obtain relief which cannot be obtained in the ordinary courts. Moreover, so far as their lordships deal with questions outside of the strict letter of law, they sustain the action of the Manitoba Legislature.

From all which quotations you may see how strangely at variance are the "Globe," which says the Roman Catholics of Manitoba have no rights, and the leader of the Opposition, who says the minority of that province are denied their rights. In speaking of the record of the Government on this question, I wish to remind the hon. member for L'Islet that this Manitoba law which deprives the Catholics of the North-west of separate schools, was carried by a Reform Government. The Greenway-Martin Government is a Reform Government, and owes more or less allegiance to the Reform party in Ottawa as well as in the North-west. If the leader of the Opposition is in earnest in trying to

Mr. MACLEAN (East York).

secure the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba, I can tell him where he can begin the work, and that is by going to the Greenway Government and urging on them to grant that relief which he has urged to-night should be conceded here. I desire to ask the hon. member for L'Islet, and those who spoke on his side of the case, where the Greenway-Martin Government got their inspiration for the provincial rights cry ? They got it in the first place from Mr. Mowat, who has been given great praise to-day for the stand he has taken in regard to provincial rights. But that, I hold, was an erroneous stand, and the evil consequences that followed are felt in this country to-day. They exploited provincial rights until the country was sick of the cry, and then they went on to Quebec and inoculated Count Mercier with the same view, which resulted in the passing of the Jesuits Estates Act, which brought on the question of provincial rights in that province, and in this Legislature. Mr. Greenway, following the example of Messrs. Mowat and Mercier, went back to his province of Manitoba and passed this law, which is objected to so strongly to-night. That is the record of the Reform party in regard to this question. They have been constantly raising this question of provincial rights ; and I venture to say here to-day that there never would have been a Manitoba School Act if there had not first been a Jesuits Estates Act passed in the Quebec Legislature. These things run in the way of compensations ; our friends in Quebec raised the cry of provincial rights in regard to the Jesuits Estates, and so we had the compensation thereof given in the form of the Manitoba Act, to which those hon. gentlemen now object. While I have much sympathy with the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, in being refused rights which they claim, I must tell them that those rights which have been invaded are not rights of conscience. They are, I must say, simply rights which affect their pockets, and that to a very small degree. Their conscience is not invaded ; it is as free to-day as ever, and if they like to establish parochial schools they are still free to send their children there, and those schools would be protected and have every privilege that the public schools possess. There is no real hardship ; at the very most, it is a hardship of money, and not a hardship of conscience. The hon. member for Bellechasse read some extracts this afternoon which will do more than anything else to settle this school question in this country. He read from the decrees of Mgr. Satolli in regard to the school question in the United States. I have heard the question as to the bearing of our Constitution on this issue discussed here to-day, and during two preceding days ; I have heard the provisions of the Constitution quoted from the many doctors who are authorities thereon, but the Satolli decrees which were published in the United States not long ago, are the decrees which, as a

matter of fact, will settle this question more than the Constitution of this country. The hon. member for L'Islet paid a great tribute to His Holiness the Pope, and said he was one of the most astute statesmen of the day; I believe he is one of the ablest statesmen known to the closing years of the nineteenth century, and that eminent man sent Mgr. Satolli to this country to investigate and settle the school question, and these decrees are the result. If I may be permitted, I will read three or four of the articles in the decrees, as follows:—

I.

All care must be taken to erect Catholic schools, to enlarge and improve those already established, and to make them equal to the public schools in teaching and discipline.—*Conc. Plen. Balt. III., No. 197, p. 101.*

II.

When there is no Catholic school at all, or when the one that is available is little fitted for giving the children an education in keeping with their condition, then the public schools may be attended with a safe conscience, the danger of perversion being rendered remote by opportune remedial and precautionary measures; a matter that is to be left to the conscience and judgment of the Ordinaries.—*Ibid, No. 198, p. 103.*

III.

We enact and command that no one shall be allowed to teach in a parochial school who has not proven his fitness for the position by previous examination. No priest shall have any right to employ any teacher, male or female, in his school without a certificate of ability, or diploma from the Diocesan Board of Examiners.—*Ibid, No. 203, p. 108.*

IV.

Normal schools, as they are called, are to be established where they are wanting and are evidently necessary.—*Ibid, No. 205, p. 110.*

V.

We strictly forbid any one, whether bishop or priest, and this is the express prohibition of the Sovereign Pontiff through the sacred congregation, either by act or by threat to exclude from the Sacraments as unworthy, parents who chose to send their children to the public schools. As regards the children themselves, this enactment applies with still greater force.—*Ibid, No. 198, p. 194. Conf., Tit. VI., Cap. 1., II.; Tit. VII.*

X.

No reproach, either in public or in private, shall be cast upon Catholic parents who send their children to private schools or academies where a better education is given under the direction of religious or approved of and Catholic persons. If they make sufficient provision for the religious training of their children, let them be free to secure in other ways that education which the position of their family requires.

XI.

It is greatly to be desired, and will be a most happy arrangement, if the bishop agree with the civil authorities or with the members of the school board, to conduct the school with mutual attention and due consideration for their respective rights.

The fact is that the Catholics of the United States are told that they must accept the public school system of that country, and if

that decree applies to Catholics in Minnesota, and if it is true that Catholics of Manitoba have no right to separate schools, as the Privy Council has laid down, then they are undergoing no greater hardships than are the Catholics of Minnesota, and they will, as a matter of course, have to accept the public schools. Those decrees, issued by that eminent statesman, if I may speak of His Holiness in those terms, also suggest ways in which the two creeds can work harmoniously together. The Government, as I have said, have a policy that should meet with the approval of the country. They simply propose to allow the minority to avail themselves of every means to state their case, and put in their petitions. The Government should command the support of the hon. member for L'Islet, and he should be in the same boat with the hon. member for Provencher. For the present, while I do not wish to say what my future course in this matter may be, I trust that the Conservative party, which is the party of conciliation in this country, which has not been the party of provincial rights, which has tried in every way to be conciliatory towards all, will, in the end, secure a decision in this matter that will meet with the approval of the Canadian people.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, at this very late stage of the debate, and at this very late hour, it is certainly not my intention to inflict a long speech upon the House. Moreover, from the stand-point from which I view this question, the discussion has already been so exhaustive, and the course taken by the Government has been so thoroughly placed before the House and before the people of Canada by the Prime Minister and by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that I feel I could only go over the same ground, without adding any force to the arguments in favour of the decisions at which the Government has arrived, and which I consider to be the right one. Sir, the eloquent leader of the Opposition, the silver-tongued orator, in so far as eloquence is concerned, has, true to his reputation, spoken eloquently to-night. He has been historic, and he has handled the argument as an able lawyer would do, by producing very interesting facts to save the weak points of a bad case. The hon. gentleman has done me the distinguished honour of referring to me personally. In the description he has given of my colleagues and myself, he has been good enough to remind me that the decoration which I wear upon my breast had been conferred upon me for military science, more than for legal distinction. I am quite willing to admit that, during the campaign, when Her Majesty conferred upon me that decoration, the hon. gentleman did not receive any such honour, and I am also ready to admit that when the history of that period is read, it will be found that the only distinction acquired by the hon. leader of

the Opposition was gained by that patriotic and constitutional proclamation of his, in which he declared that he was prepared to shoulder his musket and to go to the far Saskatchewan to fight the Government of Canada, and to fight against the Constitution of the country, while, to-day, with that patriotic soul which he possesses, he attacks us for not protecting it. The importance of this question which we are now considering is felt in the north, in the south, in the east and in the west. Its importance extends to over all this broad Dominion, and I believe that such a question should be discussed without party bitterness, and without any of those harsh feelings which, of their nature, are the result of political strife. I feel that this question should be considered as removed from the atmosphere of political opposition, and purely and simply from the stand-point of the interests of Canada. It is the object of this Government, as it should be the object of all, to form from those of different races and different creeds, and the different religions in this land a harmonious people, willing to make concessions to each other, and extending to each other the privilege of every true British subject, to follow the dictates of his conscience and to go to the church to which he belongs. We trust that, in our Dominion, we shall build up one great people, and leave the heritage of a noble and grand nation to the children who will follow us. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, in his address to-night, has not only been facetious, but he has repeated what several hon. members on his side of the House have considered to be a very important factor in this discussion. Following in the wake of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) he has ridiculed what he calls the judicial attributes which the Government conceived it its duty to assume. Well, Sir, I do not pretend to be versed in all the intricacies of these constitutional questions, but, within my experience of official life, I can say that, under the constitutional system of Canada, following the precedent of England, judicial functions come every day before those who advise Her Majesty. I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is not true that the Government performs judicial functions when it becomes the painful duty of Ministers of the Crown to advise as to the exercise of the high prerogative of mercy, which is delegated to the Governor-General by Her Majesty, and referred by him to his constitutional advisers? I ask the hon. gentleman again, when the sub-committee of Council meets to discuss matters affecting the great railway interests of Canada, whether, in that case, the advisers of the Crown are not exercising judicial functions? Taking into consideration the circumstances of Canada, considering, as we must consider, the deep feeling which has been aroused on account of difference of race and difference of creed, I ask, under such circumstances,

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

was it not a most prudent and a most patriotic course for the Government to follow, to submit a question of the importance of the one now before the House, to the highest tribunal in the country? I ask, was it not a most prudent and most patriotic act of the Government to submit to a tribunal that could not be influenced by political bias, the question whether the Government could take the responsibility of advising His Excellency as to the course to be followed in this case? The hon. gentleman, if I understood his remarks, said that if it be true in fact, as Monseigneur Taché declares that these pretended public schools are Protestant schools, he said the strongest case has been made for interference by this Government, but I heard the remark made yesterday in this House that this statement was not true, and that the system of schools now prevailing in Manitoba is not a continuation of the Protestant system. Well, Sir, I see, in the very doubt which the hon. gentleman has expressed, as to the accuracy of that statement, one of the points that should be submitted for investigation, and it is one of the points which, no doubt, will be submitted to the tribunal, whether the Government have a right to investigate this question or not. Now, as I have stated, I believe it is of the highest importance for the future of Canada that we should, as far as possible, prevent anything interfering with the happiness of the people of this country; and I think it is of the greatest possible importance that all these questions should be removed from the arena of political strife, and should be submitted to a tribunal whose judgment once rendered will leave the Government perfectly free to act according to the Constitution of the country. Sir, one thing I am prepared to state, as I believe it will be the policy of the Government: I can say, when once the questions which are the result of the appeal have been decided by the tribunal, the Government will fearlessly take the responsibility which belongs to it, and will do its duty regardless of consequences. Now, it is a most anomalous position for the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) to occupy, to have, as his ally in this matter, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. TARTE. You had him before.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman considers the matter, from his experience of the people of Quebec, or from his experience of the Catholics all over the Dominion, nothing could have weakened his case more than to have the support of that hon. member. I say so, because I believe that statement is correct, and one which the people of our province will voice as I have voiced it to-night. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have already stated, my intention was not to make any lengthened remarks. I merely wanted to submit to the House the few points which I have submitted. But I can

only say, as one who desires to see long-continued the harmony which has existed in our country, that I wish, in other sections of Canada, the example given by the people of my province were followed. Long before any constitutional rule forced the adoption of separate schools in the province of Quebec, the great majority of the people of our province conceded those schools to the English and Protestant minority. At times we felt that possibly that minority might be too exacting. Not only did we make these concessions asked for, but we went beyond anything that the Constitution or the law could expect. After years of strife in other provinces, the old province of Quebec, divided between English and French, Protestant and Catholic, remained peaceful, happy and contented, because the French Canadians felt they could not make too many concessions to teach the minority that we looked upon them in the light of brothers and wished them to have all the privileges we could possibly give them. We went still further. The Protestants appealed to that majority to have a portion of the gaols and the lunatic asylums set aside for those who belong to their creed, and their request was at once granted. I do not regret these concessions. I think we could not do too much to convince the minority that we wish to secure every right they could possibly expect from us, and had it not been for that irritating question, the separate schools, possibly we would not have adopted the system of Confederation, which was supposed to sink the divisions existing between the two larger provinces and bring into that element of strife, independent members of the Confederation, who would view the matter dispassionately. In that fight which brought about Confederation, there are some historic names, which are consigned in the pages of our political history. Men like Sir Oliver Mowat, George Brown and others, when Confederation was carried and when that bitter question was set to rest, felt that the sacrifices which both political parties had made for the purpose of acquiring that peace and happiness, which has existed ever since, were sacrifices which not only were not too great but which repaid tenfold the people, considering the troubles which had existed before. And I ask, when you come to consider the North-west, the great country of the future, is it not fitting for us to consider that this may be one of the points which will prevent people from seeking a quiet and happy home in that country, if they are led to believe that it may be the battlefield of religious strife. I say that it is of the highest importance for any Government—and I speak not now as a member of one party, but as a Canadian—to surround that case with all the protection which an impartial tribunal, removed from the political arena, can give it so as to settle once and for all the question which is agitating us now.

When that question is settled, it will be the happiest day Canada has seen for many years. It will be a day that will teach every man that the Constitution of this country is respected, and that the Government commands the respect and confidence of the people, irrespective of race or creed, because it follows the Constitution in spirit as well as in letter. I know that the people of the province of Quebec will look upon this question dispassionately. They will ask whether the Government have acted in an open, frank and constitutional manner, and I ask even the opponents of the Government, who have made to-day eloquent and long speeches, in their endeavour to attack the policy of the Government, whether the course followed by the Government has not been an open and a frank course. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the Star Chamber. I was sorry to see these gentlemen trying to set race against race and appealing to prejudices, but I fail to find any argument of theirs to show that the course followed by the Government was not the proper one. The Manitoba Government were notified of the day when argument would take place, and if they did not choose to be represented the responsibility is with themselves. The question was submitted to the Privy Council and discussed and most ably argued, and the public had every opportunity to be present. There were points of law to be settled, and the Government thought that the highest tribunal in the land was the proper one to which to submit this case, and I believe that public opinion will endorse the course taken by the Government.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a province which is much interested in the question now before this House, I think I would be wanting in my duty should I not say a word in reference to the motion of my friend, the hon. member for L'Islet. I listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. Minister who has just addressed the House, and I congratulate him upon the clever manner with which he avoided saying what the Government intend to do in relation to this question. After the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the express statements made by him, I expected the Government to come out and state how they were to settle this important litigation. I expected the Postmaster-General would state whether the Government, of which he is a prominent member, are determined to do justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, or whether they are determined to do nothing for them. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the Government are quite unwilling to do the best thing for them; that they have decided, even before now, not to interfere in favour of our co-religionists of Manitoba, and that all what they are doing presently is for the purpose of gaining time and shirking the responsibility that is incumbent on them. I wish

the position we are going to take in this case should not be likely to embarrass the Government. On the contrary, I am willing to help them in every possible way, even to the extent of voting with them on this question; but, before doing it, I beg to put a question to the hon. Minister who has just taken his seat. I understand the only reason why the Government are now unwilling to declare themselves as to whether they can interfere is because they want it to be decided by the Supreme Court whether the British North America Act can apply. The Government want, first, to inquire from the Supreme Court whether the Catholics of Manitoba can avail themselves of the section of that Act under which any minority has a right to appeal to the Government whenever rights are violated that were acquired by laws subsequent to the Union. I understand the Government intend to have it decided by that court, whether the Catholics of Manitoba have a right to invoke as a privilege the Act of 1871. Well, I beg to put a question to the hon. Postmaster-General, and to ask him this: If the Supreme Court should decide that the Catholics of Manitoba have a right to invoke the privileges conferred by the Act of 1871, will the Government be willing, after the decision by the Supreme Court, to pass a remedial legislation, or to restore the Provincial Act of 1871, or in any way to do something likely to remedy the grievances of the Manitoba Catholics?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the question just put by the hon. member, if the Government should then fail in their duty, it will be time for the hon. gentleman to assail them.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) This answer is far from being satisfactory. Why, for two or three months they have been criticising the leader of the Opposition, saying: Let him come and state what he will do in relation to this question. Well, the hon. leader of the Opposition stated this evening what he intended doing. He said that should the statements contained in the deposition of Archbishop Taché be true, the Catholics of Manitoba are ill-treated, and that, therefore, he is willing to cause any remedial legislation to be passed that is calculated to have this injustice removed. For two months they have been getting up a cabal against the leader of the Opposition in connection with this question. It seems to me it was not incumbent upon him to be the first to state what his policy would be as to this question. Yet, he did not fear to set at defiance the fanaticism of certain people, and to state his opinion honestly, while the Government decline to state what they will do. Well, we know what the Government will do. We know what they have decided upon. They are unwilling to do justice to the Catholics of Manitoba, and even if the Supreme Court should decide in their favour, I contend, and

Mr. BRODEUR.

I have a right to assert, after the statements of the Postmaster-General, that the Catholics of Manitoba will never get justice from the present Government. As stated in the early part of my remarks, I wish to raise no prejudice against the Government; I am aware it is always an easy thing to fight by means of prejudices and by stirring the popular passions; I am unwilling to take any such means to oppose the Government. As I have just stated, I blame the Government for the position they have taken as to this question, but I would be willing, this very evening, to vote for the Government and against the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet, if they should come and, at least, state they will do justice to the Catholics if the finding of the Supreme Court should be in their favour. It sufficiently shows that I am well-affected for the Government, and wish in no way to raise prejudices against them. The hon. Postmaster-General made a brilliant speech from a literary point of view, but I think it would have been much better had he stated in what position we are and, especially, whether the Catholics of Manitoba can expect a remedy to their present situation. Mr. Speaker, were I harkening to the feelings that inspire me in this moment; were I listening to the complaints and petitions sent from Manitoba to the Government, and asking that justice be done to them, I would state immediately that the Catholics of that province were wronged. I do not want to go that far immediately, however, for we are in duty bound to judge of the questions brought up in this House, not according to our feelings, but according to our judgment, and to see whether those who ask for remedial laws have a right to such a claim. We have, therefore, to examine whether, under the circumstances, the Catholics of Manitoba were wronged, whether they have a right to complain, and, further, whether the course followed by the Government can, in connection with this matter, receive our approval. Although it is late, I think it is desirable, previous to examining this question on its merits, to briefly state all the facts that are necessary so as to judge of it well. We find it plainly stated in the British North America Act that the Local Legislatures shall have the right to make laws concerning educational matters, but, on the other hand, it is also expressly stated that nothing in any such laws shall in any way prejudicially affect any right or privilege acknowledged to and enjoyed by the minorities in each of the provinces forming the Dominion of Canada previous to their admission into the Union. It is further provided that when a minority shall have any reason to complain with respect to any law or Act of a provincial authority, or shall allege that the Acts passed by these Provincial Legislatures are applied so as to prejudicially affect the interests of such a minority in educational matters, an appeal shall lie to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council. Here is, moreover,

section 93 of the British North America Act, concerning education :

93. In each province, the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the provinces at the Union.

(2.) All the powers, &c. (applicable only to Ontario and Quebec).

(3.) Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant and Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

(4.) In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

It must be observed, Mr. Speaker, that when this section was put in force, Manitoba was no part of the Dominion. The Canadian Government only took possession subsequently of the North-west Territories. We also know that serious difficulties arose when this Government undertook to take possession of these Territories, especially of that portion which now forms the province of Manitoba. We all remember that at that time these troubles came to such a pass that a civil war broke out. The inhabitants of that country took up arms in order to prevent the Federal Government from taking possession of these Territories. The Dominion Government delegated His Grace Archbishop Taché to the North-west to pacify the insurgents and induce them to submit to the Government. Archbishop Taché went there in fact and promised a full amnesty to those who had taken up arms in accordance as it were to the promises made to himself by the Dominion Government, and particularly by Sir George Cartier, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) and Sir John A. Macdonald, then Prime Minister. It was owing to these promises that delegates appointed by the insurgents were sent to Ottawa, in order to open negotiations and come to an understanding as to the terms of Union. We know what deliberations took place between these delegates and the Federal Government which resulted in the quashing of the insurrection and the admission of Manitoba into the Dominion of Canada. This brought Manitoba under the working of the British North America Act. At the time these negotiations took place, the question arose as to educational matters. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it was one of the princi-

pal questions on which the delegates laid very particular stress. These people wanted not only an amnesty for those implicated in the rebellion and the exercise of their religious rights, but they also intended to have full liberty in point of education. We also find that the Manitoba Act passed by the Federal Parliament in 1870 contains a section that guarantees to the Catholics the exercise of the rights they enjoyed, at the time of the Union, either by law or by practice. This is clearly summed up in section 22 of the Manitoba Act, which reads as follows :

22. In and for the province, the said Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the Union.

(2.) An appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any Act or decision of the Legislature of the province or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

(3.) In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section, is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to be allowed to show the difference there is between the provisions of the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act containing the terms of the Union of that province with the Dominion of Canada. We find that under the British North America Act the Local Legislatures had a right to pass laws in relation to education, in so far as they did not prejudicially affect the rights and privileges which the minorities enjoyed "by law" only, at the time of the Union. We find that the Manitoba Act went further and guaranteed to the minority the privileges it enjoyed, not only "by law" but also "by practice." There was a special reason for including such a provision in that Act and adding these words "by practice." Manitoba was not, previous to the Union, governed as to these matters by any positive law. Had they only included in the Act concerning that province the section that is to be found in the British North America Act, that is to say, had they guaranteed to the minorities the only privileges existing "by law," it would not have been sufficient. That provision could do for the province of Quebec where the minorities were protected by the laws that had been passed, but, as I have just stated, the province of Manitoba was not in such circumstances. They had, therefore, to remedy that by changing the provisions of the British North America Act, as far as questions of educa-

tion were concerned, by adding another special provision. That is why we find in the Manitoba Act a section providing that the minority in that province should have a right to complain of any law that might affect the rights and privileges acknowledged to them, not only by law, as formally stated for the province of Quebec and Ontario, but also by practice. There is still another difference between the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act; it is with respect to the right of appeal which the Catholics are entitled to exercise. That right of appeal, according to the British North America Act, can be exercised not only in connection with the privileges they enjoyed "at the time of the Union," but also in connection with the privileges acquired subsequently to the Union. As explained yesterday by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had no separate schools, like Quebec and Ontario. However, the hope was expressed that they would establish these schools and that, then, the privileges resulting from such an establishment would be inviolable.

I, Alexander Taché, of the town of St. Boniface, in the county of Selkirk and province of Manitoba, Archbishop of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical province of St. Boniface, make oath and say:

1. That I have been a resident continuously of this county since eighteen hundred and forty-five as a priest in the Roman Catholic church, and as bishop thereof since the year eighteen hundred and fifty, and now am the archbishop and metropolitan of the said church, and I am personally aware of the truth of the matters herein alleged.

2. Prior to the passage of the Act of the Dominion of Canada passed in the thirty-third year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, chapter three, known as the Manitoba Act and prior to the Order in Council issued in pursuance thereof, there existed in the territory now constituting the province of Manitoba a number of effective schools for children.

3. These schools were denominational schools, some of them being regulated and controlled by the Roman Catholic church, and others by various Protestant denominations.

4. The means necessary for the support of the Roman Catholic schools were supplied to some extent by school fees paid by some of the parents of the children who attended the schools and the rest was paid out of the funds of the church, contributed by its members.

5. During the period referred to, Roman Catholics had no interest in or control over the schools of the Protestant denominations and the members of the Protestant denominations had no interest in or control over the schools of the Roman Catholics. There were no public schools in the sense of state schools. The members of the Roman Catholic church supported the schools of their own church for the benefit of Roman Catholic children and were not under obligation to, and did not contribute to the support of any other schools.

6. In the matter of education, therefore, during the period referred to, Roman Catholics were, as a matter of custom and practice, separate from the rest of the community, and their schools were all conducted according to the distinctive views and beliefs of Roman Catholics as herein set forth.

7. Roman Catholic schools have always formed an integral part of the work of the Roman Catholic church. That church has always considered the educa-

tion of children of Roman Catholic parents as coming peculiarly within its jurisdiction. The school, in the view of the Roman Catholics, is in a large measure the "children's church," and wholly incomplete and largely abortive if religious exercises be excluded from it. The church has always insisted upon its children receiving their education in schools conducted under the supervision of the church, and upon them being trained in the doctrine and faith of the church. In education the Roman Catholic church attaches very great importance to the spiritual culture of the child, and regards all education unaccompanied by instruction in its religious aspect as possibly detrimental and not beneficial to children. With this regard the church requires that all teachers of children shall not only be members of the church, but shall be thoroughly imbued with its principles and faith; shall recognize its spiritual authority and conform to its directions. It also requires that such books be used in the schools, with regard to certain subjects, as shall combine religious instruction with those subjects, and this applies peculiarly to all history and philosophy.

I may say the above affidavit of Archbishop Taché was law in the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg and, in my opinion, it should equally be law before this House, just as it has been law before Her Majesty's Privy Council, as testified to by Lord McNaghten, who remarked:

The statement of Archbishop Taché has been accepted as accurate and complete.

Consequently, through this statement of Archbishop Taché we are quite settled as to the nature of the rights enjoyed by the Catholics of Manitoba, at the time of their entrance into the Confederation. In 1874, the Provincial Government of Manitoba, in order to give effect to the stipulations agreed upon between the delegates and the Federal Government, enacted the law known as the law of 1871, by virtue of which separate schools were established as well as a Board of Education, comprising two sections; the Catholic section of the board being allowed the full and exclusive control of their schools. The Protestant section of the board was equally given the full control of their own schools. Moreover, the Catholics enjoyed the immunity from contributing to the support of Protestant schools. From 1871 to 1890, no modification has been introduced into this legislation. But in 1890, the Greenway Government enacted a legislation utterly at variance with the rights enjoyed by Catholics, prior to their admission into the Confederation. In consequence of this legislation, separate schools have been abolished as well as the Board of Education and an Advisory Board substituted instead, consisting not of Catholics and Protestants, but of persons appointed by the Government at its own good-will. The books authorized for use in those schools, even for religious exercises, were to be sanctioned by this Advisory Board. Not satisfied with depriving Catholics of their separate schools and obliging them to recognize the schools which might be established, the Government of Manitoba went so far as to declare, through those laws of 1890, that the School Commissioners were empowered to appropriate the

goods belonging to the Catholic religion. I will take the liberty to give an analysis of these Acts, which have been sanctioned by the Privy Council of England :

By the 1st Act, chap. 37, the Board of Education which had existed up to that day, is swept away as are also the offices of superintendent and a Department of Education is created, consisting of an Executive Council, or a committee thereof appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and of an Advisory Board consisting of seven members, four of whom are to be appointed by the Department of Education, two, elected by the teachers of the province, and one, appointed by the University Council. Among other duties, of the Advisory Board, are the following:— (1) to examine and authorize text-books for the use of pupils and books of reference for school libraries; (2) to determine the qualifications of teachers, preceptors and inspectors for High and Public Schools; (3) to appoint examiners for the purpose of preparing examination papers; (4) to prescribe the forms of religious exercises to be used in schools.

Next comes the Act intitled: "The Public Schools Act," chapter 38. This Act repeals all the ancient laws concerning education. Amongst other sections, the following are enacted:—

Section 3. All Protestant and Catholic school districts, together with all elections and appointments to office, all agreements, contracts, assessments and rate bills, heretofore duly made in relation to Protestant or Catholic schools, and existing when this Act comes into force, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act.

Section 4. The term for which each school trustee holds office at the time this Act takes effect shall continue as if such term had been created by virtue of an election under this Act.

Section 5. All public schools shall be free schools, and every person in rural municipalities between the age of five and fifteen years, shall have the right to attend same school.

Section 6. Religious exercises in the public schools shall be conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board. The time for such religious exercises shall be just before the closing hour in the afternoon. In case the parent or guardian of any pupil notifies the teacher that he does not wish such pupil to attend such religious exercises, then such pupil shall be dismissed before such religious exercises take place.

Section 7. Religious exercises shall be held in a public school entirely at the option of the school trustees for the district, and, upon receiving written authority from the trustees, it shall be the duty of the teachers to hold such religious exercises.

Section 8. The public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian, and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein except as above provided.

The Act provides for the formation, alteration and union of school districts in rural municipalities, as also in cities, towns and villages, and for the election of school trustees and for the levying and collecting of a tax, by assessment, upon the taxable property within each municipality for school purposes.

Section 92 enacts that "the municipal council of every city, town and village shall levy and collect upon the taxable property within the municipality in the manner provided in this Act and in the Municipal and Assessment Acts, such sums as may be required by the public school trustees for school purposes."

Section 108, which provides for legislative grants, includes the following subsection: "(3) Any school not conducted according to all the provisions of this or any Act in force for the time being, or the regulations of the Department of Education or the Advisory Board, shall not be deemed a public school within the meaning of the law, and such school shall not participate in the legislative grant."

Under Section 141, "No teacher shall use or permit

to be used, as text books, any books in a model or public school, except such as are authorized by the Advisory Board, and no portion of the legislative grant shall be paid to any school in which unauthorized books are used."

By Section 179 it is stipulated that "In cases where, before the coming into force of this Act, Catholic school districts have been established as in the next preceding section mentioned, such Catholic school districts shall, upon the coming into force of this Act, cease to exist, and all the assets of such Catholic school districts shall belong to, and all the liabilities thereof be paid by, the public school district."

Beyond the shadow of a doubt, Mr. Speaker, both these laws affected to a considerable extent the rights enjoyed by Catholics up to that time. In order to obtain redress, the Catholics of Manitoba thought it their duty to bring in a suit, and the case of Barrett against the city of Winnipeg was brought into court. I am sorry to state, however, that on these grounds, Catholics are now denied certain rights hitherto enjoyed by them, for, in my opinion, this case is far from showing in an adequate manner, and under all their aspects, the rights which Catholics could exercise, before the Union. The only point at issue in this case pronounced upon by the Privy Council, was as to whether Catholics could be assessed for the maintenance of public schools. But by these laws of 1890, the privileges enjoyed by Catholics were affected on several grounds, for instance, by their being deprived of their schools, by the abolition of the Board of Education, and by doing away at the same time with the Catholic section of this board which, alone, had the right of control over the schools of the minority; they even went to the further length of prescribing for Catholic schools text-books chosen by a committee exclusively consisting of Protestants. Now, the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg raised but one single issue, that relating to the right by which Catholics enjoyed the immunity from contributing toward the support of public schools. Consequently, it is a gratuitous assumption to contend that the judgment of the Privy Council is law, and that Catholics are bound thereby to recognize the legality of the provisions of these Acts of 1890. Before the inferior court at Winnipeg the case has been decided against the Catholics. A majority of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba has also decided against the contentions put forth by Barrett. An appeal from that decision having been taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, the latter court, composed of two Protestant and two Catholic judges, reversing the judgment of the lower court below, unanimously held that the contentions of the Catholics were well grounded in law and should be upheld. Later on, the suit was carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. Unfortunately, the unanimous decision of the Privy Council was adverse to the claims of the Catholics of Manitoba, and the by-law of the city of Winnipeg quashed by the courts below, was upheld and declared per-

fectly legal and "intra vires." I may remark, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this judgment, that in my opinion, it is in accordance neither with the letter nor the spirit of the law, nor with the views generally entertained in our country in regard to the separate schools question. This House is aware that, from the very fact that minorities have been granted separate schools in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, not only have those minorities, in all strictness, a right to those separate schools, but enjoy, at the same time, the immunity from contributing towards the support of public schools. In 1862, at the time when the question was settled by the Parliament of United Canada, it was agreed upon that the Catholics of the province of Ontario should be entitled not only to separate schools, but should also enjoy the immunity from contributing towards the maintenance of other denominational schools. The common doctrine, grounded on public law in force in this country, relating to separate schools, includes not only the right for minorities to separate schools under their full exclusive control, but also the immunity for the same minority from liability to contribute even in the smallest degree towards the support of other schools. Now, should the genuine meaning of the expression "separate schools" be once clearly defined and perfectly understood, the conclusion would be easily reached that the judgment of the Privy Council is grounded on a construction which does violence to the language of the Statute, such as interpreted in the country. In England, as well as in the United States, the minorities are given, by law, a right to their separate schools, but, at the same time, enjoy no immunity from contributing towards the support of public schools. From the above we gather that the meaning and notion ascribed to the words "separate schools" in the above countries differ widely from the notions prevalent in Canada. And I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that the judges of the Privy Council, while rendering this decision, have been led away by an erroneous construction, which cannot be supported by strict reasoning from the meaning attributed in our country to the expression "separate schools," but were rather guided by the meaning prevailing in England and the United States. In the State of Massachusetts, for instance, whether Catholics are granted the right to their separate schools, such right is only given them by law under the strict condition of maintaining their own denominational schools, without their enjoying any immunity from being assessed and paying the tax levied for the support of public schools. This is a well known fact, that a contrary state of affairs prevails in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, where the minority, either Protestant or Catholic, enjoys the immunity from contributing towards the support of the schools of the majority. It must be confessed, Mr. Speaker, that their Lordships, the members of the Privy Council,

Mr. BRODEUR.

in rendering their judgment, have started from false premises. The rights and privileges in respect of denominational schools do not apply merely to those schools as such, but include also in their application the immunity from taxation towards the maintenance of public schools. Judge Patterson assents to this view as to the privilege at issue, and comments as follows upon it :—

In one form or another the members of the church supported the schools of the church. As a class of people they bore the burden. We are not concerned to inquire how the burden was distributed among the individual members, or whether each one bore some part of it. The privilege in question appertained to the class of people, and the burden was borne by the class. The bearing of the burden was essential to the enjoyment of the privilege. It is the maintenance of a school that is of value to the community or class, rather than the abstract or theoretical right to maintain it. In other words, the value of the right depends upon the practical use that can be made of it. Whatever throws an obstacle in the way of that practical use prejudicially affects the right. It is not conceivable that in any community, and notably among the settlers in a region like Manitoba, a burden of taxation for the support of public schools can be imposed on the people of any religious denomination without rendering it less easy for the same people to maintain denominational schools. The degree of interference is immaterial. If it occurs to any extent, the right to maintain the denominational school is injuriously affected.

It is perfectly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the construction contended for by Judge Patterson is the one everywhere prevailing in Canada. The exercise of a privilege should be such as to remove all direct or indirect obstacles thrown in the way of its practical use. The enjoyment of such privilege should not be prejudicially affected, even partially. Such as contended for in the judgment of the Privy Council, the right to separate schools is construed as carrying along with it only the right of establishing such schools, and of supporting them through a private assessment levied on those forming part of the minority, and as excluding the immunity from taxation such as understood from time immemorial in this country. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I will take the liberty of giving the views of one of the fathers of the Confederation, who has been most instrumental in framing the separate school law. The Hon. Mr. McDougall, as soon as the Privy Council judgment had been known in Canada, expressed the following opinion :—

If the Catholics of Manitoba refuse to accept the Greenway Act, and still maintain their own schools, they ought not to be taxed for the support of public schools. I think public opinion even in Manitoba would justify the Federal Parliament in exercising its constitutional power to grant remedial laws.

We find that the same view is assented to by His Honour Sir William Ritchie and the Honourable Judges Fournier and Taschereau, as to the same privileges. I will quote the opinion of the Honourable Judges Fournier and Taschereau. Judge Fournier says :

At the time when Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick joined into a Confederation, there existed in each province a complete system of public schools established by law. In Ontario and Quebec, the right of minorities professing a religious belief different from that of the majority, to have their separate schools was recognized by law. Whenever they established those schools, minorities enjoyed the exemption from contributing to the support of public schools, and were entitled to a share of the legislative grant.

The authors of Confederation, in order to prevent a return of the agitation, stirred up by this position in the old provinces of Canada, between Catholics and Protestants, while recognizing the right of provinces to legislate on educational matters, wisely stipulated certain provisions intended to protect the rights and privileges of minorities, and prohibited any legislation which might invade the existing rights and privileges on the matter of education.

Judge Taschereau spoke as follows:—

It is clearly shown, as a matter of fact, from these affidavits, which constitute the only evidence in record, that, prior to the Union, by practice, the Catholics of this territory enjoyed not only the privilege of having their own schools, but also, negatively, as a corollary and an essential part of such a privilege, the immunity from contributing towards the support of any other system of education. In fact, it was the immunity enjoyed from liability to assessment for the support of schools of another denomination that constituted for them a privilege; the privilege, if restricted to the right of their own schools, would have been illusory, and could scarcely have been called a privilege; the right to voluntary schools comes under common law; it is not a privilege; and a practice under which they would have had to support their own schools and other denominational schools would have been for them a peculiar privilege. The privilege, upon the whole, would have been the privilege of others. Such, however, is the only privilege which the respondent wishes now to concede to the Catholic minority in the province. Subsection 1 which I have quoted at great length secures to the minority, Catholic or Protestant, the rights which, by practice, they had enjoyed up to that time, and subsection 2 give them the right of appeal to the Governor-General in Council from any legislation affecting any of their rights in the matter. I am of opinion that their claims (the Catholics of Manitoba) are well grounded. They have a right to their system such as is enjoyed by their co-religionists of Ontario, and on the same principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend further that the judgment of the Privy Council has no bearing on most of the questions which ought to have been submitted in order to test the validity of the Acts passed in 1890 by the Legislature of Manitoba. I hold that the Privy Council has merely decided as to the legality of the by-laws enacted by the city of Winnipeg, without investigating the validity of the Acts in themselves. I hold that the former of these Acts, the one which did away with the Board of Education, has not been pronounced upon by the Privy Council, as testified to by these words of Lord McNaghten:

The controversy which has given rise to the present litigation is no doubt beset with difficulties. The result of the controversy is of serious moment to the province of Manitoba and a matter apparently of deep interest throughout all the Dominion. But, in its legal aspect, the question lies in a narrow compass.

We have to examine the Act 38 Vic., or the Public School Act.

Therefore, the Privy Council having not pronounced on the validity of all the Acts passed by the Legislature of Manitoba, the Federal Government was not warranted in asserting that they were bound by that judgment and that it was inexpedient for them to pronounce upon the validity of the two Acts enacted in 1890, and to allow the appeal of the Catholics. In 1890, the latter had petitioned the Federal Government asking them to intervene and to disallow these Acts. Why did not the Government accede to their request? Had the Government then disallowed the Manitoba Acts, the matter would have been set at rest. Still, the hon. member for Provencher said the other evening: Had the Acts of 1890 been disallowed, the Legislature of Manitoba might have immediately re-enacted them. It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, but it should also be borne in mind that the Federal Government might also have disallowed the law again. The Local Legislature meets but once a year whilst the Governor may meet in Council every day. Therefore, it would have been impossible for the Catholics of Manitoba to find themselves again so badly circumstanced; and, instead of seeing themselves deprived of their schools, and forced to send their children to Protestant schools, they could now, had the Government used the power of disallowance, send their children to Catholic schools. The hon. Prime Minister told us that the Government should never intervene, except in the case of Acts "ultra vires." The hon. Prime Minister, I think, is over-scrupulous in regard to this question; he has shown himself less rigorous on other questions submitted to him. When the question of disallowance, the House remembers perfectly well, came up before the Governor in Council, three other bills were also submitted at the same time for the same purpose: one, concerning the abolition of the French language, another respecting the infectious or contagious diseases of animals, and a third one concerning public corporations. What did the Government do? As to the contagious diseases of animals Act and that concerning public corporations, they were declared "ultra vires" and vetoed or disallowed by the hon. the Minister of Justice. I will read to the House the portion of his report relating thereto, such as I find in the Montreal "Gazette":

The undersigned is of opinion that for the reasons therein stated the Act under revision is *ultra vires* of a provincial legislature, for that reason and also for the reasons hereinafter stated, he recommends the Act be disallowed.

Meanwhile, one could read in the same newspaper a declaration of the Prime Minister to the effect that the Bill concerning the abolition of the French language was also "ultra vires," but that it was inopportune to veto or disallow it, as it could be annulled by the courts. What follows then from all this?

The Act concerning animals labouring under infectious diseases, is disallowed as "ultra vires"—quite true, these poor animals could not go and claim redress before the courts. But it is quite obvious that the Prime Minister seems to be more solicitous for animals affected with contagious diseases than for the French-speaking people of the North-west; or else under the assumption that the Act concerning the abolition of the French language is "ultra vires," it should have been vetoed by the Prime Minister just as the two other Bills had been. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Justice said in the same report, in relation to the Manitoba School Act, that the time had not yet come to take into consideration the grievances of Catholics, as the question was still pending before the courts of justice. But he continues to say:

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress under subsections (2) and (3) of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the "British North America Act," in relation to other provinces.

Those subsections contain in effect the provisions which have been made as to all the provinces and are obviously those under which the Constitution intended that the Government of the Dominion should proceed, if it should at any time become necessary that the Federal powers should be resorted to for the protection of a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority against any Act or decision of the Legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any "right or privilege" of any such minority "in relation to education."

As seen from the above extract I have just read to the House, the hon. the Minister of Justice had pledged himself to take into consideration the petitions from the Catholic minority of Manitoba applying for the redress of their grievances, under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. The promise of the hon. the Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson), as I have just shown, was explicit and quite positive. He declares in explicit terms: "Should the judgment of the legal courts prove adverse to the Catholic minority, we shall take into consideration the petitions presented in behalf of the same minority, under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the provincial constitution of Manitoba." But now, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer so; the hon. the Minister of Justice refuses to examine these petitions, to give a hearing to the demands of the minority, to do justice to those who suffer persecution at the hands of the majority under these iniquitous laws. In 1891, he held that the Manitoba Act applied to the case, but now he contends that it does no longer apply. Addressing the Catholics, he says: "This question has been settled by the judgment of the Privy Council. You have, it is true, the right of appealing to the Government for redress when your rights are invaded, but, according to the decision of the

Mr. BRODEUR.

Privy Council, the rights you enjoyed, at the Union, are not affected by the legislation complained of." Why this change of front? Why is the hon. Minister no longer able to deal with the question and give his decision without delay, as he stated himself ready to do in 1891, so soon as the legal courts should have pronounced upon the case? No, Mr. Speaker, the Government are unwilling to interfere and will not dare do so; and this undoubtedly accounts for the fact that a question which was held to be quite clear and obvious in 1891, is stated to be no longer so to-day. The Government who then recognized the minorities right to petition for the redress of their grievances, now contend that the same minority have no right to do so. In 1891, the hon. the Minister of Justice, through the report just quoted, was instrumental in preventing public opinion being stirred up to a considerable degree. Then the Government were lavish of alluring promises; to-day, they flinch, they deny having made any promises; they refuse to deal with the petitions and do justice to the oppressed. The hon. the Minister of Justice, spoke as follows, in his report of the 29th December, 1892:—

The two Acts of 1890, which are complained of, must, according to the opinion of the sub-committee, be regarded as within the powers of the Legislature of Manitoba, but it remains to be considered whether the appeal should be entertained and heard as an appeal against statutes which are alleged to have encroached on rights or privileges with regard to denominational schools which were acquired by any class of persons in Manitoba, not at the time of the Union but after the Union.

Now, the hon. the Minister of Justice said in 1891: "Wait till the legal courts have decided upon the matter, and then, should you fail before the courts, your appeal shall be heard." But now that a judgment adverse to the claims of the Catholics has been rendered, the Government turns round and says: Well! You have no longer the right to take an appeal under the Manitoba Act, but we are going to submit the question to the Supreme Court, as to whether you have a right of appeal under the Constitutional Act. I hold, Mr. Speaker, this is a case of breach of trust: the Government have forfeited their promises, and the House cannot approve of such a course. Now, I put the question: What is it the Government proposes to do? We understand from the report published some time since, that the Government have decided to submit the question to the Supreme Court, not as to whether the Catholic minority have any right to the redress of their grievances under the Manitoba Act, but as to whether they can claim redress under the clauses of the Constitutional Act. Now, I venture to say this is a most extraordinary position. In my opinion, the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson) should have on the floor of the House, the other day, reconciled the contradiction existing between the stand taken

by him in 1891 and his present attitude. In his report of 1891, he emphatically stated that the Manitoba Act, in so far as the educational question was concerned, was analogous to the British North America Act, and now, being called upon to express an opinion on the same Act, he takes quite a different view of it, in his last report, stating therein he does not know whether the Manitoba Act corresponds with the Confederation Act. And yet, as I have just remarked, the hon. Prime Minister had declared in 1891, that the clauses of the Manitoba Act were analogous to the provisions of the British North America Act. What will be the outcome of all this? Will the persecuted minority in Manitoba have dealt out to them every right to which they are entitled? Will the hon. Minister of Justice restore to the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba their invaded rights as to separate schools? In the assumption that the claims of the Catholics of Manitoba shall be sustained by the judgment of the Supreme Court, shall the Government interfere in the matter, as in duty bound? I expected, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Ministers declare the policy of the Government on the matter under discussion. I expected, above all, to hear from the French-speaking members of the Cabinet, who are the representatives of the province of Quebec, a full and authoritative statement as to the duty of the Government towards the protection of the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba. But, far from it, Mr. Speaker, we have heard no such utterances from the Ministers. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) and the hon. the Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron), have stated, one after the other, on the floor of the House, that they were not aware what position the Government would take on this matter should the Supreme Court uphold the claims of the Catholic minority; they have not had the courage to pledge themselves to redress the wrongs inflicted on the Catholic minority of Manitoba, should the courts assert the Federal right of interference. As already stated, I should willingly give my support to the Government, should they pledge themselves to mete out to the Catholics of Manitoba their just rights. But no, Mr. Speaker, they will take no such engagement, nor give any such pledge; they would rather be guided by men known for anti-Catholic leanings. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem at a loss to understand how it comes that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) intends voting in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). We, on the opposition side, declare, upon the floor of the House, how the Government should deal with this question, what course they should take on the matter under consideration, if desirous of doing their duty to their country. We are not afraid of speaking over-board, and to give expression to our views; and

when the hon. member for North Simcoe chooses to cast his vote alongside with us on this amendment, the hon. gentlemen on the right feel scandalized at this. We should not concern ourselves too much with the matter, however, for we have now all reached the conviction that they have made up their minds that justice shall not be meted out to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. Let me, Mr. Speaker, frankly speak my mind to the House on the subject and say what I am in duty bound to proclaim: let justice be meted out to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and let us vote with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). This attitude, in my opinion, Sir, is preferable to the course taken by the French-speaking Ministers from the province of Quebec, who lack the courage to declare themselves ready to give up their seats in the Cabinet sooner than allowing the Government of the province of Manitoba persecuting the Catholic minority and invading their rights guaranteed by the Constitution. In presence of the course pursued in the past and still adhered to by these gentlemen, they have no right throwing to us across the floor of the House the taunts of siding with the hon. member for North Simcoe on the motion brought forward by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Last night the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) was wondering how the hon. member for North Simcoe could cast his vote in favour of the amendment of my hon. friend the member for L'Islet. To say the least, I am quite at a loss to understand how the hon. gentleman can experience any scruple on the matter. Did not the hon. gentleman himself often go hand in hand with Orangemen, whenever required by party interests? On the very same educational questions we deal with now; when the rights of Catholics were at stake, did the hon. gentleman scruple to walk side by side with well-known Orangemen? He is not the man, therefore, that should throw the first stone at us. In 1874 or 1873, if I mistake not, did he not cast his vote with Orangemen on the amnesty and New Brunswick school questions? We have seen him, Sir, on certain questions, voting side by side, hand in hand, with the worst enemies of our rights and religion. And to this very same gentleman, to-day, the fact of seeing the member for North Simcoe voting with us on this question is a stumbling-block! I really wonder how a man in his circumstances should dare reproach us for our associations with any member in this House. We have heard the same reproaches from the Postmaster-General and the Minister of Public Works. These two gentlemen are also scandalized at the fact that the hon. member for Simcoe is going to cast his vote for the motion before the House. And yet, on the amnesty question, one of vital importance, I see the name of the hon. Postmaster-General and of the hon. Minister of Public Works coupled with those of prominent Orangemen, such as the

Farrows, the Douvilles, the Wallaces. Have these gentlemen any right of crying : Shame on you ! when we vote in company with the hon. member for North Simcoe ? I heard this afternoon the hon. member for Bellechasse declaring from his seat that he also was scandalized at the fact that the hon. member for North Simcoe intended voting with us. Now, in 1890, did not the hon. gentleman cast his vote along with the member for North Simcoe, in favour of the abolition of the French language in the Northwest ? Has he a right, after voting in such a direction, to qualify our course as disgraceful in voting in company with the hon. member for North Simcoe ? The hon. member for Three Rivers, has done an injustice to the hon. member for L'Islet, when assuming that the motion of the latter was but a copy of an article issued from the pen of the member for North Simcoe, published in the "Canadian Magazine." The hon. member for Three Rivers, forsooth, has read but one-half of the motion, for the other half is not found in the article written by the member for North Simcoe. This motion, as just remarked, is divided into two parts. The first portion of the resolution arraigns the Government policy in relation to the Manitoba school question, and the second blames them for assuming to act as a judicial body. Now, a last word with regard to the member for Provencher, and I have done. We felt surprised at this gentleman's strange attitude the other day when the question came up in the House. I hoped he, of all others, would stand up on the floor of this House and show how worthy of every execration was the conduct of the Government. I hoped he would stand up and say to the Government : If justice is not meted out to the Catholics of Manitoba, I will fight you to the bitter end, and do my best to defeat you. Had the hon. gentleman shown as much pluck as his colleague, the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), he would have stood up like him and courageously asserted his views and sympathies. The member for Winnipeg is ready to blame and to fight the Government should they dare lay their hands on the Manitoba School Act. Why, then, did not the member for Provencher, who, in this House, constitutes himself the champion of the Catholics of Manitoba, stand up in behalf of his compatriots with the same courage as the member for Winnipeg ? Why did he not rise from his seat and tell the House that sooner than see the Catholic minority of Manitoba denied their rights by the Government, he would fight the latter with all his might. The whole course of the hon. member for Provencher is open to suspicion to us who have been eye-witnesses to his numerous compromises and failings. The hon. member has kept on making concessions, and successively retreating from the positions taken up by him, changing his views to suit circumstances ; and should the Government, as I firmly believe, refuse to-morrow to mete

Mr. BRODEUR.

out justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, the member for Provencher would be the first to bring up a motion approving of the course taken by the Ministers. This, seemingly, would be an extraordinary assumption, Mr. Speaker, were it not borne out by the facts, as I will show. From the papers laid before the House, we see that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) first petitioned the Government in view of having the school laws enacted by the Legislature of Manitoba in 1890 disallowed. The Government having declined to accede to this request, did the hon. member for Provencher blame the Ministers for the course taken by them in this matter ? Not in the least, Mr. Speaker ; he yielded and thanked them. Later on, again, when the Privy Council had decided that the school laws of Manitoba were "intra vires," we gather from the report of December, 1892, a statement made by the Government to the effect that the appeal petitioned for by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), along with other authorized representatives of the Catholic minority, could not be entertained. Now, is the hon. member going to blame the Government for not allowing the appeal ? Is he going to move a vote of censure against the Government for betraying their promises of 1891 ? No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member submits again to the good-will of the Government and sustains them in their denial of justice to his compatriots of Manitoba. From the same papers we gather that the hon. member has also petitioned the Government, asking them to exercise their rights of interference by granting remedial laws against the encroachments complained of by the Catholic minority of his province. This petition for the redress of the wrongs inflicted on Catholics was based on constitutional grounds. The Government still refusing to grant the petition, did the hon. member for Provencher this time have the courage to censure the Government ? No, Mr. Speaker ; once more the hon. member for Provencher bowed down to the Government's decision. We have read in the newspapers that the hon. member for Provencher, from his seat in the House, was to move for the appointment of a committee to investigate this school question, and see as to the best means of meting out justice to the persecuted minority. Did he bring up a motion for the appointment of this committee ? No, Mr. Speaker ; as the Government did not approve of the scheme, the hon. member for Provencher, as usual, humbly acquiesced in the decision. The hon. member, among other statements, declared he would favour Federal interference ; that an appeal could be taken to the Federal authorities ; that the Government had, from the Constitution, the right to interfere for the relief of the Catholic minority. In the report of the 29th December, 1892, the Government state they had no such right, that the appeal must be taken to the Supreme Court, and the hon. member for Provencher, always obsequious, answers : So

be it. Thus, within the space of a few months, this hon. member has altered his views not less than five times on this school question. And we should be called upon now to endorse all this, by accepting him as champion of the Catholic minority's rights in Manitoba! I say, Mr. Speaker, he is not the champion of the Catholics of his province! this man is ready to sacrifice the rights of his compatriots and we are warranted in saying to him: We place no confidence in you. As just asserted, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Provencher has stated that the Government had a right of interference, now that the courts had rendered their decisions. In order to substantiate this assertion, I will read an extract from an article published in the newspaper "*Le Manitoba*," the organ of the member for Provencher, and in which it is said:

Therefore the courts of justice do not constitute the only tribunal before which we may bring our suits; if so, to what purpose the clauses 2 and 3. To what purpose, then, an appeal and the means of making executory the decisions rendered on said appeal, should the courts have power to settle definitely the whole question?

Let us now pass to another consideration: the Governor-General is not a tribunal, bound as common judicial courts are, to a strict and narrow construction of the letter of the law; his functions are rather those of a special court. It is incumbent upon him to protect minorities against persecutions they might be subjected to by hostile majorities. He is bound to judge in accordance with the spirits of the law, and in conformity with the intentions of the legislator, and he should decide in accordance with justice and equity. He is the guardian of the compact entered into in 1867 for the whole Confederation, subsequently, in 1870, as regards Manitoba. Now, the principles included in this contract, having a bearing on the educational and school questions, are compendiously expressed, and the powers conferred on the legislatures cannot and should not be exercised except in conformity with these principles and in their widest sense. Whenever a legislature deviates from them, and tramples under foot the compact and the engagements entered into, this tribunal constituted *ad hoc*, not only has the power, but is bound to interfere. It is its bounden duty and its right, and we trust that it shall not fail to do its duty. We repeat it: the tribunal is not bound, as is often the case with judges of an ordinary court, by legal absolutism. It is not forced to submit to the narrow and often inexorable formalism of tribunals. No! it is, on the contrary, endowed with a discretionary power. By a fair interpretation, it can even make good the apparent deficiencies which a too narrow construction of the text might give rise to, according to this legal axiom: *Quod sub-intelligitur de est*. At last, should the construction put on our Constitution by the Privy Council be final—which we deny—and should we find ourselves at the mercy of the Local Legislature, we could then but repeat what we have previously said: the Federal Parliament is bound to give the true interpretation and to remedy the wrong wording of its own law, so as to give us the schools we have petitioned for, and which they intended and believed, in fact, to have been granted us under the Manitoba Act. Parliaments, like individuals, are bound to repair the injury done by them, even without malice or premeditation.

Thus, as seen from the above, the hon. member for Provencher said in an editorial pub-

lished on the 5th October, in his newspaper: The power of the Government is discretionary; it has the power to interfere. But now that the Government has decided against his contention, the hon. member yields with humility, and far from being satisfied with disowning the rights of his compatriots, he even goes so far as to insult the men who defend those rights in this House. Does any one wish for a proof that he does not deserve to be trusted by French-Canadians? I will take the liberty of reading a letter to his address from Archbishop Taché—one of his friends—who formally declares that this man has betrayed the interests of the French-Canadians in certain circumstances:

ST. BONIFACE, 3rd October, 1892.

To the Editor of *Le Manitoba*.

Sir,—The last issue of your journal contains an editorial under the heading, "To our readers."

Had this editorial abstained from hinting at the "hierarchy" and to its "authority" I should certainly have refrained from casting some shades on the cheerful picture of the merits of your journal, so ably chalked out in this article; but I am sorry that you should have made it impossible for me to keep silence on two paragraphs of said editorial.

In one of these paragraphs you say: "The journal, under the enlightened direction of the hierarchy, has never flagged in the defence of its rights, and has always been faithful to its mission." Then you wind up with the following paragraph: "We have no fear of erring, our course being traced out by the authority, the prescriptions of which we shall always heartily endeavour to obey."

Without scrutinizing the motives nor the intentions, it is none the less true that these two paragraphs ascribe to me a responsibility which I have not incurred in the past and which I cannot assume for the future.

First, as to the past: allow me to tell your readers that they would labour under a strange delusion were they to believe that whatever has been written in your journal has been so "under the direction of the hierarchy." As a general rule, I have never seen the editorials of *Le Manitoba* previous to their appearing in print. In certain circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that I have been consulted, that I have given my opinion, and that it has been taken into consideration. It is obvious that, in such exceptional circumstances, I have incurred a responsibility, and far from repudiating the same, I congratulate myself upon it, as does also your journal.

In many other circumstances, on the contrary, instead of inspiring itself of my ideas and conforming to my wishes, your journal has given the hospitality of its columns to ideas in direct opposition to my own convictions. In certain editorials, editorial notes, communications, certain assertions have been made which I have deeply regretted. Just as silence has been kept when I should have been so happy that it had been broken; so again the large sphere of our religious and patriotic interests, in which your journal is so proud to move, has been lessened and lowered to the level and to the insignificant proportions of petty individual interests and of personal antipathy, too often made notorious through charges and innuendos deeply to be regretted.

While our educational interests are the common topic of public conversation and attention, how is the silence too often kept by your journal about the progress and value of our educational establishments to be accounted for? Why is it that the merit of the most brilliant, eloquent and patriotic efforts of our public men in the

parliamentary arena in favour of our claims and rights in educational matters, have not been publicly acknowledged by your journal? I have found these tactics too deplorable to assume any responsibility in connection with them.

Le Métis, later on *Le Manitoba*, founded 21 years ago, has rendered unquestionable as well as unquestioned services; its pages have often been adorned with brilliant and solid editorials; if, I am sorry to say, it has gone through epochs of well marked editorial decadency, it is that, on the ground above mentioned, valuable contributions have been systematically discarded, who, like myself, were sorry to see the natural organ of our population deviate from the mission for which it had been created, and swerve from the most noble end of its existence, by sowing and fostering in our midst the seeds of divisions as dangerous as they are deeply to be regretted. I repeat it once more, I cannot leave your readers under the belief that such a state of things is owing to a direction given by the hierarchy. We ought to be all agreed upon this point, we are too small a minority to gratify ourselves with the luxury of fostering struggles so much the more barren in good results as they are fruitful in consequences which all, I have no doubt, we desire to see removed from our population.

As to the future now. In your last paragraph of your editorial, it said: "We have no fear of erring, our course being traced out by the authority to the prescriptions of which we shall always heartily endeavour to obey."

Should this paragraph hint at ecclesiastical authority, I am sorry to tell you that I do see on what ground may be rested the assurance given. Nothing, as far I know, is altered in the organization and editorship of your journal; it may be in the future what it has been in the past; it may know or ignore my views, comply with them or turn from them as it may please it; it may pass over in silence, as in the past, what I held should have been said publicly; it may still accuse citizens whom I respect and hold in high estimation. Then, to obviate these inconveniences, I shall have, as now, but the difficult and nice expedient of contradicting, without any hope of attenuating the effect produced.

Mark well, I do not here question the greater or smaller degree of freedom or restriction with which a journal may be edited; my only contention, for the present, is that your readers may perfectly understand that I do not assume any share of responsibility or of joint and several liability either as to the future or as to the past.

I am sorry to be under the necessity of giving utterance to such remarks, but you must agree that you have driven me to it. The very fact of being the only French journal in our midst is a privilege, but it must also be borne in mind that privileges beget obligations. In a thickly settled centre, they who are in more intimate community of ideas have their respective organs; they may speak, and if needed, defend themselves, but when a journal is alone, it ought to remember that it is in honour bound to publish together any systematic exclusions, whatever good is done in the middle where it is edited, as also to attack those persons who are unable to defend themselves, is a kind of disloyalty and cowardice. However, I wish your journal full success and prosperity. I willingly bear witness to the services rendered by it. Nobody more than I desire to see it surrounded with the esteem and confidence of all our population. I repeat, nevertheless, that I cannot assume, either for the past or for the future, any responsibility in connection with what has been or may be written contrary to my wishes or my views.

Your obedient servant,

ALEX.,

Arch. of St. Boniface, O.M.I.

Mr. BRODEUR.

As seen from the above, the hon. member for Provencher is stated by his own bishop to be a traitor to the interests of his nationality, in view of promoting his own personal interests. Henceforth, he has no longer the right to style himself the champion of Catholics. Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said to show that the Government is worthy of all blame for the course taken by them. Had the power of disallowance been resorted to, the whole matter would now be settled and we would be entering in an era of peace and security, while on the contrary, we do not know whither we are drifting; more serious troubles are perhaps in store for us, owing to the shifting policy of the Government on the matter. Therefore, I do hope, under the circumstances, the Conservative French-Canadian members from the province of Quebec, setting aside party spirit, will not allow themselves to be seduced by the allurements of power, but will join with me in censuring the Government, who are now sacrificing our dearest interests.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members who are in the Chamber at this time are about as weary as myself. I have been trying for the last two or three hours to get an opportunity to express my views on this very important question which has been under discussion for the last two days, but I have been unable, until at this moment, to get the floor. The hour being late, I must necessarily curtail the remarks I was about to make in reference to this matter. Now, Sir, in the first place, as I come from the province of Manitoba, and have a knowledge of facts in connection with this matter that possibly is not possessed by others, except those who come from that province, it might be well for me, in a few brief words, to give a history of the school question in Manitoba, and what has brought it before this Parliament to-day. We have been told by previous speakers, that in the Constitution that was given to Manitoba in 1870, it was provided that:

In and for the province of Manitoba the Legislature may exclusively make laws with relation to education, subject to the following provisions;—

Amongst other things, it was provided:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the Union.

When the Manitoba Legislature was formed in 1871, acting under the provision and authority of the Manitoba Act, the Legislature passed the Manitoba School Act. By that Act the following provision was made with regard to education in the province. I quote the first clause of the Act of 1871:

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint no less than ten or more than fourteen persons to be a Board of Education for the province of Manitoba, of whom one-half shall be Protestants and the other half Catholics.

The statute was amended and the Education Act was consolidated in the year 1881. The Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba enjoyed, under the provisions of that Act, the rights which those who framed it and put it upon the Statute-book said they ought to enjoy under the Imperial Act, or the Act of the House of 1870. The Consolidated Education Act was in force in the province of Manitoba until 1890. That is, for nineteen long years the minority in Manitoba enjoyed the right of separate schools. And, Sir, having lived in that country from 1881, a few weeks, as I find by the Statute-book after this Consolidated Education Act was assented to. I can say here, speaking as a Protestant, that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the other Protestants of the province are concerned, we did not hear it mooted in public or in private, that a change should be made. No objection was taken to the state of education affairs of the province. We were as quiet and as peaceful as people could be. The minority were enjoying their rights, teaching their children under the regulations framed by the board. According to the provisions of the Act, a board of education was formed, half of Protestants and half of Catholics, as I have said. The chairman of the board was the Bishop of Rupert's Land, and at the board sat Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Roman Catholics. And for nineteen years these men conducted the educational affairs of the province, and not one word of controversy was spoken. No petition was addressed to the Legislature of Manitoba, no argument was used in the newspapers, and nothing was said in favour of the change. It was left to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to come to that country in 1889 and sow the seed of discord in our midst, and to the gentleman who has just made such a vigorous speech to the House, and to others who are going to support the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet. I commend their friend, the hon. member for North Simcoe. If he had not come and made a speech at Portage la Prairie, we would never have heard of this question of Manitoba schools. It is an extraordinary thing that no voice was raised among the Protestants of Manitoba attempting to show that the Catholic minority had not the right to enjoy the privileges they had enjoyed from 1871. The Government of Manitoba, in 1889, was formed, amongst others, of Mr. Thomas Greenway and Mr. Joseph Martin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is quite in error in supposing that I ever said a word about separate schools at Portage la Prairie. On the contrary, before I reached Manitoba, or rather when I reached Winnipeg, I read a statement, by Mr. Smart, I think, made at a meeting at Clearwater, held a day or two before, that the Government of Mr. Greenway had determined upon the policy of doing away with the separate

schools. I had never spoken on the subject of the separate schools in Manitoba, either there or in the House, and at Portage la Prairie my whole address was with reference to the dual language, and not with reference to the separate schools. I am sure my hon. friend will be glad to be corrected, as he is evidently much misinformed as to the facts.

Mr. DALY. I am glad the hon. gentleman has spoken, because I have here the report of his speech, taken from the Winnipeg "Free Press," and delivered by him at Portage la Prairie. He says:

There was something for the politician to live for; we have the power to save this country from fratricidal strife, the power to make this a British country in fact as it is in name. In order to accomplish this other issues must for the moment give way. We have got to bend our energies and let it be understood in every constituency that, whether a man call himself Grit or Tory, Conservative or Reformer, his record is clear, his principles are sound and no influence at Ottawa will induce him to betray his great trust. The speaker was glad to inform the meeting that the poor, sleepy Protestant minority of Quebec were at last awake. He trusted before many weeks to address a meeting in Montreal and to realize that that minority is sound to the core on this question. There is the separate school question here and in the Northwest, and there is the French school question in Ontario; we have all the work to do in our various localities; let us do that first before we seek to traverse fields where more difficulty is to become encountered because vested rights have become solidified.

I think I have proved conclusively that the hon. gentleman did speak of separate schools at Portage la Prairie. He spoke of Mr. Smart having made a speech at Clearwater. I have no recollection of Mr. Smart ever having made a speech in connection with this question, until he addressed a Grit picnic at Wawanesa, and that was, at least, a week after the member for Simcoe had addressed a meeting at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does my hon. friend say that Mr. Smart had not declared the policy of the Government prior to the speech I made at Portage la Prairie?

Mr. DALY. I say that Mr. Smart had not publicly discussed the separate school question until the 8th August, at Wawanesa. Well, we find that Mr. Joseph Martin, the then Attorney-General of Manitoba, attended the public meeting addressed by the hon. member for Simcoe, and was on the platform with him. We have the fact that Mr. Joseph Martin at that time was labouring under a cloud, as it were, in connection with some railway legislation to which it is unnecessary for me to refer—it is a matter of history. Mr. Martin found it necessary, in order to maintain the position that he held amongst the people of Manitoba, to square himself on that question, and after the member for Simcoe had made his address at Portage la Prairie, Mr. Martin got upon the platform and congratulated the member for Simcoe on his remarks, and declared that so far as he was concerned,

he was in favour of the abolition of separate schools. Mr. Martin said :

He could not say that it had been announced by the Government, at least not very definitely, what action they proposed to take in connection with the dual language and separate school system in this province, which were subjects of an entirely similar nature with the discussion now going on with regard to the disallowance to the Act in Quebec. But he thought it had been very well known in this province for some years back what his own individual feelings were in regard to the use of two languages in the legislature.

In brief, Mr. Martin, the then Attorney-General, declared himself for the abolition of separate schools, and declared that so far as he was concerned as a member of the Government, he would like to see the School Act and the Dual Language Act wiped off the Statute-book. At that time Mr. Greenway was in British Columbia, so that statement made by Mr. Martin was made in the absence of the Premier. Mr. Greenway returned shortly afterwards to Winnipeg, and was asked by a reporter what his views were on the separate school question and Mr. Greenway repudiated the utterances of Mr. Martin upon that occasion. Sir, strange to say, that Mr. Greenway and Mr. Smart, the then Minister of Public Works, attended a meeting at Wawanesa, and it was at that meeting that the first statement, other than the one made by Mr. Martin, was made by a member of the Greenway Government in reference to the school question. The only report made at that meeting was in the Brandon "Sun" of 8th August, 1889, in which Mr. Greenway's speech covered four columns; and notwithstanding that he had been interrogated by reporters as to the statement made by the Attorney-General in reference to the question, not a single word was uttered by the Premier on that subject during the whole of the speech. Next we find the Minister of Public Works speaking in reference to that matter, and this is what he said :

It was not his intention, neither by speech nor inference, to be understood as speaking disparagingly of Roman Catholics. They were as much entitled to their rights as any other people, and he would defend them as energetically as he would those of the Protestants. In referring to the schools, he did not set himself up as an educationalist, but as the matter had come before the Government, he spoke of it in a practical way. There was, he said, very much of an anomaly in it all. *While the state recognized both systems*, he did not undertake to discuss or take any side in the matter as to whether this was right or wrong.

Then, later on, in concluding his speech, Mr. Smart spoke as follows :—

The Liberal party is known to be the party of reforms, and the present Government is prepared to undertake the task of giving in the matter of the conduct of the educational system equal rights to all citizens of the province, and thereby making a reform, which should be received by every fair-minded man in Manitoba with favour. I do not wish to be understood in any of my remarks on this question to advo-

Mr. DALY.

cate the abolition of the separate school system. I am not prepared to express any opinion, at present, on this question, nor do I purpose discussing the question as to whether the principle of state aid to any class of denominational schools is or is not a correct one. Sufficient it is for me now to point out under the existing laws the unfairness that exists, with a view to giving to the people the reasons for the changes which will shortly take place in the law pertaining to the carrying out of the educational institutions of the country. The whole department will be placed directly, a responsible Minister of the Crown and similar regulations as to qualifications of teachers, as to inspectors, normal schools, &c., will be made both in the case of separate schools as well as Protestant. This course will effect the saving of some thousands of dollars, which will go further to assist in reducing the taxation raised by the people of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, that is the only full and authoritative utterance on the question that was made by the Greenway Government, because it was made by the Minister of Public Works in the presence of the Premier. Although Mr. Smart declared there that it was not their intention to interfere with separate schools, we find that the Legislature of Manitoba met in due course, under the leadership of Mr. Greenway, and the Act of 1890 was placed upon the Statute-book, which swept away the separate schools which the Roman Catholics had been enjoying for 19 years. Well, going on in the history of this cause, we find that in due course that matter came to the Court of Queen's Bench, in a suit styled the city of Winnipeg against Barrett. Now, I come to the matter particularly before the House, that is, the position that the Government have taken upon this matter. The member for North Simcoe attacked this Government yesterday in his speech for having supplied, as he said, money to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for the purpose of fighting this question in the courts. Now, he did not make it clear, nor has any one else made it clear in this discussion, that at the time this report of the Minister of Justice was made, namely, on the 21st March, 1891, the Act under which we propose now to place this matter before the Supreme Court was in existence. As a matter of fact, that Act, although passed, had not been assented to; it was not assented to until the 13th of September, 1891; so that it was impossible for the Government to have taken the course they have taken now, because there was no law upon the Statute-book which permitted them to refer that case to the Supreme Court. Now, Sir, I think it will be said by every fair-minded man, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, that the course of the Government in supplying funds to carry this case to the court was a reasonable one, was a right one, and I do not think it lies in the mouth of the member for Simcoe to dispute that position. We all recollect that in the St. Catharines Milling Company's case, in which the ownership of lands in what was called the disputed territory was in question, the hon. member for Simcoe was employed to carry that matter to the Privy Council in England, and the counsel for the St.

Catharines Milling Company was that hon. gentleman himself. Now, if it was right in the one case for the Government to supply funds to help the St. Catharines Milling Company to fight their case, and to pay heavy fees to the hon. member for Simcoe, or his firm, then I think it was equally right for the Government to take the position it did on this school question, because just as great rights were involved in the Manitoba school question as were involved in the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What Dominion right was involved in the controversy about the schools? In regard to the St. Catharines Milling Company there was a Dominion right involved; but what Dominion right was involved here?

Mr. DALY. I understood the hon. gentleman to be an authority on constitutional matters. It was to ascertain the constitutional position of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba in regard to schools, whether the Acts passed by the Greenway Government did away with the Act of 1871 and its amendments, and was a good law or not, and also as to the question of appeal.

Mr. MULOCK. In the Milling Company's case the Dominion Government saved the property.

Mr. DALY. I was going on to say that I did not know any person who would cavil at the position taken by the Government in this matter, because they have taken the same action in regard to other matters. This case of the city of Winnipeg vs. Barrett was tried before the Queen's Bench at Winnipeg, and judgment was given against Barrett and in favour of the city. The case went to the Supreme Court and the decision was reversed. It went from there to the Privy Council in England. It has been stated in this House, and also by independent papers, and by the hon. member for Simcoe in the magazine article which has been quoted here, that the present position taken by the Government is for the purpose of reversing the decision of the Privy Council of England. When a man made that statement, especially having that knowledge of the case which the hon. gentleman must possess, and an editor makes that statement, having the knowledge which a newspaper editor ought to possess when he undertakes to enter upon such a discussion, it must have been malevolently and violently made, because in the report of the sub-committee it is clearly laid down as follows:—

As to the request which the petitioners make in the second paragraph of their prayer, viz.: "That it may be declared that the said Acts (53 Vic., 37 and 38) do prejudicially affect the rights and privileges with regard to denominational schools which the Roman Catholics had by law or practice in the province of Manitoba at the time of the Union," the sub-committee are of opinion that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is conclusive as to the rights with regard to denominational schools which the Roman Catholics had at the time

of the Union, and as to the bearing thereon of the statutes complained of, and Your Excellency is not, therefore, in the opinion of the sub-committee, properly called upon to hear an appeal based on those grounds. That judgment is as binding on Your Excellency as it is on any of the parties to the litigation, and, therefore, if redress is sought on account of the state of affairs existing in the province at the time of the Union, it must be sought elsewhere and by other means than by way of appeal under the sections of the British North America Act and of the Manitoba Act, which are relied on by the petitioners as sustaining this appeal.

That is as clearly stated as the English language can state it; it is an unqualified statement under the signature of the Privy Council, that the decision of the Privy Council of England is conclusive as to the rights of the Roman Catholics as regards denominational schools under the Act of 1890. That being the case, we come now to consider the position taken by the mover of the resolution. The hon. gentleman has attacked the whole course of the Government. First, he declares that we should have disallowed the Acts, and therefore he would not have given the Government money to enable the minority to fight the case before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. I have pointed out that we were not in a position to refer the case at that time to the Supreme Court. Again, we are attacked on the ground that we have assumed judicial functions, and considerable meccrimment has been afforded here by quotations made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by the leader of the Opposition in regard to what I said on this matter myself. The hon. member from Simcoe quoted from an interview I had with a reporter in Winnipeg on the way to my constituents. The interview appeared in the Winnipeg "Free Press" of November 1st, and it is similar to that which the hon. gentleman had taken from the Toronto "Mail." It was as follows:—

Reporter—Well, they may try to make the school question a bone of contention.

Mr. Daly—That was sufficiently threshed out at the last election, and during my campaign I placed myself on record concerning the question.

Reporter—Have you anything to say concerning it now.

Mr. Daly—My mouth is of necessity closed, for I am exactly in the same position as a judge before whom a case is still being tried. The appeal of the Privy Councillors is, as it were, *sub-judice*, and I am one of the judges on the sub-committee of the Executive Council to whom Archbishop Taché's appeal was referred. Under these circumstances, it should be obvious that I can say nothing.

I should like to ask the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), who interrupts me, as an hon. member of my profession and an hon. member of this House, to intimate what position he would have taken under the circumstances? Would he when interrogated by a reporter tell him what his personal opinions were? Was I in a position to make such a statement to the reporter? At that time

the matter had not come before the Privy Council, and it was impossible for me to express my opinion when I was to sit and hear the arguments as to the right to appeal. I say on my responsibility as a member of the Government and as a member of this House that I took the only position that any Minister could take. I ask hon. gentlemen on this or some other occasion to state what position they would have taken and whether they would have taken my position or not. Most assuredly they would have done so, because, if they are the men of honour I take them to be, they could not have taken any other position. I do not cavil as to what the leader of the Opposition said in regard to this matter, but I take exception to the way in which the interview has been referred to by the hon. member for Simcoe in another place. His magazine article has been quoted at length. I will quote an extract from it as follows:—

And so at the nomination at the by-election in Soulanges, where the Hon. Mr. Ouimet graphically pictured his unhappy position in the face of an excited electorate as that of one "walking on razors," he sheltered himself under the sacred character which he filled as that of a judge who was denied the privilege of speaking of a matter that was *sub-judice*, and when the new Minister of the Interior went back to his constituents for reelection, and some ill-informed elector who had been nurtured in the spirit of the British constitutional system and in the belief that for every act of the Government the Ministers were responsible to Parliament and the constituencies, innocently asked the Manitoba representative in the Cabinet whether he could be relied on to stand by the rights of his province, he was dumbfounded—it is doubtful whether he is yet recovered from his astonishment—when he was told that on this subject the Minister not only had not, but could not, properly have an opinion. For was not he, the Minister, to hear the question of the appeal argued as one of the sub-committee, and afterwards as one of the Council.

I ask any hon. gentleman in view of the report I have read of the interview I had with the reporter in Winnipeg, which was the interview on which the hon. gentleman based this article, if the hon. gentleman fairly stated the facts in this article. The hon. gentleman has taken the same position in the country as well as before this House. He does not desire, it appears, to treat the question fairly, but he has endeavoured to reach the classes in Ontario whose passions he knows he can arouse, whose passions he has aroused, and let it be remembered that he is responsible for the present position of this question. I am prepared in five, four or three years hence to place my record in this matter side by side with the record of the hon. gentleman. I think posterity will say that I have taken the position of a patriotic Canadian in this matter, and the position of one who is desirous to allay the strifes and bitterness of religious ill-feeling, while on the other hand, I have no doubt that the verdict of posterity will be, that the hon. member for

Mr. DALY.

North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), for some reason unknown to me, and unknown to the country as yet, has taken a position, which, if pursued to the end, as he is endeavouring to pursue it, will rend this country from one end to the other. I am glad to feel that by the vote, which I hope will be given in this House to-night on the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), that that gentleman will get the same answer from the House as he got on a former occasion. I would like the electors of Canada to understand this question, and I would like the electors of North Simcoe to understand the position their member occupies here to-night. I would have liked the electors of that constituency, good men and true, to whom he so passionately appealed on a recent occasion, to see him hob-nobbing side by side with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). I would like the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) to take some of the issues of "L'Electeur" and "Le Canadien," in which the hon. member for L'Islet has written about Orangeists, and I would like him to take the speech just delivered by the hon. member (Mr. Brodeur), and read them to his electors in North Simcoe. I hardly think the hon. gentleman would fare well if he did this. I think the House will come to the conclusion that it is an extraordinary spectacle in the history of Canada, to see the new union which has taken place here within the last few days. The position occupied by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) since I have known him in public life is that of an agitator in the province of Quebec, while the position occupied by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) since he brought in his Jesuits' Bill a few years ago, has been a similar one in Ontario. These two hon. gentlemen have united their forces now on the floor of Parliament, and we shall see how far they are going to carry out their union. I appeal to the sober senses of the people of Canada on this question. I ask them to approach this matter dispassionately, and to view it as a matter of right and justice which this Government is endeavouring to do towards the Catholic minority who appeal to them, rather than to view it as a matter of religion or creed. In one breath, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) states that we cannot refuse to hear the appeal, and in the next breath he denounces the Government for endeavouring to hear that appeal. I would like the hon. gentleman to reconcile his position in that. It is stated in the law that the minority of the province of Manitoba, if their rights are prejudicially affected, shall have the right to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Canada. Section 22 of the Manitoba Act states that. And, let me ask, has not the same right been conceded by greater men than myself in times gone by to exist under the British North America Act. I find that when this section of the Manitoba Act was

under discussion before the House of Commons in 1870, the following discussion took place in reference to it:—

Hon. Mr. Oliver moved that the education clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. Chaveau hoped the amendment would not be carried. It was desirable to protect the minority in Manitoba from the great evil of religious dissensions on education. There could be no better model to follow in that case than the Union Act which gave full protection to minorities. It was impossible to say who would form a majority there, Protestants or Catholics. If the population were to come from over the seas, then the Protestants would be in majority. If, as had been asserted, Manitoba was to be a French preserve, then the Catholics would be a majority. He did not care which, because he desired only to see the new province freed from discussions, which had done so much injury in the old province of Canada. They presented a problem to the whole world, and the question was, could two Christian bodies, almost equally balanced, be held together under the British Constitution. He believed that problem could be worked out successfully.

Hon. Mr. McDougall said the effect of the clause, if not struck out, would be to fix laws which the Local Legislature could not alter in future, and that it would be better to leave the matter to local authorities to decide, as in the other provinces. He quite agreed with his hon. friend in giving the same powers to this province as the others, and it was for that reason that he desired to strike out the clause.

Hon. George E. Cartier referred to the manner in which the Red River country had been settled, and grants of land which had been made to the clergy for the purposes of education. I want to draw the attention of the House to what was said by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, afterwards premier of the country.

Mr. Mackenzie was prepared to leave the matter to be settled exclusively by the Local Legislature. The British North America Act gave all the protection necessary for minorities; and local authorities understood their own local wants better than the General Legislature. It was his earnest desire to avoid introducing into the new province those detrimental discussions which had operated so unhappily on their own country, and therefore hoped the amendment would be carried. Consequently Mr. Mackenzie voted for the amendment.

I want to call the particular attention of the House to these words used by Mr. Mackenzie:

The British North America Act gives all the protection necessary for the minorities.

It has been contended by counsel for the petitioners in this case, that the British North America Act does give that protection. That is a question that is open to argument, and it has been discussed pro and con on both sides of this House. However that may be, the minority claim that by section 93 of the British North America Act they have an appeal to the Privy Council, in addition to the Manitoba Act. I will not weary the House at any greater length, but I desire before closing to call the attention of the House and the country to the most extraordinary positions occupied by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) on this occasion. The Toronto "Mail" has taken the identical position of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc-

Carthy) on the school question for some years past, and I wish to read an article from yesterday's "Mail" headed "Mr. Tarte's Fiasco." At that time, the "Mail" did not know, I presume, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was supporting the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Here is what the "Mail," the paper that most strongly endorses the position taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says about the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and it is so good that I will try your patience by reading it:

MR. TARTE'S FIASCO.

The Quebec attack upon the autonomy of Manitoba was commenced in Parliament yesterday. No one can say that the proceedings were not opened with a due regard for the proprieties. The French province denies to Manitoba the legislative freedom it claims for itself. It was, therefore, quite reasonable that Mr. Tarte, who is the fiery champion of Home Rule in his own arena, should lead in the assault upon western rights, and that his performance should receive the distinguished patronage of the Roman count to whom we are indebted for the Quebec resolutions and other equally vigorous denunciations of Federal interference with provincial laws.

He had not only the distinguished patronage of the Roman count, but the distinguished patronage of the member for North Simcoe as well. The "Mail" continues:

The inconsistencies of the occasion were well preserved and well balanced by those who undertook the more prominent parts. Nor was the presentation of the facts in the case less free from the absurd than the application of its principles. No doubt Mr. Tarte's rural audiences applaud to the echo when he tells them that the compact of 1867 settled the educational difficulty and gave separate schools to Manitoba forever. More loudly still may they cheer when they learn from him that the obnoxious Francophobes are causing all the trouble through their repudiation of this very just arrangement. But while such statements may pass muster at the doors of the village church they will not do in the open. Every intelligent man knows that the bargain of 1867, so far as it relates to the schools, is applicable to but two provinces, Ontario and Quebec. The attempt to force it upon New Brunswick signally failed. As it had no force as regarded provinces other than Ontario and Quebec, which joined the Union in 1867, it cannot bind the provinces which came in later. To say that those who hold this opinion are Francophobes bent upon precipitating a crisis is to misunderstand the facts. The men who are doing the wrong and are thus straining the Confederation are those who seek to force upon an unwilling province a burden which the constitution does not require it to carry. The character and quality of the burden are very imperfectly represented by Mr. Tarte when he tells us of the moderation of his compatriots and the advantages they enjoy through the clerical control of education in Quebec. Mr. Tarte should consult Bishop Grandin or Abbé Prudhomme on the subject of the application of the treaty of 1763 to the North-west before he talks of moderation. He should read some of the articles signed "J. Israel Tarte," and the speeches of ex-Lieutenant-Governor Masson and Mr. Fitzpatrick on the condition of the people of Quebec, before determining that the educational system of that province is the proper thing to plant in the west, contrary to the wishes of the settlers there. But the most curious, if not ridiculous,

feature of Mr. Tarte's performance yesterday was its conclusion. His speech led direct to the demand that the Manitoba law be disallowed. Instead, however, of moving as he had argued, Mr. Tarte proposed the condemnation of the Government for sitting in a judicial disguise to hear the appeal of the separatists—only that and nothing more. Now, Mr. Tarte's resolution is a resolution in Supply. It is, therefore, not susceptible of amendment. As a result every member must say "yea" or "nay" to the simple question whether he approves of the manner in which the case is being heard; but no member can assert or vote, owing to the cunning with which the subject has been introduced, that the school law ought or ought not to have been disallowed. Mr. Tarte, who came to Parliament blustering about his programme, and announcing that there was something terrible in his intentions, has simply taken measures to prevent the House from expressing an opinion upon what really is the main issue. Possibly Mr. Tarte is afraid to test Parliament on the disallowance question.

I therefore have much pleasure in presenting to the hon. member for L'Islet the opinion of the paper that supports the hon. member for North Simcoe as to the position he has taken on this matter, and I hope that the hon. member, when he gets back to his constituents, will read to them the opinion of the Toronto "Mail" upon his fiasco. Now, Sir, in conclusion, I have simply to say this, that I approach this question possibly in a different manner from those who have previously spoken on it. As most hon. gentlemen present know, I belong to the Protestant faith, and my opinion on the subject of separate schools is on record in the discussion which took place in the province of Manitoba during the late elections, when I declared on public platforms in the presence of both parties, that I was not in favour of separate schools, but that I was opposed to the principle of separate schools. But I think I have sufficient liberality in my nature and a sufficient desire to see that justice is done to our fellow-countrymen in the minority in the province of Manitoba; and if they have rights on this question, as they claim, under the British North America Act and Manitoba Act, and those Acts provide that they shall have an appeal to the Governor in Council, they should have dealt out to them every right to which they are entitled. As a Protestant, I ask for toleration to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, I ask for toleration to the Protestants of Quebec by the Catholics of that province, and I ask for toleration from the Protestants of Ontario for the Catholics there; because I declare on the floor of this House that if we are to have much more of this kind of discussion, such as we have had in the last few days, if the hon. member for North Simcoe repeats much of the argument which he indulged in the other day in support of this resolution, and if he is going to make a similar move with regard to the North-west schools, we shall have this country permeated from one end to the other with literature and speeches that will shake the foundations of Confederation. In conclusion, I

Mr. DALY.

want to quote from the St. John's College Magazine, a Church of England magazine published in Winnipeg, the following few remarks of toleration:

In dealing with this subject, it is our intention to confine ourselves more particularly to that aspect which concerns, and which is emphasized by, the public in Manitoba, and we venture to assert that at no period of history, ancient and modern, and in no country has there been so crying a necessity for a more comprehensive view of the word "toleration" than exists at the present day in the province of Manitoba. The word almost seems to have been relegated to a column in Webster, and to have come to be ignored as a potent factor in society or politics, and worse than either of these, as a necessity in religion. In its place we find an atmosphere of egotism, a bitter spirit of antagonism, and, in some cases, an intolerable self-righteousness and bigotry.

Again, we find this want of toleration in things pertaining to religion, and here, to our shame be it said, bitterness is plainly apparent on every side. We are aware that, in a great measure, this is resultant from the public schools question, but even this cannot serve as an excuse for the lack of charity so frequently shown by one body of Christians towards another. Roman Catholics are preaching against Protestantism; Protestants, in some cases, are abusing Roman Catholics; each party apparently refusing to credit the other with the possession of the smallest degree of Christian charity, and in many cases, by so doing, the outside public is led to believe that very little charity is being shown by the self-constituted champions of either party.

I think these are words that will commend themselves to every right-minded man who desires to maintain the Confederation we are all so proud of, and I hope that in a very short time, from one end of our country to the other, such a state of affairs will exist that at no time in our future history shall we hear these matters discussed here as we have heard them discussed in this Chamber during the last few days.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House will allow me to refer to this matter while it is fresh. If my hon. friend who has just addressed the House will refer to the Manitoba "Evening Free Press," published on Saturday, the 3rd August, which was the date I arrived in Winnipeg, he will find this announcement by the Hon. Mr. Smart, under the heading of "Separate Schools," at a meeting held at Clearwater on the 2nd of August:

The anomaly existing as to the separate school system was pointed out, and it was the Government's intention to overhaul the whole educational machine. The double-barrelled system must be abolished. The two superintendents, the two boards and two sets of inspectors must go, and a minister of education will be appointed (a present minister taking the portfolio) who would administer the education department and be responsible to the people. The change would enable ministers to greatly increase the grants towards the support of schools, and would benefit the taxpayers.

That statement was made on the 2nd of August and published on the 3rd, the day I arrived in Winnipeg. My speech was made at Portage la Prairie on the Monday or Tuesday evening following.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, after the very explicit declaration which has been made by the hon. leader of the Opposition that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was in no way responsible for the drawing up or the presentation of the amendment moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), it is hardly worth while to reply any further to the inuendoes made so frequently on this side of the House that those two gentlemen were acting in collusion. There are many hon. gentlemen in this House who know, as a matter of fact, that the hon. member for North Simcoe had a resolution which he intended to move on the same occasion as the resolution was moved by the hon. member for L'Islet. That, however, is a matter of comparatively small importance. It would have been much more satisfactory to many in this House on both sides if the resolution now under consideration had been one that presented the issue fairly and squarely, that left no possibility of doubt as to its meaning, that would have had no double meaning, that would not have been capable of two interpretations. But, Sir, that is not our fault. Under the rules of the House that amendment cannot be again amended, and we are obliged to vote yea or nay upon it. Of course, it might be open to the hon. member for North Simcoe to move another amendment on another occasion; but I presume that the House will not be in a temper to listen to another debate on this question. Therefore, we have to look at this resolution as we have it. It is divided into two parts. The first part is a condemnation of the Government for their action in dealing with the Manitoba school question. With that part of the resolution I heartily agree, and I intend to vote for it as being a condemnation of the Government; let there be no possible mistake about that. The reason why I support this resolution of condemnation is because I think that the Government had it in their power to put an end to this vexed question, and to have done so would have been good politics. It would have been good for the Government, good for their future standing in this House, and much better for their standing in the country, had they said to the minority in Manitoba, when the judgment of the Privy Council was given: the matter is now ended; the highest court has given its decision, that the province of Manitoba, having authority given to it by the Manitoba Act to deal with the subject of legislation, has dealt with it in a manner within their right. That would have put an end to the matter. I do not believe that the majority or, at any rate, a very large number of Roman Catholics inhabiting Manitoba, are in favour of this agitation. I believe many of them, if not the majority, would have been perfectly satisfied to accept the system of education laid down in 1890; but be that as it may, we are dealing with this subject as we now find it. Let us see what the course of the Government has been and what that course

indicates as to the course they intend to pursue in the future. It has been said upon this side of the House, and I repeat the statement, that the whole course of the Government indicates a deliberate intention on their part to do away, if possible, with the system of education which the people of Manitoba, in the exercise of their undoubted rights, have thought proper to establish. Sir, I want no better evidence of that intention than the evidence given by the impassioned speech made by the Minister of the Interior. His whole speech, from beginning to end, instead of being in that judicial tone, which he has assumed to exercise on previous occasions, was an impassioned appeal on behalf of the separate school system of Manitoba. No other possible construction can be given it, and that brings to my mind a little circumstance in connection with the same hon. gentleman. I remember some time ago that hon. gentleman, in the province of Manitoba, when speaking in relation to this very subject of education—I cannot pretend to give the occasion or the date, but I remember the report in the newspaper perfectly well—the hon. gentleman, speaking on the subject of education and immigration, said: How can we expect immigrants to come into this country unless they will find here the same privilege and advantages they had at home. If those words meant anything, they meant that emigrants coming from Roman Catholic countries should find in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories a system of education similar to that which the province has thought proper to do away with. If the words meant anything, they certainly meant that. What has been the course of the Government in the past? They have been arraigned, and I think properly arraigned, for having made this attack upon the province of Manitoba, for having summoned the province before it as a party to a suit, for having assumed, in the first place, the role of a plaintiff, of a party to the suit, deliberately undertaking the whole prosecution. About that there can be no possible question. And when the hon. gentleman treated as analogous the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company, he could hardly have expected to delude the House by any such comparison. Everybody knows that in that case the Dominion had a direct money interest. But what money interest, what interest or right has this Government to go out of its way and assail the conduct of any province? I have noticed, indeed, that this Government, in dealing with provincial matters is guided very much by the political character of the government in the province. It is very much to be regretted that this should be the case. I am no friend of the Mowat Administration. I have fought against it on many an occasion, but it is perfectly certain that there has been a great amount of friction and needless irritation kept up between the two Governments,

which never would have existed had not the Government been on the opposite side of politics to this; and I think I am not very far from being right in the assumption that, had this measure been brought forward by the Conservative Government of Manitoba, had not Mr. Greenway and his colleagues been at the head of that Government, we should have found very different action on the part of the present Administration. I say that the whole course of the Government indicates a deliberate intention to interfere with the existing state of things. I put this strongly, and it cannot be too strongly and forcibly put to hon. gentlemen who, like the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), say they will vote against the motion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and in the same breath say they will oppose the Government, irrespective of all party ties and all party considerations, if the Government ultimately interfere with the legislative action of the province of Manitoba. How can those hon. gentlemen reconcile those two positions? Here they are aiding the Government to do that, which, if it means anything at all, means giving the Government the power to do what these gentlemen say they will be first to condemn. Do hon. gentlemen think the country will be deluded by any such logic? Do they think that because this motion has been moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), the country is going to accept such an illogical and absurd contention, as has been put forward by those hon. gentlemen. I am not concerned with the motives of the hon. member for L'Islet. It is nothing to me what he means, and very little what he said with regard to his motion. The public will understand exactly the course pursued with regard to this motion by hon. gentlemen on both sides. They will understand that, as presented by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), this motion is accepted by him and certainly accepted by me, as a direct condemnation of the Government for their manifest and evident intention to do that which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) says he will be the first to condemn them for doing. I well understand what the meaning of the whole thing is, but if hon. gentlemen opposite fancy that the country is going to be deluded by any such sophistry, I think they will find themselves very much mistaken. At this hour of the morning, I shall endeavour to follow the example of the last speaker, and make my remarks as brief as possible. The second, and not the least important, part of the resolution has reference to the conduct of ministers in assuming to deal with this subject in a judicial rather than a political capacity. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), an hon. gentleman whom no one in this House respects more highly than I do, both for his learning and the honesty and frankness with which

Mr. O'BRIEN.

he expresses his opinions, undertook to show that the Privy Council of this country has power to act in a judicial capacity, and he quoted several English authorities, taking us back to early times in the history of the British Constitution. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman through those authorities, but when he laid down the doctrine that the Privy Council had not been denuded of its power to act as a court, that it still has that power, that that power was never taken away from it, that the power exercised by the old court of the Star Chamber, which was partly done away with by the Long Parliament, still exists in the Privy Council. I think the hon. gentleman carried his argument a little too far. The author whom he quoted, "Dicey on the Privy Council," points out that while the power of the Privy Council as a Star Chamber was limited by the Act passed by the Long Parliament, it was not then entirely done away with. That power continued until the time of Charles the II, when a subsequent Act was passed still further limiting its power, and, in the reign of William IV an entire change was made and the Privy Council as it now exists was formed. Does the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) say that there is any sort of analogy between the various committees into which the Privy Council has been divided and the Privy Council as it exists in Canada? There can be no such analogy. The hon. gentleman seems to me to have forgotten—I will not say forgotten, but overlooked—the fact that the gentlemen who are sitting upon those benches are the Cabinet of this country, and the Cabinet, as such, is a thing entirely unknown to the Constitution. It is one of those extraordinary anomalies with which the British Constitution so abounds. There is no recognition in any statute or any legal authority of the Cabinet. It has grown up with the Constitution, yet has never been recognized as part of the Constitution. The logical result of the hon. gentleman's argument would be that these hon. gentlemen sitting there as Cabinet Ministers can at any time take the role of Privy Councillors and as Privy Councillors assume judicial functions and so escape the responsibility of the Cabinet Minister. The Privy Council in England, as a Privy Council, exercises no judicial function. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Committee on Plantations. That is a separate court formed for a specific purpose. We have also the judicial committee of the Privy Council. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there is anything in the position of these gentlemen here analogous to the judicial committee of the Privy Council? Does he mean to say that these gentlemen have the power, as the Privy Council have, to sit as a court? Whence do they get that power? Is it not inherent in the Privy Council. Even if it existed at an early period it has been entirely done away with since, and the Privy Council, the "Concilium Ordinarium" of the Crown, passed through a

great many mutations, and its final mutation was this, that it was divided into several bodies, and that resulted in doing exactly what the hon. gentleman contended should have been done, in entirely separating the judicial from the legislative and executive functions. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) pointed out that the supposed mistake on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in his quotation from Bagehot, supposing the hon. gentleman had omitted these sentences, was not pertinent to the main facts. I am sure those who know the hon. member for North Simcoe will not charge him with, will not believe, that he was guilty of wilfully and intentionally suppressing a portion of the passage which would have been opposed to the argument he was making. And if they will not believe that, they will not believe that he was such a fool as to deliberately suppress a passage which any one who will look at the book could correct him for. But the fact is that what Bagehot speaks of as being erroneous is the opinion that the executive and legislative functions are separated, and in the subsequent passage he points out :

The efficient secret of the English Constitution may be described as the close union, the nearly complete fusion of the executive and legislative powers according to the traditional theory, as it exists in all the books, the goodness of our constitution consists in the entire separation of the legislative and executive authority, but in truth its merit consists in their singular approximation.

And the passage which the hon. gentleman is accused of having suppressed did not refer to the judicial functions, but to the erroneous idea that the legislative and the executive functions had been separated. So that the hon. gentleman will see that, even supposing the hon. member for North Simcoe had made a mistake in not reading these particular words, it really was not pertinent to the argument, as the opinion of Bagehot, which the hon. gentleman called to the attention of the House, was that there was not a union of the judicial with the executive and legislative functions. So far as that is concerned, the hon. gentleman was perfectly justified in the argument he made and the conclusion he arrived at. The hon. gentleman from Albert spoke a good deal about the wisdom of the Government in taking such a course as would, in his opinion, avoid lighting the baleful fires of old days and renewing the events that had taken place in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and he deprecated anything being done that would cause such a state of affairs to arise in the new provinces in the west. But if anything is being done calculated to promote agitation and keep it alive, it is not the action of the hon. member for North Simcoe or any of those who are branded as bigots—strange words these coming from hon. gentlemen who represent an ecclesiastical authority that has never been celebrated for its tolerance or yielding to the wishes of other denominations—but it is

the course which the Government are pursuing and which they have pursued from the beginning of this agitation, leading those in the province of Quebec to believe—as I think they were perfectly justified in believing, as they are justified in believing now—that the object of the Government is to place the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba in such a position they can bring about the repeal of the educational establishments as now existing. These, I say, are the persons who are really to be charged with fomenting agitation. Their action is far more serious than that of the hon. member for North Simcoe. And when the hon. member who last spoke charged the hon. member for Simcoe with being the sole author of the agitation, mistaken as he was in fact, and in his date, he certainly paid a great compliment to the hon. member for Simcoe in stating that in a population where every thing was going smoothly and satisfactorily half a dozen words at the end of a speech, which was all the hon. gentleman could quote, were enough to set the whole province in a blaze and to cause an agitation which resulted in the almost unanimous acceptance of a system of education which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), party man as he is, says he would be the first to condemn the Government for interfering with. Under these circumstances, I think we are perfectly justified in the course we have taken. Now, Sir, the Minister of Justice was taken to task by the hon. leader of the Opposition for a statement which led to the assumption, the natural and reasonable assumption, that the appeal to the Supreme Court was to be an ultimate decision upon the matter. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) just now repeated that statement, and would lead the House to believe and would lead those who read the debates to believe that the appeal to the Supreme Court would bring about a decision upon the matter. Why, the hon. gentleman must suppose that people are easily deceived, that this House has paid very little attention to what has been going on, to think that hon. members will accept such a statement. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the object is a makeshift, a means of turning a difficult corner, or else it shows a deliberate intention to bring about a condition of things which some hon. members, supporters of the Government, say they will be the first to condemn. The time must come for a decision. The judgment of the Supreme Court, favourable to the minority in Manitoba, would bring the matter to a point which would make necessary political action on the part of the Government. Now it seems to me that the hon. gentleman on the occasions referred to would have been perfectly justified in saying to those who made inquiries as to what course the Government was going to adopt, that that course was not decided upon, and therefore they could give no information. But they went a great deal further than that. They did ex-

actly what the member for North Simcoe charged them with doing, they took advantage of this assumed judicial function to escape ministerial responsibility. They were not bound to tell anybody what they were going to do. As Cabinet Ministers they went into that contest. I do not suppose the Minister of Public Works went anywhere to make a speech on the hustings in the capacity of a Privy Councillor. Why do Cabinet Ministers go to make speeches on political hustings? It is because sometimes their oratory may have a good effect upon the electors. Sometimes the presence of a Cabinet Minister has a very powerful effect at the by-elections. But a Privy Councillor has no patronage to distribute; and a Privy Councillor has no business as such in taking part in political contests. So when the hon. gentleman was asked a very natural question by those who were deeply interested in the course of the Government, he did exactly what he has been charged with doing, he took refuge from his ministerial responsibility, and shielded himself in an assumed capacity of Privy Councillor. Now, I will not further weary the House upon this subject. I trust I have said enough to make clear the grounds upon which I am supporting the resolution of the hon. member for L'Islet—not that I like the resolution, nor care in the slightest degree what the intentions or the motives of the member for L'Islet are. But this is the only opportunity which we shall have in the House of giving a vote upon this question—for this is the real issue—as to whether we think this Government ought to interfere with the province of Manitoba in the exercise of its unquestioned legislative functions in establishing a system of education. I again repeat, even at the risk of being wearisome, that it is a most illogical and absurd position for a man to take to support the Government in doing something which, if it means anything, means that they intend to do that very thing which they themselves say will condemn them to the utmost of their ability for doing.

Mr. HUGHES. In rising at this early hour in the morning to say a few words, I may state that I have waited, like the Minister of the Interior, for some days to get an opportunity of being heard on this question. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion and have tried to see where in the argument advanced by one side or the other rested on the amendment moved by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). We have heard a great deal of Star Chambers and Privy Councillors, and other straw men that were put up to be knocked down for certain purposes, possibly, as the leader of the Opposition has stated, for the purpose of exciting passions and appealing to the country for a certain effect. It is not my intention to stir up passions; it is my intention to arrive, if possible, at a line of action

Mr. O'BRIEN.

which, while it will justify me in opposing the amendment of the member for L'Islet, will, at the same time, harmonise with my views on the question of education. In the amendment proposed by the hon. member for L'Islet I see nothing which commends itself to me. The hon. leader of the Opposition has counselled us to keep our passions quiet; he has advised the Government to come out and state plainly, one way or the other, their line of action. I have a distinct recollection of an issue which was before the country some years since—I refer to the execution of Louis Riel in the North-west. On that occasion we found the leader of the Opposition, and those who are in alliance with him, counselling the Government of the day to pursue a certain line of action, demanding, in short, that a certain line of action should be pursued by the Government; and then, on the Government acquiescing in their demand, immediately turning round and censuring the Government in most unmeasured terms. That agitation was carried on to such an extent as almost to bring this country to the verge of civil war. How do we know to-day that if the Government were to acquiesce in the recommendation of the leader of the Opposition, immediately the leader of the Opposition and his friends would not turn round again and condemn them? I think the Government is pursuing a proper course in keeping this matter away from the arena of popular agitation in the political field, and endeavouring to have it settled by a constitutional authority, without the exercise of that power which is placed in the Cabinet—call it what you like, call it the Cabinet, call it the Privy Council, call it the Governor-General in Council—without the exercise, I say, of the powers placed at their disposal under the constitution. The hon. member for North Simcoe, in his address the other day, stated, if I understood him aright, that this appeal was unique in the history of Canadian politics. I hold in my hand an extract from a report of the present Premier, who was then Minister of Justice, which has reference to an appeal in connection with the Jesuits Estates legislation of the province of Quebec, which was before this House a few years ago. At that time, it will be remembered, the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) took a different action from that which they are taking on the present occasion. On that occasion they were very much annoyed, their passions found vent, because the Government would not step in, because this judicial committee of the Privy Council would not step in and disallow an Act of the province of Quebec. To-day I presume they are pleased because the Government has not disallowed an Act of the province of Manitoba; but they seem displeased that the Government have heard the appeal of the minority in that province. These hon. members, both outside and inside the House, sought to create dissension throughout the Dominion

over the action of the Government in refusing to disallow an Act of a province, in other words, in refusing to exercise a certain judicial function which they had under the constitution. We find that they were not content with bringing up a motion in the House, and having it voted down, but they made a pilgrimage to the city of Quebec to lay their grievance at the foot of the Throne, and to petition the Governor-General to exercise prerogative of demanding the disallowance of the Act of the province of Quebec. On that occasion it was pointed out how this matter could be approached under section 93 of the British North America Act. After this had been repeatedly pointed out to the Protestants of Quebec, they were at last induced to take action, and they presented their petition to the Privy Council. That petition was heard, and I will read you an extract from the report of the Minister of Justice on the subject :

Inasmuch, however, as the petition now being reported on, expresses a desire that the petitioners be heard, and as they may be able to show, if so heard, that there is ground for taking action on the part of Your Excellency, under the 93rd section of the British North America Act, irrespective of disallowance, the undersigned had the honour to recommend, soon after the receipt of the petition of July last, that a day be fixed for the purpose of such hearing as early as a full attendance of the members of the committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada could be had and that on such day the petition be heard by the usual Committee of Council.

The undersigned has the honour now to recommend that should Your Excellency see fit to name a day for the purpose of hearing the appeal in question by the Committee of Council aforesaid, the petitioners be so informed. Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) JNO. S. D. THOMPSON,
Minister of Justice.

Accordingly the Government accepted the recommendation of Sir John Thompson and advised that Tuesday, the 15th day of October, be named as a day for hearing the said appeal, and the Secretary of State informed the petitioners accordingly.

On 1st October, 1889, J. K. Dougall, on behalf of the Protestants of Quebec, notified the Dominion Government that the petitioners would appear by counsel chosen on the day named, and asked at what hour and at what place the Governor in Council would be pleased to receive and hear their counsel.

On 8th October, 1889, Mr. Dougall was notified that such hearing would take place in the Privy Council Chamber at half-past ten on the morning of the 15th October.

THE PROTESTANTS WITHDRAW.

On the 12th October, 1889, Mr. Davidson, counsel for Mr. Dougall and other Protestants, telegraphed the Dominion Government as follows from Montreal:—"In view of the public declaration from Mr. Mercier, addressed to the Protestant Committee of Public Instruction and affecting the grounds of the petition in appeal, would His Excellency in Council postpone the hearing of the petitioners, J. R. Dougall and others till later day. Please reply."

L. H. DAVIDSON,
of Counsel for Petitioners.

REPLY.

To L. H. Davidson, Montreal.

I am authorized by the Privy Council to inform you that the postponement has been granted.

(Signed) P. PELLETIER,
Acting Under Sec. State.

Accordingly, the request of the Protestants was granted, and that was the last ever heard of the petition. The Protestants for dollars and cents, for the consideration of the interest on \$60,000 for a number of months, withdrew their petition under sec. 93 of the British North America Act. Thus far at all events we have on record the action of the Government along the lines that have been pursued in regard to the appeal of the Roman Catholic church—I will not say of the Roman Catholic people, for the people do not seem to have taken any part in the matter—in Manitoba. It strikes me that the Roman Catholic church of the Dominion generally must feel highly complimented at the subdued and respectful manner, and it may be rightly so, in which their representations are received by this House. I have read in history starting away back to the Quebec Act of 1774, on down to the Constitutional Act of 1791, following down through the stormy times of 1837-38 on to the present time, and in all those agitations the people of the Dominion seem to be lost sight of. The citizens seem not to be considered but as church members of this country ; in other words, the people are treated, not as citizens of a free country, but as members of certain churches that happen to exist within its bounds. That I look upon as contrary to the true spirit of responsible government. Another mistake committed in the history of this country is in regard to the province of Quebec. We find the people of Ontario treating Quebec as French and Roman Catholic, and we find Quebec coming to this House and making appeals as French and Roman Catholic. I need not tell hon. members that these two do not go hand in hand. The French as a race has ever been distinguished as lovers of liberty. They have led in the history of Europe in all struggles for liberty, whereas Roman Catholicism has ever been distinguished for its intolerance and its claim to divine right of control. I will not at the present time enter into details to bear out these statements, as the hour is late. In regard to the question of education, we have been told that it is a matter of conscience in regard to Roman Catholic separate schools or of Protestant separate schools. For a moment let us examine the question of education. I have had the privilege of being a school teacher in my day. I do not know whether I was imbued with the necessary divine spirit to qualify as a teacher or not, but I have yet to see the reason where, in education, the question of religion should come in. As I understand it, religion is a man's duty towards God, and I will en-

deavour briefly to examine wherein there is any possible room for the interference of churches, be they Protestant or Roman Catholic, in the education of the youth of the country. It is frankly admitted that it is the state's right to educate the youth of the land. The youth should be educated physically, and the necessity for this is shown in our sanitary laws and regulations. It is right for the state to educate the youth intellectually, in writing, arithmetic and necessary subjects to enable the citizen intelligently to vote, and also provide him with sufficient education to assist him in earning a livelihood. It is the state's duty to educate the child morally. Here is where the question will formulate debatable grounds; but if you will examine the question you will find there is not one single moral quality inherent as such that can in any way be connected with or shown to be dependent upon any religion. The moral qualities and virtues are known to have existed in the human race long anterior to either of the religions the people of this country profess. The moral or ethical qualities, and the distinctions between right and wrong are as easily determined as the proper kinds of food, as to materials that are poisonous and not poisonous and clothing that is proper or improper. These are facts admitted on all hands; I could quote authorities at length, but I will not detain the House. These are all the subjects that the state should insist on teaching—the development of the physical, intellectual and moral qualities of manhood. Religion being of man's duty to his God, I fail to see where the House of Commons has any jurisdiction in the kingdom of Heaven. I fail to see wherein the people of the Dominion or this Parliament have anything to do with the matters that pertain between a man's conscience and his God. Morality is a man's duty towards man. The state does legislate for the violation of moral duties, and therefore the state has the right to teach those moral qualities. I throw out these few ideas in regard to this subject, and I will not detain the House further than by reviewing in brief the question now before us, the reference to the Supreme Court, the answer of the Privy Council and the appeal of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba. The appeal has been presented. The Government either could have heard that appeal and allowed or disallowed it, or it could have refused to hear the appeal, or it could have received it and referred it to the courts, as it is now doing. The latter course was the one which would create the least friction, and the one that I am satisfied will recommend itself to the judgment of every intelligent man who does not wish to arouse passions, or to carry out an ulterior object of his own. If the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decides that the Government should interfere and grant remedial legislation, then the matter will be before the country in the identical position it would have been had the Government taken action

Mr. HUGHES.

in the first place. Then we will find our friends on one side or the other, the one advocating remedial legislation, and the other opposing it. The world has advanced to such an extent during the last 50 years, and such is the spirit of the age, that I am satisfied it would seal the fate of any Government in the Dominion of Canada—even though the matter were left to be decided by the province of Quebec—for the light of liberty is growing in the province of Quebec as in every province of this Dominion—it would seal the fate of any Government who would attempt to grant remedial legislation to any church minority in the matter of schools. Not only would the older provinces not tolerate it, but I am satisfied that before Manitoba would endure any such interference, she would withdraw from the Union and disrupt Confederation. However, I feel satisfied that in the reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, there is no fear of an adverse decision to those who are anxious to abolish separate schools. I do not wish to be understood for a moment as seeking to force any Roman Catholic to attend a Protestant school. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that that would be an entirely wrong course to pursue. But, Sir, I have read the Manitoba school law, and I see from that, that there is no attempt there at all to coerce the minority of that province to take part in any religious exercise that might be repugnant to them. In other words, the present educational system of Manitoba is entirely non-sectarian.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I will not apologize for speaking at this time of the day, because I think it is becoming a fair hour for an early riser to go to work. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches which have been made in this debate, amongst them the speech of the Minister of the Interior, and I do not think I should undertake to answer that, because it is only a settlement of some difference between the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy.) The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has also wandered wide of the subject under discussion. He has spoken to us of the Jesuits' Estate Act, and told us that the Protestant minority, on account of receiving a certain financial indemnity, were satisfied in the province of Quebec. I do not think that is putting the case in a very flattering way for his co-religionists. However, I have nothing to do with the matter, and I do not think it is relevant to the issue now before the House. It has been said here that the French people were becoming rather liberal, but that the Roman Catholic church was not, and that it was distinguished for its intolerance. I repudiate that statement, but it is not worth while making a defence against it, because a defence is not needed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has also given us his theories about teaching, and that is also

far removed from the motion we are considering. The amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), contains two propositions. The first is, "That this House desires to express its disapproval of the action of the Government on the Manitoba school question." In this point I think all the members on this side of the House agree. The hon. Minister of the Interior has told us that the real cause of the trouble in this matter was the action, or the speeches made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). With that we have nothing to do. The question now is: who is to settle the existing trouble, and will the remedy be applied. The law which the Catholics of the province of Manitoba are complaining of was assented to on the 31st of March, 1890. In the beginning of the next month, on the 4th of April, and at different dates in the same month, memorials and petitions were sent to the Government asking for redress. It has been stated that all these petitions asked that this law should be declared "ultra vires" of the powers of the Legislature of Manitoba; but I do not find that request in all the petitions. I find in the petition dated Winnipeg, April 14th, 1891, which is signed by persons representing the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, that the prayer is as follows:—

Your petitioners humbly pray that Your Excellency may be pleased to take such action and grant such relief and remedy as to Your Excellency may seem fit and just, and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I conclude from this that it did not necessarily follow that disallowance was the only remedy sought by the petitioners. Now, Sir, what did the Government do after having received these petitions? Nothing was done until the month of September following. At that time it was thought proper to institute a case supported by the Government, in the name of one Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, and it was decided to attack the validity of the Act complained of, by means of that suit. This suit passed through the jurisdiction of the courts of Manitoba, and after those courts had maintained the Acts, it was referred to the Supreme Court. That tribunal declared the Acts to be "ultra vires." On appeal the case was carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and there it had a different result. After the judgment of the Privy Council, what did the Government do? They decided to appoint a sub-committee to report as to what should be done; this sub-committee made a report; and finally, on the 22nd of February, 1893, the Government decided to refer the case once more to the Supreme Court to obtain its decision as to whether the Government had any jurisdiction to hear the appeal of these petitioners. What is the justification of the Government in the matter? The Government think that their justification is to be found in a statute passed in 54 and 55 Victoria, that is, in the session of 1891; and it is said that we have no right to complain of

the course which the Government are pursuing because that statute was passed at the suggestion of the Hon. Edward Blake. Mr. Speaker, if we look at the dates, we find that the statutes of the province of Manitoba complained of were assented to on the 31st of March, 1890, whereas this reference to the Supreme Court was decided on the 22nd of February, 1893, that is, about three years after the mischief was done. Now, Sir, the Government contend that they are perfectly justified in acting in the way they are doing, but they have waited three years to do so. One of their excuses is that the first petitions which were presented to His Excellency the Governor-General only asked for the disallowance of the Acts in question. As I have already said, there were several courses open to the Government, if they had wished to do justice and deal promptly with the case. In fact, at the time these Acts passed, the remedy which they are applying did not exist. It was only on the 29th of April, 1891, that the resolutions proposed by the Hon. Mr. Blake were passed in this Parliament, and surely it will not be contended that Mr. Blake suggested that legislation for the purpose of shelving such questions as the one now before this House. It will not surely be contended that the intention of Mr. Blake was to set aside the ministerial responsibility of whatever Government would have to deal with the question. However, Sir, if the intention of the Government was to use the legislation suggested by Mr. Blake for such an occurrence as the one that has taken place, I say they ought to have passed it in the same session. The resolution proposed by Mr. Blake was accepted by Sir John Macdonald and it was agreed to by both sides of the House, and the Manitoba legislation which was passed in 1890, might have been followed by a Bill embodying these resolutions in the same session. The session was closed on the 16th of May in the same year, and if the Government had wished to take advantage of that remedy for the wrongs to which their attention had been called by the petition I have referred to, it would have been easy for them to have passed that legislation in the session of 1890. But, Sir, they did not do anything of the kind. It was only in the next session that this Act was passed, and it was only assented to on the 30th day of September, 1891. Even at that date it was not thought of applying this remedy. When the Government consented to accept the resolutions of Mr. Blake and to pass that Act, they should have immediately acted on those resolutions; then the mischief that has been caused might have been avoided, and the question might have been settled in the space of five or six months. But evidently the Government had no such intention. When the sub-committee was appointed, this legislation of 54 and 55 Victoria was not thought of. It was only on the 22nd of February last that it was thought

fit to use this remedy which had been suggested by Mr. Blake. They were three years without doing anything, without attempting to bring any relief in this matter. Why, my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who after all is not a stubborn man, but is quite willing conscientiously to alter his views when the circumstances demand it, might be induced, if this matter were detailed a little more, to vote for this resolution if the question should come back to this House a year later. I say that these arrangements provided on the suggestion of Mr. Blake are no excuse for the Government, because if they had wished to use such a remedy, they should have used it in the same year, that is, in 1890. Now, Sir, because I am not a judge, I will allow myself to give an opinion upon the question which is, I think, the main question. The Government are submitting a case to the Supreme Court to decide whether or not they have jurisdiction in this matter, whether they have a right to hear the appeal of the petitions from the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba. If we examine all the statutes bearing on this matter, it is very difficult to come to any other conclusion, and I fail to see how this ministry, embracing as it does half a dozen men learned in the law, could hold any different views. I go further. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did not even attempt to deny that the minority had that right of appeal; but although he did not deny that the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba had a right to petition, he said their appeal should be dismissed, because, after all, as long as that law has been declared to be constitutional and "intra vires" the local legislature, it is not so bad. He distinctly admitted the right of petition, and consequently admitted the right of the Government to hear the case. If you admit that these people have the right to petition the Government, you admit that the Government whom they petition have the right to hear the case. And this was the opinion given us by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If you examine the law, you will see that the admission of Manitoba into the Dominion was foreseen before it became an accomplished fact. I take the liberty of quoting section 146 of the British North America Act, which reads as follows:—

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the Union, and on address from the Houses of Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-west Territories or either of them into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by

Mr. LAVERGNE.

the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

It is distinctly stated in this clause of the British North America Act, that, on addresses from the Houses of Parliament, Rupert's Land and the North-west Territories, or either of them, may be admitted into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act. Under that section, it was provided that sooner or later this territory of Manitoba would come into the Union and form part of this Confederation, and it was stated there that this would be done subject to the provisions of this Act. This legislation was followed by the Manitoba Act of 1870, and the statute which was then passed provides, by the first section, for the admission of a certain territory which now forms the province of Manitoba. And the second clause states this:

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or, by reasonable intentment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

I say that by the clause I have cited, 146 of the British North America Act, it was provided that this territory, which now forms the province of Manitoba, should become a part of this Confederation, and when these was done by the statute of 1870, this provisions of the British North America Act were extended to that province. Because it was thought proper to make additional legislation and to deal with the question of education, by section 22 of the Manitoba Act, will it be said that this section 22 had the effect of superseding section 93 of the British North America Act? I might find support for my argument in the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in this very same case, and on this very same question, I must say that I am far from sharing the opinion of their Lordships, the judges who sat on this case in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. When one reads the notes of the judges of our Supreme Court of Canada, he is perfectly satisfied that these gentlemen understand the circumstances and the interests of the country, and the necessities created by the different origins and the different religions of the people, and their judgment seems to be far more in accordance with our past legislation and far more in accordance with the state of affairs which has been established in this whole Dominion for so many years past. But I say this, that I can find a support in the decision of the Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of Barrett.

and Winnipeg. I believe that they have applied the law in the most narrow and literal mode that could be imagined. They have decided that the rights and privileges which we gave the minority in Manitoba were not affected by rights existing at the time of the Union, because there were no separate schools recognized by law at the time of the Union and because the schools which they enjoyed by practice were schools that they could enjoy now and which are not prejudicially affected by the new legislation. They pretend that, under the common law, public schools might be established and that private schools, established and supported by voluntary and private contributions, and by the churches of the different denominations, could also continue to exist. I do not see, at the end of this century, in a Christian community, any earthly reason why this provision should have been made just for the sake of allowing us to support private schools by our own contributions. Nobody would imagine that it was necessary to make a law to allow the people of any denomination to support a school, to allow parents to pay their own money to engage teachers and professors to carry on a school for any denomination whatever. This is a very narrow and literal and technical application of the statute. Find me in the statutes something that repeals the 93rd section of the British North America Act, which rules our system of education in every province of this Dominion. Find me in the Manitoba Act a section which supersedes the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act. If we are to apply the law in such a literal fashion as proposed, we are bound by the decision to say that the legislation in the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act is simply additional to the 93rd section of the British North America Act. It follows in a very clear and incontrovertible way that there is no question as to the jurisdiction of the Government to hear these complaints. They want to avoid a decision upon the equity of the case; they want to avoid a conflict between Protestants and Catholics. They are threatened by some of their own friends with a vote of want of confidence. We heard the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), for instance, threatening the Government, that if they dared to interfere with the Manitoba school legislation, he would vote against them and against any government that would undertake to interfere with those laws. If this question had been settled six months after the receipt of the first petition, we should have avoided all this trouble. But, Sir, the more we delay, the more difficult the case will be to settle. The hon. member for Winnipeg is not the only man who has threatened the Government. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig), also made the same threat, that if they undertook to interfere with this legislation he would vote against them. What will be the position of the Government a

few months hence, suppose they get a decision from the Supreme Court, and that the decision is favourable to the minority in Manitoba. They will be in this position that, perhaps, two-thirds of their friends will surely vote against them if they interfere with this legislation. Then they will be between their duty and their political existence. That is the position brought about by delaying the settlement of this question. Like the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), I have waited my turn to speak, and I may say that some hon. gentlemen on this side have taken my turn. I do not wish to delay the House longer, but I would have been glad of an opportunity to discuss the legal question at some length. We cannot have any hesitation in supporting the motion proposed by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), for the reason that the Government has never shown itself willing to do its duty in this matter. The Government has shown that it did not want to deal with this question, but to put it off, and, in fact, to refuse to do justice. The hon. Solicitor-General (Mr. Curran), last night, speaking of the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, and referring to the opinion of the judges, told us that Mr. Barrett had no case, because the rate levied on Roman Catholic schools did not affect him, he not being interested, as he did not own any share in the school-houses or in the chattels. If that is so, the Government is to blame. If they had wanted to have a complete decision, why did they not take a man qualified to be a proper plaintiff, a man whose claims would open every question which the courts were called upon to decide? The argument presented by the Solicitor-General seems to me perfectly preposterous, and the failure of the Government in this respect gives us another reason to support the motion of my hon. friend from L'Islet. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I limit my remarks to these few words. I would have wished to deal with the legal question at greater length, but I think it would be almost a provocation if I should do so.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not rise at this hour in the morning to make a speech on this question, or to delay hon. members by standing between the House and the division we are all so anxious to reach. But I wish to say one word to explain the position I take in regard to this question. I might, perhaps, not even have inflicted these few remarks on the House, had it not been for what has fallen from my hon. friend the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien.) Some of the remarks he has made, I think, render it incumbent upon me to put myself right, at all events. I confess that, although I have a great personal regard for my hon. friend, I was very much surprised and disappointed at some of the remarks he thought fit to make in his place in this House to-night. I do think that my hon. friend should extend to others who differ from him, the same courtesy that he would

fairly expect to receive himself; I do not think that he ought to attribute to those who differ from him, motives less pure than those which actuate himself. My hon. friend told us that those who supported the Government contention in this matter desired to delude the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. McNEILL. I took down the words. If my hon. friend wishes to withdraw the expression, I shall be very glad indeed.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I did not mean to say they desired to delude the country; I said they were deluding the country.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend did not mean to say they desired to delude the country. I am quite willing to accept his statement, and very glad indeed that I have induced him to make that statement. Sir, my hon. friend, I think (unintentionally, I am sure) was most unfair to the Government in the remarks he made. He said the Government had referred this matter to the courts for the express purpose of obtaining power to interfere with the legislation of the province, and that that was the only reason conceivable for their having so referred the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I entirely differ from that view of my hon. friend. I say that had I been in a position to deal with this question, and had I made up my mind that I would not interfere with the legislation of the province in this regard, I would, under these circumstances, have referred the matter to the courts. I think, and it is admitted by every one who has given consideration to questions of this kind, that it is of the utmost importance to obtain the decision of the courts in such cases, and to remove such questions as this as far as possible from the arena of party politics. Every one knows that a final decision of the court, could it be obtained, in reference to this question, would be far less likely to stir up bad blood in the country, to move men's passions and prejudices, than the decision of a political body like the Government. Therefore, I say that in place of the Government pronouncing upon this question in the first instance, the proper course for them to take was to refer it to the courts in case, perchance, a decision of the courts should be the final decision. If the courts decide that the Government cannot hear the appeal, that is a final decision of the matter; and if I had made up my mind, as I have already said, that I should refuse to interfere, I should endeavour to obtain the decision of the court in the hope of preventing thereby the ill-will and the excitement which would be very likely to arise in the country by my giving the decision myself. Therefore, I think that my hon. friend was utterly unfair to the Government in making the statement that they could only have referred

Mr. McNEILL.

this question for the purpose of obtaining power to interfere with the legislation of the province. For these reasons I do not share the views of those who would censure the Government in that respect. But I wish to say this (notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend) that holding the view I have endeavoured to express to the House, I also wish to express this other view, which, so far from being inconsistent with the view I have expressed, is, I think, wholly consistent with it, and that is, that if this Government or any other Government shall bring down a measure to interfere with the legislation of the province of Manitoba by imposing a system of separate schools upon the province against its will, I shall most assuredly record my vote against that Government if I have at the time the honour of a seat in this House.

Mr. FAUVEL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much attention to the able exposé of the intentions of the Government, by the hon. Prime Minister, regarding this momentous and vexed question, and as I presume this is the last occasion during this session that we shall have the pleasure of seeing him in our midst, I take this opportunity, on behalf of myself and my fellow members on this side of the House, to wish him God-speed in his voyage across the Atlantic. I am much surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. member of Provencher regarding his co-religionists in the province of his adoption. I admit that I expected that he would have proved a champion for the rights of the oppressed against the oppressor, but party spirit, the exigence of a chief is paramount above any other consideration on the part of the hon. member for Provencher. Since the last three years, we have heard a great deal of this much vexed question on the Manitoba School and Dual Language Bills of Mr. Greenway's Government. Speaking from an unbiassed point of view, that of a French Huguenot Protestant, I admire the tact and ability of the hon. member for L'Islet in placing his resolutions before the House. The hon. member of L'Islet has portrayed in most glowing language, the want of faith on the part of the Government on shelving this burning question to another court outside its jurisdiction. The highest tribunal in the land is most assuredly this House—and I say, Mr. Speaker, that to this House the question should have been placed. For the past twenty years the French population of Manitoba have enjoyed the same privileges regarding their faith and schools as minorities should have in other provinces of the Dominion. Speaking in all fairness, have our French countrymen in Manitoba deserved this treatment, that they should be deprived of the same privileges that are enjoyed by the Protestant population of the province of Quebec? Speaking from a religious point of view, I protest against such unwarranted steps. I appeal to the good sense of the Protestant community, not only

of the province of Quebec, but of all other sister provinces of this Dominion, that were they placed in the same position as the French population of Manitoba are to-day, would they give up their rights without a struggle? They would not. For my part I would not do so. What object is there to be gained by withholding the rights and privileges to the Catholics of Manitoba? Is it that the French language is so distasteful to the majority of the English population of Manitoba? Have not the French Catholics of the province of Quebec assisted towards populating that province, and who now by their numbers are placing a barrier to future social engagement between two races. Are we to see in the western portion of this country religious warfare fought over again? Are we to see the French Huguenot wars fought over again? Must we see the Condès, Guises and others of French historical religious warfare, drown in blood our prairie province? What encouragement will the Government give to immigrants from France and other Catholic countries to settle in that province? Must we see the solemn compact entered into by the several provinces in 1867 destroyed by an unlawful Act of an English-speaking Government of Manitoba? Will party spirit rise paramount above justice and equal rights to one and all? I am really surprised at the intolerance and bigotry displayed by the Protestant portion of this country. A more liberal spirit, as the hon. member for L'Islet stated to-day, prevails in the province of Quebec by the French Catholics in favour of the Protestant minority. I have the honour to represent a constituency in which three-fourths of the population are Catholics, and although my opponent was a Roman Catholic, I obtained the moral support of the majority of the clergy of the county. This is a lesson against intolerance to the hon. members from Ontario. The advantages of the dual language in any country are manifold. How many members on both sides of the House who would wish to be cognizant of the French language? What an advantage to a young man on commencing life to be gifted with the use of two languages. With a population of 2,000,000 of French people in this Dominion, the use of the dual language is really indispensable towards their future success in life. The hon. member for L'Islet, standing on the strength of his convictions, and having arrayed against him all the armour and strength of a strong Government, won a victory in his county, which was an honour to himself and to those who assisted him. Can the French Conservative members of this House vote conscientiously against those principles of fair-play, as stated by the resolution brought down by the hon. member for L'Islet? I am confident that they are voting against their own interests and of the population whom they represent. The only colonists who, having left their country and settled elsewhere, and have never lost their nationality, are the French. Take the province of Quebec, the Island of Bour-

bon as British possessions, and Louisiana in the United States, colonized by the French people, all retain the language of Louis XIV., and with glorious recollections of the "fleur de lis." And should we Protestants and English people endeavour through narrow prejudices to destroy such a nationality, shall we endeavour to deprive them of educating their children in the faith of their ancestors, shall intolerance rise rampant in the land? No; I am confident that common sense and only common sense will prevail—will give liberty to those who ask for it, and it will not be a vain word—the word "liberty." Do we appreciate to its full extent that glorious word, for which so many have fought, bled and died? In Canada I consider that it is the most glorious country for liberty. I would implore my countrymen to think well and wisely to give justice to the minorities that now demand our help, and it recalls to my mind the memorable words of William Pitt on the opening of the American War of Independence on his motion before the English House of Parliament to withdraw the English troops from Boston: "Were I an American, as I am an Englishman, and a foreign force was landed on my native shores, I would never lay down my arms, no never, never." And, Mr. Speaker, were I a French Manitoban and be compelled to forego the use of my language, I would never cave in, no, never never, never.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Tarte):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Jeannotte,
Bain (Wentworth),	Landerkin,
Beausoleil,	Langelier,
Béchar,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Brodeur,	Lister,
Brown,	Livingston,
Bruneau,	Lowell,
Campbell,	Macdonald (Huron),
Carroll,	McCarthy,
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	McGregor,
Casey,	McMillan,
Charlton,	McMullen,
Choquette,	Mignault,
Christie,	Monet,
Colter,	Mulock,
Davies,	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Paterson (Brant),
Delisle,	Pelletier,
Devlin,	Perry,
Dugas,	Préfontaine
Edgar,	Proulx,
Fauvel,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Forbes,	Sanborn,
Fraser,	Seriver,
Fremont,	Semple,
Geoffrion,	Somerville,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Tarte,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Welsh,
Guay,	Yeo.—71.
Innes.	

NAVS:

Messieurs

Adams,	LaRivière,
Amyot,	Leclair,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lepine,

Baker,
 Barnard,
 Belley,
 Bennett,
 Bergeron,
 Boyd,
 Boyle,
 Burnham,
 Calvin,
 Cameron,
 Cargill,
 Carignan,
 Carling,
 Carpenter,
 Caron (Sir Adolphe),
 Carscallen,
 Chesley,
 Cleveland,
 Coatsworth,
 Cochrane,
 Cockburn,
 Caribou,
 Corby,
 Costigan,
 Craig,
 Curran,
 Daly,
 Davin,
 Davis,
 Denison,
 Desautniers,
 Dickey,
 Dupont,
 Dyer,
 Earle,
 Fairbairn,
 Ferguson (Renfrew),
 Foster,
 Fréchette,
 Gillies,
 Girouard (Jacques Cartier),
 Girouard (Two Mountains),
 Grandbois,
 Guillet,
 Haggart,
 Hazen,
 Hearn,
 Henderson,
 Hodgins,
 Hughes,
 Hutchins,
 Ingram,
 Ives,
 Joncas,
 Kaulbach,
 Kenny,
 Lachapelle,
 Langevin (Sir Hector),

Lippé,
 Macdonald (King's),
 Macdonald (Winnipeg),
 Macdonell (Algoma),
 Macdowall,
 Mackintosh,
 McLean (York),
 McAlister,
 McDonald (Assiniboia),
 McDonald (Victoria),
 McDougald (Pieton),
 McDougall (Cape Breton),
 McInerney,
 McKay,
 McLean (King's),
 McLennan,
 McLeod,
 McNeill,
 Madill,
 Mara,
 Marshall,
 Metcalfe,
 Miller,
 Mills (Annapolis),
 Moneriff,
 Montague,
 Northrup,
 Quimet,
 Patterson (Huron),
 Pope,
 Pridham,
 Prior,
 Putnam,
 Reid,
 Robillard,
 Roome,
 Rosamond,
 Ross (Dundas),
 Ross (Lisgar),
 Ryckman,
 Simard,
 Sproule,
 Stairs,
 Stevenson,
 Taylor,
 Temple,
 Thompson (Sir John),
 Tisdale,
 Turcotte,
 Tyrwhitt,
 Wallace,
 Wilmot,
 White (Cardwell),
 White (Shelburne),
 Wilson,
 Wood (Brockville),
 Wood (Westmoreland).—121.

PAIRS :

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Patterson (Colchester),	Bowman,
Bergin,	Mills (Bothwell),
Sir Donald Smith,	Flint,
Smith (Ontario),	Rowand,
Bryson,	Edwards,
Weldon,	Borden,
Masson,	Beith.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) has not voted.

Mr. BORDEN. I am paired with the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). I would have voted in favour of the amendment.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Indians—Nova Scotia—To provide an additional amount for medical attendance..... \$1,200

Committee rose and reported resolution.

Mr. FAUVEL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 5.50 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, What is the number of manufacturers, according to the last census in the following places : The town of Victoriaville, and the villages of Arthabaskaville, Princeville and Warwick ?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say generally with regard to this and the other questions about manufacturing industries, that the department tells me that in order to answer these questions, some special compilations have to be made. They cannot take them from the compilations already made. They have an extra force on, and are making these as quickly as possible ; so I cannot give an answer to these questions to-day. They are in the nature of Orders of the House for returns, anyway.

MR. T. J. WALSH.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether T. J. Walsh was paid a sum of money for revising a "Ready Reckoner" ? If so, how much ? Is he the same T. J. Walsh who is a superannuated officer of the Dominion, drawing an annual allowance of \$1,050 per annum ? Will the Minister, when answering this question lay on the Table of the House a copy of the "Ready Reckoner" ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reply to that question. I find that the person named here, T. J. Walsh, was an officer of the Inland Revenue and is now retired on the retired list. The subject of the "Ready Reckoner" comes to my recollection. It was prepared by that officer, some years ago, for the purpose of assisting in the reckoning of timber dues in the Cullers' Office. The officers there, and the merchants interested in the lumber trade reported that not only was it of great convenience, but it secured a reduction of work in the office, consequent upon the new system of calculating. I myself recommended the payment of \$100 or \$150, and that was paid to this officer some years ago while I was at the head of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister has failed to answer a portion of my question.

Will he lay on the Table a copy of the "Ready Reckoner" ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will see that a copy of that "Ready Reckoner" is brought down.

THE VACANCY IN VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like an answer to the question I put yesterday, as to whether a returning officer has been appointed for the county of Vaudreuil ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. LAURIER. As the Prime Minister is leaving to-day for Europe, I do not find very much fault if the appointment has not yet been made, but I expect that it will be made this week, otherwise I shall be entitled to complain of a serious grievance.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bear it in mind.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FRASER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a matter that occurred in April last. I had an Order of the House granted for :

Return showing the total amount of liabilities incurred by the Dominion under any Statutes or Votes of Parliament, whether for unpaid railway subsidies, unfinished public works, or other purposes.

I find that return is not brought down. I went to the officer of the department in regard to it, and was told that the return was never brought down at all. I want it. I expected, of course, it would be here when I came back this session, and I made particular inquiries yesterday, and was told it had never been brought down. I would like to have that return ; it is a matter of some importance.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will just send me the name of the return, I will inquire where it is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Last session I moved for a return with reference to canal contracts, railway contracts and public works contracts, towards the close of the session. The Order was made by the House, but I have not got the return yet. The return is important, and I ask the Minister if he will see that it is brought down at once. I was aware that the return, if not voluminous, would require a good deal of time to prepare, and, therefore, I did not complain that it was not brought down last year. But I desire to secure it as early as possible. I also desire to ask the Government if they are in a position to give me information respecting the telegram which appears in the Montreal "Herald," in which it is stated that the steamer "Stanley" has been badly disabled. Can the Minister of Finance state officially what is the nature of the damage, and whether the vessel can be repaired so as to be able to resume her service ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have received the information which the hon. gentleman desires. It appears that the seas being more heavy than usual, the blades of the vessel's propeller came in contact with heavy ice. She is now laid up and undergoing repairs of a temporary character. The broken blades will be supplied temporarily by blades on hand, until the new ones, now ordered from Scotland, can be obtained. The repairs will be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the deputy any idea when the steamer will be able to resume her service ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give any definite answer, but every possible exertion will be made to have her again placed on service at the earliest date possible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is important that the public should know whether the steamer will resume at an early day. I shall be much obliged if the hon. gentleman will communicate with those in charge of the steamer so that he may be able to state approximately when she will be able to resume.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I shall endeavour to obtain definite information as early as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will bring down at an early day the return with respect to pig iron ordered on 6th February ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will do so.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Hospital on Blood Reserve.....\$800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the total cost of this hospital ?

Mr. DALY. A grant of \$2,500 was made last session for the building, and the sum asked is required for furnishing it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this hospital for a single reserve or for a large section of country ?

Mr. DALY. It will accommodate the Bloods, Piegans and Blackfeet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it proposed to erect hospitals on other reserves ?

Mr. DALY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What special reason exists for erecting this hospital ?

Mr. DALY. These Indians are not much inclined as some other tribes to pursue habits

of industry. Owing to their proximity to the American boundary much disease prevails among them, and it is absolutely necessary that this hospital should be provided.

To complete Red Deer Industrial School..... \$6,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to inquire with respect to the inspection of schools in the North-west. I notice very large fees and travelling expenses are paid to inspectors. One inspector named Hughill received no less than \$2,300; he inspected eighty-three schools at \$20 each; and his travelling expenses amounted to \$675. No doubt these schools are scattered over the North-west Territories and a considerable amount is required for travelling expenses, but the expenditure under this head seems to be excessive. Rev. D. Gillies inspected seven schools at \$20 each, and his travelling expenses were considerable.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will understand that the item under consideration is in connection with an Indian industrial school. The inspectors the hon. gentleman refers to are not, of course, inspectors of Indian schools and the expenditures for inspection of public schools are under the North-west Legislature. The item appears in the Auditor-General's Report because all the accounts of the North-west are audited by the Auditor-General. When the main Estimates are considered, the hon. gentleman will receive explanation under that head.

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this matter, in order that he might be prepared with an explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to inquire whether the work being performed by the industrial school is satisfactory; also to what extent the Indians are becoming civilized, and to what extent the Government's encouragement of industrial schools is producing results? Is the working of the schools satisfactory, and has the outlay of the Government produced results commensurate with the cost to the Government of the attempt made to civilize and Christianize Indians?

Mr. DALY. The results so far have been very satisfactory. It is simply surprising how the children adapt themselves to the modes of civilization. I may say that not only in regard to Christianization, but as regards their morality and adaptability to the ordinary walks of life, it is marvellous the advance the children are making. I will give further explanations on the main Estimates. I have some material prepared which will lead the hon. gentleman to believe that the work pursued in regard to industrial schools has been very satisfactory indeed.

Mr. MULLOCK. I observe in the report of the Minister of the Interior, allusion is made to the change in the mode of controlling

Mr. DALY.

the sale of liquor in the North-west. A good deal of stress is laid by one or two of the officers of the North-west Mounted Police as to the evil effects of the present license system, as compared with the effects of the old permit system. I observe Commissioner Herchmer states that, for example, in the Battleford district, within an area containing only 400 souls, there are four licenses granted, two wholesale and two retail, and under the license system liquor can be sold to half-breeds, who are made an underhand means of communication with the Indians, and thus under the present license system a large quantity of liquor is finding its way into the hands of the Indians. One of these reports states that no less than six car loads of liquor were received at one of those points within six months. Is the Minister going to take any steps to call the attention of the North-west Government to this matter?

Mr. DALY. The attention of the North-west Government has already been called to the matter. We considered it sufficiently serious to draw their attention to it, in the hope that this state of affairs existing there would be changed.

Mr. MULLOCK. Did you say when attention was drawn to it?

Mr. DALY. A month or six weeks ago. It was in Colonel Herchmer's report of the Mounted Police, and it was that that drew my attention to it.

Chilliwack Methodist Church
Indian Industrial School..... \$2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. What number of children attend this school, and of what extent is it?

Mr. DALY. The Government have already given \$2,500 towards the construction of the school, and it is thought if we give \$5,000 in all, that is all the department will be required to do, as the Methodist Church Missionary Society will pay the balance of the cost. I will give the hon. gentleman further information when the main Estimates are up.

Mr. CHARLTON. I quite understand that the hon. Minister of the Interior may not be in possession of detailed information at this moment; but I would like to ask him what the general policy of the Government is with regard to schools of this character. I see that this is a Methodist school, and I presume the Government are making appropriations for schools of other religious denominations. I wish to know if that is correct, and also whether the Government aids denominational schools of various kinds, and whether it establishes schools in the nature of public schools that are not at all denominational. What is the character of the religious teaching in these industrial schools?

Mr. DALY. The Indian industrial schools generally in British Columbia and the North-

west Territories are all connected with the different churches. We have certain schools under the Roman Catholic Church, certain under the Presbyterian, certain under the Church of England, and certain under the Methodist Church. We have in the North-west Territories what is called the Red Deer school under the Methodist Church, the school at Qu'Appelle under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church, the Blood Reserve school under the auspices of the Church of England, another school at Elkhorn and at St. Paul's under the Church of England, and the industrial school at St. Boniface under the Roman Catholic Church. Another school is about to be erected in Brandon which will be conducted by the Methodist Church. I believe Brandon was selected on account of its central position towards the Indians. It is not the policy of the department nor the intention of the Government to extend to any greater length operations in reference to these industrial schools. We think that the field is now supplied.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the Minister is not in a position at present to furnish details of the expenditure on behalf of each of these denominations.

Mr. DALY. I have the information, but I have not got it in my possession now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Minister will be kind enough when this matter comes under discussion again, to give a detailed statement of the expenses of Indian denominational schools with regard to each denomination, the gross amount paid, and the relative expenditure on behalf of each denomination. That information would be interesting to the country.

Mr. DALY. I will have that information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can very easily see how we drifted into this policy of appropriating public moneys for the support of these denominational schools for Indians. It was a very natural thing, at one stage of our attempts to civilize the Indians, that the Government should more or less have assisted the pioneers, but it is a policy fraught with very great difficulty, and very great danger, and I think it is well to know whether we shall agree to formally adopt the policy and approve of it, and let the public know that it is to be our policy in future, or whether we do not intend to go along quietly voting these moneys year after year without full knowledge of what we are doing and whither it is tending. I do not see where this thing is going to end. I thought that the different churches engaged in the evangelization of the Indians were doing so on voluntary subscriptions furnished them by the members of each church. If we continue doing this at the public expense, hon. gentlemen will see that, in the very near future, we will reach a point when there may be an uproar; each church will complain that it is not getting its fair share. Is this support to be a per-

capita grant, or is it to depend upon the number of proselytes it may make? What principle will you adopt? You cannot divide this thing into Catholic and Protestant. It will be Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist denominations, and every Christian body which goes there to carry out this work will expect, and will have the right to expect, if you continue this system, to receive aid from the state. I think we are just beginning to adopt a policy which possibly, in the near future, will result in very serious difficulties in this House. I would urge the hon. gentleman to bring down a full and complete statement on this matter, and, at the same time, that he will be able to indicate to the House whether the policy of the department is to continue still further giving this money, or whether it is their intention to retract the course which they have already taken? The hon. gentleman knows that we have had experience in this House of the difficulty of continuing these educational grants, without getting into political difficulties which may convulse the country from one end to the other. We ought to be exceedingly cautious of the policy we lay down. I trust the information which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seeks will not only be full and complete, but that it will be supplemented by a full statement from the hon. gentleman in charge of the department as to what the policy is to be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a matter of very considerable importance. Two years ago a very full statement was brought down giving the information asked for by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), so that the Minister will only have the last two years of the expenditure to look over in order to furnish the information to the House. These appropriations for denominational schools for Indians began in this way. Some four denominations applied to the Government for aid to their schools, and the policy adopted at the time application was made was to give so much for each pupil, according to the average attendance at the school, up to the sum of \$300. But no support was given to any Indian school lying outside of the Territories that were actually surrendered to the Crown. At that time many of those schools, in fact, the great majority of them, lay far beyond any actual settlement, and far beyond the region that had been surveyed and set out for settlement; and so it was thought that the missionary would serve a good public purpose in the education of the Indians by preserving order and quiet among them, and preventing them being misled by mischievous persons who might go amongst them; but they were informed at the same time that the Government did not commit itself permanently to such a policy—that it was merely a temporary arrangement with regard to which there would be no breach of faith if the Government took charge of any of those schools at any time it might think

proper. I think the Indian inspector was instructed to act as superintendent of the schools, and during his visit, when payment was being made to the Indian population, to see what sort of work was being done. Well, since that time, the Government have gone a long way further, and they have gone further without bringing the matter before the House for its decision. The only way the subject has ever come before Parliament has been by the appropriations which have been asked for. Now, there have been industrial schools established amongst the Indians by various religious bodies, and these may be doing very excellent work. As to that I cannot say whether they are doing the work better than it would be done under a public official, and with the necessary public supervision. But even though the present system should be continued—and it may be found practically the most convenient at present and perhaps indefinitely—I think it ought at all events to be the subject of public supervision by an officer who is not connected with any one of the bodies in question, and who would from time to time report to the House as to what the public were getting for the money which the public were contributing. So far as I know, we have had no indication as yet that there has been any supervision, and no report has been made as to the work done in those schools. They may be very efficient or they may be very inefficient; the Indian children may be very regular in their attendance, or there may be very few in attendance at all. My recollection is that there was a great deal of difficulty in securing the attendance of the Indian children. When a school was first established, they attended for a short time until the novelty wore off, and then they ceased to attend; and I know that in some cases there was an indisposition to keep a register because that register would indicate the paucity of the attendance. It was hoped by those who were teaching in those schools that the condition of things would be improved whenever the Indians ceased to be a nomadic population, and settled down on their various reservations. I do not know how far that expectation has been realized. I do not know how far the schools have been improved by the Indians continuing residence upon their reservations; but I think it is very important that there should be a supervision by some responsible official, and that there should be laid before Parliament every year a report with regard to the attendance at all these schools, so that that information will be in the hands of members, when the money is asked for, and so that the public will have an opportunity of knowing whether the money that is being expended is being well expended or not, which you can only tell by the results accomplished in those schools. If it can be shown that the Indians are being converted into husbandmen and good mechanics by these industrial schools, then it will be evi-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

dent that the money is being properly expended in the public interest. The question of the instrumentalities by which this work is being accomplished is subordinate to the actual accomplishment of the work, for the time being at any rate. But I think that up to the present time the House is without the necessary information, and the schools are without the necessary supervision that should be exercised over them, so that it is impossible to tell whether the teachers in those schools are doing their work efficiently, so far as industrial and secular study is concerned.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am glad that my hon. friend who has just spoken has not the strong objections to these schools in the abstract that he had on a previous occasion when he and I had some controversy on the subject. But I think he is perfectly right in demanding that there should be a proper supervision of these schools by a public official who would be removed from all sectarian influences. I think that is a condition that should attach to every public grant for educational purposes. What has given rise to so much objection to these grants is that there is no guarantee that the money given by the state, irrespective of what is given by the religious denominations, is properly expended, and I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman in that view of the case. At the same time I approve, as I always have approved, of the Government grants to these denominational schools; for, if these Indians are to be civilized, I think they must also be Christianized; it is necessary to carry on the two branches together; and I think there is no machinery which the Government could adopt which would be either so efficient or so economic as that which the Government has carried on in the past. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell, as a general principle, that where the Government grants assistance, whether to denominational schools or otherwise, it should be accompanied by public supervision, and of course that principle applies with all the greater force where the money is placed in the hands of persons who are not under Government control. Therefore I think the Government would be doing right in establishing a careful and efficient method of supervision, so that the state may see that the money it gives is properly expended, irrespective altogether of what may be contributed by the machinery through which the agency is carried on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that I have expressed to-day views different from those I have expressed on any former occasion. I have said, what I said before, that at the time the arrangement was made, the various religious bodies were expressly informed that the Government did not tie its hands, and that if the Government thought, in the public interest, they should take control of these schools, they reserved to themselves that

liberty ; but I pointed out that since then the Government have gone further, and that various industrial schools have been established, under denominational control, and that it would not be so easy to resume control, if the public interest should require us to do so. The hon. gentleman said I objected to religious bodies taking control of the schools. That was not my statement. He has forgotten the circumstances under which that discussion arose. The hon. gentleman proposed to the House a resolution in which he declared that our Constitution was founded on the principle of the absolute separation of church and state, and that any contribution to any religious body from the funds of the country, was a contribution in contravention of that principle. That was the view he put forward in his resolution ; and I pointed out what I thought was an inconsistency, and which I still think is such, that the hon. gentleman was nevertheless supporting contributions from the public funds for the aid of these denominational schools, and, in so far, he was not consistent with the particular doctrine he laid down with so much vehemence and vigour, when supporting the resolution he addressed to the House in the discussion of the Jesuits' Estates Bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is no abstract proposition of that kind to which there are not necessarily some exceptions, and this treatment of the Indians is an exceptional case, which takes it out of the general principle. The time may come when it may be no longer necessary to continue that agency, but it is an exception, intended to suit special circumstances.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not disposed to call in question the policy which dictated the giving of certain grants, in the first instance, because I am not thoroughly acquainted with the facts ; but I was led to understand from the discussion which took place in this House a year or two ago, that these grants were given entirely to churches engaged in the evangelization or civilization of the Indians in far-off places, where they could not be reached otherwise. I dissent from the proposition, that it ought to be the policy of the state to Christianize these Indians at all. The nation which has been engaged more in the work of Christianizing and evangelizing the heathen or any other is the British nation, and I have not heard that that nation has permitted itself to spend money from the public exchequer for that purpose. I think the work has been carried on as a voluntary charity, by those whose heart is in it. It appears to me we are going to get into trouble if we are going to spend money in this way. While work was going on in the outlying stations well and good ; but now we are asked to give money for the establishment of the denominational school of some Protestant denomination in the city of Brandon. If you give a grant to be used in the city of Brandon, why stop

there ? You will have to give grants all over the different parts of the Dominion, and unless I have very strong arguments to the contrary, I will, so far as my own voice goes, dissent from the policy of giving, in places like Brandon, civilized cities and regular provinces, public moneys for the benefit of any one denomination. If we aid this Protestant denomination, how can we refuse similar aid to other Protestant denominations ? You cannot stop there. Each denomination has as much right to a grant of public money as any other. Are you going to give grants according to the per capita number of the different denominations, or on what principle ? The hon. gentleman may justify, possibly, the small grant to the missionaries engaged in civilizing the Indians out on the plains, where they are outside the reach of civilization, but there is no ground I have heard advanced for granting sums of money for the establishment of a denominational school in the city of Brandon or any other city. It is opposed to sound policy in this country, where there is no state church, to recognize the legal existence of the different Christian bodies, and if you do so, you are launching yourselves upon an unknown sea of doubt and difficulty, and I do not think the end will be very far off before you will have a violent shaking from one end of the Dominion to the other. Why give this grant to Brandon more than to some of the cities of Ontario ? Brandon is a large city in a recognized province, and why establish a denominational school there ?

Mr. DALY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not studied the question at all or he would not have made the remarks he has. So far as the establishment of an industrial school at Brandon is concerned, any other point in Manitoba might have been chosen. The school is not situated in the city of Brandon. One of the main objects in the location of these industrial schools is to take them away as far as possible from the different reserves, and the Methodist Church, which is to conduct the school at Brandon, chose that city as the most central location from the different reserves from which they will draw the Indian children.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is the school ?

Mr. DALY. Across the river from the city of Brandon, about a mile from the limits. It was their own location, and they chose it because it was within a reasonable distance of the different reserves from which they have to bring their children. Experience teaches that you must locate these schools a long distance away from the reserves, or otherwise the children will be inclined to go back to their original life, and their parents will make continual visits, asking to be fed and clothed, and otherwise interfere with the education of the children. In reply to the hon. members for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), I would say that

if those hon. gentlemen will read the report which I laid on the Table the other night—the Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs—they will find that we have inspectors of the industrial schools, and that every one of those schools is subjected to the most rigid inspection from the time of its erection to the present. The report of this inspector you will find at pages 186 and 188 of the report. It has been the policy of the department since the establishment of those schools, and a policy which is likely to be maintained, that every one of them shall be subjected to a most rigid inspection. There is a uniform set of books open to the inspection of the inspector—and any other officer of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the inspector appointed by the Department of Interior apart from the denominational schools?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. You have written reports from them?

Mr. DALY. Yes; you will find the fullest possible information in the report. I did not expect this item to come up now, but am prepared to discuss it, although, after the lengthened sitting of last night, we all feel pretty tired. I may say, however, that during the last year, we placed these schools on a per capita basis. I will give to the House, when the main Estimates come down, exactly what we pay the different schools per capita. And that per capita grant is based upon the experience of the department up to this time as to the cost of these different denominations of conducting these schools, and I think that when I lay the information before hon. gentlemen they will come to the conclusion that the officers of the department have gone into this matter in as thorough a manner as they possibly could, with the one intention in view of making the work of the schools as effective as possible at as little cost as possible to the Government. I may say that we have nineteen boarding-schools, attended by 360 children. Of these schools, six are conducted under the auspices of the Church of England, six under the Roman Catholics, six under the Presbyterians and one under the Methodists. Of day-schools there are 110. These day-schools, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows, we are required to maintain under the treaty with the Indians. These schools are attended by 11,454 children. Of the schools fifty-eight are under the Church of England, thirty-one under the Roman Catholics.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this for Manitoba only, or for the whole North-west?

Mr. DALY. For the whole North-west. Two of the day-schools are under the Presbyterians, fourteen under the Methodists, and five are undenominational. Of industrial schools there are ten, attended by 1,030

Mr. DALY

pupils. Of these four are under the Church of England, three under the Roman Catholics, one under the Presbyterians and two under the Methodists. I give that information that the hon. gentleman may know the number of schools the Government are contributing to maintain or are maintaining at the present time, but if hon. gentlemen will read the report they will get the fullest information on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman in a position to say what amount the denominations contribute to these schools?

Mr. DALY. I cannot give the figures just now, but I will later on, so far as we can get the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister says we had 113 schools in the North-west, which we are supporting. But I see we give grants to 213 Protestant schools in the North-west. I suppose these are not—

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman must not confuse the Indian schools with the other schools of the North-west, as they are entirely distinct.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the hon. Minister if he would also furnish us with information as to the nature of the instruction imparted in these various schools. I presume, from the title, that the industrial schools are designed to teach some useful art. I suppose the nature of the instruction given in these schools will be shown also.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will find it all in the report.

Mr. MULOCK. The allowance is made on a per capita basis. Is that per capita of attendance?

Mr. DALY. We pay so much per pupil. Take Qu'Appelle school, for instance. We give them \$115 per pupil for 200 children, and for that they are expected to furnish everything, pay the teachers and everything else. The High River school gets \$130 for 120 pupils, and for this they have to maintain the school, provide the grub and everything of that kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any standard of qualification by which these inspectors must act?

Mr. DALY. Yes. The inspectors have been chosen with reference to their special qualifications for the work they are to perform. I would ask the hon. gentleman to read the report.

Mr. MULOCK. Is any regard paid to the denominations?

Mr. DALY. Yes; there is an inspector of Roman Catholic schools and an inspector of Protestant schools.

Mr. MULOCK. Two for all the schools?

Mr. DALY. For all the Indian schools, yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And the inspector of the Roman Catholic schools is a Roman Catholic, I suppose, and the inspector of the Protestant schools, a Protestant?

Mr. DALY. I presume so. Mr. Macrae is the inspector of the Protestant schools, and Mr. Betourmay of the Roman Catholic schools. In addition, the schools are inspected by the regular inspector of the department and his assistant, and they are not left one month without thorough inspection.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not think the hon. gentleman quite disposed of the point raised by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). It may be a matter of necessity, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says, at one stage of the development of the Indians, to carry on these denominational schools with a view to evangelize and civilize these people. But when it comes to an old settled province, such as Manitoba is now, and the establishment of a school within a mile of the limits of one of the principal cities of Manitoba, I think the necessity which alone justifies such a school has disappeared. For example, there must be in the city of Brandon clergymen of various denominations, and thus the pupils brought to these industrial schools are quite within the reach of clergymen of various denominations. It seems to me we ought to look forward to the time when these schools will cease to be, at all events, denominational.

Mr. DALY. The school is an industrial school, and the object is solely the advancement of the Indians. There is no question that great sacrifices have been made by missionaries of all denominations for the evangelization and civilization of the Indians, but it has been found that in the ordinary day-schools we cannot give them the instruction that will bring them out of their original state. The object is to give them a knowledge of the arts. Carpentry, tailoring, shoemaking, and, in one school, tinsmithing, are taught, so as to fit the pupils to earn their living. So far as the Brandon location is concerned, the school was located there without my influence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not intend any reference to Brandon, as such. My objection would have been equally tenable, had it been Winnipeg or Toronto or London; I did not refer to Brandon because the hon. gentleman happens to come from there.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will see that we have one school at Regina, one at St. Boniface, one on St. Paul Reserve—a Church of England school—near Winnipeg, and another not far from Calgary. The

location of these schools is with a view to making them convenient for the people who conduct them, and at a distance, as far as possible, removed from the reserves from which they draw the children: because it is found in practice, that unless these children are taken from the reserve a sufficient distance to remove them from the influence of their parents, the work of the schools will go for nothing.

Mr. MULOCK. While this course might be justifiable at one stage of the instruction of the Indians, it seems to me that difficulties will arise, if this policy is pursued in the civilized parts of the Dominion—the policy of giving grants sufficient to pay for the maintenance of denominational schools. If the several denominations know that they can get sufficient grants to establish a school, they will have them established, and you will have a school for every denomination of Christians in the Dominion, and you cannot give the grant to one, while refusing it to others. While denominations that send missionaries away out among the wild, unreclaimed Indians, might be entitled to a small support, under peculiar circumstances, that argument won't apply to the civilized parts of the Dominion. Now, I was led myself to make some of these remarks by a statement I saw in one of the newspapers, that one of the largest body of Christians in this country had repudiated the idea of receiving Government support at all. I do not know whether that statement is true. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has heard anything about it?

Mr. DALY. I do not know what the hon. gentleman refers to. I think, a year and a half, or two years ago, the Baptist denomination made some reference to it. Is that what the hon. gentleman means?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is one. I understand the Presbyterians did, also.

Mr. DALY. The Presbyterians may have done so, but it has not come to my knowledge. But I understand the point the hon. gentleman to make is, that he does not see the necessity for the establishment of an industrial school at Brandon, or any other place in the province of Manitoba, because these Indians there are civilized sufficiently not to require it. Now, the Indians of Manitoba require an industrial school just as much as they do in any other part of the North-west. It is even more necessary to have an industrial school for those young men than it is further west, for the simple reason that they go into villages and towns, and, extraordinary to state, but it is true, they adopt the worst habits of the whites. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that we should have these industrial schools located centrally, but removed sufficiently from the reserves from which the Indians come, that they may be taken away from the influence of their own parents. Now, have I sufficiently answered

the hon. gentleman? I say that the school is as great a necessity in the province of Manitoba to-day as it is in the North-west Territories. We have schools that are receiving assistance from the Government, even in this civilized province of Ontario, where the Indians have been educated for years. It seems to be just as necessary here to educate them as it is in the towns of the North-west.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman should understand that there is a broad distinction between supporting industrial schools as such, and supporting denominational schools in which industrial matters are a secondary consideration. I understand, that with those missionaries who go out to evangelize the Indians, their chief object is to christianize them and to bring them within the particular denominations to which these missionaries belong, and that the question of teaching them industries and matters of that kind, is a secondary consideration. My idea is, that the industrial schools are desirable enough from a state stand-point, but the importation of denominational teachings into them and the payment of them by the state, involves a principle which, I think, is calculated, in the near future, to give rise to a good deal of heart-burning and bickering.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is a great distinction between this and any other class of education. Now, apart from all the controversy we have to-day, I myself believe that religious and secular education ought to go together. But the distinction made is this, that in a civilized community and among civilized people, the ground always taken is that the home is the place for religion to be taught. That does not apply to the teaching of Indians.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman want the state to teach religion?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, I would almost go as far as to say that with regard to Indians.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which religion?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would do just exactly as the Government are doing, that where a religious body does not make a profit out of it—these people do not make money out of it.

Mr. DALY. On the contrary, they say they lose money.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If any religious body undertakes such a work as that of civilizing or christianizing any body of Indians, and give guarantees that they are able to do it effectually, I will go as far as to say that the state is perfectly justified in giving them assistance under the peculiar circumstances of the case, because there is no other way by which you can do it. These people have no home teaching. The hon. gentleman said: Why should not the different clergymen come to Brandon to this school? I think, probably, that would be useless to produce good

Mr. DALY.

results. I think the circumstances of the case justify the department in making here a considerable departure from the general rule. These people have no home teaching, and that is the only ground upon which you can justify, even, a system of secular education.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that in addition to maintaining these religious schools in the North-west, the Government contribute largely to the public schools as well.

Mr. DALY. What public schools do you refer to?

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the North-west you have a system of public schools. Does not this Government contribute largely to the maintenance of these schools?

Mr. DALY. Yes, in this way: that out of the lump sum granted, we give to the North-west Territories so much towards schools. But we are discussing Indian schools, that are entirely separate. We contribute to public schools in this way: that we give the North-west Government \$196,000 this year, and out of that they have to provide for their different schools.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No doubt there is a difficulty with reference to these denominational schools, but the question is whether you have some better plan to propose and to proceed upon. I understand that the main object of these industrial schools, undertaken under the auspices of any denomination, is to give an education in industrial pursuits and habits.

Mr. DALY. Exactly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose as long as they are managed by the different denominations, religious instruction may be given; but I do not view these schools as being established for the purpose of teaching peculiar religious doctrines, or anything of that kind.

Mr. DALY. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The main object, as I understand it, is to impart a common education, and to instruct them in some handicraft. I notice in the report of the Minister that they have pupils who have been there a certain length of time, and then left. Some of them are blacksmiths, some carpenters, some one trade and some another. I see, in a great many cases, however, that they go back to the reserves. That is one of the great difficulties, I suppose, that is encountered in the matter of Indian teaching, that they drop back on to the reserves.

Mr. DALY. That is the problem we have got to solve.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is a problem of which I know something from my own experience of an industrial institute in our own province. The House and Parliament

will have to have some patience with this work, because you cannot transform the traits of the Indian character into the traits of the white character, all at once. The progress cannot be very rapid, but if it is in the right direction and under economical management, I would be disposed to think we should not object too strongly to the present system until we can find one that is better. I presume the present system is as economical as any that we could devise in any other direction, for the time being; and the question is largely whether the country is willing to sanction the expense. But the motive, I believe, is good, the object sought to be attained, is good, and there will be necessarily more or less expense attendant upon the system while it is developing its good effects. I can see the difficulty, of course, that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has mentioned, but as he himself admits, he is not just prepared to state what other course could be taken in reference to the matter. I presume with reference to that school at Brandon, the difficulty seems to be with my hon. friend that as it was located in what might be termed a centre of civilization, there would be other means sufficient to give them instruction. But I presume the pupils at the Brandon school are brought from the reserves some distance away.

Mr. DALY. Hundreds of miles away.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is simply located in Brandon for convenience, and it is thought to be an additional benefit that the Indian child, being removed so far from the reserves, will not be exposed to the influence of his parents, who might not care for him, or desire any instruction to be given to him. The aim is that he may gradually be led to adopt civilized modes of life, and adopt some handicraft by which he can earn a living. I know from my own observation, that this is a difficult question to understand and a difficult question to handle. The time may come when it will be necessary to revise our manner of procedure in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. One denomination has, I believe, taken the ground that it was wrong in principle to do what we are doing.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That church has no mission.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Difficulties may arise when this principle is being carried out. I have been led to make these remarks because I am not prepared, for my own part, to say that this system should be abandoned until some other system, which we know will be better, can be introduced.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Brant in so far as they relate to the expenditure for Indian schools. If the hon. gentleman was a close student of public expenditure with

respect to schools in the North-west, he certainly would come to the conclusion that they were not carefully and economically handled. If the hon. gentleman read the items and turned up the reports he would see for himself, for I am sure he has capacity for seeing, that there were gross expenditures in connection with schools. We have called the attention of the Government, year after year, to this fact. I am not prepared to say that the present Minister of the Interior is to be held responsible, as he has only recently entered on the duties of his position, but it is well to call his attention to the extravagances that have occurred in the administration of the schools and in the general management of Indians in the North-west. The whole expenditure in connection with schools and reserves bears on its face the mark of extravagance. I admit it is desirable to endeavour to induce the Indians to adopt industrious habits, rather than allowing them to become criminals and cause trouble to the settlers. Accordingly, we should have industrial schools, but they should be administered under a rigid economical system. I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in regard to this matter, to go uncontradicted.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I happen to know something about the schools, because I had occasion to have some correspondence with the department in regard to them. I can only speak on behalf of one denomination, the Methodist denomination, and they have with great hesitation, taken charge of those schools. They have felt a great deal of diffidence in doing so, because the amount allowed by the Government for their support is considered to be inadequate. So far from there being reckless extravagance, there is an actual loss to the churches. I have no doubt that, were it not for the fact that the churches wish to advance their own interests, they would not take up these schools. They are, in fact, doing Government work. If this work was not being done by the churches, the Government would have to appoint inspectors and instructors, and the expenditure would be very much increased, and probably the desirable results now attained would not be secured. In regard to the general expenditure for Indians if the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would consult the records of expenditure for Indians in the United States, as compared with Canada, he would come to the conclusion that there was no reason to complain in regard to our expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My remarks were connected with the management of the industrial school, but my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) drifted off to the general management of Indian affairs, which is a pretty large question. The item under the consideration of the committee at the present time is for an industrial

school, and my remarks were confined to that item.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the religious instruction of the school under the supervision of the Minister?

Mr. DALY. I have not yet attained that perfection in evangelization that the hon. gentleman has.

Expenses of International Mining Convention.....\$1,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in connection with the meeting of the Mining Convention in Montreal the other day, at which a large number of delegates were present.

Cost of Litigation\$10,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What expenses will this item cover?

Mr. DALY. It is for litigation that may arise, and that has arisen, and in connection with suits that have not yet been settled. The Government estimate that \$10,000 will cover the amount.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the suits that have arisen?

Mr. DALY. There is one suit, the Queen and Magee, in regard to ordnance land.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a supplementary vote, the amount for litigation for 1892-93 having been voted in the main Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. The litigation has been heavy this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose this additional amount is required, but perhaps the hon. gentleman can state for what special cases it is needed.

Mr. FOSTER. A large amount, I believe, is required for litigation in connection with the fisheries—Behring Sea.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there not a special vote taken for that matter?

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the arbitration. I will, however, bring down the information from the Justice Department. The item can be allowed to stand.

Determining Boundary line in Passamaquoddy Bay..... \$2,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Has this boundary never been defined?

Mr. DALY. There never has been any actual delimitation of the boundary line at this point. This work will be carried out under the convention of last year between the United States and Canada.

Expenses of determining Boundary line between Canada and the United States..... \$32,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this amount to be expended for the purpose of determining Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the Alaska boundary? Has anything been done towards the delimitation of that line yet?

Mr. DALY. No; this money is required for that purpose. The money is needed in order that we may start our parties on the 1st of April. Our survey parties will then meet the parties of the American Government and then proceed with the work. It is expected that it will continue for three years.

Mr. A. N. Montpetit—Translation Civil Service Inquiry....\$1,102 75

Mr. McMULLEN. This seems a large sum. How long did it take to perform this work, and how was this man paid?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Montpetit was engaged by my predecessor to make this translation on account of his ability. The work has been satisfactorily done, and I recommended that the payment should be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that this gentleman was probably a friend of the late Secretary of State, and he gave him this nice little job which cost over \$1,100. I would like to know on what basis he was paid?

Mr. FOSTER. The Clerk of the House informs me that he was paid at the usual rate of \$1 per page.

Gratuity to Mr. Mowat, seriously injured by explosion of barrel of varnish at Campbellton Station.\$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How are we responsible for the explosion of a barrel of varnish?

Mr. HAGGART. There was a fire amongst the varnish in the store-room at Campbellton, and this man in trying to save the Government property was terribly injured. The barrel of varnish exploded as he was taking it out.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are you not a little short of varnish for the Government now?

Mr. DALY. We got a new supply.

Fire at St. John's, Nfld \$10,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman in a position to state the general contributions towards the St. John's fire, and how they were disposed of? There were a great many handsome contributions made from the citizens of the different parts of the Dominion, who sympathized with our Newfoundland friends in their great trouble, and it might be interesting to know if there was any official report made as to the total amount received, and how expended?

Mr. FOSTER. The Newfoundland Legislature is now in session, and no doubt an official report will be made. Of course, we placed no condition on our grant, and they are under no obligation to send us a return, but

if they publish a report, I have no doubt that the large donors will have a copy sent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To whom did we send this \$10,000 ?

Mr. FOSTER. We did not send the \$10,000. We loaded our vessel at Halifax and sent the goods that they telegraphed they were most in need of at the time. The supplies went to the relief committee, and the hon. gentleman will remember that it was one of the first donations utilized.

Prohibition Commission..... \$15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Should not the phrasing here be altered ? Should not this appropriation be for : "Further amount required for salving the Finance Minister's conscience and delivering the Government from the necessity of coming to a decision which might involve some difficulties ?"

Mr. FOSTER. That would be a private interpretation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it would be proper to change the title of this vote, and to make the \$15,000 "for the purpose of deferring action on the temperance question until some day in the dim and mystic future." The object of the Government in appointing that commission was clearly apparent. It was a deliberate action taken for the purpose of deferring the necessity of meeting this question, and while that was the suspicion at the time the commission was appointed, that suspicion has now crystallized into a firm belief. Might I ask the Finance Minister : How many years we are likely to wait for the report of that commission to be made, and whether it is likely to reach the House and the country before the next general election ?

Mr. FOSTER. I know my hon. friend is burning with a desire to get the results of this commission, and I am sorry he should be disappointed even for a few months. I may say with reference to the work of that commission, that since it was appointed it has prosecuted its work with all due diligence. The work is not a slight one, and upon the lines upon which they are prosecuting it, it will necessarily take a large amount of time. At least, it is certain from the time that they commenced that it will take a longer period than will enable them to have the report ready for this present session of the House. They have now finished the prosecution of their inquiries in all the provinces with the exception of Ontario, and they have extended their inquiries to certain of the United States. So far as I can learn, they have now simply the province of Ontario to finish, and some few further inquiries in other parts. They have been getting documentary evidence from all quarters from the very first, so that I think that, without any doubt, the labours of the commission, so far as getting the evidence is concerned, will probably finish in

the course of a couple of months. Just at this moment, they are not pursuing their investigations and taking evidence, because of the season of the year, but they intend to meet again in a short time for that purpose. Just as soon as it comes in it is the intention of the Government to have the evidence and the report published, and if that be done before next session, of which I have little doubt, it will be distributed to the members, so that they will be able to make themselves acquainted with the labours and conclusions of the commission before we next meet. I must say that I do not think there has been undue delay on the part of the commissioners. There has certainly been no design of that kind on the part of the Government. Every communication that has passed between the commissioners and myself has been with the idea of hastening their operations rather than retarding them. However, the commissioners are the judges largely of their own work. The scope of their work was laid down by Parliament, and that has not been either extended or diminished by any instructions they have received from the Government. They have conducted the investigation in the way that seemed best to themselves under the resolution of Parliament, and I believe they have prosecuted the work, which is no light one, diligently and conscientiously.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure that the country will be delighted to learn that the Government have had no desire to delay the prosecution of the investigation, or to defer action on the temperance question by the appointment of this commission. The statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance that the commission are not prosecuting their inquiries at this season of the year, leads me to suppose that their investigations are of a kind that cannot be carried on in inclement weather. I presume that they are not prosecuting them in the open air to any great extent, and I do not know why they should suspend their inquiries during the winter. I suppose that when we get the report of this commission we shall really know whether or not intemperance is an evil. It seems as if the Government were in doubt on that point, and that it was necessary to appoint a commission to ascertain for them whether or not intemperance was an evil, and whether it was such an evil as to require legislative action on their part. But I suppose, when they get the report of this commission, they will be informed as to those questions, and as to whether they should intervene in the direction of prohibitory legislation. Now, speaking seriously, this whole thing is a perfect farce, and I believe that the great mass of information collected by this commission is a mass of rubbish. The country did not stand in need of the information on this question which this commission is professedly collecting. We had already in our possession all the necessary

information with regard to the ravages of intemperance, with regard to the amount of money expended in drink, with regard to the evil results that flow from the selling of whiskey; and for the Government of Canada, in the face of the demand for legislation to check this great evil, to pretend that they did not know whether it was an evil or not, and whether it was such an evil as to justify them in introducing legislation to prevent it, and to appoint a commission to instruct them on these questions, is all simple bosh. The fact is, the commission was appointed for the purpose of staving off action on the part of the Government in regard to an awkward question on which the Finance Minister had taken very positive ground in the past when he was not sitting on the Treasury benches. Then he had no doubt that intemperance was an evil and that the Government should intervene to prohibit or restrict this traffic; but after he became a Minister of the Crown he was unable to make up his mind on the matter. He did not think the Government had sufficient information, and so a commission was appointed to inform them on facts that have been known to the world for ages. The whole thing is a screaming farce, for which I denounce the action of the Government. It was not an honest or courageous action. If they do not want to give the country a prohibitory law, let them refuse it; but to stave off the question in the way they are doing is something that will not meet with the approval of the great mass of the temperance people.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I quite concur in the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. It appears to me that this Royal Commission can be of no service whatever. Its appointment is a perfect waste of money. It appears to me that it was only intended to stave off a difficult question for an indefinite number of years, and that it would be wise to bring this expenditure to a close. It is an enigma to me which I cannot solve, how this Royal Commission, by wandering about the country from Dan to Beersheba, and getting the opinions of people for and against prohibition, will ever advance the temperance cause. I think that nothing has occurred during the past decade so injurious to the cause of temperance as the appointment of this Royal Commission. It has completely side-tracked the prohibition movement, paralyzed all efforts and acted like a placebo to keep the temperance men quiescent. I think the whole thing is a huge farce; but that is not all, it is a useless and wicked waste of money and we should not sanction it.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance whether he could inform the committee about what amount the commis-

Mr. CHARLTON

sion has cost, and, if he cares to do it, I would like him to express an opinion as to what the additional cost would be?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote taken in the main Estimates of 1892-93 was \$5,000. The expenditure to the 6th February has been \$13,325. This vote will bring the total appropriation up to \$20,000, of which there will be \$6,674 available. As to the cost still to be incurred, I can hardly speak; it will depend somewhat upon the length of the investigation. But the major part of the cost, certainly, as far as the investigations and the evidence taken are concerned, must have been incurred. Then, there will be the cost of printing the evidence and the report, which, although considerable, will not be very large. I should imagine that altogether not less than \$25,000 or \$30,000 will suffice to pay the cost of the whole inquiry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many commissioners are there?

Mr. FOSTER. Five.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the scale of remuneration allowed?

Mr. FOSTER. The commissioners are paid at the rate of \$10 per day when engaged on the work of the commission, actual travelling expenses, and a living allowance of \$4 per day—about \$17 per day. I do not think I ought to allow the remarks of my hon. friend to pass unnoticed. He has, in his burning zeal for the cause, made an attack on these gentlemen, because there has been a few months' delay. I think he was unfair in several points. He concluded that the whole matter was a farce and bosh, and that this calling for information was a screaming farce. I knew the hon. gentleman would denounce the commission. It is his business to denounce everything which has the patronage and sanction of the Government, and my hon. friend would be entirely wanting in what he conceives to be his duty if he did not always rise to the occasion, and denounce each and every one of these things. But I am not aware that this commission was intended to find out whether intemperance was a great evil. If the hon. gentleman had read the scope of the instructions, he would not have thought it necessary to make that remark, because intemperance is certainly an evil; and to find out whether it is or not is not one of the reasons why this commission was appointed. It is strange that civilized countries and Governments, besides our own, have sought information on subjects of this kind, which are quite well known in a certain sense amongst the people generally. If my hon. friend will inquire, he will find that in Great Britain they have had one or two Royal Commissions on intemperance, which went around taking investigations upon almost the same lines as this one, and that the results of their investigations and their

own opinions have been embodied in public documents and have been considered of the very greatest value, and that out of them very useful legislation has been enacted and placed on the Statute-book in Great Britain. If my hon. friend, in his zeal for temperance, which I do not doubt, has followed the temperance movement in different countries, as no doubt he has, he will understand that the temperance people of the United States have united in one great endeavour within the last fifteen years, and that is to get the Congress of the United States to appoint a commission to investigate the evils of the liquor traffic. During every Congress efforts are made by the temperance bodies of the United States to have such a commission appointed, and they have sometimes come very close to getting it, and they considered it one of the strong things for which to urge, and the effort to obtain which they do not propose to give up until their object is accomplished. It is wonderful how these strong, level-headed temperance and Christian men in the United States are carried away by this bosh, and are anxious to engage in this same screaming farce. If my hon. friend will consult his memory, he will find that he need not go out of this country to seek a parallel for this. He need not go out of this country, nor very far back in its history, for I think it was no longer ago than 1873 or 1874, when a Government in this country, leading a strong party in this House, appointed a commission to obtain information, which commission travelled from place to place, took evidence and made investigation, and gave the results to this House, and these results were beneficial, for out of them came legislation which temperance people believe has, to a certain extent at least, been beneficial to the country. There is a wide distinction between a few men knowing that a thing is evil, and between having sufficient and collected information with reference to the whole matter at hand. I do not think this commission has been a solemn farce or mere bosh, and I am certainly bound to maintain that it was not from any dilatory motives or with a view of shelving the question that it was appointed, or that it is not now at its labours. I pointed out once before, that if the Government wished to shunt the question, there were other ways of shunting a motion than by appointing a Royal Commission on a motion of a member of the Government, and that there were better means of not meeting the strength and crux of opinion on this matter than by appointing a Royal Commission to investigate and report. My opinion is, and I have always held that opinion, that the Government did far otherwise than shelve and shunt the matter, and actually brought the question to the front by appointing a Royal Commission, and brought the period nearer to a point when decisive action is to be taken one way or the other. Whether prohibition, as a result, is to be enacted or not, I am not going to express an opinion at this moment. I have my own

private opinions, and will express them publicly when the time comes. When we have that information before the House and the country, that will be the time to digest it, without making the question a party one, which it ought never to be, and without using it for political advantage. I hope the House will come to the discussion and decision of that great question as to what is most useful and beneficial and practicable on its own merits; and when that conclusion is come to, I have no doubt the right thing will be done. But I think my hon. friend ought not to have made these wild and wide assertions against the commission. I do not think the commission, either in its inception or action, deserves such strong adjectives.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may have possibly been unduly severe in my criticism, with reference to this commission, but it has struck me, as a temperance man, and I believe my impression is correct, that it was unnecessary. We had a commission, as my hon. friend tells us, in 1873 or 1874, which procured for us all the information necessary to come to a practical result. It is not necessary to appoint another to investigate the question of the evils of the liquor traffic, as we were already in possession of all the information necessary to guide us intelligently in forming an opinion and basing our action on this question. My hon. friend tells us this should not be made a party question. I do not know how we are going to avoid that. It is a question upon which men take different sides, and must necessarily be a party question. It is a question which had presented itself to this House, from time to time, and the opinion of the House has been had on it. This is a question which has long been before the people. It is a question upon which the temperance men of this country have decided convictions. They did not need the Government commission to furnish them with information upon it; they had all the information they desired to get, in order to enable them to form an opinion upon the question. They did not ask for that investigation, and whatever may be the result of it, whatever its report may be, that report will have very little effect, one way or the other, upon the temperance sentiment of the country. If they bring in a report which declares that a prohibitory liquor law is not advisable or desirable in the interests of the people of this Dominion, does my hon. friend suppose that it will convince a single temperance man in this country? If that is the report, will one man who desires to see the evils of intemperance lessened, be convinced that the Government should not take action? If, on the other hand, the commission brings in a report recommending a prohibitory liquor law, does he suppose that it will do away with one single iota of the resistance to the passing of such a law? The report will be utterly inoperative, so far as its

effect on public sentiment is concerned. The temperance sentiment of the country rests upon ample evidence, while those who oppose it, oppose it for reasons that will not be affected by the finding of the commission. But it is well known that the question was an embarrassing one for the Government. There was no necessity for the commission, and the action of the Government, in creating it, was dictated by party exigencies, by the necessity the Government felt of staving off the question and gaining time. And they did so, and I am bound to say that they did it very astutely and very effectually. It could not have been done more effectually. Now, with reference to the example my hon. friend has cited in other countries. I do not know that I am as well informed as the hon. gentleman is, but I am not aware that there ever was a committee appointed in England to investigate the desirability of a prohibitory law.

Mr. FOSTER. Not a commission on the prohibitory law, but there was one on the temperance question.

Mr. CHARLTON. There was a commission to gather information as to a proper license law, to investigate the various license systems of other countries. But a commission to investigate into the propriety of passing a prohibitory liquor legislation, has not been asked for and, I believe, has never been granted in England. With regard to the demand of the temperance people in the United States, that Congress should instruct a commission to inquire into the temperance question, it must not be forgotten that the temperance question has been dealt with by the separate states to a large extent, and that every state has jurisdiction in the matter to prohibit the manufacture or sale within its borders of intoxicating liquors, and the desire of the temperance people in the United States to secure action by the general Government upon this matter, has been simply with a desire to promote uniform action throughout the United States. And the question has arisen, whether Congress had jurisdiction in this matter, and Congress felt reluctant to act, because it has been held by some constitutional lawyers, that the question is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the states. But even if Congress were to adopt the principle of appointing the commission, and that commission were to be appointed and commence its inquiries, after the commission had completed its inquiries, the United States would only be in the position Canada stood in, in 1874, when the commission had completed its inquiry. Though a commission may be desirable in the United States, it does not follow that the same is true of Canada, because we have had a commission, and in this respect we are in advance of them. Whether it is necessary to have a commission there or not, it is not necessary here. We have had the report of the commission and all the information that

Mr. CHARLTON.

is desirable and necessary to enable the people to make up their minds intelligently as to whether prohibitory legislation is proper and desirable in the Dominion of Canada. We had this information before the present commission was appointed. We were in a position then to grapple with this great evil. It was our duty then to grapple with it. If it can become the duty of the Government of this country to grapple by means of legislation, with the evils of intemperance, that duty existed then, and that duty will not be discharged until this legislation is placed upon the Statute-book.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in what he said about the temperance commission and the necessity for it. I am rather surprised to hear it advocated that we should base our legislation at this date on the evidence of a commission issued twenty years ago. It seems to me the condition of affairs is changed since then, and it would not be fair to ask the people to base a decision upon this important question on evidence received twenty years ago. As I view the matter, the people of this country are divided into three classes with reference to this question. One class is composed of those who favour prohibition and would vote for it under almost any circumstances; the second class includes those who do not favour prohibition, and who would vote against it under almost any circumstances. But there is a third class of the people, a very large class, indeed, who are not decided about this question and who want information with regard to it, and, as it often happens in other public matters, this is the class of people who would probably decide this question of prohibition ultimately. I think it would be the duty of the Government, as soon as we ascertain definitely that a large majority of the people are in favour of prohibition, to propose a prohibitory law. But, at the same time, people cannot make up their minds, members of Parliament cannot make up their minds unless we have the necessary information before the country. Now, there are conflicting opinions. I am a prohibitionist myself, as I suppose is well known.

Mr. GIBSON. Compensation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Prohibition, but not now.

Mr. GIBSON. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Certainly; go on.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to go before the commission if he is called upon?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Well, I suppose I have nothing to do with the commission, and I doubt very much the advisability of a mem-

ber of Parliament going before the commission. It is very like a judge giving evidence in his own court.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Our functions are both judicial and legislative, and it is a very grave question whether a member of Parliament ought to appear to give evidence before that commission.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is seeking to get information, not to impart it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is true also. But what I want to say is, there are a great many different opinions expressed as to the effect of a prohibitory law, and there are two or three questions to be decided before we can ask the House to pass such a law. The first question that is often asked and often lectured upon is: Does prohibition prohibit? I have not been in the state of Maine. Perhaps my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has been in that state. I hear many conflicting reports as to the effect of prohibition in that state. I would like, if possible, to satisfy myself before I am asked to vote as to the effect of a prohibitory law where it is passed in other places, and it is not a fair thing to ask hon. members to vote unless they are satisfied, and it is not fair to ask an expression of public opinion unless we lay before the people, as reasonable men and voters, the information necessary to a fair consideration of the question. We cannot decide that question, we cannot decide the question of revenue or any modified scheme of prohibition until we get the evidence before us and judge for ourselves what has been the history of the question and what will be the probable results of any such law. So I highly approve of the prohibition commission the Government has issued. And I regret to hear any hon. member say that the Government issued it to gain time, when there is such a good reason for issuing a commission of that kind, when the evidence that commission is taking is so essential to enable us to form a proper judgment upon the question, I think it ill-becomes any member of this House to accuse the Government of issuing that commission merely for the purpose of gaining time and temporizing with the matter. For my part, I heartily support the action of the Government in issuing that commission, for, prohibitionist as I am, I am not prepared to support a prohibitory law until we can see that it is best for the country.

Mr. CHRISTIE. We all know that there is a very strong public sentiment in this Dominion in favour of prohibition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHRISTIE. A tremendous public sentiment. We have seen evidence of that since this Parliament was elected. Two years ago this House was flooded with petitions in

favour of immediate prohibition. The people asked that a prohibitory measure should be enacted, and instead of that, they got a Royal Commission. They asked for fish and they got a serpent. It is a measure which has completely paralyzed all effort. Since the commission was issued not a single movement in advance has been made. Now, while we are waiting, the terrible evil is going on. Time will not wait for that Liquor Commission, the evils of intemperance will not wait. I will not take up the time of the House by dilating upon these evils, but every man in this House knows that terrible evils do result from intemperance, and we know that the only remedy is prohibition. The licensing system has been tried for ages and has signally failed, and the only remedy is prohibition. For one, I think the time has come for prohibition. I believe that the result will be grand and glorious, that it will virtually do away with poverty, misery, wretchedness and crime, and inaugurate an era of prosperity such as we have never seen or even dreamed of. Now, others may do as they please, but I, for one, am in favour of immediate prohibition. I am not disposed to wait for this Royal Commission to report. I believe the time has come when we should make a strong and determined movement in favour of prohibition, and I hope that we will not waste any more time and public money upon this Royal Commission.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) in the opinion that any such change has taken place in the country, or in public sentiment, since this commission began to take evidence, as to warrant the action of the Government in appointing the Royal Commission. I was opposed to that action, and so expressed myself at the time, because I thought that we were in possession of all the information we needed to guide us in legislating upon this question. I do not wholly agree, however, with my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Charlton), nor with my hon. friend at my left, in saying that all the information obtained by this commission is of no value. I think a great deal of it is questionable value, and I cannot say that I approve altogether of the course taken by this Royal Commission. I think they have sought information that will be, when reported, of very little value as a guide to this Parliament in legislating upon this question. More than that, it seems to me that the course which has been taken by this Royal Commission has been, in some instances, at all events, of a character to lead us to doubt their impartiality. For this reason especially I am not disposed to change the opinion which I entertained when the Royal Commission was appointed, and I still think, as I did then, that their labours will not result in any real value to the country, or in advancing the object which we all have at heart.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who expressed the opinion that this commission was a farce, may have been right or may have been wrong; but there is no question that he has, to a very large extent, voiced the opinion of a large portion of the temperance public in this Dominion. Now, as regards the general subject of prohibition which has been discussed here, I suppose the Government will take care that the report will not be presented to Parliament in time to require the Government to formulate a fixed policy before the general election. I assume that we will have that election anterior to the time when a policy could be formulated upon that report. That will go, I take it, as a matter of course. But I have held the opinion for many years, and have expressed that opinion both by voice and by vote in this House, that there are two leading questions to be discussed and decided upon before you determine to apply the system of prohibition to Canada, and the investigation and report of this commission cannot tend towards the solution of either of these questions. The only and main question which we have to determine is whether public opinion is really ready to back up such a stringent measure. Now, if public opinion is not ripe on the question, I care not a snap of my finger for any report that any five or six gentlemen may make. There are those of us who live in Scott Act counties, and have seen the effects of prohibition where it has been partially applied. The results have not been as satisfactory as many temperance gentlemen could wish. But it is said by them that is not giving the question fair-play, because the prohibition only extends to the city or county, and as liquor is obtainable from adjoining counties, fair-play is not given to the principle. Speaking as far as the province I come from is concerned, where the Scott Act was in force in all the counties of the Island for many years, I think I can fairly say that prohibition works to the great advantage and benefit of the rural population, and to the great disadvantage and evil in the cities. I do not think that in the cities the Scott Act worked well or did good; I think it was productive of a good deal of harm. I think it did immense good in the rural districts. But I voted some years ago in favour of having this question of prohibition submitted to a plebiscite, divorced from all other questions. Why, Sir, if you go to the country to-morrow upon the trade question, what would be the result? It will be almost impossible to get a fair, unbiassed verdict from the people, because in almost every district there will be a small body of men known as prohibitionists who look upon the question of prohibition as more important than the trade question, or any other. They do not care to obtain a verdict on the trade question, but they will stand shoulder to shoulder in favour of a

Mr. SCRIVER.

man who will declare himself for prohibition. That is not as it ought to be. I think myself that we ought to have adopted the resolution that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) moved here some years ago, and which I had the honour to support in this House, that the country should be tested upon the question of prohibition, yea or nay. If at such an election the question had been discussed in its various phases, its social aspects, its economic aspects and its political aspects—using the word political in its largest sense—and this question had been discussed: You are going to lose so many millions of revenue by prohibition, and are you prepared to levy this deficiency of eight or ten millions by direct taxation or otherwise? the people would then be able to vote upon that question divorced from the thousand and one issues which are tendered to them, and mixed up at a general election. Well, when that question is solved, if public opinion largely preponderates in favour of it, then, I say, must the Government consider the ulterior and further question, whether they see their way clear to raise sufficient money by other methods of taxation to make up the deficiency which the loss of revenue from this liquor traffic would cause. That is the political question, and it is one which the Government of the day have got to solve. But how is this commission going to solve it? They came down to my province, and selected half a dozen extreme men on each side, and examined them. Examined them upon what? Examined them simply upon their own opinion as to whether prohibition would work or not. That is not the point. The question is, whether there is a sufficiently strong opinion in favour of a prohibitory law to enable such a law to be carried into effect.

Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.) How will you find that out?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By a plebiscite. I would not determine the question simply on the vote polled, but as to whether a majority of the registered electors declared themselves in favour of that system. If voters stayed away from the polls, that fact would show that their hearts were not in favour of the system. If, however, a majority of the registered electors declared in favour of prohibition, that phase of the question would be settled, and we then would be brought face to face with the question as to whether our economic and financial position would justify the Government in carrying out prohibition. That is the question which the Government would have to solve. What light were gentlemen travelling around the country going to throw on this problem? None whatever. At the conclusion of their labours we shall be no wiser than we were before. I could understand the policy of sending two or three independent men to the state of Maine to examine into the effect of prohibitory legislation there. That might

have done some good, but these travelling gentlemen visiting the different cities and asking stereotyped questions of some temperance men, of some moderate drinkers, and some engaged in the traffic themselves, cannot afford any solution of the question, and cannot place us one inch further towards obtaining a solution of the liquor question, when their report is made, than we are to-day. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite if this proposition does not present itself as the correct one, and I contend that, after this report has been made, the Government will not be justified in taking a single step until they have found out by plebiscite, or some similar method, what is really the opinion of the people as to the desirability of introducing and enforcing prohibition. If the public sentiment is not behind such a measure, it could not be carried out, and turmoil and injury would accrue to the community, which would produce far more evil effects than any benefits that would be derived; but, if the mass of the people are in favour of such a law, it behooves this Parliament to carry out their behest. I do not think you can find this out at a general election, but by a plebiscite, and by that mode only.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has not fairly indicated the province of the commission by any means, when he states that the commission simply examined a few extreme men as to whether they are for or against prohibition. If I correctly understand the duty of the commission, it is to gather information which would be valuable: first, as to how far the revenue would be affected by the destruction of the trade or otherwise; second, what amount of property was invested in the trade, and other data that would be very valuable either to the Government or to private individuals to satisfy their own minds as to what course should be pursued. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) said there will be three classes of people who will be influenced. First, out-and-out temperance people; second, those directly engaged in the liquor traffic, and, third, the intermediate class who were open to conviction, and if convinced, would decide one way or the other. But there is another class outside of these, the class of men who would be willing to support a measure of total prohibition on the basis of compensation to those engaged in the trade, whose business and property would be destroyed if such a law came into existence. This class is the only correct and honourable one. It is the duty of this commission to collect such data, by which we would be enabled to understand the amount of capital invested in the trade, the various ramifications which would be affected, and also how far the revenue would be destroyed, and what method could be adopted of replacing the revenue in the event of the Government or the country de-

termining that we should have prohibition. On these various lines, valuable information is being collected, which could not be collected otherwise than by a commission. Under these circumstances, the commission is a most important one, the information collected will be valuable, and it will enable the people to determine individually which way they are inclined to go, after the report is laid before this House and before the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say, in regard to the claim that a Royal Commission is not necessary to find out the amount of revenue collected from the traffic, that our Inland Revenue returns will show that amount. Again, with regard to the value of property no doubt hon. members are aware that this can be obtained by referring to the municipal assessments of the several towns and cities in which the distilleries and breweries are located. So, the commission was not necessary on those two grounds. My impression is that the main object of the commission was to ascertain, if possible, how far public sentiment was ready to accept and put in force and successfully enforce temperance legislation. That appears to be the point on which there was considerable difference of opinion. Undoubtedly, this report, if printed in full, will prove to be a very voluminous one, and the Minister of Finance will remember that there was a question asked across the House the other day as to whether it was the intention of the Government to put a sum in the Estimates this year to defray the cost of printing the report. The Minister of Finance answered that this was the intention of the Government. It is highly desirable that the report should be in the hands of every member of the House one month or six weeks before next session. It will be a very extensive report, and it will be the duty of every hon. member to give the question his very serious and careful consideration when it comes up, and in order to do so, it becomes necessary to have the report at the earliest possible moment during the recess in order that members may become thoroughly posted and be able to form an intelligent and independent opinion on the subject from the evidence adduced as to whether Parliament will be justified in introducing and carrying into effect a prohibitory measure. I hope the Minister of Finance will see that the report is placed in the hands of every hon. member at the earliest possible moment, so that we may be able to deal with the subject next session, as I earnestly hope will prove to be the case.

Mr. CRAIG. I attended a meeting of members of this House in favour of prohibition in one of the rooms upstairs, and I heard some gentlemen talking, as hon. members have been talking to-day, to the effect that

the report will be of very little value. But Mr. Spence, secretary of the Dominion Alliance, who has the cause of prohibition at heart as much as any one in this country, said that he had attended all the meetings of the commission, and from his own personal knowledge he had no sympathy whatever with those members who undervalued the report of the commission, that he knew it would be a most valuable report, that the information to appear within its pages could not have been gathered by any other means, and that it would prove a strong educating influence in favour of temperance and of prohibition. I thought it right to repeat this testimony which Mr. Spence gave in favour of the commission's report.

For Portrait of Lord Lansdowne. . . \$1,022

Mr. CHARLTON. Is not this a pretty large sum to expend on a single portrait?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Before Lord Lansdowne left this country, Sir John Macdonald asked him to sit for his portrait in London, and said the Canadian Government would pay for it. Lord Lansdowne sat, and the portrait has been finished, and I believe it has just been received here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is not encouraging home industry. There are many excellent portrait painters in this country, and it would have been desirable to have induced the Governor-General to have sat to one of them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some of our home artists would have been very glad to have done the work for \$300 or \$400.

Increase of salary of M. Kelly, Assistant Inspector of Weights and Measures. \$50

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is this for?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). On inquiry I find that this official does the hardest and largest part of the work connected with the Quebec division, of which he is assistant inspector. The total collection amounts to \$2,063.96, and of this Mr. Kelly collects \$1,068.57. His salary has been \$600, and it is proposed to increase it to \$700. His division extends clear down to the coast, he is engaged the greater part of the year, and his expenses are very heavy. I am satisfied that he is a very deserving official and is entitled to the increase.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are his expenses paid by the department?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). His expenses are paid, but I think in his case there are some expenses it would be hard to recompense him for, when we consider the hardship he has to undergo, because he has to travel in all sorts of conveyances. I think he is a very deserving official.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you put the increase on that ground, I would point out Mr. CRAIG.

that there are a number of very deserving officials in the town from which I come who are deserving of an increase of salary. There are gentlemen there who think their salaries should be increased, and who have made repeated attempts to get them increased. Some of the gentlemen to whom I refer hardly receive as much as would enable them to pay their way, although they have been 20 years in the service. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the principle might be extended to the deserving officials to whom I have referred.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish the hon. gentleman would draw the distinction a little finer. Mr. Kelly is one of four or five officers in the division and he does more work than any one of the others.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That may be a good reason for reducing the number.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is something in that suggestion. I will not say that the Weights and Measures branch of this department could not stand a decrease in officials; in fact I will go so far as to say that the staff could be cut down in that branch. I trust that the increases in this department may be few and far between. So far as this particular officer is concerned I am satisfied he deserves this slight increase.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. While the Weights and Measures branch of the Inland Revenue Department is under consideration, I would draw the attention of the Government to the fact that a promise was made last year, that they would inspect the milk cans at Toronto. A delegation waited on the Minister of Inland Revenue then, and he promised that he would have the cans inspected and marked. Now, that has not been done. Afterwards, I drew attention to the matter in the House and the promise was renewed, and since then we had another promise from the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue. The Government have never carried out that promise, and the people are in the same position today that they were in a year ago. I find that the inspector at Toronto has neglected his duty, and that he has been attending to other work for which there is no necessity whatever. For instance, he went to Brampton and he found a box for carrying grain from a threshing machine that he claimed should be stamped, and he threatened the law on the people and said he would get them fined. However, they settled the matter by paying him \$5, and he returned to Toronto rejoicing, with the \$5 in his pocket. I suppose if he thinks he will make \$5 another year, he will return there and threaten the people again. I would now ask the Government to insist on the inspector enforcing the regulation with regard to milk cans, because it is a great

grievance to the farmers that they have to deliver milk in cans holding nine gallons, when they only get paid for eight. I hope the Government will at once carry out their promises in this matter.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to my attention. Since my connection with the department, I may say that positive orders have been given to the inspector at Toronto to carry out the hon. gentleman's request, and the request of the deputation which visited Ottawa a year ago.

Grand Falls Bridge, N.B. \$500

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I do not know how necessary this may be, and how far it is a work that is under the jurisdiction of this House, but, Sir, I do know that I brought to the attention of the Public Works this year, and the year before, a matter of a somewhat similar kind, wholly under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. I refer to the navigation of the River Sydenham. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that there is an immense and important traffic on that river. The Government is allowing the navigation on that river to be destroyed, and, up to the present time, I have received no assurance whatever that any appropriation will be made to remove the obstructions to navigation there. I called the attention of the Minister last year to the fact that steam-boats were plying daily from Louisburg and from Dresden to Sarnia and Detroit, and other ports of importance, and that the proprietors of these boats complained that the wheels were broken by sunken trees in the river, and that it was the duty of the Government to protect the navigation, but, up to this moment, nothing has been done. I have simply had a communication this year, as I had last year, acknowledging the receipt of my application; but I have received no intimation from any member of the Administration that these obstructions would be removed, and it seems to me rather an unusual course, to make appropriations for public works that are not under the jurisdiction of this Parliament at all, and to neglect works which are of the first consequence to the trade of the country. The Government are trustees for the public, holding in trust the public funds, and the funds ought to be applied to the protection of those harbours and rivers where there is a large amount of trade and commerce carried on. Every year when the waters are high in the River Sydenham, whole trees are sometimes undermined, fall into the river, float forty or fifty miles, become filled with water, sink to the bottom, and thus become obstructions to navigation. In a little while bars are formed against these trees. A few hundred dollars would be sufficient at present to remove the obstructions, which a short time it will take as many thousands to remove if the matter is neglected. I have spoken to

Ministers personally, and not seeing anything yet done in the way of an appropriation, I bring the matter to the attention of Parliament, to satisfy those interested in the trade and commerce of that section of the country, that as far, at all events, as I am concerned, I have done my duty, and I ask the Government to do theirs.

Militia Expenses—Rebellion, N.

W. T., 1885 \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is to pay claims which have been made and which have been adjudicated upon by the authority appointed for that purpose. They come through the Department of Justice. There has been a similar sum required each year for three or four years.

Unprovided items, 1891-92. . \$158,247 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do these chiefly consist of?

Mr. FOSTER. You will see them all fully detailed in the Auditor-General's Report. During the last four years I have reduced these unprovided items from about \$800,000 down to \$158,000, and I propose, by strict supervision, to reduce them still lower, if possible. They are little odds and ends of expenses in the different departments.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 91) to amend an Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Bank—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Weldon.)

REPRESENTATION OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LAURIER. I again call the attention of the Government to the vacancy in the representation of Vaudreuil. I should like to know if, at last, the returning officer has been appointed?

Mr. FOSTER. I should like my hon. friend to put his question on Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. I will put my question on Monday; but if the returning officer is not appointed on that day, there are means which can be used when an hon. member thinks

that the justice to which he is entitled is not granted.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the printing of the revised copy of "Hansard" is far behind, the issue for March 1st not having yet been placed in the hands of members. This printing is, therefore, ten days behind, and it appears to me absurd that these revised copies have not yet been issued, so that they can be distributed to members and the press of the country. What is the explanation of the delay?

Mr. COSTIGAN. With respect to the delay, which the hon. gentleman has charged to the printing department, in the issue of the revised edition of the "Hansard," I may say that, so far as the Printing Bureau is concerned, a very complete system has been adopted of furnishing information to the House and to the Government as to the progress of the work connected with the publication of "Hansard." Whenever there is a delay of one hour or five hours in regard to the transmission of manuscript from the translators to the Bureau, or from the Bureau back for revision or correction, or in the final distribution of "Hansard" to the House, a statement is placed in the hands of the House, and a copy of that statement is furnished to the chairman of the "Hansard" Committee. I am sure if that hon. gentleman were in his place he would join me in stating that so far as regards the Printing Bureau, every exertion is being made to keep up the work and avoid delay. In some cases within my own knowledge delay has occurred respecting some speeches delivered in French. That, of course, delays the publication of that portion of the "Hansard" which is in English. Again, sometimes the copy for revision has been retained in the hands of members a little longer than it should for purposes of revision. I can assure the hon. gentleman that in performing the work of the Printing Bureau no time has been lost.

Mr. McMULLEN. The system should be changed, for at the present time the country press is deprived of the corrected copy of "Hansard" for nearly two weeks.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the Printing Bureau must be blamed. A long time ago an Order of the House was made for the printing of papers brought down in connection with the Caron Commission. I have made inquiries very recently from the officers of the House who are correcting the proofs, and they informed me that for some time the evidence proper is in type and has been corrected and struck off, and that they are now engaged in correcting the exhibits, which may take a week or two longer to get all finished. I would suggest that one copy of the evidence should be

Mr. LAURIER.

printed and distributed among the members of the House at once, even if the exhibits have to come afterwards.

Mr. COSTIGAN. My attention was drawn to the matter at the time the printing was ordered. An inquiry was made of the Prime Minister, as to when the evidence and the report would be ready for the House, and he sent the inquiry to me. I was informed by the Queen's Printer that by giving it his best attention, with a view to expedite the work and employing extra hands, he thought it would be ready in some three or four weeks. That time has nearly expired, and I am quite sure the report must be nearly ready. I dare say I would be quite safe in saying it would be ready on Monday.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman will be able to tell us definitely on Monday when we shall have it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. EDGAR. Of course the length of the session will depend on when we receive it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will not be an hour's delay.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the necessity for calling a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. We are now about six weeks here, and there has only been one meeting of the committee for the purpose of organization. If the Public Accounts Committee are going to do any work this session they should start to do it at once. I believe that a great deal of discussion which takes place in the House on items in Supply could better be done in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend say what day next week would be suitable?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wednesday.

Mr. FOSTER. I will see the chairman and ask him to call a meeting for Wednesday.

P.E.I.—COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Prime Minister intimated some days ago that he would be able to inform me whether an appointment had been made or not to the Prince County Court Judgeship.

Mr. FOSTER. The appointment has been made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has it been accepted?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it has been accepted.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Wrecks and Salvage Acts.—(Mr. Costigan.)

RECEIPT OF PARLIAMENTARY FEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 61) respecting the disposal of moneys paid in connection with proceedings before Parliament.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. Did the Minister tell us exactly the system that has been pursued up to this time?

Mr. FOSTER. The moneys have been collected by the clerk of the Private Bills Committee. These moneys have been deposited by him to the credit of the accountant in a peculiar form, so that they could be drawn by the accountant, countersigned, I think, by the clerk of the Private Bills Committee. Whatever charges are against these amounts have been paid directly by cheque upon these accounts, and after the charges had all been paid the balance was deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General. The system that this proposes is the same that is followed in Britain. They place all deposits immediately to the credit of the Receiver-General, and whatever fees, advertising expenses or refunds are necessary are paid by cheque upon the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. EDGAR. Then the accountant will receive no money; but only pay out. There is no other source from which he receives money?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. He is expected to deposit de die in diem?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Cape Tormentine Harbour..... \$6,500

Mr. OUMET. The other day in the Supplementary Estimates I asked for \$13,000 to complete the payments to the contractors on this work. The present vote is required to complete the wharf and to make certain repairs, namely, to replace the timber that has been destroyed by the teredo or sea-worm, and to protect the wharf by placing stone on each side. Since last year we have adopted a rule to use creosoted timber on all important works; but ordinary timber was used for this work, and some that has been there for only fifteen months has already been practically destroyed by the sea-worms. The wharf is to be placed in a condition to accommodate the traffic which will take place there in connection with the railway.

It will be the place of shipment on the mainland, as Cape Traverse will be on the Prince Edward Island side.

Mr. WELSH. Last year, when the subject of this Cape Tormentine pier was before the House, the question was asked when this expenditure was going to cease, and we were told that the amount then voted was the last to be asked for this work. Now, it appears, before this breakwater is completed, that it is beginning to rot and to be worm-eaten. I also asked what was the meaning of this breakwater. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that it is one end of the communication with Cape Traverse. Now, this wharf is in a very exposed position, subject to the sweep of the north-west winds down the gulf, and it is constantly getting filled up with sand; and then a further piece is built, and soon that is filled up. When the Government undertook to build this breakwater, if they intended it for the purpose of communication with Prince Edward Island, they should have taken a vote to build a breakwater at Cape Traverse, otherwise they cannot be sure of having communication there. In fact, I do not see that there is any call for this breakwater at all, because every year the Government will have to provide for the repair of damages received from the gales of wind. I would rather see some of this money voted for some of our necessary breakwaters and harbours on Prince Edward Island, which nature intended for harbours. A very few miles from this harbour there are good natural harbours. There is Pugwash, only about ten miles distant, a splendid harbour, then there is Shediac, also a good harbour, and on the opposite side we have Summerside and Charlottetown, both excellent natural harbours. Yet here is a large amount of public money being spent to build up an unnatural harbour. I do hope there will be some items in the Estimates of the Minister of Public Works, for I know that hon. gentleman is well inclined. He has lent a willing ear to the representations I have made of the wants of Prince Edward Island, and I have every confidence that he will use his endeavours to see that fair-play is done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. colleague was not in the House the other evening, or he would have learned that the object of this expenditure is not at all for the purposes of the ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, although that was the excuse which induced the House, in the first instance, to vote the money. When I spoke the other night about the expenditure of this \$30,000, which is appropriated for 1892-93, and the \$6,500 which is to be voted for 1893-94, I called the attention of the House to the fact that there was no corresponding wharf on the other side and that, therefore, the expenditure was useless. But the Minister of Public Works told me that the object was solely to provide a

shipping place for the railway which is owned by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). His railway runs down there, and, although there are the natural harbours of Pugwash and Shediac, there is no wharf to enable his railway to run into those harbours, and it was therefore necessary to build one at the expense of \$178,000 to enable that hon. gentleman to ship his lumber which is carried by his railway. Originally the House was induced to vote this estimate on the ground that the wharf was to be one of the termini of the ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, but that excuse has been thrown to the winds, and we are told that it is intended simply for the benefit of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). Had the House been told this in the first instance, strong as party lines are, I do not think the House would ever have consented to the vote. The Government have made their expenditure on the mainland, but they have not expended anything on Prince Edward Island, nor do they intend to. We were told that some surveys would be made this season to see if the project was feasible, but no trouble was felt about the feasibility on the mainland. Besides this, \$6,000 or \$7,000 of public money is to be appropriated for running the hon. gentleman's railway down to the wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's statements are somewhat wild. He says that \$6,000 or \$7,000 has actually been expended for running Mr. Wood's railway to the wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what the Minister of Public Works told us the other night.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know it.

Mr. FOSTER. Not one dollar of that money is to be expended in running Mr. Wood's railway, or any other private railway, down to the wharf. So much for that statement. The gist of the other statement is that this appropriation, from first to last, was made for the purpose of having a wharf or shipping place for a private railway concern. That is not the fact either. The hon. gentleman knows well the circumstances that led up to the construction of the Cape Traverse wharf, then of the railway extension in Prince Edward Island, and then of the terminal wharf. All these were started and in progress and largely completed before Mr. Wood's railway ran over rails at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I stated that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a fact that Mr. Wood and others built a railway which ran from Sackville, a connection on the Intercolonial Railway down to Cape Tormentine, but the connection between the two has been overstated by my hon. friend. The Cape Tormentine wharf being commenced, this railway did start and has been completed, and

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

it utilizes that wharf. That is perfectly right and proper, but the cardinal idea that underlay the construction of these three separate works was to make connection between the mainland and Prince Edward Island at this point. That arose long ago, and was very thoroughly developed in a parliamentary investigation and report, and the idea was to make that a third connection between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. That idea has not been lost sight of. This vote finishes, I believe, the expenditure on Cape Tormentine wharf; that is, it finishes that wharf as it is to-day. I quite acknowledge that there would be no justification for making those heavy expenditures for the sake of simply arranging a place where some lumber may be shipped from a private railway. That was not the underlying motive which induced these three expenditures; and if the idea is not driven to its logical conclusion, of making a short communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, then the objects with which Parliament started out in the beginning will not be carried out. But it is the intention to make improvements upon the other side, as may be necessary, so that the connection may be complete.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the hon. gentleman continues his argument I wish it to be well understood, in answer to what he said about the statements I made when I was Minister of Public Works, that what I said then is quite in accord with what the leader of the House has just stated. I stated, on behalf of the Government, that this work at Cape Tormentine was for the purpose of making communication with the other side. That was the intention, and I have never heard that that intention has been abandoned. It was not abandoned when I was in the Government, and now I hear from the leader of the House that it is not intended to be abandoned, and therefore I wish it to be well understood that, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), said just now, what I stated was the exact meaning and understanding that the Government had at the time. Their intention was to have communication between the two.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat and the Finance Minister have stated exactly what I said when this matter came up the other night. I was very anxious to impress the fact upon the House. I think I repeated it to-day that this work was intended to make part of a ferry system between Prince Edward Island and the mainland to carry out the terms of the Union. The House was induced to vote money on that representation, that was almost the sole argument for the expenditure of this enormous amount of money. What I was calling the attention of the House to was the state-

ment of the Minister of Public Works that at present they did not intend to construct the wharf on the other side, one of the termini, and, in the meantime, it was to be used to export lumber on the Shediac Bay.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Did they state that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; the Minister of Public Works stated that the other night. This is the second time the subject has come up. And that is what I stated to-day. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) has said that I made an inaccurate statement. The Minister said that \$7,000 of this money was to be used to carry down to the end of the wharf the present Shediac Railway, which he chose to call Mr. Wood's railway—the Sackville Railway. The Minister said that, and I repeated it. He said it would enable the lumber carried on that road to be exported. He told me that he had not been satisfied from the engineer's report in his department that a proper wharf could be built satisfactorily on the Prince Edward Island side. He has not yet satisfied himself that this can be done. I do not know whether it can be done or not. I am only pointing out to the House that this work was intended for a specific purpose. We are now spending an enormous amount of money, and if the wharf is being destroyed by worms at the rate he says it will cost a fortune to keep it up, and if it is only to export what is carried on the road it is not worth keeping up.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I regret that I was not present to hear the hon. gentleman's first observations with regard to this vote. I happened to be absent, also, the other evening, when he spoke, but I have had the opportunity of reading his observations in "Hansard." I regret the hon. gentleman made observations the other evening, and I am informed he repeated them to-day, that are not fair towards the railway which I happen, fortunately or unfortunately, I am not sure which, to be connected with. Now, Sir, so far as the construction of the railway is concerned. I do not see that it has any connection whatever with the construction of this wharf. We all know, and there is no one in the House who knows better than the hon. gentleman, that there was a continual agitation for the construction of the railway from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, for many years before the work was commenced. I think the Act incorporating the company was passed some ten or twelve years before the work began. A great many efforts were made to induce some person, or number of persons, to put money into the work and commence its construction, but these efforts were unavailing. I think it was in 1882 or 1883 that I and others associated with me in Sackville, decided to undertake the work, and we did undertake it, under a promise of a subsidy from the Local Legislature, but without a promise of any

subsidy from this Legislature. I had some notes upon this matter, but I do not happen to have them here; but I think it was in 1886 that, finally, this Government voted a subsidy in aid of this work. We have succeeded in building the railway, and I should judge, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, that he thinks, and that he would have the House infer, that the object of the Government, in voting the large amounts of money which have been voted for the construction of the work in question, was to benefit the Sackville and Cape Tormentine Railway. That, every one knows, who knows anything of the history of the work, is not correct. The wharf, I am quite free to admit, as the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has stated, would not be justified, if it was simply as a terminus of this railway. It was remarked, I believe, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), the other night, that some lumber would be shipped over this railway next year. I am glad to say that I think there will be, and I hope there will be some other local business. But the hon. gentleman is certainly very unfair, when he says that this work is purely for the benefit of the owners of the railway. If I look at it aright, it is not so much for the benefit of the owners of the railway as for the benefit of the owners of the lumber. The lumber goes over the railway now, shipped to a place called Port Elgin. It is carried there by rail and made up into rafts and shipped thence by vessel. The only difference to the railway of shipping it at Cape Tormentine will be that it will have to be carried to that point instead of to Port Elgin. It is certainly conveying a very unfair impression to the House if the hon. gentleman would have members believe that it is for the special benefit of this railway in connection with the shipment of lumber that this wharf is being constructed. Now, we all know the facts in connection with the construction of these branch railway lines. We know the difficulty there is in inducing people to embark in the enterprise, and we know—I know from experience, and I think the hon. gentleman will not dispute the statement—that many of those who do embark in these enterprises do not go into them with the prospect of very large profits. I am not in any way ashamed, nor have I anything to apologize for, so far as my connection with this railway is concerned. I think it has been said in this House, I know it has been said on other occasions, that this work was built expressly for my benefit and to facilitate the shipment of lumber from mills that I was alleged to have along the line of railway, and for the benefit of other property which I owned. I have stated before, and I am glad to be able to state it again, that I do not own a mill or any other property of any sort or kind along this railway, that I derive no personal benefit from it in any shape or way other than that I received in common with

other residents of that section of the country. I may further say that I have been obliged to give a large portion of time to the affairs of this corporation, both during its construction and since it was completed, in assisting in the management and operation, and I have never received, have never asked and never expect to receive, one dollar of remuneration directly or indirectly for the time and labour I have spent in connection with this work. That may seem to the hon. gentleman or to some other hon. gentlemen in the House an extravagant statement. They may have the opinion that public men are influenced in everything they do by some selfish or mercenary motives. I am quite aware there is a great deal of selfishness in the world; but I believe it is possible for some public persons to be moved by public consideration and to devote a certain portion, at all events, of their time, and perhaps, sometimes, of their capital too, to the advancement of projects which, while they do not offer to the investor a very large return, are of great public advantage to the country in which they live. I have certainly been fortunate enough to meet with some persons of that character in my lifetime, and I think it is unfair for any hon. gentleman in this House to characterize every person who connects himself with a public work, as doing so merely from mercenary motives and with the object or hope of reaping large profits in the end. I wish to say, that so far as this wharf is concerned, there will probably be some local business done over it. Whatever local business is done over it, will be of benefit and advantage of the general public who do that business. It will not be of any special advantage to me or to the other owners of the Cape Tormentine Railway. I quite agree with the Minister of Finance, that the object in constructing this railway is to afford a means of communication at that point with Prince Edward Island. I believe that is the proper place to establish communication both in winter and summer. I would also remind the hon. gentleman, when he speaks of the Sackville and Cape Tormentine Railway as having been constructed altogether for my advantage, that there are no individuals who reap more advantage from the construction of that road, even as it is to-day, than the travelling public of Prince Edward Island who have to cross in the winter time. The hon. gentleman remembers that before that road was constructed, they were obliged to drive some thirty-five or forty miles from Au Lac or Amherst by stage, and the complaints were numerous and loud against that means of travelling, and no class of persons demanded the construction of the railway between these points more than the people in Prince Edward Island. If you will turn back to the "Hausards," you will find that not a session of Parliament had passed for ten years before this road was commenced, in which the representatives of the Island in the House did not press upon the Govern-

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).

ment to take some means to secure the construction of this line of railway. They have the benefit of travelling over it now, when they cross in the winter time. Now, I quite agree with the remarks which were made by one of the representatives, the other evening, in regard to the necessity of completing this connection with Prince Edward Island. I believe that steps should be taken at once to have the wharf at Cape Tormentine put in shape, so that it will be possible for a steamer to run across there. The principal object in the construction of this railway was to afford better means of communication with Prince Edward Island, and I will endorse any effort that may be made by the representatives of Prince Edward Island, or by anybody else, to attain that object. I cannot see that any serious blame is to be attached to the Government because this work at Cape Tormentine has not been completed as early as was desirable. The contract was let in 1886 or 1887. The first contractor failed, after some few years, and there was a considerable delay before the contract was let again. The contractor who has had it in charge, and who has at last completed it, has done his work well, I believe, and as rapidly as could reasonably be expected. The work was not completed until last fall, but it was impossible, before it was completed, to have any communication with Prince Edward Island at this point. Now that it is completed, it does appear to me that there should be no loss of time in putting the wharf at Cape Traverse in such a position that communication may be at once established. That was the policy of the Government, as settled in 1883, after the committee reported, and that policy has been followed ever since in the expenditure of these public moneys. I do not expect it is the intention of the Government to abandon that policy now; they will certainly be very censurable, if they do so. I will be glad to join with any members of the House in pressing upon the Government the importance of having these works completed, and regular communication established there as soon as possible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am utterly at a loss to understand the meaning of the first three-fourths of the hon. gentleman's speech. He led this committee to understand that I had, at some time, or in some place—and he intimated that it was this session—cast some reflection upon him for constructing the Sackville Railway. I never cast any reflections upon him for constructing the Sackville Railway. I never opposed the construction of the Sackville Railway. The point we were upon was the expenditure of certain moneys to enable the owners of the Sackville Railway to export lumber. I never questioned the hon. gentleman's enterprise; I never referred to the way the railway was built, whether he built it from Government subsidies or private subsidies, or whether he

ought to be commended, or approved, or condemned, in any sense whatever. The hon. gentleman has evolved that from his own inner consciousness, for some purpose I cannot conceive of. I will refer to the record. In answer to my question, what the Minister of Public Works wanted \$30,000 for, he replied as follows:—

The contract has been completed. The estimated cost was \$185,000. The final estimate amounts to only \$179,200. The amount already paid is \$166,000, and the balance of \$13,000 now asked for is to complete the payment to the contractor. Some additional work will have to be done, and in the main Estimates we ask for \$6,500 to complete the work and put it in order so as to bring the cars on the dock. This will be done at the beginning of the summer, and we hope that the whole wharf will be ready for navigation this season. From what we hear we expect that it will be fully utilized.

That was the first comment I interposed in the debate at all. I was anxious to see that this railway should be constructed, as it had been originally intended as one of the termini of the ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Then I asked the hon. gentleman, on the next page, whether it was simply for the purpose of enabling the owners of the Sackville Railway to export their lumber, or whether it was to be constructed as one of the termini of this ferry; and the hon. gentleman went on, as I will read to the House now, to give me to understand that it was not to be constructed as one of the termini of the ferry, that it was to be constructed simply to enable the owners of the Sackville Railway to export lumber. What did he say:

My information is that when the wharf is completed, and when the cars can come to the end of the wharf, it is intended to have large shipments of lumber from that point.

Is that not explicit? Now, let us find out what the real dispute is about. The hon. gentleman told me that \$6,500 was to be asked to put the cars to the end of the wharf to enable them to export lumber from there. Why, it is as plain as a pike-staff, as you will see from page 1341:

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we are building that wharf for the purpose of enabling the owners of the Sackville Railway to ship lumber from there. Is that it?

Mr. OUMET. No, the railway will carry lumber, and the people of New Brunswick will sell it, and both will be benefited by the road. The fact that Mr. Wood is president of that railway, is no reason why the people of New Brunswick should not have that accommodation for shipping their lumber. The ferry question is another thing. The Sackville Railway, I understand, was built with the expectation that it would give the people of Prince Edward Island the shortest and best communication with the mainland. I presume that the branch of the Island railway to Cape Traverse was built with that expectation, and the present wharf was built for the same purpose; but on account of the delay in constructing the work, there has been every year an accumulation of sand, so much so that there is hardly sufficient water for a ferry to approach the wharf. Since the work has been carried to completion, communication

has been opened with the Department of Railways, and a controversy has arisen as to the success of that ferry scheme. In that view, the Department of Public Works, having been informed by the engineers that \$30,000 would be required to construct a deep water wharf there, similar to that constructed at Cape Tormentine, with fifteen feet at low water, has decided that it would be better to make an experiment before entering upon that large expenditure; and it is the intention of my department, acting with the Department of Railways, to carry out some dredging near the wharf at Cape Traverse, in order to ascertain whether we will be justified in undertaking that further expenditure of \$30,000. I think I am perfectly justified in taking the position that before I recommend such a large expenditure, I must be assured by the Department of Railways that the expenditure will not be useless.

The hon. gentleman will see the point to which my criticism was directed. I said that the Government came to this House and asked for \$200,000 to build a railway branch in Prince Edward Island to connect with a ferry, that they expended \$178,000 or \$180,000 in building a wharf, which was to be one of the termini of the ferry; and after that expenditure had been made, the Government came to the conclusion that they were ignorant as to whether it was feasible to build a wharf on the Island side, and they decided to institute inquiries as to whether it was feasible to carry out such work. Then I ask, why should the Government spend \$6,500 to bring down cars to the end of the wharf on the New Brunswick side? My criticism was directed to that point. I did not refer, directly or indirectly, to the construction of the Sackville Railway, whether it was a laudable enterprise or not, whether it was constructed with private means, whether it received a subsidy from the Government or not, nor did I refer to the hon. member for Westmoreland, or call in question his zeal, or enterprise, or motives. The hon. gentleman has himself conjured up the whole matter. I devoted my criticism entirely to what I consider was reckless mismanagement on the part of the Public Works Department. I declared that before the Government expended \$500,000 on the construction of terminal facilities in connection with the ferry at that point, they should have ascertained whether a wharf could be constructed on the Island side, and not have come to Parliament at the tenth hour, after they had expended \$400,000, and stated that they did not know whether a wharf could be built there, although it was absolutely necessary to make the ferry scheme a success. The Minister said that \$30,000 would be required to carry out the ferry scheme, and it was necessary that he should investigate the matter and ascertain if the project was feasible. I repeat that I was calling the attention of the House to the reckless mismanagement of the department in consequence of which nearly half a million dollars had been expended on the enterprise, when the very feasibility of the work that was necessary to make it a success to the people of Prince Edward Island was left in doubt, and that Parliament should be told that after this large amount of money

had been expended in New Brunswick, the department does not yet know whether the wharf on the Island is feasible, and the people on the Island must wait till the Ides of March come before anything can be obtained for the Island. I pointed out that was the measure of justice meted out to the Island, but that \$6,500 were asked by the Minister of Railways to carry a tram down to the end of the wharf so that the railway company may be able to ship its lumber there. I therefore pointed out that Parliament never would have voted \$178,000 to build a wharf there if it had known it was only for the purpose of shipping lumber. The statement to which the hon. member for Westmoreland has referred was not my statement, although both the hon. gentleman and the Finance Minister have attempted to make it my statement. I never referred to that matter until the Minister of Public Works officially stated, or rather gave it as an excuse for expending \$6,000 or \$7,000, and if those hon. gentlemen's constituents were treated as the people of Prince Edward Island are treated year after year, they would criticise these expenditures pretty closely too. How does this matter stand now? We stand charged in the Public Accounts with an expenditure of \$200,000 in connection with the Island, and no doubt people will say, as they are accustomed to say, that the Island is always giving trouble, and, therefore, \$200,000 has been expended there. This is not true. The Government have squandered that money, and the Minister of Public Works doubts whether it is feasible to build the wharf which is necessary to carry out the ferry scheme. It is time I criticised and called public attention to this matter, and to affirm that the expenditure of \$178,000 cannot be justified on any ground whatever, except on the ground originally put forward, but now thrown aside, that it was to constitute one of the termini of the ferry to the Island.

Mr. PERRY. When any small grant is required for Prince Edward Island, the excuse is invariably made that the Government have no money. That excuse can be put forward now, as the duty on binding twine has been reduced and the cost of inspection of coal oil has been struck off, and thus there may be a deficit in the revenue. I suppose these reductions will be put forward as a reason why Prince Edward Island cannot receive any consideration in regard to grants of money for public works. I do not find fault with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) for looking after the interests of his constituents, for he is right in doing so; but when it turns to a matter of self, of putting money into his own pocket, and the hon. gentleman asks that public money be voted to help himself, I will always enter my protest against such action. What is the Minister of Public Works doing? He is having money voted to enable the owner of the Sackville Railway, who is the hon. member

for Westmoreland, to ship his lumber. That is a private road; it belongs to the hon. gentleman opposite, or to some company of which, I suppose, he is president. The Government own a railway in Prince Edward Island, to our sorrow. They have built a branch at a cost of \$200,000, and when we ask that an expenditure of \$20,000 be made to extend the Cape Traverse wharf on the Island, in order that the products of the Island may be carried to the railway terminus and shipped to New Brunswick, we are told that the Government will do nothing to aid the work, or rather we are told that they may possibly do a little dredging some time or other, not even mentioning the time. We know there is only one dredge on the Island, and it will no doubt be carried away to some point where some friends of the Government wish work done. I would not, however, recommend that any dredging be done along the wharf at Cape Traverse, because the work is built on the sand, and if a channel is dredged four or five feet deep, the whole structure will cant over and be destroyed, proving another monument to the incapacity of the present Government in carrying out public works. The Minister of Railways took a short trip to the Island not long ago, and he cancelled the appointments of half of the railway officials. To-day we are short of railway accommodation. A trip from Summerside to Charlottetown, a distance of fifty miles, and return, occupies three days. Is that the sort of accommodation in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, or the upper provinces? Certainly not, and in this respect a great wrong is done to the people of the Island. When we ask a vote of \$5,000 to rebuild the wharf at Westpoint, in the beautiful county of Prince, which I have the honour to represent, to enable small vessels to carry the Island products to Richibucto and Shediac, we are told there is no money in the Treasury. Of course the duty has been reduced on binding twine, and, therefore, there is no money in the Treasury. We are told there is going to be a falling off in the Treasury, and that, therefore, the Government has no money. That is the answer we always get in Prince Edward Island. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Marine how many hundred dollars were paid last year by the owner of that Sackville railway as wharfage at Cape Tormentine for landing lumber. He is using the wharf, his road and his own private self have the benefit of it, and I presume he is paying nothing. He has free trade down there at that wharf. He is a protectionist in this House, but when he goes home and the money comes into him, he is a free trader. As I said, it is no wonder that the Prince Edward Island Railway is not paying expenses, when ten miles of it during a large portion of the year carries no trade beyond a few small articles from Cape Traverse to the junction of the main line. At least one-third of the trade of Queen's county and one-third the trade of

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

Prince county would be done there in summer, if accommodation was provided at Cape Traverse. We find, from the report, that at the terminus of the Island Railway there is only three feet of water at low tide. We know that is not sufficient to enable a steamer to load a heavy cargo and go to Cape Tormentine. What does the Minister of Public Works propose to do to remedy this evil? He says: First, we will try an experiment, we will send a dredge there and have some digging done. But where is he going to get the dredge? He has only one small dredge for the whole province of Prince Edward Island, and it has more to do outside of Cape Traverse altogether than it can do for the next fifteen or twenty years. I suppose that he will next propose to build another dredge, but the policy of procrastination will be introduced into that matter too, and it will be postponed year after year. We are told that the people of Prince Edward Island have no reason to complain. My friend the senior member for Cape Breton had the impudence to tell us the other day that we had so much accommodation for trade in Prince Edward Island that every table in Ottawa had Prince Edward Island potatoes on it. I defy the hon. gentleman to show me one Prince Edward Island potato. I heard a gentleman offer in Ottawa, the other day, a one dollar bill if he could find one Island potato in all Ottawa. Now, why is that? It is not because we have not the potatoes down there, nor because the people of Ottawa are not able to pay for them, but it is because we have no facilities for bringing them here. We are shut out from the Dominion of Canada. I say that the Government is unpatriotic in their treatment of Prince Edward Island, and that it is trying, in every way, to starve out the people of that province. As I said before, I do not blame the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) for looking after the interests of his constituents, but I want the House to remember that if you take the whole shore along there down to Pictou, you will find it lined with gold pieces—money expended extravagantly by the Government. The county of Westmoreland is held for the Government by extravagant expenditure of money, and the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou are held by the Government by lavish expenditure of money, or money guaranteed by the Government. What is the Chignecto Ship Railway got up for, if it is not for the purpose of holding the counties of Pictou, Colchester and Cumberland for the Tories. We know the members of these counties are here to support the Government at all hazards. No wonder the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) supports the Government, because he gets very good feed at the public crib. He recommends the Government to persist in a policy of extravagance. As far as the Sackville Railway is concerned, it is all very well, because he is principally and selfishly engaged in that en-

terprise. I understand that he got a large amount of money as subsidy from the Dominion Government, and he may have had a subsidy from the Local Government as well. I presume the railway has cost him very little; perhaps the whole of the stock he put in may amount to about 15 per cent of the capital, but I do not know. But he has the full benefit of the railway, and I would not begrudge it to him if he did not get it at the expense of the people of Prince Edward Island. The Government have refused to encourage navigation there, and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was right in stating that the wharf was for the benefit of the owners of the railway to run their cars on it, and not for the benefit of the people generally. Of course, if the Government persists in carrying out that policy they can do it; they have majority enough to do anything, except, perhaps, to alter the seasons of the year. I suppose they feel that Prince county sends two members to oppose the Government in this House, and they say: We will make the people of that county have a little more sense and return Tories here. Well, Sir, if they wait for Prince county to send Tories here, they will wait until they have hair on their teeth, and that will be a long time. The people of Prince county have too much sense to send Tories here. I am sorry to say that the people in the eastern end of the province did support the Government, and I regret that they have fallen amongst thieves. I had an idea, at one time, that the Government were going to be patriotic enough to extend that work at Cape Traverse. They are well aware that a meeting called by Conservatives and attended by both Conservatives and Liberals, at which I had the pleasure to attend, sent a respectable petition, numerously signed, to the department, asking that this work should be done. What was the answer given to that? The people of Prince Edward Island asked for bread and they were given a stone. The Minister said that the Government would dredge alongside the wharf, but he did not say what year he would do so, whether he would do it this year, or the next year, or when. If the bottom had been dug, five or six feet from the surface, then it might be all right to dredge four or five feet, but where is the engineer in the world that would recommend dredging alongside of a wooden wharf, built on the surface of the sand? Is it reasonable, is it practicable? Is it common sense? I am sure it is not. I am sure that the Minister of Public Works will not get one of his engineers to recommend that. The only object of it is to throw dust into the eyes of the people of Prince Edward Island. Where there is a strong tide and floating ice and drifting sand, is no place to build a breakwater. We know very well that structures built on sand are always on the surface unsafe; and that being the case, all the hon. gentleman's engineering, in order to provide

facilities there for shipping, will be of no service. He feels bound to attend to the wharf at Cape Tormentine in the interest of the railway owned by my hon. friend from Westmoreland; but he says to the people of Prince Edward Island: You may starve; we are doing very well here, making a good traffic in lumber which is our staple export, but you can keep your horses, your sheep, your potatoes and your other products at home. That is the policy of the hon. member for Westmoreland. I am sorry to find that he is so unneighbourly. When the work was going on at Cape Tormentine, I had hoped that that was meant to be one terminus and Cape Traverse the other; I had hoped to see steamers running across; but I have not yet seen them. Sir, we are humbugged on the Island every year. We have sometimes been as long as four days without receiving a mail. But it seems that that does not signify a button. The Government are quite satisfied that we should be punished. They attempt to lead the world to believe that the people of Prince Edward Island do not pay their share of the duties. They got the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), in one of his moments of weakness, to tell this House that Prince Edward Island paid in duties only \$272,000 in the year, when the fact is that we actually paid nearly \$1,000,000. And what do we get in return? A trifle over \$600,000 a year. Sir, I contend that the Government of Canada owe us the balance. I will explain why we are not represented as paying our full share of the revenue of this country. We know that Montreal is credited with paying 100 per cent more duty than the great city of Toronto, and why? Because the importations are made at Montreal. In the same way our importations are made elsewhere, but the duties are paid by the hard-working consumers of Prince Edward Island. Now, I do not know whether I can expect much in the shape of public grants from the Government. The hon. Minister of Public Works has not decided whether or not he will rebuild the wharf at the West Point. He is under the impression that the people there can travel fifteen or twenty miles and haul their produce, and he has not yet made up his mind whether or not he will grant us \$6,000 or \$7,000 to build the wharf. The old wharf was built by the Local Government a quarter of a century ago, and the people of Canada took it from the Island under the solemn pledge that they would keep it in repair, as they did all the other piers and breakwaters on the Island; but they have allowed that wharf to break up. They have not spent a single dollar upon it. The same is the case with the Cape Traverse wharf. The people of Prince Edward Island built a wharf at that point because it was a necessity. The Government of Canada came in and took that wharf, and entered into a solemn compact to keep it in repair; but I

Mr. PERRY.

suppose they would be ashamed to state how much they have spent upon that wharf since they got it. There is the same story everywhere. There is the Cascumpec harbour, on which they spent about \$18,000 to blast rocks, but the rocks have been allowed to remain on the bottom, so that there is less water there than there was before. They sent a dredge which worked two days very well, but most of the rocks are still there, and I suppose will be left until there is a change in the Government of this country, and the sooner that change comes the better for the people of Prince Edward Island, and specially for my constituents, because then they may expect to get justice. Now, I do not know what the policy of the Minister of Public Works is with reference to that harbour. It is one of the finest harbours on the Island, but the water is now so low that there is only nine feet at low tide; and although petitions and requests have been sent to the Government for the improvement of that harbour, still nothing is done. The harbour of Malpeque, if not the best harbour on the north side, is the second best, but it is almost destroyed by a bar at the mouth. One vessel, loaded with oats for the home market, because we have no other market for a great many of our products, got aground on that bar, and what would have been the result if a storm came on and that vessel had been lost? It might have cost the owner thousands of dollars. The members of the Government have their salaries assured; but the poor man who has to depend on his vessel has to risk his property because of the neglect of the Government to do their duty. When they are told that a bar is there, which might be removed in a week or a fortnight if they would send a dredge to do the work, still they do nothing. It is a great pity that Prince Edward Island ever came into Confederation; it would have been better off if it had remained as it was.

Mr. WELSH. I compliment the hon. member for Westmoreland on his enterprise in building that railway. It has been of great use and benefit to the travelling community in the winter and to the people of New Brunswick living along that line. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman asked anything from the Government to help in that enterprise any more than any other railway company. The Government built a wharf at Cape Tormentine and a breakwater, and my recollection is that when that breakwater was built, it was to be the terminus of the ferry. The Government also entertained that idea, because only two years ago they brought down in the Estimates a sum of \$40,000 to build public works at Cape Traverse, and they withdrew that and I compliment the Minister of Public Works for stating that he is going to make inquiry before asking for a sum of money to carry on that work. It is a matter which certainly requires looking after, because the wharf at

Cape Traverse is built on sand and has been extended and extended, but, as fast as it is extended, the harbour fills up again. It is useless to go on spending money dredging in sand, for, as fast as you dredge, the harbour fills up again. I think the Minister of Public Works is right. I think this should have been done at the time the breakwater at Cape Tormentine was commenced. The Minister of Public Works of that day should have attended to it then and done as the present Minister intends to do. With regard to summer navigation across there, to which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) referred, no doubt, in fine weather it will be a very nice little ferry and very convenient for the travelling community; but I know, from personal experience, that there is not a more dangerous piece of navigation in the Straits of Northumberland than at Cape Tormentine, where this pier is built. It is surrounded by a reef of rocks, except at one place which is very narrow. I have led plenty of ships through there and know all about it, and I know it is very difficult to navigate. And as for winter navigation, Cape Tormentine pier is altogether out of the question. I have listened with much attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and think he put the matter very fairly. I also think that he removed the misunderstanding in this connection. All I ask is that the Government should pay a little more attention to the wants of Prince Edward Island. I feel sick almost of getting up and bringing forward, time and time again, our needs. I have been urging our claims ever since I have had a seat on the floor of this House. I have had promises, by word of mouth, from the late Minister of Public Works, but his promises were like pie-crust, and I think he is now eating the reward of false promises.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. members for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and Prince (Mr. Perry). The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said he could not understand my object in referring to my connection with this Cape Tormentine Railway, which occupied some three-quarters of the time I used in addressing the House. I have since turned up "Hansard." What I complained of was the unfair way in which the hon. gentleman, the other day, and to-day as well, placed this matter before the House. Now, he says he did not impute any wrong motives to me. But I find in "Hansard," on page 1344, that he said:

The Government built a wharf at a cost of \$179,000, which cannot be justified in this House or the country, on any ground except that the Government were obliged to build it in order to carry out the terms of Union.

That is quite correct; but he goes on to say:

Now it appears that the whole structure was built as a feeder to the Sackville Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is the Minister's statement.

Mr. OUMET. I never said that.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I read the debate all through and cannot see anything whatever to justify that statement. The hon. gentleman ought to know himself, that the Sackville Railway cannot derive any special advantage from the construction of this wharf, except through any traffic that may come over from Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, a little further down, said:

The department has thrown away \$400,000—\$200,000 of which will benefit specially the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), who is largely the owner of the Sackville road, and it appears to me, from what the Minister says to-night, that he recognizes that fact.

The hon. gentleman thus representing that the construction of this work was for the benefit of myself or the railway with which I am connected. I endeavoured to show, a little while ago, that there is no way in which I am specially interested personally, in which even the Sackville road is specially benefited by the construction of this work. The work is only justifiable, as the Minister of Finance has said, as a means of communication with Prince Edward Island. Yet, notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman afterwards said that this \$6,500, which is the item we are considering, is for the special benefit of a railway, and to enable the owners of that railway to export their lumber. I explained, a little while ago, that neither I personally nor the owners of the railway have any lumber to export. There will probably be some lumber exported over that wharf. I know there will, but it is owned principally by persons not connected with the railway, and it is those persons who will get the benefit, if any there is, from shipping at that wharf. The railway does not get any special benefit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They get their freight.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). They get their freight now on all the lumber. It is shipped over the railway, either to Sackville wharf or to Port Elgin, and the railway gets the freight.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Could the lumber be carried to the terminus there, Cape Tormentine wharf, if the wharf were not there?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Certainly not, but it would be carried over the railway to other points. If not carried to Cape Tormentine, it would be taken to Sackville wharf or Port Elgin, and the railway would get freight in any case. The railway gets freight on all this lumber in any case, whether this wharf is built or not. And the only benefit in shipping by Cape Tormentine goes to the owners of the lumber, and I will point out how that advantage comes. The

principal part of this lumber is shipped now to Port Elgin. It is taken there on the railway and it is then put into rafts to be taken off to be loaded on board the vessels which can only be done out in the open bay. This, we know, to a certain extent, destroys the value of the lumber. If it is shipped to Cape Tormentine it can be shipped dry, and if the hon. gentleman's colleague was here, he would bear me out in saying that lumber will be worth from five to ten shillings a standard more shipped dry than when it is shipped in rafts in the open bay. The advantage, therefore, will be to the manufacturers, owners and shippers of the lumber and not to the railway. This statement of the Minister is the only statement on which the hon. gentleman has based his tirade of abuse against the member for Westmoreland.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was no tirade of abuse.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). And, notwithstanding the explanation made, the hon. gentleman, in his second speech, repeated that this \$6,500, the vote we are considering, is for the special benefit of the railway, and to enable the railway to export their lumber. And the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry), who followed him, used these words—I took them down: “The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) asks public money, \$6,500, to help him to ship his lumber,” and a number of other expressions to the same purpose. I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot discuss this matter without taking advantage of it either to make political capital for himself or to injure those who happen to be opposed to him. I think, when he gets upon his feet, addressing the House, he allows his zeal for the interest of his party to lead him into these very extravagant and unreasonable statements. I quite agree with everything the last speaker said in reference to the necessity for these public works being completed, so that regular communication can be maintained. The hon. gentleman reminded me, further, of the construction of the wharf at the Sackville end, which was mentioned in a remark which came out incidentally. The railway company have a wharf at Sackville, on the Sackville River, and never received or asked for or expected to receive a dollar of public money to assist in the construction of this wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not quote that.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I have never asked a dollar for the construction of this wharf so far as the interest of the railway was concerned. As the hon. gentleman knows, this policy was adopted as a result of the report of the committee appointed in 1883 to look into this whole subject. That committee reported strongly in favour of this means of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and recommended the Government to undertake these different public works and carry them out,

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

in order that this communication might be established. That is the policy which the Government has pursued ever since: that is the policy which, so far as I know, they still favour, and which they intend, as soon as practicable, to complete. What I protest against is the unfair way in which the hon. gentleman proceeds, in presenting this matter to the House, to lead the House and the country to suppose that the Government are making these expenditures, in some way or other, for the benefit of the member for Westmoreland and the Cape Tormentine Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is both ungenerous and unjust. He has deliberately attempted to lead the House to believe that I made statements in this House, when he knew I was merely repeating the statements of the Minister of Public Works. I knew nothing, when I spoke in this House, about the arrangements made to extend the railway to the end of the wharf. I did not refer to it directly or indirectly.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Let me correct the hon. gentleman. This vote is not to extend the railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me repeat what the hon. the Minister of Public Works said. Here is his explanation as to what this \$13,000 was required for:

The amount already paid is \$166,000 and the balance of \$13,000 now asked for is to complete the payment to the contractor. Some additional work will have to be done, and in the main Estimates, we ask for \$6,500 to complete the work and put it in order so as to bring the cars on the dock.

The hon. gentleman understands that. Then he went on:

My information is that when the wharf is completed, and when the cars can come to the end of the wharf, it is intended to have large shipments of lumber from that point.

The statement may be true or may be false, but the Minister of Public Works, in answer to my statement, said this money was being asked to enable the Government to bring the cars down to the end of the wharf, and, when asked what the cars were going to do, he said it was expected that large shipments would be made of lumber carried over the hon. gentleman's railway. And he further told me that the departmental reports showed that a large portion of the wharf had been constructed after the department knew that the complementary wharf on the other side could not be built, and, at the present time, he was not able to say whether that wharf on the Prince Edward Island side to enable the ferry to run would ever be built, that he would consult with the other departments and they would have another survey made; but that this wharf had only one present purpose and object, and that was the shipping of lumber and other material coming down the hon. gentleman's road. I think I

was justified in coming to the only conclusion that any one could come to, that this money we are asked to vote was merely to run the hon. gentleman's road to the end of the wharf, in order to facilitate the export of lumber and other material. What else is it for? He speaks of my having vented a tirade of abuse against himself. It is very generous for him to attempt to draw the fire of the Opposition from the Government, but this "abuse"—criticism would be the fair word—was directed against the department which improvidently and recklessly has spent \$400,000 to accomplish an object which could not be accomplished unless the wharf could be built on the other side, and they never took the means of ascertaining the facts in that respect, but as at present advised, they think it cannot. The hon. gentleman thinks I ought to sit quietly by, with a knowledge of these facts, and not criticise the Government, and this notwithstanding that I have been trying, year after year, to have expenditures made for Wood Island breakwater, the Rustico breakwater and others, and could not get it done. But the hon. gentleman gets anything he wants in Westmoreland, and he says to me: You should be satisfied; I am very comfortable; my wharfs and breakwaters are all built; I can get anything I want; you ought to be satisfied. The hon. gentleman knows that is an undignified position for him to take, coming, as he does, from the Maritime provinces. If he could get outside his party, he would like to assist me at times in pressing the necessity for the expenditure of some money in the county I represent, even though it is an Opposition county. He knows that we do not clamour to have works carried on merely to have public money spent in our counties, but that the works are necessary. I never asked the department for the expenditure of a dollar that the public interest did not even absolutely require. I did not go round the halls of the different public buildings in Ottawa seeking privately to influence the public men in the expenditure of public money. I made my demands, such as they were, here in this House. I have made them for the last ten or twelve years, and I have got what my hon. friend told you to-day, promises which were false, and which were not carried out. The record of the department, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, has been a disgraceful record. I stated that before, and I repeat it again. I told the hon. gentleman, the present incumbent, that I made no complaint against him, because he was new in the department, and I would not judge him until he had had fair-play. I told him I expected to get fair-play, and I reserved my judgment upon him and his department, while he presided over it, until I saw whether he was going to act fairly. But the hon. gentleman comes down now and talks about my criticism as a tirade of abuse. I think my criticism is amply justified, such as it was.

and I say that a department which spent \$400,000 in carrying out a public work and having neglected to do that which was absolutely necessary to make the public work of any benefit, neglected to ascertain whether a link could be built until that \$400,000 was spent—I say that the department is blamable, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know that I am right in my criticism. The hon. gentleman sees it, and ought to have the justice to say so, that I based my criticism concerning this wharf upon the statement of the Minister himself, and it was fully and amply justified by the quotation I have just read.

Mr. CASEY. This item would seem at first glance to be one concerning only the neighbouring provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; but, during the course of the debate, it has assumed a different character. It appears very clear that there has been a large and utterly unjustifiable expenditure of public money in this case; it appears that between \$450,000 and \$500,000 have been expended under false pretences by the Government in connection with this supposed ferry from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse. We were told at the time this vote was first proposed, and we have been told to-day by the late Minister of Public Works, that this vote was asked, primarily, for the purpose of completing communication with the Island, and having a ferry across from one harbour to the other. The House voted the money on that ground. We are told now that the ferry idea, if not abandoned altogether, is indefinitely postponed; I say, therefore, that the Government which asked us to vote this money, and which has spent this money under the pretense of building a ferry from Cape Tormentine to the Island, has simply defrauded the country of that much money. As to whether the ferry is still in view, we are left in doubt. The hon. Minister of Public Works gave, on Friday week, rather a confused account of his intentions in that respect. He said:

I was not Minister of Public Works when this particular work was undertaken, and I cannot question the correctness of the assertion of the hon. gentleman. But I may tell him from what I know—

I will call the special attention of the Minister of Public Works to the report in the "Hansard," and ask him to say if he has been correctly reported, because he appears to contradict himself directly in his remarks:

—But I may tell him from what I know and what I saw, that this wharf has been built exclusively in order to serve as a ferry accommodation with Cape Traverse. It is not an efficient harbour, true enough, but it is large enough for the ships that go there; I do not know how many there are. If it has been built only to serve for a ferry, I do not think it was necessary to build it in its present shape.

Now, that is a wonderful delivery for a Minister of Public Works. He sets out with the assertion that, so far as he knows, this

work was built exclusively for the purpose of a ferry; he winds up with the statement that if it was built for a ferry he does not see any reason why it was built in the way it has been built. He does not know, therefore, whether it is meant for a ferry or not. He says he does not know how much traffic there is.

From what I saw, this wharf has been built exclusively in order to serve as a ferry accommodation.

In two sentences afterwards, he says :

If it has been built only to serve for a ferry; I do not think it was necessary to build it in its present shape.

Two of his sentences directly contradict each other. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying, as he did, that he did not know much about this work.

Mr. OUMET. What you don't know, also, will make a big amount.

Mr. CASEY. I think if what I don't know was added to what the Minister does know, he would be a fairly intelligent Minister of Public Works. But it is quite certain that in regard to this ferry he is not informed, and it is quite certain that the work which has been carried on upon this wharf has been a waste of public money. In the first place, the Minister told us to-day that the sea-worm had eaten up all the timber in fifteen months.

Mr. OUMET. They did not eat it all up.

Mr. CASEY. There was a waste of public money, of course, in the first place, in building one end of the ferry before you knew whether you could have the other. That has been sufficiently pointed out already. Then there was a waste in building the wharf of wood which was not creosoted, so that as any person connected with such works must have known, the sea-worm would utterly destroy it in a very short time, and now it has been rebuilt. Then we come down to the connection of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and his railway with this question. The Minister distinctly stated that \$6,500 was required to get the Sackville and Cape Tormentine Railway down to the wharf; but, says the hon. member for Westmoreland, that does not concern us at all; the railway won't make anything more out of this. If they did not ship the lumber here, they would ship it from Sackville or Port Elgin, and they would have to raft it out into the bay, haul it out of the water and put it on the ship, and it is a great deal better to be able to ship it dry. But still, says the member for Westmoreland, the railway does not make any money from having improved terminal facilities. Mr. Chairman, I think even the hon. member himself must see how absurd such a statement is.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I did not make any such statement at all.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. CASEY. I took down the hon. gentleman's words, and if he will refer to the notes of the "Hansard" reporters he will find that he said that if they did not take lumber at this point they would take it at Sackville or somewhere else. At this other point it could not be loaded dry, while if they had this Cape Tormentine wharf the lumber could be loaded dry, and that was a great advantage.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I said a great advantage to the shipper; not to the railway.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman seems to think the interest of the shipper and the interest of the railway can be separated in this matter.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I stated distinctly that they were entirely separate.

Mr. CASEY. Of course people who send lumber over the railway do not pay for the freight, as the railway has no interest in the quantity shipped.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The lumber has to be shipped over the railway.

Mr. CASEY. To some extent, of course.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). All the lumber in that section has to be shipped over the railway.

Mr. CASEY. All the lumber that has been cut hitherto has been so shipped. It is childish, however, to suppose that no more lumber will be shipped, that the traffic on the railway will not be increased with improved terminal facilities. Of course, this expenditure is intended to increase it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why is an expenditure of \$13,000 proposed, if it is not to afford additional facilities for shipping lumber?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). It will enable the shipper to get a better price. Is not that a motive for constructing the works?

Mr. CASEY. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends to lower the rates of freight in consequence of the additional terminal facilities furnished at the country's expense or not. If such is his intention, there may be some force in his remarks. Otherwise the shipper will get no better price. But, of course, there will be more lumber to carry and the railway company will make additional profit. The hon. member for Westmoreland is an exceedingly disinterested man, according to his own statement. He says he expects to get no benefit from the work any more than anybody else along the line, that he expects no payment and has received no payment from the railway. I wish we could import a few such capitalists into Ontario, men who will invest tens of thousands of dollars and give their time for weeks and months and exercise the influence they possess with the Government, without expecting any

profit. I am sure the electors of Westmoreland must feel deeply grateful to the hon. gentleman who spends his time and uses his influence without expecting any profit. The statement is too thin. Nobody believes that such men exist. No doubt the hon. gentleman is a good business man, and is able to make a fair profit out of every business transaction, and no doubt he will do so in the present case. He is perfectly right to do so as long as he accomplishes it by fair means; but when he makes a profit out of public expenditure, I do not think those are fair means. During the last ten years four or five times as much public money has been expended in the county of Westmoreland as in the whole of Prince Edward Island. Is that fact due to the influence of the hon. gentleman, or to the political complexion of the electors, and is the inadequate provision made for Prince Edward Island due to the fact that the Islanders, like the people of a tight little Island across the sea, are inclined to be free traders and send members of that stripe to Parliament? I can see no other reason for Prince Edward Island being neglected. The whole story reminds me of an anecdote which a friend of mine heard when travelling on the Intercolonial Railway. Passing a certain station, which was on one side of a deep inlet of the sea, he noticed a branch line which appeared to go round an inlet, and my friend asked an ex-member of this House, beside whom he was sitting, how large a place is that to which the road runs. The answer was: "It has 400 or 500 people." The question was put: "Is there any special trade there?" and the answer came: "They do a little fishing; but there is no particular trade." Then again the question was put: "But what is the railway going to carry?" The answer was: "It is going to carry the county." I think that is the case in regard to the wharf at Cape Tormentine and the extension of the railway to that point—it is intended to carry the county, more than to carry lumber or anything else.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have taken considerable interest in this discussion, and it is quite clear there has been a very large amount of money uselessly and extravagantly expended on this wharf. When the proposition for the construction of the wharf was first made the estimated cost was placed considerably below the amount already expended. The Minister of Public Works intimated, uncautiously perhaps, that this year it was intended to lay the tracks down to the wharf to facilitate the shipment of lumber. No doubt he stated what was true; but finding it was an imprudent observation on his part he is now rather disposed to withdraw it. At the inception of the scheme, no doubt it was intended to facilitate the transport of lumber over the railway. We will not, however, charge the Minister in question with this expenditure; he has, however, been

guilty of sins of omission as well as of commission. It is obvious that from the commencement a mistake was made, because if it was intended to utilize the wharf for a ferry to the Island, proper steps would have been taken to see that there was a convenient place at which to erect a pier on the other side. This action is similar to that of a man who, desiring to build a house, selects a foundation on one side and commences to build without finding a foundation on the other side. The Dominion have erected a wharf at a cost of \$200,000, and yet the Minister confesses that in order to utilize this wharf it is necessary to have another wharf erected on the other side; but no successful effort has been made to carry out the work. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) has expressed the opinion that the proposed location for this pier is a dangerous one for vessels at certain seasons, and that vessels could only approach it in calm weather. This appears to have been a useless and improvident expenditure from the beginning to the end. Any impartial person listening to this discussion can come to no other conclusion than this as well as a great many other public works have been constructed, not in the interests of the country, not for the purposes of developing trade, not to promote the general good, but for the purpose simply of carrying a particular county. We have the post office at St. Henri, and fifty or sixty other post offices erected, not necessary to accommodate the interests of the public service, but for political purposes. I have not the slightest doubt that this wharf is on a par with those. I hope that the present Minister of Public Works, when he gets clear of these ridiculously extravagant expenditures of the past will turn over a new leaf. I hope he will not follow in the footsteps of his predecessors and bring enormous unnecessary expenditures on the country for public works which are monuments of disgrace to those who projected them.

Mr. YEO. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing this vote. We know that a large amount of money has been expended on this work, and if this comparatively small sum is required to repair the damage done at Cape Tormentine, of course it is very necessary. I had always understood, until the discussion which took place the other evening, that the principal object of constructing a wharf at Cape Tormentine was to facilitate the traffic between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. But I was astonished to hear the Minister of Public Works say the other evening that one of the principal objects was for the shipping of lumber. I am glad to hear from the present Minister of Public Works, as well as from his predecessor, that he has changed his opinion, and that he now says the object was to facilitate communication between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. We know that

a branch line is constructed from the Prince Edward Island Railway main line to Cape Traverse, and we also know that there is a wharf at Cape Traverse which is useless, because it is sanded up so that a vessel of very light draft of water cannot get near it. We see that on the New Brunswick side the wharf is completed. That certainly is a much more extensive work than would be required to be built on the Island side, and it is somewhat strange that the Department of Public Works should make such a large expenditure on the New Brunswick side without providing for corresponding wharf accommodation on the Prince Edward Island side. The Minister of Public Works has not told us yet if it is his intention to immediately construct the harbour at Cape Traverse. He said that the idea was to dredge the wharf at Cape Traverse, but I understood from him that the dredge was to be employed during the principal part of the season in King's county, on the eastern end of Prince Edward Island. I think the Minister should tell the committee if he intends doing something during the present season for Cape Traverse. I take it that no one knows better than the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) that the wharf at Cape Tormentine will be comparatively useless unless either a wharf is constructed at Cape Traverse, if such a thing is possible, or a breakwater erected at the entrance of the harbour to prevent sand accumulating. I am somewhat surprised that a large expenditure should take place on the New Brunswick side before the Government had ascertained whether it is possible to make a harbour on the other side. I find that yearly large amounts of money are paid out to construct artificial harbours in different parts of the Dominion, while where there are natural harbours they are being neglected. As my hon. colleague has pointed out, at Cascumpec, on the north side of the Island where there is a natural harbour, a good deal of money has been expended in blasting and dredging it, but the rock which has been blasted is allowed to remain at the bottom, and no doubt, sand has accumulated during the last two years while nothing has been done on the work. Then again, at Malpeque, the best harbour on the north side of Prince Edward Island, a sand bank has formed in mid-channel, at the entrance of the harbour, which will destroy it if not removed. The sand bank was not discovered until last season, but if it is allowed to remain there undisturbed, it will accumulate until the whole entrance of the harbour will be filled up. This is a matter which ought to be attended to by the Government at once, and I hope that during the coming season some action will be taken by either of the Departments of Marine or Public Works. The Minister of Public Works stated that this wharf at Cape Traverse was sanded up, and I am sorry to say such is the case with nearly all the wharfs we have at present in the

province. A large amount of money has been expended on the breakwater at Malpeque, but it is sanded around and almost useless now. There is another very good Government wharf at Victoria West, Prince county, but until some dredging is done it is entirely worthless. My hon. colleague has referred to the wharf at West Point, which is as necessary to the people of the western end of Prince county as any work could be, but that is also useless, because from year to year it has been neglected. I cannot find much fault with the present Minister of Public Works, because he has not been long in office, but I would remind him that the people in the neighbourhood of these wharfs are placed at a great disadvantage, so much so, that many of them have come to me and stated if the Government did not give them facilities for shipping they could not remain there. We know that Prince Edward Island is an agricultural country largely, and the shipping of produce is done in the fall of the year when the roads are generally very bad, and it is quite an object with them to have a shipping place within a mile or two of their farms, rather than to have to cart their produce fifteen miles or so. If they have to haul their produce long distances, they can derive no remuneration from it, and the consequence is that many of them have told me they will have to leave their farms if facilities for shipping are not provided. So far as the expenditure of public money is concerned, Prince Edward Island has been shamefully used. It has been stated by other gentlemen that this perhaps arises from the fact of the province sending members opposed to the Government. In my recollection Prince Edward Island has sent representatives who nearly all supported the Government, but I do not think we fared much better then. It may be the case in other provinces that members who support the Government can get more money for their counties than members opposed to it, but in the case of Prince Edward Island it does not seem to make any difference. We have to pay our share towards all the public expenditures on the mainland and we receive nothing in return. I trust that this state of things will not be allowed to continue, but that the hon. Minister of Public Works will pay some little attention to the interests of Prince Edward Island, and give us what we are entitled to. I know that very largely signed petitions have been sent to him asking for immediate attention to the requirements of Cape Traverse harbour, and I trust that he will give the matter his immediate attention. The wharf at Cape Tormentine, on which so large an amount of money has been expended, will be almost useless unless a harbour is made on the Prince Edward Island side.

Mr. OUMET. In justice to my predecessor and to the department, I beg to say a few

words in explanation, and to give a summary of the history of this undertaking. In 1883, in response to numerous petitions which had been sent by the residents of Prince Edward Island, a committee was appointed by this House to inquire into the possibility of establishing steam communication between the Island and the mainland. The committee came to the conclusion that the best points for the ferry were Cape Tormentine on the one side and Cape Traverse on the other. In accordance with the report of the committee, the Minister of Public Works ordered surveys to be made, and they were made with very great care. Three or four different places were surveyed by the engineers of the department, their reports were sent in, and finally the chief engineer of the department made a report recommending Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse as the two termini of the crossing. In 1886, the first vote was asked and was obtained from this House, and at the time, I see by "Hansard," a good deal of discussion took place. Cape Tormentine, I understand, was not especially objected to, but my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Welsh) was opposed to the selection of Cape Traverse, as he is to-day. Perhaps he was right, but the reports of the engineers were there, and the Minister of Public Works was bound to act upon the recommendation of the people and of the engineers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think my colleague pointed out at the time the danger to navigation of building the wharf near the rocks on the Cape Tormentine side.

Mr. QUIMET. Yes; I see he protested against it. Well, I may tell the committee that this expenditure was not undertaken either to benefit the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) or any county on the mainland. It was undertaken solely for the purpose of satisfying the people of Prince Edward Island in providing what they considered had been promised them in the way of steam communication between the Island and the mainland. The place of crossing having been decided upon, a branch railway was built to Cape Traverse wharf. Unfortunately, the contract for Cape Tormentine wharf was given in 1886 to contractors who failed two years afterwards, I think—Messrs. Strachan & Bethune. There was, consequently, a long delay before a settlement could be arrived at with these gentlemen, and new tenders were called for, and a new contract made. I think the present contractors were greatly delayed during one season by storms. These are the reasons why this steam communication has not been established at an earlier day. Now, this wharf is going to be completed. Perhaps I made a mistake the other day, or I did not express myself so fully as to satisfy my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). Although he has read what I said, my limited comprehension does not lead me to believe

yet that he has been fair in his construction of what I said, and in the criticism that he has made. However, I am able to stand it. I said at the time that the contract for the wharf was completed, and I was asking \$13,000 to pay the balance of the contract. Then I said that in order to put the wharf into proper condition, we should have to make some repairs. Some of the timber had been eaten by the teredo; these repairs are to be made with creosoted timber, so as to last as long as possible. I said that it was necessary to put the wharf in such a condition that the cars could be brought on to it, so as to facilitate the transfer of passengers as well as baggage and freight from the wharf to the ferry. That is what I said. I never said that we were building that wharf in order to enable the people of the New Brunswick Railway to ship their timber from there. I said that in order to make Cape Traverse wharf perfectly suitable for the traffic we should have to build an addition on to the wharf, and that addition I said would cost \$30,000; and the department hesitated, because when we called upon the Department of Railways to take up that work, which properly belongs to that department, we were given the answer that the communication would not perhaps be successful, or as successful as we expected from the amount that had been expended there. Then I came to the conclusion that it would be useless for the Department of Public Works to go to the expense of another \$30,000 before we could ascertain whether or not the ferry would be a commercial success, whether the people of the Island would be satisfied with it, and whether we should get a return for the expenditure. This is the position I took, and I think it is a very reasonable one. I said that we were going to dredge an approach to Cape Traverse wharf, sufficient to allow a ferry to be placed there, and if it is a success we shall have proper accommodation built there next year in addition to the wharf at Cape Traverse. The hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. Perry) then got up very excitedly and said: That is the way the Department of Public Works is spending the money! They have spent \$180,000, and he even went as far as \$400,000, and now the Minister comes down, and says that perhaps that work will not be very useful. It was then I said that after all this would be used as a harbour of refuge, and as a place where lumber could be shipped. I meant Cape Tormentine. That is true, and I will again remind the committee that it is unfair to put the blame on the department or the Minister at the head of it, since every precaution was taken at the time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the engineer that made the report on the Cape Traverse wharf? I would like to see that report.

Mr. QUIMET. I see here an answer by the Minister of Public Works, in answer to

the hon. gentleman, that he would have a report of the engineer the next day. I suppose that report was placed on the Table, and I do not see that it was ever alleged that the construction of the wharf and the location had not been recommended by the engineer of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The engineer who was responsible for the location and construction ought to be very severely reprimanded.

Mr. OUMET. For the edification of the hon. gentleman, I would say that some day I shall have a careful study made of the works done in the time of the greatest Minister of Public Works we ever had, in the estimation, of course, of the hon. gentleman, and we shall see that a great many of these public works, on which large amounts of money have been spent in different parts of the country, have been found to be unnecessary, and most of the money wasted. Was that the fault of the Minister at the time? It may have been the fault of the engineer or of those who make representations, as, no doubt, were made at the time, that these places were the best, and no doubt it was represented that these were the best places to have communication with the Island, namely, Capes Traverse and Tormentine. If a careful study were made, the hon. gentleman would be more careful not to attack my predecessor, and might find it a pretty difficult task to justify a good deal of the expenditure made by other people who were not Conservatives.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman has just advanced a new doctrine. We have seen another effort made by the Government a short time ago to escape responsibility, on the ground that they were judges. Now we have the Minister of Public Works saying that this vast expenditure of \$400,000 was made on advice of officers of the department, and that it is those officers who are responsible. The hon. gentleman referred to a great Minister of Public Works, and I presume he meant Mr. Mackenzie, but Mr. Mackenzie never dreamt of sheltering himself behind his officers.

Mr. OUMET. Does the hon. gentleman think that Mr. Mackenzie would have held himself responsible for errors made in soundings and surveys? We are responsible for the policy, but not for the mechanical work.

Mr. MULLOCK. I understand the hon. gentlemen to say that this whole expenditure was based upon the erroneous advice of departmental officers, and that if the Government had known as much then as they do now, that expenditure would never have been incurred.

Mr. OUMET. I never said so. I said we are going to make the experiment.

Mr. MULLOCK. You admitted there was a great mistake.

Mr. OUMET.

Mr. OUMET. No; I never admitted that.

Mr. MULLOCK. Well, that the officers made a great mistake.

Mr. OUMET. I never admitted that either.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman does not say that he himself would have advised the work to be done there. On the contrary, he told the committee that work was entered upon on the advice of his officer.

Mr. OUMET. I never said that.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is the drift of your whole argument.

Mr. OUMET. No.

Mr. MULLOCK. You are not entitled to spend money in that case unless the expenditure is shown to be useful. The first step is to show that it will be useful, but hon. gentlemen have a new doctrine, and they are not going to spend money unless it is found out to be useless.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the hon. gentleman going to put in the place of those wooden piles which are found not to last?

Mr. OUMET. We will put in creosoted timber.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the two inspectors employed at the same time?

Mr. OUMET. There were two, one for stone, half of the work being built of stone, and the other inspector was for the timber work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the hon. gentleman going to have an inspector for the creosoted piles?

Mr. OUMET. Somebody must be there to see that proper material is employed.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is singular that on all these public works there are always two or three inspectors. The Minister says there is one for stone and the other for timber.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Yes, both at the same time. One had charge of the stone work and the other of the timber. They were both asked for by the engineer in charge, and I believe both were necessary and were employed all the time.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any masonry work, or is the stone just dumped in?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). There was no masonry work. The surface stone is large stone of certain sizes, which has to be laid in such a way as to make a smooth surface. I know they had to be laid with great care, and that the engineer in charge insisted upon the inspector examining every one of these stones, and seeing that it was properly put in place, so that it would not be moved by the action of the sea.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the man in charge, the inspector, a practical mason, a man of experience?

Mr. OUMET. He was a man by the name of Goodwin. I will give the reason why two inspectors were employed. The contract was carried on schedule prices, that is, so much for every cubic yard of stone, and so much for every foot of timber, and a man had to be there to measure every piece of stone, and every piece of timber that was put into the work. This measurement has certainly saved a great deal of money to the department. The contract was estimated, as I have stated, at \$185,000, and it has only cost \$179,000. This offers fair ground for the presumption that these inspectors have earned their money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think we have threshed out this matter of the policy of the Government in spending this money before ascertaining whether the wharf at Cape Traverse can be built or not. I think I gleaned from the hon. gentleman that he is giving the House an assurance that he will have a survey made, and if the work is practicable, he will recommend a sufficient expenditure to build it.

Mr. OUMET. That is my intention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may remark to the hon. gentleman that whoever recommended the location or construction of the Cape Traverse pier ought to take very little credit to himself. So far as the location is concerned, any one can see that a blunder has been made; it does not require any engineering skill to know that, one has only to go and look at the place. So far as the construction is concerned, while it was supposed to be filled with stone, frozen earth has been dumped in. The fact is, the whole construction of Cape Traverse wharf was a mistake from beginning to end. I was going to say it was a disgrace, and I do not think I should be far astray in using that word. The construction, location, and all connected with the work, was a mistake and a disgrace. Heretofore, I may say plainly, I have been suspicious of any promise coming from the department; I have had no confidence in it. But I am willing to judge the hon. gentleman by his work, and not by the past history of the department. I understand that we have a positive assurance that at the next session he will lay before us full reports of the engineers if they have been prepared. I may say that I do not propose to be fooled much longer, and if progress is not made I shall take any and every means to bring the wants of the different sections of the country I represent before the House, and to expose the shameful manner in which we have been treated. And when I look back at the resolution passed two years ago, which committed the Government and the House to a fair expenditure of public money in the several districts, irrespective of the representation of the counties, whether Liberals or Conservatives, I think I have a right to complain of the manner in which this resolution has been

worked, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. Therefore, I shall not hesitate to bring to the notice of the hon. gentleman of the House the needs of my district. He knows that certain cases have been put before him by my hon. colleague (Mr. Welsh) respecting Wood Island breakwater, and others by myself, and I am waiting patiently to see how far the hon. gentleman will carry out, in the Supplementary Estimates, his promises of giving fair-play to the Island. If he does, well and good; if not, I shall resort to such means as the Constitution affords me of making our just claims known.

Mr. OUMET. The hon. gentleman cannot treat myself or the department more harshly than he has already done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have never said anything against the hon. gentleman in his management of the department, so far.

Mr. OUMET. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say so.

Ship Channel between Québec
and Montreal \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How are you going to expend this money?

Mr. OUMET. This is a revote of the balance required to dredge the ship channel at Cap a la Roche.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is a mechanical staff in connection with this work in the shop. How many are employed, and what are they paid? In the Auditor-General's Report the statement is made of \$11,719 expenditure.

Mr. OUMET. The shop is at Sorel, where the barges, dredges, tow-boats, stone-lifters, etc., are repaired during the winter. During the summer, we had no men at all; I discharged them all. During the winter, we have sometimes ten, and sometimes as many as a hundred. The number varies.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that a large amount of money was spent there. There is a man named Howden employed as superintendent. Is he an engineer?

Mr. OUMET. Mr. James Howden may not be properly called an engineer, but he was employed from the beginning of the deepening of the channel by the Harbour Commission of Montreal, as superintendent of dredging, and was retained in that capacity by the department, when the work was assumed by the Government. He has since occupied the same position, with this addition, that I placed him in charge of the dredging in Ontario also. I believe that no better man, no more competent man, could be found for the work. Those who have known of his work, know how faithfully he discharges his duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. He is evidently a good man; that is, he gets a good salary, \$2,500.

Mr. OUMET. He gets \$2,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. He gets his travelling expenses also. There is another man I want to know about, Mr. L. T. Derais, who is described as "agent."

Mr. OUMET. Mr. Dorais is a clerk at Sorel. He is in charge of all supplies for the dredges, and he is the lieutenant of Mr. Howden.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask, is the whole amount, \$10,000, to be expended at Cap a la Roche?

Mr. OUMET. No; I think the Supplementary Estimates will have an entry as to that. I expect, at that time, to explain the whole policy of the Government as regards that deep channel.

Mr. LAURIER. A needed explanation.

Mr. OUMET. I think that a full and satisfactory explanation will be given. I expect at that time to explain to the committee the future policy of the Government as regards that ship channel.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it that we pay rent for a ship-yard at Sorel, \$1,600 a year?

Mr. OUMET. This is not only for the ship-yard; it is also for the shops and, in fact, all the ground that is necessary to keep our dredges and material for repairing the dredges, etc.

It being six o'clock, the committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Adams.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Ship Channel between Quebec and Montreal.....	\$10,000
---	----------

Mr. McMULLEN. Before leaving the item which, we understood, was not passed at six o'clock, I desire to ask the hon. Minister, what is now the average depth of the ship channel from Quebec to Montreal?

Mr. OUMET. The ship channel is supposed to be 27½ feet, but it has not that depth now throughout, on account of "sliding," and in other places that depth is attained only at high tide. Below Cap a la Roche, we have been working during the summer and dredging a channel through shale rock, so as to give an additional depth of 8 feet: and,

Mr. OUMET.

when the work is completed, about 1st July next, there will be a depth of 27½ feet there at low water. Below that point, there are one or two places where the depth is only 20½ feet, and I intend to submit to the House the expediency of also dredging there to a depth of 27½ feet, when the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the hon. gentleman formed any estimate as to the cost of this work?

Mr. OUMET. The sum now proposed to be expended is the balance of \$200,000, which was the estimated cost of the work four years ago. As to further expenditure which may be proposed, when it is brought before the House in the Supplementary Estimates full plans and details will be submitted to enable the House to judge of the advisability of carrying out these additional works in order to make the navigation of the channel safe, because I must say that the work is imperfect as it is now, and a great many accidents have happened. At certain places the channel is too narrow and tortuous, and these defects must be remedied, in order to secure an average depth of 27½ feet, and also to improve the channel at points where there are cross-currents. I have had careful surveys and soundings made during the summer and winter, and all necessary information will be laid before the House.

River Kaminstiquia—Turning Basin.. \$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman expect to complete the work this year?

Mr. OUMET. This revote will complete the work under contract. I am sorry to say that, although we expected the work to be completed by 1st July, it will not be ready by that time. The river will be dredged to a depth of 16½ feet at low water at the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator and also up to the turning basin.

Mr. LISTER. To whom was the contract for the work let?

Mr. OUMET. The last contract was let to Marks & Macdonald. When the whole work connected with the river entrance and turning basin has been completed the expenditure will reach \$180,000.

Mr. LISTER. Was the turning basin a contract by itself?

Mr. OUMET. I understand the work was let, but that afterwards it was re-advertised, and, at last, the contract for the completion was given to Marks & Macdonald, at 12¼ cents per yard.

Dartmouth Post Office..... \$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the estimated cost of the post office building?

Mr. OUIMET. The estimated cost was \$16,000, but I expect to be able to carry out the work for a less sum.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the receipts of the post office, and do the receipts warrant the expenditure?

Mr. OUIMET. The receipts, in 1892, were: Postal revenue, \$2,023; money orders issued, \$19,739; savings bank deposits, \$6,727. I may say that no new buildings are included in these Estimates, and no new policy has been inaugurated.

Mr. MULLOCK. It would be much better if there was a new policy, as the old one was a very bad one.

Mr. OUIMET. These Estimates are for the completion of buildings initiated before my entrance into the Department of Public Works. We have not commenced any new buildings since that time. As to whether we will ask the House to consider the policy again, I could not say; but I only make this explanation in order to avoid a repetition of the discussion that took place last year. I suppose hon. gentlemen might take the remarks of last year as said; and if any money is asked for new buildings, the question can then be raised.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not have either, but for a few words which fell from the lips of my hon. friend. He said that probably at the next sitting the policy might be reconsidered again. That means that although the hon. gentleman is asking nothing now he contemplates reverting to the old policy.

Mr. OUIMET. If I said anything that could lead the hon. gentleman to understand that, I withdraw it.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, then.

Mr. LISTER. Do I understand that the policy of the Government in erecting post offices in small places is to be abandoned?

Mr. OUIMET. I mean to say that the present policy of the Government is, not to go into any new building except in two or three large places about which there can be no discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman means Woodstock, Ont.?

Mr. OUIMET. Well, that town has certainly very fair claims to the consideration of the Government, and if anything is done the claim of Woodstock will be seriously considered.

Mr. LISTER. What about Sarnia, then.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, we will see. We will consider the small places afterwards.

Mr. LISTER. It is not such a small place. I think it is a good many hundred times

larger than Laprairie, where you have erected a post office.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps so.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is Sarnia, anyway?

Mr. LISTER. It is not in the backwoods, where you evidently come from. The Minister has stated that he intends in the Supplementary Estimates to bring down an amount for the construction of post offices and custom-houses. Is that correct?

Mr. OUIMET. I have stated twice what is intended, and I did not suppose that the hon. gentleman would cross-examine me the whole evening.

Mr. LISTER. I have a right to ask you a question; we are paying you \$8,000 a year for that.

Mr. OUIMET. What I said was that in the present Estimates there is nothing for new buildings, and therefore there is no reason for entering into the long and uninteresting discussion of last year.

Mr. LISTER. Do you expect to be relieved from all your sins of commission and omission in the past? Will you intimate what places you will put new buildings in?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think it is pertinent to the question before the committee.

Mr. LISTER. Will you tell us whether you intend to erect them in large or small places?

Mr. LAURIER. He says they will be in large places.

Mr. LISTER. Then the policy of the Government has been changed?

Mr. OUIMET. I never said that.

Mr. LISTER. Am I to understand then that no public buildings are to be erected in future in places where the receipts do not justify the expenditure?

Mr. OUIMET. Is that the policy of the new Government that is going to take our place?

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman must not get off in that jocular style. We are in earnest in this matter. Is or is it not the policy of the Government to continue the erection of buildings in small places where the revenue does not justify the expenditure?

Mr. OUIMET. Our policy will be, not to erect any new buildings where the expenditure cannot be justified.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a new policy.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the Minister say why he has abandoned the old policy?

Mr. OUIMET. I never said we could not justify the expenditure.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has stated that he will erect buildings in Woodstock and other places with a large population. That is a change of policy and therefore a condemnation of the old policy. Is it the case of a new broom, or is it the result of deliberate conviction? Is it the Minister's own opinion or the decision of the Cabinet? It will be a relief to the country to know that the old policy has been abandoned.

Mr. LISTER. He says it is only abandoned for this year, but he does not say it is permanently abandoned.

Mr. FOSTER. You ought to be thankful for one year.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Finance is right; we ought to be thankful that the policy is to be abandoned even for one year. I take it as an indication that the policy is to be abandoned for ever, because the Minister has laid down the principle that no new buildings are to be erected where the revenue will not be justified.

Mr. OUMET. The expenditure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Finance, according to his Budget speech, has suspended the entire policy of the Government for one year.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand the policy of the Minister of Public Works to be, as stated last year, in a similar discussion, that he will carry on to completion works for which a vote was taken prior to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in 1890, and which was accepted by the leader of the Government and adopted by the House. He has reaffirmed that policy this year. Now, I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that in 1886 this House voted a sum of money for the construction of a post office in the town of Kentville, N.S.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that in your county?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes; it is in King's county.

Mr. CAMERON. What is the population?

Mr. BORDEN. Two thousand.

Mr. CAMERON. Oh, that is altogether too small for a post office.

Mr. BORDEN. At all events the post office revenue is \$3,000, much larger than that of Dartmouth, and the customs receipts are much larger also. I think we must hold the Minister to the policy he has stated, and I desire to ask him when it is his intention to carry out the policy which he affirmed last year and reaffirmed this year with reference to this particular work. The vote for Lunenburg post office was taken in 1886, but it was not immediately constructed, and I see there is a vote now asked to complete the work. There can be no possible reason for constructing a post office at Lunenburg,

Mr. OUMET.

which should not appeal to the Government to erect a post office at Kentville. Kentville is almost as large as Lunenburg, and has as good a right to have a post office, and on the line of policy laid down by the Minister it is in precisely the same position, because this House deliberately sanctioned in 1886 the construction of a public work in Kentville. I called the attention of the Minister to this subject during recess and expressed the hope that he would carry out his statement that he would complete all public works for which votes had been taken in this House. I am both surprised and disappointed to find that no provision is made for that work in these Estimates, and I hope that, when the Supplementary Estimates come down, they will contain a revote of the money which was voted in 1886 for this purpose. It is a work which can be defended on every ground; I would not ask for it, were it not. The Minister is bound to construct it, in carrying out the policy which he has announced as the policy of the Administration, namely, to complete every building for which a vote was taken prior to 1890; and, in addition to that, there is a very good reason for the construction of this building, on the ground of the postal and customs revenue collected there. I can assure the Minister, that there are a score of places in the Dominion of much less consequence than the town of Kentville, which have public buildings. In 1887, when I came here, I went to the then Minister of Public Works in regard to this matter, calling his attention to the fact that the vote would lapse after the 1st July, and he assured me that he would not allow it to lapse—that arrangements were then being made for the purchase of a site, and that he would see that those arrangements were completed before the 1st July. That promise, like a great many of that hon. gentleman's promises, was only made to be broken, for when I came back, in the following year, I found that the vote had been allowed to lapse. I may say, however, that there was some difficulty in reference to the choice of a site, there being a difference of opinion among the citizens of Kentville as to the proper location for the building. That far there is, perhaps, some justification for the department hesitating for the moment to purchase a site. But a commissioner was sent from Ottawa to investigate the matter, and I have now a notice on the Paper; which will, perhaps, be reached in a few days, asking for the papers in connection with that investigation. I do not know what the report was. But I again ask the Minister to look into this matter, in the hope that he will put a vote for the work in the Supplementary Estimates, shortly to be brought down.

Mr. LISTER. There is no doubt that the Government have been guilty of a shameful and a shameless course in the matter of these public buildings. They have simply expended the public money for the purpose

of fortifying themselves in office. Wherever there was a constituency at all doubtful, the Government were found persuading the electors to return a supporter by placing money in the Estimates for the erection of a public building. Their conduct in this respect became so disgraceful that the present Minister of Public Works is obliged to proclaim to the House and the country that the course which his predecessors have pursued he is about to abandon. Sir, this matter cannot be brought to the attention of the Government too often. The Minister even now says that he proposes to erect buildings in certain towns throughout the country, but he refuses to name the places. Now, for the purpose of showing how the hon. gentleman now in office, as well as his predecessor, have administered the affairs of the department in this respect, I desire, for a few minutes, to call attention to the places where public buildings have been erected. I find that in the town of Laprairie, a place of two or three hundred inhabitants, where the revenue amounted to the magnificent sum of \$461, it was thought necessary to erect a public building at a cost of from \$25,000 to \$30,000. In the town of Walkerton, with a total revenue of \$4,817, it was considered necessary to erect a post office, and we know for what reason. We know that the public interest did not demand it, but we know that it is in a doubtful county, and \$40,000 was voted for the purpose of carrying that county. In the town of Napanee, where the gross postal revenue is only \$6,064, in order to make things solid there for the Government, it was considered that a public building should be erected at a cost of between \$30,000 and \$50,000. In the town of Cayuga, with about 700 inhabitants, in a constituency that formerly returned a Liberal to this House, this wise Government considered that a public building should be erected. The total postal revenue being the large sum of \$1,327. It was not erected because it was required in the public interest, but because the constituency was doubtful, and a member was required from there for the purpose of sustaining the present corrupt Government in power. We find that a post office is thought necessary in the town of Port Arthur, which yields a total postal revenue of \$4,801, while places like the town of Woodstock, with a revenue of from \$14,000 to \$16,000, are passed over. In Strathroy, in the county from which the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) comes, it is found necessary, at a critical time in its political history, to strengthen the hands of the Conservative candidate, and the Minister of Public Works comes down and proposes to expend from \$25,000 to \$40,000 for the erection of a public building there, although the total revenue amounts to only \$5,004. We find that in the town of Amherstburg, a place of a couple of thousand inhabitants, and yielding a revenue of \$2,273 only, it was necessary, in order to

make South Essex solid, to put up a public building at a cost of between \$25,000 and \$40,000. And so it goes on. The town of Picton, as we know, has always been somewhat uncertain politically. At one time the constituency returned a Liberal and at another time a Conservative. The election of the Conservative member was protested and set aside, and in order to make the constituency sure before another election came on, the Administration came down and asked Parliament to vote from \$25,000 to \$40,000 for the erection of a post office there, though the revenue amounted only to \$5,691. It had the desired effect; the county returned a member to support the Government. The town of Petrolia, with a postal revenue of \$6,534, and a population of about 3,500, gets a post office for the same reason. Hon. gentlemen will have no difficulty in seeing that the real object in spending these vast sums of public money is not to serve the public interest except in so far as the public interest requires the present Government to continue to conduct the affairs of the country. Instead of putting their own hands into their own pockets and buying up constituencies they know a trick worth two of that. They understood how to buy constituencies and pay for them out of money from the public purse. Sir, the hon. gentleman has talked about the town that I come from. I desire to say to him that it has probably a greater population than his whole county. It has a population of 7,500 people, a post office revenue of \$9,211, and a money order business to the extent of \$31,496. Yet that town has not got a post office such as is given to other towns, where the same necessity for public buildings does not exist. It is a distributing centre for the mail for the States and for the west and the south. Large customs revenues are collected there, and a larger general postal business done there, with the exception of the cities, than is done anywhere else in the whole province of Ontario. Yet, because the people think proper to return a Liberal to this House, they are denied what has been granted to all the smaller towns throughout the Maritime provinces and the province of Quebec. Sir, the Minister of Public Works seems to be carrying his political feeling to an extravagant extent. I think that, while he is acting as a member of the Government, he should look to the wants of the country at large, and it should be a matter of no consequence to him whether a Liberal or Conservative be returned, when bringing down estimates for public buildings, so long as the wants of the majority require that the money be expended. It is a disgrace to the Government that this system should be continued so long, of bribing people with their own money. I am glad to hear the Minister say, to-night, that this pernicious system of robbery which has characterized the action of the Government, with regard to the constituencies throughout this country is to be discontinued,

because I understand the Minister to say that in future public buildings will be erected only in places where they are called for by the amount of public revenue received and the business transacted there. If that is to be the rule, I can appeal confidently to him to do that justice to the towns of Sarnia and of Woodstock, which the Government have hitherto refused to do.

Mr. KAULBACH. I rise to correct the impression which seems to exist in the mind of the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) with respect to Lunenburg in comparison with his own town. I happen to be familiar with the position he occupies as representative for the county of King's, and while I feel satisfied that his claim is a fair one, still, it is not so strong as the claim which Lunenburg has for a public building. When I make a contrast with respect to population, I find that the town of Kentville has only about one-half the population of Lunenburg. The exports of the town of Lunenburg are immense and increasing every year, and there is no town outside of Halifax more deserving of a post office, not excepting Kentville. I feel satisfied that the Government were fully justified in making the appropriation for a public building in the town of Lunenburg. They only did it after years of appeal to them in the most earnest manner during previous Parliaments. If the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) desires to have a post office in Kentville he should not endeavour to obtain it by representing his town as more entitled to it than the town of Lunenburg.

Mr. BORDEN. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for the lecture he has been good enough to administer to me. I have been a member of this House almost as long as he has, and am, perhaps, as well acquainted as he with my duties. I am, however, much obliged to him for the partial endorsement he gave of the necessity for a public buildings in Kentville. He entirely misunderstood my allusions to the town of Lunenburg. I never said it was not entitled to a public building. On the contrary, I think I said it was, but I said that Kentville was more than equally entitled to the same treatment. First of all, because in 1886, the very year in which the vote was introduced to provide a public building for the town of Lunenburg, a similar vote was introduced and carried through this House to construct a public building in the town of Kentville, and no doubt the Government of that day had carefully considered the question and considered the town of Kentville as much entitled to a public building as the town of Lunenburg. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to refer to the relative population of the two towns. I do not believe he is correct in saying that the population of Lunenburg is double that of Kentville, but, be that as it may, let us look at the revenue of the re-

Mr. LISTER.

spective towns. I find, and I call the Minister's attention particularly to this, that, while in the town of Lunenburg, the postal revenue was \$2,247.04, the revenue of the town of Kentville during the same year was \$3,052.78. I find also that while in the town of Lunenburg the number of money orders issued last year was 1,725, in the town of Kentville it was 2,071, and last year the total amount of money orders issued in the town of Lunenburg was \$22,002.17, while in Kentville it was \$26,163. I find also that in the town of Lunenburg last year the total amount of money orders paid was \$11,263.36, while at Kentville, this abused town, the total was \$19,848.96, almost double. Now, let us turn for one moment to the receipts of customs, and it should be borne in mind that these public buildings are constructed for the post office and custom-house especially. I have shown that the postal revenue of Kentville is at least 33 per cent greater than that of Lunenburg. I will now show the amounts collected in customs. In Lunenburg the amount was \$10,398.06; and in the town of Kentville, \$27,078.10, almost three times as much. Yet my hon. friend talks about Lunenburg's increased population. I point the hon. gentleman, the hon. Minister, and this House to the relative revenues collected in these two towns. I do not object to the town of Lunenburg getting this post office, and, under the policy put forward by the hon. Minister last year, and this, he had no alternative but to construct that post office, because this country was committed to the expenditure by the vote of 1886. I ask equal fair-play for the town of Kentville, for which a vote was taken in 1886, and on the hon. gentleman's own statement of policy, I demand, I do not ask, I demand, in the name of justice and fair-play, for the town of Kentville that it shall receive the public building which this House solemnly declared, in 1886, it was entitled to, and to which it is still more entitled now, by reason of its growth since that time. The hon. member has announced that he intends to bring down further votes in Supplementary Estimates. In view of the circumstances, and in view of what the hon. member stated, I think I have a right to ask the Minister to state now whether he intends to ask for an amount to place a public building in Kentville. I think the hon. Minister should take some notice of the statements made over and over again about this public building. I do not know but I am entitled to as much consideration as any hon. member in this House. I have had the honour of sitting here as a member most of the time for nineteen years. I am almost as old a member of this House as the hon. Minister himself. But, at any rate, the constituency I have the honour to represent has the right to know what the hon. Minister intends to do about this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not usual to announce what you are going to put in the Supplementary Estimates until those Estimates are brought down. If the hon. gentleman has a right to know what is to be put in the Estimates for his county, every other hon. gentleman has an equal right, and if this were recognized, all object of secrecy would be gone; we might as well put the Estimates on the Order Paper.

Mr. BORDEN. But this is a special case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN. If the hon. gentlemen had listened they would not be so ready to laugh. This building was provided for by a vote in 1886, and the Minister has announced it as his policy to carry on and build every work to which this country has been committed by vote in Parliament.

Mr. FORBES. While it has been said that the claims of the town of Kentville are superior to those of Lunenburg, and while this has been proved from the blue-book, by the quotation made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), in every respect except population, I might add that the town of Kentville leads the town of Lunenburg in population, also, I believe, as I have documents showing that the population credited to Lunenburg town in the census returns is not a correct representation, because of the fact that the enumerators went outside the statutable limits of the town in their enumeration, in order to swell the population. Thus, in every respect, in public demands, in growth of business and population, the town of Kentville is in advance of Lunenburg. So we see there are other towns in Nova Scotia which are as much, if not more, entitled to consideration than Lunenburg, the claims of which latter town I do not at all depreciate. The town of Kentville, I admit, has superior claims to consideration in this respect. Its rights have been conceded by the Government in the vote which was put in the Estimates and approved by this House, but, for reasons which I shall not dwell upon, it was withdrawn, and, in justice to the claims of the hon. gentleman from that county, and in justice to Nova Scotia, it should be restored. The town of Liverpool has equal claims upon the resources of the treasury with those of Lunenburg, and far superior to those of the other towns mentioned by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). The towns of Lunenburg and Dartmouth have had public buildings erected within their limits at large expense to this country, expense which might have been much smaller with equally good service. The town of Liverpool, which is the shire town of the county I have the honour to represent, had a postal revenue of \$1,926.49, in 1892, as against \$2,247.04 for the town of Lunenburg. The number of money orders issued in Liverpool was 2,132, while in Lunenburg the number was 1,725. Liverpool issued

money orders for the total amount of \$28,266.92, while Lunenburg issued money orders for \$22,002.17. The total commission received by the Treasury of Canada by the money orders issued in Liverpool, was \$213, while the revenue in this respect in Lunenburg was only \$173.58. In the town of Liverpool the total amount of money orders paid by the office was \$14,446.73, while the town of Lunenburg, which had such a great sum of public money expended within its limits, paid only \$11,263.36. Surely these proofs should commend themselves to any fair-minded Government, and command an equitable distribution of the public funds in the best interests of the public and not with an ulterior motive.

Mr. GILLIES. You have no bank.

Mr. FORBES. Certainly we have; there was a time when we had two. We have a vast trade going on there all the time, and in future I trust the public revenue and comparative business done will be given more weight. I form the criterion in determining the location of these public buildings. Drawing conclusions from the past, I claim that the town of Kentville and the town of Liverpool have claims far in advance of those of Lunenburg and Dartmouth, both of which have their public buildings. I do not find fault with the construction of public buildings in those towns, which probably only are getting their desert, though I believe equally good buildings could have been had for much less expenditure. I would ask the hon. Minister to consider the growth of these other towns in deciding upon further expenditure.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is rather amusing to hear my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) ventilating the claims of the town of Liverpool. I do not wish to underestimate the importance of that town—

Mr. FORBES. Better not.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is a near neighbour, and it would be most discourteous of me to do so. It bears no comparison whatever to the town that is getting this vote for a post office. Lunenburg, within the past year, has had an export of something like \$1,000,000. I would like the hon. member for Queen's, N.S., to contrast this with the town of Liverpool, or to ask my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) to contrast it with his town. The hon. member for King's, and the hon. member for Queen's refer to the smallness of the revenue from money orders. I would like to remind these hon. gentlemen that we have three banks in the town, and that the people use the banks in many cases for the transmission of money.

Mr. FORBES. But they cannot sell stamps at the banks.

Mr. KAULBACH. Another reason why the revenue seems small is that the town is surrounded by quite a number of post

offices, which are taps to draw business from the main office. Consequently the revenue from the town does not show the large figures that perhaps other towns do

Mr. BORDEN. I gave the revenue for the whole county.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the hon. member for King's would visit Lunenburg more often than he does he would have a more favourable impression of it. Those who have noticed its growth and expansion are satisfied that there is no town in Nova Scotia outside of Halifax to excel it.

Mr. BORDEN. I am favourably impressed with the town of Lunenburg. No one seeing the representative which it sends here can fail to have a favourable impression of the town. The hon. gentleman has stated that there are reasons why the revenue collected in the town of Lunenburg seems to be very small as compared with other towns. But the figures that I gave and which I thought were for the towns of Lunenburg and Kentville I find were for the counties of Lunenburg and King's. Now, Sir, I find that Kentville proper collects \$21,939, while the town of Lunenburg proper collects \$6,200, that for Kentville, instead of three times, being almost four times greater than that for Lunenburg which makes the discrepancy still greater. I cannot for the life of me see what the export business of Lunenburg has to do with it. The export trade of that town consists of fish caught in the deep sea, hundreds of miles away, and I cannot see that is any basis for a claim for a public building. The point is, what amount of revenue does it bring into the Treasury to justify the erection of a new post office? I venture to say that so far as exports from the place itself are concerned, the exports from Kentville are very much larger than those from the town of Lunenburg.

Mr. BOWERS. As hon. gentlemen are calling the attention of the Minister to the claims of their respective shire towns, I might call his attention to the claims of the town of Digby, which far exceeds in importance either Lunenburg, Liverpool or Kentville. The amount of money orders issued in Lunenburg is \$33,265.53; in Dartmouth, \$19,739.38, while in Digby the amount is \$37,433.10. The House will remember that last year I showed that Digby was the centre of a large postal business, and that it received the mails from St. John for distribution to many points on the Bay of Fundy and St. Mary Bay. There is also a large Custom business there, and Digby is as much entitled as any town in the Maritime provinces for the consideration of the Government. I do not know that it has as large an export trade in fish as Lunenburg; but the general export trade in lumber, fish and other things is at all events equal to Lunenburg. I trust that when the Minister brings down the Supple-

Mr. KAULBACH.

mentary Estimates Digby will not be forgotten.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly pleased to hear the Minister of Public Works announce that the Government have decided to erect public buildings throughout the country, only where the revenue would justify the expenditure. A resolution based on that principle was introduced to this House in 1890 by the Hon. Mr. Mills, and that resolution was accepted by the First Minister and unanimously adopted by the House. I am glad for the first time to have an intimation from the Minister of Public Works that the Government will adhere to that good, sound principle. I have no objection to my hon. friend (Mr. Bowers) pressing the claim of his place to the consideration of the Government; but at the same time I am glad that the persistent criticisms of the Opposition for many years on the extravagances of this Public Works Department have resulted in a change of policy for the future.

Halifax Drill Hall \$65,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has been spent here?

Mr. OUIMET. Nothing yet. Our department is waiting for instructions from the Militia Department on the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the place where the old drill hall was burned down for the purpose of getting a new one erected?

Mr. OUIMET. I am not aware of that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The minister has not answered the question of my hon friend beside me.

Mr. OUIMET. It is only fair not to ask me to say more than I have already said. I stated last year that I had come to the department late, that I found a certain number of post offices and public buildings on the slate, and that I undertook to construct those buildings, and declared I would not go beyond them until I had obtained for myself all information necessary to enable me to make a recommendation to the Government in regard to that policy. That is all I said last year, that is all I say this year, and I do not want to be understood to have said more. I find myself in a curious predicament. The policy, from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, is all wrong when applied to our friends, but is all right when applied to themselves, and if buildings were constructed in their counties the expenditure would be defended by every one of them, unless they suspected there was some treachery designed by the Minister of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Try the experiment.

Mr. OUIMET. I would be charged at once with being a briber.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have not tried the experiment.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend merely referred to the fact that if the Minister was going to continue the erection of post offices, the places mentioned by them were more entitled to public buildings than St. Henri and many other places. The Government decided in 1886 that they would erect a building there, and the Minister was supposed to implement the promise, but he appears now to be going back on this pledge. I am glad to learn that they have adopted the unanimously expressed mandate of the House that public buildings should only be erected in places where the revenue justified them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister told the House last year that in certain places the Government had decided to erect public buildings, and the faith of Parliament and the honour of the Crown was pledged to erect them. It is a serious matter, and should be so regarded, when the honour of the Crown and the faith of Parliament have been pledged to the construction of certain buildings, such, for example, as at Kentville, that such policy should be abandoned. We have always held that the word of the Crown is sacred and should be carried out by Parliament. Is it the policy of the Government to trail the honour of the Crown in the dust to suit party exigencies?

Mr. BORDEN. I want to know why a distinction is made between Lunenburg and Kentville, for the hon. gentleman seems now inclined to go back on his statement of last year. He will not say now that it is his intention to construct a building at Kentville, although the faith of the country is pledged to it by a vote of Parliament. In 1886, votes were taken for public buildings at Lunenburg and Kentville. For several years a building was not constructed at Lunenburg; then it was commenced, and it will be completed this year. The vote for Kentville was allowed to lapse. I have shown conclusively that the revenues derived from the post office and custom-house at Kentville are nearly double what are received at Lunenburg. I want to know on what principle the hon. gentleman discriminates between those towns, and I have a right to receive an answer for the information of the House and the country.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no answer than the one I have already given, that I found certain buildings on the slate and the estimates prepared, and I undertook to carry out what had been designed by my predecessor, and nothing more.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the slate, as we may be able to read the hieroglyphics?

Mr. BORDEN. The Minister cannot explain his action on any other ground except that of party favouritism and party feeling,

and the furtherance of the views of political supporters. I had hoped from his statement that he would not allow himself to be pushed into a position of that kind.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think the Minister's action in this matter can be justified, if the building just referred to was on the slate. If there was jugglery practised in former times with the mandate of Parliament, the Minister should see that this should cease, and if he desires to keep the slate clean, he should at once take steps to remedy the gross mistakes the Government has made in violating that mandate. I fail to see any justification for thus discrediting the solemn vote of Parliament, and for the hon. gentleman's failure to carry it out. Whether that vote was right or wrong I will not say, but the faith of Parliament and the honour of the Crown having been pledged to the construction of that building, that pledge should be carried out in good faith.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) has certainly made a case against the hon. Minister. I will not, however, hold the hon. gentleman responsible, because the policy was inaugurated before he came into office, and I give him credit this evening, I will not say for repudiating that policy, but for manifesting an inclination to repentance. I advise my hon. friend to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down, and if he fails to find an item for Kentville, then he will be entitled to bring the hon. Minister to account.

Halifax Drill Hall..... \$65,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Have plans and specifications been prepared for this drill hall; what will be its dimensions, what material will be used in constructing it, and what will be the cost?

Mr. OUIMET. A demand has been made by the Department of Militia for a building for military purposes. We have not yet received full information to enable complete plans to be prepared, and, therefore, I cannot give the dimensions of the building. It is to be erected, however, on the old site. Strong pressure is being brought to secure a change of site. If such demand is acceded to, the details will be given to the House, and its approval will be asked.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is a very unfortunate announcement. The Minister says it may be erected on the old site, but that very strong pressure is being brought to bear to change the site, that plans and specifications have not yet been prepared, and yet, on face of these facts, a vote is asked of \$65,000. I think that it is a very absurd request under these circumstances. The Minister is not prepared to tell this House whether it is going to be built on the old or the new site.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely my hon. friend will see that when he seeks for \$65,000 he ought to be prepared to tell us

where he is going to build this drill shed and also generally what the cost will be.

Mr. OUIMET. The cost has been estimated at \$75,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without the land ?

Mr. OUIMET. The land is there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought you said you were not going to build on that site.

Mr. OUIMET. We will not spend the money until we have decided on the site.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it not premature to ask for a vote until you decide on the site ? Probably, next session, you will ask a vote for \$65,000 for a piece of land, so that we may drift into an expenditure far in excess of what the House might sanction, if they knew, at first, what the cost would be. Before we vote this money we should have a reasonable estimate of the total cost. It is the custom of the department, when they are launching into a new scheme, to do so without giving the House an intelligent estimate of the total cost ; you commence by piecemeal, and then lead us into very heavy expenditure. I wish to show, by illustration, what this leads to. In 1884, the House voted a sum of money for the Langevin Block, and we were assured that the total cost would not exceed \$400,000. But there was no detailed estimate, and the result of this slipshod way of doing business resulted in our having to pay \$782,000 actual cash, besides several outstanding claims. Whether these claims are recognized or not is another matter, but in view of what has taken place in the past, I would not be surprised if we would have to pay more money for that building. Does the Minister suppose that any individual would contemplate embarking in an enterprise like this without having a reasonable idea of the total cost ? The Minister is not manifesting a business capacity in doing a thing like this. If we expend \$25,000 on a building, we are told that we must follow it up and complete it. There may be a shuffle of the cards in the Ministry, and some hon. gentleman will preside over his department who will say : I am not responsible for this, I found an unfinished work on my hands and I must carry it out. I think that is a very ill-omened beginning for the hon. Minister. Up to this moment he has been sheltering himself behind the past, but now he is himself originating an enterprise in the same old slipshod way which has characterized the department for years. I agree with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that Parliament should not vote this sum until it knows what the total cost is likely to be.

Pictou Post Office, Custom-house
&c., to complete..... \$14,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this a new post office ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. OUIMET. The erection of this building was undertaken about three years ago, but when we came to pass the title of the land we found there was a difficulty. There were some heirs who had some rights that we could not purge, and we had to go to expropriation, hence the delay. The cost is estimated at \$23,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a very handsome custom-house in Pictou, and it has been there for years back.

Mr. OUIMET. This is for the post office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is that post office situated ? I have been at Pictou very often, I know something about the trade and population of the town, and it is a most surprising thing to me if any money is required for a public building there. The town has been going down for the last fifteen years ; the population, instead of increasing, has largely decreased. The custom-house there at present is large enough to supply the wants of the place three times over.

Mr. OUIMET. The postal revenue is \$5,257, and the money orders issued and paid amount to \$77,648.

Mr. LISTER. The postal revenue of the town of Sarnia is \$9,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that a grant for the town of Pictou is, under the circumstances, a very extraordinary proceeding. In the first place, my recollection is that there were public buildings there a considerable number of years ago. Twenty years ago the population of the town of Pictou was 3,262, in 1881 it had grown down to 3,403, in 1891, being under the special protection of the National Policy, and being aided by the new railway constructed to the place at very great expense to this country, its population had grown down still further to 2,998, according to the census returns. Now, the waste of \$30,000 or \$40,000 of public money on a town of that size is, under the circumstances, very decidedly in opposition to any proper policy.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this vote is in violation of the principle which was recently laid down. The Minister of Public Works intimated at the commencement of the passing of these items that a departure had been made from the old policy, and that he only proposed to carry out the completion of the buildings which had already been commenced and on which considerable work had been done. Now, this is a building on which there has been virtually nothing done, while there are over a score of places in Ontario of larger population than Pictou which have never received any public buildings. For instance, the town of Woodstock is a standing monument of reproach to hon. gentlemen opposite, who have kept it without a post office for the last ten or fifteen

years. I suppose this vote is to be attributed to the fact that the town of Pictou is represented here by a Minister of the Crown, and one who is all-powerful, and also by one who is not a Minister—and Minister inside the Cabinet and one outside; and no doubt these two men, in order to keep the town solid, are demanding the expenditure of more public money there. I do think, unless the Minister has a better explanation of this vote than anything he has yet given, that the committee should insist on this item being wiped out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice by a return that was brought down to the House a few years ago that an appropriation of \$27,743 was made in 1872-73 for a custom-house and post office at Pictou. I should hope it has not taken twenty years to complete the title. Has the Minister made a mistake in this grant? Is this the place that it is intended for?

Mr. OUMET. The grant for this post office has been in the Estimates, I understand, for three years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister does not evidently understand the statement made by my hon. friend, that \$27,743 of public money was spent in building a custom-house at Pictou. Now we are asked to build another at a cost of probably \$20,000. Surely the Minister should explain this matter. The return which my hon. friend mentions referred to buildings that had been erected.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The public building erected in Pictou in 1872 was only for a custom-house, and this vote is only for a post office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the present building used for the post office?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). No; the present post office is a private building.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why is the post office wanted more than it was twenty years ago? The population has fallen off?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Every hon. gentleman who has passed through Pictou, knows that there is a very handsome brick custom-house there, standing at the very head of the wharf, an edifice large enough for a town ten times the size of Pictou. It is as substantial to-day as when it was built, and I cannot see the necessity for a new building.

Mr. OUMET. The words "custom-house" ought to be struck out. I move that they be struck off. There is only sufficient accommodation for the Customs business in the custom-house, and they want a post office.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman should move that the item stand until he can give more definite information.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The question arises, is the High Commissioner on the rampage again?

Mr. OUMET. We will let the item stand.

Chatham, N.B., Post Office and
Custom-house \$15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were there not buildings erected for this purpose at Chatham some years ago? My recollection is, that there were. First of all, we put up buildings, and then, years after, further appropriations asked. What is the population of the town of Chatham?

Mr. OUMET. 5,644. The postal revenue is \$4,197.93; the customs duties, \$14,490; Excise, \$8,944, and money orders, \$42,243.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to be done with the old building?

Mr. OUMET. It will be sold, after the new post office is built.

Mr. LAURIER. Have you secured the site?

Mr. OUMET. Yes; at a cost of \$4,750.

Mr. MULOCK. From whom did you purchase it?

Mr. OUMET. From the Fraser estate. The site is 61 feet frontage on Water street, by 330 feet depth.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of the whole work, including the site and furnishings and everything else?

Mr. OUMET. \$25,000.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of maintaining it?

Mr. OUMET. There will be heating and the payment of a guardian, who will probably be the postmaster or one of the officers living in the house. We have adopted the rule of having one of the officers who live in the building, as caretaker, in order to save expense. I suppose that will entail a payment of \$150 or \$200 to that officer, and of course there is the ordinary expenditure for maintenance.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the site of the new building close to the old one?

Mr. FOSTER. The old site was down close by the water. This is further up in the town. The old site was unsuitable, and the old house has been going into decay for a number of years. It was thought better in every respect to have a new site and new building, and dispense with the old one.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was the old one built?

Mr. FOSTER. It was bought in 1872.

St. John Custom-house..... \$75,900

Mr. OUMET. The total cost is estimated at \$145,580.

Mr. BOWERS. With regard to this custom house, last year I called the attention of the Government to the fact, that there was no watchman in the building. The Minister of Public Works and the senior member for St. John both stated there was, but when in that town, I made inquiry and found that there was not, but only a caretaker, who was the janitor. Had there been a watchman, the fire would have been noticed at the outset and probably extinguished before any material damage was done. I should think that, in the case of a building costing \$500,000, a watchman should be employed and a time-clock should be placed at each end of the building, so that, every hour, he would have to put his hands on that clock.

Public Buildings—Maritime Provinces generally \$20,000

Mr. FLINT. I would like to make a remark to the Minister in connection with this item. I think he would do well to see that these repairs are made promptly. I know one or two instances in which delay in making a moderate amount of repairs, has cost the Government a great deal of money. Where the cause of this delay lies, I am not able to say. In the case of the post office in my town, where repairs were needed, it was understood that they would be made some time during the latter part of the summer, but, owing to delay, and the lack of proper persons to look after the repairs, the whole season passed by. Of course, we know that during winter and early spring a good deal of damage is done to a building when it is in need of repairs. I mention this for the information of the Minister, in order that he may exercise more promptitude in these matters.

Quebec—St. Henri Post Office . . \$13,000

Mr. LAURIER. Will that complete the building?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes; it is under contract, and the amount that is now asked will complete the building. We expect it will be ready some time during the fall. The first contractor failed, and we had to ask for new tenders. We entered into a new contract some time during last fall, and they are now doing the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears from the Auditor-General's Report, that only \$9 was spent last year.

Mr. OUIMET. The site was bought during the fiscal year of 1890-91. Last year, for the reason I have given, the contract fell through, and, of course, we did not have to pay the contractor anything; on the contrary, we had to confiscate his deposit. New tenders were asked for, and that caused a loss of time. That is the reason we have not spent more money during the last year.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary \$32,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is that for?

Mr. OUIMET.

Mr. OUIMET. As the hon. gentleman knows, the penitentiary is not completely finished. The principal part of the work that is now going on is the construction of a boundary wall of solid masonry, which is 27½ feet high, six feet wide at the base, and about three feet wide at the top. It will be not only a splendid structure, but a great security for the penitentiary. When this boundary wall is completed, the yard will be more than three times as large as it is now, and will consequently give a much larger space for the prisoners to work in. There are some other works to be done inside. I may explain that this work is all done by convict labour. We only have to pay for the materials used in the wall, and also the material used in the different work shops. This is all included in the \$32,000.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose part is expended on capital account, and part on ordinary income account.

Mr. OUIMET. It might be well to charge it to capital account, but we charge it only to revenue. I think it prevents an increase of the debt.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a large sum to pay for raw material.

Mr. OUIMET. I have a full statement of details, of which I may give the following summary:—stone and cement, \$15,158; materials for working, \$626; materials for stone cutters, \$1,732; for repairs to building, \$2,000; tools for carpenter shop, \$150; blacksmith shop, \$1,166; salaries to Public Works officials, one year, \$1,775; maintenance of steam works for the buildings, \$1,481; maintenance of machinery, \$4,000; office keepers, hall and vestry fittings, etc., \$559; Protestant chapel, \$395; schools and surgery fittings, etc., \$395; school and library fittings, \$707.50; repairs of various kinds make up the total.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the estimated value of the work when completed?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount already spent on the penitentiary is \$508,000. After this boundary wall is completed, I can give a correct estimate of what will be required; I suppose about \$50,000 will finish the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. We understood from the Minister of Justice that these convicts would perform valuable work and save a great deal of money. Now, it appears to me this is going to cost an enormous amount of money. If we had an estimate of what it would cost had it been let by ordinary contract, we would have some idea of the saving we have made by utilizing convict labour. I would like to know what it would cost, suppose we had let it out by contract.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no figures before me which would enable me to answer that question. What is saved is just the price

of labour that we would have to pay if the work was done by contract. But there is another advantage we gain by utilizing the labour of the convicts. If they were not employed at this work, they would have nothing to do, except breaking stones and carting it away, and it is a very bad thing for the inmates of the penitentiary to have no other work than that to do. I have been there two or three times during the summer and I have been told that the convicts greatly like that kind of work. It is outside work, and it is a singular fact, that although these people have been working outside during the whole summer, there has not been a single escape, which shows the good influence outside work has upon them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the Minister that it is well to employ the convicts on outside labour where possible. The hon. gentleman mentioned an item of something like \$4,000 for repairs to machinery, and also a large item for blacksmith's tools. Can he say that this machinery and tools will be of any value after this work is performed? Will it be possible to continue the employment of these convicts at this particular kind of work in any way? How long will it take to complete the work?

Mr. OUIMET. It will take certainly not less than three or four years. After the boundary wall is completed they will have to level the ground, and they will have as much as eight feet of rock to blast and take away in some portions of the yard. I think it would be worth the hon. gentleman's while to visit that institution. It is certainly the best built penitentiary in the Dominion, much better than that at Kingston, because it is more modern. When the building was built at first, it was nothing but a reformatory school, and very deficient at that; but it has all been rebuilt, and when those works are completed, it will be the best building of its kind, I think, that can be found in America. Some of these convicts are very skilful in various trades, and they have worked in a very satisfactory manner. For instance, all the heating machinery for three or four boilers has been put up by one man.

Mr. MULOCK. I believe you have an inspector for all the penitentiaries?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said that the mode of employing convicts in this penitentiary had resulted in no attempts at jail-breaking. That is most satisfactory. I suppose that similar results have not followed in all the penitentiaries, for I believe in some of the penitentiaries of late, perhaps where there is not the same occupation, the inmates have attempted to break away: For example, in Kingston, where the inspector made inquiry into the discipline and other matters some time ago. He made

a report, and that report has not given, I believe, entire satisfaction. It is extremely important, I think, that there should be every confidence in the inspector, and if he is not deserving of that confidence, it should be discovered at the earliest moment. I have received certain communications which rather shake my confidence in the inspector. If the statements made to me are correct, he has not made a thorough and impartial investigation into the matters complained of at Kingston. I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not here, he would be prepared, of course, to deal with the matter to which I am about to refer; but perhaps some other member of the Government will take cognizance of what I am about to say, and may, perhaps, act upon the suggestion. Now, the investigation that took place at Kingston, I am told, was not at all a thorough one. Certain grave charges were made against the administration, and if the Minister likes, in order that I may not be vague, I will just give them.

Mr. OUIMET. Is this the proper time? I think it would be better if the hon. gentleman could wait for a better occasion. I have something to do with the Department of Justice myself, in the absence of the Minister of that department, and if the hon. gentleman will communicate to me privately what he has to say I will make inquiries and, perhaps, be in a position to answer him when he brings the question before the House. I would ask the hon. gentleman to postpone his remarks.

Mr. MULOCK. What time would suit the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. This discussion might come up on items connected with the Justice department.

Mr. MULOCK. I am willing to bring it up whenever an opportunity is afforded me.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will be able to bring it up when further estimates are submitted in connection with Department of Justice.

Richmond Post Office..... \$4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. It does not appear that any money has been spent on this proposed building?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote has been carried on from year to year for three or four years.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an item which the Minister could well afford to drop. What are the receipts of the office?

Mr. OUIMET. The receipts were only \$2,512; money orders issued \$16,000, savings bank deposits \$24,000. The population increased from 715 in 1871 to 2,056 in 1891.

Mr. McMULLEN. No less than six places in my riding have larger revenues, and there

are twenty or thirty places in Ontario where the receipts are three or four times as much. The savings bank deposits are \$16,000, but there is one place in my riding where they reach \$37,000. The item should be struck out.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) were present, I would ask him to defend this vote on the ground that the faith of the Crown has been pledged to it, and that it would be bad policy for the Government to break its promise.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member himself made that statement, and I am glad he intends to adhere to it. He seems to hesitate when a constituency is represented by an opponent, but has no doubt in regard to the expenditure when the constituency is represented by his own friend.

Mr. OUIMET. It would be a bad precedent to wipe out this item from the appropriation list, and the department has already been blamed for having done what it is now asked to do.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not responsible for what my hon. friend behind me said, and I support the hon. Minister in his policy, if he carries it out impartially and deals with all constituencies alike.

Mr. CHARLTON. I very much doubt whether the Minister will give any favour or even justice to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden). It would be much better to drop this vote for Richmond. It is an instance of the vicious policy of expending money, not in the public interest, in places not entitled to it, but purely for partizan purposes, and if this reform is to be commenced it is a good time now. This is confessedly one of the class of votes which cannot be justified. The hon. Minister does not justify the principle pursued, so let him drop this vote from the Estimates, and give evidence of faith by works, and show that he is honest in his declaration of policy with respect to his future action, and do what is to be done in the matter now.

Mr. MULOCK. I am surprised that we are called on to discuss the item, in view of all that has taken place in this committee. This item involves an entire departure from the position taken by the Minister at an earlier period of the evening. There is the fact that the hon. gentleman is now endorsing the old vicious principle that the country has condemned, a system which he himself admits to be vicious. The hon. gentleman is proposing to embark on an expenditure for the little village of Richmond, Quebec, with a population of 2,056, the gross receipts of the post office being \$2,153 annually. The hon. gentleman told the committee a few moments ago, that in the future such expenditure would be based on the receipts, those receipts being deemed the test as to the requirements. On what principle does the

Mr. McMULLEN.

hon. gentleman select a small place and omit altogether places with very much larger population and contributing very much larger receipts to the revenue? For example, take the old standard illustration, the town of Woodstock, with a population of 8,612. Here you are going to spend public money in a small village with a population of less than one-quarter of that. I ask the Minister of Public Works if he can justify the proposition he is now submitting to this committee? If it is not time yet to erect a public building of this kind in the town of Woodstock, how is it that the time has arrived to erect one in the village of Richmond?

Mr. OUIMET. I have just mentioned that this post office has been promised, the money was voted two years ago, and it was voted again last year, and, although, through some local difficulty, the site has not been selected, I do not see how we can withdraw from the promise that has been made. If this building is not gone on with this year, it will be the last time the vote will be asked for. But really I do not feel justified now in withdrawing this item. I think the hon. gentleman ought to congratulate me for not having gone on with the expenditure. It shows that the department was not anxious to spend the money. We are trying to fulfil the pledges of the Government, but we are not very zealous in spending money except when it is necessary. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that if the building is not gone on with from this date next year, the vote will not stand on the appropriation list for next year.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the Minister has spoken so candidly; I accept his promise, and I know it will be carried out, if he takes the vote. But I would much prefer that he would bow to public opinion now and not ask the vote at all. I can assure him that his pertinacity last year in pressing a similar vote, that for Laprairie, perhaps more indefensible than this, did him no credit, and did the Government no credit and it met with universal condemnation at the hands of the public. The only defence offered then was that which is brought now, that there was an understanding. Now, I will give the Minister a precedent whereby he can, I think, withdraw from this understanding. There is a harbour in the town of Cobourg which was constantly being dredged at the public expense. A vote was taken in 1890 for a certain sum of money to dredge the harbour of Cobourg. The item was put in the public Estimates of 1891, which were prepared before the Parliament of 1891 was elected. At that election the constituency in which the town of Cobourg is situated sent a representative who was not a supporter of the Administration. What did the Government do? They struck out that item from the Estimates. After the constituency had gone against the Government, they thought they were no longer obliged to maintain this item

for dredging the Cobourg harbour, and on the motion of the Minister of Finance the item was struck out. That was within the last two years. You did not seem bound to live up to any implied understanding at that time, and yet you seem bound to live up to an understanding that involves an expenditure where the constituency has gone all right. Now, you see that you do not follow a principle. You apply what you call a principle to defend this vote, but you ignored that principle in regard to the harbour of Cobourg, although you maintain it with regard to the public building at Kentville. I think the Minister of Public Works is now taking upon himself the responsibility for an indefensible expenditure of public money if he seriously presses this vote upon the committee. I think he will do wisely to let it stand over in order to give this matter thorough consideration, for it is not likely to pass the committee to-night except after thorough discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is one of the items that the Minister can well afford to strike out of the Estimates. He admits that nothing has been spent in the construction of the post office. Under these circumstances, and in justice to other places where the receipts are double those of Richmond, I think he can well afford to strike this item out. If he will go over the Post Office Report he will find a number of places that give \$3,000 or \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year revenue, but which have no public building. I have marked here several places in the province of Ontario where the revenue is double. Take Uxbridge, \$3,456; Wallaceburg, \$3,000; West Toronto Junction, \$3,600; Ridgetown, \$3,621; Parkhill, \$6,998; North Bay, Nipissing, \$3,605; Listowel, in the county of Perth, \$4,146, with a total amount of money orders of \$19,000. Mount Forest, where I live, returns \$4,049 of receipts, double the amount in Richmond; 2,747 money orders issued, amounting to \$32,000. I cannot understand on what principle the Minister expects that we should consent to pass this item. I want to draw his attention to one or two other towns. In Harriston, in the county of Wellington, the total revenue is \$3,298, and the total money orders issued are over \$16,000, and yet it has no post office building. These are all places better deserving of post offices than Richmond. Now, this vote is in direct violation of the resolution unanimously adopted by this House in 1890 that the construction of public buildings should be determined by the amount of revenue collected in each place. The hon. gentleman cannot claim that he is committed to this expenditure, because no money has been spent. Under these circumstances I think the committee should wipe out this vote, until public buildings are given to places like Woodstock which are more entitled to them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I fear that the hon. Minister scarcely realizes the actual character of this proposed expenditure. We have got so much in the habit in this country of expending public money, not honestly and in the proper discharge of the functions of Government, but for strictly party purposes, that the hon. gentleman scarcely realizes the turpitude of the crimes that the Government have been perpetrating almost without number. We have granted bonuses to railways to the extent of over \$15,000,000, and I venture to say that in hardly a single instance have these grants been made with a view to the public service, but they have been made almost universally for the express purpose of strengthening the Government. They have been in fact direct bribes, not to individuals, but to aggregations of individuals in ridings. The grants of post offices to small towns are exactly of the same character. We had a discussion on the appropriation for the La Prairie post office last year, and now we are discussing an appropriation for a post office in an insignificant town of about 2,000 inhabitants, with a postal revenue of about \$2,000 a year. What is this appropriation made for? Is it made on any principle of justice or fair-play, or because this town needs a post office? Not at all. It is made for party reasons, to reward this section of the country for party services. In my riding there are two towns, the town of Simcoe, with a revenue of over \$5,000, and the town of Tilsonburg, with a revenue of nearly \$5,000, two and a half times as much as the revenues of Richmond, and yet neither of them has a post office. I would not ask for post offices for them, because they are not of sufficient importance, and it would not be in the public interest to make appropriations for that purpose; but they have two and half times as good reason for post offices as the place now under discussion. If the Minister proposes, as he said a short time ago, to adopt a fairer basis, and one which will do less violence to the principles of justice and decency, this is a good time to commence. The conduct of the Government in the case of Cobourg and the case of Kentville, shows that they pay no regard to previous promises whatever. It has no restraining effect upon them if they have any political object to gain. This case is so glaring that this vote should be dropped. No reason can be assigned for the expenditure of the money.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Public Works has not explained yet to this committee the distinction between Richmond and Kentville in regard to a post office building. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), informed this committee during the early part of the evening that in 1886 an item was placed in the Estimates for the erection of a public building in the town of Kentville; that item appeared in the Estimates for two

or three years; that it was passed by the committee and by the House, and the propriety of the proposed expenditure thus acknowledged. Having been passed, the faith of the Government was pledged that that building should be erected. Yet the hon. Minister sits in his seat indifferent, apparently, to what is said, and regardless altogether of his duty to the country and the pledge made by the Government that that work should be carried out, and he comes down here and asks the House to vote \$4,000 towards the erection of a public building in the town of Richmond. It appears from the Estimates that this item has been voted upon no less than three times. Now, if he is going to follow the policy of erecting these public buildings in the small towns and villages of the country, in places having an insignificant revenue, the rule should be applied to one place, where the faith of the Government has been pledged, as well as to another; and if the Minister feels that it is necessary, in the interest of the country at large, that the town of Richmond should have a post office, I ask him upon what principle he decides that the town of Kentville, which I understand is a more important place, yielding a revenue of \$3,000, should not have one? Not one dollar has been expended on this work. If the building had been commenced, even if the land had been purchased, there might have been some reason for the hon. gentleman going on with the work. We have the right to ask why he decides to build at New Richmond when he refuses to build at Kentville. No doubt the hon. gentleman is rewarding the county for returning a supporter. No doubt at the last election the hon. gentleman for that county was authorized by the Government to say that if he were returned the Government would come down handsomely and put up a public building in this place. No doubt that was an element in the last election, and no doubt the Government were privy to that corrupt arrangement. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to get up here and be virtuous when hon. gentlemen point out to him the necessity of a public work, or if not the necessity, at all events the right, to have them in comparison with other places to which they have been given. If the hon. gentleman acts upon any principle at all, one place of 2,000 inhabitants is equally entitled to a public building as another place of 2,000 inhabitants, where the revenue is the same, or where the revenue is greater in the one which has not the building than it is in the other. It is evident that the hon. gentleman wishes to reward his supporters, and is wasting public money for the purpose of keeping himself in office. The Government finding that they do not receive sufficient from the Red Parlour and other sources to carry on elections, bribe the electors by battalions. They buy up whole constituencies by saying to each: elect such a man and we will spend \$40,000 in your town. Why, the wanton

Mr. LISTER.

manner in which the Government have spent the money of this country is simply astounding. In the little town of Cayuga, a little scattered village called a county town, we find that the total receipts from the post office are only \$1,327, and yet in that little town the Government consider that a public building should be erected at a cost of from \$20,000 to \$30,000. They pay a keeper to look after that building more money than they pay for the whole rent of the former post office. Although hon. gentlemen opposite have swelled their income enormously by the tremendous taxation they place on the country to something like \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000 a year, an increase of about \$14,000,000, they have found ways and means to spend every dollar they have improperly extracted from the pockets of the people, and in addition they have added over \$100,000,000 to our public debt, and raised the interest on our public debt from \$7,000,000 a year to something like \$12,000,000 a year, or nearly one-third of the total revenue of the country. As a matter of fact, in putting up this post office at a cost of \$30,000, when they had the old office, which suited all purposes just as well, at a rental of \$100 or \$150 a year, they subject the country to a net loss of the sum required to meet the interest on that expenditure over and above the rental formerly paid; and we have to go to England to borrow the money to pay for this new building, for which it is safe to say we pay 4 per cent. That is the interest we are paying in the post office savings banks, so that we are spending on interest alone \$1,200 a year on the cost of the erection of a post office in a little town which only furnishes a postal revenue of \$1,327 per year. And, in addition to the interest, we have to pay for light and heat and caretaking, and so on, which would be about \$400 or \$500 more. We are, therefore, spending, in order to collect \$1,300, something like \$1,700 per year. Go where you will, throughout the different provinces of the Dominion, from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, and you will find that all the little towns which have returned gentlemen to support the Government, have succeeded, after these members were returned or pending another election, in getting Government assistance in the shape of a public building. The position taken by the Liberal party has ever been, that the Government is not justified in spending public money in the erection of public buildings, unless the receipts justify the expenditure. The Government are merely trustees for the public, and you might as well justify the stealing of the money of his ward by a trustee as justify the profligate waste of public money which has been going on under the system followed by this Government. The hon. gentleman must not expect to escape this year, as he did last. We had pity for him last year, as he was green in the business and knew very little about his department. I hope he knows more now.

He made promises last year which I hope he will find a way of performing, but I am sorry to say, he is not carrying out those promises, because, of all the Ministers of Public Works we have ever had, the hon. gentleman seems to know less about his department than any of them.

Mr. OUIMET. Thank you.

Mr. LISTER. I do not ask your thanks, sir.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not looking for them.

Mr. LISTER. Then, there is no necessity for saying "Thank you." I tell the hon. gentleman, that the Minister who preceded him in that office, although he has been disgraced, knew, when he came before the House with his Estimates, all the particulars concerning the expenditures he proposed; but the hon. gentleman comes here to-night incapable of giving information. He is unable to say what the price of a certain building is; he has no estimates to submit, but takes the vote by a lump, and asks Parliament to trust him to see that the money is properly expended. Before asking for public money, the hon. gentleman ought to be prepared to give an estimate of the cost and to say that it will not exceed a certain sum, and to prove to us that the building is absolutely necessary in the public interest. He ought to be able to give every information which he should be expected to give, when asking Parliament to vote public money. He has not been able to do this, but has to ask his deputy for an answer to almost every question. I do not believe he ever studied his brief. We know that these particulars are prepared by the deputy, and the least we have to expect of the chief of the department is, that he should study his brief and be able to answer questions put to him. Sir, I think this is an unjustifiable item and that the House has no right to permit it to pass, and I beg to move:

That the item of \$4,000 for Richmond Post Office be struck out.

Mr. IVES. I do not intend to attempt to follow the hon. gentleman who last spoke through the political speech which he has just made; but he has made one or two assertions that I would like to correct. He has intimated, that the object for which this vote was originally placed in the Estimates, some years ago, was to bribe the counties of Richmond and Wolfe. If the hon. gentleman knew how absurd that statement was, if he were better acquainted with the enormous extent of those counties and of how small a portion of the community would be likely to be benefited by a post office in the town of Richmond, he would not have made that statement. I can assure the hon. gentleman, if it will help him to sleep to-night, that there is not the slightest foundation for the insinuations he has made, that the vote was originally placed in the Estimates, either to reward past fealty

to the Conservative party or to secure future support for that party. The vote was first taken, I think, in 1889, not when an election was pending and not immediately afterwards. It was put in the Estimates because of the importance of the place and the necessity for a public building. My hon. friend should understand, when he is dealing with the town of Richmond, that he is dealing with a town of considerable importance, of much greater importance than the population indicates. Richmond is a divisional point on the Grand Trunk Railway; it is a point where a very large amount of business is transacted. It is a point which not only serves for post office purposes the people of the town itself—in which town there are two post offices, the revenue of only one of which the hon. gentleman has quoted, if I mistake not—but also a very large and very flourishing and very important farming community, that is behind it. The town is the headquarters of the Grand Trunk Railway in the Eastern Townships, the point where all trains are made up and where all the transfers are made from the Quebec branch and from Portland and Montreal. It is the centre of a large population, and I think, if my hon. friend who made these insinuations against the town of Richmond, were to consult his leader, who knows something about the town, he having been a candidate in the last general election and having a general knowledge of the place, because he has passed through it nearly every week in the year for the last twenty years, I think he would ascertain that he has shot very wide of the mark. If the vote was not originally intended to affect the voters of the town of Richmond and the counties of Richmond and Wolfe, I can quite readily understand that the hon. gentleman's speech, when read in the town of Richmond, would very materially weaken the regard of the Liberals and the people down there generally for the Opposition in this House.

Mr. LISTER. That is the right line of argument; that is exactly what I thought you would say.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman lives at the further end of this country, in the coal oil district.

Mr. LISTER. I do not live in the coal oil district.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman must be pardoned if he has no accurate knowledge of what he is talking about when he asks to have this vote for the town of Richmond struck out. As a friend beside me suggests the fact of his living in the coal oil district may account for his ideas being so crude.

Mr. LISTER. You are a clever fellow.

Mr. IVES. I used to have something to do with the county of Richmond and I would not ask any better campaign sheet than the hon. gentleman's speech. With that speech I could succeed in the town of

Richmond, in meeting nearly every statement made by the hon. gentleman opposite this session. I would say to the people: You see what Mr. Lister has said in regard to your business and with regard to the importance of your town, and you can judge from this how much dependence is to be placed on the statements of the Opposition generally. I am much obliged, as having something to do with the politics of the constituency, for the aid and assistance the hon. gentleman has given us in the counties of Richmond and Wolfe. Now, the hon. gentleman has asked one question which I think ought to be answered—why has this vote been continued year after year? The reason is because of the carefulness of the Government in this matter. The Government have been offered sites more or less suitable for a post office in this town, but the price which has been asked for these sites has been, in the opinion of the Government, more than should be asked and more than the Government ought to pay. The original vote of \$4,000 was put in the Estimates to secure the site, but the Government have not been able yet to secure a suitable site at what they considered a fair price. But there is every reason to think that in the course of the current year an arrangement may be made by which a most suitable site will be secured, partly at the expense of the corporation, and at a price which a careful Government can afford to pay. I must ask my hon. friend not to persist in this motion, because the adoption of it would be a great injustice to the people of Richmond and also to the people of the rich farming district surrounding the town, as it would deprive them of the new post office which would do away with the absurdity which now exists of two post offices in different parts of the town.

Mr. FLINT. I think the whole tendency of the remarks of the President of the Council (Mr. Ives) go very far to defend, if they do not justify, the speech of the gentleman who preceded him. The tenor of the speech of the hon. gentleman shows the immoral effect of the Government's system of making these appropriations and of the bad political principles by which that system must necessarily have been inspired. The address we have listened to supported this assumption, because the hon. gentleman stated that the speech of the gentleman who preceded him could be used, and would be used, to damage in the locality the candidate supporting the party of which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is a member. It is part and parcel of the system which we on this side are endeavouring to suppress, the making use of these appropriations for political effect. The object is not only to gain for the Government candidate support because the Government has made this appropriation but to condemn those who criticise the appropriation as enemies of the town, and I

Mr. IVES.

am not one of those who believe that with sensible and impartial and reasonable electors these arguments have any great weight. But, unfortunately, there is in every community a large class of thoughtless voters, not very deep in their political principles, who are moved by such superficial arguments as this. Their passions and prejudices are appealed to by the Government, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and the result has been the sinking of millions of money for these very improper purposes. I ask on what principle is this vote defended? I plead with the Government against the utter abnegation of all principle in the manner in which these appropriations are made. Let the Government establish some principle, based upon the population of the community, based upon the revenue derived from these places, and establish a schedule by which appropriations shall be awarded, and then all these complaints will cease. Now, is it fair that the supporters of the Liberal party in Richmond should be put in the false position that their opponents may say to them that the Opposition at Ottawa was opposed to an appropriation for a public building in that village, and say that we are belittling the importance of this place, when our only objection is that the Government are spending the money for political purposes, and ignoring other places which have much greater claims. We have one locality with a large population and a large postal and Customs revenue; yet for political reasons—because no other can be assigned—that town is refused a public building, and another town with much less claim, is granted the favour. We find that large towns in Ontario and Quebec and the Maritime provinces, having greater claims than Richmond, are refused appropriations, and in every instance we find that the refusal of these claims coincides with the fact that the representatives of these constituencies are opposing the Government. Can we be expected to support a principle so utterly abhorrent to all reason, so utterly immoral, the effect of which is felt throughout the country in degrading political life? We find that Ministers of the Crown, representatives of the people, learned and talented men waste five-tenths of their energies in election times, in persuading the people to vote for the ministerial candidate on the pitiful grounds that certain public favours will be given them if they do so, or that the erection of public buildings will give a certain amount of labour to a certain number of electors. The whole system is fraught with danger, and we ought to insist that the Government shall establish a broad principle upon which appropriations of this kind can be made, that it shall no longer be left to the back-door influence of members supporting the Government to determine these appropriations.

Mr. BORDEN. I am very sorry to have to vote in opposition to some of my friends

on this side of the House. I was much touched by the appeal which the Minister made a short time ago in reference to this vote. He said, What can I do? The faith of the country has been pledged. We have voted this over and over again, and I cannot strike it out. Now, as I said before, the Minister laid down the policy which I approved of, because I thought it was a fair and just one, namely, that he intended to carry out every pledge to construct a public building, made prior to the adoption of the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in 1890; and that being the case, the hon. gentleman adheres to the vote we are now discussing. He might, however, have treated this vote as the vote was treated which was passed in 1886 for the town of Kentville. I do not know why he makes the distinction; but I have still a hope, the hon. gentleman having laid down his policy so distinctly, and being an honourable man, that he will yet restore to the Estimates the vote which was so improperly stricken out in 1886. Until he fails to do that, I propose to support him in the policy which he has deliberately laid down, of carrying out the works to which this country was pledged before the adoption of that resolution in 1890, and which was accepted by the whole House. That being the case I will vote with the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. In discussing last year the question of Richmond post office, I find the following report in the "Debates" of 19th May:

Mr. FLINT. If the hon. Minister is not too tightly bound by pledges, I should hope he might see his way to cancel this vote and give a larger amount to some of those large towns in the west, which have stronger claims from a business stand-point.

Mr. MULLOCK. Can the Minister state that the land has yet been bought?

Mr. OUMET. Not yet; it is being purchased; not a cent has been spent yet.

Mr. MULLOCK. So there will be no loss by abandoning the scheme at this stage. Perhaps the Minister would consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). It is quite clear that this enterprise is an infringement of the resolution of 1890. I would like to know how the Minister justifies asking the House for this money in view of that resolution.

Mr. OUMET. The first appropriation was made in 1890, and it was renewed last year. I think it is time we should keep faith with that locality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population of Richmond?

Mr. OUMET. A little over 2,000. The revenue is \$1,909. The cost of the buildings will be between \$16,000 and \$18,000.

Then the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) drew attention to the impropriety of expending such sums in face of the receipts given by the Minister, both with respect to the post office, Inland Revenue and Customs. Then the Minister spoke as follows:—

Mr. OUMET. I differ with the hon. member for South Oxford. The Government have undertaken

certain obligations for this locality, and they feel bound to fulfil those obligations. It is intended to have the post office, custom-house and inland revenue in the building.

It is therefore quite clear that the intention last year was that the work should be proceeded with, for the Minister of Public Works said the Government desired to implement their promises. This vote was passed in 1891, revoted in 1892, and it is now proposed to be revoted, although no money has been spent. The Minister of Public Works has already intimated to this committee, as "Hansard" will show to-morrow, that it is only his intention to carry to completion buildings on which work had already been commenced. It is unfair to ask the committee to pass this item under the circumstances, especially in view of the agitation prevailing in the country for a general reduction of duties. The Minister of Finance has promised to go round the country and investigate that matter, and next year if the reductions anticipated by the people are carried out there may be a deficit. Yet the hon. Minister is proposing to spend money to erect a post office at a village where the receipts are only \$2,000. Possibly those people may have the promise of the former Minister of Public Works; but this committee is not pledged to carry out any promise made by a Minister of the Crown in face of the decision of Parliament that public buildings should only be erected at places where the receipts justify them. On what principle does the Minister ask this committee to commit itself to an expenditure for a post office at this village of 2,000 people, when there are over forty or fifty places in Ontario with receipts nearly double that which do not now possess any post offices? It is difficult to understand on what principle the Minister asks this committee to consent to re-enact the abominably corrupt scheme of previous years in connection with erection of public buildings. On what principle does the hon. gentleman leave out Listowell, Mount Forest and Harrison, with receipts running from \$3,000 to \$4,000, and ask a vote for a place with only \$3,000 revenue?

Mr. LISTER. It is not to be wondered at that the President of the Council should defend this iniquitous proposition of the Minister of Public Works, when we bear in mind that the hon. gentleman for years has been backing up just such transactions, and worse, too. He voted last year for the erection of a post office at Laprairie. I suppose he would vote for a post office in every small village in the province. It makes no difference to the Minister. He supported all those propositions submitted by the present Minister of Public Works, and the hon. gentleman who preceded him. He voted for post offices at Port Arthur, Picton and twenty or thirty other smaller places. The hon. gentleman said that he desired no better speech with which to go before the people of Rich-

mond and Wolfe than the one I made with reference to this expenditure. I hope the people of Richmond and Wolfe have a higher sense of political morality than the President of the Council. If the people are to vote against an opponent for denouncing an iniquitous system of expenditure of public money, and have no more political morality than to allow themselves to be diverted from what is right because some one advocated what is wrong, there is very little hope for the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe; but I have no doubt that in the constituency there are many men who will not be influenced by any such clap-trap as the President of the Council has used before this committee, that they will not be turned from doing what is right because some one spoke against an appropriation that to every reasonable man would appear to be wrong. The hon. gentleman says I come from Lambton. I am proud to come from Lambton. He says that I come from the oil regions. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I do not do anything of the kind, although I would feel proud to represent the oil men of this country. He wonders I should not know there is such a place as Richmond, that magnificent town of 2,000 inhabitants, that yields to the Government of this country about \$2,000 a year. I can tell my hon. friend who does not come from the oil regions that he is very crude not to know that West Lambton is not the oil territory of this country. He tells us that the Government have been making earnest inquiries as to the advisability of erecting public buildings in this great town of Richmond, and that that is the reason why this vote has been placed in the Estimates for the last three years. I doubt that story. The hon. gentleman has got to be the President of the Council. After knocking for years at the door and kicking up a dust outside the Council room, he has got into it, and he occupies the high position of President of the Council and Judge of the Judicial Committee. He has brought all his influence to bear, and he has got the Government to do what they were loath to do for years before in reference to this post office. If I remember aright, the President of the Council once represented Richmond and Wolfe, and he afterwards took Sherbrooke, and got a friend in Richmond and Wolfe, to strengthen his position and power, as it is necessary he should have one or two followers. In order to retain this follower, no doubt, he has induced the Government to build this post office at a cost of \$20,000 or \$30,000 for the purpose of collecting \$2,153 a year. In order to collect this the country is pledged for all time to come to an expenditure of \$1,700 a year. It is quite possible, as he says, that the mails may have to be changed at Richmond; but there are many other such places in this country, and I venture to say that if a motion were made here to erect public buildings in the town of Woodstock, with an income of \$16,000 or \$17,000 a year, and a population of 14,000

Mr. LISTER.

people, the President of the Council, righteous man that he is, would be found voting against it, although he attempts to justify this expenditure for the little town of Richmond. The President of the Council and his friends for the time being have control of the purse strings; but at some future time they will have to answer for the extravagance they are now guilty of. We had an evidence in the case of Laprairie last year, as well as in the present case, of the reckless manner in which the public money is squandered. It is strange that hon. gentlemen opposite will not bring that influence which they can bring to bear, so as to put an end to this extravagant, wasteful and corrupt Government.

Mr. IVES. My hon. friend quite misunderstood me if he gathered from what I said that the people of Richmond would consider his speech a reason for continuing their fidelity to the Conservative Government, because he threatened to deprive them of his vote. What I did say was, and what, if he had been listening carefully, he might have gathered: That they would judge of the correctness of the statements of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, by the incorrectness of his statement with regard to the necessity of a public building at Richmond, and the propriety of erecting one there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is a little history in connection with this that has not been touched upon to-night, and, in order to enable hon. gentlemen to vote intelligently on the question, I shall have to tell it. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that a few years ago Mr. Colby became a member of the Cabinet. I do not know whether he was ever a judge in the Cabinet or not, but hon. gentlemen will remember that there were some who were not called to the Council at that time, who had what they call a sore head. I do not know whether it affected the President of the Council very much or not, but I do know that since Mr. Colby went away, the President of the Council comes to this House more frequently than before. I do not suppose that he is moved by little considerations of this kind, but when his head got sore and the wound got deeper, the Government, in order to heal the wound, placed this little sum in the Estimates to build a post office. He represented that constituency for a number of years, and I am not surprised at it, because he is an able, active and enthusiastic party man. Well, after the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe got to know him well, he had to go to Sherbrooke; they had found him out in Richmond. I presume some of the rest of us have to change sometimes. I remember at the time that Mr. Abbott was in the Government, and that the President of the Council was out of it, there was a paper published in the town of Richmond, which was a firm and ardent supporter of the President of the Council, and it was talking about the enormity of the offences of the Government of Mr. Abbott. I pre-

sume the President of the Council has seen that paper kick. I tried to read an extract from that paper in the House, but so incensed became the Minister of Finance that he moved that the House should adjourn rather than let me go through with the article. I think it was immediately after this article was published that this sum was put in the Estimates. The Government knew the way to apply a balm to the President of the Council, but that was not the balm he was looking after. He desired to get into the Cabinet, and nothing but that would satisfy the hon. gentleman. He looked in the Estimates at the grant for building a post office at Richmond, but he spurned it from him, and he got his "Guardian" to condemn the Government for their rascality generally. It said that there should be a change in the Government, that it was full of corruption, and that it was an abomination to the honest people of the Dominion from one end of it to the other. Well, I have not heard any vapourings from that paper since the President of the Council came in. But then, it is a most curious thing that after the hon. gentleman had won this great favour for the honest people about Richmond, he had to go to Sherbrooke. Well, he went to Sherbrooke, and attended to some little matters there. There was a gentleman in Sherbrooke who was not so glad to see him back in Sherbrooke as he was glad to be there himself. I do not think that that old politician met him with a brass band. However, the hon. gentleman went there and formed some combinations and overcame some difficulties. He held on to Sherbrooke very tenaciously. I believe he imitated Mr. Chapleau, in becoming a very vigorous kicker, and finally he got into the Cabinet, and became chief justice there, or President of the Council. Well, soon after he got into the Council he created a vacancy in the post office at Sherbrooke, and I believe one gentleman who opposed the President of the Council was appointed postmaster, and the other who opposed him was appointed inspector. Thus the President of the Council has great combining graces. It is wonderful how he could use all those agencies at his disposal to make one gentleman who opposed him postmaster and the other inspector of the mail bags. I think that this gentleman, with all these inspiring graces, should inspire the country with confidence in his ability as Chief Justice of the Cabinet, to settle the difficult questions of a judicial character that come before them. I do not know whether he will use coal oil to do it or not. He must require some lubricant at times to render his decisions acceptable to all classes. Now, you understand, Mr. Chairman, a little of the history of this transaction. You see how from beginning to end this was done for a political purpose by the late Government. It was done for the purpose of conciliating the members who became hostile in their preference

for Mr. Colby ; and you see the means used by the President of the Council to heal the difficulties and restore harmony in the local party ranks by the use of public money. That is the position exactly—the public money is used for the purpose of restoring harmony between the different factions of the party. It is not the public interests, but the party interests that are regarded in the expenditure of the people's money ; and if the people of Richmond are the honest and straightforward people that we believe they are, they will hurl this back with scorn upon those who are seeking to bribe them by this means. But it was not the people that the Government were bribing or seeking to conciliate at that time. It was the President of the Council. They first sought to do so by making a grant to the city of Sherbrooke for an exhibition ; but nothing would satisfy the hon. gentleman by the Presidency of the Council. I hope his usefulness will not be curtailed after having received that which he has sought for so many years.

West Farnham Post Office,
Customs and Inland Revenue
offices—to complete \$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has been spent on this building ?

Mr. OUIMET. The building is at present under contract. The total sum to complete it will be \$10,089.

Montreal Post Office—alter-
ations and improvements . . . \$12,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for ?

Mr. OUIMET. The Montreal post office building has become quite insufficient for the business transacted there. Hitherto the third floor has not been occupied, and we are now dividing it and generally fitting it for offices ; so that not only the basement, but the first, second and third floors will be used. The money order and savings bank offices will be removed to the second floor, and to accommodate the public who go there in thousands, elevators will be put in. I think that this year we shall not put on a new roof, but repair the present roof.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention to light the third flat with electricity, like the rest of the building ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the contract price of the electric light ?

Mr. OUIMET. Up to the present time the price has been \$16 per lamp. I propose, in future, to measure the electric light, and to pay for it at the ordinary rate. The building is such that the lamps have to be lit all day and all night, in the basement, and on the first floor. In future, instead of paying so much per lamp we will pay so much per meter, as that will be cheaper. It is also

our intention to improve the skylights in order to have more light.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have you any other buildings for postal service besides this one ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; we have several branch post offices on different streets.

Orillia Public Building \$1,600

Mr. OUIMET. This will be completed in less than two months. The entire cost will be \$16,661.

Toronto Drill Hall \$90,000

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost will be \$180,000. The city furnish the site, which they estimate at \$150,000.

Winnipeg Military Buildings. \$20,000

Mr. OUIMET. A vote was taken last year to build new barracks for the school of infantry, and the balance to be voted is \$20,000. The cost will be \$45,000.

Regina Court House and office and Registry office \$20,000

Mr. OUIMET. The estimated cost is \$60,000.

Calgary Post Office, Custom House, &c. \$25,000

Mr. OUIMET. The entire cost is \$50,000.

North West Mounted Police Buildings \$20,000

Mr. OUIMET. This is to provide for additional officers' quarters, fire protection, general renewals and repairs in the whole of the North-west Territories. There will be expended at Regina, \$2,000 ; Maple Creek, \$20,500 ; Medicine Hat, \$250 ; Calgary, \$3,000 ; Fort McLeod, \$1,050 ; Lethbridge, \$1,500 ; Saskatchewan, \$2,500 ; South Edmonton, \$2,000 ; Battleford, \$2,000 ; McLeod outpost, \$1,500 ; Lethbridge outpost, \$500 ; Maple Creek outpost, \$200, etc.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That sum will hardly provide for the erection of new buildings.

Mr. OUIMET. No ; I do not think there are any new buildings except at the outposts. I may say these buildings, as a rule, cost less than the ordinary buildings, because the members of the force are employed in building most of them. They receive extra pay, but not at all what we should have to pay other labour.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have previously called attention to the necessity which seems to me to exist for us to begin to reduce the number of mounted police, and I think that, instead of providing new buildings, as if to perpetuate the force we should begin to look forward to its reduction. Last year the Minister of the Interior intimated that it was the intention of the Government to reduce the number of mounted police. I think there were a number who had served

Mr. OUIMET.

and whose time expired last year and I think the Minister intimated that it was not the intention to fill the places of a number of those whose time expired. I would like to know what reduction there has been.

Mr. IVES. Two hundred less than last year. But there are new duties for the force in connection with the cattle quarantine, which calls for the service of a large number of men, and, while that continues, I do not think it is safe to give a promise of very great reduction. I think possibly, after the necessity for this work disappears, a material reduction in the force will be made. But the hon. gentleman must understand that the police are being called upon to do a very large variety of public duties in connection with the Customs, quarantine and watching the Indians in every part of the North-west Territories. I must say the amount which the Government have placed in the Estimates is very much less than the Comptroller would like and that it is an exceedingly moderate sum when you consider that the force is scattered all over the country, and that you have to furnish shelter for them at all their different stations. This sum is not sufficient to furnish permanent quarters and it is absolutely the least sum the service can get on with.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to learn that the force has been reduced by two hundred within the last year. There is one point to which I drew the committee's attention last year and to which I would ask attention this year. I have no doubt that the Mounted Police perform a great variety of services in connection with the revenue, I think that instead of the whole expenditure being charged to police a fair share should be charged to customs or inland revenue to represent the service performed for these departments. Of course the country has to pay the money, but it is hardly doing justice to the different accounts. I can understand that, should a reduction be made in the force making it impossible for the force to do duty as customs preventive officers and inland revenue officers, it might be necessary to have a staff in connection with these two departments. But, in that case, the expenditure would be charged to the proper departments and each would bear its proportionate share of the expense.

Experimental Farms--improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., in connection with buildings, fences, &c.. . . . \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. That should be a revote, Mr. Chairman. I marked it so in the Estimates, but it was left out in the printing.

Repairs Ottawa Buildings--Furniture, &c. \$110,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for ; this is a very large item ?

Mr. OUIMET. I will give the hon. gentleman the items : Eastern block, \$7,900 ; Western block, \$10,000 ; Langevin block, \$6,000 ; Parliament buildings, Senate, \$6,000 ; House of Commons, \$8,000 ; Library, \$4,500 ; Supreme Court, \$2,000 ; Departmental buildings and Parliament Buildings, \$5,500 ; general repairs and maintenance in connection with gas, water supply, bells, electric light, ventilation, boilers, machinery, &c., \$40,000 ; post office, inland revenue, office, custom-house and Ottawa river works office, \$6,000 ; Geological survey, \$2,000 ; Victoria Hall, \$2,000 ; Government Printing Bureau, \$3,000 ; miscellaneous, \$5,000 ; total, \$110,000.

Rideau Hall. \$15,000

Mr. MULLOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister will let that item stand ; I have a return based on that and I want to discuss it.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Grounds, Public Buildings,
Ottawa. \$6,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this include Major's Hill Park ?

Mr. OUIMET. No ; it is the amount paid under contract for the maintenance of Parliament grounds and their ornamentation.

Heating Public Buildings,
Ottawa, including salaries
of engineers, firemen and
elevator attendant. \$66,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Last session, when we discussed this item, it was pointed out to the hon. Minister that we were using large quantities of wood and, by the comparison made, it was very clearly shown that wood as fuel, instead of coal, was anything but an economy in the public service. If I am aright, the Minister said we were under contract for a time. I would like to ask if the contract has expired, and whether he has made any change with reference to it ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract has another year to run. I intend to ask for a sufficient amount in the Supplementary Estimates to have these boilers changed or replaced in order to burn nothing but coal and give up wood.

Major's Hill Park, Ottawa. \$4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it intended to spend this money ?

Mr. OUIMET. This is the amount paid for the maintenance and ornamentation of the park. It is spent under contract, after public tenders were asked for.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a very nice spot, I admit ; but it appears to me we have spent an enormous amount of money on Major's Hill Park. I am glad to see that the item is coming down. Who has the contract just now for the care of the park ?

Mr. OUIMET. A man by the name of Garello.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe the man who has charge of it, is a pretty decent old man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remark that the way in which the turf around these buildings was attended to last season was simply disgraceful. I constantly saw huge floods of cold water poured upon it. I trust the Minister will see that a little more pains are taken in the management of these grounds in the future. I do not want to spend another summer here, if I can help it, but I am bound to say that the care that was shown, or rather the want of care that was bestowed upon these grounds, was extremely disgraceful, bearing in mind that they have cost us nearly a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Major's Hill Park was watered with revolving sprinklers, and the grass was kept in terrible condition, but here they just turned on the nozzle.

Mr. BOWERS. I should suppose, when we have scientific men on the experimental farm to instruct these people, they would know enough not to turn on the grass a stream of cold water in a hot summer's day.

Water for Dominion Public
Buildings \$15,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this water supplied by contract ? It seems to be an enormous sum to pay for water for the public buildings at Ottawa.

Mr. OUIMET. It is according to an agreement that has been entered into with the corporation, three or four years ago.

Mr. MULLOCK. Where do you get your electric light ?

Mr. OUIMET. We have a special engine for ourselves and dynamo. It is well that it should be so, because at the present moment we are very poorly served in town.

Mr. DENISON. Is this sum for water alone ? It seems to me to be a very great amount. Capitalized at 4 per cent, it represents nearly \$400,000 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If that agreement is capable of being opened, I think the Minister had better look into it. How long has it yet to run ? Surely, we are not bound for all time ? I suppose you have to make certain allowances to Ottawa for municipal advantages, as is the rule, I think, in most cities where the Government buildings occupy so much space. In Washington, for example, there is a fixed portion of the municipal expenses paid in bulk sum. I think they tax the people one-third. How is it here ? Are you taxed the same as ordinary ratepayers ?

Mr. OUIMET. We pay no taxes at all ; but we have consented to pay a certain

amount, as a compromise, for what is called local improvements, and which benefit the public buildings.

Mr. MULLOCK. The water tax, therefore, I regard as a contribution. Could you say how much the Government pay to the city for municipal services of all kinds?

Mr. OUMET. This sum of \$15,500 is for water consumed at the buildings, and also for our contribution towards the maintenance of a proper system of protection against fire.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is it paid for by meter?

Mr. OUMET. A certain amount has been agreed upon, after conference. What we pay in addition to the corporation is in the shape of maintenance of certain works and bridges, for which we intend to ask this year \$6,000. We also maintain Major's Hill Park, at a cost of \$4,000, but that, of course, is the property of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the Government has also built bridges on the road to Rideau Hall.

Mr. OUMET. The Government contributed \$1,000 towards one of the bridges.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do the Government maintain it?

Mr. OUMET. No.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) for the relief of James Balfour—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 94) for the relief of Robert Young Hebden—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 95) for the relief of Edmund H. Heward—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call the attention of the leader of the House to the French Treaty, which has been laid on the Table. I have received a large number of inquiries from the Maritime provinces as to the meaning of this treaty. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will be able to answer my question to-night, but it is very important to know exactly how far the treaty goes. In article 3 it gives a list of articles of Canadian origin that can be imported into France direct, and on which we will receive the advantage of the minimum tariff, among which is fish preserved in its natural form. I would have no doubt in regard to the matter myself, but I am asked whether that description includes ordinary dry

Mr. OUMET.

codfish, or pickled herring, or pickled mackerel, which are preserved in their natural form. It is very desirable before the treaty comes before the House—and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends to ask the consent of Parliament to it this session or not—that we should know exactly what these words include. I shall be much obliged, if the hon. gentleman feels that he is not in a position to answer this question authoritatively to-night, if he will ascertain exactly what these words include, whether they include ordinary dry and pickled cod and ordinary pickled herring and mackerel.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be more satisfactory to the hon. gentleman if on Monday, before the House goes into its work, I make a general statement with regard to the treaty, giving all information in my possession, and it will answer most of the hon. gentleman's inquiries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend to ask Parliament this session to assent to the treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not prepared to answer that question just now.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VAUDREUIL ELECTION.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg again to ask if there has been a returning officer appointed for the electoral division of Vaudreuil?

Mr. FOSTER. A returning officer has been appointed. He is Mr. Francois De Sales Bastien, the same returning officer as before. Nomination, 5th April; polling, 12th April.

INQUIRY RE SIR A. P. CARON.

Mr. EDGAR. On Friday the Secretary of State promised me that he would be able to give me full information as to the distribution of the evidence taken before the Caron Commission. I hope he will have something satisfactory to lay before the House or otherwise it may delay the session.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I find that the Queen's Printer has completed a portion of the work, so as to enable me to lay a partial report on the Table. The evidence is now complete and is ready for distribution among the members.

Mr. EDGAR. They are going on with printing the exhibits?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. Marshall.)

Bill (No. 62) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company, and to change the name of the company to the St. Lawrence Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the North American Canal Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Canadian Gas Association.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend an Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Weldon.)

RELIEF OF MARTHA BALLANTYNE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved second reading of Bill (No. 82) for the relief of Martha Ballantyne—(from the Senate).

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	McDonald (Victoria),
Beith,	McLennan,
Bennett,	McLeod,
Borden,	McMillan,
Bowers,	McMullen,
Boyd,	McNeill,
Boyle,	Madill,
Brown,	Mara,
Bryson,	Marshall,
Cargill,	Mills (Annapolis),
Carpenter,	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Montague,
Charlton,	Mulock,
Christie,	Northrup,
Cochrane,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Putnam,
Davis,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rosamond,
Denison,	Ross (Dundas),
Dickey,	Ross (Lisgar),
Edgar,	Scriver,
Fairbairn,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Foster,	Stairs,
Gillies,	Sutherland,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hughes,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Landerkin,	Welsh,
Lister,	White (Shelburne),
Lowell,	Wilmot,
Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Wilson,
Macdowall,	Wood (Brockville),
Maclean (York),	Wood (Westmoreland),
McAlister,	Yeo.—73.
McDonald (Assiniboia),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	LaRivière,
Bain (Soulanges),	Laurier,
Bergeron,	Leduc,

Bernier,
Cameron,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Costigan,
Curran,
Devlin,
Fréchette,
Geoffrion,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Godbout,
Ives,
Joncas,
Langevin (Sir Hector),

Legris,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Ouimet,
Patterson (Huron),
Perry,
Proulx,
Robillard,
Simard,
Tarte,
Turcotte,
Vaillancourt.—31.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RELIEF OF JAMES BALFOUR.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved second reading of Bill (No. 93) for the relief of James Balfour—(from the Senate).

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to draw the attention of this House to the fact that there is no evidence whatever to support the Bill. There is only the simple admission, not under oath, of the wife, but not a particle of evidence of the circumstances to show any guilt whatever on her part. There is only the wife's mere admission to her husband and the minister of her church and nothing else. There are certain letters which she wrote to her husband, but you will not find any evidence taken under oath of any person to show that the woman was guilty of what she admits. If a simple confession not under oath is to be sufficient to annul a marriage and obtain divorce, well and good; but we have to take the responsibility of the precedent. I do not believe there is a court of justice which would base a judgment of this nature on such evidence.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that the whole course of procedure in this Dominion in divorce matters is one that places members in a very awkward position. The granting of divorce should certainly be a judicial act. My own feeling in this matter is simply this: Here are cases presented to me for my decision in which I have not examined the evidence and have not had opportunities to hear the witnesses. I am called on to perform a judicial act without knowing the evidence. If a divorce is to be granted at all, and I believe there is one reason, and only one which justifies granting it, the granting of it should be a judicial act after due trial in a court of justice. I presume two-thirds of the members in this House, in giving their votes on divorce Bills, are simply governed by the assumption that the Senate passed the Bills with sufficient reason. That is not a reason which satisfies me, and I believe the time will come when the good sense of the country will see, if we are to grant divorces at all, that the present cumbrous system should be replaced by a trial before a court, where evidence will be heard, and a judicial decision given. I enter my protest, as a member of this House, against the system which calls on me to vote in matters concerning which I am

not informed to the extent to which I should be in order to give an intelligent vote.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, on a division.

RELIEF OF E. H. HEWARD.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved second reading of Bill (No. 95) for the relief of Edmund Holyoake Heward—(from the Senate).

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Is the correspondent in this case still a member of Her Majesty's service in this country?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, on a division.

DUGGAN—CULLER.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether a person named Duggan, of Quebec, was appointed some time during the last two years as culler at Montreal, or to measure and report as culler or otherwise at Montreal? If so, what salary was he paid? Does not the last amendment to the Cullers' Act provide that there shall be eight cullers only? Is there not an assistant culler at Montreal? What is his name, and what fees or salary was paid him last year? How long was Duggan at Montreal, and what is his salary?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I beg to say that there was a person of that name who was employed and was paid the sum of \$500. The last amendment does not provide for eight cullers, and there is not an assistant culler at Montreal. Therefore, no fees or salary were paid. Duggan was employed from the 1st of June to the 5th of December, 1892, for which he received \$500.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Mr. WILSON asked, Has the attention of the Government been directed to the petition presented to this House, asking for a change in the "Weights and Measures Act," so far as it relates to the weight of vegetables by the bushel? If so, is it the intention of the Government to amend the law as prayed for in said petition?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The attention of the Government has been directed to the petition for a change in the Weights and Measures Act, so far as it relates to the weights of vegetables by the bushel. It is not the intention of the Government to amend the law as applied for during the present session.

SUPERINTENDENT OF I. C. R.

Mr. GODBOUT (for Mr. Cloquette) asked, Whether the Government are aware that the position of superintendent of the section of the Intercolonial Railway between Ste. Flavie and Moncton has been vacant for over

Mr. CHARLTON.

three months? If so, do they intend to fill the said vacancy at an early day, and to appoint a French Canadian thereto, in compliance with the petitions in that behalf forwarded to the Government, and in particular to the hon. Postmaster-General, Sir A. P. Caron?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been a vacancy in the superintendency of the Intercolonial Railway between Ste. Flavie and Moncton for some time. It is the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy.

MR. THOMAS BREEN.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. Delisle) (translation) asked, Is Thomas Breen still employed by the Public Works Department? If so, what is his present occupation and the amount paid to him for salary, board and travelling expenses, in 1892; also, in January and February last?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I beg to state that Mr. Breen has the supervision, as residing engineer, of all the works that are carried out in the county of Gaspé, including the Magdalen Islands, and the counties of Bonaventure and Témiscouata. Mr. Breen received, in 1892, and in January and February, 1893, the following amounts:—Salary, \$2,337.50; board, \$476; and travelling expenses, \$670.40.

MR. JOSEPH ROSA.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. Delisle) (translation) asked, Is Joseph Rosa in the employ of the Public Works Department? If so, what is the nature of his work? How much did he draw for salary, board and travelling expenses from 1st January to 31st December, 1892? What amount of money was expended for public works under his superintendence in 1892?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Yes; Mr. Rosa has the superintendence, as resident engineer, of the slides and booms of the Saguenay River, and also of the works carried on in the counties of Montmorency and Charlevoix. Mr. Rosa received the following amounts:—Salary, \$2,013; board, \$535.50; travelling expenses, \$549.60. \$7,090.10 were expended on the works under his supervision.

MR. C. E. MICHAUD.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. Delisle) (translation) asked, What amount of money was paid by the Public Works Department to C. E. Michaud, surveyor, for salary, travelling expenses and board during the year 1892? What works were intrusted to his supervision, and what is the amount expended on each of such works? Is the said C. E. Michaud still under pay, and what is his work?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Mr. C. E. Michaud was paid as salary the sum of \$2,013 ; for travelling expenses, \$196.31 ; and for board, \$150.50. The works intrusted to his supervision during the year were those carried out at Rimouski, Trois Pistoles, Ile Verte, Berthier (en bas), and St. Michel de Bellechasse. The amounts expended are subdivided as follows :—At Rimouski, \$4,592.75 ; Trois Pistoles, \$1,499.28 ; Ile Verte, \$3,999.70 ; Berthier (en bas), \$485.93, and St. Michel de Bellechasse, \$996.70. Mr. Michaud is still employed by the Government ; his last work was the compiling of a report on all the works he has under his supervision, so as to enable the chief engineer to prepare his estimates.

MR. ARSENE CLOUTIER.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. Tarte) (translation) asked, Was Mr. Arsène Cloutier of L'Islet, appointed superintendent of the works done last summer on the pier at L'Islet ? If so, what was his salary, and what amount did he receive ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Mr. Arsène Cloutier was not appointed superintendent of the works carried out last summer on the pier at L'Islet.

INDUSTRIES IN UXBRIDGE.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. What was the nature or description of each of the thirty manufacturing industries existing in the town of Uxbridge according to the census of 1891 ? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufacturing industries ? How many hands or employees were employed in each of such manufactories ? 2. What was the number and nature or description of each of the manufacturing industries in the town of Uxbridge according to the census of 1881 ? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufactories ? How many hands were employed in each of said factories ?

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to allow this question to stand.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask if the Government is ready to give any assurance that that class of questions will receive an answer some day soon ?

Mr. FOSTER. Before answering the hon. gentleman I had better ascertain how the work in the department is getting on with reference to these questions. I will ascertain and be ready to answer his question to-morrow.

TRACKMASTER—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILROAD.

Mr. PERRY asked, What were the reasons for dismissing John McPherson, late trackmaster on the Prince Edward Island Rail-

road ? Is he superannuated ? If not, why not ?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may state that John McPherson's services were dispensed with because one roadmaster is considered sufficient. He is not superannuated ; he is not entitled to superannuation.

INDUSTRIES IN THE CITY OF LONDON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved for :

Return giving the names of the 804 manufacturers of the city of London referred to in the census of 1891.

He said : I would like to add,

"The industries in which they are engaged, and the amount of capital invested in each industry."

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman had better ask for the capital of each individual manufacturer. That goes rather further than the spirit of the instructions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose there will be no objection to giving the number of hands employed by each ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I will amend it in that way ; although I think it is very important to obtain the amount of capital invested, otherwise we cannot tell how far the value of the dwelling-house has been included.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION—CLOSING ON SUNDAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved :

That in the opinion of this House, the Canadian Department of the Columbian Exhibition should be closed on Sunday, in accordance with the British example at previous exhibitions, in deference to the Christian sentiment of the country, and as a recognition of the duty resting upon an avowedly Christian people, to refuse by an official act to do violence to Christian principles and to decline to lend aid or countenance to any course that will deprive official caretaker, or labourer, of Christian liberties, or privileges, or will invite or compel any class of the population to violate Divine requirements relating to the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest.

He said : The motion of which I have given notice and which we reach to-day is substantially the one submitted to the House last session, and my reason for raising the question again is, that the action of the House on the matter last session was hardly satisfactory, and subsequent developments in the United States have, in my opinion, rendered it highly desirable that the Canadian Government and the Canadian people should take a stand on this question, so far as our influence may be exerted, that will not be of an uncertain character. Last year Congress in making an appropriation coupled it with a provision that the fair should not

be open on Sunday, the payment of the appropriation being made contingent on that provision. A very decided attempt was made to obtain a reversal of that condition during last session of Congress. I believe that attempt did not succeed. There has, however, been a movement in favour of the opening of the Chicago Exhibition on Sunday which is very formidable indeed, and promises to be a successful one. The reason for this movement, so far as the majority of the citizens of Chicago are concerned, is, no doubt, purely a mercenary one. The people of the city believe the fair is more likely to be a financial success if it is open seven days instead of six days in the week. The effort put forth by the promoters of the fair and by those who are pecuniarily interested in it has been seconded by the Sunday newspapers of the United States, very naturally, by the continental element of the population, by the anarchist and socialist elements, and in fact by all the elements of society in Chicago and the United States antagonistic to social order. The movement for the opening of the fair on Sunday has been opposed in the United States by the Christian sentiment of that country. The religious element is almost a unit in favour of closing the fair on the Lord's Day. I believe one or two small religious bodies, such as the Seven Day Baptists and the Adventists, support the opening of the fair on Sunday, because they do not believe in the Christian Sabbath. It is also opposed by the labour organizations, the Federation of Labour, the Knights of Labour, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and various other organizations; and it may be asserted unhesitatingly that the best elements of the country are arrayed on the side of opposition to the opening. It is said that petitions, representing at least 35,000,000 of the population, were presented to Congress last session in opposition to the movement to open the fair on Sunday. The issue may be said to be, Sir, between the friends of religion, morality and labour, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the enemies of religion and those who pay no attention to the religious and the civil rights of the labourer. The arguments pro and con, of course, are the old familiar arguments with reference to Sabbath desecration, and the use of the Sabbath as a day for pleasure, for pic-nics, and parties and excursions, etc. It is said that those in favour of the opening are actuated by a sincere desire to give the labourer a rest and a chance to visit the fair. The arguments in this direction would be just as applicable to the case of a circus here in Ottawa on the Sabbath. We could use the same arguments with the same force to advocate that a circus should be allowed to go on with its performance on Sunday on account of the poor labourer in the city here who was unable to see that circus on any week day. It is a significant fact that the great mass of the labourers on whose behalf this argument is put forth are themselves

Mr. CHARLTON.

opposed to the opening of the fair. If it were opened it would have the effect of depriving 30,000 employees in the exposition itself of their Sunday rest. It would have the further effect of depriving of their Sunday rest some 35,000 or 40,000 employees of the various street railway lines and elevated railway lines, and of the 100 railway lines centring in Chicago. The effect of the opening of the fair on Sunday would be to pour excursion trains into the city from about 100 railway lines. It is unnecessary to say that the people who would patronize these Sunday excursions would be of a class to make the fair not a very desirable place to be frequented by the decent and better ordered of society. I have an extract here with regard to the character of Sunday excursions at Pittsburg, which is a photograph of the character of almost all such excursions. The Pittsburg "Commercial Gazette," speaking of a Sunday excursion, such as the Sunday opening of the World's Fair would multiply beyond all precedent, says:

Think of several hundred men, women and boys, for the most part belonging to the classes who have least regard for the rights of others or the restraints of the law, gathered together in a promiscuous assembly, and seemingly let loose to follow their evil bent: Many of the men and boys had supplied themselves with flasks of liquor, and when their destination had been reached and the time came for indulging in "the dance," it is not surprising that the climax of disorder and indecency should be reached. In addition to other demoralising scenes there was cheating and gambling.

That is a fair picture of the character of a Sunday excursion. Sometimes they are rather worse, sometimes rather better; but if 100 excursions of this kind were let loose in Chicago every Sabbath day from 100 different railways, the character of the Columbia Exhibition would be such as would not make it attractive to Christian people in this country, or in any other. I stand here upon the floor of Parliament in my capacity as a representative of the people, to urge upon the Government that the example set by the Dominion of Canada in this respect should be a good one, and that we should wash our hands from all the evils which would be the result of the Sunday opening of the Columbia Exhibition. It may be said that we have nothing to do with religion here. That is very true, Mr. Speaker. We are not called upon to enact that a man shall be religious; we are not called upon to enact that he should attend church; we are not called upon to enact what his religious faith should be. That is entirely beyond our province; but we may legitimately be called upon to say: that if a man is a religious man, or if he has conscientious or religious scruples he shall be allowed to exercise his religious rights upon the Lord's Day, and that he shall not be deprived by any action of ours of his opportunity or privilege to attend church. It is for the purpose of securing civil rights, not for the purpose of dictating what a man's religious belief shall be, or in what manner

he shall spend the Lord's Day ; but it is for the purpose of protecting the civil and religious rights of the 30,000 employees of the exhibition, and of the labourers and employees of the various railway lines who desire to have the Sunday rest, that action of this kind may be justified. It is a fact, Sir, that although we cannot provide what a man's religion shall be, and that we are unable and not called upon to legislate as to what religious observances there should be, yet, by the fact that we profess to be a Christian nation we are restrained from any action that would be contrary to the provisions and requirements of the higher law. We cannot go to work and deliberately set at naught the provisions of the first commandment, or of the second commandment, or of the third commandment, or of the fourth commandment, or of any one of the ten commandments. It does not rest upon us as a Christian state to do it. We have not, properly speaking, the power to do it, and we should withhold our sanction from any attempt to set at naught or override any one of these commandments—the fourth included among the number. Now, Mr. Speaker, the tendency of the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday will be, not to benefit the labourer, but to enthrall him. The first effect would be, upon the multitude of labourers who are connected with the exhibition itself, upon the additional multitude who are called upon to act as brakemen and conductors and engineers and firemen, and in various other capacities as railway employees on transportation lines. To deprive all these men of their Sunday rest is to insert the thin end of the wedge, and it sets an example of depriving others. I have an extract here from Horace Greeley, descriptive of the effect of Sunday labour in Geneva, which would bear very pertinently upon this point of the question. Mr. Greeley, it may be borne in mind, was not a Puritan ; he was not a religious bigot ; he belonged to that society known as Universalists ; he was a man of very broad and liberal views, and his views in regard to Sunday observance were dictated solely by civil considerations, and considerations as to the effect it produced upon society. He spoke as to its effect upon the civil rights of man and upon the material development and well-being of nations. This letter was written many years ago ; it is descriptive of the condition of things in Geneva, Switzerland, and Mr. Greeley says :

I wish you might stand an hour with me on Sunday morning in the labour market in Geneva, and see the troops of dull, tired, saddened-looking labourers in ragged blouses, unwashed from the grime and sweat of one week's work of seven days, trudging off sluggishly and wearily, like dumb, driven cattle, to the work of the next week of seven days. "Are these slaves?" you ask. Slaves? Bless you, no. These are free men. These are voters and citizens in a land of universal suffrage, under the freest Government on earth, with an advanced and liberal constitution of the latest French invention, and with all the modern improvements. No blue laws here. They

once had blue laws in Geneva, but they have laughed them down long ago. This, which you see, is liberty, complete, untrammelled, personal liberty. Every one of these free citizens has a right, a proud, irrevocable right to work on Sunday if he chooses, and that is what it ends in for him, and that is what it will end in for you if you choose to make the costly experiment. The workingman who may work on Sunday has got to work on Sunday when work is wanted. The right to rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all. Think of it, think of it twice, think of it again, then say if you will barter away your birth-right, the American Sabbath, the universal privilege of rich and poor, for this miserable French delusion, this continental holiday through which one-half of the people have to toil that the other half may frolic.

This puts the case pertinently and forcibly, and it is for the reasons set forth in Mr. Greeley's letter, an extract of which I have read, that the labourer instinctively realizes that, if he consents to the demand to deprive any fellow-labourer of his Sunday rest, he is inserting the entering wedge and that the recoil may be upon himself next, and he may be called upon to submit to the same treatment which he has meted out to others. For that reason the feeling against the Sunday opening of the Chicago Exposition is almost a universal one among labourers. Some gentleman was kind enough to send me a few days ago a copy of the Chicago "Herald" containing a report of a speech by the Rev. L. C. Randolph, a Seventh Day Baptist, who takes the ground that the Fair should be opened on the Lord's Day. He says he advocates this in order to protect the weak against oppression and wrong. It is to protect the weak against oppression and wrong that the demand is made that the fair shall not be opened on the Lord's Day. It is to protect the 30,000 people engaged on the fair grounds ; it is to protect the labourers engaged in transporting people to and from Chicago ; it is to protect in their religious rights every man, woman and child whose labours shall be demanded if the fair is opened on the Lord's Day. This gentleman further says that we have no right to adopt a principle that will work injustice to any class of people. Sir, that is true, and it is another reason why the closing of the fair is demanded—because the opening of that fair and the deprivation of thousands of people of their Sunday rest is a wrong done to these people. It is purely on civil and material grounds, entirely distinct from religious ideas and observances, that I base my motion asking that we as a country shall place ourselves in antagonism to the demand that is made, and made with such promise of success, that the Chicago exposition shall be opened on the Lord's Day. I do not need to say that there is no question as to the state of Christian sentiment in Canada upon this matter. There is no question either as to the state of Christian sentiment in the United States. So deep is the feeling, so keen is the sense of importance of the question, that it is

evident—nay, it is certain—that tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands of Christian people will refuse to patronize the fair or countenance it or visit it if it is opened on the Lord's Day; and we as a people certainly do not want to place ourselves in a position to invite and sanction a violation of the fourth commandment. We have as a people a long record, extending away back for a thousand years and more, as a Sabbath-observing people. The British people before the days of Cromwell imbibed the opinion that they were the chosen people of God. It may have been a very ridiculous impression, but it led to a strict, a Puritanical observance of the Sabbath. Whether they were the chosen people of God or not, they have experienced the truth of that promise that in keeping His commandments, there is great reward; and if the heritage of Jacob, promised to the Jews was ever received by a race, it has been received by the Anglo-Saxon race. Through all the course of English history, and all the course of English colonial history, we find that that race has paid respect to the Sabbath. Great Britain, in its ordinances, has asserted that it is a Christian nation, and upon the very coins of the realm the sovereign is named, "Sovereign by the grace of God." There has never been an exposition opened in England on the Lord's Day; there has never been an exposition opened in England's colonies on the Lord's Day; there has never been, up to this time, an exposition opened in the United States on the Lord's Day. When the French exposition was held, the exhibits of England, the exhibits of America, the exhibits of Canada, the exhibits of all the British colonies were closed.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg pardon. I think you are mistaken. I think that in Paris we saw the products of all the countries of the world on Sunday, as well as on any other day of the week.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not withdraw my statement. I know that the American exhibits were closed. I have read the correspondence between Mr. Atterbury, the president of the Sunday Observance League, of New York, and the late Secretary Blaine on that subject. I know that the British exhibits and the Canadian exhibits were closed; as to the other colonies I will not answer, but I presume that they were closed also. There was an object lesson to all nations of the world. If an inquiry should be made on the part of a German or a Russian, why the exhibits of these great nations were closed on that day, the answer would be, because Great Britain and America believed in paying national respect and national recognition to the claims of the Christian Sabbath. There was an object lesson of the most powerful character. We, as a people, have never yet transgressed or falsified that declaration, and it will be done for the first time if it is

Mr. CHARLTON.

done during the coming summer in the case of the Chicago exposition. I do not say that it will be done; but there is a danger of its being done, and I wish to see the Dominion of Canada wash its hands of all complicity in that transaction. I wish to see the Canadian portion of the exposition closed on the Lord's Day, whether the United States portion is opened or not, for the sake of the influence which such an act would have upon our own people, and because it would be in accordance with our conscientious convictions as a people. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice was kind enough last session to express himself as favourable to this proposition. He acknowledged that it was quite in consonance with precedents, both in Canada and in Great Britain, and that it would be the natural course for us to take. But he added—I was not quite satisfied with his position then, and I am still less satisfied now:

I shall ask the House, however, not to adopt the motion as pledging the Government to any particular course, for this reason; that while that was the disposition of the Government, there may be considerations which would prevent its being carried out, and those considerations we are not yet aware of. Our exhibits will be, to a great extent, under the control of the managing authorities of the exhibition, and our exhibits are, I believe, to be in the main building, and we must conform ourselves to such regulations as we find imperative in that country to which our exhibits are sent, and in which the exhibition is being conducted.

Now, I can conceive of no circumstances under which we should be obliged to conform ourselves to the regulations that they might provide, and violate our conscientious scruples, reverse our national record, and disgrace our country by opening our exhibit on the Lord's Day. There is no reason why it should be done. The country does not want to place itself in a position where it can be done. I do not want to leave in the hands of the Government the power or authority of deciding this matter at all. I desire to have an expression from the Parliament of Canada as to what, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, this Government should do. I do not want this House to utter any uncertain sound. I do not want this country to take a position antagonistic to British or Canadian records or to the requirements of divine law. For that reason I have brought this question up on this occasion. We are bound to consider the question for ourselves, independently of the action of the United States; and we are not, as the Minister of Justice said last year, to be governed by their action in the matter. I presume that a good many people take very little interest in this question. I presume that I might secure more interest in it before some other audience than I am able to secure before this House; but there is not an hon. gentleman present who does not represent a constituency having a majority of Christian people. I presume there is hardly

any hon. gentleman present who would care to place himself upon record as being in favour of Sunday desecration, or of lowering the record of Canada in this matter. I believe it would be inconsistent with our past if we were to make an exception of this Chicago exhibition in the matter of Sunday observance; and, instead of lowering our record, or changing our principles, I think we ought to reaffirm them. I shall be proud of Canada if, during the coming summer, our part of the exhibition were closed, even although the American authorities should decide to throw the fair open on the Lord's Day. If we close our exhibit, as I believe Great Britain will hers, we will be making a practical protest against what we believe to be a desecration of the Lord's Day, and will be taking a firm stand in vindicating the reverence of our people for their Christian teachings.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to add a few words to what has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman has taken largely the points and notes I had made on this important question, so that I shall not detain the House by referring to them at any length. I simply wish to endorse, to the fullest extent, the views he has expressed. I think it would be a national disgrace if we were to countenance the desecration of the Lord's Day in the United States by keeping our exhibition open. Canada has a very respectable record in this matter which we should not allow to be broken. If there is any one thing to-day which is a standing reproach to the United States, it is their desecration of the Lord's Day, and if there is any one thing that we should appreciate more than another it is the sacredness of that day. The Christian communities belonging to the different denominations throughout this country are watching, with close and attentive eyes, the action of this House. All the ministers of the different denominations are strongly in favour of this House declaring that our portion of the exhibition shall not be open on the Lord's Day. I shall not detain the House. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has anticipated almost every argument that could be made in favour of his motion. There is not a nation in the world where the sacredness of the Lord's Day is openly violated, in which the labouring classes do not suffer. It is a positive fact, well established by extended investigation, that wherever labour is compelled to work seven days in the week, the violation of the Lord's Day tends to pauperize rather than enrich. We know of instances where men, when compelled to work on the Lord's Day, have had their wages reduced, so that they did not earn more in seven days than they did formerly in the six days. Any number of instances can be adduced to prove that nations which have openly disregarded the divine obligation of resting on the

seventh day have become demoralized, and the classes which suffer the most are the labouring classes. At this stage of our existence, we, as a nation, ought not to permit our creditable record to be broken in this matter, and if we do not, our action cannot fail to have a beneficial effect. People passing through the fair may have their attention drawn to the fact that the Canadian exhibit is closed on the Lord's Day, and when they ask the reason, the answer, no doubt, will be that the people of Canada so respect that day as to refuse to allow their exhibit to be open upon it. That will prove to the Christian world that in Canada, at least, there is one feature of our people which deserves respect, and that is our observance of the Lord's Day. I hope that this House will give expression to its views on this question, and show to the world at large that we, as one of the dependencies of the British Empire, are bound to follow the noble example set us by the mother country in this respect.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend to give a final or decisive opinion upon the best way of observing the Lord's Day. I do not think that is within my province. I have not been sent here for that. I have been sent here to study the fiscal condition of the country and to pass criminal laws, but not to define the Divine laws. I will observe, first, that my hon. friend who has just spoken, speaks of the seventh day of the week. I think he is mistaken. Sunday is the first day of the week. Well, we must settle that point first.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, by saying "the seventh day," I meant that we should labour six days and that we should set aside or keep sacred the seventh.

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad that my hon. friend admits with me that Sunday is the first day of the week. But I thought God rested on the seventh day of the week, and I ask myself by what right this Parliament shall substitute another than the day fixed by God. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me his authority. The Jews, who are very numerous on this continent, have always kept the seventh day. By what right should we impose our views upon these people? I do not pretend that we are wrong in taking that day; I do not discuss the question, but I ask of such religious men as the two hon. members who have spoken before me, where is their authority to substitute another day for the day chosen by God himself? These hon. gentlemen want to bring into discussion here a religious question; they want to be, not only schoolmasters, but pastors of souls. They want to legislate us into heaven. Well and good, but they must convince us first, because between God and man there is only conviction. I want the hon. gentleman to tell us by what authority they substitute the first day for the seventh

day designed by God as the Sabbath? So long as they do not satisfy us upon this point they cannot expect us to insult God and take another day than the one he has selected himself. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the hon. member that it is a standing reproach to the United States to open the exhibition on Sunday. I regret these words; they should not be spoken in Parliament or in any assembly representing the people of this country. The representatives of the United States have not been called upon to answer that charge. We make an accusation against that country when its representatives are not here, and in a body such as this, to answer to the charge that that should not be done. It may be done in the press or on the stump, perhaps, but hon. gentlemen should not use the responsibility of membership of this House to give weight to such accusations against a friendly country. Now, we want to use the exhibition to benefit the Canadian people. We have the advantage of having a large space there and our agricultural and manufacturing products, minerals and so on will be exhibited there. We received the hospitality of the United States, and yet these hon. gentlemen, on receiving that hospitality, would dictate to the United States laws of hospitality. They receive the benefit of the kindness of their hosts only to insult those hosts. I think that is not fair between one nation and another. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands, I may say millions, of people who feel that they may go on Sunday to view the wonders that will be on exhibition in Chicago, without offending God. Why should the majority impose their views upon that minority, if minority they be? And I am opposed to that. I say, without expressing my own opinion upon the other point, that millions of people who are to be at the exhibition will think that they may in conscience go either in the morning or the afternoon or the evening to look at these pictures, these machines (which will not be working on Sunday), these wonders of modern science, without offending God, just as we look on Sundays at the brilliant sun or the shining moon, which tell us that there is above us a power greater than themselves, the attainment of whose presence and favour should be the constant effort of men. Should not the hon. mover and seconder of the resolution have more pity for the thousands upon thousands of working men for whom Sunday will be the only opportunity of seeing the wonders of the exposition? Is it not too oppressive for the hon. gentlemen to try to prevent these workingmen from enjoying the exhibition? The hon. gentleman thinks it wrong to go to the exhibition on Sunday. Then let him stay at home. But the millions who think it is not wrong, let them go. They do not trouble the hon. gentleman's rest or his worship; they do not trouble him in any way. Let them go if they like. I am in favour of liberty for every one if that liberty does not

Mr. AMYOT.

encroach upon the liberty of others. Now, my hon. friends say that there are some employees in that exhibition who would like to rest on Sunday. He may be sure of one thing, that the chief officers there, whether they are from the United States or Canada or elsewhere, will have heart and conscience enough to see to it that the employees will be so treated that every one will be able to earn his living without injuring his health or doing violence to his conscience. I do not express my own opinion; I do not feel called upon to give a personal opinion; but I say this Parliament should not try to dictate to the United States the laws of hospitality and should not try to prevent the poor working classes from enjoying the exhibition. We should mind our own business, and leave every one else free to do the same. There was an American once who got rich by minding his own business, and if this Parliament will mind its own business more closely it will have enough to do, and its interests might be better served.

Mr. BECHARD. It is most edifying to see gentlemen in this House so pious as to be able to preach to their fellow-countrymen upon the observance of the Lord's Day. Since these hon. gentlemen feel so keenly upon the observance of the Lord's Day, even on an occasion when they might be excused did they feel an absence of responsibility, surely their charity and sense of justice will lead them to respect the rights of the minority in different provinces of this country, and to have great regard for the maintenance of those rights.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I do not think this question calls for any decision on the part of the House at the present time. While I may be charged, owing to the remarks I may make, with being a Sabbath desecrator, yet what I urge I urge for the welfare of the country generally. It is an old saying, and a true one, that when you are in Rome you should do as the Romans do, and if we have an exhibit there it will be no harm for us to do what the other nations do there. I have been in foreign cities, and I have been in museums, art galleries and places of that character, on Sunday, and I could not see that any harm came to the people who attended them. I have also been in Chicago on Sunday, and one of the pleasantest afternoons I ever passed was spent in visiting the new art gallery there, which was attended by as respectable a class of people as I ever met in any city. The hon. gentleman says that he has moved this motion in the interest of the workingmen. Now, I have the interest of the workingmen as much at heart as he has, and there is only one way, in my opinion, by which we can protect the interest of the workingmen in regard to Sunday labour. We must admit that the complexities of civilization are such that there must be more and more Sunday labour as time goes on; we cannot get rid of that; and that being the case, we ought to try and

make necessary provision for it, and the only provision which will protect the workman is one which will procure to every man one day of rest out of seven. It will require a law to do that, and if the hon. gentleman will introduce a Bill into this House providing that every man shall have a right to at least one day's rest out of seven, I will support it. But, as a matter of fact, these men do not work seven days in a week. All these street car men, and railway men, and men engaged in similar work, are treated by their employer on the same principle as their street car horses are treated—that is, they work only so many hours a week because the employer cannot afford to overwork them; and when Sunday necessity requires he increases his staff by one-sixth, and in that way one-seventh of the men are off every day, and none of them are obliged to work seven days a week. No doubt it does happen in many European cities that men have to work seven days in a week, but we can prevent that in our country by adopting a law that no man shall be compelled to work more than six days in seven. Now, we had this Sunday question up in Toronto, the city from which I hail, and over a year ago a petition was presented to the City Council, asking that Sunday street cars be given to the people. Ten thousand voters of that city voted for Sunday street cars, against fourteen thousand, and I venture to say that when the question comes before the people again, we will have Sunday cars in Toronto. We will have them both in the interest of the general public, and in the interest of Sabbath observance, because if there are street cars on Sunday, people will go to church in larger numbers. The proof that Sunday street cars will promote Sabbath observance is seen in the fact that the Anglican Bishop of Toronto, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto, and several members of the clergy, voted in favour of the Sunday street cars. The hon. gentleman who moved this motion told the House that Chicago, with a hundred excursions pouring into it on Sunday, would be a scene of Pandemonium, almost a Sodom and Gomorrah. But what do the Chicago people themselves say? They say that unless you allow the exhibition to be opened on Sunday, the immense number of visitors who will be there, will go to the saloons and beer gardens, which will exert a far more demoralizing influence upon them than going to the exhibition. Now, I shall not go any further into this discussion, especially as I know that by taking this course I shall run the risk of being considered up west as a Sunday desecrator. I think we had better not pronounce on this question at present, but leave it in abeyance; and if the Government find eventually that the mother country and the other British colonies insist on their exhibits being closed on Sunday, we may follow suit. But on the general principle, as I have said, that when we are in

Rome we ought to do as the Romans do, I think we ought not to form an exception to the general practice that will be followed in Chicago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I do not think the question is one of Sunday observance with reference to street cars, but it is one with reference to exhibitions: and as we are to take part in a World's Fair at Chicago, taking there Canadian goods and Canadian manufactures, I think we should at the same time take something of our Canadian character. We can at least show to the people of the United States that one of the salient characteristics of Canadians is a proper observance of the Sabbath Day. I would be more in accord with this resolution if it read in this way:

That in the opinion of this House the Canadian department of the Columbian Exhibition should be closed on Sunday, in accordance with our own custom, and in accordance with British example, etc.

It is not our custom in Canada, at all events, so far as I am aware, to keep exhibitions open on Sunday; but it is rather our custom to keep them closed on Sunday. If we are going to make a fair exhibition of Canadian goods and Canadian character in the United States, we should not go there to do as the Romans do; if we did entirely as the Romans do, we should follow their manufactures also, and as we will not follow them in that direction, we should not follow them in adopting their characteristics, but we should endeavour to show prominently the Canadian character at the World's Fair. Now, the hon. gentleman who last spoke said that if the Canadian department was closed on Sunday, the people would rush into beer gardens. Are there not churches in Chicago, and cannot people go to church as well as to beer gardens? I am not very often in the same boat with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but on this resolution I sympathize with them, although I can imagine certain circumstances in which it might be judicious and, perhaps, expedient, to keep the exhibition open on Sunday. I think this matter should be left largely in the hands of the Government to do as they may deem best. In the main, however, I am in accord with this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House votes upon the question I would like to say a word or two upon the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Whilst not disagreeing with him in general on the principle of keeping one day in the week as a day of rest, and a day for becoming religious exercises and worship, I think at the same time there are certain practical considerations arising out of this motion which the House would do well to weigh before pronouncing decidedly upon the question. The hon. gentleman has dealt with it as a protest against what he

considers unnecessary labour upon the Sabbath Day, and as a presentment of the Anglo-Saxon and Canadian character at the exhibition, as being in the line of precedents in the history of our own Canadian civilization and of Anglo-Saxon civilization. That is one point from which he has viewed it. He has also looked at it from a practical standpoint, and he urges that this resolution should be passed in the interest of the many thousands of labourers who will be employed at the exhibition, the many thousands of labourers who will be employed upon railways, the many thousands of labourers who will be employed in various ways in connection with travel, and who will have to work upon the Sabbath day while the exhibition is in progress. Well, Sir, we must, in the first place, recollect that we are not the managers of this exhibition. First and foremost, this exhibition is held under the auspices of the United States of America, through a commission which has been appointed by their Congress, and the nations are invited by the United States to exhibit their wares, and their goods, and to show their progress in various ways. So, as to whether the exhibition shall be closed or shall not be closed on Sunday, depends entirely on the United States of America. It may very well be, that certain exhibitors, individual countries, will come to a conclusion diverse from that which may be come to by the United States. That will not affect, however, the conduct of the United States in regard to the exhibition remaining open on the Sabbath Day. So, if the United States commissioners come to the conclusion that the exhibition is to be kept open on the Sabbath Day, almost all the labourers will be kept at work, the trains will be run, the hands that man those trains will be employed, and labour will go on, whether we protest or not, just the same as if we protested, and, in the language of the hon. gentleman's motion, closed the Canadian department, though as to that I shall have a word to say a little later. So that, as regards the practical side of the hon. gentleman's motion, it is really of no value. If the United States commissioners come to the conclusion that the exhibition shall be closed, this question with respect to the saving of labour and rest to the labouring man on that day, will be solved in the way the hon. gentleman wishes. If they come to the conclusion, however, to keep the exhibition open on Sunday, the amount of labour employed and the work done will be within a fraction of the same, whether we make a protest and close our department or not. I am arguing this simply on one side, and a very important side, of the hon. gentleman's motion, because he based a very strong argument, from his point of view, on the right of the working-man to have the Sabbath Day, this seventh day's rest. Well, outside of that, I think there is something to be said in favour of the view of having the exhibition open on

MR. FOSTER.

Sunday, something to be said by Christian people, something to be said by philanthropists as straightforward in motive and honest in heart as either of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to this motion, and I am not impugning their honesty of heart or goodness of motive. The very same spirit which in London and other cities of Protestant Great Britain opens the galleries of art and painting on the Sabbath Day and swings back the doors of the Museums, in order to give the man who works from early morn to night, six days in the week, a chance to go in on the Sabbath Day with his family and view the grand works, the creations of art and science, and behold in concentrated form the representation of the world's life, the world's history and the world's progress—that same spirit is abroad in this country, as well. And I would not for one moment care to place my opinion against those, in a philanthropic and Christian sense, for after all, it is the man who makes his own temple in which to worship God; it is the man's heart which will be judged, as between him and his Creator, and not the letter of the law and the enactments on a Statute-book; and a man can go and look upon the beauties of nature outside of the city, he can go and look upon the beauties of art in the museum, and his soul can be lifted up to God in an expression of trust and recognition of His divine power, just as well as it can be under the roof of the finest cathedral or the lowliest meeting-house in the world. So this must be taken into account, and we must allow a certain amount of freedom to men, a certain amount of tolerance to the opinion of men, with respect to this matter. I am here yielding not one iota in my reverence for the Sabbath Day and for the worship of God and for the keeping of our religious ordinances, to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet not daring to take the stand, that I have any right to forbid a man to go out into the broad fields of nature on the Sabbath Day and worship his God there, if he wishes to do so, and if his mind calls him to worship in that direction. So, there is something in the argument, an argument that is to-day being advanced by some of the noblest divines in the United States and some of the devoutest hearts, that if this exhibition is open, with its wealth of accomplished results of progress, its triumphs of art, and all that tends towards the greatness of the race and the continued progress made by that race in the arts and sciences, if that be open on the Sabbath Day in the heart of Chicago, how many hundreds of thousands of people may be drawn to that exhibition and elevated and benefited, who otherwise, without the exhibition being open, might be frequenting places which tended to demoralization, instead of elevation. I am not disposed to say there is not a strong argument in that, and I wish to give expression to that idea, in noticing what the hon. gentleman said in regard to

his motion. Let us go a little further towards the practical side of this matter. The hon. gentleman wishes that the Canadian department should be closed on the Sabbath. What is the Canadian department? The only Canadian department I can think of is the building which the Dominion of Canada will own and which the provinces together with her will own and utilize. I am entirely in favour of closing that building on the Sabbath Day. I am entirely in favour of having a complete day of rest, so far as that building and our employees are concerned, but that does not touch our exhibits, for the different exhibits of Canada are spread everywhere throughout the exhibition building, in that general group of buildings in Chicago. Our manufactures are along with the manufactures of other countries, they are in the same building; one of our sections is alongside another section of manufactures, and so on, throughout the whole range. Our agricultural products and every one of our other products are not complete by themselves, are not gathered in the Canadian department and in a Canadian group, but they are there in separate divisions, scattered all through the exhibition. What shall we do? We cannot close the exhibition—that is impossible—and the only thing we could possibly do, would be to draw a flag over or drape every small section of the Canadian exhibit which finds its place here and there throughout the exhibition. We could do that; we could thus make a protest. In this way we could make a protest, that we believed in not having our exhibit looked at on the Sabbath Day, in having no labour employed on the Sabbath; but the whole labour of carrying on the exhibition, provided the United States commissioners conclude that it shall be open on the Sabbath, would go on just the same, whether our sections here or there were draped and had no activity or motion about them, or whether they were not. So much with regard to that matter, viewed from the various points that present themselves. If we had all the Canadian exhibits in one building, under one roof, where we could have complete control of them, what the hon. gentleman desires might be brought about. As it is now, it is impossible of ourselves to bring that about. I have said already, that I believe the Canadian department and building should be closed on the Sabbath Day. If the United States commissioners who have charge of the exposition, come to the conclusion that it is best to close the whole exhibition on the Sabbath. I would not have one word to say against it, but, on the whole, I would feel that they had done a wise act, taking the balance of the argument and looking at both sides of the question. What Great Britain may do in regard to this matter, I do not know; and I think the position we ought to take is, not to bind our hands hard and fast by

a resolution passed in this House, but we should leave this matter in the hands of the Government, who are as solicitous for the observance, the proper observance, for all possible observance of the Sabbath Day at Chicago, as are any other persons in Canada, and who will give due weight to the opinion of the people of Canada with reference to this matter. I may say further than this, that Canada would be very glad indeed to follow the example that Great Britain may set in this respect in regard to that exhibition, and she can do that with more facility and with greater practical result, because the English and Colonial exhibit, as I understand it, will be more nearly massed together than the exhibits of the other countries. So that whilst agreeing that, as a Canadian people and as an Anglo-Saxon civilization, we ought to be just as careful of our religious life, just as careful of all proper Sabbath observance, just as careful of the good name and the sanctity of the Canadian Sabbath, which counts much for our people, and which counts as well in the nurture and bringing up of our people, I yet think that in this respect, taking all the circumstances into account, it is just as well for us to watch the trend of events, and leave this matter in the hands of the Government with this assurance: That so far as they can possibly abridge work on the Sabbath Day, and so far as they can possibly, in accordance with Great Britain in the carrying out of the exposition, make the Sabbath a proper Sabbath Day, going even so far as to say that if Great Britain, as she has done on former occasions, closed her exhibits, that we would gladly follow in her wake. I think with these statements, that it would be well for the hon. gentleman not to press his resolution to a vote, but to leave it in that way. I believe from what I heard the hon. gentleman state that that is much the policy that was adopted by the leader of the Government when he was here last year. I have not read the whole of the debate through, and I do not know how far it went, but from the extract which he read I should judge that was the policy which the House thought was best last year, and I should think that that would be the better policy for us to pursue for the coming summer.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, before this motion is submitted to the House I desire to say a word or two. I listened with a little surprise, I must say, to the very eloquent words of the hon. Minister of Finance upon this question, for while they were eloquent and while they presented a very forcible view of the Sabbath question, I was surprised to hear him ignore certain principles which I think all evangelical denominations hold in this regard. I was surprised to hear him take a position which would seem to substitute the cultivation of our esthetic and artistic for our religious nature, and I was surprised

to hear him take a position which seemed to me to ignore the duty which is incumbent upon all members of Christian denominations to meet for public worship. Carried out to its legitimate extent, I think the hon. gentleman's views would obviate the necessity of common Christian worship in buildings devoted entirely, consecrated I may say, to the worship of God. If a man can fully cultivate his religious nature in viewing works of art or in viewing the beauties of nature, what necessity would there be for men assembling themselves together to worship God in buildings devoted to that purpose, and under circumstances and with surroundings peculiarly calculated to call upon their religious nature and to enlarge it and to strengthen it. I have heard that the hon. Minister of Finance, at one time in his career, filled with great acceptance and power some of the pulpits of the land. I wonder if he ever preached a doctrine of that kind to his people. I can hardly believe that he did. I do not propose to say anything more on this point. I desire to say a word with reference to what fell from my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Amyot) as to the divergence of opinion that might exist as to what particular day the Christian Sabbath should be observed as. I am surprised that he, a man brought up, I have no doubt, under Christian teaching, should seem to be ignorant of the reasons which have led to the adoption, by most Christian people, of the first day instead of the seventh day as the Sabbath. I do not think it is necessary in an assembly of this kind, to refer to these reasons, and I do not think it necessary that we should enter into any theological discussion with regard to this matter; but I am sure the hon. gentleman is not ignorant of what his own church teaches in this respect, and I am quite as confident that he is ready to bow to the decision and to the mandate of that church. With regard to the question before the House it seems to me not so much a question of expediency as a question of principle. It seems to me that it is a duty incumbent upon us as Canadians, professing to believe in a common God and a common christianity, not to let our position in regard to this matter be mistaken. There may be some practical difficulties—I see that there are by what has been suggested by the hon. Minister of Finance—as to the carrying out in its entirety of such a resolution as has been submitted to the House. I am glad to hear him say that he is in favour of, and I take it from that that he will do all in his powers to insure, the closing up of the Canadian building proper on the Sabbath. Whether it would be practicable, in the event of our coming to a determination in the spirit of this resolution to close all the Canadian exhibits on the Sabbath Day or not, I do not know. I suppose, from what the hon. Minister says, that in the distribution of these various exhibits, there might be some practical difficulty; but I think the passage of such a

Mr. SCRIVER.

resolution as that submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) would have a good effect, specially if it were coupled with similar action on the part of the mother country, it would, I dare say, have its effect upon the decision which might be come to, as to the opening of the exhibition on the Sabbath Day at all. At all events I think our own position should not be misunderstood in regard to this question, and for myself I am prepared heartily to vote for the resolution.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say but just a single word on this question. I simply wish to state that I am in perfect sympathy with the resolution. I do think it would be most unfortunate if we were to show to the nations of the world that we, as a country, disregard the sanctity of the Sabbath Day and trample it under foot. Let others do as they may, I do trust that we Canadians shall show that we are a Sabbath-keeping people.

Mr. DALY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the action taken by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to attempt to prevent the House from expressing an opinion upon this question. The action of the hon. gentleman is equivalent to saying that he is not in favour of what is demanded by the Christian sentiment of this country, and he has not the courage to meet that sentiment openly, but adopts a parliamentary expedient to shunt the issue. Now, Sir, I shall hold, and every Christian man in this country who investigates the matter will hold, that a vote in favour of the hon. gentleman's motion to adjourn this debate will be a vote in favour of opening the Columbia Exposition on the Lord's Day, and a vote against the motion that I have proposed; and we may as well meet the issue on that motion as on the main motion, because there is intelligence enough in the country to understand what the issue is, and what the course of the Government, represented by the hon. Minister of the Interior, is. I like to see a manly, honest, courageous course on any question; but I despise a sneaking course. This course, I characterize as cowardly—a cowardly expedient—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I am out of order—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman must realize, from his long parliamentary experience, that his language is not parliamentary.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think, perhaps, it was slightly unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. I will define what I mean by a saying that it is not a proper way of meeting an issue—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw the expression.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh, certainly. In the heat of debate we often make use of words that are not parliamentary, and I withdraw it, and I will substitute something else, if you will permit me. I wish to say a few words in regard to the position taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, because I hold that the question which we have upon the amendment is the direct question, and those who vote for the amendment, vote for the opening of the exposition on the Lord's Day. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that we are not the managers of the exhibition. We are not. We are not our brothers' keepers in any sense, but we are the keepers of our own honour; we are responsible for our own action; so far as we can govern our own action; and if the managers of the exposition decide that it shall be opened on the Lord's Day, it is a question for us to consider whether that decision is correct or not—whether it is in accordance with our principle, our record or our history, or a decision that the people of Canada will sanction; and if we decide that, in our estimation, the managers of the exposition are wrong, then we are not bound by their action. Sir, did the managers of the British exhibit, or the managers of the American exhibit at Paris hold themselves bound by the action of the managers of the Paris Exposition? Not at all. If the managers of the Paris Exposition decided that it should be opened on the Lord's Day, the managers of the British, and the managers of the American exhibit decided that they would not concur in that action—

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Will the hon. gentleman tell us—

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish the hon. gentleman to keep his seat. If the managers of the Columbia Exposition decide that it shall be opened on the Lord's Day, we are not any more bound by their decision than the British or American authorities were bound by the decision of the managers of the Paris Exposition. On the contrary, we have British and American precedent to govern us in standing up for Christian freedom and Christian right, and for refusing complicity in an act which we condemn, and which the Christian people of this country will condemn. The hon. gentleman says that if the exhibit is kept open on the Lord's Day, our course will make no appreciable difference in the amount of labour that will be performed. That may be. It may be very little difference to the managers of that exposition or to those whose rights are trampled upon. But we shall be able to say that we are not guilty of complicity in the action of the Chicago authorities in opening the exposition, that we have entered our protest, and that as far as we could set the matter right we have done so. Whether our country is little or great, we shall have done what is right, we shall have stood by our principles, and we

shall have had the approval of our own consciences, and the approval of the Christian conscience of this country. The hon. gentleman goes on to say that a good deal may be said in favour of opening. I know that a good deal may be said in favour of opening, a good deal is said in favour of opening, by those who do not believe in being restrained by Christian principles or Christian usages. A good deal is said in favour of opening the fair by the Anarchists, by the socialists, by the infidels, by all the representatives of the worst social elements in the United States. There is not a demon that fell from heaven that is not in favour of opening that fair on the Lord's Day. Yes, a good deal may be said in favour of opening the fair more honestly and more plainly than has been said by the Finance Minister. But what he has said sufficiently indicates that he is not as sound on this question as he once was, and that he is not in sympathy with the pronounced Christian sentiment of this country. Talk about opening fairs, picture galleries and museums; but such talk does not command British sympathy. The attempt has been made on three separate occasions to bring about the opening of the British Museum on the Lord's Day, but on every occasion the attempt has been defeated by an overwhelming vote. Not on one occasion has that movement received the aid or the sympathy of the British workingmen, because they realize that if one class of labourers are deprived of their Sunday rest, the next step will be to deprive another, and finally every bulwark which secures to them their Christian rights, and their right to rest on the Lord's Day, will be swept away. The labourer is more interested than any other class in resisting the specious pretense that museums or exhibitions or circuses, or any other kind of entertainment that may minister to public taste legitimately and properly enough on a week day, should be permitted on the Lord's Day, and thereby deprive one class of labourers of their rest in order that another class may enjoy the day, and perhaps have a day's carouse. The hon. gentleman tells us that a man makes his own temple. Yes, a man may make his own temple. He may adopt his own form of worship, and it may be in accordance with the requirements of his God, or it may not. If he sets up his own temple and his own idol, and worships contrary to God's approval and to God's command, it is not what God approves.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you the interpreter of that?

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I am not. I take the law of God. I take the fourth commandment:

Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant nor thy maid servant,

nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath Day and hallowed it.

No, Sir, I will not be the interpreter of this law; I do not pretend to be; I would shrink from being its interpreter. I do not ask the hon. gentleman himself to interpret the law; but there is the law, and its requirements are plain and palpable. These statutes are not repealable. The Christian is bound to obey the law of God, and you are to say that a man is to make his own temple and worship as he likes. There are precepts that he who runs may read; there are laws that he cannot disregard, and that he has no excuse for being ignorant of. To say that a man may make his own temple, that he may worship as he likes, and that he may interpret as he pleases the requirements of the Almighty, is not good theology and it not good logic. The hon. gentleman says: If the exposition is opened on the Lord's Day, many thousands of people will assemble there and be benefited and elevated? If that exposition is opened on the Lord's Day, the railway trains will bear excursions into Chicago over a hundred roads. Christians will tell us that the worst classes of society will go to this fair, we will have pandemonium let loose, and there will be nothing to elevate the better sentiments of the people. The opening of that exhibition on the Lord's Day cannot fail to have a demoralizing and depressing effect on the people of the country at large, and particularly on those who visit Chicago, and there is good reason for the great fear entertained by the Christian people in this matter. I am sorry, therefore, to see the Government occupy a position of quasi hostility to this motion and declare themselves practically in favour of the opening on the Lord's Day by supporting the motion to adjourn. This will be the last day on which this motion can be reached, and the people will understand that the amendment of the Minister of Interior is one intended by the Government to evade facing this question honestly and fairly. We are told that we cannot close the exhibition, that our exhibits will be scattered over the premises in different apartments. I admit that, but we have also had exhibits in the Paris exhibition scattered through the various departments, and yet we have prevented these exhibits from being visited on the Lord's Day. We are not proposing to close the whole exhibition, but only that part over which we have control. That is all we ask. We are asking that a principle be vindicated, as a protest against action in the opposite direction on the part of the United States if it is taken. The Minister of Interior asks us not to tie the hands of the Government, but to leave to its discretion to do as they may think best. Sir, the Canadian people should have a fixed prin-

Mr. CHARLTON.

ciple in the matter, and they should demand the expression of this House in support of that principle, and that they do not intend to sacrifice it by saying it is a matter of no consequence, let the Government deal with it as they will, having due deference to the sentiments of the people of the other side. Let them close it if they can do so conveniently, but not otherwise. Sir, if we leave this matter to the discretion of the Government, as my hon. friend asks, we will be acknowledging that we do not consider it a vital principle, but are prepared to allow the Government to do the one thing or the other, just as they please, and we will be satisfied with their decision. That will not satisfy me. I bring my motion before this House, because I believe Canada should be true to its traditions, true to the traditions of British polity, true to the principles of Christianity; and whether the United States may adopt our view or any other, that ought not to make any difference in our action. So far as we are concerned, we ought to vindicate our principles by closing our exhibit on the Lord's Day in deference to the Christian sentiment of the country and what we believe to be divine command. This is not a question for politicians to shuffle over or do what they deem most convenient, but it is a vital principle to be upheld or set aside by the Government, and I am sorry, therefore, that this motion to adjourn should have been made. I am sorry to see this desire to shelve this question, and I ask the hon. gentleman who moved this motion to withdraw it and allow the question to be settled fairly on its merits. If the Government are not willing to accept the resolution, let them say so. That would be an honest and proper course for them to adopt.

Now, I feel somewhat warmly on this question, because I believe it is one of vital importance. It pains me to see a great and Christian nation like the United States almost on the verge of abandoning at this day one of its time-honoured principles and of adopting the advice of socialists and anarchists and nihilists, and of following the example of continental peoples. It will pain me still more to see the Dominion of Canada an accessory to that act, and for that reason I will close by saying that the motion of the Minister of Interior is tantamount to a request that this motion be defeated. If the hon. gentleman persists in his motion to adjourn, let the Christian people of Canada understand how it was made, and why it was made, and what will be its effect.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The hon. gentleman has told us what has been done in England. He has said that it has been a British custom to keep their exhibitions closed, but he has not shown a case where it was thought necessary by the British House of Commons to pass a resolution to that effect and similar to the one now offered.

Why not follow the same principle here and give to our Government the discretion which the British House of Commons has always left with its Government? The hon. gentleman talks of cowardice. Well, we all know something of the cowardice of an hon. gentleman who talks now so glibly about observing the Lord's Day, but who had nothing to say when he was charged in this House with the whistling of his own tug boats on a Sunday. He said, furthermore, that all the respectable and good-living people are in favour of closing the fair, and that it is only the riff-raff who are opposed to that proposition. Well, Sir, Bishop Potter has come out in favour of keeping it open, and so has the cardinal archbishop of Baltimore. Neither has he answered the charge that the day he professes to observe, and which he says the divine law commands us to observe, is not the day he asks us to keep holy, but the Saturday; so that every day of his life he has been violating the Mosaic law and has laid himself deservedly open to the severest punishment for such violation. He has also said that if the exhibition be opened on Sunday, all pandemonium will be let loose. Evidently, therefore, the workmen, of whom he professes to be the great friend, are those who will be let loose, and raise pandemonium. According to him, they are the riff-raff of the country. Now, the hon. gentleman, on most occasions, waxes enthusiastic as an anti-restrictionist; yet, on some questions, he is the greatest restrictionist in the country. He ought to take a little of his own medicine in morals which he applies to trade and show himself less a restrictionist in morals and more of a restrictionist with regard to trade matters.

Mr. GILLMOR. I did not understand the Finance Minister as my hon. friend did. I did not understand him to say that he would substitute a walk in the fields for worship upon Sunday. I do not understand him to say that he would substitute a visit to the British Museum for attendance in a place of worship on Sunday. While I sympathize with the mover of the resolution upon the whole, at the same time I thought he might very consistently have consented to the suggestion made by the Finance Minister. I thought so then, and I think so still. I think there was a good deal in the views suggested by the Finance Minister. He repeatedly said: I prefer that the exhibition should be closed and that the Canadian exhibition should be closed on the Sabbath; that is my opinion and my desire. And he suggested also that that was the desire of the Government. I think the mover of the resolution might fairly have felt that he had discharged his duty to the Christian sentiment of Canada, and consented to the proposal. That is the way it struck me. I have always been taught to observe the Sabbath. I do not think that the question whether it is the seventh or the first day is for us to consider.

We know what the Christian Sabbath is, and we need not discuss the theology of it. I was only speaking of the Finance Minister's speech, and, from beginning to end, I did not hear that he substituted any amusement or employment for the worship in the sanctuary on the Sabbath Day. I know him, and I know that he goes to worship on Sabbath as often as most of us. I say this because I do not think his speech deserves the criticism received in that particular.

Mr. DALY. As the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr Charlton) has seen fit to apply some very unfriendly language—

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he can only speak by the indulgence of the House.

Mr. DALY. With the indulgence of the House, I would like to say a few words. The hon. gentleman has referred to me in very uncharitable language, and has said that I presented the resolution I did from cowardly and sneaking motives.

Mr. MULOCK. That language was withdrawn.

Mr. DALY. It was not; he made a speech of fifteen minutes, but did not withdraw the language. Professing, as the hon. gentleman does, to be a great Christian and moralist, he might extend that Christian charity which I understand should be the leading feature of the Christian's nature, towards me. After the explanation the Minister of Finance has given of the position taken by the Government in this matter, after he has stated, as is the fact, that our wish was that, in accordance with Canadian ideas as to the observance of the Lord's Day, the exhibition should be closed on Sunday, the hon. gentleman might have withdrawn his motion, the more so considering that he had placed upon record in this House and, through the "Hansard," before the country, his position and opinion on this matter. I thought it my duty to the Government and this House to move the adjournment of the debate, and trust sincerely that upon a future occasion when the hon. gentleman chooses to parade his Christian character, as he has done here to-day, he will conduct himself more according to what I think a true Christian should be.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand it, the American Congress came to a decision that it was desirable that the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday. I believe they made their money grant contingent upon that. If they might do so, I fail to see how it could be improper for this House to declare its opinion in this matter. We have voted a large sum of money to enable our producers to make an exhibition at Chicago. I would call the attention of the Finance Minister to this, which is a point, I think he did not fully consider. While that is an exhibition that will be pleasing to the eye

as an educational purpose, the main feature of it for Canada and other countries is the opportunity it gives us to gain material advantage in the promotion of trade. The different exhibitors there will have attendants on the various exhibits who will endeavour to make sales to the inhabitants of the various countries that may go there as spectators or to display their wares. As the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) said, this is not a restriction that is not sanctioned by the community, the observance of the Sabbath, the resting from labour, the closing of places of business, but it is a Canadian custom that is universally recognized in this country, and it seems to me to be an official recognition of that fact by this House. To withdraw these exhibits from the public gaze on that day, would be simply declaring to the nations assembled there that while the people of Canada are anxious to do business, they find it is in the interest of the community that on one day in seven they should cease from their ordinary every day labours, carrying on their business on the other six days. That, I think, ought to be taken into consideration in reference to this matter. So far as I have seen, it has not been definitely decided by the World's Fair Commissioners whether the fair shall be open on Sunday or not. And if there was an expression by this House that it was the sentiment of the people of Canada, as I think it is their sentiment, that the exhibition should be closed on the Sabbath, I believe the commissioners would be glad to have such an expression of opinion and it would strengthen the hands of those upon the commission or through the country who are seeking to have the fair closed on the Sabbath. I do not see that it is necessary to adjourn this debate. I think we might be able to pronounce on the question now. Without condemning or attempting in any way to interfere with the views of those who may differ from me, I find no difficulty in voting for the hon. gentleman's resolution and declaring that it is right and proper that the question is one which may fairly be discussed and decided by the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to give one more reason why the motion to adjourn should be agreed to. The question is now represented as one of money and expenditure. But we are not the only people in the Dominion who are paying for it. All the provinces are interested in it; they are paying large sums of money to assist in this exposition. Are we going to impose upon them our views without seeking an expression of their opinion? Because there are some people who see only their own little part of the country and cannot understand that there are people in the Dominion who think differently, are we going to take advantage of our majority and impose our views upon the provinces? Who tells my

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

hon. friend that his views will be accepted in the province of Quebec? There should be further discussion of the question and we should consult the provinces.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	LaRivière,
Baker,	Leduc,
Barnard,	Macdonald (King's),
Bécharé,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Belley,	Macdowell,
Bennett,	Maclean (York),
Bergeron,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bryson,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McLennan,
Carling,	McLeod,
Carpenter,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Cochrane,	Mara,
Costigan,	Mignault,
Curran,	Miller,
Daly,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davin,	Quimet,
Davis,	Pope,
Denison,	Prior,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Foster,	Robillard,
Fréchette,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Ross (Dundas),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Ross (Lisgar),
Haggart,	Sproule,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	White (Shelburne),
Jones,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wilson,
Kenny,	Wood (Westmoreland).—76.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Lowell,
Beith,	Macdonald (Huron),
Berrier,	McMullen,
Borden,	Mills (Bothwell),
Brown,	Mulock,
Casey,	O'Brien,
Charlton,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Edgar,	Scriver,
Flint,	Semple,
Gillmor,	Somerville,
Godbout,	Tarte,
Landerkin,	Vaillancourt,
Laurier,	Welsh,
Legris,	Yeo.—34.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) did not vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member for Haldimand hear the motion?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I only heard part of the question—in French.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) did not vote.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I paired with the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beau-soleil).

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence and reports of Government officials relating to the construction of a public building at Kentville, N.S., and the purchase of a site for the same, in accordance with a vote of this House passed in 1886.—(Mr. Borden.)

Statement showing, on the occasion of taking of the last census of Canada, the following particulars in regard to each of the following municipalities, viz.: The towns of Aurora and Newmarket, the villages of Holland Landing, Stouffville and Sutton West, and the townships of King, Whitechurch, East Gwillimbury, North Gwillimbury and Georgina, in the county of York, and the village of Bradford and township of West Gwillimbury, in the county of Simcoe:—(a) The number of inhabited houses. (b) The number of empty houses. (c) The number of houses under construction. (d) The total number of industrial and manufacturing establishments. (e) The total value of machinery and tools. (f) The total number of employees (classified as men, women and children respectively). (g) The total number of steam engines. (h) The names and numbers of the various industries in each of the said municipalities. (j) The aggregate of yearly wages paid in 1891, in each of the said municipalities. (k) The value of the manufactured products of 1891, in each of the said municipalities. (l) The total capital invested in industrial establishments in 1891, in each of the said municipalities.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the claim of Mr. Lauchlin McDougall, of Victoria county, N.S., for superannuation allowance, together with the amounts paid him as Lighthouse Keeper in St. Paul's and Ing-nish, giving the separate amounts for each year.—(Mr. Flint, for Mr. Fraser.)

Return showing separately the various kinds of manufacturing establishments that make up the total number of 67 with which Liverpool, N.S., is credited by Bulletin No. 12.—(Mr. Borden, for Mr. Forbes.)

Statement showing: (a) Amount of money received as visitors' entrance fees at the Kingston Penitentiary during each year from 31st January, 1885, to 1st February, 1893. (b) Payments out of said moneys to the Receiver-General, and disposition of such funds. (c) Particulars of goods manufactured and work done at said institution for any of its officers, showing who supplied the material for such goods, what sums were charged to said officers for said goods, and what sums have been actually paid during each of said years for said goods. (d) Quantities of coal oil and gas supplied such officers, amount paid therefor and when. (e) Amount of laundry work done at said institution during said dates, for whom done, amount charged and paid therefor, with dates of such payments and names of persons making such payments.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return showing the entire cost, including grounds and out-buildings, of the Lieutenant-Governor's residence at Regina, including every expenditure in connection therewith.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return giving the names of the owners of the several industrial establishments in the town of Mount Forest, and the number of hands employed.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing a copy of certificate of qualification held by each of the commanders of the Fishery Protection Service last season, as follows:—Commander O. G. V. Spain, "Acadia;" Commander W. H. Kent, "Agnes Macdonald;" Commander E. Dunn, "Bayfield;" Commander Geo. M. May, "Constance;" Commander J. H. Pratt, "Dream;" Commander Wm. Wakeham, "La Canadienne;" Commander A. Finlayson, "Stanley;" Commander C. T. Knowlton, "Vigilant."

Copies of all correspondence, reports and other documents relative to the reduction in rank of C. A. Atkinson from conductor to brakeman, on or about October, 1887.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

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

After Recess.

DOMINION STEAMER "QUADRA."

Mr. PRIOR moved for:

Copies of all tenders, letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Government and their agents and any other persons, in regard to the contract let for the repairing of the Dominion steamer "Quadra." He said: I will briefly explain the reason for asking for this correspondence. Last summer the Dominion Government steamer "Quadra" was wrecked on the northern coast of the Pacific Ocean. She was raised and brought down to the dry dock at Esquimalt, and the Government called for tenders for her repair. I am given to understand that four or five tenders were sent in to the Dominion Government agent in Victoria, and that only two or three out of these four or five were forwarded to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in Ottawa. Now, I am perfectly certain that it is not the intention of the Government to do anything unfair to the small builders who were in a position to repair the steamer. It is thought, however, by some of these tenderers that their tenders were purposely kept back by the agent. I cannot say that I believe that myself; it may be that they did not comply with the conditions set forth in the notices calling for tenders. Be that as it may, the fact remains that their tenders were not forwarded to headquarters. I myself wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, giving him the facts of the case, and asking that an inquiry be instituted. He replied that such would be done, and I expected that the promise would have been carried out before now, but up to the present moment nothing, so far as I know, has been done in the case. I do not say that the department is at fault in any way, because neither my colleague nor myself have pressed the matter further than writing one or two letters, and I have not heard much more from the tenderers who complained at first. I felt it my duty, however, to sift this matter to the bottom, especially in view of the fact that some of these tenderers are men of small means, and the contract was given to a concern having large capital and a large plant. The small builders naturally felt that they had not had a fair chance with the larger concern, and knowing, as I do, that the Government are only too glad to give their work to the lowest tenderers who are able to perform it, I thought it my duty to make inquiry into this matter, and to get all the correspondence connected with it. I think it is especially the duty of the Government to be careful in all such cases where there is a chance of the poor man being oppressed by the rich. I do not say

that this is the case now ; but it is a case in which I think the Government might at least see their way to have a commission appointed, and to make full inquiry into the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no objection at all to the passing of this motion, and the papers will be brought down. I am very glad the hon. gentleman does not blame the Government, and I am glad that he is taking an interest in this case. I beg to assure the hon. gentleman that the investigation promised by the Minister will be held. I will make an inquiry, and see whether tenders have been kept back.

Motion agreed to.

REVENUES OF PROVINCES.

Mr. PRIOR moved for :

Return showing total revenue paid into the Dominion Treasury by each of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia, during each fiscal year, commencing on the 1st July, 1880, and ending on 30th June, 1892.

Mr. DAVIN. I move in amendment that the words "and the North-west Territories" be inserted after the words "Nova Scotia."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's amendment, but I desire to say to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) that, as a matter of fact, these returns are apt to be misleading. The returns for Quebec and Ontario do not really represent accurately the amount paid by each province, and I think the same remark is partially true in regard to the Maritime provinces, because a very considerable amount of the imports really brought in for the use of Ontario, pass through Montreal, and the taxes are paid there.

Mr. PRIOR. I concur in the amendment.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DOMINION EXPENDITURE BY PROVINCES.

Mr. PRIOR moved :

Return showing total sums expended by the Dominion Government in each of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia from 30th June, 1880, to 30th June, 1892, under the following heads, viz. :—

Construction and equipment of Railroads,	} Not including the Canadian Pacific and Intercolonial Railways.
Subsidies granted to Railroads,	
Maintenance of Railroads,	
Harbours, Rivers, Piers and Docks,	
Dredging,	
Public Buildings of all kinds.	

Mr. DAVIN. I desire that the words "and North-west Territories" be inserted after the words "Nova Scotia."

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. PRIOR. I desire to say a few words in support of this motion, because there is a general opinion prevailing in the province from which I come that the people there are not receiving a fair share of the expenditure of the Dominion Government, in comparison with the revenue they pay into the Dominion treasury. My constituents know very well what they are paying into the treasury, but they wish to know more fully and clearly what they are receiving in return. They live some three thousand miles away from the seat of government, and it is not within their power to send delegations of thirty or forty business men to interview the Dominion Government, as constituencies in Quebec and Ontario can do. We have been told by some members of the Government that the expenditure of the province will be based on the population. That, we think, is not a fair way of dealing with this subject. We are a small population, numbering, according to the census, only 97,000 odd, including Indians and Chinamen, and yet we pay the enormous sum of \$1,656,156 in revenue to the Dominion per annum, which is equal to \$16.97 per head of the population. The Customs and Inland Revenue Returns for the year 1892 show that under these heads the city of Victoria alone paid \$1,098,718, and has a postal revenue of \$45,150. I think the constituents whom I have the honour to represent are perfectly correct in holding the opinion that they do not obtain a proper share of the expenditure according to the amount they pay into the treasury. From a statement published in the Victoria "Daily Colonist," of 14th February, and which I believe to be correct, I find that the people of British Columbia paid \$16.97 per head, the people of Ontario, \$5.70 ; Quebec, \$7.06 ; Nova Scotia, \$3.75 ; New Brunswick, \$4.16 ; Prince Edward Island, \$1.94 ; Manitoba, \$7.50 ; North-west Territories, \$0.17 per head. According to these figures, British Columbia pays three times as much per capita as Ontario, twice and a half times as much as Quebec, four times as much as Nova Scotia, four times as much as New Brunswick, twice and a quarter times as much as Manitoba, eight and a half times as much as Prince Edward Island, and nearly 100 times as much as the North-west Territories. I do not think it is fair that the expenditure should be based on population, and I think such will be the opinion of the House after hearing these figures. If we happen to be living in a country that possesses vast natural resources, if thereby, to whatever cause it may be attributed, we have been so fortunate as to attain a condition of financial prosperity, if the average man in that province is better off than the average man in any other province, it is only fair that the Government should make its expenditure on that basis. All we ask is that the expenditure shall be made according to the revenue we pay. I shall wait until the return is brought down before offering further remarks, for it may

appear that we are mistaken in our views, but until the Finance Minister has allowed these returns to be laid on the Table of the House, my constituents will still adhere to their opinion, which I share myself, that British Columbia has not received a fair share of public expenditure.

Mr. DAVIN. I merely rise to say one word. The hon. gentleman says that the North-west Territories has contributed to the public treasury revenue to the amount of only 17 cents per head. That is the statement which appears in the defective return that has been referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford. But the people of British Columbia, of course, pay duties on a number of articles coming in by their seaports. We have no seaports in the North-west, and we pay our duties at Montreal, just as Ontario pays them. I have been in British Columbia, and I have observed the habits of the people there. I have also observed the habits of the people of the North-west Territories, and I must say that I fear, in the consumption of these things which redound most fruitfully to the revenue, the people of the North-west Territories cannot hold a candle to my friends in British Columbia. We are in that position that we have a very modest sum set down for what we pay in the returns, whereas, as a matter of fact, we pay as much as any other part of the Dominion. I am very glad my hon. friend has consented to have the North-west Territories placed in his motion, because when these returns come down it will be seen, that what with our population, and what with the amount of expenditure, the North-west Territories, instead of getting a great deal more than it deserves, as is the opinion of many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, gets a great deal less than it is entitled to.

Mr. PRIOR. I must take exception to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and also to the remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), if he intended then to apply to British Columbia. If I had the statistics here I could prove in very short time that there is hardly anything imported into the province of British Columbia on which duty is paid that is not consumed there. There is very, very little exportation of those goods from the province. We import a great many goods from the eastern provinces, and we consume them there duty paid. I think you will find from this time on that the customs duties paid by us into the revenue may get a little smaller, because our people are beginning to be larger users of goods manufactured in the eastern provinces than formerly. It is not the fault of the people of British Columbia that they did not use them before, but the reason was because manufacturers in the eastern provinces did not make goods up to the proper standard. The amount of duty-paid goods exported from British Columbia is very

trifling indeed, and I think I could show that it does not amount to \$500 a year taken off the revenue for which I gave the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall see that the returns are brought down as soon as possible, and I shall make all the more haste in doing so because of the imputation cast on the luxurious habits of the British Columbia people by the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). My hon. friend (Mr. Prior) says that the people of British Columbia consume more than they import. But these customs duties are largely made up of the amount collected per head from the Chinese, and it is hardly to be supposed that they consume them.

Mr. PRIOR. Oh, that is not included.

Mr. FOSTER. All these points need to be cleared up, and I shall have the returns brought down as soon as possible, so as to get at the facts.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

WHARF ON RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. BECHARD moved for:

Copy of the Order in Council, or any other document, which authorized the "Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company," or their successors, the "Vermont Central Railway Company," to build a wharf alongside their bridge across the Richelieu River, at St. John's, P.Q.

He said: I have on previous occasions drawn the attention of the Government to this matter. The railway bridge referred to is built on piers, and the company have also erected a wharf alongside the bridge which extends two-thirds of the width of the river. Barges come alongside that wharf in summer time to get loaded, and the riparian owners complain that in the spring season, when the water is at a high level, these barges prevent the easy flow of water, and as the shores are very flat, the consequence is that every spring a large portion of their farms are flooded for a considerable time. A year ago the company removed the greater portion of the old piers which had become useless, but the farmers still complain that the loading of barges along that wharf is very injurious to them. A few years ago, Mr. Parent, superintendent engineer of canals for the province of Quebec, was sent to visit the structure, and his report contains the following:—

During the past twelve months, I have caused a careful study of the action of this bridge, and of its wharf upon the level of the river. This action was found to be insignificant, when no loaded barges lay alongside the wharf. One loaded barge would hardly influence the current through the bridge, or the level above, but if more barges were added, their action would gradually tell, increasing rapidly with the number of barges, but never to such an extent as to cause a rise in the river level of more than from four to five inches. Of course, even less than such a rise would be very objectionable to farmers whose lands were low and damp; and measures should be taken to prevent more than one barge at a time to be along-

side the wharf. I think the harbour master at St. John's is the proper party to look after that. In connection with the present case, the question may arise: Did not the Central Vermont Railway Company exceed their rights in erecting alongside their bridge a bridge crossing two-thirds the river? But I do not think this point to be within the reach of this office.

Another engineer was sent three years ago by the Department of Public Works and his report was the same in effect as that of Mr. Parent. He concludes by giving advice that not more than one barge at a time should be allowed to take a load there. I can state here that during last summer I have myself seen six or seven barges at a time alongside that wharf taking cargo. This is very objectionable to the farmers, who state that it keeps the water on their farms a good deal longer than it would otherwise remain there, and the consequence is that they cannot sow their seed grain in time. I again draw the attention of the Government to the matter. My object in making the motion is to know whether the railway company has been authorized by the Government of Canada to build that wharf, and if not, that the Government should take such measures as would be proper to make a change in that state of things.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I have to state that there are no Orders in Council in the department that I know of permitting the building of a bridge or wharfs. The wharfs were built, I suppose, under the authority of an Act of 1832, which permitted the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company to build the bridge and the wharfs. By an Act of 1836 that right was transferred to the Stanstead and Shefford Railway Company, with a lease of the railroad. It is alleged that the lease was destroyed in a fire in 1875. By an Act of the Legislature of Quebec, passed in 1873, the right as granted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company to build wharfs, piers, etc., on the River Richelieu. There is no Order of this Government giving such permission.

Mr. BECHARD. I am very thankful to the hon. Minister of Railways for the information he gives me. I understand him to say that the right was given by an Act of the Legislature of Quebec in the year 1873.

Mr. HAGGART. I am mistaken in saying an Act. It was by letters patent, dated the 20th of February, 1873, given by the Local Government to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. BECHARD. But this bridge does not belong to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they do not use it at all. It is the property of the Central Vermont Railway Company. The Grand Trunk does not cross the River Richelieu at St. John's.

Mr. HAGGART. As I stated to the hon. gentleman, under an Act passed in 1832, the

Mr. BÉCHARD.

Montreal and Champlain Railway Company were permitted to build a bridge there, and in 1836 they transferred that right to the Stanstead and Shefford Railway Company, under the lease of the Montreal and Champlain Railway.

Motion agreed to.

BRANDING OF CHEESE.

Mr. REID moved:

That in the opinion of this House, "cheese" the product and manufacture of any foreign country should not be admitted for entry or "in transit" unless the name of the country is plainly marked, stamped, branded or labelled in legible letters, both on each cheese and box containing the same so as to indicate the country of its origin.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, I wish to explain my reasons for doing so. It is well known that the manufacture of cheese is one of the most important industries in Canada to-day. It is, therefore, right and just, if, by any possible means, this House can afford protection to that industry, and thereby put more money into the pockets of the farmers, that we should do so. Years ago the manufacture of cheese in Canada was unknown. At that time a different style of farming was carried on. But as the country became cleared our farmers had to adopt different methods of farming in order to make their business remunerative. They embarked in the dairying industry, which has since grown to enormous proportions. Let me just state the amount of capital invested in that industry in Ontario alone. I have made a careful estimate in regard to my own province, leaving the other provinces to be dealt with by the gentlemen who represent them in this House. It is estimated that in the province of Ontario there are 800,000 cows used in the dairying industry. These, at a value of \$30 a head, represent a value of \$24,000,000. The land used in pasture and under crop for dairying purposes is estimated at 3,000,000 acres, or three and a half acres for each cow; and the value of this land is estimated at \$90,000,000. The value of the factories, dairies and store-rooms is estimated at \$3,000,000, the farm buildings required for dairying purposes at \$50,000,000, and the machinery, implements, etc., used in the industry at \$8,000,000, or a total of \$175,000,000 invested in the dairying industry. That, Sir, I claim is a larger amount of capital than is invested in any other industry in Canada. It is well known, also, that the Local Governments in every province are promoting the further development of this industry, which is found to be the most remunerative branch of farming to-day. Now, let me just refer, for a moment, to the growth of this industry since Confederation. In 1868 the manufacture of cheese in this country was hardly known. The first year in which any large quantity of cheese was exported was 1874. From that time to the

present, the growth of the industry is shown by the following figures:—

	Quantity exported.	Value.
1874.....	24,050,982 lbs.	\$3,523,201
1884.....	69,755,423	7,251,989
1887.....	73,604,448	7,108,978
1889.....	88,524,837	8,915,684
1890.....	94,260,187	9,372,212
1891.....	106,202,140	9,508,800
1892.....	118,270,052	11,652,412

showing a steady increase; and I believe that this year's returns will show a still greater increase. Now, Sir, in addition to these exports of our own product, I may say that we exported, last year, 10,140,678 pounds of cheese that came in bond from the United States. The Canadian cheese exported last year brought an average of 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound, while the cheese brought from the United States, and exported through Canadian channels, brought an average price of 9 cents a pound. Now, Sir, it is on account of this large quantity of American cheese exported through Canada, that I have made this motion. I claim that the exportation from this country of this 10,000,000 pounds of American cheese is injuring the good name of our farmers. This cheese is brought to Montreal, not by our Canadian railways, as he has alleged, but from the frontier counties on the St. Lawrence, to Montreal, via the Victoria Bridge; and in the bonding warehouse at Montreal it undergoes the change from American to Canadian cheese. The fact of this inferior cheese being mixed with our Canadian cheese and exported as a Canadian product, injures the reputation and good name of our cheese. Now, it is a well-known fact, that the English market rules the price of cheese in Canada; and our farmers, seeing the prices at which this cheese is quoted on the English markets, are led to believe that these are the prices at which Canadian cheese is sold, whereas it is well known that there is no cheese manufactured in the world which is better than, if equal to, that manufactured in Canada, and the admixture of this inferior American cheese with it injures its good name. In the district in which my constituency is situated, the farmers depend altogether upon dairying, and St. Lawrence county, in the United States, which borders on my constituency, has 33,000 cows used in the dairying industry there, and the cheese products of these cows go to Montreal and are there mixed with Canadian cheese; so that the district from which I come is particularly liable to injury from the cause that I have mentioned. The cheese-buyers from Montreal come to that district to buy cheese, and they pay at least three-quarters of a cent more for the cheese made there than they do for the cheese produced right across the line. That fact proves the inferiority of the American cheese, and, therefore, I hold that it should not be allowed to be mixed in any shape or form with our

cheese and sold as Canadian cheese. It is not on our Canadian cheese that the buyers make their chief profit. It is on this inferior cheese, for which they pay at least 1 cent a pound less than they do for ours; so that I claim it has injured our cheese to the extent of 1 cent a pound on the whole quantity exported last year, which is equivalent to a loss to our farmers in that year of \$1,182,700. Now, Sir, I see in the "Empire" of to-day the following:—

Hon. Mr. Sanford has received a letter from Mr. Manchester, of St. John, N. B., who is at present in England, in which he makes some important suggestions with regard to Canadian trade with Britain. He says it is absolutely necessary now for all exporters of Canadian products to have everything marked in the most conspicuous manner "the product of Canada," so that if the best qualities of beef, bacon, cheese, butter, etc., are shipped, a demand will be created equal to the Danes for butter, the Swiss for cheese and the Irish and Scotch for beef. Mr. Manchester says, moreover, that the visit of Professor Robertson to Great Britain has done much good, as he threw out some splendid ideas, which will doubtless be availed of during the coming season.

Professor Robertson has done and is doing great work among the farmers, and this industry is now growing to such an extent that I ask that the aegis of the National Policy be thrown around it and all the protection possible be given to our farmers. I have heard some hon. gentlemen opposite bewail the lot of the Canadian farming community, particularly the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), neither of whom has ever uttered a word in favour of protecting our agriculturists. I hope, however, that now they will give us a little assistance in this matter. Everything that can be done we should do to protect this really important industry, and I bring this motion before the House in the hope that it will meet your unanimous support.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). In addition to a few words to the remarks of my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Reid) I would entirely deprecate the placing of any more restrictions than possible to interfere with the friendly relations and free intercourse between ourselves and the United States, but at the same time, I feel that our own interests call for prompt action. On looking into the matter, I find that the greatest transgressors are our own men. Canadian exporters find that their market in England has increased to such an extent that the demand is greater than the supply, and so they endeavour to supply the deficiency and secure greater profits by bringing in American cheese of equal, or nearly equal value, not being too particular in many cases, and exporting it as Canadian cheese, thus increasing their sales. The result is, as my hon. friend has pointed out, that Canadian cheese must, to a greater or less extent, suffer in the general average. I believe the system

adopted is to bring in American cheese as nearly as possible of the grade wanted in England, the brand, if there is any brand upon it—and I believe there is no brand upon the cheese itself, but upon the box—is removed and the article is branded as Canadian manufacture, so that the whole export passes as Canadian. The effect of this upon the Canadian cheese market must be detrimental, and the whole matter calls for the early attention of this House. There is no doubt my hon. friend has taken the right step in this matter, and I sincerely hope the House will endorse his action.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I have much pleasure in supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). We have a fair name in the old country in the matter of cheese, which I hope we will endeavour to maintain. We know that our Canadian cheese commands a higher price in the English market, and I think that the shipping of American cheese as Canadian cannot fail to be detrimental to that good name. Our cheese industry has made great strides in the last two years. In 1891, the value of the exports amounted to \$9,508,800, and in 1892, to \$11,652,411, and the quantity increased from 106,202,140 pounds in 1891 to 118,270,052 in 1892. That increased export shows how important this interest is and how productive it is of the best results to the Canadian farmer. This industry is one which yields the greatest results to the farmer and is one of the best industries relating to the farm. I hope this resolution will not meet any opposition in this House.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am very much pleased, Sir, to be able to agree with this resolution in favour of the branding of American cheese exported from Canada so that it may be known as of American production. I am glad to think that the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) will cast one vote in favour of the farmer, and I hope it is not the only one he will cast. I hope he will think upon the statement he made in his reference to the member for South Huron. I have been fighting for the farmers' interests for years in this House and out of it; in season and out of season. How many votes has the hon. gentleman given in favour of the farmer when the farmers' interests were at stake? I think it would be in the interests of the Canadian farmer to have all the American products shipped through Canada branded as American products and not allowed to be put upon the market as Canadian products. I hope the hon. gentleman will not stand up again and vote against giving the farmers free binder twine, free corn, and the relief on agricultural implements that the necessities of the farmer demand. I hope his new-born zeal will continue and that it will not die out with the single effort he has made to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words upon this subject, as it is one in Mr. Ross (Dundas).

which I took interest some years ago, and which, I regret to say, did not meet with the hearty response of some of these gentlemen who would have us believe that they were always interested in the farmer's welfare. If I remember correctly, some hon. gentlemen sitting close to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) were, at that time, rather inclined to pooh-pooh the motion as of little account; they see and think different to-day. Some years ago, when this question was brought before the House by me it was stated that we were suffering on account of United States cheese which were shipped through Canada, and from Canadian ports to British markets, and there represented as Canadian cheese, and an endeavour was made in this House to have such legislation passed as would put a stop to this practice. The object of the resolution was to have the Canadian products branded as coming from the United States. At that time I read a reference that was made in the British House of Commons to this matter, which, in my opinion, justified the statements I then made. I have it here to-night, and I think it will do no harm to read it again. It was intended to correct the very evil which this motion purposes to correct:

LONDON, March 20. — It was announced in the House of Commons to-night that the Colonial Office is about to inquire of Canada whether the alleged adulteration of imported American cheese also relates to the Canadian product, especially as regards the practice of using animal fat in making cheese.

That inquiry was made on account of the fact that cheese labelled, "Best Canadian," as I was told, were sold at the retail shops in London, which cheese were found to be largely adulterated with animal fat and cotton-seed oil. The cheese was evidently American cheese; there was no question about that. But because the Canadian article had attained a reputation in the market, unscrupulous persons engaged in the trade very unfairly and dishonestly labelled their product, "Canadian cheese," and to prove that it was Canadian, they showed the brand that it had been shipped from the port of Montreal, in Canada. Therefore, we thought it well to have the Canadian cheese exported from this country branded as Canadian cheese, and the American branded as United States cheese. On inquiry at the Inland Revenue Department, some time ago, I was told that this was already done; but I am informed now, as a matter of fact, it has never been done, and we are still labouring under the disadvantage that formerly existed, and Canadian cheese interests suffer through the way the trade is being carried on. I think it most unfair that this should continue and if we have the power, as I think we have, to compel the branding of these American cheese, we should exercise it, and not allow the inferior American article to be palmed off on the British consumer thereby bringing down the reputa-

tion of the Canadian cheese. There is no doubt that the development of the Canadian cheese industry has been very great, and that the industry is one from which the farmers receive a very large return. We should be jealous of that interest, as it is one of the few from which we receive a steady return. Our product has won a high reputation in the British market; it seems to suit their taste and appetite, and they are buying millions of pounds every year. Last year, if I recollect aright, we received not less than twelve and a half million dollars for the cheese we exported. That is a very important thing for the Canadian people, and the larger share of this goes from the province of Ontario. While on that point I trust I may be permitted to refer for a short time to an incident which took place last fall, which, to my mind, was not very creditable to the parties who were interested in it or commenced the agitation. I can cordially agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Reid) with regard to the valuable work done by Professor Robertson, and those associated with him in the Experimental Farm. He is a man, who, above all others, may be considered an expert in this line in Canada. He is head and shoulders over every other in looking after the dairy interests of the Dominion. For a number of weeks last fall he was in England, and there he rendered most valuable service to the dairying interests of Canada. I do not think that any other man could possibly have done so much to bring the Canadian product into prominence in the British market as Professor Robertson did. He succeeded in bringing Canadian cheese prominently before the attention of the English dealers and consumers directly, and also in attracting the attention to the same subject of very many of the leading English journals, and Professor Robertson has told me that he is indebted to the kindness of our Governor-General for information given him before his departure, for which he had every reason to be grateful, assistance which gave him an introduction to the class of people he most wanted to reach, and thus enabled him to do his work more rapidly than he could otherwise have done it. I am sorry to find that western men who should be men of liberal views and broad minds, instead of approving Professor Robertson's work and giving him credit for it, have passed strictures upon him that were not at all called for by the facts of the case, and were consequently discreditable to the parties who gave vent to them. I refer to the meeting of the Dairymen's Association in Listowell last fall. Some hon. gentlemen will remember that when the dairy commissioner was on his way home from Europe he stopped off at Bedford, in the province of Quebec, where there was a large exhibition being held. Somehow or other, the reputation of Quebec some years ago had fallen in respect of cheese production among the

British consumers. Professor Robertson, while in England, felt it his duty to correct, as far as possible, the impression that existed and, in coming home, took the opportunity to drop off at Bedford to see the exhibits. In his opinion, the cheese which were on exhibition there were of very superior quality. They were of high grade considering them as an average, and individually there were many of very superior quality. He advised some of the exhibitors there to make up a collection and send them up to the Industrial Exhibition in the province of Ontario, so that, in a friendly way, they might be put side by side with the cheese made in the province of Ontario, to see how the two would compare. Knowing, as he did at the time, that it was too late to make entries for that Industrial Exposition, he advised these parties to allow him to make a selection of an average number and send them up there, not for the purpose of competing, as they could not compete, for various reasons, one of which was that they were too late to be entered. But his suggestion was carried out, and the cheese were brought up there. The exhibition went on, and some of the men who judged the Ontario product, were asked, along with Professor Robertson, to examine the product from Quebec, of which there were twenty-nine samples; and to see what were the relative merits of the cheese from the two provinces. The result was that, after a careful examination, they attached this letter to the Quebec product:

TORONTO, ONT., 14th September, 1892.

To the President and Directors of the Industrial Exhibition:

GENTLEMEN,—On carefully examining a lot of twenty-nine cheese from eighteen different cheese factories in the district of Bedford, Que., we find them to be well made cheese, of uniform and excellent quality—on the whole, superior to the cheese on exhibition here, from any other part of the Dominion, and we strongly recommend that a gold medal be awarded to the President of the Dairymen's Association of the district of Bedford, Que., for an exhibit of such superior quality. We desire to record our high appreciation of the improvement and fine quality of the cheese which have come to the exhibition from a district where the cheese making industry is comparatively new.

All of which is respectively submitted.

E. CASWELL,
JOHN PODMORE,
A. F. MACLAREN,
JAMES W. ROBERTSON.

I may say, by way of explanation, that two of these gentlemen were the very men who judged the Ontario cheese, and this was done by Prof. Robertson to give the people of Quebec a better reputation for the product that they turned out, which, in his opinion, was quite equal to the best quality that was turned out any where else in Canada, and for the purpose of raising their reputation in the foreign market where they were handicapped on account of the unfortunate incident which I have already related, when some inferior cheese went to the old country. At

the association meeting at Listowell. Mr. Ballantyne, Speaker of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, who is a prominent man, one of the pioneers of the country, and who has been for a long time engaged in the manufacture of cheese, and in the promotion of that industry in Ontario, spoke as follows:—

He then called attention to what he considered an unjust clashing of interests as between Ontario and Quebec in giving first prize to an exhibit at the Industrial Fair at Toronto to cheese made in Ontario, and afterwards issuing a certificate highly recommending the cheese made in Bedford, Quebec, as equal to any in the Dominion. Waxing warm on the question, he characterized the action of the judges and the Dominion Dairy Commissioner in this matter, as a mean, dirty, contemptible trick, and concluded by administering what he thought to be a severe rebuke.

Now, I regret very much that a man's jealousy should carry him so far beyond discretion as to induce him to use such language against a worthy gentleman who is one of the ablest men in Canada on that question, and has been most successful in promoting that industry in Canada. He could not fairly say they were giving a gold medal to cheese produced in the province of Quebec as against Ontario cheese, because the former were not there in open competition, but for the purpose of showing their superior quality. This certificate was given by the very men who had judged the Ontario product. Now, I do not see why the Ontario people should have any jealousy against our friends in the province of Quebec, who have improved their knowledge of cheese making, and are now able to turn out a much better article than they did a few years ago. When Quebec cheese is brought into competition with ours and shows such a favourable quality there is no reason that the Quebec makers should be exposed to such severe strictures. A very lengthy controversy was carried on in the papers, to which I will not make reference to-day, but I believe the opinions of Mr. Ballantyne are not shared by many of the Ontario people. I believe that on the whole our people are glad to see our friends in Quebec improving that industry as they have done, and glad to see that they were able to turn out the creditable product which they did, in the Industrial Exhibition in Toronto, which is not confined to the province of Ontario, because exhibitors can go there from any part of the country, and this, in my opinion, is the only right principle upon which expositions should be held. I may say that the remarks of Mr. Ballantyne rather met with condemnation from the most eminent men in our part of the province, although they were not called upon to say a word with regard to that question, and I think that they regret sincerely that Mr. Ballantyne allowed his jealousy to carry him so far as to pass these strictures upon a very worthy gentleman who is his compeer, if not his superior, in ability and knowledge of the

Mr. SPROULE.

cheese industry in this country. That is all I have to say on this question. I believe I voice the sentiments of the people of Ontario when I say that they are always pleased to see the people of the province of Quebec or of any other province in the Dominion endeavouring to produce an article that is equally good with theirs, and that is equally valuable when sent to the foreign market. There is no feeling of jealousy towards their fellow-citizens in Quebec, if they do produce an equally good article, or even a better article, because it stimulates us to do better, showing that there are others who know a little more about that line of industry than we do. I hope this resolution will carry, and that the result will be that American cheese, which is shipped from a port in Canada, thereby creating the impression in Great Britain that they are a Canadian product, will hereafter be labelled as United States cheese in contradistinction to Canadian cheese, so that American cheese will not interfere with the reputation which our cheese makers enjoy in the British market.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am pleased to see the Controller of Customs in his place. This matter has been before the House several times, and the Government have undertaken to deal with the question of American cheese passing through Canada in bond. In 1888 a resolution, similar to the resolution now before the House, was moved by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), and seconded by myself, and I will read to the House one of the resolutions that were passed by the Dairymen's Association in my county, asking the Government to deal with this matter. I will read one now that I read then:

GANANOQUE, 14th April, 1888.

George Taylor, M.P.

DEAR SIR,—I have been requested by the President of the Gananoque Cheese Board of Trade, to forward you a resolution passed at a meeting of the Board and to ask if you would be so kind as to bring the matter before the notice of the Minister of Agriculture and ask that some action be taken that cheese manufactured in Canada will be known from cheese manufactured and shipped in bond from New York State, when shipped from Montreal to Europe.

I have the honour to remain,
Your obedient servant,

JOSHUA LEGGIE.

The question was then fully discussed: the Government took action, and for a year or two the cheese was branded as being American produce. The question was then raised in England, that, as all cheese coming either from Canada or the United States, was known as American, a distinction should be made and the word United States should be placed on the American product; and the Government issued an order that such should be done. But, as I mentioned in the House, in speaking a few days ago, a large cheese producer in my county, who had been in Montreal last year, stated, that he saw large quantities of American cheese arrive and

shipped by steamer to England, without having the brand of the Government officials placed on it before it was exported. I would suggest to the Government, that they should remove this work from the Customs department. We have in Canada a dairy commissioner, in the person of Professor Robertson, who has done, and is doing, more for the cheese and butter industries of this country than any half-dozen men in Canada, or out of it, and I would suggest that the question of cheese exportation be placed under the direct supervision of Professor Robertson at the port of Montreal, because the statement is made, whether the officials are aware of the fact or not, that American cheese was exported from Canada last year, without being properly branded under the direction of the Department of Customs. If this is not practicable, I would suggest, in the interest of this large industry, that a special officer be appointed to supervise this work at Montreal, because, as the hon. member for Grenville, who moved this resolution, stated, large quantities of cheese was carried down the American side by railway and then across to Montreal, and was shipped from that port, not passing down over the Grand Trunk Railway. I know, however, that large quantities did pass over the Grand Trunk Railway, and, previous to last season, almost all the cheese was shipped across the river. Last year a steamer was fitted up specially for the purpose of carrying cheese, it being collected on the way down the river to Montreal. This cheese went there in bond and was re-exported from Montreal to England. I know the American people must have some object in sending cheese by this route. If they are able to run the blockade and ship it in Montreal, English buyers, finding it is shipped by a Canadian steamer, will arrive at the conclusion that it is a Canadian product. It may be difficult at first sight to tell the difference; in fact, you can only distinguish it when you put a knife in it. Be that as it may, cheese which leaves Montreal, should be branded both on the cheese and on the box, and when it is placed on the market, it will carry its origin on its face, and if it is American, it will not come into competition with the Canadian product. I represent the largest cheese district, for I believe the county of Leeds stands at the head of the cheese-producing district of Ontario, according to the last census. It is the banner county, and last year produced more than any other county in the province or the Dominion. Therefore, the members representing Leeds should feel as large, if not a larger interest in this subject than any other hon. members in this House. Our cheese has won a reputation, and the Government should take every precaution to see that that reputation is not in any way interfered with by allowing American cheese to be imported and mixed with shipments of Canadian cheese from Montreal.

As the hon. member from Grenville stated, a large quantity of cheese brought into Montreal, is brought in by Canadians; but it must be remembered that Canadians are as anxious to make a dollar as any other class, and if they can go over to the United States and buy American cheese for from three-quarters of a cent to 1½ cents less than in Canada, they desire to make their money on that product, as well as on the Canadian product, while, at the same time, the Canadian product should not suffer by allowing those people to mix a lower grade of cheese with the Canadian article. I hope, therefore, the Controller of Customs will see that the department gives effect to their regulations and that they will be thoroughly and particularly carried out, and, if this cannot be done, that the matter will be handed over to Professor Robertson, who, I am sure, if he is given a pointer, will find out and detain every cheese in transit, long enough to brand, not only the cheese, but the box, and will see that, while passing through the warehouses in Montreal and while being boxed, American cheese will be properly stamped, and that brands will not be scraped off the boxes, as, I believe, according to reports I have received from Montreal, has been done. Now, as we are at the opening of the cheese season for this year, the Government, I have no doubt, will take every precaution to see that our Canadian cheese will not suffer by coming in contact with American adulterated cheese or cheese of less value than ours.

Mr. RIDER. I can fully concur in the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Grenville, as well as the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member from Leeds. This is a very important question, inasmuch as the cheese industry has assumed large proportions in Canada. The Eastern Townships are now largely engaged in the manufacture of cheese, and they are placing on the English market cheese of a very superior quality. It is right and proper that this inspection should be looked after and that protection should be given to the manufacturers of good cheese to which they are entitled. I, therefore, hope the Government will take special action in regard to this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. For my own part, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the mover and seconder and others who have spoken with respect to this resolution. There is no doubt at all, that the cheese industry is a very important one, and is particularly so in certain of the provinces, and it assuredly deserves all the encouragement and all the care that can possibly and reasonably be taken in order to ensure a high character and to maintain that high character in its principal market, Great Britain. The resolution, however, calls for the marking of all cheese admitted to entry or in transit from a foreign country, and it strikes me, as I look into it—and it came into my mind as the debate progressed—that possibly, a pretty

delicate question may be involved in the interference with goods in transit. We have a large transit trade through the United States, going to their sea-ports, and there is a large trade, on the other hand, from the United States, passing through our territory and going to Montreal and other Canadian ports. It seems to me to be a rather delicate question, and that very great care is required in legislating respecting this transit trade, a trade which is simply passing through our country, not of goods to be marketed here, but simply passing through to another country, and, as to legislating to make interference necessary with those articles and goods thus passing through our country. I think it is worth very careful consideration before a resolution like this is passed, binding the House to do thus and so. The matter was brought up three years ago with the idea of having something done to preserve the character of Canadian cheese, and to keep the inferior cheese of other countries from being palmed off as of Canadian make. Since that time the Minister of Customs has issued very stringent instructions to prevent any marking of cheese or any interference with it while it is in transit from the time it enters the country until it leaves it at the export port. The impression did get abroad that this cheese was tampered with while it lay in the bonded warehouse awaiting export, and that it was there marked as Canadian cheese; but I believe that that is not so, and certainly, if, in any case, that has been done, it is against the express orders of the Customs Department which are very stringent on the point. If, then, it is marked as Canadian cheese, it either must be done before it enters this country or when it gets on the other side. If done on the other side of the water, we have no right to interfere with it, and if it is branded as Canadian cheese before it enters this country, that raises again a delicate point as to how far we can legislate so as to interfere with the transit trade. The Government will not lose sight of the question. I have listened, and I know other hon. gentlemen have listened, to the great information that has been given. The Government will utilize that information, and will take the matter into their serious consideration. I do not mean that as a phrase, but I mean that everything that can be done will be done to protect our trade in this respect. Under these circumstances, I suggest to my hon. friend, whether or not it would be better for him to press this motion to a vote, or whether, after having brought it to the attention of the Government and the House, he might not leave it in the hands of the Government to make such regulations as they can to prevent the abuses he complains of.

Mr. REID. As the Minister of Finance states that the words "in transit" might interfere with the traffic, I will not press the motion, but I might say that I think the

Mr. FOSTER.

entering of it in bond could be remedied. It is in bond that the changes are made, and if prohibitory orders have been issued by the Minister of Customs, I do not think that they have been properly carried out. I hope that in future the order will be carried out to the letter. I cannot see why any country ought to be ashamed of its name, and, therefore, I do not understand why the Americans should brand the word "Canadian" on their cheese before it is shipped into this country. Surely if cheese comes to this country, branded with the name "Canadian," when it is not produced here, we have the right to prevent an injustice of that kind. I think the evil might be remedied in another way. We might pass a resolution that all cheese exported from this country should be branded with the name of the country of production. At all events, we are not ashamed of our own name, and we are proud of having our cheese branded "Canadian." In the meantime having brought the matter before the attention of the House, and as the Government have promised to look after it, I shall withdraw the motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to inquire from the hon. the Minister of Finance exactly what he means by the words "in transit." I can understand there would be very great difficulty indeed in intermeddling with cheese passing from one portion of the United States to another through our territory, and I can quite agree with him that that could hardly be interfered with without prejudicially disturbing the bonding privilege. But in the case of cheese coming from an American place of manufacture to be exported from a Canadian port it seems to me to stand on quite another footing, and, with respect to that, I do not think that the objection could hold. I notice that a very large amount of cheese, not the produce of Canada, is being exported from this country. Last year, as much as 10,000,000 pounds of cheese, not produced in Canada, is stated to have been exported to England, I suppose from our Atlantic ports. It is quite evident that there is considerable danger of the high character our cheese has obtained in the English market being taken advantage of to the detriment of our producers, and I think a very good case has been made out by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) for taking steps to insure that a distinction be made between Canadian cheese and American cheese. It is known to all who have paid any attention to the matter that our cheese has a decided call, as one may say, in the markets of Great Britain, and we are perfectly entitled—no one can complain of our conduct in so doing—to see that no cheese from any other country is sold as being Canadian cheese. I can say to the hon. gentleman from Grenville (Mr. Reid) that he will have undoubtedly my support and the support of most hon. gentlemen here in any step of this kind for the protection of Canadian products.

Mr. POPE. With reference to what the Minister of Finance has stated, as to our not having the power to prohibit cheese from being branded in Canada, as it comes from the other side of the line. I would suggest that the Government should furnish a Government stamp for all cheese manufactured in Canada, so that the Government stamp will be a guarantee in the English market that the cheese is manufactured in Canada and could not be manufactured anywhere else.

Mr. FOSTER. That could be done. We have a perfect right to legislate that every cheese that is manufactured in Canada shall be stamped as Canadian cheese, but I can quite see where a person who manufactures cheese on the other side of the line could get one of these little stamps and mark his cheese Canadian cheese, and send it to the British market. We can make it certain that no cheese goes out of Canada without being branded Canadian cheese. We can make it certain that no cheese which enters from the United States, passing in transit or bond through this country, to Great Britain, shall be interfered with en route, and that, so long as it is in Canadian territory it shall not be marked "Canadian cheese"; but after it gets out of Canadian territory, after it enters the warehouse at Liverpool, we have lost command over it and the person who owns it may stamp it as he likes. We have, I suppose, an undoubted right to say that no cheese shall come to this country from the United States, or that no cheese shall come to this country from the United States for transit to Great Britain unless it is marked American cheese. But, what I meant to say was this: That legislation of that kind is rather delicate legislation to undertake, and may interfere with the bonding and transit privileges which are mutual and beneficial between the two countries. That requires very great care, and very great caution, as to what legislation can be had in order to bring about the object which members on both sides of the House desire. The question is simply as to the best way to bring this object about. I made the request to my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) not to press his motion, so as not to bind the House to this resolution entirely, but to leave it free for the Government to see what can be done to bring about the object which my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. REID. Under these circumstances, I shall ask for leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

NORTH-WEST SCHOOLS.

Mr. SEMPLE moved for :

Return showing the number of school-teachers engaged in teaching in the North-west Territories, and the length of time each was engaged during the past year, with the salary received; also the number of

pupils attending each school, and all sources of revenue for the maintenance of schools.

Mr. DALY. I may say to the hon. gentleman, as I said to him the other day, that the report of the Department of the Interior will, I think, contain all the information which he asks for in this motion; but any that it may not, I will undertake to have furnished to him if he will be satisfied to take what the report contains as the other portion.

Mr. SEMPLE. The answer of the hon. Minister is satisfactory. I am aware that all the information here asked for is not contained in the Auditor-General's Report, but as the hon. Minister has signified his intention of bringing down all that is asked for, I am satisfied to wait until the report comes down.

Motion agreed to.

GRINDING IN BOND.

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

That it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 32, so as to prevent the importation of wheat, maize, or other grain, in bond as now provided by the 93rd section of the said Act.

He said: **Mr. Speaker,** the object I have in view is really to make the National Policy more complete. My desire is to give the farmers of this country all the protection we can. When the legislation that I now seek to repeal was passed, the "Mail" was the organ of the Conservative party, and the "Globe" assailed the policy of the Government, day after day, in article after article, denouncing grinding in bond, to which the "Mail," in reply, said that in a very short time, the North-west Territories would be able to supply the millers of Ontario with all the hard wheat they would require, so that this was a temporary measure. Well, as the hon. Minister of the Interior knows, we can now supply, not only Ontario, but the world, with all the hard wheat that it may require, and therefore, the necessity for the legislation, allowing the millers of Ontario to grind, in bond, hard wheat coming from the western states, has passed away. I may say that it is not at the present moment a matter of very great importance, and I will tell you why. The millers, for some years, abused the privilege of grinding wheat in bond. They brought in wheat from the western states, and, instead of sending away the flour of that wheat, they sent away the flour of other wheat, and sold the flour of the imported wheat in the markets of Ontario. That has been prevented, the Customs officers now insisting that the flour of any wheat brought in shall be exported. Well, very little wheat is, in consequence, brought in at present; but little or great it is an anomaly to have it brought in now at all free of duty, because the only reason for bringing it in was that we had not the hard

wheat which the millers require in order to make flour of the grade and quality necessary for the English market. I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Finance will see no objection to our going into committee, and if we go into committee, I shall move :

That the 93rd section of chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes shall be repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

The importer of any cattle or swine may slaughter and cure and pack the same, or if such cattle or swine are imported in the carcass, may cure or pack the same in bond, provided the slaughtering curing and packing is done and conducted under such regulations and restrictions as the Governor in Council may, from time to time make for that purpose, but the said regulation shall not extend to the substitution of other beef or pork for the produce of such cattle or swine.

The difference between that and the clause I wish to repeal, is this : I would omit from the clause in the fourth line, "and the importer of any wheat, maize or other grain, may grind and pack the same in bond." That is omitted. The clause I wish to substitute is precisely the same as the 93rd clause, with the exception of those words which I would omit, so that the result will be that I shall have secured for the farmers of the North-west that market which we proposed to give them, as far as we could, when we introduced the National Policy. The only reason why we departed from the policy was that, at that time, we could not produce the amount of hard wheat that was necessary for the millers in order to sell flour to the English market of the required character. I would move, also, that the present section substituted by section 2 of chapter 44 of the statutes of 1891, for the paragraph letter "A" of section 245 of the said Act, be hereby repealed, and the following substituted :—

For the warehousing and bonding of such cattle or swine as may be slaughtered and cured in bond.

The words that are omitted from the 93rd clause of chapter 32 of the revised statutes will be omitted from the subsection amending the Act of 1891, and for the same purpose. The necessity for taking this course is so palpable that it is not necessary that I should seek to enforce my proposition on the mind of the Finance Minister, and I trust he will have no objection to our going into committee and taking away this anomaly in our legislation.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that as he has stated to the House, at the time these regulations were made and this Act passed, the millers of Ontario were not able to get sufficient wheat from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to keep their mills in operation, and of necessity, in order to make hard wheat flour they had to import wheat from the United States. In order to meet their requirements they were therefore allowed to import wheat in bond. They had to export at first the equivalent of that wheat, but it was found by the late Minister

Mr. DAVIN.

of Customs that they were evading the law. Consequently a number of them were fined, and the regulation was made whereby it was required, as it is at present, that millers importing wheat in bond must not export the equivalent, as formerly, but the product of their wheat that they imported, so that, owing to the very strict regulations surrounding this matter of importing in bond, the fears of our farmers were set at rest ; and I think the hon. gentleman, having brought this matter to the attention of the Government, and the Government promising to inquire into it, will be satisfied, and withdraw his motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that from a conversation I had with the President of the Millers Association some time ago, who was down here, I do not think there is any very strong grounds for passing the resolution which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has moved, because, as he very correctly says, the product of any wheat imported has to be sent out of the country, and is not allowed to be mixed with Canadian wheat. I fully agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the productions of the North-west are now so great that the farmers there are quite able to supply the demand of the Ontario millers ; but a number of those millers are located along the western part of the province of Ontario where it is not very convenient to get Manitoba wheat at all seasons, and they can get American wheat at certain seasons when the supply runs short, and thus keep those mills running at a time when they would otherwise have to close them up were it not for this privilege. As long as they can do that, they can carry on their operations more successfully and profitably, and while they do not allow that wheat to go into competition in any way with the Canadian product, I do not see any very strong grounds for this motion. In our part of the country we import wheat from Manitoba every week in the year, and the wheat used by the millers outside of what is raised in their immediate localities is brought from Manitoba, and they find it valuable to mix with our soft wheat, because it makes a much better grade of flour—a flour which is more saleable in the Maritime provinces than the product of our own Ontario wheat. But while that is being done there, they are more on the direct line of railways and steamers between here and Manitoba, and they can get it much more readily than the millers can in the western part of Ontario. I think so long as they export the American product there can be no strong objection to that importation, which there might be if they were allowed to mix it with our own.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This whole discussion must be very instructive to the House. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has now no objection nor has he had from the beginning to allowing millers to

import this wheat in bond without paying any customs duties upon it. At the same time, he holds that if there was a customs duty imposed upon it, it would really not come out of the millers, but out of the farmers who raise the wheat in the United States. Holding that view, I have never been able to understand how it is that he asks that this wheat should be imported free of duty. The hon. gentleman will tell the House that if it were a duty upon tea, the Chinaman pays it, because there is no tea produced in Canada; but that rule does not apply to wheat, because there is wheat produced in Canada, that either the duty increases the price or that it does not. The hon. gentleman holds that the duty upon wheat and barley and oats and all cereals increases the prices of those articles in the Canadian market. Yet he is still in favour of having this American wheat imported into Canada free of duty, so long as the product of that wheat is sold out of the country. The hon. gentleman also expresses the abominable notion that the American wheat is a good deal better than what can be produced in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He has told us that this wheat is imported because it is good, hard wheat.

Mr. SPROULE. I made no reference to the quality of the wheat whatever, but said that the wheat raised in Manitoba and the North-west was suitable for mixing with ours, because it is a hard wheat. But as to the kind of wheat raised in the United States I said nothing. What I said was that the importation of American wheat was necessary to enable our millers to run their mills at a time when they could not get a supply from Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman spoke of this wheat as being of the same character as that produced in the North-west Territories and Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not admit, as a resident of western Ontario—and I know something of the production of wheat—that the wheat from the western States or from our western territories is a better article than what can be produced in the western portion of Ontario. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is maligning his province when he undertakes to put before the House any such notion. I tell him that he is seeking to induce the population to leave the province of Ontario; that he is depreciating the value of our wheat in Ontario, and is preaching blue-ruin, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned. It seems to me that the sensible course to take would be to throw down those barriers which hon. gentlemen have raised, and which, in a sneaking

kind of way that is not altogether courageous, they are admitting now, have been of no service to the farming population of this country. That is what in effect the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has told the House by his motion, and that is in effect what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said in the speech.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say yes. I draw my own inference from the speech of the hon. gentleman, and that inference is that he is of opinion that these duties are after all, if they are imposed, paid by the party who purchases the article. The hon. gentleman has come to that conclusion. He and his friends on the Treasury benches must have been of that opinion all along, or else they would never have allowed this article to come in free when shipped in bond. They admit that they have not been able to help the farmers by the duties which they have imposed in that way and that, if those duties have served any purpose at all, it is in keeping a market for the Canadian farmer. I would like to know at what period in the history of this country has the farmer been unable to find a market at the market price for the wheat he could produce. Sir, the price is high or low in this country as it is high or low in the United Kingdom, and the hon. gentlemen who lately led their party told the people long ago that he was not a fly upon the wheel, that he was one of the big bugs who could regulate all the affairs of this country, including the market prices of everything that could be produced. And now the hon. gentleman admits his absolute helplessness in this way and that he is as thorough a fly on the wheel as ever alighted on that piece of machinery. In the speech the hon. gentleman made to this House I do not know whether he was looking forward to the Treasury benches or not. I have been looking over the Treasury benches to see which place he might expect to obtain, because I notice the hon. gentleman always comes to the rescue of the Government and is prepared to say for them what they are not always disposed to say for themselves. The hon. gentleman tells my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that he had better be satisfied with the explanation which the Minister has given and withdraw his motion and be a loyal subject and supporter of the Administration, and especially so while the leader of the Administration is absent from the House—don't let the hon. gentleman undertake to make mischief and that at the very moment when the leader has withdrawn from the House. Let the hon. gentleman look at the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) who never fails the Administration when it is important that the Administration should have his support.

Mr. HAGGART. A few words in reply to the hon. gentleman. He seems to be an

authority on nearly every subject that comes up, but if there is one subject upon which he appears to think himself an authority it is the subject of wheat. I think he knows very little about it. When he comes to understand that the very Customs Act with the terms of which he finds fault is an emanation of the Government of which he was a member, the Mackenzie Government, that he consolidated the statutes and that this grinding in bond was included in that consolidation—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To put a duty on wheat?

Mr. HAGGART. No, grinding in bond. That was in the consolidation made by the Mackenzie Government. Every one knows who has lived in this country that the flour-milling powers in this country are largely in excess of the requirements of the people. In order to enable these mills to be employed the Government allowed American wheat to come into Canada and be ground in bond and the product of it exported. As the hon. gentleman stated, and it was a good reason of complaint, the millers were in the habit of selling the flour which they ground from imported wheat in competition with flour from wheat imported from Manitoba. That was against the National Policy and it was put an end to, and a resolution of the House was passed that when wheat was imported to be ground in bond not only the quantity was to be exported, but the actual product of the wheat. The hon. gentleman says that the wheat grown in western Canada is equal to the Manitoba wheat or some grown in the northern part of Minnesota. Any miller who knows the facts about the wheat grown in this country will know that you are able to make from 200 lbs. of flour of wheat grown in Manitoba from fifteen or twenty pounds more of bread than from wheat grown in the particular section of the country the hon. gentleman resides in. That is the reason it is imported into the country for the purpose of mixing and that is why it commands a higher price in the old country. In some portions of the western states, in Northern Minnesota and Dakota they grow a wheat very similar to that of Manitoba. If the hon. gentleman had stated that he would have been correct, and if he had stated that this facility was offered in the interest of the milling industry, it is the duty of the Government to see that something of the kind is done for the benefit of the millers of the country.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think no person who has any considerable knowledge of the experience of the millers of this Dominion must confess that they had a very serious time of it for the last ten years. Now, with regard to the grinding in bond, if the law is as stated by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and I have no doubt he is correct, and that the millers have to export the product of the wheat they import, I cannot see that the Canadian farmer suffers by the oper-

Mr. HAGGART.

ation, and I do not think we should force the Canadian miller to allow his mill to stand idle for two or three months simply because he cannot get the supply of wheat to keep the mill running. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who has brought in this question, if he is prepared to state to this House that the same quality of wheat as that grown in Manitoba has been brought into this country and ground in bond within the last six or ten years. I do not think he will risk his reputation by saying that it is. If he knows anything about what is brought in, he knows that it is winter wheat and not what is grown in Manitoba. If the hon. gentleman has introduced this resolution in the interests of the farmer of Manitoba it is wholly unnecessary, because the wheat produced in Manitoba is not brought in here to be ground in bond. If the importation of wheat from the American side and the grinding in bond militated against farming interests of the province of Manitoba or Ontario or any other, it would still be unfair to prevent the importation of wheat to keep the mills going. The milling facilities of the Dominion at the present time are far in excess of the supply of wheat that can be furnished in some seasons. Take for instance a season when the wheat crop fails in Manitoba. We have had seasons of that kind; we have had such seasons in Ontario. Would it be right to say to the millers: You must keep your mills idle and not grind at all? I think it would be cruel in the extreme. When the crops are a failure, I think it is nothing but right that they should be allowed to import and grind in bond. I think it would be a hardship to shut out completely what they require as long as they carry on an honest trade and export that which they bring in for the purpose of grinding in bond.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have heard, Sir, some rather remarkable statements in this House, but I think the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) may claim the credit of having made a more remarkable statement on trade questions than any other man I have ever listened to. When I heard him declare that it was part of the policy of the Mackenzie Government to allow the grinding of wheat in bond, and when I recollected that the Mackenzie Government had imposed no duty whatever on wheat, I find it impossible to understand how any regulation affecting the grinding in bond of wheat could have occurred under the Mackenzie Government. Wheat was imported perfectly free.

Mr. HAGGART. The regulation with reference to bonding was under your Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be but not for grinding wheat in bond.

Mr. DAVIN. After the interesting debate we have had, and knowing, as I do, that not very much wheat comes in, and

having the promise of consideration by the Government, I do not think I shall put the House to the trouble of dividing on this motion, and with the permission of the House I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons further papers respecting the several questions at issue between the Dominion of Canada and the colony of Newfoundland.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, March, 1893.

ADJOURNMENT—TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the House do now adjourn, and I do so for two reasons. The first is that to-morrow we are to have the beginning of the second edition of a debate upon tariff matters, and if my hon. friend will agree with me, I should like to have this debate go on *de die in diem* until we finish it. It will be a motion of an amendment to go into Supply, and we may have to have a late sitting. Another reason is that I promised my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., whom I do not see in his place, that I would make a statement in reference to the French treaty; and I desire to do it as briefly as possible consistent with clearness. It will be within the memory of those who have followed the course of French legislation, that for ten years, at least, previous to 1892, the French tariff consisted of two lines, a general tariff and a conventional tariff, the general tariff being against all countries with which France had not any special treaties, either most-favoured-nation clause treaties in whole, or treaties which took in a partial list of their articles, and upon which partial list they had the lower tariff. About a year ago or so previous to 1892, the French Government and Chambers came to the conclusion to revise their tariff, and they did it by way of making two columns in their tariff, a maximum and a minimum column. They also came to the conclusion to terminate all treaties of whatever kind that existed between France and other nations, involving most-favoured-nation treatment. These treaties were due to expire at about that time, and after the year's notice was given, I think nearly all, if not quite all, the treaties were dropped. That year's notice was given for the 1st January, 1892, the purpose of the French Government being then, in having this maximum tariff and minimum tariff, to give to whatever country they could make terms with favourable to their own trade, either the whole or a partial list

of articles on the minimum tariff rate. It is also a fact which ought to be borne in mind in considering this treaty, that upon a very large proportion of the articles the minimum scale of the new tariff is actually as high, and in many cases higher, than was the general scale in the tariff before 1892. I mention that because it is necessary to bear in mind what tariff articles exported from this country under the treaty will have to meet, even though these articles are let in at the minimum rate. The articles are set forth in the treaty which has been brought down to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not been printed, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. It is in the printers' hands, I suppose. The articles on the part of Canada are those, mainly, which have for a number of years constituted about the only articles by rebate in which we could hope to influence France to give us more favourable terms in her market, that is, the article of wines. Three several attempts have been made within twelve or thirteen years to negotiate a treaty with France, and in each one of these the 30 per cent *ad valorem* upon wines has been used as a lever to induce France to give Canada better treatment with reference to certain articles which we might be able to export. These also have been made use of in the formation of this draft treaty. Non-sparkling wines, containing 15 degrees of alcohol, by the method of measurement in France, and equivalent, by the Canadian system of testing, to 26 degrees or less of alcohol, and all sparkling wines, are exempted from the surtaxe of 30 per cent *ad valorem*, leaving the specific duties still remaining on those lines. Then out of the number of articles which we were urged by the French negotiators to be admitted at a less duty, a few have been allowed, such as soaps, nuts, almonds, prunes and plums. With reference to soaps the clause reads:

The present duty charged on common soaps, savons de Marseilles, castile soaps, shall be reduced by one-half.

As that clause reads, one would think that it meant that common soaps from France, as well as savons de Marseilles, or castile soaps, were to be let in at this reduced rate, but a perusal of the negotiations as they progressed from day to day, shows that it is castile soap that was meant; and if the treaty is confirmed in accordance with the project which was submitted by the French negotiations, the words savons de Marseilles, or castile soaps, are simply used as explanatory of the soap which is to be allowed into this country at the reduced rate. As I have said, the duties on castile soaps, nuts, almonds, prunes and plums are to be reduced by one-third. On the other hand, among the various articles which were negotiated for by the British and Canadian nego-

tiators, a certain number have been admitted to the minimum tariff. Among these are canned meats: condensed milk, pure; fresh-water fish, also fish preserved in natural form. "au naturel," lobsters and crayfish, preserved in natural form; apples and pears, fresh, also dried and fresh; preserved fruits, others—that is, "others" refer to the articles in the French treaty, where preserved fruits are under three headings, I think, namely, those that are preserved in sugar, honey or spirits, and fruits, preserved, "others," include, it would appear from the reading of the latter article, the latter class of fruits. "preserved fruits, others," meaning those not preserved in sugar, honey or spirits; building timber, in the rough or sawn, the sawn timber running up from a minimum thickness to a little over three inches; wooden pavement, staves—which was the translation of the French word merrains, which, I think, means stave-wood, not the completed staves, but wood for staves—wood pulp, extracts of chestnut and other tanning extracts; common paper, machine made; prepared skins, whole; boots and shoes; furniture of common wood; furniture, other than chairs of solid wood; wooden sea-going ships. These are the articles which are admitted to the minimum tariff. Now, it is only fair to take these articles and show how the minimum tariff upon them compares with the old tariff in force up to 1892 with the maximum tariff under the tariff law, which came into force in January, last year. The comparison is as follows:—

Articles.	Old Tariff, General.	Present Tariff, Maximum.	Present Tariff, Minimum.
Common paper, machine made.	11	13	10
Prepared skins, others whole.	50	50	25
Boots and shoes.	75 to 2 francs.	1 to 2½ francs.	75 to 2 francs.
Furniture of common wood.	5	6	5
Furniture other than chairs of solid wood, common.	7	11	9
Other chairs.	15	30	20
Wooden sea-going ships.	2	5	2

I thought it was necessary and only fair to read those figures, to show to the House the proportion which the present minimum tariff bears as regards those articles to the old general tariff; and the fact is simply this: that, in revising their tariff, the French Chambers largely advanced it on the old tariff, making the minimum either pretty nearly equal, or in many cases higher than the old general tariff, and then applying to other countries and saying to them: "Now, if you will treat with us and give us certain modifications, we will give you our new minimum tariff." Below the minimum tariff they do not go. I next desire to come to a consideration of the gain or loss, so far as it can be got at roughly, and it can only be got at roughly, involved in these interchanges. Take, for instance, the articles on which we are obtaining the minimum tariff, such as are laid down in the treaty, and the reduction of duty, on the basis of the trade of 1891-92 from our own books, below what would be the maximum rate we would have to pay on any exportations from this country that would find their way to France, is on the whole 157,443 francs, equivalent to \$30,416. That may be taken roughly as the reduction that France gives us on those articles. Taking the 30 per cent ad valorem on wines, sparkling and non-sparkling, and almonds, nuts, prunes and plums, soaps, common and castile, as I see them on this list, the fact is, I think, that we get nothing but castile soap from France, so that that does not disturb the calculation—we give off in that respect \$82,929. That is, on the article so far as I have read, France reduces \$30,416 and we reduce \$82,929. But Sir Charles Tupper found, as of course we might expect he would find, in going into the trade returns of the French imports, that the quantities were much larger than were shown by our exports, so that this comparison that I have read is not quite fair in this, that we used our own table of imports, which is chiefly and mainly correct, while we used our table of exports to France, which is not so correct by any means, and

Articles.	Old Tariff, General.	Present Tariff, Maximum.	Present Tariff, Minimum.
Canned meats	8 francs per kilo	20 francs	15 francs
Condensed milk, pure	6 francs	10	5
Fresh water fish eels	5	10	5
Fish, preserved in their natural form	10	30	25
Lobsters and cray fish preserved in natural form	10	30	25
Apples and pears, fresh	Free	3	2
Apples and pears dried and fresh . .	6	15	10
Fruits preserved, others	8	10	8
Building timber in rough or sawn	Free	1 to 2½	65 centimes to 1½ francs
Wood pavement . . .	1	5	3.50
Staves	Free	1½	75 centimes
Wood pulp (cellulose) mechanical		75 centimes	50 centimes
Wood pulp, chem'		2.50	2 francs
Extract of chestnut and other tanning extracts	Free	5	3

Mr. FOSTER.

if we were to take the French table of imports in these articles in which—especially in the matter of lumber—they give a much larger quantity than our exports show. So that while the \$82,929 would be the maximum of our loss, the \$30,416 is not by any means the maximum of the loss to the French customs. However, there was another point in which France made concessions to Canada. That was in the trade of the colonies. Before 1892 the colonies had a tariff of their own, but, under the legislation of 1892, the tariffs for the colonies and the tariffs for the metropolitan country of France itself, were made the same, so that the maximum and minimum tariff applies to the French colonies, and would apply amongst others to the French colony of St. Pierre and Miquelon. After February, 1893, if the tariff had remained without change, St. Pierre and Miquelon would have been under the maximum and minimum tariff of France, and our products would have been largely shut out from that country, so far as a high tariff supervening upon a very small tariff of 3 per cent before, would have the effect of doing that. France also gave, not a minimum tariff but an arrangement away below the minimum tariff for the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, allowing a long list of articles, either free or at a very low tariff. For instance, coal, which under the general tariff would have been 12 francs, is made free; salt, which would have been 2 francs and 40 centimes, is made free; salted herrings, which would have been 15 francs, is made free; staves, which would have been 75 centimes, is made free; horned cattle, 30 francs per head, free; pigs, 8 francs per head, free; and sheep, poultry, eggs and meats also made free.

Mr. LAURIER. These articles are not included in the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I am coming to that explanation. I am stating this showing that France made that arrangement as regards St. Pierre and Miquelon. Pork, 12 francs under the general tariff, is made free; oats, 3 francs before, is now half a franc; flour, 10 francs a barrel before, is now 35 centimes; hay, 30 centimes against 50 formerly; potatoes, free, against 40 centimes; sea-going ships free, against 2 francs; tobacco, 150 francs, against 1,500 francs; tea, 9 francs, against 20. The whole abatement under this arrangement of duty for our trade of 1891, from Canada to St. Pierre and Miquelon, would amount to 178,929 francs, or \$34,533. So that that has also to be taken into consideration in calculating the amount of duties mutually given off by the two parties to this agreement. Now, it is only fair to state this as well: That the proclamation by which this reduction in tariff rates is made for St. Pierre and Miquelon is a proclamation which leaves that trade in these articles open on these terms to the whole world, as well as to

Canada. From the correspondence as it went on, Council was of the opinion that that was to be as compensation to Canada as far as these articles are concerned, but the decree which was promulgated, and which reached us, I think in the latter part of January, shows that the proclamation was made general, and that these articles, as far as St. Pierre and Miquelon is concerned, came in at the lower rate. They, however, come from any country as well as from Canada. The facts are, I suppose, that the trade must mainly belong to Canada because of its proximity to these islands; its being near, producing these articles, and therefore getting the larger part of the trade. Now, I wish to state also, that this treaty contains two clauses with reference to what you might call "Third Power" treatment. With reference to the Canadian articles, France binds herself to give to Canada the same terms in regard to the articles mentioned in the treaty that she gives to any "more favoured" nation. On the other hand, as the treaty is signed, Canada agrees to give France "most-favoured-nation" treatment, not only on the articles that are mentioned, but on any articles of her tariff in which she gives better terms to any other country. That was not the intention of the Government, as will be seen by a telegram which was sent to our Commissioner in January, in which it was expressly stated that we agreed to the "most-favoured-nation" treatment, so far only as articles named in the treaty are concerned. Our Commissioner, either through error or for reasons which he explains in his correspondence, signed the treaty with the clause in it as I have read, giving "most-favoured-nation" treatment to France in all articles of our tariff. The papers which I will lay on the Table of the House will explain how that came about. There is this also to be stated: That since the treaty was made, an important change has taken place in the legislation in France with reference to ships. In olden time it was considered by Canada to be of very great moment, that she should get her wooden ships into France at a favourable rate, and the old negotiations proceeded upon that plane. Since that time the duty upon foreign ships has been largely reduced in France, so that now the maximum is 5 francs and the minimum 2 francs, reduced you may say to a nominal duty. Circumstances have also somewhat changed since 1878, so that that does not become so important to us. But ships was one of the articles which were mentioned in the treaty and which we were to have admitted at the minimum rate. But since this draft treaty was agreed upon, French legislation has intervened which makes that compensation to us of less value even than it would have been had this legislation not taken place. France has for a number of years paid a bounty upon the construction of wooden ves-

sels, and a bounty upon the sailing of both wooden and iron vessels; and the legislation which has taken place within the last few weeks has been of such a kind as largely to increase the construction bounty upon wooden ships in France, as well as largely to increase the sailing bounty, and it has made it imperative that the sailing bounty shall not be given to vessels constructed outside of France which may be bought by the citizens of France. So that, in so far as we had hoped for compensation on the article of wooden ships, that legislation has been in the direction of nullifying any benefit that we had expected to gain in that respect. My attention was drawn to that in reading some of the English papers, and I immediately had Mr. Fabre communicated with; and he sent me a copy of the French law, which I will bring down with the papers I intend to lay on the Table of the House. Now, there is another point to be mentioned, that is, as to what is the meaning of certain clauses in this treaty. From the representations that came to us from time to time through Sir Charles Tupper, our negotiator, we formed certain ideas as to what was to be admitted. The wording of the treaty raises a doubt as to whether certain articles in their entirety are to be admitted under the treaty. For instance there is mentioned fish preserved in their natural form, and lobsters preserved in their natural form. Take lobsters as an illustration or example of what I am about to say. If the treaty means that we are not to have the minimum tariff in France except upon lobsters in their natural form, then that is of very little benefit to Canada. But as the negotiations progressed, the representations that came to us were that canned lobsters were to enjoy the benefit of the minimum tariff, which certainly would have been a large concession, so far as we were concerned; and the question to be set at rest now is, as to whether the wording of the treaty as it is signed extends to canned lobsters the benefit of the minimum tariff, or whether that is confined, as it would appear to be from the simple words of the treaty, to lobsters in their natural form. The same was the case with reference to fish preserved in their natural form, which would refer mainly to pickled fish, probably to sardines, but would not include, for instance, canned salmon, which we had thought would certainly be included. There are two or three similar matters which remain in doubt; but I cite these instances as a basis for the remark which is to follow and that is, that immediately upon our receipt of a copy of this treaty we opened up communication with our negotiators so as to get an authoritative understanding as to these matters of which I have spoken, and we called attention to the change that had been made in French legislation with reference to ships, and also to the fact that the advantages of a low tariff as to St. Pierre and Miquelon were not confined to

Mr. FOSTER.

Canada, but were thrown open to the world. Under these circumstances I am not prepared at present to ask Parliament to ratify this treaty. The treaty is signed subject to the ratification of the Canadian Parliament, and I make this full and frank exposition of the treaty in order that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may look into it and consider it, for it requires a little consideration, in order to see just what the effect of the treaty is in these different particulars. And certainly, until we receive more satisfactory assurances than we have as regards these items of which I have spoken, I shall not ask the House to ratify the treaty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have it printed, I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit to the House that if anything ought to convince Parliament that Canada has now reached a stage when she should be entrusted with the power of negotiating her own commercial treaties, the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman to-night ought to confirm that impression. It is now ten years or more since we have had on the tapis a treaty with France, and after this long period we are presented with a treaty which is most deceptive—so deceptive, indeed, that the hon. gentleman will not present it for ratification to the House. I do not blame him for this, because I share a good deal of what he has himself said. I am one of those who hailed with joy the announcement made a few days ago that at last the British commissioners had succeeded in getting a treaty for us with France; but when I came to look at the treaty, though I must say I did so in a very cursory manner, I was struck with the fact that the treaty contained almost absolutely nothing for Canada. In the first place, last year France adopted a National Policy in the shape of a protective tariff, and a protective tariff with a vengeance. The minimum rate of the present tariff in France is in almost every part higher than was the previous tariff. So that if under the previous tariff we were unable to have any considerable commerce with France, if under it our exports to France reached, in fact, only a little more than \$350,000, we cannot hope that our exports will be increased at all under the present arrangement, even if we have the benefit of the minimum tariff. Therefore, we should have almost no benefit at all. On the other hand, there is this clause in the treaty which is most obnoxious, that if we ratified this treaty we should ipso facto extend to France the privilege of any treaty that we should negotiate with any other country. Well, we expect to negotiate a treaty with the United States at some time or other, I hope before long, and every one will agree with me that the commerce of the United States would be a hundred fold more advantageous to us than the treaty with France; yet, if we had a

treaty with the United States, the benefit of it would be largely destroyed from the fact that France could come in and share the advantages we gave to the United States. We could, of course, put an end to the treaty by giving twelve months' notice to the French Government; but there seems to me to be one great deficiency in the treaty. We would have expected in a treaty negotiated with France to have had the benefit of the French market, especially for agricultural products, which are the staples of this country, and yet agricultural products are altogether omitted from the treaty. The only article in the way of agricultural products mentioned in it is apples. I do not know whether there is a minimum tariff in France on apples.

Mr. FOSTER. The minimum is 2, and the maximum 3 for fresh, and the minimum 10 and the maximum 15 for dry apples.

Mr. LAURIER. The article of the greatest consequence to us, next to agricultural products, is lumber. The advantage we receive from the minimum tariff is purely nominal. The maximum tariff in lumber is 1 franc, 50 centimes and 2 francs, 50 centimes per 100 kilos, according to certain qualities and dimensions, whereas the minimum tariff is 1 franc, 50 centimes and 1 franc, giving us an advantage of only 50 centimes, or 10 cents in the one case, and in the other the minimum tariff is 2 francs 50 centimes, and 1 franc 75 centimes, giving us an advantage of 15 cents per kilos. Under these circumstances the average is not appreciable. The difference is so small, when we consider that lumber is such a bulky article, that it is impossible to suppose we have any appreciable benefit. The hon. gentleman himself has shown to the House that, in the matter of ships, there is no advantage whatever. The bounty which is given to French-built ships makes the treaty in that respect perfectly nugatory. Then, with regard to fish, it is to be remembered that the advantage is confined simply to fresh water fish, and not to salt water fish. Well, I am sure we do not export to France or any other country fresh water fish. The treaty would have been of some benefit had it been extended to salt water as well as fresh water fish. Cheese and butter are also not included. On the other hand we reduce the duties upon the following French articles: wines, nuts, almonds, plums and soaps. It is impossible to have a direct trade with France if the treaty is limited to those articles. It would be almost impossible to have return cargoes, if the articles upon which we reduce our tariff are limited to wines, nuts, almonds, plums and soaps. Under those circumstances, while I do not pretend to pass a final opinion on the treaty, I am not surprised to find that the hon. gentleman is not prepared to ask the House to confirm it. I hope the hon. gentleman will lay on the Table for discussion, at all events, the negotiations which have taken place, which, I understand, he has in his hand.

Mr. FOSTER. All those that are material.

Mr. LAURIER. Those that are material are all those that took place.

Mr. FOSTER. Everything necessary to understand it.

Mr. LAURIER. It is better, judging from past experience, to have all the negotiations, because otherwise we may have contradictions from one country to the other as to what really took place. If the hon. gentleman wants to do himself justice he should put all the negotiations before the House. I suppose he will lay on the Table a copy of the French tariff, which he has in his hands.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point that I missed, and which it is necessary to know in order to have a fair understanding on the matter. France is, if she holds to anything, holds to what she calls the "surtaxe d'entrepot," and that consequently of these articles not one can be exported from Canada into France if it touches at a European third port. They can be sent direct from here to France, or direct from an American port to a French port, but if they touch any other European port and are transhipped from that place, a surtaxe d'entrepot of 3 francs 50 centimes for every 100 kilogrammes is levied. It was with respect to that we wish to have a fast line of steamers between this country and the French ports. There are one or two other things to which I may draw attention. Preserved fish are allowed to go in under the treaty. My hon. friend speaks of cheese. There is a supplementary letter, which is attached, I think, to the treaty, or is in the correspondence laid on the Table, in which the French Government propose to give us a minimum on cheese, provided we give them a reduction on certain painting and designs. It is one of the articles of the treaty on which they wish a deduction, article 380. Then, with reference to lumber, although my hon. friend spoke of the difference between the minimum tariff and the maximum tariff as being small, yet the lumbermen with whom I have conversed tell me it will just afford them a chance to do trade against the chance not to trade and they are waiting with interest the ratification of the treaty to enable them to make sales in France. A very small margin upon 100 kilogrammes in lumber makes all the difference between being able to purchase or not for the French market. Then, as regards agricultural products, you might as well try to extract blood from a stone almost as to extract any concession from France upon agricultural products. If my hon. friend will go through the whole list of agricultural products, he will find that, with very few exceptions, there is no minimum tariff, but simply the one tariff. Agricultural protection is the one thing France has pushed to the forefront in the tariff she has made, so that it was impossible to get any minimum tariff on the large range of agricultural products,

simply because no such minimum tariff exists on those products in the French treaty. With regard to sea fish, my hon. friend will see why France is unwilling to give any facilities to the importation of foreign sea fish, when she goes to such trouble, by her own fish marine and by paying out bounties, to encourage her own fishermen. The hon. gentleman started out with a criticism on the ground of our not being able to negotiate our own treaty. This treaty was negotiated wholly and solely by our own commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper. He was commissioner with the Earl of Dufferin in the matter, but the whole brunt of the negotiations fell upon him. Then what I omitted to mention and what my hon. friend supplied was that the treaty might be terminated on one year's notice. So that with reference to most of the countries with which we could form a treaty, that is with which Great Britain would have most favoured-nation treaties, for instance, notice could be given to terminate the French treaty before the desired treaty could become operative, and at least at any time it could be terminated on one year's notice. There is just one thing that my hon. friend says: True, under the treaty you would have the advantage of the French minimum tariff but that minimum tariff is higher than the old general tariff. That may be, but that is the lowest tariff for which anything could be got into France, and if, out of fifty countries forty-five of them have not the minimum tariff while five have, the trade rendered necessary by the consumption of France is thrown into the competition of the five and very great benefit comes of that at the present time. For instance, Norway and Sweden have the minimum tariff, and consequently they do a large lumber trade with France. We cannot compete for that trade, because the new tariff shuts us out, while they are allowed in. This minimum tariff would place us on a footing that would allow us to compete for a large lumber trade with France. I only mention that as a matter worthy of notice.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The most serious objection to this treaty has not been mentioned, and that is its effect upon an important Canadian industry. I refer to the native wine industry. When I was last in Toronto, I met a large deputation of gentlemen interested in this business and they say they would suffer material damage by this treaty were it to come into force, and they contend that it should not be allowed to come into force without giving them an opportunity of being heard. When the Government, especially now that they have a Department of Trade and Commerce propose a change of this kind, they should take the greatest care to ascertain how the representatives of the Canadian industries that will be affected by it regard it. The wine growers of Ontario represent a very large industry. The whole

Mr. FOSTER.

Niagara peninsula, the Essex peninsula and Pelee Island will send representatives down to Ottawa this week to lay before the Government their facts as to the effect of this treaty upon their industry.

Mr. EDGAR. This is another instance of the old story of the labouring mountain and the ridiculous mouse. As even the Finance Minister expresses doubts as to the advantage to Canada from the proposed treaty I shall not say anything about that part of the question but I would like to draw his attention for a moment to the advantages we propose to give to France under that treaty and to understand a little more about them than I do now. The treaty proposes that wines, &c., of French origin entering Canada shall enter at certain reductions of duty. Now, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether that means, as it says on the face, that we shall discriminate in favour of France to that extent against other nations, including England and the nations with which she has most-favoured-nation treaties. I think that is an exceedingly important matter, because I can hardly conceive it possible that France would for one moment entertain the idea of giving Canada any advantages if she was told frankly by our negotiator that the advantages which we purpose to give her in favour of her wines and nuts and fruits would also be shared by other nations. Now, is it proposed to discriminate in favour of France or not? If it is proposed to discriminate in favour of France in this respect, then there is an end absolutely and forever to any objection on the part of this Government to discriminating in favour of the United States under a reciprocity treaty. That is perfectly clear. But if there was no intention to discriminate in the way the language of the treaty would imply, I wonder if France knew about it. I wonder if France understood that when we come to carry out this treaty by amendments to the custom law we would take off the 30 per cent ad volorem duty on wines imported from Germany for instance. Because if we are bound by the treaties that England has made with other countries on the favoured nations basis and including Canada in their terms, then we are bound to give Germany and a dozen other countries the same advantages, the same tariff as we give France. I wonder what value France would attach to it if we were to do that. There can be no doubt upon this subject, because, a session or two ago, discussing the treaties, which, at the suggestion of the Ministry, we asked the English Government to denounce, so far as Canada was concerned—treaties with Belgium and Germany—the First Minister explained the terms of the treaty in this House. He said:

So that if in any other country Canada, with the consent of Great Britain, makes a reciprocity treaty or a preferential arrangement for trade we shall be obliged by these clauses to give to the German States of the

Zollverein the same changes, differentiations or advantages we give to this third power.

Now, I think it can hardly be believed that France would consent to allow Germany to enjoy the same privileges—Germany of all countries of the world. It is not an immaterial thing to allow Germany to share in these advantages, because I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that a considerable proportion of the wine of the class mentioned in the treaty is imported into Canada from Germany. And surely Canada would not discriminate in favour of France as against Great Britain, and, as matters now stand, a large quantity of wine is imported from Britain to Canada yearly. I see by the Trade and Navigation Returns that nearly nine-tenths of the nuts, almonds, dried prunes and plums that it is proposed to admit under this treaty with France, are now imported from the United States; so that it would be giving the present Government of the United States, to put it in the mildest form that the hon. gentleman chooses, a tremendous slap in the face at the very first favourable opportunity, in those very importations from that country. So I think that it would throw a good deal of light upon that subject if the Minister would tell us what the Government's intention is towards France.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend had asked for the information, without making deductions of his own, and founding a speech upon them, it might have been better. I can answer him in two simple sentences. We propose to discriminate neither against Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Belgium, nor, under our present intention, any other country in the world. My hon. friend wondered if France knew it. She knew it, and agreed to the treaty under that very well-known proposition.

Mr. EDGAR. These articles go on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. No; they go on the list of the reduced tariff.

Mr. HAGGART. When I was making some remarks a few moments ago, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) replied to me as if I had made a misquotation, when I stated that the Mackenzie Government, in 1877, placed upon the Statute-book a law under which bonding privileges were used in Canada. He said it was one of the most extraordinary statements he ever heard among the extraordinary ones that he had heard me make in this House. Let me read from the statutes 40 Vic., chap. 10, section 59, passed in 1877:

The importer of any cattle or swine may slaughter and cure and pack the same (or if such cattle or swine are imported in the carcass, may cure and pack the same) in bond; and the importer of any wheat, maize or other grain may grind and pack the same in bond; provided such slaughtering, curing, grinding and packing be done and conducted under such regulations and restrictions as the Governor in Council may, from

time to time, make for this purpose; and the said regulations may extend to the substitution of beef and pork, flour and meal in quantities equivalent to the produce of such cattle and swine, wheat, maize or other grain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What matter does it make if there was no duty on wheat, I should like to know?

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say anything about the matter; I said that the grinding in bond was done under a statute passed by you when you were in the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say it does not matter a straw, inasmuch as the whole point at issue was, whether there was any provision for the grinding of wheat in bond which could affect, in the slightest degree, the right of importation. It could not affect the right of importation in the slightest way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Government inform us if Sir Charles Tupper is going to continue his treaty-making with Spain?

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to inquire whether the Government propose to go on with the motion regarding the tariff "de die in diem."

Mr. FOSTER. I said I would like to do so if my hon. friend will agree.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that we have not had a day for a private members' business now for three weeks. Through the indulgence of the House these days were granted to the Government in order to facilitate the departure of the Premier, and if the day is taken on Wednesday next, I suppose we shall have no further opportunity at all for private business. I think the Government are hardly treating fairly the private members of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. We can arrange that tomorrow.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend and leader laid down the proposition that this treaty showed the necessity of our obtaining independent treaty-making powers. While I am fully in accord with the general principle I can hardly say that the present attempt at treaty making, which the hon. Minister of Finance said was done entirely by Sir Charles Tupper, is very encouraging as to the nature of the treaties we would obtain under these circumstances. The hon. gentleman has been ten years nibbling away at this dry bone, and he has got very little out of it. He has been negotiating with France, negotiating with Spain, and negotiating with the United States, and although he has succeeded in obtaining this sort of treaty with France the attempt to obtain a treaty with the United States was abandoned on the first sign of difficulty. If Sir Charles Tupper and the Finance Minister, in their negotiations with the United States, whatever these may have been—we do not seem to be able to ascertain exactly what they were—had signed a treaty contain-

ing any such ludicrous and absurd proposals as he has presented to this House, I think they would have put themselves in a very awkward position. I say that it is quite time to stop this farce of pretending to make treaties abroad while we neglect the grand market that is open at our very door. There is no doubt that a treaty on advantageous terms to Canada could be obtained with the United States, without any more discrimination against England or any other country, than this treaty already signed by Sir Charles Tupper would involve. There is one thing that has been forgotten by those who have spoken, that is the difficulty of proving the French origin of goods which are to come in at reduced rates. I do not see how that could be established when they come from other countries here. Again, it must not be forgotten that any reduction of duty on particular articles, as long as we do not reduce our expenses accordingly, necessarily involves an increased taxation on something else. Now, if the duty on wines imported from France has amounted to anything worth while, we would have to make that up by taxation on some other things; and it would just amount to this: that the class of people who do not use wines would have to pay for the loss of revenue heretofore collected on light wines imported. Although it seems likely that we shall not be asked to ratify this treaty, I think such a proposal in itself calls for extended discussion and condemnation by the House, and I regret that we have no other chance to discuss it than on a motion to adjourn at this late hour.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates, as follows:—

The Committee have had under consideration the question of remuneration to be paid Mr. A. C. Campbell, whose appointment as temporary substitute on the Official Reporting Staff was approved of by the House, on the 8th ultimo; and recommend that he be paid the sum of \$1,200 for his services during the present session.

The Committee, owing to the increased amount of work which had to be done in connection with the translation into English of the speeches delivered in the French language, and also with the view of avoiding delays in the printing of the English revised edition, found it necessary to employ temporary

Mr. CASEY.

assistance and recommend that Mr. Frank Hughes, who was engaged for that purpose, be paid at the rate of \$2 per page of 2 columns.

The Committee submit, for the information of the House, the following comparative statement of the cost of publishing the Official Report of the Debates of the sessions of 1891 and 1892, viz.:—

	Session 1891.	Session 1892.
Reporters.....	\$17,000 00	\$16,985 82
Amanuenses.....	3,720 00	3,203 00
Translators.....	13,825 12	10,200 00
Printing, binding and paper.	24,064 49	16,622 24
Miscellaneous.....	115 70	299 99
	\$58,725 31	\$47,311 05

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be well if the hon. gentleman would consent to let that lie over.

POSTING OF PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the time for posting private Bills under the 60th Rule, be reduced from one week to two days, such reduction to apply to all Bills posted on or after Friday, the 10th inst.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems to be really offering a premium to parties to delay coming here for legislation to the last possible moment, and I would call the attention of the Government to the practice which seems to be a very bad one.

Mr. SCRIVER. I may say, as a member of the Committee on Standing Orders, that the circumstances which led to this recommendation was stated to the committee, and it appeared to the committee that the delay was a result of unavoidable accident, and that the House ought to entertain the application for the suspension of the rule. I quite agree that the departures from the salutary rules which exist for the government of the Committee on Standing Orders have been departed from in too many instances in the present session, and, so far as I am concerned, if I should live for another session, and be again a member of the committee, I shall, so far as it is in my power, insist on a more rigid observance of these rules than has prevailed during the present session.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the province of Quebec.—(Mr. Costigan.)

RELIEF OF R. Y. HEBDEN.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved :

That Bill (No. 94) for the relief of R. Y. Hebden, be placed on the Order Paper for second reading on Wednesday, the 15th of March.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct attention to a matter which I had intended to bring up yesterday, but was unable to do so through a misunderstanding as to the point at which the Orders of the Day began. I refer to certain statements alleged to have been made by the Controller of Customs at the meeting in Kingston of Saturday evening last, in which he referred to the action of the Ulster men—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is, I am afraid, bringing up a subject which will provoke discussion, and I have ruled upon former occasions that, upon the calling of the Orders of the Day, no matters can be brought up which will provoke discussion.

Mr. CASEY. I was just going to explain my object in bringing the matter up. I had intended to call attention to the matter, but, as the Controller of Customs is not here to-day, there will be no use in bringing it up, but I give notice that I will do so on the first opportunity when the hon. gentleman is in the House.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Finance has forgotten to put on the Table the papers he referred to yesterday in the discussion of the French treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. When I looked over the papers last night, I found they were not as complete as I wished to make them, and am having the others copied to-day. I have no objection, however, to bringing down those I quoted last night, and will do so this evening.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has other papers. I was under the impression, from what he said last night, that they were already too complete.

COUNTY COURT JUDGE, WELLAND.

Mr. LAURIER. I am informed that the judge of the county court of the county of Welland died a month ago, and that the vacancy has not been filled, and that great public inconvenience is felt in consequence.

Mr. FOSTER. The vacancy has been filled.

Mr. LAURIER. When ?

Mr. OUIMET. Saturday.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is the appointee ?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Fitzgerald.

DISMISSAL OF THE POSTMASTER OF ST. LEON.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to point out to the hon. Postmaster-General that nearly a month ago, I asked for a return including all the documents respecting the dismissal of the postmaster of St. Léon. I should like to inquire from the hon. Minister whether these papers will soon be laid on the Table of the House. I should not like to charge the Government with negligence, but it seems to me that it is taking a good deal of time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I may say to the hon. member that the order to prepare these papers has been given. The hon. member will find, no doubt, that they contain very little information. The only papers that cannot be laid on the Table of the House, according to a rule invariably followed so far, are the confidential reports of the inspectors ; these reports are never communicated outside the department. I think those of these papers that can be communicated to the House will be brought down tomorrow.

SUPPLY—TARIFF REFORM.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McCARTHY. I beg to move, in amendment, the resolution of which I had the honour to give notice to the House, and which has been for some days on our Votes and Proceedings. I make no apology, Sir, for bringing up this question, although the subject of the tariff has largely engaged the attention of the House for many days, and been spoken to, and perhaps very fully discussed, by members on both sides. I say I make no apology, Sir, because I regard it from a different point from that which the matter has been treated up to this time. The question has been debated on both sides of the House with reference to the antagonistic position which the members supporting the Government and the members who are opposed to the Administration have always taken with regard to the question of the tariff. On one side it seems rather to be dealt with as if the policy of protection had now become one of the prominent planks of the Conservative platform, while, on the other side, it has been dealt with as if free trade had always been and still was a cardinal principle to which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House adhered. But, Sir, I am one of those who, in a humble way, it is true, but still as a member of this House, have been responsible from the very first, from the very initiation of the principle which ultimately came to be known as the National Policy. I say I am one of those who supported that principle in its early days, during

the very earliest time in which I had the honour of a seat in this House, and who, from time to time, though perhaps not very prominently, has continued to give his adherence and support to the principles which have been known throughout this Dominion as the National Policy. And, Sir, it is because I think the time has come when we ought to reconsider, or, at all events, to consider, the position which the country holds with respect to the trade policy that I venture to ask the attention of the House to the statement which I propose to make, and to the principle which I propose to adduce in support of the conclusion which, from the notice I have given, it is sufficiently apparent my mind has already reached. Now, Sir, the National Policy, as it came to be known, was not thought of at all, was not advocated in this Parliament, at least, I think, until the year 1876. But from 1876 onward, during the session of that year and the two succeeding sessions of 1877 and 1878, and, finally, upon the resolution of the last named year, the principles which are known and spoken of as the National Policy were set forth by the then leader of the Opposition, the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. These principles were accepted by his followers in the House, and were ultimately adopted by the country, and crystallized into law in the session of 1879. And now I desire, Sir, to recall what it was that those who supported that policy expected as the result of the change which they advocated, what they expected would eventuate from it, and I want to see whether or not, and to what extent, the anticipations which were then formed have been justified by the result. Now, Sir, I think I am perfectly right in saying that, at all events, up to the last session of the Parliament in which the National Policy, as I say, was adopted through the resolution which was moved, it was never very strongly contended, or if was very strongly contended it was by a comparatively small minority of the members of this House, that the system of protection was, in itself, a very desirable system. The system of protection, Sir, was advocated and supported as one called for by the exigencies of the occasion, and not called for, and not justified as good in itself, and not one which, in the abstract, met with the support or approval of the majority of the members who, at that time, advocated the National Policy. I do not think, Sir, that it can be questioned that the great leader of the party to which I have had the honour to belong was not an advocate of protection as opposed to free trade. On the contrary, as his speeches at that time indicate, and as those who were intimate with him and knew his personal views are aware, his views were those of a free trader, his views were those of a statesman who thought that while free trade, in the abstract, was the correct and proper theory, he ultimately came, and, perhaps, not very hastily, but by slow degrees, to the conclusion that,

Mr. McCARTHY.

under the circumstances which then prevailed, the system of protection might well be justified and urged as the proper system for this country to adopt. I would recall the attention of the House, even at the expense of reading the resolution of that early day, to the three resolutions which were moved by the then leader of the Opposition, Sir John Macdonald, one in 1876, one in 1877, and the final resolution in 1878. And they very fairly, I think, indicate the change that was going on in the mind of that statesman, as well as the change that was going on in the feeling of the country, or, at least, in what was then believed—and it proved rightly believed—to be the feeling of the country in regard to this question of protection, as opposed to free trade. In 1876, the resolution was as follows:—

That this House regrets that His Excellency the Governor-General has not been advised to recommend to Parliament a measure for the readjustment of the tariff, which would not only aid to alleviate the stagnation of business deplored in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but also afford fitting encouragement and protection to the struggling manufactures and industries as well as the agricultural products of the country.

It will be observed that the resolution of 1877 was somewhat bolder in tone, and the climax was reached when the resolution of 1878 was proposed as embodying the belief of the then Opposition. In 1877, the resolution was as follows:—

That this House regrets that the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burthen of taxation on the people without any compensating advantage to Canadian industries; and, further, that this House is of opinion that the deficiency in the revenue should be met by a diminution of expenditure, aided by such readjustment of the tariff as will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

The resolution of 1876 was in favour of protecting the struggling manufacturers and industries as well as the agricultural products of the country, but in 1877 the mining interests were also included among those to be protected under the policy it was proposed to ask the House and country to adopt. And finally, in the following year, we had the resolution upon which the election was fought, and upon which the battle in the country was won:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity treaty.

That was the resolution, Sir, which was the embodiment of the wisdom of the Opposition of that day, and which found acceptance with the people of this country. In the speech of the right hon. gentleman who moved that resolution, we find that he made this observation concerning free trade, as compared with protection :

Now, free trade may be all very well in its way. In the abstract, free trade is the liberty of buying in the cheapest market, and selling in the dearest. In the abstract, it is a proposition not to be disputed ; but, when brought down to the concrete, when the needs of nations are considered, and the peculiar needs of Canada are considered, it is found impossible to carry it out.

So, I think I am right in saying that, even up to the last moment, the right hon. gentleman who moved the resolution was in favour, generally speaking, or in the abstract, to use his own language, of the policy of free trade as opposed to protection. Now, Sir, what did we expect from this policy of protection ? I am not going to repeat the language of the resolution, but I am going to deal with some public utterances of great moment upon which, very largely, I think, the Opposition went to the country, and upon which the Opposition succeeded in the end in securing a victory at the polls, which placed them in power. Some of the things which we expected were mentioned in the speech of Mr. Colby, and those who remember the debate on the subject will agree with me, I think, that Mr. Colby's speech was the ablest utterance which was given in support of the policy enunciated by the Opposition. Now, Mr. Colby was undoubtedly a protectionist, in that he differed from his leader, in that he differed from a great number of gentlemen who supported that resolution ; he was a protectionist in principle, and he supported the theory which was advanced on behalf of the Opposition on grounds which commended themselves to him as a protectionist. I do not think I will be dealing unfairly—and I desire not to deal unfairly in this matter, either with gentlemen on this side or on the other side of the Chamber—if I refer to Mr. Colby's speech, for the arguments which he used, and for the principles that he laid down, as justifying the policy that was then proposed ; and I shall afterwards endeavour to see to what extent the result justified Mr. Colby's anticipations. No clearer utterance was ever made on the floor of Parliament than that made by Mr. Colby in support of these views, and I perfectly well remember that so highly did we think of Mr. Colby's effort, that it was printed and circulated as a campaign sheet throughout the whole of the province from which I come, at all events, and I believe throughout the whole Dominion. Now, Mr. Colby laid down five or six principles in support of the view which he then advocated ; and before I come to these, I want it to be distinctly understood that I am not going to find fault, if in the end I

do find fault at all, that the anticipations of other gentlemen have not been realized. There were speeches made on the stump—I do not think they were made in the House—but speeches were certainly made on the stump in which a much more bright view was pictured for the policy than Mr. Colby anticipated himself, or than sober-minded men who occupied seats in this Parliament at that time ever dreamed or imagined. Those gentlemen thought there would be tall chimneys in almost every village and town, and numerous tall chimneys in every city. They thought and advocated that the result of this policy would be to give to the farmer a home market for all he could produce ; that no matter what the prices might be in the markets of the world, no matter how low they might become, under the beneficent effects of the protective policy which was then to be inaugurated the farmer would always find a home market absolutely his own, without competition ; and consequently, whether his crop was large or small, whether the crop of the world was large or small, the farmer would always get a ready market at very considerable, or very high, prices. I am not going to condemn the policy because it has not answered these rather far-fetched anticipations ; but I do think I have a right to look at the utterances of a gentleman who occupied the very distinguished position that Mr. Colby did, whose speech was so satisfactory to those who agreed with him that his views became their platform, and his speech became their campaign document, throughout the contest which then supervened. Now, this was the first proposition that Mr. Colby laid down—and, I dare say, the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will remember that he adopted the views which that gentleman held on the subject, a year or two earlier, as the views which had been best expounded to this House, and which most fully carried out the doctrines which he, as a protectionist, entertained. He laid down as a principle, in the first place, that it was specially necessary in a new country, such as ours, to enable it to compete with countries whose manufactures were already established. That was the foundation proposition which the hon. gentleman propounded in his very able address. The next proposition was, that judicious protection benefits the nation at large, and especially a few interests ; that it created for the farmer a home market ; that the purchasing power of labour was increased. The third proposition to which he gave in his adhesion was, that protection benefited the agricultural interests ; and he also believed that the purchasing power of the farmer and of the labourer would be vastly enhanced by the creation of home markets and proximity thereto. He further contended that the tendency of protection was not to increase, but to cheapen, prices to the consumer, and he put it very strongly, for he said :

This is an incontrovertible proposition. Protection is mainly a defence of the markets of the nation to the people of that nation. It simply gave a fair field to competitors seeking industry and capital, where the highest prices are for those who produce the best and sell the cheapest products.

And, finally, he used these words :

We who entertain protectionist principles hold that the ordinary effect of protection would not ultimately enhance the price of goods to the consumer. And why? Because, when an industry is protected, those engaged in that industry had an opportunity of making money, and the result was that others, finding an industry to be a profitable one, would embark their capital therein: thus competition would regulate prices. In this way rings could not be formed.

Now, these were the six propositions that Mr. Colby urged in a speech of very great power, and which found favour with the Opposition, and ultimately, I think, found favour with the country. It will be my business, before I close, to see to what extent the anticipations of Mr. Colby have been realized. I think I may add, as really embodied in what Mr. Colby then argued for, although not stated in terms, but plainly from the language he used, that it was not intended that the system of protection was to be permanent, that it was only for the purpose of establishing industries that it could be justified, and that, as soon as those industries had been established, recourse should then be had to the ordinary principle which all admit to be, in the abstract, correct, namely, the principle of free or freer trade. Now, I take this as my first proposition, that the time has now come, that there has now been a sufficient period—and in that I do not suppose I will meet with very much approval from either side of the House—I contend that the time has now come when we can say to these protected industries that were established in 1879, that, if they can live in Canada, they ought to be able to live, at all events, without any further protection than may be the result of a revenue tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite will, no doubt, say that that time had arrived long since. Their argument will be that it was not necessary to experiment with a National Policy, that it was not necessary for the establishment of those industries that there should be any protection whatever. For my part, I am not prepared to recede from the position I took in that early date of my political career; but I think the time has now come, if it ever will come, when such industries as can satisfactorily live in Canada ought to be able to stand, I do not say altogether alone—I do not say if the doctrine of free trade were properly, thoroughly and literally carried out, which I understand would involve the imposition of an excise duty on a manufactured article to the extent of the customs duty on the importation. I do not mean to that extent, but I do mean to say that after fifteen years' experience, after an opportunity has been given for the establishment of industries in the home market, for obtaining that mar-

Mr. McCARTHY.

ket, for obtaining the necessary skilled labour, for securing the best appliances that are admitted here or are to be found, if half a generation is not sufficient for that purpose, then I do not know what time is sufficient. I am very much more convinced of the truth of the proposition by a statement to be found in one of the much abused and much condemned census bulletins. I find Mr. Johnson, in bulletin No. 10, states distinctly one proposition, which I suppose we are all glad to know to be the case, that one of the results—I am reading from bulletin 10, page 10—is, to use his own language :

In fact the great feature of the decade's industrial progress is the vastly improved state of manufacturing machinery on account of which Canada is much better fitted to meet outside rivalry than she was ten years ago; that the average workman in 1891 is a more skilled hand than he was in 1881.

I do not propose—because in this matter every hon. gentleman has probably his own view and nothing I could say would probably take from that conviction—to labour on that point. I merely state it. I thought it was necessary that a certain amount of protection should be given to manufacturing industries, more especially under the peculiar circumstances of that Bill. If that be granted, then I do not think it can be fairly and reasonably denied that during the period that has elapsed since that protective policy was adopted and the time we have now reached ample opportunity has been afforded to the protected industries to take foothold, if indeed they are ever to succeed, and I do not see any reason why some of them should not succeed in this Dominion. But I come to another branch, and to the second branch of my recollection of those hon. gentlemen who were members of this House at that period, now some fourteen or fifteen years ago, of those hon. members who took part in that contest, which I think I am right in saying was the first great contest which has divided the people of this Dominion since Confederation, that the argument used was always this: That monopolies would be established, that rings would be formed, that there would not be competition in the home market; and the answer made, by every hon. gentleman who took part in that discussion from first to last was, that prices would be regulated by competition in the home market, that all we were doing was keeping out foreigners, having Canada for the Canadians, and that if in the end there should not be that competition in the home market which we all anticipated, means would be taken, prompt and conclusive, to put an end to any monopoly. We had from Mr. Colby himself, in the speech to which I have referred, a very strong statement in that regard. At the time I speak of, one of the protected industries was coal oil. It had been protected from the earliest time, and it continued to be protected during the early period of the Mackenzie Administration. In fact it was

very difficult for the Mackenzie Government to be the author of the destruction of that particular industry, bearing in mind the fact that the Premier at that time represented one of the ridings—I am not sure whether he represented one of the ridings or the whole county of Lambton—very much interested as it was in the coal oil industry. But Mr. Colby in 1877 moved against the Government for the reduction of the duty on coal oil. The duty then was 15 cents per gallon, which, of course, was an enormous duty; and I think at the same time there was an excise duty on it, which, of course, had something to do with the amount of duty imposed. Mr. Colby's motion was that the duty on coal oil should be reduced, and that was opposed by the Mackenzie Administration in the year in which it was brought forward. In the subsequent year, 1878, the Mackenzie Administration came down with a measure reducing the duty on coal oil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was in 1877.

Mr. McCARTHY. My recollection is that it was in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The movement was made in 1876.

Mr. McCARTHY. That may be so. About that time, at all events, the duty was reduced, and a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was then Finance Minister, was that the reduction of that duty would save the people, directly or indirectly, \$2,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my statement was not so much as that. I think if the hon. gentleman will look at my speech, he will find I did not go so far.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am taking the hon. gentleman's statement from Mr. Colby's speech, and that was what Mr. Colby stated. I did not look at the hon. gentleman's speech, and I will not, therefore, say that the hon. gentleman's recollection is not better than mine. Mr. Colby made that assertion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He did?

Mr. McCARTHY. That the hon. gentleman's statement was that this reduction would effect a saving to the people somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2,000,000. Mr. Colby was taunted, as a protectionist, in moving for the reduction of the protective duty upon this particular industry. He was told that he was inconsistent. He was arguing the imposition of higher duties, and yet, in regard to the article of coal oil, upon which there was admittedly a duty for purposes of protection, he urged this reduction, and I will read to the House his answer, because it embodies the argument to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and which I beg to adopt as my own. Mr. Colby, in 1878, said:

In 1876, I felt it my duty to propose a reduction of the duty on coal oil from 15c. per gallon to 7½c., leaving the excise tax exactly as before. The proposition as made and explained by me was intended to give protection of from 20 to 25 per cent upon oil according to the current prices at that time.

It will be observed that those engaged in that industry are not content now with 20 or 25 per cent, but want something nearer 150 or 200 per cent, something in that neighbourhood now.

But I told them that this high duty had had the effect of creating a ring that controlled all oil wells, refineries, and stepped between the producer and consumer, who declared what the prices should be and compelled the consumer in Canada to pay just what American oil would cost, with the duty added.

It was said by a gentleman on the other side of the House the other night, that those who advocated the protective policy were inconsistent, but the want of consistency, I fear, belongs to the other side.

Further on, speaking on the same subject:

But if there was an excepted industry, to which the protective system did not safely apply, and which was monopolized by a ring, then protectionists would demand that protection be reduced on that industry to a point where competition would fairly regulate prices. To tolerate rings and monopolies is a blot and a stain on the national character, and protectionists are the first to decry it. Of all the industries in Canada, the protection on the refining of oil is, perhaps, the only one in which a monopoly is fostered.

I do not think the hon. gentleman would say that in the year 1893.

And that is simply because the area of production is limited, and may, by events, be brought under one control. There is, therefore, no inconsistency in their urging the Government to make this reduction.

It will be observed that the school in which I was taught to admire the National Policy was based upon two propositions: First, that the price would not ultimately be increased and enhanced—in point of fact Mr. Colby put it rather strongly; he did not think prices would be enhanced at all, but certainly the fair meaning of his speech is that they would not ultimately be increased—and, secondly, that rings could not be formed except in very exceptional cases, and that if rings were formed, protectionists would be the first to decry them, the first to take away the protection which enabled them to exist, and to bring about the result by opening the markets and allowing the foreigners to come in. Now, Sir, protection is, after all, a self-denying ordinance. When we pass a law which prohibits us buying, we do so against, as it were, the natural inclination of a man to buy. The foreigner cannot force his goods upon us. There must be two to make a bargain, the vendor and the purchaser, and when we deliberately pass a law to say we will not do what otherwise we would feel inclined to do, namely, to buy in the cheapest market, we do it as a self-denying ordinance, if I may call it so, and we do it because on the whole we are prepared to sacrifice our rights, so to speak, and to a certain extent

to sacrifice our money in order that the country as a whole may be benefited thereby. And protection can only be justified, I venture to say, to the extent in which the benefit to the public at large is equivalent to the general burden imposed. You cannot carry it higher than that. Protection may possibly be justified to the extent that if a great public benefit is gained by the establishment of industries by which raw material is used which otherwise would go to waste; by which labourers are employed who otherwise would not find employment within the Dominion; to that extent, and to that extent only, can protection be justified, and even then, just as a business proposition, commensurate with the value of the benefit which flows from these industries, from this consumption of material, and from this employment of labour. But, Sir, if it be a fact that under the system of protection the manufacturers who are warmed into life under its sheltering folds and have in that way derived advantages and, in a sense, subsidies from the rest of the tax-paying public; if these manufacturers having become firmly established have not kept prices down, if there be no competition in the home market to regulate prices; if, on the contrary, combinations have been formed amongst them, and trusts have been created by means of which the manufacturer is permitted to say: This mill shall manufacture such a quantity of such a kind of material, and the price that we will fix for that and charge for it is so much a yard or so much by whatever measure it may be disposed of; if, I say, that stage has been reached in the fiscal history of this country, then, according to the principles which Mr. Colby enunciated, and which I fully adopt, a time has been reached when the protective policy should be changed and the market should be thrown open to foreign competition, so that prices may be regulated. Has that period been reached in our history?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hear my hon. friends behind me say, "No." Of course, we all must be entitled to our opinion on this subject. I venture to say, Sir, that there is hardly an industry, certainly not one of the great industries, so to speak, which have been fostered by the protective policy, that is not now in one way or another in combination, and in which, in other words, there is not a practical monopoly. Now, I will endeavour to prove my words, and I think I can prove them. I do not mean to say that I am going to weary the House, and I am perfectly well satisfied the House would not be wearied by me at that length, for me to go through all these varied industries and to show that in this one, and in each one, and in all of them, there is some arrangement or some trust existing between them, and that, so far as that is concerned, they were not longer entitled to the protection they enjoy under this tariff. But, with the

Mr. McCARTHY.

indulgence of the House, I will, before I close, give some instances of that kind, instances of a very glaring character indeed, and I have no doubt that it is in the knowledge of the members of this Parliament that what I say is substantially correct. Before I come to that, let me for one moment deal with the advantages that have flown from this system of protection. Now, it is the habit of those, and very naturally so, in the state of political warfare in which we live, to cite the industries that exist as all owing their existence to the National Policy. Even my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, if I dare allude to an important utterance by him on a recent occasion—and I do so, Mr. Speaker, subject to your correction—spoke of the output from all these industries as being due and owing to the National Policy. Well, Sir, before the National Policy was ever thought of, twenty odd years ago, there were industries in this country. Ten years ago there were industries in this country, within a few months after the establishment of the National Policy, and, although I do not pretend to say that these industries have not been increased, or that the number of hands employed has not also been relatively increased by the National Policy, I want, if I can—getting out of the controversial view which is taken on both sides of the House, one side saying that none are due to the National Policy, and the other side claiming that all are due to it—I want fairly to see to what extent any of these industries are indebted to the National Policy; and, having ascertained that, we shall probably be able to see what these industries are worth. The increase in the number of employees during the ten years was 112,561. I see the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shaking his head, indicating, of course, that he does not accept either the number of establishments or the number of employees returned by the census. Well, Sir, I am frank to say that neither do I. Not that I blame the Government—I want that to be understood; for I do not think the Government are responsible for that. Neither do I blame the census commissioners, because I realize, what is perfectly true, that the instructions under which these compilations were made were the same in 1891 as they were in 1881. But there was one great difference, which, I think, has brought about a result so extraordinary that it has shocked the common sense of those who know anything at all about the facts, and has practically rendered the census utterly worthless as a statistical record. The great difference was this, that, while the census officers were instructed to ascertain the number of industries exactly on the same principle in 1891 that was followed in 1881, in 1881 they were not paid for finding them out, and possibly omitted some that ought to have been included, whereas in 1891 they were paid, and, possibly, included some that ought never to have been there. The result is that in the town

where I formerly resided, and in various towns in my constituency, I know—there is no question at all about it—that the industries have not at all increased, rather have they diminished. And, remember, I do not make an accusation against the census commissioner, because I can well understand that the officers who gathered the figures should be paid for the additional labour cast upon them.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that Barrie?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the town of Barrie. I am speaking, not merely of the town of Barrie, but the town of Collingwood and the town of Orillia, and all the towns within my own personal knowledge. It is not too much to say that my part of the country, if I may so call it, so far as the protective policy has created manufacturing industries, has not derived the slightest benefit from it. Whatever benefit from the National Policy has fallen to the Georgian Bay counties—and I say it here in the presence of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I think, will not dispute it—has come from the protection of the farmers, who, if they needed protection anywhere, needed it there, because they were so much exposed to the competition of the western farmers, who had the means of sending to the lumber country supplies which otherwise would have been contributed by the farmers of the Georgian Bay counties. But so far as manufacturing industries are concerned, there is less manufacturing in the whole region of the Georgian Bay to-day than there was ten years ago. Now, it is plain that we cannot regard the total number of employees, men and women, put down in the census at 367,496, as being due to the National Policy. I do not suppose that my hon. friend the Finance Minister would claim quite that. You have to take—we have not yet the means of doing it with regard to the last census, but we have with regard to the census of 1881—you have to take the part which relates to the so-called industries; and, analysing the different employments, you have to endeavour to see which of them are to be attributed to the National Policy with regard to the census of 1881, and which of them you are perfectly well satisfied can exist without the National Policy. It is not pretended in the least that in Manitoba there is any manufacturing; it is not pretended that in British Columbia, with the exception of one sugar refinery, there is any manufacturing—I mean in the sense in which we are now speaking of prominent manufacturing industries due to the National Policy. Yet we find that there has been an increase in the number of employees in Manitoba to the tune of 127 per cent, in the North-west Territories to the tune of 1,200 per cent, and in British Columbia to the tune of over 300 per cent. That, of course, enables us at once to see that we are not to attribute to the National Policy all the industries which are set

down in the bulletins and treated under one head—and as to that I do not know that there is any good ground of complaint; nor are we to treat them as though they existed there in 1881. For instance, we have bakers—and I am afraid we shall have bakers whether we have a National Policy or not—blacksmithing, brickmaking, carpenters and joiners, lime kilns, saw-mills—if the National Policy has any effect, and perhaps it has a very great effect, on saw-milling, it is not certainly of an encouraging kind—tailors, clothiers, sash and door factories, breweries, printing offices, stone and marble cutting—perhaps there might be a difference of opinion in regard to this industry, but more or less there will be stone and marble cutting with or without a National Policy. I do not know whether any hon. gentleman will agree with my result or not, but I have endeavoured to analyse first the returns of 1881 to ascertain and separate into two columns the industries which do more or less owe. I will not say their existence, for the word is too strong, but their development in the stage at which they have now arrived, to this protective system, and those industries which do not and cannot by any fair-minded man be said to owe their existence to any such system; and I will give the House the result. I will not trouble the House by reading the whole table. I have given some examples of industries which I do not think owe their development to the National Policy, and I shall be glad to show the table that I have prepared to any hon. gentleman who likes to see it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a long story, and I would much sooner that it be taken as read. The result of my analysis is this—speaking now of 1881—that of the total number of employees then engaged in industries more or less dependent on the National Policy—and I want it to be understood that I put it as more or less, because these industries all existed in 1871, I think, and, therefore, would only, in a limited degree, be dependent on the National Policy—there were not more than 112,000, or 44 per cent of the total number put down as engaged in industrial pursuits, leaving 56 per cent of the total number engaged in industries which were not dependent, in any sense, or shape, or way, for their existence on the National Policy. That, of course, does not take us very far. I have not got the census of 1891, to make a table of, and am, therefore, left to estimate, to the best of my ability, and have been, to some extent, aided in the calculation at which I have arrived by the number of employees that appears in one of the bulletins. In one of the bulletins, it will be remembered, although not exhaustively given, the number of employees in the different provinces engaged in these different industries is to be found. I have included those, and have arrived at this result, which I do not think

will be considered as unfair, that, whereas, in 1881, 44 per cent of those engaged in manufacturing industries were to be attributed, in the sense in which I have used that term, to the National Policy, in the year 1891 perhaps 50 per cent may be attributed to the same policy. Hon. gentlemen will see that that, of course, is giving the benefit of 6 per cent increase to the industries fostered by the National Policy, so that we would have, in the year 1891, out of the total number employed in all industries, 168,333 as employed in those dependent upon the National Policy. Now, it is from that source that we are to get our home market. The benefit was not to consist in seeing tall chimneys, or, to quote the language used by a gentleman who spoke the other day, in seeing the St. Lawrence blackened by the smoke from these tall chimneys, but the object was to create a home market for the farmers, and, although I am saying a very trite thing, I am yet making a statement which is pertinent, as it seems to me, and I, therefore, may be excused when I ask: Who, after all, are the great producers of the country, and on whose prosperity we all depend? Now, if the farmer, who is the great consumer of these manufactured products, is to be benefited, there must be something in the shape of a home market for his products in return, or else he gets no advantage whatever. Now, I have the number employed in manufacturing, and to whom we owe the home market, furnished by the National Policy. I put that number at its very widest limit. I am approaching this matter, if I may use the expression without incurring the danger of being treated as a judge, in a judicial sense. I am approaching this subject, not with any desire to injure the hon. gentlemen with whom, up to a very recent period, I acted in cordial unison, and not with any desire to advance the cause of the regular Opposition. My desire is merely to see whether, under these circumstances, it is right or proper that we should continue in that policy; whether it is advisable to retain these high duties and still keep up the burden under which the consuming masses are suffering; or whether it is not our bounden duty now to put an end to that system and to return as quick as we reasonably can to the more appropriate system of a revenue tariff. Now, the floating population of the country, by the last census, is 4,829,411, in round numbers 5,000,000. If we assume that the 168,000 employees, men, women and children, were all to be credited as constituting the home market furnished by the National Policy for the balance of these 5,000,000, it is reasonable and right that we should count the cost. What is that cost? That, of course, depends on whether we are paying more to the home manufacturers than we pay in the open market. Is that open to doubt? Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who honestly believes and would seriously state that the goods manufactured in Canada could, irre-

Mr. McCARTHY.

spective of the tariff, be sold at their present prices? Or, put it the other way: Will it be said seriously that the consumers would not be able to obtain these goods at a much less price, if it were not for the tariff? Why, the very fact that we maintain it, the very fact that the First Minister insists that there shall be no panic in the country, and that any changes he may make shall not interfere with the protective system—that very fact is, to say the least of it, prima facie evidence that our Canadian manufacturers are absolutely and actually dependent for their existence, or, at all events, for the high price they now charge, on the protective policy. Well, what is the output now from these factories? I am not going to charge or credit—whichever way you like to look at it—the whole output from the industrial institutions, according to the bulletin, to this moiety of the industrial classes; but from the same table that I made of 1881 I reach the conclusion that the output in that year, of those industries which I set down as owing their existence to the National Policy, was \$165,000,000, the total output being \$309,000,000. Of that \$309,000,000, according to the way I analyse it, I attribute \$165,000,000 to those industries that are protected by the system which now prevails. Then we have to estimate—and it is only a matter of estimate—how much of the increased production, as appears by the census of 1891, is to be put down to the same source. I have roughly put that down at \$100,000,000. If these figures be at all accurate, and I have endeavoured to make—

Mr. FOSTER. That is \$100,000,000 of an increase.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You mean \$100,000,000 attributable to the National Policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. If these figures be reasonable and fair—of course, \$100,000,000 is a larger proportion; but I thought in all cases it was better to give a larger proportion, because undoubtedly the industries as well as the employees do show a larger increase, referable to the industries created, than would have existed but for this policy. Now, this \$265,000,000 of goods manufactured in our midst was of course in addition to the large volume of goods we imported, and the practical question for the people is this: how much of that \$265,000,000 are the people of Canada paying to-day more for than they would pay if it were not for the protective policy? If it be true that \$265,000,000 of goods is manufactured in Canada, in addition to the large importation we make, if it be true that these prices are dearer than they would be but for the protective policy, it is for us here to see, and it is for the people of this country to determine, how much more we are paying than we would pay but for the system to which I have referred. I will not attempt to put that into figures, but perhaps one would not be far out if it was said that, taking

quality and price into consideration—because I do not think the comparison would be true, unless you took into consideration quality, as well as price—about 30 per cent of that \$265,000,000 is paid by the people of this country, in addition to what they would have to pay but for this protective system. Now, these are figures higher than any hon. gentleman has stated here, but, while it is impossible, with the means at our disposal, for any hon. gentleman—or, at all events, for me—to arrive at an exact result, I will endeavour to fortify my conclusion by the statements that I am about to make. I am sitting near my hon. friend here (Mr. Bergin), who is very much interested in the cotton industries, and I am glad to know that the statements I make and the conclusions I draw with regard to these industries, as one of the circumstances which enter into the consideration of this question, will be subject to his criticism and to any correction which they may require. And I am not caring very much what profits these manufacturers are making. I do not wish ill, Sir, to the manufactures we have established; I desire to see these manufactures prosper, within reasonable limits. I desire to see these manufactures able to stand alone, and, as I have said in another place, I shall be exceedingly disappointed if these manufactures are not able to maintain their position, are not able to live and not able to prosper under the conditions which, before very long, I think, may exist in this country. But, at the same time, I want to know whether we are paying more for our cottons because of the protective system. These two things, of the price and the manufacturers' profits, are wholly different. We may be paying very much more, and they may not be making anything commensurate with the enhanced price. The question is, what we are paying for them. We arrive at the conclusion, perhaps, that we are paying too much, if we find that they water their stock and pay high dividends. If we see that kind of thing going on, we, perhaps, come to the conclusion that the cotton companies are having rather a good thing of it. I shall call attention to some information I have, before leaving this cotton question, but what I want to draw attention to at this moment is that, while it is said, and, no doubt, said correctly enough, that cotton goods have fallen in this country since 1872 up to the present time, to the tune of 24 per cent—I am taking that from a table, and I dare not mention where I heard or saw it, for fear of incurring your displeasure, Mr. Speaker—but I am told that the statement was made, that prices of cotton goods, since the year 1872, have fallen by 24 per cent. Let us, for one moment, see what that means; let us work it out and see exactly what it comes to. Cotton that in 1872 would have cost \$100, could now be bought for \$76; that is, \$100 worth of cotton, with the deduction of 24 per cent. In 1872 cotton goods paid a duty of 15 per cent, and this, with the

freight and carriage to be paid on them, made the difference between \$100, the price in Canada, and \$80, which was the price in the market where the goods were first sold; and goods which, in 1872, cost \$80 in England, can now be bought in Canada for \$76. But, Sir, what has been going on during that period of time? I find, from the English Statistical Abstract, by Mr. Giffin, that, since 1872 up to the present time, cotton goods have fallen to the tune of 38 per cent. In other words, the cotton goods that cost, in 1872, \$8.43, cost in 1889, \$5.21, or a decrease, as I make it, of 38 per cent. That is the last date to which this statistical abstract goes. But, Sir, since that day the price of cotton has fallen enormously, and cotton was lower last year, and is lower to-day.—just as wheat is—than was ever known in its history, and that is proved and established, if proof were required, by the Trade and Navigation Returns. I find that, according to these Trade and Navigation Returns, the cotton which cost, in 1870, 9⁸ cents, cost, in the last year, 7³ cents, a difference of 2⁵ cents per pound. So that, besides the 38 per cent decrease up to 1889, you have to allow a further decrease by reason of the reduction in the raw cottons, and that reduction, regard being had to the relative cost of the raw material and the manufactured article, that result would be, as I make it, about 15 or 16 per cent more. Seeing what proportion the wages and the raw material bear to the duty, I think that this percentage ought to be added to the 38 per cent. Now, what is the conclusion? In the first place, your hundred dollars' worth of cotton in 1872 was worth, in England, \$80. You have \$80 worth of cotton goods, purchasable in 1889 for \$49.60, and if you add the carriage in 1872—there is no duty, and thus we gain in that respect—it will bring up the cost to \$52. I have to add to that 15 per cent for the fall in the raw materials since 1889. And to what conclusion do you come? The cotton that costs us \$76 here can be procured in England for \$52, less 15 per cent of the value of the raw material.

Mr. CASEY. What does it cost here?

Mr. McCARTHY. It costs here \$76. I accept, of course, the statement that there has been a fall of 24 per cent. Now, are these figures fair?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you base your argument on that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no information other than that I have derived from my hon. friend who does not sit very far from me (Mr. Bergin). Now, just see the enormous difference in cost on this one industry of cotton. Why, Sir, last year alone, on the 46,000,000 pounds which were imported into this country, the difference in cost of the raw material was over \$1,000,000, as to which we have had no benefit or no advantage whatever. While the farmer

has been bound to take for his wheat just what he could get in the open market, the cotton manufacturer has not given, and it is not pretended that he has given, to the people of this country any reduction in prices during the last year or two, although his raw material cost him over \$1,000,000 less than it did at the time the census was taken. Well, are these theories, or facts, or conclusions, whatever you choose to call them, borne out by what we know? In the first place, that there is a very great protection upon cotton no person can doubt. They have the system of specific and ad valorem duties. We know that the specific duty does intensely increase the price of the commoner and poorer article, and we are told that it is impossible that there can be a protective system unless there is a specific duty, though not necessarily an ad valorem duty. Now, what do we find with respect to the cotton companies? It is to be remembered that their operations are not given to the public; they are close corporations with respect to which we cannot go to a newspaper or to a trade return and find their annual reports; but I am speaking from information which I certainly credit, otherwise I would not venture to give it to the House. Take the Dominion Cotton Company. In 1892 its stock opened at 132; it rose in that one year to 226, nearly 100 per cent of increase in the value of stock. In the same year a share for share allotment took place with a payment of \$10; in other words, the stock was watered to the extent of 90, or 90 per cent, and that stock so watered stands to-day at 143. Sir, is that a legitimate profit? While others have got to take 7 or 8 per cent, running risks in the business, here we find an industry which is virtually—notwithstanding the information which reaches the Government—I unhesitatingly say is virtually under one control, and an industry in which the output of each establishment is regulated, and the price at which that output is to be placed on the market, is also fixed, so that it is as perfect a monopoly as you can make. That industry has been able in this one year to double its capital and to pay handsome dividends besides. And that is not the only one. The Coloured Company's stock, which opened at 80 in the year 1892, is now selling at 110. The cotton companies outside the combination—because there are some who have not actually come in, as I understand it, but are virtually controlled by the same owner—opened at 94 and 92, and are now selling at 156. The Merchants' Manufacturing Company's stock opened at 103 in 1892, and could not now be got for 160. These companies have been paying dividends of between 6 and 10 per cent since the combination has been in force. Now, to conclude what I have to say with regard to this point, the Montreal Cotton Company are now watering their stock to secrete or to hide their earnings. One of the small companies in Montreal, whose name

Mr. McCARTHY.

I have not got by me just now, but who held their meeting on the 14th February last, reported a net profit of 26 per cent, and put by \$20,000 after paying handsome dividends. Now, Sir, I think that, so far as the cotton industries are concerned, the conclusion that I have reached, that these goods are sold at 20 per cent more than they could be bought for in the open market, is amply justified. But we have other industries to take into consideration. Take the iron industry. Nothing is more important to the general consumer than these manufactures, and let us see, under the tariff of 1887, what the gentlemen who are interested in iron duties are actually charging for their goods. We all know, and we all lament, that notwithstanding the enormous duties that were imposed in 1887, with a view of promoting the industry of mining, practically no success has attended those efforts. That we all know. We also know, and also lament, that while no benefit has been derived by the public, no advantage has been gained; those who are interested have also practically formed a combination. I do not mean to say that there is a formal trust deed; I do not know; but they have meetings at which they regulate the price, and so late as the 7th January last the rolling mill proprietors, meeting under the head of the Bar Iron Association, which includes in its membership, as I am informed, all the rolling mills except those in the Maritime provinces, adopted a new schedule in which the base price of bar iron is quoted at \$2.05, free on board, at Montreal, Hamilton and Toronto. Now, I will take bar iron, and I have statements which justify me in showing to the House what the position is regarding bar iron. It was subject to a duty of 17½ per cent in 1887. The duty upon bar iron now varies, except the specific duty of \$13 per ton, and it increases with the lower grades and decreases with the higher grades of iron. I am taking now the ordinary cost of iron, and I have statements furnished to me, verified by papers which warrant me in adopting them as my own, that the cost in Liverpool of bar iron this year was \$27.57 for the long ton—Staffordshire crown bars, £5 17s. If you add carriage and freight, you have \$2.96, making the sum of \$45.05. Comparing that with the price of the home article manufactured for the most part out of scrap, not at all equal to it, and we have for the long ton, \$46, or an increase on the English price of 70 per cent. Now, these figures, at all events, are undeniable. We find, therefore, that the home manufacturers practically regulate their price by an association; fixing as they did here the other day, \$2.05, free on board at the cities I mentioned, they have fixed the price just as high as the tariff allows, or 70 per cent more than the cost in England. Now, that is an article the price of which affects every household throughout the whole Dominion. There is not a man

throughout the whole Dominion that is not affected by the cost of bar iron; and we have the enormous duty of \$13 a ton—I forget at the moment what percentage it is—and the selling price of \$46 per ton. For what result, may I ask? Why, Sir, for this result: We have 831 employees connected with these rolling mills. Their output was \$1,750,000—I am speaking now by the book, because these are the figures the Minister of Finance gave me the other day in answer to my question—wages \$335,000, raw material \$575,000, 6 per cent on capital \$60,000, 5 per cent on value of plant, \$13,250, or 1·3 per cent on capital, 5 per cent on output, or 8·6 per cent on capital.

Mr. BERGIN. What do you allow for bad debts?

Mr. McCARTHY. They should not make bad debts. We have here a profit of over 60 per cent in addition to 6 or 7 per cent which these rolling mill people are earning if these figures are correct.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the buyer does not get an article of as good a quality.

Mr. McCARTHY. The buyer is buying scrap, and that is a great evil of the system to which I draw particular attention, for, although this resolution may not bear practical fruit immediately, I trust when the proper time comes for a reconsideration of the question, the facts to which attention is now drawn will not go unnoticed. What has been the result of the imposition of the duty on iron? I have taken two years before the duty was increased, for it was enormously increased, as we all know. In 1885-86 the importation was of the value of \$7,646,000; next year it reached \$8,000,000. It is even more to-day. Notwithstanding that fact, the consumption has increased, so that, in 1891, it had nearly reached the value of \$10,000,000, and it was an equal amount in 1892. But the duty has enormously increased, and more especially in the direction to which I call attention. Take iron bars. The importation in 1886 was of the value of \$728,208. What has taken its place? Its place has been taken by scrap iron, because, in 1886 the importation of scrap iron was only of the value of \$200,300, whereas, in 1892, it had reached more than three times that amount. So we have encouraged the importation of scrap iron, and our rolling mills have been manufacturing scrap, and charging us the full price of Staffordshire crown bars, with 50 per cent added, and that is the result of the tariff arrangement of 1887, which gave no substantial increase to our industries. There is another proof which I propose to give in order to justify my conclusion, because that is all I am seeking, that is, that it is not too much to put down 30 per cent of the \$285,000,000 of output of these industries to the protective policy, which should be charged against any possible corresponding benefit. Before I leave the subject of iron,

however, I may draw attention to the views that were held by the trade publications. Reading from the "Trade Bulletin," a non-political paper, I understand, I find it writes editorially as follows:—

The complete fallacy of the iron duties as imposed by Sir Charles Tupper in 1886 is demonstrated by the absolute failure of the one concern (for which these duties were imposed on this country) to fulfil their promise to supply all the pig iron and all the puddled bars which the country would require. It is not only the importers, for whom the present Government have shown no consideration, that object to the duties as outrageous and uncalled for, but the manufacturers, who were led to believe that they could obtain their raw material in the shape of pig iron and puddled bars from the Lower Province Company; all admit that they have been grossly deceived, inasmuch as the company since 1886 has not increased its facilities so as to enable it to supply the increased demand from the manufacturers, but on the contrary it is producing less pig iron and fewer puddled bars to-day than in 1886. The manufacturers of bar iron are therefore prevented by the high rate of duty from importing puddled bars which would enable them to manufacture a regular and merchantable quality of bar iron, and are obliged to use scrap, which anyone knows produces iron of irregular quality. The present tariff has not benefited these manufacturers, which is evident from the fact that they only exist to-day through the influence of combines governed by large moneyed deposits necessary to insure good faith in sustaining unnatural prices. This rotten condition of affairs cannot be maintained. The people of this country insist upon tariff reform, and where the raw material is heavily taxed, and the experience of eight years has demonstrated that the production of such material has not under such protection been at all stimulated so as to cope with the requirements of the country, Sir John Thompson ought to apply the lopping axe, to which he referred in his Toronto speech, and thus save the other industries which are at present being ruined and only exist by resorting to the unnatural means to which we have referred. We do not go the length to which free traders urge us, as we do not believe in that policy for Canada, situated as she is beside such a powerful neighbour as the United States, which would absorb our manufacturing interests completely had she free access to our markets; but we do insist that a material modification of the outrageously high duties on iron is imperative in the interests of manufacturers as well as consumers.

I could read other statements from different trade journals, from the "Canadian Journal of Commerce," for example, to the same effect, but I will not weary the House with more than is absolutely necessary to establish my point. An industry against which complaint I understand has been made is the wall-paper industry, a very small affair; and I have a copy of a letter which was sent to the Controller of Customs dealing with this subject, in which it is represented by the largest importer in the country that the average rate of duty he pays on wall-paper is 85 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And the duty runs up all the way to nearly 200 per cent on the same article. The Minister of Finance did not require to put off, for a year's time, the reform which I think such a state of things

as that demands. There was the statement, made by a respectable merchant, easily capable of proof; and I have it from no less than two merchants who are engaged in that business, first, that they cannot obtain the paper they require from the home producer, that it is not sufficiently good in quality, and is not varied enough in pattern to please the taste of the public; and second, that they are compelled to buy imported goods at this enormous duty, which ultimately comes, of course, out of the pockets of the consumer. I give that, therefore, as another instance of a very high duty which is imposed, and of which advantage, more or less, is taken by the manufacturers. Leaving that subject for the moment, I come to this conclusion, which I ask the House to adopt with me, that, for both reasons, both because a sufficient time has elapsed to enable industries to take root, and more especially because I think it is capable of the most complete demonstration—and if time permitted, I think I could satisfy the most doubtful member of this House on that point—that advantage has been taken by the manufacturers to enhance the prices up, or nearly up, to the tariff wall. In many cases it will be found that the prices of the Canadian articles are not as dear as the imported articles, but I venture to say—and I shall have a word to say on this point, especially in dealing with agricultural implements, to which I shall call attention—that where the price is not as high, the article is not as good, and people are compelled, and people do, and that is the best evidence on the point, pay a higher price for the imported article than for the domestic article, demonstrating, at all events, what is their opinion as to the relative value of the two commodities. Is it true that this tariff has been burdensome to the great mass of the consuming public? Why, if the public ever spoke with decided voice, they are speaking to-day. Their voice may not be heard in this Chamber, their voice may not have effect given to it here, although we are their representatives. For one cause or another, we may be willing to postpone the justice which they demand, but if ever the people of Canada spoke, all classes included, with a certain voice, and with a positive determination that if their will is to prevail, this tariff has to be reduced. Unrest is admitted to exist throughout the land. The farmers, slow to move, the best party men, as we know, in the Dominion, men who dislike to vote against or to leave their political allies or to take ground against a policy which they have been hitherto adopting; the farmers almost unanimously are demanding—and I think I speak with authority when I say so—that in their interests there should be a change. I have not been able, Sir, to present to this House a bundle of documents, which were sent to me, in the nature of petitions from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and I take this opportunity of laying on the

Mr. McCARTHY.

Table these 113 papers, which are not properly in the form of petitions, but which very clearly embody the views of the farmers of the North-west Territories and Manitoba. They came officially to me from the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba and the North-west. They are petitions, so-called, from 113 of their associations, and they are signed by 1,712 bona fide farmers, who also, I am informed, are qualified voters and are entitled to return members to this Parliament. And what do these petitions say:

We, the undersigned farmers, members of Clover Bar (that is one of the associations and there are 113 altogether) representing Patrons of Industry, of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, feeling that the duty now existing upon farming machinery and binding twine, coupled with the heavy freight rates we have to pay, bear so heavily upon us in our farming operations, that we cannot advise our friends to come to this country to become agriculturists under existing burdens, and we deem it unwise on the part of the Government to pursue their proposed immigration policy unless these burdens are reduced.

That comes, as I say, the most authoritative set of documents that have ever been laid on the Table of this House, from the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, and if the hon. gentlemen who represent those parts of the country do not speak for them, why, Sir, then I cannot understand how it is that these people have taken all the trouble to circulate and adopt the petitions and papers which I have now the opportunity of presenting in this form to the House. I think, that so far as that is concerned the self-evident proposition which I have asserted in this resolution needs no demonstration at my hands to support it. I will come later on to the very important question as to whether now is the appointed time or not, or whether this question should be postponed to a more convenient season. In the meantime I deal with the question, that the people of this country demand—as the people of the United States demanded, and as the people in the United States accomplished their demand—the people of this country, I say, demand tariff reform, and tariff reform I am perfectly certain the people of this country are going to have. It may be delayed for a time, but in the end they are going to have it. But, Sir, I mean to say that there was strong ground for the Government coming down at the present session and meeting the discontent which prevails. I mean to contend, Sir, that this discontent has spread through this land, and I mean to say that this discontent has been, to a very large extent, the result of the burdens of this tariff, and the monopolies, and the trusts, and the evils that have grown under this tariff. I think, Sir, that in accordance with the system which has always prevailed in the history of England, which prevailed in the days of the Tudors and Plantagenets, that the governing body in this country ought to have met these discontents by their removal and not simply

by their postponement. I accept in perfect good faith—although, perhaps, others may not be inclined to do so—the statements of the two gentlemen whom the "Globe" newspaper sent out to make an examination of the conditions of the affairs of this country. I know one of these gentlemen, not personally perhaps, but I know him by reputation, and I know him to be a Conservative of the Conservatives, an Imperial Federationist, a man who bears a high reputation, and one who would not swerve from the path of duty, and I have no reason to suppose that Mr. Atkinson, the other gentleman, was less worthy of trust. Their statements went uncontradicted, although sufficient time was given to indicate the persons with whom they had interviews, and these statements would have called for a contradiction if untrue. And what are the statements made by these two gentlemen? They tell us that in several counties they visited an annexation feeling prevails, and that that annexation feeling is due to the burdens which this tariff has imposed on the people of this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How do you explain that that would cause an annexation feeling?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) asks me how I can explain it. I am only stating a fact. I am not called upon here to explain it; I state the fact. There is no man who has ever read a page of history but must know that grievances and oppression do produce disloyalty. I do not speak of this country, but I speak of England. Oppression does produce disloyalty. I am not saying it is right that it should; I am not commending it; I am not dealing with anything more than facts; but I do say, Sir, that it does appear that the people of this country feel the oppression and burdens of this tariff so greatly that they look for annexation as the only means of escape.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Why do you not give Ireland Home Rule, then?

Mr. McCARTHY. When we come to the Irish question, if any gentleman chooses to bring it up, I will not be afraid to state why I do not give Ireland Home Rule. Well, Sir, what do we find? We find that in the county of Bruce, these gentlemen report in substance in the "Globe," as follows: "The farmers are restless and discontented. There is some annexation feeling. A desire for freer trade, especially with Great Britain."

Mr. DENISON. Which of the gentlemen states that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot tell for the moment. It is either Mr. Cockin or Mr. Atkinson; but I think they state substantially the same thing. In East Huron there is dissatisfaction with the National Policy; some annexation feeling. In Ontario (south) the farmers are discontented, although there

is no statement that there is annexation feeling. In East York—my hon. friend who made the last interruption can perhaps tell us—there is said to be some annexation feeling. I remember seeing a correspondence from a gentleman there by the name of Bruce, who, in his old age, saw no hope to escape except through annexation, although he had not been able in that to carry his son with him, who thought there was a brighter day coming, as I think there is, and that no person would be driven out of this country on account of the tariff, if he only remained here a couple of years longer.

Mr. FOSTER. You have great faith in us.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have great faith in you. Then, Sir, in Victoria, which is represented here by two very loyal gentlemen, there is also said to be a feeling that tariff reform is wanted. Annexation is not desired except as a measure of relief. And then, Sir, finally in Lincoln there is a strong annexation feeling on account of trade matters. But, have I to prove this annexation feeling? Why, there is actually established in our midst an association for political union, an association which is propagating these doctrines from one end of the country to the other, and an association which gained support only because of the discontent with the tariff and the trade policy. I do not say it gained support on these grounds from those who are promoting it. But I do mean to say that the men who attend these meetings, that the men who go and vote in favour of it or countenance it in any way, are led to do so solely by the discontent which prevails and which they feel with respect to this tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. They are all Grits.

Mr. McCARTHY. They may be. I do not know whether they are Grits or Tories, and I do not think it makes any difference. I do not think we ought to legislate so as to drive the Liberals into annexation. I do not think that our legislation should be such that men of any political stripe would not enjoy the benefit of equal and just laws, and I regret to think that any gentleman should take comfort in the fact that these annexationists belong to any particular political stripe. Now, Mr. Cockin, in his last letter, winding up his tour, says:

I desire to write at greater length on the question of annexation and the attitude of a certain minority in our midst regarding it. Mr. Atkinson and myself have each been pitched into by annexationists and Conservatives alike. The former charge us with the 'suppressio veri;' the latter with the 'suggestio falsi.' Nothing could be more unfair than such charges. Wherever I have found genuine annexation feeling, such has been mentioned. But it so happens that converts to annexation are claimed where an honest investigation has proved conclusively that a disposition to accept annexation has been the mere outcome of an irritating condition of affairs, which latter is capable of a satisfactory readjustment. Such readjustment secured, we should

hear nothing more of annexation from these men. This being the case, no honest man can term these annexationists. I admit that such are the stuff out of which annexationists might be fashioned. As I remarked in my Paisley letter, "there are hundreds of men on the fence, and their backs are towards Canada," but one good harvest and satisfactory market would turn these men to the right-about in double-quick time. These men say: "We prefer to live under the old flag, but if we cannot get free trade without annexation, well, we shall have to accept annexation." There are many such in Bruce and other counties, but no reasonable man will call them annexationists. They are simply men who are dissatisfied, or, if you will, men disheartened to such an extent by the present policy of the Government that they are ready to sacrifice their patriotism to the nearer claims of the hearth and the home. We city men may sneer at such a lack of the higher patriotism, but we may well reserve our sneers until we have been similarly tried.

Now, Sir, I have not pretended to justify that course, or to say that it is the only course. On the contrary, I think it is not. I have no sympathy with men who cry out for annexation as a means of relief, nor have I any sympathy with the men who are always threatening to break up Confederation if they do not get their way. I think that within the lines of our constitution there are the means of redress, and, although they may be postponed for a time, if our people will only have confidence in themselves and in their country, redress in the long run will be theirs. I think, however, that I have justified that paragraph of my resolution in which I state that there is discontent verging on disloyalty. Now, Sir, if these things are true, or approximately true, ought this matter to be postponed or delayed, and if so, why? Surely, Sir, this is the place where all the representations that the Finance Minister requires from the people can be obtained through their representatives. The hon. gentleman who so worthily fills that office is no novice. He has been at the head of the Finance Department for some years, and he has associated with him the hon. gentleman who was formerly at the head of the Customs Department, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and they have recently obtained a practical gentleman to assist them, one who understands, if any man in this House does, the necessity for prompt and immediate action. I allude, Sir, to the hon. Controller of Customs. I have examined what happened here in 1888, and I find that that hon. gentleman, who moved for a committee and presided over that committee while it examined into the whole subject of combines, commenced his report by saying that the time at the disposal of the committee was not sufficient to enable them to examine into the nature and extent of other alleged combinations than those specified; but sixty-three witnesses were examined, and the committee held twenty-six meetings. I cull from this report some very valuable statements, which in a doubting body like this seemed to require proof, although I should have thought that they might have

been accepted without any evidence. The report, dealing with the alleged combinations in groceries and sugars, said:

Thus facts prove this Grocers' Guild, with its several combinations, to be obnoxious to the public interest, in limiting competition, in enhancing prices, and by the familiar use of its growing and facile powers tending to produce and propagate all the evils of monopoly. Certain dealers are refused admission into its ranks, others are admitted and afterwards expelled, others again are placed under its ban, who from conscientious scruples or in a spirit of independence, refuse to join them. Merchants who have been buyers on equal terms and with equal facilities as other merchants, suddenly find themselves under the power of this combination.

Further on:

It was seen that an association formed at first to arrange uniform terms of credit and discounts, and to prevent the dating ahead of invoices, &c., soon and rapidly extended its operations to more ambitious schemes. The power used, cautiously at first, soon grasped with a firmer hand, and at length 'the simple plan that they may take who have the power,' governed the operations of these associations.

Dealing with coal combinations, the report says:

Citizen consumers in a like manner pay, not competitive prices, but such fixed prices as the combination choose to extort.

As to barbed wire:

An attempt was made during the past winter by barbed wire manufacturers to secure uniform prices for their product. The agreement the retailer was asked to sign bound him to sell at 6½ cents per pound, the inducement being that he could purchase at 5½ cents, which was a reduction of a quarter of a cent from last year's prices.

As to the Oatmeal Association:

A certain percentage of the oatmeal production is allotted to each mill, and upon every barrel sold by any miller in excess of this allotment, he pays a premium of 30 cents per barrel into the association, and vice versa, when any miller falls short of his allotment he receives an equal premium per barrel upon the quantity short.

As to the Confectionery Association:

The confectionery association is of recent formation and the usual result followed at once, viz., a rise in the prices.

Finally, the report says:

The committee find that the evils produced by combinations such as have been inquired into have not by any means been fully developed as yet in this country.

No truer word was ever uttered. In 1888 they had not been fully developed; I think they have nearly reached perfection now.

But sufficient evidence of their injurious tendencies and effects is given to justify legislative action for suppressing the evils arising from these and similar combinations and monopolies.

And a Bill was reported to this House. That Bill, as we all know, was virtually shorn of its provisions by an amendment made to it in the Senate, and it has remained from that day to this practically a dead letter. But

Mr. McCARTHY.

will any one say that the combinations have decreased since? On the contrary, they have gone on increasing and fortifying their position until I doubt if there is any large industry to-day which is not virtually a combination.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the combination in coal due to the tariff?

Mr. McCARTHY. I freely say that it is not. It does not at all follow that there cannot be combinations without the tariff; but I do not say that the experience in the States proves that no legislation can put down combinations. The last remedy which has been suggested, whether it be fair or not, is the passage of a Bill permitting the Executive at Washington to reduce the duty upon any article which the Attorney-General will certify is governed by a trust or by a combination. Sir, no combination can be put down by law. The combines have only to change their mode of proceeding; they have only to create a trust. Look at them in the States. Look at the sugar trust, even the whiskey trust, the coal combine, of which we heard in this House the other night, the lead combine—why, there is hardly a commodity which has not to-day its trust, enormously enhancing the cost to the consumer, and which the law has been found powerless to check, and which there is no other means suggested of checking except the one of lowering the tariff. I propose to deal for a moment or two, with the indulgence of the House, with the question of the farmer, because I have ventured to insert in my resolution the statement, that of all industries the farming industry suffers the most from this present tariff. There are some injustices, some evils, flowing from the tariff which are common to all classes; but the farmer has been told that because of the countervailing advantages which he was to get under the tariff, and which, I am free to admit, to some extent he has got—and I will investigate their value—that because of these countervailing advantages he has agreed to submit—because he has agreed up to this time—to the disadvantages of the tariff, so far as he is concerned. Now, what are they? Why, some hon. gentlemen think that the agricultural industry is the most highly protected of all. Some hon. gentlemen think that the farmer has no duty to pay; that, wearing home-spun as he may, shingling his house from his own timber, using the logs cut from his own bush, sticking in pegs instead of nails, virtually the farmer may go free from all taxation. And, of course, not taking anything stronger than tea, because I believe he can have tea and coffee without being subjected to a tax; and, of course, if the farmer wore a fig leaf no doubt that would be still better, because there could be no question about a tax upon that, but in our climate, unfortunately, it would be impossible for him to go about in that way—living in this way he need pay no

duty. Let me see if that statement of the farmers' condition is right.

Mr. FOSTER. That statement is not right. That is stated by the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not at liberty to prove what was said by another hon. member of the House, as I am not allowed to refer to a previous debate, or I would have very little difficulty in doing so, but it stands on record, and there is no difficulty in any hon. gentleman seeing whether what I have said is virtually or not a repetition of what has been said on the subject during a previous debate. I desire, as coming from an agricultural constituency, to repudiate the idea that the farmer is to be relegated to any such position. I deny in the most emphatic way that the farmer is to be treated as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, as a man who must, in order to escape taxation, live in the manner pictured to us the other night. I deny that altogether. But, I say, if he did live in that way, nevertheless he could not escape from a very heavy burden of taxation. What are the taxes a farmer bears? Tell me what he does not bear. Although he is not a great manufacturer, is there any indulgence made to him in the matter of raw material? Agricultural implements, large and small, binder twine, everything he uses, as a farmer, is subjected to an enormous taxation.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). State the duty on agricultural implements.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am asked to state the duty, and it is as well I am able to answer that question, or else I would have to go down foot. It is 35 per cent. My hon. friend may not think that a very high duty. I differ from him. I say it is an enormous duty. It is not a duty for revenue. We know what the revenue tariff of this country has been. The highest tariff we ever reached for revenue purposes was 17½ per cent, and when you double that by one stroke and make a man pay \$135 for a \$100 article, do you mean to say he is not paying an enormous duty? But he is paying it on every possible article: binders, threshers, ploughs, seeders, hand instruments, binding twine, sowers, harrows, furniture,—perhaps he is not permitted to have household furniture, except such as he can tinker up in his own workshop—cutlery, lamps, clothing, blankets, harness, what is it the farmer does not pay duty on?

Mr. MULOCK. He pays more than 35 per cent on some implements.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of the large implements. Take, for instance, the province of Manitoba, and let us just see what duty the farmer has to pay in that province. I find, taking the last importations into that province, that he imported agricultural implements to the value of \$278,036, on which he paid in duty \$97,863. In that small pro-

vince, that is the direct and positive duty the farmer has paid into the revenues of this country, and yet we are to be told that he goes free of duty. Now, my information varies, and hon. gentlemen coming from that province will be able to set me right, if I am wrong, but my information is that about one-third of the implements used in that country are imported.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, there is a great number of them. The hon. gentleman who says "no" will see that there must be. Take harvesters, 659 were imported in one year; mowers, 523; ploughs and sulkys, 1,844; threshers and separators, 193. The hon. gentleman who says "no" has, no doubt, better means of information than I have, but my information is that there is not more than two-thirds of the agricultural implements used in that country purchased from the domestic manufacturers. That one-third which is imported is taxed to what extent? Why, how many farmers are there in that country? What is a fair calculation as to the number of farmers in the province of Manitoba? Any hon. gentleman, working that out for himself and making the division, will at once see what proportion of taxation the farmer of Manitoba has to pay directly to the revenue. But we are told that the same farmer who buys these articles and pays this duty, could get the same articles for less price made at home. Why, then, does he not buy them? Why does a man give \$185 for a harvester or a binder, if he can get the same article, manufactured by Massey, Harris and others, for \$150? There is only one answer to that. These men are not paying \$35 more simply for the pleasure of it and for the purpose of sitting on an American machine. The answer, of course, is that the American machine suits their purpose better and has better value. The farmer is content to pay \$180 for an article, notwithstanding he can get it at \$150, because the dearer articles last longer and suit him better.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Protection made it a better article in the States.

Mr. McCARTHY. That may have been so. I do not know. I do not know how that is. I do not know whom they were protected from. Certainly not from Canadians. Whom were they in the States protected from? Certainly not from Canadians. They could hardly be protected against any others, because we have never understood there was active competition between the English manufacturers of harvest implements and the American. Now, Sir, I think it would be perfectly true to say that these farmers who are buying the home implements are paying on the average just three times the sum which I have mentioned; that is, for years past, instead of paying \$100,000 into the public revenues, they are paying \$300,000, of which \$200,000 go into the pockets of the manu-

Mr. McCARTHY.

facturers. But, Sir, that is not the only article. Barbed wire is a most important article for the farmers. We have been flooded with petitions in favour of the removal of the duty on barbed wire. What is the history of barbed wire? In that country they have no wood or other material for fencing, and they have to use barbed wire. That being so, one would have thought the Government would have jumped at the opportunity to place barbed wire on the free list. It is a raw material of the farmer. The farmers all over the Dominion are petitioning against the duty upon this article. The production and sale of this article is regulated by a combine which fixes the price and determines the quantity, and which I declare, upon the responsibility of a member of this House, is regulated by a solemn bond and instrument, which limits the output and tells the different manufacturers at what prices they are to sell. In the United States the same article can be got wholesale for \$2.25 per hundred; galvanized, \$2.75 per hundred. In Canada the wholesale price is \$4.50, and the retail \$4.75 per hundred. I would like to know what benefit the consumers, the farmers, are gaining from it; I would like any hon. gentleman to say that he believes he is right in postponing relief for one day or for one hour after the facts have been brought to the notice of the Government. The information that I state here has been obtained from a gentleman upon whom I have a right to rely, and I believe it represents the case correctly. He says:

There are three barbed-wire factories in the East and one in Winnipeg. All four have joined by agreement and made a money deposit by way of penalty whereby each is bound to obey the commands of a certain board. This board fixes the quantity of wire which each company may send into this province, and binds the company here to a limited output. The territory of Canada is also divided up in a certain manner, and one is not to take trade in the preserve of another. The price at which all these sell is fixed and the paternal Government by duties compels the granger here to buy from these companies. Any one of these companies could produce all the wire used in Canada, and, as a result, our company here is shut down more than half the time, but the price permits it and makes profitable the enforced idleness.

That is the history of barbed wire. But, Sir, that is not the only thing that the farmer has to complain of.

Mr. SPROULE. How much duty did they pay on barbed wire?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think they paid any; I do not think there was any importation. That is not what I am complaining of. If there was a duty and it would go into the revenue, it would benefit us all. The increased cost by reason of the tariff which excludes the foreign manufacturers—I have not figured at the percentage—goes to the benefit of the manufacturers, and does not go to the revenue of this country. If ever there was a complete case made out with

reference to any article under the tariff, that case has been made out in relation to barbed wire. Now, the same difference will be found in regard to axes. We know how it is with regard to binding twine, and we know the measure of relief that has been meted out. That measure of relief, as I understand the statement made by experienced members of this House, gives to each farmer \$1 a year. The reduction from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent means, to the average farmer, \$1 a year, but leaves him to continue paying what he has been paying on his agricultural implements and other goods which are to him raw material of production, in addition to the enormous duties which we all have to pay on articles of clothing, and so on. He has this sop thrown to him in order to keep him quiet for a time—\$1 a year. But, Sir, the farmer's case has not been all stated, and I desire to state it on both sides, and to give every advantage that can be given to the position that benefits the farmer. Sir, the farmer is protected. The hon. gentleman who generally sits behind me, but whom I do not now see in his place, has always been very strong in his representations that the farmer was the best protected man in the country. Well, Sir, undoubtedly, he is protected. Undoubtedly, in my riding my advocacy of the National Policy was not so much with a view to establishing great industries—tall chimneys and that kind of thing—it was because the farmers of that part of the Dominion had to meet the active competition of the United States, of the western farmer, because the home market and the lumber camps were flooded with the produce of western farmers—corn, beef, pork, &c.—and I desired to retain that market for the farmer, as, undoubtedly, the farmer was entitled to retain it, if he was to be subjected to the increased duties imposed. But it is well to estimate the value of that home market. Let us see here, face to face with the hon. gentlemen who hold different views, what this protective policy, so far as the farmer is concerned, is worth. I do not think my hon. friends will quarrel with me, when I say that I have taken the years 1877 and 1878, the last years in which the importation of farm produce reached high-water mark. In the first year the importation was \$14,149,181, and in the latter about \$13,736,525. The average for the two is \$13,942,853. Now, Sir, that has been curtailed, no doubt, by the high duties we have imposed. In 1891 the importation of products of the farm was reduced to \$2,740,253, and in 1892 to \$1,824,200, the average being \$2,282,231. So that the farmer is getting the home market to the extent of \$11,660,622, so far as products of the farm are concerned. I take the figures which the Finance Minister gave as to the extent to which the farmer is getting the benefit of the National Policy in respect of meats, and I find that to be \$1,011,144. Altogether, therefore, the

benefit to the farmer of the market secured to him by these duties, is \$12,671,766. Now, I want to know, supposing the farmer gets the benefit of the market to the extent of \$12,750,000 for his products, how much better off is he? That is the question. The duties do not increase the farmer's output. He does not grow a bushel more of corn or oats; he does not produce one solitary stem additional by reason of this policy. The difference is that, whereas before his products would have been forced out of the country in order to find a market, under the present system a greater proportion of the products are retained in the country and consumed here.

Mr. SPROULE. How about the development of the hog industry?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman asks, "What about the development of the hog industry?" The Minister of Finance gave us the figures as \$1,144,000. I have taken that, in addition to breadstuffs. If these goods did not come in, all I can say is, that to the extent they did not come in, the farmer is benefited. But I will take the Finance Minister's statement, according to which the result was some over \$1,000,000, so we have now \$12,000,000. Now, the best way, perhaps, is to take the farmers' output. I find that the farmers' output for the province of Ontario is \$260,000,000 per annum. Now, if you take that sum and say that for that \$260,000,000 he is able to sell \$12,000,000 worth more at home than he would but for the National Policy, you have the measure of the benefit which the farmer derives. What is that? Is it 5 per cent, or 7 per cent, or 10 per cent? As we know the price of most of these articles the farmer has to sell is regulated by the export demand, to what extent will it be said that the farmer of this country is benefited by this \$12,000,000 of home markets? If you put it at 10 per cent—I do not think any person would put it higher—what do you get? You get a better price for the farmer of about \$1,250,000 more for his produce. Divide that among the number of farmers in Canada, and what have you got? Why, Sir, about \$1 a head; so that, dividing the number of farmers by the net result, in the manner I have stated, the farmer gets, to that extent alone, advantages of somewhere about \$1 a head on the average.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What number of farmers do you take?

Mr. McCARTHY. I estimate the number of farmers from the census of 1881, with 12 per cent added, assuming that the farmers have increased in number at the same pace with the rest of the population, and I divide that number into \$1,000,000, which is the outside sum, I think, which any fair-minded man will attribute as any possible benefit to be derived from the home market.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many farmers do you make ?

Mr. McCARTHY. 742,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You must have made a mistake in your division.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I have ; I won't be sure about the figures. But, at all events, any hon. gentleman can correct them. I find, on making my calculation, that it is \$1.70, not \$1.07. But, when you take \$1.70 as the average value of the home markets to the farmers, it is bringing the matter down to an absolute absurdity. Sir, I have stated to this House that this tariff wants immediate amendment. Now, I distinctly say here, in enunciating my policy, that I have no sympathy with any trade policy which discriminates against Great Britain. I am absolutely and unequivocally opposed to any kind of so-called free trade, no matter whether it gives a continental market or not, which discriminates against the mother country : on the contrary, I think we would be moving altogether in the wrong direction. I regret that we have not heard yet from the ostensible leaders, and from the actual leaders, of the opposite side of the House any positive statement against a policy which, only a year or two ago, they so warmly and so thoroughly endorsed. For all I know, that policy is their policy to-day. No word has fallen from hon. gentlemen on that side to show that they do not still adhere to and advocate that view. For my part, I do not believe in it, as a fiscal matter. I do not believe that this country would be better off, as a fiscal policy, in discriminating against Great Britain. But these are not the only considerations which ought to weigh in a matter of that kind. Why, Sir, it is a contemptible policy, if I may venture to use the term, to say of the country that gives us free trade—because that is what it amounts to—that we will take their markets and all the advantages they give us, and we will actually discriminate against them in our market and sell out to another country, in order to gain an advantage of that kind. I do not wonder that that policy has been repudiated ; I do not wonder that it has been rejected as ignoble, as dishonourable, and as dishonouring to the people of this country. I only wonder, if I wonder at all, that hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet seen their way to abjure a policy which they must know, by this time, can never be accepted by the people of this Dominion. But, on the other hand, are we to wait, as suggested by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), for a preferential trade ? That seems to be a policy which is almost as unwise as the policy to which I have just referred. Are we to wait for days to come for preferential advantages in the British market, which we feign hoped for, and which I, for one, still hope for, and which we may possibly yet get ? Are we to remain as we are ? If it is true, that this tariff is crushing the people

Mr. McCARTHY.

of this country, if this tariff is causing discontent among the people of this country, are we to wait for some possible time in the future when, from economic or other causes, a different policy may prevail in Great Britain, which will induce this country to grant us preferential trade ? Sir, I advocated that policy in 1855. I do not know whether I convinced any gentleman in this House, but I convinced myself, that economic causes were fast hurrying on Great Britain to a condition in which she would be compelled, in self-defence, to adopt a protective policy. I arrived at the conclusion, whether rightly or wrongly, that the closing to Great Britain of the United States markets, of the markets of Germany, France and Russia, and a diminishing trade, relatively, not absolutely, would inevitably cause Great Britain, in self-defence, to adopt some policy of fair trade, which would mean a policy under which Great Britain could make a barter and exchange for the trade of other countries. We have seen how that policy succeeded in the United States. We have seen Mr. Blaine from time to time make an agreement with the South American Republics by which, for better terms in the United States market, he got better terms in their markets. I am free to say that at one time I hoped, and I am not sure that I do not still hope, that a day may come when these conditions may force Great Britain to adopt a like policy. But one disturbing cause has since occurred, a cause so enormous as to upset every prognostication, no matter how well founded those prognostications may have been in 1855, and that is, that practically the people on the other side of the line have adopted free trade.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). No, Sir.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says, no. Then all I can say is that Mr. Cleveland cannot be true to the policy on which he was elected.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). He may not be able to carry it out.

Mr. McCARTHY. No man can read the platform on which Mr. Cleveland was nominated, no man can read the journals that support him, no man can read the declarations which have been made with respect to his policy without feeling confident that he will carry it out.

Mr. MULOCK. There is also his message.

Mr. SCRIVER. And his inaugural address.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is not a word about free trade in it. Say what you mean.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is getting angry. If he will keep his patience and temper, no doubt he will be afforded ample opportunity of stating his views to the House. I have not said anything that I have not a perfect right to say, and no interruption will prevent me stating what I

intend to convey to this House. Read the platform on which Mr. Cleveland was nominated, read the journals which support the President, read the speeches which were delivered not long ago by the leading men of the Cleveland party at the banquet at New York, read Mr. Cleveland's inaugural, and no man can come to any other conclusion than that he will fail to fulfil the promises and pledges he has given, unless he gives such free trade to the United States as is consistent with a revenue tariff. The hon. gentleman appears to have supposed that I thought Mr. Cleveland was going to carry out free trade pure and simple. Of course, he was mistaken in that view. What I meant, and every hon. gentleman who knows anything about the policy of the Democrats is aware of it, was that according to the views of the Democrats it was unconstitutional to levy taxes except for revenue, that for any indirect purpose or any such purpose as that of promoting industries the tariff could not be changed, and that circumstance completely altered the position which any person took in the year 1888. But, Sir, there is more than that. I voted against a resolution proposed by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and in favour of a motion proposed by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I voted then in favour of offering the English people preferential trade. I voted against the resolution of the hon. member for Queen's, which set out that the tariff should be lowered on those goods which were imported from England. I did not at the time, as my hon. friend who knows more about my views perhaps than any person else, suppose that any great good would come from the resolution submitted by the hon. member for North Bruce. But I thought it was reasonable on the eve of a general election for us to let it be understood by the fair traders of England, so that they might advocate that policy on the stump and endeavour to have candidates returned holding those views, that Canada was prepared for preferential trade with them. That I thought to be a reasonable proposition, and I, therefore, voted for that resolution. But how do we find the state of affairs to-day? Suppose we were perfectly certain that it would come, suppose our faith was clear and sure that we were to have preferential trade, was that any reason why we should not, in the meantime, lower our tariff? Is it necessary to retain a tariff of 35 per cent, which is injurious to our domestic interests, because by and by we may squeeze out of Great Britain a tariff for preferential trade? When our tariff is lowered to a revenue basis, there will be quite enough left, if ever we gain preferential trade on our breadstuffs in the English market, for the Government to come down and propose that it should be made lower still. If one dollar a bushel were guaranteed for our wheat, I would be prepared to give free trade to England. Let them guarantee \$1 per bushel for

our wheat, or a sliding scale which would give 40 shillings a quarter, or \$1 a bushel at home, and I would be willing to admit, duty free, every product of England,—and I do not think any member of this House would vote against such a proposition. But the reduction of the tariff to a revenue basis would not prevent preferential trade, if we still want to hold a grip on the mother country. If we want to occupy this position and say: "We will do nothing for you until you have done something for us," there will still remain a sufficient amount of duty to throw off whenever the mother country shall give preferential trade. What are the prospects at home? There is such a struggle over home rule that the people are thinking of nothing else. That question will not be settled this Parliament, and we know perfectly well that the struggle is destined to go on for some years yet to come. And then, what?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Controller of Customs is going to settle it soon.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, what? We are still to hope and believe that a protective party may be formed in England. There is no question as to the fact that protection in England is gaining ground. The farmers are for protection. But their protection is as much against Canada as it is against the United States. Why, it was only the other day that, in the British Parliament, a motion was made to exclude our cattle. That motion obtained a very large vote, and it was to the effect that, under no circumstances, should Canadian cattle be admitted to the English market as they had been prior to the recent order scheduling Canada. Why should they not so vote? What do we do for England? Why should we expect England to keep her tariff down?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was that the reason, in your opinion?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think it was the reason. I think the reason was that the English people do not want competition in their markets. It was the protectionist feeling gaining ground among the farmers, who are worse off to-day than the farmers in any other part of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. At last I have drawn a sympathetic cheer. I have been fishing for it in pretty shallow water. I am afraid, but I have got it at last. Will any one venture to say that there is any similarity between England and Canada with respect to that matter? Free trade to the English farmer means that we Canadians, the people of the United States, the people of India, the people of Australia, and the peoples of Hungary and Russia and all over the world send their wheat to that country. Protection on the sliding scale that Mr. Lowther proposes would at once enhance the price to the British farmers. Surely the hon. gentleman can

see that it is not the word "protection" that makes the difference; it is whether there is a matter to be protected or not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They do not understand the question.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was discussing the possibilities of obtaining preferential trade, and while I do not at all doubt the ultimate possibility that a protective party might grow in Great Britain, and might be willing to give to the colonies preferential free trade, it yet appears to me so distant a possibility, or even so distant a probability, that it can hardly be said at present to be worthy of practical consideration. Moreover, I venture to think that the difficulties which lie in the way are not such as ought to induce us, at this moment, to postpone action to remedy what appears to me to be admittedly very great evils. The view which I took when I had the honour to address the House on this subject some years ago was, as I briefly said this afternoon, that economic conditions would force upon the British Government the necessity of establishing some system of protection, not with a view of carrying out protective measures, but with a view more of being able to enter into negotiations with other countries for free or fair trade. If, indeed, that event should happen, there is nothing at all in the proposition I now make which would render it impossible for Canada to give such terms to the mother country as would induce the mother country to admit Canada to all advantages which would be thus obtained. But, as I have said, if the United States adopt it, as I think they have practically adopted free trade—when I say free trade, I mean free trade, subject, of course to the necessity of a revenue tariff—that would completely change and alter the complexion of the case, and would, no doubt, prevent and delay the possibility of the British people departing from the course which they have adhered to for so many years, a course which they believe to be to the great advantage of the country, namely, the policy of free trade. In an analysis of the import trade of the United Kingdom, compiled by Sir Rawson W. Rawson, who is a member of the Imperial Federation Council, I find statements given which certainly are worthy of the very gravest consideration by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and by those members of this House, including the hon. Finance Minister, who may think that there is a possibility or a probability of getting from the British Government preferential free trade in favour of Canada. This statement which I have here, explains the proportion of the imports to Great Britain

Mr. McCARTHY.

from the colonies and from foreign countries of the food supply which that country finds it necessary to import, and, judging from the figures given, the House will at once see what an enormous sacrifice Great Britain will have to make if the policy which is suggested is carried out. For instance, we have in this statement, on page 21.—I have no doubt my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is quite familiar with it—an analysis of the imports into England, distinguished under the headings, value, percentage, articles, raw materials and materials, and we have also the proportion received from foreign countries and from British possessions, respectively, in the year 1889. Taking food supplies, we find that the following were imported into Great Britain from foreign countries and from British possessions:—Animals (alive), from foreign countries, 81.5 per cent; from British possessions, 15.5 per cent. Meat (fresh) 74.6 from foreign countries; from British possessions, 25.4 per cent. Meat (salted or preserved) 88 per cent from foreign countries; 12 per cent from British possessions. Bacon and hams, 94 per cent from foreign countries; and 6 per cent from British possessions. Other products, 91.5 per cent from foreign countries; and 8.5 per cent from British possessions. The result is that, of the whole 100 per cent of food which is imported into Great Britain, 90 per cent comes from foreign countries, and only 10 per cent, or a little over, from British possessions. Then, passing to other articles, we have the following statement:—Vegetables, corn, grain and flour, 87.6 per cent from foreign countries, and 12.4 per cent from the colonies and British possessions. The vegetables we are not very much concerned with; but in regard to them the same relative proportion is observed: 80 per cent from foreign countries, and only 19 per cent from British possessions. This same little work, at page 49, gives the result of the adoption of a policy of preferential trade. At least three rates, it says, have been proposed by different advocates of a preferential duty on foreign imports, namely, 2, 5, and 10 per cent, and it shows the amount of duty that would be imposed on foreign imports at these different rates in the United Kingdom, and throughout the British possessions. Anything less than 10 per cent would hardly be of any advantage to us in British markets, and, at that rate, there would be a duty levied on foreign food importations of no less than £14,600,000; and the equivalent to that, on the basis of 10 per cent imposed by the colonies on the manufactures of foreign goods, and in favour of the British manufacturer, would entail, not merely upon us alone, but upon all the colonies, a duty of only £4,825,000. These figures, of course, demonstrate the great difficulty there would be in such a trade policy as the one I have mentioned. At the same time, it is not at all impossible that between the manufacturers, who are at present

suffering very greatly from the exclusion of their goods from foreign markets, united with the agriculturists who are suffering from the reverse, that is, the importation of food supplies, animals, etc., into Great Britain, a protective policy might, in the end, be brought about. But when we find such a statement made as was made recently by Lord Salisbury, at Liverpool, a statement which has, I think, been more than once read in this House, it does appear to me that it would hardly be practicable for us to postpone dealing with our own matters here in the hope that such a policy would be reached in England. Lord Salisbury spoke in the most positive terms :

I was also grateful that, in spite of some words in the address, he (the chairman) did not lead me into the thorny paths of fiscal restrictions. I am very nervous to allude to it, because I have found when I have uttered most innocent and tentative observations that I am always accused of reimposing a duty upon corn. You will therefore forgive me if I say that I look upon a duty on corn as outside the dream of any practical politician, and I am perfectly convinced that if a duty on corn should be reimposed, it would have so precarious a hold that no sane man would invest a farthing on the security of its continuance.

Now, if there is to be a protectionist party in England, undoubtedly it will be the Conservative party, and yet we find the recognized leader of the Conservatives speaking in these unequivocal terms in reference to the policy of imposing a duty on food, and it is only in regard to food that we, as Canadians, would be interested in any protective policy that the British Government might in the future adopt. So that for these reasons—first, because we cannot afford to wait, and, secondly, because if such a policy is adopted in England, there will be quite enough left in our tariff on a revenue basis to give in exchange for reciprocity that we might have in that direction—I am convinced that it would be unwise for us to postpone action in this matter, trusting to the possibilities, whether they be near or far, of benefits from a protective policy or a preferential trade in Great Britain. That is one of the policies which have been proposed. Another policy which is proposed is the policy of delay ; and I must state now why I am not satisfied with the proposition made by the Government that this matter should be dealt with in the next session of this Parliament. I am not satisfied with it for more than one reason. I am not satisfied, in the first place, that I have heard any valid excuse for the delay. I am not satisfied, in the second place, giving every credence to the sincerity of the Government, with their promise of tariff amendment ; on the contrary, I am very much the reverse. We must read, Sir, and I propose to read, the views which the Government have put forward on this subject from the time that the new Administration came into office ; and bearing that in mind, and having some regard to the consistencies, which I

have no doubt the Government desires to maintain, it does appear to me that there is not the promise of a tariff amendment or change, in the sense in which I understand these terms, and in the sense in which I believe the country at this moment desires and seeks for change. The first Minister of the Crown who spoke on the subject of the tariff was the hon. Minister of Public Works. Speaking at Coteau Landing, at the nomination for the representation of Soulanges, that hon. Minister used this very clear and emphatic language :

Referring to the trade question, Mr. Ouimet declared that protection had proved a great benefit to the country. The prosperity which reigned everywhere was the best proof of this. Luxuries were taxed, while necessities were freed. The present Government, he announced, did not intend to make any change in this respect. It would, on the contrary, perfect it by certain modifications according to circumstances.

Now, there is no doubt at all about that statement, and I apprehend that a Minister occupying so important a position as the Minister of Public Works does know perfectly well of what he was speaking ; and his announcement was clear and definite that the Government intended to adhere to the protective policy, and would make certain modifications in the direction in which I apprehend the policy has since been changed. Then, the First Minister went to Toronto, and was present at the dinner given by the Board of Trade of that city. At that dinner, unfortunately as it appeared to me for the First Minister, under his hand he found the sentiment that the mouldering branches ought to be lopped off. Adopting this, as was not unnatural under the circumstances, he announced that the policy of the Government would be to lop off the mouldering branches. Very naturally he did not go into any details ; very naturally he spoke in general terms. It was not the place nor the time, and it was not to be expected that he would do more than intimate what the policy of the Government was to be, but that policy he announced to be the lopping off of the mouldering branches. What was to constitute a mouldering branch and when the lopping off was to occur was, at that time, left to inference. Some words, however, did fall from the First Minister, which indicated that it was not the intention of the Government to deal with the tariff until President Cleveland's Administration was installed, and until the Government here saw what the new Administration at Washington was going to do. But in a short while afterwards the First Minister was at great pains to explain that that was not what he meant, that he was altogether misunderstood, that it was not the intention of the Government to postpone action with regard to the tariff until the Washington Administration had arranged theirs under the new regime ; and at the Auditorium, shortly afterwards, dealing with

this question, he is reported to have thus spoken :

I was misconstrued as having said that we would not make any changes in our fiscal system until they make changes in theirs. Admitting as I did that the National Policy was not perfection, the Liberals of this city were told that what I had said was that while I admitted it was not perfect, I did not propose to improve it until the United States improved their tariff. I need hardly tell you such a statement would have been absurd, that it was never uttered or thought of by me. I was speaking of fundamental changes which the mercantile community had been led to believe were necessary in our tariff organization in anticipation of fundamental changes in the tariff organization of the United States, but while I admitted that the National Policy is not perfection, that it never was, and requires to be moulded from time to time, to suit the changing circumstances of this country, I did not postpone the time for a tariff reform until tariff reform shall have been completed in the United States; we propose to put our hand to the work in the very session that is coming, in so far as may be necessary, to change and mould, from time to time, the tariff system under which we exist, and the most terse and energetic way of expressing the necessity of that was made by the leader of the Opposition last night when he said such changes are necessary because what is allowed one day may be abused the next. A tariff wisely framed and carefully framed as the tariff may require, in consequence of the changing conditions of trade in surrounding countries, may need to be altered, but our principle is well expressed, as contrasted with the principle of the Opposition, as expressed by Mr. Laurier, who declares that he will lay the axe to the root of the tree. We propose, in the words which were extended to me as a motto and toast at the Board of Trade banquet, simply to trim the tree and lop the mouldering branches. You will understand perfectly, ladies and gentlemen, without my telling you, that while to-morrow the papers will say I am very vague and sphinx-like in speaking on a subject like this, it is impossible for a Minister standing on a public platform in advance of the session of Parliament to put his finger upon one item of the tariff or another item of the tariff and say "That shall be repealed or that shall be reduced." All that we can state to you under our duty to those to whom we owe the highest duty as members of the Government, is the principle upon which we intend to proceed, the principle of sustaining the National Policy, but of reforming the tariff to suit the wants of the Canadian people, as they may change and alter from time to time.

Well, at the same meeting spoke a gentleman of almost equal authority in the Government, perhaps of still greater authority on the subject of trade, and that was the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said that this idea in substance of tariff reform was to be found in the acts of the past, and that we had only to look back upon the Statute-books to see what the Government of which he was a member had done from the first time that Government was formed, in 1878, until that date, to see how the tariff had been changed and reformed. His language was as follows:—

There are one or two things which I desire to say, and I shall try to keep within my ten minutes, in reference to what has been termed, and to which Sir John Thompson referred, as tariff reform. It is difficult, very difficult, to understand what is meant by this expression. It is one great advantage, in a free

Mr. McCARTHY.

country like this, that those who are engaged in administering the affairs of that country that they can be told by their friends what reforms should be made, particularly in all that affects the taxation of the people. And if a system prevails which we believe is true and correct and will lead to the prosperity and greatness of the country, it does not follow that the details of a system of that kind cannot and should not be changed save as circumstances may require. We adopted a policy in 1879, and I am proud of the part I took at that time in assisting and promoting that policy. I do not hesitate to say, sir, that from my boyhood up I have always been a protectionist, and though it may be treason I might say that my teacher was Horace Greeley.

So the hon. gentleman goes on to explain how it was he learned the doctrine of protection. Then he proceeds to say :

Reading Horace Greeley's tracts, showing that the only system that would build up a new country as it has built up that country to a prosperity unparalleled in history, was the same one that must give prosperity and greatness to Canada was a policy of protection, and I have not changed my mind yet.

Then the hon. gentleman pointed out what had been done in the way of the remission of taxes, and he wound up in this way :

This is a great practical specimen of what I consider to be tariff reform, and in carrying out the suggestion of Sir John Thompson to-night that if, in the investigation which must take place by the Finance Minister, by the Controller of Customs, and by myself as Minister of Trade and Commerce we find there are any rotten limbs in connection with this policy of ours we will lop them off just as readily and freely as we did those other taxes we considered onerous upon the people of this country. But, at the same time, in doing that, I state for myself individually, and I think I may also state for the Government of which I am a member, that we do not intend to abandon the great principle of the National Policy as far as it is a protection extended legitimately to all interests, the manufacturing, agricultural and commercial interests of this country. I think after what I have said that you will come to the conclusion that the system of tariff reform has been actually practised by us ever since we have been in power.

Now, Sir, referring to that, it will be found that from 1879 until 1887, or 1886, at all events, no single session of Parliament has been allowed to pass without what is called tariff reform in that sense. In 1880 we had a Bill, and in 1881, and 1882, and 1883, and 1884, and 1885, and 1886. Every year there has been an alteration, or change, or modification of the tariff. Some goods have been put on the free list, the duties on others have been increased. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was, therefore, perfectly justified in saying that he could refer to the past, and that from the past we could judge what were his ideas of tariff reform. Then we had a final statement made to this House. Now, let me pause here just for a moment, if the House will bear with me. We have arrived at the opening of Parliament; we have the statement, first, of the Minister of Public Works; we have the statement made by the First Minister at the Toronto Board of Trade dinner; and we have the statement made at the Auditorium, that there would be changes in the tariff in the view which the

Minister proclaimed of lopping the mouldering branches off. And what has been the result? Two modifications in the tariff. On coal oil the duty is said to be reduced to the extent of about 2½ cents per gallon. On binder twine there has been a reduction in favour of the average farmer of about \$1 per annum. And the result is that the Government have lopped off the mouldering branches; they are not postponing matters, not delaying matters for the change that is to be made at Washington; they have arrived at the conclusion that this is all that the tariff needs at the present session, and these are the substantial changes which were promised by the First Minister at the meeting in the Auditorium, in Toronto. Curiously enough, Sir,—because it is by going from home that we learn news—I find in the London "Times" the report of a meeting which was not published here, but which appears to have got as far as the other side of the water. It is reported that the First Minister announced to his followers at that meeting that he did not propose to change the tariff until the tariff changes had been made at Washington, and he must ask the forbearance of those who were urging for tariff reform until the necessary time had elapsed. Now that will be found in the London "Times" shortly after the meeting was supposed to have been held here, but no public announcement was made in this country. This has never been put forward here as a ground for delay. The Minister of Finance has spoken of the financial policy of the country here and has not attempted to urge this House to delay or stay its hand by reason of the possible changes that might be made at Washington. And for obvious reasons. After the speech made by the First Minister at Toronto, where he repudiated that interpretation put upon his earlier statement, and for other reasons which for obvious reasons I need not dwell upon, it would be a policy to commend itself to the people of this country that they should wait for the changes at Washington before they changed our tariff here. Now, Sir, we have no sympathy for such a policy. Why did we wait for the change in the matter of sugar before altering our own tariff? If it was good policy to make that change when we did, why would it not have been good policy a year or two before? The only ground for making the change was that we could not afford to have it said that the people of the United States were getting their sugar for something like twenty pounds for \$1, while our people were paying \$1 for twelve, thirteen or fourteen pounds. But, if it was a wise policy it might as well have preceded as followed the change at Washington. We surely can regulate our own domestic concerns without waiting to see what is going to be done by the people to the south of us. We know already that what is going to be done will be in the way of reduction. We know, generally speaking, how changes must be made there,

and it would perhaps tend to improve our relations with the United States, if we were to decide upon our tariff changes without waiting for the action they may take in that regard. But, for another reason I do not see my way to agreeing to this postponement. Is it possible, I ask hon. members of this House, taking the statement made in the most solemn manner by the Finance Minister, to imagine that there is to be any substantial change in the tariff in the way the people of this country desire? There may be modifications, there may be goods put on the free list, there may be increases here and reductions there, but what I understand as the change desired and what I advocate myself is a material reduction of the tariff in the direction of the revenue system, and I do not see that there is any possibility of that. In point of fact such a change is excluded by the language the Finance Minister used, because he said: There must be no panic; there is no intention on the part of the Government to do anything in the way of the reduction of the tariff so as to affect the industries of this country; no intention on the part of the Government to abandon the policy of protection that has brought about such prosperity and happiness to the people. Therefore it is clear that there is a radical distinction, a clear and unmistakable cleavage between those who favour delay and as little change as possible and those who go the length of free trade—which I do not, because I think there ought to be continuity in our politics and in our trade policy just as there would be if we had a foreign policy. I do not think it is right to encourage people to invest in manufacturing industries by our laws, to encourage artisans to come here in the hope of being able to obtain a living, and suddenly to change to their injury as if they were our enemies. I think we ought to lead the people to regard the laws of the Parliament of this country as laws not lightly to be changed or lightly to be revoked. At the same time we ought to proceed, as it appears to me, without unnecessary disturbance of the business relations, in the direction of freer trade and lighter tariff, no matter what the consequences may be. Now, Sir, I am told, and I will no doubt be told here, that I am not taking any account of the loss of duty. I am told: You propose to cut down the tariff substantially in reference to England—because that is what I do propose, I propose that as the only means at present available, the only practical measure of relief, to reduce our tariff in favour of that country in whose markets we have absolute free trade. I do not propose to go all the length of reducing our tariff in favour of the United States at this moment. I do not propose to restore matters to the condition they were in in 1877 and 1878. But I think the time may come—I believe the time will come, I have confidence in the justice of the new Presi-

dent of the United States, and I think that before long happier relations existing between this country and Washington than those which existed during the administration of the late President—the time will come when freer trade, and reciprocal trade if you like, or at all events trade upon better terms to both countries, can be established. But in the meantime I believe, Sir, the people of this country, of both sides of politics, would not approve of the Government lowering its duties in favour of the Americans while the Americans maintain their duties as against the Canadians. In the statement that was made by Mr. Atkinson in winding up his tour on behalf of the "Globe" newspaper, he puts that very strongly. He says:

This and other evidence all goes to show the advantages of free trade with the States. The conviction is held by almost every farmer I have talked with. And it is, in a majority of cases—

I ask the attention of the House to these words:

I think, accompanied by a sturdy objection to Canada doing anything humiliating or unbecoming to put it into effect. There is, too, an objection felt by members of both parties to allowing Canadian manufacturers to be put at the disadvantage of American competition while shut out from participation in the American market.

Now, that is stated by a Liberal making a tour on behalf of the great Liberal newspaper of Toronto to be the feeling of men of both parties. There is no desire to put the manufacturers at a disadvantage until the markets of the United States are open to them. Then, Sir, what about the loss of duty? Now, the duty on British goods, on those classes of goods which pay duty is, in round numbers, 30 per cent. The duty on goods coming from Belgium is, I think, somewhere about the same rate, and on the goods from Germany also the same. Why do I include the goods from Belgium and Germany? Because, Sir, whatever advantage Britain may have in any market, even in the markets of one of her colonies, under the stipulations of treaties which have been made by Britain with these countries and referred to in this House (the treaty, so far as Belgium is concerned, of 1862, and, on the part of Germany, 1865), both these countries are entitled to the same advantages in our market that Britain would have. So that, whether willing or not, the reduction of our tariff in favour of Great Britain and admitting her goods at any particular rate, would mean that both Belgium and Germany, at all events, would be entitled to the like privileges in our markets, and possibly too—as to that I express no positive opinion—many other countries who have the favoured-nation clause in their treaty with Great Britain, would be entitled to similar advantages; but the importation from other countries are so infinitesimal that, for the purposes of revenue, they need not be

Mr. McCARTHY.

taken seriously into consideration. What, then, would be the result of taking off a duty of 10 per cent? Remember, I do not mean that it should be 10 per cent, or even 10 per cent all around, because nobody but the Finance Minister can regulate details of that kind. On many of these articles it ought to be much more. On iron, I think most members will agree with me that we ought to return to the duty that prevailed prior to 1887. That would be, of course, a reduction of much more than 10 per cent. But, just for the purpose of illustration, suppose that the amount of the duty taken off goods imported from Great Britain were one-third of the revenue, which is now collected, and suppose the same amount of reduction was made on goods coming from Germany and Belgium, we would practically suffer a loss of revenue to the extent of \$3,000,000—\$2,722,000—being 30 per cent of the revenue collected on British goods, the balance being made up by the duty collected on importations from Belgium and Germany. Well, where are you going to get the \$3,000,000? How do you propose to make good that loss to the revenue? If this tariff means anything, it means the prohibition of importations. It is not a tariff for revenue purposes; it is a tariff for prohibitive purposes; and, without pretending to say that that can be demonstrated—it is a matter, of course, for the calculation of experts—I do not doubt that this loss would be made up upon the greater importation of goods from Great Britain under the reduced tariff. However that may be, it is certainly not a matter that should stand in the way of the reform which I advocate, if the reform in other respects commends itself to the intelligence of this House. Then, once more, let me recur to the position of the farmer in this country. I have spoken of his position, because, in speaking of him, I embrace all other consumers. I venture to think that everything I say with regard to the farmer that is not specially applicable to him, applies, with equal force, to the other consumers in this country. But, after all, the farmer is the man who is now knocking at our doors. In the "Globe" of to-day is a most important statement made at Moosomin, on 3rd March, and I commend this statement to the attention of the hon. member who represents that district, to whom these resolutions have been sent, and which speak, in no uncertain terms of the wants of the farmer in that part of this great Dominion. These are the resolutions:

Whereas, agriculture is the leading industry in Canada, on which three-fourths of her people depend and through which all true national prosperity must come; and

Whereas, the "protective tariff" cannot appreciably affect the value of farm products in Canada; and

Whereas, the present "protective tariff" of 35 per cent increases the cost of imported manufactured goods to the farmer from 58 to 60 per cent and has had the effect of causing the formation of trusts and combines with the result of extorting from the farmer

a like high price for all protected home manufactures ; and

Whereas, this has made farming unprofitable in Canada—has reduced the value of farm lands in Eastern Canada from 35 to 50 per cent and has brought this “greater Canada” to a state of extreme depression ; and

Whereas, because foreign governments may prevent their citizens by high tariffs from satisfying their wants from us ; we must suffer the consequences with them if we cannot find an equally good marked elsewhere. That is our advantage and we are not blind to the efforts of government in this direction ; but it does not follow that our government should prevent us from supplying our wants from all foreign countries by imposing a like high tariff ; and

Whereas, a tariff is considered on all hands a necessary evil until some better means of collecting a revenue is devised ; therefore

Be it resolved, That this meeting does humbly petition Government to reduce the tariff to such an extent that it shall not exceed 12½ per cent on all farm products and all prime necessities for the household and the farm ;

Be it further resolved, That we request the active support of the public press and public bodies interested in agriculture and the rapid settlement and development of this great country, knowing, as we well do, our weakness if unsupported ; and that a copy of this petition be forwarded to the Minister of Inland Revenue and a copy to our representative, W. W. McDonald, M.P., and a copy to the Hon. Senator Perley.

Now, Sir, that is a resolution coming from a non-political body, speaking of their grievances. But it does not stand alone. From the Central Farmers' Institute, meeting in Toronto, not very long ago, resolutions of like import were adopted. From the Board of Trade at Lethbridge, I find resolutions also in favour of tariff reform :

Whereas it is the opinion of this Board of Trade that the time has arrived when it would be to the interest of the residents of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories to have the duties at present imposed on farm implements, binder twine and barb wire removed ;

Therefore this Board of Trade extends its thanks to Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., M.P., and the other members of the House of Commons who are pressing for the removal of the said duties, for their efforts in that behalf, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. McCarthy and that a telegram be sent him containing the substance of the same.

That resolution was also adopted. Then we have a mass meeting of the farmers at Brantford. Against these, we have the meeting of the Manufacturers' Association, who are perfectly satisfied with things as they are, and the only hope of relief they hold out to the farmers is the preferential trade for which the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) contends, and which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance thinks, in the not very near future may possibly be accomplished. Sir, I am done with just one observation. In my opinion it ought to make very little difference what my course in the past may have been, if my arguments are well founded, if my facts are fairly stated, and if my conclusions are reasonably just. The question now is, whether, at this time of day,

and under all these circumstances, there ought to be a reconsideration of the policy that was adopted in 1879, whether there ought to be a change, regard being had to the various matters which I have had the honour to submit to the House. But I know perfectly well, my experience as a politician has been long enough to teach me, that much may be made against the views I now advocate, by my heresies of the past, if they be heresies. For that reason only I venture to trespass upon the House with the views which I have entertained and expressed on this subject on former occasions. I would not take up the time of the House by referring to them now, were it not that, whether I be right or wrong, whether my course now is one that ought to meet with the approval of this House and the country, I am not very far away from the views which I have held on this subject of trade from the earliest time at which I have ever taken part in this discussion. I had the honour to speak in this House as long ago as 2nd March, 1877. I then addressed the House upon the subject of the tariff, and the only passage that I have been able to find in the speech which I then had the honour to deliver, which is reported in the “Hansard,” is contained in the following words :

His right hon. friend's amendment contained a reference to another branch and that was with reference to readjustment of the tariff. He was aware that, not being a commercial man, his opinions had not the weight of those of hon. members who were directly interested in commerce, therefore, he felt a little diffident about saying anything on this matter. * * * He was not going to dispute the grand doctrine of free trade nor the philosophy of the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who especially championed it. But he did say that there were exceptional cases to every doctrine, and the position of this country at the present time was exceptional, and ought to be dealt with in that spirit. We formed a sparsely settled country, stretching from ocean to ocean, with a great people south of us, who put a duty of about 45 per cent on what we sent to them. Whether free trade or protection was right or wrong those people were able not only to compete more than successfully with us with a duty of 17½ per cent, but they were able to compete with British manufactures in England itself.

Well, Sir, in the following year, 1878, I used this language :

He had never pretended that, looked at in a purely abstract light, a system of protection was to be preferred to one of free trade, and that it was wise, or would be good statesmanship for the country to build up against the laws of nature, manufactures which could not exist in the Dominion without such aid.

But what was the difference between the northern part of the United States and Canada? In regard to manufacture, our climate and natural products were, to a great extent, similar to theirs, and were we not in as good a position to manufacture north of the line as our American cousins on the south of the line? We could not, however, hope to compete against such an inferior system as we were now competing against. It was absurd to pretend that our manufactures could exist when the American markets were shut against us, while ours was open to them. What we wanted was not to inaugurate a system of protection, but to

initiate such a system as would remedy the mistakes made against the doctrines of free trade, by our friends south of the line. If they were doing violence to what hon. gentlemen claimed to be a proper system of trade, we had to enact such laws as would meet the difficulty and to protect our own manufacturing industries, and the other branches of industry in this country, against that system. It was scarcely open to argument, whether reciprocity would not be better than protection. He had never heard any hon. gentleman say that it would not be.

Those were my views in 1877-78. I did not pretend then. I have never pretended to be a protectionist. I adopted the National Policy, or the policy of protection, as the policy which under the circumstances was best in the interest of this country. I supposed then, as we all supposed, that it would be merely a temporary one in regard to those articles which could be properly manufactured here. It has since gone much further than any one in 1877-78 ever dreamed of. An attempt has been made to protect every industry. A man had only to come to Ottawa and say that he proposed to start a manufactory in some line and ask that he be protected by a duty of 30 per cent, and that duty was imposed. Next year he would again visit Ottawa and obtain an additional duty of 5 per cent. If he then failed, the duty was left as it was. Coming down to a later period—because I have not taken much part in the discussion of the trade question, so far as I am aware—in 1891, after the last election, speaking before the young Conservatives of Collingwood, I used these words :

It was never contemplated in 1878 that our industries would always require to be spoon-fed, or would always require unlimited protection. The day must come, and the day is coming, when these industries must endeavour to stand alone, or with a reasonable amount of protection, and they should be prepared in the future to dispense with the high taxation necessary to their infancy.

These were the views, so far as I know, I have from time to time expressed on this subject, and I do not feel that I have departed in the slightest degree from those views I have held hitherto. I suppose, rightly or wrongly, that this protective policy was to exist for a limited time, and for a limited time only. I supposed, further, that if it was found in practice that the prices of the commodities produced were decidedly enhanced, that alone would be sufficient to bring about a revision of the tariff; and I do not feel that in adopting the policy which I advocate I am departing in any degree from my earlier views, even if that action would be a cause for shame. But it may be said: why, the country is so prosperous; the bank accounts are so large; the deposits are so large; the number of life insurance policies have so largely increased; all this wealth shows such manifest and patent evidence of prosperity, it would be madness to change the tariff. I am familiar with these arguments; I have heard them time and again.

Mr. McCARTHY.

After all, what do they prove? I, for one, do not venture to say that during the last ten years the country has stood still. I do not pretend to say that we have not more or less added to our wealth; I do not pretend to say that the industrial classes of this country of all descriptions have not by toiling and spinning materially improved our position; but what I do mean to say is, that the distribution of wealth is not, perhaps, as it was ten years ago; that while wealth has accrued in some hands, the distribution of it is not, perhaps, as general as it was ten years ago. When I hear the argument that the enormous balances in the bank, the enormous amounts in the building societies and savings banks show prosperity, I am reminded of what I saw in a New York magazine that I looked at not long ago. It was stated that there are six or seven men in New York city whose wealth is three or four times more than the whole national debt of Canada. No doubt that money appears in securities, bonds or deposits; yet in New York, the same magazine tells us, during the last year there were 100,000 evictions, and a large proportion of these who die were buried in the Potter's Field. So, while we have these great millionaires on the one hand, showing apparently that the country as a whole is very rich, we have most extreme poverty surrounding those millionaires in that very city of New York, to which these references are made. Then our farmer is better off, we are told, than is the farmer in the American states. I believe he is. I believe that the farmer here is, on the whole, better off than the average farmer in the United States, and I trust he is, because here is an account I find of the American farmer, and I am now reading from an article published during the last election in the Chicago "Herald," and this account of the American farmer does not indicate a desirability to continue our present system of taxation for another 20 years:

Thirty years of protective tariff taxation have reduced American agriculture to a position so ignoble that in some places it does not even retain its self-respect. A generation ago the American farmer was the proudest and most independent workingman on earth. To-day he cannot persuade his own son to remain on the farm. Thirty years of unjust laws and class privilege have made the farmer the sport of the cities, the butt of all cheap evils and the hoped for victim of every thief and swindler in the land.

Thirty years of oppression by favoured interests—oppression in many cases submitted to with cheerfulness and acquiesced in with patience,—have established in the minds of the thoughtless millions the idea that the farmer is necessarily a gullible fool; that he is legitimate prey, for shrewder men and that gold bricks and green goods exist for him and him alone. Thirty years of extortion and fraud on the part of his own government have spread the belief that the farmer lives to be duped and plundered, and our cities large and small, are full of cheap fellows who have so much contempt for his intelligence that they are sometimes disposed to boast of their own forbearance in not despoiling him further. In the thirty years of protection the typical American farmer with whom

we are familiar has been changed from a well-dressed, well-read, independent and spirited man to a scarecrow, with vacant eyes and gaping mouth, with the inevitable confidence man near at hand. We do not deceive and oppress a man and retain our respect for him. The contempt with which the privileged classes in America regard the farmer whom they plunder has been communicated to the whole body of the people.

Now, Sir, if that is a fair description given by themselves of the American farmer I am free to confess that our farmer is much better off, but I trust, Sir, that we will see in time that we do not continue the system which has reduced the American farmer to the state of despondency that we find he occupies there. I am ashamed, Sir, for occupying the time of the House at such enormous length, and nothing but the great importance of the question would be any justification for it. I have endeavoured to make the argument which I started out to make as clear as I possibly could. I feel that I could not make the matter complete in any less time, but at all events, I am perfectly conscious that in making my statement I trespassed on the House in a way which deserves at my hands the very greatest thanks, and I am perfectly sure the House, under the circumstances, will be indulgent to me. I conclude by moving, seconded by Mr. Hodgins :

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved—

That since the introduction of the protective system sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as under existing conditions can be successfully carried on in Canada. Moreover, many manufacturers, sheltered behind the rampart thus erected, have formed combinations and trusts which prohibit competition and create and maintain monopolies.

That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure, has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes, and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits; is unfair and unequal in its incidence; and has been productive of discontent verging on disloyalty among those who suffer from its injustice.

That no sufficient reason has been adduced or exists requiring investigation respecting the foregoing facts, which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation which is imperative.

That in the opinion of this House the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated, and also by the substantial reduction of customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom, in whose markets all Canadian products are admitted duty free, and of those nations which under treaty obligations with Great Britain would be entitled to the same advantages; graduated, however, so as not unnecessarily to prejudice the business of the country nor to do wrong to those who have imported and paid duties in accordance with its provisions.

And this House declares its readiness to make a like reduction in favour of such other portions of the empire or with such other foreign countries, especially the United States of America, as are willing to reciprocate in matters of trade with Canada on fair and equitable terms.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware that it must always be somewhat of a difficult task to answer an hon. gentleman of the parliamentary experience and admitted ability of the gentleman who has just taken his seat. But, I count myself somewhat fortunate to-night in the fact, that during the afternoon and during this evening my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) has been sailing in somewhat strange and troubled waters, over a course that was shoaly and tortuous; and having abandoned those strange lights upon the shore, to which he formerly trusted, he had scarcely become accustomed to the new ones, which for the present, at least, he has adopted in their stead. I am aware, Sir, that the jars of a family, or the jars among those who have been formerly members of a family, are never exceedingly pleasant to those who may have the misfortune to be participants. I assure my hon. friend that I am filled with regret—a regret that is intensified by my appreciation of his ability and of my personal friendship for himself—that we were not able upon this side of the House to join in that liberal measure of applause, which, under other circumstances we have extended to him in days gone by. I am quite aware, Sir, that in this country there are those who are ever ready to crown with laurels and eulogy, those who for the moment and from whatever cause may consider it their duty or their interest to break the ties, sometimes called pernicious party ties, which have bound them to those with whom they have been engaged in political work in the past. But, Sir, it is satisfactory to know that glory thus won is apt to be exceedingly ephemeral, and it is satisfactory also to feel that the history of Canada in the past—and its future history will probably be but a repetition of its past history in that regard—teaches us that those who in days gone by, whether in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite or on this side of the House, have admittedly done the best for Canada, have found ample scope for the patriotic employment of their genius within the ranks of one or other of the great political parties of the country. I am far from contending, Sir, that the party system in this country, or in any other country, is without its faults; but I fancy I speak the opinions of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, when I say that its advantages are many and its faults are fewer than those of any other system which we could adopt in Canada for the purposes of Government to-day. And while I say that, Sir, I desire to add another statement which is equally true: that in a country like this, where any political party of any pretensions must contain individuals who represent sections and interests as wide apart as the seas which bound us, it is impossible within party confines to secure any absolute uniformity of opinion upon great public lines or for the promotion

of any great system of public works or benefit. Just as provinces in a Confederation such as this have to yield their individual preferences for the greater general good, so we members of a party have for the time being to yield opinions which we may honestly and firmly hold, in order that a great consensus of opinion may form a policy that will be acceptable to the party in general, and in order that the system of government may go on; and this House—this country—has no right to regard men as less honest, less conscientious, because they make such a compromise in the public interest; as any less honest or any less conscientious simply because they adopt the more delicate and perhaps the not less effective method of pressing their views privately upon those who for the time being may be in the position of having to mould either into statutes or resolutions the general opinion of the party as a whole. Now, there is a tendency, also, in this country, the moment a member of a political party happens to step out of its ranks, to accept his statements without any criticism, and to adopt his theories, however vague and however ill-considered they may be; and my hon. friend who has just taken his seat is not an exception to the general rule. Although my hon. friend has departed from the party caucus, I fancy that he will not say that upon his mind the dawn of millennial wisdom has come, or that he has freed himself from those failings and faults which are common to our fallen humanity; and I am sure that our hon. friend is far too brave a man to object to his statements being criticised, either from this side or the other side of the House, in connection with the theories which he has advanced in the present debate. I congratulate my hon. friend upon the applause that greeted him from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite; but I tell him we appreciate quite well that they do not applaud him because they love him the more, but simply because they love us the less. I have congratulated my hon. friend thus far. I am sorry, Sir, that I cannot congratulate him upon the resolution which he has presented to this House. In the earlier days of the medical profession, when the science of physical diagnosis was not exceedingly well understood, and when a physician found a case as to the diagnosis of which he was not very well assured, he employed what in those days was called—and it was a very expressive term—a “shot-gun prescription.” In other words, he sought a judicious combination of diuretics, anti-philogistics, expectorants and chologogues, in the hope that if one remedy did not hit, another would. Now, Sir, what is the resolution that my hon. friend has placed upon the Journals of this House on the present occasion? It is a resolution which, if I read it aright, says that we must be loyal, that we must extend particular advantages to Great Britain, our mother country; and, having done that, we must also do it to those favoured nations that

Mr. MONTAGUE.

have treaties with Great Britain. That would not be an act of generosity, because my hon. friend knows that we are compelled to do it if we extend preferential advantages to England; but, having done that, then we are to go to the United States, and I suppose offer some special advantages to them; then we are to go to the colonies and offer some special advantages to them; then we are to go to the other countries of the world and offer some special advantages to them; and then we are to come back to Great Britain in the hope that we shall receive discrimination in her markets in return for the great loyalty and fidelity that we have shown to the British Crown in matters of trade. I confess that it seems to me that the British Government that would refuse to accept such a magnanimous offer as my hon. friend sees fit to make must be a very hard-hearted Government indeed. Now, Sir, I can congratulate my hon. friend on one feature of this matter. In days gone by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been the champion resolution-framer of this Parliament, and I am bound to say—and I give him full credit for his ability in that regard—that he has placed upon the Journals of this House many a specimen that is rare and curious. But, Sir, the laurels have fallen from his brow, and have passed by an easy succession to the brow of my hon. friend from North Simcoe; and I am quite sure that the resolutions of the hon. member for South Oxford will go down to posterity as plain writing, while the resolution which my hon. friend has seen fit to place on the Journals of this House will go down as the hieroglyphics of the present, to puzzle the intelligence and the science of future generations. Now, Sir, the first thing which my hon. friend offers to this House is to lower the tariff towards Great Britain. The hon. gentleman has in his speech made this intention very clear, but he has not made so clear the reason which would impel him to do that, except, as I gathered it, that he wished to take off the burdens from the back of the Canadian farmer. But if the hon. gentleman made that contention in the House this afternoon, he made somewhat another contention recently in the city of Toronto. He made a contention there, that, if we did that, we should have England responding to us in the matter of discriminatory tariffs, and we should thus, in a very short time, enjoy a special advantage in the British market. Now, my hon. friend is a member of the Imperial Federation league. I have the honour of being a very humble member of that league myself, not because I believe that its theories are practicable for the moment, but because underneath its organization and underneath the idea which dictates its policy, is the strong feeling that the ties between this country and the motherland should be widened and strengthened and made more lasting if possible,

Well, the hon. gentleman was the leader of that movement in Canada, and when he was asked to give a practical basis upon which Imperial Federation could be carried out, he refused, up to the end of 1888. In that year I had the honour of attending a great public meeting held in the city of Toronto, of which my hon. friend was the father. And at that meeting my hon. friend propounded anew Howard Vincent's scheme of mutually preferential Imperial trade, and he told the people there that he would have the privilege of bringing such a scheme before this House during the session which was then on. Well, my hon. friend again referred to that scheme the other day in Toronto, and here is what he said at that meeting, held by Mr. Parkin, in the Auditorium :

Will we have the impudence—at least the want of modesty—to call upon Great Britain to change her free trade until we had done something at home? When Canada remembered that her trade was only 3 or 4 per cent of the trade of Great Britain, was it reasonable to expect that England would change her policy in a matter of that kind?

Now, it is interesting to go back for a very short time, in following my hon. friend's course in connection with this Imperial trade movement. In 1888 he placed this motion on the Journals of this House;—it was not reached, but the hon. gentleman strongly supported another motion in the same line exactly, moved by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) :

That it would be in the interests of the Dominion, that such advantages should be sought for in the trade relations in the United Kingdom and Canada as would give to Canada advantages in the markets of the mother country not allowed to foreign states, Canada being levied for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favour of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, and to the financial interests of the Dominion as well.

There was no impudence, no want of modesty there, in the opinion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe. That was the resolution of my hon. friend himself. But my hon. friend has veered round, and to-night he says that this mutual preferential trade is a wild and hazy scheme. He says that it is in the impene- trable future, and that, consequently, we cannot depend much upon it. I want to show this House what the hon. gentleman thought of it in the session of 1888 :

I think I shall be able to satisfy the House that there is good ground to believe and strong ground to hope that there is a party in England which favours the giving of advantages in the English market to the colonies and that this opinion will ere long prevail.

There is a strong probability—

You see, Sir, he is very strong in his opinion—

—there is more than a strong probability that England will be compelled to put a duty on bread stuffs. Either England must fall from her great estate or she must adopt some such policy as I have outlined.

In the hon. gentleman's opinion, there was no cheek, no want of modesty, in advocating the scheme then. It was a perfectly practicable and feasible scheme, calculated to strengthen and make still more lasting the ties between Great Britain and Canada. That was his opinion then. But the hon. gentleman went still further. He went still nearer the Throne, and spoke in favour of this movement in England. Cheek, did he say? Want of modesty, did I hear him say in Toronto? Why, the hon. gentleman himself, under the shadow of the British Throne itself, propounded this policy. He propounded it to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, in his speech at Worcester, England, on 23rd July. He there said :

There must be a policy of give and take.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear," but he wants to give up everything now, and take nothing.

While we on our side must reduce our tariffs to admit your goods, so that you will be able to compete in our markets with all the world, with great advantage; yet, on the other hand, you must admit to your markets the produce of our farmers and our purchasers, on somewhat more favourable terms than you give to our foreign competitors.

Will my hon. friend say that he did not lend a word of encouragement to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), whose eloquent words are still ringing within the shores of the British Isles, and who went over to promote this policy, which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) introduced into this House and proposed to the British people, as well? Now, what is his idea in opening up this whole question and in declaring that it is perfectly mythical and impossible of fulfilment? The other day a motion was moved in Montreal by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), which sounds very like the motion which is upon the Journals of this House, that we should reduce the duties as against Great Britain, yet the hon. gentleman from Simcoe will not say that he has the backing of the Imperial Federation League in Canada in moving the motion which he has placed on the Journals, and which he asks this House to support. The Montreal motion, Sir, was defeated, and he therefore has not the authority of the Imperial Federation League at his back. Now, I recognize at once, that, with regard to the conduct of the hon. gentleman as a member of the Imperial Federation League, this House has no right to have anything to say. But this House has a right, for the sake of its own consistency, when a motion moved last session by my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and endorsed by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and promoted by the Imperial Federation League of this country, was, through the instrumentality of these

gentlemen, accepted and placed upon the Journals of this House, to contrast the past record of my hon. friend on this Imperial Federation question with the motion he asks us to adopt to-day. I think my hon. friend is asking this House to follow him in a ridiculous course, when he asks us to nullify and to express the very antithesis of what he expressed last session, and this simply to gratify his own personal whim or vindictiveness. I want to show for a moment that the hon. gentleman is inconsistent in another regard. In 1891 the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) moved a resolution almost identical with that which my hon. friend has now placed upon the Journals. My hon. friend has admitted to-day that they were almost essentially the same, and at his great meeting in Stayner, only a short time ago, my hon. friend doubted whether he would take some such line as was moved by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), or propose the motion which he has given to this House this afternoon. What did the hon. gentleman then do? Did he stand up and vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)? He stood up in this House, as I very well remember, and voted directly against that resolution. Sir, I have searched the Journals of this House, and I may say to you that, though I have seen some particularly short turns in the careers of would-be statesmen in this Chamber, I have failed to find a shorter turn around the corner than my hon. friend has made in twelve months in proposing the same resolution, in effect, which he voted against one short year ago. It is not very long since my hon. friend declared in Toronto that he had voted for Home Rule; but he explained that it was in the face of an election. But there was no election in 1891, and my hon. friend need not have voted against his convictions: if his motion to-day was his conviction, he need not have voted simply for the purpose of conciliating public opinion in this country. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in regard to these resolutions as to Imperial preferential trade, is in this position: either he was conscientious then or he was not conscientious. He declared in 1888, as to a scheme of Imperial preferential trade, that there was more than a strong probability—which, if I know anything about English, means an almost absolute certainty—that the scheme could be carried out. Now, if the hon. gentleman was not conscientious then—and I believe he was conscientious—how can he ask us to believe that he is conscientious now? If, on the other hand, he was conscientious then, he must admit that his judgment was exceedingly bad, and he cannot ask us in this House to follow in the trade policy of the country the judgment of one who was so exceedingly short-sighted only a year or so ago upon so simple a matter. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, why do we have this resolution of my hon.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

friend upon the Journals of this House? Is it simply for the purpose of showing our loyalty to Great Britain? If it is, I am bound to say I do not think it was necessary. This House, a short time ago, passed unanimously a resolution expressing the opinion that we were bound to stand by Great Britain as the head of the greatest Empire in the world. But, in days gone by, when it was not in so comfortable a position as it is at this time, Canada stood by the heart of the Empire, and I am proud to say to-night that in some of the toughest spots on which British valour and British heroism have been displayed, native Canadians have taken their places and have shown themselves the bravest and most heroic on the field. But, Sir, I ask my hon. friend, does Britain ask that we should make any such concessions as these? Great Britain knows the fight that Canada has upon the continent of America. Great Britain knows that we have a strong neighbour by whose legislation we must to a certain extent be influenced. Great Britain knows that she has a large amount of capital invested in her colonies which she must protect. She knows that in order to keep our credit good, in order to construct public works necessary for the country, we must have a revenue. She knows that we have been carrying on upon this continent the greatest work of nation-building that has been seen within the four corners of her Empire. She knows that we have constructed a grand public work which lends permanency and stability to her Empire more than any work that has been done by any other colony, or even by Great Britain herself for many long years, and she knows that we have done these things without asking her for the contribution of a single cent; and she knows still more, that it is upon the success of Canadian effort that the permanence of British institutions upon the continent of America depends. And, knowing this as she does, she is not the mother country to hamper us or load us down with obligations which in our young and imperfect condition we are unable to carry. But if it is for another purpose, which he outlined in his speech in Toronto, namely, that we shall win the favour of Great Britain by making the reductions which he proposes in this resolution in her favour, I tell my hon. friend that he is labouring in a most futile cause. Does he think for a moment that the miserable three or four per cent—I use his own choice expression here—which he referred to in the city of Toronto as the share of Britain's trade which comes from Canada, does he think for a moment that this will influence the great political party which has the control of British politics? Does he believe that sentiment controls the trade of Great Britain? Does he believe, I say, that the effort which he has made will have the effect which he hopes upon the people of Great Britain? If so, I tell him that he is reckoning altogether without his host. Great

Britain knows. Sir, what it is to reduce her duties and open her markets to the world. We know that when Great Britain proposed free trade it was the belief of many of those who favoured the change that the effect upon the nations would be so great that in a few years all would open their ports to Great Britain. The years are passing by, Sir, but instead of the markets of the world being opened to Great Britain, the bars are being raised against Great Britain and her trade the wide world over, and that movement is gone so far that my hon. friend himself admits to-night that it is not impossible that in the future Great Britain may adopt protective measures herself. Now, Sir, I want for a moment to refer to the wording of this resolution in regard to this preferential trade. I do not think it is written for the purpose of misleading this House; that would be impossible. I do not think it is written for the purpose of misleading the country, but I tell my hon. friend that it might have that effect. The statement is made, "in whose markets all Canadian products are admitted free." The hon. gentleman might justly have written it, "in whose markets the products of every other country are free as well." The hon. gentleman has stated very fairly that we have no advantage in the markets of Britain. If we sell our cheese there, as we do, it is because we make a cheese that will compare favourably with any cheese which is manufactured on the continent of Europe. If we sell our apples there, it is because our soil and climate produce those apples which are most toothsome to the British people, and which keep best during the winter months. If we sell our butter there, it is because we are making a better article of butter, and I am glad to know that the trade has doubled within the past year. If we sell our wheat and flour there, it is because our great North-west, as well as the older provinces, produce the best breadstuffs to be found in the world at the present time. The hon. gentleman knows that on one occasion we had preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain. He knows that for a time we had advantages there for our breadstuffs and our timber. And he knows perfectly well that instead of being controlled by any sentiment in favour of the British colonies, when the time came for Britain to take down the bars and allow the products of the world to come free into her markets, she disregarded the view of the British colonies, expressed in special protest and prayer in our behalf, and she let down the bars, and there are men here to-night who are old enough, I fancy, to remember the prostration of Canadian business that followed. I am only saying that England is not controlled by sentiment, and my hon. friend knows very well that the position I take is the proper position in that regard. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved a resolution here

in 1891. The resolution was this: That we should take down the bars as against the United States, reduce our duties against the people of the United States, and then, having done that, we could go to the people of the United States and ask them to make a favourable trade arrangement with us. The hon. gentleman's resolution is the same, except that England is substituted for the United States. He says, now, let us go to Great Britain and say to them: We have taken off 10 per cent from our duties, we are giving you an advantage in our market; and the hon. gentleman ought to know that we are thereby giving away that with which some time we may be able to make a splendid arrangement with Great Britain in connection with the mutual preferential trade between England and Canada. Now, then, the hon. gentleman says: But we do not do that. Why, we can go to England and say that we will take off the rest. Of course, to theoretical politicians, revenues do not amount to anything. Revenue is nothing to them. The hon. gentleman says: I am going to have a revenue tariff; but in the very next moment he says: If that don't satisfy England, we will take off the balance of the tariff, and the revenue may go. Now, Sir, I was not exactly satisfied with the statement of the hon. gentleman as regards the manner in which he was about to raise the revenue—because he admitted that about \$3,000,000 of revenue would be destroyed. How will he raise it? By direct taxation, or by duties upon tea and coffee, as would hon. gentlemen with whom he is consorting? But he says that is rather an unimportant matter, because, though he did not lay it down as a principle, he suggested that very possibly the imports would be greater, and that consequently the revenue would be greater in that regard. The hon. gentleman must remember that that was not the experience of the past. He must remember that when we had low duties against Great Britain, our imports from Great Britain lessened, year by year, until they fell from \$68,500,000 in 1873, to \$39,000,000 in 1878; all of which goes to show that if our trade with Great Britain is to be profitable to her, and if we are to buy a large amount of goods from the mother country, it must be by making our own industries prosperous and having a large amount of money in circulation among our people. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's other contention? He says we are going to make up the revenue by an increase of imports. Does he know the natural sequence of that, that we must depreciate Canadian industries by bringing in the products of cheap British labour, and shutting out our own people from our workshops and from our factories in our own country? In other words, if the imports are lessened, the revenue will be gone, and if the revenue is sustained, our workshops and our industries will be gone on account of the increased importations from abroad. Now, then, Mr.

Speaker. I want, for a moment, to show that if all the disadvantages to which I have referred are brushed aside, there is another disadvantage—to which my hon. friend did not refer at any length to-night—and that is the disadvantage that we shall raise recriminatory feelings in the breasts of other people with whom we may seek to secure trade upon better terms. The hon. gentleman says himself, in his resolution, that we had better go to the United States—and I shall deal with that a little later on—and secure a market there. Well, Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that we are friendly to the people of the United States on trade matters. We have always held from this side of the House that they have some things to sell which we could, with advantage, buy from them, and that we have some things to sell which we could sell them with advantage, and that they could buy with advantage as well. But the hon. gentleman sees, he must see at a glance, that the resolution which he asks this House to adopt is a resolution that would at once stir up the feelings of the people of the United States, and shut out the probability of our securing a settlement of the difficulties which we have with them, and, perchance, a better trade arrangement with the new Administration. Now, what does my hon. friend propose to do all this for? Practically, that we may lessen the burdens upon the farming population of the country. I congratulate my hon. friend upon having taken the farmers of this country to his bosom: but I do not congratulate him upon the fact that it has been the stock in trade of hon. gentlemen opposite for many a day, and he is only putting himself into those worn out garments in which the Opposition has presented an exceedingly shabby appearance from 1878 to 1893. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? He says: We will relieve the burdens of the farmers by dealing with Great Britain, and by lessening our tariff against her. Now, I admit that on one or two articles there would be a lessening of burdens, but I tell my hon. friend again that he is dealing with a matter of which he does not seem to have any very great practical knowledge; because the articles that we import from Great Britain are largely luxuries, and do not bear upon the farmer at all. I admit that in the question of iron, perhaps, and in the question of some fabrics there may be a burden upon the farmer, to a certain extent; but I tell him—and, if he likes, I will read him a list of the articles which are imported from Great Britain—that he will not be considered as great a friend of the farmer, supposing he could secure this reduction. I think they would look upon him as Goldsmith looked upon his friends, when he said that they always sent him a ruffle when he badly needed a shirt. Now, Sir, what is the fact? I fancy I see my hon. friend from North Simcoe canvassing a farmer upon his platform of tariff reform. He goes into the house of this hard-working farmer and he

says: My dear friend, I see that your floors are bare. I am going to lessen the duties against Great Britain in order that you may put Brussels carpet upon these floors. I see that your hands and your face are brown, and I intend to reduce the duty in order that you may have silk parasols and English kid gloves. The Minister of Finance is a temperance crank, and you have to drink tea, or coffee or cold water. I propose to reduce the duty on ale, on Dublin stout, on brandy, on gin, on wine and whiskey. In order that your farmers' wives and daughters may be comfortably clad, I propose to reduce the duty on silk ribbons, on laces, on velvets, on fringes, on bracelets and on artificial flowers. But the farmer says: You have not taken any duty off our agricultural implements. Then my hon. friend from Simcoe says: I am coming to that after awhile, and I am going to make bicycles free, in order to reduce the burdens upon the shoulders of the farmers. More than that: It was stated by an individual in the country, a son-in-law of the member for North Simcoe I understand, that there are to be Thompson-Conservatives, and—if you will pardon me, Sir—that there are to be McCarthy-Conservatives; and while the Thompson-Conservatives may go around in their old slouch hats of Canadian make, the hon. gentleman from Simcoe proposes to reduce the duty so that every McCarthy-Conservative shall step up in line with a shiny tile silk hat. Now, what does his resolution propose to do? He lessens the duties against a country from which the imports are largely luxuries. I hope that is not the policy of this Government. I hope the policy of this Government is to increase the duties upon luxuries, so that gentlemen like my hon. friend from North Simcoe—and I am glad he is able to do it—may be compelled to pay more to the revenue of this farmer than the farmer, who does not use a silk hat, who does not use bicycles, and whose tastes or necessities do not impel him to the use of artificial flowers, bracelets, silk ribbons, velvet, whiskey, wine and gin, and all those costly luxuries which are imported from Great Britain. I hope that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance comes to revise his tariff, he will take the very opposite tack to that which is recommended by the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe. Now, Sir, I want to say to my hon. friend one word more in regard to his Stayner speech. My hon. friend does not seem to be exceedingly sure about his judgment on the trade question even yet. In his Stayner speech, delivered on the day before this House opened, he will not deny that he declared that he would extend the same privileges to the colonies as he did to Great Britain; he would take the duties off goods coming from the colonies, to a certain extent, as well as off those coming from Great Britain. He is not very sure as a party leader, he is not altogether certain of his opinions, because he has dropped that in the resolution which he has placed before the House to-

day. Why is that? Has he changed his well-founded, well-grounded opinions again? The hon. gentleman cries out against combines, and I shall have a few words to say with respect to that point further on; but, in passing, I want to say that my hon. friend's political methods have warmed into existence a variety of combine that has been exceedingly peculiar. One combine is this: The hon. member for North Simcoe says he will not vote for any resolution which discriminates against Great Britain, yet he places upon the Journals of this Parliament a resolution, which is cheered by hon gentlemen opposite, and for which, strange to say, with charming consistency, they will vote—in other words, a combination between political antithesis for the purpose of puzzling and annoying and defeating the Conservative Government of Canada at the present moment. I want to deal now with another phase of this question. The hon. gentleman says these industries have been long enough established, that the National Policy has been long enough in vogue to do the work which it was intended it should do. In beginning this branch of the subject, I wish to say this, that the hon. member for North Simcoe is not at all in the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. They declared that they would uproot the National Policy industries from the beginning; they declared that the National Policy was wrong in its inception, wrong in its theory, and wrong in its practice and wrong in its influence from beginning to end. The hon. gentleman says that is not so. The hon. gentleman says that he was in favour of the principle of the encouragement of home industries. There was no necessity of his saying so, because his declarations in calmer, cooler and more satisfied moments have made that exceedingly plain. But he has taken on himself to outline a policy for the Government and for the Parliament of Canada. And having taken upon himself to outline that policy, I suppose he has thoroughly studied the whole question from beginning to end, also the history of industries, not only in Canada, but in every country under the sun; and I suppose he is prepared, as he ought to be, to give this House, the result of wide study, of wide research and of the very best information he can secure on this question. When the hon. gentleman is consulted on a point of law, he not only goes to the statutes of the present, but he goes to the case law as well. He sees what the decisions have been in similar cases. Now, at the present moment I ask him not to look alone at the condition of the to-day, but to go to the case law to get the experience of the past, to go to those countries where industries have been established, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the truth or falsity of his conclusions. Sir, the hon. gentleman has admitted that the National Policy was necessary for the establishment of Canadian industries. I take it for granted that he will not deny

that fact now. He has not done so in his speech, and if it were necessary I could quote line after line delivered at Stayner recently, in which he said the life was being ground out of Canadian industries under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the National Policy was necessary for the industries of this country. That being agreed, let us go for a moment to other countries. Let us look at the countries of Europe, and there the hon. gentleman will find a long list of protective measures extended to industries in order to establish them, whether he takes Belgium, or Germany, or France, or others if he choose. If he go to the United States of America he will find, not a tariff history of thirteen or fourteen years, but a tariff history extending from 1789 up to the present moment to promote, advance and protect American industries. There was one break in 1846, and that was the only break the American people have had, and they repaired it a short time afterwards, because they saw they had made a mistake. I do not intend to engage in a wordy discussion with the hon. gentleman as to whether the American people have lately adopted free trade or not. The hon. gentleman will see in a very short time whether his statements are true; but I will tell him this, that if he expects the American people have passed on that question in favour of free trade, or in favour of the destruction of protection to American industries, he will find he is exceedingly mistaken when the policy of the new American Government comes into force. For if the new President did personally hold such an opinion, he would find that the American people would rise in their might at the very first opportunity and reverse any verdict it was supposed they had given in that regard.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman may jeer, but I will tell him that I will be in this House when it will be shown that I was right and that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was wrong. So far as England is concerned, every one who has studied its economic history for a moment knows that it reached its splendid position through a long and continued history of protection; not a protection of thirteen or fifteen years, but a protection of her industries for five centuries. Go back, if you like, to 1307, when she placed prohibitive duties on the exportation of her wool, when she placed prohibitive duties on importations of wool from abroad and made those penalties almost the penalties, and in some cases really the penalties of death for the infringement of her Customs laws. Even until 1842 she prevented the exportation of machinery, in order that she might not have competition from abroad. Take her history of the silk industry. First, placing on high duties, then trebling those duties, and then passing prohibitory Acts in order to prevent her silk

goods coming in from the outside. So with regard to iron, and so with regard to her great merchant marine, of which Britons everywhere are proud, which was thoroughly established, as every one knows, by her prohibitory navigation laws passed during the time of the Protectorate. Yet, my hon. friend says, in the face of all this history of industries elsewhere: we have done sufficient during thirteen or fourteen years of the National Policy; we have established our industries so that we can expose them to the winds from every quarter of the world, and know they will stand; and, if they do not stand, they should not stand, is his verdict. The policy of this Government has been somewhat ridiculed by the hon. gentleman to-night. The hon. gentleman asked, in his Stayner speech, whether there is to be no remission of duties and if the National Policy is never to be changed. He has answered that question himself. He has declared that it has been changed in days gone by. He was correct. I am proud to say. It has been changed sometimes for purposes of revenue, it has been changed sometimes by the change from ad valorem to specific duties for the purpose of preventing frauds on the revenue; it has been changed sometimes for the purpose of establishing and maintaining new industries which it was thought might take root in Canada, and it has been changed, as my hon. friend did not, with the fairness we should have expected from him, tell his constituents in North Simcoe, by relieving the people from millions of dollars of taxation under the policy of the present Administration. The position of the Government to-day is a most tenable one when they state they will inquire into the whole matter and that they will change the duty as the necessities of the country require. And when my hon. friends on this side of the House and myself are voting against the resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), we are not by any means voting that monopoly shall be maintained; we are not by any means voting that we have any feeling against Great Britain; but we are voting that we have confidence in this Administration—as he had till he was not consulted—owing to its history in the past, to do justice by the people in every regard in the future. Now then, Sir, I have briefly sketched the declaration of the Government. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) objects to it because, he says, there is no reason for delay. Why, the hon. gentleman's movements upon the question of Imperial or mutual preferential trade ought to warn himself and this House that we make haste slowly upon these matters. I see that clubs named after my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) are being established in various parts of Canada. I see that they have laid down no definite idea upon the tariff as their policy. It is wise that they have not done so, for if the hon. gentleman's future is to be judged—and I say it

Mr. MONTAGUE.

pleasantly—by his past, they might wake up some morning to find the whole platform upon which they had built floated out from under them, and they might find themselves without a policy and without anything to maintain and sustain them. What is the reason for his great haste? My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) says: Oh, the suffering masses of Canada! Oh, the burdens that are bearing upon the farmers of this country! We must change the tariff on their account. But my hon. friend answered the first part of his speech in the last part of it. He told about the horrible burdens that bore upon the Canadian farmer, and he wound up by showing us that the only farmers that we could for a moment think of comparing the farmers of Canada with were a thousand times worse off than the farmers of this Dominion. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) who is now in his seat, and who complained so loudly about the burdens upon the Canadian farmers—I ask him to rise now, and I want him to answer, and it is his duty to do so, and to name, that this House and this country may know them, any class of farmers under the broad heavens that are better off than the Canadian farmer. I pause for an answer, Sir. I ask him again. I hope my hon. friend will name them.

Mr. CAMERON. He cannot find them in America.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He will not name them in America; he will not name them in Europe. He is silent; yet, here is my hon. friend in the position of weeping and wailing in the Canadian Parliament over Canadian farmers, who, he admits, are the best-off farmers under the sun. The hon. gentleman may perhaps say that silence does not always give consent. Well, let us see. The hon. gentleman told us to-night that he favoured the National Policy at its inception; but he does not think it has done just as it ought to have done. The hon. gentleman guarded himself, I am bound to say, somewhat cleverly by quoting from his speeches in order that those who followed might not quote them. I want to show the hon. gentleman that he did not quote all his speeches, and for fear that he may have forgotten them—and they are good speeches, and I am bound to say that he pounded home his facts with a magnificent logic that he has not applied in the promotion to his new ideas—I want to read these speeches of the hon. gentleman for his information and for the information of the House. He will see that he said in 1888:

The policy has been beneficial on the whole.

He said that after the National Policy had been in force nine years, mind you.

The condition of our people will compare favourably with that of any other people who are known to us, or of any other people that we are brought in contact with, and I am sure it will be found that the policy we adopted here, and which the country has

twice ratified by a very large vote, has on the whole been exceedingly beneficial.

And now I wish my hon. friend to watch this, and to place it alongside of his statement that the National Policy is actually causing disloyalty :

And whatever may be now said of the difficulties we are labouring under, they are not at all attributable to the policy of protection known as the National Policy, but to causes over which we in this Parliament have no more control than have the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland.

I shall quote again from this magnificent speech of his—a really magnificent speech, which I was thinking of when he was painfully working to show the beauties of his new policy—a magnificent speech which he delivered in Bowmanville in 1887. He says :

I need not say—

And I fancy I can see the satisfaction that beamed upon his handsome countenance when he said it—

I need not say that the National Policy is necessary for this country and that it has brought comfort to many a home.

After nine years of experience of the National Policy the hon. gentleman stated that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where was that reported ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the " Standard," the last copy of the " Standard." The speech was made in February, 1887, and my hon. friend will find it on the last page of the " Standard " newspaper that is bound in the Library. On 30th April, 1887, he said again :

I may say at once at the outset that I do not admit that what we know as the National Policy has been a failure.

Why, Sir, his conversion has been as sudden as the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, on the road to Damascus ; but instead of going as Saul did, to preach the Gospel of peace and contentment, my hon. friend is going abroad to preach the gospel of gloom and despair. Further on, the hon. gentleman said :

I do not desire to join the band which is sufficiently large in my view, altogether too large, who are always proclaiming that the people of this country are worse off than the people of any other country.

What does my hon. friend say to-day ? Changed conditions ! Where are they ? Changed conditions, does he say ? Let him point them out to us. We have more industries ; that he has admitted. We have more people employed ; that he will admit. We have more capital, our trade is extending, our credit is better in the markets of the world, and there is more money in the savings banks, a fact which, in that same speech at Bowmanville, he declared was a test of the people's prosperity. There is more money in the banks. There are more bank notes in circulation. The prices are very much lower than they were in 1887 ; and

yet my hon friend says : Oh, the burdens that are falling on the people. He says it is Customs burdens now. He said then :

I need not say that the National Policy is necessary for this country, that it has brought prosperity to many a home, and that the burdens that fell on the people were not of the National Policy.

And yet, look at the facts : The Customs per head in that year was \$4.83 ; last year it was \$4.25 ; and yet my hon. friend says : Oh, the burdens that are falling upon the people. Now, I want for a moment or so to refer to that Bowmanville speech again. He was replying there to the Hon. Edward Blake, who had just a little while before adopted the National Policy and gone back upon the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) said (I do not read it all, through it is a magnificent speech—I only give the pithy sentences.) :

I would like to know how Mr. Blake is, after his acrobatic feat.

I am bound to say the word is a splendid one :

He had opposed the National Policy, but now supports it. He would like to know how the Hon. Edward Blake could face the people, as he had gone back on all the principles he had ever advocated. He had done all this simply to oust the Government from office.

History repeats itself, Sir !

Mr. Blake was now supporting the National Policy—why ? He says the conditions are changed. What conditions ? Simply that he could now see what he could not see for eight years before.

Then my hon. friend gets rather sympathetic in his tone, and remembering that there was one hard-hearted sinner—and I use the word, of course, in a Parliamentary sense, Sir—who could not see and could not agree with Mr. Blake, he says :

And Sir Richard could not even see yet. Poor Sir Richard ! There never was a more melancholy sight than poor Sir Richard.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it was all a question of eyesight. Now, the scales had fallen from the eyes of the Hon. Edward Blake ; with age his eyesight had improved. I am sorry to say that the eyesight of my hon. friend from North Simcoe has not improved with age. Then he grew sympathetic once more, and he said :

Now, what about the poor followers ? I do pity some of those poor honest Reformers. There are honest Reformers, you know, who have been telling of the beauties of free trade and all the wrongs of our protectionist policy. Have these men jumped Jim Crow with the same agility as their leaders ?

But, recovering himself, he says :

They are to go, but whom will they follow ? They will become sheep without a shepherd.

My hon. friend is in the reverse position : he is a shepherd without sheep, unless he esti-

mates the hon. member for Muskoka as a flock.

Mr. COCHRANE. He has one goat.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, Sir, it is exceedingly interesting to look at the hon. gentleman's record on the National Policy. In 1879 he declared that he supported it; he supported it in 1880; he supported it in 1881; he supported it in 1882; he supported it in 1883; he supported it in 1884; he supported it in 1885; he supported it in 1886; he supported it in 1887; he supported it in 1888. Now, by his statement made at Stayner, he said that he had always been consulted by the chieftain of the Conservative party, and I believe that is quite true, because he was a firm friend of his leader and was in his confidence to a very large extent. But if he was consulted by the right hon. gentleman, he was as responsible as anybody else, perhaps more so, for the policy which that chieftain placed before this country. Well, Sir, in 1891 my hon. friend accepted a Conservative nomination, and in his speech at Stayner he declared that he agreed in the main with the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, and those points on which he disagreed with the party were so small that he did not see fit at his nomination to address to his convention a single word with regard to them. And then, Sir, there came that trying time in the history of the Conservative party, and in the history of this country, when the old chieftain, who, through many a year, in storm and in sunshine (thank God, mostly in sunshine) had been the chiefest hand in guiding the destinies of Canada, lay at "Earncliffe," on the banks of the Ottawa, fighting a hopeless contest with a relentless foe, from the result of which there was no appeal. And I remember, Sir, when the end came, the Conservative members of this House and the other House, with sad and gloomy hearts, met in the room to the left, to express our sorrow for the demise of the greatest Canadian that has ever occupied a place in our public affairs; and I remember that my hon. friend from North Simcoe, as the mouth-piece of the Conservatives of the two Houses on that occasion, penned an address to the widow of the deceased statesman, the words of which were these:

We should have been unworthy followers of our departed chief if we gave away to despondency; rather shall we, remembering his patriotic counsels and noble example, earnestly endeavour to carry on the great work so dear to his heart and for which he laboured so long and so successfully, the consolidation of a united, free and prosperous Canadian nationality on this northern continent, in connection with the great Empire of which it forms no insignificant part.

Sir, these were our sentiments then. They were our sentiments when we left the silent Catarqui cemetery and came back here to perpetuate our great leader's memory by

Mr. MONTAGUE.

carrying on the work which he had inaugurated and which he had so nearly carried to a successful completion. They were our sentiments through the longest and stormiest session of the Parliament of Canada, during which my hon. friend, I remember perfectly, was not fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, but was enjoying himself abroad. They were our sentiments in the by-elections, in which we fought the policy of commercial union from Marquette on the west to the sea on the east, without the hon. member for North Simcoe, and came back here with the grandest majority the Conservative party has had since Confederation. They are, Sir, our sentiments yet. We are going along the line of the address which my hon. friend wrote to the widow of the deceased chieftain; and I call his attention to the fact that instead of going along that line, instead of joining with us hand in hand and heart with heart in the promotion of these principles, he is joining with the lifetime enemies of the chieftain who is gone, for the purpose of defeating the followers and successors whom he has left behind, for the purpose of destroying the effects of his patriotic and progressive policy. Now, Sir, this is an exceedingly delicate matter, and I would not for a moment have referred to it had it not been that the hon. gentleman has made the matter public himself. At the meeting at Stayner he made a speech to his constituents in which he declared his reason for sitting on the cross benches of the House of Commons. He there declared:

It is not so much a matter of policy, gentlemen, which has driven me out of the ranks; it is, gentlemen, as a man of honour with regard to all these circumstances, I cannot do otherwise than back out, as I am not worthy of being consulted. That is one of the taunts against me: "we have formed an administration without consulting Dalton McCarthy." That is perfectly true, and that for the first time since I have been in public life a government has been formed by the leaders of my party without my being consulted. I am unworthy of being consulted. If I am not worthy of being let into their confidence and into their councils, I can only speak out to you in open meeting what I believe to be right. Had the circumstances been different it would have been my duty and privilege and pride to induce them to adopt the policy which in the interests of the country I believe to be the best.

That is the statement as reported in the Toronto "Empire." The "Telegram" had a report in these words:

It is not so much a question of policy that has driven me out of the ranks; it is the first time since I have been in public life, that I have been ignored in the formation of a new Government. If I cannot be taken into the confidence of the councils of my party, it is time I asserted my independence.

The "Mail's" report said:

It is not as much a question of policy that has driven me out of the ranks. It is the first time since I have been in public life, that I have been ignored in the formation of a new Government. If I cannot be

taken into the confidence of the councils of my party, it is time for me to assert my independence.

I am aware that the hon. gentleman has explained this report and declared that he did not mean that. I can only say that these words, as reported by the different newspapers, are almost the same in each, and he must have said something very close to it. But, writing a letter to Mr. Long, the president of his association, he declared :

I think I made it plain, at least I tried to do so, that my reason for severing my connection with the Ministerial party was due to the fact that I had been attacked by the Government organ, which attack I thought must have been inspired by the Administration, or if not so inspired had not been denied or repudiated, and therefore, I had no other alternative but that of holding the Government responsible for it.

The Government had nothing to do with it, as I happen to know, but I do not intend to enter into the merits of that discussion. I may say that in this statement there is not a word about the trade policy. The reason which he gives for the calling of the meeting is the reason that the "Empire" had attacked him. He does not say that he had any objection to the trade policy of the Government. There is not a word about the trade policy of the Government. It is a marvellous reason for his right-about-face that the people will understand. But, notwithstanding that, in the resolution now before the House he asks us to believe that it is notorious that the trade policy of the Government is a curse almost to the people of Canada. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he has arrived at his conclusion? When did he discover it? I would like to ask him how he has changed his opinion so rapidly. I would like to ask him whom he has consulted as to the trade of this country. How much time has he spent in seeing business men and visiting business industries? And I would like to know how much practical study he has given to the question, because he did not display that practical study in his speech this afternoon. I would ask him how he has come to change his mind, or whether the reason for his attack upon this side of the House is to be found—and I am not suggesting that it is, though these Sir, are ominous words—in this statement :

Now, I will see what will be done. The *Empire* may in a moment of insanity, or some person may have got hold of the editorial columns and may have written this article which has certainly not given any strength to the Conservative party throughout the Dominion, because even a member may be of some consequence. Even insignificant as I am, I may be of some consequence. Some men labouring under a delusion may have got hold of it. I will abide my time.

I want the hon. gentleman to say whether that was the reason, or whether he has become converted owing to the changed conditions of the industries which he has found from a careful study of that question. I only repeat, Sir, those words were ominous

words. Now, it is a strange sight indeed if the gentleman, who in his speech declares he is a National Policy man, because he says :

I am a National Policy man.

We are all National Policy men. And to the people of North Simcoe he says this :

And if we could settle this Manitoba question, we could still afford to spread out upon trade matters while adhering to the National Policy in all its integrity.

I am dwelling on this question, not for the purpose of sneering at the hon. gentleman, not for the purpose of charging him with anything, but for the purpose of showing that his utterances in his Stayner speech, in which he announced his departure from the Conservative party, seemed to contain other reasons than those he has given to this House to-night. I was amused at hearing the hon. gentleman say that he was not a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. He denied that emphatically. He had no part with them, he said. I can only say that I am afraid my hon. friend is in a dangerous position. When I saw the smiles that crossed between him and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who seems not to be that most melancholy sight of days gone by, I remembered another speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Speaking in this House, in 1878, he said : It was well known that the hon. gentleman who now sits for South Oxford had desired to be Finance Minister some years ago, and that he quarrelled with his leaders and deserted his party. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that was false. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said he did not know what the hon. gentleman termed false, but he knew the hon. gentleman did desert his party ; that the hon. gentleman claimed to be independent, and that the hon. gentleman had balanced himself upon the pole of independence until he fell into the very ready arms of hon. gentlemen opposite. I can only say that I am afraid my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is upon the other end of the pole, and that the easy descent which the hon. member for South Oxford found may be found alike by my hon. friend. Still another problem strikes me in regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman says it is absolutely necessary to reform the tariff at once. How will the hon. gentleman do it? It is absolutely necessary, he says, to reduce these duties at once. How will the hon. gentleman do it? The Government have said : we will arrange the tariff next session, when the full information is before us. They have said : we will take the very best means to ascertain the situation of each industry, its requirements and necessities, and we will rearrange the tariff next session. How will my hon. friend do it before? Suppose he defeats the Government by this resolution. A new Govern-

ment will have to be formed—and formed out of hon. gentlemen opposite, mark you, Sir.—new elections will have to be held, the House will have to be reassembled, there will have to be a new session, a new tariff will have to be brought down, and so my hon. friend will find the months slipping by and the year around, just as the year will come around, even if this Government continues to occupy its place, as it will, Sir, and to carry out its promises, as it will. The hon. gentleman is asking for undue haste. He does not consider for the moment the interests that are involved. Speaking in 1878, he declared that it was criminal on the part of the Mackenzie Administration not to protect the industries of the country, because there were \$77,000,000 invested in them, because these industries paid wages amounting to \$40,000,000, and he desired to know whether those people who had invested that capital had not a right to the protection of the Government. What do we find now? We find \$353,000,000 invested; we find 367,000 employees; we find \$100,000,000 paid in wages; and we find \$475,000,000 of annual products. And yet my hon. friend says: let us with a stroke of the pen, without inquiring into these matters, take away the protection from these industries, and perhaps destroy them entirely. Why, he admitted here to-day that there were 168,333 people employed directly on account of the National Policy, people who would not be employed if the National Policy were not in force. What does that mean? It means that there are 600,000 souls in this Dominion, counting 3½ people to each man, who labour in these factories—600,000 souls depending on the National Policy—and yet my hon. friend will take away the National Policy with a stroke of his pen and drive these men and these women into the same condition in which he described the people as being in the streets of London and the streets of New York, in abject misery and want. Sir, if there were reason to protect the industries in 1878, when he spoke in his manful voice in favour of it, there is still stronger reason for us to continue the system which keeps so many men and women employed. Then, Sir, I want to deal for a few moments with another phase of the question. I wish to deal with some statements that were made by my hon. friend this afternoon. I must confess that his charges against the National Policy were somewhat disappointing. They were the old charges which we have been in the habit of listening to in this Chamber ever since the enactment of the statute which brought this policy into force, and which my hon. friend has answered many a time with a force which he has not brought to the support of his new contentions to-day. Now, Sir, I read this motion, and I find in it some statements which seem to me extraordinary. I expected that when the hon. gentleman came to the House to make his speech he

Mr. MONTAGUE.

would give us proof. What were his proofs? He made statements that would put the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the blush; he made statements the most extraordinary that have ever been given in the Parliament of Canada; but he did not bring any proof of them, except to read the "Globe" newspaper in support of them; and when my hon. friend is driven to have recourse to the "Globe" to prove his assertions against the Government of this country, it must be admitted that he is hard up for arguments. I have no fault to find with the "Globe" newspaper, nor with its correspondents, one of whom, the gentleman he named, I know very well and respect very highly. But it is the business of the "Globe" to destroy this Government, and when the hon. gentleman takes the "Globe" as the only line of proof he has for his assertions, I repeat that he is exceedingly hard up for political capital. One of the first statements in this resolution is that the National Policy is making the people disloyal, and he proves that from the "Globe," and the only alternative, he said, was annexation—

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend will wait a moment. What he said was that the "Globe" newspaper's correspondent said that he found a feeling in some parts that the only remedy was annexation. What does that statement lead to? He says that the National Policy causes disloyalty, and my hon. friend seems to think highly of the assertion. Disloyalty is either general against the mother country or it is based upon some specific desire to desert the British Empire and join another country. Can it be general disloyalty? No; because Great Britain has had nothing to do with the National Policy. Is it a specific desire on the part of the people of Canada to join with the United States due to the National Policy? If so, it is an extraordinary thing that people are becoming disloyal under a tariff of 30 per cent and exceedingly anxious to join a people who are living under a tariff of 60 per cent. Observe the sequence of the hon. gentleman's statements. He wept over the combines which he said had been formed in Canada; he told us that disloyalty was caused by these combines, and then he said there was this desire to join the people of the United States, and followed it up with a description of those gigantic combines that were ruining the people of the United States as well. Sir, that is an extraordinary sequence of statements and it is an argument I have never heard addressed to this Chamber before. Then he followed with another statement that on the articles manufactured in this country the people were robbed of about \$90,000,000 a year. Shades of Arithmetic! That is the statement that I meant would put the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to

the blush. The hon. member for South Oxford, who is rather free in his use of phrases and figures, declared to this House that the manufacturers were stealing \$30,000,000 a year. But my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to use the language of my hon. sabbatarian friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) saw him and went him better and made it \$90,000,000. Sir, I do not think it worth while to answer that, because, when the people see my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), with all his vitriolic opposition to Her Majesty's Government, says they are only stealing \$30,000,000, and then they see that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says the robbery amounts to \$90,000,000, they will say that the hon. member for North Simcoe does not know what he is talking about; so I feel there is no necessity for answering that statement to-night. Now, Sir, another statement that he made was that the foundries of this country—the statement being based upon a most extraordinary system of calculation which I have not time to go into in detail—were making 66 per cent profit each year. Why, if the hon. member were to compute his law business and charge up mucilage and stationery as raw material, and take that from his income, I venture to say it would not be much more than 66 per cent profit. The statement is absurd, as the hon. gentleman must surely know. No foundry in Canada to-day, I am credibly informed, is paying more than an average return upon the investment, and a great many of them are not doing that at the present time, so keen is the competition. When the statement made by my hon. friend goes out to the business men of this country it will show the fitness of the hon. member to deal with trade and fiscal matters for the Dominion of Canada, setting his information, as he does, against the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and against those of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). The hon. gentleman said further that these factories prevented competition. He said that we were promised competition and that we did not get it. But he said he did not believe that the fiscal policy proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, commercial union with the people of the United States, would do us any good in this respect. Now, how does the hon. gentleman harmonize these two statements? He says we have combines and no competition, and yet he says that by opening up our markets to the people of the United States we will get no advantage, notwithstanding the great industries they have in that country. And then he talks of coal oil and says that coal oil is a great combination. He forgot to say that the price of Canadian coal oil to-day was about 7 cents, 7¼ cents to 7½ cents in bulk at Petrolea, and that it is selling to-day in the city of Toronto for about 12½ cents per gallon. And how does he hope to

rid us from the combines? I want to read to him what an American journal, "The Paint, Oil and Drug Review," says as to the remedy he proposes to take—that of allowing the Standard Company into Canada:

We appreciate the fact that it would be policy upon the part of this country to have free entry into Canada for its crude and refined petroleum or any and all other products of our soil and workshops. It would be considered patriotic, therefore, for the "Review" to advocate the abolition by Canada of the duty which the Standard is working to have removed. But in the present instance there is a very large nigger in the wood pile which the public do not see. If the independent petroleum interests here were as powerful as the Standard, and would receive their share of the benefit, it would be quite another thing, and would inure to the advantage of this country; but, as the petroleum industry exists in these United States, the advantages of free entry into Canada would only fill the coffers of a corporation whose very existence is a menace to the prosperity of our country, an organization which violates its laws with impunity, tramples on the rights of its citizens, bankrupts all honest competitors that it can, and is un-American in all its instincts.

It is stated that refined petroleum from these states is preferred to the Canadian refined, and is purchased by the Canadian even though it costs ten cents a gallon at retail more than the product of their home wells. If this is so—if it sells anyway—why need Canada reduce its revenue in favour of a foreign corporation which would use its newly acquired power to crush out all Canadian competition, with the eventuality of charging the public there even higher prices than they now pay?

That is the opinion of an American newspaper, with especial knowledge of its subject, with regard to the remedy which my hon. friend proposes. Now, the hon. gentleman said here this afternoon that there was no great industry in Canada that was not under a combine. That is another evidence that the hon. gentleman knows exceedingly little about it. Can he name a combine in woollen manufacturing? Referring to tweeds, I want to call his attention to a speech he made at Stayner, in which he said:

Take, for instance, a piece of tweed which you would buy in Scotland for £2. It costs \$10 here. The duty is 35 per cent upon it, and it is therefore \$13.50, \$10 being the original cost and \$3.50 the duty. Add per cent for carriage and freight and you bring it up to \$14. That \$3.50 goes into the revenue.

Now, my hon. friend touched a subject he never should have touched. If there is an industry in this country that is not under a combine it is the tweed industry, it is the woollen industry. My hon. friend knows, if he has studied the subject, that there is no combine in tweeds, and he knows that the prices of tweeds in Canada to-day are cheaper, quality being considered, than in any other country under the sun. Why, when one of these advocates of tariff reform was speaking in the country, he said to the old chairman who presided over his meeting, an intelligent farmer: "Why, Mr. Chairman, for the very coat that is on your back you pay 50 cents a yard more on account of the National Policy." The old chairman was surprised, and he responded:

"Well, that is a most peculiar thing, because it only cost me 35 cents, all told." The fact is to-day that tweeds are being sold at from 28 cents upward, that the highest dividend which has been paid by any company manufacturing tweeds in Canada during the past few years, is only 4 per cent per half year, and the vast majority of them have not paid any dividend at all. Yet my hon. friend, in his speech at Stayner, cites the price of tweed as an argument against the National Policy. What careful farmer cares whether there is a duty on Scotch tweed? I wear Canadian tweed; 99 per cent of hon. members in this House wear Canadian tweed; and if my hon. friend is the hundredth man and wears Scotch tweed, let him wear it and let him pay the tax to the revenue in consequence. Now, my hon. friend spoke this afternoon about agricultural implements. He dealt in generalities again. I ask him to remember that he did not cite a single instance where the Canadian people pay more for agricultural implements than the American people do. There is no use in making a comparison with Britain, because the British people do not manufacture the kind of implements we want. Now, what are the facts? To-day a binder in the United States costs, on the average, \$125; in Canada it costs \$115. Mowers cost \$55 in the United States; in Canada, \$45 on the average. Wheel-rakes cost \$25 in the United States and \$22 here. Fanning mills, \$15 to \$20 in the United States, and \$10 to \$15 here. Ploughs cost \$12 and \$15 in the United States and \$10 to \$13 here. Does my hon. friend want the proof? If so, I am afraid I shall have to fall back on the columns of the Toronto "Globe," because the Toronto "Globe" declared a little while ago that agricultural implements were cheaper in Canada to-day than they were in the neighbouring state of New York. Now, my hon. friend did not give comparisons. Let us see the price of agricultural implements in 1878. Self-binders were worth \$325; they are now worth \$110 to \$115. Self-rakers were worth \$115 to \$150 then; they are now worth \$75. Mowers were worth from \$70 to \$90; now they are from \$40 to \$50. Sulky ploughs were worth from \$55 to \$60 in 1878; they now sell from \$25 to \$30. Hand ploughs were worth from \$17 to \$20; now they can be bought for \$11 to \$14. Does this please the hon. gentleman? These are specific facts. But my hon. friend went to distant parts, and he declared that in the North-west the people were being ground down by the duty on agricultural implements. The people from the North-west are here, and the people from the North-west will say whether I am right or wrong, and the hon. gentleman can easily find out, if he desires to go to the trouble of doing so. I say that in the North-west, to-day, binders of Canadian make are worth \$140; of American make, they are worth \$175 to \$185.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

The one is as good as the other. I tell him that the price between the American North-west and the Canadian North-west is only a matter of 4 or 5 per cent either way. Now, my hon. friend read some resolutions bearing out his declaration, and among them was a resolution from the Lethbridge Board of Trade, which complimented him, and defended him in the course he was pursuing in this House. I hand him the paper now, and I tell him that that resolution was defeated. Sir, one by one his contentions are shown to be as groundless as possible. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to find that the hon. gentleman prepares his facts so carelessly, because these are important matters to be placed upon the records of this House. Now, I come to deal with another matter, that of the cotton trade, in regard to which the hon. gentleman travelled over a great deal of ground. I think I shall be able to show that his calculations were extraordinary calculations. I want first to speak of the cotton industry in 1879. Previous to 1879 there were mills in Canada employing 3,000 hands. Now, there are twenty-four mills, with a capital invested amounting to \$13,700,000 and the yearly product is \$8,700,000. These mills employ 9,000 hands, and the yearly wages paid are \$2,350,000; in other words, under the National Policy, there has been an increase in that industry, one of the most magnificent industries of the country, of 7,000 hands. I am under the necessity of calling my hon. friend's attention to another serious mistake that he has made. I am afraid that he depends too much upon the accuracy of the printers. He founded a whole line of calculations upon the fact that a speech delivered by an hon. gentleman on the other side and printed in "Hansard," showed certain reductions in the prices of cotton since 1872. Then the hon. gentleman went on to say that, from 1872 to 1892, twenty years, the price in Canada had not decreased nearly so much as the price of cottons in England. For the moment I was struck with his calculation, but I was not so much struck when I discovered that the printer had made a mistake, that the date was 1878 instead of 1872, and the hon. gentleman was comparing twenty years of England against only fourteen years of Canada, and complaining because the reduction was not sufficiently great; in other words, the hon. gentleman based all that long and laboured calculation upon a mistake in "Hansard," so accurate was he, and so long did he labour to find out the facts in this regard. If the hon. gentleman will take pains to make a proper comparison, he will find that not only have Canadian cottons, under the National Policy, been reduced 22 per cent, but they have been reduced a great deal more, and quite as much as they have been reduced in the free trade country of England. What is the fact? The hon. gentleman talks of combines; but, before he can prove to this

House they are an injury. he must show they have increased prices. I admit there is a trust formed of the cotton mills—

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." There are trusts formed in every line of business for the purpose of cheapening production, and they are formed in free trade countries as well as in protection countries. There was a trust formed but before the hon. gentleman can show there is any injury done, he must show they have raised prices. What have they done? They have raised prices on three lines of goods, in which lines there was admittedly a cutting of rates, and there has not been any objection from the trade in any portion of Canada because those three lines of prices were raised. Where is the foundation for the hon. gentleman's complaint? Has this trust been grinding the life out of the Canadian people? Can he produce the members of the wholesale and retail trade that will say the combine has been charging too high prices? The fact is that our manufacturers have been supplying lines just as good as are to be found in England or the United States at just a shadow of an increase over the price in those countries at the present time, and I look upon the growth of the cotton industry in this country as one of the greatest monuments raised to the National Policy, so long as it retains its present position and gives the fair prices which it gives at the present time to Canadian consumers. When it does not, without the help of the hon. member for North Simcoe, this Government will cut its wings and restrict its operations, as it will the operations of any combine that works against the public good. So much for the cotton industry of this country, with which, however, I will deal a moment longer. What is the proof of the cotton combine? The hon. gentleman did not go into details. I desire to give what I believe to be an authentic statement of the income and output and profit of the cotton industries. They pay wages to the amount of \$2,380,000; they buy coal to the value of \$271,000; stores, etc., \$870,000; freight, \$400,000; duties on machinery and supplies, \$65,000; outlay on repairs, and the placing of new plant, \$501,000. It is estimated that they pay taxes, and this is a low estimate, to the amount of \$100,000; and insurance is estimated at \$50,000. The cost of selling their goods, according to the opinion of a leading merchant in this House, must not be less than \$200,000. The amount expended for raw cotton is \$3,298,000; or a gross total of \$8,135,000. Deduct that from the output, \$8,825,000, and there is a profit of \$690,000, or from 6 to 7 per cent of profit obtained by the cotton manufacturers of this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I shall be exceedingly glad if the hon. gentleman will go into the figures as fully as I have done, and if he

comes to any other conclusion, I shall be glad to listen to him when I have done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That accounts for the premium on the stock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says that accounts for the premium on the stock. I am not dealing with that point just now. My hon. friend will no doubt deal with it when he comes to speak on the question.

Mr. CAMERON. And he will be answered.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) says the hon. gentleman will be answered. I now come to deal with another question. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has submitted a resolution to the House, and it is an exceedingly peculiar resolution, coming from the hon. gentleman. It declares that this House wishes to open up special negotiations and to specially deal with the people of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not in the resolution.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is true, I do not remember all of the resolution, word for word, because there is so much of it. I find it reads:

And this House declares its readiness to make a like reduction in favour of such other portions of the Empire or with such other foreign countries, especially the United States of America, as are willing to reciprocate in matters of trade with Canada on fair and equitable terms.

My hon. friend need not have placed that resolution on the Journals of the House, and I think he himself was of that opinion, because he scarcely referred to it when he made his speech. But, Sir, I should like my hon. friend, before he asks this House to vote for that resolution, to point to a single instance in all the long years of our history where we have refused to deal on fair and honourable terms with the people of that or any other country. I hope the hon. gentleman does not blame us for not having accepted commercial union, which we could have obtained from the people of the United States. He does not do that, because he told us so to-night, although he appears to try and join hands with the party which believes in unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But why has he placed this little addendum to his resolution? Sir, the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau. It looks to me as though my hon. friend had placed it there in order that hon. gentlemen opposite might be prepared to vote for his resolution, and yet so little inclined was he to favour it that he scarcely referred to it in his speech. It is strangely discordant with his past. Why should we pass this resolution in favour of special arrangements with the United States? Here is the hon. gentleman's speech in 1888:

Why, the people of the United States are our competitors in the great markets of the world. They are producers of corn; we are producers of corn. They are producers of cattle; so are we. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, which are open to all, we will find that the great market for both countries is in Great Britain, and to talk of sending our goods to the United States is like sending coals to Newcastle.

And yet the hon. gentleman gives, as one of the modes of relief for the distressed farmer, that we must open up special arrangements with the people of the United States. This House is willing to do so on any occasion, so long as it is attended with some advantage to the people of Canada, and it is not willing to do it under any other conditions, or to make any other arrangements than those to which I have referred in that regard. I am sorry I have occupied the attention of the House so long in reference to these matters, but I am still more sorry that it becomes the painful duty of any hon. member on this side of the House to argue trade matters with the hon. member for North Simcoe, who, however much he may in the past have deplored the mournful condition of hon. gentlemen opposite, seems to be going with them in their cry of ruin, seems to be going with them in their constant proposal to keep nostrums before the people of Canada. These are the old symptoms we have had described so often, and to a very great extent they are the old treatments which the physicians to your left, Mr. Speaker, have offered us on so many previous occasions in days gone by. However ill Canada may have been, she retained her consciousness to a certain extent, and, retaining her consciousness, she refused to accept the dosing of hon. gentlemen opposite, and she will refuse to accept the remedies which have been proposed by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I ask my hon. friend, is he joining with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his cry of blue ruin? He says: No; I did not vote for him the other night. Why did he not vote for him the other night? Was it because he did not agree with the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? Why, one resolution, that of my hon. friend from North Simcoe, is an amplification of the other, and in principles and in essentials they are as like as any two toads that ever went together in a puddle. Why did he not vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? Was it because he had a tender regard for the feelings of the Government party? I fear not. Was it because he did not desire to join the mournful member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? Perhaps that might have been the case. Or was it because he wished, to use his own language, from behind the ramparts to attack the men who are defending the fort, in order to secure for himself a larger following and a greater strength in this country. Whatever may be the cause, and how—
Mr. MONTAGUE.

ever and whoever he may join with in this regard, I may tell him that Canada is not so easily discouraged. The people of this country listen to the wail, but they hold for the National Canadian party. They have voted for it in the past and they will vote for it in the future. They look to the past quarter of a century of their history and are proud. They look to the obligations of the ante-Confederation period that have been carried out. They look to the bond having been kept with the provinces of the east in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. They look to the keeping of the bond with the provinces of the west and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They look to the development under this Government of the North-west Territories, upon whose broad plains must depend the hope of future Canadian greatness. They look to our extending trade. They look to our credit, which stands higher than it ever did in the markets of the world. They look to our recognized ever growing importance as a country, and they are proud of Canada's past, they are satisfied with Canada's present, and they are ever hopeful for Canada's future. And, Sir, that hope is soundly based. Notwithstanding the abuse of hon. gentlemen opposite, our stock in trade is such as to encourage Canadians everywhere. What is it? We have a splendid territory, we have splendid resources, we have the freest institutions under which men live, we have that climate which in every age has given the best samples of mind and muscle, and which, in all ages, has been the ever hospitable home of freedom and of liberty; and we have 5,000,000 of people who are prepared to work out their destiny on the old lines. There was a time when my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) might have found a sympathizing audience in Canada. There was a time when the people of this country might have been discouraged, but that time is not the present, and I tell him that, instead of the nostrums that are being proposed to remedy the ills to which the Canadian body may be heir, it would serve our purpose better if we would encourage a strong, healthful, vigorous, harmonizing, unifying Canadian spirit throughout our whole Dominion; a spirit that recognizes our opportunity, a spirit that strengthens us for our task, a spirit that bids us to be on friendly terms with our neighbours, but bids us at the same time to look chiefly to Canada's sons for Canada's future; a spirit that looks, and longs, and labours for the union of our provinces, for the union of our people, for the ceasing of the cry of sectarianism, with a devotion that will never falter, until jealousies have ceased, until the strife of sections has been stilled, until the war of creeds is no more, until, over all the broad space from sea to sea, it is written: "The varying tints have united and formed, in Heaven's bright light, an arch of peace."

Mr. EDGAR. I have not had the advantage of hearing the whole of the speech of

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague), and I will not undertake to follow him in his long address. However, I did hear a portion of his remarks upon a subject which I take a little interest in, and on which I have already addressed this House during the session. I would like very much to follow him in that matter, and to set him right as far as I can in regard to it. I heard the hon. gentleman using very eloquent language indeed in eulogizing the great cotton industry of this country. I am sure that nobody desires to injure the great cotton industries of Canada, but I think we ought to ascertain whether these cotton industries are not making a good deal more than legitimate profits out of the people of Canada. When a resolution such as has been moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is under consideration, it is especially our duty to see that this cotton combine is not taking infinitely more than honest and fair profit out of the people of Canada, and is doing so absolutely under the protection of the tariff which this resolution attacks. I attempted to show, and it has not been contradicted, that the duties collected by the Government on the cotton which we imported in 1892 were 28 per cent ad valorem. I showed by undisputed figures, what the duties were which we paid to the manufactures. I did not show it in the same way as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) showed it by comparing English and Canadian prices, but by taking particular articles and showing the specific duties and the ad valorem duties combined upon goods which were made in the country by the Canadian cotton mills. I showed, and it cannot be disputed, that the duties levied upon the Canadian people by the manufacturers of cotton, range from 35 to 65 per cent. I have also showed that these same cotton manufacturers are able without one cent of protection, to ship their products to China, to the value of about a quarter of a million dollars and compete there with the manufacturers of England and the United States. Surely, Sir, if they can compete with the other manufacturers of the world for the Chinese trade, it is not unreasonable for us to suggest that they are also able to compete with the other manufacturers of the world for the Canadian trade. I do not think the hon. member for Haldimand met any of these points. He did not attempt to answer them. It has also been pointed out to-day by the hon. member for North Simcoe, as it was pointed out once before this session, that the fall in the cost of the raw material between 1890 and 1892 saved over \$1,000,000 in hard, clear cash to the manufacturers of cotton goods; and yet there was no consequent increase in wages or decrease in prices, but, on the contrary, an increase in price to the Canadian consumer of from 10 to 25 per cent. It has also been shown, and not denied, that one of the first effects of the National Policy on the cotton trade was to hold forth the promise of such exorbitant profits to those engaged in the

business, that there was a rush into it, people almost losing their heads in their anxiety to invest their capital in the business. The honest, solid money of the investors of Canada was put into the cotton trade to twice the extent required for legitimate business, so that our limited market induced competition which for a time inured to the benefit of the consumer, but ultimately inured to the ruin of the investor. In various parts of this Dominion there are people who lost 25, 50, 70, even 100 per cent of their investments for some years in the cotton business, under the system which the hon. member for Haldimand is defending here to-night. That was one of the first evils which the high protective tariff inflicted upon this industry. And, Sir, what happened then? Naturally, what always happens in similar cases. The stronger financial corporations held on, and they froze out or wrecked the smaller and weaker concerns, and a short time ago, those remaining formed a combine, and that combine stands to-day in full force and operation, under the protecting aegis of that high tariff on cotton goods which the hon. member for Haldimand has so brilliantly pictured as a blessing and a benison upon this country. Why, Sir, how can men in their senses possibly believe that legitimate profits alone could have enabled the Dominion Cotton Company to increase its stock, last September, from \$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000 at one swoop? Of that increase of \$1,500,000, all except \$150,000 was pure, unmitigated, limpid water—and sugar, I suppose—and the remaining \$1,350,000 the original stockholders have put into their pockets out of the enormous profits that they have already made and out of their anticipated profits under this tariff. I wonder if the hon. member for Haldimand can answer that? He cannot answer it. Nobody can answer it. It is a patent fact, which is there as clear and undisputed as the fact that the sun shines at noonday; and if there were nothing else at all to be said on the subject, that is a conclusive reason why we should call upon the Government to redeem the pledge which the First Minister made in this House last session, when he promised that if it were shown that there was a combine in the cotton business, the tariff would very soon be lowered. Instead of that, we have it defended here to-day by the champion who is put forward by the Treasury benches to crush out the independence of the hon. member for North Simcoe. That is their redemption of the promise that was made by the First Minister last year. What did the hon. member for Haldimand say in defence of this cotton combine, apart from the eloquent and inflated sentiments with which he surrounded the question? I do not intend to attempt to bring any eloquence into the discussion, even if I were able to do so; but I have a few figures, which, I think, will be a little more to the point. The hon. member for Haldimand said that cotton was sold by the Canadian manufacturers to-day at just a shade over the English and Ameri-

can prices. We know, Sir, that to the "heathen Chinee" it is sold at a price equal to or under the American and English prices; but to the Canadian consumer it is sold over the English and American prices. I will give you two or three examples in detail. American gray cotton that can be bought without a duty at 5 cents per yard, exactly the same quality and class, is sold at 6½ cents by the Canadian manufacturer, which is 30 per cent more than the American price. This, according to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is only a shade over. Well, bleached cotton, which is sold here at 8 cents, which is 23 per cent of an increase. Now, those are the American goods. English check shirtings which are imported can be laid down here, freight and charges paid, at 4½ pence, and this quality is sold by the Canadian manufacturer at 10½ cents, which is an increase of 29 per cent. So, in answer to the general assertion that there is not more than a shade of difference, I show that, on these particular articles, there is a difference, ranging from 23 to 30 per cent. Another important point which I caught from the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand, is this: He showed us, and I suppose he did not minimize the figures at all, the total cost of manufacturing the output of cotton by the Canadian mills. After putting in every thing he could think of, or that those who supplied him with the figures could think of, he brought a result of \$8,135,000 as the entire cost of production. Well, Sir, I am very much obliged to him for furnishing those figures, because it helps us a good deal. I have been able, from other sources, to get the cost of the raw material and the cost of the wages, but all these other things that he gave us, freights, and so on, I had not got, so we will take his estimate of \$8,135,000. Well, let us try and get at a fair estimate of what they sell their output for. The hon. member for North Simcoe made a calculation of it from one point of view. On a former occasion I estimated it from two points of view. I took this way of doing it. I took from the Trade and Navigation Returns the gross imports of raw cotton in 1882. I compared it with the gross imports of raw cotton in 1892, and I found that there was a difference of 26,000,000 pounds in the imports. That is to say, that in 1892 our imports had increased 26,000,000 pounds. I found, also, that the importation of the manufactured material, from 1882 to 1892, had decreased 7,000,000 pounds, and, therefore, the 26,000,000 pounds of raw material would represent 7,000,000 of manufactured material. That being so, the 46,000,000 pounds of imported raw material in 1892 would represent nearly \$13,000,000 of manufactured material in 1892, unless our population has decreased, and unless the people of Canada were using less cotton goods than they did ten years ago. We cannot admit that our population has decreased,

Mr. EDGAR.

as the census returns show that it has increased between 11 and 12 per cent, and I know from inquiries I made personally in the trade, that the demand for cotton goods has considerably increased during that time so that there is no doubt, from those figures there is an output of some \$13,000,000 worth. Take another way of looking at it. The Montreal cotton mills company, a month ago, gave to the world the figures of their output for the past year. They gave their figures at \$1,468,000. Now, they have got 54,000 spindles in that mill. The whole of the mills of Canada have 520,000 spindles, and the simple rule of three will show that if 54,000 spindles can make, as they did last year \$1,468,000 worth, therefore, the whole of the mills, working as the census returns say they are, full time—and I think the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) not very long ago said they were working full time—would turn out \$14,000,000 worth. Now, I cannot be mistaken in those figures of the Montreal Company, because that was the output reported on the same day in the Montreal "Star," and on the next day in the Montreal "Herald," and the following day in the Montreal correspondence of the Toronto "Mail," and they have not been denied. We have a good many other ways of making that calculation. In answer to some questions put upon the Paper by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the Finance Minister said that, according to the census of 1891, the output was \$8,451,724. Now, that was no doubt made from the raw material imported in 1890, because the census was taken in 1891. Well, the raw material imported in 1890 was 36,000,000 pounds. Therefore if 36,000,000 pounds produced, as the Finance Minister said they did, \$8,451,000 worth, then the imports for 1892, which his own Trade and Navigation Returns show to have been 46,000,000 pounds of raw material, must have produced over \$10,000,000 worth, and, as the prices have risen, the prices of Canadian goods in that time have been raised from 12 to 20 per cent, this would make the output of 1892, with even the 15 per cent of increase, \$11,500,000 worth of manufactured cotton.

Mr. KENNY. Will my hon. friend permit me for one moment. Does he contend that in Canada during the past year 46,000,000 pounds of cotton were manufactured into cotton goods? We only imported 42,000,000 pounds of cotton—there were 4,000,000 pounds of waste.

Mr. EDGAR. There is a proportion of waste every year. I include the waste in my comparison of the year before. I treated all as raw material. The waste is used in the manufactures of cotton; I am entirely misinformed if it is not so used. I know that waste is exported from the cotton mills. I know also that waste is used in the manufacture of cotton goods as well as raw cotton. We know what it is used for; it is used to

deteriorate the article. But it is raw material and imported for the purpose of being so used. So that I am right in my contention: I have included waste in both cases. That is one way of calculating. Now another way to get at it is this: I take the exports from England to Canada of cottons in 1891, taking the figures in the English public documents. Sometimes they were given in pounds and sometimes in yards. I find that 25,000,000 yards were valued at £420,000 sterling, in round figures, or \$2,000,000. Counting the raw material at $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards to the pound—and I have no doubt that is a fair estimate, I do not know whether my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who has asked me a question, will dispute the estimate that one pound of raw material will produce $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cotton—that would bring this English export to Canada in 1891 down to 7,000,000 pounds. Now, the imports of raw material into Canada are 46,000,000 pounds, therefore, at the English price of export, without freight or charges, this quality of cotton would produce \$13,000,000 worth. Now, I will tell the House on what authority I assume that one pound of raw material will make $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of manufactured cotton. If any hon. member will turn to the "Hansard" of 1882, he will see a debate upon this subject of the excessive specific and ad valorem duties which were imposed upon cotton. The debate arose on a motion by Mr. Anglin, which was supported by a speech from him and by a very much more elaborate speech by Mr. Blake, and he will find that Mr. A. F. Gault, who is the president of all these combines to-day, gave as his estimate that the average yield of a pound of cotton would be $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of the manufactured article. It is a great deal more in many cases, but Mr. Gault gave that as the estimate of the average. There is another way of reaching a conclusion. The import of raw material, as I have said already, is 46,000,000 pounds this year, and at $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards to the pound, that will give 161,000,000 yards. Now, I have taken a great deal of pains to inquire from a large number of large houses in Canada what would be a fair average figure at which to place the price of the cotton sold by these manufacturers to the trade. There is a gray cotton, the cheapest, then there are the white, the bleached cottons, and the great variety of expensive coloured cottons of a number of different classes, which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) knows a great deal more about than I do. But I am sure it is a fair thing to put the average of all these goods at 9 cents. They run all the way from over 20 cents down to 5 cents. The larger quantity is the lower, I admit, and that brings the average down. But the dealers tell me that about 9 cents is a very fair average. The 161,000,000 yards made out of this 46,000,000 pounds of raw material would produce, at 9 cents per yard, \$14,490,000 worth of out-

put. So, Sir, I have a number of calculations on a number of different bases making this output \$11,500,000, \$13,000,000, \$14,000,000, \$14,439,000. Two of them yield a result of \$13,000,000. Sir, we have the official statement from the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that the cost of making all this is only \$8,000,000, and I would like him or his friends or the supporters of these combines to figure out what the profits are. They are anywhere from \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000. Is it any wonder, under these circumstances, that the combines can water their stock? Is it any wonder that the Dominion Cotton Company stockholders, by their last operation, have made a bonus on their stock equal to 154 per cent—for that is what it means having reference to the current price paid for that watered stock and what they paid in cash for it. And are we to be told that the country is to submit to this condition of things, that the Government sitting there is unable to ascertain these facts when any private member can ascertain them if he will take the trouble, as the hon. member for Simcoe and myself have done? Are the Government going to listen to the stories poured into their ears by some promoters of these factories that they are only making such and such a quantity of goods? These men are not bound to give any return. These men are not under obligation to give any statement under oath. And they are interested to the amount of millions of dollars in concealing the amount of their output. I do not want to ask them about their output. We know what it is, what it must be, and I am only too glad that they have had a spokesman in the House to tell us what their expenses are. I give them the benefit of all these expenses they have piled up, and yet I insist, and the people of the country know and believe, that the cotton mills are making, by reason of this outrageous tariff, a profit of anywhere from \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000 a year even on their watered stock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Representing as I do a large manufacturing town, I feel it my duty on behalf of these industries to repudiate the statements made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he says that every large manufacturing industry in this country is under a combine. We have in the town of Gananoque some dozen manufacturing establishments, and I do not know one of them that is interested in a combine. I am closely associated with the Gananoque Carriage Company, which at present has one factory in Gananoque and another in the town of Brockville, employing 225 hands. I know this factory is not in any combine, and the keenest competition exists between the different carriage manufacturers in this country. I am satisfied that all of them, to say nothing about the smaller shops, employ at least 1,500 hands manufacturing carriages in this country. The price

of carriages, as every person knows, has been reduced since 1878 fully 50 per cent. Yet the hon. gentleman from Simcoe says that these large industries are all joined in a combine. I repudiate that statement most emphatically; there is no truth in it. While he may single out the cotton industry, or the sugar industry, and say that they are run by large corporations, he cannot point to the varied industries of our country and say the same thing. We have at Gananoque a shovel factory, employing some 80 men; there is no combine in that factory. We have next to that the Nail and Hinge Works, run by Cowan & Britton, and there is no combine there. We have our agricultural implements works, run by Mr. Cowan, and there is no combine there. I might mention a dozen other factories employing some of them from 80 to 120 hands, and not one of them is in a combine, but all are in keen competition with other manufacturers in different parts of the country. The goods turned out by these different manufacturing establishments are from 25 to 50 per cent cheaper than they were previous to the adoption of the National Policy. My hon. friend from Simcoe has taken up the cudgel for the farmers. Farmers, as a rule, do not think much of lawyers, and I do not see why the lawyers should feel called upon to champion the cause of the farmers. But he has joined with our friends on the opposite side of the House to spread the feeling among the farmers of this country that they are burdened by taxation. The farmers are as intelligent a class as the legal profession, although they may not know quite so much law, and the farmers themselves know that they are not overburdened by taxation. Now, let us apply practical common sense to the situation. Let us bring out from England or Scotland a practical farmer to this country. Let that farmer go into any of the older provinces and purchase a farm of 100 acres of choice land, with good buildings upon it, at a cost, we will say, of \$5,000. We will suppose that he carries on a system of mixed farming, as is generally done in this country, and he stocks that farm. He purchases twenty cows at \$30 a head, that is \$600; a span of horses at \$200; thirty sheep for \$100; five pigs for \$25; and \$20 worth of fowl. That constitutes the average stock of a farmer on a hundred acres of land. For all these he pays the sum of \$5,945 in cash. That is his capital invested in the farm. But then he must equip that farm with implements, and he purchases a set of double harness for \$20, a set of single harness for \$15; a wagon, \$60; a buggy, \$75; a cutter, \$25; a plough, \$15; a harrow, \$10; a seeder, \$50; a mowing machine, \$50; a reaper, \$110; a fanning mill, \$30; a straw cutter, \$20; a spade, \$1; a shovel, \$1 three forks and a barley fork, or straw fork, \$3. Now, that constitutes the full outfit for a farmer. These goods at these prices—and many of them will not cost that much—that farmer purchases on going on to this farm, for the sum of \$470.

Mr. TAYLOR.

These are the prices they can be bought for to-day. Now, my hon. friend says the farmer has to pay 35 per cent duty. I claim that the most, if not all, of these articles, are made in the country, and therefore the farmer pays no duty upon them; but for the sake of argument we will say he pays 35 per cent duty on this \$470 worth of goods. That amounts to \$164 on that outfit. At the very least they will last that farmer for ten years, and some of these articles will last fifteen or twenty years. Now, what is that burden upon this farmer? It amounts to \$16.40 a year. That is the taxation that the average farmer of this country pays on his implements, even supposing that he has to pay a duty of 35 per cent on the original cost. He pays no taxes upon his food. He grows all the coarse food for his family. He gets his tea, coffee and everything of that kind, free of taxation. A lot of cotton goods come in free. There is no duty on raw cotton, and it is manufactured in the country. He grows his own wool, and he makes Canadian tweed, such as I am wearing, from his own sheep. Where does he pay any taxes? My hon. friend refers to wall paper, and these costly goods that he and other rich men of this country pay taxes upon. The farmer indulges very little in these expensive luxuries. Now, we will take the farmer of 1878. He, also, purchased an outfit amounting to the sum of \$470 under the revenue tariff advocated by the hon. member for Simcoe. He bought this same machinery under a duty of 17½ per cent, or \$82.25. We will say that outfit lasted for ten years, so that it cost the farmer \$8.20 a year. There is a difference of \$8.20 per head that the farmer pays more now than he did in 1878 on these implements; but let us suppose that in addition the farmer purchased 25 pounds of tea, on which he paid a duty of \$1.50; \$12 worth of sugar, with a duty of \$2.40; five pounds of coffee, on which he paid 25 cents, and the duties on these three articles and his agricultural implements amounted to \$12.30, or a difference of \$4.10. There is the sum and substance of the argument of the member for Simcoe boiled down; that is the enormous burden on the farmers of this country—\$4.10 according to his argument, even supposing they pay the whole duty of 35 per cent; but I repudiate that statement; there is not a word of truth in it. The Canadian farmer buys agricultural implements, buggies, wagons and other supplies that I need not enumerate, better and cheaper than the American farmer can buy right across the line opposite where I live. I am acquainted with the prices, and save and except barbed wire, hand-tools, pitch forks and shovels—there is a slight advantage in the American market on those articles—but save and except those articles, every other article that I have enumerated the Canadian farmer buys as cheap or cheaper, and of as good quality or better, than the American farmer does six miles across the river from where I reside. Then where is the Canadian farmer

paying 35 per cent when he gets his goods as cheap here as the American farmer does? Besides, he has the benefit of the home market at his door. All the money that is paid for labour is expended in the country, in place of being sent away to a foreign country. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) might just as well take up and argue the case of the workingman of this country, and say that they, owing to the National Policy, had to pay a large duty on everything they consume; that they had to pay 50 cents a barrel on flour, 3 cents per pound on beef, 2 cents per pound on pork and so on; that the workingmen have to pay a duty on everything which the farmers grow, as to tell the farmers that they pay the duty on their agricultural implements. The workingman, if he purchased his flour in the United States, would have to pay the duty. I might give an illustration, which I have given before. We will take a workingman living in Gananoque. He has a family of five or six children, and he wants four barrels of flour to provide for his family during the winter. The same workingman keeps a cow, and instead of buying flour and bran and shorts to feed his family and his cow he comes to the conclusion that he will buy a number of bushels of wheat, take it to a mill and have it ground, and feed the offal to his cow. He goes to a Canadian farmer, and says to him: "At what price will you sell me 10 bushels of wheat?" The Canadian farmer replies: "At 75 cents per bushel." This workingman does not believe in patronizing home industries, so he thinks he will go across the line and buy American wheat and have it ground in an American mill. He goes to an American farmer and asks the price of 10 bushels of wheat, and receives a reply that the price is 75 cents per bushel, the same price as in Canada. He buys American wheat, and takes it to an American mill and asks to have it ground, and he finds the price charged for grinding is the same price as he would have to pay at a Canadian mill. He has it ground into flour, and he takes home 4 barrels of flour and the bran and shorts. As his family are in Canada he has to bring the flour and shorts over the border. At the boundary line the customs officer demands \$2 duty on the four barrels of flour. Then the workingman pays the duty; but he was obliged to pay it because he purchased his wheat and had it ground in the United States, while he could have bought it as cheaply in Canada and have given employment to a Canadian mill. That workingman should pay the duty, and the hon. member for Simcoe might as well try to convince that workingman that, the circumstances being such as they are to-day, when he could buy his wheat as cheaply in Canada as across the line, he had to pay the duty, no matter where he bought it, as to tell the Canadian farmers that they are being oppressively burdened because they buy goods manufactured here as cheaply as they could

purchase them in the United States. Notwithstanding that fact, the hon. member for Simcoe says that the farmers pay 35 per cent duty. I have explained quite satisfactorily. I think, to this House that, to place the amount at the outside, the farmer, even if he pays 35 per cent, pays only \$4.10 more than when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The great majority of the farmers would not only pay \$4 a year, but would be willing to pay \$40 a year and have the good times they enjoy now, as compared with the bad times from which they suffered during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, with a revenue tariff of 17½ per cent. But my hon. friend admits that we must have a certain revenue for this country. How are we going to obtain it? A revenue tariff must produce taxation. We collect from Customs about \$20,000,000 annually, or \$4 per head of the population. If we remove that taxation, that amount of money will have to be raised from some other source, for the farmers do not want to repudiate their share of the taxation. We will take an average farmer's family of seven members. Under a system of taxation per head that family would pay \$28 per annum, instead of which they pay on an average, from \$5 to \$10 per family. If we abolish Customs, the Government must obtain the revenue according to some other method than that adopted at the present time. We must obtain \$20,000,000 of revenue from Customs or by direct taxation, and if a per capita system were adopted it would amount to \$4 per head, which, with an average farmer's family of seven souls, would give \$28. That would be direct taxation. If the taxation were imposed on a per capita plan, it would amount to \$5 for every \$1 that farmers pay now. I think the farmers understand the situation just as well as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) understands subjects connected with the legal profession. They know how their dollars are earned and how they are spent, and they are fully aware that they pay very little towards the taxation of this country. The hon. member spent a considerable portion of time, not in trying to convince hon. members of this House, but in endeavouring to convince the farmers outside of this House that they are being oppressed by the National Policy. The farmers, however, know that the produce of their farms is as highly protected as are the manufactures of the country, and they know, further, that farming and the manufacturing industries and the labouring class must go hand in hand. The farmers, so far as I know them, and I represent a large agricultural constituency, if this question were put to the vote, would be prepared to stand by, and will stand by the National Policy in the future as they have in the past, and although the Government have proposed, and I have no doubt they will carry out their promises, to go in for a revision of the tariff on the protective lines, when they make that re-

vision. I am sure it will be found to be acceptable to the House and to the country, and the farmers will stand by them when they again appeal to the country.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIERE moved that the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present session be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 98) to amend the Act incorporating the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Stairs.)

MR. FERDINAND BELLAVANCE.

Mr. CARROLL asked, Whether the Railway Department have repaid to Mr. Ferdinand Bellavance, of Sayabec, in the county of Rimouski, a deposit of \$300 made by him in 1890, with a tender for "sleepers," which said tender having been accepted, the said Bellavance declined to execute the contract?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman I have to state that Mr. Ferdinand Bellavance made no deposit of \$300 in 1890 with a tender for "sleepers," and no contract was awarded him in that year. Consequently he could not have declined to execute the contract.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES IN ST. MARY'S.

Mr. GRIEVE asked, What is the description of each of the seventy-three industrial establishments in the town of St. Mary's? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. FOSTER. The following is a statement of the industries, etc., in St. Mary's:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—	
Frank Aiken	1
Benjamin Robinson	2
James Marshall	2
Alex. Colquhoun	2
John Galbraith	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Henry Carr	1
John Johnston	3
W. H. Hunt	1
John Perrin	1
John Ready	2
Wm. Quast	1
R. T. Gilpin	4
S. Dusty & Son	3
Bakers—	
John Bartlett	3
Henry Weir	4
Carriage Builders—	
D. McLarty & Son	2
Wm. Moyes	9
Robert Furness	1
Coopers—	
F. E. Butcher	5
R. W. Kingston	3
Weaving Establishments—	
James Moore	5
Chas. Salvage	1
Chas. Monaghan	1
Hannah Dalamates	1
Lime Kiln—	
James Sclater	1
Pump Factories—	
Joseph Billings	1
John H. Bridgman	2
Dress-makers and Milliners—	
Fannie Taylor & Co.	3
Charlotte Johnston	1
Fannie Moss	2
Maggie Clifford	3
Annie McLarty	5
Maggie Watt	1
W. J. Gilles	3
Kate O'Connor	6
H. & C. Wright	4
Mary Norris	3
Maggie Clark	4
Lizzie Othen	3
Agricultural Implements—	
David Maxwell & Sons	80
Wm. Mathieson & Co.	2
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
John W. Wood	1
Chas. McCall	1
Thos. F. Harrison	2
Foundries and Machine Shops—	
Robert Reid	5
Richardson & Webster	13
Geo. Vice	2
Sash, Door and Blind Factories—	
Jacob Wear	10
Jewellers and Watch-makers—	
Wm. Andrews	3
R. S. Wilson & Co.	2
Carpenters and Joiners—	
John Johnson	4
Treacy Brothers	1

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Tinsmiths—		Cider mill—	
John C. Gilpin.....	4	Frederick Noll.....	1
Jas. Chalmers.....	2	Flax Mill—	
Flax Manufacturers—		Wm. Livingston.....	25
Clark & Carman.....	40	Planing Mills—	
John M. & W. Weir.....	61	Jacob Buncho.....	5
Planing Mill—		Henderich & Wilderhold.....	6
J. D. Moore.....	6	Pottery—	
Picture Framing—		Henry Birnstihl.....	1
John Watters.....	1	Saddle and Harness Makers—	
Harness Makers—		C. H. Boeckner.....	1
Joseph Stafford.....	2	Wm. Apple.....	1
Thos. McGobrick.....	3	Saw Mill—	
Meat Curing—		Jacob Hahn.....	4
Allen & Butcher.....	2	Tailors and Clothiers—	
Printing and Publishing—		J. A. Baker.....	2
Geo. T. Robbins.....		Wm. Burton.....	3
Wool and Cloth Factory—		Henry Schaefer.....	6
S. Myers & Sons.....	33	Tannery—	
Stone and Marble Cutters—		James Strery.....	1
Scele & Hoover.....	3	Tin and Sheet Iron Works—	
John Grant.....	1	Weir Archeson.....	2
J. H. Brown.....	1	Schneuker & Rothernal.....	1
Wm. Porteous.....	1	Flour and Grist Mill—	
Tailors and Clothiers—		L. & P. Pfeffer.....	2
F. W. Long & Co.....	9		
Andrew J. Rason.....	2		
Dan. McLaren & Co.....	12		
A. H. Lofft & Co.....	9		
White & May.....	13		
A. Beattie & Co.....	23		
Flour and Grist Mills—			
Geo. Carson, Son & Co.....	15		
Stephen Knight.....	3		

MORNINGTON TOWNSHIP.

Baker—		Lawrence Dietolt.....	2
Brick and Tile makers—		Joseph Johnston.....	6
Geo. Kerr.....	5	Blacksmiths—	
John Adna.....	1	David Henry.....	1
Wm. Robertson.....	1	Wm. Robertson.....	1
Thos. Connolly.....	1	Thos. Connolly.....	1
Wm. Moser.....	1	Wm. Moser.....	1
Jacob Gatschene.....	1	Jacob Gatschene.....	1
Donald Ross.....	1	Donald Ross.....	1
Peter Helm.....	2	Peter Helm.....	2
Chas. Sargison.....	2	Chas. Sargison.....	2
John Snider.....	1	John Snider.....	1
Philip Helm.....	1	Philip Helm.....	1
Carriage-maker—		Wm. Milne.....	2
Wm. Milne.....	2	Tailors and Clothiers—	
Tailors and Clothiers—		Henry Gerbraught.....	2
Henry Gerbraught.....	2	Alphonse Deimont.....	3
Alphonse Deimont.....	3	Saw Mill—	
Saw Mill—		John Gropp.....	5
John Gropp.....	5	Boots and Shoes—	
Boots and Shoes—		Ferdinand Dietrich.....	1
Ferdinand Dietrich.....	1	Dauh. Christian.....	2
Dauh. Christian.....	2	Cheese Factories—	
Cheese Factories—		Jack Hugh.....	6
Jack Hugh.....	6	John Chalmers.....	4
John Chalmers.....	4	Dress-makers and Milliners—	
Dress-makers and Milliners—		Euphemia Magwood.....	2
Euphemia Magwood.....	2	Sara Gilliland.....	2
Sara Gilliland.....	2	Flax Mill—	
Flax Mill—		Peter Livingston.....	36
Peter Livingston.....	36	Photographic Gallery—	
Photographic Gallery—		Chas. Jones.....	1
Chas. Jones.....	1	Pump Factories—	
Pump Factories—		Thomas Armstrong.....	1
Thomas Armstrong.....	1	John Gropp.....	1
John Gropp.....	1	Wm. Crummie.....	1
Wm. Crummie.....	1		

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES IN MILVERTON VILLAGE, &c.

Mr. GRIEVE asked, 1. What is the description of the industrial establishments in the township of Mornington and the village of Milverton? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In Milverton Village, etc., the industries are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
J. H. Schmidt.....	1
Blacksmiths—	
P. Ducklow.....	1
David Merklinger.....	2
Henry Hasempfen.....	2
Boots and Shoes—	
J. G. Grosch & Co.....	5
C. Siegner.....	1
Carriage-maker—	
Henry Miller.....	1
Cheese Factory—	
Geo. Goodhand.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.
Pot and Pearl Ashery— Joshua Dobson.....	12
Saddle and Harness-makers— Louis Seogner..... Wm. Fink.....	1
Tin and Sheet Iron Works— John Ritter.....	12
Woollen Mill— Joseph Waterhouse.....	1
Carpenter and Joiner— Valentine Voll.....	2

CHARGES AGAINST LAWRENCE HERCHMER.

Mr. DAVIN asked. How many of the charges made against Lawrence Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police, have been found by the Commissioner the Honourable Mr. Justice Wetmore to have been proved? Has the learned judge found him liable to violent fits of temper? What course, in the interest of the North-west Mounted Police Force, does the Government intend to take?

Mr. IVES. As to the first question, 137 charges were preferred against Commissioner Herchmer. Of these Mr. Justice Wetmore found fourteen proved, and twenty-three proved in part. As to the second question, Mr. Justice Wetmore reported that none of the charges brought home to the Commissioner affected his honesty, his business capacity or the efficiency of the force. The learned judge found him liable to lose his temper. As to the last question, the matter is under the consideration of the Government.

BRANDON INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. McMULLEN asked. Whether \$284.91 spent in advertising, stationery, &c., as set out on page D-33, Auditor General's Report, is all the money spent on Brandon Industrial School last year? If so, how many pupils were in training? Has not the school been closed for the last three years, and why is it considered necessary to reopen it?

Mr. DALY. The amount of \$284.91 was the total expenditure during the year 1891-92. It was for printing and advertising for tenders. No pupils were in training; the school building is not yet erected; but the work of construction is to be pushed on without delay, now that the amended plans have been approved of.

CHEVALIER BARLEY.

Mr. MULLOCK asked, With regard to the Chevalier barley imported by the Government and supplied the farmers for seed, 1. Was the
Mr. FOSTER.

same pure when imported? 2. Was it tested by the Government? If so, when and with what results? 3. Was it supplied the farmers at cost? 4. Does the Government intend to import any seed grain for Canadian farmers?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The barley imported was considered pure from the English seedsmen's stand-point. There was no admixture of any other sort of barley. A few seeds of other plants, but not pernicious weed seeds, were found among the barley received. The whole, therefore, was thoroughly clean, and including light barley seeds, a proportion of about 1 per cent was extracted by this process. A part of this loss was paid by the firm furnishing the barley. 2. The barley was tested in relation to its fertility and germinating power, at the Experimental Farm, with the result that it was found to be very satisfactory. Some of it was grown on each of the Experimental Farms where it was found to be pure and distinct. 3. The barley was sold to Canadian farmers at a slight fraction under cost. This was found to be a little over \$4 per bag laid down, but it was sold at \$4, and freight charges were paid on the purchase made, so as to insure its being furnished at an equal price to farmers in all parts of the Dominion. 4. There is no intention to import any other seed grain in view of existing information of facts.

LOCKS ON THE DU LIEVRE RIVER.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Devlin) asked. What is the total amount paid out in connection with the construction of the Little Rapid lock or locks on the Du Lièvre River? What were the extras? Are these extras still claimed, and if so, what is the amount?

Mr. OUMET. 1. The total amount paid out in connection with the construction of the locks on the River Du Lièvre, is \$255,384.91, including surveys, land purchases, work done by days labour or contract, and superintendent. 2. A claim for extras to the amount of \$60,971.74 has been filed by the contractors, but it has not been allowed.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Devlin) asked. 1. What was the amount of money received by the contractor or contractors for the construction of the Little Rapid Lock or Locks on the Du Lièvre River, county of Ottawa? 2. The dates of all payments made in connection with such work, and the names of the parties to whom paid? 3. The name or names of the Government inspector or inspectors and engineer or engineers who superintended the work?

Mr. OUMET. 1. The amount of the final estimate is \$183,301.05. Payments were made on the following dates:—1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891 and 1892. 2. The payments were all made to Thompson, Poupore & Company and to Poupore & Company, through

the Bank of Ottawa. 3. The inspector was James S. Wilson. The engineer in charge was Mr. F. M. Hamel. The chief engineer was Mr. H. F. Perley. The original survey was made by Mr. W. B. Snow. The original plans were prepared by Mr. J. E. Boyd.

Mr. RIDER (for Mr. Devlin) asked, Who was the contractor, or who the contractors for the construction of the lock or locks at Little Rapid on the Du Lièvre River, Ottawa county? What was the original amount of tender for such contract?

Mr. OUMET. 1. The contractors were Thompson, Poupore & Company. 2. The original amount of tender was calculated, from scheduled prices, at \$41,592.50, but the plans and specifications on which tenders were asked, were wholly deficient, not including entrance pier at the upper end of the lock, retaining wall, upper and lower wharves, excavation at upper and lower end, submarine work and lockmaster's house.

ELECTRICAL MACHINES FOR COMPILATION OF CENSUS.

Mr. RIDER asked, In bulletin No. 9 it is stated:

For the compilation of the population statistics of Canada, as collected in the census of 1891, electrical machines have been used.

Is the machine system, as used for the compilation of the last census returns of Canada, reliable, and by whom was this system introduced? From whom, upon what terms or conditions, and how many of the said machines were procured and so used?

Mr. FOSTER. The electrical machine was adopted by the United States Government, on reports made by the Franklin Institute, and by a special commission appointed by the United States Superintendent of Census. It is declared by them in their report to be decidedly more accurate than other methods. Under the former system there was no review of the work. Under the card system, worked by electrical machine, there is permanent record of population statistics. The system of counting is called the Hollerith system. It was introduced into the Canadian system by Hon. Mr. Carling, on a report by Mr. George Johnson, after a visit to Washington. The machines were rented from the inventor, Mr. H. Hollerith. At first, five machines were ordered; subsequently five more, and still later, one additional. The amount to be paid was \$625 per month for the ten. The machines were to be set up, kept in order, and the necessary power to run them being supplied by the inventor.

AGRICULTURAL PURSUITS—CAPITAL.

Mr. RIDER asked, What is the total value of capital invested in agricultural pursuits in the Dominion of Canada, according to the census of 1891? (a) Total value of real

estate? (b) Total value of stock, including animals of all kinds? (c) Total value of agricultural machinery, carriages, &c.?

Mr. FOSTER. The census schedules asked for quantities of the various crops, number of stock, &c., but in no case were values asked for.

TUNNEL—P.E.I. AND MAINLAND.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Statement showing in detail the expenditure incurred since last session of Parliament, in carrying on the borings in the Straits of Northumberland to date as to the probable cost of a tunnel, also for all contracts, correspondence, telegrams or papers in anywise relating to such borings or such expenditure.

He said: The question of the construction of a tunnel across the Straits of Northumberland between Prince Edward Island and the mainland has been frequently discussed in this House, has been considered by the Government and has formed the subject of public discussion by the people of the Island during a number of years. I find from the correspondence brought down to the House that in 1890 Senator Howlan wrote to Sir Douglas Fox, an eminent engineer in Great Britain, asking him, first, for what sum of money he would give a professional opinion as to the feasibility and practicability of building a tunnel; 2. For what annual subsidy, payable half-yearly in London, and satisfactorily guaranteed, contractors could be furnished to complete the work; 3. If, in his judgment, the total cost would fall within \$5,000,000? In answer to this, Sir Douglas Fox wrote:

If I heard from you by cable upon receipt of this letter I could probably arrange for Mr. Alfred Palmer to examine the condition of the tunnel and the connecting railways on his way home from Labrador, where he is at present engaged. For the opinion which you mention I would suggest the following: that you pay Mr. Alfred Palmer time at the rate of \$25 per month, together with his extra travelling expenses occasioned by this detour, with a fee for myself of £202 10. Upon the receipt of Mr. Palmer's report to me I shall be better able to deal with the second and third questions in your letter.

Now, Senator Howlan telegraphed to Sir Douglas Fox on the 28th January, 1891, requesting him to send immediately an estimate of the cost of the tunnel, and Sir Douglas answered that he would rather wait until he heard from Mr. Pearson, a civil engineer engaged in tunnelling work. As it was a very urgent time, Senator Howlan again telegraphed Sir Douglas Fox that he wanted the estimate immediately. I wish to show that the Government of the day were very anxious to see this work commenced and carried on. Even the late Sir John Macdonald himself gave Senator Howlan a letter in February, 1891, in which he pledged himself and his Government, if it were sustained at the election, that immediate steps would be taken to carry out that work. Sir Charles Tupper, on the 28th February, 1891, telegraphed from

Amherst to Mr. Ferguson, who was then a candidate in the interests of the Government, that he was sorry he could not visit Prince Edward Island, as the "Stanley" was not then crossing, and he dared not trust himself by the Capes. I do not know that he is so very precious that he could not cross there as well as anybody else. I have crossed there myself; but at all events it did not answer his purpose. Sir Charles Tupper said then:

I am satisfied that the tunnel can be built for \$6,000,000 and you can rely on all my influence that the work that is so desired by the people of the Island and the people of the mainland will be carried out immediately.

I want the Government to understand that Engineer Palmer is the first engineer that I know of who recommended the building of the tunnel from the Island to the mainland. His report dates as far back as September, 1890. Now, all the information that was got in 1891, previous to the election, appeared to me to be a fizzle, and the Government did not act upon it. It turned out that Sir Douglas Fox had not sufficient information to make a close estimate of the cost of the tunnel, or even the feasibility of building it. Senator Howlan was sent to London in the spring of 1891 for the purpose of giving Sir Douglas Fox further information. He came back and we find that during that summer some further experiments were made, a report of which was laid on the Table of the House last session. The Government were not yet satisfied. They got the House to vote last session of Parliament a sum of \$12,000, in order to have further borings made across the straits, and they came to an agreement with Alfred Palmer, C.E., to bore twenty-nine or thirty holes for the sum of \$12,000. To my great surprise, I find that the Government required no security from Mr. Palmer. Mr. Palmer says himself, whether it is true or not I do not know, but I have no reason to doubt his words, he says that Senator Howlan became security, not by written agreement, but by word of mouth, and that Senator Howlan also volunteered to become banker and financier in this business. He was quite willing to spend the money as long as the Government would give it to him, and I dare say he is not the only one who would feel that way. We find that sometime in August only four holes were bored, and that something like \$5,000 had been expended. What I want the House to bear in mind is this: Palmer was obliged by the contract for \$12,000 to bore so many holes, but Palmer had not the fingering of the money. He had not even the hiring of the men, he was not even allowed to purchase a piece of rope, a piece of steel, a piece of iron, a bolt, a ton of coal, or anything else. I find that Senator Howlan bought these articles at his own prices, and he sold some of the coal at his own price. I find in one of his letters, dated 20th July, that he sold the Hon. David Rogers, of Summerside,

Mr. PERRY.

coal for \$3 a ton. This was coal that he had bought somewhere over in Nova Scotia, and had chartered a vessel at a very large amount to bring the coal across, and when he found that he had more coal than he wanted, he sold the balance to Mr. Rogers for \$3 a ton, so he says. In another of his letters, dated 1st October, 1892, he says he sold the coal to Mr. Rogers for \$2.25 a ton. Now, there is a conflict at once. He says in one letter that he sold the coal for \$3 a ton, and in the other that he sold it for \$2.25. Bear in mind that this coal was bought by a portion of the \$12,000 which Mr. Palmer was supposed to earn. Why should the money be allowed to go into Senator Howlan's hands? Why should he be the banker or the financier of Mr. Palmer? Why should not the Government occupy that position themselves? That sent down their engineer, Mr. Henry, who I understand, is a very efficient man, and from his certificate I am sure that he was satisfied that the contractor, Mr. Palmer, had earned the money, and that the Government would have been justified in paying it to him. Now, I find that very little work has been done. Mr. Palmer states that seven holes were bored up to some time in August, and for that work the Government paid Senator Howlan, as banker and financier for Mr. Palmer, something like \$5,000. How did the Government expect that the remainder of the holes, twenty-two in number, would be bored for the balance of the money voted? The holes that have been bored are near the shore, but no holes have been bored in the deepest parts of the strait, where they will cost a good deal more, on account of the depth of water, than the holes near the shore. I understand also that on the Island side there was some conflict between the men in charge of the diamond drill and Mr. Palmer. I believe that it came to a pitched battle, for Mr. Palmer bears the marks of having been assaulted. He states that he was cut on the nose by a knife. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but the mark has the appearance of having been made by a sharp instrument. I understand that after all this happened the Minister of Finance made another agreement with Mr. Palmer, under which Mr. Palmer was to go on with the work, and to receive the balance of the \$12,000. I believe that Mr. Palmer was willing to do that; but it appears that some time in September Mr. Palmer was stopped in his work by the Government, and was told by them that they had no more money to squander in this way. This I would almost call imbecility; at any rate it was a very careless way of expending money. It is strange that the Government should make such a loose bargain. The simple fact that they did not exact security from Mr. Palmer, but simply took the Senator's word for the due performance of the contract, is enough to show that they acted very carelessly and in a very unbusi-

ness-like way in this transaction. Mr. Palmer also complains of the usage he got. He says that he would have had this work completed according to the contract if the means had been forthcoming. The Government state that they gave the money to him, but he says he never got it. If they gave it to a person who went around and paid perhaps 100 per cent more than he should, and hired unnecessary labourers, and thereby robbed Mr. Palmer of what was due him, was that just or fair or honest? Now, Mr. Palmer, in a very long correspondence, which I have no doubt the Minister of Finance has seen, makes very serious charges against Senator Howlan. He makes no charges in this correspondence against the Minister of Finance or against the Government as a body. He says in one place that there was an understanding, and that he was forced to come to that understanding by Senator Howlan, that the profits should be divided equally between himself and Senator Howlan. Now, am I to believe that statement? Mr. Palmer is a man well known in this country. He has been highly recommended by Sir Douglas Fox and by Senator Howlan himself. He has also been, I understand, the bosom friend of the Government, and I am sure that when they thought so much of him as to give him a \$12,000 contract without security, I have no right to stand up here and doubt his word. Now, I want to read what he says :

Senator Howlan undertook to finance the contract as banker, giving me an assurance that my fee of \$1,250 would be paid, even though the contract should prove a losing one.

It appears that Senator Howlan gave Mr. Palmer to understand, as far as his word of honour went, that he would get his \$1,250, whether the contract was a failure or not. He goes on further to say :

The Senator then unfolded his little plan as banker, which was as follows. He verbally guaranteed me \$1,250 whichever way the contract went, he to receive all the profit over and above that amount.

First, Mr. Palmer says, Senator Howlan wanted all the profits, whatever they might be. Now, I do not state things as facts. I read merely as the statement of Mr. Palmer, and I have no reason to doubt it until Senator Howlan proves himself guiltless of the charges, which to my knowledge he has not yet done. Mr. Palmer goes on further :

I objected to this proposal and told him I wanted half the profit as well as my fee of \$1,250.

There is an acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Palmer that the stipulation between Senator Howlan and himself was that the profits were to be equally divided between them. He goes on :

He thereupon agreed to allow me one-half the profit, but stated that he wanted \$500 to recompense him for his loss of time from the Senate. I reluctantly agreed to this rather than lose the chance I saw of making a reputation for myself as a civil engineer.

Senator Howlan asked the sum of \$500 in addition to half the profit, to indemnify him for the loss of his indemnity as a Senator. Now, what right had he to expect that this money should come out of the \$12,000 which was voted for the purpose of experimenting by boring holes across the Straits of Northumberland? It is unjustifiable, to say the least of it. I am afraid, if there had been any profits, there was no division of them, and that it all went the one way. He was asked further :

Did Senator Howlan at any time consult with you with respect to the money transaction.

And he replied :

Not exactly, but about the end of June he presented an account in a book which he included the \$500 he had advanced to me as banker upon my IOU, as well as money for his own travelling expenses and other items amounting to nearly \$1,200, which I signed at his request, and which sum it was understood would be deducted from the amount of the contract.

If Senator Howlan was acting as banker and financier for Mr. Palmer, and if this money was not to be paid until the works were performed, why should this \$500, upon Mr. Palmer's IOU, be obtained in the month of June, when the contract money would not be paid until October? Mr. Palmer was not able to live on the wind, he did not belong to Prince Edward Island, and could not go to a hotel there, and live for months without money, and I suppose he had no free pass and had to pay his travelling expenses. However, this was the stipulation, and I suppose Mr. Palmer tells the truth when he says he was driven to sign this document. Then he goes on further :

I called upon him, and finding that the Senator wished me to certify to a statement of some \$4,000 of accounts, in which was included \$500 for his loss of time from the Senate, previously referred to, as well as the \$500 given to me at the commencement of the contract, also before mentioned, besides heavy travelling expenses, I refused, as the sums had nothing to do with the Government advance.

No wonder he refused. There were \$500, which ought not to have been paid until the contract was completed. There were \$500, to which he said he was asked to certify as being correct. He was called upon by Senator Howlan to indemnify him for his loss of time as senator. I do not know whether the Government were cognisant of the facts ; but if they were they should have put a stop to this. Then he goes on further and says that the result was, the Minister summed up both sides of the case. This was at the interview had between him and the Minister of Finance :

The result was that the Minister summed up both sides of the case, and subsequently he and Mr. Schreiber agreed to a rearrangement of the contract—with the Government instead of Senator Howlan as banker.

This was the second contract. The contract was taken from Senator Howlan's hands, or

rather he was dismissed as banker and financier, according to this, and the Government entered into a contract with Mr. Palmer, and agreed to become paymasters themselves. I believe that if they had done that from the first, if they had acted in a business-like way from the first, if they had taken proper securities from Mr. Palmer, and paid this money on the recommendation of the Government engineer, it would have been all right. I am sure Mr. Palmer could have gone, if he only thought well of it, to the banks and borrowed any money he required; but instead of that, Senator Howlan stepped in and introduced himself, so Mr. Palmer says, as a very rich man, which no doubt he is, and as able to finance this matter all through, so that there would be no humbug. Now, Senator Howlan thought necessary, as financier and banker, to charter a small schooner—I do not know exactly how many tons—to go from Summerside to Pictou for a load of coal, and paid the sum of \$191 out of Mr. Palmer's money, out of the money which should have gone to perform this contract. I suppose Mr. Palmer knew nothing of this charter, and that Senator Howlan was allowed to make whatever bargain he thought proper, and I see the Senator charged \$5.75 for superintending the unloading of that coal on the wharf at Summerside. He sold a part of the cargo at \$2.25, as he says in one letter, and at \$3, as he says in another. Which of these two letters are we to believe? He also has a sum total of account of \$1,197.98 against Mr. Palmer. These items Mr. Palmer is entitled to be shown, so as to ascertain their correctness. In my opinion, he has a right to know what are the items which make up the \$1,197.98, because I contend this is Mr. Palmer's money. If he were able to make \$1,000 on this contract, would that not be his lawfully? Would it be right that a third party should interfere between him and the Government and squander the money in that manner, taking \$1,000 out of the profits of Mr. Palmer and letting it go adrift? I find also a lot of charges here which Senator Howlan makes for going to Halifax—I do not know for what. I find other charges he makes for going to St. John, \$21.10, and another bill, without being itemized, for \$15.15. Why should Mr. Palmer be called upon to pay this account? How did he become responsible? What authority would I or anybody else have to go and buy stuff for Mr. Palmer and make him pay that out of his \$12,000? What right would I or anybody else have to travel to St. John or Montreal or anywhere else and make Mr. Palmer pay my expenses? If we had the items of that \$1,197.89 made public, we would be able to judge how far they are honest, genuine and bona fide. I should not think that Senator Howlan or anybody else would hesitate for one moment to lay these papers before the eyes of the public, and let the people judge themselves who is wrong and who is right. But to my knowledge Senator

Mr. PERRY.

Howlan has not undertaken to deny these charges, and even if he did, it would be only a denial against an assertion. I am not prepared to stand up here and say that Senator Howlan would make a false statement or appropriate money falsely to himself, but I say that the charges are made by an honourable man, by an engineer, whose reputation is well known, not only in Canada but in the United States, Australia and different parts of the world, and until these charges are proved false I am not going to stand up here and say that Mr. Palmer made false statements. Here is a letter from Senator Howlan, in which he makes an attempt at denial. It is written the 17th of December last:

In regard to Mr. Alfred Palmer's interview concerning me which appeared in the Halifax "Chronicle," the material parts of which are published in this morning's "Guardian," permit me through your columns to assure the public that the statements made by Mr. Palmer so far as they charge me with conduct inconsistent with my position as a Senator are utterly untrue.

Now that is the only denial.

Mr. Palmer has for the last three or four months—

He says four months from the 17th of December, which would go back to July, but if we are to believe the correspondence they were friends in July.

Mr. Palmer has for the last three months spent all his time in slandering me from house to house, and publishing paragraphs insinuating—but not making—charges against me.

It will be my duty to show with what object and for what purpose he thus went to work. I have ample materials in my hands to show that his statements are untrue and that he is not entitled to credence—all I ask the public now is to suspend judgment until I have time and you can afford me a space to show what manner of man he is. I did not know of his publication until near noon to-day, and it is utterly impossible for me before the issue of to-day's papers, to expose the fallacy of this man's charges, the more especially as they contain references to persons at a distance, to whom I may have to apply to contradict him.

Permit me here to say, however, that his statement that I wanted or stipulated for the profits, or any part of the profits of his contracts, and that I personally guaranteed him a professional fee of \$1,250 is an absolute falsehood. Knowing all the circumstances thoroughly, I can only account for his production as the effusion of a disordered mind.

GEORGE W. HOWLAN.

CH'TOWN, Dec. 17, 1892.

Now, Mr. Palmer is in Ottawa; he has been in Ottawa, I believe, more than one month, perhaps for two months, for I think he was here before the House met, and I am sure he must have been met by many hon. member of this House. Will any man who has met Mr. Palmer tell me that he has the behaviour of a man with a disordered mind? Does he look like a man who does not know what he is doing? Look at the plans he has on exhibition in the smoking room, look at the immense quantity of work he has per-

formed. Will any one tell me, except, perhaps, he be such an engineer as Senator Howlan—for he appears to be far in advance in the business—that these are not great works and worthy the attention of the members of the House? I am proud to say there is hardly a member of this House but has taken the trouble to go and examine these plans, and all have spoken of them very highly. Mr. Palmer is no common man; he belongs to a professional class in this country that must be respected. In fact, your great public works cannot go on unless you have an engineer to back you, and is that the way an engineer, an eminent engineer, a young man who stands high in his profession, who has taken part in engineering works of the greatest importance in the world, should be treated? Is this a man to be cast aside by the Government or Senator Howlan? If they treat Mr. Palmer in this way, is that not enough to throw a damper on this work? Where can we get an engineer, if we use Mr. Palmer in this way? Here is a man who has been used, since the fall of 1890, on works the most important in Canada, and they have the benefit of his engineering skill, of his plans, of his estimates; they have all they could get from him, and now, when they suppose that they are done with him, they throw him aside; they leave him starving in Ottawa, for I know he came up here without a cent; I know he has no money here. The Government have made one mistake in not letting this contract as they should have done; let them not make a second. Let them settle amicably with Mr. Palmer; let them do justice to him. If he is entitled to \$1,000, let the Government be magnanimous enough and just enough to pay him. If he is entitled to \$2,000, pay him, for it is enough, as I say to throw a damper over one of the greatest undertakings in the whole Dominion, to have it said that an engineer, one of the most eminent in his profession, has been treated with injustice. I am glad to say that Mr. Palmer has not a word to say against the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). Mr. Palmer tells me that he received from that gentleman every consideration, and he speaks in very high terms of him. I am glad of that. But that does not say that Mr. Palmer has had justice done him. Now, coming back to this tunnel business, I would like to know how much longer the Government intend to keep the Island people in suspense? They told us, as I said before in the early part of April, 1891, that all the information that could be desired or could be obtained, or all that was necessary to enable Sir Douglas Fox to give a close estimate, was at hand. Now, that is two years since, and still the information is not got. And one of the biggest farces that has been played in connection with the work was played last summer. I would like very well to find out how much money has been expended? The amount voted was \$12,000. But I am told that something like \$5,000 has

been spent. But I am told, further, that, if all the debts were paid, the amount expended would be in the vicinity of \$8,000, and I believe that is nearer the mark. So there is \$4,000 left, and I am told the Government intend to get the work finished for \$4,000. But I do not think they can. I forgot to mention that Mr. Palmer had invented a plan by which the borings could be done very safely in the deep water where there is a heavy tide, a plan which was not previously known. I believe the first offer was made to some eminent men in the United States, but the answer the Government got was that there was no instrument invented, so far as they knew, that would carry out the work. Thus, the whole devolved upon Mr. Palmer. He perfected the invention and he has got the patent. He has got the machine that can bore successfully across the straits. And is he now to be cast off; is he to be no longer regarded as a useful man in his profession, or even as a citizen having rights to be protected? If so, where do the Government expect to get engineers for any works that they may have in hand? They are going on with some works of great importance—I don't know that they are of very much utility—but they are important, at least, so far as the cost is concerned. For instance, there is the Soulanges Canal. How do they expect to get engineers for such work, with Mr. Palmer publishing, over his own signature, statements of the way he has been used. I tell this House and the Government that unless Senator Howlan can prove himself clear of the charges made by Mr. Palmer, the great majority of the people of Prince Edward Island, so far as I know, will be inclined to believe the statement Mr. Palmer makes. And if Mr. Palmer is right in the statements he makes, I must come to the conclusion that he has been badly used. I need not refer further to the utility of the tunnel. I only remind the House that the Government, led by the late Sir John Macdonald, was, to a very large extent, pledged to complete the tunnel. Now, I would put the House in mind of what he did say. On the 6th of February, 1891, he wrote to Senator Howlan as follows:—

If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay.

This is more than two years ago.

I understand Sir Douglas Fox is of opinion the scheme is a feasible one. I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the "Stanley," but of course she cannot fight against the elements.

There is the admission of Sir John A. Macdonald himself that the Government had failed to carry out the terms of Confederation, and he said: "If I am returned to power, the Government, under my guidance,

will at once take up the matter, and do justice to the province of Prince Edward Island. Has that been done? Is the Finance Minister prepared to stand up here and say: "Well, we are going to experiment further next summer, and, when this is done, in the fall of 1893, we will be able to go on with the tunnel, advertise for tenders to build it, or condemn the whole machinery." But I have no reason to believe they are going to condemn it. Perhaps this is kept up so that it may be used again on the eve of another election. I do not know, but really it looks very much as if we might be nearer to an election than a great many of us suppose. The Government, no doubt, know, but we, who are in Opposition, do not know. However, I warn my friends on this side of the House to be prepared, and not to be caught napping. This critical time may come much sooner than a great many of us anticipate. My opinion is based on the fact that this work is delayed. Now, I will read Sir Charles Tupper's telegram from Amherst, dated 28th February:

I regret that it is impossible for me to go to the Island, as the "Stanley" cannot cross, and I dare not attempt the capes. I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for \$6,000,000, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

Is that not enough to induce the people of Prince Edward Island to believe that the tunnel is going to be built? Is that not sufficient to induce the people to believe that the Government were honest? They had the promise of the Premier, Sir John A. Macdonald; they had the promise of no less a personage than Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner in England, who came over here, in his dignity as High Commissioner, to tell the people how they should vote. He told the people of Prince Edward Island, that, if the Government got in again, this was going to be built at once. The Government were sustained—perhaps, not by the electors of Prince county, nor of Queen's county; but, at all events, we are here, and we are a portion of the House. The Government has been sustained by the greatest majority they ever had since 1878. They have made promises which, I contend, ought to be fulfilled; and, as I have stated, I think, on a former occasion, if I found that the Government were bona fide intending to carry out this work, I do not know but that they would have my support. I would be very strongly tempted to support them. It would be a great consideration. A few millions and daily communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island might tempt me to do a great deal. In respect to continuous communication, how have the terms of Confederation been fulfilled? In what way have they been fulfilled? This beautiful steamer "Stanley" cost this country \$250,000. She is one of the finest vessels afloat on the waters of the St. Lawrence, but we find to-day that she is

Mr. PERRY.

disabled and, perhaps, will be disabled, to my sorrow and to the loss of the people of Prince Edward Island, for days and weeks. That is a serious thing. Our trade is stopped. We find that potatoes are now bringing a good price in Montreal, a good price in Boston, in Philadelphia, in New York, and even a good price here in Ottawa. To-day we have 1,000,000 bushels of potatoes to export from the Island, while the prices are good, but we are shut up and cannot take advantage of these prices; and by the time navigation is open, prices will be down, perhaps, and the people will have lost the opportunity which they ought to have, of selling their products. Notwithstanding all that, the people of Prince Edward Island are expected to pay taxes, just as well as the people who have the privilege of the home market, who live near Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, St. John and other large cities. We are expected to pay our taxes, just as well as these people. I repeat, that I do hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration, and that they will do what is right by Mr. Palmer. I am sure the House will readily endorse a vote of \$1,000 or \$2,000 for the assistance of Mr. Palmer. Mr. Palmer has been ill-used. I do not charge the Government with wilful injustice in this matter; I think it may be an oversight. People are apt sometimes to do things they should not do. However, it is never too late to repent. There is no sin, even a political sin, even a sin by the Finance Minister himself, but that may be forgiven, if he shows true contrition, if he shows that he is prepared now to do what is right and stand by Mr. Palmer, do justice to him, and send him home a pleased man. I think it will be a great feather in the cap of the Government, when they have to knuckle down to an engineer and intrust \$1,000,000 in his hands. I expect that the Minister of Finance will take immediate action, and that he will see that the people of Prince Edward Island are fairly and justly dealt with, and that if the project of the tunnel is feasible and if the cost comes within a reasonable sum, the Government will commence it in a short time. I hope they will not any longer follow the policy of "to-morrow." Let the Finance Minister at once take action and satisfy the people of the Island, and satisfy the people of his own province of New Brunswick, who also feel very much interested in this matter. Why, Sir, we find that in Prince Edward Island there are a hundred travelling agents from Toronto, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, trying to introduce their wares, their boots and shoes, although we are told by the census returns that the 109,000 in Prince Edward Island have 173 boot and shoe factories; still the boots and shoes we use are manufactured in New Brunswick and other places. Sir, it is ridiculous. I do not know myself what we can believe in respect to these re-

turns. In conclusion, I trust the Government will take this matter up at once. They have a duty to perform. They are legislating here, not for the Conservative voters of Canada, but for all Canada; and I contend that Prince Edward Island being part and parcel of Canada, we have a right to consideration. The Liberals are a respectable portion of the people of Canada, and we have a very strong belief that the first time the Government dare to open the doors for an election, we will be in power. Sir, they have a right to legislate for these people as well as for themselves. Let them show an example of doing unto others as they wish others to do to them. Follow that grand principle, and you will be all right. Do not do us an injustice because we are a small people; do not do us an injustice because we may think differently from you on political matters; but be assured that we are just as honest as you are, just as loyal as you are, that we pay our taxes just as well as you do, and the least we can expect at the hands of the Government is fair and even-handed justice.

Mr. YEO. My hon. colleague (Mr. Perry) has dealt with this matter so fully that he has left very little for me to say. However, it is a matter of regret to members of this House from Prince Edward Island, and to the whole population of that province, that delays have occurred in completing the boring and survey of the Straits of Northumberland. According to the promises which were made to the people of Prince Edward Island a short time previous to March, 1891, it was expected that during the following season steps would be taken to ascertain whether this project was feasible. We find now that two seasons have passed, and very little has yet been done. My hon. friend alluded to the letter which Sir John A. Macdonald wrote to Senator Howlan, and which was used pretty freely in Prince Edward Island during the winter and spring of 1891; and he also read the telegram from Sir Charles Tupper, which greatly raised the hopes of the people. They expected that justice was going to be done. We find that, up to the present, very little progress has been made. It appears, according to my humble judgment, it was an unfortunate step to let the contract for this undertaking in the way it appears to have been let. The work should have been performed by the Government, and no private individual, and no member of the Legislature should have been mixed up with the undertaking. There is no doubt the engineer who was employed to do the work, was competent, as he was highly recommended. Surely there was some one in the public service in some of the departments who could have superintended the work, so that it need not have been placed in the hands of a member of this Legislature, it matters not who he is. So far as regards the gentleman named, I know very little about the affair

except what I have seen in the public prints, but I say that, in an important matter of this kind, which would necessarily involve a large expenditure of public money, the Government should have taken steps to have seen that the work was properly done. It would be of very little consequence if it cost a few thousand dollars more to have it efficiently and properly done, and it would be far preferable to an expenditure being incurred which accomplished very little and left the matter still in an unsettled state. The terms of Union have been referred to. We see by the letter written by Sir John Macdonald that he admitted the terms of Union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion had not been carried out, and the tunnel seemed to be the only feasible scheme by which those terms could be carried out; and knowing the fact that the faith of Canada was pledged and that the Prime Minister had given this promise, which was backed up by a promise given by the present High Commissioner, it should have been the duty of the Government to take the most speedy steps to have these borings and surveys completed, instead of which, very little has been done. It was estimated that, in all probability, this undertaking would cost \$6,000,000. Of course, this is a large sum; but still, it is a small sum when we place it against the faith of the Dominion, and the solemn compact entered into between Canada and Prince Edward Island, but if, after the survey was completed, it was found the expenditure would involve a larger sum than the Dominion Government felt they would be justified in expending, then it would be a matter for consideration between the two Governments. But I do not think it is fair that this matter should be delayed from year to year. Two seasons have already passed since the promise was made, and very little has yet been done. I know it is the wish of every one in Prince Edward Island, that this matter should not be delayed until the elections come around again. This question caused great excitement during the last election in Prince Edward Island; it was handled for all it was worth by gentlemen running as candidates for the Government. We do not wish this to occur again. So far as the people of the Island are concerned they should be fairly and justly dealt with. I do not come here asking for favours, I ask only for justice, and that the terms of Union with Prince Edward Island should be carried out. Our people are suffering every year from the delay. During the present winter very great inconvenience has been felt from not having anything like continuous communication with the mainland. During part of the winter the steamer "Stanley" has been unable to make her regular trips, and at the present time she is laid up for repairs. The people, therefore, have had to resort to the old style of carrying the mails and passengers by ice-boats, the same way in which this was done with very little improve-

ment on the method in vogue previous to Confederation. The condition of things is not what we expected when we entered Confederation. The people of the Island have faithfully fulfilled their part of the contract, and they look to the Dominion Government to fulfil their part. I would strongly urge on the Minister of Finance the necessity of at once taking other steps, not by letting a contract in the way in which this contract has been let, but by taking prompt measures to have the borings and survey completed, and completed in a satisfactory manner. The people of the Island complain loudly in regard to the absence of expenditure of public money in that province; but this question of the tunnel is our greatest grievance. One of the inducements held out to the people of the Island to enter Confederation was that continuous steam communication between the Island and the mainland would be provided. We know this from the letter of the late Prime Minister; but notwithstanding all the efforts made, the Government have not succeeded in carrying out their part of the contract. I hope the Minister of Finance will, during the coming season, have the borings and survey completed in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am not myself aware of the correctness or otherwise of the statements made by the hon. members for Prince Edward Island. The subject is an entirely new one to me; but I have listened with much interest to their remarks. The hon. member who moved the resolution, read from certain documents some very grave statements. I am not acquainted with the engineer referred to, and I have never heard of him until this moment; but having listened to what the hon. member has said, that engineer Palmer is a man of professional standing, of world-wide reputation, in fact, one can hardly allow the grave charges he has made against a member of Parliament to pass by in silence. If I correctly caught the gravamen of the charge, this engineer alleges that one of our colleagues—and we are all interested in the reputation of our colleagues, both in this House and in the Senate—has been trafficking in a public grant, has by some process become possessed of public money voted by Parliament for a certain undertaking. If so, two very serious things have occurred: one, a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and the other a misapplication of public money. These are exceedingly grave charges to be made in any place, especially if made in a place such as this, the House of Commons of Canada, for they are thus made to the whole people. I appreciate extremely the delicacy that my hon. friend manifested in saying that he could not for a moment father these charges as against our colleague, the Senator in question. That being the case, I feel in justice to him that it would be unfair that we should depart from this question and allow

Mr. YEO.

it to pass away from the attention of the House at this moment in silence. It is due, I think, to our colleague, the hon. Senator, that some authoritative denial, if possible, should be made by the Government in regard to this transaction, some explanation, and if that explanation is not forthcoming to-day, let it be said that such explanation will be given at a later period. If we drop the matter now, it practically leaves these charges unchallenged, and in that way it is almost declared by the action of the House that they are well established and well founded. I should grieve to believe that there is foundation for that, and therefore if no one else rises to offer a word in his behalf I myself will express the hope that there is some satisfactory explanation which will remove a cloud from the reputation of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this affects the expenditure of public money, and money too with which, if I correctly followed the hon. member who introduced the matter, the Minister of Finance was specially concerned, I think the Minister ought to give us some explanation as to what he knows on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a motion for information, and if you pass the motion the information will be brought down in five minutes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Statements have been made of a serious character, bearing in mind the relations existing between the Hon. Senator Howlan and the Government, who practically employed him as an electioneering agent, and who thought so much of his services that they first of all induced him to resign his seat in the Senate, and then when he was rejected by the people of Prince Edward Island, put him back in the Senate to represent the interests of the people who would have nothing to do with him as a member of this House. I think the Finance Minister owes it to a man of that character, and also his own character, to give us an explanation, if there be any explanation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not propose to enter into any of the disputes which exist between Senator Howlan and Mr. Palmer, the engineer, but I think there has been sufficient stated to call upon the Government for an explanation upon one or two points. The House will recollect that some years ago, Senator Howlan expressed himself as taking a great interest in this scheme of uniting Prince Edward Island and the mainland by means of what was then called a subway. That scheme was condemned by Mr. Palmer, the present engineer, as impracticable, and he, or Sir Douglas Fox, or some of the engineers suggested that instead of a subway a tunnel should be constructed. We then had the letter of Sir John Macdonald, the Premier of this country, and the tele-

gram sent by Sir Charles Tupper, as to the political action the Government contemplated taking with reference to this great work. Whether it was for political or other purposes, the solemn assurance was given that from the investigation they were able to make into the matter they deemed the scheme feasible and promised it would have the support of the Government. When the election took place, we had the unseemly spectacle of a Senator resigning his seat in the Senate and contesting Prince county, not upon the politics of the country, but simply upon the construction of that tunnel. It was then charged against this gentleman that he came there simply as the mouthpiece of Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, and that if he did not secure his election he would be reappointed to the Senate, and that the whole thing was an insult to the people. That charge was stoutly denied. It was called an infamous slander, and the people were appealed to and asked whether they thought it was possible that a man occupying the high position of a Senator of this Dominion would condescend to be made a catspaw of the Government in this way. The charge that he would be reappointed to the Senate was repudiated on every hustings, and those who made the statement were charged with slander. In course of time, Mr. Howlan was defeated, and his defeat was no sooner recorded than he produced a new document appointing him to the Senate again. To show the connection the Government have with this gentleman, and how far they are responsible for his action, I may say that no sooner is he reappointed to the Senate again than he received a commission from the Government to travel across the Atlantic and give the benefit of his personal knowledge to Sir Douglas Fox, the engineer to whom the feasibility of this work was referred. The newly-appointed Senator—I think almost before he was sworn in—travelled across the Atlantic at the public expense, and gave Sir Douglas Fox the benefit of his experience, whatever that might have been. The Government certainly had my approval in their action before attempting to adopt Sir Douglas Fox's estimate, or put this country to the expenditure of from \$11,000,000 to \$20,000,000, as the different kinds of tunnels were variously estimated at; in determining that some practical facts should be ascertained before Senator Howlan's or Senator anybody else's opinion should be taken on the matter. They proposed that borings should be made across the Straits of Northumberland, so as to ascertain the nature of the soil where the tunnel was about to be built. That was all right, and now we have got to that stage of the history of the case where complaints are being made by my hon. friend (Mr. Perry), who moved for the papers. What are these complaints? With a large part of the complaints of Mr. Palmer, the engineer,

I take it that this House has nothing whatever to do, and I do not propose to take up the time in dealing with matters which are more strictly affairs between one business man and another. But there is just a point where I think the House has to do, and where my hon. friend the Minister of Finance also has to do. Mr. Palmer, the engineer, complains that he has been treated very badly. If the Government were altogether unaware that Senator Howlan was the real man in this matter, drawing the Government money, spending the Government money, as and when he pleased, purchasing all the supplies, hiring all the men, paying all the wages, doing all the work, announcing himself as the real contractor, and acting as the real contractor, and treating Mr. Palmer, the engineer, as a mere subordinate of his own; if the Government were altogether unaware of these facts, it is, to my mind, a rather extraordinary condition of affairs, because they had their own engineer upon the ground and knew what was going on, for I assume they must have been informed. Now, Sir, to the one or two matters that I think the public have an interest in, I propose to call the attention of the House, and to see wherein the Government, if at all, are to blame. The charges made by Mr. Palmer were these: That Senator Howlan made a bargain with him, induced him to enter into a contract for boring twenty-nine holes across the Straits of Northumberland, promised him that he (Howlan) would finance the matter, whatever that may mean—the Government were to pay the money, and I should imagine they did not want any financing about it at all—promised he would pay Palmer \$1,200 a fee, and that he (Howlan) would have all the profits. Subsequently that agreement, Mr. Palmer says, was modified, so that Palmer was to have one-half the profits and Howlan the other half. It is only fair to say that Senator Howlan denies that absolutely. I do not know whether we have anything to do with that fact standing alone. Senator Howlan has as good a right to have his word accepted, in the absence of any document, as Mr. Palmer has. But what further? He was to receive, as I said before, according to Palmer's statement, all the profits, which was modified afterwards to one-half the profits. And then they went on, Howlan advancing some money and drawing money from the Government on a draft, as I understand it, made by Palmer on the Government. So far so good. Now, as the work went on Palmer says:

As the Senator would not see the matter in this light, being evidently bound to carry out his own ideas, he therefore would not allow me the money to spend (that refers to \$4,000), but purchased everything himself, and engaged the workmen, not particularly for their merit alone. His hostility was based on my determination to carry out the work upon the usual practice of scientific routine. The Senator, on the other hand, desired to do it in a way

that, from an engineering point of view, was extremely ridiculous and impracticable.

Now, here is the statement made, that a member of the Senate, who had been specially taken into the confidence of the Government from time to time in connection with this business, who had gone across the Atlantic as their representative, and had seen Sir Douglas Fox, who had been paid for that trip out of the public money, who had returned and had induced one of Sir Douglas Fox's engineers to tender for the work, was acting as financier, paying the workmen and disbursing all the money that was paid by the Government under the contract. What I say is that as soon as the Government found that Senator Howlan was doing that they should have interfered. If he were not Senator Howlan I would say that it was not the Government's business; the contractor had a right to employ any one he chose to do his business; but he had no right to make an agreement with a member of this House to share in the profits of that contract. No more had he a right to engage the services of a Senator.

Mr. FOSTER. Could he not engage you as a lawyer?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He might engage me as a lawyer. What have we to do with that? What I complain of is that Senator Howlan was, in the name of Mr. Palmer, carrying on a contract with the Government. This House has nothing to do with his paying a retaining fee for a lawyer or a doctor or anybody else. But Senator Howlan held himself out to the people of the Island as the man who was doing this work, and Mr. Palmer as being simply a subordinate of his. The gravamen of my charge is that this matter, instead of being a purely business matter, was reduced to a purely political matter, and that Senator Howlan was permitted, with the knowledge of the Government, to act in a way which, to say the least of it, ran very close to a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and, if Mr. Palmer's statement be anything like true, was a direct violation of that Act. Upon that point I express no opinion, because it is only fair to say that Senator Howlan directly contradicts the statement that Mr. Palmer makes, and I suppose it cannot be determined which is right and which is wrong until a committee is appointed to take evidence and report. I am not going to adopt the statement of the one or the other, or to say that I believe Palmer as against Howlan, or Howlan as against Palmer; but we want to know what the charges were and how far the Government knew the facts, because therein lies the whole point. Mr. Palmer goes on to charge:

The work was delayed in every possible way, owing to the fact that Banker Howlan was not forthcoming with the money. The cash he had already used had been expended in carrying out his own erroneous experiments, and he would not allow me one cent to

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

spend upon the work. I received \$100 from the Senator on my own private account, but outside of this he entirely controlled the expenditure.

Now, I do not understand Mr. Howlan to call in question or deny any of Mr. Palmer's statements on this material point, the only one in which the public are interested, that Senator Howlan controlled all the expenditure, paid all the money, hired the men, bought and paid for the materials, and did what he liked in connection with the contract. The question was asked Mr. Palmer:

Did Senator Howlan at any time consult with you in respect to money transactions?

He answers:

Not exactly, but about the end of June he presented an account in a book which included the \$500 he had advanced to me as banker upon my I O U, as well as money for his own travelling expenses and other items amounting to nearly \$1,200, which I signed at his request, and which sum it was understood would be deducted from the amount of the contract. I may say, that it is for a detailed statement of this expenditure that I have asked Senator Howlan privately and through the press.

Now, the complaint in which the public are interested is this, that \$4,000 or \$5,000 of public money, which was paid on account of this contract, went through Senator Howlan's hands, and that Senator Howlan has refused to give him the items of that money. Palmer charges that in that amount the Senator charged \$500 for his own personal time. If these charges are true, they constitute a direct violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I do not know whether the Government were aware of these charges or not. The papers containing them were sent to the Finance Department, and the attention of the department must have been called to them because they were in all the press of the Maritime provinces. Now, it is also fair to say that Mr. Howlan in his report, so far as I remember it, in reply to this charge, said that he had expended all the money for the public works alone, and denied having appropriated any part of the money for his own expenses. I understand also that he was willing to leave the matter of his dispute with Mr. Palmer to arbitration. With all these disputes between Palmer and Howlan, or as to whether Howlan properly or economically expended the money, I take it the public have nothing to do, but we have to do with the question whether a Senator was allowed to act as a contractor, or as a financier, to control the expenditure of public money under a contract, to hire the men, to buy the material and pay for it; and when the nominal contractor charges that he got \$4,000 of public money, for \$1,200 of which he refuses to account, the Government have a right to insist on his giving an itemized account of the expenditure. With all the other disputes we have nothing to do; I brush them all to one side. If the Senator satisfies the public that he never made a charge for his time or his services, he will

have discounted Palmer's charges against him so far. As to that we have not the material on which to form a judgment. All that the public know is that although Palmer was the nominal contractor with the Government, Howlan was the only and the real contractor, that he handled the public funds under the contract and spent the money as he pleased. Then we have the charge made by the nominal contractor that Senator Howlan refused to account for \$1,200 of the money that had been expended, and the further charge that a part of that money was appropriated by Mr. Howlan for his own services. Mr. Howlan simply denies the statement, saying that it is absolutely false. But the public want to know what the items of the \$1,200 account consist of, and they have a right to know. This is public money. Senator Howlan is a public man, he is charged with doing that which, if true, would forfeit his seat, and he cannot expect to get off with a mere denial. I do not think that the Government are justified in remaining quiet either. They have a right to say to Mr. Howlan: Since you are charged with spending this money for your own services, you must give an itemized account which will justify the expenditure. I understand that some seven borings have been made, and that some \$4,000 to \$5,000 have been spent in making these seven holes, and that the balance of the \$12,000 has not been paid. I presume the hon. gentleman has not paid it, because the work has not been done, and I suppose he has paid what his engineer has represented to be a fair estimate of what was done. Of that I make no complaint, but I do think the hon. gentleman has been negligent, after this charge was made in the public press against a gentleman who was allowed, for political purposes, to appear down there, on behalf of the Government, in order to impress people with the idea that they were to look to him for employment and everything in connection with that business. This having been done in order to carry that county, the Government are to blame for not having cleared their skirts in the matter more than by a bald denial. These are the only matters in which I think the public are interested and for which the Government are, to some extent, censurable.

Mr. FOSTER. I have nothing to complain of with respect to the manner in which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has treated the question. I think he has treated it eminently fairly. The hon. gentleman who spoke first has, from his point of view, done what he thought was right as well; but I think the main part of his matter is, as my hon. friend who has just spoken has said, something with which this House has nothing to do. It appears that there is a misunderstanding between two gentlemen outside of this House entirely. One alleges one thing and another alleges another; and we in this House, I do not think, so far as that

is concerned, are called upon to listen to the complaints of either or to arbitrate between them. These gentlemen have had private business, and if one of them feels aggrieved, he has the remedy the law gives. If they do not choose to take those remedies, they must take the result of what opinions people will form with reference to the matter. It will probably be most satisfactory to my hon. friend and the House if I state briefly what took place. I may correct my hon. friend in two things. This is the first time I have heard that Senator Howlan was sent, as an ambassador or envoy of the Government, to London to see the celebrated engineer, Sir Douglas Fox, with reference to the Prince Edward Island tunnel or subway. I do know that he was sent there for quite another purpose, and I do happen to know that when there he took the opportunity of seeing Sir Douglas Fox; but he was not sent by the Government for that purpose in any way, nor was he paid a single dollar of public money for that purpose. This is the first time I have heard the idea advanced, and my hon. friend is entirely wrong. Then, again, my hon. friend, in order to show that Senator Howlan, in this matter, must have been acting with the approval and in the confidence of the Government, made the assertion that the Senator was a trusted and confidential friend or agent of the Government in the matter of this tunnel. Now, there was nothing of that. It did happen that Senator Howlan, who was then a Senator, resigned his seat, and went down to Prince Edward Island, and took a very active part in an election there. Why did he do that? With a quiet seat in the Upper House, with an arduous contest ahead of him—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And an appointment in reversion.

Mr. FOSTER,—would it not have been very much easier for Mr. Howlan to remain here in Ottawa and attend to his senatorial duties when the time came, and receive his pay, and have an easy time, rather than go down to the rough climate of Prince Edward Island, in an inclement season of the year, and conduct a very vigorous and hard campaign? Why did he do it? He certainly made nothing out of it. He certainly must have been out of pocket by the transaction. I have my own opinion as to why he did it. He did it, I think, because of his very great interest in the tunnel. He has always had an interest in that, as my hon. friend knows, and a real interest, and I think he showed it in sacrificing his position and going down to fight a battle in its behalf. My hon. friend concluded, and, I think, almost stated, that Senator Howlan had the reversion of a senatorship in his pocket. That is not at all true. He had no promise of reappointment. He took his senatorial life in his hands, he went down into the battle, and

was, I am sorry to say, unsuccessful. After that battle was over, and the smoke had cleared away, in looking around for a gentleman to fill the vacant place, it did happen that Senator Howlan's name was thought of, and he was reappointed. It was a new appointment, but to say that there was a reversion of it, and that he held that reversion, is to go quite beyond the record. Outside of that, I think I have plainly shown that there was no confidential relations between the Government and Senator Howlan with reference to the subway. Now, after Sir Douglas Fox's estimate as to the cost, it became apparent that no fair estimate of the cost could be given until the stratification of the bed of the straits was shown, and the Government promised to have borings made in order to find out the stratification, so that that being ascertained, it would be possible for the engineer to make a comparatively near estimate of the cost. Well, when that came to be decided, a sum of about \$12,000 was put in the Estimates in order to carry out these borings. Then came the question as to how these shall be done. Now, one complaint my hon. friend might have, was that tenders were not called for publicly, and a contract let. So far as that is concerned, I consulted our Government engineer, Mr. Schreiber, and, after going over the matter, we found that that would be almost impossible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made no complaint about that.

Mr. FOSTER. No; but I said that might be made a subject of complaint, and for fear it should, I state how we came to do as we did. At the same time, there was here, Mr. Palmer, who had a reputation as an engineer, who had been engaged by Sir Douglas Fox himself in various works, in one capacity or another. He had something to do with the straits, and knew the country, and was interested in the tunnel, and he offered to do this work for \$12,000. I did not take his offer at first. I referred it entirely to Mr. Schreiber, and asked him to report as to whether he thought that was a reasonable sum, and whether we had better accept Mr. Palmer's undertaking to do the work. The Government engineer reported upon the matter, and gave it as his opinion that it was a very reasonable sum, if it could be done at that. An element of uncertainty in the whole thing was how the boring could be carried out, as to whether an apparatus could be arranged by which the boring could be successfully done, taking into account the season of the year, the stormy weather and all that. And so it happened that, on the advice of the chief engineer, I gave the contract to Mr. Palmer. He was to bore twenty-nine holes of certain dimensions and certain depths, and certain other things were to be done. On the other hand, there was to be an officer of the Government there, as a sort of supervisor, to keep track of the work and to

Mr. FOSTER.

keep the Government informed and Mr. Bain, a local geologist, was to go there and watch the cores, as they came up, and form his opinions and write a report afterwards as to the geological formation. This happened in May, I think. The vote was put into the Estimates and voted, but the money was not available until 1st July of that year. Now, the season there, as my hon. friend knows, is a very short one and a very uncertain one, and, in order to do the work within the season—because his contract bound him to finish it by 1st October—it was necessary that Mr. Palmer should get at the work before 1st July. He came to see me, and asked me if I could advance money. I said: I cannot advance money until 1st July; you will have to do as you please as to that; on 1st July you will be paid according to progress estimates, and thereafter on the same plan. If you cannot start until then, that is your own look out; you know your contract. You will be paid, but you cannot be paid until that time. What arrangement Mr. Palmer made, or was going to make, I know no more of than my hon. friend. All I know was, that he went to work, and that the borings progressed, to a certain extent. I went away shortly after that on my own holidays, and the whole charge of the matter was placed in the hands of Mr. Schreiber, as was right. I had nothing to do with it, after the contract was signed, but gave the whole into the hands of the chief Government engineer. About 1st July, I think, an order was brought to me, signed by Mr. Palmer, to pay Senator Howlan \$5,000. I said to myself: I cannot pay that money until I know what work has been done. I telegraphed the engineer, and he made a report to the chief engineer. That report, as revised by the chief engineer, said, that up to that time work had been done which justified the payment of \$4,000. I telegraphed the department to honour the order to the extent of \$4,000. A little later, I was in the city of St. John, probably a little after the middle of July; I am not sure of the date. Then, for the first time, I learned that there was any difficulty between Mr. Palmer and Senator Howlan. As soon as I found what the difficulty was and saw the dissatisfaction which seemed to be breeding between them, when Senator Howlan made that fact known to me, I said to him: I shall pay no more on that order. I took the precaution to see that Mr. Palmer's receipts and certificates were for the whole of the \$4,000 that was paid. I then said: That ends the matter, as far as you and I are concerned; now the money is released, it is after 1st July; now Mr. Palmer can carry on his own work. Then came the tug of war. Mr. Palmer still had no money. The work could not go on, unless the men were paid and the drills were paid and supplies were paid for, and it came then to be a point as to whether the Government should go a little further than the contract bound them

to go, in order that Mr. Palmer might still have a chance to do his work. He came to me. I sent him to the chief engineer. He saw the chief engineer. I was in Ottawa at the time. Because of the Government's desire that the time should be utilized in the best of the season, I said: I will advance \$2,000. I will place it in the bank in Charlottetown, and it will be paid out for material and labour, on the certificate of yourself and the Government engineer, that it has gone into the work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This was subsequent to the payment of the \$4,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I put the \$2,000 there in the bank, and Mr. Palmer worked on it until that was spent. That brought him up to about 1st October, and about that date the Government engineer reported that the weather was rough and unsuitable and that work could not be done to advantage. The time had elapsed within which the contract should have been finished, and I did not think it wise to continue the work longer. The chief engineer advised me strongly in that direction, and the work ceased. Now, that is all there is to it. Whatever difficulties, in the first place, Mr. Palmer may have had in financing his scheme, I know nothing of; I have nothing to do with. It might have been better, if I had said to Mr. Palmer: Before I let the contract, I want security that you will carry it out; but I did not think this necessary, because I proposed to pay him on progress estimates, and, therefore, the work could go on. Whatever difficulties took place in financing, it was not for me to know. Whatever difficulties took place between Mr. Palmer and any person financing for him, I knew nothing about and had nothing to do with. I acted in the payment as I told the House; I considered it my duty to do that. As to these little affairs that have come up, I think my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry) did not take the right ground. He said: These are the charges against Senator Howlan, and I want him to prove himself guiltless. That is not British justice. The proper way, I think, would be to say: These are charges made by a gentleman of whom I know very little, though I know nothing against him; they are made against a Senator of whom I have known something and for whom I have respect as my colleague; I cannot believe these statements until they are proved. It is assertion against assertion, and I think it is something that we here have nothing to do with. I quite acknowledge the position taken by my hon. friend opposite me (Mr. Davies), that if the Government had authorized this and was cognizant of it, they might have something more to do with it in the way the hon. gentleman has stated. But we have not, and I think these little things should be settled between Mr. Palmer and Senator Howlan outside. If any hon. gentleman in

this House or the other thinks that Senator Howlan has violated the law or the independence of Parliament, or made himself liable to the penalty, there is a way of bringing that up and having it tested. But I do not suppose any hon. gentleman thinks that. As to the stories that have been told, I do not want to say one word against Mr. Palmer. I have tried not to listen to anything he had to say against Senator Howlan; I have tried not to listen to anything the other side had to say against Mr. Palmer. I have tried to keep myself clear from that and I have tried to keep the department and the Government entirely clear of it. It is true that ten holes were bored where Sir Douglas Fox said he would like to have twenty-nine bored, and a large amount of the money, I do not know exactly how much, but I think about \$6,000, has been spent. But the chief engineer, Mr. Schreiber, and the engineer on the work on behalf of the Government, have united in a report to me that they think that the boring of six or seven more holes in proper positions would give all the data that are necessary, and they say this can be done for the amount of money that is left. It is my intention to have the borings finished as the Government promised, with the money that has already been voted. I think that will be sufficient. I may say here that there are some few bills yet out of men who say they have put their labour into it, or supplied something that actually went into it. The Government are not liable, they did that for Mr. Palmer; but at the same time we must act fairly. When these bills are collected and given to the engineer to supervise, the payment, or a proportional payment, will be made for what actually went into the work, so far as the sum will allow.

Motion agreed to.

BREAKWATER AT RUSTICO.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Copies of all reports, correspondence or other documents, not already brought down, relating to the state of repair of the breakwater at Rustico, P.E.I.

He said: I make this motion in order that I may bring to the attention of the Minister of Public Works the condition in which that public work stands to-day. The Rustico breakwater is built at the mouth of Rustico Harbour, in Prince Edward Island. Rustico Harbour is situated in the bend of the Island, and is a large fishing place. It is one of the first and oldest settled places in Prince Edward Island, perhaps is the most thickly-settled place, as it is almost a village for many miles, and is peopled by French Acadians. It is the largest fishing harbour in Prince Edward Island, and is the only harbour of refuge on the north side of that Island. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that this is not like an ordinary breakwater, at an or-

dinary place, for local purposes. In the autumn of the year, when large fishing fleets gather about Prince Edward Island, it is off the vicinity of Rustico that they very often congregate; and in case of a storm from the north-west or the north-east, they have to run to a harbour, and Rustico is the only harbour of refuge near that place for many miles. Unless, therefore, the fishing fleet can, in case of a storm, gain access to a harbour, the chances of loss of life are very great; and if they are caught in the bend of the Island, on the lee shore, it is sometimes impossible for them to beat off: they must run for a place of refuge or be destroyed. I am old enough to remember when a very large number of ships, some fifty or sixty, went ashore on that coast for want of a harbour of refuge, and many hundreds of lives were lost. A few years ago the Government built a breakwater there. The harbour at the bar was silted up, and the quantity of water over the bar was so small that vessels were unable to frequent the harbour that formerly used to frequent it. The Government, therefore, built this breakwater, and the consequence was to deepen the water on the bar some three or four feet, and make it quite a nice little harbour for small schooners. The breakwater, of course, is very much exposed to storms. It began to be destroyed at the end, a little more each year, and was continually repaired by the Government. Almost every year some little repairs had to be done upon it, and I think that three years ago they ceased to repair it. The end of the breakwater was washed away, and the consequence was that the bar of the harbour, which in the first instance had a depth of some three or four feet given to it from the construction of the breakwater, again silted up, and I believe there is now a depth of three or four feet less than there was a few years ago. Vessels that frequented it after the breakwater was built are now unable to do so with safety. Before I came up from Charlottetown I wrote to one or two of the leading people in that place, asking them about the condition of the work as it is to-day, and in order that I may lay it before the hon. gentleman I will read a letter I received in reply to my own. I want to urge upon him that it is not simply a local work, and it ought to be treated in a different manner from works which are purely local, because it is not for the fishing boats and the fishing vessels of Rustico alone; but it is for the fishing fleet of the whole Maritime provinces that congregate off that harbour as a harbour of refuge. The letter which I received from Mr. James Laird, a large miller, ship-owner and ship-builder, residing in the vicinity, in reply to mine, was as follows:—

Yours of the 22nd ult. came to hand in due time, but I did not reply sooner because I wanted to gather all the information I could on the matter. In the first place, there have been repairs put in on the end of the breakwater, less or more every year for the last

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ten years with the exception of last year. The end of the breakwater would undermine with the heavy current around the end, it being built on the sand, and the piles not being driven to the solid, would undermine and hang by the bolts fastening at the top. It has been wearing away at the rate of from ten to twenty feet a year for the last ten years, until nearly 150 feet of it has gone, leaving in that space a mass of rubbish nearly dry at low water, and very dangerous for boats after dark. Now, in my opinion, if all the money that has been expended on it for the last ten years, had been laid out at first in good, long iron pointed piles driven through the sand to the solid earth or rock below, and at least the outer end kept filled with hard imported stone (as our Island stone won't stand the action of frost in the winter and salt water and storms in the summer) it might have stood pretty well until the present time. The breakwater improved the harbour from four to five feet, and now there is about one and a half feet less than there was at the time water was at the best. As regards the amount that it would take to put it in good repair, I do not feel myself competent to decide. * * * That is a matter, of course, that the engineer will report upon.

I spoke to the local member for the county, a very good Conservative, I may say, Mr. McDonald McKay, and he wrote me the following:—

OYSTER BED BRIDGE, P.E.I., Feb. 7, 1893.

L. H. DAVIES, Esq., M.P.

DEAR SIR.—I would bring to your notice, now that you are going through the Estimates for the current year, the state of the Rustico breakwater. This is a very important work which cost the Dominion Government over \$18,000 for construction. I think it was in the year '80 or '81 that this work was constructed. Previous to that time the harbour was very poor, it being very difficult for vessels having a draft of over 8 ft. water to do any trade with the place, there being only 8 ft. water on bar at high water. Since the completion of that work there has been an average of 12 ft. water on bar, allowing vessels of 11 or 12 ft. draft to trade freely, until two years ago a heavy storm carried away some 50 or 70 ft. of work; since which time the harbour has been growing continuously worse until last season, when there was only 7 to 8 ft. water on bar. In August of last year a schooner drawing only 8 ft. 3 in. water, loaded with coal, got stranded on bar in trying to enter harbour, and has been a wreck since. The work at present is in a wretchedly bad condition; the outer end that now remains of the work is all open to the sea, and lifts and works with every heavy storm, and the sea wall of the work is stripped of the plank covering for a distance of 150 ft., and the sea makes a breach through the work for this distance, removing ballast and tearing up the work. There has not been one dollar voted for last two sessions to keep it in repair. If there is not some sufficient amount placed in the Estimates this year and authorized to be expended early next season, I am afraid the whole work will be carried away next autumn and fall storms. The months of June, July and August are the proper months to proceed with the works, in fact the only months that any expenditure can be placed on this work to advantage. I need not remind you of the great importance of maintaining and adding to this work, so that the people of Rustico may have a good shipping harbour. As you are aware, Rustico is some ten miles from our Island railroad, and therefore can derive little or no advantage from it in the transfer of produce to markets or of the importation of coal or lumber, which are now very extensively brought in and sold to farmers of Rustico, nine-tenths of them now being obliged to have coal brought here for fuel,

and all the lumber for building and fencing purposes having to be brought here from New Brunswick and neighbouring provinces. Besides, Rustico has the second, if not the largest, fishing industries situate on the Island, employing some 50 or 60 large boats, and giving employment to some 300 men for five months of every year. There are eight schooners of different sizes owned and trading out of Rustico, with as many more which trade with Rustico each season.

Yours very truly,

DONALD McKAY.

Hon. gentlemen will see from the letters I have read the very great importance of the work, not only from a local stand-point, but from a provincial one, and even from an interprovincial one, because the fishing fleet of Nova Scotia is almost as much interested in this harbour as is the fishing fleet of the Island. There are a large number of boats, employing from 300 to 400 men, and it is absolutely essential to the existence of hundreds of families residing in the vicinity of this harbour that this breakwater should be placed in an efficient condition at an early date. I hope the hon. Minister will observe that the work can only be done during the months of June, July and August, in the opinion of Mr. McKay, who has lived there for many years, and who distinctly states that unless these repairs are executed at an early date the present work, which cost \$18,000 or \$19,000, will be carried out to sea. I hope the Government will not allow the coming season to pass without placing this work in good condition, so that the fishermen and seamen who have frequented the harbour in the past will be able to enter with vessels drawing from ten to twelve feet, as they have been accustomed to do for many years. This harbour will also afford an excellent harbour of refuge for the fishing fleet, and hundreds and thousands of sailors and fishermen will bless the Government that has provided that harbour on that which, at certain seasons of the year, is a dangerous coast.

Mr. OUMET. I find there is in the department correspondence from Messrs. Welsh, D. McKay, Blake, McLeod and Hon. D. Ferguson, who exchanged letters with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that correspondence has been referred to my department. This work has not escaped the attention of the department. I have had the work surveyed by the local engineer, and a report from the chief engineer is now in the department, stating that it is desirable to construct an "L" 60 by 30 feet, at the outer end of the breakwater, which would cost \$1,500. The repairs to the rest of the breakwater would cost \$1,000. This expenditure would place the breakwater in good order, and make it useful to the fishermen as well as to shippers who frequent that port. The department will certainly make the repairs if the amount placed at its disposal is sufficient for the purpose. The correspondence will be brought down at once.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I trust the hon. gentleman may be able to look at the letters I have read, when published, and, if possible, submit to his engineer the propriety of adopting the suggestion made by one of those gentlemen, namely, that the piles should be iron-pointed and driven down into the rock. Otherwise the same result will follow as has occurred in the past, and the sand will be washed away and the structure will float.

Motion agreed to.

NICKEL COINAGE.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York) moved :

That it is expedient, with the end in view of encouraging native products, to adopt a nickel coinage in place of the present copper coinage.

He said : Mr. Speaker, during the few moments which I have to address the House, I shall bring before the attention of the Government and of hon. gentlemen a very important question. Within the last few years we have discovered in this country a very important and valuable metal known as nickel. In Canada we have the largest known supply in the world of that metal, and the only other country which produces it is the French colony of New Caledonia. I am glad to say that the uses to which nickel is being adapted are steadily increasing, and as we have an immense supply of it in this country, I think it is our duty to further its use in every way which we possibly can. My motion now suggests that, for a subsidiary coinage, we should use nickel instead of copper. It has great advantages over the latter metal, it has about the same specific gravity, has a better colour, is odourless, and is non-corrosive. In the Report of the Geological Survey, a year ago, there is a full description of our nickel supplies given by Mr. Barlow, an officer of the Geological Department, and I would commend that report to the perusal of any one interested in the question. I may mention that among the many other uses of nickel, it is valuable as an agent for hardening iron, to be used in making steel plates for armoured vessels, and is now largely employed in the manufacture of cooking utensils. I am informed that, this year, there will be from five to ten million dollars worth of nickel taken out of this country and sent to all parts of the world. It is obvious that nickel will make a much better metal for coinage than copper, for the reason that it has a better colour, that it has no disagreeable odour, and that it has already been successfully adopted by many countries in different parts of the world. I have in my possession specimens of nickel coins now, used in a great many European countries, and the experience is that they are much better than copper coins. Nickel is already used in the United States, as a subsidiary coinage, the average issue there exceeding \$1,000,000 a year. Among the

other countries in which nickel is used for coins. I may mention Salvador, San Domingo, Switzerland, Egypt, Servia, Bulgaria and Jamaica, which spent £500 sterling in 1889 for nickel coinage. Germany issued a small nickel coinage in 1889, and there is a proposition now before the Chambers of France to adopt a pure nickel coinage. The alloy at present used for nickel coinage is made up of 75 per cent of copper and 25 per cent of nickel, but I think we ought to show that we believe in our own products and our own metals and that we should issue a coinage in Canada made out of pure nickel. This metal can be bought as cheaply as 25 cents a pound, and in that way, the issue will far more than pay for itself. I believe that if Canada shows the example of issuing a nickel coinage, it will have a good effect on other countries in the world toward introducing this metal, and, in this way, we would find an enormously increased demand for our nickel supply. Although the quantity used in Canada would not be great, still the other countries of the world use an enormous quantity, and perhaps our example might strengthen us in inducing the mother country to also adopt nickel coinage. It is for this reason that I ask the Minister of Finance to consider the question, and to see if he cannot, by next session of Parliament, bring down some measure in this direction which will give us the use of one of our own metals for our subsidiary coinage.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to my hon. friend's advocacy of a new coinage. I do not know if the amount of the raw material we would use in this country would cause a great demand for our nickel supplies. But I think with him that the coinage itself would be a cleaner and better coinage than copper. It would not be quite so profitable to the country; but if it helped the nickel deposits and gave us better money, we might forego the profits. It would probably then be found that no one in the country would be reduced so low as not to have a nickel in his pocket.

Motion agreed to.

BRIDGE AT ST. MICHEL D'YAMASKA.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all documents, memorials and correspondence between the Government and the Sorel Board of Trade and others, in relation to the granting of a subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the rebuilding of a bridge at St. Michel d'Yamaska.

He said : In placing this motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the subject. The bridge on the river Yamaska having been carried away by the ice, the town of Sorel and the neighbouring region thereby found themselves last fall without any means of communication. In 1870, debentures were issued at Sorel in favour of the Richelieu, Drummond and Arthabaska Counties Railway Company to the amount

Mr. MACLEAN (East York).

of \$40,000, on the understanding that the trains were to be kept running over the line between Sorel and Yamaska. Later on, the obligations of the Richelieu, Drummond and Arthabaska Counties Railway Company were handed over to the South Eastern Railway Company, upon the express condition that full satisfaction should be given to the town of Sorel and to the neighbouring parishes; it being agreed upon that the trains should be kept running over the line as usual. The South Eastern Railway Company have become insolvent; trustees have been appointed and arrangements made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company so as to secure the regular running of the trains. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company state that they are creditors to the amount of nearly two millions of dollars, and further that they are unable, under the present circumstances, to build the bridge on the river Yamaska. On the 1st October last, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having stopped running the trains over the line, we were left at Sorel without any communication southward and eastward. I have repeatedly called the attention of the Government to the matter, as will be shown by the papers submitted. A delegation from Sorel is coming up to-morrow, accompanied by the bishops of St. Hyacinthe and Nicolet. Our petition is before the Governor-General in Council, and I do not see on what ground, in a pressing emergency like this, the Government could deny our request. It is said that no railway subsidies will be granted this year. Ours is quite a special case and I call the attention of the Government to the urgency of our demand; judging from the past, I entertain no doubt as to our securing from the Government before the next session, some aid towards the rebuilding of this bridge.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Documents, memorials, plans and reports of surveyors, and correspondence in relation to the dredging of Baie La Vallière.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

Correspondence, tenders, engineers' reports and estimates, as well as all other documents in the possession of the Government, relating to the construction of the lock or locks at Little Rapid on the Du Lièvre River, County of Ottawa; also all correspondence in the possession of the Government referring to the payment of the extras to the contractors, including all reports with regard to the right of the contractor or contractors to bring a suit against the Government in the Exchequer Court for the recovery of extras claimed.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Correspondence, documents and petitions relating to the following subjects:—Improved mail service to and from Perkins' Mills, Stagburn, Venosta, Lascelles; the establishment of post offices in the township of Eardley and Hull; better mail service between Montreal and Ottawa and intermediate points.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Return showing the number of employees dismissed from the Prince Edward Island Railroad since the 1st day of March, 1892, the name of each employee dismissed, the date of each dismissal, the reasons for such dismissals; also the names of employees reinstated, if any.—(Mr. Perry.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Justice and the Hon. J. G. Bossé, Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in relation to the trial and condemnation of R. H. McGreevy and O. E. Murphy, charged with a conspiracy to defraud; of all recommendations and of all reports made by the said Murphy and McGreevy and to a commutation of the sentence of R. H. McGreevy; of the order for the commutation of the sentence of R. H. McGreevy, and of any petitions, letters, &c., in relation thereto.—(Mr. Tarte.)

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 56) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. McInerney.)

Bill (No. 67) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Frémont.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 94) for the relief of Robert Young Hobden—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.) On division.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise electors who have taken bribes.—(Mr. Weldon.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. JEANNOTTE. When this Bill was last before the House, I spoke in French, and the English press stated that I had declared here that I owed my election to corrupt practices. I never said anything of the kind. I certainly would not have been such a fool as to buy votes when I was elected by acclamation. There was an English newspaper from Toronto which went further, and described me as a representative Frenchman of Canada and of France, and then went on to say that the French people in France are the most corrupt people in the whole of Europe. If the editor of that Toronto paper had visited London, he would have seen sufficient there to make him do penance for the rest of his life for the sins of his countrymen. If those editors who take this view had read the English newspapers, they would have seen that some months ago that a certain number of ladies had published a letter in the press declaring that women of the first

society in London were not at all what they ought to be. And some years ago, some titled people had a club in London, of which no one would dare to give the name, and some of the members of that club were obliged to leave London and remain abroad for one year at least. I do not wish to accuse anybody, but he who accuses first his neighbour must be very clean if something is not found that cannot be said against himself. I said that the only way to prevent corruption in elections was to stop canvassing from door to door, either by the candidate or his agent. That is now done in every election, and I have done it myself, and it is that canvassing from door to door which I said that I did, but I never said that I bought votes. Why should I buy votes when I was returned by acclamation?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I approve of the principle of this Bill: the object aimed at by the promoters of the Bill, the prevention of bribery at elections, is undoubtedly one which commends itself to the approval of this House; but, although there seems to be a consensus of intelligent opinion as to the principle involved in this Bill, still we differ considerably as to the means of reaching the end in view. I am strongly in favour of any measure tending to the promotion of electoral purity. Speaking, however, from experience, I am not prepared to say that bribery prevails as extensively in the province of Quebec as it does in Ontario. This is easily accounted for, Mr. Chairman, from the fact that, with our lack of capital in Quebec, candidates who take the field cannot afford to expend large sums of money. We all know the instance of that Ontario candidate, within a short distance of Ottawa, who found it convenient to lock up a few years ago, fifty thousand dollars. A candidate who is wealthy enough to throw away such a large sum of money in buying votes, will find it an easy task to break your law and corrupt the electors in canvassing for votes. In the province of Quebec, we are too poor to lock up such large sums with us. Candidates or citizens aspiring to become so, are seldom found willing to expend, not fifty thousand, but say, ten thousand dollars; why, Sir, the expenditure of five hundred dollars would sometimes cause serious financial annoyance. However well grounded may be the cause of alarm about the prevalency of bribery at elections through the Maritime and English provinces generally, thanks be to God, the evil has not yet deeply taken root in our French province. Although no one can dispute but that the principle of this Bill is a thorough good one, still I question very much whether it will have any practical effect, were it to become law. An election once over, as there always happens to be a successful candidate, and an unsuccessful one, proceedings will be forthwith taken by the friends of the former against the latter. A petition will be pre-

sented with a view to have the election voided; and after the petition is served in due form, and the preliminary examination of parties gone through, there will be a delay of six months running from the end of the session—which delay parties may avail themselves of—to have a petition signed by twenty-five or more electors, asking that an investigation be made as to whether bribery has prevailed at such election. It is no difficult task to conjecture the result. But, I may first ask, Mr. Chairman, who is going to pay the cost of this inquiry. Who is going to pay the travelling expenses and the remuneration of commissioners? Is it the Government, or the accused parties, or the candidate whose election is under trial? The Bill is silent on the matter. Let us for one moment suppose that the commissioners, after indulging, through the different parishes of the constituency in parades involving considerable costs to be paid, I presume, by certain parties, may succeed in unearthing two or three corrupt practices committed at the election, what hence? The Bill only provides that the commissioners may declare that the electors guilty of such corrupt practices shall be disfranchised for seven years. And please remark, Mr. Chairman, the Bill contains no provision as to hearing the accused parties in defence of the acts which incriminate them, or to show their falsity. No, Sir, not the least mention is made of it. I say this is a false principle according to English law. As we are all aware of, the Court of Appeal and subsequently the Supreme Court of Canada have given judgment to the effect that no elector is to be disfranchised except for acts of personal bribery and unless he has been put on his trial by direct action. Contrary to this decision, the commissioners may under this Bill, on the evidence given by "ex parte" witnesses, declare that the accused are disqualified. With reference to the judgments above alluded to, I may relate what took place in connection with the trial of a controverted election held in the county of Laprairie. The president of the court had deemed it his right to disqualify an elector on the single evidence that he had received one dollar from another elector, apparently as a bribe. An appeal was taken from this decision to the Court of Appeal; the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, no doubt, recollects the fact, as he was one of the counsels. By the unanimous finding of the five judges composing the Court of Appeal, the judgment of the inferior court was reversed and the decision of the Court of Appeal confirmed by the Supreme Court, was to the effect that no elector can be disfranchised unless a direct action be brought against him. Under this Bill, no direct action need be brought against the indicted parties; the commissioners may take the course they please; and whenever they choose, may hear or not witnesses, according to their caprice. Assuming for a moment I am accused be-

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

fore the commissioners; I have no right to attend the proceedings. The power of the commissioners is altogether discretionary. It is quite immaterial whether the commissioners be judges or not. The purity of elections at which the Bill aims, the checking of bribery at elections, is a principle I approve of; it is the means proposed I disapprove as self-destructive and worthless. Unless a direct action be brought against the culprit, the sentences of the commissioners cannot be put in execution, nor can the former be disfranchised. The impression will, no doubt, go abroad again, through the English press, that I advocate bribery at elections. No, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to corrupt practices and bribery at elections. I venture to hope there is no man, either in this House or outside of it, who does not sincerely wish to see bribery at elections stamped out. True, bribery does not extensively prevail in the province of Quebec; and whether evidence of any corrupt practices has been found before the courts, is more than I could say. Out of so many trials of controverted elections following up each general election, very little has been elicited. The same fate awaits, quite likely, the trials recently entered in court. No more will be heard of them. Mr. Speaker, in the province of Quebec, we have witnessed the case where, though some over-zealous friend spending a dollar bill in corrupt practices, an election has been voided and the candidate unseated, which does not go to prove that bribery prevails to any great extent in our midst. This Bill provides that, on a petition being signed by twenty-five electors, an inquiry shall be held in a county, in view of discovering whether bribery has prevailed to any extent. I entertain no doubt as to whether twenty-five electors may be found to sign such a petition, but as to whether there may be found twenty-five responsible electors; the Bill does not enlighten us on the matter, nor does it offer any security to that effect, as it provides only that such petition shall be signed by twenty-five or more electors, and nothing else.

Mr. AMYOT. The Bill provides also that the twenty-five electors shall deposit the sum of one hundred dollars.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. I am aware of it; but it is also required to make a deposit of \$1,000 to enter a controverted election petition, and, the suggestion is offered to raise the costs to \$1,500, with the view to do away with vexatious trials. Now, this Bill tends to aggravate the existing state of affairs, as it creates a new machinery and only provides for a deposit of one hundred dollars. But to what end is this deposit made? It is not contended, forsooth, that it will serve to defray the costs of the trial, as the commissioners have full power to summon such and as many witnesses as they please, thereby involving heavy costs.

These witnesses will have to be paid and therefore taxed. Again, on whom are the costs to be saddled? On the Government, I presume, the Bill being quite silent on the matter. The Bill is also reticent as to whether the accused parties may be summoned to appear before the commissioners to prove that they are not guilty of the charges brought against them. As every one knows, such acts as seem to infringe on the law may be quite the reverse. From the fact that a man gives money to another, it does not follow that he intends to bribe him. Where acts of benevolence are intended, one should not without reasons, impute corrupt motives. Charity is of season, even during an electoral campaign. This Bill, to my mind, such as drafted, will be tyrannical in its operation over honest electors, as twenty-five voters will suffice to cause inquests to be held throughout the different parishes of a constituency; quite an easy task, with the number of grumblers to be found in each county, when an election is over. The Montreal "Star" in its issue of the 6th March, dealing with the law-amending mania so prevalent nowadays, says:

They are doing altogether too much law-making at Ottawa these days. There seems to be an impression among the leading men in Parliament that, if they can only get laws enough passed, this community will run itself without exercising will or conscience or common sense.

This year they are gone into the "thumb-screw and rack" line of business and are rapidly pushing through a revolutionary Bill that will compel a prisoner to incriminate himself, and, worse still, will compel a wife to incriminate her husband or a husband to incriminate his wife.

Hitherto British law has refused to stoop to this infamous torture of the most sacred affections among mankind, even for the purpose of dragging forth the truth; and how often will even this turning of the rack fail to exact the truth when a perjury will shield a loved life.

Should this Bill become law, the accused parties, on appearing before the commissioners, would be bound to say: "I have bribed to the extent of one dollar—disfranchise me or send me to jail. The remarks of the "Star" relate to criminal law. The same journal goes still further:

This was the amendment to the old law lately passed, being simply an extension of the British principle of giving the prisoner the benefit of every doubt. But to make the person a "compellable witness" is a total reversal of British practice and precedent. Nay, it is an attempt to repeal a law of nature.

Nor is there any defence of the iniquitous bill to be found in the plea that it may sometimes aid in reaching the truth. They get at the truth out West occasionally by partially hanging a man. To learn the truth was the excuse for long centuries of examination by torture. It is not sufficient to show that a method of inquiry may elicit the facts. It is also necessary that the method itself does not infringe the liberties and national rights of man.

This Bill is a kind of lynch-law, whereby an elector who allows himself to be bribed at an election is disfranchised, on his own

evidence. I believe this Bill also violates a principle of English law, inasmuch as a man may be compelled to answer questions tending to criminate him and involving certain consequences, as fines and disfranchisement for seven years. Does any one believe that this Bill is going to put a stop to bribery, as practised in the province of Ontario, for instance? Not in the least, Mr. Speaker. Bribery will prevail in spite of this Bill. In England, if I am correctly informed, the Controverted Election Act has been amended, with the result that out of six hundred and some elections, which have been held since the last appeal to the people, hardly thirteen have been contested. And who will dare say, Mr. Speaker, that bribery is unknown in England? Who does not know that those great advocates of electoral purity, the English lords, spend to the tune of 30,000 pounds sterling at one single election? Were the law to be altered so as to enact that canvassing from door to door, either by the candidate himself or through his agents, shall be in the future strictly prohibited and deemed an offence sufficient to void an election, I would favour such an amendment, for, as previously said, when this Bill came up before the House, I see no other way of insuring electoral purity and putting down bribery, the growing evil of this day. But, no doubt, such a drastic amendment to the franchise law could hardly suit these gentlemen from the English provinces who would find it impossible, under such stringent provisions, to resort to bribery and corrupt practices, and therefore they feel reluctant to accede to this suggestion. It is not in public meetings that bribery is practised, the time being so well taken up with the speeches; but in committees corrupt practices are sometimes, though seldom, resorted to. In conclusion, although I approve of the principle of this Bill—I emphatically assert it again, to prevent any misapprehension—still, I object to the wording of it as defective; and as to its practical operation, it will prove powerless in checking bribery. I contend that the decision of the commissioners will not be put in execution, for so soon as they will apply the law, their finding will be set aside by the courts of justice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose, Sir, that the principle of this Bill has already been adopted by its second reading, and we have now simply to consider its provisions, and to see how far the Bill carries out the object the hon. gentleman aims at. The Bill says, speaking of the petition, "signed by twenty-five or more electors of such district," then further down, in lines 8 and 9, "signed by the petitioners, stating that they are such electors." This might mean that they are "such electors" as have committed the bribery, or "such electors" as have signed the petition. If the hon. gentleman will take out the word "such," and add after "elect-

ors." "of the said electoral district," no room will be left for doubt as to the intention. Then, in lines 10 and 11, "the Governor-General shall appoint one or more persons," and so on. It would be well to state the persons who are to be appointed. They are described here: "such persons being judges of the Superior Court of the province." I suppose that the principal court of the hon. gentleman's province is called the Superior Court. It is not so with us, and perhaps would be better if we were to designate the court as the election court. Then the court that would have the right to try election petitions in every province would be the court from whom these persons should be chosen. I think if these changes were made, there would be less ambiguity in the section, and that it would, perhaps, better fulfil the object that the promoter of the Bill has in view.

Mr. WELDON. I think these are very good suggestions, especially the last, to substitute "judges trying election petitions" for the reason given. I think it is a more accurate expression. The others are verbal changes which it would be well to make.

Mr. TISDALE. In Ontario, I think, there are no judges designated who are to try the elections. They are appointed and selected, if my memory serves me aright, by some of the judges themselves. I think the idea is a good one, but let us not be indefinite in expressing it. It seems to me, any Superior Court judge of Ontario may be one of the election judges, but this does not designate which it shall be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the Controverted Elections Act he will see that a court is established for the trial of election petitions. That was held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It consists of judges taken from the Supreme Court of the province, which consists, as the hon. gentleman knows, of two divisions, the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeals. The reason I suggested a change was that I do not know that this expression "Superior Court" would cover any class of courts in the province of Ontario. But if you designate a court by some Dominion name, and you have a Dominion election court provided, it would include those judges of the higher court that have the right to try election petitions under the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. WELDON. I had in mind the language of the British North America Act, where the terms used are "Supreme District and County Courts." I meant a judge higher than a district or county court judge, but I think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is a good one.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Does not the election law cover all such cases? Sec. 1, chap. 8, 53 Vic., intituled: An Act to further amend
Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the Revised Statutes, chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise, says:

2. No person found guilty of any corrupt practice under the provisions of 'The Dominion Elections Act' shall, during the seven years next after the time at which he is so found guilty, be entitled to be registered on any list of voters, subject, however, to the removal of such disqualification under the provisions of section ninety-one of the said Act.

Now what is meant by corrupt practices? Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting elections of members of the House of Commons says in terms:

The following persons are guilty of bribery, and shall be punishable accordingly:—

(a.) Every person who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, gives, lends or agrees to give or lend, or offers or promises any money or valuable consideration, or promises to procure, or to endeavour to procure, any money or valuable consideration to or for any voter, or to or for any person on behalf of any voter, or to or for any person in order to induce any voter to vote or refrain from voting, or corruptly does any such act on account of such voter having voted or refrained from voting at any election.

(b.) Every person who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, gives or procures, or agrees to give or procure, or offers or promises any office, place or employment, or promises to procure or to endeavour to procure any office, place or employment, to or for any voter, or to or for any other person in order to induce such voter to vote, or refrain from voting, or corruptly does any such act as aforesaid on account of any voter having voted or refrained from voting at any election;

And every person so offending is guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall also forfeit the sum of two hundred dollars to any person who sues for the same, with costs.

I contend, therefore, that the electoral law, such as it stands, covers all the questions raised by the present Bill. In my opinion, it would be preferable to adopt the Bill (No. 90) of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), which is now on the Orders of the Day. I think this Bill would meet with the approval of all the members of this House, and I think it will have the same effect as this. Besides, it is in accordance with the laws, and the Bill we are discussing now is against the law. I do not think there is any man who knows law who will say that a man can be disfranchised for seven years except by direct action. The Supreme Court, and the Appeal Court in Montreal, have both given judgment to this effect. The effect of the Bill I speak of will be the same as this, and it will probably be quicker in its action than the one now before the House.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman makes a suggestion that I withdraw the Bill. I would make a suggestion in return that he give the Bill his support, and then the English papers that have misunderstood him will no doubt do justice to his position.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. But your Bill is im-

practicable; there is no law to put it in force. I move that the committee rise.

Motion negatived.

Mr. AMYOT. I am certainly in favour of the principle of the Bill. Anything which tends to purify elections and prevent candidates from succeeding by means of money will receive my support. But in this instance I ask myself if the Bill is not rather incomplete. Would we not be acting a little hastily by passing it this session? First of all, there is no clause in the Bill by which the accused party shall be notified so that he may be present and make his defence.

Mr. WELDON. I have an amendment to propose, which I think will meet that.

Mr. AMYOT. Here are twenty-five electors who will deposit the sum of \$100, \$4 each. They will have no responsibility. They will make oath that to the best of their belief corruption has prevailed on a large scale. But we know that after an election, when the minds of the people are excited, it is very easy to find twenty-five men in a riding who will swear that to the best of their belief corruption has prevailed. But these men will have no responsibility whatever. Very often this \$100 may be the balance not spent of a reptile fund. After they put up that money, the Government has to appoint a commission of one, two or three commissioners; then that commission goes to work and becomes nothing else but an inquisitorial commission. They go on a searching expedition; they visit each family; they may call every citizen of a parish, nay, even of a county. They may involve the Dominion in an expenditure ranging from \$1,000 to \$20,000, in making an inquisitorial investigation, based upon the quasi affidavits of twenty-five men without responsibility. Now, Mr. Chairman, the accused party will have to employ lawyers, and when this costly enquete is over, and those who have been accused have paid their lawyers, and lost there time in going here and there wherever the judges may hold their enquete, who will refund them for their expenses? Not only will that be an inquisitorial investigation, but it will be a tyrannical one, one which you will make without any guarantee to the accused party that the expenses incurred by him in self-defence will be reimbursed to him if he clears himself. The idea of the Bill may be good, but the plan should be more matured. Now, there is another consideration. You go to a poor man who is in need of money. Perhaps his family is suffering, and you give him a loaf of bread, or \$1. The man who does this is a rich man, with his pocket-book full of money, and he goes and bribes the poor man with \$1. This rich man goes free, but the poor man who has been bribed and seduced by money, owing to his poverty, is deprived of his rights for eight years. I think that is not correct. The briber should

be punished as well as the party who is bribed. That is another feature of the Bill to which I object. Now, Mr. Chairman, should not these twenty-five petitioners be responsible for the costs? Should twenty-five men have the power, by a quasi affidavit—I call it that, because when we say that to the best of our belief corruption has prevailed, without giving details, it is only a quasi affidavit—should not these twenty-five men be responsible for their affidavits and for their petitions? Should they not guarantee to the Government that they are in good faith by becoming responsible for the costs or part of the costs? Now, there is no county in this Dominion, there is no place in the world where counties are organized, I may say, where you will not be able to find twenty-five men who will join together from motives or revenge, or some other unworthy motive, swear that there has been corruption, and you give power to these twenty-five men to involve the Dominion in heavy expense without holding them responsible. When you attack a candidate you attack only one man, but \$1,000 are exacted from you as a guarantee for costs. You do not have to look after his estate, or after his property, to see if he is able to pay, but he has to make a deposit in the court of \$1,000 as a guarantee for costs. But in this case you take any one who is on the list, rightly or wrongly, and you give him power to involve the Dominion in great expense, and you institute an inquisitorial investigation, you trouble families and saddle the accused party with heavy costs, and you do that without making the petitioners responsible in any way. Under these circumstances I can not approve of the Bill as it stands now. It needs to be so largely remodelled that I think the mover had better wait till next session, and then when he has prepared a new Bill, as he is very well able to do, we will give it our hearty support. Now, I must protest against some words which have fallen from the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte). That gentleman says that he is against corruption; but whenever a Bill to prevent corruption comes before this House he always votes against it. He has made the extraordinary statement that in the province of Quebec we are too poor to practice corruption. Such a piece of nonsense I never before heard in this House. In the province of Quebec we are not so poor as that. If you want to practice corruption in Quebec you can do it. There is corruption in our province in many places; it is no use to deny it; it is no use to say that Ontario is corrupt and that Quebec is not. There is corruption everywhere in Canada, and it is the duty of this Parliament to try and stop it. But when any measure is brought before this House with the purpose of preventing corruption, the hon. gentleman immediately jumps up from his seat and protests, and says that is not the way to stop corruption. Then let him suggest some way of his own of preventing corruption, when our attention is

turned towards devising repressive laws. If we do not pass stringent laws against corruption we shall go on, as we have been doing, having many counties corrupted—

Mr. GEOFFRION. And misrepresented.

Mr. AMYOT—and the representation of Parliament will not be what it ought to be. I will close my remarks by asking the mover of this Bill to withdraw it and calmly consider it until next session, and then when he brings it back, in an acceptable form, we will give it our support.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Of course I cannot speak for the district of Quebec, with which I am not acquainted, but I am able to say that in the district of Montreal there is no corruption. We are not rich enough to throw our money away for nothing; we keep our money in our pockets and live pretty well with it. The hon. member for Bellechasse has said that it is always desirable to prevent corruption. I likewise favour any Act that will prevent corruption, but this Bill will not suppress, but rather encourage corruption, and I will prove it. Twenty-five electors will sign a petition setting forth that they have reason to believe that there were corrupt practices at an election, and then a commissioner will be appointed. What will follow? The candidate who has been elected will have to buy up those twenty-five electors to shut their mouths. There is no doubt that course will be pursued. Of course those twenty-five electors will not have deposited \$100, but there will be some one behind them who will have made the deposit. He will go and see the candidate elected, and say to him, "You are in trouble, but I think I can settle the matter, very quickly and very easily. You have been elected, but you will have to defend your seat. This may cost you \$2,000 or \$3,000, and unfortunately you are not a rich man and cannot spare it; if you have any money, you had better keep it for your family." Then the man will close by saying, "Give me \$1,000 or \$1,500 and I will settle the whole matter." Then the newly elected member will settle it and will pay \$1,000, and no more will be heard of the enquête. Money will thus be saved, for the enquête would not be a proper one, but would simply be a fishing expedition for evidence. Instead of \$3,000 or \$4,000 being spent on an enquête, the party himself will be called upon to spend \$1,000 to protect himself and his friends, especially if he has been guilty of some corrupt practices, and the member-elect will be willing to do it. My hon. friend opposite desires voting to be made obligatory. I take a different view, and I want to vote when I like. I do not want to be told that I have to vote, but I want to be free. This country is the most free country in the world and we want to maintain that freedom, and do not want to be told by any law whether we shall vote or not. I am not against a law preventing corruption, but I

Mr. AMYOT.

should like it to apply to those who commit corrupt practices and who sometimes feel themselves obliged to buy votes. They want not only a strict law but a tyrannical law, while I am in favour of a very strict law being enacted. The present law, however, affords every protection to both candidates and electors. If a candidate is guilty of corrupt acts he can be fined and sent to gaol for three months, and he may also be disqualified for seven years, and any of his agents or any person guilty of corrupt practices can be fined \$200 and disqualified for seven years, and every elector who receives money or promise of money for voting or abstaining from voting, can be fined \$200, and his name may be erased from the list. The hon. member for Albert cannot want any more rigid legislation than this, unless indeed they want to pass a law by which not only the truth will be ascertained but by which the newly elected member will be prosecuted because he has not secured a large majority. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the Bill until next session.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have been impressed a good deal by the remarks made by the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte). It seems to me that I see some further difficulty in the way of passing this Bill. I equally with the hon. gentleman opposite am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and in favour of any provisions that will have a tendency to lessen corruption in the country.

An hon. MEMBER. How about the cities?

Mr. COATSWORTH. In the cities, too. We have to be careful, however, to protect the interest of all parties. I will put a case. Let us follow up the proceedings a little. Twenty-five persons, who may be worthless, because, I am sorry to say, a great many of the electors are so from a financial point of view, and I do not use the term "worthless" in any sense derogatory to themselves personally, but, from the financial point of view, they are no good—file a petition, with their affidavit or declaration, against an elector, say, in East York, to bring the case to Toronto. The man lives twenty-five or thirty miles out of the city. An act of corruption is charged against him. He is summoned to appear on a certain day before a commissioner at Toronto, because the trial is not necessarily in the parish or township where the elector lives. So this elector, who may be a substantial man, is brought into Toronto and has to bring his witnesses and wait there for trial. Suppose he succeeds, then he is so much out of pocket, \$100, \$200, \$300 or \$400. There is no provision here that he is to be paid his costs. One of the primary principles of litigation is, that the successful party must be paid his costs by the other party. There is no such provision in this Bill. Any hon. gentleman who happened to have votes in another district—and I myself have votes in East York and other districts—might be brought up him-

self, and have to incur a long bill of costs in defending himself against a petition of twenty-five electors, who may be worth nothing financially, and in the long run he may be compelled to pay a large bill of costs, in order to have his name confirmed on the voters' list. That is the end of the matter. No doubt, proper provision should be made for preventing corruption, but it seems to me that this machinery is cumbersome. It is a multiplication of lawsuits. The tendency of our legislation, I think, should be to reduce the number of lawsuits, not to increase it. I do not see why the same machinery we use in our election trials may not safely and fairly be used for the purpose of preventing corruption; but I think this Bill should be remodelled. It may be, that the hon. gentleman has remodelled it so as to meet the objection I have taken, but it strikes me as an almost fatal objection, that a voter's vote may be challenged and a person be obliged to travel twenty-five or fifty miles to stand his trial in court, and be kept day after day attending court; and the result may be, that the case may be dismissed and he cannot get his costs. In some cases he will be out of pocket \$1,000. One of the privileges we now enjoy, except in one of our courts, in Ontario, is the privilege of appeal. I believe that a voter, if he has been disfranchised, ought to have the right of appealing to the court 'en banc.' It appears to me, that the Bill, in that respect is defective. There is a summary trial under the Bill; there are no pleadings; there is no way in which a man may know beforehand exactly what evidence is going to be brought against him. He may be taken by surprise by the evidence, and if a judgment goes against him, he ought to have the right to have that judgment reviewed. While entirely in favour of this Bill or of any Bill which would tend to reduce electoral corruption, at the same time I do not think I can support it as the Bill is framed.

Mr. WELDON. In moving the second reading of this Bill, I took occasion to say that I hoped that the members of the House who favour its principle, would give us the great advantage of a constructive and helpful criticism of it. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out, in the first section, a criticism that seemed to me helpful, and as indicating that he was disposed to carry out the mandate of the House in passing the Bill through that stage, and my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) made, what I consider, apt and proper and fair criticisms. I may say to the hon. gentleman that when we come to the proper clauses, I propose to move amendments which, I think, will answer all but one of the objections he has offered. On clause 11, dealing with the matter of notice, I intend to move that the following shall be added:

That the Commissioners shall not report that any voter has taken a bribe, unless and until they are sat-

isfied that he has had actual notice of the charge against him, and has had an opportunity of meeting the same, or that it was impossible to give him notice by reason of his intentionally avoiding service.

I also agree with the hon. gentleman that the deposit mentioned in the Bill is too small and, in my judgment, a deposit of \$400 or \$500 would very well meet the objections on that ground. If we put the deposit at too high a figure the Bill will be entirely useless and unworkable. The objections taken by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) I must say, without any spirit of gibing or harshness, do not seem to me to be based upon, at least, a sympathetic view of the Bill. Of course, I take the hon. member at his word when he says he is in favour of the principle of the Bill, and I ask him, then, to use his legal ability to help to reduce his views to some form in which they can get expression. I do not agree with his views in the main. I think the danger he speaks of is whimsical and imaginary. I cannot see what in the world could induce people in a county to take unreasonable and unjust action without any party behind them, without any party fund behind them, without any organization behind them, but simply a desire to say that their votes should not be swamped by the ballots of those who sell their franchise. If there is no feeling in a county, and if the men who will not sell their votes do take hold of this thing, and put up their money to cleanse their county, then I grant you in such county the Bill will be of little service. I propose, when we come to the proper section, also to ask the committee to adopt the following:—

That the Commissioners may make rules, regulating their procedure as to the duties of any officer appointed in connection with the inquiry.

These are not unimportant, but very simple amendments, which, I think, will meet the real objections so far offered.

Mr. LISTER. I think that hon. gentlemen that desire to put down the growing evil of this day, should be found supporting this Bill, and, instead of finding fault with the Bill and picking out objections, that they should use their best exertions to make it as perfect as possible. No hon. gentleman can dispute but what the principle of the Bill is a thoroughly good one, and ought to be supported by every person. Desperate diseases require severe remedies. It is not at all likely that this Bill may be brought into use in a great many counties, but it is notorious that in some counties throughout the country bribery has become a desperate disease, and in these counties, it will be the interest of the law-abiding portion of the community to invoke the law which my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) is now endeavouring to put upon the Statute-book. It may not be a law that will be often called into force, but it will be a law 'in terrorem' for the purpose of frightening the wrong-doers. There is no question about it, notwithstanding what

some hon. members may say, that, throughout the length and breadth of this country, bribery does prevail to a great extent. Notwithstanding the very stringent laws we have on the Statute-books for punishing bribery, we know, as a matter of practice, that on a trial of an election petition, it is the custom of the judge, when one case of bribery is established, to say: "I void the election." There may be one hundred charges of bribery in the particulars, but, from that moment, the election is voided and you cannot go into the other charges. Unless you charge personal bribery, these charges are not investigated, and persons who have been guilty of bribery escape the penalties of the law. This thing is repeated election after election, with the result that persons who are disposed to break the law become more careless as to the means they resort to, and bribery, like a cancer, is spreading.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what position of affairs would come from the following state of facts: The election is not protested; a petition is filed under this Act against, say a couple of dozen persons, because under this Bill the same twenty-five men can impeach any number of voters. The case is tried by the commissioners, and all these men are, we shall suppose, found guilty of taking bribes. In the meantime let us suppose that the time for protesting the election has passed. There is the finding that the election has been corrupt, and yet the real remedy that Parliament has always been aiming at, namely, to avoid the election, cannot be had.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think that is the object of this Bill. We have an election court to regulate that. This Bill is for the purpose of purifying the county and to punish men who have accepted bribes regardless altogether as to who may be elected in the constituency. It is no punishment to a man who takes a bribe to have an election set aside, but it is a severe punishment to the candidate who has been put to heavy costs. The longer a law of this kind is left out of the Statute-book, the more dangerous the position of the candidate becomes. It is so to-day that a man must be either enormously wealthy or miserably poor to go into politics. If he is in moderate circumstances it is almost as much as the support of his family is worth for him to enter into politics. An election petition or two may be filed against him, and though he may be entirely innocent himself, yet through the action of some indiscreet agent his election is set aside and he has to pay all the costs. Now, unless we adopt some radical means to purify our constituencies of men who are guilty of that kind of thing, it will go on increasing from election to election. The object of this Bill is not to try election petitions at all, but to punish men who have been guilty of taking bribes at elections; and when it is known

Mr. LISTER.

that a law of this kind is on the Statute-book, disfranchising men and imposing severe penalties on them for acts of this kind, it will have a deterrent effect upon them. I think this is a law which every hon. member of this House should support, whether he comes from the province of Quebec or not. It is his duty to the country, as a loyal and patriotic man, to support it. If he takes a more selfish view of the question, it is his duty to himself to support it. Whether he looks at it from the higher or the lower ground, every man in this House should support a measure that is going to purify the electorate of this country, and the tendency of this measure will be in that direction. When twenty-five men put up, say \$500, that surely ought to be a guarantee that they are taking proceedings which they think at all events are just. That sum will be used, I suppose, as security for the necessary expenses of the proceedings.

Mr. AMYOT. The Bill does not say that.

Mr. LISTER. Well, the Bill can be amended. There is a principle here, and every man who approves of that principle should bend his energies to making the Bill as perfect as possible. It is not necessary to put this Bill off to another session. That is a mere makeshift. The Bill is before the House, and the House is just as capable of dealing with it to-day as it will be one year hence, and the hon. gentleman who refuses to support it may have to answer to his constituents for refusing to do what little lies in his power to remedy this great and crying evil.

Mr. DICKEY. There is one more consideration that I think ought to influence this House to favour the principle of this Bill—I mean the principle of stopping bribery in the constituencies. I think it is the experience of a good many hon. gentlemen in this House that, though money has been spent in securing their election, it has been spent largely against their will. They have found it impossible to control enthusiastic supporters who wanted to spend money whether forbidden or not, and men of that stamp always have this security, that if a protest is filed, they can stop the inquiry at any time by throwing up the sponge, and thereby escaping the danger of being put on the stand. This Bill will serve a very useful purpose in giving men who handle bribery money to know that if they bribe extensively they run the risk of a commission going into their county and sitting down and waiting for them, and bringing up the men who receive the money and finding out who, in the county have been bribed. I think that any hon. gentleman who wants to assist in putting down corruption, cannot get any better way of doing it than by striking terror into the minds of the men who handle the money.

Mr. COATSWORTH. But the Bill does not touch the briber.

Mr. DICKEY. I know that it does not. It is not for that purpose. It is to purge the electoral lists of men who do not sufficiently value their franchise as to use it honestly. With regard to the question of costs, I cannot see that there is practically very much in that objection. In that respect, the Bill may be subject to amendment. But as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, here is a great and crying public evil, and I do not think we should be stopped from doing anything we can to correct it, by some mere technical objection about some individual in some constituency who may have to pay out something. If the Bill is imperfect, we can amend it, but I should be very sorry if the principle of the Bill should not be given a fair trial.

Mr. FREMONT. With respect to the principle of the Bill, I think all the members of this House are of the same opinion: We all aim at what is good, and are all desirous of making the elections more moral, and we desire to prevent bribery and corruption. The question is, whether this Bill is practical, and whether it would do away with bribery and corruption in elections. In looking over the revised statutes of Canada, I see that chapter 10, "An Act respecting inquiries as to corrupt practices at elections of members of the House of Commons," contains about the same features as the Bill now before the committee. It settles, in a fair and honest way, some of the questions to which this Bill relates. This law, by section 1, provides for two cases in which commissioners may be appointed by the Governor-General in Council, to make inquiries respecting corrupt practices in a riding. The first case is when a judge, in his report on the trial of an election petition under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, states that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the election. This case is not provided for in the Bill before the committee. The second case is exactly the case provided for in this Bill. Within sixty days after the publication in the "Canada Gazette" of an election, a petition may be presented, signed by any twenty-five or more electors of the constituency, stating that no petition charging corrupt practices has been presented and that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the election; and there is annexed to the petition a solemn declaration. Now, I heard the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), while speaking a few days ago on this Bill, stating, if I understood him aright, that there was a great deal of corruption in every election that took place in this Dominion. This evening, to my great surprise, I heard the same hon. gentleman stating just the contrary—that in the province of Quebec, or in his district, at least,

there was no corruption. I think there is a great deal of exaggeration in both of these statements of the hon. gentleman. It is undoubtedly true that in many cases corrupt practices take place at elections, but it is equally true that, as soon as an election is over, those who supported the defeated candidate cry out every where that the result was due to corruption and bribery. In those circumstances, it would be very easy, immediately after an election, to find, not only twenty-five electors, but a large number, who would be quite willing to sign any petition, especially when it does not require to be backed by a heavy deposit. This Bill provides for a deposit of \$100, but I understood from the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that he intended by an amendment to raise the amount to \$500. I think the law actually in force is a better one. Section 15 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes provides that any person presenting a petition shall deposit with the Accountant of the House the sum of \$1,000. That is a more reasonable amount in proportion to the expense, which would be very heavy indeed if commissioners were appointed under the Bill before the House.

Mr. GILLIES. That is on filing the petition.

Mr. FREMONT. I mean the petition to have commissioners appointed to make inquiry respecting bribery, under chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes. Another feature in the Bill I cannot approve of is section 11, which, even with the amendment mentioned by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), cannot, to my mind, be acceptable. It is contrary to all principles of the administration of justice that, on a simple notice given to a party that evidence has been adduced against him, a report might be sent and his privileges as a citizen and elector be cancelled for a number of years. The law, which I quoted just now, meets this case in a perfectly just way. Section 14 of chapter 10 of the the Revised Statutes says:

Whenever it appears by the report of the Commissioners under this Act that any person named by them has been guilty of a corrupt practice and has not been furnished by them with a certificate of indemnity, such report, with the evidence taken by the Commissioners, shall be laid before the Attorney-General of Canada, who shall, if in his opinion there is sufficient evidence available for a prosecution, certify such opinion to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon communicate the report with the evidence to the Lieutenant-Governor of the province in which the election was held and the Attorney-General of Canada shall instruct counsel to assist in any prosecution which is thereon instituted by the local authorities charged with the administration of justice.

So that the Act which is now in force provides for the trial of all these parties against whom corruption and bribery has been proved before the commissioners. It is not simply the report of the commissioners which disqualifies him, but the action must be taken in the name of the Crown upon that

report, and a trial had before he can be punished. I would suggest that the Bill be withdrawn, and that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) should present, at the next session of Parliament, a Bill amending this chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes in such a way as to meet his views, which are, I doubt not, those of the majority of this House.

Mr. MASSON. With regard to the first section, we have to consider whether the judges of the Superior Court and such judges as try election petitions are the proper parties to appoint as commissioners to make inquiry, and be, at it were, Grand Juries to visit each riding in the Dominion—in fact to take upon themselves the duties of a grand inquest. We also have to consider whether, having made the inquiries, they shall proceed one step further and draw an indictment against the parties accused before them, and who, on their report, must necessarily be punished. As to the matter of principle, I would object to the inquisitorial nature of this Bill, but as has already been explained, the object aimed at cannot well be met except by something in the nature of an inquisition. Now, what have these commissioners to do? They have to go, upon the petition of twenty-five electors, to any riding in their province. They are to give their notice when they shall hold sittings. They will necessarily receive evidence, and the party accused, it is suggested, shall have ample notice. The Bill already before us does not provide that, but the mover tells us he will propose an amendment whereby ample notice will be required. When that section is before the committee, I shall propose some amendments, by which to fix what shall be considered "ample notice," and to see that no precarious or slipshod manner of giving notice is allowed them. These judges are then formed into a grand inquest, to hear the complaints. They make such inquiry as may be suggested. Being from a distance, they can know nothing of the cases themselves; they are entirely at the mercy of those who brought them there, those who appeared before them with a view of prosecuting the parties. Therefore, they issue a large number of subpoenas. The expense of the witness' subpoena is provided for, but not in the definite manner I think it should be, but that is very easily rectified. A case is made out against a certain party. Now, I think it is one of the principles of our law, that, when a person is accused of a crime, or an offence against the law, be that offence small or great, he should have notice of it, he should have particulars of it and should have time to prepare his defence. Therefore, instead of going on with one continuous sitting, hearing a complaint that is brought before them, they should give this man notice that the sitting is to be held on that day, otherwise he comes there entirely unaware of the particulars of the charge against him, that

Mr. FREMONT.

he received a bribe, or in what manner the bribe was received, whether in money or in "kind," whether directly or indirectly. They come there, and, in nine cases out of ten, they will claim to have been taken by surprise, whether actual or pretended. Dissatisfaction will follow; their friends will be dissatisfied, and not wholly without reason. It, therefore, should, in my opinion, be provided, that when a prima facie case is made out before the commissioners, they should then adjourn their hearing for a definite time, say, ten days. It seems to me, ten days or twenty days is short enough notice, but, I suppose most judges would consider it ample. It would depend altogether upon the constituency. In one constituency it would be ample, but in another it would be a very short time. Notice of this adjournment should be given, with such particulars as the commissioners have at that time, so that the man put upon his trial for receiving a bribe, would be in the same position as the man brought before our courts on information having been made before a magistrate, and a prima facie case having been made, he would have reasonable notice, with the details of the charge made against him. If that is the work we expect these men to do, I question the propriety of incurring the great expense to the country and of placing such a tremendous burden upon the shoulders of our Superior Court judges. I doubt whether they are the proper persons to appoint for the preliminary inquiries, at least. Would it not be better to provide for some local official, such as the revising officer or some officer in the county, already there, to make the preliminary inquiry, and when before that officer, who takes the place of the grand jury, it should be remembered, in making the inquiry, if he finds a prima facie case, then the application should be made to try this prima facie case before him. It seems to me, that even the penalty of disfranchisement is one that should not be inflicted without the protection which goes with other trials involving questions of penalty. There is no member of this committee, I suppose, no member of this House, I trust, no elector in the country who will not admit frankly that bribery does exist, that bribery should be stopped, and that, if legislation can stop it, then legislation should be resorted to for that purpose. But at the same time, while we admit all that, we must at the same time admit that no person should be hastily tried, no person should be hastily punished and no person should be hastily deprived of his vote.

Mr. McLEOD. There seems to be a consensus of intelligent opinion that bribery is a growing evil and one that should be stamped out. This Bill proposes to do it. I have heard a good many objections made to it, but it seems to me that after all they can be answered. Let us see what the difficulties are. The object of this is to do away with bribery.

in other words it is to say to a man: Your franchise is not an article of merchandise; it is not for you to trade in, and if you turn it into an article of merchandise you shall no longer have a right to use it. I think the judges are the proper persons to inquire into these charges. Under the Act that has been referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, they were the persons to try them; but that Act was simply ineffective. This Bill is to do what I presume was intended by the other; in other words it is to make the other effective. A good deal has been said about the cost of the party getting witnesses there to defend himself. These objections do not strike me very forcibly. The charge is that he sold his vote. He knows whether he did or not. He cannot possibly have many witnesses; I do not see how he could call any witnesses. He could call twenty witnesses to say: I did not know that you sold your vote; but that is a question for himself. There is one section I would like to see amended when we come to it—section 4. It provides that the courts shall be held in the district or within ten miles of it. I think it should be held in the district itself. I admit there are some sections, as is admitted by the promoter himself, which could be advantageously amended; but, having agreed upon the principle, it seems to me the true course is to take the Bill up section by section, and amend those sections which require amendment in order to carry out the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. MASSON. My hon. friend who has just spoken seems to think the case a very simple one for a man who is put on his trial that he is restricted to one piece of evidence. I was going to speak of that on another section. He might require evidence to meet a circumstantial case; he might require evidence to discredit the witness who says he is bribed. There are many ways in which he might be put to expense and many reasons for which he might require time to prepare his defence, which points are not provided for in this Bill. I threw out these suggestions while speaking on the first section, not with a view to harassing the promoter of the Bill in its passage through the committee, but with a view to finding the remedy for the difficulties which suggested themselves to me. In my suggestion as to an inquiry made by a local officer, the prima facie case to be made out and the giving of reasonable notice, there would be ample time, because the next court would have to be fixed, and there is no necessity to rush it through at one sitting. While speaking before, the promoter of the Bill referred me to section 4, and said that that provided for the case I mentioned. I thought he had made some amendment; but as I read the Bill it does not provide for the difficulty. It provides for holding the court "from time to time." They may move about; they do not need to meet in the same place.

An hon. MEMBER. They have certainly the right of adjustment.

Mr. AMYOT. I entirely agree with the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has spoken (Mr. Masson). I studied political law in the English authorities and I admired that law. I found there the first principle of justice and equity, that when you want to try a man you give him notice and bring him into court and tell him of what he is accused. Section 13 of this Bill provides that the commissioners shall make their report to Parliament, and those whom they report as having been bribed are ipso facto condemned and punished for eight years. Is that an English principle of law? Here is a man who is accused of corruption, without receiving notice. The commissioners are sitting in the county, perhaps 20 or 40 miles from his residence. They hear one or two or three witnesses, and are satisfied that that man has been bribed; they report him to Parliament without even giving him a chance of making his defence, and he is condemned ipso facto; no chance of appeal; no possibility of bringing witnesses in his defence to explain the surrounding circumstances. I say this is against the principle of English law, and the liberty of the citizen. It is not only an inquisitorial court which you establish, a court to fish for evidence, but it is a court which decides without appeal, and without hearing the accused party. The idea of the hon. member who has just spoken is perfectly correct. Have a provisional court, if you like; get some parties to go there; but let them have a list of particulars which will first establish a prima facie case, then give notice to the party, and establish a regular tribunal and try him. Now, the hon. member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Frémont) has quoted a law which seems to apply, but I may tell him at once that it is not applicable in practice. We know that the judges in Ontario have adopted the practice of trying election petitions, each case separately, and as soon as they are satisfied that there is one case of corruption they void the election. In Quebec the judges do not proceed in that way, and I believe they are right. They examine all the witnesses, and then give their judgment and report to Parliament whether there has been general corruption. Now, under that practice of trying petitions in the province of Quebec it is impossible to apply chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes.

Mr. FREMONT. That law provides for a petition signed by twenty-five electors.

Mr. AMYOT. It has never been applied because the security of a thousand dollars, which has to be given, is so high that it has been found impracticable. Another reason why that law has not been applied, and the general law of contested elections which contains something to this effect, has been applied, is because in Ontario the judges proceed as I have mentioned, trying each particular by itself, and so soon as one case of corruption is established, they void the election. I do not think that is within the

spirit of the law. That section 13, which is the main object of his Bill, is most unjust and tyrannical.

Mr. WELDON. You do not mean section 13.

Mr. FREMONT. It is section 14.

Mr. AMYOT. In French it is section 13; in English it is section 14:

All electors whom the commissioners report to have taken bribes shall be incapable of voting at any election.

My hon. friend sees that the commissioners make their report, and upon their report the punishment is inflicted. That report is made without trial, and that is not fair. So many changes are required in the Bill that I suggest that it be referred to a special committee. It is impossible to pass it as it stands now.

Mr. FREMONT. There is another irregularity; the Bill is not printed in French the same as it is in English. In the English version there are two sections that do not exist in the French version.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am aware that in opposing this Bill we shall be blamed by some unscrupulous newspapers, but I do not care much for that. I am in favour of the Bill so far as it tends to purify elections, but I think this legislation is quite unnecessary. We already have all the laws that are needed to punish candidates and electors who are guilty of corruption. I was going to cite chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, but as my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Frémont) has gone over it very clearly and eloquently, I will only refer my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) to chapters 8 and 9 of the Revised Statutes. I suppose that the object of his Bill is to punish the candidate who buys votes and at the same time to punish the electors who sell their votes. Well, if he refers to the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 8, sections 82, 85, 88, 90 and 92, he will find there all necessary provisions to prevent corruption. In section 90, of chapter 8, he will find that "every person other than the candidate found guilty of any corrupt practice in any proceeding in which, after notice of the charge"—and here is just what this Bill does not contain—"will be punished."

Mr. LISTER. It is proposed to amend it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Suppose we do, I see no necessity of making another law when we already have all the machinery we need for the purpose. In section 98 you have all that is necessary to purify elections, to punish and disqualify a man who sells his vote. You have in this Act a clause which says that the candidate himself shall be disqualified for seven years if he is proven guilty of corruption, and the Act contains a clause to punish the elector who sells his

Mr. AMYOT.

vote. What do we want more than that? Is it necessary for us to spend the time of this House in making new laws when we already have upon the Statute-books of this country, provisions of precisely the same character? I repeat, I am in favour of the principle of the Bill so far as it tends to purify elections, but I see no necessity for taking up the time of this House in passing another law similar to those we already have. As the member for Quebec county has said, in chapter 10 we have almost the identical clauses providing that the petition must be signed by twenty-five electors, but in addition, and what is far better, there is a deposit sufficient to cover the expenses of a speedy trial. According to the Bill proposed by the hon. gentleman, the accused has no notice of the charge laid against him, which may be brought by a man of no means whatever, and yet whose oath may remove him. He is not protected in any way. That man, without any means, may appear before a commissioner, who may be an unfriendly party, who may take his oath and make a report to Parliament, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may report, the name may be struck from the list and the party disqualified for seven years, without knowing what the accusation is. The Bill is not only unnecessary, but it is very bad. I may go further, and again refer the hon. gentleman to chapters 8, 9 and 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. I do not want to say anything against the principle of the Bill, but, in my opinion, we have already all the laws that are necessary to prevent corruption at elections. If the hon. gentleman will take chapter 9 of the revised statutes, section 43, he will see that the sitting judges in an election court are bound by law to make a report to the House, and if they find it necessary to make further investigation in any county as to corrupt practices, they have a right to do so. What necessity is there to name commissioners and have another trial, except to annoy the member-elect and his friends, and incur expenses? If the hon. gentleman will look at section 44 of chapter 9, and section 48, he will find a similar provision, and not only according to chapter 8 has the judge the right to disqualify an elector who has sold his vote, but by section 69 of chapter 8, it is provided that if, during the trial, the judge finds there are parties before him who have sold their votes, or bought votes, he has the right to call the party before him and proceed with his trial at once. Under these circumstances, I am opposed to the Bill, because it is quite unnecessary, and will only hamper members-elect, and their friends.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. member, if he will look at the provisions of the Bill, and the provisions of the law as it now stands, will see that this Bill aims at something not accomplished by the existing

law. The existing law is for the purpose of securing to the party whom the people have returned to this House, the seat to which he is entitled. That is the object of the law. But the object of this Bill is to inquire into the general conduct of the electors, on certain electors, to the number of twenty-five, taking the responsibility of charging that general corruption prevails in that particular constituency. This is not the first time a measure of this sort has been submitted to Parliament. The former member who occupied the seat I now have in this House, the Hon. Mr. Blake, in 1876, when Minister of Justice, introduced a Bill on this subject, and the hon. gentleman has, in the present Bill, followed largely the Bill that was then introduced and placed on the Statute-book as chapter 10 of the statutes of 1876, but which, after there was a change of Administration was repealed and removed from the Statute-book. The object of the present Bill is quite different from the object in view in the Controverted Elections Act. Let me suppose, for a moment, that it is not the successful party that has been guilty of extensive bribery, but the defeated party. If the defeated party has been guilty of extensive bribery in a constituency, surely that is not to be tried by filing an election petition. How can you get at it: what provision is there for inquiry into the general practices in such a case? The law relating to the trial of controverted elections does not meet that case, but chapter 10, of the statutes of 1876, which was subsequently repealed, did meet that case. There is the difference between that statute and the Bill which the hon. gentleman has submitted in some particulars, and if the time of the session permitted, I would myself have been very glad to have seen the Bill referred to a Select Committee, to compare it with the former statute and consider in what point it might be amended, and report it to the House, with a view to pushing it through, not perfecting it another session, but placing it on the Statute-book this session. That Act, which was formerly on the Statute-book, provided that:

When the House of Commons by address represents to the Governor-General that a judge, in his report on the trial of an election petition under the said Act, states that corrupt practices have, or that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have, extensively prevailed at the election, or is of the opinion that an inquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of the parties to the petition, a further inquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable.

That is one case. There is another case, which is provided for in the statute, as it is by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in the first portion of the section, except that petition is presented to the House of Commons and it is the House of Commons that reports to the Governor-General on the petition and not the petitioners directly. There is that difference between the former

statute in this particular and the one which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House. On comparing them, I find they are in a large degree alike, that there are many of the sections which the hon. gentleman has copied from the statute to which I have referred. But under the statute of 1876 the primary object is to ascertain whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed or not. It is an inquisitorial proceeding, in its very nature it must be an inquisitorial proceeding, and the hon. gentleman has provided by section 14 of his Bill further that those who are found upon this inquiry to have been guilty of corrupt practices shall be disqualified. I think that is not an unreasonable proposition. It may be desirable to get certain parties who may not be known to any one, but the commissioners will, no doubt, make necessary provision to protect the party against any injustice arising out of the commission. Let me suppose an inquiry is made on a petition. Those parties make a declaration that corrupt practices have prevailed. Commissioners are appointed, and an inquiry is held. Upon investigation and examination of a party, some one who was not before suspected, is accused of being guilty of corrupt practices. That party perhaps was not accused by the petitioners. It may be that the petitioners knew nothing about the bribery prior to his misconduct being declared. The party may not be present in court, he may not have the remotest idea that his acts of guilt were known to any party or likely to be disclosed. Where such a fact comes out, the commissioners, no doubt, will require the party to be notified, and an opportunity will be given to him to explain the charge made against him, if he can. But in the nature of things, you cannot give such a notice as one hon. gentleman suggested. It is only as the proceedings are had that you can discover who is and who is not accused, and when the accusation is made, then the commissioners in the rules of procedure which they will, no doubt, lay down for their guidance, will make the necessary provision that notice shall be given to the parties. I favour this measure on another ground, viz., that when you come to have an inquiry of this sort, you cannot bring an accusation against a man who is not in the country, who is a thousand miles away, and what you must do is to get rid of every non-resident voter from the voters' lists, so that the parties against whom the charges may be brought, will be parties who are resident in the locality where the voting takes place. That being so, I think it is an additional reason for favouring the measure which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House. But if the hon. gentleman feels that he can get this measure through this session, and I think he can, I believe it would perhaps facilitate the Bill if the committee were to rise and the hon. gentleman were to ask for some friends to act practically as a Select Committee to

report, so that next Wednesday the measure would be ready to be pushed through this session. I think the proposed method of putting the inquiry on foot objectionable.

Mr. WELDON. I do not know how long the session is likely to run. I would be very glad to accept that suggestion if I thought the result could be reached, but I am apprehensive that that would mean a miscarriage of the measure. I compared this Bill most carefully with Mr. Blake's Act of 1876, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) will see I copied the machinery part from that Act. I think Mr. Blake's Act ended by handing these names to the Attorney-General of the province for prosecution. I am sure the hon. gentlemen who criticised the Bill have magnified the changes that are required. There are only one or two clauses necessary to meet the consensus of opinion of the House and they are very simple and clear. I would like, at all events, to take the decision of the House on the first section and to see whether we can carry it or not.

Mr. MASSON. I have no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to me as one who had demanded notices. I agree with every word he says as to the impossibility of giving notice in the first instance. I stated that, at first, it had to be inquisitorial, and that when a "prima facie" case was made, that another time, not necessarily another place should be named for the trial. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the difference between the adjournment of an investigation, and a new time appointed for the trial. A trial is quite different from the continuation of an inquiry. On a trial, whether before the same judge or the same tribunal that had found the "prima facie" case, the evidence should be given "de novo" in the presence of the accused, and he would have the opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses. If it is an adjournment of the inquiry, the accused is brought before it, and he is told certain things have been alleged against him and he is asked for a defence. He has only recently obtained the particulars and if he wants to cross-examine the witnesses who have already appeared, he has to bring them there at his own expense. There is no provision made for the court bringing them back again. There is no reason why we can expect that judges will double their work by making rules that would require them to have two investigations, where only one is provided under the Act. I do think that the suggestion I made, to have a local officer make the inquiry in the first instance is a good one. I understand that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) gave notice of a motion some time ago that this officer should be the revising officer. I would accept that official as, perhaps, a very proper officer to make the 'prima facie' inquiry and then let the trial come before the judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, although this Bill has already been objected to on several grounds, still, I think there are other reasons which militate against its adoption, which have not yet been adduced, in so far at least as the province of Quebec is concerned with the execution of this law. I may say, first, in reply to an objection from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the object the Bill has in view is similar to that contained in the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapters 9 and 10. The election law provides that certain classes of persons shall not be entitled to be registered upon the list of voters, such as, for instance, those who are disqualified by the courts. One of the first grounds on which I object to this Bill, not in its basic principle, but in its application, is that in my humble opinion, judges are thereby taken away from their ordinary functions. One bar of the province of Quebec justly complains of the drawbacks in the administration of justice; and under such circumstances I question very much whether the judges are the proper parties to appoint, when they have plenty of business already cut out for them. It must also be borne in mind that there are only eighteen or twenty judicial districts for the province of Quebec. Under the first section of the Bill, the commissioners appointed to make inquiry shall be judges of the Superior Court. Each judicial district, on an average, includes three counties. The judicial district of Richelieu, for instance, has but one judge, and comprises the counties of Richelieu, Yamaska and Berthier. Let us suppose the case of twenty-five electors in each of the three counties of the judicial district of Richelieu petitioning for such an inquest at the same time; then, in addition to requesting the services of the judge of the Richelieu district, another judge from the districts of Montreal, Three Rivers or Quebec will, of all necessity, have to be adjoined to the former. But should an inquest be equally asked for in the last mentioned districts—in the county of Nicolet, for instance, which is included in the judicial district of Three Rivers—then, the judge at Three Rivers will have to summon to his help a judge from another district, either from Montreal or Quebec, to make the inquiry. What a disturbing element this would introduce into the administration of justice is easily gathered from the above. But it strikes me as an almost fatal objection that this provision has a tendency to substantiate the charge brought against the judges, about their meddling with politics. We have revising officers in the province of Quebec, in my county at least, whose impartiality is above suspicion; in certain instances complaints have been made against them and they have been accused of partiality. I need hardly say that, at this very moment, when in the province of Quebec, judges are being accused of meddling with politics, I look upon as quite untimely a legislation which could hardly fail to be considered as calculated to

substantiate the charges levelled against them. Another reason which seems to militate against the Bill is, that the deposit required to cover the costs of the inquests, is quite insufficient. I may say also that this Bill infringes one of the basic principles of common law; for it is a matter of right that the accused party should have information as to the particular charges he has to meet; and, further, according to French law, the rules of indictment are so drastic that the incorrect description of defendant's name is sufficient to nullify the action. Although the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has stated that he would amend his Bill in this direction, it still remains open to objection on all the other grounds mentioned; especially section 5, which, in my opinion, gives quite arbitrary powers to the commissioners appointed to make the inquest. It reads:

5. The commissioners shall by all such lawful means as to them appear best, with a view to the discovery of the truth, endeavour to ascertain the names of any electors who have taken bribes at the last election.

We are all strongly in favour of the principle involved in this Bill tending to stamp out bribery and to secure pure elections. They who take bribes at elections commit a bad action and should be punished; and it is provided for in the statute. I may also offer suggestions as to the clause of the Bill which puts the exercise of the law in the hands of judges. I think the names of revising officers should be substituted to those of the judges of the Superior Court of the province. Why not also give them the right of striking off from the list of voters the names of the electors who have taken bribes? There might also be an appeal before the courts on questions of law and fact. An honourable member stated on the floor of the House that bribery did not prevail in the province of Quebec to so great an extent as in the province of Ontario. I may say that bribery prevails throughout the Dominion. It has existed at all times and in all countries. Bribery at elections is, to my mind, the stumbling block of self-government. As long as we shall live under parliamentary institutions, it is idle to think that we may have pure and perfectly honest elections. However, I am happy to avail myself of this opportunity to state from my seat in the House, that I have been returned for a large constituency without spending a single cent. I still object to the Bill on another and very serious ground. I mean the evils likely to arise from the abuse of this legislation, at the hands of the twenty-five electors mentioned in this Bill. Any one who calls to mind how divided our people is, and where political animus may lead to, as also what blunders we often fall into through party spirit, cannot refrain from dreading the consequences likely to result from the application of this law. On these several grounds, I think this House, while

strongly supporting the principle of this Bill, should unanimously reject the means suggested by this Bill to stamp out bribery.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) The hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau), in the course of his remarks, has questioned the propriety of appointing judges of the Superior Court as commissioners to make inquiry, as open to criticism. The revising officers, he suggests, are the proper parties to be appointed to such a position. The hon. member should not forget that revising officers, in several ridings, are the very judges of the Superior Court. Therefore, his first objection falls to the ground.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) The hon. member should also recollect that I have suggested to inscribe the right of appeal to a superior jurisdiction on questions of fact and law. This right is not provided for by this Bill.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) This Bill, to my mind, is quite a new departure, and were it adopted, it would be the first time that a procedure would be seen in which twenty-five witnesses would be required to initiate proceedings. The most objectionable feature of our election laws, relating to bribery, is the complicated nature of the legal machinery, which creates considerable difficulty in the way of the execution of the law. As a preventive law, the Bill now before the House appears retrograde, at least, so far as procedure is concerned. To my mind, it outbids the law now in force, concerning the prevention and repression of corrupt practices, as regards technical difficulties and exaggerated formalism. First, Mr. Chairman, all corrupt practices are rigidly repressed by the law, and were a new legislation to be enacted, I think the first step should be taken in the direction of simplifying the procedure. Corrupt practices at elections being assimilated to a misdemeanour, I fail to see why they should not be treated as such. Why not, for instance, make parties indicted for misdemeanours in election matters, amenable to the police court? Any party could bring an action as in ordinary misdemeanours, before the police magistrate. The latter should be authorized to issue forthwith a summons against the accused.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) In the city of Montreal, the municipal law contains similar provisions. Cases of bribery and corrupt practices are heard before the police magistrate.

Mr. PELLETIER. (Translation.) The hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), calls my attention to the fact that my suggestion is embodied in the municipal law of Montreal, and that cases of bribery at elections in municipal matters, under the clauses of the municipal law, are disposed with as suggested. The municipal law of Montreal provides that whosoever wants to

ledge a complaint against another party, accusing him of being guilty of having taken bribes at an election, shall bring his charge before the recorder, who shall order a summons to be issued and served upon him. The recorder summarily hears and tries the case, and when the person offending is convicted, he forfeits for three years his right to vote at any municipal election. The Bill now before us provides that, as security for the costs, a deposit of \$100 shall be made by the petitioners. Should the procedure be simplified, as suggested, any elector could go before the police court and, having deposited the sum of \$100 lodge his complaint to the effect—not that bribery has prevailed at an election, to the best of his knowledge,—but declare, after alleging facts and making charges, that he intends to prove specified charges against certain persons accused by him. This procedure would put a stop to many malicious, futile or vexatious actions, too often brought by certain parties with a view of putting the defendant to expense. I suggest that the Bill be postponed until next session. I am also of opinion that all laws framed with a view to prevent and stamp out corrupt practices at elections, should aim at simplifying the procedure and facilitating the application of the law, instead of making it cumbersome and unworkable, as it happens in the present instance.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Can the hon. mover of this Bill cite me the case of another country where a law of this kind has prevented corruption?

Mr. WELDON. I do not know how other countries are, but I do know that, if the hon. members of this House will allow us to put this Bill on the Statute-book, there are some counties in which there was scandalous corruption in the last election, and that if we will cleanse of bribers and bribe-takers, if some of their friends in those counties are sufficiently in earnest as to put up the necessary money to have the law put into force. We ask this House to give us that opportunity—that is all.

Mr. DELISLE. (Translation.) After listening to the remarks of the hon. members who have occupied the floor before me, I think it is quite evident that this Bill, in its present shape, offers many objectionable features which make it a cumbersome and unworkable measure. It strikes me as an almost fatal objection, Sir, that a flagrant injustice is sanctioned by this Bill, in so far as it takes away from the accused party the privilege of defending himself. Charges will be brought against him by unknown parties and he is left without any means of proving his innocence. Now, it is a well known fact that charges in connection with corrupt practices at elections generally originate in feelings which are far from being actuated by justice. Charges, as a rule, will be brought

Mr. PELLETIER.

by rabid opponents, before the commissioners, who, on an "ex parte" examination, are empowered to disfranchise the accused person for seven years. Now, I say, this procedure is unfair, and should not be countenanced by this House. I hold, further, that the election law which deals with bribery at elections, is already too stringent; it should be amended so as to shorten the period of time during which the culprits, even the most guilty ones, are disqualified; as, under such a law, our most useful citizens are liable to be punished with too great a severity. They will fall victims to the hatred of their opponents, and the country will be deprived of the benefits it might derive from their services. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I am quite at a loss to understand the purport of this measure. It might be construed as an attempt to empower political partisans to ruin, politically and financially, their opponents. I suggest that if the friends of the hon. promoter of this Bill had been more cautious in their constituencies, and had handled less bribery-money, the House would have been spared the trouble of discussing such a measure. I think all the members of this House should oppose the Bill, not out of a desire to prevent bribery, this great and crying public evil, being put down, but out of a desire to extend an equal measure of justice to every one. We hold, Sir, that this House should not support a law whereby an elector may fall a victim to the persecution of twenty-five opponents, apparently on the ground of stamping down corrupt practices and bribery—when the same men are far worse and more corrupt than he is. We are all in favour of measures framed with a view to purify the electorate of this country, and to put down bribery, but we should beware of any measures by which injustice may be sanctioned on the ground of promoting political morality and the purity of elections. Under these circumstances, I declare I shall oppose the Bill, as lacking, in its wording and its applicability, all the constituent qualities and features required from a legal and judicial standpoint.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I beg the hon. the Minister of Justice to tell us whether, in the province of Quebec, there is a sufficient number of judges to hold the inquests likely to be asked for under this Bill. As there are sixty-five counties in the province of Quebec, it is quite likely that sixty counties will ask for similar investigations. Who is going to hold these inquests, should there not be judges enough? How is the hon. the Minister of Justice going to make up the rest?

Mr. AMYOT. This is a most important question, and we must have an answer from the acting Minister of Justice. The clause says that the commissioners to make these inquiries shall be judges of the Superior Court. I do not know what is the case in the other

provinces, but I would like to know whether in the province of Quebec there are a sufficient number of judges to hold an inquiry in every one of the sixty-five counties? That is the question, and I think it deserves an answer.

Mr. DELISLE. I really think the hon. Minister should answer that question. It is very important for us to know whether there are a sufficient number of judges to be appointed commissioners in the sixty-five counties in the province of Quebec. I really think that our judges have had enough to do in the last two years on Royal Commissions, without putting aside civil cases for political matters. Besides, I think this measure would afford a chance to a certain number of judges to make inquiries against their political adversaries. I really think the hon. Minister cannot refuse to answer that question.

Mr. OUIMET. In the province of Quebec the number of judges of the Superior Court is reduced to eighteen by the Bill passed during the last session, so that there will not be a sufficient number of judges to do the kind of work proposed by this Bill, if it is going to be enforced.

Mr. FREMONT. I think that the question that has been asked is not a serious question, because it is based upon the supposition that a petition would be presented in every constituency in the province of Quebec, which, of course, is altogether absurd. I think we must be a little more serious than that, and examine the Bill on its merits. I have already expressed myself in favour of the principle of the Bill, but I think it needs to be amended, and I wish to make a suggestion to its promoter. As I have already stated, after an election has taken place in a constituency, the defeated party always cries out that the result of the election is due to corruption, and there is no doubt that it is very easy to get twenty-five electors who will sign a petition or a solemn declaration of any kind. Therefore, I would suggest that the words "solemn declaration" be struck out, and that they be replaced by the word "affidavit, sworn to." If the law requires only a solemn declaration, especially where there are illiterate electors, they will sign the declaration without knowing exactly the meaning or importance of it, and they will certainly not feel themselves bound in their consciences, before God, as they would if they were obliged to swear to the facts. Therefore, I move that the clause be amended in the way I suggest.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. What would they swear to—that they have good cause to believe or that they suppose? That means nothing at all. If they have to make an affidavit, let them say what they know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is quite evident that there is a great deal of difference

of opinion in the House as to this Bill, and I think the hon. mover would have been wise to adopt the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and refer it to a Select Committee in order that its merits and demerits may be reported upon. For my own part, I do not think that the Bill is one that should be passed in its present shape. There are a good many objectionable features in it which, I think, make it a cumbrous and unworkable measure. And I think the difficulties have been pointed out so clearly, that the House cannot, in justice to itself, pass the Bill in its present shape. One of the great objections is, that it will create a new court of procedure, with all the paraphernalia of a court. Our courts are already sufficient in number and complexity, without making more confusion by establishing new ones. I can fancy what a picnic it will be to the lawyers, after a general election, if this Bill becomes law. Take the two hundred and fifteen counties in the Dominion. After each election there is always a dissatisfied party, and there will be no difficulty in getting twenty-five men who will put up \$4 apiece and file a petition, that, to the best of their belief, certain irregularities have taken place. On the strength of that, an investigation is held, and the party accused has got to defend himself, and the judge may appoint any place in the county for his sittings, or within ten miles of the county. The judge may adjourn the court, from time to time, and carry on the proceedings as he sees fit, and the defendant will be put to heavy expense in defending himself against a charge of this kind. We will have two courts then in connection with elections. In one a petition is presented, stating that the candidate elected has not been elected fairly, and he has to go through all the turmoil and expense of defending his suit before the election court. Then, as soon as he is through, the parties have another fling at him, by twenty-five of them signing a petition, stating that they are led to believe that certain irregularities have taken place, so that he is brought before the courts a second time. It will be easy to amend the law so as to meet the views of the mover of this Bill. For my part, I think it is a very cumbersome and expensive measure, and I do not believe it will meet the object the hon. gentleman has in view. I think that this House ought to guard against committing themselves to the punishment of the man who was bribed. I would punish severely the man who offers the bribe, because I think he is the one who ought to be punished. We all know how bribery is carried on. It is not done in the open day or in the market place, and the only way you can get at it is by the party who received the bribe, giving it away. If you put a penalty upon him, you will close his mouth, and it will be almost impossible to prove that bribery has been committed. I believe that,

if this Bill were to pass, bribery and corruption will prevail to a much larger extent than it does to-day. It would be very unwise for the House to pass the Bill in anything like its present shape. It would be better to amend the law at present on our statutes and avoid all this paraphernalia of a new election court.

Mr. LISTER. It is somewhat remarkable and amusing to see what a unanimity of opinion exists in the House against bribery and corruption, and then see how earnestly and zealously hon. gentlemen try to escape the responsibilities of appearing to support bribery and corruption, by finding all sorts of faults with the Bill before the House. Many hon. gentlemen who spoke, evidently have not even read the Bill, or they are confounding it with the Election Act. This is not at all in connection with the Election Act. It is for an entirely different purpose. The Election Act is for the purpose of voiding an election in which bribery has been committed by a candidate or his agent. This is for the purpose of purifying the country from the class of people against whom it is directed. One hon. gentleman says that we should not have a statutory declaration, but an affidavit, that you should have people swear that they know of their own knowledge that such and such a person has been guilty of a corrupt act. The object of this Bill is to have an investigation in any constituency where bribery has prevailed to such an extent as to call for an investigation. If we insisted upon having an affidavit that the person, of his own knowledge, knows that bribery has been committed, the Bill could not be enforced. Where bribery has been committed, it is pretty generally known, it is in the air, and people may safely say that they have reason to believe bribery has been committed, and such an affidavit ought to be sufficient. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), while professing his zeal that does him credit, in the way of putting down bribery and corruption, fears that the candidate may suffer. Let me remove that doubt at once and for ever. Let me say there is no danger of the candidate being involved in these proceedings. They are not directed against the candidate, but against a class of men who should not be permitted to exercise the ballot. They are directed against the men who sell the highest privilege the law gives them. Surely, such men are not entitled to sympathy and should not longer be permitted to exercise that inestimable privilege, the right to say who shall represent them. But the hon. gentleman tells us, that it is a secret transaction, and that, if we are going to punish both parties to the offence, we will deprive ourselves of the evidence necessary to conviction. How are you going to convict them in the Bill? There are only two men in the world who know anything about it. Are you going to charge both with the offence? I say the man who is bribed usually looks for

Mr. CAMPBELL.

that bribe. He follows people up seeking to be bribed, and in the excitement people forget their duty, and, desiring to elect their candidate, yield to the importunity of the man who seeks to be bribed. He is punished under the Election Act if you can get at him, but by the course taken here an investigation is made and the men who have taken bribes are liable to be punished. There is no danger such as my hon. friend fancies about the procedure. It is of the simplest kind. The people who are supposed to have taken bribes are notified to appear on a certain day. The case is investigated, and if they are guilty they are punished; if they are innocent, I take it that their fees are to be paid. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson) talks about a formal trial after notifying the accused; but there is nothing of the kind contemplated here. It is a simple investigation, such as might take place in the House of Commons or any place else. The person is called upon to appear; he is accused of violating this law, the evidence heard in support of the charge and he is given an opportunity to answer. Why should we hunt up difficulties in the way of a measure that is, at all events, in the right direction? The hon. gentleman must not forget that this House some years ago passed almost a similar measure except that the twenty-five people had to petition Parliament, and Parliament ordered the investigation. With that one exception the Act is identical, so far as initiating the proceeding is concerned.

Mr. DUPONT. Amend it, then.

Mr. LISTER. Was there ever a trial under it, was it ever given a chance? Why was it repealed? The House deliberately passed it; but at all events that was a more cumbersome system than that my hon. friend proposes; by that Act the petition had to come before Parliament, and Parliament had to order the investigation. The proceeding here is simplicity itself. Twenty-five men, who, we must assume, are respectable citizens, say by petition that bribery has been committed, and they invoke the law; and if men are proven before a competent tribunal—not a partisan tribunal—to have taken bribes, punishment ensues. The whole matter will be left to the judges to say what is fair and right. If a man has been guilty of taking a bribe why not punish him by deprivation of a right that he has abused?

Mr. DELISLE. (Translation.) The third section, Mr. Chairman, ought to be set aside; it will be a source of a large expenditure, and, moreover, it will create a new political machinery.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) It is the reproduction of section 3 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Under that law it is the Minister of Justice who controls the appointment of the officers therein mentioned; therefore, there is no danger.

Amendment agreed to. Yeas, 55; nays, 27.

On section 4,

Mr MASSON. Before that clause is adopted I would like to move several amendments. I would move that the words "or within ten miles thereof" in the fourth and sixth lines be struck out, and that the words "or the neighbourhood thereof" be struck out, and in lieu thereof, there be inserted "if there be no such papers published in the said district then in the two papers published nearest thereto." I would also move that the word "ten," in the twelfth line be struck out, and in lieu thereof the word "fourteen." Ten days publication would mean one insertion in a weekly newspaper, unless it would be construed that it would require two insertions. Fourteen or fifteen days would insure at least two publications, and there would be seven days after the second before the court could take place.

Mr. RIDER. What is meant by "district" —electoral district or prohibition district?

Mr. WELDON. I would ask to put in the word "electoral" district.

Mr. AMYOT. Is there any provision about the expenses of the commissioners; who will take the money?

Mr. WELDON. That is provided later.

Mr. DELISLE. If I understand it aright that provision is contained in the seventeenth clause, which provides that persons presenting a petition to the Governor-General under this Act will be obliged to deposit \$100. I would be very much surprised if the hon. member (Mr. Weldon) would be ready to say that \$100 would cover the expenses to be incurred.

Mr. WELDON. When we reach that clause I will ask to amend it.

Mr. LISTER. Suppose no newspapers are published in the electoral district?

Mr. CURRAN. That would be an amendment made for the province of Quebec, publication to be made in both languages the same as in other cases.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not see the use of amending that; the Bill says "two newspapers of general circulation in the district or the neighbourhood thereof." A paper of general circulation in the French district is a French paper.

Mr. CURRAN. Not in every place. Take the city of Montreal, there are papers published in each language and there are many who read exclusively papers in one language.

Mr. DELISLE. This raises the question what is "general circulation"? We have in Quebec English papers, the "Morning Chronicle," the "Mercury" and the "Daily Telegraph," and if you do not mention in what language this notice is to be given some people will be left without the necessary notice of the holding of the court.

Mr. WELDON. That is the present law.

Mr. DELISLE. But it has been stated that this is a new Bill, that the Bill is quite a stranger to the old law.

Mr. FREMONT. The words "general circulation" are not the words usually used for notice by statute. I should think it would be better to provide for publication in two papers in the district.

Mr. WELDON. That is the very language of the Act.

Mr. FREMONT. I am speaking of the law generally and not of this Act alone. It is provided that notice shall be given in papers published in the electoral district, and if there are no newspapers published in the district then in the neighbouring district. I think it would be preferable to provide for publication in newspapers published in the district; otherwise, for instance in Quebec, they might pretend that the Montreal papers have a general circulation there.

Mr. MASSON. What I propose is the addition of these words: "And in the event of there being no, or only one, newspaper published in said district, then in two newspapers published nearest to the said electoral district."

Mr. AMYOT. I do not think the hon. gentleman has read the clause as it stands; it covers that. It provides for publication in two newspapers "of general circulation in the district." It does not say the papers are to be published in the district.

Mr. RIDER. I would like to make another suggestion as to notice to be given to the electors who are petitioned. I move that the words "by registered letter" be put in after the word "mailing."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that suggestion should be accepted.

Mr. WELDON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. The difficulty with regard to publication is that if there is no newspaper published in the electoral district, then, unless you provide for publication in the nearest newspapers, you may not have the notice in the newspaper reach the people interested. I have a section here which I will send to the hon. gentleman, and which I think would meet the case.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend has put in my hand the statute of Lower Canada which seems to me to meet the case perfectly. It provides that notice is to be given to the defendant by publication twice in the French language and twice in the English language in papers published in the locality if there be any, and, if not, in the newspapers published in the nearest locality.

Mr. DELISLE. The observation of my hon. friend is quite right, but the section he quotes has no reference to such cases as are covered by this clause.

Mr. AMYOT. The clause the hon. gentleman has read refers to notice served upon parties who are absent. The clause my hon. friend has read refers to actions served upon the parties who are present. But what is the object of this notice at all? Is it for the general public to know that the court will be held, or is it for the petitioners?

Mr. WELDON. The primary object is to let the parties who are interested in this proceeding, have notice. The secondary object is to let the general public who have anything to contribute to the inquiry, come in and be heard.

Mr. AMYOT. In our province the notice had better be given at the church doors. The municipal notices are always given at the door of the church.

Mr. WELDON. Let the hon. member move an amendment to that effect.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. The Bill says that as soon as the commissioner is ready to go on in the county or riding, he shall publish a notice in the press. The clause says he may adjourn from time to time. Suppose he adjourns for a month, then he would have to give notice again. Perhaps there will be no witness present at the court, and he may adjourn again for fourteen or fifteen days. Suppose he calls twenty witnesses and not one of them is present; then he will adjourn, but who will know it unless he gives another notice?

Mr. LANGELIER. It is just that way in election petitions. Notice is given, the court may adjourn from time to time, and the interested parties always know it.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. That is a case of one party petitioning against another. If the plaintiff is not ready he applies to have a day fixed, and both parties know it. But here there may be 100 parties.

Mr. LANGELIER. The public notice is intended for the general public in the electoral district. I do not see the necessity of publishing further notices as the amendment suggests. In the province of Quebec there is a proceeding much more important than this, which involves the cancellation of Crown lands. When I was Commissioner of Crown Lands, I introduced an amendment which is exactly in accordance with what is now suggested. Formerly the cancellation of lands might take place by simply publishing the notice in the "Official Gazette," which no one ever reads. The law now provides that notice must be sent by post card to the interested party, so the Commissioner of Crown Lands will be sure that notice reaches the party before cancellation takes place. One can understand that the cancellation of location tickets is much more important to the parties interested, than this proceeding can be. I think that notification has been found sufficient, and has worked in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. DELISLE.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. In this Bill a petition signed by twenty-five electors is sent to the Governor-General asking for an investigation. The judge fixes a time and place, and when he arrives not one of those twenty-five petitioners may be present. Perhaps they have all been bought out by the opposite party. Then the judge will be alone with two or three clerks, and he spends the whole day there without hearing any witness.

Mr. DELISLE. I would like to ask the framer of this Bill what he means by the words "within a reasonable time?" Is it a time for a debtor to pay his debts, or for a man to be hung? It is important that we should know what the hon. member means by these words. Of course he provides by a further clause that if the judges or commissioners fail to act through death or otherwise, they can be replaced. But it is very important for us to know what these words mean.

Mr. WELDON. I had the great advantage in drafting this Bill of having an admirable procedure ready made to my hand, which was drafted by Mr. Blake and put on the Statutes in 1876. It was reaffirmed by this House seven years ago, and is in the present Acts of Parliament. "The commissioners shall, upon their appointment, or within a reasonable time afterwards," is a phrase of which we have the equivalent in our statutes.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. The notice must be given in English and French. The section says: "They shall give notice of their appointment and of the time and place of holding their first meeting, by publishing the same in two newspapers in general circulation in said electoral district or the neighbourhood thereof." Suppose there is no paper published in that district. I move to add: "In the province of Quebec such notice shall be published in the English and French languages."

Mr. LANGELIER. In the province of Quebec it is sufficient to say that one of the said papers shall be published in the French language, because it would be of no use to publish a French notice in an English paper. The amendment suggested would mean that you might publish a French notice in an English paper.

Mr. CURRAN. In the greater part of the province of Quebec there are only French papers in many districts.

Mr. LANGELIER. In Quebec we have several papers which circulate among both French and English, in which you might publish a notice in both languages.

Mr. OUMET. I move in amendment that in the province of Quebec, the province of Manitoba and the Territories of the Northwest, such notice shall be published in at least one paper printed in the French language.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the sense of applying that to the North-west? There is no French paper published there.

Mr. FREMONT. If there is no French paper in the locality, will the notices be published in English and French in an English newspaper?

Mr. MASSON. Under the amendment it would be necessary to publish notices in French in the North-west Territories, and I believe there is no French paper published there.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not think we need the amendment, because there might be a French newspaper there.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. The Government will pay the expense, at all events.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I must warn this House that the French language is still official in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. AMYOT. What is the consequence of the hon. gentleman's warning?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I object to the amendment, and I wish Manitoba and the North-west to be included so far as publications in French are concerned.

Mr. AMYOT. But if there is no French paper, how can the notices be published in French?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If not, the notices will not require to be printed.

Mr. DELISLE. The publication can be left to the procedure of each province.

Mr. FREMONT. Much trouble would have been saved if this Bill had been referred to a special committee, where these matters would have been rapidly dealt with. There is a clause in all statutes in the province of Quebec dealing with this question. The rule in the province of Quebec is, that in a district where the newspapers are published only in one language, whether English or French, notices are published in both languages in the same newspaper. A similar provision might be embodied in this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think we are introducing very vicious legislation. We understand very well that in the province of Quebec important notices are published in both languages. It is, however, perfect nonsense to apply that rule to Manitoba. There is a very small French population there. In many districts, there is no French paper issued, and if we make it a necessary condition that notices should be published in French newspapers, when we know there are scarcely any there, we are simply defeating the Bill. I object, on principle, to the proposition that we should apply to Manitoba the rule that all notices should be published in the French language. It is almost absurd to talk about it. It may be very well to say

that French is an official language in the Local Legislature. Of course, the Legislature can decide that certain official notices shall be published in the French and English language, separately or jointly; but to declare that this Bill shall not go into operation until notices have been published in both languages, when it is known that in most of the districts no French newspapers are published, seems to be an attempt to defeat the Bill, and, at the same time to introduce a very vicious system.

Mr. LANGELIER. A similar remark would apply to English newspapers published in the province of Quebec, because there are several districts where no English newspapers are published.

Mr. AMYOT. At half past eleven o'clock the cat has got out of the bag, and we see the bottom of the hon. gentleman's heart. He knows there are many townships in Manitoba where the English language is not spoken. He knows that we are determined to keep our rights, and now he comes here at half past eleven, with his white necktie and says it is perfect nonsense to give the notices in the French language in the province of Manitoba. We have inherited our language, and I tell him at any hour of the day or night we are prepared to defend it. I am surprised that a man who intends becoming the leader of a great party should make a statement like that. He may be sure that the statement he has made to-night will be repeated, and that the electors of the province of Quebec will know who their real friends are. These parishes and townships in Manitoba where French is spoken have a perfect right to have notices given in the French language. What harm does it do the hon. gentleman that French people receive notices written in French? I hope he will not increase fanaticism and passion by trying to take that right away from them.

Mr. LISTER. I rise to a point of order. What is all this talk about. The clause the hon. gentleman refers to has been carried.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman wants to withdraw what he has said I will resume my seat.

On section 5-A.

Mr. WELDON. I move to add to this clause the following:—

The Commissioners may make rules regulating their procedure as to the duty of any officer appointed in connection with the inquiry.

Mr. FREMONT. I think there is a very great objection to this clause.

Mr. WELDON. They all seem to be very objectionable clauses.

Mr. FREMONT. After the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon) has heard what I have to say, I think he will himself suggest another clause instead of this. The powers of a commissioner appointed in con-

nection with this Act commence when he is appointed and finish when he has ceased his inquiry, so that the rules of practice which he will adopt can only apply to the case which he will investigate and will not apply to inquiries which take place elsewhere. These rules of practice should be uniform and should extend to all inquiries, and they should be made by the Governor-General in Council upon the report of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose it is in order to discuss whether these rules shall be printed in both languages? My hon. friend (Mr. Amyot) misunderstood what I said. The Bill, as amended, provides that, whether you have a French paper or not, in Manitoba, you shall publish the notice in a French paper, and, if there is no French paper, the law will become inoperative. It would be perfectly proper for the commissioners to publish the notice in such language as they thought right. Of course no one but a fanatic would prevent the notice being published in the language of the people to whom it ought to be addressed, but what I drew the attention of the committee to was, that, whether there was a French paper in the district or not, the amendment provides that it shall be published in a French paper.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I call the attention of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to the fact that the election law provides that the proclamation shall be published in both languages in Manitoba, and, therefore, we are only following the words of the Act in this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If there is no French newspaper, how can you publish it?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In the next district.

Mr. McLEOD. I think there is a good deal of force in the objection taken by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Frémont). I move as follows:—

The judges authorized to try election petitions in each province shall make rules regulating the duties of any officer appointed in connection with the inquiry.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. I want to know if those opposed to corruption are serious or not; and, in that view, I move that words be inserted here to punish those who give bribes as well as those who take them. A poor man with a family to support may be offered a bribe, and if he accepts it, he is disqualified for seven years, but the man who gives it to him is let go. I do not think that is just. The Controverted Elections Act provides for punishing men who buy their votes. I want it provided that the more guilty man, he who gives the bribe, shall be punished as well as the less guilty man who accepts the bribe. I would move to add the words, "and also those who have offered or given bribes."

Mr. DELISLE. I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman is quite reasonable.

Mr. FREMONT.

The more intelligent a man is the more guilty he is when he commits a bad act, and if we punish the poor fellow who accepts a dollar, not knowing the wrong that he does, why should we not punish much more severely the man who offers the bribe, and who, generally being more intelligent, knows the evil he is doing? I think the law should be amended in the way the hon. member proposes.

Amendment negatived.

Committee rose and reported progress.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to lay on the Table of the House certain papers relating to the French treaty, and to that end I move:

That a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General for a return of certain papers relating to the treaty with France.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are there any other papers?

Mr. FOSTER. I think these are all that will be necessary.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman tell us briefly what the scope of the Bill is?

Mr. FOSTER. The Harbour Commissioners were given certain borrowing powers and they have borrowed under the power. Some of their debentures are about maturing, and this is to enable them to borrow the amount necessary to redeem the maturing bonds.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it comes to be a Government measure?

Mr. FOSTER. The Harbour Commission was formed by a Government Act, and this matter was brought to my notice a short time ago by the Commissioners, and the present was considered the best and speediest means—

Mr. MULOCK. Of getting over the regulations in regard to Private Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. It is only a little one.

Mr. MULOCK. But it is a Private Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a quasi-Private Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) further to amend the Insurance Act. He said: This Bill is at the request of a number of the insurance societies and in line of the provision which is found in many of these societies, the object being to limit the number of shares on which any one director or stockholder may vote.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN DIGBY, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, What is the number of industrial establishments in the town of Digby, N.S.? The number in the township of Westport, including Long and Brier Islands, Digby county? The number in the township of Hillsburgh, Digby county?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that in the town of Digby the industries, with the hands employed, are as follows:—

TOWN OF DIGBY.	
Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
Wm. W. Hayden	3
R. P. Saunders.....	3
Blacksmiths—	
E. G. Woodman	1
Edward Armstrong.....	1
Harris Bowles	1
C. E. Armstrong	1
Fredk. Dakin.....	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Thos. Hill.....	1
James E. Young.....	1
Edwm Beaman.....	1
Edw. McCormick.....	1
Richard C. Carns.....	1
Geo. H. Haldsworth	2
Jesse Sweeny.....	1
Carpenter—	
M. L. Oliver.....	1
Carding Mill—	
Elkanak Trask.....	1
Confectioner—	
Edmund Biden.....	1
Coopers—	
Thomas S. Huxman.....	1
Andrew Hegan.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.
Dress-makers and Milliners—	
Mary J. Warne.....	1
Blanche P. Gupill.....	4
John F. Saunders.....	4
E. & Grace M. Theal.....	2
Jane E. Wright.....	2
Ostranda N. A. Ruddock.....	3
Cabinet and Furniture Factory—	
Chas. F. Dunham.....	1
Fish Curing—	
D. & O. Spraul.....	8
Lyda & Cousins (canning industry included).....	35
Saddle and Harness-making—	
John A. Russell.....	1
Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
Geo. M. White.....	1
James M. Keen.....	1
Printing and Publishing—	
Limited Company.....	6
Tailor—	
John A. Clinton.....	5
Tin and Sheet-iron Workers—	
Chas. A. & H. W. Dakin.....	2
Carriage Makers—	
Reuben Cassaboon.....	2
Wm. S. Hutchinson.....	2
John G. Rice.....	4

TOWNSHIP OF HILLSBURG, DIGBY COUNTY.

Cider Mill—	
Geo. Tupper.....	1
Blacksmiths—	
Joseph Spears.....	1
Wm. Iles.....	2
Norman A. Cummings.....	1
John A. Pindy.....	1
Geo. A. Purdy.....	1
Block Maker—	
E. E. Tupper.....	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Fruma Benson.....	1
Sum. Troop.....	1
John Iles.....	1
Frederick Fleet.....	1
Chas. McCullogh.....	1
Richard Godfrey.....	1
Whitfrik Taylor.....	1
Cabinet and Furniture Factory—	
James H. Purdy.....	1
Carding Mill—	
Geo. Tupper.....	1
Carriage Makers—	
Bernard Wade.....	4
Fred. Bishop.....	1
Wm. Collins.....	1
Cooperage—	
W. H. Thomas.....	3
Tannery—	
Wallace A. Purdy.....	2
Dress-makers and Milliners—	
Jessie Henderson.....	5
Mary E. Dornid.....	3
Mary Troop.....	2
P. Wade.....	5
Flour and Grist Mills—	
Jas. F. Rice.....	2
Gillet Rugglis.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.
Planing Mills—	
O. Parker.....	1
Rice & Miller.....	3
Wm. Thomas.....	9
Saddle and Harness-makers—	
James N. Kelly.....	1
Sail Maker—	
Wm. Russell.....	1
Saw Mills—	
Harris & Harris.....	4
Ansly Moyan.....	10
Benjamin Rice.....	2
Samuel Moyan.....	10
Rice & Miller.....	3
Shipyards—	
Thomas Rice.....	15
John H. Benson.....	15
Tailors—	
Joseph Higgins.....	6
Joseph B. Morine.....	1
Ernest Goodere.....	4
Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
Geo. G. Brooks.....	1
Wm. Clinto.....	1

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS—SPEECH AT KINGSTON.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Controller of Customs is correctly reported as having said, in the course of a speech at a banquet at Kingston, on Friday :

Our friends [meaning? Orangemen in Ireland] over there will never submit: Britain may cast them out, but if she does she has no right to look for their further allegiance. They are preparing for action. Their unalterable determination is never to submit to Home Rule, and they will have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada. Aye, more than sympathy! they will have our active aid if that active aid be necessary. We shall be unworthy of our ancestors if we fail in our duty at such a crisis.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer, I will say that the Government has no information with regard to this matter.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS— PRECEDENCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That for the remainder of the session Government Orders shall have precedence on Wednesday after Questions put by Members.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it proposed to take Mondays, also ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at present.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to the Minister that it would be better to take Monday and leave Wednesday, as on Wednesday we can take up Notices of Motions and Public Bills and Orders for a portion of the day.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I think an arrangement was made by which we could take Monday. After next Monday, I will have no objection to take Wednesday's Orders.

Mr. WELDON. Does the arrangement apply to Monday, next week ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. WELDON. I wish the leader of the House could see his way to give us a little more time. I had a Bill before the committee last night which was placed on the Order Paper on the first day of the session, and not a single opportunity has been missed of getting it before the House. We have had practically only two opportunities of reaching it during the session.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Government insist on taking one of the two days, I think it would be better to leave Wednesdays. It would divide up business in the hands of private members more equally.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think any case has been made out for interfering with either Monday or Wednesday. We are only a month and a half in session, so far, and there is no doubt a good deal of useful legislation on the Public Bills and Orders that ought to receive fair treatment. There is a lot of work on the Notice Paper which will absorb all of two Mondays, and I do not think it is fair that these Bills should be crowded out, for that is what it means if the Government persist. I would suggest that this motion be deferred until we see how we get along at the expiration of the week. I do not think the Government is doing fairly by the private members this session. They began to take private members' days at a very early date; and, in order to facilitate the departure of the Premier, this side of the House voluntarily assented to the motion taking Thursday, much sooner than it would otherwise have done. I think the Government ought to reciprocate and not press this motion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire, also, to enter my protest against the course which is now proposed. As the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has said, he introduced his Bill on the first day of the session, and, if this motion carries, there is no possibility of reaching it again, so that he may move its third reading. If the Government are determined to call us together merely for the purpose of voting a Supply Bill, they might as well announce it, and then we need not go to the trouble of preparing public Bills and putting them on the Paper. I think the hon. gentleman who is leading the House had better postpone this motion, or else put important public Bills on the Government Orders. I am interested in a Bill which I placed on the Paper at the beginning of the session, but, if this motion carries, there will be no possibility of reaching it.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I have on the Order Paper a Bill which, although comprising only a section, is of some importance respecting the province of Quebec. If the Government take Wednesdays, I do not see how I shall be able to reach it, although the leader of the Government has informed me that I should have a chance to bring it forward. If a Bill introduced so early in the session cannot be reached it is perfectly useless to attempt to bring any measure before this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. There are twenty-two Orders under the heading of Public Bills and Orders, and thirty Notices of Motion. I do not think the Minister of Finance needs to be reminded that private members have not had a day until yesterday for public Bills since the day on which the Budget was delivered. The Budget debate consumed several of the private days, and then concessions were made for the purpose of facilitating the departure of Sir John Thompson. Private members will not be treated with any degree of fairness if the two days are taken next week. The Government should permit the public business to be done as well as their own. If we have twenty-two or twenty-three Orders for Bills on the Paper they should not be sacrificed.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no disposition, I am sure, on either side of the House to curtail the working time of the House beyond what is at all prudent. The proposition I am making will give hon. gentlemen who have private Bills at least two occasions for proceeding with them, provided the general wish on both sides of the House that we should try and get through the business by Easter succeeds in being realized. I think that is very strongly the opinion entertained on both sides of the House. I have not made this motion without doing the courtesy to the leader of the Opposition of consulting him about it, and he perfectly agreed with me, and concurred in the arrangement, and I then put the motion on the Paper. I think it fairly indicates what is the wish of both the Government and Opposition sides of the House. Of course, it must be taken with a fair measure of liberty to all members of the House who are entitled to it. There are no doubt twenty-five or thirty motions on the Paper, but if the House is never to decide on an approximate day on which to get through its business until the Order Paper is clear the House will sit from January to December, and it will be within the memory of the House that we have taken unopposed motions six or seven times so that every motion that required information and was not placed on the Paper for the purpose of some hon. member ventilating a question, there has been an opportunity of passing it and obtaining the information. What I propose to do, and I think it is a fair proposition, is to take succeeding Wednesdays for the Government, and to make the Order for Monday to be Wednesday's Order. That

will give hon. members the evenings for public Bills. It must be remembered, even by those who have complained, the hon. member for North Simcoe, and the hon. member for North Norfolk, that we have passed their Bills, if not two or three times, or at least once.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one feature of this session's legislation to which I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance. It has been the custom for members to get Orders of the House for returns, and no doubt a great many members have motions on the Paper with the intention of addressing the House so soon as the returns are brought down. The hon. member for North Norfolk has drawn attention to the fact that there are twenty-four notices on the Paper. I am quite satisfied that a great many of these are motions for the purpose of securing information on which the members will afterwards address the House. I notice that although there have been a large number of returns granted this year, only one-third of the returns have been laid on the Table as yet. It is impossible for hon. gentlemen to discharge the duties of the Opposition efficiently if the information necessary to enable them to proceed with their resolutions is withheld until the closing days of the session. The hon. gentleman now proposes to take the last day left to private members, and thus shut private members out from getting on with motions. If we are to close the business at an early day, more energetic efforts should be made to place in the hands of members returns granted early in the session, so as to enable them to take up the different matters and discuss them.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) has stated that there was an understanding across the floor, I suppose between himself and the Government, that he should have an opportunity of proceeding with his Bill to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act. It appears to me that the only way in which this can be done is for the Government to place it on their Orders.

Mr. FOSTER. I will explain. By the motion I make there will be two days, even though we are able to get away by Easter, in which the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of proceeding with his Bill—two Mondays.

Mr. EDGAR. The Public Bills and Orders are never reached on Mondays.

Mr. FOSTER. But I have asked to substitute Wednesday's Order Paper for Monday.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That for the remainder of the Session Government Orders shall have precedence on Wednesday, and that the Orders for Wednesday under Rule 19 be substi-

tuted for Monday's Orders during the remainder of the session.

Motion agreed to, on division.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to draw the attention of the Government to an astonishing statement which appears in the Montreal "Star," of a very recent date, respecting the treaty recently negotiated between this country and France. I will read what the paper says :

LONDON, March 15.—Surprise, amounting almost to indignation, exists here over the statement made by Hon. G. E. Foster in the House of Commons on Monday night, that he would not ask the House to ratify the French treaty this session of Parliament, as there were some points in the draft treaty which would require still further consideration. Apparently this decision was reached at a late stage in the day, or, in other words, after the plenipotentiaries had appended their signatures to the agreement, for the High Commissioner for Canada, Sir Charles Tupper, who acted on behalf of the Dominion in negotiating the treaty, says he cannot understand the action of the Ottawa Ministry. He declared to-day to the "Star's" correspondent that every detail of the French treaty was before the Canadian Government when the authorized British plenipotentiaries signed it. Moreover, he states that the treaty, as signed, was made in exact conformity with the Canadian Government's wishes, except the most-favoured-nation clause, stipulating that Canada should receive the same treatment in France with regard to the articles mentioned in the treaty as any other favoured nation, while Canada was to extend like treatment to France in all articles. But, Sir Charles stated, he had every reason to believe that the explanation he had given on this point was perfectly satisfactory. If it was not, the Canadian Government had been given plenty of time to express their disapproval, for the treaty was sent to Ottawa on February 6, the same day on which it was signed in Paris by the plenipotentiaries. But not a single intimation of disapproval was received until Mr. Foster's exceptions in the House on Monday evening were cabled here.

I understand the Colonial and Foreign Offices are utterly at a loss to appreciate the Canadian position. They do not understand how it is possible after the treaty having been drawn up in accordance with the Dominion Government's wishes and signed by Sir Charles Tupper on their behalf, that the Minister of Finance should, without expressing any disapproval to the authorities here after having received the draft treaty, rise in the House and declare that he objected to the favoured nation clause and some of the stipulations about canned fish.

Speaking in this connection, a prominent official said to the "Star's" correspondent to-day: "This statement of the Canadian Finance Minister is an insult to the British Government: it is an insult to France, as well as to the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava and Sir Charles Tupper. Canada has aspirations for free treaty-making power, and I see Mr. Laurier drew attention to this in his criticism of the French treaty. Well, if the Canadian Ministry keep up this practice of throwing everything overboard after the treaty has been signed, their desire for treaty-making power will receive but little encouragement from the Imperial authorities."

In conjunction with the matter a leading "city" man remarked: "Why, the attempted repudiation by Premier Mercier in 1891, of the Quebec loan, is nothing to an action like this. Canada may as well shut up shop if it cannot improve on these methods

Mr. FOSTER.

so foreign to the usages existing in connection with international affairs.

It will be interesting to the country to know whether the statement contained in this article is correct: That the Canadian Government was apprised from time to time, and knew what the conditions of that treaty were at the time it was signed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the opinions that the city man and the other prominent man have with reference to the transaction, I have nothing to say. Every man has a right to his opinion. The whole telegram was based on a fundamental error, namely, that I said I did not intend to ask Parliament to ratify the treaty this session. What I stated may be found in the "Hansard," and it will not bear out that interpretation. As to the insult to the British Government, or to France, or to Sir Charles Tupper, I do not conceive it is any insult—when a fundamental article of the treaty provides that it shall be subject to the ratification of Parliament—to lay it before Parliament with a full and frank explanation, in order that Parliament may have a full chance to consider it.

Mr. EDGAR. I find in the papers which were laid on the Table last night by the Finance Minister, a couple of cablegrams between the Government here and Sir Charles Tupper which throw a good deal of light upon this feature of the matter. One dated 6th February is as follows:—

PARIS, 6th February, 1893.

To Sir John Thompson,
Ottawa.

Treaty was duly signed at Foreign Office to-day at five; only alteration in draft already sent you is the addition of wood pavement in the piece. The letters were also exchanged. Am mailing full text in English and French both of treaty and letters Wednesday.

(Sgd.) TUPPER.

On the same day, 6th February, a cable was sent from Ottawa, addressed to "Tupper" at London, and signed "Thompson," as follows:—

OTTAWA, 6th February, 1893.

"Tupper,"
London (and forward).

No draft received; no steps shall be taken towards ratification until we cable approval. At present cannot understand what terms proposed either side.

(Sgd.) THOMPSON.

That is the way it stood when the treaty was ratified. Then on the 8th February, Sir Charles Tupper telegraphed from London to "Bowell," Ottawa, as follows:—

LONDON, 8th February, 1893.

"Bowell,"
Ottawa.

Had left Paris for London before your message arrived. Treaty was signed at five on Monday in accordance with instructions from your Government. No change in original draft except to give minimum tariff on wood for pavement in addition to all the

other articles enumerated. The proposals in letters exchanged by plenipotentiaries are not binding but optional.

(Sgd.) TUPPER.

Sir Charles Tupper contends in his cablegram that the treaty was signed in accordance with instructions from the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, before you pass from this subject, which is one of the very gravest importance—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is hardly in order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The matter is so important that I shall have to ask some hon. gentleman to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TARTE. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not have done this were it not that the matter is of such importance. The hon. Finance Minister left the impression on those who heard him the other day, that it was not the intention of the Government to ask the House to ratify the treaty this session. He may not have intended to do that, but at all events it is the impression he conveyed. The hon. gentleman asked us to refer to his exact words in "Hansard," and I think it is of importance that we should do so. I call his attention to the fact that after he had brought to the attention of the House the treaty, as he understood it, and taken certain exceptions to the clauses of that treaty as he understood them, he said:

"Under these circumstances I am not prepared at present to ask Parliament to ratify this treaty. The treaty is signed subject to the ratification of the Canadian Parliament, and I make this full and frank exposition of the treaty in order that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may look into it and consider it, for it requires a little consideration, in order to see just what the effect of the treaty is in these different particulars. And certainly, until we receive more satisfactory assurances than we have as regards these items of which I have spoken, I shall not ask the House to ratify the treaty.

I may say that so far as the hon. gentleman's statement went, it was not only understood pretty clearly by us, but it gave some of us a great deal of satisfaction to know that he did not intend to ask sanction for the treaty this session. But, if the hon. gentleman, or if the Government of which he is a leading member, propose to ask the ratification of Parliament to that treaty this session, I think in view of the language the hon. gentleman used the other day, that we should now have an intimation from him to that effect. This matter will require a great deal of consideration and a good deal of prolonged discussion, and if the House is to be asked at this late period in the session to assent to the treaty, we ought to have some intimation to that effect from the Government, because we have been misled by the language the hon. gentleman used.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This matter is one of very great importance, and I cannot understand myself, any justification for the language that Sir Charles Tupper is reported to have used in regard to the position of the Government on this treaty. The Government may have acted imprudently or improperly in concurring in the treaty before they fully realized the character of its provisions; but, Sir, when that treaty provides that it shall not come into operation without the sanction of this House, the sanction of this House is not to be regarded as a mere formal matter but as a matter of substance; and being a matter of substance there is no ground for any such accusation, unless Parliament had given that sanction, and then had undertaken to repudiate it. Now, Sir, that is not our position. I would just refer to a very important case that I believe is precisely on all-fours with this: Many years ago, when the French Government was asked by the Government of Great Britain to join with them in treaty stipulations with a view of putting an end to the slave trade, an arrangement was made by the executive Governments of the two countries. If I remember rightly that treaty on behalf of France was signed, but had not yet been exchanged. The French Chamber had expressed a very strong opinion adverse to the ratification of that treaty and to its exchange and Guizot, who was Prime Minister at the time, said: That every step taken in the negotiations of the treaty towards its completion must be regarded, not as a mere matter of form, but as a matter of substance, and that if the Government had known the feeling of the French Assembly at the time the agreement was arrived at, then the Government of France would not have given its sanction to the treaty; it would not have negotiated a treaty adverse to the public opinion of France. And the Government of Great Britain with whom the negotiation was had, admitted that that was a good and sufficient reason for not going on with the treaty to its final completion. So, I say in this matter: If the Government has given its sanction to the provisions of that treaty, then the Government of this country has made a very serious mistake, and there has been a very great deal of carelessness, or, at all events, a very great error of judgment. But it is infinitely better that the Government should retrace its steps than that it should ask the House to ratify a treaty of the character of this one, a treaty that the hon. Minister of Finance himself clearly intimated to the House was, in his opinion, not in the interests of the country, if it were carried into effect. Sir, I agree with that, although I am inclined to think that a very great blunder has been committed in the negotiation of this treaty, a blunder so great that I cannot understand how a gentleman of the intelligence and ability of Sir Charles Tupper could have for one moment entertained such one-sided propositions as those embraced in

this treaty—a treaty to some extent in the interests of France, so far as it goes, but to no extent whatever in the interests of this country. When it is expressly provided in that treaty that it shall not come into operation without the sanction of this House, I say there is no treaty at this moment, and there is nothing to complain of on the part of either the Government of Great Britain or the Foreign Office of France. We are here, in my opinion, masters of the situation, so far as we are concerned, and I trust that the Government will not commit the folly of proposing to this House the ratification of a treaty of the character of that which the hon. gentleman laid before the House two or three evenings ago.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, the point I desire to make in reading this article is this: When this matter came before the House the other night, the language of the Minister of Finance was such as to leave the impression on the minds of the members here that so far as he was concerned the terms of the treaty were not satisfactory to the Government, that it was doubtful whether the Government would ask the House to approve of the treaty, and that as at present advised they would not. Now, I say that the Government are censurable, because, as a matter of fact, if we are to take the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, that treaty was made in conformity with instructions given by the Ministry more than a month ago, while the negotiations were going on. So that when the Minister of Finance made the statement he did, he knew that the treaty was in conformity with the instructions given by the Government, that the Government had been fully informed of the terms and conditions of the treaty, and that the Government approved of the action of Sir Charles Tupper in concluding the treaty with the French authorities; yet he gives the House to understand, not by express terms, it is true, but by implication, that the Government are dissatisfied with the terms of the treaty, and that it is doubtful whether they will submit it to the House for approval or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is scarcely fair to let the matter go as my hon. friend has left it. My words are before the House, they were meant to convey everything they do convey, and they were not intended to convey one thing more than they do convey. What I said I had weighed carefully before I said it, and I intend, and the Government intend, to stand by what I said. What the hon. gentleman has stated as the purport and substance of my remarks may be his impression of them; but I do not think he can gather it from the remarks themselves. A matter of this kind I think we should treat calmly and fairly, without any attempt to make party capital out of it. It is a matter between this country and France. I quite agree with the hon. member for Both-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

well (Mr. Mills) that it is within the power of this Parliament to ratify the treaty, or not; and I do not think it can be spoken of as an insult, if this Parliament finds that it cannot ratify the treaty. Not more than three months ago, after the French Government itself had made a treaty with Switzerland, embracing a large number of articles, and subject to ratification by the Chambers, the French Chambers took that treaty and refused to ratify it; yet the French Government was not charged with discourtesy or with insulting the Swiss Government. The very fact of that clause being put into the treaty shows that it was meant to be a fundamental clause. The fact that it is stated that the treaty should be put before the Canadian Parliament shows that it was meant that it should be left to the wisdom of the Canadian Parliament, in the interests of Canada, to ratify it or not. I am loth to believe that the report in the "Star" clearly represents the views of Sir Charles Tupper in this matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly I think the deduction might be fairly drawn from the words of the Finance Minister the other night, that the Government at that moment, and as advised, had no intention of submitting the treaty for our ratification. I think that deduction was very clear from the very damaging criticism which the Minister of Finance, properly in my judgment, subjected the treaty to—about as damaging a criticism as I have often heard indulged in. But the point to which I wish to call his attention is this. Undoubtedly the impression left on the minds of the members of this House was that we were not to be called on to discuss this treaty. We are as desirous as he is, of facilitating in all proper ways the business of the session, and I would ask, inasmuch as this is a matter of importance, if he does not do it to-day, that he will to-morrow or Monday, inform us what the decision of the Government is with respect to this same treaty—are they going to proceed with it, or are they not? Surely that is time enough for them, considering that this matter appears to have been within their cognizance for six or seven weeks, if we may judge by the dates of the telegrams which passed between Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Thompson.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find on page 2355 of "Hansard," that the Finance Minister used these words:

The treaty is signed subject to the ratification of the Canadian Parliament, and I make this full and frank exposition of the treaty in order that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may look into it and consider it, for it requires a little consideration, in order to see just what the effect of the treaty is in these different particulars. And certainly, until we receive more satisfactory assurances than we have as regards these items of which I have spoken, I shall not ask the House to ratify the treaty.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to this,

that he has not, as I understand it, answered what is the real gravamen of the question, that is, whether this treaty is based on the instructions given to Sir Charles Tupper or not? If it is, of course, the position is one thing; if it is not, the position is clearly another thing. We want to know exactly what the fact is in regard to that, because, as I understand from the statement we have before us, this treaty must have been in the hands of the Government at least a month ago; and if it is true, that the first intimation which the authorities at home and Sir Charles Tupper got of any objection on the part of the Government to this treaty, was the statement made in the House by the Minister of Finance the other evening, we cannot be surprised that Sir Charles Tupper felt a good deal of annoyance. That is a point which the Finance Minister has not touched upon.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not think it necessary to touch upon it. I thought the papers asked for conveyed the information upon that point, and they were laid upon the Table last night. With reference to the question my hon. friend asks me, it is a fair question, and I intend to give it a fair answer. My words conveyed the exact meaning they were intended to convey, and, unless the conditions change, I do not intend to vary those words.

Mr. EDGAR. We know that the cable despatches from the other side, and perhaps from this side also, are not always thoroughly to be relied on, and I dare say that the Minister of Finance is not to be held responsible for the cables about his movements and exploits which were received on this side of the Atlantic, when he was over there lately. But I wish to inform him, that among the brilliant achievements which were cabled out of the hon. gentleman over there, was a visit to Paris in connection with settling the terms of this treaty. It was, in fact, stated, that he had just about closed the matter so that I suppose the hon. Minister himself was not entirely ignorant of what was going on. I have no doubt, that if the plenipotentiary over there has exceeded his authority, or, at any rate, has done what is for the disadvantage of Canada, the Minister will find the Opposition supporting the Government against our very able plenipotentiary. I took the opportunity of looking hurriedly through these papers, with reference to another point. The other evening, I raised the question, whether Canada had informed France that she would not discriminate in favour of France at all in respect of the articles upon which we were to reduce the duty, because I understood the Minister of Finance to say that the Government did not intend to discriminate in favour of France against any country, and that France was perfectly aware of that all through. Perhaps there are papers that will show that, but I do not find any among those which have been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I informed the House—perhaps the hon. gentleman was not present—that I would put these papers on the Table, and that they would be followed by others.

Mr. EDGAR. I am calling his attention to an omission in these papers in that respect.

Mr. TARTE. There is a most important point on which we have not been informed. Sir Charles Tupper says most positively, that he was authorized to sign that treaty. We ought to know if he was really authorized or not. If he was, I do not see how we can refuse to ratify this treaty. If he was not authorized, we are entitled to know it now. When such a man as Sir Charles Tupper has signed a treaty and says he was authorized to do so, it is a very serious matter to find the Government which gave him that authorization, refusing to ask our ratification. There are not many precedents for such a course.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look at the papers, he will find just the authority that was sent and more. He will find the explanation, as well, in the papers already brought down.

Mr. TARTE. There may have been no written authority, but there may have been verbal authority, which would be just as good.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no authorizations except what are contained in writing.

Mr. BORDEN. The words of the telegram read by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and which were sent to the "Star," were as follows:—

Sir Charles Tupper declared to the "Star" correspondent that every detail of the French treaty was before the Canadian Government when the authorized British plenipotentiaries signed it. Moreover, he states that the treaty, as signed, was made in exact conformity with the Canadian Government's wishes, except the most-favoured-nation clause, stipulating that Canada should receive the same treatment in France with regard to the articles mentioned in the treaty as any other favoured nation, while Canada was to extend like treatment to France in all articles.

But Sir Charles stated he had every reason to believe that the explanation he had given on this point was perfectly satisfactory.

Now, the Minister states that the papers will show whether this is true or not. Very few of us have had an opportunity of reading the papers, and it seems to me only fair that the questions put by the hon. members for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and Lambton (Mr. Lister) and L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) should be answered. I cannot see why the hon. Minister should hesitate. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated that he approves of the position taken by the Government, inasmuch as this treaty is subject to the ratification of Parliament, but if the statement made in that telegram be correct, that the treaty was signed with the express understanding that the Government approved of it, it is the

duty of the Government to submit that treaty to Parliament. The Government is committed to it, and it will be time enough for Parliament to decide, after the treaty has been submitted to them, whether they will ratify it or not.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

KEMPTVILLE POST OFFICE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that a return moved for and granted by the House, with reference to certain irregularities and reports of the post office at Kemptville, has not been brought down, although considerable time has elapsed.

SUPPLY—TARIFF REFORM.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. IVES. After the remarkably able and comprehensive reply of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) to the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, my task is an easy one. All that I propose to do is to notice a little more at length a few of his points, which, for want of time, my hon. friend from Haldimand did not give quite so much prominence to as I think might be desirable. I may say here that I think the Conservative party are to be congratulated upon the fact that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has come out from under cover and informed the House and the country what sort of tariff reform he is in favour of. We have heard a good deal said about unrest among the people with regard to the fiscal system of the country, but I beg to say that, in so far as that unrest affected National Policy Conservatives, it was in favour of a rectification and amendment of the tariff on the lines and within the principles of the National Policy. I don't know what Liberal uneasy people might have wished, or what they might have thought, but, in so far as the attitude of the hon. member for Simcoe affected National Policy Conservatives, it affected them because they supposed that the hon. gentleman still was a Conservative, still was a supporter of the National Policy, and that what he proposed was immediate change and improvement of the National Policy itself. And I think that nothing that could have happened in this House could more quickly have settled that unrest, so far as National Policy Conservatives are concerned, than the speech and the resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe. The hon. gentleman has been so completely answered with regard to his own record, that I do not propose to refer to that branch of the subject at all. I am more concerned with his resolution, with what he proposes to the country, than I am with his record. He

Mr. BORDEN.

bases his resolution upon two principal premises. His major premise is that the existing tariff has, in many instances, proven oppressive and burdensome to the great consuming classes, and more particularly to the agricultural classes, and that it is unfair and unjust in its incidence; and, as his second premise, and as his reason for immediate action, he says that the discontent created by its unfairness and its burdensomeness has amounted and does amount to disloyalty. Now, the proof of his first premise is the most important thing about his speech; it is the part of his speech that business men will examine most closely. If he has made out to the satisfaction of the country that the present tariff is, in many instances, burdensome and oppressive, and that it cannot be made less burdensome and oppressive within the lines and under the principles of the National Policy, then he has made out something of a case for what follows as the declaration of his resolution. Now, what has he said to justify the House or the country in coming to the conclusion that the existing tariff has proved burdensome and oppressive to the consuming classes and especially to the great agricultural classes? I must say I have heard a much better argument made by men on the back benches on both sides of this House than was made by the hon. gentleman. I was amazed when I read his speech, the important part of his speech and the part which business men will examine most closely, to see how little there is in it that is new, or that a business man would like to be responsible for. He starts off with the general statement that the National Policy may be credited with \$265,000,000 of the total industrial production of the country. I believe the total industrial production is given at \$350,000,000, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), by some process of reasoning that he does not explain, reaches the conclusion that, of the total amount, \$265,000,000 is due to the protective system. Well, he may be right or he may be wrong. He has not told us why he did not say \$100,000,000 or \$300,000,000; he has not given us any means of judging of the correctness of his figures at all. Then he makes another statement that, taking quality into consideration as well as price, this \$265,000,000 worth of manufactured goods cost the people of this country, when they come into consumption, 30 per cent, or \$80,000,000 more than they would have cost had we had a revenue tariff, and the people had been permitted to import them from other countries.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word? I did not say that they cost so much more than they would have cost under a revenue tariff. I said they cost that much more than they would have cost under a system of free trade.

Mr. IVES. Very well; then take the hon. gentleman's statement of the case, and it

raises one more question, and one more impracticability regarding his proposals, and that is: How are you going to get a revenue for this country? Take the hon. gentleman's statement as he now makes it, that these goods cost \$80,000,000 more than they could have been brought here for from foreign countries under free trade; I want to know how he arrives at these figures. Has anybody who heard his speech the slightest idea of how he gets at these figures? Has he taken a yard of cotton and given us the price of it in the English or American market, estimated the cost of bringing it here, quoted the price of a yard of similar goods here and then compared the difference in proportion to the total consumption and ascertained that it represents so much? Did he do this with other items of the tariff? If he had made such a statement as this, if he had given us the opportunity to scrutinize his figures, there might be some basis for discussing them. But, because he, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) assumes that the difference is \$80,000,000, he asks us to believe it, without any proof or argument, and, for that reason, to change the whole fiscal policy of this country. Now, that was the hon. gentleman's general statement. He made some specific statements in this part of his speech. He went into what he will pardon me for calling a very awkward and involved calculation as to cotton. Instead of taking the price of cotton goods in England or the United States and comparing it with the price of cotton goods in Canada, which would seem to be the reasonable course, he undertook to show that there had been a much greater reduction in the price of cotton goods in England than there had been in the price of cotton goods in Canada. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) pointed out to the House how much dependence could be placed on this calculation, when he showed that the hon. gentleman had been making his statement on the strength of a typographical error of some four or five years in "Hansard." But, Sir, what did he prove? He shows that there has been a greater decrease of price in cotton goods in England than there has been in Canada. I want to tell the hon. gentleman there has been a much greater deterioration in the quality of cotton goods manufactured for export in England in the last few years than in the cotton goods manufactured in Canada. I want to tell him that in Canada cotton goods have been constantly improving in quality, until now they rank fairly well with the best goods made in the United States, while in England cotton goods have been constantly deteriorating in quality, and the whole effort in Manchester and all Lancashire seems to be, by lowering the quality of their goods, stuffing with China clay, to make an article with weight, which they can export cheaply all over the world. That is the line they have been running upon. When the

hon. gentleman comes here and undertakes to make out a case against the National Policy by claiming that there has been a greater reduction in England than there has been here, I point out to him the fact that the reduction has been in quality much more than in price. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the fact that cotton manufacturers have been making enormous profits in this country; they have watered their stock and are paying enormous dividends. Sir, I do not propose to take up the time of the House at any length upon this subject, but I would like to correct one or two important statements of the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. gentleman from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman from Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the other night, stated that a large amount of cotton waste had been imported into this country, and he jumped at the conclusion, and asked us to do the same, that the cotton waste was all used in deteriorating the quality of Canadian cottons. Why, Sir, let me tell the hon. gentleman that there is five times as much cotton waste used by woollen manufacturers in making union goods, as is used by cotton manufacturers. Let me tell him that cotton waste is a material that is used for cleaning on all the railways, and in all the shops and factories in this country; and we could easily account for the use of the cotton waste brought into this country, without supposing that a pound of it was used in deteriorating the quality of cotton goods. Then, as to the watered stock. I want to tell my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that not one dollar of stock was added to the capital stock of the Dominion Cotton Company, except that which represented the sacrifice made by the original shareholders of the companies that the Dominion Company bought out. They did what is usually done, they bought the property as cheap as they could. They bought a number of mills when they organized their company, and they issued stock to represent the amount for which they had bought these properties less than what they were worth, and less than what they cost. The hon. gentleman from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) stated that the cotton output of this country, if I mistake not, amounted to \$14,000,000; it only amounted to \$8,750,000, and when he stated that this enormous dividend had been paid, I can assure the hon. gentleman—and it will be made out by some hon. members in this House in the course of the session—that the total earnings of the cotton companies in the year 1892 amounted to less than 6 per cent upon the money which has been invested in these enterprises. Then my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) went on to tell us that the rolling mills of this country had earned 67 per cent profit in the last year. Well, I can only say that a statement so absurd, so ridiculous,

only needs to be mentioned to refute itself in the House and in the country. The hon. gentleman then went on to speak about agricultural implements, and he gave us the old Liberal argument in which the duty is added to the cost of the implement when bought in the United States and brought into this country. He decried the quality and the character of Canadian implements, but he lost sight entirely of the argument which has been used so effectually a hundred times in this House, that agricultural implements are now made in Canada and as good as they are made in any other part of the world, and they are sold at prices as low in Canada as American manufacturers sell their implements to people in the United States. It is true that there are a few farmers who come from the United States, and, having used the Buckeye reaper, want to use the implements they have been accustomed to, and they go over there to get them. It is true that American companies, for the sake of selling goods in Canada, will occasionally sell a reaper, or a binder, or a mower, for less money to get it into Canada, than they would sell it to their own people. That is true; but the fact remains, and it has been established over and over again in this House, that our implements are sold as cheap to the Canadian farmer as the American implement makers sell to the farmers on the other side. Now, excepting a reference to wall paper, that is the whole of the hon. gentleman's argument in support of his major premise that the tariff is oppressive and burdensome, and that it is unfair to the people of this country. I leave the House to judge, and I ask the country to judge, whether he has given us facts, or figures, or arguments, or data, which would justify us in throwing over the National Policy, and in adopting a revenue tariff. Now, what is the proof of his second premise? His second premise is that discontent in this country is so intense that it is verging on disloyalty. Any one unacquainted with this country would almost fancy that nightly drills and meetings of men were going on, and that we were likely to have an invasion of the city of Ottawa by angry people from all sections of the country to drive out this Government and Parliament. Well, what is his proof? His proof is the report of the commissioners that the "Globe" newspaper sent out to investigate the feeling in the country, and the result of a public meeting which was held at Lethbridge. Those are the main items of proof which he gave us for the existence of that degree of discontent which, he says, makes it the imperative duty of the Government to act at once. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman what is the constitutional way for the people to show discontent? Is it not at the polls? Now, the National Policy was adopted in 1879. We had a general election in 1882 in which the people supported the National Policy by a large majority. But, it may be

Mr. IVES.

said, that they had only had a few years' trial of it. True, but in all the by-elections which followed that general election, the Government was strengthened, and we had this remarkable fact, that, when we came to the dissolution of the Parliament which was elected in 1882, the Government were stronger than they were immediately after the general election. Then we had another general election in 1887. Surely there has been sufficient time for the people to form some idea of the oppressive and burdensome nature of this tariff; but what was the result again? The result, in 1887, was the triumphant return of the Government to power. It was the National Policy that aided the Government in 1887, and nothing else; because the influence of the Riel agitation and other questions was against the Conservative party. Sir, you may notice further that all the by-elections which followed the general election of 1887 went in favour of the Government, and at the time of dissolution the Government were stronger than they had been previously. Now, we come to 1891, when the country was more or less excited by the hope of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and when one province, in particular, was, in some sort, mesmerized over this question. What was the result in 1891, after many years' experience of the National Policy? The result was that the Government was again sustained, although by a smaller majority. I remember well that when we had only a majority of ten or fifteen, we spent six months in this House because of the hope entertained by the Opposition that they would be able to defeat the Government. Finally we got to the country, and thanks to the enormous expenditure of money the Liberal party had made and the large number of their friends that had been unseated, we had an opportunity of strengthening ourselves, and by virtue of the National Policy we came back the next session with a majority, not of ten or fifteen, but a majority of sixty-five or seventy. If that is not a constitutional way of approving of the National Policy, I do not know what is. But we have had more recent elections than those of the by-elections of 1892. The Government was reconstructed only a few weeks ago, and the result of that reconstruction was that four elections were held in widely different parts of this country and among widely different classes of the community. We had at the same time two other by-elections, one in Hochelaga and one in Terrebonne. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that in Hochelaga, the most populous constituency in Canada, we have an entirely urban population, not an agricultural, but a consuming population. We have in Terrebonne an agricultural French population. In West York where the Controller of Customs was re-elected, we have an agricultural English population. What was the result? How did this discontent, verging on

disloyalty, manifest itself? It did not show itself in any one of the six by-elections, every single one of which was carried by acclamation, and that was only a few weeks ago. Where is this discontent verging on disloyalty? I have not the slightest doubt but the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) feels discontent. But I wish to tell him that because he is discontented, it does not follow that farmers of this country are unhappy or discontented. I wish to call your attention, Sir, for a few moments to one or two points that go to show that the existing tariff is not, on the whole, burdensome. Take, for example, this fact, that of our total importations, nearly one-half under the existing tariff are free of duty altogether; and, not only one-half are free altogether, but in that one-half are to be found sugar, tea and coffee, which the great mass of the consuming population use, and have to use, and use to the same amount per capita as rich people use. Besides the fact that \$48,000,000 of our total importations are free goods, besides the fact that we have over 113 items of free goods on the free list more than were on the list in 1878. I may tell this House that on the dutiable list are a large number of goods which are recognized luxuries and which are taxed at a high rate of duty, and the duty on which does not affect the consuming population. The bulk of our importations from England, silks, satins, silk hats, gin, beer, porter and all such articles, which bear a high rate of duty, do not affect the consuming population. When we come to the items which necessarily affect the consuming population, such as cottons, woollens and agricultural implements, if we are right in our claim that the prices have decreased, as I maintain they have decreased, 25 per cent all round since 1878, and those goods are of good quality, and that they are, take them all in all, as cheap here as in any other country in the world. I ask in what particular can the hon. gentleman show that the tariff on the whole is burdensome and oppressive? I undertake to say this, that no member of this House can, by figures, satisfy the House or the country that a farmer with a family of seven persons can possibly expend \$20 more per annum under the existing tariff than he would expend under a revenue tariff. When you talk about cottons, what an enormous item it is. I should estimate 125 yards of cotton to be a pretty liberal allowance for a farmer's family. The average price of all the different kinds of cotton could be fairly stated at 8 cents per yard; that is \$10 worth of cotton on an average for a family's use. If the hon. gentleman's statement was entirely correct, if 30 per cent must be added to that price, it would make a difference between the cost of the goods under the present tariff and the cost under free trade \$3 on the quantity of cotton required for an ordinary family. The hon. gentleman has already fixed the tax in the case of binding twine. He said that the taxa-

tion on binding twine has amounted to \$2 per head for each farmer, and we had removed one-half, and it now amounted to \$1. So there are \$4, if you give \$3 to cottons and \$1 to binding twine. You may go through the whole list, and I defy any hon. member to show that it costs a family of seven persons \$20 more to live than it would cost under a revenue tariff. The hon. gentleman, however, would abandon the National Policy and would adopt a revenue tariff. He says that the existing tariff is not defensible, excepting as a protective measure. He also says we have all the industries now in Canada we are likely to obtain, and that those which are here have had protection long enough to be able to stand alone; and if they cannot stand alone, let them go to the wall. The hon. gentleman also would give 10 per cent reduction to Great Britain, for the reason that Great Britain admits our products into her markets free of duty. Well, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) well observed, Great Britain admits our products, in common with the products of all other countries, into her ports free of duty because that is her policy. It is no special favour to us any more than to the rest of the world. She thinks it better to do it, and she does it, and she does not fancy, I think, that we are under any obligation to her to lead us to make this concession. But what would be the state of facts if this concession of 10 per cent were made to Great Britain? It would have to be made also in favour of all other countries with which Great Britain has treaties with favoured nation clauses. To what countries would this 10 per cent reduction have to be granted? Besides Great Britain this reduction would have to be given to the Argentine Republic, Austro-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Borneo, Chili, Colombia, Corea, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Germany, Liberia, Morocco, Muskat, Persia, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Sandwich Islands, Sweden and Norway, Tonga, Tunis, Uruguay, Venezuela. I ask therefore, would this 10 per cent reduction inure to the advantage of Great Britain so much as it would to the advantage of Germany, Norway and Sweden and some other countries on the list I have read? It is well known that the German glass manufacturers have driven the English manufacturers out of their own market, and it is well known that German manufacturers of toys have also taken possession of the English market. Under the scheme of the hon. gentleman, which would open our markets to Austro-Hungary, Germany and Denmark, I believe that the result would be, that we would have reduced our tariff for the benefit of Great Britain, while these other countries which will not give us the slightest concessions in their markets, because of the reduction of 10 per cent in their favour, would benefit, to a great extent, and would compete injuriously with our own trade.

Mr. EDGAR. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the list of countries he read were countries with which we had most-favoured-nation treaties which bound Canada in this respect?

Mr. IVES. I yesterday asked the Deputy-Minister of Trade and Commerce for a list of such countries as have favoured nation treatment treaties with Great Britain, and which would participate in this 10 per cent reduction that it is proposed to make in favour of Great Britain, and the list which I read is the list which Mr. Parmelee furnished me.

Mr. EDGAR. How many are there?

Mr. IVES. Twenty-six with Great Britain.

Mr. EDGAR. If the hon. member will pardon me, I think he will find on investigating that he has included about ten more countries than he ought to; because, while there are that number of countries with which England has most-favoured-nation treaties, binding the colonies in some respects, there are only fifteen with which she has most-favoured-nation treaties binding the colonies as to customs duties. I think the department which furnished that statement will have to revise it. The discrimination would have to be in favour of these countries only with which England has most-favoured-nation treaties binding the colonies in respect to imports, and not in respect to commerce and other things.

Mr. IVES. I will have the list revised before I hand it in to "Hansard," if that is thought proper. I made the statement in good faith. I asked the Deputy-Minister of Trade and Commerce to give me the list of countries that would be entitled to participate in the 10 per cent reduction, provided it was given to Great Britain, and that is the list which I got. If it is not correct, I will have it revised. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is: after having done all this for Great Britain and for Germany, and for the other countries, what would be the effect of this policy at home? And here, so far as manufacturing enterprises are concerned, I propose to read from an authority which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself cited. He quoted from the "Trade Bulletin" with reference to the iron duties, and the closing part of that article which I wish also to read, says:

We do not go the length to which free traders urge us as we do not believe in that policy for Canada, situated as she is beside such a powerful neighbour as the United States, which would absorb our manufacturing interests completely had she free access to our markets; but we do insist that a material modification of the outrageous duties on iron is imperative in the interests of manufacturers as well as of consumers.

Now, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) cited this authority with great approval upon the subject of the iron duties, and read this portion of the article, I would like to have repeated in "Hansard" the opinion of what

Mr. IVES.

he hon. gentleman considers a good authority, as to effect which his policy would have upon the manufacturing industries of this country. I would like to ask, Sir: Before this combination in the cotton trade, which is so much complained of, was made, what position were the cotton industries of this country in to enable them to live under the policy which the hon. gentleman proposes? There was hardly one of them, except the present parent company, the Hochelaga Mills, which had earned a dividend for four or five years, and some of them were in an insolvent condition. It is true that owing to that very combination, which has reduced management expenses and expenses generally, they are in a condition to-day which would enable them to fight a battle with the cotton manufacturers of the States. But let us look at the woollen industries, industries in which almost without exception the stockholders have been without a dividend for the last three or four years. Our Canadian woollen mills are making goods to-day as cheap as they are made anywhere else in the world. What position would that industry be in if Canada were made a slaughter market for bankrupt woollen stocks from the United States, or cheap shoddy bankrupt stocks from Great Britain? They have all they can do now, with the competition among themselves, to sustain themselves and earn running expenses and keep their hands employed. Under this resolution you are not providing for the opening of the American market to them, but you are practically excluding all possibility of ever making an arrangement with the Americans for the opening of their market. While excluding our woollen products from the American market, you at the same time propose to make them an easy prey for bankrupt stocks from other countries, and the result of the policy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) would be, in my opinion, to close up the woollen mills in this country. Then, Sir, let us look at the condition of the paper mills. The policy proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) would put a revenue tariff upon the soda-ash and rags which now come in free, and the result would be that the raw material which the paper mills use would have to pay as high a duty as they would be protected by so far as their manufactured products are concerned. The result of that would be that these paper mills, which to-day are selling their paper at extraordinarily low prices, prices not more than 40 per cent of what they were three years ago, which are having a life and death struggle with our somewhat restricted market, would get no enlarged market, but would have to compete against the overstocks of the great mills of the United States, which, in my opinion, would completely ruin the Canadian paper-making industry. Let us look to the position of the boot and shoe manufacturers of this country, who produce

as good boots and shoes, and produce them as cheaply as they are produced anywhere in the world. Boots and shoes could not possibly be made and sold at a lower price than they are in this country to-day. The manufacturers of these goods are not rich, they have no spare capital, they are having all they can do to get along, and if you were to open a slaughter market here for the bankrupt stocks of boots and shoes of the United States the result would be that you would close up our boot and shoe factories.

Mr. MULLOCK. How is it then, that a large quantity of American boots and shoes find their way to Canada?

Mr. IVES. There are some tony people like my hon. friend who are not satisfied with the home product, and who want to have something made in Boston, and they pay three times as much for boots and shoes as they are worth, and three times as much as they could get the equally good Canadian article for.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is not the answer.

Mr. IVES. That is not the answer the hon. gentleman wanted, but that is the truth. Now, how would this policy affect the farmer, the class for whom my hon. friend is so solicitous? I noticed with pleasure, in reading his speech, that he gives credit to the agricultural protection feature of the tariff for the annual saving of the importation of \$13,000,000 worth of agricultural productions from the United States into Canada. I am much obliged to him for that admission. I know how he gets at that. He takes the decrease in the importations of agricultural products in 1880 from what they were in 1879, amounting to \$13,000,000, and he says that is the amount of the additional home market that the National Policy has given to the farmers; but he loses sight altogether of the fact that we have now a much larger population in our cities and towns, and that the importations to-day, particularly in view of the remarkably low prices of meat products in the United States, would make that protection, instead of \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000, very likely double that amount. But, taking the increased home market at his own figure, \$13,000,000 a year, is not that worth keeping? Does the hon. gentleman want to open the tariff door, so that meat products from Armour's and Swift's, instead of passing through our country by rail to New England towns and cities, would be unloaded at every town and city in Canada, so that our own people, who are making beef and mutton and pork for consumption by our own people, would be obliged to leave their work and hand it over to the Americans? That is what the hon. gentleman proposes to do to benefit the farmers of the country. The hon. gentleman could find nothing else that the National Policy does for the farmer. He has estimated that \$265,000,000 of manu-

factured products are due to the protective policy. I note that the manufacturing industries of this country are paying \$100,000,000 a year in wages. Therefore, my hon. friend cannot find fault with me if I take, as a result of wage-earning, such a proportion of that \$100,000,000 as the \$265,000,000 bears to the whole production of manufactured goods, \$75,000,000 annually as received in wages which would not be received but for the National Policy. Now, I have estimated that at least \$50,000,000 of that amount is expended for food products, while \$25,000,000 is expended by the operatives in clothing and other things. Therefore, \$50,000,000 may be added for what the farmers get for the food products they raise and sell to the operatives in the factories of the country. The \$13,000,000 would be equal to an average of \$18 a head to the farmers of this country, and the \$50,000,000 would be equal to \$70 a head, or \$88 a head to the 720,000 farmers in this country. Then you must remember that when you have manufacturing industries in a town or a city or a village, you have many people there besides the operatives working in the factory; you have shoemakers, tailors and other people gathered around a manufacturing centre and more or less supported by it. These people buy the farmer's products also, and I think it would be infinitely easier for me to show an increased market for agricultural productions due to the National Policy, of \$100 a year to every farmer in this country, than it would be for my hon. friend to show that it costs any average farmer \$20 more to live under the existing tariff than it would under the tariff which he proposes. Now, Sir, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do? We imported last year \$117,000,000 worth of goods, of which \$48,000,000 worth were free and \$69,000,000 worth were dutiable, and we collected on them \$20,500,000 of duty. Now, if you apply the amount of money we collected to the amount of dutiable goods imported, you will find that my hon. friend, under a revenue tariff, would have to fix a rate of 29.7 per cent as an average rate upon the present dutiable list, in order to produce the same amount of money that we had last year. Is that what my hon. friend proposes? If he proposes to apply a revenue tariff and levy an equal rate upon all the imports, both dutiable and free, then he would require a rate of about 17½ per cent. Is that what he proposes? Or does he propose to tax luxuries higher, and to levy say \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 on sugar, tea and coffee, and then fix as low a rate as he thinks will raise the money necessary, and apply it equally to the whole list of imports? If that is what he proposes, then the condition of the poor farmer will be this: He will to some extent lose the home market which the manufacturing industries give him, and he will have to pay a higher price for many of the manufactured goods he has to buy, and

perhaps double the price for his tea, coffee and sugar that he is paying to-day, in order to raise the \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 that would have to be levied upon those articles. But we have to make a still further calculation, because the hon. gentleman is going to impose 10 per cent less duty against England and some other countries than against the United States. What rate shall it be against the United States, and what rate against England? Has the hon. gentleman all these matters figured out? Is he as clear as to what rate of duty he would have to levy on English goods and German goods, and what rate of duty he would have to levy on United States goods, as he was in many other portions of his speech? I doubt very much, if the hon. gentleman had imposed upon him the duty of framing a tariff according to his own ideas, whether he would not think that a request for delay was a very reasonable request. The hon. gentleman does not consider, I presume, what result his policy would have so far as the United States are concerned, or what the United States would say to a proposal for a differential duty of 10 per cent against them and in favour of England, Germany, Denmark and the South American Republics. What do hon. gentlemen opposite think about a differential duty of 10 per cent against the United States? What is to become of continental free trade if we start off by imposing a differential duty of 10 per cent against the United States? Are the United States likely to go on with the scheme of a revenue tariff which the hon. gentleman is so sure they are just on the eve of adopting, if we take this course with regard to them months in advance of their considering the tariff question at all? I think we would have a right to expect, if we were to adopt such a hostile policy towards the United States as that proposed by the hon. gentleman, in his resolution, that the United States, if they should adopt a revenue tariff, would insert in it a provision similar to that which they put in their lumber tariff with respect to countries that impose export duties on logs. We would have reason to expect that, in the case of any discrimination in our tariff against the United States, the amount of that discrimination would be added to their duties against us. That would be the least hostile thing we should expect them to do. They might go further, and declare a customs war, and refuse to have anything to do with us; and I shall be very much surprised, if, when a division is taken, hon. gentlemen opposite, who have favoured in turn unrestricted reciprocity, and commercial union, and continental free trade, should rise and vote for a resolution to discriminate to the extent of 10 per cent in favour of Great Britain, as against the United States. In one part of his speech the hon. gentleman stated, that the British Government would sooner or later have to adopt some scheme

Mr. IVES.

of protecting her agricultural population, but that, probably, in view of the fact that the United States were likely to adopt the principle of free trade, England would be justified in waiting to see what the United States really did. But, while he thinks that would be a good reason for England to wait, it is no reason at all for Canada to wait, and, according to him, we ought to proceed at once and enact 10 per cent discrimination against the United States. He calls upon us to declare our hostility to that country. He asks us to destroy the better feeling which has begun to prevail between the two countries, and renew and intensify the old soreness, and he wants us to do that at once, without waiting to see what the United States are disposed to do with reference to Canada, when making their tariff—and all this because the hon. gentleman was not consulted in the formation of the Government. I am quite satisfied, that the country, after reading the hon. gentleman's speech and seeing what it is he really proposes, will be satisfied to wait until the Government have submitted, during next session, the changes they think should be made, in order to improve the existing tariff. And I think we shall hear less about unrest and less about tariff reform than we have heard in the last few weeks. I know that the Government sincerely and honestly intend to undertake this task and to do the best they can. The House and the country may rely upon that, and I believe that the House and the country will be satisfied with what the Government proposes and will refuse to withdraw confidence until the Government fails to redeem its pledge.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not intend to trouble the House with any lengthy remarks, as I have already spoken on the trade question, but many of my constituents expect that I shall vote in a certain way with regard to the motion before the House. I, therefore, wish to state my views very briefly. But, before doing so, I will, with the permission of the House, refer to some historical allusions that were made by my hon. friend, who went back to the inception of the National Policy, and presented the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald to us as a free trader. There can be no doubt that the late right hon. gentleman was a free trader. In 1875 I happened to be visiting the "Mail" office, on whose staff at that time was a man to whom the National Policy owes, next to Isaac Buchanan, more than to any man who has lived in Canada, and that was John Maclean, a friend of mine, and father of a son who sits in this House, and who, I hope, will be worthy of his sire. On that day I happened to be reading a leading article in the "Mail," but which was marked "communicated." Whether it was written by the gentleman to whom I have referred, or by a Mr. Phipps, who used at the time to contribute to the

"Mail," or by another person who sometimes also contributed protectionist articles at that time, I forget; but I know that Sir John Macdonald happened to come in, and entered into conversation with Mr. Belford, who was then editing the "Mail." He said: "Belford, what is the meaning of those protectionist articles in the 'Mail'? I am not a protectionist; I am a free trader." But, Mr. Speaker, it is quite consistent with the character of a great statesman to be a free trader in the abstract, and yet, with regard to a country placed as Canada was at that time and as she is now, with regard to a young country, to be a protectionist. In fact, there are three stages in the history of a country, in regard to which enlightened free traders and enlightened protectionists might agree. There is a stage when absolute free trade—that is the barbaric stage—is best for the country. Then comes a stage when the country is young and struggling into civilized life, and then, if you are to make it anything else but a cattle-growing and wheat-producing country, you must have protection. Then comes a time in its history—for instance, the United States may have reached that time—when an enlightened protectionist might come to the conclusion that the best thing for the country would be free trade. So that there was no inconsistency on the part of my late right hon. friend and leader, when he decided that the time had come for announcing the National Policy in Canada, as he did announce it. I may tell the House, and the House will excuse me, because it is interesting, a bit of gossip in connection with that. When the late right hon. gentleman was Receiver-General of Canada, Mr. Isaac Buchanan went to him and proposed that he should go in for protection. Sir John said to him: "Buchanan, the most contemptible of all things is an unsuccessful politician; and a politician who takes up a question that is ahead of the opinion of the country, is sure to be unsuccessful. Now," he said, "Buchanan, I mean to be a successful politician." Mr. Buchanan was at that time a very rich Hamilton merchant, and he went to London and called on Lord George Bentinck, who with Mr. Disraeli, was leading the Conservative opposition to Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Buchanan explained his views. He impressed Lord George Bentinck and convinced him, that if his views were taken up, England might be carried against Sir Robert Peel, and he said: "Buchanan, I wish you would see Disraeli." Just at that moment a gentleman in a black frock coat was seen to pass through the hall and go up the staircase. Lord George Bentinck said to Mr. Buchanan: "Do you know who that is? That is Disraeli. Just wait, and I will see if he will see you." When he came back, Mr. Buchanan said, eagerly: "Will Mr. Disraeli see me? What did he say?" "He said," replied Lord Bentinck, "If Buchanan will tell me how we can carry twenty-seven constituencies, I

can beat Peel; but if he cannot, I really have no time to see him." I think the House will excuse me occupying its time with that little historical reference, because it throws light. I think, on the similarity of character between the late leader of the Conservative party in Canada and the late leader of the Conservative party in England. Now, Sir, I say in regard to the motion of my hon. friend what I said to a friend of mine in this House when he asked me what I thought of it when it was first put on the Paper. The great weakness of that motion is the part that relates to the discrimination in favour of Great Britain, and I am not surprised that my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), when he came to reply, pounced on that portion of the resolution, and, so far as he laboured the argument, laboured against that. Because, whatever way you approach it, it will not commend itself to you. That has been so far discussed that it would weary the House were I to take up its time in regard to the point. I will only say this, Sir, that I entirely dissent from discrimination of any kind, and especially at this time, for a reason that has been stated by the hon. member who has last spoken (Mr. Ives). The superstructure reared by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not as large as his scaffolding. The speech made by my hon. friend, the petitions he referred to and the discontent, would in my opinion, have justified a motion calling for reduction or even abolition of duties on certain articles. But I do not think that there is any such discontent in the country, or any such claims put forward in any of the petitions—and I have presented a large number—as would lead any one to suppose that the time had come for sweeping away the National Policy altogether and going in for a revenue tariff policy. There are petitions on the Table, some of them presented by my hon. friend, some presented by myself, from all parts of the North-west. There are some presented from the city of Brandon, signed by every important man in the city, leading Conservatives, leading supporters of my hon. friend, the Minister of Interior (Mr. Daly). There is a petition presented to this House by myself from Souris signed by hundreds of farmers. And all these petitions called for is for the reduction of the duty on certain articles. Oddly enough, though I had nothing to do with preparing or even suggesting these petitions, they are for the reduction or abolition of the very duties referred to in the motion which I had the honour to place on the Table in the early part of the session. Take the first proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe:

That no sufficient reason has been adduced or exists requiring investigation respecting the foregoing facts which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation which is imperative.

There can be no doubt about that; it is acknowledged; and not only is it acknowledged, but the existence of such monopolies

is condemned by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said that a quartette,—if I may speak in that undignified way of the Cabinet Ministers and Ministers of the Crown—at all events, four hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the two Controllers, are to investigate, and, if they find that there are combines and trusts, the Government will see that these combines and trusts shall not longer exist to oppress the people. Something like that is what fell from the lips of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. And my hon. friend the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said he did not stand up to defend monopoly. So we may take it for granted that there is no division of opinion in this House as to whether monopolies should exist, nor yet as to whether they do exist. Then we have :

That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure has proved in many instances, oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits : is unfair and unequal in its incidence ; and has been productive of discontent verging on disloyalty among those who suffer from its injustice.

Now, Sir, that is a strong statement in regard to certain phenomena and it is undeniable. For instance, there cannot be the least doubt that there is discontent to the limit of which I have spoken with the tariff in the North-west and in Manitoba. There can be no doubt, also, because we have evidence of it, that to the limit I have spoken of, there is discontent in Ontario. The "Globe" commissioners were quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). One of them, Mr. Atkinson, states that the farmers are discontented, that certain farmers have annexationist feeling, but he also states, and I believe it is very important to notice it, that those men do not wish to have the tariff changed so as to oppress manufacturers of this country in favour of the manufacturers of the United States. Now, I believe that is a very general sentiment, and we had a meeting in Regina at which the tariff was discussed ; though the feeling was universal that the tariff should be reformed and the duty on certain articles lowered, nevertheless one of the gentlemen who were strongest in expressing their feelings declared that he did not want to have the duties so reduced as to be greatly injurious to the manufacturers of implements. He mentioned implements specially. He said he wanted the duties reduced, but did not want them swept away entirely, because he did not want to do sudden harm to those persons who had been induced to go into that speculation by reason of the National Policy. Now, Sir, comes the third proposition :

That since the introduction of the protective system sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as

Mr. DAVIN.

under existing conditions can be successfully carried out in Canada. Moreover, many manufacturers sheltered behind the rampart thus erected have formed combinations and trusts which prohibit competition and create and maintain monopolies.

Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had confined himself to the reduction or the abolition of the duties on certain articles, I consider that he could stand by that proposition. But when we read that in connection with my hon. friend's speech, and with the other parts of his resolution, clearly what it means it this : That there is no sufficient reason given why a general overhauling of the tariff should not take place this year, and why we should not go for a revenue tariff, qualified by this, however,—in justice to my hon. friend from Simcoe—that he said he wanted to do this gradually, he wanted a graduated tariff, looking towards a revenue tariff. Now, Sir, I think that the Government is reasonable in saying : If we are to revise the whole tariff, we certainly want more time than we have had to consider. I agree with that, but I do not agree that when we have certain things pointed out, such, for instance, as the duty on barbed wire, where you have a combination, where no revenue comes from it to the Government, so high is the protection, and where it is clearly oppressive as it is to the farmers of the North-west Territories and Manitoba—I say there is no sufficient reason yet given why the Government should not deal with that matter at once. No sufficient reason, in my opinion, has been given why the Government should not deal with agricultural implements, not sweeping away the duty, but lowering the duty at once, so as to relieve the farmers in the North-west. And so on in regard to one or two other matters. But I quite agree that if we are going to have a regular overhauling of the tariff, one year is quite short time enough to do what is in fact a very big job. But I may say here to my hon. friend from Simcoe, that I should be opposed to any graduated tariff. A graduated tariff was introduced into the United States in 1833. It went on till 1842, and the result was that business men were never certain, during the nine years, how the tariff would affect them, and it had a very serious effect on business. While I am dealing now with that tariff, may I say a word or two to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) ? He took up a position in regard to tariff changes in which I cannot agree with him. He spoke of the tariff of the United States, and pointed out that only in 1846 was there a lapse from the sacred policy of protection ; with that year excepted, the United States had gone on consistently in a protectionist policy. My hon. friend, I confess, metaphorically, of course, seemed to shed a tear of regret over the backsliding of the American statesmen of that year. Now, what are the facts about that ?—for they should have some bearing on our discussion with regard to the tariff in this House. On this side, and

on the other, when you come to deal with the tariff and to bring forward your figures, it does not apparently ever occur to any hon. gentleman that all the conditions of the problem are not before us. They seem to think that they have all the conditions of the problem, whereas, not one only, but many conditions, are absent. Now, in the United States, from 1846 to 1860, during those fourteen years, there was an amount of prosperity such as was never surpassed before, and has never been surpassed since; yet you had, during that time, as near an approach to free trade as you can have in a country where you have not direct taxation. But, Mr. Speaker, I say that no free trader, no revenue tariff man, can take that circumstance and say that it demonstrates that a protective policy is bad, or that a free trade policy is good. You cannot do it, because there are a number of conditions that have to be taken into account. There is the application of anthracite coal to the making of iron; there is the enormous expansion in the building of railways. A lot of things like that have to be taken into account, in order to get at the sum of the forces that led to the prosperity in that period. But I say that the fact that the United States, during that period, from 1846 to 1860, was so prosperous under the tariff they then had, is full of lessons for us in Canada at this time, because it shows this—and it is a view that in a protectionist country we cannot keep too strongly before us—that you have a thousand manufactures, you have a thousand industries, going forward on a moderate tariff, and a moderate tariff may do, in fact, more for you than a very high tariff will do. Under a moderate tariff, you avoid one of the dangers of a protectionist policy, you avoid combines, you avoid rings, and avoid those oppressive monopolies of which we complain, at least those of us who take the stand I do, and think that we ought to have redress. I would even now urge on my hon. friend the Finance Minister that I do not see why, when he goes again into Committee of Ways and Means, having seen what are the opinions advocated in the petitions we have placed before him, having seen what is the sentiment in the House,—I do not see why he should not do what would be done in England, and say: Yes; I intend, in regard to certain things that have been brought before me, to make certain changes: we will reduce the duty, or we will abolish the duty on barbed wire; and we will see that, in the Northwest, where men have no timber to make fences, and in Manitoba, where men have no timber to make fences, they shall not be charged 7 cents a pound for barbed wire, which, I need not tell you, is almost a prohibitive price. He might also take up implements. I point out to him that a representative of the implement manufacturers was down here, and he stated that he would be very glad indeed if he was let off with 25 per cent. Now, I would urge on my hon. friend,

when he goes into committee the next time, that, in two articles like that, he might make such change as will show that we have that elasticity in our tariff policy, that we ought to have. What is the use of hon. members coming here and getting up, one after another, and telling the Government what their constituents think, what they complain of, where the shoe pinches, and where a grievance is felt? What is the use of doing that, if it all falls upon deaf ears, and nothing is to be done for twelve months? Therefore, I appeal strongly to my hon. friend. He gave us a little aid on binder twine; he did a little for us on coal oil; let him do something for us on agricultural implements; let him do something in regard to barbed wire, and I promise him that his popularity, and the popularity of his Government will be immeasurably enhanced throughout the length and breadth of the farming community. Now, Sir, I have referred to the practical reforms that I think ought to take place this session. Will the House permit me briefly to refer to the contention made by my hon. friend from Simcoe? One statement he made has not been fully answered yet. I do not know how he demonstrates it, but he made the statement, he gave us the calculation, that, on \$265,000,000, 30 per cent was paid by the people of the country, which would amount to some \$79,000,000, double the amount we require to carry on the affairs of this country—paid, mark you, not into the coffers of the country, but paid into the hands of manufacturers. Now, take the argument made by the hon. member for South Ontario about the cotton combines. The hon. the President of the Council did not attempt to answer that argument, although he is in a position to know; he understands that question very well, and he ought to have been able to give an answer, if any one could answer the hon. member for West Ontario. The hon. gentleman's statement, in which he showed that something like \$6,000,000 profit must have been made by those manufacturers, has not been answered yet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman gone into the calculation himself, at all?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman asks me, if I have gone into the calculation, I have. Is there any other catechism my hon. friend would like to address to me? Mr. Speaker, I have gone into the calculation, and I may say here, that I not only followed the speech delivered, but I went to the office upstairs and obtained the papers that were in the hands of the hon. member for West Ontario, and I went over the calculations, and, so far as I could see, although I am not an expert in regard to this matter, they were quite correct. A remark fell from the hon. the

President of the Council to which I desire to call the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman said: Can it be shown, that the farmers of this country, in consequence of the National Policy, pay \$7 per head more than they would pay if there was a revenue tariff in operation? If they pay each \$7 or \$6 or \$5 more, it is an enormous sum. Seven dollars would be 75 cents more than the per capita taxation of this country, and 742,000 farmers, multiplied by seven, would give an enormous amount. I may say that, speaking generally, in regard to all these calculations in which it is sought to show that the amount of taxation is small per capita, the hon. gentleman who is our popular whip, speaking on Tuesday night, made a calculation as to what the farmer paid, and he made out, that, if the farmer paid anything in excess, it was probably about \$4, and that on a number of necessary articles. But he admitted that, besides those articles, barbed wire and some other articles could be obtained cheaper across the line. When an hon. member declares that the increased price is only \$4 or \$5 or \$7, to use the language of Mr. Jevons, the great logician, "You are resorting to the fallacies of the spendthrift." With \$3,000 or \$20,000 income, he thinks one bottle of wine does not matter much, or one box of cigars, or one horse, or one anything else. Taken individually, these expenditures do not amount to much, but, in the aggregate, they destroy the man's position. And so in regard to any class or in regard to communities, if it could be shown that the National Policy was taking taxation out of the pockets of the people to the amount of \$4 or \$1 per head, in regard to any given industry. Take, for instance, binding twine. It is said that, in consequence of the reduction made, every farmer would pay \$1 less for binding twine. Of course, that would be the average. But extensive farmers in Manitoba and the North-west, instead of saving \$1, would save \$5 or \$6. Suppose you take a large number of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west and put \$1 into each one's pocket, as a saving in a single article, until they each receive \$5, \$6, \$7 or \$10, look at the amount of money that would be kept in the North-west. Instead of passing into the pockets of the plutocratic manufacturers that money, spent in the North-west, would make all the difference between the prosperity of the country and its depression, between its solvency and insolvency, between ease, on the part of the farmer, in paying his bills to the storekeeper, and ease, on the part of the storekeeper, in meeting his notes early each month. The position taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe, will have to be met, for it has not yet been demolished. No doubt the hon. Minister of Finance will deal with it, but it will have to be demolished or it will have its effect in the country. The farmer has been represented by the hon.

Mr. DAVIN.

the Finance Minister as though he obtained nearly every article he used free of duty, that he obtained his clothes free, his food free, and so on. Why, Mr. Speaker, there could not be a more unjust description of the articles that a farmer uses. He has to have as many tools as a tradesman; he has to have iron in nearly everything he uses; he requires a gig or trap, like a gentleman who indulges in riding about the country; he, moreover, requires a wagon, also leather, nails, and an innumerable number of articles, all of which pay duty; and, in my opinion, there is not a man in the community who is touched at so many points by the National Policy as is the farmer to-day. And, therefore, when we come here, those of us who represent farming constituents, and press our views, as we have done, on the Government, and when it is demonstrated that combines exist in certain industries which affect the farmer, I confess that, strong supporter as I am of the Conservative party, I think the Conservative Government ought not to put us off for twelve months, in order to remedy palpable grievances and to meet a case that is right before them, ready for solution and ready for the solatium that a reduction or abolition of duties would give. These are the points I wished to bring out, and I have done. I have shown why I differ from the hon. member for Simcoe, in regard to his motion, and I have also shown how far I sympathize with him. I have no desire to enter into the controversy raised the other night, in regard to the hon. gentleman's consistency. The hon. gentleman came before us as a member of this House, and presented a reasoned statement of the course he proposed to take. I remember the Hon. Joseph Howe, when his speeches of former years were thrown up to him, said: "Do not quote me against myself; there is no authority for whom I have such a supreme contempt." I take that greatest of statesmen of modern times, Mr. Gladstone. Suppose you were to quote Mr. Gladstone against himself. If that course were adopted, the time of the English House of Commons would be taken up, and at every sitting the morning would dawn before members would get through a debate. In my humble opinion, in any parliamentary assembly, especially in the Parliament of a great young nation, such as this, the proper way to judge a man is by the propositions he lays down and the reasons he advances to support them, because I do not at all agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in what he stated in the early part of his speech. The hon. gentleman deprecated the hon. member for Simcoe coming forward to air his opinions, and intimated, that the proper course to take was to go quietly to certain gentlemen to discuss the subject with them. Mr. Speaker, I dissent entirely from that view, and for several reasons. First, and greatest of all, my reason is this, that Mr. Bagehot and all writers of consti-

tutional government, lay down, that parliamentary government is the best means of educating the people that can be used. And if hon. members were not to bring forward questions for discussion in Parliament, where is the education of the people to come from? How can the people at large form their opinions on a given question? And, above all, are we not surrendering our rights as members of this House, because it must be remembered that the Parliament of Canada is the real Government of Canada, for, although for convenience sake we commit the Government to a committee of the House, the real Government is, after all, the Parliament of Canada, His Excellency, the Senate and the House of Commons. Here is the place to discuss whatever views we have, to establish them or have them refuted. My hon. friend, the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) when he quoted from my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) against himself, established this: that that hon. gentleman differs from himself in years gone by, and I should not be surprised if a member of Parliament so busy as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) no longer holds the opinions he held at other times. I can easily understand a man coming conscientiously to a change of view in regard to a thing so delicate as tariff legislation, and I must say, too, that it was complimentary to the hon. member for Simcoe that some of the cleverest and most amusing things in the admirable speech of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) were the quotations made from the speeches of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself; so that the hon. member was like that eagle of which Kirke White sings: He was transfixed with a dart, impelled by a pinion which he himself had nursed; the hon. gentleman was impaled by arrows picked up from battlefields where he had fought and won. For my part I consider the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe was an able speech, a speech well worthy of this House, and a speech that would do honour to any Parliament. I differ from it. But the position he took up has not yet been really impaired, and I look forward to seeing it dealt with by some member of the Government, no doubt by the Finance Minister when he comes to close the debate. One of his positions taken there, namely, that there is no reason for putting off reducing the duty on these articles where the need is palpable, I entirely agree with, and if there had not been certain things introduced into the resolution, which are larger than the petitions justified, and larger than the argument of my hon. friend, in my opinion justified, I might have found myself able to vote for his resolution. As it is, I certainly cannot support it; I cannot above all support it, with Great Britain in it; but at the same time I am glad that it was brought forward in a speech so able; I am glad that a subject so vital to the interests of this country was so

thoroughly discussed and so thoroughly probed, and I look forward to great advantages arising from the discussion introduced by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not intend to trouble the House with any lengthened speech on this subject; but I would like to state the reason why I support the Government in their tariff policy at this present time. The constituency that I represent includes almost all classes of people: the manufacturer, the merchant, the mechanic, the farmer, and if there are any other classes I think they will be found in East Toronto to a greater or less extent. I have been cognizant of the unrest which has been referred to by so many speakers, and the unrest exists not only in my constituency but in other parts of the country to some extent. So far as I have been able to analyse and account for that unrest and discontent, by whatever word we may call it, I do not think that it arises from tariff conditions, or, at any rate, I am perfectly safe in saying that it does not arise entirely from tariff conditions, but that it arises very largely from business conditions. We have periodical times of depression, and unfortunately not only in Canada but almost all parts of the world are passing through just such a period as that at the present time. I have had a number of communications with regard to the tariff from different persons in my constituency, and I find that there are diverse interests. I find, for instance, that one firm wrote to me to say that the duty must be reduced on bar and pig iron, and I have a letter from another firm in my constituency to say that if the duty is removed from bar iron and pig iron it will be injurious to their industry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What industry?

Mr. COATSWORTH. The rolling mills.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. COATSWORTH. My hon. friend need not laugh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not laughing. I was cheering the statement. From my stand-point, it is all right.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The point I want to bring out is that there are diverse interests. One interest asked to have the duty taken off a certain article, and the opposing interest writes that it will be ruined if the duty is taken off. In what position am I about that?

Mr. LISTER. Resign.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not know that my hon. friend resigned on the oil question. I do not think he did.

Mr. LISTER. I am all right on the oil question.

Mr. COATSWORTH. You did not support the reduction in duty, anyway, which you

ought to have done from your point of view. What I want to say is this: That the very fact that there are so many diverse interests to be considered, places every hon. member in the position that without a full and fair investigation into all the interests concerned he is not qualified to vote properly on this question of the tariff. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), among the arguments that he brought forward for an immediate dealing with the question of tariff, said: that there had been representations from various parts of the country, and that the thought, in response to those representations the Government should take up the question and deal with it at once. Now, on the same principle there is other legislation that ought to be carried in this House, if we are to act upon representations, not representing the majority of the country necessarily, but representing a large section of it. If we ought to pass laws on these representations, then why should we not a law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquor?

Mr. LISTER. You voted against it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No, I did not. I voted for it consistently, as I propose to vote on this occasion, and that is that we should not be called upon to vote until we have a full and fair investigation of the whole question, and then we will be able to decide as intelligent men, not as partisans, what vote we ought to give on these important questions. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the Government are doing perfectly right, and just exactly what it is their duty to do, in investigating these questions of tariff, before they call upon us to vote as to what reduction shall be made.

Mr. LISTER. Do you think they ought to be made?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Do you wish me to answer in advance of the investigation? I listened to the speech of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with a great deal of interest, as I always listen to the speeches of my hon. and learned friend who stands so high in Ontario, but I must confess that it produced, in my mind, a measure of disappointment, and I notice it produced a measure of disappointment, also, in the minds of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. The speech divided itself into three parts, to a certain extent described by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). First, there was the speech itself, which was a general arraignment of the National Policy. Then, there was the resolution; that was another thing, and I do not think the resolution justified the speech, for the speech went far beyond the resolution. And there was the conclusion, that is, the statement by my hon. friend of his own policy, and of what he would have the Government do at the present time. That was another thing, entirely distinct from the resolution and the speech. Now, I say that, be-

Mr. COATSWORTH.

cause, at the conclusion, or towards the conclusion of his address, he laid down this proposition: He would not, he said, at the present time, do anything towards the United States. He said the same thing in the Stayner speech—that the time had not come for dealing with the United States on this question. Therefore, his position at the present time, is, that we should leave the duties on goods coming from the United States. But, he says—and this is the sum of his whole speech—I would take one-third only off the duties imposed on British goods. Then he went on to say that that one-third would be of great benefit to the farmers. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is that conclusion which I propose to deal with this afternoon. I suppose the hon. gentleman cannot ask more than that we should discuss the conclusion that he arrives at himself. I think his own conclusion is not justified by the facts which we have before us in our Trade and Navigation Returns. Then, the hon. gentleman can no longer ask us to support his resolution. But first, Mr. Speaker, let me say that, to my mind, the speech, as coming from one of our great lawyers, was a very sectional one. It was not a national speech in any respect. It was a speech delivered entirely from the stand-point of the farmers. Now, I do not quarrel with the farmers, because, as I have said, I have farmers in my constituency, and I do not lose sight of the fact that they constitute a very large proportion of the population of this country. But when we are dealing with a national question, we should not deal with it from a sectional point of view, but we should endeavour, as far as possible, to embrace all classes of the population, and determine the effect of a certain policy, not upon one section, but upon all sections of the community. Now, in following out that policy, there is no doubt that there will have to be forbearance exercised on all sides. Our hon. friends on the opposite side of the House who would ask us to adopt the policy of free trade, well know that it would involve many sacrifices in this country. Where there are conflicting interests, we cannot adopt any policy which will be beneficial to all the people of the country, that will not involve sacrifices on the part of some. I do not mean to say that certain sections of the people must endure all the suffering, but, for the sake of each class, there must be forbearance on the part of other classes, and there must be mutual forbearance all around, for the sake of the general prosperity of the country. Now, I think we have to consider, not only the farmer, but the mechanic. The farmer, according to the census, numbers nearly one-half of our population, about 720,000, while the mechanics number nearly 400,000. Now, my hon. friend, in his speech, gives no thought whatever to the effect the reduction of the tariff he proposes would have on the mechanics, and I say that no policy which overlooks the interests of the mechanics of this country, the men who have to work from

day to day, is a truly national policy. Now, the National Policy has been favourable to the mechanics.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, no; it has degraded labour.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I know more about the mechanics than you do.

Mr. LISTER. No, Sir.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I say I do. I have been a mechanic myself.

Mr. LISTER. You were glad to get out of the business.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not at all. I learned my trade, and I could go back and work at it if necessary. I have had a great deal of experience among the mechanics of this country. I know what the rate of wages was fifteen years ago, when I was working among them myself, and how they had to live and were housed and clothed, and any one who compares their condition at that time with their condition at the present time, will have to admit that the National Policy has been a great boon to the mechanics of this country. I know that the average wages of the mechanics fifteen years ago were about \$1.50 a day, whereas to-day they are from \$2 to \$2.50 a day. These are facts which hon. gentlemen opposite cannot dispute. Moreover, when we consider the necessary supplies that the mechanic has to purchase, we know that there has been a reduction of at least 30 per cent in their cost, as compared with fifteen years ago. So that, if the mechanic is obtaining higher wages, and if his wages have a greater purchasing power than they had fifteen years ago, he is unmistakably in a better condition than he was then.

Mr. McMULLEN. What happened to sugar when the duty was taken off?

Mr. COATSWORTH. It went down in price very much, so that the mechanic is enabled to buy 25 pounds of sugar to-day for the same money for which he could get only twenty pounds before.

Mr. CASEY. What brought it down?

Mr. COATSWORTH. You did not bring it down.

Mr. LISTER. Yes; we brought it down. We forced you to bring it down.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that. They have tried to force us to do many things, but they have not succeeded very well, and I tell them that the Government and their supporters are not the men to be forced unless they see that what is desired is the right thing to be done, and then they will do it, no matter how much hon. gentlemen oppose it.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COATSWORTH. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was coming to the part of my remarks where I wished to speak about the conclusions arrived at by my hon. friend from North Simcoe. As I have said already, I was rather surprised at the smallness of the conclusion in comparison with the length of his speech and the magnitude of the resolution. I expected that the hon. gentleman, following out his speech, would have asked a general reduction of the tariff. But in summing up the whole matter, what is the conclusion he arrived at? He simply asked the Government to take one-third off the duties now imposed on goods imported from Great Britain. That is all he asks. He has stated that he does not desire the Government to interfere with the tariff at present, so far as the United States are concerned, but simply wishes them to take one-third off the duties charged on goods coming from Great Britain, and this he asks in the interests of the farmer. Now, strange to say, he does not expect that the farmer will in any way be enabled to obtain more for his produce by this policy, but he expects simply to reduce the burden of taxation weighing on the farmer and thus enable him to effect a saving of \$3,000,000 per year. Now, it will be interesting to ascertain what the result really would be to the farmer, if the Government acceded to that proposition. I am bold enough to say that I feel satisfied that any hon. gentleman who will follow up the calculation, as it affects the farmer, cannot support this resolution, because, so far as I have been able to work out the figures—and I have endeavoured to do so accurately and fairly—this proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe would be actually detrimental to the farmer. I have endeavoured to make an analysis from the Trade and Navigation Returns, in order to determine what proportion of \$9,000,000 duty which is paid on British imports is chargeable against those purchased by the farmer, and I was surprised to find there was such a small result. I expected that the hon. gentleman would follow out his argument to a logical conclusion, and was surprised to find what a very small proportion of the goods which are imported from Great Britain are of such a class as are used by the farmer. I intend trespassing on the time of the House for a few minutes in order to read some of the principal articles, so as to convince the House that the statement I make is correct. After a careful calculation of those duties, I find that the proportion in which the farmers are interested is about \$1,000,000 only, and that in which they are not interested \$8,000,000. When I speak of the proportion in which they are interested, I refer, of course, to the things that are not necessary, although I am glad to say that many of our farmers are in such a position as not to be confined to the necessaries of life, but are able to purchase

many of the luxuries, so that many of the articles I refer to are not necessary at all, in any sense of the word, and yet, at the same time, may, to a considerable extent, be used by the farmer. The first list I prepared is what may be termed the large items of duties in which the farmers are not interested as necessaries essential to their occupation or mode of living. Those articles are ale, \$42,000; books, \$61,000; brass-ware, \$20,000; carriages, \$55,000—by carriages I mean the higher grades; carpets, \$31,000; cement, \$58,000; chocolate, \$10,000; copper, \$5,000; cottons, \$500,000. Now the duties on cottons amounted altogether to about \$850,000. I have made as careful an analysis as possible, and I find that the proportion of cotton goods in which the farmers are in any way interested is very much less than I have allowed, that is \$350,000; and when I say there is \$500,000 of duty collected on a class of goods in which they are not necessarily interested, I am keeping well within the mark. Curtains, \$57,000; decorated earthenware, \$69,000; white granite, \$83,000; china and porcelain, \$21,000; tiles, \$5,000; electric light apparatus, \$28,000; embroideries, \$26,000; fancy goods, \$343,000; feathers, \$5,000; fish of special kinds, \$6,000; flax, \$200,000. Now, with regard to flax, some of the largest items are a high-class of linen. The total duties on flax amounted to \$325,000. And I have fixed the figure at \$200,000 as the proportion in which the farmers are not interested. Fruit, \$55,000; furs, \$57,000; glassware, \$80,000; gloves, \$129,000 (this is the higher class of gloves); fancy gold ornaments, \$19,000; gunpowder, \$14,000; rubber, chiefly rubber clothing, \$96,000; hats, beaver, silk and felt of the higher class, \$190,000; ironware of different kinds, including car iron, iron pipes, railway iron, boiler tubes, special classes of iron not agricultural, and firearms, \$457,000. Now, the total amount of the iron duties is \$1,339,000; so, in taking those estimates, which, I think, no one will dispute, in which the farmer is not interested in, I estimate \$457,000, a good deal less than one-half of the duties paid on iron. Jellies and jams, \$18,000; jewellery, \$9,000; lead products, \$4,000; leather belting, \$6,000; mats, rugs, &c., \$14,000; metal (gas meters, &c.), \$27,000; mineral waters, \$5,000; oils, flax seeds, &c., \$101,000; oilcloth, \$68,000; packages, \$25,000; paintings, \$5,000; paints, \$31,000; paper, such as note paper and that class of goods, \$117,000; pickles, \$22,000; post office parcels, \$28,000; ribbons, \$4,000; sauces and catsups, \$12,000; silks, \$610,000; soaps of a higher class, \$10,000; spirits, including whiskey, brandy and liquors of that description, \$619,000; sugar candy, \$23,000; tobaccos, cigars and pipes, \$28,000; umbrellas and parasols, \$91,000; watches, \$11,000; elastic webbing, \$13,000; wool cassimeres, \$22,000; wool cloth of the higher class, \$1,437,000. I may say that the duties on all

Mr. COATSWORTH.

wool products amount to \$2,920,000. I have carefully analysed that and have fixed the amount in which the farmer is not interested at \$1,437,000. Carpets, chiefly Brussels, \$267,000, and coal of a special class which comes from England, \$29,000. Now, Sir, the items I have mentioned are all large items, and they amount in all, in round figures, to \$6,500,000. But that is not all there is. There is a very long list of items of duty, most of them smaller than the items I have read, but many of them of considerable size, in which the farmers are not interested at all, but which I have not taken down in detail. There is also a large class of articles which they may be interested in to a certain extent, but in many of them to a very slight extent. And when I analyse the whole statement I find in addition to this \$6,500,000 in which they have no interest whatever, except so far as they are able to purchase luxuries, there is at least \$2,000,000 worth more in which they have not a direct interest. So that, according to my calculation, and I must say I have gone over it very carefully, and I do not think any gentleman will dispute the figures or the items I have read, the best conclusion I have been able to arrive at is that the farmers are possibly paying \$100,000 of that duty. They are certainly not paying more and possibly they are paying less as a considerable portion of it is paid for the goods not at all necessarily used by the farmers. That brings us to the conclusion that the farmer will gain from the proposition of my hon. friend to reduce the duties by one-third, \$330,000. Now, when we come to analyze that \$330,000 to find out what it means to the farmer, we find that my hon. friend has not much reason to laugh at the gentleman who said that the farmer would make a dollar a year by the change in the duty on binder twine, for the farmer would only make about 45 cents a year out of the reduction my hon. friend proposes to make. Now, I challenge any gentleman who will take the trouble to go over the figures to prove that they are in any degree incorrect. I feel satisfied that on careful analysis it will be found that the farmer would get only 45 cents a year taken off his taxes by the proposition of my hon. friend. Now, there is another side to that. While he may have 45 cents a year taken off his taxes, we must bear in mind that this \$3,000,000 of loss to the revenue must be made up. Now, I ask whether it is possible to put the duties on a class of goods more favourable to the farmer than in the list I have read? I challenge any gentleman to do so. The result would be that while the farmer might gain 45 cents, he would have to lose a dollar at least to make up the \$3,000,000 loss to the revenue. I feel that every farmer who will make an analysis of the proposal of my hon. friend, and will set the result to himself, would vote against the proposal and declare it to be in the interest of the rich instead of in the interest

of the poor. Now, Sir, just a few words in conclusion as to the claim of my hon. friend that we should move in this matter at once. I was rather surprised at that. While he spoke as a farmer the other day we cannot lose sight of the fact that he is a lawyer and consequently is not accustomed to see cases decided on ex parte statements. The proper, the legal way to proceed—and when I say the legal I do not use it with the meaning a lawyer gives it—but the proper and legal way for Parliament to proceed, is to hear the whole case and not to decide upon any change of policy until we are satisfied, having all the considerations before us, that it is best in the interests of the country. Therefore, I say that the hon. gentleman proposes to us to decide first and then investigate. In my opinion the proper course for the Government to pursue is the very one they have adopted, first to investigate and then decide. It may be that there are combinations in the country. I am not going to argue that question, but it seems to me that the hon. gentleman himself, when he referred to American legislation on that subject, suggested the proper remedy. The proper remedy to deal with combinations, if they exist to any extent here—I am not going to say whether they do or not—but even if they exist to the extent my hon. friend claims, the proper course to take is the one suggested, as the course they follow in the United States, and that is, to give the Government power, on the certificate of the Minister of Justice, to lower the duty on any article in regard to which a combine was formed. But I say that combinations are no ground for a general revision of the tariff. Combinations, if they exist in this country at all, exist in no greater number of articles than I could count on the fingers of one hand; they do not exist in regard to half a dozen articles. I say the proper method of dealing with a combination, is not by tariff legislation, but by putting it in the power of the Government to lower the duty on articles in regard to which the combine is formed. I am in favour of breaking those combines, because I think, as my hon. friend does, and as every hon. gentleman thinks, that a combination which has the effect of keeping up prices, and of shutting out opposition, is detrimental to the interest of any country. I think, therefore, we are perfectly safe in following the course the Government have decided upon, and for my part, I shall most heartily support them in it.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall not take up the time of the House very long in speaking on this subject. I have not yet spoken upon it this session, and I presume hon. members on both sides will bear with me for a short time while I give my views on the matter. In the first place, I will say, and I make no bones about it, that I am a supporter of the National Policy. I place my feet fairly upon that rock, and I don't wobble. I will

give you my reasons for it. I have been in business in one town fifty years, and I ought to be pretty well posted. I have seen good times and bad times. I have seen them in Peterborough, and I have seen them elsewhere in Canada. The worst times I ever saw that I recollect, was during the reign of my hon. friends opposite. I recollect well those days when you had to pay 12 per cent for money, and could not get it for less. I recollect well that labouring men got 60 cents a day, and were paid that by our corporation at that time. Now, I have a distinct recollection of those things. I have employed a great deal of labour myself for the last twenty years, but I never employed a labouring man for less than \$1.25 a day, I never offered a man less than \$1.25 a day. We have heard the National Policy abused here a great deal; we have heard it opposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I must say that, judging from their statements, they must have very poor counties, the people in the counties they come from must be very poor, everything must be going to the dogs. I must say, also, that I have heard my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) give a very doleful description of the state of the farmers. Now, I will give you another picture. The farmers in my section of the country are not so bad off. I have been a great deal amongst the farmers. I have been at picnics during last winter, and I never met a farmer yet that was not satisfied; I never heard a farmer complain of the National Policy on either side of politics. I have been at many meetings, and I never heard a question asked about it—they were all perfectly satisfied. They talk about unrest. Mr. Speaker, I say that is a question that ought never to be heard on this side of the House. Unrest, indeed! Well, I will tell you about the unrest: it is in the brains of the politicians who wish to exchange sides in this House. It is not among the farmers. I ought to know as much about the farmers as most men in this House, as I have been a great deal amongst them, but I never heard of any unrest among them. I will say further, that I never heard about this unrest and disquiet until I came to this House. I am sorry to say, from the course of some gentlemen here, that it proves the truth of the saying which was uttered nearly 2,000 years ago, that the worst foes you have are the foes in your own household. If I was ill and wanted medicine, I would not go to a lawyer. If I wanted to fix the tariff, I would not go to a lawyer, for, although he may know something about law, he does not know anything about tariffs. Now, I will say this, that I come from a town that the National Policy has built up; I come from a town which, ten years ago, only had a population of 6,000; it has now, including Ashburnham, an adjoining village, 13,000. We

have gained over 1,000 in population during the last twelve months. Yet, we are told that the country is being depopulated. I wonder if those gentlemen ever took into account the number of Americans we have coming over here to settle. Our friends opposite only tell us about those who go away. I regret that our people are going away, but this will always be the case. The road is open, and they will go if they like, and where they like, if they think they can do better. I know that we have in our town over sixty American families who have come there during the last seven years and settled there, bought property there, and have taken the oath of allegiance, and they are as strong Conservatives as I am. There is no trouble about them, either. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I came from a town that is rapidly growing under the aegis of the National Policy, and I can prove it to you very easily. Now, just take one instance. I heard the Finance Minister to-day reading over the number of factories in some towns. I am not ashamed to tell you that we have factories in our town, many of them. I am not ashamed to tell you the number of hands that are employed there, and you will be glad to hear it, and I think some hon. gentlemen opposite will be glad to hear it, for I believe there are some hon. gentlemen opposite who do not go in for blue ruin; I am satisfied that some of them feel as I do about it. Now, Sir, we have woollen mills in Peterborough, we have factories in Peterborough, and I do not know of one combine in that town, I never knew of a combine there. The only combine I know of in Peterborough is a lawyers' combine. I know the lawyers have a card on their doors, giving their fees, and they will not deviate from it one iota; and yet we have lawyers coming here to tell us what we ought to do. I have stood by the National Policy, and I do not propose to stand by any man that tries to cut my throat and kill my business. As a good Reformer stated to me during the last election in Peterborough: "I have been looking around, but I cannot vote for the Liberal candidate, although he is a friend of mine, because I believe that man is coming behind my door to steal my coat." I may mention to the House that I shall not state anything but absolute facts, without exaggeration, and I must be excused if I talk somewhat earnestly, because I am interested in some of these industries. The Auburn mills in 1874 were managed and owned by proprietors in Montreal. The factory could not be made to pay in 1875, and it was sold, my friend Mr. G. A. Cox buying the stock at 5 cents on the dollar. What is the result to-day? That factory has been run so as to be a success; and I may say here that management is everything in conducting industrial establishments.

Mr. LAURIER. Then prosperity is due to management, and not to the National Policy?

Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. STEVENSON. That stock to-day is worth 120 cents on the dollar. Why? The National Policy has no doubt helped it, but the establishment has been well managed. I can instance another factory equally as large that does not pay one cent on its stock to-day, and that is due to want of management. The National Policy at all events has helped the woollen factory, which now employs not less than 200 hands. Then there is the Wm. Hamilton Manufacturing Company, which makes boilers and everything connected with them. It also manufactures the machinery used in almost all the saw mills at Ottawa, or at all events the bulk of it. This company has also a factory in British Columbia, and is supplying that market. The number of mechanics employed is 130, and the pay-list is large. There is scarcely a week that machinery is not made for different parts of the country and car loads are not shipped. The next establishment is that of the Peter Hamilton Manufacturing Company which manufacture agricultural implements. It has been asserted in this House that Canadian manufacturers do not sell implements as cheap as the Americans, and that the manufacturers ought to reduce the price. I can prove before this House that our implements are sold as cheaply to-day as they are sold at Detroit. This is known to every manufacturer who sells in Canada. This concern employs 125 hands the year round. The next factory we come to is that of the Canada General Electric Company. It has been established two years, and employs on an average 500 hands. I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would visit Peterborough. I should be glad to show them around the town free of expense, and their eyes would be opened to what is going on at all events in one part of Canada. The company manufacture all articles connected with electric lighting. Many of these are now being brought to Ottawa and other places for sale, as that is the only establishment in which they are manufactured in Canada. The Hilliard Woollen Company employ about 60 hands; the John White factory employ about 30 hands; the Steel Bridge works employ about 80 hands. In 1876 there was not a steel or iron bridge company in Canada. In Peterborough we contracted for a bridge to be brought from Ohio. The manager who came to our town we engaged and he started business in Peterborough. He is now engaged in building bridges, also tunnels, he being employed at the present time in constructing a tunnel for the water power at Niagara Falls. So we do work not only for home but also for abroad. I am familiar with their work, because I happen to be connected with the company. We have no "combines" at Peterborough. If the people of other cities would act as we do I have no doubt they would be equally successful. We do not stand by and refuse to help these industries; but we take stock in them, because we are certain that we will

get our investment back indirectly. We get stock taken in the town without any trouble, and, in fact, all the stock of these companies is owned in Peterborough. For example, the stock of the Auburn mills is entirely owned in the town, and the only stock not owned is that of the Edison company, which is controlled in New York. I come next to the Lock works, with which I am familiar. In 1878 no locks were manufactured in Canada, except a few at Kingston penitentiary. We went to Cleveland, bought out a factory, hired the men, bought the patterns, and brought the men and patterns to Canada. We established the works in Peterborough. For seven years we have run the factory with about 175 hands. Our output is of the value of \$125,000 or \$150,000 a year. We send our locks to every part of the country. Let me explain briefly this business, with which I am familiar. After we started, the Americans still retained control of this market, although that statement will perhaps not be accepted by the hon. member for North Simcoe, who says our people should buy English locks. Such a class of locks is not made in England. Let the hon. gentleman go to any hardware store and ask for English locks, and then he will see their patterns. Not only does the company make locks but they manufacture brass-work and do plating and bronzing for Pullman cars. When we commenced this business our American friends did not like the competition, and the fact that we bought out the Cleveland concern and brought over the men and patterns. What did they do? They sent out circulars to every wholesale dealer reducing the prices to them 20 per cent. We fought them, until the McKinley Bill passed, and that placed the price of the raw material so high that the American firms could not send their goods into Canada. Two other factories have started since, and the competition resulting has brought down the prices until they are now 40 per cent less than they were seven years ago. The foreman of the factory told me the other day that he would be glad to supply all the locks and screws needed in every farmer's house in the country for \$5 for each house. We manufacture a first-class lock for \$1.25 per dozen, complete. That surely cannot be considered an excessive price and one that our farmers cannot afford to pay. The concern employs from 100 to 150 hands at present. If you go down to the market and see farmers selling their produce you will find all the mechanics buying from them, and they have no trouble in disposing of their goods. We have also two factories making windows and doors for export, which engage about 40 hands. We have also a factory making porcelain knobs for doors and cut-off switches for electric lights, and they employ 100 hands there. A few years ago we started carbon works. There were no carbons made in Canada then, and as we had plenty of oil and coke here we commenced their manufacture, and we now supply nearly all that is used in Canada.

When our friends on the American side of the line found that we had brought some experts from Chicago to start the manufacturing of carbons they sent over the president of their company to Peterborough, and he said to us: Now, gentlemen, we have this trade in Canada entirely in our hands, and if you like we will take a big share of your stock, if you will combine with us and not lower the prices. That was the proposition we received from the American manufacturer of carbon. The price of No. 1 carbon was then \$10 a thousand. We held a consultation upon the matter, and we decided that we would not go into the combine, and what was the result? They sent their carbons over to Canada and sold them for \$5 a thousand here. They said: We will shut that factory up in a short time; but they did not succeed. They have been underselling us, but we were not a bit scared, and we are working away still. We have not made money to pay one cent of a dividend, nay, more, we were called upon to double our stock, and I am proud to say that every stock-holder responded, and that in one day we raised our stock from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and we are going on still and employing 100 hands. If I am to take the statements of some hon. gentlemen opposite there is a great deal of poverty in some parts of the country; but it is not so in Peterborough. The sheriff of the county of Peterborough has not sold out a farmer in the county for twelve months, and he told me the other day he was afraid he was going to starve. Peterborough is famous for its canoes, and we have two large canoe factories there, and also two furniture factories, employing 75 hands. It is known to most hon. gentlemen that we have very fine water-power in Peterborough, and we have three large flour mills there that turn out 1,000 barrels of flour per day. We do not supply wheat enough in our part of the country to keep these mills going, and we are constantly buying wheat in the west, and I leave it to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) who knows it well, to say if we are not paying 5 or 6 cents a bushel more for wheat than in any other part of Canada. Under these circumstances, we would be a very poor lot indeed in Peterborough if we did not support the National Policy. I have, within the last few days, received the complete returns of the money paid into the public treasury by the town of Peterborough in Customs, Inland Revenue and Excise. These returns are up to the present date, as the information in the blue-books is a year behind. Last year the port of Peterborough paid \$100,000 into the Dominion Treasury for Customs, \$76,000 for Inland Revenue and \$16,000 into the post office. That is a fairly large contribution for Peterborough, and it shows that the Government should give us some return in the shape of some public works we want up there, in consideration of this large revenue. I may state that I have been engaged largely

in the coal trade and that I exerted myself to get the duty taken off hard coal, and the duty was reduced by 50 cents a ton. Before the duty was reduced, I was getting a small percentage off from the coal company because we paid duty, but I will take my oath that in less than one week after the duty was reduced, the railway raised the freight 25 cents per ton, and the people of Buffalo said: "Oh, you have no duties to pay, and up goes your rates for coal the same as any one else." So we were just as badly off as when we started. I hear some hon. gentlemen talk about reducing the duty on binder twine, but you can take my word for it, that if the duty is taken off, the farmer will not get it any cheaper. I know that some of the manufacturers up our way do not intend to reduce the price, notwithstanding Mr. Mowat's factory. In view of all these things, and in view of the benefit the National Policy has conferred upon Peterborough, at all events, I am prepared to stand up for it, as long as I know it will benefit the country. I have been fifty years in business, and I know, from my experience, that the National Policy is for the benefit of a young country like ours. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite think that if they get on the treasury-benches they will turn the world upside down. There may be one or two of them who have got the name of throwing fat on the fire, but I think the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite would not like to introduce any policy that would shut down all the factories in Canada. We are selling locks at our factory at 10 per cent less than the same kind of locks are selling at in the factories in Massachusetts. The only lock that they send in that can compete with ours is a very inferior iron lock, which is put down at a very low price to injure us. It is selling at \$1 a dozen, while we are selling a much better lock at \$1.25 a dozen. Now, I know what I am talking about, because I am familiar with the business, being connected with the factory, having a little stock in it, though not very much, and I take a deep interest in it. Now, as to profits, we have heard a great deal about bloated manufacturers. I never saw any of them. I wish some of the men who talk about bloated manufacturers would take some stock in our factories and see how much bloating there is in it. They would get a dividend of 5 or 6 per cent—no more. In fact, we are not getting one cent of dividend in one case, but still we are not going to throw the business overboard, because these factories employ large numbers of men, who bring their families there and build up the place, and if we do not get our profit in one way, we get it in another. Six per cent is the largest dividend I have got this year. Surely there is not much bloating about that. Now, I am not telling you anything but what I am prepared to prove, and I am not exaggerating in the least. I am familiar with the facts that I am speak-

Mr. STEVENSON.

ing of, ten times more so than my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who knows so much about them. I am not so familiar with law, but I tell you that the farmers have ten times less dread of the factories than they have of the lawyers and the lawyers' bills.

Mr. EDGAR. What are their dividends?

Mr. STEVENSON. Now, I want to tell you about the wages paid in Peterborough. The wages paid, last year, by the factories there amounted to a little over \$600,000. In the face of that fact, will you tell me whether or not the National Policy has not built up Peterborough? Why, Sir, at the time the National Policy was announced, I venture to say that not over \$100,000 a year was paid out in wages in factories in that town, where now there is \$600,000. Probably some hon. gentlemen may think that this is a singular thing, but I will ask any one of them to come to Peterborough—I will pay his expenses—and I will satisfy him that I am stating the truth. As a representative of Peterborough, I support the National Policy, and I think hon. gentlemen will not deny that it has benefited us there, and that we ought to support it. We ought to keep our feet as firm upon the plank as we can, and we intend to do it. So long as I am in this House, I will not vary from that one iota. I support the man who supports the National Policy, whether he is on that side or on this side; I am here to do that, and I intend to do it. There is not a manufacturing establishment in Peterborough which, to my knowledge, is paying more than 6 per cent dividend. Yes; I think that, last year, there was one, and only one, that paid 8 per cent. I am not connected with that one, and I am not certain of that; I only heard so. Now, it ought to be a matter of rejoicing to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side as well as to us on this side that we have factories in Canada, and that the National Policy is building up even one town, and I only regret that we have not the names of some hon. gentlemen opposite among the stockholders of some of these factories. I know that we have some very strong Conservatives by getting them in as stockholders; and if it were not for this miserable, shaky business that prevents us from knowing one day what may take place another day, we would have far more. Now, I wish to draw your attention to something else, for it is not very likely that I shall be here to draw your attention to anything very much longer, because I intend to get out of politics. I have so much else to attend to that I cannot attend to this. But, let me say that I learned one thing many years ago, that is, that the farmer and the mechanic should go hand in hand, and I think that is the true way to build up a country. From my experience, and I am nearly as old as a good many gentlemen who sit on the opposite side, and I have certainly had as much

experience in business as most of them, any country or town that lets its manufacturing go down will not amount to much. I will say more than that: I do not like a town that has a lot of rich men who will not do anything. I like to see them use their money instead of lending it out at 7 or 8 or 10 per cent on mortgages; I like to see them invest it in factories, and, if they did that, we would have better times. Just so surely as you drive out the factories by changing the policy and refusing to give them reasonable protection, just so surely will the country go down in its receipts, its money, and everything else. Now, I have told you already that in the county of Peterborough there are few sales under execution. I do not recollect seeing a sale on the market within the last two years, and I repeat we have a first-class county, both east and west. The farmers in that district know, from practical experience, the benefits they derive from the National Policy. We draw them from within five miles of our neighbouring town, we bring them from Lake Ontario to Peterborough, and buy their produce; and they can sell everything there at much higher prices than they can anywhere else. And all that is due to the National Policy. It is quite true we have good water power, but, with the exception of the mills, our factories are chiefly run by steam, and when I made these estimates of what we pay out, I did not include any of the mills. I have said nothing about them, although they turn out a thousand barrels a day, and employ a considerable number of hands, so that when I give \$600,000 as an estimate, I am very much within the mark. Stores pay rents from \$500 up to \$1,300 per year, and do a rushing trade, and yet we are told that the country is going to the bad. If I only had as much money as some hon. gentlemen opposite, I would make things jump. I wish I had the money that Sir Richard Cartwright has, and I would soon make that little town of Napanee work up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you come?

Mr. STEVENSON. I would like to first rate. If you will take stock in something down there which will build the place up, I will guarantee to bring you over to this side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We expect to go over there.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not wish to take up any more time of the House, and am very much obliged for the kind attention with which my remarks have been listened to.

Mr. KENNY. It must have been gratifying to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to have heard the practical speech to which we have just listened, showing the beneficial results of the policy of protection which he was instrumental in inaugurating

in this country in 1878, which he supported in 1882, which he supported in 1887, and which he supported in 1891, and which is still the policy of the Conservative party, of which he has been so prominent a member. There has been no change in the policy of the Conservative party. And when this hon. gentleman asks us to desert the ranks of that party and abandon the policy which was inaugurated by himself and others in 1878, and which we have been sent here to support, and when he accompanies this demand by a resolution in which he says that as a consequence of that policy, discontent verging on disloyalty exists in Canada, I say he must make a strong case indeed before he can expect his appeal to be successful. In 1878, when the policy of protecting Canadian labour and Canadian capital was inaugurated, the conditions of the trade and commerce of Canada were worse than they have been at any period of our history. The few industries that we had were in a state of paralysis. Some of them had been actually closed, and when the hon. member for North Simcoe pointed out the other evening, that in 1878 we had a certain number of factories in this country, he ought to have told us as he mentioned in his public speeches in 1878, that unless some changes were made in the fiscal policy of this country, those few industries would be closed. As a matter of fact, does not the hon. gentleman know that the only sugar refineries we then had had been closed by the action of hon. gentlemen opposite? Does he not remember that when the people of Canada in 1876, 1877 and 1878 appealed to the Government of that day to so arrange the tariff that a fair measure of protection should be granted to Canadian labour. Hon. gentlemen opposite refused to listen to that appeal, and that, as a consequence, they lost their majority in Parliament, and their control over the public affairs of this country. Therefore it is that I say that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) must make a strong case, indeed, before he can expect us to follow him and to change our party allegiance or deviate from the policy which has resulted in general advantage to the people of Canada. I am free to admit that the National Policy is not an unmixed blessing. I recognize that in certain branches of commerce it has not been beneficial, and without any desire to be personal, I must express my regret that to wholesale, the business in which I have been engaged all my life, it has been detrimental. To the importer of dry goods the National Policy has been a disadvantage. I say further, that in the community in which I live, Confederation has been an injury to that business, but would that warrant opposition to Confederation? Because the business of the wholesale dry goods importers in Canada has been prejudiced by the National Policy, that is not a sufficient

reason for our opposing a policy which has benefited the masses of the people. That policy may be inconvenient to me and to a comparatively small number of merchants in Halifax, who are engaged in the importing business, but I can point to factories existing there which never would have an existence unless the Canadian labour employed therein was protected, and which had no existence before 1878. So that, while the few have suffered, the many have benefited. The hon. member for North Simcoe, in trying to establish his case, assails certain industries of Canada, and notably the cotton industry. I know that I run the risk of incurring your displeasure, Mr. Speaker, when I refer to anything that took place in a previous debate, but we are all aware that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made a speech which has been referred to during this debate, and which attracted very considerable attention, and these two learned gentlemen in the law have undertaken to instruct us in the matter of the cotton trade of Canada. I quite recognize their ability to deal with any question, but when these two gentlemen do not speak from original knowledge, we cannot be surprised that they should have drifted into errors to which all men are liable when they are not personally acquainted with the theme they are discussing. I refer to this industry more particularly because it is one of the most important in the country, and because it was the first to which the hon. member for North Simcoe paid any special attention. He laid down this proposition, that if he could show that the cotton mills paid too high dividends, or watered their stock, or charged excessive prices, he had established that it was necessary that this Parliament should interfere by tariff regulation. I think these are the points the hon. gentleman laid down.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think so, but however—

Mr. KENNY. If my hon. friend will permit me, I will read from his speech in the "Hansard":

We arrive at the conclusion, perhaps, that we are paying too much if we find that they water their stock and pay high dividends.

Then again, the hon. gentleman, in the course of his argument, proves to his own satisfaction that the prices of cotton goods have fallen a certain percentage in England and that they have not fallen by so large a percentage in Canada. If I am in error, I would call upon my hon. friend to correct me now. As regards the price of cotton goods, he has made a statement, and it is a very important one, that from 1878 down to 1891 the prices of manufactured cotton goods in Canada have decreased 24 per cent.

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, with this understanding, that I made the statement upon the information of my hon. friend who sits near me here (Mr. Bergin). I said so at the time. It was by a mistake in the "Hansard" that I spoke of 1872, when it ought to have been 1878.

Mr. FOSTER. So the basis of the argument was wrong?

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as the quotation of 1872 instead of 1878 was concerned, that would make a difference, I think, of 13 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. And vitiate the whole argument.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it does not. The argument was that between 1872 and 1891 cotton goods fell in England to the tune of 38 per cent. Between 1878 and 1889 they fell to the tune of 25 or 26 per cent. So that the calculation is wrong to the extent of the difference between 25 and 38.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman, in trying to make a case against the National Policy, gave to this House certain figures. He brought down here a resolution in which he tells the people of Canada that the existing tariff is engendering discontent, verging on disloyalty, throughout the country, and it was unworthy of the hon. gentleman not to be accurate in a matter of such importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not my fault; it was the fault of "Hansard."

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman made a mistake—

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I spoke from the "Hansard" report. I stated that it was the unrevised "Hansard," and it was there I found the figure 1872.

Mr. KENNY. Well, I accept that. Now, let us see where we are. The hon. gentleman stated, on what he believed to be a reliable authority—he would not have quoted it, if he had not thought it reliable, but he accompanied it with no explanation—that the reduction in the price of cotton goods manufactured in Canada from 1878 to 1891 was 24 per cent. Now, let that stand in the memory of the members of the House. I now propose to deal with the other figures, the accuracy of which, I suppose, he has tested before he came here. I will quote for the hon. gentleman the part of his speech to which I refer:

I find from the Statistical Abstract by Mr. Giffen that since 1872 up to the present time cotton goods have fallen to the tune of 38 per cent.

That is in England, of course. Now, I might be permitted to ask my hon. friend, what class of cotton goods he referred to?

Mr. McCARTHY. All the cotton goods referred to in that abstract. That abstract purports to give the prices from 1872 to 1888

of all classes of cotton goods, and what I said refers to those.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman took the average price ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I took the average price given there.

Mr. KENNY. I went to the Library and was furnished by the officers there with the last Statistical Abstract, which appears under date of 1892, "Giffen's Statistical Abstract." I find that it does not contain the average price per yard or per hundred-weight of cotton goods for 1872. I will ask my hon. friend if that is the work to which he makes reference ?

Mr. McCARTHY. This book I have not seen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Take the witness box.

Mr. McCARTHY. The book to which I referred, was a much larger book than this.

Mr. KENNY. As I could not get the average prices in the larger work to which he refers, and as he was dealing with the years 1878 down to 1891 in Canada, and these were the years of the National Policy of the fiscal system which is now on its trial before this House, I propose to deal, through "Giffen's Statistical Abstract," with the average prices of cotton goods in England from 1878 down to the latest information this book affords. I find on page 144 of "Giffen's Abstract," that in 1878 cotton yarn was 12·47d. a pound, and in 1891 cotton yarn was 10·94d., a difference of 1·53d., or about 12½ per cent. That is the difference in price by the very authority which the hon. gentleman has quoted in this House. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said that he included in his calculation such articles of cotton as appear in this abstract. I find that in cotton manufactured goods, that is, plain goods, in 1878 the price was 2·76d. per yard. In 1891 the price was 2·31d., a difference of :45, or say 16½ per cent. Why, Sir, to get 38 out of that comparison you have to add the difference in cotton yarn to the difference in piece goods.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not take from 1887, I took from 1872.

Mr. KENNY. Well, I cannot get the average prices in "Giffen's Statistical Abstract" of 1872. I am dealing with the years of the National Policy, and he gave us the Canadian statistics for 1878 to 1891. I took the same years for the English statistics. Let me go further. Take cotton printed goods. If the hon. gentleman will give me the statistics of average prices of 1872, I will be very glad to have them. I cannot get them in the Library.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will get them for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENNY. In 1878 the average price per yard cotton goods, printed, cost 4.18; in 1891 they cost 3.15, a difference of 1.03, or 24¾ per cent. We all know that the cotton goods which were imported into Canada from England before we had the National Policy would principally come under the designation of plain goods, and that the difference in those goods in England from 1878 down to 1891, was only 16½ per cent; and that the difference from 1878 down to 1891 on printed goods, was only 24¾ per cent. Now, from the very authority upon which the hon. gentleman has based his statement, in the very book to which he has referred me, I find that in Canada, taking his own figures, there has been a greater reduction in the price of manufactured cotton goods, than in England. Therefore, the charge the hon. gentleman has made against the cotton manufacturers of Canada in relation to the price of cotton goods, falls completely to the ground. "Ex uno disce omnes." If the hon. gentleman says that we in Canada are paying more for our goods, I say that from his own showing he has no case which deserves the support of this House. So much for the price of goods. Next, the hon. gentleman has intimated that the cotton industries in Canada pay an excessively high dividend. Sir, unfortunately for myself, I was connected with a cotton factory which was established in Halifax, I think it was in 1879; I happened to be on the first board of directors. My association with it was not a very fortunate one. After struggling along in a very unfortunate financial career for some years, my connection with it ceased. I sold my stock at a loss of 75 cents on the dollar. In starting that industry we were not dazzled by the prospect of big profits; we did so in hope and expectation that we would get a fair return for our investment, and we desired to find employment for our people, to keep them at home and prevent them from straying off into the cotton mills of Lowell—the same spirit, the same idea, I have no doubt, which animated the hon. member for North Simcoe when he so eloquently urged the adoption of the National Policy, and which influenced him in supporting and continued to support until very recently. The hon. gentleman has stated, or has insinuated, at all events, that the cotton companies of Canada have earned very large dividends on their outlay. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is a shareholder, or has been a shareholder, in a cotton company, but surely there are hon. gentlemen in this House who have been associated as shareholders in cotton companies, and they must know, that the cotton companies of Canada have not paid 2½ per cent per annum on their investment since their establishment. We laboured under very great difficulties in starting this industry in Canada. We had no trained labour, we had

to send to England for managers, and for operatives to instruct our Canadian labour. It takes a long time to develop a manufacturing enterprise in any country. How did England attain to her manufacturing supremacy? By adopting in its early stages a protective policy, by cheap labour, cheap capital and long experience. We had to contend with many obstacles. The industry was new to us. It takes, in my opinion, a long time to establish a new industry successfully, and to produce at the lowest possible rate, any class of goods. Recurring to cotton goods. I am sure that the hon. member for Simcoe has taken pains to inform himself on this question; the hon. member must know, and my hon. friend from West Ontario will admit, that the class of cotton goods we produce in this country, is infinitely better value than the class of goods that are sold at the same prices in England.

Mr. EDGAR. No.

Mr. KENNY. If the hon. gentleman had any practical knowledge, he would not deny it.

Mr. EDGAR. Not at the same prices. The hon. gentleman surely does not mean that.

Mr. KENNY. I do not know how these hon. gentlemen can expect to be very familiar, personally, with these goods. They do not import them. Surely those of us who are selling them every day, importing them from England, must know something more about them. I admit as to price that there are certain goods manufactured in Lancashire, largely filled with China clay, which are lower in price than any goods made in Canada. But we do not make those goods in Canada: in fact they are such an objectionable class of goods that we so adjusted our tariff as to exclude these goods, to a large extent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman say, then, what we want protection for?

Mr. KENNY. What we want protection for! Mr. Speaker, I will ask my hon. friend a question. An Irishman, you know, always has the privilege of answering a question by asking another. My hon. friend asks me why we adopted a protective policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I ask you what you want it for now?

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend, if he had been importing cotton goods from 1872 down to the time when we commenced to protect the manufacturer of cotton goods in Canada, would have made this discovery, that the Americans were in the habit of coming into Canada, as my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) pointed out in the matter of other classes of goods—so with cotton goods—the Americans came into Canada and slaughtered their goods here. The fact came palpably under my own notice when I was in the city of New York before 1878. Not knowing

Mr. KENNY.

where to go for certain classes of domestic cotton goods. I consulted a gentleman in the trade, and he told me if I went to the agents of those companies which manufactured the goods I required, and said that I wanted them for Canada, I would buy them cheaper than they sold them to Claffin, or Mellen, or A. T. Stewart. That is my own experience. I asked an explanation, and he said: "Because these goods are going into Canada, the manufactures will not break their prices in the United States of America, but they will in Canada." The hon. member for North Simcoe must know that before the Mackenzie Government were driven from power the merchants of Montreal and other Canadian cities—so I am told, at least, and I think "Hansard" will show it—came to this Parliament, or to the Government at Ottawa at least, and begged of them to impose some tariff protection in order to prevent Canada becoming a slaughter-market for American productions. That is the kind of protection I want. I do not desire protection that is going to make the Canadian capitalist rich at the expense of my fellow-countrymen, but what I do want is protection for Canadians employed in our different manufacturing industries. When I refer to a slaughter market, every gentleman engaged in business having any knowledge of the important business before 1879 must be thoroughly familiar with the phrase. I venture the statement that the hon. member for North Simcoe, no doubt, referred to it in some past speeches. The "Hansard" for 1878 has just been placed in my hands, in which I find the hon. member made a reference to it. In a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman on 26th February, 1878, I find the following:—

Mr. McCarthy said he was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say "hear, hear," but he wanted to know to what these figures pointed? If we were then able in 1873 to export to the United States goods to the value of \$42,000,000; and if we were then able to send manufactured articles there to the value of very nearly \$2,000,000; and if we were not able now to send these goods to the value of more than \$1,250,000, was not this because the United States was flooding our markets with their goods: and he wanted to know whether under these circumstances, remedial legislation was not required, and whether some protection should not be afforded, or whether we were to remain as flies on the wheel—that was to say; not take any steps to do what was unnecessary to be done in 1873. The accusation which the Opposition made was that these circumstances pointed conclusively to the fact that either this country had been made a slaughter market of, or that the protection system in the United States was a success, and he did not think it made any difference upon which horn of the dilemma the hon. gentleman chooses to be impaled.

Sir, there is the hon. member for North Simcoe's reference to the slaughter-market, and when that hon. gentleman asks me why I favour protection to Canadian labour, I refer him to his own speech of 1878, made on his responsibility as a member of Parliament. When I look at the hon. gentleman's course from the date

when he uttered those words in this House, through the fourteen years that have elapsed since, and at his continuous support of the protective tariff, I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should ask me now abruptly to turn round and follow him because he chooses to change his mind. I have established, I think, that as regards prices, taking quality into consideration, the reduction in prices of Canadian manufactured cotton goods has been greater than that of goods manufactured in England. But my hon. friend will say—I am sorry that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is not in the House, because I should like to finish with this cotton question now—that some terrible company has been watering its stock, and he points to the Dominion Cotton Company. It is within the knowledge, as I said before, of most hon. gentlemen who have taken any trouble to inform themselves as to the history of our cotton factories in Canada since we started them, that they have had a precarious existence, that there has been great difficulties with respect to their management, and like pioneer enterprises in all countries, they proved very unremunerative and unfortunate investments to their shareholders. I think, with the exception of one or two, there were no cotton mills in Canada which paid dividends, and so difficult was it to carry them on that they were in danger of being closed. As hon. gentlemen engaged in manufacturing businesses are aware, the last step a manufacturer will take is to close his factory, and in order to prevent this calamity some gentlemen in Montreal, who had acted as agents for some of the mills, and possibly to whom these mills were under financial advances, helped the mills in their difficulty. What did they do? These gentlemen in Montreal, who acted as distributing agents for these cotton mills, entered into an arrangement with the shareholders of these mills to take over their properties partly, and pay them the price agreed upon, partly in bonds and in cash. In this way six or seven cotton mills were acquired by those gentlemen. The gentlemen who were connected with this enterprise—I am subject to correction if any hon. gentleman has better information than I have, for I am stating the case simply to the best of my knowledge—were connected with the Hochelaga company, that being at the time the largest cotton company in Canada. It was subsequently suggested that those properties which had been so acquired should be incorporated with the Hochelaga company. Before that was done, it became necessary for the gentlemen who were organizing the new company to secure a Dominion charter, for the reason that the mills which they were acquiring were scattered in different provinces, and to organize the company and give it a legal status they applied for letters patent and placed their organizing capital at \$100,000. To comply with the law it became necessary

for those gentlemen to deposit with the Secretary of State, what is now a public document and available to all of us, the sworn appraisement of the value of their property, and if I am correctly informed, the property of the Hochelaga Mills alone was valued by the sworn appraisers at \$2,600,000. They also acquired the Magog print works, I think the only print works to-day in Canada, and other cotton mills, representing a sum of \$2,000,000. If hon. members will add the value of those mills and the Magog works to the sworn appraisement of the Hochelaga mills, they will see that the property represents an estimated value of \$4,600,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman say at what figure those people placed the cotton mill at Dundas in that estimate?

Mr. KENNY. I really cannot tell the hon. gentleman what mills were thus acquired. I make the statement simply that the number of mills so acquired was five or six. I have not the names of the mills.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman understand that the cotton mills at Dundas are shut up?

Mr. McKAY. Although the Dundas Mills are shut up, the good machinery in those mills has been moved to other places, to Hamilton and Cornwall, and the spindles are now running and are employed in manufacturing cottons.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). That is just what the Dundas people complain of, that notwithstanding the National Policy the mill has been closed.

Mr. KENNY. Before proceeding with my argument, I may make a statement with regard to some of those mills in the eastern portion of the Dominion of which I have some personal knowledge, that if some arrangement had not been made, they would be closed to-day to the great delight of hon. gentlemen opposite, because their animus and intention is, if they ever get into power, to destroy every manufacturing industry we have in this country. Why, Sir, the other night, when the hon. member for North Simcoe Mr. McCarthy was making his speech, the only time they cheered was when he pointed to some misfortune in Canada or said something against our industries. When the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) told them he had no sympathy with their disloyal policy of unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union, they hung their heads in silence. When the hon. gentleman told them that the condition of the Canadian farmer was infinitely better than the condition of the United States farmer, and that all the statements which they had been making in this House for the last five or six years, were, therefore, in his opinion, incorrect and misleading, hon. gentlemen opposite had not a word to say. But,

when the member for Simcoe referred to something unfortunate for Canada, then the hon. gentlemen opposite applauded. Now, Sir, to continue my reference to the establishment of the Dominion Cotton Company, which has been so fiercely assailed in this House. I pointed to the fact that the Hochelaga Cotton Company, according to a sworn statement which is now in the office of the Secretary of State, possesses an estimated value of \$2,600,000. In addition to that, there were six or seven mills and the Magoz Mill, representing an outlay of \$2,000,000. At that time the stock of the Hochelaga Cotton Company was \$1,250,000, and the directors of that company said to their shareholders: At present we will issue no further stock; we will wait a year until the business is thoroughly organized, and then we will give you your stock, if you want it. Hence the increase of the Dominion Cotton Company to \$3,000,000 capital, and, when hon. gentlemen consider that the real estate, the mills and the plant which they have acquired, represents an outlay of \$4,600,000, and that in order to get the funds to pay for these, they had to issue bonds to the extent of \$1,500,000, they will see that there is nothing very wrong in estimating that property to be worth \$3,000,000. Sir, reference was made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to the mill at Valleyfield, and, in the course of his remarks, he said that that company was watering their stock. He made that statement very boldly and very emphatically. I have some slight knowledge of what is going on amongst the cotton mills in Canada—there is no secret about it; those in the trade hear of it—and I was under the impression at the time the statement was made, that it was the intention of the Valleyfield Mill to add to its capital, in order to increase its machinery and capacity. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) should, I think, have looked carefully before he made such a sweeping charge against a very respectable manufacturing company in this country. Now, Sir, I find in the "Empire" of the 16th instant, which has just been placed in my hands, the following letter, which, I think, appeared in the Montreal "Herald" of the 15th. It states:

Sir,—In your report of Mr. Dalton McCarthy's speech on the tariff you say:—

"The Montreal Cotton Company was now watering its stock in order to secrete its earnings."

Please note that this is a gross misrepresentation, and could only have been made by Mr. McCarthy out of a fervent desire to gain a point, no matter in what way.

If the other statements in his speech are as far removed from accuracy as this, those who put their trust in him will be very far misled.

The facts are: The Montreal Cotton Company are increasing their capital stock and are enlarging their mills and their business. The new capital which was authorized is to be used for this purpose solely, and will be issued to the shareholders at the rate of one hundred cents to the dollar. It will represent capital invested, and in no sense can it be called watering the

Mr. KENNY.

stock. These facts were made public at the annual meeting held last month, and could have been learned by anyone.

STEVENSON, BLACKADER & CO.,
Agents for the Montreal Cotton Co., (Limited.)

And yet the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will tell this House, on the responsibility of his position and as one of the leading and oldest members here, that that company was watering its stock. The hon. gentleman must deal with the statement I have read, in such a manner as to him seems best. Now, so much for the prices, so much for dividends, and so much for watering the stock. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) also spoke about these terrible cotton mills the other night; and I sometimes wonder, when I look back at the career of the cotton mills for the last ten years, if the law lords of Canada have not had a much better time of it than the cotton lords. When my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) asked across the floor of the House to-night, what were the lawyers' dividends, I could not help thinking, from my knowledge of cotton stocks, that the lawyers' dividends had been very much better than the dividends received by these terribly abused cotton manufacturers. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) comes to the conclusion that the profits made in the cotton mills of Canada must be from \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000 a year. He points out that the importation of raw cotton has enormously increased of late years, until it has reached to 46,000,000 pounds. That in itself ought to be gratifying to every Canadian here, when he remembers that in 1878 we only imported 7,000,000 pounds of raw cotton, and now we import 46,000,000 pounds, while we get our goods as cheap, and better quality than ever we had them before, and our own people get the benefit derived from manufacturing them. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says: Oh, these terrible people; they imported 46,000,000 pounds of raw material and they manufactured them into cotton goods, and these goods, by my calculation, must amount to \$14,000,000 a year. My hon. friend must permit me to point out to him—I asked him the question across the floor of the House the other evening, to which he very courteously responded—that of the 46,000,000 pounds of cotton which the Trade and Navigation Returns show were imported into Canada last year, 4,000,000 pounds is what is known as cotton waste. He should know that that cotton waste does not go into piece goods, that it is largely used as machinery waste, although some of it is used for making batting and wadding and such goods. Again, let me point out to the hon. gentleman, that all of the 40,000,000 pounds of cotton imported into Canada, does not go into cotton cloth, but that a large amount of it is mixed with wool in the manufacture of many classes

of useful goods. Also a large amount of it is used in making cotton hosiery and cotton underwear. Again, my hon. friend knows that the waste in the manufacturing of cotton is fully 10 per cent, so that if he will deduct 10 per cent from the 40,000,000 pounds, I think he will come to the conclusion that there cannot be much more than 36,000,000 pounds of cotton used in the manufacture of piece cotton goods. In making his estimate the other night, he stated that the average price of cotton goods was something like 9 cents a yard; but I think he would be nearer the true average if he called it 8 cents a yard; and if he will take these goods at 8 cents a yard, I think he will come to the conclusion that the statement which was made by the hon. President of the Council to-day was more correct: that the value of the piece cotton goods manufactured in Canada does not exceed the value of \$9,000,000.

Mr. EDGAR. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? The only use I made of the importation of 46,000,000 pounds in 1892 was to compare it with the importation of the same class of material in 1882. Now, does my hon. friend pretend to say that there was either more or less waste in proportion in 1882 than there is now? If he admits that the proportion is the same, as I contend, my argument stands perfectly good.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend went further. He said that so many spindles turn out so many yards of cotton goods.

Mr. EDGAR. That is another thing.

Mr. KENNY. Certainly: I should think the percentage of waste would be the same this year as it was in the past. But the hon. gentleman must remember this: that he took as a basis of calculation the assumption that every pound of raw cotton made $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth, that he multiplies 46,000,000 pounds of cotton by this figure, and thus turned it all into yards of cloth. Well, my hon. friend will see that he is out 8,000,000 pounds by his own showing. He is out 4,000,000, pounds on the cotton waste, and he is out 4,000,000 pounds or 10 per cent loss in manufacturing. I think I am correct in placing the value of the product—and my statement is made on the very best authority—at \$8,800,000. The hon. gentleman himself told us the other night that the wages and the cost of raw material amounted to \$6,000,000, and he deducted this amount from the value he put upon the product, and that was all he deducted. My hon. friend knows very well that this cotton did not fly from Georgia or Alabama or from wherever it was purchased, to Canada; he knows that the transportation of that cotton is a very large item; he knows very well that in these manufacturing industries the motive power costs a very large amount of money. It may be water;

it may be steam; it is generally steam, which consumes a large amount of coal. Again, the hon. gentleman knows that in all these manufacturing industries there is a large outlay for supplies and stores. He knows, too, that within the last few years there have been vast improvements made in the processes of manufacturing cotton goods. Every year we are making new goods, which necessitates an outlay for new machinery and for keeping up the general equipment of the mills and duty must be paid on the new machinery imported. The hon. gentleman knows that property has to be insured, and that there is interest to be paid on borrowed capital. So that, with all due respect to my hon. friend, if he will take these additional items into consideration, and deduct them as well as the cost of the raw material and wages, he will see that he is entirely astray in his estimate, and that no such money as he supposes has been made out of the cotton industry in Canada; and the hon. gentleman emphasized his statement, because he made it twice in this House, and it has attracted attention in the country. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely preposterous to try to make the business men of Canada believe that the cotton mills made \$4,000,000 or \$6,000,000 last year. I think, therefore, that my hon. friend, relying as he had to do on data that he received from others, will find, on reconsideration, that some real error has been made in the calculations. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Simcoe referred to the iron industry of Canada, and we all know that the iron industry of any country is the basis of all manufacturing industry. He gave us one specimen item. He told us that the cost of Canadian bar iron was \$46 a ton, and that English iron, better in quality, because it was not made from scrap, could be landed in Canada for \$45.05 a ton. Sir, is it likely that we Canadians would pay \$46 a ton for an inferior article when we could import a better article for \$45 a ton? In that statement, I think, the hon. gentleman simply proved too much. If there is any industry that requires protection in its initial stages it is the iron industry, and I assume that my hon. friend, who has taken some pains to inform himself on this matter, must have learned in the course of his investigations that at the end of the first forty years of the development of the iron industry by a protective tariff in England the duty on pig iron was £6 10s. a ton, and yet he says that we in Canada should have firmly established iron industries in the country under a protective tariff which has only existed since 1887; if the evidence of history is worth anything it is all against him in his contention. Look again at the United States, and what has occurred there. Under the protective policy the iron industry of the United States has wonderfully developed. In 1870, the amount of pig iron produced was 1,665,000 tons; in 1880, it was 3,835,000 tons; in 1888

it had increased to 6,489,000 tons, showing an immense development, which could not possibly have taken place unless the iron industry had been protected. Now, what has been the effect of protection on prices? In 1860, the price of pig iron per ton was \$22.75, but, in 1889, it had decreased, under a protective tariff, to \$17.75. My hon. friend said that there had been no great development of the iron industry. I regret to say that is largely the case, and it is a disappointment to those of us who realize the importance of the iron industry as the basis of all manufacturing industries, that greater development has not yet taken place in Canada. But allow me to point out one industry in the eastern section of the Dominion to the notice of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It was in 1887 that the tariff was adopted whereby Canadian labour engaged in the manufacture of iron was protected. Hon. gentlemen know that it takes a long time to gather the necessary capital even after you secure the area, and the ores suitable for smelting works and in Pictou county, N.S., although immediately after the adoption of the tariff of 1887 efforts were made to secure suitable properties and to acquire skilled labour and the necessary capital for the development of these industries, it was only in August last that the blast furnace at Ferona was lighted, although ever since 1887 or 1888 people have been working at that industry. To-day the capital employed at Ferona amounts to \$750,000. In that neighbourhood a charcoal furnace has been erected, where a higher grade of iron is produced, and the investment in that immediate neighbourhood connected with the Ferona iron furnace and the charcoal furnace, the steel works amounts to \$1,300,000 to-day. I do not think that this is a very discouraging result for the few years of protection which the iron industry of Canada has had. Let the hon. gentleman consider that, in England, which owes her manufacturing supremacy largely to her iron and coal, the iron output for the first forty years of the existence of that industry was protected to such an extent that, at the end of that period, the protection amounted to \$31.50 per ton. I have dealt with the iron and cotton industry. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the wall-paper industry. But, as I am not familiar with the trade, and have no expert or technical knowledge of my own, and have not had time to acquire information, I will not venture to discuss it. These here are the principal items to which he has referred, and it is in connection with those he attempts to persuade us that he has established a case which should induce us to abandon a policy that has resulted so advantageously to this country. When the hon. gentleman was referring to the discontent prevailing in Canada—a discontent so great, he said, that the country was on the verge of disloyalty and rebellion—he was asked why he would not

Mr. KENNY.

give Home Rule to Ireland, and he appropriately replied that he would give his reasons at a suitable time. If any one had asked him why he would not give a National Policy to Ireland he might have given his opinion immediately, and he might have told us that a national policy of protection for Ireland would have benefited the Irish people as it has benefited the Canadian people. Nothing could be more unfortunate for a country than that the energies of its people should be confined to one industry, as nothing can be more profitable to a country than that diversity of employment should be furnished to its people. To a large agricultural community, you can offer no greater boon than a home market for surplus agricultural products. The hon. gentleman knows that if our manufacturing industries were closed, as they would be if hon. gentlemen opposite had their own way, and our industrial establishments had to wind up their business, the agricultural community would be great sufferers, and our labouring classes now engaged in these industries would be again driven out of the country as they were previous to 1878. It is infinitely better for the farmer of Canada that he should have a home market for his produce than that he should be obliged to send his wheat to England, the great market of the world, and meet there the competition of the cheaper labour of India and Russia and all the other countries of Europe and South America, and any hon. gentleman who has followed the shipping business knows what that competition means, and how low the freights are from these countries to England. Grain, to-day, is transported from the River LaPlata and from other points in South America at the rate of 12 to 14 shillings per ton, to the great consuming centres of England, so that the Canadian farmer, if all these cotton mills and iron mills and other industries were shut down would be obliged to send his wheat there. He cannot send it to the United States, because they do not want it. He would thus find his wheat depreciated by the cost of transportation and the competition he would have to contend against, and unexchanged he would have to buy his cotton and other goods which he requires for his family and pay the transportation of the same across the Atlantic. Is it not infinitely better for the farmer to have his market alongside of him, where he can supply the men who are engaged in the iron and cotton and other industries with their daily bread and meats and the other produce of the farm which they require, than to be obliged to force them on the English market in competition with cheap foreign labour. The hon. gentleman said that the whole burdens of the tariff fell upon the farmers and that they receive no protection. I suppose he wants to go back to the condition of things which existed when hon. gentlemen opposite controlled this country. But I can hardly think he can have very

much in common with them. If we are to judge by the sentiments which he expressed the other night, the great ambition of the hon. gentleman, after all, is—and I would be sorry indeed if he should change his opinion in that respect—to strengthen the ties that bind Canada and the mother country. But the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been to loosen those ties, irrespective of the consequences, and, therefore, I do not see how the hon. gentleman can have very much sympathy with the Opposition. But let us look at the condition of the farmer in years gone by, when hon. gentlemen opposite controlled the Government of Canada. At that time the farmer was taxed 6 cents a pound on his tea; now it is free. He was then taxed 2 cents per pound on coffee, and now it is free. He was taxed 2·37 cents per 100 pounds on his sugar, and now raw sugar, under 14 Dutch standard, is free. Has the farmer any protection? Is not the wheat he raises protected to the extent of 15 cents per bushel? Is not the flour he raises protected to the extent of 75 cents per barrel? The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) jeers. I wish he would come down to Nova Scotia and run an election there, and he would have that tax flung at him in every constituency in the province. Further, what about his oats? If I understand aright, oats are now protected to the extent of 10 cents per bushel. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) may jeer at the tax on flour, but if he says there is no tax on flour, let me tell him he has deprived his friends in the Maritime provinces of their stock argument against the National Policy. I am sure it will be a pleasure for me hereafter to refer them to my hon. friend from Lambton. I can tell them that when I referred to the fact that the farmer was protected by this duty of 75 cents a barrel on flour,—and I want him to be protected, I think he has as good a right to be protected as any other man—the hon. member for Lambton laughed. I have mentioned the fact that my idea of a protective tariff is the protection which we accord to Canadian labour. I do not care what a man is engaged in, whether in raising wheat, or in producing iron, or in digging coal in the mines, or in our fisheries, I desire that he shall be protected in that industry. I referred to the fact that the farmer is protected. Do my friends from Ontario deny that? Does my hon. friend from Lambton deny that 75 cents a barrel duty on flour is no protection to the Canadian farmer?

Mr. LISTER. That protection does not affect the price of his product by the one-hundredth part of one cent.

Mr. KENNY. But the hon. gentleman's leader (Mr. Laurier) stated in Abbotsford, in 1890, that the Tory Government had increased the duties on agricultural products in order to enrich the Ontario farmer. Here is a statement on one hand that the duty on flour is no advantage to the Ontario

farmer, yet the hon. gentleman's leader, now sitting in front of him, declared, on the responsibility of his position as leader of a great party, that this corrupt Tory Government had put a duty on flour in order to enrich the farmers of Ontario. Who is right? The hon. gentlemen must settle that between themselves. Why, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe that the hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to vote for the resolution. As I have pointed out before, the only portion of the speech of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), gentlemen opposite cheered, was that in which he referred to something injurious to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KENNY. Why it is not the first time you have done it; you have done it steadily for years. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to speak for fifteen minutes longer—

Mr. LISTER. Tell us about the Halifax Sugar Refinery.

Mr. KENNY. I will tell you all about sugar at the proper time. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I believe, would applaud me even if I were to say any thing injurious to Canada. But it will be a very serious matter if gentlemen opposite do not agree with my hon. friend from Simcoe. I see it stated in the newspapers that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has actually sent around the province of Quebec, in his newspaper, the photograph of my hon. friend from North Simcoe. I must admit I did not see it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Can the hon. member prove that, I am afraid I shall have to bring an action for libel against him if he cannot.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is he only trying to put a good face on it?

Mr. KENNY. I sympathize with my hon. friend from Simcoe. When, as I mentioned early in my address, I discovered about Giffin and the statistical abstract, I was surprised and disappointed at the conduct of my hon. friend from Simcoe. But, as he says himself, if this really was true, that his likeness had been published and circulated as stated, I would pity him. It is said in the province of Quebec that it is actually a race between the member for Simcoe, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and Count Mercier, as to which of them is to lead the Opposition. Certainly, if the member for Simcoe can follow the hon. member for L'Islet in all matters, ecclesiastical and spiritual, in return the hon. member for L'Islet must follow the hon. member from Simcoe in all secular and mundane affairs. But who is going to vote with the hon. gentleman, the hon. and amiable and gracious leader of the Opposition? The hon. gentleman's amiability can always be relied upon, and I really think he will vote for it. And if it was absolutely necessary to protect the hon.

member for L'Islet, and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in their new happy combination, the hon. leader of the Opposition, no doubt, would shoulder his historic musket. And then there is the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He has hitherto been looked upon as the guide of the hon. gentlemen opposite in all matters of trade, commerce and finance, but the hon. gentleman will have to surrender his position under the new arrangement to my hon. friend from North Simcoe, who has taken charge of this department, as the hon. member for L'Islet has taken charge of spiritual matters. I expect to see the hon. member for South Oxford jump up as quickly as the leader of the Opposition to vote for this resolution. If not, I think the hon. member for Simcoe will be very much disappointed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the hon. gentleman enlisted for Ulster under Clarke Wallace?

Mr. KENNY. I do not turn my coat or my Ulster. Sir, my idea of protection is that we should protect Canadian labour, wherever it is employed. I think there are certain anomalies in the present tariff which should be amended and I believe they will be. I think this system of specific and ad valorem duties is cumbersome, troublesome and vexatious, and that it should be, if possible, abandoned. I think that so far as is consistent with that measure of protection which should be accorded to Canadian labour, we should adopt an ad valorem system. There are certain incongruities and anomalies in this tariff which should be obliterated. I find myself that the greatest grumbling that reaches me in connection with the tariff, comes from merchants who are engaged in the importing business and who are subjected to petty annoyances and vexatious demands from the customs, as, for instance, the duties on an imported sample card, or some other little matter, worth five or six cents. There is another class in the community who are very apt to grumble at the tariff, and these are my lady friends when they get dresses from Paris or London. I do not believe that the majority of the people of Canada desire the destruction of our industries, or that we should abandon a system which affords a fair measure of protection to every man engaged in the development of Canada's resources. I shall therefore vote against the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not rise with the intention of adding to the discussion which has taken place, nor even to answer the criticism of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. The question has been well threshed out, and those hon. gentlemen opposite who have not yet been converted by the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) are simply past redemption; they are condemned to die un-

Mr. KENNY.

repentant sinners. My object in rising is simply to explain the vote which I intend to give upon this question. If I were to give a silent vote, my action would be, perhaps, misconstrued, as is evidenced by the speech of the hon. gentleman. I may say, without astonishing the House, that there is a great deal in the motion of the member for North Simcoe which I altogether approve; neither will I astonish the House by saying that there is something in it with which I cannot agree. I could not vote for it in its entirety, neither could I vote against it in its entirety. Were I to vote silently for the motion without giving a word of explanation, it would be supposed that I am voting for matters as to which it is well known that I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. Were I to vote silently against his motion, it would be supposed that I have recanted some of the opinions which I have already expressed on this question. The motion, in some particulars, is most commendable, in some other particulars it seems to me objectionable. Unfortunately it is an amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Supply, and therefore, according to the rules of the House, is not amendable. We have to take it as it is, with such explanations as we may give upon it. It is not amendable, and, therefore, the only course which is left for every member who must vote upon it, is to consider whether the objections against it or the reasons for it, preponderate. Now, in this motion I find that, first of all, it asserts of the protective system:

That since the introduction of the protective system, sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as, under existing conditions, can be successfully carried on in Canada.

The proposition here laid down has been approved again and again by gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House; it has been approved by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who, after extolling the National Policy, said it was susceptible of amendment, that there were incongruities in it, that it ought to be remodelled and recast. It has also been approved by the Minister of Finance in the speech which he delivered to the House; for, although he was not prepared to bring down an amendment this session, still he recognized that the policy was amendable, and he promised to look into the matter so as to be prepared next session to make some amendments to it. Then the motion asserts:

Moreover, many manufacturers, sheltered behind the rampart thus erected, have formed combinations and trusts which prohibit competition and create and maintain monopolies.

Sir, that is a proposition so true that it requires no enlargement at my hands. Then the motion asserts:

That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure, has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the

consuming classes; and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits.

It has been established in this debate beyond a possibility of doubt, that the farmers of Canada are very much oppressed by the present tariff. Then the motion goes on to affirm:

It is unfair and unequal in its incidence, and has been productive of discontent verging on disloyalty among those who suffer from its injustice.

Now, Sir, no man who will look upon this question dispassionately, laying aside all party bias, can deny the proposition which is here affirmed, that there is in this country, deep, growing, and ever-spreading discontent arising out of the injustice of the present tariff. Then, Sir, the conclusion which is asserted by the hon. member for Simcoe, is:

That in the opinion of this House the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated.

What matters? That is to say, that the tariff ought to be amended so as to remove the shelter behind which combines take refuge in order to exact from the people of Canada extortionate profits; that it should be amended at once in order to remove from the shoulders of the farmers the burden of taxation which they now carry; that it should be amended at once in order to remove the discontent which is spreading through the land to such an extent as to make the future of this country, perhaps, doubtful. Now, Sir, for these reasons I am prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. gentleman; for these reasons, which we have asserted again and again on this side of the House, I am prepared to cast my vote in favour of this motion. The principal proposition which is laid down there seems to me to be true, and the conclusion drawn from it appears to me to be a logical conclusion, and to be based upon the facts herein set forth. While I say emphatically, and without hesitation, and without the slightest equivocation, that I am prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. gentleman for the reasons I have given, and I must say that while voting for it, I do not intend to be bound by the proposition which follows, and to which I must take exception. The proposition which follows is this:

That the tariff ought to be amended also by the substantial reduction of customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom, in whose markets all Canadian products are admitted free of duty, and of those nations which, under treaty obligations with Great Britain, would be entitled to the same advantages.

I am not prepared to be bound by this resolution. Were it possible, according to the rules of the House, to offer an amendment to this resolution, I would offer an amendment in the direction I have indicated; but, as I said a moment ago, we are obliged, under the rules of the House, either to adopt the proposition in its entirety or to reject it

in its entirety; so that the only course which is left to us is to weigh and balance the advantages and disadvantages which the motion presents to us. While the balance of advantages seems to me to be altogether on the one side, at the same time I am bound to put in a disclaimer against every other proposition contained in the motion which is not a legitimate conclusion of the first part of the motion, but which is, in my judgment, an excrescence, which has no logical connection with the foregoing part of the proposition. This latter proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe is based on sentiment. But if the proposition were to carry, sentiment in this case would carry consequences so wide and so large, they would simply, in my estimation, prove a weight to Canada with respect to what we hope is the future of this country. If the proposition were to prevail, that we should reduce the duties in favour of British goods only, the proposition might be debated from another point of view; but, when the proposition of the hon. gentleman is not only to reduce the duties on British goods, but also to reduce the duties on goods of all countries with which Great Britain has commercial treaties, the proposition, if it were adopted, would offer a serious obstacle to the future course of Canada. The President of the Council made an enumeration, this afternoon, of all the countries with which England has commercial treaties, and if we were at once to declare that the duties on all goods from those countries should be reduced, it would involve a serious disturbance of the revenue, and it would also create a wide economic revolution, while at the same time it would be ultimately imposing an impediment in the way of Canada negotiating her own commercial treaties. I have always claimed that the time has arrived when the Dominion of Canada should have power to negotiate its own commercial treaties, but whether we have that power technically or not, it is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that we possess that power practically to-day; and, moreover, all parties in this House, whether they sit on this side or on the other side, are agreed as to this, that it would be most conducive to the interests of Canada that we should have a treaty of commerce with the great nation to the south of us, whether wider or less wide in its scope, is a question of difference between this side of the House and the other; but as to the necessity, or rather the utility, or the advantage of having such a treaty, it seems to me, not only to me, for there is no discussion as to that, to be obvious; but if the proposition of the hon. gentleman were to carry, we would create a state of things such that it would be impossible to negotiate a treaty with the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Yet you are going to help the hon. gentleman to carry his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. The statement of the hon. gentleman is too light to have any

weight whatever. If it were open to me to amend this motion, I would do it, as I have stated to the House. But, because it is not within my power to amend the motion of my hon. friend, shall I be asked to say that there should be no amendment to the tariff? Would the hon. gentleman have me to say here, and this is what I would have to say if I did not vote for the amendment, that there is no depression, that the farmers are prosperous, that there are no combines and the tariff should not be amended? Sir, I would seriously stultify myself, if I so acted. We have asserted this on the floor of Parliament. I know the hon. gentleman cannot vote for this motion, because he says the farmers are not depressed, that there are no combines, that the country is prosperous and the tariff is not to be amended this year; but, as I hold the very reverse of every one of these propositions, I say it is my course on this occasion to vote for the motion. I affirm that every proposition laid down is true, and, if so, there is but one consequence, and it is to assert, as it is asserted by this proposition, that the tariff should be amended at once, and not next year. While I adopt this course, I do so for the reason I have just stated, and at the same time I do not hold myself bound by the latter proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe, that the tariff should be amended in the direction he has indicated, that is, a reduction in the duties on British goods and on the goods of nations with which England has commercial treaties. I will say at once to the hon. Minister of Finance, and he can take what advantage he pleases from my words, that, if this motion were to carry, and if the Government were to be defeated on it, the Opposition would not be committed to the proposition that the duties should be reduced on goods from Britain and countries with which Britain has commercial treaties. That is my proposition. The hon. gentleman will attempt to make something out of it; but, as I cannot amend the resolution, I will amend it in so far as I can possibly do so by my words, and I now say that I do not intend to be committed to anything else than what I indicate by these words I now utter. The stand I take on this motion is this: That the first part of the motion contains a recital of facts which is true; the second part contains a proposition which is a logical consequence of the statement of facts; the third part contains another proposition, which is not at all a logical consequence of the statement of facts, and to that part of the resolution I do not hold myself bound. I may say this, in conclusion, on this subject, that the only reason which impels me to vote in favour of the proposition is, that it contains a strong, unanswerable condemnation of the system of protection followed during the last fifteen years in this country, the baneful effects of which are therein powerfully condemned. Hon. gentlemen opposite are like the Bourbons: they forget nothing; they learn nothing.

Mr. LAURIER.

They are like the idols of the pagans: they have eyes, but they see not; they have ears, but they hear not. They are like the ostrich, which buries its head in the sand, in order not to see danger. They are like the stump in the field, which rots in its place until kicked away by the foot of the farmer. Having eyes, with which they do not see, burying their heads in order to avoid seeing danger, they will not budge until they are kicked away by the foot of the farmer. Not only so; they will not even consider statements made on the floor of the House, which do not bear out their own views, and such statements drive them into a passion. When the hon. member for Simcoe made the statement, that the issue fought in the last election in the United States had been an issue between free trade and protection, and that free trade had triumphed, that statement of fact at once aroused an angry concert of protestation and disclaimer.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I observe hon. gentlemen opposite still protest. I will quote for the benefit of those voluntary sceptics, for those hon. members afflicted with voluntary blindness, some extracts from the language made use of by President Cleveland in his inaugural address. This is what he said:

The verdict of our voters, which condemn the injustice of maintaining protection for protection sake enjoins upon the people's servant the duty of exposing and destroying the brood of kindred evils which are the unwholesome progeny of paternalism.

Can anything be plainer than this language: the verdict of the people has condemned protection, for protection's sake, and has imposed on the servants of the people the duty of destroying the brood of kindred evils which are the result of protection. Nothing can be plainer than that language. Mr. Cleveland says, a little later on:

When we proclaim that the necessity for revenue to support the Government furnishes the only justification for taxing the people, we announce a truth so plain that its denial would seem to indicate the extent to which judgment may be influenced by familiarity with perversion of the taxing power.

Well, we know this perversion of judgment in this country also, and we have the evidence of it every day on the floor of this House. But, Sir, I made this quotation only to show that in truth the issue which was fought in the United States was an issue between freedom of trade and protection. In the words of President Cleveland, protection has been condemned in the most emphatic terms, and the duty is enjoined upon the servants of the people to destroy the progeny of evil which is the result of protection. I assert that the second election of Mr. Cleveland to the Presidency marks the second era of the development of free trade throughout the world. It has been stated often and many times on the floor of this Parliament, that free trade in England has been a failure because

the expectation of its promoters have not been fully realized. Free trade a failure! What a word! Free trade has made the small Island of Great Britain the banking counter of all the nations of the earth, and the distributing warehouse of the trade of all nations. It is certain, however, that the anticipation of Mr. Cobden and of Mr. Bright with regard to other nations have not been realized. It is quite certain that Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright expected that the other nations of Europe—France, Germany, Italy, Spain—would follow in the van of England. In this, however, they were mistaken. But what does it prove? It proves that in matters of trade, as in many things else: while wisdom is scarce folly may be very abundant. Perhaps it was not the most natural thing to expect that the nations of continental Europe would follow in the van of England. There were other nations, however, from which this was to be expected. John Bright once compared England and Rome, and he recollected the well-known phrase of the poet with regard to Rome: "The lone Mother of dead Empires"; and he called England "The living mother of living nations," and so she is. England has produced, not only the greatest commercial race, but the greatest colonizing race the world ever saw. Rome has conquered the world by violence; England is conquering the world by commerce and the arts of peace. England is not only dotting, but covering the earth with nations of her own kith and kin, and although these nations in course of time may be separated from her politically, still they remain attached to her by her language, by her literature, by her civilization, and it might have been expected indeed that the principle of free trade laid down fifty years ago in England would germinate and bear fruit amongst those nations of kindred origin. We see to-day, in the example of the United States, that the first nation to follow the example of England in free trade is the first daughter of England—the Anglo-Saxon Republic to the south of us. I heard it stated on the floor of this House a few days ago that the free trade movement in the United States was ephemeral. Why, Sir, look at the movement which is going on there from west to east and from north to south. Look at the state of Massachusetts, ever in the van of freedom and progress. It is very true that during the last election Massachusetts pronounced itself in favour of protection, but by an ever-decreasing majority. Look at the young generation of her public men. Look at Governor William Russell. Look at the Congressmen Hoar and Adams, all sons of Republicans and protectionists; but they aver to-day that as the mission of their fathers was to destroy the curse of slavery, their mission to-day is to destroy the slavery of protection. And, Sir, I venture to say to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the third nation to follow the example laid down by England fifty years ago will be this Canada of

ours. I will not indulge in any boasting, but I can see all round me evidence that the dawn is approaching of the day which shall see the highest development of British civilization on the basis of ever broadening freedom of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker.—

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I think I had the floor first.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is customary to give the leader of the House the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give way to the hon. gentleman, if he wishes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) towards the close of his remarks, made the observation that hon. gentlemen opposite only cheered the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he said something that was derogatory to Canada. The hon. member probably forgot that the only occasion upon which the Tory members upon this side cheered the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was when he said that the British farmer was in a most deplorable condition. Now, Sir, whatever the result of this debate may be, whatever the result upon the country may be; one thing is very evident, and that is, that the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has excited, not only in this House, but in the country, a degree of interest and a degree of importance that has seldom been accorded to the motion of any private member of Parliament. And, Sir, the fact that so great an effort is being made to meet his arguments and to disparage his political position, and to prove him guilty, if not of insincerity, at least of inconsistency, proves how the position that he has taken is felt by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. At the very beginning of the debate, an hon. gentleman well known for his eloquence—and certainly the speech that he gave us on that occasion was one fully up to his reputation—devoted the principal part of the time, after evidently very careful preparation, to endeavouring to prove the insincerity, or at any rate the inconsistency of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But what did the hon. gentleman for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) succeed in doing? He unearthed a speech delivered five years ago, delivered upon an election hustings, in which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said with perfect consistency, both with his past and his present career, that he defended the National Policy. The rest of that speech was some very amusing chaff at the expense of the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), having no bearing on the question in the slightest degree. Against that was the declaration made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself, by quotations from the speeches, bearing all the in-

press of being delivered with the utmost gravity and premeditation, which clearly and distinctly declared what his course has been, and how far his present position is consistent with it. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) had a little to say about some acrobatic feats. I wonder if the hon. gentleman can remember that in days gone by, when he and I were much younger and more agile, that there was a game played at school called "follow my leader." The great object of that game was that those who followed should do everything the leader did, and as the hon. gentleman gave us some little exposition of his ideas upon party Government and party discipline, I think they might be very simply embraced in that proposition "follow your leader." The leader not only had to climb fences and jump over walls, but he would probably occasionally jump into a ditch, and all who followed him had to besmirch themselves with mud as he did. I do not know how far the agility of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) will enable him to follow in that respect. But I must say that if we have a few more such exhibitions on the part of the Administration as we had to-day in regard to the treaty with France, I think the hon. gentleman's agility will be pretty well tried. Now, let me say that it is not often that a member of this House enters upon a task so great, so laborious, so difficult as that essayed by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I venture to say that if some of those gentlemen, whom I have heard remark that he does not know anything about figures—if they had attempted to do all that my hon. friend has done—they would have failed at the very first table they would have encountered. Now, the hon. member for Haldimand entirely failed, in all essential particulars, to meet the case presented by the hon. member for North Simcoe. It is true, he found some little inaccuracies, and talked about a resolution moved before a board of trade at Lethbridge, which my hon. friend should have said was lost instead of carried. Well, I believe it was lost by a majority of one, so that the hon. gentleman cannot derive any very great satisfaction from that matter; but the hon. gentleman's speech was valuable in this, that it proved most conclusively, if any proof were needed—and I do not think that there was much needed—that the Government have no serious intention of interfering with the present protective system. He spoke, as the mouthpiece of the Administration; he was put forward with a carefully prepared speech to meet the arguments of the hon. member for North Simcoe. His speech was a protectionist speech from beginning to end, and not only a protectionist speech, but he admitted, and not only admitted but defended, the existence of one of the greatest combines now existing among the manufacturers of this country. I say that his speech was

Mr. O'BRIEN.

made for the purpose of establishing, which hardly needed to be established, after all that has taken place, that the Government have no serious intention of interfering with the present tariff. But, Sir, we had a speech from another hon. gentleman—an hon. gentleman who speaks with a good deal more authority even than the hon. member for Haldimand, with more authority, I might almost say, than the Finance Minister. In fact, I do not know that he does not speak with almost as much authority as the leader of the Government. At any rate, he regulates us all; I do not know but he regulates the Finance Minister, and, with that exquisite good taste and breeding which characterizes that hon. gentleman in all his parliamentary functions, he undertook to regulate the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hodgins). Well, the address of the hon. gentleman, coming from one who regulates this House and therefore regulates us who regulate the tariff, must be taken as very authoritative. That hon. gentleman proved to his own satisfaction, if not to the satisfaction of the House, that the farmer, of whom we have heard so much lately, paid no taxes, or at any rate, if he did, he did not pay any more than \$4 a year. Now, the hon. member for Haldimand, who was very severe in his criticisms on little matters which I think may fairly be admitted to be inadvertences—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If hon. gentlemen will wait until I have done, they will not crow so much. The hon. member for Haldimand was guilty of a misrepresentation—I do not mean to say wilfully, but he was guilty of a misrepresentation of facts far more serious and far more important than anything committed by the hon. member for North Simcoe. He would lead this House to believe—and, of course, as his speech will no doubt be scattered broadcast through the country, he would lead the country to believe—that a reduction of the duties on English goods really means nothing to the farmers. Now, what did he say? As this was a very considerable portion of his speech, I will take the liberty of calling the attention of the House to it, and pointing out what a grave and serious misrepresentation it was. Speaking of the hon. member for North Simcoe, he said:

He goes into the house of this hard-working farmer and he says: My dear friend, I see that your floors are bare, I am going to lessen the duties against Great Britain in order that you may put Brussels carpet upon these floors. I see that your hands and your face are brown, and I intend to reduce the duty in order that you may have silk parasols and English kid gloves. The Minister of Finance is a temperance crank—

Is that true, I wonder?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not now.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only a quotation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say that the hon. member for Muskoka was a temperance crank.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the hon. gentleman had said that he would have made a mistake, that is all. The hon. gentleman went on :

I propose to reduce the duty on ale, on Dublin stout, on brandy or gin, on wine and whiskey. In order that your farmers' wives and daughters may be comfortably clad, I propose to reduce the duty on silk ribbons, on laces, on velvets, on fringes, on bracelets, and on artificial flowers. But the farmer says: You have not taken any duty off on agricultural implements. Then my hon. friend from Simcoe says: I am coming to that after awhile, and I am going to make bicycles free, in order to reduce the burdens upon the shoulders of the farmers.

An hon. MEMBER. Read on, it is very good.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Of course, if hon. gentlemen are so ill-informed as to what our imports from England are, they are justified in applauding that little bit of wit on the part of the hon. member for Haldimand.

Mr. LISTER. Do you call it wit?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, I do not pretend to be a judge of what is wit and what is not wit. One would suppose that the hon. member for Haldimand did not know, as of course he does know, that the value of the dutiable goods which we import from England is about \$31,000,000, and he certainly must know that at least one-half of these goods are goods which enter into general consumption. So that when he talked about reducing the duties on silks, velvets, ale and wine, and so on, as the result of such a proposition as that made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, he was entirely misleading the House and the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him where he gets the statement that \$31,000,000 is the value of the dutiable goods we import from England?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think that was the value of the dutiable goods imported from England according to the last return.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Duty paid?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Goods liable to duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought you said duty paid.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am sorry I am so incapable of making myself understood. The value of dutiable goods imported from England, according to our last return, is, I believe, \$31,000,000, of which, at least one-half—I make it rather more than one-half—are goods that enter into general consumption. Now, let us take a few of those items as to which it seems the farmer and the general consumer would not derive any benefit from a reduction of the duties. The first item on the list is printed books. According to ideas of the hon. member for Haldimand,

we are not to give the farmers the privilege of reading anything but those trashy novels, reprints which are published in this country. Printed books they are not to have; \$233,000 is the amount of printed books brought into this country. The farmer and the general consumer is not to have the benefit of this importation. We import \$100,000 worth of bibles and prayer books, but, according to the Minister of Finance, the other day, it is not of much consequence whether the farmer gets them, because every farmer is to be a divinity to himself, and a priest to himself, and so he can do without bibles and prayer books. But I am happy to think that that view of the case is not one generally accepted by the people. The farmer and the general consumer is not, under the hon. gentleman's contention, to have any books and to get the benefit of this importation at all. Well, on this point, I will call the attention of the House to the fact that there is not, in our whole tariff, any item more thoroughly unjustifiable and indefensible than that tax upon books, and I was glad to see public attention called to it lately by Principal Grant in an article in the new magazine, in which he declared that whatever other changes or alterations might be made in the tariff, this duty on books ought to be done away with, and I do trust, when the tariff is revised, if it be revised, that the Finance Minister will take that advice into his serious consideration. We know that the hon. gentleman is not a very deep scholar, we have had evidence of that a good many times in this House, but he has always been a student, and therefore ought to have sympathy with those who find it exceedingly difficult, at times, as Principal Grant says, to get the books necessary for the prosecution of their studies. Then, we come to boot and shoe laces, which are imported to the value of \$25,333, but, I suppose the farmer is to tie his boots and shoes with binder twine. We import suspenders to the value of \$27,734, no part of the duty on which the farmer pays, as no doubt, according to the Minister of Finance, he can tie up his trousers with a hay band. Neither is he to have arrowroot or tapioca, or buttons, which are rather important articles in the household, for they too are taxed. Cement is another thing which enters into the consumption of farmers very often, and that also is taxed. Cotton, we import to the value of \$1,578,000. With regard to cotton manufactures, I would say to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) that when he made that statement by which he endeavoured to show, I am sure with perfect honesty, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was entirely mistaken in his statement, concerning which there has been so much controversy, he omitted to notice that the difference between him and the hon. member for North Simcoe consists in the fact that the hon. member for Simcoe did not include in his calculation the article of cotton yarn, but took manufactured

cottons alone, and in doing so he was perfectly fair, because, without knowing very much about cotton, I take it that cotton yarn is not an article which generally enters into consumption, and it is that which makes the difference in the calculation.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Is that all you know?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Of course, I always bow to the superior knowledge of the hon. member for Inverness. Spools and thread are imported to the extent of \$241,000. Does the hon. Minister of Finance think that the farmer uses no spools or thread? The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said something about the farmer not washing his face. Evidently, the hon. gentleman did not intend him to have a towel, because, among the articles imported, are towels to the extent of \$37,000. And so we could go through a very long list, with which I will not trouble the House, but the simple result is that, excluding the articles of luxury, which can in any sense be termed such—articles which need not enter into general consumption—my calculation is—and I think it will be borne out by the Trade and Navigation Returns—that there are \$18,000,000 worth of goods imported from England to this country in which the farmer and general consumer are directly interested. A great many qualities of these goods might be regarded as luxuries, but the great bulk are articles that everybody will consider himself entitled to share in, unless indeed it is taken as granted, as we were told the other day, that the farmer has to clothe himself in fig leaves or vine leaves, which ever be most convenient, and eat and drink nothing but what he produces on his own farm. I do not think he will be complimented or flattered by being placed in any such classification. In addressing myself to the general question, I would like to say that I have, perhaps, in my humble way, made as many speeches on the subject of the National Policy as any man in this House, having supported it in 1878,—not in this House, because it was not my good fortune then to be elected—and having supported it on subsequent occasions up to the last general election, and here I will say this, that the last general election was not fought, or was only partially fought, on the National Policy. It was mainly fought upon the issue of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, and the real issue of the National Policy came very little into the question; and I am much inclined to think, from what I know of public opinion, at any rate in the province of Ontario, that had the Opposition not committed themselves to such an impracticable, I was going to say stupid policy, as they did, with regard to financial matters, the probability is that the issue of the last election would have been very different. I do not agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in many of the

Mr. O'BRIEN.

statements he made, and the views he has put forward as to the financial position of the country. I think he has taken very exaggerated views, and I will endeavour briefly to point out, because it has an important bearing on the subject, in what respects the hon. gentleman's arguments are fallacious, and then I will try to show that I think the Finance Minister is endeavouring to bolster up his case by statements which are equally fallacious and equally misleading. Now, these are the three bases on which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and those who take the same view that he does, treat the doctrine which they have put forward. They take the general depression which prevails in this country among the farmers, they take the fall in the value of farm lands, and they take the emigration out of this country to the United States. I firmly believe, and I think I can fairly establish, that none of these causes are at all connected with the existing tariff. With regard to the general depression under which our farmers are now labouring—and that they are labouring under depression of course goes without saying—that is due to a fact common to agriculturists in all parts of the world, and that is over-production. It ought not to be a matter of regret, I suppose, that the world has more food than it actually requires, and yet such would seem to be the case. Consequently there has been a fall in breadstuffs and all articles of food, and in some articles, at any rate, there has been a fall of 50 per cent. Well, now, the fact of this depression might be used as an argument both ways. It might be said if this depression is common to farmers all over the world, why interfere with the National Policy? My reply is simply this, that the farmer, no matter from what cause, is suffering from depression. His products are reduced in price, his purchasing power is 50 per cent less, and therefore every effort ought to be made to reduce, as far as possible, the burdens under which he is labouring. No matter what the cause may be, his purchasing power is less, and it is the duty of the Government and Parliament to do all they can to help him to meet that deficiency by reducing the taxation to which he is subject. Take the other point, the reduction in the value of farm property. Upon that point, I think, the case is exceedingly simple. Shortly before the development of the North-west, farm lands had risen to an abnormal figure. Anybody who knows anything about farming, knows that even when wheat is at \$1.00 a bushel and possibly \$1.50 per bushel, it is impossible to make money, when you pay rental on a basis of \$100 per acre. It is clearly impossible. Land, I say, had gone up to fictitious value. Then the North-west was opened for settlement and immediately heads of families who had sons to settle in life—and we know the Ontario farmer is not content to put his son on less

than 100 acres, and he prefers 160 or even 200 acres if he can get it—instead of buying land in the neighbourhood, left in a body for the North-west. Many of them moved out. I regret very much to say, to Minnesota, Dakota and other Western States. They were led by the laudable desire to establish their sons in a position to make a good living out of farming. They were ambitious and they were not content to leave their sons forty or fifty acres, as in many other countries, and that was one reason why the depression in land took place. An immense quantity of land was thrown on the market, the supply exceeded the demand, and, necessarily, there was a fall in the value. With wheat say at \$1 a bushel, a man might afford to rent a farm—or own a farm, it does not matter whether he pays so much in the form of rent to another, is out of the interest on his own money invested in the place—at \$80 or \$100 an acre. But when wheat fell to 75 cents a bushel he could not afford to pay so much and, necessarily, the value of the land fell in sympathy with the value of the productions from it. That is quite sufficient reason for the fall in the value of the land without attributing it in any way to any tariff. That depression would have taken place no matter who might have been in power and no matter what tariff might have been in force. Then, with regard to the exodus. I think it is evident to every one who has paid attention to the subject that, in a small country like this, inhabited by an ambitious, pushing, thriving people, especially with our present system of education (when everybody, at least the great mass of the people are, not over-educated in the abstract, but over-educated for the positions their fathers filled and which they would naturally fill) there must be a very general desire on the part of the people to find a living in the centres of education and population. And, of course, in the great cities of the United States, with the enormous variety of employment, a young man going from this country had a chance of employment which he could not have had probably anywhere else. And it is a very remarkable thing, and one of which we ought to feel proud, though it has affected us injuriously, that whenever a Canadian goes to the United States he is almost sure to get employment. On the railways, in the mills, in the lumber camps, on the farms—everywhere where honesty, integrity, industry and perseverance are valuable qualities, there the Canadian will obtain a position. Also, it must be borne in mind, this movement of which we complain so much, and which is certainly to be regretted, is one common to all parts of the continent. There has been a movement from the Eastern States to the Western States, which is precisely similar to the movement noted in this country. The census commissioner of the United States, in a late census bulletin, says :

In Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont the rate of increase between 1870 and 1880 has not been main-

tained, probably due to the fact of a large migration of the farming population to the far West and manufactures not having yet assumed sufficient prominence.

In agricultural states generally the rate of increase has declined. The commissioner says :

In Ohio it has fallen from 20 to 15 per cent; in Indiana from 18 to 11; in Iowa from 36 to 18; in Missouri from 26 to 24, in spite of the rapid growth of St. Louis and Kansas City; and in Illinois—

And this is the most remarkable statement, and I commend it to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite :

—dropping Chicago from consideration, from 149 to 59. In these states the agricultural interest, which is still the prominent one, has begun to decline, owing to the sharp competition of western farmers.

Then he goes on to deal with another subject which has also been made a topic of many remarks on the other side, and that is the encumbrances on farm lands. I have always contended, and I think rightly, that a very considerable portion of the mortgage indebtedness on farm lands is not to be regarded as a debt; it is simply capital invested. If a man borrows money on his farm to purchase more land, to buy better stock, or to put up new buildings, that is simply an investment of capital and it does not matter in the slightest degree whether it comes out of his own pocket or somebody else's. If he has it he is entitled to interest upon it; if he borrows he must pay the interest. Of course if he borrows to pay off a debt, the amount still represents a debt. And so borrowed money is, in many cases, not a debt, but capital invested. I do not wish to labour that argument, but as hon. gentlemen are fond of comparing our country with the United States, I would simply point to the facts that the American census shows that the amount of money by which the farms of the United States are encumbered is very largely increased in all these states. So, if that is an argument against the existing state of things in this country, it is an equally strong argument against the country that has all the benefit of the "60,000,000 market." Now, Sir, very interesting questions arise in comparing our position. We find the agricultural population of the eastern states have moved to the west, and that states formerly producing large quantities of grain now produce none for export. A century ago, the valley of the St. Lawrence was an exporting grain country. I can remember when the Genessee Valley was the centre of the wheat trade. That centre has moved west to Minneapolis. Illinois does not now produce wheat for export; it produces pork, beef and so on. The census commissioner says there is a steady diminution in the product of breadstuffs in all these states. The centre of the grain-producing region has moved west, even the farmers in Illinois can no longer hold their ground in competition with the western states. That proves that

the time must come when these states which have ceased to be wheat-producing will necessarily require supplies from elsewhere. And I think we may look forward to the time, not very far distant, when, instead of St. Paul and Minneapolis being the centre of the wheat trade, Winnipeg will be the centre, and the milling interests, instead of being confined to Minneapolis and St. Paul, will be distributed between Winnipeg and Montreal. And, when that time comes, it will be a matter of very little consequence whether we have a protective duty or not, because then the American consumer, no matter how strong the interest opposed may be, will compel the free admission of Canadian bread-stuffs in order to feed the people in these states. In regard to population, it will have an important effect, because, when those western states get filled up, as is evident they are getting filled up—because the commissioner shows, for instance, that the state of Illinois, outside of Chicago and Cook county, is standing still in population—there will be an overflow of population. That overflow must go back to these worn-out lands in the east, or, as is much more likely to be the case, it will flow into the Canadian Northwest. So that, for my part, I have no fear about agriculture in this country. A very important change has taken place already, and it has an important bearing upon this tariff question. The advocates of the National Policy who defended the agricultural interests, did so upon the ground—and that is what carried the policy, as has been stated by the hon. member for North Simcoe—that the prices in the states in 1878 and subsequent years, for almost everything, were lower than they were in Canada; and, therefore, it was to the interest of the Canadian farmer that these cheaper productions should not come into this country, and therefore, he had a direct interest in this protective tariff. But things have changed. I was surprised to hear an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), I think it was, say, the other day, that the prices of grain were better in Canada to-day than they were in the United States. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I think, for twelve months past the only article of agricultural produce which has been higher in this country than in the States, is the article of pork. It follows, therefore, that so far as the farmers are concerned, the duties upon American grains are of very little value to him; all the more, therefore, is he entitled to consideration, if he has lost the only thing that reconciled him to the establishment of the National Policy in the first place. That point has not been dwelt upon so far, but it is evident that the conditions with regard to the farmers have entirely changed from 1878. In that year the price of grain and of all agricultural produce in the United States, speaking generally, was lower than it was in Canada; and, therefore, the farmer

Mr. O'BRIEN.

benefited by protection, but, in 1892, the price of almost every article produced is higher in the States than it is in Canada; and, therefore, the duties have ceased to be of any value to the Canadian farmer. Whether that sort of thing is to continue, I won't pretend to say; I simply state the fact as it exists to-day. Well, so much for what I think are the erroneous views held by hon. gentlemen opposite. I must say, I cannot help saying, that I think the frequent enunciation of these views, the frequent depreciation of this country, entirely, as I think, upon false premises, has seriously affected this country, has caused a flow of people out of it, has caused Canadians to lose faith in their own country, for which loss of faith, I think, there was not, in reality, the slightest foundation. Now, I want to say a word or two to the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, has, I think, been guilty of a great many misleading statements. He laid a great deal of stress upon our foreign trade. His figures with regard to foreign trade formed the principal basis of his whole argument. I think that his comparisons were exceedingly unfair and exceedingly misleading. He took a comparison between 1873 and 1891-92. Well, as a matter of fact, speaking of foreign trade, our exports in 1873 and 1874 were equal to those in 1885, 1887, 1889 and 1891. The imports in 1873, 1874 and 1875 were larger than in any subsequent year except 1883, when the balance of trade against us was \$34,000,000, and that was a year under the operation of the National Policy. Our trade with Great Britain in 1892 was less than it was in 1873 and 1874. So that so far as regards our general exports and imports I say that the comparisons made between the year with which the hon. gentleman commenced his statement and the year with which he compared it at the end was altogether misleading, because he did not convey in any way a true statement of what our trade has been, and to say that this country is prosperous by that comparison would be making a statement which is entirely set aside by the figures I have quoted. Our trade with Great Britain in 1892 was less than that in 1873 and 1874. Then he spoke about our trade with foreign countries, and a great deal he made of that. Now, the fact is that it has really increased steadily since 1873 with Germany, Holland, China, Japan and with other countries generally. The only real increase of trade—because I do not call our trade with Japan and Australia an increase trade, it is entirely a new trade—but the only foreign country with which our trade has really and steadily grown is Germany, and with Germany it has grown from \$1,000,000 to over \$6,000,000. It has fallen off with Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Newfoundland, South America and Switzerland, and with France it has remained stationary. It is, therefore, entirely misleading to take the

figures of 1873 and 1892 or any two years. I do not care which two years, at the beginning and end of a period, and make a comparison. These figures show that it is utterly baseless. Our exports alone to Great Britain in 1889 and 1879 were less than in 1873, and higher in 1881, than in any year except 1891, when they were the lowest of any year except 1879. So that to compare the exports of 1873, when they were the lowest of any year except 1879, with 1892, when they were the highest, is altogether misleading. So our exports to the United States in 1873 were higher than in 1892, and to France they were just double. Therefore the hon. gentleman has no basis whatever for the argument that he based upon his figures as regards our foreign trade. Then he laid a great deal of stress upon the census. Now, it unfortunately happens that that census is going to be a source of more trouble to statisticians who endeavour to arrive at any conclusion as to the true position of this country than anything that has ever appeared in any country up to this time. Of course, we know, as a matter of fact, that the same instructions were given in 1881 as were given in 1891. I take the town of Barrie, with which I am familiar, as I know every house in it, and I find first, that the number of establishments has increased from 77 to 139; that the capital invested has nearly doubled; the number of hands employed has increased about 75 per cent, and the value of the material used has increased about 50 per cent. Now, it is a singular thing that with this enormous increase in the number of establishments, the increase of capital invested, and the increase of hands, the cost of material used has only increased from \$265,000 to \$378,000. Now, there is an inconsistency on the face of it. With all this enormous increase in the number of establishments, capital invested and hands employed, the material used has only increased by \$100,000, and the value of the produce has risen from \$497,000 to \$789,000. Now, that statement is absolute and perfect rubbish; no other name can be applied to it. I know, as a matter of fact, that there is no increase, either in the number of establishments or in the number of people employed. I can say nothing about the capital, but as for the rest, the statement is entirely astray. Now, we had a curious instance here the other day in regard, I think, to the town of Bowmanville. The census commissioner made out that the number of establishments had largely increased there, the capital had increased ever so much, the number of hands had remained about the same, and the population had diminished. Surely no hon. gentleman in his senses will contend that that can be a beneficial policy which increases the number of establishments and reduces the population. If anything can justify a protective tariff it is the asserted fact which has been so often heard in this House that it gives employment to people, and makes a home market. But here the home market,

in spite of all the advantages, in spite of the alleged increase in the number of factories, had actually increased. I should like to know where the home market was. I must say that these figures rather make one lose confidence in the infallibility of the Minister of Finance, and when that hon. gentleman asks us to perpetuate a policy based on figures such as those I have just quoted, I must say it shakes my confidence in the wisdom of the hon. gentleman.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It does not shake the confidence of some hon. gentlemen. Some hon. gentlemen's confidence cannot be shaken. They adopt a policy of follow my leader, no matter how much mud there is. Now, all these circumstances combined naturally lead us to ask, in this condition of affairs, what ought to be done? I listened to the Minister of Finance with the greatest attention. I heard him pile up sentence on sentence; I heard him, for the gratification of our ears, indulge in rounded period after period, of most eloquent language from a most eloquent tongue, and he went on sentence after sentence, and we all thought something was coming. We listened to catch the result. He admitted there was unrest and discontent. Yet did he propose to do anything? He said he was going to take the matter into consideration and give us something at the end of another session. The hon. gentleman spoke as if the Government was a sort of deputy providence, a sort of providence that had controlled and overruled everything and out of whose extreme beneficence all sorts of good things were to come. The hon. gentleman talked about reducing the sugar duties. One would believe that the Government were paying all this money out of their own pockets to hear them talk. He spoke of the great things they were going to do; he told us the Government would do this, the Government would do that, the Government would take this into consideration. One would think they were like the gods on Olympus, instead of being ordinary mortals, and so far as some of them are concerned, very ordinary mortals. That kind of language is not exactly the way to meet the wants and feelings of the people. This Government is very fond of doing things by committees and commissions, and this will be done by commission. The late Minister of Customs, and if there was anybody who knew about the condition of our trade affairs he ought to know, could not get on with this task until he obtained the assistance of two level-headed men. So the affairs of the country are dependent on the exertions of two level-headed men, who are to bring us out of the slough of despond into a state of prosperity. I did not know that the Government depended for carrying on public affairs on any two men, especially on two men who, with all due respect to them,

had very recently come into office, and could not be supposed to know all that was necessary to be done ; but to say that the Minister of Finance, who is constantly dealing with facts and figures, who has had control of the financial affairs of this country for many years, does not know what he is going to do, does strike me as extraordinary. One would think the hon. gentlemen had been asleep for the last few years, that they did not do anything whatever to earn their salaries except to talk platitudes when the opportunity offered. In supporting this resolution I have not much to say, because the subject has already been pretty fairly discussed, but there are one or two points to which I call the attention of the House before I close. One of them is with respect to the rolling mills. The hon. member for Simcoe made a statement, which was jeered at and treated with great contempt by hon. gentlemen, that the rolling mills showed a profit of 60 per cent. If there is any fault to be found with that statement, the fault lies with the Minister of Finance, for the figures are his, and the figures quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe entirely bore out the statement. The figures as given by him were: capital invested \$78,000, buildings the same amount, machinery \$265,000, working capital \$590,000, or a total of \$1,000,000. Add to that sum wages, raw material, interest on capital, and interest on value of plant, add anything you can possibly think of, and there remains a surplus of about \$678,000. If there is anything wrong in that statement, the President of the Council can settle it with his colleague the Minister of Finance, for the figures are given in a return presented to the House. It was asked with respect to agricultural implements and some other articles: how is it, if these articles are much cheaper in the United States, they do not come into this country? That statement was made in regard to barbed wire. I am not in the trade, so I cannot pretend to answer the question. But we have two facts clearly established. First, that barbed wire can be bought and the duties can be paid for, \$3.75, or at all events, less than \$4; and, second, that it is sold here for \$4.50, and that there would be a very considerable reduction in price if it were not for the duty. I do not know how this half dollar difference in price does not cause the article to come in, but such is the fact, notwithstanding. We have the evidence of hon. members in the North-west, and in the hundreds, I might almost say a thousand, petitions sent in, all complaining of the heavy prices charged for barbed wire, and so with respect to many other articles. The unsatisfactory part of the business is that, while we are paying those heavy duties, we are receiving no return. Take the article of wall paper. There we have duties imposed equal in some cases to over 100 per cent, in the form of specific duties, and the whole number of establishments is given in the return as four, and the

Mr. O'BRIEN.

number of hands at 139, but some hon. gentlemen who have written on the subject never heard of the fourth establishment, and did not believe there were more than three. The idea of paying an enormous duty for the employment of 139 hands is absurd. It shows that the evils of the tariff are certainly much greater than one could possibly have supposed who had not made an investigation in regard to it. As to the discontent prevailing in the country, hon. gentlemen choose to deny it and will not admit it. As the leader of the Opposition said, the Government do not choose to see it or admit it. I have no doubt about this fact, that there is, especially among the farming population, a feeling, as the Minister of Finance said, of unrest, which has developed into this, that they want a reduction in these duties. As I have said, no matter whether the duties are unfair or not, the purchasing power of the farmer is diminished by at least one-half, and, therefore, they say they have a right to have the duties reduced; and the feeling is correctly described by the hon. member for Simcoe, that while they do not want to change their political conditions, they have got so far that they look forward to it as a possible alternate, in case they do not get the relief they want. That is the position of affairs. How is it to be met? Is it to be met by promises, which I have shown by the evidence of many hon. gentlemen do not mean an intention to deal with the tariff in any substantial way? What is the meaning of all these speeches? They mean that the Government have no intention of departing from the protective policy. I say as an advocate of the National Policy from its beginning, that I never was a protectionist in the sense in which the Government are now protectionists. I never looked upon the National Policy in any other light than as explained by Mr. Colby, which was the first speech I read respecting the introduction of protection in this country. Circumstances which he mentioned where the National Policy or any protective system should be done away, have come to pass, and, therefore, the defence of the National Policy falls to the ground. The hon. gentleman said he was going to stand by the old land marks, but I say that so far as the National Policy is concerned, it is he who has departed from the landmarks. It is not myself, nor the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), nor the thousands of people in this country, former supporters of the National Policy; it is not we who have departed from the old landmarks, but it is the hon. gentleman who has established in place of what was intended for a National Policy, a system of protection pure and simple, from which it is quite evident from all that has been said that these hon. gentlemen do not intend to depart. Believing these things, and not intending to take more time than I have already done in giving views which I trust may at any rate have been reasonable, and expressed in a manner con-

sistent with my position as a member of this House. I support the resolution now before us as being a correct exposition of the views I hold. There is another thing I wish to say. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen opposite in the belief that the United States is our best market. I think they are wrong there. It would be simply folly to ignore the enormous trade which is carried on between this country and the United States, notwithstanding the barriers erected on each side of the frontier. It would be folly to say that that trade is not of importance to this country, but speaking as a farmer, and speaking in general terms, I say that I do not think the United States is our best market. I think the time may come. I think the time shortly will come, when the consumers of the United States will give us a market in spite of anything the protectionists may say to the contrary. In the meantime I say that the market which fixes the ultimate price of all these productions must be the best market, and our business is to get there. There is one thing for which I give credit to the present Administration—at any rate, especially to the late Minister of Agriculture—and that is, the pains and care they have taken, and the efforts they have put forth to get a better footing in the English market. Although things have gone wrong in some respect, although the two-rowed barley has not succeeded so far, I have great faith in that market ultimately. I believe the fault is mainly with ourselves. The Dairy Commissioner told us before the Agriculture Committee to-day, that one reason why our products did not get that reception in the English market which they otherwise would get, was owing to the stupidity of our own producers, who thought that anything was good enough, and that the people over there wanted food and would take anything they sent. Mr. Robertson showed that that was an entire mistake, and that we must study the English market, and put aside any prejudices which we may have, and adopt the prejudices, if you like to call them, of the English consumer. He showed us that with regard to butter and cheese, and the same thing applies to barley. If we had sent to England two-rowed barley of as good a quality as we grew—and we grew lots of it of good quality without any of those admixtures which render it valueless to the English maltster, I believe a fair trade could be well established at the present time. Unfortunately, either through ignorance or greediness, dealers send barley to England which they should have known was altogether unsuitable to that market, and, consequently, we lost it. But I believe the market is still open to us; I believe it is one we may always fall back upon, and it is our duty to promote it in every possible way. Hon. gentlemen may remember that a letter appeared a short time ago from an old Canadian living in England, with reference to the apple trade. He said that he knew Canadian apples were

good, but he had seen barrels of Canadian apples which had been sent to England, which were so fraudulently put up—good apples on top, but inferior apples all through the barrel—that it completely spoiled the sale of the article in that market. If our people do such things as that, if they are so stupidly ignorant or wilfully fraudulent, it is impossible for us to make a trade. They must study the market, they must find out what it wants, and send that, and if they do. I am satisfied that with a little perseverance we will have a market in England more reliable, and more valuable both as regards conditions and everything else than the United States markets. It will not be so liable to fluctuations, consequent upon changes of policy which we have so often found redound to our disadvantage. I am not myself very much in favour of reciprocity and I have no hesitation in saying so. I would much rather deal on the basis of following our own interests in every article which we have to dispose of, and if the Americans want our produce let them take it, and if they do not want it I believe we will find another market. If you have a treaty of reciprocity in all products somebody has got to be sacrificed, and I will say further, that I also object to making treaties with a people who have in many respects not acted up to the high sense of national honour which we would expect a great country to act up to. Therefore I think the less we have to do with them in the way of treaty-making the better. If we wait a little I believe they will be anxious enough to take what we have to sell. There is a motion on the Order Paper with reference to the export duty on saw-logs, but as it is not likely to be reached this session, I wish to say something on the question. In this, I will be following the example of the Finance Minister who dragged these export duties into the debate when it had no possible relation to any of the matters under discussion. My position on this question is somewhat peculiar. I represent a constituency which is, perhaps, the most interested in the matter of any in the Dominion of Canada, and no man in this House or in this country, can feel more regret and more vexation than I do, at seeing the saw-logs, the raw material, exported out of this country and manufactured in the United States. No man would go further than I to adopt any practical method of putting an end to that loss to this country. The only question with me, and the only question I feel inclined to discuss at this moment, is this: It is a fact that if we reimpose the export duty, that the \$2 per thousand duty on sawn lumber would come into force as a matter of law, without any action of Congress, and then behind that is the Bill mentioned by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) held in reserve in case an export duty was reimposed. Now, the Minister of Finance was very careful to go out of his way, I think, to tell

the American producers of saw-logs that they need not think they were going to establish any vested rights, because if the interests of the country required it, he would set all such things at defiance. I think the language was unnecessarily strong, was not calculated to soothe the feelings of our neighbours on the other side, and was not germane to the discussion. The whole question for the present, resolves itself into this: There is more than a probability that the American Congress, at its next session, will take the duty off our sawn lumber. As the matter stands at present, with the duty on, and without any export duty, it is just the turn of a feather, whether these purchasers of saw-logs manufacture them on this side or tow them across to the other. As a matter of fact, we know that many men who have purchased limits have also purchased mills. A man named Peters purchased limits from the Midland and North Shore Lumber Company, and he has not only purchased the limits, but failing to purchase the mill, it is well known that he has been looking about for a site on which to build a mill for himself. The purchasers of the principal limits from the Georgian Bay Lumber Company also purchased the mill, with which they will cut a large portion of the logs which they will produce. As a simple matter of fact—I am not basing my argument upon it—there has not been one single mill closed so far, except the mills at Midland, and the mills at Midland will, I am very much afraid, be closed in any case, because the owners of those mills have not the limits to work them, and if a man has to tow logs from the Georgian Bay, he might as well tow them to Saginaw or other places in Michigan as to Midland; so that the trade of that place cannot be taken into account. But the statement which is often made—it was made to me in a letter the other day—that an immense number of men have been thrown out of employment as a result of the sale of these logs, is, I know, absolutely untrue. I know, as a matter of fact, that employment has never been so abundant or wages so high in the Georgian Bay district as during this winter; so that so far—and I am only speaking so far—the general labourer has not suffered; there is not a man in the Parry Sound and Georgian Bay districts who has not had all the labour he wanted. To that extent, the situation is unchanged. I must say that I think the lumber interest is hardly fairly treated in the discussion of this question—I speak of our own Canadian lumbermen. The hon. Minister of Finance was ready enough to threaten the purchasers of the logs with a reimposition of the duty, but he had not a word to say as to its effect upon our Canadian lumbermen. There is no industry in this country that employs as much labour and capital as the lumber industry, and therefore it should be treated with every consideration; and we know that the reduction in the duty of \$1 a thou-

Mr. O'BRIEN.

sand has enabled them to get rid of a large quantity of lumber that was lying on their hands, and to cut up large quantities of saw-logs that would otherwise have been burned in the woods. All I would say now on the subject, as my own view, is that it would be the height of folly to do anything at the present moment which would imperil the placing of lumber on the free list. If lumber is placed on the free list, the export of logs will at once cease, because it would be to the interest of nobody to export logs and cut them on the other side instead of cutting them in this country. I can understand that even the threat to re-impose the export duty places our lumbermen in a very uncomfortable position at this moment. With such a threat hanging over their heads, how can they make contracts for the coming season? How can they tell what price they can charge? Because \$1 a thousand makes a tremendous difference to them. Therefore, to re-impose the export duty now would be to embarrass our lumber trade, imperil the possibility of getting free lumber, and cause most serious loss to all. But, having said this much, I say further, that if, at the next meeting of Congress, nothing is done to give us free lumber, then the question will assume an entirely different shape. Then it will be the duty of all interested in the preservation of our forests—and I do not know who is not interested—seriously to consider the question, even at the risk of all damage that would happen to the lumber interest, whether it would not be the duty of the Government to step in and re-impose the export duty. But to do it now would result in no good, but would cause infinite harm.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help feeling that one owes an apology at this late hour, almost an early hour of the morning, for offering any observations at all to the House. But there are some matters in connection with the question that we have now before us about which I feel I must say a word or two. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in the first place, that it affords me a great deal of pain to find myself obliged to differ a second time during one session, upon a most important question, from an hon. member of this House, with whom I have been on terms of the closest intimacy, both personal and political, ever since I came to Ottawa. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) I have always regarded, and I still regard, as an ornament to this House. I prize his personal friendship as highly as I ever did, I admire his conspicuous ability as much as I ever admired it, and I am only sorry to think that an hon. member who has been such a brilliant supporter of the Conservative cause should, on this occasion, at any rate, be acting in opposition to what we consider to be Conservative principles. However, these things will occur in public life, and we can only lament them. I should have liked very

much, had it been possible for me, to act shoulder to shoulder with my hon. friend, as I have done in the past. But in this case, and on this resolution, I find it is quite impossible for me to do so. I regard this resolution of my hon. friend as nothing less than a declaration that the policy of protection to the native industries of Canada, which we have pursued since 1878, is to-day a mistaken policy, that it should be reversed, and that we should go in for a policy of so-called free trade. There is one part of the resolution to which I should like to call attention for a moment; it is the proviso at the end of the fourth clause, in which, after expressing the opinion that "the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated and also by the substantial reduction of duties," he goes on to say, "so as not unnecessarily to prejudice the business of the country." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is just where my hon. friend and I differ—where the roads on which we travel diverge. He sets the business of the country in the second place, and the reduction of the duties in the first. Now, I think the first thing we have to see to is that, by giving employment to the people, we provide our people with the purchasing power; and, in the second place, we have to take care that, as far as possible, we reduce the prices of what they have to buy. I do not put the second first. I think that is really the difference, to a great extent, between the principles that underlie the policy of free trade and the policy of protection to native industries; and I was very glad indeed to find from the utterances of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, that the Government are fully satisfied and assured that the policy which we have pursued since 1878, is a sound and salutary policy. My hon. friend said, as a matter of course, that a sound and wise and strong protective policy did not necessarily imply that every item in the tariff was to be regarded as rigid and immutable. It is quite evident that duties which may have been perfectly reasonable fourteen years ago, may, under altered conditions and circumstances, have become unreasonable and excessive, and it is just as clear, on the other hand, that duties which may have been supposed to be sufficient, may be, on investigation and under altered conditions and circumstances, found to be insufficient and inadequate for protection. But while my hon. friend the Finance Minister said so much as this, he gave us distinctly to understand that the Government were determined to abide by and to nail their colours to the mast upon the old policy that this country has so long approved and under which it has so steadily prospered, and under which its credit has gone so high among the nations; and I was exceedingly glad to find that there was no uncertain sound on that subject. Now, I do not intend to discuss the theoretical bearings of free trade and protection, and I do not intend to discuss

either what to me did seem the extraordinary arguments and calculations to convince the House and the country that we ought to reverse our policy, adduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). These arguments and calculations have already been replied to by several members in this House in several respects. There is one matter to which I should like to have referred, but it is so late now that I shall not enter into it, but no doubt others will, and that is with reference to the calculation my hon. friend made as to the amount of benefit the farmers have received from protection—the calculation he made with regard to the output of the farms and the \$12,000,000 worth of produce imported into this country. I think my hon. friend in that calculation was mistaken in his argument, in his premises, and in his conclusion. He altogether left out of consideration the fact of the greatly enhanced prices which the farmers in this country have received for the goods they have to sell. However, I do not wish to elaborate that. I wish to call the attention, however, of my hon. friend to one fact, which I think has a good deal of bearing on this subject, and that is, that when he asks this young country to reverse the policy we adopted in 1878, and to adopt a policy of so-called free trade, more properly called free imports, he asks us to do something which is opposed to the judgment of every civilized country in the world, with one exception only. I say that the whole civilized world is against my hon. friend in this matter, with one exception only, and this is with the exception of England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. But that is an exception which year by year can be pleaded with less and less authority, because year by year there is growing up a greater and greater body of opinion in opposition to that policy in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend may say "hear, hear," but his jeering does not in any way alter the fact. It is notorious that it is so. Why, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself did not venture to deny that there was a growing feeling in favour of protection in England, and I will show in a moment very good reasons why there should be such feeling. When my hon. friend cheers that statement, he ought to remember that the Prime Minister of England last year told us himself, in a very famous speech which he made at Hastings, that in his opinion, in order to enable even the great industries of England to hold their own in the markets of the world, they ought to have recourse, in some degree at all events, to a reimposition of duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He revised that the other day.

Mr. McNEILL. That is all very well. I made the statement with reference to what Lord Salisbury said last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said he was entirely misunderstood.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon friend says that he said something different this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say that he said something different, but I said that he explained that he was entirely misunderstood, and did not mean to say what the hon. gentleman says he did say.

Mr. McNEILL. I will refer to that in a short while, and my hon. friend will find that he is entirely mistaken. He will find that Lord Salisbury virtually repeated what he said last year. I have his words, and will quote them, showing that he is as strongly in favour of what he said last year as he was then. Therefore, I say there is but one exception, and that is the only plank hon. gentlemen opposite have to float upon at all; and that one exception is becoming less and less of an exception to be applied in their favour. The leader of the Opposition to-night expressed his belief that a wonderful change is about to take place in the policy of our friends to the south of the line, but I will believe that when I see it. I am not so sanguine as he is on the subject. I have kept poultry, and find it is always well not to count my chickens until they are hatched; and if my hon. friend will follow that course in this case, he will follow a safer course than in assuming what the policy of the United States is to be. If there be one thing crooked in this world, it is the course of Yankee politics, and I should be very sorry to say where that will land us. I say that there is not a nation to be found to-day, not even including England, that, situated as we are, could be induced to follow the policy suggested to us by the hon. member for North Simcoe. There is not one that would be prepared to denude its young industries of that protection, which every other country in the world, except England, thinks it necessary to cast around its great industries. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to admit at once that, under certain conditions, perfect freedom of buying and perfect freedom of selling is a very much better thing for the country enjoying it than any possible system of protection. I am perfectly willing to admit, I state with the greatest confidence, that if the nations of the world had allowed England to follow a policy of free trade when she wished to, she would have dominated the markets of the world to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). She does.

Mr. McNEILL. That she would have dominated the markets of the world—let me say to please my friend—to a much greater extent than she does to-day, and would have

Mr. McNEILL.

been the workshop of the world for many years to come. She would have dominated the markets of the world more than she has done, and, just to that extent, the manufacturing industries of these other countries that, under a system of protection, succeeded in manufacturing goods for themselves would have suffered, the industries of France, of Belgium, of the United States, of Germany would, just to that extent, have suffered. I am not prepared to say that that would have been a benefit to these countries, while it would have been a benefit to England. That would have been the case provided the nations of the world had permitted England to follow a system of free trade. But as they would not allow her to follow that policy, she was obliged to do the next best thing, and adopt a policy of free imports. I am prepared to give some weight to the position of my hon. friends opposite. I admit not only that under a system of free imports, the manufacturing industries of England enormously progressed and developed, but that because of that policy these industries progressed and developed. That was the only result that could follow, because at that time all the other countries of the world almost were dependent upon England for their manufactures, at least for those lines of manufactures which England turned out. And the fact that these countries were in this way dependent upon England made it possible for England, without risk or competition to her own manufacturers, to open her markets freely, and by opening her markets she admitted free the raw material and the food-stuffs which were necessary to enable her to manufacture cheaper than she had manufactured before. After that time, of course, matters changed. Just at that time there came to her assistance that wonderful agency, call it giant or wizard, or what you will, which set a thousand spindles revolving where ten revolved before, which crashed, and hammered and welded, and planed, and lifted and carried without hands; that whirled men and merchandise across the earth faster than most birds can fly; and that, on the sea, set tides and calms and contrary winds were at defiance and reduced the uncertainty of ocean traffic almost to the regularity of that by land. Mr. Speaker, it is not a hundred years ago since I heard a gentleman of philosophic frame of mind, in a deliberate assembly, rise in his place and gravely question whether it was of any benefit, whether it was even of any importance to a trading community that there should be an extraordinary shortening of ocean voyages. I do not think it is necessary for me to say to the business men of this House that among all the agencies which have conspired to advance trade and commerce the world over, none has been greater, none has occupied a more conspicuous place than the extraordinary shortening of ocean transit, which has been brought about

by the use of the steam engine. Because of the position of vantage England held at this time, because she had the capital, the skill and the experience, she was able to utilize this discovery of the application of steam power to manufactures and locomotion. She was able, therefore, to turn out her goods by the hundreds in place of by the tens, thus wonderfully cheapening the production of these goods, so that she flooded the markets of Europe and the United States with the product of her cheap labour and her skill. And all went well; none could compete with her. But, Mr. Speaker, the day arrived when, under a system of protection, whether it was right or whether it was wrong I do not argue; I simply state the fact—these countries, or many of them, which England had been supplying with her manufactured goods were able largely to manufacture these goods for themselves. The day arrived when they were so independent of England's manufactures that they were able by tariff arrangements, largely to exclude the products of England's labour from their market. And the day arrived, still further, when they were able, not only to supply themselves, but to send the surplus of their products to compete with the products of England in the neutral markets of the world. And, Sir, the day has now arrived when, not only are they able to compete with the products of English labour in the neutral markets of the world, but when the open market of England does not mean only an open market for breadstuffs and raw material for the purpose of cheapening her manufacture, but it means the importation of millions upon millions sterling worth—hundreds of millions of dollars worth—of products of foreign manufacturing skill to compete in her markets with the products of her own people. Now, Sir, that time having arrived, the conditions have been entirely changed; and, as the conditions have been changed, so we find that the policy which worked well at a time when foreign countries were dependent entirely upon England for the product of her manufactures, works well no longer, and the result is that there has been an enormous falling away in the trade which England has been carrying on successfully for so many years with foreign countries. With the permission of the House I will give a few figures in reference to this point. In the first place, the total of export of English produce and manufactured goods has fallen away from £263,500,000 in value in 1890, to £247,000,000 in 1891, and £227,000,000 in 1892. This is the gross result. But it becomes still more remarkable when you look at it a little more deeply, because you will find that the export is becoming less and less through all the great lines of manufacture. The Trade and Navigation Returns classify these manufactures, and I will read a table showing the figures in millions and hundreds of thousands of pounds sterling, which represent the value of exports in the various articles mentioned:

	1890.	1891.	1892.
Yarns and textiles..	£1,123	£106	£100
Metals.....	45	39	33
Machinery.....	16.4	14.8	14.7
Apparel.....	11.2	11.3	10.4
Chemicals.....	8.9	8.8	8.5
All other....	34.5	32.2	28.6
Total.....	263.5	247.25	227

Sir, I think these are figures of such gravity as that they might almost impress hon. gentlemen opposite with the absurdity of the suggestion that we should sweep away protection from our industries, in face of what we see is the result in the great industries of England. If England herself, with all her vast experience, with all her vast skill, with all her vast wealth and appliances of every kind, finds that her giant industries are unable to stand the strain of the policy which is suggested by the member for North Simcoe, surely it is absurd to suggest that our comparatively insignificant industries, after a protection of only 14 years, should be denied that defensive armour which the Prime Minister of England last year stated ought to be taken up again, and ought to be brought to the assistance of some of the great lines of industry in the mother country. Now, Sir, we have heard that it was freer trade and not free trade that hon. gentlemen support. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say you may think unparliamentary; if so, you must call me to task for it; but we have heard a great deal about free trade, and freer trade, and continental trade, but I was going to say that I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite care one continental what trade it is, whether it is free trade, or freer trade, so long as it only frees them from those sombre and sorrowful shades in which, during all these weary, weary 14 years, they have wandered, and wailed, and sought for a policy and found it not. Those hon. gentlemen in their sore distress, I fancy, have been looking towards my hon. friend from North Simcoe to assist them out of their difficulty and provide a policy for them. I had thought there was some hope for them, because I think my hon. friend would be a most talented leader; but the hon. leader of the Opposition repudiates the suggestion, and I am afraid that they are as badly off as ever. However, Sir, I had hoped from some observations that had been let fall, that they were going to change their course, that they were going to head with that hon. gentleman in the direction of the mother country, and away from the United States. I do think that if such a result were to follow, if we found that the only difference between hon. gentlemen on this side and hon. gentlemen on that side was a difference as to how we could best develop trade with the mother country and with the

outlying portions of the Empire; if hon. gentlemen would look a little less towards Washington and a little more towards London; if the only difference that divided the great parties in this country was emulation as to which of them could devise a policy that would best develop, and strengthen, and cement our common Empire, then I do think that we might hope that a better era would dawn for party politics in Canada, and that the prosperity of this Dominion might be expected to advance with leaps and bounds. I had begun almost to hope that was the desire of hon. gentlemen, because it has been said—and I hope you will not consider that I am unparliamentary in referring to a previous debate—it has been said that the hon. gentlemen were strongly in favour of a policy of taking the duty off goods in favour of England; but however anxious I may be to accept that statement, I find it altogether impossible to believe that hon. gentlemen are very much in earnest in that regard. They may consider themselves consistent, but for my part I am unable to reconcile, and I have never yet met any one who was able to reconcile a proposition with its logical opposite. Therefore, so long as the member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), for example, does not repudiate that policy of which he has been so distinguished and persistent an advocate in this House, the essence of which policy, we are told, is discrimination against English goods—so long as he and his party do not repudiate that policy, I cannot think that he is very serious when he desires to lead us to believe that he is in favour of a policy to discriminate against the United States in favour of English goods. Let hon. gentlemen opposite either repudiate their Yankee policy and go in for a British policy, or else they must expect we will regard what they have been saying, and what they did last session in respect to this matter, as a mere unadorned party move. There is no dispute here about stealing the party clothes, of which we heard from the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). This thing has no covering of any kind. It stands there, nude and shameless in all its grotesque deformity. I will just say a word with respect to the proposal that the hon. member for Simcoe, who I am sure is serious in the matter, has made in regard to the reduction of duties on English goods. He unfortunately, and I agree with the leader of the Opposition in that regard, includes along with England all those nations that are entitled to preferential treatment from England, and that makes this an exceedingly wide suggestion indeed. Not only so, but by doing so, we would throw away a lever we might have possessed, by which we might have secured the abrogation of these obnoxious treaties. I cannot help asking, in passing, why it is when so many nations are included, our own colonies are not included also. It seems to me that is rather a curious position for the hon. mem-

Mr. McNEILL.

ber to take, whose views on such questions I always thought I knew pretty well. I do not wish to take refuge in any kind of subterfuge. This resolution, loaded as it is with prepositions altogether obnoxious to my views, I would be obliged to oppose at any rate; but I wish to say distinctly with respect to this question of reduction of duties on English goods, that if that proposal stood by itself, simply a reduction of duties on English goods without including other nations, at the present time and under the present circumstances I would most unhesitatingly record my vote against it. Such a resolution coming from this House could only have the effect of strengthening the hands of those free trade fanatics in England who are opposed to the policy which this House adopted by so large a majority last session, the policy of preferential trade with England in return for preferential treatment in her markets. It could have no other result on the minds of the people of England than that, because they would naturally say, what is the use of our giving preferential treatment in our markets to Canadian products in return for preferential treatment in her markets, when the Canadians are ready to give us preferential treatment without securing preferential treatment in our markets. From an Imperial and English point of view, I think nothing could be a more mistaken and more short-sighted suggestion than the adoption by this House of any such proposition. The great need and the great desideratum of England to-day is the building up and development of Greater Britain. England's future lies with her empire. That is a proposition, the truth of which is becoming more and more evident and more and more impressed on the minds of the English public. England's best customers are to be found within her own empire. Her own people living in her own empire are infinitely better customers than are the subjects of foreign powers, and by increasing the number of purchasers in her markets abroad, in the colonies and in Greater Britain generally, she will develop her trade enormously. By giving preferential treatment to Canada in her market, in the market which is equal to the market of the United States and the markets of several great European powers added together, she will induce immigration in this country and add to the number of the consumers of her own goods in this country to an exceeding great extent. There is no gainsaying that proposition. I think the probability is that under such circumstances we would find ourselves not troubled by having too few, but by having too many immigrants. Our climatic conditions, however, would always prevent our having the scum of southern Europe poured upon us, as has been the case in the United States. But be that as it may, the possibility of trade in this direction from England is, as I have

said, simply enormous, and giving England this preference in our market without asking preferential treatment in return, if it would have the effect of delaying this great Imperial policy, should be repudiated by every hon. member of this House. I desire to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Simcoe as to the improbability of this policy being accepted by England. There have been references made to the speech of Lord Salisbury, a copy of which I have in my hand. Before I leave the question of corn I wish to say this. When Lord Salisbury said that it was beyond the dream of the politician to impose a duty on corn, we ought to understand that, under the pressure of this free trade policy of England, the protective spirit has risen so high that the proposals for a duty on corn have become very extreme. It has been proposed, not merely that a duty should be imposed on corn—and when I speak of corn I mean wheat, as is understood in England—but it has been proposed that the price of wheat should be raised from 30 or 35 shillings a quarter up to 42 shillings a quarter. If hon. members consider that the duty is probably divided about equally between the consumer and producer, they will see that that means a very high duty must be imposed in order to increase the price to 42 shillings. So when Lord Salisbury said a duty on corn is outside the dream of a politician, it must be remembered that he had this in mind, and in comparison to that any proposal we have made is insignificant. But I may say further that I think personally this trade policy, which we shall have, I have no doubt whatever, sooner or later, will in all probability be carried, not en bloc but in detail. I think in all probability that it will come about by degrees. It is quite possible that the last thing we may receive will be the reduction of the duty on corn. So far as my province is concerned, the duty upon wheat is not a matter of such very great importance, but to other parts of the Dominion it is. I wish to say this, Mr Speaker, with regard to this duty on corn: There is a very strong feeling rising up in England in favour of the imposition of this duty upon corn, and Lord Salisbury has told the people who are advocating this policy that what they have to do is to educate the people of England, and that he is prepared to carry out that policy which the majority of the people of England are in favour of. At the great conference held in England, the other day, one of the delegates from Birmingham mentioned that at one meeting of labouring men, there having been some dispute as to the true feeling about this matter of the duty upon corn, he asked the 323 people who were present for a show of hands, and he found that out of the whole meeting there were just three hands held up against the duty upon corn. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that Lord Salisbury has in some way retracted what he said in reference to protection, and with the indulgence of the

House I wish to show that that is not the case:

Having put that question aside [that is the corn question], I will invite your attention to the very curious and remarkable fiscal problems which are now being worked out for our benefit by other nations. The great question which I think really divides us on the question of fiscal legislation is whether it is lawful, and if lawful whether it is expedient to use your tariff as a fighting weapon. I have always been of opinion that the doctrine held by distinguished free traders on this subject is somewhat too absolute, and when people say that reciprocity means protection I am tempted to doubt whether they have taken the trouble to clear their thoughts, which is necessary in dealing with fiscal science. But the matter, I hope, will be one which need not be settled in controversy. Mr. Blaine, by his calm legislation, undoubtedly succeeded in securing some very advantageous stipulations for his country in negotiations with other powers. The results have not been so definite nearer home. France and Italy, France and Switzerland, may be said in a tariff sense to be at open war. One thing is quite certain—that that war does infinite harm to both parties concerned. How it will end it is impossible for us to guess, but we must watch the issue of the campaign with the very deepest attention, for it is full of lessons for ourselves. Everyone will agree that such a war is usually injurious to both parties concerned, and that we ought to keep out of it as long as we can. But my impression is that with tariff wars, as with other wars, it may happen, in spite of the terrible injury which the making of war inflicts on all who take part in it, that it may be necessary to avert greater dangers. I earnestly beg of you to study this question with an open mind and a clear appreciation of the issues concerned, and not allow yourselves to be pushed aside from it by any preconceived opinions or any watchword from scientific men.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is as clear a statement in favour of the views which Lord Salisbury had announced last year as could very well be imagined. We have been told that it was utterly improbable that we would obtain this policy from England. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) rung the changes upon the absurdity of our asking or suggesting such a policy. He said that the suggestion of it, was enough to bring ridicule upon the poor foolish heads who had thought of such a policy, and he repeated these statements this session. When my hon. friend repeated these statements, I could not help thinking it was a great pity that he did not do more justice to his ability and talent, because when an hon. gentleman in his position makes a statement of that kind on the floor of the House, a statement which is so far removed from fact, it must depreciate his influence in any deliberative assembly of this kind. This policy was adopted by this House last session, on the 25th April, and on the 27th April the great exponent of public opinion in Great Britain, published a leading article on the subject. It commenced by saying it was an important resolution that had been passed, not a trifling and absurd resolution as my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) would have us believe, and it went on to say:

We have not disguised our opinion that if the colonies as a whole, and without arrière pensée, were prepared to enter into a Customs Union with the mother country on mutually advantageous terms, there would be a strong body of public opinion in favour of meeting the offer, if possible, even at the cost of some departure from the rigorous doctrines of free trade.

It is certain that for the consumer generally, absolute free trade is the best, but it is not certain that the interest of the consumer, as such, is the only thing that ought to be considered. If not by too great a departure from the strict lines of free trade, it were possible to bind the great self-governing colonies in close and permanent commercial alliance with the mother country, securing not only a vast reserve of political strength, but the command of a large and rapidly growing markets, it would probably be thought well worth while to incur some sacrifice. When nations like the United States, Russia and France are strengthening their exclusive systems against us, and when Central Europe is involved in a network of commercial treaties, it is not pleasant to contemplate the possibility that, under protective tariffs of increasing stringency, our colonial trade may slip from us and the political allegiance of our colonial fellow subjects may be gradually broken down. We hail, therefore, the action of the Dominion Parliament, as a most encouraging sign of loyalty and good-will, but we cannot pretend to ignore the immense difficulties that have to be faced if the question comes to be seriously raised. In the first place, though Canada is a most important colony, we could not for a moment think of establishing a differential tariff for the advantage of the Canadians alone. Were Canada to be joined by the colonies of Australasia and South Africa in opening the colonial markets freely to British goods, there would be a substantial basis for negotiations.

If, however, there is a general disposition on the part of the colonists to move in the direction indicated, the lead given by Canada may be widely followed and may possibly create a new situation altogether.

And yet, in the face of that article, it has been argued here that it was perfectly absurd to suppose that the people of England will ever consent to such a policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may just say that from my own observations when I was in England, I am satisfied that there is an enormous growth of public feeling in the mother country in favour of some such policy. I was in the United Kingdom for some five months; I was in England, Ireland and Scotland—in each of them two or three times; I saw a great many people while I was there, and I can only say that it was really a revelation to me to find how great a feeling there was there in favour of such a policy. If you go to certain classes in London, you will find that the old policy of free trade has a very strong foothold there still; but if you go to the great centres of industry in the provinces—to Sheffield, Manchester, Belfast and similar places—you will find that there is a very strong feeling growing up in those places against the existing tariff arrangements in England, and in favour of such a policy as this which has been approved by the Canadian House of Commons. I may say that the "Belfast-News-Letter," which has, I believe, the largest circulation of any paper in the province of Ulster, on the 14th October last, had a leading article in support of such a

Mr. McNEILL.

policy. I am almost afraid to weary the House by reading it, but the article is as strong and striking a one as could very well be penned, and I will read a small portion of it:

Our empire is world-wide; it can provide us with everything we require; and the dwellers in Canada, Australia, and other British possessions are our own people. There are no bounds to the possibilities of our colonies; and by developing the resources of the Empire we would be developing our best market. On the other hand, foreigners whom we are favouring at our own expense, by our present trade policy, are our commercial rivals, and they are doing their utmost to injure our trade in every part of the world. We are helping foreigners to undermine that trade upon which so much of our greatness rests; and we are neglecting to cultivate the friendship of our own kinsmen, who might be of immense benefit to us.

When my hon. friend from North Simcoe says that all this is to be changed because of the election of President Cleveland in the United States, I can only reply that I myself, subsequent to that election, addressed a meeting in Manchester composed of delegates from the different workmen's associations in the counties of Lancashire and Cheshire; the meeting knew perfectly well about his election; the matter was referred to during the proceedings; yet the meeting unanimously endorsed the policy which has been adopted by this House. There was no evidence whatever of any departure from the position that had been previously taken up by reason of Mr. Cleveland's election. I may mention also that the great meeting of the Conservative Association took place long afterwards, and at that meeting this policy was brought forward. Although it was notorious that the leaders of the party were opposed to taking up the question at that time, and although a very strong plea for delay was urged, nevertheless the resolution in favour of this policy was carried by an overwhelming majority. Since then, in the month of January, in John Bright's own constituency, the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution referring to the resolution passed in this House last session, and commending it to the Imperial Government on the ground that England's trade with her colonies was the trade that she could most rely on. And I have here a letter which I received yesterday from that indefatigable worker in this cause, Colonel Howard Vincent, and he does not tell me that there is any failure of the cause in England. On the contrary, he tells me that it is progressing in England, and that he has addressed large and sympathetic meetings all over the country, and even in Radical centres and clubs. Now, I do not think I need weary the House any longer. I have to thank you exceedingly for the great patience with which you have heard me at this hour of the morning, and I will only say that I think that when we find our friends doing their best for us in England, we in Canada, by the vote we are giving here tonight, will show them that we, at all events, are going to do our part.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, there are several yet to speak on this question, and if the leader of the House will look at the clock, perhaps he will agree to an adjournment.

Mr. FOSTER. We are ready for the vote now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. leader of the Government takes the responsibility of saying that they are ready for the question, though I intended to speak on this subject, I shall occupy the time of the House only for about five minutes, and then I shall give way to its evident desire to have the vote taken. Now, I vote for the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe, not because I agree with it in all particulars. One particular that has been noticed by speakers on both sides of this House, is that it involves in some degree discrimination against our neighbours to the south. I should very much have preferred this resolution to be on the same lines as that proposed a year ago by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that the duties on such goods as we mainly import from Great Britain should be reduced, which would of course apply to all countries. At the same time there is, as my hon. leader has already said, so much of truth in this motion that, under the circumstances, considering that we cannot move an amendment or express our views more particularly, we have to choose between voting yea or nay on the very words before the House. I cannot bring myself to vote against it, I cannot bring myself to abstain from voting, and, therefore, I am bound to vote for it. As to the general question involved, I shall not at this moment, as the House is anxious to vote, go into details, but I must say that the remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) were the most refreshing and original that have been addressed to this House during the whole course of this discussion. He told us he was in favour of the National Policy, no matter what might happen, that his feet stood firm on the rock and that he would not wobble under any circumstances. It reminded me irresistibly of a good old Highland Conservative in my county, who has gone to a better place than this. He used to say some of my friends call themselves Conservatives, and Liberal-Conservative and Union and progress men, but, for my part, I love the good old name of Tory. That seems to be the position taken by the hon. member for Peterborough. He said that several of the factories in that town were paying no dividends, that the highest dividend he had yet received from any of them was six per cent, and yet he maintained that the National Policy was doing everything for Peterborough and creating a grand boom there. He said also that they could make things cheaper than they could be made in the States, but yet they were afraid this irruption of costly Yankee goods would drive our cheap Canadian goods if

these barriers were taken down. That is the sum of the whole argument in favour of protection from the other side. They say we make these things cheaper than they can be made or sold at anywhere else, but still we dare not face competition. If that is the argument, I do not think we need fear it very much. As my five minutes are up and the House is eager to have the vote taken, I will not say anything more on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is any consolation to my hon. friend, who is in distress at not having time to deliver the speech which he evidently had prepared, I would say to him that I am in the same box. I had an excellent speech all ready, but I forgot making it in order that we may have a division at once. My hon. friend and I are therefore in the same boat.

House divided on amendment (Mr. McCarthy) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth);	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchar,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Bowman,	Lowell,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown,	McCarthy,
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan,
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Paterson (Brant),
Delisle,	Perry,
Edgar,	Préfontaine,
Featherston,	Proulx,
Flint,	Rider,
Forbes,	Rinfret,
Geoffrion,	Rowand,
Gibson,	Sanborn,
Gillmor,	Seriver,
Godbout,	Semple,
Grieve,	Somerville,
Guay,	Sutherland,
Hodgins,	Vaillancourt, and
Innes,	Yeo.—64.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,	Leclair
Amyot,	Lépine,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baker,	Macdonald (King's),
Barnard,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Belley,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	Maclean (York),
Bergin,	McAlister,
Boyd,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bryson,	McDougald (Picton),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McInerney,
Carignan,	McKay,
Carling,	McLean (King's),
Carpenter,	McLennan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McLeod,
Carscallen,	McNeill,
Chesley,	Madill,
Cleveland,	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Metcalfe,

Corbould,	Miller,
Corby.	Mills (Annapolis).
Costigan,	Moncrieff,
Craig.	Montague,
Daly.	Northrup,
Davis.	Patterson (Colchester).
Denison,	Patterson (Huron).
Desaulniers.	Pope.
Dickey.	Pridham,
Dugas.	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer.	Reid.
Earle.	Robillard.
Fairbairn,	Rosamond.
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster.	Ross (Lisgar),
Fréchette,	Ryckman,
Gillies,	Simard.
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),	Smith (Ontario).
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Smith (Sir Donald)
Grandbois.	Sproule,
Guillet.	Stairs.
Haggart.	Stevenson.
Hazen.	Taylor.
Henderson.	Temple.
Hughes.	Tisdale.
Hutchins.	Turcotte.
Ingram.	Tyrwhitt.
Ives.	White (Cardwell).
Jeannotte.	White (Sherburne).
Kaulbach.	Wilmot,
Kenny.	Wilson.
Lachapelle.	Wood (Brockville).
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland)—116.

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.

Hearn,
Olmsted.
Curran.
McDowall.
Jonas.
Roome.
Pelletier.
Wallace.
Weldon.

Opposition.

Frémont,
Devlin.
Choquette.
Edwards.
Tarte.
Fauvel.
Monet.
Fraser.
Brodeur.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) did not vote.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I was paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). Had I been able to vote, I would have voted against the amendment

Mr. WELDON. I paired with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden).

Mr. GUAY. The hon. members for Montmagny and L'Islet have not voted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I was paired with the hon. member for Montreal Centre. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I was paired with the hon. member for Gaspé. I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment *negatived*.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Committee rose and reported progress.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That Rule No. 93 be suspended, and that all the papers in relation to the agreement entered into be—
Mr. FOSTER.

tween Her Majesty the Queen and the President of French Republic regulating the commercial relations between Canada and France in respect of the customs tariff be printed forthwith for the information of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection and approve of the motion, but I understand that there are more papers to come down. When will they be brought down ?

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as I can get them arranged, they will be brought down and printed with these.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1893, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 16th March, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) to amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 102) to amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

VAUDREUIL ELECTION.

Mr. LAURIER. I am informed that the returning officer for the county of Vaudreuil, Mr. Bastien, has not yet received the writ of election. It should have been issued as far back as last Sunday, and I cannot understand the delay.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot account for it either. I do not remember the day on which I made the announcement, but I know that the Order passed. I will make inquiry.

EXPORTS—CONSULAR FEES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) If it is not out of place, I would like to make inquiry for infor-

mation with regard to the certificates required, under the regulations of the American Government, from their consuls in this country on all goods shipped to the United States. I think the practice has grown up in the trade between the two countries, that everything shipped from Canada to the United States must be accompanied by a certificate of the consul, for which the exporter has to pay a fee. I do not understand that anything of that sort is required, on goods shipped from the United States to Great Britain or to Canada, from the British consul. It seems to me that this is placing the trade of Canada upon a different footing from the trade of any other country in Christendom, and different I am told from the regulations which the United States require in respect of goods exported from any other country to the United States. I would like to ask the Minister whether he has looked into the matter, and whether any representations have been made to the United States Government on that subject, because it seems to me that it is a practice that ought not to be continued, and that Canada should in this respect be put upon precisely the same footing as any other country when we ship goods to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say just now from memory as to whether these fees are actually required by law; but I know that the practice has prevailed for years, and has been growing all along more uniformly, that all goods shipped, no matter whether it be \$2 worth or \$2,000 worth, are accompanied by the consul's certificate, for which the shipper has to pay him a fee. Whether that is necessary under the law, I am not prepared just now to say; but I know the impression prevails among the shippers that unless this is done the difficulty will be greatly increased at the frontier, or at whatever port the duties are collected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My point, the Minister will see, is this: that this regulation is not applied, so far as I can learn, to goods shipped from any other country into the United States, and it is not required on the part of the British Government in respect of goods shipped from the United States to Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the consular certificate is not necessary for goods shipped from other countries into the United States?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is my understanding, and I think we are unfairly dealt with. The United States consuls, under this arrangement, are practically pensioners on the Canadian people.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt; but I rather think these consuls are nearly all of them paid fees, and I think my hon. friend will find that the same practice prevails in respect to goods shipped to the United States from other countries; but I am not certain. I do

not think it is obligatory by law; but it has come to be considered in practice as the best thing to do in order to avoid greater difficulties on the frontier. The practice amounts, as my hon. friend says, to a heightening of the customs tariff on goods going into the United States, and a large amount of fees are gathered in Canada in that way, because consuls are being multiplied very rapidly in our ports. However, I will get further information.

THE CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the Minister whether the Controller of Customs has returned to the city, and whether he is likely to be in his place to-day?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I may say that I am not my brother's keeper in that respect. I have not been informed as to whether the Controller is here or not. If it would be a favour for the hon. gentleman, I will have inquiries made.

MR. BRODEUR, M.P., AND THE Mc-CARTHY AMENDMENT.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House that last night I voted for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I find that my vote was not recorded in the Journals of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's name does appear in the Votes and Proceedings, in the English version, at all events.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the French version I see that my name has not been entered.

INDUSTRIES IN MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the House to the following facts. On the 23rd February last I put the following question:—

What are the names of the 37 manufacturers mentioned in the last census as existing in the town of Montmagny?

To which the leader of the House replied:

The information in the census schedules was obtained by sworn enumerators, on the understanding that nothing but general statistical results should be published. No names nor personal particulars can, therefore, be communicated.

I see that all these particulars are given now and I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better put his question on the Order Paper again.

STEAM-BOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) further to amend the Steam-boat Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is proposed by this Bill, as I explained when introducing it, to amend the 43rd section of the Revised Statutes by substituting the word "minister" for the word "board." I want to ask the consent of the House to make a further change. In the present Act power is given to impose penalties on vessels proceeding without having been inspected, and the penalties are recoverable by process of law, and half of the fine is payable to the person making the complaint. Experience has shown that this is liable to abuse and I propose to make the following change in the law:—

All penalties recovered under this Act shall be paid to the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General, and shall be by him placed to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, provided that the Governor in Council may, if he sees fit, authorize the payment of a portion of any such penalty to the informer if the informer be not the inspector.

To strengthen my request to adopt this clause, I may relate an experience which occurred while acting as Minister of the department. The owners of several steamers usually made it a point to run until the inspector came to inspect their vessels; but last year, the office of inspector was vacant and as no inspector had been appointed, three of four vessels went on their trips without inspection. Some individuals took advantage of the law and prosecuted these people and put them to great cost and under the present law they could not get relief. This section is proposed in order to give the Government a little discretionary power. We do not propose that any of the penalties shall go to our own officer, and the proposition is that any such part of the fine as is considered fair may go to the informer.

Mr. WELSH. I think it is a good proposal to lessen the premium to the informer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The premium is a little too high, I think, at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to inquire of the Minister in charge whether the words, "no person shall serve as engineer on any passenger steam-boat," are intended to apply to the case of any little steam yacht or steam launch that a private owner may choose to run for his own purposes?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The department understands that the law does not include the class of steamers referred to.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one class of steam vessels not provided for here at all. I refer to tugs. Would they be classified as freight steam-boats?

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The department has never considered tugs to come under the operation of this section, because they do not carry passengers; but they come under the law regarding the inspection of boilers and hulls.

Mr. CHARLTON. Must they have certificated engineers in all cases?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no certificate required for a tug.

Bill reported.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) to amend the law relating to Holidays—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 76) to correct a clerical error in the Bank Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

SUPPLY—CABINET CHANGES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House and the Government to a matter of vital importance to a very large and important class in this Dominion: I refer to the agriculturists. We had several changes in the personnel of the Government during last year. At the present time the head of the important Department of Agriculture is a lawyer. I have no objection whatever to lawyers filling any positions either in the Cabinet or in this House. They are a class of men whom I respect and who are unquestionably entitled to their fair share of representation, both in the Cabinet and in the Legislature. At the same time, I contend that at this particular juncture the interests of the farmers should be intrusted to the hands of a master, a man of extensive personal experience, and one who is fitted to lead in the education of the farming class; but at the present time this department is in the hands of a gentleman who neither by personal knowledge nor by theoretical knowledge, is sufficiently posted to give agriculturists advice on any practical subject. I contend, if there ever was a period in the history of agriculture in this Dominion when this department required a man of extensive personal knowledge with respect to matters of agricultural detail, that time is the present, especially when some of our trade channels for farmers' produce are being closed and others are being opened, and when the methods of agriculture are undergoing changes in the different provinces, and I hold that to place a man at the head of the department who knows no more about farming than he does of astronomy, is nothing short of an insult to the agricultural community of this Dominion. I do not think the Government were so driven for want of suitable material that it was necessary for

them to take a lawyer into the Cabinet as Minister of Agriculture. I see on the Government side of the House several hon. members who, from personal, practical experience, are fairly well fitted to fill the position of Minister of Agriculture. But it appears that every other interest will receive fair consideration at the hands of the Government, except agriculture. If a man is required to efficiently fill the position of head of the Department of Justice, a lawyer is selected. I would like to know to what extent the lawyers of this Dominion would acquiesce in the appointment of a farmer as Minister of Justice. Why, all the barristers of this Dominion would raise their voices in indignant protest at the injustice done their profession by such an appointment. I would like to know, should a vacancy take place in the Supreme Court, whether it would be considered advisable, in the interests of the legal profession, and of those who are forced to go to law, that it should be filled by a farmer. Every lawyer would loudly protest against such an utter disregard of the rights and intelligence of the legal profession. I would like to know whether, at this moment, when it is most desirable that we should have the best men as quarantine officers, we would endorse the action of the Government in placing at the head of our quarantine service a farmer who necessarily, from his training, could not be supposed a competent judge of the best means to prevent the introduction into this country of the fatal disease of cholera. On the contrary, we would insist on the most skilled and experienced medical man being put in that position. If you want a Supreme Court judge, you must take an experienced and admittedly able lawyer, and if you want a Minister of Justice, you select also a leading member of the legal profession. I ask then, how can you expect the farming community to patiently submit to the policy of taking a man from the legal profession, who must necessarily know very little about agriculture, and placing him at the head of that department? It is nothing short of a piece of gross injustice. I have heard that, in the United States, a lawyer was once put in nomination for the position of Minister of Agriculture in some particular state. When he got on the stump, the farmers of his constituency began to question him concerning their agricultural interests, and he got so terribly mixed in his replies that he made himself a laughing stock. For instance, when asked what kind of cows he would recommend for that particular state as the best fitted for the purpose of giving milk and making butter and raising stock, he said that his careful study of that question had led him to the conclusion that the best kind were Southdown. Then they were anxious to know his views with regard to the best breed of horses, and he replied that, after seriously considering that question, he had come to the conclusion that the Durnam

breed was the best. When asked to give his ideas with regard to sheep, he said that he was in a position, from careful study, to give them an intelligent answer, and had come to the conclusion that Polled Angus were, all things considered, the most preferable breed. Then, as poultry was a very important industry in that state, the farmers were anxious to have his ideas on that subject, and he replied that the best kind of chickens was the Berkshire. When they came to the subject of hogs, he thought that of the numerous breeds of hogs extant, Plymouth Rock hogs were the kind he would recommend most strongly. Now, this was the experience of a lawyer in dealing with agricultural matters; and we may expect that the lawyer, who is now at the head of the Department of Agriculture, will, in all probability, become as badly mixed as the lawyer down south to whom I have referred. This is a matter of very great importance. There never was a period in the history of the Dominion when our farmers were more driven to their wits' end to find out the best kinds of grain to grow and the best line of agriculture to follow. Our cattle are scheduled, and if that scheduling should continue it will seriously interfere with that branch of industry. Our horses are shut out from the United States by the enormous duty, and our country is full of them, so that our farmers do not know exactly what is best to do. And in many other lines the same trouble exists. In what position then will be a lawyer, who knows nothing at all about agriculture, to advise our farmers in these matters? Instead of our new-cast Minister of Agriculture going into the country and teaching the farmers, they will have to instruct him. I say further that the Minister of Agriculture should have a seat in this House. Besides appointing a lawyer, the Government have placed him in the other Chamber, where he is not directly responsible to the people, and where we cannot have the opportunity of questioning him concerning matters of vital interest to agriculturists. Now, Sir, the whole thing looks like this: The Government were in a box; they had to take Mr. Angers into the Cabinet; they could not get him a seat in this House, they were afraid to make the attempt to elect him, and they gave him the position of Minister of Agriculture and relegated him to the Senate, with many others there who are of very little use to the country, and of very little use to anybody except themselves, and that in the drawing of their salaries. I presume Mr. Angers will perform that part of his duty very admirably, but, so far as the agriculturists of this country are concerned, he will not be able to give them that advice and assistance and instruction they need. He is not going to lead in the matter of progressive agriculture, but he will have to remain behind until he gets his education, for he has yet to learn the very A B C of the profession

of agriculture. It is nothing short of a gross piece of injustice to the agriculturists of this country to place a man of this stamp at the head of the department, and to put him in the Senate where he is beyond the reach of the elected representatives of the people, particularly at a time when the agriculturists are more anxious about their future and about the changes that undoubtedly must take place and are now taking place in the calling of agriculture than at any time since Canada became a home for farmers. It seems to me an insult, nothing less, to expect the farmers of this country to quietly submit to this condition of things, and it is to be hoped the Government will take such steps as will place at the head of the department a man possessed of extended knowledge in the calling of agriculture, a man who will be able to take his place either on the platform or in this House in the discussion of questions of vital interest to the farmers of this country, and not a man who is a complete stranger to that calling, and totally incapable, from profession, and from the Chamber in which he is placed, to discharge the duties of this office.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I appreciated the compliment my hon. friend paid the legal profession at the outset of his speech, but he has evidently overlooked the fact that the new Administration of the United States, Mr. Cleveland's Administration, to whom my hon. friends on the other side look for example and for everything else that is good, have, within the last few days, appointed a lawyer as Minister of Agriculture. My hon. friend evidently overlooked that fact, and, while the story he told about the legal Minister of Agriculture was a very amusing one, he surely did not expect any one in this House to believe it. In this part of his speech he was something like the witnesses we sometimes get in the box who hurt the case they would like to help by proving too much. If the Minister had anything to do with the understanding of crops and was supposed to know the rotation of crops and about the Clydesdale hogs and Berkshire sheep, and that kind of thing, perhaps my hon. friend himself (Mr. McMullen) would be a better man for the position than a lawyer. But I find, on looking over the report of the Minister of Agriculture, that the work does not require a farmer more than a lawyer, or a lawyer more than a doctor. In fact, so far as I am able to see, it requires a man of general executive ability. Not only have the farmers an interest in the Department of Agriculture, there are many others that have an interest. I find in the report of the Minister a list of the branches taken up in his department: Crops, cattle trade, cattle quarantine, investigation of animal diseases, public archives, agricultural societies in the North-west. Then there is a report on phosphates, one on the experimental farms, one on dairying, one on exhibitions, and one on

Mr. McMULLEN.

the World's Fair. The Minister has also the patent department, copyrights and trade marks, the general quarantine department, census, statistics, immigration, and other important duties besides. Now, I say that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken would place a farmer in a very embarrassing position if he put him in such a department and expected him to run it. I say that without disrespect for the farmers, and, especially when I find myself surrounded by so many in the House, I am bound to show my respect in the proper way. What is wanted at the head of the Department of Agriculture is a man of general executive abilities capable of managing men and with enough knowledge of human nature to employ the officers of the department so as to call out the best service from each of them.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, we will take up the remaining items of the Supplementary Estimates, those first brought down.

Further amount required for Census and Statistics—(Governor-General's warrant... ..\$2,672

Mr. FOSTER. That was an item in the Agriculture Department which was allowed to stand over pending the bringing down of the instructions and schedules for the census. I placed these on the Table within a day or two after, and I suppose there is no objection now that the item pass.

Mr. CHARLTON. For what reason was this item allowed to stand?

Mr. FOSTER. As I have explained, it was because a discussion arose about the census figures and I had not the papers with me. I brought them down afterwards.

Mr. CHARLTON. Were these census enumerators instructed to take seamstresses, making dresses for people in the neighbourhood, as industrial establishments?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of that is detailed in the instructions which I brought down; we had a full discussion of the matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; but we have had some revelations since that discussion. The returns read before the House by the hon. Minister are most astounding, as they seem to show that everybody except kitchen maids, engaged in any industrial employment, were enumerated as constituting industrial establishments. These returns are the height of absurdity. For instance, the milliner engaged in making dresses, is an industrial establishment; the woman who is doing a little work for her neighbours and a little work for herself, is an industrial establishment; the blacksmith who is shoeing horses, running a single bellows, work-

ing in a little shop for his neighbours, is an industrial establishment; a single cooper, repairing old tubs and butter firkins, is an industrial establishment. Why, Sir, the whole thing is a farce, and we failed to understand the character of it until we got these returns which the Minister of Finance laid before the House in detail the other day. Now, if this is the general character of these instructions, I think that the census is entirely unreliable. I received a letter a day or two ago from a gentleman in Port Dover, who informed me that one of his sons had been enumerated three times, and the boy had actually been out of the country over a year. These are some of the glaring inconsistencies and inaccuracies that are complained of all over the country, and they show the evident intention on the part of the Government to swell the number of industrial establishments in this country, the number of persons engaged in manufacturing pursuits, the capital invested in these various concerns, and the output—why, almost everything in the country is tabulated as being an industrial establishment. I wonder they have not got the farmer who is raising cattle put down as an industrial establishment. It would scarcely be more absurd than the returns that have been brought down. I express the opinion that the money has not been earned in getting these census statistics, and that we have got a set of statistics that are totally unreliable, and that, whether it was the intention of the Government or not, they have presented us with returns the result of which is to place the National Policy and its operation before the country in an unduly favourable light. If there was not an intention on the part of the Government to do this, if these instructions were not intended to bring in as industrial establishments, seamstresses, milliners, coopers, blacksmiths, and all these persons, then a serious bungling has been made. The result is that we have a set of census statistics that are practically useless for the purpose of comparison and furnishing reliable information as to the progress of the country during the past decade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the Minister in a position to inform us whether the statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe was correct, that in making the census of 1881 no special allowance was made for the industrial establishments therein enumerated, but that on this occasion 15 cents for industrial establishments was allowed?

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather have the discussion on the census take place on an item that will come up afterwards in the Estimates, when I shall be prepared to give the hon. gentleman more information than I am able to do to-day. I have not had time to look into all the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to that, only I would ask you

to leave one or more items in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose. I do not care which.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a census item in the succeeding Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To prevent further confusion I will ask you to take a note of certain points on which I desire further information. In the first place, as to this matter of payment; in the next place, I would like the hon. gentleman, for purposes of comparison, to bring down the list of industries for 1881, similar, for instance, to those mentioned in the question which my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Grieve) asked the other day—bring down the lists for 1881, that will give us some chance of making a comparison. I only ask for a few samples of them, and those that you gave the other day will do just as well as any—just give the corresponding list for 1881. If you do that, we can then consider what steps should be taken to prevent what I agree with my hon. friend in considering is likely to vitiate the value of these statistics.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime I wish to enter my protest, and have it on file, against the statements made by my hon. friend just now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I base these statements upon the returns presented by the Minister of Finance, and there can be no doubt about their correctness, I suppose.

Mr. MULLOCK. Would the hon. gentleman produce the census returns for 1881 in regard to some matters that I got an order for in 1891?

Mr. FOSTER. What was the order?

Mr. MULLOCK. I will get it and send it across. I want to make a comparison between 1881 and 1891.

Militia — Ammunition and Cartridge Factory at Quebec. . . . \$30,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the Minister give us some information about this item?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The \$30,000 is made up of the following items: material purchased in England for the cartridge factory, steel cylinder, \$584; brass and strips and material, \$3,000; pay of staff of factory from 1st December, 1892, to 1st June, 1893, estimated at \$2,000 per month, \$14,000; fuel, iron and machinery, \$5,000—that makes up \$23,000. Then there is also paid for ammunition for militia and artillery, 9,900 pounds of artillery powder, \$1,485; fuses and artillery ammunition bought in England, \$3,000, and the balance is made up of general supplies required for the next 12 months.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are all the cartridges used by the militia and the mounted police manufactured in this factory at Quebec?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The cartridges are all manufactured in this country.

Militia Stores\$20,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What class of stores are being supplied?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There were purchased in England, through the High Commissioner, from Her Majesty's Government, miscellaneous and ordnance stores to the value of \$7,000; 200 sets of saddlery, \$6,325; small-arm materials, being interchangeable parts of rifles, \$1,000; waist-belts, \$500; flags, \$300; Metford rifles, \$150, and other stores amounting in all to \$15,260. There were purchased from contractors in Canada, militia stores, \$1,500; military tents, \$3,360; marquees, \$1,640; 4,000 blankets, \$4,400; accoutrements, \$740; haversacks, \$1,040; mess tins, \$620; flags, \$275; transport, \$220, and one or two other items. These are the various items of supplies let by contract.

Mr. MULOCK. How does it occur that saddles, flags and belts were not ordered in Canada?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The 200 sets of saddlery were imported from England on the order of my predecessor, the late Minister. It is stated that the saddlery of that quality could not be obtained in this country. That is a matter into which I will inquire, and if the saddlery can be obtained here at a cheaper rate, I will give Canadian manufacturers the preference.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do the Ministers think it proper to place themselves as a Government in a different position from private citizens? If a private citizen finds it necessary to import goods, he has to pay duty, and the manufacturers in this country are thus protected. The manufacturers, however, do not obtain the benefit of protection if the Government does not pay duty upon its importations, or rather does not treat the matter on the same basis as if the goods were increased in cost by the amount of the duty the private citizen would be required to pay on the same article.

Mr. MULOCK. The explanation given by the Minister is that the saddlery, flags and belts were purchased by his predecessor. I have not that supreme confidence in the immaculate character of the hon. gentleman's predecessor in matters military to accept that as an entirely satisfactory explanation, and as one to justify the Government passing by all Canadian manufacturers. The present Minister gives as a reason for these importations that the manufacturers of Canada are not up to the standard and cannot do the work efficiently. That is not intended, I suppose, to be a wholesale allegation against the efficiency of Canadian manufacturers. But since the hon. gentleman does not really know what is the answer to this particular question, and as his adviser, the ex-Minister of Militia, is in his place, perhaps that hon. gen-

Mr. CHARLTON.

tleman will favour the committee with the explanation.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The departmental explanation is the only one I can give, for I do not pretend to know the subject personally. The explanation is that a special kind of saddlery was required, which was not then made in the country, but which I hope will be manufactured here. When I give orders, I shall be able to give the fullest explanation with respect to them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend has asked me to give some explanation, as the Minister has stated that the order for this purchase was given by his predecessor. The hon. gentleman forgets that, since my immaculate administration of the Department of Militia, two other Ministers have been at the head of the department. I have no manner of doubt that the compliment to that hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell), the benefit of whose presence we had in this House, was justified. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in my time every saddle used by the militia was manufactured in Canada, except the models which I imported from England in order to have our saddles made here; and, as one having some little experience in saddles, I say that you can buy as perfect a saddle in Canada as you can import from Veith, who is reported to make the best saddles in the world. In my time orders were given to Canadians and the saddles were manufactured in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. I am exceedingly glad that the present Postmaster-General has testified to the efficiency of Canadian saddles. It is unfortunate that his successor should have passed by the Canadian manufacturers and have gone to England. He had forgotten how we were called on to protect native industries, and, contrary to the policy of the Government, had paid out money even in the old land. The Ministers of Militia have changed so rapidly that it is a little difficult to refer to them. Therefore, I will call the last speaker Minister of Militia No. 1, and the one who was transferred to a higher sphere Minister No. 2, and the present Minister No. 3. We were told, when Minister No. 2 came into office, that he was going to go back on all the old records, that there had been unpopular things done, that Minister No. 1 was not up to the standard, and that there was a new man at the helm. Now, I understand why he has been removed from the helm. It is because he went back on Minister No. 1 and because he went back on our own manufacturers, and so he has escaped public opinion by being transferred to the other branch of our Legislature. The present Minister, No. 3, when asked about a certain thing, says he knows nothing about it, as it was done by Minister No. 1; but when we put Minister No. 1 on the witness stand, he says: "I know nothing about it, another fellow who has gone away from here has done the wrong." I think that the

item should stand over until we get a real answer. In view of the testimony of the Postmaster-General, that the manufacturers of Canada could supply these things, we want to know why they were not purchased in Canada. So much for the saddles, but what about the flags? Cannot we raise any old flags in Canada? Have you got to import all of them from England?

Mr. FOSTER. They have been waved so vigorously that they are all worn out.

Mr. MULOCK. Where does the supply come from now?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). When the main Estimates come up, I will give all the information as to the reason which inspired Minister No. 2 to get these saddles from England.

Mr. MULOCK. I am inclined to do a good deed for my hon. friend, but I think we should know why he has not purchased the old flags in Canada? We have cotton industries here.

Mr. PRIOR. They are not made of cotton.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will remember the point about the flag and give you the information.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not want to hit the Minister below the belt, but would he tell us why he went to England to buy the belts? Are they not made of leather, and are they not manufactured in Canada?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). We will put the belts with the flags.

Mr. CHARLTON. The item had better stand until we get the information. Minister No. 1 tells us that saddles can be purchased in Canada of better quality than elsewhere. The amount involved may be small, but it is a matter of principle to get the information. If we do not let this matter stand it will be forgotten when we reach the main Estimates.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Oh, no; I have taken a note of the matter and will bring it up myself.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the main Estimates come up there may be a fourth Minister of Militia.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will leave the information to my successor.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this matter of saddles, Minister of Militia No. 1 is willing to saddle himself with the responsibility of getting the saddles in Canada, and my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) has saddled the second Minister of Militia with the responsibility of getting the saddles from the other side of the Atlantic, and after saddling him so forcibly with regard to that, he mounted him with regard to the flags.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like the Minister of Militia to tell us, when we come to the main Estimates, as to who are the present contractors for the supply of militia clothing. I want him to be prepared to pass a good examination on that point.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Very well.

Gratuity to Lieut.-Col. Alger... \$1,200

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister of Militia explain this item?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Col. Alger was a great many years in the public service. He is now upwards of 80 years of age, and on his retirement he was recommended for a gratuity equivalent to two years' pay.

Mr. MULOCK. I know Col. Alger very well, and I believe him to be well worthy of the recommendation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish the Minister to explain the gratuity of \$1,000 to Captain J. A. Martineau, Lévis Garrison Artillery, who received injuries by falling from his horse.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will note the request and answer it.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Minister of Militia decided on placing the various brigade and district officers on the same footing as other officers with regard to superannuation allowance?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That matter is under consideration.

Compensation Claims--Accidents
and Injuries at Militia Drill... \$1,500

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this for?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). One case is that of Capt. McKinnon, of No. 8 Company of the 50th Battalion, who lost his right arm by a rifle shot in 1878, while on active service in Montreal. He received some compensation, and it is recommended that he receive \$500 more.

Mr. McMULLEN. This practice of going back and trumping up old claims has been taken exception to by the Opposition, and unless there are strong grounds and undoubted evidence in favour of this claim, I do not think we should quietly pass it over. If the man was entitled to compensation, he should have received it before, and if he is not entitled to it, it is the duty of this committee carefully to investigate the grounds on which he bases his claim. Before we pass the item I think the Minister should give the committee full details as to how the accident happened, the necessity of making this grant, and the reason for the delay.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The claim went before the proper board, was inquired into by the medical authorities, was recommended by the general in command, went through Council, and, as it is considered a meritorious claim, I would urge my hon. friend to let the item go through.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has it been under investigation for fifteen years?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). In 1880, \$800 was voted by this House for this man, and this is an additional amount. I suppose that he is really disabled, and incapable of earning his living, and this further gratuity is given to him in consideration of the exceptional circumstances attending his misfortune.

Mr. MULLOCK. I think we have not yet got all the explanations that would warrant us in voting this money. We have certain rules laid down for compensation in these cases—so much for the loss of an eye, so much for the loss of an arm, so much for the loss of a leg, and so on. This may be a meritorious case, but it does seem extraordinary that, after voting \$800 thirteen years ago, we should now be asked to vote another \$500. I suppose that the case went before the Military Board, and that there is evidence and the finding of the Board. I think that these ought to be brought down before the item is passed. I sympathize with all persons who suffer in this service, but sympathy is one thing and the public money another.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). In view of the fact that we have no means of pensioning in cases of this kind, I hope the hon. gentleman will let the item pass, and I will bring down all the details. I can assure my hon. friend that this is a meritorious case. My information is that this man had his arm shot off when on active service in aid of the civil power in July, 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that on the 12th July of famous memory?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I cannot tell. That is the extent of my information. The other item is to pay \$1,000 to the widow of Corporal R. Macdonald, of Prince Edward Island Garrison Artillery, who died from injuries received at drill in 1891. He was crushed by a gun, while acting in the discharge of his duties.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not object to this item, but I would like to know if this is a precedent which is to be applied in the cases of all who have been wounded or killed in the employ of the Government or on Government railways?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is not a case of a man having been killed on Government railways. This man was a volunteer who came from Prince Edward Island to the Island of Orleans to compete at the annual competition. In the shifting of the gun, it fell on him, and he was killed on the spot. There has been no compensation granted to him, and his widow is entitled to compensation, as a matter of right.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is all right, but the other case is different. Seeing that com-

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron).

penetration was previously granted, there is a possibility that there might be some irregularity in it, and we should have full explanations before we pass the vote.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not object at all to this vote, but I would like to know if it may be taken as a precedent, and if in the case of persons killed by accident while travelling on the Intercolonial Railway, after having paid their fares, the widows have not the same right to compensation? There are many cases of this kind pending against the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has raised a very important point, but it is scarcely within the lines of this vote, that is, how far the Government are bound by contract to carry passengers, and whether in case of a breach of contract, they are liable for damages. Now, the hon. gentleman will remember that last year I called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the judge of the Exchequer Court had ruled that the Government were liable, and had given his ruling upon the changing of the statute since the case of McLeod and the Queen. The Minister of Justice did not concur in that decision, and he told me that the Government intended appealing the case to the Supreme Court; and I have been waiting patiently to learn the decision of the Supreme Court, because I am in the same position as my hon. friend. I know of many meritorious cases of passengers who were seriously injured, when travelling on the Government roads and compensation refused. To my mind, the refusal of the Government to acknowledge liability is indefensible. I know a good deal may be said about bogus claims, but it appears to me that when the Government undertakes to carry passengers and freight for money, it becomes a common carrier and is equally liable. If the Minister of Justice were here, I would press him very strongly for his opinion, one way or the other, as I have one or two most meritorious cases, which I desire to press as soon as a conclusion is reached.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The cases I referred to arose from the said accident on the Intercolonial Railway, in which a late lamented colleague was killed, Mr. Dessaint, as well as five or six others.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not the place to bring that matter up.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I quite admit that, but merely ask the leader of the House to call the attention of his colleagues to this matter, because I know it has already been brought to the notice of the Government by a petition. The action was dismissed before the Exchequer Court, but I was told to file a petition to the Government and that they would look into the matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. As the item under discussion is for compensation of claims, it might save time if the Government were to give their opinion now as to whether they hold themselves above the law which governs common carriers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That question cannot be discussed on this item.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to this \$1,000 vote, I am perfectly satisfied; but with reference to the \$500 vote, as the accident occurred fifteen years ago and compensation has already been given, we ought to know all the circumstances before passing it. It is a matter of principle, although the sum involved be not large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the usual allowance for the loss of an arm in the case of an officer holding the rank of captain?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not state from memory. There is a regular scale.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. colleague's proposition is a fair one. The item is a small one mixed up with others, and it is not convenient to have little items of this kind left standing over in the different estimates. The Minister will bring down the report in full, and the whole matter can be discussed when the item, which has been allowed to stand in the main Estimates, comes up.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are so liable to overlook these matters that it is much better to have them explained when the item is before us.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will bring down the information on the item, which has been allowed to stand, on Tuesday, and will then give full details.

Costs of Litigation.....\$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. I have a full statement of the different cases, but have not got it in my desk, and if the House will consent to pass the item I will bring down that statement to-night.

Mr. CHARLTON. Better let this item stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a question of legal expenses amounting to a considerable sum, and we ought to know the details before passing the item. I am glad to know that, since we have a Solicitor-General, we are not likely to be troubled with items of this kind in future, for it is to be earnestly hoped that he will attend to this kind of thing, and that we will no longer have the first page of the Auditor-General's Report covered with a long list of legal expenses.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Minister will promise to give us the details within three hours, we might let the item pass.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make no promise to furnish it within three hours. If the hon.

gentleman chooses to catechise and be domineering in that way, I will not bind myself to any such promise.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman had much better keep his temper. This item has been allowed to stand already, in order that we might have the information before passing it; and since we have not got that information, I ask that the conditions of the agreement be carried out, and that it be allowed to stand until the details are furnished. It is not unreasonable to suggest, as the hon. gentleman proposed to bring down the information this evening, to let the item stand until he does so. I do not want to be captious; I do not wish to impede the work of the committee; but I submit to the Minister, he should not take exception to a reasonable request such as this. The request was acceded to before and it is perfectly proper the item should be carried over now.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been some considerable time in Parliament, and I never heard an hon. member say that he would not allow an item to pass unless the Minister would give a categorical promise to bring down papers within three hours; I do not think it is courteous.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the Minister to say, in reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he would bring these papers down after dinner. Understanding that to be the case, I suggested that, if the Minister was going to bring the information down, it would be better to allow the item to stand until the information was down.

Mr. FOSTER. No; the hon. gentleman said that if I would promise to bring the information down after dinner—

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister says he has been some considerable time in Parliament and never saw an item held over for particulars—

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman should not misrepresent me. I said I never had a gentleman make a demand of a categorical promise that papers should be brought down within three hours, or he would not allow an item to pass. This whole affair took place between the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and myself. The item stood because I had not then the information asked for by the hon. gentleman. I got the information from the Justice Department, and to-day asked that hon. gentleman if the item might pass, that I would bring the information down after dinner. I have it in my desk in the office. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that he would. If that is satisfactory to the hon. member for Queen's, I think other hon. gentlemen should be satisfied.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had the Minister in the first place stated that he had made such

an arrangement with the hon. member for Queen's, in all probability the committee would have consented to that arrangement. I certainly have enough respect for my hon. friend to consent for my part. The hon. Minister must admit that, so far, the Opposition has treated the Government with great courtesy in the discussion of items in Committee of Supply. We have got along, so far, fairly well. I would venture, at the risk of not being thanked, to suggest that in order that we may close the session with that feeling, the hon. Minister should not allow his temper to overcome him. It is just as well to guard against anything of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I generally have it pretty well in hand.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I am in this position: It was asserted by the Minister that I had dictated terms to him, that he was to bring this information down in three hours. He stated twice that he did propose to bring the information down after dinner. I suggested that as he was going to bring the information down in three hours, the item might as well stand until the papers were brought down. This item has stood for that information, and I propose that it shall stand until the information comes down. If the hon. Minister has the information to place before us after dinner, let it be brought down and in the meantime let the item stand.

Mr. CASEY. If, as the hon. Minister seems to indicate, the information has been ready for some time, he might have had it here this afternoon, and, no matter what arrangement was made with the hon. member for Queen's, it is more proper that the information should be given and the discussion take place before the item is passed than after. If the information is not brought down until after the item is passed, there will be no opportunity for discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item coming up after dinner on which you can discuss the whole thing—an item of \$100,000, a much larger item than this, so hon. gentlemen can discuss it longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A hundred thousand dollars for litigation?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I beg your pardon. I thought we were still on this militia business.

Mr. CASEY. Is there any other item of litigation on which this item can be discussed?

Mr. FOSTER. There will be in the main Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister of Finance propose that we should vote the money and afterwards be told why we voted it?

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. CASEY. That is what it comes to.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not understand this bringing down of information four hours or four days after the money has been voted. When will the opportunity arise to discuss the wisdom of the expenditure, if we pass the item now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My only interest in the matter was this: When the item came up I asked for particulars of this expenditure, and the hon. Minister said he would get it and, meantime, the item was allowed to stand. To-day he said he would bring the information down after dinner and I said I was satisfied. I see there is an item in the further supplementaries, an amount for damages in the case of Allen vs. Attwood. Perhaps it may be possible to discuss the whole thing on that item.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is just as possible to discuss the whole thing on this item, because the item was to stand until the information came down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, yeas and nays?

Mr. MULOCK. I am extremely anxious to meet the Minister of Finance, but, with all respect to him, I submit that he is inclined to be rather arbitrary with the committee. He is asking us to vote \$10,000 for an item of litigation, an expenditure already incurred. If it was for something in the future, there might be a reason in the position he has taken, but as the expenditure is for something that has already happened, he must have the exact accounts, or very nearly the exact accounts, for it. I submit that the Minister of Finance is not adopting a very good plan to get on with public business. He may not have respect for the Opposition, but, before he drives us into opposition with regard to himself, I think he will be wise to reconsider his determination to say "carried." It is monstrous that he should ask the committee to carry an item of \$10,000 without affording a word of explanation of what it is for. We would be derelict in our duty to vote it without information as to what this expenditure is for and who got the money. I appeal to him, and it is not our duty to appeal, it is our duty to point out in a respectful way what the Minister's duties are. It is not a sacrifice of dignity on his part to quietly and gracefully yield to a reasonable request and defer pressing this matter upon the consideration of the committee until he is prepared to advise the committee as to the details of this expenditure. Think for a moment what would be the result if the whole of the public business was transacted on these lines. You might as well ask for a vote of \$36,000,000 and tell us: Give us the money and when it is too late for you to discuss it, we will tell you what

we are going to do with it. I ask him whether he would not make better progress by yielding in a reasonable way as suggested and allow this item to stand?

Mr. FOSTER. I will consent to let it stand.

Customs Department—To provide for the payment of Mr. J. R. K. Bristol, private secretary to the Controller of Customs, from 8th December, 1892, to 30th June, 1893, the same being a revote of the balance of an appropriation for the same period to pay the private secretary to the Minister of Customs \$338 71

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this private secretary supposed to accompany the Minister to various places when he addresses meetings, and hold demonstrations? Is he in the city just now, and has he been up to Orangeville lately?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the duties of this private secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly the same as the duties of a private secretary of the Minister of the Crown.

Department of Agriculture—To pay the following clerks their salaries from the 1st to 31st January, 1893, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act:—John Thomson, \$50; R. E. Armstrong, \$38.75; T. H. Morgan, \$50; T. B. Bassett, \$46.50 \$185 25

Mr. FOSTER. These are clerks in the Department of Agriculture employed in the patent office, and now paid out of contingencies; this is for their salary for one month to supplement contingencies. They have been paid out of contingencies since then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes it that you take it out of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. FOSTER. They have not passed the Civil Service examination, and are paid out of contingencies. They are engaged in different employments in the patent office.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of so many extra clerks in the patent office?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend has visited that office and looked into the returns, he will see that a vast deal of business is done there. It returns a revenue of some \$60,000 a year. The number of patents issued every year is very large.

Mr. CASEY. I do not like to see this principle introduced of overriding the Civil Service Act. The Minister has explained that these clerks have not qualified themselves by passing the preliminary examination, and,

therefore, they are paid out of contingencies. It is evident that clerks are being employed in contravention of the Act. Considering the immense number of young men and women who have passed the Civil Service examination, there is no need for this state of things at all. There are thousands of persons in the country qualified by having passed those examinations, for employment in that service, and it is introducing a vicious principle to pass over all these who have taken the trouble, and time, and expense to be examined, and to bring in those who have not passed examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. They have been there for some time, and have had experience.

Mr. CASEY. Then if they have been for a long time in the office without having passed the prescribed examination, it only makes the matter worse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they have been paid out of the contingencies from 31st January, what is to prevent their being paid for the time mentioned here?

Mr. FOSTER. The want of \$185.25.

Amount required in consequence of the transfer of several clerks from specific votes to contingencies \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. In some of the services, for example, health statistics, the Year-book, and services of that kind, as in other departments, so in this vote, a vote has been given for the work, and then the clerks have been charged against the work. We have entirely done away with that system at the seat of Government, so that a vote is taken for that work, whatever it may be. Then for a public work, or whatever it is, there is just voted what is sufficient for that work, so that clerks are not charged against it. It is by far the best system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that the system of having clerks at the works is practically at an end?

Mr. FOSTER. Not clerks of works in the technical sense. For instance, take the Public Works Department for illustration. We vote, say, \$40,000 for a public building somewhere. The system heretofore has been that all the extra clerks which were employed in the Public Works Department in Ottawa were paid out of those different works. It was the practice to pay the work done by a clerk with reference to certain work, out of the appropriation for that work. Any one can see that that could only be got at in a very rough way, and it might be only a payment for the clerks that were required here for the different works, appropriating a sum to one work and a sum to another. That method we decided to change. This is the principle we are pursuing in all the departments.

Further amount required for
printing, paper and binding... \$75,000

Mr. CHARLTON. I should like some explanation in regard to this item. Has this work been performed in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. SPEAKER. The work is performed at the printing establishment and the paper supplied from the Printing Bureau. I may say, with respect to this large sum now asked, \$75,000, that it is accounted for in this way: The custom has been, for a number of years, to take a vote of \$70,000 each year. Some years ago, that vote was sufficient to pay the whole of the expenses connected with the printing of Parliament, but within the last three or four years, and notably since the House has ordered such large numbers or editions of the Dairy and Experimental Farm Reports, the amount has not been anything like sufficient. For instance, for the year ending 30th June, 1892, a vote of \$70,000 was taken in the main Estimates, and a vote was also taken in the Supplementary Estimates for \$35,000, making \$105,000 in all. There was a balance from the year ending 30th June, 1892, of \$26,000, which was paid out of the vote for this year, 1892-93, thereby reducing the amount available for this year's service, as voted last session, to \$44,000. With the large expenditure, as I have already stated, in connection with the Experimental Farm and Dairy Reports, it has been found that an additional sum of \$75,000 will be required for this year's service.

Mr. CHARLTON. So it makes the estimated expenditure, in round numbers, \$120,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. \$119,000, as against \$131,000 last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. About how many copies of the Dairy Report were printed altogether?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not the information with regard to the number of copies printed; but the information I have is, that the cost of the Farm and Dairy Reports ordered during the session of 1891 was \$24,214, of which \$19,340 was for paper, and the balance for composition and press-work; and the reports ordered last year cost over \$8,000, of which \$5,800 was for paper.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt that is a very valuable report, but there appear to be irregularities as regards its distribution. I received no less than sixteen bags.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you use them?

Mr. CHARLTON. I sent them all around.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say, with respect to the distribution of these reports, last year, at all events, I do not know what system was adopted previously, that each member of the House was asked to indicate how

Mr. FOSTER.

many copies of the Dairy Report and Experimental Farm Report he required. I have heard some hon. gentlemen say, during previous discussions, that they had not received any copies of the reports. The reason was that they did not ask for any copies, for the number asked for by each member was distributed, as I am informed by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. CHARLTON. If there was a surplus, they were not sent along "pro rata." I made a pretty liberal requisition, and I received the copies asked for, and more, too.

Mr. SPROULE. The department appears to have been more liberal to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) than to some other hon. members. I believe the explanation is this: that, owing to the fact that some members asked for very large supplies, the Printing Committee decided to cut down the number from 300,000 to 100,000, and distribute them on the same principle as was adopted in other years. It afterwards turned out that some members did not get any copies, and yet it is stated that the distribution was made on the same principle as other distributions were made in that branch of the service. As the number was reduced from 300,000 to 100,000, of course each member received a reduced supply of copies.

Mr. McMILLAN. I received copies of the Dairy Report, but my copies of the Farm Report only reached me the day before I left home for Ottawa. I left four bags of them at home. These copies should be either distributed earlier, or allowed to remain at Ottawa and be distributed to members here.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless a very much larger staff is employed at the Printing Bureau it would be impossible, so the Superintendent of Printing informs me, to have these reports distributed at an earlier date.

Mr. SPROULE. The recommendation of the committee was that, in the event of the report not being issued early in the season, it would be better they should be kept until members reached Ottawa, when they could be distributed to them here. Unfortunately that recommendation was either forgotten or neglected.

Mr. CASEY. It is better, I think, to speak plainly in regard to these reports. The Dairy Report is a good and useful one, but, after having gone carefully through the Report of the Experimental Farm, I am of the opinion that it is not worth the money it costs to print, and the trouble taken with distributing it. I do not find much information in that report that is useful to the average farmer of Ontario, no more than can be obtained in two or three copies of an agricultural journal. No doubt there is a good

deal of matter respecting new kinds of wheat suitable for Manitoba and the North-west; but, according to the latest investigations, it appears that some of the new wheats have been false and misleading lights, like the two-rowed barley. In fact, there is a great deal of matter respecting two-rowed barley and Ladoga wheat, but neither has proved successful, the climate being very different to what it is here. The issue of these reports appears to be intended more to furnish members with a means of doing the polite thing to their constituents than to serve any practical purpose. The experiments have been conducted in a climate limited to a small area, for twenty or thirty miles outside this city. Moreover, those experiments are carried on at a farm where there is not the typical soil of the province, but a very poor soil, from which no practical farmer could make a living. For these two reasons: first, on account of climate, and, second, on account of the nature of the soil in which the experiments have been made, and on account of the arbitrary manner in which they were conducted, very little value can be attached to the report. It will also be remembered that many of the experiments were conducted on small plots of ground, covering only a few feet, and results were deduced from those experiments. Such experiments, however, do not fairly test any kind of grain or vegetable. A great deal has been spent on that farm in fancy landscape gardening, as well as in those little garden plot trials of grain, which are of very little value. For that reason I think that not much good has resulted from the distribution. Then, in regard to the part of this item which refers to the Printing Bureau, I have an inquiry to make. It will be remembered that two years ago, when looking into the affairs of that Bureau, it was shown that the transactions with regard to the purchase of paper were of a very peculiar character. That one bargain in connection with that had fallen through, because the New England Paper Company could not, or did not, supply the kind of paper that could be used, but that immediately after arrangements were made with a firm in Montreal, and another firm near Toronto, for the supply of paper, that these firms had been large contributors to election funds, that they got very large orders without tenders, and so forth. I wish to ask the Minister in charge, on what system the paper for which this money is required has been bought? Has it been bought by tender, or has it been purchased at the discretion of the Queen's Printer, or of the Minister; what prices are being paid for it, compared with other years, and all such particulars as will suffice to give us a knowledge of how this money has been spent?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My understanding is that the paper used in the Bureau is purchased by contract.

Mr. CASEY. Since when?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot say exactly since when, but I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. I want to know whether this contract was made by public tender, or whether it was ordered at the discretion of the Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have not the information just now, but I will obtain it.

Completion of Census.....\$13,500

Mr. CHARLTON. How much is the cost of this census to be altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. About \$500,000.

Mr. CASEY. How does that compare with the last census?

Mr. FOSTER. That sum, I am told, is less than the census expenditure in 1871, but a little over the census expenditure of 1881.

Mr. CHARLTON. Could the Minister give us the exact figures for each of these decades?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the information just now, but I will get it.

Mr. CASEY. There are a number of questions in regard to industries in various towns and villages on the Order Paper. These questions may not be reached, and I would suggest that the information relating to them should be brought down in the form of a return, and published during the session.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there will be no difficulty in getting the information before the House closes.

Mr. MULOCK. When will all the bulletins in connection with the census be in the hands of the public?

Mr. FOSTER. In about three months.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be possible by putting on a larger force, to get the returns out sooner?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it could be economically done any more rapidly. There is also the printing department to be considered, as well as the census department.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think we can let this vote pass without making a few remarks on the nature of the information already given by the Minister as to the so-called industries in the different towns and villages.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably my hon. friend was not here, when we had a conversation across the floor this afternoon, the purport of which was that we should have a general discussion on this matter at some time when I have all the papers with me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might explain to my hon. friend that there was an item somewhat similar to this, and a re-

quest was made to the Minister for complete information, which he promised to bring down and discuss when a reserved item in the main Estimates is reached. If there are any points my hon. friend specially wants to have information on, he had better add it to this now.

Mr. CASEY. I was not asking the Minister for information. I wish to make some remarks on the information we have already got. All that has been said about the peculiar manner of enumerating the industries of the country and of making capital out of them, has, to my mind, been amply justified by the information already laid before us. When people speak of industrial establishments in ordinary, common-sense language, they mean factories employing some considerable number of hands. For instance, a foundry and a place where cabinetware is made in large quantities, are looked upon as industrial establishments. With all due respect to the Minister's personal aversion to such things, even a brewery or a distillery may be looked upon as an industrial establishment. But when it comes down to speaking of a photograph shop, a millinery shop, a blacksmith's shop, or a cobbler's shop, where one man does all the work, as an industrial establishment and a proof of the success of the National Policy, the whole thing becomes so ridiculous that the usefulness of this report is utterly destroyed. The list which has been read includes a number of such cases. One of them was a cider press, which is hardly an industry. Many farmers have a cider press to squeeze and crush apples for their neighbours, and each of these has an equal right to be called an industry. If the hon. gentleman goes to the back districts of Quebec or Ontario, he will find cases where all the woollen and linen goods for the family are woven and spun; and each of these is as well entitled to be ranked as an industry as many of those that have been included in the roll given to the House during the last day or two. An Indian who makes boxes or axe-handles has the same right to be ranked as an industrial establishment. I do not know whether it is fair to charge all this to the slight bonus offered to the enumerators, and to say, as the newspapers have been saying, that these are fifteen-cent industries. I think the enumerators must have had directions from the Government, apart from the small temptation offered in their terms of agreement, to count every establishment where anything was made, as an industrial institution. For these reasons, I think it is not fair to let this item pass without saying that the census, so far as it relates to the industrial products of the country, has of late become a matter of ridicule, and nothing else.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the item in the main Estimates will give ample scope for a discussion on quarantine?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Quarantine and Public Health...\$15,200

Mr. FOSTER. There was an expenditure of \$9,000, in consequence of additional pressure put upon the several quarantine stations last year, including \$2,000 for medical advisory assistance in the department. Then, there is \$3,200 for a steamer which was bought at Victoria for quarantine purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be advisable for the Minister to inform the House as to what precautions the Government are taking to prevent any contagious diseases finding their way into Canada during the approaching spring and summer, with more particular reference to cholera.

Mr. FOSTER. All the ordinary precautions which are taken by any country upon the threatened approach of cholera, have been, and are now being taken by the Government. These precautions consist, in the first place, of organizing regular quarantine ports at available points on the coast, both east and west. Of course, it will be impossible to have every port equipped for taking care of cholera patients. It will be necessary for all infected vessels to go to the ports where there are regularly equipped stations. Vessels which are not infected may go to any port, and the customs authorities there, with the medical advisory authorities, will see that all vessels are inspected. The principal ports are at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Grosse Isle and Albert Head, the new station which is being fitted up in British Columbia. Everything that science has suggested up to the present, for the destruction of cholera germs and the fumigation and cleansing of vessels, and every reasonable means of caring for passengers who are not infected, together with hospital accommodation for passengers who may be infected with disease, have been taken advantage of. These hospitals, of course, whilst being well equipped, are built on but a reasonable scale, as it would not be advisable to have hospitals which would provide for infected passengers to the number of all the passengers who might come into the country. We hope that we will have none infected, and we certainly do not think that we will have a very large proportion. If the disease were to spread and become very virulent, and a large number of the passengers should be infected, of course, extraordinary measures would have to be taken. Then there are a second order of ports, such as Sydney, C.B., Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Chatham, on the Gulf coast, where, although there are not all these large equipments, there is yet what is considered necessary for taking sufficient care of those ports. These are, briefly, the preparations that have been and are now being made. I might say as well that Dr. Montizambert is in charge, as heretofore, of the St. Lawrence station, which is the most important one we have. It is also intended by

the department to have a medical adviser and inspector, who shall travel, if necessary, to the different ports and see that the conditions there are in perfect order.

Mr. CASEY. What arrangements are made with regard to railway travel? Cholera is just as apt to be imported by rail as in any other way.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter which it is largely the province of the provincial authorities to attend to. The arrangements made there are those which take place when cholera is actually within or approaching the country. They would have to place sanitary officers at each port or place of entry to inspect every train. A sanitary conference was held between the Dominion authorities and the different provinces, at which these matters were discussed, and measures taken for co-operation in every way to prevent the spread of cholera, should it approach our coast. Of course, on the United States border, from which our railway travel comes, we have the advantage of having the assistance of the United States. The United States authorities are making elaborate preparations for a patrolling quarantine along their coasts, so that they provide a fence for us on that side. Unless cholera breaks through that guard and gets into the cities of the United States we are safe on that side, and as far as possible we protect our own coast by the means I have mentioned.

Mr. CASEY. It is too much to ask that the quarantine will be absolutely effective. If a vessel imports cholera, no doubt it will get into some port in the United States. There might be cholera in the West India Islands from which it might be imported into the United States. As regards the inspection, I do not think that is much of a preventive, because the parties infected might be landed in Canada and be there some time before the disease showed itself. It is quite possible a man might become infected in New York and be landed in Canada before the disease developed itself. Then can the hon. gentleman tell us anything with regard to the inspection of clothing? Even if the inspector found a case of cholera on the train, he would be helpless to deal with it in that respect. At the different points where railways cross the border there ought to be facilities for isolating the patients and disinfecting their clothes. If cholera reaches Canada, it will be in this way it will come. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be prepared with details to-day. An official statement of all the precautions taken published broadcast throughout the country would do a great deal to reassure the public mind.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman was good enough to make some general observations in reply to my inquiry. Has he adopted the recommendations of the medical officers who met at the conference?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know to what extent they were adopted.

Mr. MULOCK. Does he know what they recommended?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Mr. MULOCK. How does he know that the department has adopted proper precautions?

Mr. FOSTER. I know it has.

Mr. MULOCK. On whose advice does he say the precautions adopted are sufficient?

Mr. FOSTER. Dr. Montizambert is, I suppose, recognized as an authority, and he is one of our chief men in the quarantine service. The Deputy Minister informs me that he adopted what these experts considered necessary to protect the country.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Grosse Isle is in my county, and Dr. Montizambert told me last summer that he had frequently made application to the Government for what he thought necessary, and the Government always refused to take the precautions he advised. He complained bitterly against the conduct of the Department of Agriculture in not following his instructions. I met him last fall at Montmagny at the closing of navigation, and he said he was very sorry the Government had not taken his advice. While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the reason why the \$20,000 voted last session for repairs and maintenance at Grosse Isle were not spent? I wrote to the Department of Public Works about the 10th July last, asking information. I wanted to know whether they were going to do the work, and, if so, whether they were giving out the work by tender. There were many carpenters in my riding who were thinking of going to the States or elsewhere to get work, but they thought that if this work was to be done, they might as well stay and find work at home. I received a letter signed by D. A. Macpherson, stating: (1) that the work was going to be begun during the month of July, (2) a certain part of the work was to be done by day work, and the balance by contract, (3) the works would be under the control of an officer of the department, and (4) the Government would employ men from the county so far as they could be found. I published this letter, this official letter, and many carpenters spent nearly the whole of July and August waiting for the work to be begun, thus losing nearly half the summer. I think they have good ground for complaint, and I think I have a right to ask why the work was not done, and why this \$20,000, appropriated for the benefit of the public, which might have benefited also the working classes of the neighbourhood, was not spent.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman labours under a mistake; this work does not belong to the county of Montmagny more than to the whole Dominion, and to Bellechase and

L'Islet, which are in the neighbourhood. These have as much right to the patronage as the constituency of my hon. friend.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have no objection to that at all.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I desire, with the permission of the House to present a petition for leave to present a petition for an Act to amend an Act "To incorporate Les Dames Religieuses du Sacré Cœur de Jésus."

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid this is unusual.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I desire to move that this petition—

Mr. SPEAKER. These motions may be made, of course, by unanimous consent. There is no doubt about that. But my view is that it is better to keep within the rules unless there is special reason for the contrary.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Of course, I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to go contrary to your ruling in any way. But I understand that it is important, the company deem it important, that this should come before the House if it be possible, and it is upon these grounds that I ask this indulgence of the House. If I can bring the matter forward now, it will save three or four days.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that we are in Supply, except for the Order of Private Bills. If it is desired to make this motion during the present sitting, it might be well to defer it until the Committee of Supply rises. That will not delay the proceedings in any way.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 98) to amend the Act to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Stairs.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) further to amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the British Columbia Dock Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

Bill (No. 26) relating to the Harbour of Thornbury, on Georgian Bay.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 82) for the relief of Martha Ballantyne—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Mr. AMYOT.

Bill (No. 93) for the relief of James Balfour—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 95) for the relief of Edmund Holyoake Heward—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Automatic Telephone and Electric Company of Canada.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Atlantic and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MULOCK. At six o'clock I requested the Minister, if he deemed it necessary, to have present such officers as might be necessary in order to answer certain questions. I suppose he has either the information himself, or he has the officers here. I now desire to obtain some more specific information as to what has really been done. The Minister, before dinner, gave the committee in his usual way some very general statements in regard to the perfection of the quarantine arrangements. The condition is, doubtless, as he says, but I should like to ask him a few questions. First, has any officer been appointed to inspect any or all of the quarantine stations in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think arrangements have been made for the appointment of a general officer, whose duty will be to inspect all the quarantines and see that they are in perfect order in regard to their sanitary and scientific arrangements.

Mr. MULOCK. Has that appointment been made?

Mr. FOSTER. If it has not been actually made, I think it has virtually been made.

Mr. MULOCK. This is a medical officer to be on duty during the season?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, to be at headquarters to advise the department and to be sent wherever necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman describe the details of all the quarantine arrangements?

Mr. OUMET. We have provided for three steam disinfectors, which are to be completed and in position before the last of this month. A contract has been entered into to that effect with Messrs. Carrière & Lainé, of Lévis. The foundation for these has been laid in cement, and concrete. All the machines have been placed in position,

with the exception of one, which, I think, was taken from Lévis to the Island yesterday. There is one boiler for each disinfectant. Everything will be in readiness before the end of this month. The disinfection of ships has also been provided for, by means of the sulphur blast and the dioxide blast; both systems are to be used. This apparatus will be placed on a tug, and will also be ready before the end of the month. Then, we are providing an apparatus to boil water, (a condenser), in order to have a full and wholesome supply of drinking water for the people who may have to make a stay on Grosse Isle during the summer. We have repaired, cleansed and put into first-rate order all the present buildings, and our men are there now erecting other suitable buildings for the suspects, and also for first-class saloon passengers who may be detained by reason of cases of cholera being found on board the ships on which they may have come over. An apparatus was shipped last week, for the purpose of sinking an artesian well: so that we expect to have the purest water possible.

Mr. LANGELIER. What provision has been made for the landing of passengers? I understand that the Government do not intend to have built this year the wharf which has been suggested. At present, as the hon. Minister must be aware, it is very difficult to land passengers at Grosse Isle.

Mr. OUMET. We shall have two large boats at the disposal of the director of the quarantine, to be used for the purpose of landing passengers. I think we have now the "Challenger," and we shall have the "Druid," and, if necessary, we shall have another boat. We shall have ample means of landing passengers, either sick or in health.

Mr. MULLOCK. I have been told—I know nothing about it myself, as I am not a scientist—that it is idle to expect to obtain pure water at Grosse Isle by boring, owing to the formation being Laurentian.

Mr. OUMET. I am not sure that we shall get pure water; we have to make the trial. But in case we should not, we have provided the means of getting pure water by way of a large condenser.

Mr. MULLOCK. How does the hon. gentleman propose to disinfect the ships in rough weather?

Mr. OUMET. I think they cannot be disinfected in rough weather. But, if the ships have to wait for a few hours, they will not be any worse off than they would be, if we had a wharf, because it is the opinion of the pilots that in rough weather the ships could not reach the wharf. The channel to the Islands is very difficult, so that, in case of accident or mistake, the ships would be in danger of getting stranded. These are the principal reasons why the

Government have not thought it well to incur the expenditure necessary for building a wharf. It is not because we have been afraid of the expenditure, because, if it had been advisable, it would have been done.

Mr. MULLOCK. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the report of Dr. Montizambert, who, I understand, has been in the service of the Government at Grosse Isle for the last twenty years, and who is, probably, quite as familiar with the navigation of the channel, and, perhaps, quite as good an authority on this subject as anybody else, even the pilots. Dr. Montizambert has, over and over again, advised the construction of a wharf. The hon. gentleman says that in rough weather he is going to land the passengers without a wharf. He may not be able to accomplish it. The disinfecting appliance is placed on board a vessel and brought alongside the ship to be disinfected, so that the process of disinfection cannot take place in rough weather. Therefore, without a wharf, a cholera ship may be lying off in rough weather and not be able to land her passengers. The hon. gentleman will see how important it is to have a wharf, even from a humanitarian stand-point alone. How is the hon. gentleman going to land his passengers in rough weather?

Mr. OUMET. In rough weather a large boat will take the passengers and land them at the wharf.

Mr. MULLOCK. Where experts differ, I am not able to express an opinion, but if cholera should come, time will tell whether Dr. Montizambert or the Minister is right. I do attach a great deal of weight, indeed, to the professional opinion of a gentleman of Dr. Montizambert's standing and experience, who has been so many years stationed at the point in question. Besides, the report he has made has been endorsed by the highest medical authority in the country. The last time the Canadian Medical Council met in Ottawa, there were present medical gentlemen of high standing from all parts of the Dominion, with the exception of Nova Scotia, and they unanimously endorsed Dr. Montizambert's recommendation. The predecessor of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Carling, said at that meeting that the Government were fully alive to the importance of the subject, and that everything necessary would be done before spring. With regard to the deep water wharf, he said that it would be built, and that if the channel were not of sufficient depth for vessels drawing twenty-five feet, that would be remedied. He added that although Dr. Bergin said the cost would be \$200,000, the chief engineer of Public Works estimated it at \$100,000. In reply to this, Dr. Bergin said that they might add 50 per cent to that estimate. Mr. Carling proceeded to say that if it was necessary to have more steamers, they could be got by telegraphing for them, and that the ques-

tion of expense would not be allowed to stand in the way. The wharf would be commenced almost immediately at Grosse Isle or at a new station, if it was found necessary to make the change. Special steps were also being taken for protection at Albert Head, B.C., at Halifax, St. John's and other points, all of which points would be well supplied with steam disinfectors. For some reason, however, the present Minister has overruled and disregarded that pledge.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not disregard the suggestion, because I have every respect for Mr. Carling's opinion.

Mr. MULOCK. You are not going to carry out that pledge and have taken serious responsibility in not doing so. How is the hon. gentleman to disinfect the vessels?

Mr. OUIMET. During last season, in the port of New York, over 5,000 ships were disinfected out in the harbour.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows that New York is a land-locked harbour, where a vessel can run into shelter in any weather, no matter what way the wind may be blowing.

Mr. OUIMET. I may say that ship-owners, who will be the principal losers by any delay in the landing of passengers, sent a delegation to the Government, which distinctly stated that it would be quite useless to build that wharf as the vessels could not get to it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. They do not know the place if they say that.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say what accommodations are provided for the suspects and the sick when landed?

Mr. OUIMET. We have a hospital for the sick, we have a building for the convalescents, we have a building for the suspects, and we are now building what the medical assembly required, and that is better accommodation for the first and second-class passengers. In fact we are doing everything these gentlemen asked for, with the exception of building the wharf. We did not object to building that on the ground of expenditure. We have done everything that could be done under the circumstances. I would suggest one thing—that, if there are people who are more responsible than others before the public, they are those who create unnecessary fear by repeating everything that is said that will lead the people to believe that we are not prepared to receive cholera if, unfortunately, it should come. We are ready to receive it, and I think we will successfully cope with it. I hope that if it comes into the St. Lawrence it will never pass Grosse Isle.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope the Minister's prophecy will be fulfilled, but the best way to allay the fears of the people is to let them know that the necessary steps are

Mr. MULOCK.

being taken, and if any questions are successful in eliciting that information, they will have accomplished great good. Now, will the hon. Minister be good enough to say—still referring to the harbour of Quebec—what provision is made for taking care of the passengers who are not suspects and not sick? I presume they will be allowed to land at some point?

Mr. OUIMET. Who are these people?

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose a ship comes in with a clean bill of health and is allowed to pass quarantine. She comes towards the city of Quebec. There are some passengers who do not intend to remain in Canada, but are going to the United States. I understand that, according to the United States regulations, such passengers will not be allowed to pass from Canada into the United States unless it can be shown that they and their effects have been disinfected before being allowed to land, and that being the case, that the officers have recommended to the department to provide another landing station, say at the Louise Embankment or some other convenient point at Quebec City, and to have the necessary apparatus in order to disinfect the effects of those supposed to be in a sound state. If you do not do that, these people will be quarantined in Canada for whatever time the United States require. Is any provision made for these cases?

Mr. OUIMET. One of the great difficulties we meet in treating this question of quarantine is the conflicting powers of this Government and of the local and municipal governments. Last year, for instance, a ship coming in had her clearance at Grosse Isle and was stopped by the medical authorities at the harbour at Quebec. We had no right to interfere, because, after ships received their clearance from the quarantine station which is under our jurisdiction we have nothing more to do with them. If the municipal authorities or the provincial authorities take upon themselves to add any precautions to those we have already taken at Grosse Isle, we have nothing to do with that; we have no jurisdiction. The same ship of which I speak was afterwards, I think, stopped at the port of Montreal. We could not interfere and we did not. Every municipality has the right, I am sure, to protect itself when it has what it considers good reason to be afraid of being infected, and it is within their power to stop any one coming within the limits of the municipality. The steamship companies have some responsibility also, because, after all, these companies, when they sell through tickets from Liverpool, say, to St. Paul, are under obligation to take care of the passengers who have paid them for their transportation. I am sure every case will be treated with the greatest liberality on the part of every one in order to assist these poor people who may be detained, but in such cases as I speak of, we have no jurisdiction.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman has no jurisdiction, I want to attach no responsibility; far from it. But I submit it is part of his duty, having to do with quarantine and with the general health, to put himself in communication with local authorities in order that, between the two conflicting powers, the general public may not suffer. I think it would be well for him to do that, and surely he would win the gratitude of the people. I assume that up to the present time, so far as this Government is concerned, there is no provision for dealing with the class of cases I have referred to.

Mr. OUIMET. Arrangements are being made at the Louise Embankment to take care of these people.

Mr. MULOCK. Made by the province?

Mr. OUIMET. No, by this Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Why, they have no jurisdiction.

Mr. OUIMET. As I said in the beginning, it is a very difficult question to solve, and the Provincial Governments, not later than three or four weeks ago, sent delegates to consult with this Government and settle this question of jurisdiction. But, I think, they had only one way of settling it, and that was to place upon the shoulders of this Government the whole expense and responsibility. I desire to say further, so that the public may not be misled by what the hon. gentleman is saying, that the responsibility for quarantine does not rest with my department, and if I make statements which are in some degree inaccurate or incomplete, I do not want the public to believe that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is responsible for them. My department is only responsible for carrying out the plans that are sent to us by the Department of Agriculture. If they want a building, we build it; if they want anything in the shape of disinfectors, we supply them. But we have no responsibility as to the policy of quarantine.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government as a whole is responsible.

Mr. OUIMET. We are willing to face the responsibility.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government as a whole is responsible and, if the public service is not covered wholly by one department, the Government should see that some other department supply the hiatus. I am not going to try to find out which department is responsible; I asked the Government as a whole what provision was being made at Quebec to deal with the class of cases to which I refer. The Minister told us nothing; he said they had no responsibility. Now he tells me they are doing something by a reasonable arrangement made with the province of Quebec under which the whole responsibility is cast on the Dominion and therefore they are at work. That being the case,

I ask what precautions are being taken at Quebec?

Mr. OUIMET. I understand that a disinfecter will be placed there.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it built, or in process of building for the class in question?

Mr. OUIMET. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. I am told that these matters are most material for a proper system of quarantine, and if any pressure is necessary on the part of the public to force the Administration to do these things, I want to assist on putting that pressure on the Government. I therefore want the Minister to tell the House and the country, if there is provision being made for the disinfecter at the landing point in Quebec. I am told by the medical authorities that that is a most necessary requirement for quarantine. Now I will go to Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word before he goes to Halifax?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is founding his remarks on the report of Dr. Montizambert, and I have before me that report. He may be perfectly satisfied that everything Dr. Montizambert has recommended will be carried out, so far as medical equipment is concerned. I find in that report, dated 31st of August, 1892, that Dr. Montizambert recommends fifteen different things. The first requirement is a deep water wharf. That wharf has been recommended by Dr. Montizambert on several occasions from year to year. It has not been built this year, and the Government takes the responsibility of not building it for these reasons: In the first place, it cannot be built to be available this year, and in the second place, if it were built, it would be of no avail for steamers in rough weather, as was the unanimous testimony of the steamship owners who have visited the Government. The second thing he recommended was putting a second steamer on, as a supply, disinfecting and inspecting boat. That has been provided for. The third recommendation has reference to accommodation for cabin passengers. That is being provided and will be ready when the season of navigation opens.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what extent will that accommodation go?

Mr. FOSTER. It will go to a reasonable extent. The accommodation for cabin passengers is furnished for somewhere between 200 and 500. The third recommendation is: "Accommodation for intermediate passengers." They have buildings there which will be sufficient for about 2,000, and these buildings will be ready for the opening of navigation. The fifth recommendation is: "An adequate water supply for drinking purposes from artesian wells or by condensing and

aerating for drinking purposes." The Minister of Public Works has explained what has been done in that regard in the way of sinking wells and providing condensers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the department satisfied that there is any reasonable probability of obtaining the water by the artesian system?

Mr. FOSTER. They cannot discover that except by experiment, and that is being tried now. Suppose they cannot get water by artesian wells, they must get it in some other way, and they have provided for that by condensation. The 6th recommendation of Dr. Montizambert is: "An adequate water supply for washing, and similar purposes, with a reservoir on the hill with pumps and pipes." That is being provided. The 7th recommendation is: "Completion of steam disinfecting appliances; by the early connection and testing of all three chambers; the fitting up of rain baths; of mercuric chloride tanks; of electric contact thermometers with gongs, and automatic registering dials; the providing of baggage wagons to run to and from the end of the pier; and of galvanized iron wire trunks (with lock and key) to fit into racks on trucks, to prevent mixing of clothing of passengers." As there is no such pier, the arrangements recommended are being made from the pier there at present. The 8th recommendation is: "The providing the steamer "Challenger" with incandescent electric lights, to be charged from her own dynamo. This will save expenditure for coal oil, and greatly obviate the present constant risk of fire." That was not considered necessary, but that is a trivial thing in itself. The 9th recommendation is: "Galvanized iron berths, to replace wooden ones in all the passenger buildings." These are contracted for, and are being made. The 10th recommendation is: "Completion of bath and closet building as per list of 1st September, 1891. That is being carried out. The 11th recommendation is: "Fitting stronger pumps to this building, or in some way increasing the water supply to it, so that the water may come into the tanks as rapidly, at least, as the use of the baths and closets by immigrants takes it out." That is being attended to. The 12th recommendation is: "Completion of bacteriological laboratory by the necessary appliances, as detailed in my official letter and list dated 18th October." That is also being carried out. The 13th recommendation is: "The opening of a telegraph office in the western division for the convenience of vessels and passengers. The present office is in the central division, the most convenient place, as a rule. But a branch office at the wharf, to be attended by the operator whilst a passenger vessel is in quarantine, would be a great convenience. Estimated expense, one instrument, three-quarters of a mile of wire, no poles." That has not been considered necessary, and has

Mr. FOSTER.

not been done. The 14th recommendation is for three more telephones, and that is provided. The 15th recommendation says: "If it be decided"—it shows that Dr. Montizambert must have had some opinion of reserve as to that—"to disinfect luggage and clothing from healthy vessels, some other locality than the quarantine station, which is constantly liable to become infected, would need to be selected and fitted out for that purpose. Arrangements are being made to carry out that. The Dominion Government has a building on the Louise Embankment, and it is proposed to fit that up, and the luggage and clothing from the healthy vessels and passengers will be landed there. So that, on the hon. gentleman's own statement, that we ought to try to do everything that Dr. Montizambert urges, almost all that he has recommended has been, or is now being carried out, with the exception of the deep-water wharf. I think that is a very satisfactory showing for the department.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, a very satisfactory statement. I only wish that it was confirmed by the medical officer. I presume that the hon. gentleman is making his statement on the evidence, probably, of carpenters and people of that kind. This matter is too important to be passed over with glib words, and it is the duty of the Government to send a proper medical expert to examine and to advise on all these matters, and to see that they are being carried out in a scientific way.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought you were satisfied with Dr. Montizambert.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman state that the work has been done, on the authority of Dr. Montizambert?

Mr. FOSTER. I make the statement on an authority which the hon. gentleman ought to take. The department is carrying out the request of Dr. Montizambert, and it is only befogging the issue with words for the hon. gentleman to say that he will not accept this testimony, unless a medical man comes here and states it.

Mr. MULOCK. I say again, that the Minister has no expert evidence to warrant him in making the statement he has now made. If he has, let him say so.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the evidence of the officers of the department who are carrying out this work.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope they are.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not admit it unless you have evidence to the contrary?

Mr. MULOCK. Because the hon. gentleman before dinner made general statements that everything was satisfactory, but now I find his specific statements are inconsistent with that general statement.

Mr. FOSTER. What have you found unsatisfactory ?

Mr. MULOCK. You have not carried out the first recommendation to build the wharf. You have no disinfecting system at Quebec City, and you have not the first provision to supply patients with pure wholesome water.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that there are no sick patients there now.

Mr. MULOCK. Navigation will be opened on the 15th April, and you are talking of boring an artesian well on the 17th March, before the 15th of April. Perhaps after boring through the Laurentian rocks you will not have pure water, and then you will have an infected ship and no water for the patients.

Mr. OUIMET. They have three wells there now, and they have only to boil the water.

Mr. MULOCK. Fancy having suspected persons on an island full of cholera patients, and compelling them to drink water from surface wells. The simplest novice in sanitary science would not make such a proposition as the Minister of Public Works has made, that wells receiving more or less drainage water, when the whole island is full of the excreta of cholera patients, should supply the water for drinking purposes. The Minister has made a most unfortunate slip in making any such suggestion, and no medical officer will sustain him in it. What has been done for the quarantine at Halifax ?

Mr. OUIMET. The same thing that we have done at Grosse Isle, with the exception that it was done on a smaller scale. For instance, instead of having a three compartment disinfector we have a two compartment disinfector. The disinfectors were built and have been sent down and have been placed in position now. We are building a wharf there and we are erecting buildings which will be ready for use when required.

Mr. MULOCK. What has been done for the quarantine at St. John ?

Mr. OUIMET. The same precautions have been taken there.

Mr. MULOCK. Now, with reference to the protection of the border between the United States and Canada. I am told that the principal danger that Canada runs is from cholera being brought in from the United States. However that may be, the conference recommended proper precautions at leading points of contact, and I would ask the Minister to briefly state what provision has been made for quarantine regulations at Niagara, Suspension Bridge, Kingston, Montreal, Windsor and other points of entrance into Canada ?

Mr. OUIMET. There is no danger of the cholera coming that way until it has reached New York and the Atlantic cities. We will take the same precautions then, on a more

extended scale, that we took last year. All the collectors at the ports where railways or boats come into this country from the United States are being made officers of the quarantine departments, with authority to retain the services of medical men in order that every train that comes in will be examined and proper disinfectors will be provided. Of course, in that, we expect the co-operation of the Provincial Governments.

Mr. MULOCK. Are you building disinfectors now, in case they should be required at these different points ?

Mr. OUIMET. They can be bought in Europe and brought here in ten days.

Mr. MULOCK. So that you are depending on a foreign supply. I understand that, at present, no precautions have been provided at ports between the United States and Canada, and that you are going to wait until cholera establishes itself in the United States, and then that you are going to send over to England and get disinfectors.

Mr. OUIMET. There is no fear of cholera coming to Canada from the United States until it reaches the United States, and it is not probable that it will establish itself in the United States this year. Last year they coped with it with very inferior resources, and now that they are warned and well prepared, I should think there will not be much danger. You will find any amount of newspaper talk about the danger that Canada and the United States are exposed to. Reports of that kind do a great deal of harm and no good service. I had a conversation with Dr. Jenkins, who kept cholera at bay at the very doors of New York last summer, and, although he had to contend with the shipping interests and the commercial interests of New York City, and the Washington authorities, who wanted to interfere with his business, he said that one of the worst things he had to contend with was the false reports in newspapers. It was announced all over the continent that four cases of cholera had appeared in New York, but afterwards that was found to be absolutely untrue. I say to the hon. gentleman that the Government is doing all they can in this matter, and the people of this country can rely on us that everything will be done that possibly can be done, to prevent cholera coming to Canada. The best way to prevent cholera coming in is not to alarm the people with false reports.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think we have arrived at that stage of faith cure in medical science that we must not do a little to help ourselves. Perhaps the panicky feeling may not be the best for health, but the worst thing for the public health would be neglect on the part of the department. I will read what the Medical Conference advise. I will read from the report of their proceedings in the "Globe" of 23rd September last.

There were sixty-five medical officers present, and I understand the report was unanimously adopted.

Mr. OUIMET. Every one of them was willing to sacrifice his life for the country!

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the hon. gentleman need sneer at the sixty-five medical men. They came down disinterestedly in the public service for the good of the Minister of Public Works and his family and other people's families, and I think it is unjust for the Minister to sneer at them for giving a report advising the country what to do. At all events, whether they are deserving of the sneer of the hon. Minister or not, this is what they advised him to do. No wonder he belittles them when he ignores their advice:

That quarantine regulations must be made applicable to the protection of all the internal borders of the country, and that houses of observation and for the accommodation of suspects, and hospitals for the treatment of such, be supplied and equipped at Niagara and similar border posts.

The Minister of Public Works tells us that he has entirely ignored that recommendation. He has made no provision whatever for protection as between Canada and the United States, and he intends to wait until cholera breaks out in the United States, and then he will send to England to get the necessary disinfecting appliances to be brought out here for the protection of the public health. He is satisfied with the assurances he has received; he has information in advance that cholera will not come here. The hon. gentleman is living in a fool's paradise, he is going against public opinion, going against the advice of the medical experts and is probably taking on himself one of the gravest responsibilities a Minister ever assumed.

Mr. OUIMET. I protest against the hon. gentleman's strictures. We have done everything that has been recommended by those medical authorities, with the exception of the wharf. I say the wharf is not a necessity, and the hon. gentleman is very unfair.

Mr. MULOCK. In what way?

Mr. OUIMET. In trying to make the public believe we are not doing our duty. The hon. gentleman at once jumps to the conclusion that we are sneering at the medical authorities. The hon. gentleman is not a medical authority. We have followed every recommendation which those medical authorities have made to us, and I say it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to say otherwise. I will say more, from the way he talks it would seem that he would be very glad if cholera would come into the country, so as to be able to say that he was right in charging the Government with incapacity or negligence.

Mr. MULOCK. That is about on a par with all the hon. gentleman's character. I
Mr. MULOCK.

say he is unworthy of his position as a member of this House, I say he is unworthy of his position as a member of the Government—it is a cowardly, an ungentlemanly, a ruffianly observation.

Mr. OUIMET. What is it that is cowardly? A coward sits in your chair—he does not sit here.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the Minister in attributing to an hon. member a desire to see cholera in this country, in order that he might be able to say that the Government had not done their duty, made an assertion unworthy of the hon. gentleman. He had better withdraw the remark.

Mr. PRIOR. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a very unfortunate charge that has been made by the Minister of Public Works, and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. OUIMET. I have not said one word that was not parliamentary.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is in error there. When a Minister of the Crown accuses a member of the House of desiring to have disease brought into the country to sweep away many thousands of people, there is not the slightest doubt he has transgressed the limits of parliamentary propriety.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the first transgression? I think the hon. gentleman transgressed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think he said anything that would warrant such a charge as the Minister was pleased to throw across the floor. I should be very glad to have it established that he did.

Mr. MULOCK. I asserted, and I assert again, that the Minister of Public Works in disregarding the advice of those experts has assumed one of the gravest responsibilities that a Minister of the Crown can assume. I repeat that charge.

Mr. OUIMET. I again protest that we have not disregarded one single recommendation of the medical authorities, with the exception of the building of a wharf at Grosse Isle. I say it is unfair to the Government, and still more unfair to the country to let people believe we have not done all that could be done in order to protect the country against cholera.

Mr. PRIOR. Before this vote is carried I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if I understood him correctly in saying that a medical inspector would be appointed to take charge of all the medical officers in the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. A quarantine officer.

Mr. PRIOR. Because I think this is a very serious matter, especially on the Pacific coast. I believe there is much danger, if not more, of cholera coming from the Orient than there is of coming from Europe. At the present time there are five or six steam vessels running regularly between China and Japan and British Columbia, and on several occasions lately they have brought small-pox to our port. Last year the cities of Victoria, Vancouver and Seattle were all visited with the scourge of small-pox, and there is no doubt it was brought on the steamers running from China and Japan. I have been told during my visit to the departments, especially the Departments of Agriculture and Public Works, that the Government are about to put up first-class quarantine buildings at Williams Head, just outside the limits of Victoria, in the Straits of St. Juan de Fuca, where all ocean vessels have to pass. I am very glad to hear that statement, and I hope the Government will erect first-class buildings, which will give proper accommodation not only to the poor unfortunates who may be stricken down either with small-pox or cholera, but also that they will provide proper buildings for suspects, who have been taken off the ships and who have been in contact with those invalids, and that they will also receive proper treatment in proper buildings at the hands of medical practitioners. I am sorry to say that this has not been the case heretofore, and although the Government are going to do what is right now, for everybody will be thankful, still I believe they have been very lax in the past, and Victoria especially has suffered at their hands. I have no doubt that small-pox in the city has cost the municipal authorities \$75,000 at least, besides the great loss caused to all the merchants and business men in the city. That is attributable, I may say, to the neglect of this Government in not giving us a proper quarantine station before now. The representatives of the province have, for the last eighteen months, been pressing on the Government the necessity of providing a proper quarantine station, but up to the present time we have not been able to induce them to act. They have now, I believe, made up their minds that the matter is serious, because they are threatened with cholera. But small-pox is also a most dangerous disease, and has the effect of causing great loss to everybody in the country. I would like the hon. Minister of Public Works to state publicly here whether he has given orders to have a really first-class quarantine station built there without any further delay, because every day's delay is of the greatest moment to the people of British Columbia. My hon. colleague received a telegram yesterday from Victoria stating that another Chinese steamer had come in with small-pox on board. These steamers carry from 200 to 500 Chinamen on almost every trip, and it is most dangerous to allow them to land unless there are

proper buildings, fences and guards to look after them.

Mr. OUMET. I assure the hon. gentleman that we have taken every measure to have a first-class quarantine station established at William's Head, and that we are going to spend \$97,000 for that purpose. We had Mr. Gamble brought here to confer with the authorities of the Department of Agriculture and our own architect, and he has received every instruction necessary for carrying on the work. Contracts have been let for the steam disinfectors, and they will be ready very soon. I understand that contracts are to be let at once for the buildings. Tenders have been called for the 23rd of this month for the wharf. Everything will be done to make the quarantine first-class.

Mr. PRIOR. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he has not received a claim from the city of Victoria for losses sustained last year, owing to the Government neglecting to have proper quarantine facilities to prevent the small-pox coming into the city. I think that under the circumstances the Dominion Government should stand at least a portion of the expense to which the city was put, and I think that any gentleman who looks into the case and goes through all the correspondence will be of the same opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure that such a claim would not come to my department. I cannot state for certain about it, but I think I remember some claim being made by the city of Victoria in the direction in which the hon. gentleman speaks.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Is the Government going to appoint a second medical assistant at Grosse Isle?

Mr. OUMET. Another assistant will be provided. We shall provide as many assistant doctors as will be necessary.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I hope the hon. minister will appoint Dr. Cote.

Mr. OUMET. If he is recommended to the Minister of Agriculture by the hon. gentleman, I am sure he will be appointed at once.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am informed that the buildings there at present will accommodate from 200 to 500 first-class passengers, and about 2,000 second-class. Are there to be any new buildings in addition?

Mr. OUMET. New buildings are being erected, and they will be ready for the opening of navigation. They have been prepared at Quebec, and they were to go down the day before yesterday. We have sent our own man, Mr. Billings, along with another first-class man, to superintend the work and see that it is done properly and as quickly as possible.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. These buildings are not done yet?

Mr. OUIMET. They are made in sections, and the sections are taken to the island and will be put together there.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand the hon. Minister of Finance to say that all the recommendations made by Dr. Montizambert, with one exception, had been or were being carried into effect. I also understood him to say that a medical inspector would be appointed. I would like to know whether the buildings under construction, the wells being dug, the disinfectors, and all the preparations being made, have been carried on under the inspection of some competent medical expert. I think it is important that that should be done, and that such an officer, if he has not yet been appointed, should be appointed at once. It seems to me that the whole service should be under the inspection of one competent man or a board acting together. I think it would be the greatest mistake possible to have the arrangements carried out in a disjointed manner, with one man at Halifax, another at Quebec, and another at Grosse Isle. I think there should be an acknowledged head at least for the whole Atlantic coast, instead of leaving all the arrangements to the ipse dixit of some officer in the department at Ottawa, who perhaps knows very little experimentally about a matter of such importance. I understand the Minister of Public Works to say that nothing was being done at the towns on the Canadian side of the border between Canada and the United States. I would like to ask him whether means are being taken on the American side to prevent cholera going into the United States from Canada. I understand that there are. At any rate, I know that not very long ago a number of immigrants who were landed at Halifax and passed on to St. Croix on the border between New Brunswick and the state of Maine were not allowed to go into the state, but were all sent back to Halifax. The hon. gentleman seems very sure that there is not the slightest danger of an outbreak of cholera in New York this year. I hope he is corrects in that opinion; but I think that medical men—and I am sorry to see he has not the highest opinion of medical men—who know something of these things, differ with him. I find from very excellent authority that there were cases of cholera during the past season in New York, and it is well known that while the cholera germ becomes dormant during the cold season it only requires warmth to break out again. I rose, however, to ask whether the precautions that have been carried out already have been carried out under the inspection of a medical man.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Billings has had charge of this quarantine matter for some time. He is an architect and has studied the

Mr. OUIMET.

matter with Dr. Montizambert, and besides that, he was sent to Galveston and some other of the best quarantine stations in the United States to make a special study of the appliances in use there, and he has had plans prepared according to the opinions of Dr. Montizambert. If there has been some delay, it is due to the fact that these plans were not quite matured; but everything has since been pushed as rapidly as possible. The hon. gentleman says that I have not much respect for medical authority; but he knows that when doctors differ, laymen have to take one side or the other, and when I said there had been no cases of cholera in New York, my authority was no less than that of Dr. Jenkins, who was really the man who prevented cholera from coming into that city last year. I do not know of any better authority.

Mr. BORDEN. I made the statement I did in view of what I understood the hon. gentleman to say concerning the medical conference which took place here last summer. I think I heard him ask how many of them would risk their lives, so that he seemed to throw doubts on their sincerity. I may tell him that in Halifax, a few years ago, when a ship arrived infected with cholera, four medical men from Halifax volunteered to go on board that ship and to the island at which the patients were landed, and two of these doctors lost their lives in ministering to these unfortunate people.

Mr. JONCAS. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works have told us that they have complied with the recommendations of Dr. Montizambert, and of the medical men who met here last summer, with the one exception of building a wharf at Grosse Isle. When this question of building that wharf came up, I expressed myself very strongly of the opinion that it should be built. Since then, I have taken the trouble of consulting some medical men, and my hon. friend from Cornwall, who is an authority on these matters, told me the other day—and I am sorry he is not here to confirm my statement—that, in his opinion, a deep-water wharf was not necessary at all at Grosse Isle. Now, I have written to Dr. Taché, who has been for a number of years, Deputy-Minister of Agriculture, and who has given much attention to this quarantine question. I have asked Dr. Taché if the disinfection of vessels could be made as easily, as rapidly, and as thoroughly, outside in the stream, as at the wharf, and I asked him if the building of a wharf at Grosse Isle would lessen the danger of the introduction of cholera, and he answered me thus:

To your first question I beg to say that I am of opinion that the disinfection of vessels can be made as rapidly, as easily and as thoroughly outside as at the wharf. I may add that this disinfection can be made with even more security. A vessel cannot be more effectually disinfected than when she is lying at anchor. To the second question, I answer that the

construction of a wharf at deep water cannot in any way diminish the dangers of an epidemic. A wharf is necessary at the quarantine station for the services of the station, but it is sufficient that this wharf should be accessible to vessels employed by the station.

I think it is well that the committee and the country should know that, in the opinion of Dr. Taché, the construction of a deep water wharf at Grosse Isle is not, after all, a necessity, and that the dangers of the introduction of cholera into the country cannot be lessened by the construction of such a wharf. Now, as to the other matter, the Minister of Public Works has just told us that the buildings which are to be erected at Grosse Isle have been sent in, yesterday, in sections. Navigation will not be open on the St. Lawrence for nearly a month and a half—I mean outside navigation.

Mr. LANGELIER. Steam-ships can come up to Quebec even now, without any trouble.

Mr. JONCAS. But, as a rule, navigation does not open at the port of Quebec before the 20th of April, so that we have more than a month in which to put up those buildings. I have no reason to suspect the veracity of the assertions of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance, when they say they have followed the recommendations made to them by Dr. Montizambert. I do not think they are to blame for the course they have thus far taken.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the reasons given for not building the wharf are not satisfactory. It is all very well to quote the opinion of Dr. Taché, who has never lived at the quarantine station of Grosse Isle. On the other hand, Dr. Montizambert has been there for twenty years, and knows better than anybody else what is required, and what can be done. The Government admit that, for the last three years he has been recommending the construction of a deep water wharf. No medical man who is acquainted with questions relating to quarantine, says that this wharf is not desirable. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) says, on the authority of Dr. Taché, that ships can be easily disinfected in the river, but Dr. Taché has never been at Grosse Isle when it is blowing a strong north-east gale, and when disinfection would be impossible. I have visited that station myself when the previous medical superintendent lived at Grosse Isle, and I went with him on board ships when only a light wind was blowing, nothing at all compared with the gales which prevail sometimes for two or three days; the sea was very rough, and I say without hesitation that, during one of these north-east gales, which may prevail for three or four days at a time, no ship could be disinfected; it would be impossible to get alongside a ship with the disinfecting apparatus, and the steamer would have to lie three or four days before anything could be done. No man, who has any knowledge of the River St.

Lawrence at that point, and of the roughness of the sea when the wind blows from the north-east, will say that it is possible to disinfect a ship in the stream. That is the reason why Dr. Montizambert, who has been living there so long a time, is of the opinion that a deep-water wharf is absolutely necessary. I admit that, in ordinary weather, when there is no wind, it would be very easy and very safe to disinfect ships in the river; but at other times, when the wind is blowing, especially from the north-east, it would be completely out of the question. The hon. member for Gaspé knows very well that, at times, we have, in the River St. Lawrence, gales from the north-east, which last for three, or four, or five days; and it is generally during those days that sailing vessels come in large numbers, and when we are more exposed than at other times to see cholera-stricken people coming into the country. Now, as to the objections which have been made to the construction of that wharf, I think they are not at all as great as has been represented. It would require some dredging between the present ship channel and the wharf. Without dredging it would be difficult, if not impossible, for large steamers to come alongside that wharf. But I am told it would not cost much to dredge the river between the present steamship channel and the proposed wharf. Whatever it might cost, if it is necessary to protect this country against a cholera epidemic, we should not hesitate to make the expenditure. It is said that the wharf would not be available this year. I admit that, but if we delay the construction of that wharf, another epidemic may break out at a future time unexpectedly, and the wharf would then become very useful. It may be too late for this year, but not too late for another year. I am told that the dredging could easily be done so as to make the wharf accessible.

Mr. JONCAS. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) has not understood the drift of my argument. I did not quote Dr. Taché to prove that vessels could be disinfected in the middle of the stream in bad weather; but I quoted him to show that the construction of that deep water wharf will not lessen the danger of the introduction of cholera into this country. As to the other question, I have often been at Grosse Isle myself, and I am aware that these north-east gales which occur in the spring and sometimes in the summer, may last several days; but if it is impossible to disinfect a vessel in the stream during one of those gales, it will also be impossible for the vessel even to come up to Grosse Isle. If the weather is bad enough to prevent a vessel from being disinfected in the stream, it will certainly prevent these vessels from coming up to the wharf, even if you had a deep-water wharf there.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. No.

Mr. JONCAS. I have read the reports of the pilots on this matter, and they declare emphatically that in bad weather, not only are the steamers unable to stop at the wharf, but they cannot even get inside the bar. They say they would not take the responsibility of piloting a steamer inside the bar during a gale.

Mr. LANGELIER. If it is left in its present condition, but it can be improved by dredging.

Mr. JONCAS. It is impossible to remove the sand bar by dredging. It has been proposed to deepen the channel outside by dredging, but it is no use to try to dredge in sand. I repeat that it is very dangerous for a steamer in severe weather to come inside that bar. I say again, that I have quoted Dr. Taché, not to prove that a vessel may be delayed sometime by rough weather, but to prove that the construction of a deep-water wharf would not lessen the danger of the introduction of cholera. If the Government have not decided to build this wharf it is because it has been demonstrated by pilots, by ship-owners and by medical authorities, that it would be a useless expenditure.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have great respect for the opinions of Dr. Taché and Dr. Bergin; but I think we might also take the opinion of our own official, and what did he say?

I can only repeat that the deep-water wharf at Grosse Isle is the one essential, all-important, ever-pressing need of the St. Lawrence quarantine service. Until that is supplied and fully equipped as above the service cannot be depended upon, nor be expected to protect the country from the invasion of epidemic disease.

If our officer, the man who ought to know, says that, he must be either right or wrong. If he is right, the Government ought to take his advice and act upon it; if he is wrong, then he is not an efficient officer, and the Government should put Dr. Taché in his place. But as long as Dr. Montizambert insists that this measure is necessary for the protection of the country, the Government ought to heed his advice. Now, as to what the Minister of Public Works said about the difficulties of navigation, I admit that some dredging will be required at the wharf, but not to a great extent, to make it easy for steamers to approach the wharf. I know some pilots have given a contrary opinion; but the great number of pilots and navigators, and those who live on the spot, say that it is quite possible to build a wharf there, and possible for steamers to reach the wharf.

Mr. AMYOT. It strikes me that Dr. Montizambert acts in two qualities, first, as a doctor, secondly, as a seaman, and as an expert in maritime affairs. As a doctor, the Government have accepted the greatest part of his advice, but so far as navigation is concerned, the parties who are interested in

Mr. JONCAS.

navigation do not agree with Dr. Montizambert. If Dr. Montizambert insists, in spite of the maritime interest, in spite of the reports of pilots, in spite of the opinion of all those who know anything about navigation --if he insists in making reports that cause so much trouble, the time has come when the Government should give him some assistance. It is well known by every one who has visited that Island, that it is impossible, on account of the quality of the soil, to build a large and useful wharf there. It is also well known that further down, there are islands where a wharf could very easily be constructed; and then the city of Quebec and its neighbourhood would not be exposed. In case of a cholera epidemic, to the danger of a large number of people being buried on that island and thus exposing to contagion the inhabitants of the city. It will be a constant danger to the city if, in case of an epidemic, the island should become a cemetery for the burial of those who may die there. Under these circumstances I strongly urge upon the Government not to build a wharf at Grosse Isle without first ascertaining whether there are not other islands where it would be much safer for the general public to construct a wharf which would be at all times easily accessible to large steamers. I approve of the course of the Government in adopting all necessary precautions against the introduction of cholera, but I also approve of their hesitation in going to a useless expenditure, which would also be a source of danger to the city and neighbourhood of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is evident from the discussion to-night that the Minister of Public Works, at all events, takes an optimistic view of the matter of the introduction of cholera during the coming season. This question, above all others, is one in the consideration of which we ought not to lose our temper, but we should approach it with a desire to arrive at a just conclusion as to what is best to be done. Great interests are involved. The introduction of a pestilence into this country is something to be dreaded; and if we settle down to the belief that there is no likelihood of cholera coming this summer, I think we are making a great mistake. There are symptoms just now on the continent, which are not of a reassuring character. Cholera is in fact manifesting itself at various points in Europe, and many cases of it have broken out during the winter. The indications are that we are in danger of an outbreak during the coming season. If precautions are to be taken, they must be taken in good season, and the circumstances do not warrant us in believing that we will escape a visitation of the pestilence during the coming year. It reached the shores of America late last season, and we have no reason to suppose that it will be as late in coming in during the present season. It reached Hamburg rather late in the season, and it

is there now. The disease will appear, in all probability, in Hauburg and other seaboard cities in Europe, as soon as the warm weather begins. If immigrants are to be brought into this country again this year, it will be almost a miracle if the disease is kept out of the country. I doubt whether we do not need a deep-water wharf at Grosse Isle. Possibly it would have been judicious to remove the quarantine station to some better point. But I believe the greatest sources of danger will be at inland points. The greatest stream of immigration comes to New York and passes on towards the west. I apprehended that one of the most dangerous points is at Suspension Bridge, a point on the great trunk lines from New York to the west. It is a point that should be guarded with as much care, I think, as the entrance to the St. Lawrence. There are other interior points also, and it is the duty of the Government to make preparation at those points. If there is any conflict of opinion, any question as to the jurisdiction between the Provincial and Dominion authorities, this is not the time to haggle about it. Let the Dominion Government assume its national responsibility in this matter and see that proper precautions are taken at all these points. It is insufficient to guard the entrance into our seaboard ports; we are more likely to have cholera introduced at inland points from the United States. Cholera, beyond all question, will be found in New York before it is found in Quebec, and will be transmitted from New York westward; and if it once gets a foothold in New York, it will require the utmost vigilance to prevent its becoming epidemic in Canada. Now, the fact that there has been a claim made upon the Government for a large sum of money because it has not discharged its duty in the matter of quarantine against small-pox at Victoria, is a significant one. If a claim has been made for \$100,000 damages against the Government, it would seem to indicate a very strong belief, on the part of the inhabitants of British Columbia, that the Government has not discharged its duty in regard to quarantine matters there. Although we are naturally anxious to guard against expenditure, yet this is a matter where so great interests are involved, that the Government may well dismiss the economic and prudential considerations that should govern them under ordinary cases, and take the steps that may be necessary, that will be necessary, in case the disease is introduced here—not assuming that it is not likely to come. I am sorry to see the Minister of Public Works take the ground, that probably we will not have the disease this year. I do not want to say a word here that will create a feeling of alarm or uneasiness among the people, but it would be folly to shut our eyes to the probabilities of the case. We want to be prepared, and we want to realize that there is great danger, indeed, more than danger,

that this disease will be introduced this year. Now, it strikes me that the duty of the Government at interior points has not received that consideration it deserves. We have seen the Medical Council that met last September, sixty-five doctors, making recommendations, and the Minister of Public Works speaks of that declaration of physicians in rather deprecating terms, indeed almost sneeringly. The occupants of the Treasury benches have no right to assume that they understand this case better than do the medical men. They are bound to give due and favourable consideration to the formally expressed opinion of those gentlemen, arrived at after full discussion and concurred in by all. We want to realize that this is a matter of grave importance, that we are dealing with a question of greater moment than matters of merely material interest and progress. It is different from subjects ordinarily dealt with by the Government for it is a matter of life and death, and let us so grapple with it. Let us not deal with it from a party stand-point or with party feeling or with a desire to make political capital out of it. I hope the Government will review their decision on all these points. I hope they will not be guided by the assumption that the disease is not likely to be here, but that they will be on the alert to the danger that is threatened, that they will see the necessity of the utmost efficiency in the arrangements made in order to guard against this threatened epidemic. Whatever money may be necessary to ensure the adoption of proper precautions, will be cheerfully granted by Parliament and the people, and it will be a crime for the Government to withhold arrangements and refrain from taking all precautions necessary, simply on money considerations

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have listened carefully to the debate, and I frankly admit that I did not at once appreciate the importance of the suggestion made by Dr. Montizambert, which the Minister of Finance says is the only practical recommendation the Government have not accepted. The hon. gentleman from Montmagny read part of the report, and I have read the report since. I begin now to see the meaning of the deep-water wharf and why it is necessary, as part of the appliances to protect us from this dreaded scourge. I do not desire to press on the Government the necessity of building it, until the Minister has answered one or two questions. I think the hon. member for Bellechasse intimated that Dr. Montizambert's opinion was very well from a professional stand-point, but that the pilots said it was impossible to construct a wharf there. If the Government has determined not to carry out that essential requisite for prevention, they should be prepared to state authoritatively to the House, whether the statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse is true, whether they have informa-

tion before them which satisfies them beyond a doubt that a wharf cannot be constructed there, on account of lack of water or other physical impediment.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bellechasse did not make that statement, and that is not the current of the discussion to-night. The whole question is, not whether it is possible to build a wharf, because, if you have money enough and time enough, you can build a wharf anywhere, but the question is, whether, when such a wharf is built, it will be productive of adequate benefit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I mean a wharf for practical utility.

Mr. FOSTER. If so, that is quite different from what the hon. gentleman said a few moments ago. The whole point is, whether if a wharf was built, it could be utilized and would act beneficially as regards vessels, from a quarantine point of view. Nobody doubts that, if the wharf was built, as suggested, it would be very convenient in fine weather for vessels to come to it and discharge their passengers and be disinfected. That would save time to the steam-ship owners and facilitate the operation. But the question is, whether that would be a benefit in rough weather; and there is doubt on that point. Some of the pilots think vessels could go there, but most of them think vessels could not utilize the wharf in rough weather. The main thing, however, is as to what the steam-ship owners themselves think, and their opinion is, that in rough weather no owner would bring his vessel there. That is the very time when the wharf is required for disinfection. My hon. friend, if he will look into the question, will find there is not a quarantine station in the world where there is a wharf at which vessels are disinfected, and at many of them there are rougher currents and rougher weather than we have in the St. Lawrence. The work of disinfection is done by a vessel that lies alongside the incoming steamer and disinfects it. That is about the position of the question as regards the deep-water wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that you can carry it out with a vessel lying alongside the infected vessel.

Mr. DALY. It was done in New York last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. And there were great complaints respecting it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Dr. Montizambert concludes his report by stating that these modern methods have been in use on the St. Lawrence for several years and have proved effective during ordinary years, but until the deep-water wharf was built and equipped as described by him, the St. Lawrence quarantine station would be quite in-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

sufficient to cope with disease during an epidemic. My point is this: With a report such as that of the medical superintendent before them, the Government were bound to do one of two things; to ascertain, beyond a possibility of doubt, whether, from a medical stand-point, that opinion was good or bad, and, if they came to the conclusion that the doctor's opinion was well-founded, and that a wharf could not be built at Grosse Isle, it was perfectly apparent that it should have been built somewhere else. If Dr. Montizambert's statement is true, that the methods the Government have at present in operation there may do during an ordinarily healthy year, but are quite insufficient to keep out disease in an epidemic form, then the fact is that all the money spent has been thrown away and we are resting in a very false state of security. Of course it is impossible for me to give an opinion on this question, but I assume the Government have received the assurances of practical gentlemen as to whether a wharf can be built so as to be useful after it is built. If the exposed condition of Grosse Isle is such that a wharf would be of no service there in rough weather, surely the alternative must have presented itself to practical men to build the wharf elsewhere, if it is an absolute necessity for grappling with the cholera. If the Government have taken the opinion of others as reliable as Dr. Montizambert, and found that his recommendation for this wharf is unfounded, then, perhaps, we need not go to the expense of building it; but we cannot afford to have an epidemic in Canada, and, if a wharf is necessary to keep it out, and Grosse Isle is not the proper place for it, build it somewhere else.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman is arguing on the assumption that the cholera cannot be kept out without the wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; I say that it should either be built, or the Government should get evidence to prove that Dr. Montizambert's recommendation of a wharf is not justified.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the wharf would be useful principally for landing passengers and handling baggage more easily; but if the hon. gentleman has given any attention to the subject, he must know that, last summer, vessels were miles outside of the harbour of New York when they ran up the yellow flag, as a signal that there was cholera on board, and that the health officials went out and disinfected them there with every success. It is true, it was not done as conveniently or as quickly as it would be done if the vessel were run up to a wharf, where the appliances would be stationary and where the baggage would be transferred to trucks that could run from the

vessel to the chamber for disinfecting them and back to the side of the vessel; but that is only a matter of convenience and a little time. With regard to what was said by the hon. member for King's N. S. (Mr. Borden) about the danger of cholera patients coming into Canada from New York, I wish to say that, when I saw a rumour in the press that cholera was allowed to get a foothold in New York, I looked into the medical reviews published in that city, and I found in them no authentic account of cholera getting into the country, from which I concluded that it was not the case. Notwithstanding the fact that there is ten or twenty times as much shipping at New York as comes through the St. Lawrence, the health officers there grappled successfully with the cholera without the convenience of a wharf, and, therefore, we may conclude that it is not by any means impossible or improbable that we shall be able to do the same in Canada. I may state that the Deputy-Minister of Public Works was brought before the Committee on Agriculture the other day to state what was being done in regard to quarantine, because some members of that committee, like members here to-night, were anxious to know whether active measures were being taken to avoid the danger of cholera; and the committee were told that almost the whole staff of the department had been engaged, during almost their whole time in the last three months, in getting out plans and pushing on the work of properly equipping the quarantine stations. The information given, I think, satisfied every member of that committee that everything that was possible was being done in the direction aimed at, and that there was no ground for apprehension by reason of any laxity on the part of the department. I admit that we would be safer if there were quarantine regulations on the frontier between Canada and the United States; but hon. gentlemen must not forget that there are quarantine stations at New York, Boston and other ocean ports, along the United States, where vessels arriving will be disinfected. But, if the disease should pass those stations, we have an Act which prohibits the carrying on railways of passengers having infectious or contagious diseases. But, with regard to regulations made by this Government, if it was attempted to enforce them against passengers coming into the province along the frontier, we might encounter the same difficulty that we had a few years ago when it was proposed to establish a Dominion health association, that is, a conflict of authority between the Dominion and the province. Supporters of the Government of Ontario protested against the right of the Dominion undertaking anything of that kind, contending that the province had the right, in connection with municipal regulations, to look after the public health and to detain

passengers known to be infected with contagious or infectious disease. Therefore, in the event of any cholera patients escaping the health officers of New York or Boston, and coming to Canada, our provincial authorities could stop them at the frontier. They could even stop intercourse between the two countries until they were satisfied that no passengers having infectious disease would come in. So that I apprehend there is no danger from that source. With regard to these quarantine stations, I think the Government are doing all that can be done. The committee satisfied itself the other day that the department was attending to the work most energetically, and that, before navigation opened, every one of these quarantine stations would be ready for the reception of passengers who might be infected with cholera or any other contagious disease.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask whether the precautions taken against the introduction of cholera are being extended to Charlottetown?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Militia and Defence—To provide for payment of annual drill to be performed in camps of instructions in the month of June \$100,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you to cut down the grant for next year to this extent?

Mr. FOSTER. The drill has for several years taken place in June, and we have been in the habit of paying from the vote which became available on the 1st of July. That plan was an irregular way of doing it, and it was thought better to make this year a supplementary grant of \$100,000, which will enable the bills to be paid this year. We have the whole grant next year, but that cannot be lowered because next June, if drill takes place, \$100,000 will be required for that drill.

To pay claim of the City of Ottawa, Taxes from 1880 to 1892, inclusive, on the unused land, Rifle Range at Ottawa, leased by Government \$3,693 22

Mr. OUIMET. This is a settlement between the city of Ottawa and the Government with reference to lands used for rifle ranges. The chief part of the claim is brought before the Government and was met by a counter claim that we had, and the whole matter was referred to the Justice Department. The claim of the city of Ottawa consisted of several items, one of which was taxes for that part of the land which was not used for a rifle range, although included in the lease, and the city complained that they should not be deprived of the revenue, as

the ground was not really held for Government purposes. The greatest part of the claim was for taxes for local improvements, and the Government came to the conclusion that it was not fair to have these improvements paid for by the citizens when they benefited our buildings. These improvements consist of drains, sewers, &c., which otherwise we would have had to build at our own expense.

To pay T. J. Galbraith, landing waiter in Her Majesty's customs at Dunnville, Ont., in addition to his salary for services as acting sub-collector from 1st March, 1892, to 28th February, 1893. . . . \$300

Mr. FOSTER. For several years we have not adopted the principle of paying officers for over-service ; but this is a special case in which this officer saved the expense of appointing another officer. He had one port which he took charge of, and the other was six or eight miles further away. His son, a young man, took care of the home office, while he drove out to the other port. His son had the salary.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) to amend the Act respecting public officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With respect to the issue of commissions, the present law provides that the Governor in Council may decide as to the officers and class of officers of the Civil Service that may receive fees for commissions issued, and some doubt has arisen in regard to the payment of such fees, it being held by some officers that those fees could not be demanded from them. This Bill is to remove the doubt in that regard as to commissions that may be issued.

Mr. OUIMET.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BREWERIES AND DISTILLERIES.

Mr. FORBES (for Mr. Flint) asked, What was the number, according to the last census, of breweries and distilleries in Canada and the location of each ? The number of employees therein ? The quantity and value of raw material ? The quantity and value of the output ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Census of 1891. Number of breweries, 144. Located according to provinces as under : Manitoba, 9 ; New Brunswick, 4 ; Nova Scotia, 5 ; Ontario, 82 ; Quebec, 25 ; British Columbia, 18 ; Prince Edward Island, 1 ; total, 144. Employees, 1,840. Wages paid, \$891,381 ; raw material used, \$2,530,631 ; finished product, \$5,717,873. Number of distilleries, 8. Located as under : Nova Scotia, 1 ; Ontario, 7. Total number, 8. Employees, 404 ; wages, \$178,950 ; value of raw material, \$1,226,019 ; value of products, \$2,199,600.

PORT HOPE INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Port Hope ? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers ? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment ?

Mr. FOSTER. In Port Hope the industrial establishments are as follows :—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Knitting Factories—	
T. C. Elliott & Co.	3
Walter Waller	1
Carriage Factories—	
R. Clarke	3
J. O'Brien	3
Blacksmiths—	
Wm. Kingdom	1
Thos. Leonard	1
Wm. Evans	1
Alex. Gilmour	1
T. Van Home	1
H. Radcliffe	1
Glue Factories—	
Lickmor & Hawkins	3
E. Burnett	4
Bakers—	
Wm. Jewell	1
E. Shuman	1
W. Hall	1
F. Doney	1
Jas. George	2
Sam Hugh	1

Industry.	Hands employed.	Industry.	Hands employed.
Confectioners—		Harness and Saddlery—	
S. Hooker.....	1	Wm. Black.....	2
P. Connell.....	1	J. Thompson.....	2
John Curran.....	1	V. A. Coleman.....	1
Flour and Grist Mills—		H. Hales.....	1
W. & J. Greevy.....	3	Repairer of Musical Instruments—	
H. Barrett.....	3	R. B. Williamson.....	3
Tinsmiths—		Tailors—	
Geo. Gamble.....	3	H. Richards.....	2
J. Brundrett.....	4	C. Marrifield.....	12
M. Millward.....	2	Jas. Clarke.....	12
S. Spry.....	1	E. Budge.....	13
W. J. Foster.....	3	R. Bauleh & Son.....	6
R. Dunn & Co.....	4	W. Stevenson.....	10
Dressmakers and Milliners—		John Martin.....	2
Mary Creamer.....	3	E. Jenkins.....	1
Ann Haddon.....	2	C. Lithgow.....	1
E. Hewson.....	1	Wm. Skitch & Sons.....	12
E. Strickland.....	1	F. E. Sandrie.....	10
S. Paul.....	1	Sash, Doors and Blinds—	
Jas. Craick.....	6	J. W. Wallace.....	4
E. Little.....	4	S. Coombe.....	3
J. & T. Wickett.....	4	Photographers—	
Till & Spotten.....	1	E. Hamby.....	2
M. Cook.....	2	E. Neal.....	3
E. Glass.....	3	Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
R. Burnett.....	1	R. Davy.....	1
Mrs. Ryan.....	9	Jos. Tait.....	1
Misses Barrie.....	1	Alex. Pringle.....	1
Miss Geary.....	6	R. Scott.....	2
N. Hockin.....	3	Book Binding—	
Misses Dundas.....	9	W. Williamson.....	4
M. Brookume.....	1	Foundries and Machine Shops—	
F. Roberts.....	1	J. Helm.....	6
Jane Brock.....	1	Wm. Wallace.....	8
Misses Cochrane.....	3	Geo. Gibbs.....	1
Misses Clarke.....	1	Tanneries—	
E. Massie.....	3	Jas. Robertson.....	5
S. Jewell.....	2	Craig & Son.....	32
Jas. Foy & Co.....	3	Hair Work—	
E. Oliver.....	2	Jas. Williams.....	1
Misses Milligan.....	2	Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
Eliza Beggs.....	1	J. W. Smith.....	1
Mrs. Wright.....	1	J. T. George & Son.....	1
Lime Kiln—		W. McLean.....	1
H. Payne.....	3	J. Walker.....	7
Sails, Tents and Awnings—		Gas Works—	
Jas. Stone.....	2	Port Hope Gas Co.....	4
Pump Factory—		Cordage Works—	
John Record.....	1	Consumers Cordage Co. (Limited).....	32
Breweries—		Ship Yards—	
Jas. Calutt.....	3	H. Hackett.....	5
St. Ambrose Winslow.....		Wm. J. Hicky.....	19
Bruot Malt Co.....	25	Electric Light—	
Boots and Shoes—		Port Hope Electric Light Co.....	4
M. Simon, jr.....	4	Fish Curing—	
J. Lees.....	1	B. Woollard.....	3
Wm. Kelly.....	3	Copperine—	
Wm. Coots.....	1	A. W. Spooner.....	6
Wm. Brownscombe.....	1	Coopers—	
R. Johnstone.....	6	F. Beamish.....	3
J. Thompson.....	1	R. Rankin.....	1
H. McCarthy.....	1	Weaver—	
D. Pillsworth.....	1	C. Green.....	2
F. Foster.....	1	Carpet maker—	
W. Marshall.....	1	Andrew Hooley.....	1
F. Sanisbury.....	1	Carpenters—	
Harness and Saddlery—		James Tape.....	2
Robt. Warner.....	1	R. Stott.....	1
Thos. Earle.....	1	Arated Water—	
J. R. Smith.....	1	Wm. Serfet.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Dried Fruit--		Boots and Shoes--	
W. J. Ferguson & Co.....	12	Thomas Coventry.....	2
Planing Mill--		Robert Willis.....	4
J. Fricks.....	1	Hamilton & McGimies.....	2
Land Plaster Works--		D. McCullen.....	1
F. Beamish.....	4	J. Glass.....	1
Printing--		D. McIntyre.....	
Geo. Wilson & Son.....	9	Carriage Works--	
Hayes & Laird.....	12	J. Smith.....	
File Manufacturers--		J. Dorsey.....	10
Outram & Grose.....	63	S. Barton.....	3
Meat Curers--		Cabinet and Furniture Factories--	
John Whitman.....	1	M. Robertson.....	4
Geo. Steacey.....	1	Broadfoot & Box.....	95
J. Curtis.....	2	Confectioner--	
Picture Framers--		J. Burgess.....	1
Mark Smith.....	1	Carpenter--	
Jones & Natrass.....	2	J. Hughes.....	1
Leather Lace Factory--		Coopers--	
S. A. Buckell.....	17	W. Ament.....	3
Furriers--		E. C. Coleman.....	6
E. Gordon.....	2	A. W. Ogilvie.....	1
F. Dodder.....	4	Samuel Trott.....	1
Marble and Stone Works--		Creamery--	
Cooper & Rutter.....	2	J. Hannah.....	3
Fancy Goods--		Cider Mill--	
Eva Hooker.....	1	J. Klein.....	2
Agricultural Implements--		Dressmaking--	
T. Hayden.....	7	Misses Ballantyne & Brett.....	2
Rug making--		M. Nevills.....	2
John Holmes.....	2	M. Wright.....	3
Refrigerator Factory--		E. Campbell.....	6
Jefferson Zimmerman.....	1	B. Murphy.....	2
		M. Simpson.....	3
		X. Dickson.....	2
		E. Shaw.....	3
		J. Boswell.....	3
		M. Stogdill.....	2
		R. Grieve.....	1
		Margt. Belt.....	1
		M. & H. Berry.....	2
		Ed. McFauls.....	6
		Wm. Richard.....	4
		Electric Light--	
		Seaforth Electric Light Co.....	1
		Flour and Grist Mills--	
		Wm. Code & Co.....	3
		A. W. Ogilvie & Co.....	16
		D. D. Wilson.....	10
		Foundry--	
		T. T. Coleman.....	10
		Fancy Goods--	
		S. Moran.....	1
		M. Stevenson.....	2
		S. Carlisle.....	2
		Flax Mill--	
		Livingston & Bros.....	20
		Woollen Factory--	
		A. G. Van Egmond & Sons.....	52
		Weaving Factory--	
		M. A. Ryan.....	1
		Knitting Establishment--	
		Ida Arbuckle.....	1
		Meat Curing--	
		Robert Beattie.....	2
		Photographers--	
		Allen Bansbough.....	1
		Andrew Calder.....	1
		Sash and Door Factory--	
		J. H. Broadfoot.....	12

SEAFORTH INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Seaforth, as per census returns? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment? 4. What is the value of land and buildings attached to each industry? 5. The value of the output of each industry?

Mr. FOSTER. The different industries in the town of Seaforth are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Ashery--	
John Joynt.....	3
Bakeries--	
Clark & Ingram.....	3
Alex. Carduo.....	4
Blacksmiths--	
J. Rale.....	2
Alex. Stewart.....	1

Mr. FOSTER.

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Tin Shops—		Button Factory—	
Johnston Bros.	2	Port Elgin Button Co. (Ltd).....	34
Charles Whitney.....	3	Carpenter—	
Andrew Kidd.....	2	James Chapman.....	1
Harness—		Carriagemakers—	
J. Ward.....	3	Jacob Howe.....	4
S. Henderson.....	4	Moses McBride.....	1
Jos. Gillispie.....	2	J. C. Kennedy.....	1
Printing—		Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
M. McLean.....	11	James Muir.....	1
F. G. Mullin.....	5	Ernest Vaupil.....	1
Planing Mill—		Dentists—	
Cluff & Bennett.....	5	Henry Robinson.....	1
Stave Factory—		Dressmakers—	
T. & E. Coleman.....	6	Margaret Bell.....	7
Saw Mill—		Margaret Green.....	2
E. C. Coleman.....	9	Mrs. Burton.....	2
Salt Works—		Mary J. Esplin.....	1
T. T. Coleman.....	23	Barbara Twill.....	7
Stone and Marble—		Dinicon Labrock.....	2
D. Grant.....	2	Maggie McCall.....	3
Tailors—		Ruby and Hilker.....	1
Bright Bros.....	21	Zina Schrink.....	3
M. Pillman.....	3	Martha Stewart.....	2
H. Spere.....	11	Jenny Coffey.....	3
J. Williams.....	2	Foundry and Machine Shop—	
Richard Deem.....	2	William Oetschlagar.....	6
PORT ELGIN INDUSTRIES.		Fish Curing—	
Mr. ROWAND asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the village of Port Elgin, as per census returns? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment? 4. What is the value of land and buildings attached to each? 5. What is the value of the output of each?		Joseph Bowes.....	5
Mr. FOSTER. In Port Elgin they are as follows:—		Flour and Grist Mills—	
		George A. McKay.....	4
		John C. Hide.....	2
		Harness and Saddlery—	
		Thomas Elam.....	1
		John Hutton.....	2
		Photographers—	
		George Briggs.....	1
		Charles Severy.....	1
		Patent Medicines—	
		Martin F. Eby.....	5
		Pump Factory—	
		M. Detwiler.....	1
		Printing—	
		Munro & McKenzie.....	2
		Pork Packing—	
		Sam Eby.....	2
		Picture Framing—	
		Moses Eby.....	1
		Saw Mills—	
		Port Elgin Brush Co.....	7
		David Eidt.....	6
		Tailors—	
		John H. Wallace.....	8
		H. Beeker.....	3
		John Campbell.....	2
		Tinsmiths—	
		James H. Kennedy.....	1
		Jos. & John Thompson.....	2
		George McLaren & Co.....	2
		Tanneries—	
		Emanuel H. Eby.....	5
		Philip Cress.....	20
		Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
		Alexander Moffat.....	3
		John E. McIntosh.....	1
		Weaving—	
		Allen Barbour.....	1
		Susan Brown.....	1
		Christina Shoemaker.....	1
		Woollen Mill—	
		M. G. Barber.....	10
Agricultural Implements—			
Sam. Buschlen.....	9		
Boots and Shoes—			
Dennis McFarlane.....	1		
Daniel Barclay.....	1		
Neil McGillivray.....	1		
James George.....	1		
Reuben Hilker.....	1		
Bakers—			
Mary A. Bowes.....	4		
William Martin.....	3		
Broom Factory—			
Port Elgin Brush Co.....	45		
Blacksmiths—			
Rolland D. Northgrave.....	2		
Robert M. Lowry.....	1		
David Hunt.....	1		
Jacob Hessmaner.....	3		
Brickyard—			
Smith Bros.....	14		

TRANSPORTATION OF CATTLE.

Mr. JONCAS (for Mr. Henderson) asked, Is it the intention of the Government this session, for the purpose of preventing speculation in vessel space, to introduce legislation fixing a maximum rate to be charged by any person for the transportation of cattle from the port of Montreal to ports in Great Britain?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this session for that purpose.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What progress has been made in the direction of getting the embargo now placed upon the shipment of live stock to England, removed? Do the Government expect to get the order scheduling Canadian cattle removed by the opening of navigation?

Mr. FOSTER. The last telegram that has been received is one from Sir Charles Tupper, dated the 17th inst., as follows:—

Mr. Gardner stated House of Commons last night he had arrived conclusion should not be justified restoring privilege free entry Canadian cattle until in possession additional evidence which systematic examination extending over reasonable and sufficient period of lungs cattle landed for slaughter at ports would afford. He trusted result such examination would confirm view slaughter at port could be waived with reasonable security against importation diseased animals, in which case and absence any unfavourable news from Canada he considered should be bound under statute allow free entry be resumed. He added examination would not be prolonged beyond period found necessary for purpose, and that the more numerous the cattle arriving the shorter will necessarily be period examination.

REPAIRS TO QUEBEC DRILL HALL.

Mr. FREMONT asked, How many masons have been employed to the repairs made to the Drill Hall in Quebec, in September and October last? How many days were they employed? What wages were allowed them per diem? What amount has been actually paid them per diem? Is it the intention of the Government to pay them the difference?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I am informed that the work was performed under contract, and the Government have nothing whatever to do with the payment of the men employed,

CONDUCT OF DETECTIVE SKEFFINGTON.

Mr. OHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government, the hon. Minister of Railways, Mr. D. Pottinger, General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway, or Mr. Schrieber, Deputy-Minister of Railways, have received, since 1890, any complaint as to the conduct of Detective Skeffington, employed on the Intercolonial Railway, or in some other capacity.

Mr. FOSTER.

city, by the Government? If so, what person or persons made the said complaints, and what were the grounds thereof?

Mr. HAGGART. Neither of the parties named has received any complaint against Detective Skeffington.

SPEECH OF THE CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. CASEY (for Mr. Davin) asked, Whether the Controller of Customs is correctly reported as having said, in the course of a speech at a banquet at Kingston, on Friday: "Our friends (meaning Orangemen in Ireland) over there will never submit; Britain may cast them out, but if she does she has no right to look for their further allegiance. They are preparing for action. Their unalterable determination is never to submit to Home Rule, and they will have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada. Aye, more than sympathy, they will have our active aid if that active aid be necessary. We shall be unworthy of our ancestors if we fail in our duty at such a crisis."

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is possessed of no information on that subject.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the Controller of Customs give the information, if the Government cannot? He is here.

Mr. WALLACE. I am ready to give the information at any time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak now.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not been asked yet.

IMPROVEMENT OF SPANISH RIVER.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Devlin) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to dredge the bars at the mouth and otherwise to so improve the Spanish River, in the province of Ontario, as to permit deep draft ships to navigate said river?

Mr. OUMET. The hon. gentleman will have to wait until the Estimates are brought down.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FREMONT asked, By what lines of steam-ships are the mails carried between Canada and Great Britain? Are there any contracts entered into with such lines, and if so, for what period of time? What does the Government pay for such service? Has the Government abandoned the idea of having a Canadian fast line of steamers carrying the mails to Great Britain? If not, what progress has been made towards the settlement of this question?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the first question: By the Allan line, by the

Cunard, the White Star, North German Lloyd via New York. 2nd. There is a contract for the carrying of mails by the Allan line for one year, from 24th December, 1892. 3rd. The amount paid to the Allan line is \$126,533.33. For the mails sent by New York, payment is made to the United States Post Office, at the rates fixed by the Postal Union regulations, namely, 5 francs per kilometre for the letters and 50 centimes per kilometre for other matter. 4. No. 5. Negotiations are still going on in reference to that important question.

TOBACCO DUTIES.

Mr. DUGAS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a change in the mode of collecting the duties on tobacco?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is not.

MR. ALPHONSE GUAY.

Mr. WELSH asked, 1. Is Mr. Alphonse Guay, who was employed in the Government Printing Bureau, and who left last fall to accept a situation in the Weights and Measures Office in Quebec, the son-in-law of Mr. Simard, M.P. for Charlevoix? 2. At whose request was Mr. Guay so transferred?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That application was made when I was Minister of that department. It is my opinion that he is a son-in-law of Mr. Simard. He was appointed to fill a vacancy on the recommendation of some members in that district.

PORT ALBERT HARBOUR.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, 1. Has the Government advertised for tenders for repairing Port Albert harbour? 2. If so, has the contract been let? 3. If let, what is the amount of the contract? 4. How many tenders were put in? 5. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tender? 6. What is the name of the contractor? 7. If tenders have not been called for, is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work during the coming summer?

Mr. OUMET. 1. Yes; 25th January last. 2. Yes; contract signed by contractor 10th March inst. 3. \$10,497. 4. Six. 5. Yes. 6. Patrick Navin.

WHARF AT ILE PERROT, IN THE COUNTY OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LANGELIER (Translation) (for Mr. Brodeur) asked, 1. What is the cost of the wharf constructed on the south side of Ile Perrot, in the county of Vaudreuil? 2. To whom was the money given for the construction of the said wharf?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The total cost of the wharf constructed on the south side of

Ile Perrot, in the county of Vaudreuil, was \$12,410.55. The work was done in 1887-88 by contract. The lowest tenderer was Mr. Denis O'Brien. His tender reached \$4,065; the amount was paid to him on completion of the work undertaken by him; no extras was paid to him. In 1889-90 and in 1890-91 the work was prosecuted by day's work under the superintendence of the Government engineer. The local superintendent in 1889-90 was Mr. John Middleton; in 1890-91, Mr. Emilien Séguin.

WHARF AT POINTE-A-VALOIS, IN THE COUNTY OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. LANGELIER (Translation) (for Mr. Brodeur) asked, 1. What is the cost of the wharf constructed at Pointe a Valois, in the county of Vaudreuil? 2. To whom was the money for the construction of the said wharf given?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The cost of the wharf constructed at Pointe a Valois, in the county of Vaudreuil, in 1889-90 and 1890-91 was \$4,621.64. The work was done by day's work, under the superintendence of the Government engineer, the local superintendent being Mr. Carolus Leroux. The wharf was constructed at Mr. Hugh McMillan's demand.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. Minister will allow me to remark that he did not reply to the first portion of the question put to him, namely, as to whom the money for the construction of the wharf was given. The same remark applies to the first question put.

Mr. OUMET. The papers at hand do not supply the desired information.

THE WHARF AT THE VILLAGE OF VAUDREUIL, P.Q.

Mr. LANGELIER (Translation) (for Mr. Brodeur) asked, 1. What is the cost of the wharf constructed at the village of Vaudreuil, P.Q.? 2. To whom was the money for the construction of the said wharf paid?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The cost to the Government of the wharf constructed at the village of Vaudreuil in 1887-88, was \$2,400. The money for the construction of this wharf was paid to Mr. G. W. Brabant, for materials supplied only. The manual labour was supplied by the people of the village.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 104) relating to juvenile offenders in the province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Costigan.)

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to direct the attention of the Government to the papers that were brought down a few days ago in con-

nection with the French Treaty. There are certain other papers, I understand, which do not appear, so far as I have been able to see, in this return, and I think they might throw some light on the matter. I refer to a letter from Sir Charles Tupper to the Premier, dated Paris, 6th February, and the Premier's acknowledgment thereto, dated 2nd March; also, a letter from the Colonial Office to His Excellency the Governor-General, covering a letter from Lord Dufferin to Lord Rosebery, dated 6th February, and one from Sir Edward Grey, dated Foreign Office, 10th February, to the Colonial Office. I would like to ask the Government if these papers are in their possession, and if so, whether they intend to lay them before Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to my hon. friend I would say, as stated the other day, that the papers already laid upon the Table, are but a partial list. Others are being prepared, and I expect to be able to lay them on the Table after dinner. Some of the papers to which he refers are included in those that are being prepared; as to one or two others, I will make inquiries.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman cannot say whether he will bring them down or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say until I look at them. The hon. gentleman would not ask me to say that, would he?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call attention to a personal explanation which was made in this House by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a few evenings ago, of which I gave him notice the other day. If it is necessary for me to do so, I shall move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I make that formal motion. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, did not want to misrepresent the character and pecuniary standing of a gentleman not in this House. He made an explanation the other day with reference to an article which appeared in the Moncton "Transcript."

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend cannot refer to a former debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not quoted from any former debate. I merely referred to the fact that the hon. gentleman made a personal explanation with reference to an article which had appeared in the Moncton "Transcript." I have received a telegram to the effect that the hon. gentleman was incorrect in some of his statements.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend, I am afraid, is getting further into the mud, because he will remember—

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope I have not got there yet.

Mr. SPEAKER. He will remember that I ruled on former occasions, and in strict accordance with parliamentary practice, that no letters or communications from persons outside the House, in reference to what transpired in the House, could be brought up in the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I am prohibited from reading the telegram, I shall have to content myself with asking the hon. gentleman whether he desires to amend any statement he made in this House, or to correct any statement he made in his personal explanation; and shall have to depend upon his honour to make the matter straight.

Mr. WELDON. By looking at the unrevised "Hansard"—I have not at hand a revised copy—I find I am reported on the 6th March as having said, respecting an action I brought last summer against Mr. Hawke, that "I got my verdict, but I have not yet got my money."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Read what you said a little further.

Mr. WELDON. I thought that was the point referred to in the notice the hon. gentleman sent me across the House. I said further:

I think, therefore, my civil remedy as practicable against Mr. Hawke, would be of very little service.

That statement made on the 6th of March is perfectly accurate in word and in substance. Some five days afterwards, my solicitor wrote me that Mr. Hawke had paid the judgment. I should add that he does not name the date of the payment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the 1st day of January last, nearly two months before the statement was made.

Mr. WELDON. I should add that my solicitor does not write me when the judgment was paid; but from the tone of the letter, I think the judgment was paid before I made my statement, although I did not know it. A very few days previous to that, I had heard from my solicitor that the judgment had not been paid. I should have added that my solicitor gave as a reason for his delay in notifying me, that he had been confined to his house by severe illness, and that consequently his business had been neglected for some days.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

WATER-WAY FROM LAKE SUPERIOR TO THE ATLANTIC.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That in view of the early completion of the canal around the St. Mary Rapids upon the Canadian shore, and of the enlargement and increased depth of our canal system to the Atlantic sea-board, and also of the ever-increasing volume of traffic tending in that

direction, it is desirable that Canada should have a complete and uninterrupted water-way from the head of Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean through her own territory; that in furtherance of such object the Minister of Railways and Canals should with all reasonable despatch proceed to have made explorations and surveys to ascertain the most direct and feasible manner of connecting Lake St. Clair or the River St. Clair by canal with Lake Erie through Canadian territory, and report the same, with an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, to this House.

He said: It is an old and a wise saying, I believe, that to forecast wisely the future we should refer to the past. Speaking in support of the resolution of which I have given notice, I think it will be the proper time and place to review the relations and the international transactions we have had with the great republic to the south of us. In doing so, I wish the House to understand what my feelings are in regard to this matter. I wish to repeat here, as I have before stated in this House and in other places, that I have the most kindly and friendly feelings towards the people of the United States. I have a great many personal friends and also those dear to me by ties of blood and affection in that country, and I have personal relations of an intimate character with the people of the United States. I wish the American people, under their form of government, the greatest measure of prosperity and happiness, but, at the same time, I love our own institutions and our own country better, and, therefore, although I shall endeavour to present this subject in a manner so friendly, so just and fair that even an American cannot find fault with me in that respect, yet I do not propose to try to be either so friendly or so fair as to be afraid to be just to my fellow-countrymen. Reading the records as I do, it looks to me as if, on our part, it had been one long period of patience, tolerance and concession as contrasted with one long period of affront, assumption and aggression on their part. The matters are somewhat weighty and the instances somewhat numerous, so, while I wish to be brief, I am afraid I shall have to crave the indulgence of the House for a longer period than I would desire. I propose to commence, Sir, with the first convention that we ever had with the United States; the convention concluded by our patriotic forefathers with the people of the United States in 1783, at the end of the revolutionary war. By that convention, among other things, it was agreed:

That Congress shall earnestly recommend it to the legislatures of the respective states to provide for the restitution of all estates, rights and properties which have been confiscated, belonging to real British subjects, and also of the estates, rights and properties of persons resident in districts in the possession of Her Majesty's Arms and who have not borne arms against the said United States. It was also provided that Congress would recommend the several states to revise all inimical laws regarding the loyalists, so as to render the said laws perfectly consistent not only with justice and equity, but with that spirit of con-

ciliation which on the return of the blessings of peace should universally prevail.

I propose to quote from some American authorities to show how that treaty was observed. Sabine says:

In some parts of the country there really appears to have been a determination to place these misguided but then humbled men, American Loyalists, beyond the pale of human sympathy.

Mr. Lodge, in his "Life of Hamilton," says:

There was an active determination to take vengeance on all who had sided with the Crown and were now helpless, and this was done in utter violation not only of wise policy, of public morals and of the law of nations, but also in direct contravention of the treaty with England.

The next illustration we have of the friendly spirit of the United States in her transactions with this country was the war of 1812. Mr. Madison, in my opinion, declared that war without any justification, and it is pretty generally conceded now by all impartial authorities, without any contravention on the part of Great Britain of the then existing law of nations. Great Britain had been compelled by the decrees of Napoleon to take strong measures to protect her trade, and although the great Frenchman had given the United States much greater cause to find fault with his actions, the United States took no notice of them whatever, even although then Napoleon was endeavouring to overthrow the liberties of the world. But the United States declared war against Great Britain and invaded Canada; Canada that in no way had anything to do with even the alleged cause of the war, and to show the spirit that prompted the invasion, I will quote from the proclamation of the commander-in-chief of the invading army. Before doing so, in addition to what I have said, I wish to quote from Mr. Schuyler's American History, in which he declares that the best people of the United States, and particularly the New England states, were against the war and condemned it as unjust and barbarous. General Howe, in his proclamation to the invading army, as quoted in Lossing's History, said:

The first stroke of the tomahawk, the first attempt with the scalping-knife, will be the signal for an indiscriminate scene of desolation. No white man found fighting by the side of an Indian will be taken prisoner. Instant destruction will be his lot.

This, of course, alluded to the expected alliance with the great Indian Chief Tecumseh, an alliance which was quite proper and a matter of course, and an alliance which resulted in a very few days in the pusillanimous surrender of this brutal braggart and the whole host of invaders to the British and Canadian forces. I may say that this proclamation was at first sustained at Washington, but so great was the horror that it provoked among the people, that it was eventually repudiated. I shall not further allude to this period, than simply to remark upon how,

even in these early days, our forefathers, though untrained to arms and although few in numbers, rose as one man and joined together, and drove back in dismay and disgrace their much more numerous invaders. Even at that early date two things were proved: first, that the battle is not always to the strong, and secondly, that neither force of arms, nor unfriendly acts, nor threatening proclamations, were then, are now, or please God will ever be, the way to influence the Canadian people. As a further illustration of the spirit of the people at that time, I wish to quote again from Schuyler's History:

"Strange," said John Randolph, that we should have no objection to any other people, civilized or savage. The great autocrat of all the Russias receives the homage of our high consideration. The Dey of Algiers and his Divan of Pirates are very civil, good sort of people, with whom we find no difficulty in maintaining relations of peace and amity. Turks, Jews and Infidels, Melinelli Prince of Tripoli, or the "Little Turtle" Chief of the Miamis, barbarians and savages of every clime and colour are welcome to our arms. With Chiefs of Banditti, Negro, or Mulatto, we can treat and can trade. Name, however, but England and all our antipathies are up in arms against her, against those whose blood runs in our veins.

The next period to which I wish to allude, and the next illustration of our relations with the United States is the period of 1837-38. The open attitude of hostility then assumed by the people of the United States during that unfortunate period is too well known to require remark. I shall content myself by quoting from Withrow's History, and from official documents to show generally the transactions on the part of the Americans at that time:

The American Government was guilty of grave dereliction of duty in permitting its frontier to be made a base of hostile operations against an unoffending neighbour. Secret societies, known as "Hunters' Lodges" were organized in many of the American border towns, for the purpose of aiding the Canadian rebellion.

On the 13th December, a mob, described by the Buffalo paper as a "wretched rabble, ready to cut any man's throat for a dollar," under the command of an adventurer named Van Rensselaer, took possession of Navy Island, about two miles above Niagara Falls. They were supplied with artillery and stores taken from the United States' arsenal, or contributed by American citizens. They threw up entrenchments of logs, mounting thirteen guns, and opened fire on the Canadian shore.

Early in January, a force of several hundred men, from Cleveland and Detroit, well equipped with muskets and artillery, taken with the connivance of the authorities from the United States' arsenals, made a demonstration against Sandwich and Amherstburg.

In utter defiance of international comity, simultaneous attacks on Canada were organized at Detroit, Sandusky, Waterdown, and in Vermont.

The Legislature of Upper Canada in 1838 appointed a Select Committee to report upon the state of the province, which continued its work into 1839. Extract from the report of 1838.

Mr. TISDALE.

The occupation and conquest of Texas in the south, and the assembling of an armed force on its eastern frontier, openly recruited in its principal cities and towns, commanded by its citizens, and by them also supplied with arms, ammunition, clothing, money and provisions, and transported in the presence of and unrestrained (if not encouraged) by its magistrates and public officers, in steam-boats and other vessels into this province, and landed in it for the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Government and wresting the colony from the Crown of Great Britain, sufficiently prove that, if the countries bordering on the United States desire to protect themselves from the inroads of freebooters, pirates, fugitive traitors and outlaws, they must look for security to their own fleets and armies, and not to the honourable forbearance of the American people, or the efficiency or moral influence of their Government."

After a year's further experience and examination the committee, amongst other things say:

Your Committee are well assured that nothing could afford your honourable House greater satisfaction than to feel justified in recalling the imputation which this declaration conveys upon the integrity of the people with whom it is the inclination as well as the interest of all Her Majesty's subjects, and especially those residing in this province, to keep up the most friendly intercourse. The detail of facts, however, which it will be the duty of your Committee to lay before your honourable House and the British nation, will too painfully and undeniably prove that the apprehensions entertained of want of faith and of outrage and aggression on the part of the people of the United States upon Her Majesty's subjects in Upper Canada, was far from being exaggerated in the report referred to; nor was it less truly stated by the illustrious Duke of Wellington, whose patriotic and powerful advocacy of the interests of his grateful fellow-subjects in these provinces can never be forgotten by them—that these outrages and aggressions were committed for no other reason than that the people of Upper Canada were loyal to the Sovereign.

It was clearly ascertained that a secret combination or conspiracy, of vast extent, including many of the most wealthy citizens of the republic, as well as officers of the general and state governments, and possessed of great resources in money and military stores, was then in active progress, and had been on foot for some months within the jurisdiction of the United States, for the purpose of waging war upon both provinces of Canada. This combination extended from Maine to Michigan and was carried on by means of local associations resembling Masonic lodges, formed in every town and village along the frontier. The lowest estimate of the numbers of the confederates was 40,000; and the depositions of some of the informants who had been admitted into the secret of the conspirators, carried the number very much higher. A pretended national bank was organized, to be established and maintained by the seizure of public and private property in the provinces; and the chief officers who were to compose the "New Republic" were chosen and determined upon, all of them being citizens of the United States.

The superior lodges of the conspirators were established at Rochester, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit and Cincinnati; arms and warlike stores were purchased to a very large amount, and secreted in different places; and the services of at least nine steam-boats on Lake Erie, as well as of several on Lake Ontario, were secured by the leaders in this felonious association.

It has been with feelings of the deepest concern and, at times, of indignation, that the loyal people of the Canadas have observed the apathy of the Gov-

ernment of the United States, notwithstanding the repeated appeals which have been made to them, in restraining and punishing the brigands who are within its reach. It is a fact not only undeniable, but almost universally admitted, that the conduct of the United States is, and from the beginning has been, such as to show that they regarded with satisfaction rather than disapprobation, the attempts made to sever these colonies from the British Crown.

Notwithstanding the repeated invasions that have taken place, the murders that have been committed, the acts of piracy and arson that have been perpetrated by thousands of persons that are well known, and who are now living unmolested in the adjoining states, openly boasting of their infraction of the laws of the Union as well as of this country, not one of them has been subjected, so far as your Committee are aware, to any legal punishment. Neither does it seem in any degree probable that any of them will be molested. In like manner the conspiracy so extensively organized during the last summer and autumn, for the overthrow of the Government of the country, although undoubtedly known to hundreds of persons holding official situations, was not only not suppressed, but received direct encouragement and support from those whose duty it was to break it up, and to expose and punish all engaged in it.

Now, Sir, I come in the order of succession to the times of 1865 and 1866. It will be remembered that in 1864 and 1865 the great civil war between the North and the South was in full operation. It will be remembered also that in the fall of 1864 a raid was made by southern refugees upon the town of St. Albans, in the state of Vermont. That raid was planned and perpetrated in a part of the country sparsely settled, and was carried out privately, so that we had no knowledge of it. After raiding the town, the raiders returned to our borders. Now, what was our conduct on that occasion? Because I wish to illustrate fairly the conduct of both sides under similar circumstances. Without waiting to be asked, without any request on the part of the United States, we promptly took steps to compensate, and did compensate, the parties who had been injured in the raid, though it had been planned and carried out without our knowledge or consent. Not only that, but we sent out a large force of volunteers in the month of December following the raid, who patrolled our frontiers at great sacrifice and expense to themselves and the Canadian Government; and these volunteers, for several months from that time to the end of the American war, remained on duty to prevent any recurrence of the raid. How was this action of ours reciprocated by them? In 1865 the American war terminated, and during the mid-summer of that year our citizen soldiers were allowed to return to their homes. Shortly afterwards the Fenian organization in the United States prepared to make a raid on Canada. They publicly solicited money, purchased arms, enrolled, equipped and drilled men, and openly announced their intention to invade Canada. They commenced by making a demonstration in the month of April, 1866, on the New Brunswick borders. Our Government called out a force of 10,000 men for the defence of the Dominion. Though the

United States Government were fully and publicly aware of the intention of these ruffians to invade Canada, though they publicly fixed a date for the invasion, and though in the month of June, when they crossed the Niagara River at Fort Erie, there was an American fort occupied by a regiment of United States soldiers in sight of the very place where they crossed in broad daylight, never did the United States authorities raise a hand until after they had come upon our shores, destroyed our property, killed a number of our citizens, and were driven back by the Canadian forces. Then, when the trouble was all over, when the outrage had been consummated, when the death of a number of our young men had taken place, a number of the Fenians on their return were arrested. What took place in the month of December following, when the President, in his Message to Congress, announced the action which he had taken in arresting a part of the gang on their return from Canada? Did he express any regret for the outrage, the destruction of our property, or the murder of our citizens? Not one word of regret. On the contrary, all he found to express regret for was that "some of our citizens," as he called them—thus acknowledging the responsibility of his Government—had been arrested and were now on trial. He expressed a hope for their release, and he announced the "discontinuance of the proceedings which had been instituted in the courts of the United States against those who had taken part in the expedition." And to this day we have never been able to get one cent of compensation or one word of apology for the outrage, or for the destruction of property and life which we suffered at the time of that raid. Lord Monck, in opening Parliament in the month of June, 1866, said:

The province has been invaded by a lawless band of marauders, but I congratulate the country that they were promptly confronted, and within twenty-four hours compelled to make a precipitate retreat. I deplore the loss of life and the sufferings which have been entailed upon the gallant body of the Canadian volunteers in the engagements which took place in repelling so promptly the invaders who had attacked the country, and I feel assured that you will not omit to alleviate, as far as may be in your power, the miseries so wantonly inflicted on many families. But, while I grieve for their individual loss, I must congratulate the country that the first note of danger has shown that Canada possesses in her volunteers a body of men ready to imperil their lives in defence of their Queen and country.

Now, in Hall's International Law, probably the highest authority, at all events one of the highest, referring to the action of the United States in 1837 and 1838, and to the Fenian raid in 1866, uses the following language:—

It would be difficult to find more typical instances of responsibility assumed by a state through the permission of open acts and of notorious acts, and by way of complicity after the acts. Of course, in gross cases like these, a right of immediate war accrues to the injured nation.

There may possibly be room to hope that the United States have become more alive to their duties in respect of such acts as those described; for in 1879 they showed a disposition to press state responsibility to the utmost possible extreme as against Great Britain. A body of Indians under Sitting Bull took refuge from United States troops in the then very remote and inaccessible British territory north of Montana. There was apparently reason to expect that they might make incursions into American territory. Mr. Grant, in a despatch to Sir E. Thornton, called the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the gravity of the situation which may thus be produced, and expressed a confident hope that Great Britain would be prepared on the frontier with a sufficient force either to compel the surrender of the Indians to our forces as prisoners of war, or to disarm and disable them from further hostilities, and subject them to such constraint of surveillance and subjection as will preclude any further disturbance of peace on the frontier." (Wharton Digest, 18.) In other words, the country, which had been guilty of direct complicity with raids on a friendly state from settled country close to the seat of government, did not hesitate when its own interests were involved to ask that state to undertake a distant and difficult expedition into wild and almost uninhabited regions.

I think that further comment is needless. I would further call attention to the contrast between our treatment of their soldiers during the civil war, in regard to transportation, and the treatment they extended to us on the occasion of our two North-west rebellions. During the civil war, I have seen myself whole regiments of armed American soldiers passing by railway through our territory, from one part of the United States to the other. We did not object to that, although we were blamed at the time for sympathy with the South. But what happened on the occasion of our first trouble in the North-west, when we had no railroad communication with that country? The Americans positively refused to allow us to send our soldiers through the United States to the far North-west, and we all remember the difficult march they had from Port Arthur through the wilderness to Fort Garry. At the time of the late North-west rebellion, also, they even refused to allow our troops to go through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and you remember the hardships our citizen soldiers then had to endure going by the Canadian Pacific Railway, in its then uncompleted state. The next step I propose to trace has reference to the Confederation of the provinces of British North America. In 1867, when, instead of being frightened into annexation by the repeal of the Treaty of 1854, we determined to unite these provinces into one great confederated nation, under British institutions and in alliance with the Empire, what did the United States do? Mr. Banks, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported a joint resolution respecting the proposed confederation of provinces on the northern frontier of the United States; which was read a first and second time. The joint resolution which was read at length, declares that the people of the United States cannot regard the proposed confederation

Mr. TISDALE.

of the provinces on the northern frontier of this country without extreme solicitude: that a confederation of states of this continent, extending from ocean to ocean, established without consulting the people of the provinces to be united, and founded upon monarchical principles, cannot be considered otherwise than a contravention of the traditions and constantly-declared principles of this Government, endangering its most important interests, and tending to increase and perpetuate embarrassments already existing between the two Governments immediately interested. Fancy such a resolution as that solemnly passed because we dared as free men, in the state of affairs then existing in this country, to attempt to bring about a union of these British provinces—a union which laid the foundations of a nation that in time to come, I have no doubt, will excel that of the people who assumed such an arbitrary attitude towards us under those circumstances. Another significant action in June, 1866, showed the trend of American desire. The chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, in the House of Representatives, reported the following Bill:—

That, when the Department of State should be officially informed that Great Britain and the several British provinces in Canada accepted the proposition of annexation, the President shall declare by proclamation that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Lower Canada, Upper Canada and the territories of Selkirk, of Saskatchewan and of Columbia should be admitted into the United States as states and territories.

Now, I propose to come next—for I am endeavouring, as far as possible, to deal with events in their chronological order—to the question of reciprocity, about which there has been a great deal of discussion. As we all know, up to 1854 there was no reciprocity, and each of the countries imposed such duties as they saw fit. I shall not here enter into a discussion as to the merits or demerits of reciprocity, as it would not be pertinent in this connection and would take up too much time. I purpose merely to review the transactions and compacts that, from time to time, have taken place with reference to that question between the two Governments. The circumstances which led up to the Treaty of 1854 will be more properly detailed, when I come to deal with the fisheries matter. The Treaty of 1854, as we all know, was a broad measure of reciprocity in natural products, or raw material, between the two countries; and it will be remembered that it remained in force until abrogated in the most peremptory and unfriendly manner by the people of the United States. Not only was it so abrogated, but when Earl Russell, on receipt of the notice, wrote the American authorities, asking:

Whether the notice given by Mr. Adams in terms so peremptory is intended to put an end to the treaty, or whether it leaves open the door to negotiations,—

he was informed that no negotiations would be entertained. Everybody knows now that the real cause of the abrogation of that treaty by the United States was the feeling engendered by their belief that Great Britain and Canada had sympathized with the Southern Confederacy during the great civil war. There is strong evidence in support of that contention in the report of the select committee of the United States Congress on the relations between Canada and the United States, presented to Congress 20th July, 1890, by Mr. Hoar, in which was the following paper by Mr. H. V. R. Poore.

Owing to the ungracious conduct of Great Britain towards the United States during the civil war, the upper or Canadian provinces being the headquarters of great numbers of malcontents seeking the overthrow of our Government, and the ports of the lower provinces being the resorts of privateers and vessels of war preying upon our commerce, no sooner were we relieved from the stress of war than on the 16th March, 1866, the necessary notice of one year was given for the abrogation of the treaty.

Now, there is no foundation for those assertions, and all authoritative writers now concede that they were not well founded. The fact is also well authenticated that, during the American war, from 50,000 to 75,000 Canadians fought in the Northern army. But the American authorities expected that the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 would strike such a blow at Canada as would materially check her development and progress and probably compel her to seek admission into the Union. The American people are slow to learn that such proceedings are not the way to affect the Canadian people favourably towards them. When will the American people learn the capacity of our people and the capacity of this country? They are slow to learn and slow to believe how fixed is the determination of the great majority of our people to hold and develop it under British institutions which we love so well and under the aegis of Great Britain. Their desire, however, to drive us into annexation is no proof of their friendliness. I propose next to deal with the unsuccessful efforts to obtain reciprocity. That those efforts have not been successful all people in this country will agree is owing to the persistent hostile attitude assumed by the authorities of the United States. As I have already stated, when they gave notice of the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, the British Government asked if negotiations would be entertained for its renewal, and were answered in the negative. Consul Wilkins, in a report of 7th September, 1855, on the Detroit convention, said :

The New York delegates had been well educated in the school of opposition. On behalf of the latter it was argued that no treaty should be made with an unfriendly people, and hints were thrown out that the annexation of Canada to the United States must follow the abrogation of the treaty.

The British and Canadian Governments joined in attempts to renew the treaty, and sent

Sir A. T. Galt and Hon. W. P. Howland from Canada; Hon. W. A. Henry, Nova Scotia, and Hon. A. J. Smith from New Brunswick, to Washington, to co-operate with Sir Frederick Bruce in friendly attempt to renew the treaty; but the United States authorities refused. Again, in 1869, Sir Edward Thornton made another attempt, and was refused. And in 1872 the Canadian Government, in response to a resolution of the Dominion Board of Trade, said :

That both Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Canada have availed themselves of every suitable opportunity since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty to press upon the Government of the United States the desirability of a renewal of reciprocal trade relations between the latter country and Canada upon a broad and liberal basis; and submits for the favourable consideration of Your Excellency in Council, that the Dominion Board of Trade be informed that should the Government of the United States comply with the wishes of the United States National Board of Trade, the subject will receive the fullest consideration of the Government of Canada.

Again, in 1874, Sir Edward Thornton and the Hon. George Brown, after much discussion, negotiated a treaty; but the Senate refused to ratify it, and the United States Government, though they had encouraged the negotiations, and had agreed to the treaty, used no effort whatever to influence the Senate in favour of its ratification. In 1888, when the Fishery Treaty—which I will refer to later—was negotiated with Mr. Cleveland, our Government wanted to discuss reciprocity; but President Cleveland declined. Last session, under Mr. Harrison's regime, our Government succeeded in getting an informal discussion of the reciprocity question. With what result? With the result that they were plainly informed that the only terms upon which the Americans would negotiate a treaty was that it should be a treaty covering both manufactured and raw material, that we should have a uniform tariff fixed by the Government of the United States, with discrimination imposed against all countries, and especially against Great Britain, and with a uniform excise law also fixed by the United States. These terms, I am satisfied, no right-minded or independent Canadian would for one moment think of entertaining. They were terms that, in my opinion, if accepted, would hand over this country to the United States and to direct taxation. With regard to those efforts to obtain reciprocity, and with regard to the other matters I have discussed, I wish to say that the fault lies almost entirely with the American authorities. The political lessons they instil from time to time into the people seem to be such that whatever be the will of the other portions of the United States, as expressed from time to time, the politicians are so powerful that they goad up a continuous trend of public opinion against anything British or English, and this they have done from the time of the revolution up to the present. Now, Sir,

I come to some more important considerations; I come to the fisheries, the transit in bond, reciprocal use of canals and retaliatory proceedings on the part of the United States. These run so into each other that I shall deal with them as they occur in the different treaties. The first convention in regard to fisheries was contained in the treaty of 1783, which, as I before stated, ended the revolutionary war. That remained in force until abrogated by the war of 1812. The Treaty of Ghent, which was made in 1814 and terminated the war of 1812, was silent as to the fishery question, because the United States and Great Britain failed to agree upon any convention in regard to it, so that the treaty of 1783 was abrogated. The consequence was that the American fishermen not only claimed the old privileges of the treaty of 1783, but they smuggled and committed serious violations of the law. I quote from a letter of Lord Bathurst to Mr. Adams, dated 30th October, 1815, in which, speaking of American fishermen, he said, among other things:

They forcibly excluded British vessels from places where the fishery might be most advantageously conducted. They had likewise (*i.e.* Her Majesty's Government) reason to complain of the clandestine introduction of prohibited goods into the British colonies by American vessels ostensibly engaged in the fishing trade, to the great injury of the British revenue.

These flagrant breaches of the law continued down to the treaty of 1818, which granted the United States fishermen "liberty" to fish on certain North American coasts, and they "renounced forever" any liberty heretofore claimed to take, cure or dry fish within three marine miles of the bays, etc., not in the permitted territory, and obtained permission to enter bays, etc., for shelter, for repairs of damage, for wood, and for water, and for no other purposes whatever. This treaty was constantly broken, down to 1854.

Mr. FORBES. Is that treaty in force to-day?

Mr. TISDALE. Certainly, but they constantly broke its provisions down to 1854. But they have got other privileges to-day, which I will come to presently. I call attention to that fact to show that they have continuously acted on the same line. Every time they got a concession, they wanted more; every time they got a concession they took more under it. When they had not concessions, they took them, particularly in those times. During the period between 1818 and 1854, they were encouraged by their public men, both in Congress and out of it, as their own papers and documents will show, to encroach upon our rights. In proof of that, I will quote from Schuyler's American Diplomacy:

Very many seizures and confiscations of American vessels by the British authorities took place on the following grounds:—1. Fishing within the prescribed limits. 2. Anchoring or hovering in shore during calm weather without any ostensible cause, having on

Mr. TISDALE.

board ample supplies of wood and water. 3. Lying at anchor and remaining inside of bays to clean and pick fish. 4. Purchasing and bartering bait and preparing to fish. 5. Selling goods and buying supplies. 6. Landing and transshipping cargoes of fish.

Those difficulties were finally settled by the treaty of 1854, by which we got reciprocal trade, and their fishermen got material concessions beyond those granted under the treaty of 1818. As I have already mentioned, the Government of the United States, in 1866, in the most peremptory and unfriendly manner, abrogated the treaty of 1854, and they refused even to consider negotiations for renewal. This, of course, terminated their fishery rights under the treaty of 1854. What did we do? Following our invariable custom of concession and friendliness, we agreed for a nominal consideration, if they would take out licenses, to allow them the benefit of our inshore fisheries. What followed on their part? The number of licenses taken out shrank from 354 to 25 in three years, although the number of American vessels fishing in our waters increased to from 700 to 1,000. Even with that concession, for an infinitesimal consideration, they took advantage of it to such an extent that, although they took out 354 licenses at first, there were only 25 in existence when the treaty was terminated. Besides that, they paid no attention to the terms of the treaty of 1818, but they simply took greater advantages. They openly defied the law, they transhipped cargoes, and refused to pay customs duties, they smuggled liquors, disturbed the peace, and, in some places, our people were compelled to put a guard by night over their property. That was the state of affairs among the fishermen while they were enjoying the concession that we, in a friendly spirit, granted to them. Then, because our Government took steps to punish offenders and to maintain the rights of Canadian citizens, General Grant, in his Message to Congress, in 1870, gave utterance to threats that were as undignified as they were unjust, in a state paper of that sort. One or two extracts will suffice to show their spirit. He says:

The Imperial Government is understood to have delegated the whole or a share of its jurisdiction or control of these inshore fishing grounds to the Colonial authority known as the Dominion of Canada, and this semi-independent but irresponsible agent has exercised its delegated powers in an unfriendly way.

And further:

Anticipating that an attempt may possibly be made by the Canadian authorities in the coming season to repeat their unneighbourly acts towards our fishermen, I recommend you to confer upon the Executive the power to suspend, by proclamation, the operation of the laws authorizing the transit of goods, wares and merchandise in bond across the territory of the United States to Canada, and further, should such an extreme measure become necessary, to suspend the operation of any laws whereby the vessels of the Dominion of Canada are permitted to enter the waters of the United States.

However, notwithstanding this, their failure to observe even the terms of this friendly concession that we made to them was so open and flagrant, that there was nothing left for our Government to do but to make the necessary measures to enforce the terms of the treaty; and so they equipped a protective service, which, aided by the British gunboats on duty in American waters, seized and confiscated a number of American vessels. I think some fifteen. This, seemingly, had a healthy effect for a time, because, shortly after that, we were able to make a fishery treaty, called the treaty of Washington, in 1871. We all know the important features of the treaty of 1871. I will mention some of the most important points of that treaty, which are pertinent to a discussion of this sort. The first feature was the reciprocal use of the canal systems of the respective countries by their respective citizens, upon the same terms as they were enjoyed by the citizens of the country to which they belonged; secondly, the transit through the respective countries of foreign goods in bond; thirdly, the transit in our vessels and railways, of goods, etc., from one part of the United States to another part of the United States, and "vice versa"; fourthly, each country was granted the right to use the inshore fisheries of the other. Fifth, that a board of arbitrators be appointed to assess damages, if any, that either country may have suffered by the use of the fisheries of the other during the disputed period, of which I have spoken. Sixth, the Americans gave us the right to import fish free. No better illustration of the spirit of two Governments in dealing with each other in regard to international matters can be quoted than this one. The British and Canadian authorities immediately passed legislation, so that almost at once the Americans, not only the fishermen, but the whole American nation, became entitled to use in the broadest sense—I say the broadest sense, because we followed not only the letter but the spirit of the agreement—the benefits granted by Canada. Not only so, but during the time the treaty existed, in spite of numerous instances contrary to the spirit of the agreement, to which I will presently refer, the Americans acted in the very opposite spirit, notwithstanding the fact that we have allowed them from that time to the present, and are allowing them still, the full use of all those benefits. What was the conduct of the Americans? Three years elapsed before they named arbitrators who were to assess the fishery damages; and when they did give us independent and unprejudiced arbitrators, we obtained an award of \$5,500,000 as damages, for the use of our fisheries. Further, when the award was made, the American agent took a technical objection to it, and it was paid under an ungracious protest. Although the treaty was conceded to be friendly to them, they tried to enjoy more rights than were conceded to them and kept up an ag-

gressive attitude. Five years elapsed before they allowed us to enjoy the use of their canals, even according to the letter of the agreement, and before they would permit our boats to go as far as Albany. Even then, they deprived Canadians of all benefit by refusing to allow the use of the Hudson River, so that our vessels could get no return cargoes, though we allowed them the use of the Ottawa and Richelieu rivers in parallel cases. They nullified the concession in favour of the Canadians in reference to free fish by exacting a duty of 1½ cents on the cans. The United States applied to have Prince Edward Island, which was not then part of the Dominion, extend the privileges of the treaty to American fishermen, which it did, and the United States Government promised to use its endeavour to get refunded all duties paid on fish or fish oil during the period which would elapse before Congress confirmed the treaty. This they subsequently refused to do. Further, because the treaty was signed in July, 1871, two months before British Columbia became a part of the Dominion, although their Act giving force to the treaty was not passed until 1872, and although we gave the United States fishermen the full benefit of the treaty from its date, they have always refused to allow British Columbia the benefits of the clause regarding free fish. The abrogation of the treaty of 1871 was entirely the work of the United States. In July, 1883, under authority from Congress, the President gave notice, terminating on 1st July, 1885, the fishery clauses of the treaty. Though the notice was silent as to the clause relating to the transit of foreign goods through the respective countries, the President has lately held that that was abrogated. Here again came an illustration of the spirit of American diplomacy. So anxious were the Americans to repeal the treaty that it was abrogated in the midst of the fishing season, many of their vessels being at that time fishing on our shores. The President again appealed to the good-will of Great Britain and Canada, and obtained an agreement or modus vivendi by which their vessels were allowed to continue their operations in Canadian waters until the close of the season. The President promised, as part of the understanding, to bring the subject of the fisheries before Congress, and recommend the appointment of a committee to consider the matter and see if any new arrangement could be made. What the President said was as follows:—

In the interest of maintaining good neighbourhood and friendly intercourse between the two countries, thus affording a prospect of negotiation for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America.

In his Message to Congress in December, 1885, the President recommended the appointment of the committee in question in these words:

The fishing interests, he said, being intimately related to other general questions dependent on contiguity and intercourse, consideration thereof, in all their equities, might also properly come within the purview of such a commission and the fullest latitude of expression on both sides should be permitted.

The Senate, with the usual exhibition of friendly feeling towards Canada, rejected it by 35 to 10 votes. The benefit to their fishermen having been acquired for that season at the expense of Canada, any "further latitude or expression" was unnecessary. Notwithstanding the concession of this *modus vivendi* for 1885, on 2nd July, 1885, the very next day after the notice expired, the United States Treasury issued an order cancelling the right of shipment of goods in transit in either Canadian or United States vessels to pass through Canada to the United States. In twenty-two days, however, they rescinded that order as to United States vessels, because they found this hurt themselves, and to this day we have allowed them the benefit of that concession, although they have refused a like concession to us. Further, they continue their regulations, which practically prevent our boats from using their canals, except the St. Mary's Canal, and we still allow them to enjoy to the full extent the use of our canals and the rivers connecting them. They are not ashamed to accept benefits from the generous spirit of the Canadian people, while declining to reciprocate. The rejection by the Senate of the President's proposal of a commission for inquiry left no course open for Canada but an enforcement of her rights under the treaty of 1818. The seizure of a number of American vessels for infringement of our rights brought about a renewal of correspondence, which led to the appointment of plenipotentiaries in 1887 to negotiate a treaty. On 15th February, 1888, a treaty was duly signed, in reference to the fisheries, between the negotiators. President Cleveland forwarded the treaty to the Senate, with his Message on 20th February, 1888, in which he said :

As a result of such negotiations a treaty has been agreed upon between Her Britannic Majesty and the United States, concluded and signed in this capital under my direction and authority on the 15th of February instant, and which I now have the honour to submit to the Senate, with the recommendation that it shall receive the consent of the body, as provided in the Constitution, in order that the ratifications thereof may be duly exchanged and the treaty be carried into effect.

And again he said :

Especially satisfactory do I believe the proposed arrangement will be found by those of our citizens who are engaged in the open-sea fisheries adjacent to the Canadian coast, and resorting to those ports and harbours under treaty provisions and rules of international law.

Again :

The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal.

Mr. TISDALE.

Again :

The treaty meets my approval, because I believe that it supplies a satisfactory, practical and final adjustment upon a basis honourable and just to both parties, of the difficult and vexed question to which it relates.

Again :

The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantage and convenience are the only permanent foundations of peace and friendship between states, and that with the adoption of the agreement now placed before the Senate, a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established so as to secure perpetual peace and harmony.

Again, referring to the *modus vivendi* offered by the British plenipotentiaries of their own accord, pending the adoption of the treaty, he said :

This paper, freely and on their own motion, signed by the British conferees, not only extends advantages to our fishermen pending the ratification of the treaty, but appears to have been dictated by a friendly and amicable spirit.

Mr. Bayard, his Secretary of State, referring to the conference, said :

He hoped and believed that the conference had led to a basis upon which Canada and the United States could look forward to a period of enlarged intercourse and increasingly friendly relations.

The treaty was submitted to the Senate, but after a prolonged debate, it was rejected. Now, what was the action of the President of the United States, who had expressed himself in a satisfied and friendly manner in the utterances which I have briefly quoted, and whose plenipotentiaries, on the 5th February, alluding to the *modus vivendi*, had thanked the British and Canadian plenipotentiaries for, as they expressed it :

This manifestation of an intention on the part of the British plenipotentiaries by the means referred to, to maintain the relations of good neighbourhood between the British possessions in North America and the United States.

Let me quote from the Message of the President on 29th August, eight days after the rejection of the treaty by the Senate :

The co-operation necessary for the adjustment of the long-standing national difference with which we have to deal, by methods of conference and agreement having been thus declined, I am by no means disposed to abandon the interests and rights of our people in the premises or to neglect their grievances ; and I therefore turn to the contemplation of a plan of retaliation as a mode, which still remains, of treating the situation. * * *

I deem it my duty, therefore, to call the attention of Congress to certain particulars in the action of the authorities of the Dominion of Canada, in addition to the general allegations already made, which appears to be on such marked contrast to the liberal and friendly disposition of our own country as, in my opinion, to call for such legislation as will upon the principles already stated, properly supplement [the power to inaugurate retaliation already vested in the Executive.

One hardly knows what language to use to properly characterise such a lamentable exhibition of inconsistency on the head of a

great nation. In 1887 what may be called the retaliatory policy of the United States was inaugurated by Mr. Gorman in passing the following resolution :—

That the President of the United States is authorized whenever it shall appear to him that there is an insistence on the part of the Canadian authorities with the obstructions, indignities and annoyances above recited, to issue his proclamation, prohibiting the transit through the United States or the territorial waters thereof from point to point in Canada or from Canada to the ocean, of any engines, cars, goods or vessels proceeding from Canada.

Upon this resolution an Act was passed, on 3rd March, 1887, enabling the President to cut off all privileges from British or Canadian vessels, which were alleged not to be granted to American vessels in Canadian ports. It did not matter to them whether there were any treaty obligations—in fact these obligations did actually exist—the President was authorized to debar our vessels from all privileges. The violation of existing treaties by the Legislature of the United States, I think you will see before I am through, is an added jurisdiction that they have assumed in modern times. To show the spirit of the American Senate in passing this Act, I will make one quotation—I could make many of them which are equally offensive and equally unjust to us—Senator Dolph said :

The Congress of the United States by the Act of 3rd March, 1887, conferred upon the President of the United States power to deny to the vessels of the Canadian and other British provinces of North America, the privileges in the ports of the United States which were denied to American vessels in the ports of the Canadian provinces ; and it further conferred upon him power to retaliate upon the Canadian provinces for the unlawful, unjust and brutal treatment of our fishermen in Canadian waters, and for the denial or abridgment of the rights of our citizens, under the treaty of 1818 or under International law, in Canadian waters.

At this very time the American fishermen were enjoying privileges under the *modus vivendi* which we had voluntarily granted them in connection with the treaty of 1888, and which they had rejected. Fancy a man getting up in Congress and using such arrogant, insulting and untruthful language under such circumstances. We still allowed them these privileges, although the time was long since past that they were entitled to them under the *modus vivendi*, and although they rejected the treaty, we gave them the privileges and still allow them without any return. In September, 1888, the Retaliatory Bill of President Cleveland was passed, and, although he never acted upon it, it was used as a threatening and disturbing element in connection with our transportation relations with the United States. In August, 1888, the Senate adopted a resolution to inquire into the question of transportation relations between Canada and the United States, and in December of the same year, the Inter-State Commerce Committee were instructed to make inquiries. In May, 1889, Mr. Collum, from

that committee, submitted a report which, among other things, contained the following :—

At no period in our history have the American people been called upon to consider a scheme of encroachment upon American commercial interests more injurious than the scheme by the Dominion of Canada in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the subsidizing of British steamer lines on the Pacific Ocean in connection with such railway, and finally, by an arrangement by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with an American steam-ship company by which goods are carried in bond between Port Moody and the seaports of Washington, Oregon and California to and from the east via the Canadian Pacific Railway and rendering certain the destruction of American steamer lines now engaged in our foreign commerce and the diversion of our Asiatic commerce from American seaports to the ports of British Columbia.

It is beyond question, from this, that American politicians look upon the legitimate attempts of a great transport corporation to compete for business as an international offence, and call upon their Government to retaliate, instead of themselves resorting to intelligent competition to meet it. In July, 1890, Mr. Hoar, from the Select Committee on Relations with Canada, presented a great bulk of evidence, but no summary of conclusions, and in that there were included two offensive and untruthful papers from Levi Woodbury and Joseph Nimmo. The testimony that they called before that committee was largely collected with a view of showing the worst possible state of affairs in Canada, and showing unfriendly sentiments in regard to closer relations with them. The McKinley Bill was passed in September, 1890, and we know that the object of that Bill was unfriendly to Canada. In July, 1892, the Retaliatory Bill of President Harrison was passed, under which, he, in August, 1892, issued a proclamation imposing tolls on Canadian vessels passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canals. I wish to say one word with regard to this. In the long series of transactions, of a diplomatic and international nature with the United States, from 1783 up to the present time, that is the only one that I can find, after a fair perusal of the records, where it was even discussable as to which might be right and which might be wrong. In regard to these canal tolls, I believe that, putting the same construction upon the treaty, and considering the narrow construction that they put upon the way they allowed us to use their canals, our Government were fully justified, so far as the letter of that treaty went, in imposing the canal tolls in the way they did. But our Government having done that, what was their treatment of us ? Did they exhibit the conciliatory spirit that we have exhibited from time to time, and even for years together, in regard to the friction that arose from time to time under the treaties ? No ; they said at once : We are right ; you are wrong, and you must do so-and-so. There was no question of referring the mat-

ter to any authority—no disposition to meet the conciliatory spirit in which our Government suggested that they should wait, at all events, until the existing season was over, so as not to disturb the arrangements that had been made for the season. Not at all. They were bound to retaliate, and a Bill authorizing the President, not only to retaliate in that respect, but giving him much wider power, was passed by Congress.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. member cannot continue to speak upon this motion, as it will require an expenditure of public money. I think it should come from the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr. Tyrwhitt). I think the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order.

Mr. TISDALE. I hope the other hon. gentleman was in order; it is impossible for me to say. Lastly, we had the farewell Message of President Harrison, in which he suggests that, whether there is any treaty in force or not, allowing us to transport goods through the United States, they should make such internal regulations as to render it impossible for us to take advantage of the transportation concessions, and to render them as nugatory as the privileges that we supposed we had in connection with the use of their canals. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to some excuses or pretenses frequently put forward to justify the unfriendly attitude of the United States in the way of retaliation. There are two in particular. First, that we have subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway so unduly, and so far beyond anything that the American Government have done for their transcontinental lines, as to make it unfair to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to come into competition with their railways; and, secondly, that both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, being beyond the control of the inter-state commerce law, have an advantage over the American lines, and have not complied with that law in reference to thorough business. Now, President Harrison, in his Message, states:

The statutes relating to the transportation of merchandise between the United States and the British possessions should be the subject of review. The Treasury regulations have given to these laws a construction and a scope that I do not think was contemplated by Congress. A policy adapted to the new conditions growing in part out of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad should be declared and the business placed upon a basis more just to our people and to our transportation companies. If we continue the policy of supervising rates upon the railroads of the United States we cannot in fairness at the same time give these unusual facilities for competition to Canadian roads that are free to pursue the practices as to cut rates and favoured rates that we condemn and punish if practised by our own railroads. I regret that circumstances prevented an earlier

Mr. TISDALE.

examination by me of these questions, but submit now these views in the hope that they may lead to a revision of the laws upon a safer and juster basis.

Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble of ascertaining, and I propose to read the true figures in regard to the subventions given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and those given to the great American transcontinental lines. In regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I find that the Government built 708 miles and the company the balance, being 1,917 miles, making a total of 2,625 miles. Our Government granted to the railway 25,000,000 acres of land, of which they took back, at \$1.50 an acre, 7,000,000 acres, making a value of \$10,000,000. The balance, 18,000,000, I value at \$2 an acre, making \$36,000,000. The cash granted by the Government was \$25,000,000. This makes in all \$71,000,000, or, say \$37,000 a mile for what was built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The 708 miles built by the Government, including all explorations, trial lines and surveys, cost \$37,000,000. This makes the total cost of the 2,625 miles \$108,000,000. Now, take the main line of the Northern Pacific Railway, from St. Paul to Tacoma. I only deal with the main lines, because I cannot get the proper statistics in regard to the branch lines, though I venture to say that in the case of the branch lines you will find as great a disparity as you do in the case of the main lines. The total length of the Northern Pacific main line is 1,911 miles. The land grants from Wisconsin and Minnesota were twenty sections or 12,800 acres a mile. I estimate that grant at \$4 an acre, which is a lower relative rate than \$2 an acre for the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The land grants from Dakota, Montana, Idaho and Washington were forty sections, or 25,000 acres, a mile, which I put at \$2 an acre, the same value as I have put upon the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, though, at the time, the former were considered the more valuable. That gives the Northern Pacific an average of \$51,200 a mile, as compared with the \$41,000 a mile granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or \$10,200 a mile more, making the total grants for the 1,911 miles \$98,000,000. But, when we come to the Union Pacific and Central Pacific, what do we find? The mileage of the Union Pacific Railroad, from Council Bluffs to Ogden, is 1,034 miles, so that the land grant of 12,000,000 acres for the whole mileage, at \$2 an acre, would amount in value to \$24,000,000. The report of the Commissioner of Railways of the United States to the Minister of the Interior, on 30th June, 1882, shows that the amount due on bonds of the United States delivered to the company, was \$62,000,000. Then, we take the Central Pacific Railroad proper, from Ogden to San Francisco, with a mileage of 985 miles. For this the land grants from the United States amounted to 8,000,000 acres, which, at \$2 an acre, gives a sum of \$16,000,000; and the report of the Commissioner

of Railways of the United States to the Minister of the Interior dated 30th June, 1892, shows that the amount due on bonds delivered to the company by the United States Government was \$64,000,000, or a total grant to the whole system of the Union Pacific Railroad of \$166,000,000. This, on a total mileage of 1,929 miles, gives \$87,000 a mile, or \$46,000 a mile more than the Canadian Pacific Railway got. To summarize: The Northern Pacific, for 1,911 miles, got subventions amounting to \$98,000,000; the Canadian Pacific Railway, for 2,625 miles, or 714 miles more than the Northern Pacific, got subventions amounting to \$108,000,000, or only \$10,000,000 more; the Union and Central Pacific, with a mileage of 1,929 miles, or 696 miles less than the Canadian Pacific Railway, got subventions to the extent of \$166,000,000, nearly double the subventions for a little over two-thirds of the mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, in reference to the non-observance of the inter-state commerce law by our two great railway corporations, I wrote to the general manager of each road. In reply, I received from Mr. Van Horne a reference to a letter which he had sent to the New York "Times," and from which I quote, as follows:—

As to the Interstate Commerce Law, permit me to say that so far as the Canadian Pacific is concerned every pound of United States freight it carries is carried in accordance with the requirements of that law. If there has been any violation of that law on the part of the Canadian Pacific Company, some specific cases must surely have come to the knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, and if this Company has in any case defied the law or shown any disposition to withhold information from the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, the Commissioners must surely know of it.

In the sixth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners just published, it is somewhat broadly hinted that the Canadian railways are evading the law. The Commissioners may not have had the Canadian Pacific in mind, but as the public may have taken their strictures as applying to it, I desire to say, in the most emphatic terms, that if the Interstate Commerce law has been violated by this company, it has been without the knowledge of the directors and executive officers, and I have yet to hear of the first specific complaint of anything even looking like an international violation of the law on our part.

Mr. Sergeant, general manager, replied as follows:—

With reference to the inquiry which you have made as to the observance by this company of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Law, I beg to say that when this Act was passed by Congress a general consultation with our counsel, American and Canadian, took place, with the object of formulating such regulations for the guidance of the company's staff as would, in their judgment, strictly carry out the provisions of the Act. As a result, my predecessor issued general order No. 85, dated 25th March, 1887, of which I have the pleasure to enclose copy. This will evidence the spirit in which we dealt with the question.

A number of rulings have been made by the Commission which may possibly have varied, to some extent, the very stringent instructions then issued.

You are probably aware that states to states tariffs, both east and westbound, are the result of conference between the whole of the carrying lines. These tariffs are separately deposited with the Commission and have been since the date of the enactment by the Grand Trunk.

Tariffs are also deposited with the Commission from Canadian to States points by the company.

Our local tariffs have been the subject of examination by the Commissioners. They were forwarded to Washington as a matter of courtesy in order that the fullest opportunity might be given of checking them, and in no case has it been found that any one provision of the law has been infringed.

The Grand Trunk was cited before the Commission in a case which involved the question whether the law extended to tariffs from points of origin in the United States to points of destination in Canada. It was held by the Commission that it did. In one of the United States courts, however, a subsequent ruling of the judge was that the United States jurisdiction did not extend beyond its territory. Whether this ruling is sound or not the company has declined to avail itself of it, as we have always been willing to comply with the provisions of the Act apart from any technicality.

I am under the impression that the agitation upon this subject in the United States is mainly due to the efforts of rival railway companies who allege that the non-application of the Act in Canada itself affords this company some mysterious means of manipulating through rates, forgetful of the fact that Canada is precisely in the same position as the State of New York, or any other state in the Union, to which this legislation does not apply.

If I can give you any further information upon the subject, I shall be happy to do so.

These extracts and figures, I think, dispose very effectually of either one, or rather both, those charges. I do not propose here to refer to the Behring Sea matter, further than to call attention simply to the high-handed manner in which the American gun boats seized our fishing vessels on the high seas, carried them into hostile ports, confiscated the cargoes and ships and treated the crews in a very high-handed and unfriendly manner. You will remember, Sir, that they paid no attention to the protests of Canada, and at first to the remonstrances of England, and it was only when Lord Salisbury gave them to understand that if they did not pay attention to his protests he would send the British fleet out there and blow their gun boats out of the water that they came to terms, and this matter is now in a proper way of adjustment by international arbitration. Neither do I here propose to do more than cast a passing glance at the question of the delineation of the boundaries of Oregon and of Maine. We all know that, as regards Oregon, the Americans got an immense tract of country which they were not entitled to, and with regard to the Maine boundary they obtained that in a way which reflects great discredit on the diplomatic methods employed by them, because they got thousands of square miles of territory by the suppression and concealment of a map, about the existence of which the other plenipotentiaries knew nothing. Another marked contrast between their treatment of

us and our treatment of them is the letting of contracts for public work. No Canadian can get a dollars worth of a public contract in the United States, no matter how low he may tender, while we throw open our public contracts to the Americans. Although we have plenty of able contractors in this country, we let our contracts out to open competition, and if an American tenders sufficiently low he will be given the preference. In closing this branch of the subject I wish to call attention for a short time to an illustration, which I think is an excellent one, of the peculiar notions and methods of American authorities, both executive and legislative, in dealing with solemn treaties and international compacts. I refer to clause 29 of the treaty of 1871. The joint resolution providing for a notice to repeal the treaty read as follows :

Joint resolution providing for the termination of articles numbered XVIII to XXV, inclusive, and article numbered XXX of the treaty between the United States of America and Her Britannic Majesty, concluded at Washington, May 8, 1871. Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That in the judgment of Congress the provisions of articles numbered XVIII to XXV, inclusive, and of article XXX of the treaty between the United States and Her Britannic Majesty, for an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between the two countries, concluded at Washington on the 8th day of May, A.D. 1871, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time, and be no longer in force.

When that joint resolution came up for approval in the Senate it was considerably discussed, and I will read part of the debate which took place :

Mr. WINDOM—I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont whether section 3, which repeals “An Act to carry into effect the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed in the city of Washington, the 8th day of May, 1871, relating to the fisheries,” will repeal the Act under which goods are imported in transit through American territory.”—[That refers to clause 29.]—I desire to say that I am very unwilling to repeal those clauses of the treaty and those laws which relate to transportation in bond through this country, because it is a very large business, and a very great interest would be injured if it should be done. The question is whether the law which is proposed to be repealed affects transportation ?

Mr. EDMUNDS—The 29th article of the treaty provides for complete transit from the sea at Portland to Quebec, and from Port Huron, in Michigan, to Buffalo, for another illustration ; reciprocally.

Mr. FRYE—No notice is given as to article 29. I said to both the Senators from Minnesota that it did not interfere at all with the rights and privileges which were of advantage to us. I refer to the 29th article, which was not repealed.

Mr. EDMUNDS—To guard against all possible misconstruction about it, I move to amend—so that we repeal the Act only that far.

Mr. McMILLAN—I think that covers it.

Mr. WINDOM—I am sure it does.

In Congress, upon the same question :

Mr. WASHBURN—I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether the passage of this joint resolution

Mr. TISDALE.

will in any way interfere with section 2866, Revised Statutes, which provides for the carrying of goods in transit through this country ?

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts [who moved the resolution]. Those provisions are excepted from the operations of this resolution in terms in the resolution—this applies only to the fisheries.

President Arthur, in issuing his proclamation, terminating the treaty under the authority of the joint resolution, used the following words :—

Now, therefore, I, Chester A. Arthur, President of the United States of America, do hereby give public notice that Articles XVIII., XIX., XX., XXI., XXII., XXIII., XXIV., XXV., XXX. and XXXII., of the treaty of Washington, concluded May 8, 1871, will expire and terminate on the 1st day of July, 1885, and all citizens of the United States are hereby warned that none of the privileges secured by the above-recited articles of the treaty in question will exist after the 1st day of July next ; all American fishermen should govern themselves accordingly.

In January, 1877, Mr. Cleveland's Secretary of State wrote as follows :—

This document is reprinted in full in the recently printed executive document in relation to the rights of American fishermen in British North American waters (Executive Document No. 19, House of Representatives, Forty-ninth Congress, second session, pages 199-210) a copy of which is also inclosed herewith.

The treaty of Washington between the United States and Great Britain did not relate solely to the Canadian fisheries. Only the fishery articles thereof were abrogated, as enumerated in the President's proclamation of January 31, 1885.

The remaining articles, comprising those which relate to commercial intercourse between the United States and the British North American possessions, are still in force.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) T. F. BAYARD.

The Retaliation Bill of 1887 assumed, from its very terms, that clause 29 was still in force. It said :

And upon proof that the privileges secured by Article XXIX of the treaty concluded between the United States and Great Britain on the 8th day of May, 1871, are denied as to goods, wares, and merchandise arriving at the ports of British North America, the President may also, by proclamation, forbid the exercise of the like privileges as to goods, wares, and merchandise arriving in any ports of the United States.

When, in 1888, President Cleveland's Retaliation Bill was passed upon the assumption that this article 29 was still in force, Representative Nelson, in discussing that Bill, to which he was opposed, because he claimed that clause 29 was still in force, used these words, and I quote them as an illustration of the arguments used and deemed sufficient to induce American Representatives and Senators to vote in a certain way on matters relating to England and Canada :

The truth of it is, and we might as well state it in plain terms without any circumlocution, that the President in his zeal to “un-English” himself before the American people has permitted himself, in a sort of

mental hallucination, engendered no doubt by the stress of a political campaign, to recommend the unwarranted abrogation of a solemn international compact—a compact, too, that concerns one of the most important and momentous interests of the country, and from the abrogation of which we would suffer far more than our neighbour. And he asks our legislative sanction for such abrogation.

And we as legislators sitting here, not to be outdone in what has jocosely been termed torturing the British lion, will no doubt after mild verbal protests complacently pass the President's little bill.

So to-day, when the President attempts to carry aloft, perched on his banner, that bird of freedom before us and the American people, although we can see little or no occasion therefor, yet a glimpse of that bird, however slight or momentary, engenders in each bosom a spirit to do or dare all that the Republic may ask, whether right or wrong; and in this spirit do we acquiesce in yielding to the President what little he now asks, for we all have a love for our land as if she were our daughter: her pipes in peace, her tomahawks in war.

Then, Mr. Cleveland, in his Message of August, 1888, used the following language:—

In any event, and whether the law of 1873 construes the treaty or governs it, sec. 29 of such treaty. I have no doubt, terminated with the proceedings taken by our Government to terminate articles 18 to 25 inclusive and article 30 of the treaty.

If by any language used in the joint resolution it was intended to relieve sec. 3 of the Act of 1873, embodying article 29 of the treaty, from its own limitation, or to save the article itself, I am entirely satisfied that the intention miscarried.

Mr. Harrison affirmed this attitude in his farewell Message, because he says:

I have asked the opinion of the Attorney-General upon this question, and he is of the opinion that article 29 has been abrogated * * * * *
I have come to the conclusion that article 29 of the Treaty of Washington has been abrogated.

We certainly have here a not very reassuring illustration of the consistency of American opinion in regard to their international relation. Neither in the resolution that I read, authorizing the President to give notice of their intention to terminate the Treaty of Washington, nor in the Proclamation subsequently issued abrogating the Treaty, do you find clause 29 mentioned; and in both Houses of the American Congress, gentlemen who said they were opposed to the repeal of article 29, arose in their places and asked those in charge of the motion whether it would affect that clause of the treaty, and they were solemnly assured in both Houses that the legislation asked for would in no way affect clause 29. Four years after the Secretary of State of the United States wrote an official letter, declaring positively that clause 29 was still in force; and later, both branches of the Legislature joined with the President in passing an Act which assumed that that clause was still in force. Yet we find that in 1888 President Cleveland, in face of a political exigency, turned around and solemnly declared that the treaty was repealed, and asked both branches of the Legislature to pass an Act, which they did, based upon that assumption.

Lastly, we find President Harrison, in his farewell Message, backed up by his Attorney-General, without any explanation whatever, as to how he arrived at the conclusion under this state of facts, solemnly affirming that it had been repealed, and asked for legislation accordingly. Now, that brings me to consider, for a moment, what, under these circumstances, our attitude ought to be in regard to the United States people and Government. I have shown that our fishery relations with them are precisely where they were in 1818, with this important exception, that the fishermen of the United States are to-day enjoying all the benefits that were obtained under the "modus vivendi" in connection with the treaty of 1888, which treaty they promptly rejected, and they still continue to enjoy them, practically, to the full extent, without our getting anything in return. I have shown that the privileges granted our vessels under the treaty of 1871 have been abrogated in the most peremptory and unfriendly manner, and they have persistently refused them to us, though we continue to allow them their full enjoyment for no return. I have shown that, in regard to our canals, they are enjoying to the broadest extent the full benefits that were granted to them under that treaty, while, by the internal regulations that they exacted from us, except on the St. Mary's canal, we do not enjoy anything; and that their extraordinary rulings in reference to the abrogation and construction of solemn treaties and international compacts and the retaliatory nature of the authority bestowed by the Legislature upon the President, are such that, coupled with the unfriendly and menacing Messages submitted to Congress from time to time by the President, we can never feel certain how soon all commercial relations and interchange of traffic may be prohibited. As to reciprocity, in my opinion, we have taken every possible method to secure it that any right-minded or independent Canadian would consider we should take. I think we are now more than ever entitled to use the language which was used in 1878 by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), then Finance Minister, and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, then Prime Minister. The member for South Oxford, in speaking at Halifax, on August 19, 1878, used these words:

For my part, I deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or another. No Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among any great number of his fellow-countrymen.

And at Charlottetown, in August, 1878, referring to the failure of the Hon. George Brown, in connection with that treaty, he said:

It is said we must have reciprocity and cannot along without it; I deny this. We will seek out new markets. We have men and we have ships and will carry the war into Africa.

Mr. Mackenzie, on 18th February, 1878, questioned as to efforts for reciprocity, said :

As that question has been put here categorically, I may say once for all, that since the effort made by the Government through the Honourable George Brown, the Government had made no effort to secure Reciprocity—when the United States made any propositions, the Government would be prepared to consider them.

The more I examine the records, the more I am struck with astonishment and admiration at the patient and tolerant spirit of the people of Canada. Let us continue this spirit coupled with a dignified self-reliance. I am satisfied, for my part, that it will be better for the people of the United States and better for us, the sooner we give them unmistakably to understand, "come weal, come woe," we purpose to hold and maintain Canada as Canada, for the Canadians; that we purpose to stand by British institutions and British connection against all comers; and that we are determined to construct, upon the boundless heritage which God and nature have given us, a great British Canadian nation. Sir, taking the history of Canada, whether with or without reciprocity, we have every reason to be satisfied, hopeful and confident—no reason for doubt or alarm, let alone despair or craven fear. Let us treat our neighbours with friendship, firmness and independence. If they are coercive and aggressive, let us be self-reliant but not boastful, patient but not cowardly. That brings me to the practical consideration of the resolution of which I have given notice. It is pertinent to consider, in connection with the subject of an all Canadian water-way from the head of the great lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, whether we have one now, or will have one when the St. Mary's Canal will be completed. I am bound to concede that, so far as the treaties go, we have the right to use the St. Mary's Canal, because, under article 7 of the treaty of 1842 :

It is further agreed that the channels in the river St. Lawrence, on both sides of the Long Sault Islands and of Barnhart Island, the channels in the river Detroit on both sides of the Island Bois Blanc, and between that island and both the American and Canadian shores, and all the several channels and passages between the various islands lying near the junction of the river St. Clair with the lake of that name, shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties.

Under article 17 of the treaty of 1871, it is provided :

The Government of Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion; and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and further engages to urge upon the State Governments to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of the several State

Mr. TISDALE.

canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the high contracting parties, on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

So far as a treaty can bind our volatile American cousins, we have full right, on the same terms as themselves, as neither of these clauses are, according to the terms of the treaty, revocable. This resolution practically involves three things: Is the scheme feasible; what will it cost; will the benefits be worth the cost? As to the feasibility of the scheme, I cannot do better than quote from practical and scientific men. As long ago as 1855, an engineer, Major R. Lachlan, read before the Canadian Institute a report, the substance of which, on this subject, is as follows:—

At the junction of the east shore line of Point Pelee Peninsula, and the north shore line of Lake Erie, is a harbour called the Two Creeks, in the township of Romney; the name of Two Creeks is derived from two branches happening to unite within 100 yards or so of the beach of Lake Erie. The western one is small, shallow and marshy towards its mouth, but the eastern or main one, which is peculiarly calculated to form a commodious harbour capable of containing one hundred vessels, consists of a fine clear channel, from twelve to sixteen feet deep, and about twenty rods wide, extending fully half a mile inland, beside being skirted to the eastward by a marshy bay of less depth, about 100 yards wide, the mass of vegetation on the surface of which being known to rise and fall with the level of the water in the lake, might easily be broken up and floated down into the lake, and thereby add much to the capacity of the harbour; the land on the east side of this bay is low, but on the west side of the East Creek forming the point between the two branches, and also the right bank of the west branch is high and commanding, and well suited for a village, being from twelve to sixteen feet above the water level, with steep banks. The soil also is good, being a light coloured sandy loam, resting upon yellow clay, and there is no indication of rocks or stones in the neighbourhood. Supposing two vessels to start from Buffalo for the Upper Lakes, they might voyage together until they arrive near Two Creeks aforesaid. We will suppose one to be a Canadian vessel, not allowed to pass through the St. Clair Canal; the other an American vessel. The Canadian vessel will part company at this point and enter through one lock (five and a half feet rise) into the St. Clair and Erie Canals, and through that into and across Lake St. Clair and through one of the channels east of Walpole Island, until she gets by the most convenient route into the St. Clair River. The American went around by Detroit and the St. Clair Canal, and when she arrives at the same location she will have travelled fifty-seven miles more than the Canadian vessel; and if they are destined for the same port on the Upper Lakes, the American vessel will have travelled 114 miles when they arrived at Buffalo, on their return voyage. The most desirable work to be considered here is not a harbour but a canal, to be constructed between this proposed harbour, along near the boundary between the counties of Kent and Essex to Jennett's Creek, near the mouth of the Thames, or some place near it. By looking at a good map of Ontario, it will be seen that to continue northward along the eastern boundary of Lake St. Clair, there are two passages or channels along the eastern boundary of Walpole Island, leading into the river St. Clair, which I think, in all probability, could be made navigable at a comparatively trifling expense,

considering its importance in shortening the voyage from Lake Erie through this proposed canal, northward and southward on the return trip. Why it is supposed that a canal passing through those two counties would help to drain one million acres of the most fertile land, and help to make that part of those two counties, both as to soil and climate, the garden of Canada. Military men can understand what an advantage it would be in case of war in avoiding the passage of Detroit, &c., &c., &c.

I find, also, that an engineer, Mr. Pinney, in 1857, made a survey, and I will quote briefly from his report :

SANDWICH, 19th May, 1857.

To the Committee of the Two Creeks and St. Clair Ship Canal.

GENTLEMEN,—In accordance with instructions received from you directing me to proceed with a survey of a canal from Two Creeks, in the township of Romney, in the county of Kent, to a point at or near the St. Clair River, and report as to the feasibility of building the proposed canal, I beg to lay before you the plan, profile and estimates thereof, and this report thereon.

I have, &c.,
CHAS. PINNEY,
Civil Engineer.

REPORT.

Being in possession of a copy of the plan of the harbour of the Two Creeks, which was most thoroughly surveyed by Wm. Scott, Esq., C.E., by order of the Government, I found it totally unnecessary to make any examination of the survey of the same, as it showed conclusively the natural facilities for a good harbour, and saved both time and trouble in re-endorsement that which had already been most satisfactorily ascertained; and I therefore proceed to commence at a point on the main branch of the Two Creeks, and ran a line directly straight for Baptiste Creek, which place I made at its intersection with Wilson's Creek. At the spot where I made the junction there was 12 feet of water, and at no part from thence to its emptying into the Thames was there less than 12 in the channel, the deepest part being 20. I then followed the course of Baptiste Creek to the Thames, the distance from the river to the Two Creeks being 15·85 miles.

The line was continued thence up the Thames about two miles, and Lot 6 in the 3rd concession of Dover West, and then with the same bearing as the tangent from the Two Creeks to Baptiste Creek, I ran the line also directly straight for Little Bear Creek, which place I made at its junction with the Chenal Ecarté. I examined said creek, and found that there was 13 feet at its mouth, and for nearly a quarter of a mile up the same depth of water, which gradually shallowed down to 9 feet, the distance from River Thames to Little Bear Creek being 13·28 miles.

The face of the country through which I passed in making the above survey being so remarkably level and without the slightest obstacle intervening, I found it unnecessary to run another.

Then I have later information from an engineer named J. C. McNabb :

About 1850, the townships of Mersea, Romney, Tilbury East and Tilbury West contributed \$250 each for the purpose of having a thorough survey made and estimate of cost. The levels taken at this time showed a difference of level between Lake St. Clair and Erie, of five feet ten inches (5 ft. 10 in.) and these figures were practically corroborated by Mr.

Molesworth, Government engineer, in 1869, whose figures differed but two inches from those of Mr. Peeny, in 1850. The admiralty charts give four feet as the difference of level between the two lakes, but as this finding, is from barometric readings, it is at best approximate. The route of the canal would doubtless follow the line of least resistance, and this would be from near the mouth of Baptiste Creek on Lake St. Clair, southerly, taking advantage of the low levels of Baptiste, Tremblay and Two Creeks, to the mouth of two Creeks on Lake Erie, and this line gives almost a straight run from Lake Huron to Lake Erie, effecting a great saving in time and distance. The physical characteristics of this route do not involve any engineering difficulties as the thirteen or fourteen miles of cutting necessary consist of clay loam with possibly some sand in the neighbourhood of the summit and these materials with the improved machinery of to-day can be handled expeditiously and cheaply. With a lock at the northerly terminus to control the waters of the River Thames and Lake St. Clair, the point of discharge for the drainage of the adjacent municipalities would be about on a level with Lake Erie or five feet below that now obtainable, and once this is attained it will put at rest at once and forever all contention regarding drainage matters in those townships

I wrote to Mr. McNabb then, and inquired as to the feasibility of the route from the mouth of the canal where it struck Lake St. Clair, to get east of the Walpole Islands, to which he replied, on the 28th February last :

CHATHAM, Ont., Feby. 28th, 1893.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 25th instant, I would beg to state that there are no difficulties in the way of constructing the St. Clair and Erie Canal wholly within Canadian territory. The shores along the line of the proposed extension consist of fenlands, and the bottom of St. Clair is sand from four to six feet on a stratum of blue clay. The work on the extension would consist of a dredge cut, across Lake St. Clair, in a line with the canal shown on plan to the mouth of the Chenal Ecarté, or to the Johnston's channel, this cut would have to be protected by a dyke on the lake side, and a rough estimate of the work necessary would be

Dredging.....	\$250,000
Dyking.....	200,000
Incidentals.....	20,000
	\$470,000

or in round numbers, say \$500,000. Then you would have a route with all the difficult and dangerous features of the present route eliminated. The present route *via* Lake St. Clair and Detroit River, is anything but a satisfactory one, the obstructions met with are, Colchester reef in Lake Erie, Bar Point, Grosse Point and Limekiln Crossing.

The St. Clair Ship Canal is not self-scouring and requires constant dredging, but in the proposed channel such would not be the case, as the swift current of either Johnston channel or the Chenal Ecarté would be sufficient to keep it free from sedimentary deposits. The current is such that a steamboat turning north at Johnston's bend out of the Sydenham River, has about all she can do to make the turn. The easterly shore of Lake St. Clair from mouth of Thames to Walpole Island, is very shallow, and a dyked channel, similar to the St. Clair Ship Canal, is all that is necessary. The correct and complete scheme is such as you describe, and in comparison with the enormous sums being spent by the Government of the United States, is inexpensive. To complete their waterway, they contemplate the following expenditure ;—

Sault Ste. Marie Lock and Channel	\$7,000,000
St. Clair River improvements	\$3,000,000
Niagara Ship Canal	\$23,000,000
Erie Canal improvements	\$250,000,000

Whilst if the Chicago and Mississippi scheme is carried out, the expenditure will reach \$500,000,000. These amounts are the estimates of United States engineers.

In the matter of a waterway, nature has been kind to Canada, and with a small expenditure, she can control the lake traffic.

Yours respectfully,
JOHN C. McNABB.

D. TISDALE, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

The Pinney route is, of course out of the question. His object in going two miles up the Thames was, undoubtedly, to get a tow path, because, at that early day, they knew nothing about steam propulsion or steam barges for use, or passage through canals. The practical scheme is the one which Mr. McNabb advises: a short canal, fourteen miles long, and then a canal with a dyke, built in this inexpensive way, on one side, which will strike the channel back and east of the Walpole Islands.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all documents, reports and correspondence between the Government and the Quebec Board of Trade, or any other person, in relation to the treatment endured by Canadian fishermen from Newfoundland fishermen along the Canadian Labrador coast.—(Mr. Joncas).

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of British Columbia and the Minister of the Interior, relating to the boundary of the Railway Belt in the province of British Columbia.—(Mr. Mara).

Copies of instructions issued to the fishery overseers of Berthier, Maskinongé, St. Maurice, Champlain, Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu, since 1st January, 1892, and of all correspondence on the subject between the Government and the said fishery overseers; or between the Government and any other persons, from 1st January, 1892, up to this date, in relation to such instructions and the enforcement thereof. 2. A statement of fishing licenses issued in the counties aforesaid during the year 1891 and 1892, separately. 3. A statement of the quantity and value of the various kinds of fish taken in the said counties—separately—during the years 1891 and 1892.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

Copies of all documents, claims, petitions, correspondence, reports of the Superintendent of the Chambly Canal, reports of experts and others, plans, agreements, proposals, and decisions of the Government in relation of the claim of Joseph Lacouture, of the parish of St. Luc, for damages caused to his property by the waters of the Chambly Canal.—(Mr. Lavergne.)

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

After Recess.

LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 47) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Mr. TISDALE.

In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. TISDALE. By an Act of last session it was enacted that the bondholders should have the same power of voting as the shareholders, and under this clause as at present it may be doubtful whether they have that power. I move therefore:

That the words, "and for the purpose of this section the mortgage debentures and bonds of the company shall be deemed stock, and the holders of such bonds and debentures shall be deemed shareholders of the Company," be inserted at the end of subsection 1.

This was agreed to by both parties, but was inadvertently left out of the Bill in Committee; and, as it is purely a formal amendment, I hope there will be no objection to my having it inserted in the Bill now.

Mr. LAURIER. I would simply point out that this is a vicious practice, and that the better way would be to send the Bill back to the committee. If the leader of the House is satisfied, he must take the responsibility.

Mr. HAGGART. The amendment is merely declaratory that the powers they had before are not taken away.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not like the phraseology. No doubt, a bondholder would not like a clause saying that, even for any limited purpose, he was only a shareholder. The same end could be attained by a different set of words, as, for instance, "carried by a two-thirds majority of the shareholders and bondholders, ascertained as in section 2."

Mr. TISDALE. I take no interest in the matter, except that as the chairman of the Railway Committee I was asked to bring it up in the House, and I supposed, being purely formal, there would be no objection to it. I would prefer that the amendment should pass in the shape in which it has been given to me. I understand that all parties concerned agree to this amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. These sets of words become precedent for imitation later on, and I do not think, even by consent of the bondholders, we should put in a set of words not quite sufficient.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Calgary Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Calgary Hydraulic Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation and Railway Company, and to confirm an agree-

ment respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Roome.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Chilliwack Railway Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

ALLEGED UTTERANCES BY CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. CASEY. I beg leave to give notice that I will, on the first occasion when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, call attention to certain alleged utterances by the Controller of Customs at Kingston on Friday week last, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be present on that occasion.

Mr. WALLACE. I will be on hand and ready to meet your charges.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to disfranchise electors who have taken bribes.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. I will take occasion at this stage to call the attention of the House to the fact that, following the suggestion made by hon. gentlemen across the floor on Wednesday evening last, I invited a number of members who evinced the most active interest in this Bill during the debate to meet informally as a committee and run through the remaining sections of the Bill. Accepting that suggestion, the hon. members for Bothwell, for Bellechasse, for Quebec Centre, for Cumberland and for North Grey, were good enough to meet and spend a considerable time in running through the measure. The changes suggested by them were inconsiderable, though enough to make it desirable to have the Bill reprinted, embodying the substance of the amendments moved the other night and one or two amendments which I announced my intention to move, as well as some minor changes suggested by this informal committee. The most important point taken was in regard to the very excellent suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to shorten the operation of the inquiry by having the petition sent direct to the court and the money deposit also sent to the court. Therefore, with the consent of the committee, I will ask that this newly-printed Bill be considered. I may add that it has been printed in English and French and distributed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot proceed after that manner. We have a copy of the Bill before the Committee, and we have considered clause 5. We will, therefore, read the clauses as printed, and the amendments desired to be moved and considered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose when the Committee rises and reports, we can move that the House resolves itself again into Committee of the Whole to consider the first five sections. This will simply alter the order in which we consider the sections.

On section 6.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Was section 6 passed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Section 6 as printed cannot even be put in force, since the section in the new Bill reads as follows:—

Sec. 8. All persons duly summoned in accordance with the rules of court in that behalf shall attend, and shall answer all questions, lawfully put to them, touching the matters to be inquired into, and shall produce all books, papers, deeds and writings required of them and in their custody or under their control.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is right. Section 6 was not passed.

Mr. AMYOT. The number of the sections are not the same as in the other Bill, and I would suggest that we should commence the Bill again.

Mr. WELDON. I would wish with the consent of the House, to adopt that suggestion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We cannot proceed without the consent of the House.

Mr. WELDON. There is a rearrangement of the clause; but it is a mere matter of numbering largely. I hope the House will not stand on a formality, but allow us to go on with the Bill.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have not the Bill as amended; therefore I object to its being any longer discussed, and I rise to a question of order.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Does the hon. gentleman wish to begin over again the whole debate? He complains of not having read the Bill. We may take it up from the beginning, if he wishes.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I do not wish merely to peruse the new Bill, but to have time to study it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Under the rules of this House, the consideration of the clauses of the Bill should be proceeded with in their proper order; all amendments are to be reported by the Chairman to the House, and should any one propose any new amendments the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) Under the rules of this House, the procedure to be followed is the one pointed out by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont); but, as the Bill has been so materially altered, I think

it might with the leave of the House be considered over again from the beginning.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) As just pointed out by the hon. member from L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), the Bill just submitted to us for consideration offers some new features which make it quite different from the former Bill; this new Bill possibly has been studied by the members of the sub-committee; but the members who do not belong to this committee have not had the opportunity to consider it.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Though but slightly conversant with parliamentary procedure, I find all the same this is an extraordinary mode of procedure. The Bill was first taken up for consideration last week; a private sub-committee has since then sat outside this House, and to-day we are asked to concur in amendments altogether new, and so, from day to day, they may keep on amending the Bill, till we never know where we stand on the matter.

Mr. DICKEY. There can be no doubt, I think, that the hon. member for L'Assomption is quite correct in his contention. When the great majority of the House wishes to give the Bill a fair consideration I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his objection. He said this was a secret committee.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. I did not say "secret." I said it was a private committee.

Mr. DICKEY. It was a committee to assist the Committee of the Whole House in getting through this Bill. There is merely a question of procedure standing in our way now. It seems to me more logical to begin at the beginning, and I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jeannotte) will not object to what the great majority of the House want to do.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I am sorry I cannot comply with the request of the hon. member in the latter case. Either I have a right to insist or I have not. I stick to my right. I insist on a further ground: the Bill has been altered almost beyond recognition; the contents of the new clause, 6, having been reduced by three-fourths. What need is there of hurrying on this legislation, as if the House of Commons were on fire? The first error of the promoter of this Bill was his refusal to accede to the wise proposal of the hon. member for Bothwell, who suggested referring this Bill for consideration to a committee consisting of four or five members of this House, who should report to the House. The hon. member for Albert thought it below his dignity to condescend to this. Well, let him bear the responsibility which devolves upon him. As, under the rules of parliamentary procedure, the Bill cannot come again before the House, I withdraw my objection.

On section 6,

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) If I take it right, clause 8, such as it stands in the
Mr. CHAIRMAN.

newly printed Bill, is substituted to clause 6 of the original Bill. Clause 8 reads as follows:—

8. All persons duly summoned in accordance with the rules of court in that behalf shall attend and shall answer all questions lawfully put to them touching the matters to be inquired into, and shall produce all books, papers, deeds and writings required of them and in their custody or under their control.

As I already previously remarked, the last time the Bill came up before the House, the object of this Bill, while tending to prevent bribery at elections, will not effectually put a stop to bribery. The Contested Elections Act was enacted, if my memory serves me right, in 1873; it was amended in 1874 and in 1875, then in 1879, 1887, 1888, 1890 and 1891, which goes to prove how difficult a task it is to make a law with a view to putting a stop to bribery and preventing electors to sell their votes. To prevent bribery such has been the main object of all the amendments introduced up to this day. And did we succeed in preventing it? Were I to believe the statements made on the floor of this House by certain members, bribery instead of decreasing is on the increase. Why so? It is beyond my knowledge to answer this question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) By no means.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) The amendments made so far, with a view to stamping out bribery have only resulted in encouraging it and making it more secret than before. The object of the Bill now under consideration, though excellent in itself, is reflective in this sense: that it has a tendency towards introducing, in this free land of ours, where every one has the full enjoyment of his rights, a law of an inquisitorial nature. The Bill will, as already said, result in developing bribery, while restricting the elector's liberty to sell his vote. This is a false principle, grounded on false promises, from which will proceed equally false consequences, when, after studying for over eighteen years the Contested Elections Act, this House, composed of many eminent lawyers and other professional lights did not succeed in framing a perfect legislation calculated to prevent bribery. I have a right to question the efficacy of the present Bill. It has been said that it would prove a profitable affair for lawyers, and it was likely to multiply law suits, thus giving them a chance to replenish their pockets. I must say in this connection that as lawyers wishing to earn honestly their living, we do repudiate such an imputation, as money thus earned is little short of ill-gotten gain. I consider that, in spite of all present and future amendments, this Bill is not calculated to stamp out bribery. In my opinion it will only result in developing and encouraging this crying evil and involving very high costs. After discussing the Bill in committee, the other day, the hon. member

for Albert found out that almost every section of it was defective. He, therefore, was wise enough to prepare a revised and corrected edition of his Bill; but it remains unaltered, as far as its principle and its practical operation are concerned. He did not exert himself to bring down the costs, nor did he aim at making the meaning of his Bill more obvious; he did merely confine himself to condense the subsections, shortening them by half. The hon. member is labouring under a strange delusion, were he to flatter himself of obviating thereby all chances of law suits. Under this Bill, every witness called upon to give evidence is liable to be disqualified on his own evidence, which is contrary to the principle of English law by which no one is obliged to criminate himself. I venture to hope that this House will not allow such a Bill to become law. From a careful analysis of this Bill, the conclusion is easily reached, that an elector, in consequence of his telling the truth under oath, may be incarcerated and deprived of his political rights during the space of seven years. I sincerely trust that, in this Dominion of Canada, we have not yet come to that; I trust that freedom is not to be infringed upon to such a degree. As to the province of Quebec elections, I may say, are carried on without any scandalous bribery being indulged in; apart from a certain amount of chicanery, bribery and corrupt practices do not prevail extensively in our midst, and I may state here, that such a legislation as is now under consideration is uncalled for, as far as our province is concerned, notwithstanding the statement made in the English press to the effect that I bribed my electors and bought the seat which I now occupy in this House. I need not repeat my denial of such an absurd and gratuitous imputation, on the ground that having been returned by acclamation, bribery was altogether out of the question; but, in spite of my denial, I should not wonder at seeing the imputation repeated in the press. In my constituency—L'Assomption—thanks be to God, people do not take bribes. I hold that the principle of the Bill—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that we are no longer discussing the principle of the Bill. Should the general discussion on the principle of the measure begin over again, why, it will take us two weeks before we see the end of it. The debate on the principle of the measure having occupied two days, it is, to my mind, quite sufficient. We are now considering clause 6. I call the hon. member to order, and I beg that he will confine his remarks to the clause under consideration.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the explanation just given. I will now deal exclusively with clause 6 of the Bill. This clause reads as follows:—

All persons duly summoned in accordance with the rules of court in that behalf shall attend and shall

answer all questions, lawfully put to them, touching the matters to be inquired into, and shall produce all books, papers, deeds and writings required of them and in their custody or under their control.

It is, therefore, a court, Mr. Chairman. I had made out, however, from the remarks fallen from the promoter of this Bill, at the outset of the debate, that they were to be only commissioners appointed to make inquiry, whenever asked for. This is a new feature which comes for the first time under my notice. We had simple commissioners, now we have judges, regularly constituted into a court.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The first clause of the Bill provides for it:

In each of the provinces of Canada, the court which has power, jurisdiction and authority with reference to election petitions therein, shall be held to be, and is hereby constituted in such province a court for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) This refers to the first clause, which I am forbidden by the Chairman to discuss at the present time. I move that the following words be added to clause 6: "No voter shall be disqualified on the grounds of his giving evidence." Formerly, persons were condemned on their own evidence: this procedure was still in force in France and elsewhere towards the close of the 18th century; but it is done away with now in civilised countries.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) This is already provided for in the law concerning contested elections. Under this law, no witness is liable to prosecution on the ground of any answer given by him in his evidence. All he requires is a certificate from the judge to that effect. The present Bill is but an amendment to the Contested Elections Act.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I call the attention of the hon. member from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), that we have not to deal with a court of justice, but with commissioners appointed to inquire as to whether corrupt practices has been committed. Under this clause, witnesses shall be bound to answer all questions put by the tribunal, whether or not these questions call forth answers tending to criminate them. And let it be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that once the inquiry is over, the commissioners are bound to publish the names of the parties found guilty and disqualified by him; he is to report to the Governor-General in Council, and the revising officer of the county shall be directed to strike off the list of voters the names of all electors thus found guilty of taking bribes. There is no provision in the Bill to the effect that the witness who has given evidence criminating himself, shall not be prosecuted. I am aware that the contested elections law decrees that a witness is not liable to be indicted on the ground of any answers he may have given

criminating him, in the course of his evidence; but there is no provision for it in this Bill, and I hold that a witness who has stated in his evidence that he has taken bribes is liable to be indicted on the strength of his own evidence. No such law should find place on our Statute-book. Let us suppose that, as an elector, I took a bribe of five dollars for my vote; under this Bill, I am bound to tell the commissioners who may disqualify me or incarcerate me, and will have my name published in the official "Gazette." Hence I infer that this law will be inoperative.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Under the Contested Election Law, an elector, who has taken bribes shall not be excused from answering questions put by the judge. The court reports his name to the Speaker of this House, and he can no longer be an election agent; anyhow, were a candidate uncautious enough to employ him as such, he runs the risk of having his election annulled.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) This Bill is no amendment to the Contested Elections Law; it is a copy, they say, of the law passed by this House at Mr. Blake's demand. Under this Bill a candidate elected by a majority of five votes will not be unseated, were this new court of enquiry to find one hundred cases of corrupt practices committed with the view to further and secure his election. This candidate although elected through bribery, will not be unseated. Let us suppose one hundred witnesses stating under oath that they have taken bribes: the commissioners, within the meaning of the Bill as construed, are empowered to disfranchise the witnesses for seven years. Such a provision is beyond my comprehension. Not so with the Contested Elections Law, which provides that the votes cast in favour of a candidate are struck off the list. The commissioners are quite at liberty to conduct the inquest as they think fit. Whereas there is no law to prevent any one having a counsel to represent him, the commissioners may say: We have the right to conduct this enquiry as we think best, even privately, with closed doors, and closeted in our room; you have nothing to do with it. And the commissioners have a right to oblige witnesses to answer. Were this Bill to become law, it will only remain for us to introduce immediately another Bill, providing for the putting of the witnesses to the rack, and so we will have a complete set of inquisitorial laws.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. member is utterly mistaken; the commissioners are done away with.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Then it is no longer the same Bill.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The commissioners are altogether out of question now; the Bill now deals with judges as-

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

signed by the court for the purpose of making inquiry into acts of bribery under the Act.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman is right, then I rise to a question of order. As we no longer have to deal with the same Bill, and as judges have been substituted for commissioners in the clause, I contend that the committee should not go on with the consideration of this Bill. I have been ruled out of order just now on the ground that I was dealing with the principle of the measure, which was not at issue; but, as the measure has been altered almost beyond recognition, I consider I am quite in order now in discussing the principle of the measure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I raise a question of order. The committee should rise, as, obviously, they can no longer continue examining a Bill which has been so materially altered. Clause 6, which is now under discussion by this House, is no longer germane to the Bill, as it refers to a court of justice. The first Bill provides that "on a solemn declaration being signed by twenty-five electors, the Governor-General shall appoint commissioners for the purpose of making inquiry into bribery." But now, we have to deal no longer with commissioners, but with a court of justice.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I press on the objection just raised by the hon. member for L'Assomption. The amendment is not germane to the preamble of the Bill; it even involves a contradiction with the preamble as the amendment refers to a court, while the preamble has reference to commissioners. There is a question of order which ought to be attended to first.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member cannot offer an amendment and raise at the same time a question of order. We are now discussing the amendment.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Well, then, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment of the hon. member for Albert does not agree with the principle of the Bill. The amendment deals with a court of justice, while the preamble of the Bill implies a commission.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that when he speaks to the amendment, he speaks to a new clause of the Bill.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Exactly so, but I maintain that the hon. member for Albert is out of order in moving this amendment, as it utterly alters the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member forgets that another amendment has been moved by the hon. member for L'Assomption.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) He has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is not an amendment, but an addition. I add words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) In parliamentary parlance it is an amendment.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Well, I ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. FORBES. When a judge comes to hold his investigation, you will find there is very little difficulty in getting from the witnesses, not only the name of the man who received the bribe, but also the name of the party who offered the bribe. In nine cases out of ten, you will find the men who take bribes, are not those who go round a constituency asking for them, but those who are induced to accept money by others more influential than they, who have their pockets well lined during election times. I have seen such men go to the fishermen and farmers, and show \$5 or \$10 bills, and tell these people that there was no crime either in offering or accepting the money. I have heard men put seriously the question to these people as to whether they would be doing wrong, morally or legally, in accepting that money, and they have been told: "Not at all. I do not want to influence your vote, but here is a \$5 or \$10 bill; do what you like." The crime is with the man who offers the money, and not with the poor fellow who takes it. I would, therefore, move that these words be inserted.

Mr. WELDON. That raises a question which I discussed when I moved the second reading of the Bill. It goes to the very heart of the matter in this way. The principle of the Bill is not wide, but narrow, and intended to deal with a specific evil. It is not meant to be a punitive measure. If it does punish incidentally, it does so in pursuance of another object. It is a protective measure, intended to protect the commonwealth and the state, by providing that those who cast ballots, must be men who value them. The man who gives a bribe, is a criminal now, under our law, and if my hon. friend feels it necessary to make that law any more drastic, let him do so. We are not in this Bill disfranchising that or any other criminal. I quite agree with the spirit of my hon. friend's remarks, in a general way; but I am pursuing another idea, the idea of disfranchising a person who is not qualified, not because he is a criminal, but because he is like a child and not fit to cast his vote. He does not prize his right, but lets another give him money for it. If my hon. friend brings in his amendment, it will be a new idea. I had thought of that at first, but it was pointed out to me that it would not be logical.

Mr. LAURIER. If a man is bribed not to cast his vote, and does not cast it, is he disfranchised?

Mr. WELDON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Would not that apply as well to the man who bribed him?

Mr. WELDON. A man in that case has abandoned his right for corrupt purposes, and should be treated as a child, but the man who gives a bribe is a criminal and our law makes him a criminal. A strong reason that induced me to abandon this clause was this: It was pointed out by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) who, I am sorry is not here to-night, who gave this Bill such an intelligent and clear support the other night, that if this disability were inserted, it would put it out of our power to succeed.

Mr. FORBES. Why?

Mr. WELDON. The only possible hope of practically succeeding in any single county in Canada with this Bill, is the hope of getting evidence from the bribe-giver. If my hon. friend's amendment were accepted, there would be a new difficulty in the way of getting evidence, and that is a very strong reason against it, but, mark this, if this Bill becomes law and the machinery is put in motion, and it turns out that eight or ten men have been buying voters in blocks of from five to twenty, and you get evidence that by these eight or ten some 200 have been bribed, in that way you will succeed. Is not the man who is publicly proclaimed by a Supreme Court judge in a province to be a bribe-giver, notoriously and openly, not severely punished by that fact alone, if he is a man of any standing and influence in the community? The Bill will have a very salutary effect in that way, that men of good standing, respectable, highly esteemed citizens will be unwilling to be found to have been handling election money; and the fear of this exposure in connection with this discreditable business will be very salutary and effective.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I never can see where the exposure comes in. The judge is not allowed to ask, or to permit to be asked, any question which may tend to criminate a third party. The only man I want to punish is the man who offers the bribe. I care very little for the other men at all. If they will keep out of my county with their money, I will answer for the virtue of the voters.

Mr. DALY. You would have it all your own way then.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The men in the county do not bribe. It is the money which comes from outside that does it. I ask the hon. gentleman to point out some clause which justifies a counsel or a judge in asking any question tending to incriminate third

parties not before the court. The question would be stopped the moment it was put.

Mr. FORBES. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the principle of the Bill is a sound one, but I do not see why he should refrain from going as far as he possibly can. The witness is asked whether he has accepted a bribe or not and evidence is given. Possibly evidence can only be got from the man himself. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) claims that the exposure of the briber will prevent him committing that offence and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said that the commission will not be allowed to take evidence of that point. Could the judges allow evidence to be given with respect to a man offering a bribe to an elector? The question could not be asked. If the object of the Bill is not to punish at all, but simply to treat those who receive bribes as incapable of being citizens of the commonwealth, why is it any more praiseworthy or honourable to offer a bribe to a man than it is to take it?

Mr. MASSON. The amendment is not only useless, but worse than useless. With such an amendment it would be impossible in any case to obtain a conviction except where the party who had bribed, did so for that purpose, and then came and voluntarily gave evidence for the purpose of wreaking revenge upon a man. Instead of rendering the Act serviceable, this amendment would make it worse than useless, because it would be possible for evil-disposed persons to levy blackmail upon the parties whose names he might mention, or upon the parties that these persons represented. Therefore the amendment is not entitled to support.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has raised the point of order, and we ought to have the decision of the Chair upon that point of order.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I submit to the Committee that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Albert is out of order, as involving a contradiction with the principle of the Bill; and on the ground that, in the preamble of the Bill adopted by this House, a commission of inquiry is mentioned, while the amendment refers to a court of justice.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I refer the hon. gentleman to the Bill as previously brought up before the House, and he will be satisfied that the Bill speaks of the commissioners as being judges of the Superior Court; now, the amendment of the hon. member for Albert has reference to a court of justice, to a Superior Court.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the point of order is well taken, because the amendment of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is simply to strike out the first part of section 6, and to retain the words in the last five lines. Now, these words are

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

nearly the same in the clause proposed by the committee, except one or two words, which are germane to the clause. In fact the words "commissioners" or "court" appear in both clauses, consequently the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Well, as the clause is in order, I move again my amendment.

Section agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. WELDON. I move that section 7 be dropped, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof:—

The evidence shall be taken under oath, and shall be in writing, and stenographers may be employed in the discretion of the court.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I object to this clause. I hold that it is useless to take this evidence in writing and still more so to employ stenographers. This would only result in making these inquests unnecessarily expensive, much more so than election trials. The deposit made by the petitioners to meet the necessary expenses will be utterly insufficient. I have not the least doubt that a deposit of \$1,000 will be required to cover the costs of stenographers. I would ask the hon. member for Albert to modify this clause so as to have the stenographers dispensed with by the court.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) I consider that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Albert is quite to the point. It is material to the good administration of justice that the evidence at the inquest be taken down, and, if necessary, by stenographers. They against whom prejudicial evidence is brought during the inquest, are entitled to know, subsequently, the contents of the depositions taken against them. How will they know such evidence unless it be taken down? How will they be enabled to defend themselves and object to the evidence if the court or the commissioner neglect having the depositions taken down. The matter of costs is, to my mind, of minor importance, where justice has to be meted out; and were not such evidence taken down, the accused parties would be unjustly deprived of a means of self-defence.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Frémont) that this commission of inquiry will dispose of cases summarily. In my opinion, the attendance of the respondents before the commissioners, after notice has been served upon them, will be compelled; such evidence as they intend objecting to will be taken down and noticed; this would suffice, to my mind, to enable them to object to the evidence. Where the deposit made is so small, I think it unfair to make the respondents liable to pay the costs of shorthand. Let us put a

case: Five or six witnesses are summoned to give evidence as to whether electors have committed corrupt practices; each one of these witnesses will be taxed from three to four dollars. Now, let us suppose the case of twenty or twenty-five persons accused of having taken bribes, and you see at one glance what an enormous bill of costs this legislation may involve. Formerly, justice was administered as now-a-days; there were no stenographers to be found, and evidence at the inquest was not always taken down. In the Court of Circuit, to-day, evidence is not taken by writing, and justice is being administered all the same; witnesses are summoned to object to the evidence of other witnesses. I would ask the hon. member for Albert to adopt more summary proceedings and do away with the employment of shorthand writers.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) If I am not mistaken, the fact of selling one's vote is an act involving a penalty, and a very heavy one, as it goes to deprive an elector of his franchise for seven years. But, with a view to establishing the evidence required for the purpose, it was thought that such evidence should be better taken down by stenography. It is only fair to give the respondent the right of cross-examining the witnesses who have made a deposition against him; unless he be well posted in law, he will, of course, secure the help of a lawyer. Time and a full knowledge of the evidence will be required for the preparation of his defence. I go still further than the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) and I put the case of a hundred electors accused of taking bribes at an election. As each one of the respondents has to cross-examine two or three witnesses, this examination will take more or less time. Now, stenographers are employed for taking down evidence in order to facilitate the reading of the evidence to be objected to by the respondent. The motion of the hon. member for Bagot is no extraordinary or new departure. How is it that a man can be sentenced to be hanged without a word of the evidence being taken down? I consider that the latter is in more critical circumstances than an elector who only runs the risk of being disqualified. I consider that the man who is disfranchised is not in a worse position than the man sentenced to penitentiary. All those who appear in our criminal courts suffer, when found guilty, ignominious punishment; and, though individual liberty, a right which excels all others, be at stake, still no stenographers are required to take down the evidence. The judges dispose of the case summarily, and forthwith the jurymen, when the trial takes place before the Court of Queen's Bench, give their verdict, and the judge pronounces the sentence. And, though penitentiary be the lot of the guilty party, the law does not provide for the employment of any stenographers. The question, in this in-

stance, is far from having very material consequences. Should this clause be adopted, the bill of costs will be something enormous. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) stated that the taking down of the evidence would amount to something like \$3 or \$4 per deposition. Obviously, the hon. gentleman is not practised in handling these questions of costs of parties calling witnesses for evidence, for he would know that the Bill of costs runs up much higher than that. Any lawyer he would know, could tell him that the costs amount to something like \$25 up to \$40 per deposition. And who knows? The Quebec Government are, perhaps, contemplating already to impose and levy a stamp duty on these depositions. This would create an additional source of revenue, and they would quite likely collect it, as this is to be a court of justice. Who, then, is going to be saddled with the costs? The Federal Government, I presume, as they have plenty of money. The costs, at any rate, will not be defrayed by the poor electors; they could not afford it. And the briber? No mention is made of him. Why so? This court of new creation will have nothing else to do but fishing for cases of corrupt practices. Nobody is to be held answerable for the costs! Truly, this is acting too blindly.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The costs, it is to be presumed, will be defrayed by somebody.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Many things may be conjectured; but a law ought not to be framed in this way. In cases of appeal, it will be a multiplication of lawsuits, and lawyers will find it a profitable business. Should the costs be saddled on the Government, I suggest that no lawyer be chosen, in order to give each lawyer a chance of replenishing his pocket. For lawyers to be mixed up in one of these inquests, will be one of those golden opportunities they will avail themselves of to make enough money to allow them to live comfortably till the next election.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I should wish that the members who favour this Bill, would condescend to answer the objections offered to it. The hon. Ministers who are intrusted with the mission of watching over our legislation, the French-speaking Ministers who fully catch the meaning of this Bill, ought to give a reply, should the promoter and his friends not understand our idiom. The hon. the Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron) and the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) ought to remember that it is within their province to give a solution to our objections. I would beg of the hon. Ministers to express an opinion on the objections raised by the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) and by myself, for, I dare say, were this Bill to pass, it would be a blot upon our Statute-book and a discredit to the Government who suffered such a retrograde legislation to become law.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I consider that the Government share in the opinion of their friends: they find, like us, that the objections so far offered are so groundless as to be hardly worth answering.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I was not aware that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) was so fervid a friend of the Government. So much so, indeed, that he usurps the role of the Ministers, when we ask them for a solution to the objections raised. Notwithstanding all the esteem I profess for my hon. friend, I may tell him that it is to the responsible Ministers I addressed myself, and from them I expect a reply. I wish to know, whether it is intended to organize secret inquisitorial courts unworthy of our nineteenth century, and to enact laws with a view to reviving the torture, in order to force from the electors a confession to the effect that they have taken bribes. I, therefore, hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Government will tell us their way of thinking on the clause at issue, and whether it is fair to allow electors to become a victim to such persecutions and become liable to pay such heavy costs? The committee, in my opinion, cannot adopt such a Bill without the Government giving expression to their views on the matter, whether they approve or disapprove of it. Again I beg of the Government to condescend replying to my question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The vote is to be taken; it is too late. The amendment is lost.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to on a division.

Mr. WELDON. I move that the following be section 8:—

The judge sitting on such inquiry shall be a court of record.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to explain that the object of this clause is to make it clear that the judge shall have common law jurisdiction and power to commit for contempt of court, which might be found to be necessary.

Section agreed to on a division.

Mr. WELDON. I move the addition of the following clause:—

The allegation sworn to in the petition, that the election took place, shall be *prima facie* evidence thereof.

This clause will dispose of a number of preliminary and technical objections.

Mr. MASSON. A preliminary case must be made out at some time, and it should not be made out on a petition sworn to in general terms. A person should not be put on his trial simply by the presentation of a petition, of which he has no notice. This clause is very objectionable, and should not

Mr. DUPONT.

be adopted. It can have no beneficial effect, and it may be productive of injury.

Mr. DICKEY. This clause is only intended to cover *prima facie* evidence of one fact, namely, that an election was held. Great difficulty might be experienced in proving that fact, and it might be necessary to obtain the original writ from Ottawa.

Mr. MASSON. If the section were changed so as to embody the intention expressed by the hon. gentleman, there would be no objection to it.

On section 10,

Mr. WELDON. I move that clause 10 read as follows:—

The judge may if he deems fit, award to any witness who appears before him a reasonable sum for travelling expenses and maintenances.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Who is going to defray these costs? I wish to know whether it is the elector who has been found guilty, or the informer? The Bill does not provide for it. The Bill merely says that the judge may, if he deems fit, award to any witness who appears before him, a reasonable sum for travelling expenses and maintenance; but it does not contain any provision as to who shall pay.

Mr. WELDON. Section 16 provides a handsome sum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You see in section 8, that all parties duly summoned shall attend. The serving of subpoenas on them is not duly summoning them, unless you tender fees to the witness. You ought to state in some section that they shall be compelled to attend without the fees being tendered in the first instance.

Mr. WELDON. That seems to be a very good suggestion and I think the hon. gentleman ought to reduce it to writing.

Mr. McLEOD. A man should at least have his actual travelling expenses before he is compelled to attend. It is rather severe to compel a man to go a long distance without money.

Mr. MASSON. I should think that section 8 would cover the matter. It refers to persons duly summoned in accordance with the rules of the court. The rules of the court would provide for the payment.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. You should not compel a poor labourer who has not a cent, to travel twenty or thirty miles without money.

Mr. MASSON. I agree that a witness should be paid in the first instance. It would be a great hardship to compel a poor man to attend without giving him his travelling expenses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I move as an addition to the eighth section:

All persons duly summoned in accordance with the rules of the Court in that behalf and paid their travelling fees according to the scale allowed in the court, shall attend and shall answer all questions.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Is it the intention that the costs shall be paid out of the deposit of \$500 made by the parties complaining, whether the plaintiffs prove their charge or not? If that is so, I have no more objection to the Bill.

Mr. WELDON. Under the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) the witnesses are to be paid beforehand.

On section 11,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In this section you provide that the Secretary of State shall instruct the revising officer to strike off the list of voters the names of all voters who have taken bribes. I do not think these words are necessary, because you subsequently provide that it shall be the duty of the revising officer to strike off the names. If the Secretary of State neglected to instruct the revising officer there might be some doubt as to whether the names ought to be left on the list or not.

Mr. MASSON. I would also point out that the mode of procedure proposed seems to relate to the state of things that existed prior to the passage of the Franchise Act, when the clerk of the municipality made out the list of voters shortly before an election. At present the revised list is sent to the Secretary of State, and it might be very difficult for the revising officer to carry out his instructions, and there might be several by-elections within a few years. Would it not be better to provide that the names should be struck off the last revised list, and should not be replaced for a certain length of time?

Mr. FORBES. It is easy for the revising officer to revise every list; but I would suggest that, as the object of this Bill is to kill bribery of every description, this section be amended by inserting after the word "taken" the words "given or offered," so that the names of all voters who have given or offered bribes shall be reported as well as those who have taken bribes. There is no use of passing an Act which is going to entail such a great expense as this is, and stop half way in our good intentions. The object of all our legislation should be to get at this fearful corruption, which is sweeping over the country, and which, I believe, is in its infancy. You at once draw a line of demarcation very pointedly. You say virtually in this Act that the man who takes the bribe is branded as unfit to be a citizen of Canada; on the other hand, you say the man who tempts him with gold is not a bad man, because you say that the judges who make the investigation shall not report his name to Parliament as having been guilty of offering a bribe, in other words he shall not

be classified among those who are unfit to have the right to vote.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) The first subsection of section 13 seems to me greatly open to objection. It reads as follows:—

13. The judge shall report the names of all voters whom he finds to have taken bribes; but he shall not report that any voter has taken a bribe unless and until he is satisfied that such vote has been served with a notice of the charge against him, and has had an opportunity of meeting it or that it was impossible to give him such notice by reason of his intentionally evading service.

Electors are not expected surely to abstain from travelling, as it happened in the past. A good many are away from their home during two or three months in the year. Let us take, for instance, the case of an elector who is working in the shanties. Even when served with a notice he will be said to have evaded service; and who is to produce the evidence? The bailiff commissioned to serve the notice? Fishing for cases of corrupt practices should not be the object aimed at by a law. Even when a single action of \$5, or even 25 cents, is brought, should the respondent evade summons he is served with the notice through the newspapers. With this Bill it is quite the contrary; notice shall be served on respondents, even when away from their house, and this will suffice to have them condemned. As just remarked by the hon. member for Queen (Mr. Forbes)—and let him allow me to congratulate him, as he is the first English-speaking member who has not been afraid to give out his opinion—why should not the briber be punished just as the elector who takes bribes? The Bill of the hon. member for Albert may reach its object through having a notice served upon people absent from home; but the candidate will remain in his seat. Let it, at least, be enacted that the names of those electors who have taken bribes will be struck off the list; but no such provision is made by the Bill. Though the member elect may, after the inquest is over, find himself in a minority, he will nevertheless retain his seat. Bribery, therefore, far from being put down by this clause, will, on the contrary, be practised on a larger scale.

Mr. DICKEY. I think the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), would be a very radical change. If the hon. gentleman will look more carefully at the Bill, he will find that it is not directed against corruption at all. If he will look at section 15 of the new Act he will see that the evil that is aimed at in this Bill is a very narrow one indeed, it is simply the taking of a bribe. He will notice that not even the promise of an office will strike a man off the list. I take issue at once with the hon. member. I think that the man who really does take money for his vote, is, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand, the inferior of the man who gave him the money. I agree with him that the

man who gives the money is the greater public enemy, and deserves the greater punishment; but taking intelligence as a test of a right to be put upon the voters' list, I say that a man who gives a bribe is nearly always the more independent man, the more intelligent man, and the man better able to cast a vote. If you adopt the principle that the hon. member for Queen's, N.S., wants us to adopt, you will have to incorporate all the clauses with regard to corrupt practices. It is not only the giving of bribes that you are going to make a corrupt practice as such, to be punished by disfranchisement, but you must extend the provision to all corrupt practices. The proposition of the hon. member for Albert is not to deal with corrupt practices, as such, at all. He is taking the lowest, what I may call the most degraded, form of corruption—that personal contact with money of which no man, I believe, can be a recipient and be fit to be trusted with the franchise. The Bill does not strike at that, perhaps, still more dangerous and subtle form of corruption, the promise of an office, for the reason that a man might be induced to vote against his convictions by the promise of an office. But at the same time, it is not such a transaction as shows that the man is utterly devoid of the moral sense which is involved in taking money, or the equivalent of money, for his vote. Therefore, I am entirely opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, N.S., as being not only illogical, but inexpedient.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I desire to add a few words. If I understood aright the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) he said that the briber, the man who gives the money, is more intelligent than the man who takes the money for his vote, and consequently it is the man who is inferior in intelligence who is punished. For instance, one man steals and another receives the stolen goods; the robber is punished and the receiver goes scot free. I cannot join issue with the hon. member. I enter my solemn protest against such a wrong principle.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I enter my protest against the immoral principles advocated by some hon. members. The briber, it was asserted, should be spared, and the poor wretch who takes the money, who is less intelligent than his tempter, he who takes a bribe of a few dollars, is worthy of every chastisement. Well and with great apropos might we apply to this law the saying that according as one is powerful or weak the judgments of the courts will make him white or black. The hon. Ministers have not deemed it fit to express their opinion on the Bill. I notice also that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his principal friends are silent on the matter. When these gentlemen canvass for the votes of electors they grow eloquent and profess a great devotion to the interests of the people; but when in this House, they stand in presence

Mr. DICKEY.

of tyrannical and retrograde laws, like the Bill now before us, the same gentlemen, who stand at the head of the great parties, are silent; their lips are sealed.

Mr. CASEY. I think, in spite of the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down, that the man who offers the bribe, the tempter, is the more guilty; the other is the weak man who yields. Of the two, I think the tempter should be punished, as I believe the law at present provides for his punishment. Whether the man who is tempted, should be punished, is a different thing altogether. If you provide that the man who is tempted is subject to a penalty, you stop the source of information in regard to the tempter. I am afraid if we pass this law no information will be obtainable as to the man who has offered the bribe, because no man is going to tell of the offer of the bribe when he himself is liable to suffer by the information he gives. In the second place, if any such law is going to be enacted, it will be necessary to provide that it shall be the duty of some person, the Attorney-General of the province or the Crown prosecutor of the county, to prosecute those parties who are supposed to be guilty of such offences. If such provision is not made, the parties who are guilty will not be prosecuted. Neighbours do not prosecute neighbours in matters of this kind, that when elections are over the matter is looked upon as settled and neither party is willing to prosecute for offences of this kind. I urge on the hon. member for Albert that provision should be made so as to have the prosecutions conducted by the proper officer.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Let me call your attention to the fact that our hon. friends, the members who favour this Bill, and do not understand French, indulge in bursts of laughter over the triumph they have just secured; but I will tell those who are silent: "You are the victors; but you lack the necessary courage to bring in arguments in favour of the measure now before the committee."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I raise a question of order on the clause now before you. It is not a court of record, but of commissioners.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) The preamble of the Bill reads as follows:—

1. Whenever, within sixty days after the publication in the "Canada Gazette" of the receipt by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the return to a writ of election, a petition has been presented to the Governor-General, signed by twenty-five or more electors of such district, (the postal address of each elector signing the same being added to his name), stating that they believe or have reason to believe that bribery has extensively prevailed at the election, and having annexed thereto a solemn declaration, signed by the petitioners stating that they are such electors and that the allegations of the petition are true to the best of their knowledge and belief, the Governor-General shall appoint one or more persons to be a commissioner or commissioners under this Act, for the purpose of

making inquiry into such bribery, such persons being judges of the Superior Court of the province; and if any of the commissioners so appointed die, resign or become incapable to act, the surviving or continuing commissioners or commissioner may act in such inquiry as if they or he had been solely appointed to be commissioners or a commissioner for the purposes of such inquiry; and all the provisions of this Act concerning the commissioners appointed to make any such inquiry shall be taken to apply to such surviving or continuing commissioners or commissioner, and in case a sole commissioner is originally appointed, then to such sole commissioner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) All this clause has been altered.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) The hon. member has just been reading to us clause 1 of the old Bill; this is not the preamble. The preamble reads as follows:—

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

That is all the preamble.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member meant to say the first clause.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) This clause is not consonant with the fundamental principle of the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill as to whether this commission being a court; now, I may ask, Mr. Chairman, was ever a commission created to fish after cases of bribery constituted into a court of record? In virtue of the principle of the measure, such as presented to the House, provision was made for the creation of commissioners appointed to hold an inquest, in a determined manner. The old Bill has then been replaced by a new one. Had it not been taken away from us, we might have studied it to greater advantage. It is the first time that such a proceeding takes place and I confess my surprise at this new departure.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I shall very much doubt the motives of the mover of the Bill if he refuses to accept the amendment. I do not see why the man who offers a bribe should not be as guilty and be punished in the same way as the man who accepts it, and words should be added to the clause that the judge shall report the names of all voters who have been found to have been given or offered bribes.

Mr. WELDON. I shall be very sorry to have the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) doubt my sincerity, but I must incur that penalty in refusing to accept an amendment which in my judgment, and after giving the matter some months reflection, will make it in practice impossible to secure a successful result. My only hope of getting a successful result is to put in the box the man who has given the bribe, and get the evidence from him. I am sorry that I cannot hold the respect of the hon. member for Montmagny, whose sincerity I would be very slow to challenge,

but at the risk of losing his confidence in my sincerity, I must hope that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) will not be adopted, and mainly for the reason I have just given.

Mr. FORBES. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), but do not concur with those expressed by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). The hon. gentleman has said that the amendment is illogical and that the object of the Bill is to punish offenders, and he stated that worthy citizens are generally bribers and members of the higher class. I consider these remarks entirely illogical. The object of the Bill is not to punish, but simply to mark or brand every person guilty of having accepted a bribe. Why should you discriminate? Why should we not as well brand the man who offers the money as well as the man who takes it. I admit that there is a law in the Statute-book which renders a briber liable to heavy penalties, but under our law, until these parties are proved guilty, they are supposed to be innocent. We are all aware, personally, from our knowledge of elections, that many persons who have offered the bribes have not been prosecuted, and that such can still continue their calling, for there are people practically engaged in that business, one or more of whom I know to my sorrow as prominent Conservatives. There is no necessity, as was alleged by the hon. member for Cumberland, to incorporate all the corrupt practices Act in this Bill. In addition to the penalties imposed in the other Acts for bribery, why should we not disfranchise and mark the briber as well as the bribee if defendant? There is not the slightest reason for separating the giver or the taker of bribes. Neither should be entrusted with the confidence of the people. The man who will offer bribes directly or indirectly is as quite unfitted to receive the confidence and respect of his fellow-man as the man who takes a bribe. In every way in which we look at this question, the same principle will apply to the man who gives as to the man who receives the bribe. In addition to other penalties attached to the breaches of the law, a man should be disfranchised. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. We have at present laws to apply to both parties. Clause 85 of the present law punishes any one who receives a bribe. We have, therefore, a law now to punish both parties. In framing a new law, I do not see any reason why you should only punish the person who takes the bribe and not the person who gives it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The amendment should be adopted. The briber should be made punishable by this clause just as he who takes the money. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), as well as the hon. members who lend him their sup-

port, desire that the weight of the all-powerful arm of justice may be felt by him who has succumbed to the voice of the tempter, and has taken money for his vote, by the poor wretch who was unaware of the extent of the offence committed against society by selling a sacred right; and still nothing is provided for against the one who speculates coldly, with full knowledge, upon the credulity of the elector. I see no reason why, Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I move:

¶ To insert in line 34 between the words "taken" and "bribes" the following words "offered or given," also on line 46 after the word "taken" the words "offered or given"

Motion negatived: yeas, 28; nays, 30.

On section 13,

Mr. WELDON. I move that clause 12 be struck out and the following substituted:—

All voters whom the judge reports to have taken bribes shall be incapable of voting at any election of a member of the House of Commons of Canada, held for seven years after the same has been reported to the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I move that the words, "given or offered" be inserted after the word "taken" on the first line of clause 13.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) What is being done with clause 12?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) I already told you that this clause had been altered.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) This clause ought to be amended in the sense as just proposed. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) ought to understand that the committee are of opinion that this amendment is quite fair and ought to be adopted, from the fact that the majority has only been of two against an amendment similar to this one. I beg of those members who have just voted against the principle of the amendment to think and consider attentively before rejecting the one just moved by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette). It is quite evident that the man who takes a certain sum for his vote is less guilty than the tempter who prevailed upon him to commit such an offence. I ask the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and his friends to accept the amendment.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Last Wednesday the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) accepted an amendment to the same effect. I was the mover, and my amendment was unanimously carried.

Mr. BERGIN. I think this clause ought to be amended so as to refer only to the last previous election. That may be the inten-

Mr. DUPONT.

tion, but it is not so expressed. I do not think the House will consent to inquire into all previous elections. I move that it be amended to that effect. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should have another clause of the same kind referring to the person who gives the bribe, who, I think, every fair-minded man will admit, is far more guilty than the one who takes the bribe. The briber is generally an intelligent man, whereas, the poor, ignorant fellow who can neither read nor write, trusting to the character of the man who gives the bribe, believes that he is committing a lawful act in taking it, and one for which he should not be punished. I submit that this sort of legislation will not increase the reputation of the members of this House.

Mr. WELDON. If the words, "the said election" are substituted for the words, "any election," my hon. friend's object will be obtained.

Mr. FORBES. I heartily agree with the views of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), and upon the third reading of this Bill I will have an opportunity to support them.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. I want to know why the words referring to the promise of an office, place, or employment, as a form of bribery, which were in the original Bill, are left out of this one. If a man is bribed by the offer of a situation worth \$2,000 a year or so, it seems he is not to be punished, while the poor man who receives 50 cents for his vote is to be punished.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) No more cash money will be given, but promises only will be made. It is an omission much to be regretted. Promises made to electors to prevail upon them to vote should also be included in the Bill. Things likely enough will come to pass, as follows:—In order to avoid falling under the effect of the law, the canvasser will address himself to an elector as follows: If you vote in the right direction, as suggested, you will get a position of \$100 per annum. Certain people, they say, have no very expensive tastes, and are quite moderate in their desires; they do not want any very high situation. The canvasser, to convince his man, will tell him: Instead of a place, I will give you \$100. Should the man be influential, as is often the case in our parishes, if the man commands fifty or sixty votes, the effect of such a promise is readily seen. Again, an elector may say: If you promise me to use your influence to get a situation for my son, I will vote for your candidate. The promise made, he will vote accordingly. And still, these corrupt practices are not reached by your law. These promises may be made either to the elector himself or to any other person. It is immaterial for the purpose of influencing the vote.

Wiser, in a certain sense, the Controverted Elections law looks upon it as a greater offence to lavishly scatter promises of places or other advantages. The deposit of \$500 is quite insufficient as a security for the costs of the inquiry; it ought to be \$1,500 or \$2,000, such a sum being quite reasonable and in proportion with the probable costs of the inquiry, while \$500 is a ridiculous sum. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) did not look upon the promises of situations as a corrupt practice; however, everybody knows, and the members of this House better than any others, that the great evil of Canada is the too large number of place-hunters. This tendency of our young men acts unfavourably on agriculture and commerce, on the arts and industries, from the very fact that it kills all spirit of initiative in those suffering from this malady. Young men are heard to say: See how happy such a one is, he has nothing to do. I have a well-educated boy, and I wish him also to live without working, as a gentleman. Every member of this House can testify to the truth of what I just said. As a matter of fact, the greatest portion of our time is taken up with this kind of place-hunting business. Should there happen to be a vacant place, fifty will apply for it. In his Bill, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) intends to reach the poor wretch who, in a moment of error, took a few dollars, much needed for the maintenance of his wife and family; but he is quite silent as to the corruptor who, to my view, is a hundred times more guilty than the former.

On section 14,

Mr. BERGIN. I look upon this as one of the most objectionable clauses in the Bill. The amount paid out as a guarantee for the expenses ought to be at least \$1,500. Less than that would be no guarantee to the party who is put under fire. I move that the amount be increased to \$1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. It is entirely too much already, because whatever amount you may make it, it will be gobbled up by the lawyers, whether you make it small or heavy.

Mr. WELDON. The expenses will consist of summoning witnesses, the employment of a stenographer, payment of a judge's expenses, and there will be left considerable for other purposes.

Mr. BERGIN. A whole county may be summoned under this Bill. When you take the expenses of the witnesses from all over the county, and the judge's travelling expenses, you will find that \$3,000, in a large county, will not cover the cost.

Mr. McLEOD. The petitioners will have to pay the witnesses' fees in advance, before they can compel the witnesses to come. If the \$500 be not sufficient, it will be their loss.

Mr. OUMET. What will become of this money?

Mr. FORBES. Supposing the \$500 be not spent, should not a provision be made to refund the balance?

Mr. WELDON. I think the hon. member's suggestion is a very good one. In my judgment, in most cases, the expenses will not be \$500. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has not given as many hours as I have given weeks to the consideration of this Bill, and I am satisfied that the way in which the Bill will be carried out, will not be by summoning fifty or sixty or seventy witnesses, but by summoning half-a-dozen or so witnesses, who are bribers, and the expenses in practice, will be found very small. Therefore, I think, when hon. members who, in the nature of things, cannot be supposed to have given this measure so much consideration as others who have been puzzling their brains over it for a year or two—when they have given it more consideration, they will see that this is the only way the Bill can be worked, and it will be in a very inexpensive way.

Mr. BERGIN. My hon. friend from Albert says he has given a great deal of time to this Bill. Now, I was inclined, knowing the high character of the member for Albert, to give this Bill a most sympathetic consideration, and I abstained the other evening from opposing it, but the more attention I give to this Bill, the greater I perceive to be its anomalies, and the more satisfied I am that it will be impracticable for the purpose he intends to serve. I cannot for a moment believe that twenty-five respectable men can be had in a country to have a smelling commission established for the purpose of wrecking the characters of their neighbours—that is really what will be the result of this Bill. I would be satisfied, if my hon. friend would place in this Bill a clause to punish the so-called respectable men, the upright, honourable men, who give bribes to the poor, ignorant dupes who receive them. His refusal to put such a clause in the Bill, and the inadequate amount that he places in the Bill for the purpose of carrying it out, shows to me plainly that he is not disposed to punish that class of men.

Mr. OUMET. I have not seen the new Bill, as it is reprinted, and that is the reason I asked how this money is to be appropriated, when I heard the Chairman read clause 16 in the old Bill as being just as it stands there. I have not expressed any dissent from his Bill or from the principle of his Bill. I think his intentions are the best possible, although I do not know that through this Bill he will attain the end he has in view.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the amount be reduced to \$300. I think that the larger sum might prevent an inquiry being held that otherwise would be held.

Mr. MASSON. The new clause differs from the old more particularly in

the last words relating to defraying the expenses of the inquiry. That is entirely changing the nature of this deposit. It is not to meet the expenses to which one or ten or one hundred men may be put in defending themselves, their character and their votes. There is no provision made for their costs at all; there is nobody liable for their costs. Now, if this \$500 is not to be applied towards paying, under the direction of the court, the costs of the men who are being prosecuted, who are brought there to defend themselves, then I think that provision should be made. As this clause now stands, not one dollar of that would go to these men to pay their own expenses, or the expenses of the witness that they might bring there to rebut the evidence that had been given against them. My hon. friend from Albert may believe that such expenses may not amount to \$500; I assure him that wherever an inquiry is instituted, wherever a court of this magnitude is known to hold sittings, when you take into account the expenses of the judge who attends, of the officers who attend, and the evidence which may take days to hear—when you take all these things into consideration, \$500 will not cover the expense. I do not suppose the promoter of the Bill had any idea that the twenty-five men who petition were going to pay the expenses of the court. I do not think this House should ask them to pay the expenses of the court; but these should be borne by the country, as they are in all other cases.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FORBES. I move that the following be added as a subsection to section 16:—

That any of the funds remaining in court after defraying the expenses mentioned in clause 14 be paid out to the petitioners "pro rata."

On section 19,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has my hon. friend considered that fully? It seems a pretty drastic measure that a single judge on circuit should disfranchise a man for seven years on evidence which might be considered very weak, and which another judge might reverse, and the man could have no possible opportunity of appealing from that. Some men value the franchise very much, and a man would not want to have a stigma attached to his name and to his family, such as would be done by an order of the court, against which there was no appeal. I hope there will be some mode found of giving a simple and inexpensive appeal, if it be desired to take it.

Mr. McLEOD. If nothing is specified, a writ of certiorari will go.

Mr. DICKEY. I hope the hon. member for Albert will drop this clause, because it is too severe.

Mr. MASSON.

Mr. WELDON. I am willing to drop it. It was a suggestion made in the committee the other day, and was not in the original Bill.

Mr. OUIMET. If it is intended to give a right of appeal, provision must be made to give it. This is a special jurisdiction that is being created. If you make no provision for carrying an appeal, which court will have jurisdiction?

Mr. BERGIN. I suggest that some provision should be made for paying the costs of the petition, because if the costs are taxed against the petitioner, he should be protected, and there is no protection given against costs. There is not sufficient guarantee that men, summoned as witnesses will be paid their expenses. If the hon. gentleman makes provisions of this kind, I will withdraw my further opposition to the Bill.

Mr. WELDON. As we have the matter of appeal to consider, the suggestion of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) can, at the same time, be dealt with.

Bill reported.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Bill (No. 24) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (Mr. Lavergne) was considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE CONNOLLY TRIAL.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has been served with a subpoena to attend the High Court of Justice of Ontario, in and for the county of Carleton, with the Roll of the House of Commons of Canada from 1878 to 1887, inclusive, showing the list of members of the House during those years, with the oath of office.

Mr. OUIMET. I move:

That the Clerk of the House or other officer have leave to attend the High Court of Justice of Ontario in and for the county of Carleton in the case of the Queen vs. Nicholas Knight Connolly and Thomas McGreevy with the Rolls of the House of Commons from 1878 to 1887, both inclusive, and that he be permitted to give such evidence as may be necessary in the interests of justice, but he shall not allow the said Rolls to go out of his possession.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SECOND READING.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) respecting the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). With the consent of the House, I would move that the said Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WORLD'S FAIR COMMISSIONERS.

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

That it is expedient to provide for the payment to two honorary commissioners, to represent Canada at the World's Columbian Exposition, to be held at Chicago in 1893, of such sums for their services as are determined by the Governor in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman would do well to strike out the word "honorary." If the commissioners are to be paid, they are not honorary, as the meaning of the word is commonly understood.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion cannot be discussed at this stage.

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to be that this motion is not to be discussed?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not debatable at this stage.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—SPEECH OF THE CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASEY. In pursuance of a notice I have already given, I beg leave to call the attention of the House and the Government, and especially the Controller of Customs, to certain alleged utterances of the latter gentleman at Kingston on Friday week last. I think it was. I have taken the report of his remarks from the Kingston "News," a paper which I believe is not unfriendly to the hon. gentleman. That paper published an abridged account of his remarks the day after he was supposed to have made them—because I cannot assume as yet that he really made the remarks that are ascribed to him. But on March 15 it published an article

headed in large type, "What Mr. Wallace said," which article reads as follows:—

Inasmuch as one portion of Mr. Clarke Wallace's recent speech in this city has become a subject of inquiry in the House of Commons, we may as well give the entire passage exactly as it was delivered. Our first report was somewhat abridged, but the shorthand notes were preserved, and they are herewith transcribed in full. After sketching the growth of the Orange order in the several provinces of the Dominion, Mr. Wallace said:—

"We find to-day in the old country that brethren, the descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago, are perhaps facing difficulties of a similar character to those which their ancestors had to face in 1688—that the men of 1893 are threatened with a rule which is antagonistic to freedom there, to the liberty which they have always enjoyed as citizens of the British Empire. What is proposed is not only to shake off their allegiance to Great Britain—the bonds of love that bind them to the Empire—but to put them, forsooth, under an alien and hostile Government. We have their (the Home Rulers') public declaration of what they would do if they obtained power—that they would never cease agitating until the last link that bound Ireland to the British Empire is severed. That is their object to-day. They are trying to take the loyal men with them; but our friends over there say they will never submit. Britain may cast them out, but if she does so, she has no right to say what may be their future allegiance. Our friends in that land are preparing and have asserted their unalterable determination never to submit to that Home Rule which Mr. Gladstone and his Government have laid out for them. (Applause.) I am sure that in their efforts they shall have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada—more than sympathy: they shall have our active aid, if that active aid is necessary. We should not be worthy descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago—we would not be worthy of our ancestors of old, if we failed in our duty in that respect. I believe we are not unworthy descendants of the men who, driven from Dublin, stood at bay at Enniskillen and at Derry. In the history of the world there are no such records of heroic bravery, and I believe their descendants are not unworthy sons of such noble sires. Then, to come nearer home, we have questions that are agitating ourselves here."

Then Mr. Wallace, according to report, diverged to the Manitoba school question, which I am not going to discuss to-day. Now, Sir, this language, used by a gentleman who, if not a member of the Cabinet, is yet in a sense a member of the Ministry and a gentleman for whose utterances the Cabinet are responsible, deserves the serious notice of this House. When he endorses in such thorough-going fashion the utterances of the Orangemen of Ulster, we have to consider what those utterances are. I have in my pocket a report of some remarks that were made on the occasion of a meeting in Belfast on 2nd March. I take the report from the telegrams of the day to our Canadian newspapers. I might have obtained a fuller report from the English newspapers, if I had taken the trouble to look through them; but the telegram says:

Five thousand people were present. Dr. Kane, the chairman, said that Ulster was determined to defend herself to the last against the proposals of the Home Rule Bill.

The men of Ulster need not feel, however, that they would be alone and unaided in the fight for their liberties.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I rise to a point of order. I did not come here to discuss Irish politics, and I think that is the feeling with a great many of the members. I do not think it should be brought up in this way, as we are not here to settle Irish questions.

Mr. CASEY. I did not rise to discuss Irish politics either, but to discuss the hon. Controller of Customs, and I intend doing so until I get through with him. I read this to show what it is the Controller of Customs endorses in his alleged speech at Kingston:

The men of Ulster need not feel, however, that they will be alone and unaided in their fight for liberty. We have the sympathy of Englishmen throughout the world. We have received letters from military and police officers in England and Ireland and telegrams from Canada and Australia promising to co-operate with the men of Ulster if the latter resorted to arms to defend their liberties against the tyranny of their historic foes.

Is the Controller of Customs one of those who sent telegrams from Canada?

A hundred thousand Orangemen were ready to the death to fight the Home Rule Bill.

Then Mr. Johnson, M.P. for Ballykilbeg, swore on a Bible that he would never submit to a Home Rule Bill. Mr. Kane tore up the Home Rule Bill, and Gladstone and Morley were burned in effigy. I have given the hon. Minister, or quasi-Minister—it is hard to define his position—at all events, the under secretary of the department, every opportunity to affirm or deny that he used the language I have quoted from the Kingston "News," or language to the same effect. The Government to which he belongs are responsible for his utterances, as well as his actions, and I have given them an opportunity to say what they think about it. It was only yesterday that I asked the question formulated by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), as to whether this was a correct report of the hon. gentleman's speech, and the Finance Minister replied that the Government had no information on the subject. They had no information on the subject, although the Controller of Customs was sitting about four yards from the Minister of Finance, and it must be supposed that he had some conversation with his leader on this question. Is it to be supposed that he did not tell any of his colleagues whether he had used the language attributed to him by the Kingston "News," or not? In the meantime, in the absence of any information from the hon. gentleman, as to whether he used that language or not, we must accept the report of the Kingston "News" and the statement of this Conservative newspaper, that they have preserved the shorthand notes of his speech, and that he is correctly reported. I had hoped yesterday that the hon. gentleman would

Mr. CASEY.

have told us what he really meant to say, and I judge from the fact that he shirked answering my question, that he was correctly reported. If so, nothing more disloyal, nothing more tending to incite revolt and rebellion in this country has ever been uttered by any man, whether a Minister of the Crown or not, in this Dominion. He has distinctly, if correctly reported, said that the Orangemen of Canada would support the Orangemen of Ulster in physical resistance to a measure of Home Rule passed by the Lords and Commons of England, and assented to by the Queen, and, if such physical resistance is not treason I should like to know why the late lamented Mr. Riel was hanged. If the one offence is treason the other is. I say that when a law is passed by the Parliament of Great Britain and assented to by the Queen it becomes a law for the whole Empire, it becomes the law for Ireland, it becomes the law for Ulster, and if the Parliament of Great Britain should choose to pass a Bill granting Home Rule to the people of Ireland, that will become the law which must be respected and against which Orange resistance constitutes treason. I say that the Orangemen of Ulster, in their conclave at Belfast, have talked treason against the Empire and the Queen. If the Controller of Customs is correctly reported, he by endorsing their words, has talked treason against the Queen, and I say I require from him to-day an explicit and distinct statement of what he did say and did mean on that occasion and of what course he is to take in the future with regard to this question. Having said that I will sit down and wait for his version of the matter.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken accused me of cowardice because I did not reply to the question he put yesterday from his place in the House. I did not reply to that question at the time, because I was informed that the question was coming before this House in a more formal manner, when a more suitable opportunity would be given me to make whatever statement I may choose. I may also say further with reference to the question which the hon. gentleman asked yesterday, I do not choose to reply to it, because he has given a more full and accurate version of what I am reported to have said in Kingston on Friday week last. I may inform the hon. gentleman and those other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are so anxious for information upon this matter, that the amended statement in the Kingston "News" of 15th March, which the hon. member for West Elgin has just read, is, I believe, a correct statement of what I said in Kingston on the night alluded to. So far as I know, that statement is a correct report of my remarks; and for the information of the hon. gentleman, I would further say that that was my opinion then, that it is my opinion to-day, and that I do not take back one word of the statement I then made.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want you to.

Mr. WALLACE. You could not get it if you did. Sir, I repudiate the charge of disloyalty made by the hon. member for Elgin. Men whom I represent and men who hold the views that I do, do not need to take lessons in loyalty from the hon. gentleman. The record of those men is one long record of unimpeachable loyalty to the British Empire. In the remarks I made then, I was but following out the views expressed by the late Premier of England, Lord Salisbury, on the 6th day of May, 1892, when Premier of England, and which remarks I may take the liberty of reading to this House. They are as follows:—

I am a Tory,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE :

—yet I cannot accept in all their width these doctrines of unrestricted passive obedience. I believe that the title of both Kings and Parliaments to the obedience of their subjects is that these Kings and Parliaments should observe the fundamental laws and the fundamental understandings of the compact by which they rule. Parliament has a right to govern the people of Ulster. It has not a right to sell them into slavery; and I do not believe in the unlimited unrestricted power of Parliaments any more than I do in the unrestricted power of Kings. Parliaments, like Kings, may take a course which, while it is technically within the legal limits of their attribution, is yet entirely at variance and in conflict with the understanding of the institutions by which they rule. James II. forgot that law. He stepped outside his attributions. He stepped outside the limits of the spirit of the constitution, and we show how the people of Ulster met him. If a similar abuse of power—be it on the part of a Parliament, or on the part of a King—should ever occur at any future time, I do not believe that the people of Ulster have lost their sturdy love of freedom or their detestation of arbitrary power.

This is the utterance of a Prime Minister of England; I think my own was somewhat moderate in comparison. But, as I have already said, they were my own views at any rate. I do not know, Sir, that this House of Commons has any right to interfere with my views upon British politics or upon any such subject. I hold these views; I hold them, I hope, honestly and sincerely. The holding of these views does not interfere in any way with my duties in this Canadian Parliament, so far as I know or so far as I can see. The Government of this country are not responsible in any degree for my utterances in this respect; I did not consult them; I did not ask their opinion before I spoke. I did not think it was necessary then, and I do not think yet that it was necessary. Other members of this House have given their views upon the political situation in the old land, as they had a perfect right to do. My hon. friend to the right here, the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan) has given his views upon the other side of the question, as he had a perfect right to do, and as I had a perfect right to do, in discussing a matter which does not

interfere with the performance of my duty as a representative of the Canadian people. I have nothing further to say, Mr. Speaker, except this, which I repeat, that I shall, from time to time, as occasion may require or as my opinion may decide, express my views upon questions as freely as I may choose to do, and I do not think that this Parliament of Canada has any right to interfere with the expression of my views upon these questions. Sir, what are these views? Is this a time when it is not desirable to do one's best to maintain the integrity and unity of the British Empire, because that is what the men of Ulster are trying to do, and that is what my remarks point to as well. Is it disunion, is it disintegration we desire? No, Sir. It is, as I expressed it, to maintain the unity of Great Britain and Ireland, and I know some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are not so strong in their views on such questions. I hold the view strongly that the state of this country and of the Empire demands that we should draw closer the bond of union and not do anything that would lead to disintegration.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman states that he has been correctly reported in the Kingston newspaper on the 15th of March. I am sorry he has felt himself called upon to make such a frank admission. I am sorry the report is a correct one. All who dwell under the shelter of the British flag make the proud boast that they are the freest people under the sun. We have the right to make laws for our own government, and the representatives of the people are called upon to use every care in framing those laws. In the British House of Commons, absolute freedom of speech prevails. A measure introduced in that august assembly is subjected to the most severe criticism, and may be debated day after day by any one opposing it. It can only be passed after everything that may be urged against it has been presented by those opposing it. A Bill introduced in the British Parliament must run the gauntlet of the House of Commons and then be submitted to the criticism of the House of Lords, after which it may or may not receive the assent of Her Majesty, and, until it does receive that assent it does not become law. But after it has received the assent of the Crown it becomes law, and then men who are loyal to the institutions of a free people will submit to that law. For generations, a portion of the Irish people have been asking for Home Rule. The proposal has been under consideration for nearly a century. Earnest men have opposed it, and every aspect of the question has been discussed; everything that could be urged against it has been said, and it has been defended by men equally earnest. Seven years ago a Government was defeated on this question, and since that time it has occupied a large share of public attention. The recent elections in Great Britain were

run mainly on that issue. This question overshadowed every other question, and, as we know, it was discussed on every platform in the land day after day, and night after night, and discussed in the press, column after column, so that every man in England, every man in Scotland, or Wales, or Ireland, had the fullest opportunity of making himself acquainted with the merits of the scheme proposed. The elections came on, and Home Rule won the day; the electors of the British Isles declared, by their votes, that they desired their representatives in Parliament to introduce legislation designed to give Home Rule to Ireland. In obedience to the views of the people, so expressed, Mr. Gladstone has introduced his Bill into the House. It will be subjected to the fullest and freest criticism, and will be attacked by those opposed to it, day after day. The Opposition are free to put on record every possible objection, but it may be that, in the end, the voice of the people, as expressed by their votes, will be obeyed, and the Bill will pass the House of Commons. It will then go to the House of Lords, where the cold steel of calm criticism will be applied. And yet it may live and pass the House of Lords. It will then be submitted to Her Majesty, who may assent to or may veto the Bill. Following the advice of her responsible Ministers, she may give her assent, and the Bill will become law. Thus it will be Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, who will give Home Rule to Ireland. In short, it will be Her Majesty who will grant Home Rule to Ireland. In no other way can a Parliament in Dublin be called into existence, save by legislation for which the Queen, the Lords and Commons are equally responsible. We will suppose this Bill has become law. Men may think it unwise legislation; and if so, the constitutional means are left in their hands by which they can agitate for repeal of that law. Because men are opposed to it, are they justified in threatening an armed resistance to an Irish Parliament, if called into existence? We have had a rebellion in this country, and there is no man who will say that there were no causes leading up to that rebellion; but, although men deemed themselves justified, I dare say, in rising against the constituted authority, all loyal men uniting in putting down that rebellion. In the North-west, doubtless, there were many who believed they had grievances, it is admitted they had grievances, but they were not justified in rising. The rebellion was put down, and afterwards the grievances were removed. Because some men may think that the proposition to grant Home Rule is unwise, are they justified in declaring that they will never submit to Home Rule, and that if Her Majesty dares to give effect to the voice of the people, constitutionally expressed at the polls, they will, to quote the words used by the hon. gentleman, say that

Mr. Dawson.

“she has no right to determine what may be their future allegiance.” I was pained when I read the report of the speech of the hon. gentleman, that he should have given utterance to such sentiments as these. Sir, the hon. gentleman is sworn to stand by Her Majesty, to uphold the Crown, to maintain her laws; yet here we find him applauding his friends in Ireland for declaring they will not submit to the law if it establishes a Parliament at Dublin; nay, more, proclaiming that the Sovereign has no right to say what may be their future allegiance if she enacts a law displeasing to his friends. He goes further, and pledges these people the support of his friends in Canada. I regret that any man should utter such sentiments as these. Had they been uttered hastily by an unthinking man, some allowance might be made, but when they are made by a member of this House, by the Controller of Her Majesty's Customs the circumstance demands more than a passing notice. I was also pained because he presumed to speak for the members of an association whose principles, I believe are outraged by this speech, whose principles of loyalty to the Queen and loyalty to the laws which she enacts are outraged by this speech. There is nothing in the teachings of the order over which the hon. gentlemen presides to warrant him in assuming that they are ready to throw off their allegiance to the Queen, and rise in rebellion against her, should she, through her Parliament, enact laws which they think ought not to be enacted. The hon. gentleman fears that the liberties of the minority will be invaded. He must have but little confidence in Her Majesty if he supposes she will give her assent to any Bill which will make it possible for the Dublin Parliament to invade the rights of the minority. It is not for me to prophesy, but I think that hon. gentlemen will live to see a Parliament in Dublin and they will look in vain for legislation which will invade the rights of the minority. Those rights are safeguarded in the Bill which is now under discussion in the British House of Commons, and those safeguards are provided with the unanimous consent of the friends of Home Rule. Why, then, should the hon. gentleman endeavour to arouse his friends in this country to rebellion against such a Parliament, knowing that rebellion against a Parliament of the Queen's creation is rebellion against the authority of the Queen? If the speech of the hon. gentleman is allowed to pass unchallenged many people may think that the members of this House agree with his sentiment; that any man has a right to consider himself absolved from his allegiance, “cast off by the Crown,” if and when Her Majesty enacts a law with which he is not in accord. I think the utterances of the hon. gentleman cannot be justified in this House, and I beg therefore to move:

That all the words after the word “That” be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

Whereas N. Clarke Wallace, a member of this House and Controller of Her Majesty's Customs, is reported to have spoken, as follows, at a public meeting held in Kingston, the 10th March instant:—

"We find to-day in the old country that brethren, the descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago, are perhaps facing difficulties of a similar character to those which their ancestors had to face in 1688—that the men of 1893 are threatened with a rule which is antagonistic to freedom there, to the liberty which they have always enjoyed as citizens of the British Empire. What is proposed is not only to shake off their allegiance to Great Britain—the bonds of love that bind them to the Empire—but to put them, forsooth, under an alien and hostile Government. We have their (the Home Rulers') public declaration of what they would do if they obtained power, that they would never cease agitating until the last link that bound Ireland to the British Empire is severed. That is their object to-day. They are trying to take the loyal men with them, but our friends over there say they will never submit. Britain may cast them out; but if she does so, she has no right to say what may be their future allegiance. Our friends in that land are preparing, and have asserted their unalterable determination never to submit to that Home Rule which Mr. Gladstone and his Government have laid out for them. (Applause.) I am sure that in their efforts they shall have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada—more than sympathy: they shall have our active aid, if that active aid be necessary. We should not be worthy descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago—we would not be worthy of our ancestors of old, if we failed in our duty in that respect. I believe we are not unworthy descendants of the men who, driven from Dublin, stood at bay at Enniskillen and at Derry. In the history of the world there are no such records of heroic bravery, and I believe their descendants are not unworthy sons of such noble sires."

And whereas on the floor of Parliament the said N. Clarke Wallace has admitted the accuracy of said report:

Now, therefore, this House declares it to be the duty of all Her Majesty's subjects loyally to submit to the law; that the constitution contains within itself the means whereby all grievances may be redressed by constitutional methods, that no changes in the law should be sought to be brought about by resort to armed resistance, civil war or other physical force, and that an attempt to depose Her Majesty in respect of any portion of Her Empire, is unwarrantable and treasonable, and should receive the uncompromising resistance of all loyal citizens:

That the action of the said N. Clarke Wallace in expressing sympathy with, and holding out the hope of active aid to those who threaten to levy war in Ireland against Her Majesty, is deserving of the severest censure at the hands of this House, and if allowed to pass unnoticed would expose Canada to the slanderous imputation of being disloyal to Her Majesty, the very reverse of which is the fact:

And further, it is the duty of this House promptly to repudiate said utterances of said N. Clarke Wallace, lest his political connection with Parliament and the Government might lead the public to the erroneous conclusion that his views so expressed were shared in by this body, a conclusion which would give additional influence to such utterances, and the more endanger peace, order and good government throughout Her Majesty's Dominions.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was anxious to hear an expression of opinion from the Secretary of State and from the Solicitor-General with regard to the language uttered by their colleague. We do not complain of the British politics of the Controller of Customs.

What we complain of is what he says Canadians will do, and we complain of that because he attaches to his utterance all the responsibility which goes with the utterances of a Minister. If the Mr. N. Clarke Wallace who is referred to as having made use of this language were not a member of the Canadian House of Commons, and were not Controller of Her Majesty's Customs; perhaps not such importance, nor such weight would attach to his remarks. He says he did not speak as a member of this House. He spoke, no doubt, as the Grand Master of the Orangemen of the Dominion of Canada. With what he has to say as Grand Master of the Orangemen of the Dominion of Canada, I have nothing to do, but I have to do with him as a member of this House, and as Controller of Customs. And, Sir, I ask you to consider this: if it is not painful for a large portion of the people of this country who think differently from that hon. gentleman on this subject, who feel hurt when they hear a member of the Canadian House of Commons and Controller of Customs, paid with the taxes levied from them, use such language. I ask if they have not a right to feel hurt when this gentleman stands upon a public platform, and states that if Home Rule should be granted Ireland—remember, Home Rule could only be granted after having passed the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and after having been sanctioned by the Queen—that notwithstanding all this, if this measure be granted to the people of Ireland, that he and those who think with him are ready to go across and fight against this measure, are ready to go across and fight against the constitution, and are ready to go across and fight against their Queen. I have nothing to do with his British politics; but I have certainly reason to find fault, that he, speaking in a House of liberty, speaking in the Canadian House of Commons, speaking as the Controller of Customs in a Canadian temple of liberty, says that although Canada may have liberty, and although Canadians may govern themselves, he is not prepared to allow that the people of another country shall have the same liberty, and shall have the same right to govern themselves. I say, Sir, that that was the most shameful expression that was ever heard in this House since the day that the Canadian Parliament was established here. I say, Sir, that when he gives utterance to this language he does not reflect the sentiments of any other member of this House, that he insults the Canadian people, and that he insults the intelligence of the Canadian House of Commons. Sir, if any man should go across the ocean to fight the Queen in her old age, it may be the Controller of Customs, but I do not think he will have anybody to help him in that fight. Loyalty! He speaks of loyalty!

Mr. LANDERKIN. A rebel.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does he understand what loyalty means? Does he understand that if

he wishes to be loyal he must be loyal to the constitution and loyal to the Queen? But, he comes here with his threat, that he is prepared to fight against the constitution, and to fight against the Queen if justice should be granted Ireland. An hon. gentleman opposite interrupted the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and said: We want no Irish politics discussed here.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. He does not simply understand what the question is. It is not only an Irish question, Sir; it is a question affecting the British Empire. It is a question in which the whole Anglo-Saxon race is interested. It is a question which, when settled, will bring peace and happiness, not only to the people of Ireland, but to the whole of the British Empire. That gentleman stands up here every now and then to dictate to us. He forgets that we are hurt, and that a great portion of the people of this country are hurt by the utterances of the Controller of Customs; and have we not the right to stand up here to protest against this language, and to affirm the feelings that are entertained by that portion of the population which has been so hurt? I, for one, protest against the language of the Controller of Customs. I say that the language was unworthy of a British subject, unworthy of a member of the House of Commons, and unworthy of a Controller of Customs. It is language calculated to prevent people of Irish origin and pertaining to the Catholic faith going with anything like peace and comfort to the Department of Customs whenever they may have business to transact there. They know that when they go before this officer of the department, they go before a man who has insulted them publicly in the country and trampled upon their feelings in every way. Sir, I do not wish to deal with the question further. I trust that the utterances made use of by the Controller of Customs will be denounced by his colleagues the Secretary of State and the Solicitor-General, who are in a position to be better champions of the rights of Ireland in this matter than I am.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, I always assume—my parliamentary experience, however, is not very lengthy—that we occupy here a judicial capacity, and that it is not desirable to unnecessarily incorporate into our deliberations, questions which pertain wholly to race or religious sentiments. I do not yield to any gentleman in this House in my loyalty to my Queen, and I certainly say that I should not consider myself as giving very strong evidence of my devotion to my Sovereign, if I stated, after a measure had passed both branches of the Imperial Legislature, and had been approved of by Her Majesty, that I would personally, or induce others, or assist others, in taking up arms against such a measure. I think that such conduct is injudicious

Mr. DEVLIN.

and is unconstitutional. I will go further and say that I consider that we members of the Canadian Parliament should, even the most humble of us, be guarded in our utterances. I was individually astonished, and shocked, and horrified, in going to the reading room the other day and in looking over the files of the recent Halifax papers, to find that one of the organs of opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite in the province of Nova Scotia had its editorial article headed "Mr. Kenny's views," and I realized then that the most insignificant member of this House should be careful in his utterances on such difficult questions as the one now before us. Mr. Speaker, I need not intimate to you what is due to your position, but if you transgressed in that way, I should think you would be more culpable than myself, and that the higher the position an hon. gentleman occupies in this House and the country, the more careful he should be in his utterances. These are my opinions. I was not here when the resolution was introduced, nor when the hon. Controller of Customs made his statement; but I have no sympathy with any body of men on either side of the Atlantic who, after a measure of Imperial concern has been approved by both branches of the Imperial Legislature, and has been assented to by the Queen, would consider it their duty, or a patriotic or loyal course, to take up arms in opposition to that measure. I hardly think, with my knowledge of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, that that was what he meant. Now, let us look, for a moment, at the position in which this resolution places us. We are called upon to vote certain supplies for the Government of the country, and before we are allowed to do so, a motion is brought forward arresting that vote—a motion involving a vote of want of confidence in the Government of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. KENNY. That is exactly what it seems to me to mean—a vote of want of confidence in the Government of Canada, because a member of that Government expressed himself outside the House in a manner which I entirely disapprove. The motion is so made that it is impossible for us to move an amendment, and is brought in with the evident intention, the avowed intention, the well-known intention, of simply embarrassing the Government. Now, I was sent here by the citizens of Halifax—the Irishmen of Halifax are divided in politics, some of them voted for me—to support this Government, and I cannot see how I can go back to them and say that I voted against this Government simply because one of its members made, on an outside question and outside the House, an indiscreet and injudicious speech. Therefore, while I entirely disapprove of any such utterances as those attributed to the hon. Controller of Customs, while he was dealing with

a question that was not a Canadian question. I do not see how I could vote for a motion of want of confidence in the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), in referring to this motion as a motion of want of confidence in the Government, takes a wholly erroneous view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I will undertake to show that I am correct in the statement I make. It is quite true, Sir, that a Government may treat any motion, even a motion for the adjournment of the House, as a motion of want of confidence, but no Government is obliged to treat an ordinary motion as a motion of want of confidence, and, so far as I know, no Government has hitherto treated as such, a motion in amendment to go into Supply. Why, Sir, let me refer the House to a motion which I myself made two or three years ago, on going into Supply, with reference to the distribution of public moneys for the construction of public works. The leader of the House on that occasion, the late Prime Minister Sir John Macdonald, accepted that motion and supported it in opposition to the Government's own proposition to go into Supply. Let me refer to another case:—A few years ago, on the proposal to go into Supply, the late member for Niagara, Mr. Plumb, moved a motion on the subject of the boundary award, and the Government supported that motion against their own proposition to go into Supply. So, when the hon. gentleman speaks about this being a motion of want of confidence, a motion to embarrass the Administration, he takes a wholly mistaken view as to the nature of the motion. Sir, the hon. gentleman said that the speech of the hon. Controller of Customs was an indiscreet speech. He said he could not suppose that the Controller of Customs meant precisely what his speech critically read, would necessarily imply. But the hon. Controller of Customs has interpreted his own speech. He says that he stands by the revised report of that speech which appeared in the Kingston "News," and that he still entertains the view that he there expressed. He declares that those who seek Home Rule in Ireland are not honest in their declarations—that they do not mean simply to acquire local self-government for Ireland, as we have local self-government in Canada. He says that behind that there is the intention to throw off the authority of the Queen, to establish the independence of Ireland, to give it a separate existence, and that he is prepared to sustain the Ulster men in resisting that measure from its inception. Well, Sir, I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Secretary of State, who sits beside him; I would refer him to the Solicitor-General. Both of those gentlemen are his colleagues in the Administration,

and one of them is a member of the Cabinet. They are as ardent supporters of Home Rule as any who support it in the British Parliament. Does the hon. gentleman say that his colleagues are not honest in declaring themselves in favour of Home Rule solely for the purpose of local self-government? Does he say that they are not honest in their professions of loyalty to Her Majesty? I admit that hon. gentlemen in this House may honestly take exception to the policy of Home Rule. There are many of us who believe that it is a proper measure—that it will allay discontent, and unite the Empire more strongly together than it has ever been under legislative union. That is a question on which there may be differences of opinion, and I find no fault with the views the hon. gentleman entertains as to the propriety or impropriety of Home Rule. That is not the question before us; that is not the question dealt with by this resolution. The question dealt with by this resolution is that the hon. gentleman, a member of this House, a member of the Administration, a man who has taken the oath of allegiance to the Queen upon entering upon the discharge of his duties as a Minister of the Crown, declares that he intends to disregard that obligation—declares that he intends to take up arms—declares that he intends to stand by others who take up arms—in resisting the authority of the Imperial Parliament. That is the position which we criticise; that is the position which we condemn; that is the matter dealt with by this resolution, and the matter upon which the House will be called upon to vote. Sir, the hon. gentleman has stated that Lord Salisbury had declared himself opposed to the principle of Home Rule. Well, the hon. gentleman, correctly, no doubt, represents the views of the late Prime Minister of England, in saying that the late Prime Minister was opposed to Home Rule. Every man in the United Kingdom who chooses to give his mind a holiday, and who is satisfied with the constitution as it is, may be disposed to take the same view as that expressed by Lord Salisbury; but we, in this country, have had experience of local self-government. We here deal with our own local affairs, and every hon. gentleman knows that before the introduction of parliamentary government into the colonies in British North America there was growing up on this continent, within the domain of Her Majesty, a condition of discontent not unlike that which exists in Ireland. How have the people of this country become contented and united with the United Kingdom? By conceding to them what the Home Rule Bill proposes to concede to Ireland. Whether that be the correct view or not, is not a matter of any consequence here to-day. What is of consequence here to-day is that a Minister of the Crown, one who is specially pledged to sustain the authority of Her Majesty, has declared that if the Imperial Parliament, in the exercise of its

undoubted constitutional rights, chooses to carry a measure of Home Rule, then he will be prepared to disregard his obligations and to take up arms against Her Majesty, and resist the authority or the attempt to establish the authority, of that local parliament thus created by the law of the land. That is the position which is condemned in this resolution, and every hon. gentleman who opposes this resolution will commit himself to the principles enunciated by the Controller of Customs in his Kingston speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I am surprised at the speech of my hon. friend. He is generally calm and philosophic, and in the main fair; but I can scarcely conceive of a more unfair rendering of the sentiments of a political opponent than that which he has just given of those expressed by my hon. friend, as reported in the Kingston "News." Now, I hold that it is well for us to look at this matter calmly and moderately. I approach it with a good deal of doubt in my own mind as to the bona fides of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not sure that it is out of hearts overflowing with deep and abiding loyalty and love for the mother country that they approach this matter. I do not think that their past history, to say the least of it, proves that they are more loyal and devoted to the integrity of the Empire than hon. gentlemen who sit on this side. It strikes me that the motion is what you might call a mischievous party motion, meant simply to embarrass the Government, and brought forward for that purpose, and that purpose alone. Well, whether it be brought up for that purpose and that alone, or not, I am at least within the sense of every member of this House in stating that it ought to be discussed calmly and deliberately. Let us give to every man his perfect right in this free country, and let us give every expression of opinion its fair rendering in this House; or if it be made out of this House, let us render it fairly when it comes before us. And, while it is fresh in my memory, let me say that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has been most unfair in stating that the Controller of Customs advised armed resistance against his Queen and country if a certain event should take place. There is nothing in the language, nothing in the statement my hon. friend made to-day, to back up that rendering for an instant. Let us examine what my hon. friend the Controller of Customs said. We find that there are two parties in Great Britain, the one in favour of Home Rule and the other deadly opposed to it. I am not going to discuss the merits of that question to-day, as it is not my place to do so. I may say that I do not think such a discussion would be very profitable. I must say that we have sufficient disturbing questions of our own and sufficient important questions to discuss, without taking upon ourselves to argue and discuss all these questions upon the other side of the water.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

At the same time, I do not deny that you cannot put a wall around this country or any other country. You cannot put a wall around the sympathies of human beings; and so long as they live and breathe they will have their sympathies for and against causes the wide world over. Our people will not confine their sympathies simply to Canada; and any great struggle going on in any part of the world must evoke sympathies on one side or the other on the part of intelligent and reading men. But it would be better for this Parliament to confine itself to the questions more particularly germane to this country, in its progress, advancement and legislation. I do not mean by that to say that we should shut ourselves up, and refuse the sympathies of our hearts and feelings to great causes, wherever they may have their central sphere of action. But I do say this, that, in that respect, we must be in the last degree, tolerant to each other, and in relation to any causes which appeal to the sympathies of the world, but which do not affect our country directly, we must be very tolerant and large minded in allowing people to express their feelings for or against them as they may think best. We must carefully distinguish between what a man says outside the sphere of his parliamentary duties, outside the sphere of political questions and action, outside the sphere of policy, and what he has a perfect right to express, as an individual, as a member of a society, as one who has sympathy with outside causes, in one direction or another, and that is the first point of difference I want to ask hon. gentlemen in this House to think upon before they vote for or against this resolution. Now, there was a very instructive occurrence which took place in this House in 1876, and which was very widely debated in this House, and which was debated, I am bound to say, in a spirit of greater liberality and tolerance than this promises to be debated to-night. In 1876, when Mr. Mackenzie led the Government, there was a gentleman who belonged to his Government by the name of Huntington. He was, I believe, Postmaster-General. There was an election going on in a county in the province of Quebec, and he went down to take part in that election, and made a violent and strong attack upon the Roman Catholic hierarchy, or, at any rate, upon a portion of it. In this way he touched that vexed question of religion and creed in the province of Quebec. It happened that another member of that self-same Government was Mr. Cauchon, the President of the Council. As soon as he read that speech, he came to the Premier, Mr. Mackenzie, and complained of those utterances of the Postmaster-General—which were not merely the utterances of his private opinion, for he took occasion to say that if they were not the opinions of the Government to which he belonged, he would not remain a member of it. Mr. Mackenzie said frankly and fairly: I do not agree with those senti-

ments ; but, at the same time, I do not hold the Government responsible for them. The matter was brought up in this House. Mr. Holton, one of the best authorities on constitutional matters, and as fair-minded a man as sat in the House at that or possibly any other time, condemned the speech of the Postmaster-General. He asked Mr. Mackenzie, as leader of the Government, to state whether he repudiated the sentiments therein expressed or not. What was Mr. Mackenzie's answer ? It was, in brief, that Mr. Huntington had a perfect right to go down to his province and speak on matters connected with his province, and, although he did not agree in the sentiments, the Government were not responsible for them. The House was satisfied with that declaration, Mr. Cauchon was satisfied, Mr. Mackenzie never repudiated the sentiments of his colleague, nor do I think he was called on to repudiate them ; and the House, after discussing the matter, let it drop. Mr. Cauchon saying he had in reality gained his point when the Premier said he had no sympathy with the utterances of Mr. Huntington, and that the Government were not responsible for them. Now, Sir, that is in every way a stronger case than this. Mr. Huntington was a member of the Cabinet ; Mr. Huntington went down into his province when an election was taking place for the Dominion House of Commons ; and in speaking upon the issue and before the country, he made that statement and he raised that storm ; yet Mr. Mackenzie, in the broad spirit of tolerance, contended, and contended successfully, that though he did not agree with the sentiments of the Postmaster-General, he did not hold the Government responsible for them, and did not propose to repudiate them. Now, Sir, this is a different case. My hon. friend, as is well known, is a member of the Loyal Orange Order. Gentlemen on the other side and on this side of the House may be members of that order ; they may be members of an order of an entirely different aim, so far as that is concerned. We allow them all to belong to such orders as they please. No man in this House has a right to dictate to me to what society I shall belong, how often I shall attend its meetings, what my sentiments and expressions shall be with reference to that society. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a member of the Orange order, and he, in right as a member, went to one of their meetings, and at that meeting, he spoke upon a question which, of course, evokes a great deal of discussion, the question of the struggle for Home Rule for Ireland. Now, what did he say ? The first part of his speech is simply a representation of what he thought to be the position of Home Rulers in Ireland. Some gentlemen may get up and say that that representation is not a correct one. I venture to say that you may take any twenty-five men and ask each one of them to state what he thinks is the position of the Home Rule

party, and the position of the Anti-Home Rule party, in Great Britain, and no two of them will entirely agree. It is a matter of opinion, formed upon reading, more or less extensive, formed upon other bases, but so formed that not two men out of twenty-five would come to the same conclusion upon the matter. My hon. friend stated his opinion as to what was the attitude of the Anti-Home Rule party. What did he state next ? He stated what they themselves have stated upon their platform, and he gives it as their statement, and the only point in which the Controller of Customs, in his speech, really went a little beyond the record, I think, is where he touched upon the question of allegiance. Now, mind you, that is beyond the record as regards my own feeling on the subject, and as to what I would have thought politic to say. My opinion may not be the opinions of my hon. friends opposite, it may not be the opinion of my hon. friends here. Each of us has a right to his own opinion. But I simply ask the House to remember that it was his own opinion, and he so expressed it. It may not have been to the taste of all hon. gentlemen, but at the same time it was a private opinion expressed by himself at a meeting of a lodge of an order to which he belonged ; and as such I do not consider that he bound the Government in any respect, I do not consider that the Government is responsible for those utterances in any respect. I believe, as the hon. member for West York says, that he is as loyal to the British Crown, and as devoted to the interests of the Empire, as any other gentleman who sits in this House ; and I do not believe that, privately, there is a gentleman in this House who would doubt the sincerity of that hon. gentleman's statement. He spoke nothing at all about armed resistance ; he went on to say that they were making resistance, that they were determined not to submit ; and he went on still further to say that they would have the active aid and sympathy of Orangemen on this side of the water. What does that mean ? My hon. friend opposite jumped at the conclusion that the hon. member for West York is going to shoulder his musket and to take up arms against the country. Well, Sir, I think we had a little episode about shouldering a musket in this country before ; and it strikes me that I have heard it stated that a gentleman in this country, holding the very responsible position of leader of a great party in this country, actually stated—if he did not he was greatly misunderstood, and he has over and over again had an opportunity to correct the misstatement—that he was quite willing to shoulder his musket and fight against the volunteers of this country in putting down the rebellion in the North-west. Sir, that is rather a celebrated case, but I never knew of any gentleman on this side of the House being so foolish as to move a resolution asking us to censure that hon. gentleman. In

this case what my hon. friend said was his own opinion; he stated it, not in his public capacity, but in a private capacity. He did not bind the Government—he could not do it. It is not a matter of policy with reference to the Government, and the Government does not hold itself bound by these utterances, or responsible for them in the least degree. Now, let us ask what this resolution proposes to do. Instead of bringing up the question and getting the opinion of my hon. friend, hon. gentlemen opposite think it is their duty to go a little further, and bring a claptrap resolution before this House in order to embarrass the Government, and to make it appear that those hon. gentlemen are the only loyal men in this country, and that it is the duty of this House now to vote for this motion, if this House desires to have any reputation for loyalty. I do not submit to a proposition of that kind. Now, I want to analyse this resolution in two or three respects. This resolution says:

Now, therefore, the House declares it to be the duty of all Her Majesty's subjects loyally to submit to the law; that the constitution contains within itself the means whereby all grievances may be redressed by constitutional methods; that no changes in the law should be sought to be brought about by a resort to armed resistance, civil war, or physical force; and that any attempt to depose Her Majesty in respect to any portion of the British Empire, is unwarrantable and treasonable, and should receive the uncompromising resistance of all loyal citizens.

I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite that, for the second time in their history, in this Parliament, they have put a good, square, loyal sentiment before this House. They did it once before when the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), moved by an impulse of great loyalty, placed a resolution before this House, which was bereft of all disagreeable incidents in connection with it, and was accepted loyally by the House. Now, for the second time, they have engaged in this outburst of loyalty. I think they are to be congratulated on once in a while, in a moment of weakness, giving expression to loyal sentiments. The resolution goes on to say:

That the action of the said N. Clarke Wallace, in expressing sympathy, and holding out a hope of active aid to those who threatened to levy war in Ireland against Her Majesty,---

I say that is not a true representation of the case; there is not a word of truth in that representation of the case; and, as one who is desirous of simply voting for the truth and not for an error, I refuse to endorse that sentiment. I do not understand that any such threat was made. I understand that men who believe in Home Rule, are canvassing this country, as they have a perfect right to do; they are holding meetings, they have organizations, and are raising money, in order actively to aid those who are engaged in furthering the cause of Home Rule on the other side of the water. There is a great deal of activity in that movement,

Mr. FOSTER.

and they are perfectly justified in doing it. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman whose action is now under discussion, went any further, in the expression of his sentiments and in the aid and sympathy he was ready to give, and by subscriptions, such as are now made on behalf of both parties who are warring at this time on the other side of the water. Now we are asked to say, that, because he expressed sympathy with the movement against the party opposed to Home Rule in Ireland, he is deserving of the severest censure at the hands of this House.

And if allowed to pass unnoticed, this would expose Canada to the slanderous imputation of being disloyal to Her Majesty, the very reverse of which is the fact.

I do not believe that any such opinion can be sustained by the expressions referred to. You cannot make any country believe, you cannot make Great Britain believe, it is the height of absurdity to argue, from an individual utterance here and there throughout the country, that the country, as a whole, is disloyal. It is impossible. The only thing that would commend itself as an argument to Great Britain, as a public utterance that would be at once so strong and overpowering as to make itself felt to be unanswerable and absolute, would be a resolution of Parliament, or something of that kind, and I do not think the House is called on to affirm that—I do not think it is true—and affirm it on the private utterance of an hon. gentleman who is Controller of Customs in this House, spoken at a meeting of that organization to which he belongs, and to which he has belonged the greater part of his lifetime.

And further, it is the duty of this House promptly to repudiate said utterances of said N. Clarke Wallace, lest his political connection with Parliament and the Government might lead the public to the erroneous conclusion that his views so expressed were shared in by this body, a conclusion which would give additional influence to such utterances, and the more endanger peace, order and good government throughout Her Majesty's dominions.

I think the House is not bound by those words as a body. Individual members may have views exactly similar to those held by the hon. gentleman, but to say that the private utterances of any person outside of this House, be he member of the Government or not, binds this House, as an expression of the House, is to say a thing which, to simply state it, proves it to be manifestly untrue. I think I have said about all that is necessary, so far as a slight analysis of this resolution is concerned. Now, I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite, whether they have served the interests of this country, whether they have served the interests of good government here, whether they have served the interests of any cause that is good under the sun, by bringing up this matter in the House, as they have done to-day, by inducing an acrimonious debate on it, and by causing outside views and outside sentiments to be greatly

worked upon by what, probably, has very little effect in this House. Hon. members, as this resolution was read, and as it has been spoken to, have shown by their jocund faces, their rubicund countenances, their smiling appearances, that they were not very deeply moved, that there was none of the deep patriotic indignation that swells every vein, but that it was rather a piece of by-play among themselves. They think they have the Government in a corner, and they are playing with these resolutions in a wholly partisan and half-political way, in order to see what capital they can make out of them. I do not think they will make much capital out of them, for I believe steady, sensible people outside of this House will come to the conclusion, that this is simply a small, and not very effective, explosion of partisan artillery. I think the people outside of this House who are sensible and intelligent and reflect upon this question, will feel, with hon. members on this side of the House, although they may not, and as many of them do not express themselves as agreeing with the utterances of my hon. friend, as he does not agree with all the utterances I myself may state outside of this House, will come to the conclusion that this is a very small matter to make so great a time about, and that they will, while expressing their own opinions and asking latitude for their own opinions, outside of this House, accord to other hon. gentlemen, be they members of the Government or not, the utmost liberty of expression on matters outside of this House, not connected with the policy of the Government, and not connected germanely with Canadian affairs at all. I desire, before I resume my seat, to again call attention to the case I have cited, which occurred during the Mackenzie Administration, the calm way in which that was treated, the explanations that were made, the explanations of the leader of the Government and the stand he took; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, whether, after all, it would not be wisdom on their part to withdraw this resolution and allow the House to go on with its work in Committee of Supply?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be wisdom on our part to allow that course to be taken, after the Government have formally and distinctly repudiated the exceedingly injudicious and uncalled-for statements made by the Controller of Customs, and reaffirmed by him on the floor of this House. As to the view which good and sensible people will take of this matter, I think I am in a position to assure the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat, that good and sensible people of Canada will hold, that a man who occupies a position at the hands of Her Majesty, greatly derogates from his position, and is guilty of a gross breach of good faith towards the Government of which he is a part, who uses

such language as the hon. Controller of Customs is proved, out of his own mouth, to have used on this subject. I am not myself of the opinion, that Mr. Gladstone is going to lose many nights' sleep because he may be advised by cable or otherwise, that the Controller of Customs of the Dominion of Canada contemplates a hostile invasion of the province of Ulster. But, notwithstanding that, I do hold that any man with Her Majesty's commission in his pocket, using words the plain and obvious sense of which is directly to advocate armed resistance to an enactment of the Imperial Parliament, commits an action which calls for prompt repudiation on the part of the leader of this House and on the part of his colleagues. Sir, this may be a mischievous motion, as the hon. Minister of Finance states, but it is not half so mischievous as was the speech of the Controller of Customs. If there be one thing more clear than another, from the speech we have just listened to, it is this, that the Government have no right, under the circumstances, to attempt to treat this motion as a motion of want of confidence. As my hon. friend pointed out, there are numerous cases when the Government have chosen to accept motions on going into Committee of Supply, and he might have added to the motions to which he alluded, a motion moved by myself, defining the authority of the Committee of Public Accounts, and which was accepted by the then leader of the House and allowed to pass, although it was moved on going into Committee of Supply. Sir, what the Government must do with this matter is, either to assume responsibility for the utterances of the Controller of Customs, in which case, if they assume the responsibility, if they declare that they, like him, are of the opinion that resistance, and armed resistance, too,—for on this point I differ from the Minister of Finance—is justifiable, under the circumstances, as against a law enacted by the Imperial Parliament, then they may ask their followers to view this motion as a vote of want of confidence. But if they do not assume that position, if they repudiate the hon. gentleman's utterances, then I say they are abusing their position if they call hon. gentlemen behind them to vote on this matter contrary to their own individual opinions. Let us look, for one moment, at the real position of affairs. It is perfectly idle for the Minister of Finance to say that the advocates of resistance to the legislation now pending in the British Parliament, look to a peaceful or constitutional agitation. Sir, they perfectly well know that to-day, all over the north of Ireland, demagogues and firebrands (I am sorry to say they include in their ranks some men who should know much better, peers of the realm, as well as commoners), are doing their best to stir up racial and religious enmity between the various sections of Ireland. They are declaring publicly that they are opening com-

munication with officers in Her Majesty's army. They have dared to cast a slur upon the loyalty of the commander of Her Majesty's forces in Ireland. They have dared to declare that Her Majesty's soldiers and policemen will not act against them if they rise in arms. Under such circumstances, and while the Controller and his friends know this kind of agitation is going on, we find a member of the Government, although a man in an inferior position, I grant, endeavouring to create a similar state of affairs here; we find that hon. gentleman, who is connected with what, despite his declarations, I am willing to regard as the Loyal Orange Order, openly advocating a breach of allegiance to Her Majesty's Crown. I was very much pleased, indeed, to hear the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), who, I believe, is a distinguished member of that same order, rise in his place to repudiate those sentiments as they should be repudiated; and hon. gentlemen may depend upon it, that if the Controller of Customs fails to do this also, he will most assuredly leave himself under this imputation, an imputation justly brought against gentlemen of his political persuasion before, that they are good and loyal men just so long as they have their own way, and no longer. Sir, the kind of loyalty of which the Controller of Customs is the exponent, is the true legitimate, spiritual descendant of that kind of loyalty of which we have seen a specimen or two in this country when these same loyalists rotten-egged Lord Elgin in the streets of Montreal, is a specimen of the same kind of loyalty which led many of their leaders to sign annexation manifestoes, and of the same kind of loyalty which, if their peculiar views are interfered with, would, I have not the slightest doubt, lead them—as they appear to be leading the hon. Controller of Customs, and his friends—to advocate active aid and armed resistance to any measure which the Commons, either of Canada or the mother country, may pass, and which does not happen to jump with their particular passions and prejudices. Sir, what did the hon. gentleman declare? He declares that he advocates the union of the British Empire, and he says that the way to bring about the union of the British Empire is to aid and abet the people of Ulster in organizing a rebellion against the same British Empire. Now, Sir, I know that we have loyalists and loyalists. I know that there are very many men who call themselves by that honoured name, and who never did any one thing, and never will do any one thing to deserve the title. Sir, we have 35 per cent loyalists, and a great many of them in this country. We have loyalists who, as I said, just so long, and no longer than they happen to be exponents of the Royal Will are disposed to insist on all possible occasions, and under all possible circumstances, on obedience to Her Majesty, and obedience to constituted law and order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

But, Sir, let the case be changed; let these gentlemen's prejudices be interfered with for one moment, and we have, as in the case of the Controller of Customs, a very clear and a very practical proof of the real value and extent to which the loyalty of such gentlemen as himself will go. Now, as I have said, I am not very seriously alarmed as to the result of the hon. gentleman's threat. I think we have heard that kind of threat before. I think, if his memory will take him back to the time when Mr. Gladstone disestablished the Irish Church, he will find that there were loyalists of the same description, who were willing to kick Her Majesty's Crown into the Boyne, and publicly threatened to do so; but I never heard that the threat went any degree further. Perhaps, however, as the Controller of Customs has indicated his intentions to organize, and, I suppose, head a movement, in the way of active aid to the loyalists of Ulster, it may become the other members of the Government who do not entertain precisely the same views, to take some measures to repress his martial ardour, and, unless I greatly mistake, as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia was in times gone by a pretty pronounced Home Ruler, I would suggest that as the Supplementary Estimates are not all down, that a vote might be placed in the Estimates to provide for volunteers to repel any hostile invasion of Ulster which may take place from these shores. However, Sir, the Government must not suppose, and the Government cannot suppose, that it is possible for them or any other Government to escape responsibility for the utterances of one of their members. I must say that as the Controller of Customs is not a very old member of the Government that it is possible that he may not be quite aware of the responsibilities he undertakes when he becomes even a subordinate member of the Government. But it is the business of the elder members and the superior members to see—I use the word in no offensive meaning—to see that these young hounds do not run riot, but that they must be disciplined to proper action. They must be compelled to understand that when a man becomes a member of the Government he compromises a great many other people than himself by his utterances. That is all that I wish to say, but the hon. gentleman, the Controller of Customs, and the Minister of Finance, and all other members of the Government ought to understand this: Here in Canada, as everybody knows, we have two different religions and we have two different races. One thing the hon. Minister of Finance did say, which I heartily agree in: That man is no true friend of Canada, that man is no true patriot, that man is no true friend of the British Empire, who does anything to bring forward these discords more prominently than they already exist. And, it is just, because the language used by the Controller of Customs in his position as a

member of the Government is eminently qualified to make ill-blood between the two great divisions which exist in Canada, because it is eminently calculated to set one class of Irish Canadians against the other, that I think that this motion is properly put. As I said, Sir,—and I think the Finance Minister admitted it—I believe that the vast majority of this House feels disposed entirely to repudiate the obvious deductions to be drawn from that hon. gentleman's speech. I am very sure, Sir, that even the Loyal Orange Order—unless possibly it may be the Grand Lodge—would, if they were fairly consulted, entirely repudiate any idea of active aid and interference, and whether they do or not, I feel certain that our people all through Canada do believe: That if it pleases Her Majesty and the British Parliament to grant Home Rule to Ireland, they will at least do so with the hope, which we all trust will be fulfilled, of removing one of the very greatest obstacles which ever existed to the progress of the British Empire. Sir, I know, and I have known long, that the best of British statesmen have believed that until peace and concord were obtained in Ireland that it was utterly impossible for them to hope for anything like solidarity in the Empire. For many and many a year I myself have advocated that object, and I have advocated it in the interest of the British Empire at large. I believe, moreover, that until Ireland is satisfied and pacified, that there is very little hope of securing that cordial friendship with the people of the United States which every English statesman who is worthy of his salt ought to strive for. I know this, being myself in part of Irish descent, that taking the last ninety years, I do not care what the future Irish Parliament may do—it would be utterly impossible as a whole to govern Ireland worse than it has been governed in the period which has elapsed since the time of the Union. Be that as it may, I here call upon the Government to state distinctly—what the hon. gentleman did not please to state—I call upon them either to adopt the views of the Controller of Customs; and in that case they are justified in calling upon their friends to vote this motion down; or I say that if they will not do that and if they repudiate all responsibility for his utterances, then they have no ground whatever for treating this motion as a motion of want of confidence or for using their majority to vote down sentiments which they themselves admit to be correct and true.

Mr. HUGHES. I have listened with a good deal of attention and interest to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). If I remember aright, in the year 1876, when Mr. Mackenzie was Premier of this country, both of these gentlemen occupied seats in his Cabinet, and I find in the "Hansard" for that year, that the gen-

tleman who rises to-day to make this motion (Mr. Casey) was in his place in the House to move the Address. I find that the Hon. Mr. Holton rose on that occasion and drew the attention of the Speaker as follows:—

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend the First Minister to a matter of very grave importance which has stirred the public mind, in the province from which I come, to its very depths, during the last two weeks; and before the first step in the business of legislation is taken in response to the Speech, I think it but fair to him, and to those who support him on the floor of this House that he should be given an opportunity of making the explanation, which I am satisfied in my own mind he would be able to give, and which would be received by the country, or at all events by his friends, with the utmost satisfaction. I allude to the speech, which I cannot but characterize as an unfortunate one, made by the Postmaster-General in a neighbouring county not many weeks ago. The Postmaster-General was undoubtedly, and it was quite proper, detailed by my hon. friend the First Minister to explain the policy of the Government and to promote the interests of the Government in an important election then pending in the county of Argenteuil.

The address of Mr. Huntington referred to by Mr. Holton was delivered in an election campaign. He was detailed, as Mr. Holton says, by the First Minister, the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, to go and make the speech, and he made it; and he repeated the speech in Parliament. But we do not find either the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on record on that occasion as demanding that the Government should be held responsible for the utterances of their own Postmaster-General, a gentleman speaking in his official capacity as the delegate of the leader of the Government to the electors of Argenteuil. On the contrary, here is what the First Minister himself said, when he was appealed to on the subject:

I believe that every member in this House has a perfect right to discuss politically in his province local questions which may come up, that he may consider it a duty to do so, and that for their share in any such discussions members of this House are not to be held responsible here.

We all know what the subject under discussion at that time was. It was an insult on the part of Mr. Huntington to a large section of the French-Canadian people who did not choose to agree with him and his friends in politics. We find further that, in consultation, I presume, with the Government, Mr. Huntington, the Postmaster-General, made the following explanation:—

No member of the Government is responsible for that speech, and I have the right to express my individual opinions there to my own people. The opinions which I expressed are my opinions; they were my opinions then and are my opinions now.

Such we find to be the precedent laid down by the Cabinet of which these gentlemen were members on an occasion within the easy recollection of the members of this Parliament, and, Sir, I think it is a safe

rule. If we are to have the privilege of examining into the expression of the private opinions of members outside of this House—although on that occasion the matter very properly came within the purview of Parliament—what is to prevent us establishing that system of espionage and of paternal government which has been highly injurious in the history of all lands. Now, I shall not enter into a discussion of this question, for several reasons. One is that I do not think it would do any possible good. I heard the speech of the hon. Controller of Customs at Kingston, and I may say here that while I admit the right of every man to differ from him, I endorse every word he said. What did he say? Hon. gentlemen opposite, as the leader of the Government has said, have brought up a clap-trap resolution in the hope of getting a little sympathy in this House. We have had a great many such resolutions brought into this House before by members of the Opposition, and every resolution of the kind which they have brought in has recoiled on their own heads. The people of this country are capable of reading between the lines; they are an intelligent reading-people, and they will not be misled by any such clap-trap resolutions as this, brought in for the purpose of alienating if possible, those who support the Government, and who yet disagree with the views expressed by the hon. Controller of Customs. On the occasion in question the hon. Controller of Customs said:

What is proposed is not only to shake off their allegiance to Great Britain—the bonds of love that bind them to the Empire—but to put them, forsooth, under an alien and hostile Government. We have their (the Home Rulers') public declarations of what they would do if they obtained power—that they would never cease agitating until the last link that bound Ireland to the British Empire is severed.

We all remember the famous speech delivered by the late Mr. Parnell in Cincinnati, when in an unguarded moment, possibly in a moment of weakness, he let the cat out of the bag, and stated that if they ever got Home Rule for Ireland they would never cease agitating until the last link that bound Ireland to Great Britain should be severed—until, in other words, they had an independent Irish republic of their own. That being the view the hon. Controller of Customs took of the case, and that being the view held by a great many other citizens of this country, whether rightly or wrongly, he went on to say:

That is their object to-day. They are trying to take the loyal men with them; but our friends over there say they will never submit. Britain may cast them out; but if she does so, she has no right to say what may be their future allegiance.

In case Great Britain allowed Ireland to become an independent republic, you might as well say that Britain had a right to control the action of the citizens of the United States after they had declared their in-

Mr. HUGHES.

dependence, as to say that she could control the action of the citizens of an independent Irish republic. What would be the allegiance of any man in Ireland under the circumstances? You might as well say that Austria, after giving up the Netherlands, could retain control over them, or that Spain, after being forced to abandon her South American possessions, could assert her right to control the people of the South American republics. These are the lines on which the hon. Controller of Customs was speaking, and I am satisfied that there is not an hon. member of this House who will deny the right of any citizen of this country, in case such an event happened in Ireland, to act even in the line of the extreme views laid down by the hon. Controller of Customs. Now, Sir, let us take another view of the question. After the United States rebelled and rightly rebelled, against the tyranny of Great Britain, and obtained their independence—though I regret that they did not remain in connection with the old land—a very large number of the citizens of that country came over and settled in the Maritime provinces and in these upper provinces of Canada, and to-day, Sir, the descendants of the old United England loyalists, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, in Quebec and in Ontario, are ranked among the best citizens we have. In case the United States had undertaken to prevent those people leaving the country, who would deny the right of any British subject in the empire to take up arms in defence of those people in their desire to come to this country? You might as well say that those British subjects who went to assist Greece in her stormy times were disloyal. Great Britain has again and again encouraged people to go and take up arms in support of those who were struggling for liberty in other lands. Look at the Huguenots of France who were determined to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, and were persecuted by other people. Great Britain encouraged her people to go to their assistance. When the Netherlands asserted their independence in the time of the Dutch Republic, Great Britain encouraged almost whole armies of her people to go across and assist those people. Now, I do not wish to prolong this discussion to a great length. It is a pretty warm subject, and I am afraid that if I kept on I might get warmed up—I might get excited. But I would just draw the attention of the House to this one fact, which may possibly be a justification of us who fear. Not that we are afraid, in this enlightened age, of the tyranny or intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church, which—because there is no use disguising the fact—is what the Protestants of Ireland are afraid of. I have no fear on that score. But, five or six years ago, I took the liberty of writing a letter to Mr. Parnell, in which I suggested to him that, instead of agitating for Home

Rule for Ireland, he should ask for the establishment of a municipal system, such as we have in our county councils. Indeed, in the opinion of many, provincial rule in Canada is a failure. We were told, before Confederation, that there was great discontent and danger of the people seeking some change in the form of Government, which discontent it was that brought about our present system. These hon. gentlemen, today, do not seem to be very much taken up with our present system. We are justified, probably, in our suspicions of the ultimate aims of those seeking Home Rule, by the fact that the hon. gentlemen who bring up this motion, are those who are anxious to bring about annexation by gradual steps. They are, in fact, anxious to make two bites of the cherry. It would not do for them to come out and say that they want annexation at once; but they first asked for continental free trade, which will be the first bite of the cherry, and then, when the people are educated up to it, they will agitate for annexation. I am satisfied that this resolution will meet the fate it deserves, and that the same fate will befall the hon. gentleman who took the opportunity of moving it in this House.

Mr. McINERNEY. I deprecate entirely the discussion of such questions as this in this House, because I know they are calculated to lead to bitter feelings and sometimes to expressions of sentiments, in the heat of debate, that the speakers afterwards regret. I cannot, however, give a silent vote on this question. The county from which I come, represents, in a small degree, the different discordant elements which go to make up this country. We have a large French-Acadian population, who are in the majority. We have then a large English Protestant population and a very small Irish Catholic community. In that county I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to keep down all religious bickerings, so that peace might prevail; and, as the best proof that we are free from these bickerings, I may say that, in the different elections I have run, at least nine-tenths of the Protestant vote have been cast for me, against all competitors. The stand I take here, both by words and vote, is one which I wish understood properly by the intelligent men of the different nationalities and religions in the county of Kent. I cannot fail to admit that the words of the hon. Controller of Customs are not calculated to promote peace and good-will in this country. They are, on the contrary, opposed to peace and good order in Canada, and should not be supported or upheld by any person in this Parliament or country who wants to see Canada contented, happy and prosperous. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) endeavoured to raise a question which I do not think is germane to the subject. He submitted the proposition, that this was a vote

of want of confidence in the Government, and that, as he was sent here to support the Government, he could not vote for the amendment. Then, we have the leader of the House, in whom I have every confidence, declaring, immediately afterwards, that the Government were not responsible for the utterances of the Controller of Customs. If the Government do not hold themselves responsible for these utterances, how can a vote of censure upon them include a vote of want of confidence in the Government? I cannot understand the logic of that conclusion, and, therefore, in voting for this amendment, I claim that I am not voting want of confidence in the Government. I wish to censure the remarks made by the Controller of Customs, because I think they were un-called for, unnecessary and harmful. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman a simple question. The leader of the House stated, that he did not see in the utterances reported in the newspapers, any declaration of the Controller of Customs, that he would carry armed resistance to the Home Rule Bill into Ulster. Now, I wish to ask the Controller of Customs, if he meant, by the words "active aid," armed resistance or anything of that nature? What did he mean by those words? I would be glad if he would do me the honour of giving me an answer, because, throughout this country, the impression is growing, and the impression will grow still further, that active aid, as expressed by the Controller of Customs, meant armed resistance, and that is the interpretation which has been put upon these words. I think that every member of this House ought to be free to vote according to his own conscience and views in this matter. That is what I intend to do, and I wish to be in the position of being able to go back to the independent, honest, sturdy, intelligent and stalwart Protestants of the county of Kent, and tell them it is for these reasons I vote for this amendment.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am very glad that the tone of the discussion has been very moderate; but one who has occupied a seat in this Parliament as long as I have, would be disappointed, if it took any other direction. On all questions that have come up for discussion here, we have always found gentlemen who occupy seats here, meet those questions, no matter what they may be calculated to give rise to, in a calm, deliberate way, just as they have done to-day. I rise particularly for the purpose of explaining my vote—and it is even necessary sometimes that a member of the Government should explain his vote—and to put right, as far as my understanding goes, the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford, that the leader of the House had called upon his followers to vote this motion down. I do not so understand him. Perhaps, I am not interpreting the words uttered by the leader of the House, properly, but I feel on this

question a good deal like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McInerney). The leader of the House has very properly—as any gentleman occupying a seat in the Cabinet of this country, should do—repudiated and refused a semblance of responsibility for the utterances attributed to my hon. friend and endorsed by himself to-day. Therefore, I feel that I am in this position, that I agree with the hon. gentleman who spoke and who refused to take the responsibility of those utterances, but I go just a little further, and say that, in repudiating these utterances, I cannot, at the same time, assume the responsibility of them, by voting against this amendment, as I would do if I voted so. I would have preferred, had the mover of the resolution left out that personal allusion to the Controller of Customs. By doing so, he would have obtained the same object, he would have affirmed the same principle. He would have done more. He would have freed the resolution from the semblance of any personal charge. It is not the individual, as I understand it, that the House of Commons is dealing with, nor is the case similar to that of Mr. Huntington, that has been referred to, although our friends took strong grounds against his utterances at that time. The language used at that time was most offensive to a section of the people of the country; but the question now before us is whether the language used is consistent with the obligations of a loyal citizen in this country? It does not affect a particular class, it does not affect a particular nationality. The question is whether a loyal citizen has any right to give utterance to such language. Therefore, this question is of wider scope than the one already mentioned. Now, some gentlemen, in this House or elsewhere, have drawn attention to what they call the parallel case of some language of my own uttered outside this House; and it has been said that it was a very singular thing that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) should be condemned for his utterances in Kingston, when I should be left free to preach disloyalty, or words to that effect, in other parts of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I challenge any man in this country to point to any utterances of mine, in this House, or in the country, or in the press, or anywhere else, that had the slightest resemblance to disloyalty, or showed me wanting in my duty and obligation to the Crown, or to the country in which I live.

Mr. WALLACE. Do you mean to say that I did anything of that kind?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am clearing myself. It is not my character to insinuate. I am only referring to some remarks made in reference to myself. The motion that has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is one of principle. While I do not think that the question of Home Rule should be dis-

Mr. COSTIGAN.

cussed at the present time in this House, while I do not express any opinion as to whether the Anti-Home Rulers are seeking the dismemberment of the Empire, and while I do not place too much importance on the talk of armed and active resistance to Home Rule, I do not think that these affect the question of the interpretation to be put upon the words of the Controller of Customs. But we must remember that in this country, men are liable to be tried for their lives, and have been tried, and have paid the penalty of their lives, even in our country, for rebellious acts and want of allegiance to the constituted authority. I say that the question of allegiance and obedience to the laws and constitution is one that affects every portion of the people and our laws and constitution must be observed and respected. Holding these opinions, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me that a good deal of excitement is being created over a little matter. It occurs to me that many hon. gentlemen are virtually evading the essence of the question. If I understand the question is, how far has this House the right to control or call in question what is said by any member of the House outside? The Controller of Customs, exercising the right that belongs to any other member of the House, goes out, and, in his private capacity, attends a meeting of the Orange Society, and gives his opinion on a certain public question relating to Imperial affairs. Now, how far has this House a right to take cognizance of what members say when they are not within the precincts of this House, and when they are acting as private members of a society? If we have a right to take cognizance of every statement of this nature that is made by members of the House, then I think we can go a little further, and we can cite cases where opinions have been expressed by members of this Parliament, and by members of the British Parliament, that are much more wide in their application, and yet no attention has been drawn to them. The hon. Controller of Customs has a right to say what he did without being called to account for it by this House. He says: "I am prepared to state that the society with which I am allied will give active aid." Any individual of this House may put what interpretation he likes upon these words, but we ought to be very careful that we do not put a wrong interpretation upon them. We can remember instances where members of the British Parliament have used language in respect to Home Rule, on platforms in the United States, and on platforms in Canada, at Toronto, quite as strong as the language now complained of, but no member of this Parliament took any notice of it, nor did any member of the British Parliament, of which these speakers were members, pay the slight-

est attention to their language. Now, if we have a right to take cognizance of the language under discussion, were we not entitled to take cognizance of the statement which was made by the leader of the Opposition when, speaking in his private capacity, on the Champ de Mars, in Montreal, he said that had he been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket and fought against the Queen's authority there? Is not that a stronger statement than the one made by the Controller of Customs? But no member of this House moved a resolution condemning him for using such language, because they believed he had a right to speak as a private citizen in accordance with his own views without being indicted for it here. Now, I notice that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in speaking upon this resolution, showed, to my mind, that this amendment had been carefully prepared, that he, at least, was well acquainted with it before it came before this House, because he could recite the very language it contained, although he was not reading the resolution. Evidently this resolution is moved for a specific purpose, for the purpose of creating political animosities that might be turned to the advantage of the Opposition. I think they are engaged in a very unfortunate work. It is a work that I do not think the people of Canada will endorse, it is a work for which hon. gentlemen opposite will not receive credit when they go to the country. It is something they should keep out of this House, and if there is one thing more than another they should endeavour to do, it is to allay every acrimonious feeling that might arise in respect to a question of this kind, rather than try to arouse such feelings by entering upon such a debate as the present one. If I understand correctly the terms of this motion, it is a vote of want of confidence, if I know what such a vote is. I understand, provided that the House will not vote supplies with which to carry on the affairs of the country, and if the Government are unable to control the House in that respect, they are not worthy of its confidence; and if a motion to go into Committee of Supply is met by an amendment, and that amendment carries, it is clearly a motion of want of confidence. Such a motion is submitted with that view in the present case, as I understand it. I shall, therefore, vote against the amendment for two reasons: First, I vote against it because I view it as a vote of want of confidence in the Government; and second, because I think any hon. gentleman has the right which every citizen possesses, of expressing outside of this House his views in connection with various topics with as much freedom as the Controller of Customs exercised in expressing his views at Kingston.

Mr. CURRAN. The question now before the House has assumed an importance which I did not give it when I read the speech delivered by the Controller of Customs at

Kingston. In fact I may say that on reading that speech it did not roughen my temper at all, nor cause me any loss of sleep, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated it would not cause so great a man as even the Prime Minister of England to lose sleep. On the contrary, I felt that really there was not much to talk about in it. I was under the impression that it was very much like the story a police inspector tells about himself. He was crossing the Atlantic, and a certain individual had attracted his attention as being rather suspicious looking. This individual kept his eye upon him, and as they approached the landing, the suspicious character went up to the inspector and said, "Are you with us?" "With what?" he said. "Are you with us?" he repeated. "because we have in Dublin 50,000 drilled men, and we can knock the British Government into smithereens, just as quickly as you can say Jack Robinson." The inspector said, "Why do you not do it?" "Well," said he, "the police won't let us." Now, I felt that any body of men leaving this country, or any other country, and going over to Ireland to invade it might find that the police would not let them. This question is one which has assumed some little importance owing to the debate that has taken place, and I must say that I regret that the Controller of Customs did not answer the question which was put to him by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Melnerney). I fully agree with the proposition, that what a member outside of this House says on a subject which is foreign to our Canadian politics should not be brought up here; but the hon. gentleman who made the speech assumed the responsibility for that speech here. He had a perfect right to tell the hon. member who addressed him and put the answer to him, in the most pleasant language possible, but meaning this, that it was none of his business. The hon. gentleman had a perfect right to take that position. He, however, undertook to assume a different one, and to state that the speech which was alleged to have been delivered by him was actually delivered by him. And the hon. gentleman allowed something still further, he allowed an hon. gentleman to rise and put an interpretation on the words he used in that speech. There is no hon. member on one side of the House or the other who will not coincide with the first part of the declaration contained in the resolution, that here we are all free men, orderly men and law-abiding men. That declaration is correct. But when the motion comes down to allege that the Controller of Customs has declared, in effect, that if Home Rule is carried for Ireland he is prepared to take up arms and fight against the authority of the Queen, I say that, in view of what I thought was held out as a settlement of this matter by the hon. member for South Oxford, so far as he is in a position to speak on behalf

of his party, and I presume he is in such a position, if the hon. gentleman had stood up and said: I never intended to say that I would take up arms and defy the Queen's authority, or defy the authority of the British Government that carried such a measure, a measure sanctioned by the House of Commons, by the Lords and by the Queen of England. I never did say so, and I never meant to say that I would take up arms or counsel anybody else to do so—I think that would have settled this question. But the whole point is in that. My hon. friend who spoke last said: What is meant by "aid?"

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Active aid.

Mr. CURRAN. If by "active aid" was meant what the Secretary of State has done, what I have done myself on our side of the question, that is argue the matter in as calm a manner as possible, using all persuasion possible, pointing out that it would be conducive to the interests of the Empire that Home Rule should be granted, and putting our hands in our pockets and subscribing our money to help a constitutional agitation—if those hon. gentlemen, who are against Home Rule, are prepared to put their hands in their pockets and assist a constitutional agitation on the other side, they have a perfect right to do so. The hon. gentleman has as much right to be opposed to Home Rule as I have to be in favour of it. I will not vote for any resolution to hamper the hon. gentleman's right to hold his opinions. My only reason for supporting any resolution that will condemn the hon. gentleman, whom I have always found to be quite liberal and ready to act with all classes, or I would not have accepted office in a Government with him under my leader—the only reason that will induce me to condemn him will be because he refused to rise and say: I never used any language that can be justly construed to mean, and I never did mean, that in case Home Rule for Ireland was granted, I would take up arms myself, or I would advise any other man to take up arms against the Queen's authority. That is the whole point. If the hon. gentleman makes a declaration that he never intended to take up arms, if he makes a declaration in consonance with the statement of the hon. gentleman now leading the House, I say then the whole difficulty is removed. I believe that the question is in a nutshell, and that the hon. gentleman should not have allowed himself to be saddled with an interpretation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is hardly fair, because the Controller of Customs had certainly the courage of his convictions, and told the House what he meant, and he read from Lord Salisbury's speech, which advocated open resistance.

Mr. CURRAN. The statement of the hon. gentleman shows that he is not anxious to have the matter settled, but is desirous of

Mr. CURRAN.

obtaining some party advantage from it. It is of no importance what a man may say either in England or elsewhere; and I do not care a brass farthing for the utterance of Lord Salisbury or any other lord if it can be construed into disloyalty. It is no justification, if Lord Salisbury made a speech that could be construed in that way. He would be very likely to do it and say that he never meant it to be disloyal. I have nothing to do with Lord Salisbury in this matter; I have nothing to do with his utterances. I have nothing to do with anything but what is before me, and with what I have heard from the other side of the House as to what the main point at issue is. Did the hon. gentleman mean to say that he was prepared to take up arms, or advise other people to take up arms, or give active aid in taking up arms against the Queen's authority in Ireland. That is the whole point.

Mr. MULOCK. Read the speech.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman says, "read the speech." I do not see anything to that effect in the speech. I do not care whether it is there or not constructively, but what I want to know is this: Is the opinion that is sought to be attributed to the hon. gentleman the opinion that he maintains, namely: That in the event of a certain Imperial Act of Parliament passing into law, that he is prepared to rebel against the Queen's authority? The whole of this matter is really in a nutshell in so far as any value being attached to the utterance is concerned. Utterances of an equally violent character upon other questions have been made, and those questions once settled there were no rebellions, and the affairs of the British Empire went on just the same as before. All I have got to say in conclusion is, that I am sorry these questions should be brought up in this manner before the House. I am very sorry, for instance, that I, and the Secretary of State should be appealed to in one breath as the parties who should speak first on this matter, and that in the next breath the hon. gentleman who appealed to us should say, this was not an Irish question at all. I am satisfied that the people of this country like to see all classes living together in peace and harmony. I am satisfied that in so far as Canadian affairs are concerned, our people of different races and creeds wish to live together in peace and harmony and work together for our country's good. I should be sorry indeed to see that by any possibility the old strife of contending factions in the Old Country should be implanted on our soil, and I trust that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs will, at all events, state before this debate closes, that he never gave utterance to any sentiments that would lead any one to believe, who had studied the question fairly and studied his utterances in a calm and impartial spirit, that he had said anything that would lead people to believe that he meant to take up arms against his

Queen, in the event of Home Rule being granted.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, the debate which has intervened since I rose to a question of order some time ago has proved the very point I raised then, namely: That we have enough to do in this country to mind our own affairs without interfering in Irish politics. I wish now to tell the House that the view which I have expressed as to that is the view of the great bulk of the large majority of Canadians. Our people believe in Canadian politics, and in their representatives attending to the affairs deeply interesting to our own country as well as we can, and they believe also that we had better leave Irish politics and other politics of a kindred nature alone. I express my opinion here that there has been too much Irish politics in this country in the formation of Cabinets, and in this sense I speak not only of the Dominion but of the province of Ontario as well. There has been too much Irish politics in the policy of Reformers and Conservatives alike. I, as a young Canadian, and as a young member of this House, protest here and now, against the introduction of Irish politics into the legislative affairs of this country, or indeed I might say into our political questions outside of this Chamber. I may say further, that there has been too much Irish politics in the United States, and we as a country, have suffered therefrom. Irish politics in the United States has interfered as much as any other question in the obtaining of that reciprocity treaty which our friends opposite are anxious for. Irish politics has prevented the negotiation of an extradition treaty between England and the United States, which treaty would be a benefit to our advantage. As a young Canadian here to-day, I protest against the introduction of Irish politics in this House and on the present occasion I hold the Opposition responsible for their introduction. It is patent to us here that hon. gentlemen opposite were not honest in introducing this question, but that they did it only to obtain a partisan advantage. Mr. Speaker, I think further, that a politician in this country, that any man in this country should be allowed to express opinions outside of this House for which he should not be held responsible here, if they are not concerned in Canadian affairs. I shall, therefore, Sir, in the first place, vote against the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Dawson) because I protest against the introduction of Irish politics in our Canadian House of Commons, and in the second place because I wish to uphold the principle, that a politician, that any member of this House ought to be allowed to express his opinion with regard to anything which he believes for the welfare of the country or the Empire.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have regretted to see so much acrimony introduced into the discussion this afternoon. I think it is a very unfortunate thing if we cannot

discuss a question of law here—because, practically, this is a question of law—without debating it so warmly. I must say that I do not agree with the position taken by my hon. friend the Solicitor-General—that is in regard to the challenge of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) to the Controller of Customs to state what he meant by the report of the newspaper. I do not consider that it is any part of the duty of the Controller of Customs, at this stage, or at any stage of the debate, to state what is meant by that article, or any words in that article. We have the article here before us, and it is for us to decide what is the meaning of the words. It is for us to decide whether we are right in supporting the acting leader of the House in his declaration that the Government are not responsible for anything uttered by a gentleman outside of the House. Now, I am not going to state what my personal views are in regard to this matter. I have very strong personal feeling about it, and I have regretted to see that, apart from the question actually at issue, many gentlemen have brought their personal opinions in the debate, and endeavoured to impress them upon the House. In my view, we ought to consider this question in the light of a matter brought before us, as to whether members of this House, and as to whether the Controller of Customs has exceeded his privileges in making statements outside of the House. I think the case laid down by the Minister of Finance is clearly a precedent for our guidance in this particular case, and I consider that the attitude that the Minister of Finance has assumed, when he said that the Government could not take the responsibility of such utterances, and that he would accordingly vote against the amendment, is a good one. I feel, Sir, that I cannot do better than follow him in that respect, because I think, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) says, that the further we keep Irish politics and the politics of any other country away from this House, the better it is for Canada. I therefore support the Minister of Finance against the amendment.

Mr. BERGIN. Mr. Speaker, I fear, Sir, that we are face to face to-day with a question more fraught with danger to the future of Canada, than any that has ever been brought before this House. I am sorry that this occasion has arisen, and I am more sorry still that the person, from whose speech, outside of this Chamber, this question comes up for discussion to-day, is one in whose liberality I have always believed, and still believe, beyond that of most men in this community. I have always looked upon the Controller of Customs as one of the most fair-minded of men. Although the Grand Master of the Orangemen, I have looked upon that hon. gentleman as a man who possessed really no antipathies and no prejudices, to any great extent. I may say, that I have

not lost faith in him by what has occurred to-day. I have not lost that faith in him because of the speech he made at Kingston. That speech was a speech for which, I think, he alone was responsible; the Government was not responsible, nor was any member of the Government responsible; but, Sir, unfortunately, to-day he repeated that speech in this House. Unfortunately, he not only repeated that speech, but he said: They were my sentiments then, they are my sentiments now; I shall not go back on them. Now, Sir, we have to deal with the utterances that he made in this House to-day; we have to deal. I am afraid, with the consequences that may flow from his utterances in this House. The speech he made at Kingston was one which, when I read it, caused me to smile. So far from feeling any indignation over it, I felt very much as they did in the House of Commons at Westminster the other day, when the question was put, whether the utterances of the men of Ulster had been noticed by the Government. The answer was: Yes, we have noticed them. Then the question was: What does the Government propose to do? The Government said: So far as the language of the men is concerned, we propose to take no notice of it; but in regard to the threat of rising in arms against the Government, we propose to take good care of the men who do so. So I felt inclined to look upon the hon. gentleman's speech—I say it not in an offensive sense—as a bit of buncombe on the part of my hon. friend, and not as an attempt to raise strife or ill-feeling in this community.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BERGIN. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was discussing the speech made by the hon. Controller of Customs at Kingston. I stated that the impression made on my mind at the time I read that speech was that it was not intended to be serious. My impression was that it was one of those post-prandial orations that gentlemen sometimes make. I took into consideration the time and the place and the surroundings of the hon. gentleman. I took into consideration also that he was as, it were, upon his trial with the members of his order, now that he had accepted the position of Controller of Customs in this Government. Making all these allowances, and bearing in mind his record in the past as a man of very liberal mind, notwithstanding the professions that he had made to the contrary, at other times—bearing all this in mind, I was not disposed to regard this matter seriously; but when the hon. gentleman took occasion upon the floor of this House to-day to repeat all that he said at Kingston and confirm the report made by the Kingston "News," when he took occasion to say that these were his

Mr. BERGIN.

opinions then, that they are his opinions now, and that he would not go back upon them, I feel that I am obliged to treat the statements of that hon. gentleman in an entirely different method from that in which I had intended to treat them when I first saw them. I cannot consent to have it placed upon the records of this House that I gave a silent vote upon this question. I cannot consent to have it placed upon the records of this House that I approve in any way the doctrine announced by this hon. gentleman. I represent a great Protestant county, largely Orangemen, and in the name of those Orangemen I say that there is not in that county one who will approve the words of the hon. Controller of Customs. I say, Sir, that the Orangemen of my county are a noble set of men. Their fealty to me, the loyalty with which they have stood by me during so many years, is proof that they have no prejudices against their Catholic fellow-citizens; and more than that, I know that a large number amongst them are ardent supporters of Home Rule. I know that a goodly number of them believe that the people of Ireland should be placed in the same condition as the people of this country. They believe that if we are entitled to free Government in this country so are our countrymen in Ireland, and refuse to deny to our countrymen there that which we claim for ourselves. I would be untrue to this great body of men, who have supported me so faithfully and long, if I for one moment admitted that there was one of them tainted with the prejudices and views of the Controller of Customs. What is to be the result of such speeches as this which this hon. gentleman made at Kingston and which to-day he approved and confirmed? Are we, Sir, to have the brand of discord thrown into this community by a gentleman who is a member of the Government, although he is not a Cabinet Minister? Are we to have the worst passions raised in this country by speeches such as that which we are now discussing? Are we to have the brand of religious discord lighted and thrown broadcast throughout this Dominion? Are we, Sir, to imperil the future of this country by taking sides upon a question of this kind, as Catholics and as Protestants? No, Sir; the people of this country desire to live in harmony and concord. As the people live in my county, so do our people desire to live in all other counties throughout this Dominion. We do not wish to imperil our future by questions of religion or questions of nationality. We believe that this country is wide enough and broad enough to hold the people of all denominations and of all nationalities, and we believe that he must be a very narrow-minded man, unworthy of our public confidence, who takes advantage of any occasion to do that which will breed strife and discord and rouse the worst passions in a community like ours. If Canada is to have a future, if Canada is to continue

a bright jewel in the British Crown, it will only be through the loyalty of her people. And there is no man, I care not what his faith or nationality, who desires the prosperity of this country, who desires to see Canada become some day a great English-speaking nation, who will not repudiate, with all his strength and heart, statements such as those made by the Controller of Customs. We profess that we love Canada, that we desire its prosperity, that we wish to make it a great, a glorious and a free nation. We desire, first of all, that we should have a national feeling. Can we have a national feeling whilst we have the brand of discord thrown among us by men in high places? Is it possible that our aspirations can ever be realized under such circumstances? Had the hon. gentleman, when the question was put to him by the hon. member for Kent, repudiated—as I felt in my heart he would have—that he had any desire to take up arms or that he would expect any portion of this country to join him in casting off his allegiance to Great Britain, had he done this I would have been the last to censure him. But to that appeal, and to the appeal of the Solicitor-General, he did not vouchsafe any reply; and having kept silence during that debate, I for one am prepared to believe that he does feel as he spoke, and what he spoke were his honest sentiments. Believing this, I cannot help expressing my disapprobation of all that fell from him, and my condemnation, so far as it is in my power to condemn. If this motion prevails, I cannot help but feel that this is one of the darkest, if not the darkest day, that Canada has ever seen. If this motion prevails, and if no explanation is given by the Government as to the course it intends to adopt, previous to this vote, we stand face to face with a most threatening condition of affairs. We stand face to face with this prospect: that the country will be divided upon questions of religion and race. Instead of in the future being divided, as we have been in the past, by great political issues, we shall be divided upon the narrowest and most dangerous and most terrible line of religious discord.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is not a word about religion or race in what is alleged to have been stated by the Controller of Customs.

Mr. BERGIN. I am prepared to admit that the Controller of Customs did not state one word of religion or race, but I am prepared to say when a man, who is at the head of a great Protestant organization, asks this House not to condemn him, he is bringing into issue the question of race and religion, and it will be upon such questions that the future of this country for many a year, and upon such issues, that our politics will be divided, and not upon the great political, commercial and other interests which have divided us in the past. In justice to the

great county that I represent, and which has been to me so loyal and true, in justice to that great body of Orangemen, I must repudiate all that has fallen from that hon. gentleman. I do it in justice to them, because if people suppose, for one moment, that that great body in my county is not as loyal—and it has given proof of its loyalty always in time of trial—as any other body in this country, then I must repudiate any insinuation of that kind; and I feel I would be false to them and to my duty, if I did not take this opportunity of repudiating any such feelings on the part of the Orangemen of the grand old county which I have the honour to represent, and I call the attention of the leader of the House to what I am about to say (if he thinks it worth while to pay any attention to what I am about to say). I call the attention of the leader of the House to the measure of doubt which prevails as to whether the Government intend to make this vote one of confidence or not. If they are about to leave it an open question, then they will relieve some of their supporters of a difficulty, but if they are determined to make it a vote of want of confidence, so that we shall be obliged to vote against our own opinions and our consciences upon them be it; it will not be upon us. There is one difficulty which appears to me as almost an insurmountable one in the position in which I stand, and as the hon. Minister has not said whether this is to be an open vote or not, I am not quite as free as I would like to be, and I must ask him to give me a categorical answer to that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give the hon. gentleman the answer which I think is fair and honest. If this amendment which has been moved for a purpose—for a purpose which is evident, to sow the seeds of dissension amongst our ranks, and to turn out the Government, if possible—if this motion passes, it will not be by the vote of friends of the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will have to act judicially now.

Mr. BERGIN. If the hon. gentleman would keep his silence judicially, it would be, perhaps, politically to my advantage. The answer which the leader of the House has given to me, is substantially this: That any one who votes for the amendment is not a friend of the Government. Now, Sir, I do not think that that is an answer which a man of my long service to this party, a man of my fidelity to the party was entitled to get. I deny, Sir, that I am not a friend of this Government. I feel that through the laches of the Government in not calling us together, in not explaining to us what they proposed to do in this matter, in leaving us in the dark until this moment, until I have dragged it from the leader of the House, they have not done to us as they

ought to have done. They should not have put us in a false position; they should not have put us in such a position after we had committed ourselves to a certain course. Why, Sir, so strong a friend am I of this Government that, notwithstanding that it is about to violate every principle I hold dear, that it will violate every pledge that I have made—no I have made no pledge, but I have given my friends to understand how I felt after the hon. the Controller of Customs had confirmed his speech to-day. Up to that hour, I treated it as a jest, not worthy of serious consideration, but making that statement, as he did, in the presence of the whole Government, and of this House, I feel, Sir, that I could not but take notice of it, holding the views I do, desiring to live upon the closest and warmest terms of friendships with my Protestant friends, desirous of keeping those ties forever, or rather during the time I live. Because there is no man in the county from which I come, who can put his hand upon a single syllable I have ever uttered that would tend to bring about difficulties between people on account of their race or their religion. But, Sir, when I found the aspersions that this hon. gentleman made were confirmed by himself to-day, I felt that I must be true to my principles, and that I must take the course I am about to take. And if I take it, I do so with, perhaps, a greater love than ever, and a greater respect for my leader, Sir John Thompson, who is now in Paris, where, in two days, will open that great conference, that important mission upon which he goes, and in the conduct of which I know he will display all that ability and that care for Canada and her interests that we know is his. I feel almost as if I were giving a stab in the back to that great leader, to that man whom I love and honour, in voting on this question as I am obliged to vote, because of the reply given to me by the leader of the House. Should this motion prevail, I feel all the evil consequences that are likely to ensue, because, as I understand the leader of the House, if this motion should carry this Government would resign. I can imagine no greater disaster to this country, during the absence of our great leader. But all these questions I have weighed carefully. Perhaps I have not the ability to weigh questions of such character as some people have, but, all the same, I take my political life into my hands, perhaps, but, live or die, I shall vote according to my principles, and I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). These appear to be rather troublesome times for Controllers. I have been considerably amused as well as interested during the course of this debate by the references that have been made to men of my class in the Government. On occasions, when it suits our friends opposite, they are very anxious to belittle the position of Controllers, but to-day they are bound to have this Parliament declare that Con-

Mr. BERGIN.

trollers are full-fledged members of this Government anyhow, and that they are to be held responsible for all that a Privy Councillor would be held responsible for in his utterances, whether in this House or out of it. I rise, Mr. Speaker, more for the purpose of emphasizing an interruption that I made, which was, perhaps, not Parliamentary, when the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me was speaking. I wish to emphasize this fact—that in the speech that has been so largely criticised, so adversely criticised, there does not appear one single word, sentence or sentiment against the religion or against the creed or race of any man. I wish to say to my friends in Quebec, to those who differ from the hon. Controller in their views, that the inference my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Bergin) sought to draw from his remarks, is, to say the least, unkind, unfair. And my hon. friend from Stormont is not the generous friend I have found him to be—and he is a generous man—if he does not, at least, do the hon. gentleman, the Controller of Customs, the justice of correcting that portion of his speech. I would regret if the Controller of Customs, if any member of the Government, or any member of this House, were to give expression to any word which would tend to sow the seeds of religious discord in this country. Goodness knows, Sir, it is hard enough to govern countries where this problem is not present. Government is a matter of compromise in any case, much more must it be a matter of compromise in a country where the interests are so divers, and people of different religions and races are to be found under the same Government. How careful, then, ought we to be to avoid saying anything that would tend to arouse religious passions or prejudices of our people. I must say this for the Controller of Customs, that during an acquaintance extending over many years, I have never yet heard it said of him, though holding the highest position in that order of which he is the head, that in his public utterances he has ever offended the religious feelings of any person, and this fact ought to be stated to his credit here to-night. Now, Sir, ought this matter ever to have been brought up in this House? Do we not understand the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite. Do we suppose that they are brimful of that enthusiasm which would naturally inspire a native of Ireland for the good of the Irish cause? Wishing to give them credit for all sincerity, I firmly believe that the idea of gaining a little political advantage at the expense of the Government, was one of the principal motives that actuated hon. gentlemen opposite in bringing this matter into the House. Now, the leader of the Opposition, for whom I, in common with all my fellow-Canadians, entertain a very high opinion, upon a certain occasion, outside of this House, an occasion, in one respect, similar to the occasion when the Controller

of Customs made these remarks—the leader of the Opposition—stated that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have taken up arms and fought against the volunteers of Ontario. If these were not his exact words, at all events, they were of the same tenor. Did any hon. gentleman on this side of the House feel himself called upon to drag that before this Parliament, to move here a vote of censure upon that hon. gentleman for using that language? Supposing I were to ask that hon. gentleman to-night, as my hon. friend the Controller of Customs has been asked categorically, if he is still of that opinion, if he would say now that were he on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would take up arms on behalf of the half-breeds, and if he reaffirmed his language? Sir, there is not an hon. gentleman on this side of the House who would, for one moment, think of parading in this Parliament a resolution condemning him for what he may have said outside of this House, in the course of a heated political discussion. Reference has also been made to what Lord Salisbury has said. Now, it is not my concern to justify what Lord Salisbury has said in connection with the movement in Ulster; but the concluding words of a speech made by that distinguished statesman, when he held the responsible position of First Minister in England, will bear repetition here, and the speech, I may say, was one beside which the speech of the Controller of Customs is very mild indeed:

Be it on the part of a Parliament, or on the part of a king, should it ever occur at any future time, I do not believe that the people of Ulster have lost their sturdy love of freedom, or their detestation of arbitrary power.

As I have said, it is not my concern to justify what any English statesman may say for or against Home Rule for Ireland. But I must say that that speech was made in England, was commented upon by the public press throughout that country, but no Liberal in the House of Commons afterwards ever thought of parading it in Parliament, or trying to make political capital out of it. Now, why is it that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs is treated in this way? I consider it wholly beneath the dignity of this Parliament, wholly unworthy of us as members of this House, utterly inconsistent with the duties which we were sent here to perform, that we should take up, possibly, the whole of this day in discussing a matter which any person must admit is entirely foreign to that legislation which properly comes within the purview of a Parliament like this. I desire, in discussing this question, to bring whatever of cool judgment I may possess to bear upon it, and I must express my sincere regret that this matter has ever been obtruded into this House. I am much mistaken, and I very much mistake the good judgment, the honesty of motive and of purpose, of my fellow members upon this side of the House,

if they do not vote this motion down as a piece of political claptrap unworthy of having ever been brought into the House.

Mr. DAVIN. The point raised by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, as to the propriety of this Parliament discussing a question of this kind, has met with a good deal of approval on the part of hon. members; nevertheless, I venture to say that if a Minister of the Crown—because the hon. gentleman the Controller of Customs is a Minister of the Crown—

An hon. MEMBER. No; he is not.

Mr. DAVIN. Who says he is not?

Mr. JONCAS. I say so. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I am ready to prove that the Controller of Customs is not a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman can prove it after I sit down; but meanwhile I suppose the position of the Controller of Customs is considered analogous to that of an Under Secretary of State.

Mr. JONCAS. It is not at all the same thing.

Mr. DAVIN. The Controller of Customs states that he is a member of the Government. He is reported as saying so since he entered the Government. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying, from my place in Parliament, that anybody who attempts to say that the hon. member is not a member of the Government is quibbling, and is descending to a style of discussion unworthy of this Parliament. The Controller of Inland Revenue, who is at the head of the department, who is in the service of the Crown, and the Controller of Customs, after they took office, went back to their constituents—I forget whether I am right—but if they went back, why did they go back? They went back because they had taken office under the Crown. Why, until this matter came up, nobody thought of denying that the hon. member was a Minister of the Crown. In fact, what does he say himself? I think in the same speech, at all events in another speech, addressing his brother Orangemen, he tells them that the Government of which he is a member stands in this position before the country, and he says:

Suppose the Grits had come into power, would you have had one Orangeman in the Government? No, but now you have two Orangemen, you have the Minister of Trade and Commerce and you have myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that language used by members of the Government and by members of this House, outside the House are matters with which this House is concerned. I am told that my hon. friend the leader of this House declared, in the course of his speech—and I hope he will correct me if I am not properly informed; I went to the reporters' room and tried to get it—he

said that the Government was not responsible for the private opinion of any of its members expressed outside this House on subjects of foreign policy. Well, if the point is in the phrase, "expressed outside of the House," the hon. gentleman who spoke before the Commissioner of Inland Revenue pointed out that, to-day, the Controller of Customs has reaffirmed the language within the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion I have read is none of mine; I was away in Toronto or Kingston when this motion was concocted. But I had a question on the Notice Paper. I put it there, first, in the interest of the Controller of Customs, to give him an opportunity of saying whether or not he was properly reported; next, in the interest of this Parliament; and next, in my own interest. He is one of my leaders—I have not chosen him as a leader, but he has been given me as one of my leaders, without any choice or word of reference so far as I am concerned. The Controller of Customs is one of my leaders; and am I to be told that it is of no consequence to me whatever my leader may happen to say on so important a subject as taking up arms against Her Majesty? I have gone into the four courts of Dublin and seen a man prosecuted for singing a song written by Professor Ingram, a Protestant professor of Dublin University. The song commences: "Who fears to speak of '98?" That event had passed away for more than half a century at that time; nevertheless he was indicted and given penal servitude for singing that song. I have gone into the four courts and seen Lord O'Hagan try a man for singing one of his own songs, composed when that eminent judge was a young man, and sentence him to imprisonment. The leader of the Government and the Minister of Railways and other hon. gentlemen who are my leaders need not be surprised if I, as an Irish Protestant, feel strongly on the subject of loyalty. It seems that it is a very light matter with some hon. gentlemen, whether a member of the Government uses seditious language, uses language that, if used at the time I speak of in Ireland, would have sent him into penal servitude. Do you mean to say that we who are always talking about our loyalty, flaunting the British flag when we want to make a point, if some member of our party asperses that loyalty and encourages sedition and encourages men to rise against Her Majesty, are to sit quietly by and declare: "Oh, it was an after-dinner ebullition, and think no more about it." If it was an after-dinner ebullition, the hon. gentleman should have stated so, and we should have heard no more about it. But, to-day, he has reaffirmed it. Todd says of the position of an Under Secretary of State, that "the responsibilities of a Minister who has no seat in the Cabinet is less comprehensive, although, in its degree, no less complete." And who can deny, for one moment, that although the Controller of

Mr. DAVIN.

Customs may not be in the Cabinet, and may not have to form policies, he, as head of a department, as a Minister of the Crown, as a member of this Government—for nobody ever heard that he was not a member of the Government until this matter was brought up—who can deny that his responsibility is complete? I understand also that the leader of the Government said that active aid might merely mean aid by subscriptions. The proper person to put the gloss on it is the Controller of Customs. It might be quite right to accept a commentator if the author himself were not present, but no one ever heard of sending a man to a commentator or a glossarist to learn the meaning of language when the author himself was present. And so we have the language of the Controller of Customs, and, if he says he sticks by that language, we are shut up to its natural meaning, and the natural meaning of the language when he spoke of active aid, combined as it is with a sentence in which he speaks of throwing off allegiance to Her Majesty, shows what his opinion was.

Mr. WALLACE. Permit me to say there is not such a sentence in my speech, and the hon. gentleman twists it unfairly and improperly when he makes use of that expression. There is not a sentiment of disloyalty from one end to the other. I belong to a society, the foundation-stone of which is loyalty.

Mr. DAVIN. The speech is here in the "Empire," and is put in quotation marks. In speaking of Ireland, he said:

Our friends over there will never submit to Home Rule. Britain may cast them out, and if she does she has no right to look for their further allegiance. They are preparing for action. Their unalterable determination is never to submit to Home Rule, and they will have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada—aye, more than sympathy: they shall have our active aid, if that active aid be necessary. We shall be unworthy of our ancestors if we fail in our duty in such a crisis.

I do not understand language if the hon. gentleman does not mean active aid; if he does not, he should rise in his place and say that he does not mean it. If he means, as the Minister of Finance, I understand, has suggested, simply subscriptions, then the hon. gentleman should tell us that he merely meant subscriptions, or sympathy. But other people would understand he meant active aid. Probably the hon. gentleman has a dictionary of his own, perhaps I am not qualified to understand his "copia verborum;" but I was quite ready to take the hon. gentleman's own interpretation. I say, however, that this is a serious matter. Again, I am told that the Minister of Finance said there was no instance whatever of notice being taken by a Parliament of this kind of public action, of public expression of opinion by a member of the Government outside of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said such a word.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad the hon. gentleman did not. Let me call attention to what took place in England in 1864. Mr. Stansfeld was a Lord of the Admiralty. Grecco was on trial in Paris. Ten years before some letters had been addressed to the house where Mr. Stansfeld lived, not addressed to Mr. Stansfeld; but Mr. Stansfeld was known to sympathize with Mazzini. He rose in his place in the House of Commons and said he knew nothing whatever about the matter, but he said he believed Mazzini had been maligned. What happened? Because he was under suspicion of having taken part in this foreign movement, a movement, in Italy, that many might sympathize with, because he had taken part in the Mazzini movement, a motion was moved in the House condemning his action. That motion was carried by a majority of ten, or at all events by a narrow majority, and a few days afterwards Mr. Stansfeld resigned. I am sorry the Controller of Customs has not denied that he meant to incite men to sedition, because he is a member of an order that is pre-eminently loyal and pre-eminently attached to British connection; and it would be a most extraordinary thing if a man at the head of an order pre-eminently attached to British connection, should in addressing members of that order in Canada urge them to take a course that would be throwing off allegiance to Her Majesty in another country. I say whether you call it foreign politics or any other kind of politics, it is a matter in which the whole of the citizens of Canada are interested when a member of the Government talks in that way, but specially those of us who are Conservative, and especially those of us who are Irish Protestants. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Government and the hon. the Controller of Customs, that we Irish Protestants do not regard the Controller of Customs as a representative man of the Irish Protestants of Canada. I was addressing Irish Protestants on Friday night in Toronto, and I could not help dwelling on what the Irish Protestants had done for the Empire. I told them that in every walk of art, in every walk of human endeavour, and in every place, that small body of men had given the very greatest and foremost names to the service of Britain. I could not help recalling that Irish Protestants had fought bravely on battlefield after battlefield for the glory of the Empire. I said that, when England had to face a world in arms, an Irish Protestant led her army, and, if she had to face a world in arms to-day, an Irish Protestant would be her greatest general. If we consider the great statesmen of the Empire, the Irish Protestant names are household words, and wherever the English tongue is used to-day throughout the Empire the statesman goes to an Irish Protestant, as to a quarry, to get materials to fortify his statesmanship and to enrich his rhetoric. I say that in Canada the Irish Protestant—and, not less, the Orangeman—is of the same

type as the men who fought and worked for the glory of the Empire, and I say that the Controller of Customs is not a representative of us. Now, Sir, the point was made, that the leader of the Opposition spoke of shouldering a musket. If the leader of the Opposition spoke sedition at any time, he is amenable to the censure of this House as any other man; and presupposing that he did talk sedition, if I had been a member of this House, and if I had known of it, I would have brought the matter before Parliament; that is, on the hypothesis that he did talk sedition. Now, Sir, I have known my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue for some time, and I have known him as a pretty ingenious man. I think he quoted from Lord Salisbury, in these words:

That the people of Ulster have not lost their strong love of freedom or their disdain of arbitrary powers.

Is that correct? Is there anything improper in that statement?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman will understand that I merely quoted the concluding portion of the speech, which, I said, compared to that in criticism, was very mild indeed.

Mr. DAVIN. Quote the part that has the sting in it, because there is no sting in what you have quoted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That speech was quoted before, and if the hon. gentleman had been in the House attending to his duty, he would have heard the speech read before.

Mr. DAVIN. But, Sir, what is the use of quoting the part of the speech that does not help the hon. gentleman's argument? If it was read before, let him read it behind now.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is just precisely what I did. I read the concluding portion of it. I cannot satisfy the hon. gentleman. Like some men, nothing will ever satisfy him.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Sir, I have read Lord Salisbury's speech, and I say that Lord Salisbury's speech contains nothing in it—

Mr. FOSTER. That is not complimentary to Lord Salisbury.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is constantly advising those on the Opposition benches to hasten slowly, and I would advise my hon. friend—he is only a little while in the leadership—to hasten slowly, because, since he has become leader, I do not think, in his position as leader, he has been quite as successful as in his position of second man in the Government, and I would, therefore, advise him to hasten slowly. I was about to say, Sir, that there is nothing in the speech of Lord Salisbury, compared to the speech of the Controller of Customs. There is nothing in it calcu-

lated to incite insurrection, and I say this: That even though Lord Salisbury were guilty of impropriety, and even if the leader of the Opposition were guilty of impropriety, do you mean to say that their language would excuse impropriety on the part of a Minister of the Crown in Canada to-day? or that I, as a supporter of the Government and a member of the Conservative party, and an Irish Protestant, may be asked to sit tamely here, or indeed be asked to take a still different course, because two or three or four or five gentlemen sitting on the Government benches, say that I should take such a course, against my opinions? Now, what is the position of the Government? I have read this motion, and I must say that any motion coming from the Opposition, if it were framed by the Angel Gabriel, is liable, and fairly liable, to the criticism that it is meant to disturb the Government. Why, it is like asking a hedgehog, when he puts himself in battle array, for what reason has he got his prickles on? It is the most natural thing in the world, that if a member of the Opposition moves an amendment, that he does not intend to help the Government. But that is not the point we have to decide in a matter like the present one. The point we have to discuss now is: Is it a motion—prompted by whatever motive—is it a fair motion, and is it one that we ought to assent to? That is the real question. Now what does this motion say? It affirms the gross impropriety of a Minister of the Crown giving utterances to seditious statements. It construes these statements, as any rational man will construe them, and it says that this House should censure the Controller of Customs. Well, Sir, if the House does not censure him, the House must do the other thing; it must approve of him. If we do not censure the words, we must approve of them. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in response to one of the members, said: That anybody who votes for this motion is not a friend of the Government. I say that that was not after all a straight answer. I have heard answers given under such circumstances by Ministers of the Crown, and they were generally given very calmly, and not in the least with an air of menace. What have answers under such circumstances generally been? The Minister says: I have only to tell the hon. member that if the motion now before the House is carried the Government will consider its position. That is the stereotyped phrase used in the English Parliament if it is intended to declare a motion to be one of want of confidence; but the phrase that we must henceforth use, if we are to put an extreme interpretation on the words of the Minister of Finance, is, I suppose, this: "No friends of the Government will vote for this motion." But, Sir, that does not mean if the motion were carried that the Government would resign, and I do not see why, if this motion were carried, the Government should resign. I do not

Mr. DAVIN.

at all see that it is a vote of a want of confidence in the Government; but I will tell you what it is: It is a vote of want of confidence in the Controller of Customs, and I say that I have no confidence in any man as a member of the Government that I am asked to support if he is capable of using such seditious language as the Controller of Customs says he used. And, Sir, I will tell you moreover why I have no confidence in him. It is because I have reason to believe that the hon. gentleman, in using that language—and to my mind it adds very greatly to the gravity of having used it—has not actually used that language from his heart, or from his calculated opinions at all, but has used it to inflame prejudices, and to awake passions, with a view of filling sails, spread for what purpose it is not necessary for me now to analyse. And I will tell him why I have no faith in his sincerity in this matter. I remember very well when he stood up—here is the book where he is registered—as one of the noble thirteen. He stands before the public as such; he stands before the Orangemen of Canada as such; he stands before the Irish Protestants as having voted with those noble thirteen, and no doubt he voted sincerely; but I know—and I ought to have brought it forward before this—that at the very time he was voting in that way, he was urging his fellow-Orangemen in this House to take a different line and support the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to state that that assertion applied to me is absolutely false. There is not a word of truth in it, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to name the man that I tried to induce—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman ought not to use the expression "false."

Mr. WALLACE. I say that the assertion as applied to me is absolutely false.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a proper term.

Mr. WALLACE. It is true, though.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the word "false," and substitute some other word.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman's statement is absolutely unfounded, and I challenge him to name the members that I tried to induce to do such a thing.

Mr. DAVIN. Must I give the name?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman, I understand, denies it. I heard him myself address his brother Protestant members and urge them to vote with the Government, and to say that he could not from his position vote otherwise than with the minority.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not true.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Name the others besides yourself.

Mr. DAVIN. Nobody who knows me will suppose that I would invent such a thing as that out of the whole cloth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I see hon. gentlemen laughing. I defy them or any one else in this House—they know me well, and there is not a man who knows me who would suppose that I would for one second invent that statement out of the whole cloth. I heard the hon. gentleman, and I will give him day and date and place. Those hon. gentlemen who took his advice, some of them, have been left at home, and if he had been a chivalrous man and a real man as a member of the Orange body, he would have said: I will take my life in my hand and vote with the Government; but he urged them to vote with the Government, while his name was blazoned before the public as one of the noble thirteen. Therefore, I have no confidence in him.

Mr. WALLACE. I state again that it is absolutely untrue, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one man. He says he himself was there. If others were there, I would like him to name them; and if he does, I will bring those gentlemen to state the contrary.

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell where it occurred. It occurred upstairs in room 46, at a meeting of the Protestant members of the Conservative party when Sir John Macdonald brought before us the question how we should vote on the Jesuits' Estates question. As the hon. gentleman wanted it, he has got it out. I heard him say it myself.

Mr. WALLACE. Of those men who were members of Parliament at that time are here to-day. I call upon any one of them to verify, if they can, the statement made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. They cannot do it.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what party loyalty may lead men to do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame, shame.

Mr. DAVIN. I have heard men denounce Jesuitism; but, Sir, I have seen as much Jesuitism in politics—I have seen men stoop to as great villainy in politics as to say what is not true.

Mr. WALLACE. We see it now.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman denies it, but I venture to say that if I wish I can get members who will prove what I say. But my statement is enough for the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. My statement, Mr. Speaker, is not only enough for the people of Canada, but it is enough for the Orange-

men of Canada, and enough for the Irish Protestants of Canada, and enough for the Conservative party of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I am no heeler; I have no axe to grind; I am looking for no position. I have nothing whatever to do except to attend to the duties of my constituency; and, standing here as an impartial man, condemning the action of the Controller of Customs, and forced to take the course that I have taken, I rather think that the people of Canada who know me, especially the people of Ontario, who know me as well as any man in that Government, will believe my statement. There is hardly one man in that Government whose honour stands as high in the estimation of the people of Ontario as mine does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen laugh. The people of Ontario know me better, happily, than they know them.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for one minute, I would like to say—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not going to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only interrupt the speaker by rising to a point of order.

Mr. SPROULE. I was rising to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. SPROULE. I have said so. I wish to ask whether the hon. gentleman is in order in making the statement he has done in the presence of men who were there, without allowing them an opportunity either to deny it or to assent to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I imagine that every member of the House, except those who have already spoken on this question, will have the right to speak.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, there was a further reason which I had for putting this question on the Paper. When the hon. leader of the House gave me a somewhat short answer, as I thought, when I put this question—when he declared that the Government knew nothing of it, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said to me: "Put your question on the Paper; he—meaning the Controller—will glory in it; I heard him say it;" or something to that effect. He also said, committing a high breach of the privileges of this House: "If you put it on the Paper, you will never come back here again." Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can only come back here under favour of the Controller of Cus-

toms and his lieutenant, the member for North Victoria, why, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to come back here at all. Hitherto I have thought I was indebted to my seat to the people of Western Assiniboia. I thought they had voted for me in spite of the blandishments of the late Minister of the Interior. In spite of the blandishments of the Commissioner of North-west Mounted Police, in spite of the leader of the Reform party in the riding, and in spite of the head of the Lester-Kaye farms. I thought it was because I had done good service before I was elected originally and after I was elected; and if it should come to be a question of asking permission of the hon. Controller of Customs or the hon. member for North Victoria, why, Mr. Speaker, I hope now, and I hope at all times in the future of my public career, be it long or short, to be able to parody Pope's splendid lines, and say that I did not rise by sycophany, that I did not rise by intrigue, that I did not rise by truckling, that I did not rise by sending deputations to the Premier and bothering him, that I did not rise by pleading and bleating and shedding tears. "Be this one poet's praise," said Pope, "that if he rose, he rose by manly ways." I would to God that I could say that when men rise in Canada, they always rise by manly ways; but, any way, of this you may be perfectly certain and the party may be perfectly certain, that as there has not been in the past, neither will there be in the future, any stooping on my part to those arts which consist in a wriggling from the base of the tree right up to the topmost leaf, and being the same little dirty worm at the top that you were when you left the base of the tree. I want to come back to the gravity of this question. I say that the position taken by the Government is one that will not commend itself to the people of this country. I say that any man occupying the position of a Minister of the Crown—but the hon. gentleman declares he is not a Minister of the Crown, and I suppose we will have some quibbling on that—he will probably try to prove that he is only a three-quarter Minister of the Crown, or a Minister of the Crown north by north-east: but not a full orb'd Minister of the Crown. What did his brother, the Controller of Inland Revenue, do the other day? He dismissed J. J. Cosgrove for having signed a disloyal declaration. Mr. Cosgrove was dismissed because he signed a statement of opinion that was absolutely disloyal. I approve of that; I approve of Mr. Mowat dismissing Myers; but it is quite a different thing when a man gets within the sacred precincts of the Government of Canada. I know what a sacred inclosure that is. I know that we ought all to go down on our bellies and worship every man that becomes a Minister of the Crown. I know that when a man becomes a Minister of the Crown, not only he himself thinks that he is a sacred personage, but that all the members of his party think

Mr. DAVIN.

so too. I know that he is a most-worshipped personage as a rule. I know well that it is not needed that a Minister of the Crown should be an educated man. In fact, we are going fast towards having what I do not think we ought to have, an utterly illiterate Ministry. But I can sit here patiently and allow men to become Ministers of the Crown, who may want administrative ability, and we have had such men. There was one man who passed out of that Ministry, and who had no administrative ability and no weight in this House. I can sit here and bear that patiently; but I come from a stock of men who have served and fought and bled for the British Crown, and have been reared to believe that the most grievous sin a public man can commit is to encourage sedition, to encourage men rising against the Crown, and when any man, whether he be a Controller or a full-fledged Minister, or a deputy-head, whoever he be, especially if he has a seat in this House has uttered seditious sentiments, I will not sit tamely by, knowing him to have uttered such opinions. Mark where I draw the line. If the hon. member had declared that the men of Ulster would use every means of constitutional agitation and constitutional proceedings—and that evidently is what Lord Salisbury referred to—I should not object to that; but when he talks sedition, when he says that which, in the mouth of another man in this House, would call for his strongest reprobation, whether the Ministry declare that the man who denounces that is a friend of theirs or not, I am the enemy of that kind of thing and the enemy of the man who utters such sedition.

Mr. McKAY. As one of the members who attended the meeting referred to by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), at the time the vote was taken on that question, I must say that I never heard the Controller of Customs say one word at that meeting, or at any place outside of it, which would lead me to think that he was not perfectly sincere in his conviction at that time and in the vote he gave. In justice to him, I must say that I never heard myself, nor did I hear any intimation from any other members, that the Controller of Customs was not perfectly sincere in the vote he gave. I wish to make this statement, as one who was present at that meeting. He did not advise me to vote otherwise than he himself did, and I did not hear that he advised any other Protestant members of the House to do so. There were two meetings, and at neither did he give us reason to think that he was not perfectly sincere in the vote he was giving.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who was at the caucus—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken, spoken.

Mr. CARPENTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem very anxious to muzzle the mouths of any members on this side who wish to say a word in this House which is not in accord with their views. As one who occupied the same room with Mr. Wallace, during all the time of that discussion, and who was at that caucus, and as one who voted, not with the thirteen, but against them, let me say that I never heard in that room or outside it, or at the caucus or elsewhere, the Controller of Customs state one word, or do one act that would lead any one to the conclusion that he was not sincere, nor did he advise any one of us to vote against the amendment he supported. It would be impossible for him to have done this without my knowing something about it. For the first time in my life do I hear from any source that Mr. Wallace ever promulgated such sentiments or advice as those attributed to him. I know that he constantly endeavoured to get me to vote with him, and he also used the same endeavours towards the other friends in the room, and every other person who was brought into the room.

Mr. BOYLE. I was also in room 46 referred to by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and my recollection of the circumstance is very clear. I certainly have no recollection of the Controller of Customs in any way taking the position which he is charged with having taken to-night, namely, of voting one way himself, while he urged other members to vote another way. I have another remark to make with regard to that, and it is this. The evening the discussion took place, followed by a vote, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) the Controller of Customs came to me and said he had the census returns for 1881. He asked me if I did not see my way clear to voting with him and the other members against the Government on that subject. He stated that it would do me no harm, as there was a large Orange settlement in the constituency I represented, and that I would be following in the van of popular sentiment of my constituency if I voted against the Government. I told him I was aware of that, but that my conscientious views differed from his; that I thought the Government were not censurable, and that, although it might be popular to vote with him, I supported the position taken by the Government. He said he was sorry, because he and his friends were in the right, and it would not only be the proper but the popular thing for me to do, to vote in that way. Therefore, I must say that I never knew of the Controller taking the position charged against him by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. COCHRANE. I occupied a room for several years with the Controller of Customs, and during that time, I must say that the strongest words which he and I ever had were over that very question, and I deny

most emphatically the assertion made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). With all his eloquence and influence the hon. gentleman cannot influence me to vote with him and vote censure upon the Government, because I think I ought not to vote censure upon the ground that has been taken.

Mr. GUILLET. I also occupied the room that has been spoken of, No. 27. I was also a fellow-boarder with Mr. Wallace at the same hotel during that eventful session when the vote of want of confidence was brought forward because of the refusal of the Government to disallow the Jesuits' Estates Act, and I can say positively that Mr. Wallace never endeavoured to use any undue influence with me either in room 27 or 46, or during our conversation when we met at the hotel or elsewhere, to obtain my support or vote on the lines he was taking. I can say that he never discussed the matter with me, except in a fair, reasonable and logical way, and used no other influence to obtain my vote.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not rise for the purpose of saying anything in regard to the sentiments of the hon. the Controller of Customs at the time mentioned by the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, because I did not hear him say anything about it at that time. I rise because I happened to read this resolution, and I recognize that it is an attack upon the Government. It is not an honest assertion, in my opinion, or I would not have said a word, of loyalty, of desire to show loyalty or attachment to the British Crown, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. I recognize in this resolution the hand-writing of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who so lately in this House, for the first time proclaimed, so that the people in this country could really understand what his sentiments were—and which I accepted—that he was loyal to the Crown, and I gave him a test to show whether he was honest in his proclamations of loyalty. He went home shortly after and I feel it my duty, as representing part of the same county to inquire, whether his practice coincides with the principles he then avowed. The very gentleman I mentioned here, the secretary of the association in North Norfolk that nominated the hon. member, the editor of the paper that the hon. member, I think, largely controls, openly avowed annexation sentiments and still avows them, yet he still holds his position in the Liberal party, in the riding of the hon. member for North Norfolk, who declared that they dared not put any one in nomination against him on account of his annexation proclivities. I recognize the hand-writing of the hon. gentleman; he produced, though he did not move this resolution which speaks so strongly of loyalty, and, by this means, seeks to induce members on this side to support these sentiments in a manner which would turn the Government out, because of their proclamation of loyal

sentiments on this occasion. I have read, also, for the first time, the words of the Controller of Customs, and I defy any man to find in the words themselves anything whatever that is disloyal. I regretted to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), an hon. gentleman whom I have long known, and of whose loyalty I am satisfied, a gentleman between whom and myself there exist not only sentiments of the highest personal respect, but a community of sentiment in that highest of loyalty, which consists of loyalty to the institutions of Canada and the British Crown. I regretted exceedingly to hear him using such words as "sowing sedition," with regard to the utterances of the Controller of Customs, which I find reported in this newspaper. The hon. the Controller of Customs, like every other member, has the right to his own opinions and the right to express them. And if there is one sentiment more than another that is British, it is that the man who has spoken his honest sentiments shall not be called upon, at the dictation of a political Opposition, trying to put the Government in a critical position, to deny or attempt to deny or withdraw or apologize for the sentiment he has honestly expressed. Let me read the words :

We find to-day in the old country that brethren, the descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago, are perhaps facing difficulties of a similar character to those which their ancestors had to face in 1868—that the men of 1893 are threatened with a rule which is antagonistic to freedom there, to the liberty which they have always enjoyed as citizens of the British Empire. What is proposed is not only to shake off their allegiance to Great Britain—the bonds of love that bind them to the Empire—but to put them, forsooth, under the alien and hostile Government. We have their (the Home Rulers') public declarations of what they would do if they obtained power, that they would never cease agitating until the last link that bound Ireland to the British Empire is severed. That is their object to-day. They are trying to take the loyal men with them; but our friends over there say they will never submit. Britain may cast them out; but if she does so, she has no right to say what may be their future allegiance. Our friends in that land are preparing, and have asserted their unalterable determination never to submit to that Home Rule which Mr. Gladstone and his Government have laid out for them. (Applause). I am sure that in their efforts they shall have the sympathy of the Orangemen of Canada—more than sympathy; they shall have our active aid, if that active aid be necessary. We should not be worthy descendants of the heroes of two hundred years ago—we would not be worthy of our ancestors of old, if we failed in our duty in that respect.

Now, Sir, I wish to say I have met the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite and I have helped to fight them—and it was the first political fight in which I ever took part—when the Protestants and Orangemen of Ontario almost to a man favoured the granting of separate schools to our Catholic friends in Lower Canada. And our opponents were as bitterly against them as they are bitter here to-day and their endeavour was to win the Orangemen to their side by appealing

Mr. TISDALE.

to their prejudices against their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I have never sought to make political capital out of any such question. I am a Protestant; I never was an Orangeman, but I claim to be a Canadian and a Briton, and I say that in that fight the Liberals were as bitter in endeavouring to gain an advantage of that kind as now. And, had they succeeded, the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario would never have had the privilege of having their separate schools as we thought they ought to have and in their claim to which I have been ever ready to support them. I am as strong in my religious faith as any Orangeman or as any Roman Catholic among my fellow-citizens. The whole object of this resolution is simply to arouse a spirit of contention in the ranks of the Government supporters. This cry of loyalty is raised, this cunningly devised scheme is proposed by an hon. gentleman who, when his words declaring that he was a Briton and loyal to the Crown were hardly cold, dared not go home to his own county and there show that he meant the words, he dared not go home and ask his fellow-Liberals, many of whom would have been only too glad of the chance to put out of their councils and out of control of the association in their riding the man who is preaching dissolution of this country and handing it over to annexation. These are the general sentiments that are underlying this proposition. I declare to you, Mr. Speaker, that whether the Controller of Customs was judicious or not, his utterances sink into insignificance in comparison with this larger question which is the real one upon which we are to vote. So far as I am concerned, I think it is a boyish trick, it is a patent political trick, and it is too unworthy to capture an hon. gentleman so bright, so intelligent, and so loyal as my hon. friend from Assiniboia. I ask him to consider the broader question that underlies this discussion to-night. I would not have spoken were it not that I have been deeply moved at seeing the direction in which matters were drifting, because I see the larger danger behind this insidious and cunning attempt, which is only worthy of being quarrelled over by school boys, instead of being discussed by statesmen, and made the basis of an attempt to upset the Government.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a constituency containing a mixed population—that is to say, a constituency where one-fourth of English Protestants is to be found with three-fourths of Catholics—I think it my duty to say a few words on the question before the House. I am called to pronounce on a very important resolution. I am sorry that circumstances should have given rise to this resolution, and I am sorry that such words should have been uttered by the hon. the Controller of Customs at a meeting held at Kingston. I have not the least hesitation in saying that he would have been wiser and

he refrained from using such language as he is reported by the newspapers to have done. But, Mr. Speaker, I hold that the other Ministers are not to be held answerable for his words. Therefore we ought not, especially during the absence of our chief from Canada, the hon. Prime Minister, to show a want of confidence in the Government. From the information I have been given on the matter, I fail to see any reasonable ground, under the circumstances, of overthrowing the Government. If I am correctly informed, Mr. Speaker, the motion which is before you has been moved by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), who is an Orangeman himself. I know I may be told that the question is not as to whether the hon. member is or is not an Orangeman. I admit that this is not the issue; but meanwhile it is quite interesting to know that the author of the motion is an Orangeman himself. Then, I submit, that in proposing this motion, he has been guided by one single purpose—not, as it might be presumed, in view of speaking in this House against one of his brother Orangemen—but with a view to create difficulties in the way of the Government and its friends. Were we to propose a motion against Orangemen he would be the first to register his vote against us. This is not the first time that the Liberals, to embarrass the Government, resort to these tactics. But I warn them that they are wrong when they mix up national and religious questions with politics. It is perfectly true that the words attributed to the hon. the Controller of Customs should never have been given utterance to, he has certainly been found wanting in discretion, on that day. It is a fact deeply to be regretted by us French Canadians, but I consider, as already said, that the other Ministers are not responsible for his utterances. While asserting that the utterances of the hon. the Controller of Customs are deeply to be regretted, I wish it to be well understood that I am not opposed to Home Rule for Ireland. Quite the contrary. I sincerely wish that Ireland may enjoy a free government like the one we are enjoying in Canada. We have confidence in the policy of the Ministers, and although, as a French Canadian, my position might be open to criticism under the circumstances, still it seems to be my duty, and it is the duty of all the supporters of this policy to vote with the Government. I do not think this to be a favourable occasion for our party to divide on such a question. As everybody knows, and our hon. friends across the floor would be the first to admit, had they not a party advantage in view, that this motion is made with the single purpose of embarrassing the Government. So much so that with the exception of the hon. member who submitted it to the House, no other member could have been found willing to present it. I am quite positive that the hon. leader of the Opposition himself would never have proposed such a mo-

tion. Under the circumstances, I may ask, Mr. Speaker, why we should withhold our support from the Government? As far as I am concerned, I fail to see on what reasonable ground I could do it. Why should we vote for a motion made by an Orangeman, I am told? In doing so, we would be found supporting an Orangeman. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that this motion was made with but a view to overthrow the Government, and, as for me, although representing a constituency the three-fourths of which are Catholics, I think it to be my duty to continue my confidence in the Ministers in general. It may be that by this vote I shall lose the support of a certain number of my Irish electors; however, my duty is to support the Ministers, who cannot be held accountable for the utterances of the Controller of Customs, and I will vote with them. It is immaterial whether I be defeated or not; but should I have consulted my own private interest, I could have voted in the other direction to my advantage. Under circumstances like these, Mr. Chairman, all French-Canadians should unite. Our chief, the hon. the Prime Minister, is absent, and nobody entertains any doubt as to his being well equipped to defend himself, were he present. The time would be ill-chosen to shew any lack of confidence in him. We should not allow ourselves to be led away by this motion, chiefly when we are persuaded that our hon. friends across the floor are not sincere, having but one desire, to embarrass the Government. I am ready to defend the position I now assume, not only in my county, but in any public meeting in the province of Quebec. Should I be defeated by reason of this vote, my opponents shall perhaps have rendered me a greater service than they imagine. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that we must support the present Prime Minister, on the ground that whatever advantage we may hope for will undoubtedly come to us through him, as for instance, the Manitoba School question—for the Prime Minister is one of ours. The motion of the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson) is a motion of non-confidence; I think it is quite obvious.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation.) Should the hon. member allow me to interrupt him for a moment, I will ask him a word of explanation about the words he has just uttered; he just told us that it was a motion of non-confidence intended to overthrow the Government. Now, how does he account for the fact that the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan) and the Solicitor-General (Mr. Curran) have both declared that they were going to vote in favour of this motion?

Mr. FRECHETTE. As far as my friends are concerned, it is within their province to ponder this question and pronounce on it. As far as I am concerned, I will vote as I think best. Up to now, Mr. Chairman, both French and English nationalities, in Canada,

have lived in perfect harmony; let us endeavour to keep up this concord for the future. As a French-Canadian, having long resided in the midst of English people. I speak from experience, I have been reared in a county where lives an English population, and never have I witnessed any difficulty to arise between both races. I have transacted business with English Protestants and I have often received from these people a support they denied their own people. I must further say that never have I met among them people imbued with hatred and prejudices against us, as some contend. In the province of Quebec, they who think that the Protestant population fosters feelings of hatred towards Catholics, are greatly mistaken. I do not wish to detain the House any longer, as I have stated the grounds on which I will vote on the question.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The House has now spent a large part of the day in discussing the propriety or impropriety of certain words that have fallen from the lips of the Controller of Customs, and we of the Eastern Townships cannot understand the feeling manifested here to-day in discussing the speech referred to. I represent a constituency in the province of Quebec where the people, composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants, have agreed to disagree on matters pertaining to religion, and to unite on one broad platform in matters pertaining to the good of the Dominion as a whole. I think the example is one that might well be followed by the people of the other provinces, especially the province of Ontario. Sir, I have the honour to represent a constituency, three-fourths of whom are Roman Catholics, of whom nearly three-fifths are French-Canadians, the balance being made up of Irish Catholics, making a total Roman Catholic vote of fully three-fourths. I consider that the very fact that a Catholic majority of such strength elected me, an English Protestant, over the head of one of their own race and nationality, should show to the Orangemen of Ontario how free we are in the province of Quebec from religious prejudices. If Ontario could point to such an instance of Protestant liberality in that province, it would do more towards cementing and binding together people of different creeds in our Dominion, than months of idle talk in this House. Now, in regard to the speech of the Controller of Customs at Kingston, I wish to say that I consider such language uncalled for, foolish, and aggravating to our Irish Catholic friends. Let the people of Great Britain attend to their Home Rule Bill, and if it passes, let every loyal Briton, no matter whether be he English, Irish or Scotch, do all he can to make it a success. I know that in my own constituency there are none more loyal to our fair Canada than our Irish Catholic people, and I am happy to say that I number my most valued friends among them. In conclusion,

Mr. FRECHETTE.

I will say that if our Grit friends had not attempted to make a catch vote of this matter, in fact, to make it vote of non-confidence in the Government, I certainly would have favoured a vote of censure on the ill-advised expressions of the Controller of Customs; but under the circumstances, and in the absence of our honoured chief, Sir John Thompson, I feel it my duty to support this Government, even more loyally than if he were present.

Mr. CASEY. Some very singular reasons are urged against the motion before the House. One is that it is a motion which embarrasses the Government; another is that no good Conservative can vote for it. Now, Sir, there are reasons which might be urged against a great many motions which are brought before this House, but they are reasons which does not in the slightest degree concern the merits of the motion itself. Another reason is that the chief is away, and, therefore no friend of the Government can vote for this motion. There is no doubt that the Finance Minister, who is now leading the House, must feel himself in the position of an orphan, he must feel that there is no guiding hand conducting the business of the House, and that he has no right to expect that his friends will look upon him as managing the business before the House. The argument is by no means complimentary to the Minister of Finance. We on this side of the House may be quite ready to admit its force, but I think it is a very strange argument to come from anybody on the other side. Next we have the argument of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette), that he is going to vote against this resolution because it is moved by an Orangeman. Because one Orangeman in this House thinks that another Orangeman has not been loyal, has not performed his duty as a three-quarters Minister of the Crown, whatever that may amount to, in making certain statements in Kingston, therefore, my hon. friend from Megantic will not vote for a motion of censure on the other Orangeman. If this motion was proposed by a Roman Catholic, if it had been proposed, even, by an stingless in-offensive Protestant, who is not an Orangeman, no doubt, the member for Megantic would have voted for it; but seeing the motion was proposed by an Orangeman, he does not find it compatible with his duties to his religion and to his church, to vote for this resolution of censure on an Orangeman. I think this is the best joke of the whole evening. But as the discussion appears to be drawing to a close, it may be well to draw a few general lessons from the tone of that discussion. I deeply regret to see that there has not come from the hon. gentlemen who support the Controller of Customs, a single speech which has tended to justify the language he used. That language was used at a public meeting at Kingston, and it was reaffirmed in this House. The hon. member has said nothing, none of his friends have said anything, to justify that lan-

guage, and the plain common sense interpretation which every one must put upon it. And that plain interpretation the Controller of Customs and those who support him in this House, are willing to adopt, and it indicates that physical force should be used in a revolt against a law passed by the Imperial Parliament and sanctioned by Her Majesty. If that language means anything else, it means nothing at all. It is quite possible that the quasi-Minister meant nothing by that language, for individuals do sometimes make statements which mean nothing. But if he meant nothing by it, he should have stated so to-night. On the contrary, he affirmed and reaffirmed the language he used. He has, by the language he used, adopted means to incite rebellion against the Crown and the Parliament of England, if a measure of Home Rule be granted to Ireland. The Minister of Finance stands here and asks the supporters of the Government to endorse the language. I deeply regret that, in the course of this debate, not one word has fallen from the ministerial benches to induce loyal British subjects to sympathize with them in the stand they have taken on this question, and no matter what agitation may arise in Ulster from the use of language such as that used by the Controller of Customs and his conferees in the old country, I hope there will still be a sufficient number of loyal men in Ireland to see that a law passed by the proper authorities will be duly carried out, in spite of their fanaticism and bigotry.

Mr. DENISON. With respect to the after-dinner speech of the Controller of Customs, which seems to have excited some debate, I may say that I do not approve of his language, because it may be misunderstood. But while I say that, I must add that the hon. member is as loyal a man as there is in this House or in the country. It comes with rather bad grace from the hon. member, who, I understand, has prepared the resolution, to lecture us on what our loyalty should or should not be. What does he want us to do? On account of the after-dinner speech of this hon. gentleman, on a question with which this House has really nothing to do, a question that does not come up before us on any resolution, it is perfectly absurd to ask us, as members of this House, having a majority in the House of 60 or 70, and having been sent here to support the Government on certain great lines of policy, to be asked to turn out the Government because of the speech of one of its members, and that speech one which is interpreted one way by the members of the Opposition, and in an entirely different way by members on this side of the House. The language can have two interpretations. It has been said on the Opposition benches, that it is preaching sedition and so forth, while on this side of the House it has been held that

it may mean that the hon. member will put his hand in his pocket and subscribe towards furthering his views. I, therefore, shall certainly vote against the resolution and in favour of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think I would have occupied the time of the House, had the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) been in his seat. I think a very uncourteous attack has been made on him by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), during the absence of my hon. friend from the Chamber. The hon. member for North Norfolk is always able to defend himself against any attack made by any hon. gentleman on that side of the House. The hon. gentleman knows that fact, and he took the opportunity of making a very discourteous attack on my hon. friend, when he was absent from his seat. That hon. gentleman said he detected the sentences, ideas and writing of the hon. member for North Norfolk in this resolution. That hon. gentleman is not the author of a single sentence or a single word it contains. So that the hon. member for South Norfolk is quite mistaken in attributing the contents of the resolution to the hon. member for North Norfolk. That is one error he made. In the next place, the hon. member for South Norfolk should have been the last man to rise in this House and cast a slur or endeavour to reproach the hon. member for North Norfolk for trying to arouse opposition to the Government on the resolution now before the House. It is well known, and it is within the recollection of many hon. members, the prominent part the hon. member for South Norfolk took, as chairman of a committee of this House, two years ago, in a scheme for whitewashing a member of the House charged with selling a canal bridge and taking a man's cow and horse in exchange.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is within the recollection of hon. members of this House. It may, perhaps, be irregular and unparliamentary to refer to these matters, but I think the hon. member for South Norfolk has undoubtedly left himself open to a castigation at the hands of the hon. member for the north riding, for the course he has taken. With respect to the utterances of the Controller of Customs, I have only to say that I regret the hon. gentleman should have gone so far beyond the boundaries of truth in the statements he made. I think it was exceedingly unfortunate that the hon. the Controller of Customs should have in a public place even sanctioned, to say nothing of having uttered the words spoken by him on that occasion. I quite agree with the opinion expressed, that there is not a more loyal body of people in the Dominion than the Orangemen, as a whole. They claim

to be loyal, and no one has felt disposed to challenge that claim. It certainly would be exceedingly disloyal, were they to take the course indicated by the Controller of Customs, if Home Rule became the law for Ireland. The hon. gentleman has stated, in that speech, that they would virtually go into rebellion against Her Majesty and the Home Rule Law, even if it received the Queen's signature. We all know very well that every law passed in this country is subject to Her Majesty's veto. I carefully read the address delivered by Mr. Gladstone, in introducing the Home Rule Bill, and I read the Bill itself, and I can come to no other conclusion than that every necessary provision is made for the protection of the rights, privileges and liberties of the minority in Ireland. I was much pleased to attend a reception given to the Hon. Mr. Blake in the city of Toronto, before he accepted a seat in the British House of Commons, and at that meeting a resolution was unanimously adopted to the effect that every necessary guarantee for the safety, and liberty, and the rights of the minority in Ireland should be embodied in Mr. Gladstone's Bill. I have never known a single case in which the advocates of that measure have not been prepared to sanction the introduction of every clause, necessary to secure the liberties and privileges of the Irish minority. In the face of that I cannot see any ground whatever for such pronounced opposition to Irish Home Rule as indicated by the language of the Controller of Customs in his overflowing speech at Kingston. It would be well for the hon. gentleman and those who share his views, to wait patiently until they see the full details of that measure when it becomes the law of the land. Then, if the rights and the privileges of the minority are not amply provided for it would be quite right for them to use every constitutional means possible to secure those rights, and it would be right for them even to agitate that guarantee clauses should be inserted while the Bill is passing through its several stages in the Imperial House of Commons. I do not believe that the Controller of Customs would have uttered these words after mature consideration. I regret as a member of this House that the hon. gentleman should have risen in his place and avowed these sentiments. Had he expressed them in an after-dinner speech, or in a moment of excitement, I daresay the House would accept that explanation; but, that he should adhere to them in this House is to be regretted. When men get into the position of being leaders of any party in this country they should be exceedingly careful and moderate in their statements, more particularly on questions which may cause trouble and lead to irritation between the two great classes of people in this Dominion. I regret from that stand-point that the Controller of Customs should permit his zeal to so over-ride his prudence as to cause him to

Mr. McMULLEN.

make that seditious statement. If he had thought of the prominent position that he occupied, and the position in which he has placed the Government, of which he is a prominent member, I do not think he would be guilty of the language on mature consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I extremely regret the course which the hon. Controller of Customs has taken in this House to-day. When a question was put in the House and notice was given that this matter would be brought up, I thought the hon. gentleman would have stated that he did not recognize that it was a matter which should be brought before the House, that the House had no jurisdiction in it, and that therefore he should refuse to answer. The hon. gentleman thought otherwise. He thought that he should state at once openly—in the most manly way I must say—that the remarks attributed to him were correct. Thus we are placed in the position that we have now to vote on a motion in amendment to going into committee of supply. Now, it is a well known fact that such motions are not necessarily votes of non-confidence. On the contrary, very often these amendments are carried by the House and the Government does not consider that they should resign, but proceed with supply as soon as the amendment is disposed of. I have seen that repeatedly, and I have even seen the late leader of the Government (Sir John Macdonald) on several occasions accept a motion of that kind, and have it carried in the House, showing that such a motion is not a vote of non-confidence. In this case, the hon. Secretary of State, after hearing the remarks of the Controller of Customs, declared in his speech that he would vote for this amendment. The Secretary of State is a member of the Government and therefore his statement at once disposed of the idea that the motion should be considered as one of non-confidence. That is for the reason that a motion of non-confidence is one that the Government as a whole refuses to accept and votes against, and that those who are opposed to the Government vote for. In this case the hon. Secretary of State, being a member of the Government, says that he will vote for the amendment, and the other members of the Government—perhaps all, and perhaps not all—will vote against the amendment. Therefore it cannot be considered as a vote of non-confidence. The Minister of Finance, who leads the House now in the absence of the First Minister, has stated that those who will vote for the motion are no friends of the Government. How can that be explained when we see one member of the Government, who surely is a friend of the Government, voting in favour of that motion. It therefore seems to me impossible to maintain the contention that the motion if carried under the circumstances will be a vote of non-confidence in the Gov-

ernment. After the vote the Government may do as they please, but no one can tell them on the strength of that vote that they must resign. There is this constitutional privilege in the House amongst the supporters of the Government, that the members may exercise their judgment on such motions. Of course, when there is a doubt, or when their leaning is against the motion, they give the benefit of that doubt to their friends in the Government. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of Parliament for thirty-five years. For four or five years I was not a supporter of the Government, while it was composed of hon. gentlemen who were not of my political convictions; but during the remainder of that period, during thirty years, I went with my party, the Conservative party; I was faithful to my party; I have always been considered a Conservative, and as good a Conservative as I see here. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when I look at the members of the Conservative party all around this House, when the House is as full as it can be, I do not see one single member who was in Parliament when I was first elected. I see one on the opposite side who came a little before me—the veteran, the “doyen” of the House—that is, the member for St. John, in the province of Quebec. (Mr. Bourassa). But, Mr. Speaker, during all that time I have been a Conservative, I am a Conservative, and I intend dying a Conservative. I may be obliged to vote in favour of this motion. If the hon. leader of the Government wishes to make it a vote of non-confidence, of course I cannot help his saying so; but when the history of the vote that will be taken to-night comes to be written, no historian or constitutional authority will say that the Government could take the vote as a vote of non-confidence in them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the beginning of my remarks, if the hon. Controller of Customs had not renewed here the statement with which he was reproached in the motion which was laid before the House, I do not think I could have voted for that motion, because then I would have considered that he would deny the power of Parliament over him for a speech or an utterance made by him outside of the House. But he has changed the question by stating again in this House what he stated before. Of course, other questions were put to him, as to which he was perfectly free to say yes or no, or to explain them or not. I do not find fault with him for that. But I must say that I regret exceedingly that I have to vote for this motion, especially when it refers to him. From the time he came to Parliament up to the present time, I have been on friendly terms with the hon. gentleman, and though I feel it my duty to exercise my right as a member of Parliament, and vote in favour of this motion, I hope that the hon. gentleman will remember the past, and that, per-

haps, the same intercourse may follow afterwards.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I must, at the very outset, express the very deep regret which I experience at the incident which has caused this prolonged discussion, and which, at this late period of the session, has delayed, during the whole of this day, the work of Parliament. I regret it more especially because, in the discussion to which this motion has led, not only the words spoken by the hon. Controller of Customs have been incriminated, but views have been expressed and words used which, I think, contribute largely to keep up the antagonism and to create between the races which inhabit this portion of the continent, bad feelings. It should be the endeavour of every patriotic Canadian to desire, as much as possible, to remove from our midst all causes of irritation and antagonism, so that these different races might work together for the purpose of developing the resources of the country and making of Canada a country united, happy and prosperous. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the opening of this discussion, and before it was brought before this Parliament, I have read, in the different newspapers of the country, the expressions which have been used by the hon. Controller of Customs. I have endeavoured, as far as my powers of comprehension go, to ascertain the true significance of these expressions, and the intent with which the words were spoken. Well, Sir, desiring, as we all must desire, to do ample justice to any of the members of this hon. House, whether sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker, or on your right, it has been my endeavour to ascertain exactly the significance of the words used and the intent of the hon. gentleman who made use of such expressions. Well, Sir, I must say that I cannot attach the great importance which some hon. gentlemen on the left have attached to these expressions. I seek in vain to find in them indications of a great act of disloyalty on the part of the hon. gentleman who has uttered these words, though I must say that, for one, I do not approve of the expressions used. I am prepared here to state that I regret infinitely that these expressions should have been used by the hon. gentleman. But when they are brought up in a motion submitted by an hon. gentleman to the sound judgment of the members of this hon. House, then it is time for us to leave aside prejudices and every other motive but the one which should determine the course we should follow on such an important question affecting an hon. gentleman. I say that I fail to see, in the terms used, or in the feelings expressed, any indication of disloyalty to the Crown or of a desire to subvert the constitution, or to prevent people from following the laws of the land under which we live. In many newspapers I have read discussions of the politics which are

not the politics discussed on the floor of this Parliament, but the politics discussed in another Parliament and under circumstances which do not exist in this country; and, Sir, reading, as I do, the history of a good many years past of our parliamentary life in Canada, I venture the opinion that we attach possibly too much importance, and give possibly too much of our time to the discussion of these foreign questions. Sir, when I read the speech made by the hon. gentleman, not in his place in Parliament, but in another place, I find that that hon. gentleman has permitted himself, as he had a perfect right to do, to discuss the problems which are discussed in the Parliament of England; and frequently in the columns of the press of England I have seen the same sentiments expressed. I have seen, in those papers, the statement that the men in one portion of Ireland would not submit to what the men of another portion of Ireland were trying to obtain. Well, Sir, I know not who will succeed in that discussion, or who is likely to carry the day; but when the hon. gentleman stated that the friends who sympathized with one of those factions in Ireland, felt their hearts beating with the hearts of their friends in Ireland, I see no great treason in the expression of such a feeling. I know that the words which are more particularly quoted as incriminatory, are the expressions used by the hon. gentleman when he says to those friends to whom he refers, feeling as they do for their friends in Ireland, that not only will they give sympathy, but if necessary, active aid and support. It is a fact which cannot be denied that those two factions, for years past, have been organized on the one side and the other, and I understood those words of the hon. gentleman to mean that his friends in Canada would send to their friends in Ireland that help and succor which the other faction have often obtained from their sympathizers on the American continent. It is well known that when the most brilliant members of that galaxy of talent who advocated Home Rule in the British Parliament came out to Canada and to the United States to ask for aid their friends gave them active help and support. I have known the hon. Controller of Customs for years. I have had the privilege of sitting next to him in Parliament and of belonging to the same political party, and I must say that I was surprised to hear him accused of preaching treason and disloyalty. I have never heard that hon. gentleman express one word that could indicate disloyalty or treason or want of loyalty to the Crown, and I think we ought to oppose a motion calling on us, his colleagues in the House of Commons, to pass censure upon him which he does not deserve. But where does this insinuation of disloyalty come from? It comes from a quarter where continually attacks are plotted against the Government of the day. Those of us who have had a seat in this House since 1878 have

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

witnessed these ebullitions of patriotism on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite on more than one occasion. They now consider it as evidence of patriotism and an act deserving of the highest eulogium that this motion should be made the sole object of which is to embarrass the Government, in the form of an amendment to Supply. We recognize the motives by the source from which that motion comes. We know very well that it is not at all intended for the protection of the high privileges of the Crown. We know well it is not for the purpose of making Canada more secure to the Crown of England. We know very well it is not intended to prevent Canada being annexed to the United States. Had this been the motive, hon. gentlemen opposite would have treated this matter as one which took place outside the House, and as the expressions of a gentleman who spoke outside of his functions as a member of Parliament, and gave expression merely to his own views. Hon. gentlemen opposite have selected a time for presenting this motion when it must be looked upon as a direct attack upon the Government. It is all very well to say that it is one which really need not be taken as a motion of want of confidence; but judging it by its surroundings and by the source whence it comes, I cannot consider it in any other light. I have only a word to say in answer to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), and I take this opportunity of saying how very pleased I was to hear him impart to us the valuable and long experience which he has acquired as Minister of Public Works in the Parliament of Canada. If I understood him rightly he said that he could cite more than one precedent indicating that an amendment on going into Supply was not considered by the late Sir John Macdonald as a motion of want of confidence. I know myself of amendments which were moved on going into Supply, which certainly our late lamented leader, Sir John Macdonald, accepted, or without accepting, did not consider as a direct vote of want of confidence. But I fail to recollect a single instance where Sir John Macdonald, when leading the House, would not consider an amendment to Supply, censuring a member of the Government, as a direct attack against the Government. That is the point which the hon. gentleman stated, if I understood him correctly. I have not looked over the books or the precedents, but from memory I fail to recollect a single instance where a motion directly censuring a member of the Government was considered otherwise than as a direct attack against the Government. Now, this unfortunate incident has taken up a great deal of time already, and I certainly do not wish to prolong this debate; but I hope sincerely that when this amendment has been voted down, the Canadian Parliament will avoid as much as possible all those foreign questions with which we have nothing to do. We have

R

enough to do in looking after the interests of our own country, and in legislating for the future benefit of this country, and there is no need for our taking up in this quixotic manner the affairs of other people. I think that we should occupy ourselves solely with the divers interests of our own country and try to develop it as much as possible. When we did interfere once we were told to mind our own business, and, though it may not have been very pleasant at the time, I think it was good advice, and I hope that when this question has been disposed of we shall try to avoid the recurrence of such incidents which take up the time of the House and create among our population, divided as to race and religion, deep-rooted prejudices that, in the interest of Canada, should be avoided as much as possible.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I can congratulate the last speaker upon having succeeded in keeping clear of the question at issue about as effectually as it was possible for any one to do. I am not aware that the question of Home Rule is involved in this motion. I am not aware that it is a question as to which church one worships at. My idea of the motion is that it involves a plain proposition that one shall live up to the law of the land. It is proved here by the admission of an hon. gentleman that he does not propose to submit to that wholesome doctrine. He proposes to wage war upon a portion of Her Majesty's dominions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. He has so declared, if language is capable of any reasonable construction. He has been asked upon the floor of this House to remove any doubt whatever as to the meaning of his words, if any doubt there be. Over and over again during this debate has that opportunity been given to him and up to this moment he has allowed the debate to proceed, members drawing reasonable conclusion from these words that he proposes by physical force to resist the law in a part of the Empire. And not members of this House alone have drawn that conclusion, but the press as well. The newspaper reporter who first reported this speech introduced his report in words indicating this opinion, and when, after some days, the same newspaper, the Kingston "News," again referred to the question, it so indicated that the Controller's intention was to promote civil war. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a plain issue before us. The words in question do certainly lead any reasonable person to the conclusion that the Controller of Customs intends, if possible, to aid in interfering with a certain Imperial Act should such an Act be passed. And the last member who spoke, a member of the Government took this extraordinary ground, that a man may be qualified to occupy a seat in Parliament and be a member of a Canadian Government though disloyal to other parts of

the Empire. Sir, in my judgment, there is no territorial limit to loyalty. The man who is disloyal to one part is disloyal to the whole Empire. The one flag which gentlemen opposite so properly revere floats over the Briton in the old land and floats over the Briton in the new, and, if it is proposed to depose Her Majesty from any part of the Empire, whoever makes that proposal is unworthy to hold Her Majesty's commission in any Parliament, be it Imperial or colonial. That is the issue we are face to face with here, not with the merits or demerits of the great question of Home Rule. A measure of Home Rule has been receiving the attention of the people of Britain. The Parliament of Britain, the legally constituted tribunal is dealing with that question and, if it becomes law, it will be only with the sanction of the supreme power of the people and Her Majesty. And when that Bill becomes law, the hon. Controller of Customs proposes, by physical force, to prevent its taking effect and further to separate, if possible, a portion of Her Majesty's Empire from Her Majesty's rule. When that proposal is advanced, the time has arrived for us to say whether Her Majesty should have such an advisor, whether he be an advisor in matters colonial or matters imperial. I would remind hon. gentlemen of the concensus of opinion in Canada when, a few years ago, we had to deal with an emeute among ourselves. When the rebellion took place in the North-west and we were compelled to send up our own volunteers to fight in arms against their brethren, what was the unanimous expression of public opinion, regardless of politics, of nationality and creed? Was it not declared by all: First, restore the majesty of the law; if there are grievances they will be redressed afterwards. There is but one way of redressing grievances under the British flag and that is within the means provided by the constitution. The British constitution will afford the means of redressing any grievance should any arise in connection with the proposed Home Rule measure. Therefore, this House, in refusing to endorse the utterances which have been called in question here, will remove a slur which has been cast upon the loyalty of the people of Canada. Let me invite the attention of the House to the plain proposition that ought not to require lengthened explanation. I ask any hon. gentleman if he is prepared to vote against these propositions?

It is the duty of all Her Majesty's subjects loyally to submit to the law.

Do hon. gentlemen propose to vote against a declaration of that kind?

That the constitution contains within itself the means whereby all grievances may be redressed by constitutional methods.

Surely if grievances arise under the proposed measure, the constitution itself will afford a constitutional means whereby these grievances may be redressed.

That no changes in the law should be brought about by a resort to armed force, to civil war, or other physical force.

In this case it is proposed to curtail the extent of Her Majesty's Empire and to drive her flag from a portion of Ireland. Sir, if that is not treason, I fail to know what treason is. It is not treason of a vague character, but it is treason that has received a statutory definition, both in the old land and in the new. My hon. friend the Controller of Customs would do well if he had profited by the teachings of a great man, much of whose life work is a subject of pride to the hon. gentleman—if he had studied well and digested well the laws passed in the reign of the great and good King William the III., who took precious good care to pass a law dealing with all classes of traitors. Our own statutes as well declare what shall be treasonable, and they assign serious fines and penalties to persons guilty of such an offence. It is not very long since the hon. gentleman himself and other members now present, indorsed the Government and indorsed the law, in taking the life of a citizen because he had chosen to raise an armed insurrection in our land. And, as has been cited by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), a comparatively humble individual, within the last couple of months, was removed from a position in the service of the Crown because it was said he had given utterance to some treasonable doctrine, or had otherwise manifested his disinclination to live under the British flag. If those in high office can give utterances to such sentiments, where are we to draw the line? If the highest in the land can declare treason against the Empire, on what principle are you going to rebuke humble imitators of those more exalted individuals? Therefore Parliament will be stultifying itself, in my judgment, if it passes this matter over in silence, or indorses it. The moment Parliament indorses this transaction, if it should make that fatal mistake, that moment Parliament forever renders it impossible, in consistency with its own conduct, to repudiate similar utterances and similar threats on the part of others. Under these circumstances I deem it my duty to support the amendment. I can only express my regret that in regard to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) who, on many occasions, has declared his undying loyalty to the Empire, when it is now put to the test, party pressure is a great deal stronger with him than his convictions of duty as a citizen. I fancy that when he returns to his constituents in West Toronto he will find there will not be the same weight attached to his utterances upon that subject. He will be told that he has openly indorsed upon the floor of Parliament the doctrine that a member of the Government can enjoy Her Majesty's commission, and be her trusted agent, and that he can on the floor of this Parliament give expression to doc-

Mr. MULOCK.

trines of treason, and receive indorsement at the hands of the loyal member for West Toronto. I think when that comes to be known, and when he appreciates what he has done, he will regret his vote here to-night. I venture to prophecy that if this House indorses this transaction, it will strike one of the severest blows that has ever yet been struck at the reputation of the people of Canada. I rejoice to know from the language, not only of the mover of the motion, but from others who are well able to speak on the subject, that the Controller of Customs was entirely in error when he purported to say that others would imitate his example. When the hon. member for Ad-dington (Mr. Dawson) declared, as he no doubt declared correctly, that the Loyal Orange Order would in no sense indorse such treasonable utterances, I am sure he gave expression to a sentiment that will find an echo in the hearts of all loyal citizens, regardless of creed and regardless of nationality. I venture to tell the Postmaster-General that he entirely mistakes the issue if he supposes that this is the commencement of a fratricidal war; on the contrary, it is the protest of the representatives of the loyal people of Canada against treason, whether it be found in men in high or low degree.

Mr. McNEILL. It affords me great pleasure indeed to listen to the loud expressions of loyalty which we hear from the other side to-night. It is exceedingly gratifying to find that this spirit has been stirred up in breasts in which, for some time past, we thought, at all events, it had not been glowing to any great extent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that in reference to the charges that have been brought against my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, an oversight has been made. I have not understood that it was a disqualification for a position in the Government, or a seat in the Cabinet for a man to be Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Order in Canada. If it be not so, I take it that if a gentleman can continue to be Grand Master of the Orange Order of Canada, and at the same time a member of the Government of Canada, his utterances to an assembly of Orangemen must be considered to be the utterances of the Grand Master of the Orange Order, and not a member of the Government. It is quite clear that if he is addressing an assembly of Orangemen, unless he distinctly states that he is not addressing them as Grand Master, but he is addressing them in some other capacity, he must be taken to be addressing them in the capacity which they are in the habit of regarding him as filling, that is, as Grand Master of the Orange Order. Therefore, it seems to me that the remarks my hon. friend made, whether they were right or whether they were wrong, must be taken to have been made in his capacity as Grand Master. He is in that respect in a position altogether different, I take it, from that of

an ordinary member of this House, or an ordinary citizen of the country. He is there filling an official position, and in that official position he speaks. It therefore seems to me that those utterances of my hon. friend must be taken in that regard, and in that regard only. So far as the question of loyalty is concerned, I just wish to make this remark, more especially in reference to what fell from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who said that the Parliament of the United Kingdom was within its undoubted constitutional right in handing over the people of Ulster to a Parliament in Dublin. I wish to make this remark, that it seems to me that Lord Salisbury, the late Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, may be taken by this House, even, as quite as high a constitutional authority as the hon. member for Bothwell. We all bow to my hon. friend's views on constitutional questions; we all realize what a great constitutional authority he is. We believe, notwithstanding, that there are as great constitutional authorities as he is in the Empire, and most people will agree that Lord Salisbury must be considered as good a constitutional authority as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Lord Salisbury has distinctly stated as his opinion that it is not constitutional to hand over the people of Ulster in this way. I will take the liberty to quote once more for the hon. gentleman's information, the words of Lord Salisbury in this respect. He said:

I am a Tory; yet I cannot accept in all their width the doctrines of unrestrictive passive obedience. I believe the title of both kings and parliaments to the allegiance of their subjects is that those kings and parliaments should observe the fundamental laws and fundamental principles of the compact by which they reign. Parliament has the right to govern the people of Ulster; it has not a right to sell them into slavery, and I do not believe in the absolute restrictive power of parliaments any more than I do in the unrestrictive power of kings.

Therefore, when the hon. gentleman hurled those accusations of disloyalty against my hon. friend and against the Orange Order, and against the Protestants of Ulster, who are undoubtedly, I am afraid, determined if the worst comes to the worst, to resort to the most extreme measures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I am afraid it is so. I cannot conceal from myself the fact that I heard when I was in Ireland, but a very short time ago, that there is the greatest fear to be apprehended that if an attempt be made to place the people of Ulster under the control of a Parliament in Dublin extreme measures will be resorted to. Under those circumstances to which I have referred, I do not think my hon. friend or any hon. gentleman has the right to bring these accusations of disloyalty. As to what the Controller of Customs has said, I do not see so far as I can gather that the words can

imply that he was offering in the meantime to give active support in the sense of armed assistance. The time has not come when such an offer would be necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McNEILL. I shall be very glad.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He seems to deny the legal right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate on this subject. Does the hon. gentleman hold that that right is not as full and complete as the right of the Irish Parliament in 1800 to hand over the Government of Ireland to the United Kingdom?

Mr. McNEILL. I have no intention to enter into an argument on the constitutional question with the hon. gentleman. That intention never entered my mind. If the hon. gentleman will write Lord Salisbury he will, no doubt, receive an answer to his question; but that is not my position in this House to-night. I have simply quoted an authority, Lord Salisbury, which will carry as much weight as the hon. member for Bothwell, or any hon. gentleman who has been denouncing to-night the action of the Protestants of Ulster. While I do not wish to take up the time of the House or say anything in any way to incite passion in regard to this very painful subject it is only right that I should enter a protest on behalf of the people of Ulster, and on behalf of the Orange society of Canada against the imputations of disloyalty that have been to-night hurled across the floor against them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is a volunteer under his hon. friend.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by a volunteer; but I do know that the hon. gentleman considers himself to be a philosopher, although I do not know whether anybody else does.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have listened with a great deal of attention to the debate on the motion made by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), censuring the Controller of Customs for language used in his speech at Kingston. So far as I can understand, the hon. Controller of Customs declined to be categorically catechised by this House, and was willing to stand by his speech as reported. While I do not intend either to endorse or censure the view he has expressed, and my views on this subject are well known, still I am prepared to sustain the position of the Controller of Customs in declining to be catechised by this House for words uttered outside the Chamber. I think the motion is a most unfair and misleading one. It suggests what is untrue and misrepresents the facts of the case. But the Controller of Customs was talking about

the question of Home Rule. What he said was this :

What is promised is not only to shake off their allegiance to Great Britain—the bond of love that binds them to the Empire—but to put them, forsooth, under an alien and hostile government. We have their (the Home Rulers') public declaration of what they would do if they obtain power, that they would never cease agitation until the last link that bound Ireland to the British Empire is severed.

Then, having drawn what, in my opinion, is an imaginary and erroneous picture, which he has a right to believe is accurate if he pleases, although I do not agree with him in that view, he then went on to show the feeling that animates the breasts of his friends, in the belief that this picture is a true one. There is not one word that can be twisted into a sentiment of disloyalty to the Empire in the utterances of the hon. gentleman, when the whole speech is taken together and construed as I have read it; I cannot find one word which can lay the hon. gentleman open to the censure which is charged against him in this motion, and which has been enlarged on most extensively by hon. gentlemen opposite in their remarks this evening. While the member for West York declined to subject himself to be catechised by his opponents, yet, when the hon. gentleman, who had hitherto posed as a friend and a presumed supporter of the Government, rose and made the charge, my hon. friend did rise in his place and deny that he had said one word which could be construed, in any sense, into a statement that he would be false to his allegiance, and he proclaimed himself on the floor of this House as a loyal man, a devoted subject of our beloved Queen, and a supporter of the Empire. Having read this speech, having considered that portion which I read to the House, having shown the remarks that were uttered before the remarks were made which form the subject of censure by the motion of the hon. member for Addington, I have no hesitation whatever in voting against that amendment, which I look upon as a catch motion, intended to embarrass the Government and create ill-feeling between the various nationalities and creeds which go to make up the population of this Dominion. I would also draw the attention of my hon. friends to the fact that our honoured leader is absent from this House, that he has gone to fulfil important functions, which he has entered upon at the instance of the Imperial Government, in the interests of Canada, and in the interests of the Empire; that when he went away he left public business far advanced, trusting to the chivalry and courtesy of his opponents, and to the thrice-sworn fidelity of his supporters, and I should like hon. members to remember this, or, at all events, some of those who are disposed to think they are justified in taking a view of this case which is somewhat at variance with the view taken by the Government. I would like

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron).

them to remember some of the words they uttered when the hon. leader of the Government was on the eve of his departure. There is no question, whatever, about any man's loyalty in this motion. The picture drawn was such that, if true, it might almost have justified a man in forswearing his allegiance, but, even if true—and I am sure it is not true—the hon. gentleman who made these remarks did not adduce from them the statement which would justify the member for Addington (Mr. Dawson) in putting that charge against a brother Orangeman on the Order Paper of this House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have sufficiently wasted the time of the House in discussing questions which are not germane to the business of the House, and we had better proceed with our own business and not interfere with the freedom of speech enjoyed by members outside the walls of Parliament.

Mr. HEARN. Mr. Speaker, having been elected to support the Government, I desire, before the vote on the amendment in your hands is taken, to give expression to one or two ideas that present themselves to my mind in reference to it. I think, Sir, that however much we may differ in opinion on the subject before the House, we will differ but very little indeed concerning the fact that a great deal has been said in reference to the matter that is in no way at all germane or pertinent to it. What is involved in the question before hon. members, appears to me to consist mainly of this: Has the hon. the Controller of Customs given expression to sentiments which are unquestionably disloyal and unwarrantable and unbecoming in him as a member of the Government? He has been charged a dozen and more times by hon. members who have taken part in this debate with having done so. He has been charged again and again with having expressed himself seditiously, and he has been invited by his colleague, the hon. Solicitor-General—he was implored, I may say, by that hon. gentleman—to rise in his place and deny the accusation.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to say that I deny such charges in toto. I never uttered a disloyal sentiment, nor ever thought of a disloyal sentiment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just explain what you mean by "active aid."

Mr. HEARN. Well, it is very satisfactory to me, and I am sure it must be satisfactory to a great many others, to find the hon. gentleman make that statement. Nevertheless he is reported as having stated, that if those in Ulster to-day who are organizing for a resort to arms in the event of Home Rule becoming law, in the event of the Queen, Lords and Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, approving that the people of Ireland shall be granted that which during nearly the last hundred years they have been agitating and praying for; that in the event,

I say, of the Queen, Lords and Commons of Great Britain and Ireland consenting to grant what the five-sixths of the whole population of Ireland constitutionally demand—that in such an event, a small minority in Ireland, about one-half the population of Ulster, who threaten to resort to arms, shall have, not alone his sympathy and the sympathy of those he represents, but that they shall have as well their “active aid.” Now, I ask what do these words signify? What is the “active aid” of the body whom my hon. friend the Minister of Customs represents? What is the fair logical inference to draw from these words? Active aid! The so-called Unionists in Ulster are subscribing money for the purchase of arms. Their organs say that already orders have gone forth for thousands and thousands of stands of arms, and that they are in communication with officers of the army and navy who will be at their back in the hour of need. With all this before us, what do the words “active aid” mean? If they do not mean that the Controller of Customs and those whom he represents shall be at the back of those people in armed resistance to lawful authority, then I confess that I do not know the meaning of words. Now, Sir, a great deal has been said by many members of this House about the time that has been taken up with this subject. The hon. the Postmaster-General devoted the greater part of his speech to stating how unbecoming it was, and how out of place it was, for us to occupy ourselves with matters relating to another part of the Empire. Well, who is the party to blame in this instance? Is it the hon. the Controller of Customs, or is it those who believe it their duty to avail themselves of their position here to show to all concerned that they are not in consonance with him upon this question? Let me for a moment suppose that the minority in the province of Manitoba, feeling sorely oppressed with legislation there, were to form themselves into an organization, and send forth a proclamation, to the effect that if redress to them were not given by the Government of the Dominion, they would resort to arms. Supposing that were the case, what, I ask, would be thought of the hon. the Postmaster-General, were he to attend a meeting of Catholics in the city of Quebec and express himself in a similar way towards the organization in Manitoba that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs expressed himself at the meeting in Kingston. Would hon. members here think that the time of the House was wasted in taking the hon. Postmaster-General to task in such a case? I do not think they would. I do not think that the hon. Minister of Finance, in such an event, would take the stand in reference to his colleague the Postmaster-General that he has taken upon the question now before the House. The hon. the Minister of Finance likened the present case to that which took place in the time of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, when the Hon. Mr. Huntington spoke his mind about ecclesiastical

influence and action in the province of Quebec. He assuredly said not a word in the direction of destroying them by unlawful means. The cases would bear no comparison at all. No one questions the right, at least I have heard no one who has spoken in favour of this amendment, question the right of the hon. Controller of Customs to express his opinion or to pledge his sympathy in all constitutional ways to prevent the people of Ireland, five-sixths of Ireland's population, getting what, in the opinion of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, they ought to have. The hon. Controller of Customs is fully entitled to say within the law what he pleases on that subject; but he is not entitled to go to the length of saying that if a small minority in Ireland resort to arms, in so doing they shall have the active aid of himself and those he represents. Now, Sir, this is one view of the subject under debate, and one which, I think, as upheld by the amendment, before the House, deserves support. I come now to the point, whether or not all those who will vote for the amendment, are to be considered, as the hon. the Finance Minister and Postmaster-General have thought proper to declare them—unfriendly to the Government. The question was well put by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), when he asked: How can those be considered unfriendly to the Government who will vote for this amendment, when members of the Government itself have declared they will vote for it? The hon. Minister of Finance surely will not say that the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. Solicitor-General are not friendly to the Government of which they are members, for, if I understood the hon. Solicitor-General rightly, he declared that, unless the hon. Controller of Customs would state that he did not mean by his utterances at Kingston what so many members of this hon. House charged him with having meant, he would vote for the amendment. Then, Sir, I submit very respectfully, that the hon. Minister of Finance has not put his friends in their right place upon this question. I have made professions of support of the hon. Premier of the Government, not alone on the eve of his departure from this country, but from the first time I had the honour and advantage of having become acquainted with him, and, Sir, I will not admit at this moment that I am second to any man on either side of the House, or second to any man in this country, in feelings of esteem and high regard for that hon. and distinguished statesman; and, in supporting the amendment now before this House, I deny that I am fairly open to the charge of wavering in my loyalty to the Government which I have been commissioned to come here and support.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have read, I regret to say, with sorrow

the utterances of the hon. the Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), reported by different newspapers of the province of Ontario, last week. I believe, up to this day, that these reports were ungrounded; but, I am sorry to say, the hon. Controller of Customs has come and asserted in this House that these reports were correct; that not only were the words exactly reported, but that they were justifiable, and that every British subject should entertain the same notions as conveyed in his speech. I am sorry these words were uttered and I enter my protest against such a doctrine and the course followed by the hon. member at that meeting. Such words as these are inexpedient and impolitic. First, inexpedient: had the hon. member any need of giving utterance to such sentiments. Impolitic also, in so far as calculated to stir up prejudices and passions throughout the country. Impolitic again, because calculated to wound the feelings of one of the races of Canada. Not only will these words wound the feelings of the race, but equally those of the three-fourths of our people who sympathize with all the friends of Ireland. I do not deny the hon. member, Sir, the right of opposing Home Rule, it is an open issue. But what I deny him is the right to rouse up the Orangemen from Ontario against the British Crown. What I deny him again, is the pretended right claimed by the Orangemen of Ulster not to submit to Home Rule, and to take up arms, under such occurrence, against the British Crown. What are Ireland's claims to-day? The very claims put forth by Canadians years ago. It is not the dismemberment of the Empire which is looked for, as asserted by the hon. Controller of Customs, but they demand the right for Ireland to bask in the sunshine of liberty and to take its place among civilized nations enjoying a constitutional system of Government. They ask for Ireland, to-day, what we asked for half a century ago, that which our fathers fought and bled for, and which was finally granted them. They ask for Ireland the same rights the province of Quebec formerly petitioned for, and which they now enjoy in their plenitude. I am aware, Sir, that the utterances of the hon. the Controller of Customs will have no effect on the laws which may be passed with regard to Home Rule. I am aware, also, that the Orangemen will not rise up in arms against the British Crown; but assuming that the Protestants of Ontario should lend their active aid to an uprising in Ulster, I believe there would be found in the country a large number of English, Irish and French volunteers, ready to enroll also, not with a view to fight the British Crown, but on the contrary, to defend it against rebellion and sedition. Were the question brought up before the House, only with a view to censure the course taken by the hon. the Controller of Customs, I would have voted in favour of it; but the end in view is quite different. It is not a motion

Mr. BELLEY.

of censure against the hon. member, but a pretext for embarrassing the Government. The motion before this House is a motion of non-confidence. In my opinion, the Opposition are going too far; they cannot get the support of the Conservative party; and I consider it my duty, equally with all the Conservative members of this House, to support the chiefs of the Conservative party. I openly declare that I prefer supporting Sir John Thompson, whom we all respect, rather than supporting the motion of an Orangeman.

Mr. KENNY. Before the vote is taken I desire, with the permission of the House, to make a personal explanation. It will be remembered that, early in the debate this afternoon, I expressed my disapproval of the regrettable and very unhappy language, as I considered it, used by the hon. Controller of Customs at Kingston. I also stated that, inasmuch as in my opinion, at that time, the resolution involved a vote of want of confidence in the Government, I should be compelled to vote against it. Subsequent to my remarks, the opinion has been expressed by some of the older members of this House that the vote does not involve a vote of want of confidence in the Government; and when I consider the action taken by one of the members of the Cabinet and by one of the Controllers, and in the absence of any emphatic expression of opinion from the leader of the House to the effect that the motion does involve a vote of want of confidence in the Government, I feel at liberty under the circumstances to vote for the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Dawson):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Grieve,
Allan,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Hearn,
Bécharde,	Innes,
Beith,	Kenny,
Bergin,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Langelier,
Borden,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bourassa,	Laurier,
Bowers,	Leduc,
Bowman,	Legris,
Brodeur,	Lépine,
Brown,	Livingston,
Bruneau,	Macdonald (King's),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McGregor,
Casey,	McInerney,
Charlton,	McMillan,
Choquette,	McMullen,
Christie,	Mignault,
Colter,	Mills (Bothwell),
Costigan,	Monet,
Curran,	Mulock,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Davin,	Pelletier,
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Rowand,
Flint,	Sanborn,
Forbes,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,

Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,

Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Vaillancourt,
Welsh,—74.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Barnard,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carignan,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Craig,
Daly,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Foster,
Fréchette,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Lachapelle,
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (Winnipeg),

Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Picton),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfé,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Quimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pridham,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Turcotte,
Trywhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland)—105.

PAIRS.

For.

Against.

Messieurs

Baker,
Macdowall,
McNeill,

Campbell,
Edwards,
Bowers.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a statement made in the Montreal "Star" of yesterday. An interview is reported with Sir Charles Tupper, in which he said that the treaty was essentially a Government treaty, which they were obliged to carry through the House or re-

sign. Has the hon. gentleman taken notice of this paragraph and has he information to give the House ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not taken notice with regard to that paragraph, and do not propose to criticise it.

Mr. LAURIER. Nor to give information ?

Mr. FOSTER. At present time not.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1892.—(Mr. Daly.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 108) for the relief of Annette Marion Goff—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 105) for the relief of John Francis Schwaller—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Dickey.)

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of James Frederick Doran—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Dickey.)

Bill (No. 109) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Daly.)

THE PATENT ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) to amend the Patent Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to provide for a third copy of the plan being furnished, it being required by the printers for publication in the "Patent Record." Then, it is provided that patents, of which there are a great many, may be signed by the Deputy-Commissioner instead of by the Commissioner. A further provision relates to registration notices. The fee is \$2 for a notice, but the practice has grown up of putting four or five different patent claims into one notice, and so avoiding the payment of the fee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SOFT FISH IN LAKE ST. PETER.

Mr. DESAULNIERS asked, Have the Government considered the petition presented last year to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in relation to the taking of soft fish in Lake St. Peter? If not, is it their intention to so modify the stringent regula-

tions forwarded to the fishery overseers as to extend protection to the poorer class of soft fish fishermen? Who are the parties—Senators, members of the House of Commons and others—who have made representations to Government in relation to the said soft fish fishery? What is the date of each representation? Have fresh representations been made again this year again, to Government, in this matter? If so, by whom and on what dates?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government considered a petition presented on the 11th May, 1892, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, relative to the taking of soft fish in Lake St. Peter. It was on the 12th May, 1892, referred to a sub-committee of the Privy Council. It was decided to maintain the prohibition against the taking of soft fish. This petition was signed by Senators Montplaisir, and Guévremont: Messrs. Pelletier, Carignan and Desaulniers, M. P.'s, and Allard, M. P. P. Representations have been made this year by the following persons:—Senators Guévremont and Montplaisir, and Mr. F. L. Desjardins, M.P., on 19th February, 1893; Messrs. A. A. Bruneau, M.P., J. H. Leduc, M.P., A. A. Bruneau, M.P., and L. C. Pelletier, M.P., on 14th March, 1893; Mr. Paul Lavallée and others, Ste. Anne de Sorel, on 7th March, 1893; Mr. Joseph Barque and others, Isle St. Ignace, and Rev. V. S. de Carufel, Ste. Angèle de Nicolet, 14th March, 1893. The above petitions have been considered so important that the Government are now considering the subject to see if the said prohibitory regulations should be relaxed or not.

JAMES CLARK.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether James Clark, an extra clerk in the Post Office Department, is or was a resident of Brockville? Is he now, and has he been continuously, engaged in the Post Office Department as extra clerk? What was the date of his engagement? Has he been off work? If so, what time in each year? Is he engaged at present? Has he been at work in Ottawa all the time of his engagement? If not, where was he and in what way employed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. James Clark was a resident of Brockville. He is not now an extra clerk in the Post Office Department. He was first employed in 1889. He was absent from duty in 1890 about fifty-three days. In 1891 he was absent 162 days, for two months of which he received no pay. His mother was for some time dangerously ill and died. In 1892 he was absent twenty-two days. He was at work in Ottawa all the time of his engagement.

STRATHROY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Strathroy? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3.

Mr. DESAULNIERS.

What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In the town of Strathroy the industries, &c., are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Carpenters—	
Henry Owens.....	1
Alex. Hilton.....	1
H. Sickle.....	2
J. Murray.....	4
Robt. Davidson.....	1
George McBeith.....	20
John McIntyre.....	1
Thomas Hill.....	3
Peppermint Distillery—	
James Gilzeau.....	3
Tailors—	
Margaret Davis.....	1
William Wray.....	1
Mrs. Albert Scott.....	1
Mrs. F. Scafe.....	1
H. Rose.....	6
William Dawson.....	15
George Raymond.....	12
P. Mathews.....	5
B. Case.....	7
Geddes Bros.....	11
R. Sutherland.....	2
James Fitzpatrick.....	1
Grant & Co.....	5
Parker & Macrault.....	4
C. Pike.....	2
P. Morrison.....	2
Knitting Factory—	
Strathroy Knitting Mills.....	122
Flour and Grist Mills—	
David Waitt.....	3
Strathroy Roller Mills.....	7
Flax and Scutching Mill—	
Gunn & Murray.....	35
Weavers—	
John McCormack.....	1
B. Bicknell.....	1
T. Banks.....	1
L. Kearney.....	1
Dressmakers and Milliners—	
A. Ellico.....	1
A. Gordon.....	1
Jane French.....	1
J. M. Mann.....	1
A. Anderson.....	1
Miss M. Ellico.....	1
E. Audet.....	5
M. McLarty.....	3
M. Alexander.....	1
J. Hambly.....	7
E. McCandles.....	10
M. Peace.....	4
A. Gills.....	2
M. Graham.....	2
E. Brock.....	1
L. Parker.....	3
Ida Humphries.....	1
A. Thompson.....	1
Agnes Herbert.....	4
M. Willis.....	3
C. Smith.....	4
A. Worsfold.....	2
E. Gilleau.....	11

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Foundry and Machine—		Saw Mill—	
Arch. Filshie.....	10	E. Murphy.....	3
Carpenters—		Pump Factories—	
A. Humphries.....	1	John Renolds.....	1
Jas. Allen.....	4	Wm. Gardner.....	2
J. McCurren.....	5	Carriage Factories—	
John Renolds.....	1	T. Brown.....	1
Jno. Gosford.....	1	F. Yeo.....	3
Tailors—		William Miller.....	1
N. McMullen.....	1	Thomas Ryan.....	2
Robt. Lewis.....	7	Edward Woods.....	1
F. Porter.....	1	Blacksmiths—	
J. Scott.....	3	Thos. Ryan.....	1
Geo. Tanner.....	8	M. McNiven.....	1
J. Addison.....	13	N. Dingman.....	2
W. Boos.....	5	Frank Yeo.....	2
Boots and Shoes—		Wm. Miller.....	2
J. Davidson.....	1	J. & D. Urquhart.....	1
Jas. Brown.....	1	E. & T. Wood.....	2
T. & S. Allen.....	4	Robert Ewens.....	1
W. Lewis.....	1	H. Mellon.....	2
R. Hall.....	1	Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
Harness and Saddlery—		R. Knox.....	1
A. Marshall.....	1	J. Scales.....	2
John Rodgers.....	1	R. Dale.....	1
W. Tasker.....	1	Painters and Glaziers—	
R. Campbell.....	1	W. Bingham.....	2
Dressmakers and Milliners—		J. McFadden.....	1
S. Rorke.....	6	Dye Work—	
F. Flett.....	6	T. Creighton.....	2
M. Riley.....	1	Woollen Mill—	
M. O'Neil.....	1	George Tanner.....	17
A. Ritchie.....	9		
I. Prebble.....	2		
W. Glanville.....	6		
A. Hunter.....	7		
C. McDougal.....	1		
F. McCarthy.....	2		
A. McQueen.....	6		
A. Skipper.....	2		
E. Dickie.....	1		
M. Kumford.....	1		
J. McAffar.....	1		
E. Cowan.....	1		
S. Nichol.....	1		
M. McKimmon.....	1		
M. Costello.....	1		
Tinsmiths—			
A. & D. Lament.....	2		
J. Noonan.....	2		
Tomhill & Woodhall.....	5		
Weavers—			
Jas. Collis.....	1		
J. Jack.....	1		
Bakers—			
Geo. Dickson.....	1		
A. Dixon.....	1		
E. York.....	2		
Marble and Stone—			
McIntyre & Gardner.....	5		
Sash, Door and Blind Factories—			
Geo. Scott.....	2		
Davidson & Leslie.....	4		
Geo. Hughes.....	4		
Photographer—			
J. Caley.....	2		
Pork Curers—			
J. Ellise.....	1		
E. Murphy.....	4		
Flour and Grist—			
E. Murphy.....	3		
T. Martin.....	16		

MR. FOSTER.

LIEUT.-COL. AMYOT.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Whether Lieutenant-Colonel Amyot has resigned as commandant of the 9th Battalion of Voltigeurs, Quebec? 2. If so, why has not his successor been appointed?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Colonel Amyot has tendered his resignation after ten years' command of the 9th Battalion of Voltigeurs, so as to give an opportunity of promotion to the subalterns in that regiment. His resignation has been accepted, and his successor, Colonel Roy, is now virtually in command. There has been some delay in connection with the appointment of a successor, caused by the necessity for examining into certain shortages in the equipment of some companies of the battalion. The matter is now being satisfactorily settled.

COMMANDING OFFICERS OF VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to retire the commanding officers of volunteer battalions having over five years of service as such, with a view to insure the promotion of subaltern officers in the same corps?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The general officer commanding, to whom this matter has

been referred, does not think that such compulsory retirement would be in the interests of the force.

SAINTE-ANNE DE LA PERADE POST-MASTERSHIP.

Mr. RIDER (translation) (for Mr. Legris) asked, 1. Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the petitions of the citizens of Ste. Anne de la Pérade by appointing a postmaster in place of J. A. Marcotte, deceased? 2. If so, are they about to appoint the person recommended in the petitions? 3. If not, why not?

Sir A. P. CARON. (Translation.) 1. It is the intention of the Government to appoint a postmaster in place of Mr. J. A. Marcotte, late postmaster of Ste. Anne de la Pérade. 2. The Government have not decided so far which of the persons recommended to them will be appointed. 3. The matter is still under the consideration of the Government.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BOWERS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Finance Minister if the balance of the questions I asked with regard to the manufacturing establishments in the town of Westport is yet in hand?

Mr. FOSTER. I have it here, and I will send it over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House when I may expect the returns I asked for some time ago, and which were approved by resolution of the House. I refer to the return ordered last session, about the indebtedness of the Dominion, and the one ordered this session in relation to the fishing bounties in Victoria county, N.S.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make inquiry about these returns.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not observe whether the hon. gentleman has brought down the papers he promised with regard to the treaty with France.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are not ready yet. They are being prepared by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I suppose they will be down in the course of the day. But I may say that all the important papers, without exception, are down.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. CURRAN (for Sir John Thompson) moved second reading Bill (No. 43) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1 of the schedule,

Mr. CURRAN. The first amendment is to section 133, and is to insert the word "indictable" before the word "offence" in the first line. This is to make it uniform with the other sections of the Act.

On section 2 of the schedule,

Mr. CURRAN. It is proposed to amend section 181 of the Code by substituting the word "or" for the word "and" in the second line.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what amendment he intends to effect?

Mr. CURRAN. Under the section as it stands now, mere illicit connection with a child between the ages of 14 and 16 years would not be an offence. There must be an element of seduction, and the object of the amendment is to make that element unnecessary. In future, the element of seduction is not necessary to constitute an offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand the meaning of the amendment. The section reads now that every one is guilty of an indictable offence who seduces and has illicit connection.

Mr. CURRAN. Seduction is unnecessary, as I understand it. It is the illicit connection that creates the offence. If a man seduces a girl, he is certainly guilty; but we go further, and say that if he has connection, meaning that the element of seduction is not absolutely necessary to constitute an offence, I think it is better to put it all in one section than to create two different offences.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot understand how anybody can have illicit connection with any girl, of previously chaste character, without seducing her. If you make this change here, you are going to make, apparently, two separate offences. Now, will you tell me what distinction there is, if there is any?

Mr. CURRAN. If we restrict the matter altogether, as it is done here, an indictment can only take place under this section, where there is actual seduction. Seduction is absolutely necessary to constitute an offence. But by taking out the word "and," seduction is an offence, and illicit connection with a girl of previously good character generally, not a prostitute or anything of that kind, would be equally an offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that the argument won't hold. This section has only reference to a girl of a previously chaste character; it has no reference to any other kind of woman. Under

the present law, there is one offence provided for in the section, in seducing and having illicit connection. Now, you are going to sub-divide it and constitute two offences, and I want to know what they are. One is to seduce a girl of previously chaste character, and the other is to have illicit connection with a girl of previously chaste character. I do not understand the distinction. That distinction will exist when we substitute the word "or" for "and," and the court will want to know what the distinction is.

Mr. CURRAN. The distinction as laid down by the Minister of Justice was this :

The section as it stands in this Act is now the law, embodying the provisions of chapter 157 of the Revised Statutes, section 3a, as amended by 53 Victoria, chapter 37, section 3. As the section stands, however, while illicit connection with a child of these tender years, between 14 and 16 would not be an offence, there must be the element of seduction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will you tell me what is the element of seduction apart from the illicit connection ?

Mr. CURRAN. The illicit connection under the circumstances set forth in the section will alone constitute an offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is confined, don't you see, to a woman of previously chaste character. I fancy the object is this : Under the section as it stands now, forcible connection, against the will of the party, would not be an offence under this section at all. Now, under the section, as you are going to make it, it will be. Do you intend that ? As the section stands now, there must be illicit connection with the consent of the party. Here you are altering the section, and after you alter it, illicit connection against her consent would be an offence under this section.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, you are constituting a new offence of rape. If it is against her consent, it must be rape ; if it is with her consent, it is seduction. I understand that under the section as it stands now, a man must seduce and have illicit connection in order to be guilty of the offence ; that is, the illicit connection must be with the consent of the party and not against her consent. If it is against her consent it is rape. Now, you are going to alter all that.

Mr. CURRAN. There is no doubt that if a person has illicit connection with a woman without her consent, forcing her, it is rape ; but I think it is quite clear that the explanation given here makes the law intelligible.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the proposed section a man cannot have illicit connection with a girl of previously chaste character, without seduction accompanying it. It strikes me that if the words "of previously chaste character" were omitted, the section

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

would read sensibly. How can there be illicit connection without the girl being of previously chaste character ?

Mr. CURRAN. There is no necessity for seduction. Even if the girl consented, and she was under the age named, the man would be guilty ; consent is unnecessary.

Mr. LAURIER. Why is it necessary to leave the word "seduce" in the clause ?

Mr. CURRAN. I dare say the object might be covered without that word ; but, at all events, it is perfectly certain that in case of seduction there is a crime committed. I repeat, that the element of seduction is unnecessary in order to constitute the offence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the section now stands, there must be illicit connection, with seduction ; and the object of the amendment is to establish that there can be no seduction of a child under fourteen.

Mr. CURRAN. Suppose a man has illicit connection with a girl of that age, even with her consent, he is guilty of the crime specified.

On section 215,

Mr. CURRAN. It is proposed to add to section 215 the words, "unless the offence amounts to culpable homicide." This section renders every one guilty of an indictable offence and liable to three years' imprisonment and to being bound over to prosecute for any offence specified in sections 209, 210 and 211, without lawful excuse. The section makes it an indictable offence and punishable with three years' imprisonment to neglect to provide necessaries of life, without lawful excuse, in certain cases. It is considered desirable to add these words, because the section might otherwise be misinterpreted by an ignorant magistrate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is hardly correct to place the responsibility on an ignorant magistrate, when the necessity for this amendment was suggested by a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) The amendment suggested by the hon. Minister (Mr. Curran) will not be understood in French, as by following the wording of the amendment, subsection 2 of the section as amended has no meaning whatever.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) The translator will do that.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) The translator cannot alter section 2 if it is not amended.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) The subsection is amended in the English version so as to make the law fairly read. In the Criminal Code, subsection A begins in the middle

of a section, instead of beginning by a word giving the meaning of the sentence.

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) It is not the same section, it is section 2 that could not be understood.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) A line is added to section 2. Has the hon. gentleman compared it with the Statute ?

Mr. FREMONT. (Translation.) I have the Statute before me.

On section 507,

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to offer an amendment to this section. I want to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that although almost every species of mischief is provided for in this Act, there is nothing with regard to the protection of natural harbours; and where a harbour exists by reason of a bar, if that bar were cut across maliciously or injured in any way, there is no punishment provided for the person who commits the act. This seems to be an anomalous state of affairs, because a harbour might be of incalculable value to the locality and even to the public. I therefore propose the following amendment:—

That section 507 be amended by adding thereto, "as 507a the following:—

"Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding \$50, who wilfully and without the permission of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the burden of proving which permission shall lie on the accused; who removes any stone, wood, earth or other material forming a natural bar to any public harbour or forming a natural protection to such bar."

I may say that damage to artificial protections to harbours are provided for already in the law, but there is no provision with regard to a natural bar. The matter was drawn to my attention more particularly by the case of a harbour in my county where there is a bar in that position, and which is becoming endangered by reason that it is not protected. My wish is that some law should be made in regard to this matter so that the public should be protected. In order to secure conviction under this you would have to prove there was a natural bar to the harbour, or a natural protection to the harbour, and that the injury was done wilfully, and without the permission of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think that where so important a matter as a public harbour is in danger, it is not unfair that the criminal law should intervene.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he is not using the word "bar" in a special sense. In the case of a bar formed under the water, his provision might prevent a private party dredging it in his own interest. This seems to me to be rather a matter of harbour police than a matter of criminal law.

Mr. DICKEY. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that there should be some protec-

tion to harbours formed by bars. I should be very glad to have his assistance in so framing the clause as to attain my object without doing any harm.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the hon. gentleman's proposition stands, every time a dredge goes to a harbour to remove an impediment, those in charge of it will be committing a criminal offence unless they first get the assent of the Minister of Marine. I would object to this on general grounds. We have made so many things criminal by this Code that unless the hon. gentleman can state that some real grievance exists, I think we should not enact a provision of this kind. If the hon. gentleman knows of cases in which public injury has been committed by people removing these bars, there may be some grounds for the amendment.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I think there are many such cases on our coasts, where there are long tongues of land or beaches partially covered by stones. These stones are often taken away by vessels for ballast, and in that way the beach is lowered and the harbour destroyed. I know no way of preventing that being done at present. There is no police of any description having control over the persons who carry off these stones.

Mr. CHARLTON. These statements are made in very general terms. There have been no cases cited where any damage has been actually done. It strikes me that the removal of stones and sand will require to be done on rather a larger scale than it can be done by individuals, to injure a harbour. I can hardly realize how a harbour can be damaged by the individual action of a few persons removing a little dirt or driftwood or a few stones from a beach, and it strikes me that the introduction of a clause making that a criminal offence requires more consideration than we have been able to give to this amendment so far.

Mr. DICKEY. There is in Cumberland county a very old and valuable harbour, which is protected by a narrow bar covered by enormous quantities of driftwood which have been washed up by the sea, and have become matted together so as to form a perfectly natural protection of the bar from breaches of the sea. It is the opinion of persons there that if this wood were removed, on the occasion of the first storm, there would be a breach of the sea through the bar, and a destruction of the harbour which could only be repaired at enormous expense to this Government. I have been looking after this matter for three years. The wood has been carried off in thousands of cords to the United States and New Brunswick at \$1 a cord.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it public property?

Mr. DICKEY. I suppose it is no man's property. It lies on the bar. The people who carry off the wood are very careless,

only seeking their own gain, and I have tried on several occasions to stop them. I have had notices served on them by the Minister of Marine and by the Minister of Public Works, but they have found, what is the fact, that there is no law against them. The people of the neighbourhood are alarmed for the harbour, and I am afraid that this season, if this practice is not stopped, it will be worse than ever.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who owns the soil?

Mr. DICKEY. It belongs to the Crown.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, they could be prosecuted for trespass.

Mr. DICKEY. That is no remedy. The first difficulty that would present itself would be the question whether the land belonged to the Queen in the right of the Dominion or to the Queen in the right of the province. Then, you might get damages, but you would not be able to recover. An engineer of the Public Works Department has examined this particular bar and has certified to the department that there is serious danger of the harbour being destroyed. I will gladly accept any precaution that the committee think well to throw around a provision of this sort. I see the difficulty, but I think the committee will agree with me that so serious a matter should be dealt with in some way.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the hon. gentleman certain that the removal of this driftwood is at all likely to destroy the harbour? The tendency of sand-bars is to increase by the action of the sea rather than to be washed away.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). On the Atlantic coast their tendency is to decrease.

Mr. CHARLTON. How are they formed in the first place?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). They are thrown up from the sea, but it is only when they are formed at the mouths of rivers, which bring down certain deposits, that they increase.

Mr. OUIMET. There can be no inconvenience in this law, because the offence will only be committed when stone, earth or material which is a protection to the harbour is taken away. The essential element will be to take away something which protects the harbour. When a sand-bar forms itself and fills up the harbour, that is not a protection but an obstruction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was not objecting to the legislation, but it seems to me rather a matter of police than of criminal law, and the wording is very much wider than what the hon. gentleman aimed at. Take the case of Rondeau Harbour. That embraces 5,000 or 6,000 acres, which belong to the Ontario Government, except 400 acres

Mr. DICKEY.

of a military reserve which belong to this Government. Would you undertake to prevent the Ontario Government disposing of the timber upon Rondeau Point, the removal of which would, in the opinion of many, destroy the harbour?

Mr. OUIMET. That would be a subject of negotiation between the two Governments. If it is important that the trees should remain there, they ought not to be removed before giving notice to the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman's friends have sold the timber on the 400 acres there which belong to this Government. There is where the principal danger is. I submit this as an illustration of cases that might come within the clause. I am not objecting to the clause, but the phraseology would require to be changed.

Mr. OUIMET. No doubt, if a case of the kind presented itself, the law might be amended, or the Governments come to some agreement, and I do not think there would be any real inconvenience. This matter is, however, pressing. This very important harbour would be utterly destroyed if the cutting of the timber goes on, and then it would cost us over \$100,000 to replace that protection.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the hon. gentleman made a good case for legislation of some kind; but it is just a question whether it would not be better just to legislate specially for the case he has in view, rather than to incorporate in the general Act a section which will cover the whole Dominion and may give rise to many complications. It would be better to introduce a special Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 13 of schedule,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This seems to be important. Will the hon. gentleman explain the alteration.

Mr. CURRAN. It was deemed advisable to amend this section so that it might conform more nearly with section 289, and we think this is about the nearest approach we could get to it.

On section 14 of the schedule,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the explanation of this?

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman will refer to section 743 of the Code, he will find that proceedings in error are abolished, and the reference to writs of error in this section, therefore, was an oversight.

On section 15 of the schedule,

Mr. CURRAN. This is in order to make the proper references. Nos. 318 and 361 were the sections in the Bill introduced in 1891 and the corresponding sections in the Act are

320 and 363, but this was overlooked. So this change merely makes the reference to the proper sections.

On section 20 of the schedule,

Mr. CURRAN. Subsection 2 of the section as it stands, provides that, with respect to offences committed before the Act comes into force, the old procedure shall obtain. It is thought better to make the change proposed in the schedule so that the procedure, after the Act comes into force, shall, with the slight exceptions mentioned, in the new subsection, be uniform in all cases. The provision that in the case of prosecutions commenced before the Act comes in force the old procedure shall govern up to the time of committal, is taken from the English code. The object was to give the inferior magistracy time to familiarize themselves with the new statute.

On section 21 of the schedule,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do you except these two clauses, 16 and 23 from repeal?

Mr. CURRAN. Would the hon. gentleman allow that to stand a few minutes. In the meantime, I move to add to section 540, part 10, "perjury" in clauses 141 to 150, inclusive.

Mr. HAZEN. May I ask the Solicitor-General if that will have the effect of withdrawing cases of manslaughter and perjury from trial before county court judges?

Mr. CURRAN. Yes.

Mr. HAZEN. In our province, the judges of the county court have always had power to try cases of that sort, and I do not believe that there ever has been cause for dissatisfaction. I believe if that power were withdrawn, it would result in inconvenience. Have the Government considered that?

Mr. CURRAN. It has been considered by the Minister of Justice, who wrote me that the change was made at the request of several parties, who were interested in the legislation. I think, more particularly, the Attorney-General of the province of Ontario, and Sir John Thompson agreed to it.

Mr. McLEOD. In New Brunswick it will work serious inconvenience, because in some of our counties we have only one circuit of the Supreme Court during the year, and, in some other counties, two circuits. The result would be that a man charged with perjury, who could not get bail, might be kept in jail for nearly a year. I think we will have to ask the Solicitor-General to except New Brunswick from the operation of that clause.

Mr. McALISTER. In the county of Restigouche, we have only one circuit court in the year, and three county courts, and if that section is put in force, it will cause great inconvenience.

Mr. HAZEN. I agree with my colleagues from New Brunswick. The county court judges have always had a right to try cases except capital offences, and if this section were put in force, a man might be prevented from having his trial for eleven months. The system of allowing county court judges to try all except capital offences, has always given satisfaction. A county court judge is quite as well able to try cases of this kind as a superior court judge. I believe that the law should not be changed except to effect some good purpose, but in this case I think the change in the law would rather cause an injury.

Mr. CURRAN. Under the circumstances, we will allow the amendment to drop.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but if this change has to do with the jurisdiction of the inferior courts, I think the time has arrived when the Government ought to look into this whole matter, and propose some measure in reference to it. Take the jurisdiction, for example, of some city magistrates who have the power to try serious crimes, and to send a man to penitentiary for life, without a trial by jury. Such trials take place free from the public gaze, sometimes in the magistrate's private room, and I think, at times, it results in a failure of justice. It is an unwise system, and requires action at the hand of the Government. Magistrates think that they are despatching business, and they get into the habit of treating human liberty with a degree of carelessness that is not conducive to the ends of justice.

Mr. HAZEN. Under what law do they get the right to do that?

Mr. MULLOCK. The Speedy Trials Act.

Mr. McALISTER. It does not give magistrates that power.

Mr. MULLOCK. Certain magistrates have it. They argue in this way. They say that their experience is that prisoners once convicted elect, when they come up again, to be tried by the magistrate rather than by jury. There is an explanation of that. If the prisoner knows that his trial will not go on until the time of the assizes, he prefers, if he expects to be convicted, to have it come on at once, thinking that he will get a short sentence which will run out before the time of his trial at the assizes would be reached. He is sometimes disappointed by the magistrate imposing a longer sentence than he had expected. I think it is an entire mistake to treat the administration of justice in this way. I think that the trial of all except the most trivial offences should take place in open court surrounded with all the solemnities of the law. I am told that the way these trials are usually conducted before magistrates is something like this: The prisoner in the dock is a good many feet

away from the magistrate, while the witness-box is close to the magistrate. The prisoner is perhaps not defended by counsel, and the presiding magistrate, who has acquired, as he thinks, great executive ability in convicting, speaks to the witness, who leans over and tells the magistrate something that the prisoner probably cannot hear. Then the prisoner is hustled out and taken away before he knows that his trial is begun, and hurled into a dungeon. That is called British justice. That is no imaginary representation, but on the contrary represents the administration of justice in a very important court of this country at the present time, or within a very short time, and it all arises from what I consider a radical defect in what is called the Speedy Trials Act under which trials can take place "in camera." It is too important a matter to be dealt with in this way. If the Government look into it they will find, to their amazement, how many convictions have been entered by one man not very far from the city of Toronto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does he sit "in camera"?

Mr. MULOCK. He does not technically; but he does practically. I asked the Solicitor-General, who must have something to do to justify his existence as Solicitor-General, to look into this matter and see when he is told that a magistrate convicted, perhaps, 10,000 persons in one year, whether he could have done justice in all or any reasonable number of those cases.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to draw the attention of the Solicitor-General to one matter more, that is, the payment of county court judges under the Speedy Trials Act. In Nova Scotia the county court judges have two counties in each district, and practically all the criminal business is thrown upon them, and there is practically no provision made for the payment even of sufficient to cover their expenses. I would ask the hon. Solicitor-General to look into this matter, and see whether better provision could not be made for the payment of these officers.

Bill reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 29) further to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I simply want to ask the House to assent to the second reading of the Bill. I do not propose to go into committee upon it at present, because I intend to make certain changes in the Bill which I will now announce. In the first place, provision will have to be made for the changes caused by the creation of the positions of Controller of Customs and Controller of Inland Revenue. In the next place, in the section providing for the creation of a Civil Service Board it is stated that the Supervisor shall be one not previously a member of the Civil

Mr. MULOCK.

Service. The word "previously" should not be there, because there is no necessity of disqualifying any one who may have happened to be in the service previously. Then, subsection "B," referring to the powers of the Supervisor, states:

He shall have general supervision of the inside division of the service, with constant and ready access to all rooms and buildings in which clerks are employed.

That I propose to amend by adding a clause providing that he shall have no control over papers or records or documents on his own authority. Then, with regard to the hours of attendance, if the Bill bears the interpretation which has been put upon it, that it would take away from the Civil Service the Saturday holiday usually granted, that doubt will of course be removed, as it is not the intention to do so. With regard to the fixing of the hours, they cannot be arbitrarily fixed by an Act. It never was intended to apply to the outside service, nor can it, we think, apply by any cast-iron section to the inside service, and powers will be given to the Governor in Council to regulate the hours, according to the requirements of the service, in the departments. There will also be a clause in the Act providing for the cases of old civil servants who have, by practical knowledge and long experience and faithful service, made themselves masters of the routine of their departments, but who cannot be promoted unless they pass the technical examination required. While it is not desired to open the door too widely, it has been considered only fair that in any department, where a public servant has served five years at the maximum of his class, he will be considered fit for promotion, on the certificate and recommendation of the chief officer of the department, without passing the ordinary Civil Service examination. A memorial has been sent by the outside Civil Service principally, asking the privilege to form associations within themselves for their own insurance and benefit, and a provision will be made in this Act to give them the power to do so. These are the changes; they will be printed and may be discussed when I ask the House to go into committee on the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill was introduced on the 3rd of February without any word of explanation at all. The Bill provides for the creation of a Civil Service Board. Certain powers are given that board, and more extensive powers are given to the new officer who is to be appointed and called the Supervisor of the Civil Service. Neither on that occasion, when he introduced the Bill, nor on this occasion, has the hon. gentleman given to the House a single word of explanation which would render necessary the creation of this board. He has not stated directly or indirectly, or given the slightest intimation, as to what is the present condition of things in the service which would render necessary

the creation of such a board as this. I submit that, under such circumstances the House cannot, with justice to itself and in the proper discharge of its duties, agree in any shape at all to the creation of this new board until some reason is given to show that the present service is ineffective, that more supervision is necessary, and that more officers require to be created who will keep our present staff up to the discharge of their duties. If I understand the Bill rightly, what the hon. gentleman proposes, under the name of the Civil Service Board, is simply a detective agency to look after the Civil Service. Look at section 4 of the Bill, and see what are the duties it is proposed to place upon the supervisor of civil servants :

9A. The Supervisor of the Civil Service, hereinafter called the Supervisor, shall be under the direction and control of the Governor in Council, and his duties shall be as follows :—

(a.) He shall, as hereinbefore stated, be secretary to the board :

(b.) He shall have general supervision of the inside division of the service, with constant and ready access to all rooms and buildings in which clerks are employed :

(c.) He shall report, at such times and in such manner and form as the Governor in Council directs, upon the said division generally, and specially upon its condition, requirements and practical working :

(d.) He shall, whenever directed to do so by the Governor in Council, examine into and report upon the practical working of any part of the outside division of the service :

(e.) He shall perform such other duties of a like nature as are assigned to him by the Governor in Council.

Now, the duties detailed here are simply those of a chief of police. He is to go whenever he chooses into the offices ; he is to go into the cabinet of the Minister, into the room occupied by the Deputy-Minister ; he may visit the rooms occupied by the clerks, and may remain one second or a minute or an hour at his own discretion. At all events, his duty is to see whether or not the clerks are properly discharging their work. I submit, in all conscience, that the Minister, under whom the department may be, or the Deputy-Minister, or the chief clerk of the department, are quite competent to do that. I cannot see what reason can be urged to have an outside officer to see whether the clerks of the Minister of Finance or the Secretary of State or of any other Minister are properly discharging their duties. It seems to me to be absolutely childish that there should be a police officer—because he will be nothing else—going the rounds of the departments of the Civil Service to see whether or not the clerks there are discharging their duties. If the Deputy-Minister, who is responsible to the Minister for the proper discharge of the duties which belong to the department, is not able to know whether those duties are properly discharged or not, if he cannot look after the fifty or sixty clerks under him, he is not fit to discharge the responsibility and duties

of his office. Can the hon. gentleman point to any such system where you have to bring an outsider, for I am justified in calling him so, to see how the work is performed ? There are subsidiary duties given to this officer, but they are all subsidiary to this one idea, that the duties of the supervisor are to consist simply of police work within the departments. I look upon this Bill as a new device to put pensioners upon the Civil List, and there is no other reason for it ; and I, therefore, move that the Bill be not now read the second time, but be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have only this to say, that the amendments I have explained are not yet printed, and that my intention in moving the second reading was not to have any discussion, but simply to allow the measure to pass that stage, and then, when these amendments were printed and the whole Bill before the House, we might discuss all the details on the motion to go into committee.

Mr. LAURIER. But I object to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a different thing.

Mr. CASEY. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman should ask us to go on with this Bill to-day. I asked the hon. gentleman who is leading the House if he intended doing so, and he said not. I agree with my leader in his objection to the Bill passing this stage, as I think we should have a discussion on the principle of the Bill before giving it a second reading. As to the official proposed to be created, to be called the supervisor of the civil servants, my leader has aptly expressed all the objections to such an appointment, and I will not add anything to what he has said. As to the creation of a Civil Service Board to examine candidates for admission, promotion and so on, so far I can go with the Government. But, Sir, I intend, at a later stage, to propose an amendment carrying out more efficiently what one would understand to be implied by the appointment of an impartial and non-partisan board to manage the affairs of the Civil Service. I believe that the conduct of the Civil Service should not be on partisan lines, but that appointments and promotions and other proceedings should be dictated by a board appointed as judges are appointed and as the Civil Service Board in England are appointed, during good behaviour, and not responsible to any political Minister of the day. I believe the service should be conducted on business principles, that appointments, promotions and all other matters connected with the service should be carried on as in a bank or insurance company or any other institution of that kind, and apart from political considerations. On a subsequent occasion, I shall propose an amendment to this effect,

but I am not ready to propose it now. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has brought the Bill up to-day, when it was stated that it would not be brought up.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to explain. My hon. friend asked me if it was the intention to bring the Bill up to-day. I said it was not, and at that time I did not think it was coming up. I understood only the resolution was to be taken up. But as I passed my colleague's desk, he explained that he simply wished, as the Bill was to have a great many additions and amendments, to ask the House to read it a second time "pro forma," and he would have the proposed amendments printed before we went into committee, so that the House would have the proposition before them. That is all the hon. gentleman asked. I think he had a perfect right to ask that, in courtesy, and I think the Opposition have been rather curt in reference to a measure which the Government has been considering, and which is not perfected, and which the hon. gentleman who has it in charge simply asked to advance one stage in order that he might get the amendments proposed before the House. I think my hon. friend, in courtesy, should allow the second reading. The hon. gentleman shakes his head and, I understand, says he will not allow it. Then, of course, it will be necessary for us to have a vote upon it. I must say, Sir, without going into the discussion of the Bill, which it was not the intention of the House to do, I think the hon. gentleman ought to have the courtesy to allow the gentleman who has charge of the Bill, what he has asked, as a matter of information to the House and of justice to the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman's demand is not logical. If I agreed to the principle of the Bill, I would give every facility to perfect it. But we object to the Bill "in toto" and object that it should go any further.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, will my hon. friend allow me a suggestion. If the House wishes to reject the Bill, is it not right to wait, before doing so, until it is in the shape in which it is intended to be placed before the House? The Bill is now imperfect, and the intention is to present a number of amendments. Should the hon. gentleman ask to be allowed to withdraw his motion, he could have the Bill reprinted and have the vote on the reprinted Bill. My hon. friend shakes his head again and says: "No." He is not fair. He does not wish to give the Government an opportunity to present the measure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The suggestion I make would be, that, instead of taking up the Bill now, the mover should have the Bill reprinted, with all the amendments, so that we will know exactly what is proposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But they insist upon the second reading.

Mr. CASEY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Yes; that is what they are asking.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it would be better to have the whole legislation before us. The amendment could be withdrawn; the Bill could be reprinted as the Government intend to bring it forward and submit it to the House. If that meets with the views of the hon. gentleman, I think it should be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is impossible. The hon. gentleman has submitted the Bill, which has been read once. If he presents the Bill with amendments, it will be a new Bill, and would require to be reintroduced. I am sure many hon. gentlemen remember that a few years ago, when we had before us the Redistribution of Seats Bill, it was reprinted, and the Government offered their reprinted Bill for a second reading, and objection was taken. The Speaker ruled that it was a new Bill. And so it is perfectly clear that if the hon. gentleman wishes to make important alterations in the Bill already read the first time, he must come forward and have these amendments made in committee, or he must ask to have the order discharged and to have a new Bill introduced and thus begin all over again. Now, the hon. Minister of Finance was not dealing fairly in his criticism upon the amendment of my hon. friend beside me. We object to the principle of this Bill; we are opposed to the Bill altogether. Therefore, we cannot permit the second reading. If objection is to be taken to the principle of the Bill, it is upon the second reading that that objection should be taken. If the House agrees to the second reading, it commits itself to the principle of the Bill. I do not admit that this Bill is a proper Bill at all. It is in every way objectionable. It provides a cumbrous, expensive and inefficient system, and I think if hon. gentlemen wish to make an efficient system, they must assume the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown. We know that the executive of the Government is in the hands of the Crown, and the hon. gentlemen, as representatives and servants of the Crown, ought to assume the responsibility of carrying on the executive government of this country with that responsibility to Parliament which exists under our present constitutional system. Now, what do the hon. gentlemen propose by this Bill? Every measure of this sort that has been introduced has proposed to shift from the shoulders of the Government a certain amount of power and a certain amount of responsibility to the shoulders of some subordinate officers in the departments of the Government. When I read over this Bill, I see that there are certain changes which cannot be made "unless and except upon the report of the deputy-head, setting forth the necessity thereof, accompanied by a report." Why should hon. gentlemen under-

take to shift from their own shoulders the responsibility of determining whether such changes are required? The deputy is a subordinate of the Minister. If the Minister may require his deputy to make a report upon the constitution of the department—

Mr. FOSTER. It shows the difficulty of discussing the Bill which my hon. friend has declared to be imperfect. The very point that my hon. friend is discussing, is a misprint in the Bill as it stands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has asked the House to read a Bill for the first time that is misleading the House. That is a thing that ought not to be done. If there are mistakes in the Bill, the Minister who has charge of the measure ought to have brought them under the attention of the House. He ought not to permit a Bill to be read the first time without pointing out the mistakes of that sort that exist in the measure. But I point out that the Bill which hon. gentlemen put upon the Statute-book before, is a Bill which undertakes to shift from the shoulders of the Government, or the Ministers, to a Deputy-Minister, a certain amount of responsibility that ought ever to remain with the Minister himself who is the head of the department. Then, look at the provisions of this Bill with regard to the appointment of this officer whom the leader of the Opposition has designated a mere police officer, an officer whose business it is to visit the various departments, and to determine whether they are efficiently conducted, whether the parties employed in those departments efficiently discharge their duty. Why, Sir, whoever undertakes this work must have the knowledge possessed by the deputy-head of every department of Government in this country. The man who is best able to determine whether a department is properly constituted, whether it is properly organized, is the responsible Minister of the Crown to whom Parliament has intrusted the functions of a Minister. He ought to have discretionary power, his power ought to continue discretionary, but for the exercise of that power he ought to be responsible to Parliament. If he discharges his duty, he is best qualified to say whether a department requires to be differently constituted or not. If his deputy properly discharges his duties, he knows whether every person employed under him is engaged in the performance of the work which his appointment requires that he should perform, and if he fails in that, if he fails to keep the Minister informed as to the efficiency and competency of the men under him, he is neglecting his duty, and the sooner the Minister assumes the responsibility of getting rid of him and appointing another party in his place, the better it will be for the service. When I look at the provisions of this section it would seem to indicate that there is some party who wishes a larger salary than the

Government can at present pay him, some party who may be a disgruntled Deputy-Minister, for aught I know, and who, in addition to the discharge of his duties as such, is to have imposed upon him those police duties for which this Bill provides, and who is to receive this additional sum for the performance of these additional duties. I do not know whether that is so or not. The Minister can inform the House whether that be true.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman should know if he has read the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman had properly explained his Bill, we would have been informed. But we do not know what ought to be in the Bill that is not here. But this much we do know, that it is an attempt to shift upon the shoulders of men who are supposed to be obedient servants of the Administration, the duty of saying what changes shall be made, and what appointments shall be made in the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell):

No clerkship or office of packer, messenger or sorter shall be created by Order in Council, except upon the report of the deputy-head setting forth the necessity therefor, accompanied by a report.

Why should that be so?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the law now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say so, and I said so already, but it ought not to be the law. The hon. gentleman would come down to the House and say that if an objectionable recommendation has been made it was his Deputy-Minister who made it.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been that way ever since we had a Civil Service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, Sir; we do not want to interpose between the responsibility of Ministers to this House in the discharge of their duties as Ministers, any one deputy or otherwise, who apparently limit the power that a Minister should possess, but who really carry out the Minister's behests. Why should we say that a deputy should make such a recommendation?

Mr. FOSTER. For the very reason that the deputy knows the work of the office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the Minister's business to know the work of the office.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister did not know when you were in office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is speaking beyond his knowledge. The Minister, if he does his duty, knows as well as the deputy; it is impossible that it can be otherwise. The theory of our Government is not that the Deputy-Minister is responsible, but that the Minister is responsible, and if

the Minister is responsible we ought not to impose limitations upon the discretionary authority of the Minister. Let the hon. gentleman look at the English organization as set out by Mr. Todd. Does he find any such limitation there upon the authorities of Ministers? There is but one limitation, and that is with regard to appointments to office. Limitations have been imposed by the Act providing for competitive examination of parties who are to be appointed. Sir, every provision of this Act is objectionable on the lines I have mentioned. In section 7, subsection 3, we read:

No officer, clerk or employee shall be considered deserving of such increase unless he has received 75 per cent of the maximum number of points obtainable for attendance and conduct.

Here is a Minister who ought to have power, who ought to have imposed upon him the responsibility of dismissing a man who fails to come to his office, to remain there, and to discharge the duties that devolve upon him. But instead of that, you propose to treat him as a pupil at school, to mark his attendance, and to say whether he comes early or late, whether he is regular or irregular, whether he discharges his duty or does not; you give him a certain number of marks, and if he does not get 75 per cent he can get no promotion and no additional salary. I want to know whether there is not an exhibition of imbecility about an arrangement of that sort, that is sufficient to paralyze the efficiency of any Government? There can be no doubt about that. All these limitations that we are undertaking to impose by statute are limitations thoroughly inconsistent with the principles of parliamentary government and of ministerial responsibility. Let hon. gentlemen have the wide discretionary power that ought to belong to Ministers, and let them be held by this House to a strict responsibility for the efficiency or the inefficiency of the officers that are in their service. Every clause of this Bill is a clause that, if acted upon, if carried out, imposes obstacles in the way of an efficient Administration, and will seriously interfere with everything like a proper and efficient discharge of the public duties of public officers. It is because I hold those views, and hold them very strongly, not only with regard to this measure, but the one which we are undertaking to amend by it, that I support the motion of my hon. friend beside me. The law is bad enough as it is, and we should move in the opposite direction instead of undertaking to impose further restrictions, which are delusive and illusive, because they can never be carried out. The Government is master of the situation, and the Government in pretending to tie their own hands are simply using the deputies, using those whose reports are required, to cover a responsibility which under our system ought to devolve on them, and as a matter of fact actually does devolve on them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would ask the House to accord me the opportunity of offering a few further remarks on this question. I simply made the proposition to the House that, in view of the changes it will be necessary to make in this Bill, not to ask for the second reading with a view to proceeding with the Bill immediately, not to ask the House to go into committee, but to take advantage of the present opportunity, with the consent of hon. members, to take this step and obtain the second reading of the Bill, so as to afford me an opportunity of informing the House as to the several changes I would ask hon. members to sanction, which changes I would have printed and laid before the hon. members for their consideration, when, with these printed changes in their hands, they could consider the whole Bill, not the objectionable points which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has discussed now. I do not want a discussion now—I did not expect a discussion to arise to-day on this Bill. Look at the position in which the leader of the Opposition wishes to place me. If any hon. gentleman objected to the second reading being moved to-day, I simply say I would not ask for the second reading. If the House will give me the second reading, "pro forma," I will take the opportunity to state the amendments which I will have printed and laid before the House, and I will give the fullest information before we take another step in the consideration of this Bill. If the hon. gentleman had stated that he did not wish the second reading to be moved until full information had been given to the House, I would not have moved it. But the hon. gentleman took a very different course, and I am sorry he adopted it. If the hon. gentleman had said that he did not wish the second reading to be moved, until the proposed amendments had been printed, I should then have said that I regarded his objection as a proper one and I would not ask for the second reading. But the hon. gentleman simply took the ground that the motion for second reading having been moved, he was in a position to move the six months' hoist. That is not the way I would treat the hon. gentleman. That is what I complain of.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not see the hon. gentleman has any cause for complaint. I treated the motion moved by the hon. gentleman according to the well-known parliamentary rules. The hon. gentleman moved the second reading of the Bill, and stated, at the same time, that he wanted to make certain explanations and amendments. I have no objection to the adoption of that course.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the House consented?

Mr. LAURIER. The moment the hon. gentleman moved the second reading, it was apparent that he persisted in upholding the

principle of the Bill. Is it not evident that, since the hon. gentleman asked the House to agree to the second reading, he persisted in the principle of the Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. I object to the principle of the Bill, and, whether the hon. gentleman takes the second reading to-day or not, I object to it, and I shall continue to object to it. If the hon. gentleman wants to introduce a new Bill, let him withdraw the present one; but, if he persists in upholding the principle of this Bill, I persist in my amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Government would act wisely if they withdrew the Bill altogether. The Bill is objectionable on principle, it is impossible in practice, and it is a Bill that will degrade and humiliate the Civil Service. It will be impossible for any man retaining his self-respect to remain in the service, or for any such man to enter it, if the provisions of the Bill are carried into effect. It is not only open to the objections taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which are most serious objections, but it is unquestionably a method by which Ministers will endeavour to escape the responsibility due to this House and the country. It is part of a system by which we are gradually endeavouring, in all sorts of ways, to escape the ministerial responsibility. It is not only apparent in this measure, but in a great many others. There is not a member of the Civil Service who does not object to the Bill. There is no Bill brought in this session or any previous session, open to the number of objections to which this Bill is liable. I object to the principle of it, and to every detail of it, and so far the explanations of the Secretary of State do not appear to make the Bill a particle better than it is now. If the Government are wise, they will withdraw the Bill altogether, and endeavour to bring, another session, if they must bring down such a measure, a Bill that will not be liable to such numerous and insuperable objections as can be presented against the present one. It is not only objectionable in detail, but objectionable in principle, and I cannot believe that members of this House who have taken the trouble to read it and consider its effect on the service, can possibly support it. I am very certain I do not stand alone on this side of the House in objecting to this Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the House will allow me, I will withdraw the motion for the second reading.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can move the second reading another time when the amendments are prepared.

Mr. LAURIER. When you choose to do so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move that the Bill be read the second time to-morrow.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will to-morrow ever come?

Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Adams.)

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Forbes.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend "An Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund."—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 98) to amend the Act to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 94) for the relief of Robert Young Hebden—(from the Senate).—Mr. Sutherland.) On division.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Canadian Gas Association.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

SUPPLY—THE CARON COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to call the attention of the House to the evidence which has been laid before the House, and which was taken by the Royal Commission appointed last session to make inquiries in regard to certain charges relating to the Postmaster-General. It will be remembered, Sir, that this inquiry was taken out of my hands altogether. My charges were voted down, and other charges, not the same, were substituted for them by the Government, and, therefore, I had naturally supposed that when the evidence was laid before the House, the Government would have been in a position to bring something before the House upon the subject, or to make some recommendation to the House as to how this evidence of their own commission should be dealt with. But as the Government have made no move in the matter, or have delayed doing so up to this late period of the session, I feel, having read the evidence over very carefully, that I should bring it to the attention of the House. I see, Sir, as I dare say many other members of the House have also observed, that the authorities of the Printing Bureau have undertaken to put a heading to this blue-book. They head it all through, in the evidence and in the exhibits, as in a law case, "Edgar versus Caron." Well, Sir, I think that if they required a heading of that kind, considering that my charges were taken out of my hands and that Mr. Mackenzie Bowell made other charges which were referred, the heading would have been much more properly, "Bowell versus Caron." However, ever since

I have been in this House, and in public life, I have endeavoured, in all my political battles, as strongly as I know how, to separate political differences from my personal relations, and I was very sorry that the printers had thought it necessary to make a sort of a personal charge of this case. I think the most I would have consented to have inserted as a heading would be "the member for West Ontario against the Postmaster-General," and so I think we will take it to be. Now, I do not wish to trouble the House with any personal discussion as to whether I was right or wrong in not appearing before this Royal Commission to assist in the prosecution of charges which were not mine. Those members of the House who desire to inform themselves of my views, can do so by referring to the blue-book which is before us, and which contains a couple of letters from me to the commissioners, setting forth my views on that subject. However, I would like to say this, that whether I was right or wrong in declining to appear before that commission, I had, in that course, the unanimous support of the independent press of Canada, as far as I have been able to read their utterances. I was thoroughly and absolutely backed up by the Montreal "Star," the Hamilton "Herald," the Ottawa "Evening Journal," the Newmarket "Era," the Toronto "Evening News," the "Week," the Toronto "Telegram," the Toronto "Mail," and the Montreal "Witness." I have here quotations from all of them thoroughly endorsing my position in that matter. However, that is a personal affair with which I do not desire to encumber the consideration of this important case. I wish also to frankly admit, in reading over the evidence taken and the proceedings of the Royal Commission, I think no fault can be found with the rulings of the commissioners themselves. But I am sorry that I cannot say as much with regard to the counsel for the Crown. I could point out, and possibly I may incidentally refer to, many cases where they stopped short, and did not follow inquiries which would have led, evidently, to many more disclosures, but, of course, they had a hard road to travel. They were counsel employed by the Ministers to prosecute another Minister, and that their position was a very delicate and painful one, I must admit. So, I suppose, we must make some allowance for them, but I have been told by an eyewitness of the proceedings of that commission, that there were mysterious secret whisperings going on at the trial between the counsel for the prosecution and the counsel for the defence; and I have been often told that the junior counsel for the prosecution was careful to obtain copies of portions of the evidence, which he thought was exculpating the defendant, and to press upon the newspaper men that they should publish those parts of the evidence which he thought would tell in favour of Sir Adolphe Carou. I am glad now that I did not place myself in the tender mercies of those gentlemen as

Mr. EDGAR.

counsel, when they generously offered to act for me in the matter. The charge was made against me more than once, not by the Postmaster-General himself, but by some of his rather unwise friends, that I was afraid to make these charges, which I made against him, openly and outside the shelter of my privilege as a member of this House. Well, I felt that it was my duty to first lay before this House any charges of a public character that I had to make against a member of this Government. It was within my right, and I think it was my bounden duty to do so. If I had gone outside this Parliament and talked at large about charges against the Government, I would have been at once met with the answer that I was afraid to bring them up face to face with the Minister on the floor of this House. So I brought them up first fairly and squarely here, but when I was told that I was sheltering myself behind my parliamentary privileges, I did not lose a great deal of time in withdrawing from that shelter completely. Hon. members will see in this blue-book a copy of my letter, of the 13th of September, addressed to the commissioners, in which I reiterated positively every word of the charges I made in this House, and which I caused to be published, over my own signature, in a number of the leading newspapers of Canada. That certainly was withdrawing from all shelter that I have as a member of this House. And then, that there might be no mistake about that matter whatever, some time ago, when I had the pleasure of meeting, on the public platform in North Hastings, the leader of the Government in the Senate, Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, I repeated every single word of my charges on the public platform, and challenged him on behalf of his colleague, to bring me into any court in Canada and give me an opportunity to prove them, and I would show him whether I could do so or not, so that he would say nothing more about my being a coward and sheltering myself behind my privileges in Parliament. I propose now to address myself to the evidence contained in this blue-book, and to show what is proved by it. I propose also to verify every statement which I shall make to this House by referring to the page of the evidence, so that hon. gentlemen on both sides may have ample opportunity of verifying the accuracy of my statements. I shall not seek either to twist the evidence to suit any charge, but shall seek to ascertain what fair and indisputable conclusions should be drawn from the evidence, as I find it here between the covers of this book, and to that evidence I propose to ask the consideration of this House. Now, Sir, I will first call attention to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, and the Construction Company in connection with the railway, which was called the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, Lumbering and Trading Company. But as that is a lumbering name to use very often, I will only refer to it as the Construction Company, and I will

ask your attention while I show you the relations which those companies held towards the Dominion Government in the way of subsidies, and towards Sir Adolphe Caron. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, when considering evidence of this nature upon charges of this kind I am within parliamentary rules, when I refer to the Postmaster-General by his private name. If I am not right, Sir, I will not do so. Now, then, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company was the originator of an important railway scheme. But the Construction Company was the contracting company that undertook to build the road. Page 90 of the evidence shows that. The relationship between the railway company proper and the Constructing Company is shown in exhibit "J S 3." at page 516 of the exhibit, and the relations were briefly these: The contracting company undertook to build the road and also agreed to do it for the consideration of the transfer to them, the Construction Company, of all the subsidies of all kinds, municipal, provincial and Dominion, which were then to be obtained. That contract was entered into on 30th April, 1878. So at that time the Construction Company, you will observe, became the contractor for the railway, became entitled to receive every dollar of Dominion subsidies for the construction of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway. That is a very important point to bear in mind. Now, Sir, what was Sir Adolphe Caron's relationship to the Construction Company? Why, Sir, he became a shareholder of that company in 1879, and his stock of \$2,500 in that company—which is, I think, in error, once or twice in the evidence put down as \$25,000; it was only \$2,500—represented the interest, he says, of his firm, the firm of Andrews, Caron & Andrews, in that stock. Be that as it may, he was interested in it, and he was a shareholder, and the stock stood in his name, and, moreover, he also became, in 1879, a director of that company. I refer to pages 98 and 221 of the evidence. Now, at that time he undoubtedly was a shareholder and a director in a construction company absolutely and entirely interested in the whole Dominion subsidy. He was a private member of this House at that time, and he became a Minister in November, 1880. When he became a Minister, the railway or the Railway Construction Company had received no grant of Dominion subsidy. But, not very long after that, they did receive considerable amounts of railway subsidies. Now, after the entry of Sir Adolphe Caron into the Government, in 1880, and before the 10th July, 1883, when there was a change in the Construction Company, they had received public grants, at least votes, from the Dominion of Canada to these amounts: In 1882, a subsidy of \$384,000, and in 1883, a subsidy of \$80,000; in all, \$464,000 of subsidy. Remember that all that time Sir Adolphe Caron was a shareholder and a director in this company. Now,

a change occurred in the position of the Construction Company on 10th July, 1883, and it was this: They had been building the railway, and they sublet or assigned the work which they had undertaken, to Mr. H. J. Beemer. And the contract which the Construction Company entered into with Mr. Beemer appears in exhibit "J S 2" at page 442. And what was his obligation? He was, under that contract, to build the railway to Lake St. John. And what did the Construction Company propose to give him for that? The Construction Company proposed to transfer to him, and did transfer to him, as you will see at page 444, all unpaid subsidies, "now or hereafter acquired. So Mr. H. J. Beemer became the assignee and recipient of the Dominion Government subsidies already voted or to be acquired after the date of his contract. Then, the company also agreed, under that contract, to use every effort to procure for Mr. Beemer additional Government subsidies. And, Sir, I might as well mention here to the House, that, not only was Sir Adolphe Caron at that time a director of the Construction Company—when the Construction Company made the contract with Mr. Beemer—but that Sir Adolphe Caron was present at both the meetings of the directors at which the contract with Mr. Beemer was considered, and at which it was ordered to be executed, as will be seen at pages 552 and 553 of the exhibits. And, Sir, that was part of the conditions of this contract. But there was a very extraordinary provision in this contract, inuring entirely to the benefit, the future benefit, the prospective benefit of the Construction Company and its shareholders. I will draw attention particularly to this clause. There was a recital in clause 5, that the company's outlay in time, labour and money is put down by mutual consent at \$450,000; by mutual consent of the Construction Company, of which Sir Adolphe Caron was a director, and Mr. Beemer, contractor, the outlay was put down at \$450,000, which Mr. Beemer agreed to pay back to the Construction Company out of the bonds and subsidies. There is the position. In addition to that, he agreed to pay Sir Adolphe Caron and his fellow directors and shareholders of the Construction Company, \$11,000 per annum for office expenses. Now, Sir, when I tell you that the whole subscribed stock—not the paid-up stock; we do not know how much was paid up; there is no evidence of it—the whole subscribed stock of this Construction Company, at the outside figure, was \$94,250, as will be seen at page 98 of the evidence, then you will see that this bargain, made on 10th July, 1883, with Mr. Beemer, the contractor, was to give them more than 450 per cent upon their entire subscribed capital. I think that was better than some of the cotton combines. Of course, in 1880, the Minister removed from Quebec to Ottawa and has been living here since. He was able, however, to

he in Quebec, as I have told you, at two meetings of the directors, when this important contract with Mr. Beemer was being entered into. He says himself, at page 222, that he knew nothing of what was going on in this matter; that he only occasionally went down to Quebec and dropped in at the meetings to shake hands with his friends. Well, he took a very fortunate opportunity of shaking hands at those two meetings, when Mr. Beemer's contract was being put through; that is all I can say. However, there was another branch of the business, that was done in Ottawa, the most important branch of the business for them. They had put Beemer to work on the road; they had agreed to get subsidies for him from Ottawa, and they were to get \$450,000 out of the road, when it was finished, or out of the bonds of the road, if it could be finished with subsidies, and, therefore, the biggest part of their business had to be done at Ottawa, and had to be done in the Dominion Government, in recommending subsidies to this House. Was not Sir Adolphe Caron here during all that time? Was he not in the Government? And what do they say about that? The secretary of the company, Mr. Scott, at page 105, says:

The company did apply for subsidies very frequently. Some they got, and some not.

But he says, also, at page 1055, that he received "loyal assistance from Sir Adolphe Caron." "Loyal assistance"—that is where the loyalty comes in. Sir Adolphe Caron claims, at page 222, that, of course, he took an interest in this road, as a representative of that district, and also as a Quebecker; he naturally took an interest in this matter. But Mr. Scott, the secretary, at page 106, also says that "Sir Adolphe Caron was fully informed of all our proceedings with reference to subsidies." Of course he was. He was in the very position to do them good. Mr. Scott also says, at page 112 of this book, that "our only chance to get \$450,000 was to have the road finished." Of course we know that the road could not be finished without subsidies, and was not finished without subsidies. Well, that \$450,000 is still unpaid, has never been paid by Mr. Beemer yet, but subsidies have been granted from time to time until the votes upon the Statute-book since Sir Adolphe Caron went into that Ministry, have reached an aggregate of over a million of dollars. \$850,000 has actually been paid of Dominion money to that road alone, and a million dollars has been voted. Instead of resigning his directorship when he became a Minister, instead of assigning his interest in the shares, he continued to hold both positions for twelve years, as a Minister, voting a million dollars of subsidies to himself. I would like to know whether the members of this House, if they had known that, would have voted money into a Minister's pocket in that style?

Mr. EDGAR.

They would not have dared to do it. Still, that was the actual position, as shown by the evidence in this book. Why, Sir, I consider that he was really a partner in a firm of contractors, drawing, year after year, these subsidies which he voted and used his influence to get, in the Government. I say that that position, for a Minister of the Crown, is indecent and unprecedented. I am glad to say, and is deserving of the censure of this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another feature of this business that I have not presented. I propose dealing as briefly as I possibly can with Sir Adolphe Caron's relationship with the late Senator Ross, and his position with reference to the Dominion subsidies voted by this Parliament. We all know that general elections were held at the end of February, 1887. The evidence shows us that there was a general election fund raised for those elections in 1887. We are told that by Mr. Thomas McGreevy, in his evidence at pages 161, 162 and 163; and we are also informed of it by Sir Adolphe Caron in his evidence at pages 224 and 228. Sir Adolphe Caron tells us that this election fund was in the charge of three gentlemen, Sir Hector Langevin, the member for Three Rivers, at that time a Minister of the Crown, Sir Adolphe Caron, a member of the Government, and Mr. Thomas McGreevy, then a member of Parliament. Sir Adolphe Caron explains, himself, in his evidence, pages 223 and 224, that he had charge of the campaign in the district of Quebec. Now, what was a natural thing for him to do? Why, he applied for money to carry on his elections there and to build up this great election fund which was distributed by this distinguished triumvirate whom I have mentioned, although I may say that Mr. McGreevy differs a little from Sir Adolphe Caron in that particular, because he says that he was a mere machine, giving out the money without being consulted, upon the order of these other two gentlemen. However, it is between them. Now, Sir Adolphe Caron applied to Mr. J. G. Ross for funds for the campaign—legal and legitimate expenses, of course. He took care to say so, and it must have been so because he said so; and how could it have been for anything else? Now, Sir, what were the ostensible reasons for his applying to Mr. Ross? Let us look at the reasons he gives himself first. I will tell you, Sir, what he said. He applied to Mr. Ross, he said—at page 223 he tells us about it—on account of Mr. Ross being a strong personal and political friend; and also because Mr. Ross, being a strong believer in the National Policy, had consequently previously contributed on several occasions. I think we suspected before that very strong believers in the National Policy were in the habit of contributing election funds in several elections. That, I think, has been suggested, but it has been denied very often. However, now we have it on the authority of a Minister of the Crown, that Mr. Ross.

being a strong believer in the National Policy, had previously contributed on several occasions. The amounts, of course, which he contributed on those occasions, I suppose from motives of delicacy, Sir Adolphe Caron forebore to mention—he did not particularize. He was being examined in his own behalf; he was not called by the commission, but volunteered these explanations and was being examined by his own lawyers when he made this statement. However, the amount of Mr. Ross's previous contributions were not stated, but Sir Adolphe Caron did say that they had never been so large before as they were in 1887, on the occasion I am coming to speak of. These were his ostensible reasons for applying to Mr. Ross. But I think this little blue-book can give us much better reasons, much more solid and substantial reasons he had for applying to Mr. Ross for assistance on that occasion. One reason was this. Mr. Ross was, at that time, the president of this Construction Company, which we have seen had a claim then subsisting of \$450,000 against Mr. Beemer, its recovery being dependent on obtaining the subsidies from Ottawa. And, more than that. Mr. Ross, out of the \$94,000 of stock held himself \$25,000 and his brother, John Ross, had held another \$25,000 of it. So that, in that family, the two brothers held more than half of the entire stock of the Construction Company. That appears at pages 104 and 98 in the evidence. Now, Sir, Mr. Ross said in his evidence, at page 112, that the only chance to get this money back for the Construction Company was to have the road finished. And what was Mr. Ross's personal, private and individual interest in that sum of \$450,000? It amounted to this: His share, he being owner of \$25,000 of stock, would have been \$118,000, and his brother's share would have been as much more. It may be that this sum of \$450,000 was not going all to be profit for the Construction Company. They, by consent, stated it at that figure as the amount of their previous outlay when they entered into contract with Mr. Beemer, for time, labour and money. There are no particulars given of that outlay in the evidence by the secretary of the company who appeared before the committee. We know that the total subscribed stock was only \$94,000, and how they could have made an outlay of \$450,000, even if the stock were all paid up, I can scarcely see. Probably they had subsidies from the city of Quebec and some other subsidies and stock subscriptions which they expended to the extent of \$450,000. But admit for the moment that they had expended \$450,000 of hard money of their own when they entered into this contract with Mr. Beemer, and admit that they were that much out of pocket, they expected to get \$450,000 of good money back from Mr. Beemer to recoup them, if they had spent it, or put profits in their pockets if they had not spent it, I do not care a straw which it was.

It was as good a thing for them to get a dollar back they had lost as to make a dollar of pure gain. So that of the sum of \$450,000 Mr. Ross's share of \$118,000, and his brother's share of the same amount, was the interest which he held in that company and which Sir Adolphe Caron knew well, because he was personally at the meeting when the contract was proved to have passed. There is one reason why he went to Mr. Ross for a subscription. This was the only way Mr. Ross could get that money back possibly, because Mr. Beemer was not a rich man, and he did not pretend to be, and the road could not have been built without these subsidies; the only possible interest Mr. Ross had was to get all the subsidies out of the Dominion he possibly could, and he was deeply concerned in bribing those who were connected with granting the subsidies. There is no pretense that Sir Adolphe Caron did not know that Mr. Ross was president of the company. He admits that he did, at page 227. And now what other good reason had Sir Adolphe Caron for going to Mr. Ross? He had a personal and a private and a prior direct interest in those Dominion subsidies beyond what he had as a shareholder and president of the Construction Company; and Sir Adolphe Caron knew what I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker. He has told us he did, in his own evidence. Mr. Beemer was not a man of capital. He was a railway builder, and he could not do his own financing, and so he went to the firm of Ross & Co.—and J. G. Ross, at page 223 and 134, is shown to be the only member of that firm—Mr. Beemer went to him to do his financing for him for the construction of this railway. Mr. Beemer tells us this, at pages 133 and 134. These are his own words:

That embodied "financing," which I did through Messrs. Ross & Co. by transferring the subsidies to him. Mr. Ross advanced me on my progress estimates, and ran his chances of getting the subsidies.

There is another personal interest which Mr. Ross had in these subsidies as transferee of them to Mr. Beemer. That he was interested to a large extent is shown in this way. Perhaps you will say, Mr. Beemer was able to pay him off and that the subsidies would be a small matter to him as security; but that is not the case. Mr. Scott, the secretary of the railway company, was examined and at page 114 of the evidence he stated: That Mr. Beemer owed Mr. Ross, over and above and beyond the subsidies he had got from him, \$220,000 on these advances; so that Mr. Beemer had not a straw's worth of interest in these subsidies practically. Beemer was \$220,000 behind in his arrangement with Ross, in addition to the subsidies, and Mr. Ross, in that personal respect, was enormously and directly interested, and, as the secretary of the company said: He ran his chances on the subsidies. Now, Sir Adolphe Caron, in his own evidence, at page 227, says, that he must have

known that Beemer was getting these advances from Mr. Ross. I had not the honour of knowing Mr. Ross, but if he was a sentimental man, Mr. Beemer points out that this railway was Mr. Ross's pet scheme, that without him it could not be accomplished, and so he may have had some sentimental idea of getting the road finished, which could only be done, however, by the subsidies. To show that Sir Adolphe Caron's judgment in soliciting Mr. Ross for a "douceur" of this kind was justified, you have only to look at the evidence, and you will see in Sir Adolphe Caron's own evidence, at page 223, that on the first application he made to Mr. Ross, Mr. Ross promptly promised to give him \$25,000 without hesitation; and you will find more than this, according to Sir Adolphe Caron's own evidence, that he accepted this \$25,000 from Mr. Ross as Ross's personal contribution, and that Ross never hinted to him, never even suggested to him, that it was anything else than his own personal contribution. Therefore I say that we are bound to hold Sir Adolphe Caron strictly responsible for demanding and for receiving this amount from Mr. Ross with the fullest possible knowledge of Mr. Ross's position both as to the Construction Company, and as Mr. Beemer's financier in his relations to the Dominion subsidies. Well, Sir, let us see if this contribution so handsomely given by Mr. Ross was altogether fruitless. Was it thrown away? No, Sir. That blue-book shows us the contrary. That blue-book shows that no doubt Sir Adolphe Caron was able to use this argument with his colleagues, that Mr. Ross had come down with a princely gift at a time, when, as Sir Adolphe says, they had a hard fight in Quebec, and Sir Adolphe was able to tell his colleagues, that Mr. Ross, who had done thus handsomely, was president of the Construction Company which was largely interested in the subsidies, and that he was the financier for the contractor, and was assignee of all the subsidies. And, Sir, that appeal must have been irresistible to a Government such as Canada has been blessed with for some years past. At any rate I turned up the schedules to see what was the tangible result of this gift. Remember this little "douceur" was handed over in February, 1887, and at the session which was soon after held in that year, there was a subsidy granted—well, not exactly \$25,000, but just a little over \$28,000—just to correct some mistake that had been made. Then, in 1888 there was a subsidy of \$96,000 also passed, and in 1889 a subsidy of \$64,000. All these, you will remember, were transferred by Mr. Beemer in advance to Mr. Ross, and were paid out by the Government, as the records of the department show, to Mr. Ross's order in the different banks. Then, in 1890, there was another subsidy passed for \$68,000, and even in 1891, a subsidy of \$5,250, or altogether, subsidies amounting to \$262,450 voted to that railway for Mr. Mr. EDGAR.

Ross's absolute benefit, after that subscription of his. So we see, that the gift was not fruitless; it was not bread cast upon the waters. Why, Sir, it bore fruit in great abundance. Twenty-five thousand dollars produced more than ten-fold; it produced more than \$262,450. Now, Sir, it would be doing an injury to Mr. Ross probably, if I refrained from drawing attention to the fact, that this does not appear to have been the limit of his generosity. I cannot exactly say how much more he gave, but in a letter which I wrote to the commissioners, I gave a list of witnesses that should be called, and a list of documents which I thought it would be well to produce, and would have produced if I had been going on with the inquiry. They take great credit for having called all these witnesses, and I must admit that any evidence they have in this book such as I have told you, came out of the witnesses whose names I sent them. But, Sir, I gave them a list of documents that I recommended them to produce, and they did not produce them at all. They did not order them to be produced. They only ordered the documents to be produced which bore Sir Adolphe Caron's signature which were in Mr. Thomas McGreevy's hands and which related to this general election fund. I contend, Sir, that if the counsel had been doing their duty, when Sir Adolphe Caron swore that he was jointly responsible with the member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) in all the expenditure of that fund, and when Mr. McGreevy swore that it was Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir Hector Langevin who were responsible; then, in order to show the connection of Sir Adolphe Caron with this election fund they should have called for all these documents. They did not, however. But, Sir, just to show you how important it would have been to have called for those documents, although not as exact legal evidence, I will just read you one of them. I do not think anybody will dispute its authenticity, because there is a gentleman in the House who, I am sure, will acknowledge his signature in a moment. This is a photograph copy of a letter marked "private":

MY DEAR MCGREEVY,—Mr. Valin has come. He says that he wants more help for his legal expenses. Do what you think proper and necessary, and send him for any more to Senator Ross. This county is a very hard one.

Yours truly,
HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

Quebec, 17th February, 1887.

Received, \$500.—P. D. VALIN.

I merely introduce this, not to call it legal evidence in the case, but to show how careful we must be not to charge Senator Ross with not having given more than \$25,000 on that occasion, seeing what enormous subsidies he and his railroad got following that election.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to

say a word on this. As this does not form part of the evidence that has been brought before the House, but is outside of the record altogether, I think the hon. gentleman might have left it out, and attacked me at another time, if he thought proper. But about this, I would explain at once what was meant when I said that Mr. Valin, if he required more than could be given for his legal expenses, should apply to Mr. Ross. It was this—and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman did not know what answer there was in regard to that. Mr. Valin was in partnership with Mr. Ross in ship-building and in owning ships which navigated outside of Canada on the Atlantic and elsewhere, and therefore this went at once to show that Mr. Valin, if he wanted money, should go to the man with whom he was in partnership, and not come to me or to any other person to ask for money that could not be given him.

Mr. EDGAR. I hope I have not hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings by producing that letter. I would not have produced it unless it had relation to Mr. Ross and Mr. Ross's contributions for the elections of 1887. I have here a small bundle of photographs of the hon. gentleman's signature, which I could produce if he desired to see them or if we were going outside of the record. But I do not produce them to-day, though I may do so on another occasion. I only brought this forward because I thought it was entirely apropos of the occasion. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Valin and his partner had means of their own for his election; but he will observe in that receipt that the general fund gave Mr. Valin \$500 anyway, and he was referred to Mr. Ross for more. The general fund, which amounted, as I could show by papers in my desk, to nearly \$100,000, was not to be drawn on for more than \$500 for Mr. Valin; but he was to go outside for more. That shows the hard stress and the great fight which they must have had in that election, when the general fund was not sufficient. Now, although Mr. Ross appeared to Sir Adolphe Caron to be the donor of that \$25,000—in fact, he always thought so, he says, until the other day at the inquiry—it is a very extraordinary and very interesting thing for the House to ascertain how Mr. Ross managed to recoup himself for that \$25,000 in addition to getting it out of the Dominion subsidies. Why, Sir, he charged it directly to Mr. Beemer, whose ability to pay his obligations to Mr. Ross was, of course, so much reduced. Now, I do not claim that Sir Adolphe Caron got it from Mr. Beemer. Far be it from me to suggest anything of the kind, because Mr. Beemer has denied it, and Sir Adolphe Caron has also denied it. Sir Adolphe Caron has admitted that he got it from Mr. Ross, and I am sure that is quite enough for the purposes of this inquiry. I think, however, that the dealings of Mr. Beemer with this particular \$25,000 throw an interesting side-light upon the whole Ross-Caron transaction, and show

the tone of the contractors—their ideas with reference to their obligations to assist Governments who have subsidies to give. Now, this is Mr. Beemer's story. He says that Mr. Ross sent for him and told him, just previous to the elections of 1887, that the friends in Quebec wanted some contributions to the election fund, and Beemer gave his note for \$25,000 to Ross, which Ross discounted, and which Beemer ultimately after a good many renewals, paid. Now, Beemer says, at page 156, that Ross asked it because the members of the fund were asking him for assistance. He is careful to say that Mr. Ross did not tell him that Sir Adolphe Caron wanted it, and Mr. Beemer does not remember Sir Adolphe Caron ever talking about it: he is very clear about that. But in his cash account, at page 556 of the exhibits, you will see some extraordinary entries, which he says he made himself. For instance, the first item is: "28th June, 1887; extraordinary account; paid Ross & Co.'s note, on account G. E. F., dated 3rd February, 1887, A. P. C., \$5,000." Then he gives another one: "On account of note of 18th February, for \$5,000; on account of G. E. F. and A. P. C." Then there is a sum of money, \$5,000, "G. E. F." and then \$5,000 on account of "G. E. F., A. P. C.," and so he goes on to the fifth one for \$2,500 on account of "G. E. F." and then there is another one. I do not think that the Finance Minister was down in that part of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no bank account anywhere.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Beemer most positively told us that the "A. P. C." had nothing to do with any contribution between the parties, so that even if "G. E. F." did mean the Finance Minister, instead of the General Election Fund, as Mr. Beemer explained, it would not implicate him in any way whatever, because "A. P. C." does not implicate Sir Adolphe Caron. Mr. Beemer explained that "A. P. C." and "G. E. F.," meant Sir Adolphe Caron and General Election Fund, but that he simply did that to divide the accounts, as, he says, Sir Adolphe Caron was head and front of the Quebec district. Fancy a man being the head and front of a district and getting into such a scrape as that. See how dangerous it is to be the wire-puller of a province. Of course, when Senator Ross told him that the members of the fund required this subscription, and that their friends in Quebec at another time required that subscription. I wonder was it necessary for Mr. Ross to tell Mr. Beemer any more about Sir Adolphe Caron, or if it was necessary for Sir Adolphe Caron to tell Mr. Beemer who wanted it. It just shows, however, the masterly position which Mr. Ross occupied in the whole affair, when, as Mr. Beemer says, although Mr. Ross simply told him to give the notes and he would get them discounted, and although there was no arrangement made as

to who would pay, Beemer paid them without a word of protest. He says so at page 187. That shows he was absolutely in the power of Mr. Ross, and that Mr. Ross was the man who was entitled to everything that Mr. Beemer had—to the subsidies at any rate that he had—and that Mr. Beemer was a mere tool in the matter. No doubt Sir Adolphe Caron went to the right man. No doubt when he went to Senator Ross, he went to the master and not the man. However, Senator Ross knew his man, too, when he approached Mr. Beemer in that way, because Mr. Beemer tells us very frankly, at page 132, that he was not a politician, that he was not even a British subject, that he was doing business on a commercial basis—promissory notes and so on. And he says he did not interfere with politics. Of course not. But he also adds, “I must say this, that I did not think a change of Government would be beneficial.” I do not suppose he would. Things have been going on so delightfully in the way of subsidies that I think he was about right, and that a change of Government would not be beneficial to him. And, remember, he gave \$30,000 altogether. This \$25,000 is not the only amount shown in this cash account of Mr. Beemer. I will draw attention to the additional sums. There was an extraordinary account in 1890, in which he paid \$1,000 on the Merchants Bank and another \$1,000 on the same bank, both of which he identified “re A. P. C.” in 1890, and he explained later on that these sums went to a by-election in Montmorency in which Mr. Desjardins was running. But Mr. “A. P. C.” in some accidental way got mixed up with that too. A further extraordinary account shows three items of \$1,000, which, he says, would seem to have been paid to the Chicnic Hardware Company in 1892. Those were for subscriptions which he made for the elections of 1891, and Mr. Beemer tells us that Chicnic, one of the firm, was the treasurer of the fund in 1891. Mr. McGreevy having ceased to occupy that dignified position, Mr. Chicnic took his place, and the head and front of the Quebec district, of course, had charge of everything there, and I think it a very extraordinary thing, as I read that evidence, that some questions were not propounded by the counsel for the prosecution, following up the gifts of that \$2,000 and \$3,000 by Mr. Beemer, to see whether the head and front of the Quebec district had not something to do with it, which was the inquiry before the Royal Commission. However, they thought it was not their duty to proceed so far as that. Now, Mr. Beemer, after giving \$30,000 altogether, explained that he believed the Conservative Government was a good Government. Of course, he had no prejudices, he was not a British subject, he was only doing business on a commercial basis, and he approached the subject with an absolutely unbiassed mind, and he says: “I like their policy of advancement—\$1,000,000 advancement to

Mr. EDGAR.

the Lake St. John Railway—and I believe it worth sustaining in my humble way”—\$30,000 being the modest and humble way he proposed to sustain the policy of the Government, whose advanced ideas he liked. Then he gives his reason for not having subscribed in 1882. He is very frank, and I like his style of giving evidence. At page 154, he is asked if he had subscribed to the general election fund in 1882, and what was his answer? “My contract, said he, did not commence here until 1883. Why should I?” That settled the whole question. The advancement evidently was on the contract. The idea of asking him to contribute—a man who did business on a commercial basis—when he had not a contract. The idea was preposterous. The whole business about the marking of these initials, “A. P. C.” in 1887 and 1890, and all through, up to that time, is very puzzling. Sir Adolphe Caron, according to the evidence, did not actually and personally come into communication with Mr. Beemer, and, therefore, he must have hypnotized Mr. Beemer, for how otherwise could Mr. Beemer have put those initials on the account? The invisible influence of the great head of Quebec must have permeated the whole district and forced Mr. Beemer to put these initials in his cash-book. Well, now, I think it is too bad, after all, for Mr. Beemer to have done so, when Sir Adolphe Caron was so utterly innocent of any connection with Mr. Beemer or these funds. I think it was cruel, when Sir Adolphe Caron had never even asked him to contribute a cent at any time of his existence: I think it was very unfair of Mr. Beemer to have done anything of the kind. Let us look at some of the circumstances attendant upon this gift of \$25,000 by Mr. Ross to Sir Adolphe Caron. Was this an open, fair transaction, or was it a secret, concealed transaction? Why, Sir, if they had not wanted to hide it from the world we would not have found that Mr. Ross concealed even from Mr. Beemer the fact that he was going to give this money to Sir Adolphe Caron. We would not have found, as the fact was, that Mr. Ross concealed this from his confidential clerk, Mr. Geggie, as Mr. Geggie swears at page 177. And, Sir, if it had been an open, honest transaction we would have found an entry in Mr. Ross's books showing where the money went, that it went to Sir Adolphe Caron or to an election fund. But, Sir, there was no entry of the kind. The clerk from whom the truth was concealed did make an entry on his own account, as he says at page 189. And what was that entry, Sir? It was to charge all this \$25,000 up to subsidy account, No. 2, Lake St. John. He charged it straight into the subsidy account, like a man: but afterwards, when Mr. Beemer was made by Mr. Ross to pay these notes, of course it had to be taken out of that account and settled by cash by Mr. Beemer. But I am talking now of the concealment at the time and of the

surroundings of it. Why, Sir, did Mr. Ross, who was dealing in very large sums of money, not sign his cheque? Did he give his cheque for this amount? No, Sir. He had the money, as Sir Adolphe Caron tells us, in bank bills. And, Sir, he placed this swag in the pure hands of the Minister of Militia, the Privy Councillor, the K.C.M.G., who could not trust anybody in Quebec to get that money, but had to take it in his own hands, those filthy bills, probably twos and ones, to suit the capacity of the electors—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, no; they wanted fives.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps fives. And what did he do with it? He carried it himself, as he says, and placed it in the immaculate hands of Mr. Thomas McGreevy. This is what Sir Adolphe Caron says himself, at page 224:

Q. You say you got these different sums of money, amounting in all to \$25,000 from the Hon. Mr. Ross himself?—A. I did.

Q. Personally?—A. Personally.

Q. In what form?—A. In bank bills.

Q. And you took it in that form to Mr. McGreevy?—A. Yes; I drove from his office to Mr. McGreevy's. The amount never left my hands until it was deposited into the hands of Mr. McGreevy.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it took five trips to do this. He had to make five special visits to Mr. Ross to get his bank bills from him, and five special trips to Mr. McGreevy. How dignified were these secret trips of the Minister of Militia, conveying this reptile fund from Mr. Ross in bills to Mr. Thos. McGreevy up Mountain Hill. Five separate trips! What a beautiful sight it must have been! They did not dare to use cheques. They were evidently conscious of guilt the whole three of them, Mr. Ross, who gave these bills, Sir Adolphe Caron, who carried the swag in bills, and Mr. McGreevy, who received it in bills, and, I believe, distributed the same. Now, Sir, who disbursed this money which had been got under these extraordinary circumstances by a Minister of the Crown? It was disbursed on an elaborate system. Mr. McGreevy had the money in his hands in bills, and he says, at page 162, that he paid it out in bills. He never gave a cheque. Oh, no; he knew better! Mr. Ross would not give a cheque; Sir Adolphe Caron would not give a cheque, and would not receive one; Mr. Thos. McGreevy would not give a cheque, and would not receive one. They had to pay all in bills to cover up their tracks. Mr. McGreevy says he paid out no money except on order. Now these sums were controlled in Mr. McGreevy's hands by Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir Hector Langevin. Sir Adolphe Caron swears there was a triumvirate and not only two. He says, at page 228: No amount was ever given out "until we three agreed." Therefore I say Sir Adolphe Caron was responsible for the whole sum, and what I contended a moment before was that the counsel for the Crown should, under these

circumstances, have insisted upon the production of all the vouchers from Mr. McGreevy in connection with that fund and should have found out where the money came from and what Sir Adolphe Caron had to do with it. Now, Sir, I observed among the orders produced with the name of Sir Adolphe Caron that some of them bear no date; but that makes no difference, Sir, because I will show you they must have been all for the election of 1887. For this reason: Mr. McGreevy swears at page 161 that he only acted as treasurer in the general elections of 1882 and 1887. And he also swears that Sir Adolphe Caron had nothing to do with the election of 1882. Therefore, the only election with which Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. McGreevy had to do jointly in this way was the election of 1887, and therefore the orders which Mr. McGreevy produced, and which he swears, though they were not dated, belonged to 1887. Now, Sir, I would like to inquire for a moment how the head and front of the Quebec district treated his own county. I find, at page 167, he gave \$500; at page 168, he gave \$150; on the same page, \$2,000; again on the same page, \$200 more, and, on the same page, \$400 more; on page 171, \$500; on page 174, \$200; on page 167, \$150. I find that on page 69 there is a mistake in the transcribed evidence and in the printed evidence, for an order, No. 9, which is put down there, on page 168, for \$100, is really \$1,000. It was also stated as \$1,000 in the Votes and Proceedings of 10th June, to which I referred the Royal Commissioners in my letter; and I also have here a photograph of the document itself: "Received from the Hon. T. McGreevy, \$1,000 for legal expenses, county of Quebec. Adolphe P. Caron." So that, if it is not \$100, it is another \$1,000. But, if it is \$100, the sum will only be increased by \$300. If it is not, here is another \$1,000, over Sir Adolphe Caron's signature, and I will be glad to send the photograph to him or to anybody who wishes to see it. Therefore, we find his orders on Mr. McGreevy, apart from some others, of which I have photographs here, and which were not produced by Mr. McGreevy, amounting to \$5,100—\$5,100 in Quebec county out of the general fund—I suppose, for expenses; but we will see about that. Now, I have no doubt that a Minister of the Crown would get something out of his own pocket, not out of Mr. Ross's pocket, or out of the general election fund; he would give something. I dare say, out of his own pocket for his own election expenses. However, supposing he did not; supposing he only gave this \$5,100. Now, the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 8, section 118, provide that election payments are to be made only through agents; and they also provide that any person who makes them otherwise, is guilty of a misdemeanour. Now, not one of all these payments appear on their face to be made through an agent. What did the

agent, whose name does not appear in any of these orders, return as the total amount of election expenses in that campaign in the county of Quebec? Mr. A. J. Turcotte was Sir Adolphe Caron's agent on that occasion, and he returned and published the election expenses in this way: "Personal expenses of candidate, \$58; expenses of his agent, \$846.46." Very particular about cents, you will observe, Mr. Speaker. In all, \$904.46. Well, Sir, we have his own orders on the general fund for that election, for legitimate purposes, he is careful to say, of course, of \$5,100, leaving a good deal more than \$4,000 paid out by him, with his own hand, for his own election, besides some that we do not know about; and for that the Minister of the Crown is liable, in face of the Statutes, which he has sworn to uphold, to be tried for a misdemeanour. Is that fitting conduct for a Minister of the Crown—over-riding the law, not even appearing to obey the law? But we know perfectly well that was the reason which influenced him in giving the money received from Mr. Ross, in bills to Mr. McGreevy, and Mr. McGreevy paying it out in bills; so that we have no trace or track of it. If we had not these documents, and if these documents had not been before the Commission, being brought there by Mr. McGreevy, we would never have heard a word of these legitimate expenses at the election by that Minister. So much for the Lake St. John Railway and the connection of Sir Adolphe Caron with the subsidies, and the Construction Company, and Mr. Ross, and Mr. Beemer. There was another subject of inquiry, that relating to the Temiscouata Railway Company. I want to say, at the start, that Sir Adolphe Caron's connection with that, I will not say was not so intimate, but has not been proved by that Blue-book to be so intimate, as it was with the other railway which I have already discussed; and, therefore, I shall not give a great deal of time to that subject. Sir Adolphe Caron had some connection with it, and I shall refer to a number of little incidents which are proved in the Blue-book relating to the Temiscouata Railway, which throw a great deal of light upon the idea of railway contractors and the recipients of subsidies, as to what they ought to do about election times. Now, Mr. J. J. Macdonald became contractor to complete this railway in 1886, and he received, of Dominion subsidies that have been voted for it, \$498,000. He also received some provincial subsidies, and he also received, under his contract, which is exhibit "A R M 1," at page 582, a municipal subsidy of \$25,000 from Fraserville. Those were all received by him and put into the same pot. Well, he made an agreement with Mr. A. R. Macdonald, who was connected with the old company. Mr. A. R. Macdonald swears, at page 191, that Mr. J. J. Macdonald told him that he had used \$25,000, the amount of the Fraserville subsidy, for political purposes. Now, J. J.

Mr. EDGAR.

Macdonald gave us some explanation about that. It took him a long time to decide whether he would answer, but ultimately he decided to answer. Unfortunately, the agreement connected with that was not to be found. It was supposed to be in England; therefore, we have to take the verbal evidence given by these gentlemen of its contents. Mr. J. J. Macdonald swears, in substance, to the agreement at page 208 of the evidence. He said, referring to the discussion with A. R. Macdonald:

I said we had to help our friends during the progress of the work. I proposed that that amount should be left for that purpose, and if there was anything left after we got through, that he could have it.

This evidence is restated by Mr. Macdonald three or four times, at pages 207, 208 and 209. He was asked what subscriptions he had given for the elections of 1887, and he said he had given two or three small amounts, and one large one. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in this contract which J. J. Macdonald received from the Temiscouata Railway, he not only received the existing subsidies, but he took a power of attorney to collect and receive all Dominion subsidies to be hereafter granted, and with that object in view, possibly, he may have subscribed, as he says, in 1887, one amount of seven or eight thousand dollars, he could not say which. Now, it would be very interesting indeed if the counsel for the prosecution had inquired where this \$7,000 or \$8,000 went; but they apparently did not think it wise to press for information on that point. We know that Sir Adolphe Caron himself in his evidence, at page 227, says he did not get any money from J. J. Macdonald, but he suggested that if J. J. Macdonald gave anything he must have given his contribution to the general fund. Of course, we know who were the controllers of the general fund, and therefore I think it is most extraordinary that counsel did not get a little more information as to where that \$7,000 or \$8,000 went. As to the smaller amount, Mr. J. J. Macdonald was not even asked about it. However, when Mr. Macdonald was pressed to say whether Sir Adolphe Caron had asked him for any election contributions, he said that in 1890, at the general election, Sir Adolphe Caron did ask him to assist. He said after this, and when he had said he would assist, that a party drew on him for \$2,000. Now, Sir, we are not told, no interest is taken in inquiring as to who this party was. No questions were asked on that point. How careful, lenient and polite the counsel for the prosecution were for the feelings of the Minister, how zealous they were to carry out the inquiry under the commission, when they did not even ask where the money went for which Sir Adolphe Caron had asked. But, of course, Mr. Macdonald said it was quite natural for him to assist at elections. And why? He gives his reason: Because he was "a loyal Conservative right

through." We have had a good many reasons given by different gentlemen for contributing; some were doing business on a commercial basis and receiving subsidies, and so supported the Government; others were strong believers in the National Policy, but this gentleman gave as his reason that he was a loyal Conservative right through, and of course he gave money to elections. According to his own statement, and according to A. R. Macdonald's statement, he expended for political purposes during the progress of the work, \$25,000. He told us also that he paid \$2,000. Were these different amounts, or were the \$8,000 and the \$2,000 included in the \$25,000? We don't know. At all events \$25,000 at least were paid by him for political purposes during the progress of the work. Sir Adolphe Caron said that if Mr. J. J. Macdonald gave anything it went into the general fund. We must assume that it went into the general fund. There was Sir Adolphe Caron's connection with it, as well as his demand on Mr. Macdonald for a contribution, which resulted in a party drawing on him for \$2,000. Twenty-five thousand dollars appears to be the regular round figure for railway people to pay who are expecting subsidies. Was this little contribution from Mr. Macdonald although not given directly into the hands of the Minister, as Mr. Ross's amount was altogether fruitless, and did it not produce some results? Why, of course it did, because in 1888 the Government voted \$100,000 to the Edmundston branch, in 1890 they voted a further sum of \$51,200, and even last session—1892—against some protest made by me in this House, they voted \$21,600, so that Mr. Macdonald did not go away empty-handed. And that shows the general idea which he and other contractors, recipients of subsidies, had respecting their duties towards the general election fund. I think I have shown very clearly and from the hard facts established by this evidence that Sir Adolphe Caron was deeply interested as a shareholder and as a director in the construction company, and that he was voting enormous subsidies from year to year for the benefit of that company. That was bad enough for a member of Parliament; and I say it was disgraceful for a Minister of the Crown. Then I have shown beyond peradventure that this Minister of the Crown was extorting and accepting the huge sum of \$25,000 from Mr. Ross, who was more interested than any one living man in getting the subsidies for the Lake St. John Railway, and that I hold to be a direct bribe from him to the Minister, asked for and accepted. It must have been in that shape and form, although the words may not have been said—the act was there, the result followed, the subsidies were received in return for that gift to the extent of more than a quarter of a million dollars. Again, I have shown a close connection with the sum of \$25,000 or \$30,000 which J. J. Macdonald, the appli-

cant for subsidies to the Temiscouata Railway, gave for election purposes during the progress of the work. Then I have shown, which is as bad as any part of this horrible history, the Minister's direct and personal dealing with the distribution of this reptile fund, and taking advantage of it to break the law in his own constituency by violating the statute which provided that expenses should go to agents; and I could show, if the vouchers I had suggested had been called for, that in nearly every constituency in the Quebec district the law was broken in the same respect. But that is not the subject for the consideration of the House to-day. There are a number of these things and other things which may hereafter be brought before the attention of the House, but, as I said, I will confine myself entirely to the covers of this blue-book to-night. Now, Sir, I ask the House calmly and dispassionately whether this Minister is not deserving of censure. If the evidence shows it, I want to know then why was he made a new adviser of the Crown in January last, when this evidence shows what I have pointed out to the House by page and paragraph, line upon line. I say, Sir, that the Royal Commission submitted the evidence contained in this blue-book to the Government on the 24th November last as appears by the report in this blue-book, so that the Government knew then, all that we know to-day. I say besides, that the inquiry was public, and the prosecuting counsel was directly under the control of the Minister of Justice, who in January last called Sir Adolphe Caron back into the councils of the country at a time, when Sir Adolphe Caron was as much out of the Cabinet as I am out of it to-day. I say, Sir, that while the Premier is undoubtedly chiefly responsible for this action; every single one of his colleagues, by accepting office with Sir Adolphe Caron, with the evidence before the Minister, in the hands of the Secretary of State, assumed and hold to-day the same responsibility for the acts of the Postmaster-General. However, let the Ministers take their course. Parliament has something to say in this matter. Parliament has its own responsibility to Canada, and we individual members have each our own responsibility to our constituents. Let me ask you honestly now as fellow-members: Will it be conducive to the fair fame of Canada, if we approve of the Postmaster-General's conduct. Imagine the scorn of the people of England when they hear that the Parliament of Canada has approved of such things, and the contemptuous pity with which they will speak of the colonial Parliament that will whitewash such a Minister. The members of the House all know that I am speaking the truth. They all know that what I say is true, and no matter how they will vote, I am sure that when they read that evidence they must be satisfied that my words are correct and true. I believe that when the public read that evidence, they will also know that my conclu-

sions are correct. Surely, Sir, we are not to ask alone what are the opinions of the voters in the Liberal constituencies of this Dominion. Surely we are not to ask them alone to join in condemning wholesale bribery by a Minister. If it is nothing more than wholesale bribery it is that at least. I say, Sir, God help Canada if the Conservative electors do not take that view of it too. Twenty years ago the Conservatives in this House took a view of that kind and turned the Government out, and the electors of the country took that view of a certain transaction at the same time, and turned the Government out. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that in this inquiry, with which my name has been connected for a year or so, I have received encouragement from many and many a staunch Conservative who never gave assistance to the Reform party. I have been told by many and many of them that they would not assume the responsibility for such conduct as the public press had shown to be the conduct of the Postmaster-General, and as this blue-book absolutely proves to-day. And, Sir, I have no doubt that there are many and many scores and thousands of Conservatives in the Dominion who take that view of the case, and who will sustain that view by their votes. At any rate, if this House whitewashes such a Minister, I am satisfied that the day will come, when on the very first occasion when the people of Canada shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon this action, they will reverse the verdict of this House, if it should prove to be a whitewashing verdict. Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Borden :

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof :—

"That Mr. Speaker do not leave the Chair, but that it be declared that in the opinion of this House, the evidence taken by the Royal Commission appointed last session to inquire into certain charges made against the Hon. Sir A. P. Caron, K.C.M.G., M.P., which was reported to the Government on the 24th November last, and is now laid before us established facts which should have prevented the subsequent appointment of Sir A. P. Caron to be an adviser of the Crown, and also renders it highly improper that he should continue to hold such office."

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a very great deal of attention to the remarks that have just fallen from the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and I must say, that the course of his speech very much maligned the introductory sentences by which he opened his discourse. He told us that he was going to deal with the subject in an impartial spirit, and that he was going to confine himself to what was within the two covers of the book which has been laid upon the Table, and which contains the evidence that was adduced before the Royal Commission appointed by the Government in obedience to the Order of the House. After having made that declaration, he commenced by telling us, that although he could not com-

Mr. EDGAR.

plain, and did not complain of the conduct of the commissioners, who had given great scope—and he might very well say so indeed—to the examination which was conducted before them, yet, he could not say so much with reference to the learned gentlemen who had been appointed to conduct that prosecution, and he felt it was within his power to show, and that he intended to show before he resumed his seat, that they had fallen far short of their duty indeed, and that they had not carried on this investigation in a manner to bring out all the facts and circumstances within their reach, if they had sought for them. As a member of the Bar of Quebec, and as a confrère of both of these gentlemen who conducted the inquiry, I regret exceedingly that any such aspersion should have been made upon the character of either one or the other. Mr. Archibald, a Queen's counsel, and the leading counsel in that investigation, holds a first-class position at the Bar of Quebec. He is an honourable man, he is a man who stands high in his profession, he is a professor of law in the McGill University, and he has the confidence of some of the most prominent members in this House for whom he has acted as counsel, amongst these, I think, I may mention my hon. friend from Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith). He has acquired a proud position at the bar, and, whether speaking of him or of my learned friend, the junior counsel, Mr. Bisailon, who was the partner of the present chief justice of the province of Quebec, Sir Alexandre Lacoste, I feel that the hon. gentleman has done them a gross injustice—an injustice which I resent here in their name and in the name of the bar of the province from which I come. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has given, as one evidence that these gentlemen did not perform their duty, that they did not go still further into the question of the Fraserville subsidy. Why, Sir, let any lawyer read this blue-book and see how that evidence was brought in ; for the hon. judges did not merely allow questions with regard to Dominion subsidies, which alone were implicated in this investigation, but they allowed the inquiry to extend to provincial subsidies, and the very subsidy there spoken of was a municipal subsidy, which they had no power to investigate at all. After the door was opened, not only with regard to subsidies given by the Dominion, but with regard to every subscription for election purposes, the hon. commissioners were determined that nothing should be left uninvestigated ; and the fact that the learned gentlemen who represented the Crown brought out such evidence shows that they were in earnest in the investigation which they were charged to carry on. My hon. friend said that he was going to be exceedingly impartial in this matter, that he did not intend to go outside of the cover of the blue-book in addressing the House to-night. But, to show how utterly impartial he was, to show how

he treated it as a question of law, he entertained us with something about the cotton combines, which, of course, have a great deal to do with the subject now before the House. He told us that he was not going to go outside of the record; and yet, one of the very first things he did was to produce a letter written by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), which was not published in the blue-book at all, not having been admitted in the investigation, which shows that there was nothing in the covers of the book which would justify him in the conclusion at which he attempted to arrive. He told us that he was going to be perfectly fair and candid, that he was not going to attempt, for one moment, to bias the judgment of the hon. members of this House; but, in dealing with this evidence, he stigmatized the conduct of a man who had put in his book an entry regarding money which he had paid, holding that the entry indicated what the payment of that money was for; and in the next breath he denounced the gentleman in whose book there was no entry. There was an entry—it was disgraceful; there was no entry—it was equally disgraceful. It did not make any difference to the hon. gentleman; he was bound to find from first to last that this was a disgraceful business; and, no matter how contradictory his statements might be, he was perfectly willing to make them in order to arrive at the conclusion to which he wished to lead this House. He tells us that the Prime Minister should not have called the hon. gentleman to his councils. Well, at the time of the formation of his Government, in the beginning of this year, that evidence had been taken. That evidence had been produced in the Department of Justice; and the Minister of Justice, no doubt, having read it then, came to the conclusion, which I am satisfied the majority of this House will come to and which every man in this country will come to who will take the trouble to read the evidence, that the charges made by the hon. gentleman were not proved in any particular, but were, on the contrary, disproved from beginning to end. Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a few remarks also with regard to what took place in this House in connection with this investigation. But we must not forget that if the hon. gentleman complains now that he has not had everything his own way in this matter, at the close of last session, he told us that he himself had chosen his tribunal—that he was going to take the public press as the tribunal where this evidence was to be brought forward, and that he was going to convict the hon. Postmaster-General of the crimes of which he had charged him—not upon the floor of Parliament, not in the court-house, but in the columns of the public press. A few days afterwards he launched forth all the evidence that he had, because if he had had more, naturally he would have published it; and I may say that, although he published

certain receipts for moneys paid in connection with election expenses, there was not one solitary tittle of evidence given to show that Dominion subsidies had been corruptly applied to pay election expenses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) says "hear, hear." I intend to go through this case as well as I can—not as well as it should be done, because I am not able to do it; but I intend to go through this case and to deal with it in an impartial spirit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. My hon. friend says "hear, hear," again. He does not believe it. No doubt it is hard for him to believe it, after the solemn promises that were made by the gentleman who sits beside him, and who, only a few moments ago, transgressed in such a manner. But I tell him that I will try to be more careful than the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar); and what I do say I shall not say by inference; what I do attempt to prove I shall not prove by torturing the evidence. What I shall endeavour to prove will be by quotations from the evidence itself, leaving this House and this country to judge whether I shall have made out a case or not. It may take a little time, and I have to request the kind forbearance of hon. gentlemen while I go over the evidence. But this case is one of very great importance. It is one involving the honour and the political existence of a Minister of the Crown, an old parliamentarian, one who has very many friends throughout this country. But even if he had not a single friend in this country, I think there is this to be said, that in dealing with the honour of one of our fellow members, we are not here as persecutors, we are not here as oppressors, we are not here to blacken, if blacken we could, by torturing evidence, or endeavouring to wring from it a meaning which it does not convey. I think we ought in this House to endeavour to maintain, as far as we can, the honour and the good name of those who are sent here as representatives of the people; and I regret to say that, in my estimation, fair play has not been given my hon. colleague by the hon. gentleman who has opened this case to-night. Why is the hon. gentleman so savage over this case? Why does he feel it incumbent upon him to make an attack upon the counsel who were engaged in the case? I will tell this House why it is perfectly evident. Because these gentlemen have shown up his insincerity; because they have shown up how thoroughly insincere he was in this matter. Not only did they first of all notify him that they were going on with this investigation, but they wrote him asking him for his aid and assistance, and stating they were ready to act under his instructions. It is in vain then for him to tell us that

there was no use in his placing himself under their tender mercies. He need not come here to-night and tell us what he has heard from an eye-witness. He should have been there himself and seen that the counsel performed their duties, and had they not done so he could have stood up here and denounced them for having failed to carry out the orders of this Government. But they went still further. When the hon. gentleman addressed his letter to the commissioners, later on, these gentlemen pointed out to him that his complaints were utterly groundless. Their letters were published in the public press, and confounded the hon. gentleman. I will not weary this House by reading those letters; but they are contained in this blue-book, and from the beginning to the end it will be seen that these gentlemen pointed out to him how utterly baseless were his complaints, how thoroughly the charges had been ventilated, and how they were still ready, even at the very last moment, to receive his suggestion. They told him that they had examined every witness he had asked them to call, and were ready to examine other witnesses should he name any. They left the door open for him at the last moment to come in and take part in the proceedings; they adjourned the court again in order that he might come in, but he declined. They showed him that the charges made were not confined to his own—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is responsible for the extra charges?

Mr. CURRAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman was responsible; but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was, and my hon. friend who made the first speech to-night was responsible. The hon. gentleman asks me why were more charges put in. It was because, when those charges were laid before the House, the hon. gentleman undertook to tell us what they meant. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said:

These charges point to a member of this House in his official capacity as a member of this Administration, rather than to his conduct as a member of this House. What, in effect, are the charges here made? They point to the fact that the Crown was advised to appropriate large sums of money for particular purposes, and that these moneys were diverted from these public purposes and placed in the hands of a Minister of the Crown for the purpose of corrupting the electorate in certain portions of the Dominion of Canada.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to say:

That it was further stated by the said Mr. Mills: 'There is a statement made here that this hon. gentleman, the Postmaster-General, is the Minister of the Crown who advised these subsidies being appropriated to aid these companies. There is a charge that he obtained a portion of the subsidy so voted, or its equivalent, from these companies, and used it for his own purposes in his own election, and in the elections in twenty-three constituencies in this Dominion. That charge is specific and clear enough. It is also stated that after some of these moneys were received by him this same gentleman advised the Crown to

Mr. CURRAN.

grant other subsidies to other parties, and that from these other subsidies, moneys were also obtained."

If he advised the Crown to make these appropriations, and had an understanding with one of the railway companies participating in them that these moneys, or a portion of them, should go to him, we ought to know it; we are entitled to know it.

Then the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) grew eloquent and told us that the Postmaster-General and others were guilty of a terrible conspiracy. He said:

What in the name of wonder is it that my hon. friend beside me has charged the Postmaster-General with? He has charged him in no vague language, but in terms, with being guilty of the most corrupt conspiracy, for the purpose of destroying the electoral liberties of the people of Canada, of which any adviser of the Crown can be found guilty.

And the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Edgar) said:

Those railways which are involved in this charge were aided by the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and what I complain of is the appropriation of Dominion subsidies to the Postmaster-General.

The Minister of Marine drew a nice point when he said that I did not, as I should have done, charge his colleague with public robbery. Well, I did not put it in those words but in words which I certainly intended to mean robbing the public. If it is not public robbery for a member to take moneys out of public subsidies, I would like to know what is.

So I think if I get a chance to go on and prove these charges there will be what is, under the law, a most abominable conspiracy.

All these things were incorporated in the charges. They had been uttered in speeches explanatory of the charges; they were made for the purpose of influencing the public mind of this country. The charges made by the hon. gentleman in his formal indictment were vague and definite; but the hon. gentlemen who sat on either side of my hon. friend undertook to enlighten the public, and throughout the length and breadth of Canada these words were carried to show what these charges meant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is reading an extract from my speech. I wish to call attention to the fact that that speech points to the 10th charge made by Mr. Edgar, which was eliminated from the charges referred to the committee.

Mr. CURRAN. It applies to the whole of the charges. It says: what do those charges mean? and not, what does No. 10 mean? The hon. gentleman asks what those charges mean, and he goes into them all, and we incorporated those words. However, that is not worth discussing now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why refer to it?

Mr. CURRAN. Because the hon. gentleman asked the question. The hon. gentleman may smile; but he is not smiling in his heart. He knows very well that he and his friends made a mistake, and that

having made those foolish speeches they had to answer for them. They put the load on the shoulders of their friends, and consequently he and they are responsible for what they stated in their speeches here. The hon. gentleman, after having refused to take part in this investigation, thought better of it in one way, and he wrote a postscript to his letter. He told the commissioners that he wanted to have a certain number of witnesses called. He said :

Although I have been refused the investigation I demanded, and while I declined to take any part in this reference for the reasons stated, yet I take this occasion to make public a list of witnesses whom I would have called had I been given the opportunity to prove my charges, namely :—

1. Sir Adolphe Caron, whom I would have also called upon to produce for inspection his bank books, cheque books and books of account, during the period from 1882 to 1891.

2. The Secretary of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Construction Company, and the production by him of all contracts, sub-contracts, and agreements in connection with the construction of or financing for the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway ; also the minute books, and books of account of the company, and any books showing the receipt or transfer of any Dominion subsidies.

3. The Secretary of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, and the production of books showing dates of the receipt and payment or disposal of Dominion subsidies.

4. The Secretary of the Témiscouata Railway Company, and the production of books showing the dates of the receipt and payment or disposal of Dominion subsidies.

5. The Hon. Thomas McGreevy, whom I would also have required to produce all books, bank books, cheque books, cheque stubs, receipts, letters, orders, papers and vouchers relating to the receipt and to the payments of election expenditures while he acted as political treasurer of the Conservative party in the district of Quebec.

6. J. J. Macdonald, whom I would also have required to produce all agreements, correspondence and papers of all kinds relating to the purchase by him of his interest in the Témiscouata Railway, and all vouchers, notes or cheques connected with, and books containing entries relating to the payment by him of the consideration therefor, and all vouchers, notes or cheques connected with, or books containing entries relating to the payment of moneys to aid in the election of Sir Adolphe Caron or other members or supporters of the Government of which he was a member since the said J. J. Macdonald acquired an interest in said railway and became beneficially interested in the Dominion subsidies to said railway.

7. J. Israël Tarte, whom I would also require to produce all agreements, correspondence, papers, vouchers, or documents of any kind relating to the sale to J. J. Macdonald of an interest in the Témiscouata Railway, or to the payment of the consideration therefor, or to contributions by any person beneficially interested in the subsidies to said railway for election purposes, to aid in the election to the House of Commons of Sir Adolphe Caron or other members or supporters of the Government of which he was a member.

8. Dr. Grandbois, M.P., whom I would also require to produce all agreements, correspondence, papers, vouchers or documents of any kind relating to the sale to J. J. Macdonald of an interest in the Témiscouata Railway, or to the payment of the consideration therefor, or to contributions by any person beneficially interested in the subsidies to said railway for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Com-

mons of Sir Adolphe Caron or other members or supporters of the Government of which he was a member.

9. A. R. Macdonald, whom I would also require to produce all agreements, correspondence, papers, vouchers or documents of any kind relating to the sale to J. J. Macdonald of an interest in the Témiscouata Railway, or to the payment of the consideration therefor, or to contributions by any persons beneficially interested in the subsidies to said railway for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of Sir Adolphe Caron or other members or supporters of the Government of which he was a member.

10. The representatives of the estate of the late Hon. J. G. Ross, of Quebec, and the production of all agreements, vouchers, papers, correspondence connected with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, or the construction thereof, or the financing therefor, and also all notes or vouchers, books containing entries, relating to payments to or for Sir Adolphe Caron while the late J. G. Ross was connected with the construction of, or financing for, the said railway or beneficially interested in the Dominion subsidies thereto.

11. H. J. Beemer, and the production by him of all contracts, agreements, books, papers or correspondence relating to the construction of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, or the financing therefor, and all notes, cheques, cheque stubs, vouchers, bank pass-books, books of account or any other papers, letters or documents relating to or containing entries relating to the payments of money to Sir Adolphe Caron or relating to contributions for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of Sir Adolphe Caron, or other members or supporters of the Government of which he was a member.

12. The manager of the Quebec Bank at Quebec, and the production of all books showing the discount and deposit and general accounts of Sir Adolphe Caron and Thomas McGreevy, during the period from 1882 to 1891, while subsidies were being granted for the construction of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and the Témiscouata Railway.

13. The Manager of the Banque du Peuple at Quebec, and the production of all books showing the discount and deposit and general accounts of Sir Adolphe Caron and Thomas McGreevy, during the period from 1882 to 1891, while subsidies were being granted for the construction of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and the Témiscouata Railway.

14. In the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of 10th June, 1892, in a Notice of Motion given by Sir Richard Cartwright, are to be found copies of letters, receipts and other documents which seem to have a direct and essential relevancy to the charges which I made in the House of Commons. In case of failure to secure the production of the originals from Mr. Thomas McGreevy, I would have called upon Mr. John Alexander, of the Engraving Bureau, 16 Adelaide Street, West, Toronto, to produce and prove the photographic facsimiles thereof which he had executed.

J. D. E.

Every one of those witnesses was called, and some other witnesses were called as well, because the evidence tended to show that perhaps other gentlemen might be able to reveal something. I take this occasion to repeat that this commission, although confined to the subsidies given by this Dominion, went beyond that. They went into provincial subsidies and municipal subsidies, and any impartial man going through that evidence must come to the conclusion that, instead of attempting to screen the Postmaster-General in that investigation, neither the lawyers for the prosecution nor the com-

missioners showed the slightest disposition to do so, but, on the contrary, felt it to be their duty to make a most thorough and searching investigation into every description of electioneering expenses. The charges, as the hon. gentleman has said, arose out of the subsidies granted to two railway companies, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company and the Témiscouata Railway Company. In the charges of the hon. member for West Ontario, he commenced by stating :

1. That during each of the years 1882 to 1891 inclusive, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received by way of bonus from the Dominion of Canada, subsidies amounting in the aggregate to upwards of \$1,000,000, which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Ministers of the Crown.

This is the first statement—that they received within this period by way of bonus, cash, upwards of \$1,000,000. Now, the proof has shown, and it is admitted by the hon. gentleman himself, that the actual subsidies of this Parliament to that railway amounted to exactly \$844,000, or \$156,000 less than the hon. gentleman alleged. But what is \$156,000 to a gentleman of his charging capacity? Now, there was the first mistake. He went on to say so again to-night, but when it comes to a statement of the figures, as produced, these are the actual sums that were paid by this Dominion. He says :

Arrangements were entered into——

I am reading from his own charges now——

—by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a construction company through or in conjunction with one H.J. Beemer, a contractor—and the said Beemer, and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies.

3. During the whole of the said period from 1882 to 1891, the Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron was, and still is, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, a member of the Canadian Government and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada.

4. That the said Sir Adolphe P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said Construction Company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

Now, it may be necessary here to state something concerning this railway company, from its inception. It is just as well to admit at once that from 1882 to 1891—we all know it—the hon. gentleman who is accused was a member of this Parliament, and of the Government of Canada, one of its Privy Councillors. And we might as well come also to the charge which is the most important one, which would be the most damaging if it were true, and upon which hon. gentlemen to-night have harped at very great length, and with very great injustice. I refer to the charge about Sir Adolphe Caron being a member of this Construction Company. One would imagine, from the statements made by the hon. gentleman, that Sir Adolphe Caron was

Mr. CURRAN.

really and truly, in his own right, a member of this Construction Company, and that he was a very prominent man in it. Now, what are the facts? Sir Adolphe Caron was there representing the firm of Andrew, Caron & Andrews, to the extent of \$2,500. That was the whole sum and substance of that firm's interest in this Construction Company. And the fact that he was there for a short time—and I will show that it was for a very short time, indeed, in a few moments—was the basis of this great outcry that has been raised. On page 98 of Mr. Scott's evidence, we find these words :

Q. Have you got any books here which will show who were the members of the Construction Company?—A. Yes, these books here will show.

Q. Will you open them at a point to show that, and mention the names of the shareholders, with the amount of stock held by each of the shareholders?—A. Yes, they are as follows:—John Ross, \$25,000; James G. Ross, \$25,000; William Withall, \$25,000; James Connolly, \$1,250; J. B. Renaud, \$5,000; William Ogden, \$2,500; Sir A. P. Caron, \$2,500.

By Mr. Justice Tait :

Q. From what period was Sir A. P. Caron a shareholder?—A. From the first; he is still a shareholder; the account was opened in 1879.

Q. He was a shareholder from the beginning of the company?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Archibald :

Q. Name the other shareholders?—A. E. Beaudet, \$3,000; Honourable I. Thibaudeau, \$2,500; Honourable P. Garneau, \$2,000; Prudent Vallée, \$500.

By Mr. Justice Tait :

Q. I suppose all these parties were shareholders in the railway company?—A. No, sir; they were not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the Construction Company?

Mr. CURRAN. They were shareholders in the Construction Company, and not in the railway company. Sir Adolphe Caron entered the Government in November, 1880, and I quote again from the evidence of Mr. Scott, at page 105 of the blue-book :

Q. I asked you, Mr. Scott, to look up the minute books of the Construction Company, of the meetings, both of the shareholders and directors, to see at what meetings Sir A. P. Caron was present. Have you done so?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got the list of those attendances?—A. I have, I can read them, they are as follows: He was present on the 14th July, 1879, at a meeting of directors; on the 6th August, 1879, meeting of directors; on 25th August, 1879, and the 16th September, 1879.

Counsel for Sir A. P. Caron objects to the attendance at meetings before 1882.

Objection reserved.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that here was the counsel objecting to anything before 1882, and that objection was overruled.

A. He was present on the 27th October, 1879, 15th November, 1879, on the 19th December, 1879, on the 20th December, 1879, 31st December, 1879, 6th Feb., 1880, 5th July, 1880, 7th July, 1880, 14th July, 1880, 16th July, 1880, 28th September, 1880, 30th Sept., 1880, on the 1st August, 1882, and at shareholders' meetings on the 9th and 10th July, 1883.

Q. Anything in 1881?—A. No, he was present on the 16th July, 1886, at a director's meeting.

Q. After 1883, he was only at two meetings of directors, and two meetings of shareholders?—A. Yes.

Now, all this shows the number of times the hon. gentleman—who had left Quebec and had come to reside in Ottawa—attended those meetings, and, after his removal, he attended by mere accident. So that, although he was there, though he was a member of the Construction Company, the sworn testimony of Mr. Scott goes to establish that he had no interest in it, took no part in it, that he knew nothing about the transactions, and that, upon these occasions when he was present, he went there to shake hands with his friends, being on a visit to Quebec during the summer months, but took no part in, and knew nothing of their proceedings. Mr. Scott goes on to speak in his evidence, on page 108, as to the political complexion of the company. One would suppose, from the speech of the hon. gentleman to-night, that this was a Conservative conspiracy, that the whole Conservative party, from top to bottom, were in it, and that nobody else could put his nose there. What do we find in the evidence :

Q. If I mistake not, I believe that you were chiefly interested in organizing that Construction Company?—A. Yes, mainly so.

Q. You had been for a great many years in the service of John Ross & Co.?—A. Yes.

Q. A brother of James Gibb Ross?—A. Yes.

Q. You organized the Construction Company in 1878?—A. Yes.

Q. And you induced people to go into that Construction Company simply because you were satisfied that the Lake St. John Railway Company never could build the road as it then stood?—A. Yes.

Q. You took into that Construction Company Mr. James Ross, Mr. William Withall, Hon. Pierre Garneau, Hon. I. Thibaudeau, Mr. James Connolly and Sir A. P. Caron?—A. Yes.

Q. Were these men chiefly of much financial means?—A. Oh, yes, the best men in town.

Q. Practically the best men of the town and out of it too?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Thibaudeau, Mr. Garneau and Mr. Connolly were men of large financial means?—A. Yes.

Q. Sir A. P. Caron at that time was member for Quebec County?—A. Yes.

Q. And the county of Quebec was largely interested in the construction of that road?—A. Yes.

Q. It ran through the county to a large extent?—A. Yes.

Q. Sir A. P. Caron was also at that time a member of the firm of Andrews, Caron & Andrews?—A. Yes.

Q. The firm of Andrews, Caron & Andrews had been solicitors for the Quebec and Gosford Railway for many years?—A. Yes.

Q. And took a lively interest in the progress of the road?—A. Very great interest; yes.

Q. All these gentlemen who went into that road put their money into it, did they not?—A. Yes.

Q. Sir A. P. Caron put in \$2,500 as representing the firm of Andrews, Caron & Andrews?—A. Yes.

Q. He has not got much of that back, has he?—A. Not a cent.

Q. The other gentlemen who went into it—Messrs. Ross, Withall, Thibaudeau, Garneau—all put their money in also?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell us how much more the Construction Company put into the road?—A. The Construction Company put in about \$450,000.

Now, I will stop here for a moment to answer the assertion made by the hon. gentleman who brought this charge. He told us that there was nothing to show that this \$450,000 went into the road at all, that it was a mere matter of agreement between the parties. I want to direct attention to the fact that Mr. Scott swears that the Construction Company actually expended about \$450,000. He goes on :

Q. And that has been the profit which they derived from their connection with it; they are out of pocket \$450,000?—A. That is about it.

Q. Tell us what the political complexion of the board of directors was—was it uniform, or was it varied in its colours?—A. We always had two colours.

Q. Mr. Thibaudeau and Mr. Connolly were both very strong Liberals and both ran as candidates for the Liberal party in the county of Quebec?—A. Yes.

Mr. Scott proceeds to tell us, on pages 112 and 113, about the action of the present Postmaster-General after he had entered the Government :

Q. Now, let us come to Sir A. P. Caron's connection with the Construction Company. As a matter of fact, who subscribed that \$2,500 worth of stock that was paid into that company in his name?—A. His firm did.

Q. What was the firm?—A. Andrews, Caron & Andrews.

Q. They subscribed and paid for the stock, and Sir A. P. Caron was there to represent their interests in the company?—A. Exactly.

Q. You have given us the dates of Sir A. P. Caron's attendances at the meeting of the board up to 1886, and I notice that from 1882 to 1886, he was present at only three meetings of the directors?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, will you tell us how many meetings there must have been from 1882 to 1891, on the average; you have one several times a month, do you?—A. Probably thirty or forty meetings each year.

Q. From 1882 to 1886, what part did Sir A. P. Caron take in the management of the affairs of the company during that time, so far as he was concerned?—A. He took no part at all.

Let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to these facts that are sworn to. Here is an hon. gentleman who has stood up in this House, and for an hour to-night has endeavoured to impress Parliament with the idea that the Postmaster-General knew all about this company, that he was cognizant of its every move and every step, that he was at their back in Ottawa whenever they needed money, that he was, from beginning to end, the moving spirit of this organization. They held thirty or forty meetings a year, from 1882 to 1891, and, during all that time, Sir Adolphe Caron was present at only three meetings. Mr. Scott goes on to say :

Q. Did he practically know anything of the business of the company or of its operation?—A. No, he could not, because he was not here.

Q. Did he take any part in the administration of the company during that time?—A. No.

Q. His attendance at those board meetings were simply what?—A. Accidentally, in most cases.

Q. And I suppose his stay at the meetings would not be very prolonged, as a rule?—A. When he did come in, he would shake hands and go out again.

Q. Still you put him down as being present?—A. Yes.

Q. His fees were large during that time as director?—A. He had one fee but he sent it back again. He would not take it.

Q. Now, you have spoken of the assistance which Sir A. P. Caron gave you at Ottawa; at the time demands were made for aid for the railway; Sir A. P. Caron was member of Parliament for the county of Quebec, and a Federal Minister from this district from 1882 to 1891?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware that the Lake St. John Railway Company found Sir A. P. Caron willing to help when they had anything to be done at Ottawa?—A. What do you mean?

Q. Did you apply to him because he was a member of your company, or because of the position he occupied as member in this district, to get his assistance at Ottawa to put your affairs through?—A. He was the member representing the county through which the railway ran.

Q. And therefore you felt you were justified in calling upon him, to give you any help that you could get to obtain these subsidies?—A. Just so.

Q. During the time that this work was in process of construction you occasionally had meetings of the members of Parliament from this district and all that sort of thing?—A. Yes.

Q. Meetings of ministers and priests and bishops to help you with their influence?—A. We got all the influence we could.

Q. You did not pay very much attention to the religion or the politics of the people you asked for help, did you?—A. No.

Q. You had members of Parliament of both political parties?—A. Both sides.

Q. In fact every one around Quebec wanted to get the road built, no matter what was their political complexion?—A. Every one helped pretty well.

Now, I think that, in view of this evidence, sworn to by Mr. Scott, I have pretty well disposed of the charge made to-night that Sir Adolphe Caron was the main mover in this Construction Company, that he was responsible for all its acts and all its management. I think we have established beyond the shadow of a doubt that he had nothing at all to do with it, and that the charge made under that head must, therefore, necessarily fall to the ground. He did not use his position as a Minister in any way derogatory to the honour and dignity of the position which he held in the Government, and the charges made under that head are utterly baseless. He did what every member of Parliament, and every Minister is obliged to do in connection with his constituency—take a legitimate interest in the affairs of his county, in the affairs of the district for which he was Minister. I defy any man, who will read that testimony from beginning to end with a desire to arrive at a fair and honest conclusion, to pronounce any other verdict than that he did not go beyond the position which he should have assumed, and that his acts were justified in every particular in that respect. We now come to the charges with reference to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company:

Mr. CURRAN.

That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from money raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same.

That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of money were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

It may be well here to say a few words about the railway company itself. The complaint was repeated by the hon. member when speaking about his charges that the exclusion of the words "persons beneficially interested" deprived him of the opportunity of making his proof, but the evidence goes to show, and there is no other proof than that adduced—because everything connected with the railway, its construction, advance of subsidies and their application has been brought out—and the only person interested throughout was Mr. J. G. Ross, because he was connected with Mr. Beemer, who was acting under contract with the Construction Company to build the road, and the Government were paying the subsidies as the road was built, on the certificate of the engineer in charge. The history of this matter was this. There was, first, the Quebec and Gosford Railway, which built a wooden railway for a distance of ten miles, towards which they received \$48,000 as a subsidy from the province of Quebec. The Construction Company already referred to, which had the corporate name of the Quebec and Lake St. John Lumbering and Trading Company, was incorporated in 1878 by provincial letters patent. It constructed forty-eight miles of road, including the ten miles built by the Gosford company. Then the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway was organized, and the Construction Company undertook to build the railway. Then the Dominion Government made the contract with the Lake St. John Railway Company. There were forty-eight miles of road then built by the Construction Company. I have already shown by the sworn evidence of Mr. Scott that \$450,000 had been expended on the road. Then they entered into the contract with Mr. Beemer, known throughout the country as one of the most prominent contractors, on 10th July, 1883, to build the balance of the road from Lake Simon to Lake St. John, a distance of 135 miles. The Construction Company transferred to Mr. Beemer all the subsidies, Dominion, provincial and municipal, and they promised their aid towards obtaining more

subsidies if they could be secured. It has been made to appear as a terrible scandal, that these gentlemen in making a contract with a public contractor to build a road on which they had expended themselves \$450,000, and felt they could not go further, should have transferred to the contractor who was to build the road all subsidies, Dominion, provincial and municipal, and promised to do the best they could to obtain further subsidies. Afterwards there was a branch projected to Chicoutimi, which made the whole contract cover a distance of 190 miles. But over and above the amount which Mr. Beemer was to receive as subsidies for the building of the road, there was a sum of \$20,000 allowed per mile in bonds; he was to get bonds for \$20,000 per mile, or £750,000 sterling. He was to recoup the Construction Company for the \$450,000 which they had expended on those forty-two miles of road out of the proceeds of these bonds and not out of the subsidies as alleged by the member for West Ontario. A great deal has been said about this scandalous transaction; but the House and the country should know what was the actual cost of the road, the amount put into the work, and so I again refer to the evidence of Mr. Scott, at page 113, where he shows that the sum of \$4,572,000 in cash was actually spent upon the construction of the road. He was asked as follows:—

Q. Will you give us figures which show the amount of money they spent or put into the construction of this road?—A. Yes, in round figures, the amount of money that has been put into this road, has been \$4,572,000.00.

Q. That is money that has actually gone into the brick, stone, mortar and clay on this road?—A. It is the actual cash in the road.

Q. To purchase the road?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, where did the money come from?—A. \$844,000.00 from the Dominion subsidy, \$1,507,000.00 from the Province, \$450,000.00 from the Construction Company, \$100,000.00 from the original Gosford shareholders, and \$1,000,000.00 from the English bondholders.

\$220,000 more were advanced by Mr. J. G. Ross to Mr. Beemer, and over and above the subsidies there was the balance of bonds, and there was along with that sum \$83,000 of Mr. Beemer's own money in excess of what he had received in subsidies and in bonds from every other source. Mr. Beemer has explained that he had made considerable money out of contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that he put into the railway. The charge that the subsidies of the Dominion, or any other subsidies, or any part of them were diverted from railway construction purposes to election purposes is proved to my mind to be utterly groundless. Every cent of that money went into the railway, and every dollar of these subsidies had to be earned before the engineer gave his certificate. The engineer's certificate that each ten miles of railway had been built had to be forwarded to Ottawa,

according to the requirements of the law, and not one dollar of the Dominion subsidy went out until it had been earned. Mr. Beemer, we are told, had this transaction with Mr. Ross. It is considered a most extraordinary occurrence that a man carrying on such an extensive work had to finance. Certainly Mr. Beemer had to do some financing. He had to obtain money, and Mr. Ross was his friend, and so he went to him and said: I will transfer to you the subsidies as earned, if you will advance me the money in the meantime. And Mr. Ross advanced the money, and paid himself out of the subsidies as earned and paid over. What does this witness Scott say? At page 115 of the evidence I find the following:

Q. Now, by what means are these payments made by the Federal Government; on what documentary evidence of the work done did the Federal Government make the advances?—A. They inspected every ten miles.

Q. When you say "they," who do you mean?—A. The engineer, Mr. Ridout.

Q. And on this report, the Government paid the money to the party to whom the subsidy had been transferred in ten-mile sections?—A. Yes.

Q. So that there was no money paid by the Federal Government out of these subsidies until after such time as the letter of the law had been complied with, in so far as the inspection was concerned?—A. No, and it was very difficult to get it then.

Q. Why do you say that?—A. They were very hard to please.

Q. You mean to say they were very particular that the work had been done and the money earned?—A. Oh, yes, the most trivial things were set up as a reason for delay. If we neglected to do the most trivial work it was not paid.

And yet we had the hon. gentleman standing here to-night for an hour and a half talking about these subsidies having been paid into the pocket of Beemer or into the pocket of Ross, the same as if the Postmaster-General, or any other member of the Government, had actually put his hand into the till, stolen the money and handed it over, as he called it, as swag to one of his confederates outside. Yet we have the proof that not one dollar of these subsidies was advanced to Beemer, or to anybody else, until every cent of it had been earned. Continuing his examination, we find the following:—

Q. To your knowledge was any application made by the company supported by Sir A. P. Caron to obtain any of these subsidies by reason of any corrupt payment, or any bargain, or any promise of any corrupt payment?—A. Not at all.

Q. Was any suggestion made at any time of anything of that sort?—A. No, never.

Q. Were your demands for subsidies generally supported by the people of this district and the people of the county of Chicoutimi?—A. Yes.

Q. Were your applications made in the regular way by correspondence with the department?—A. Yes, invariably.

Q. Nothing done outside but what appears by the official correspondence to obtain these subsidies?—A. Except personal solicitation.

Q. That personal solicitation, was it largely by petitions?—A. Yes.

Q. Deputations of public men from the district who called on the Minister of Railways at Ottawa to get this?—A. Yes.

Q. There was nothing done outside of that?—A. No.

Q. That you know of your own certain knowledge?—A. Yes.

Q. While I understand that your company has been very flush, yet you have not always had a great deal of money to throw away for elections of that sort, I presume, Mr. Scott?—A. No.

Q. Now, Mr. Scott, I want to trace this money, as far as it is possible to trace it, from the Federal exchequer into the road-bed, and I want you to give us the documents which are necessary to do that—the progress estimates, the transfers and everything else?—A. I will give you all the progress estimates that I can find.

Q. Have you got them with you?—A. They will be here in a few minutes; I have sent for them; they are all in the same form as the one you have got.

Q. You have said that there were £200,000 worth of bonds sold; who sold those bonds?—A. They were sold by Cotts & Son, of London.

Q. The proceeds of the sale were handed over to whom?—A. The proceeds of the sale were put in trust.

Q. For the benefit of?—A. For the benefit of the bondholders. That is, for the completion and equipment of the road.

Q. You said this morning that the proceeds of the sale, the amount realized upon the sale, was applied to the completion of the road. Now, what works were done by this money?—A. Here is a list; the annual report of the company; which shows the amount of expenditure of that trust fund, and which will be found on page 6 of report of the annual meeting of shareholders on the 12th May, 1892.

Q. All the payments made by the Government to the parties in exhibit J S 3, were made, I presume, on the estimates of the Government engineer?—A. Yes, on the report of inspection of the Government engineer.

Q. He also furnished to the Government the progress estimates of the work done?—A. No.

Q. The Government engineer simply came on the road and made an inspection and ascertained whether or not the work had been done in accordance with the conditions of the subsidy contract?—A. Yes, he had access, of course, to any documents that he wished, to ascertain for himself what we had done.

Q. You said that reports were made by him after careful and actual inspection?—A. I say that in this statement of moneys received from the Dominion Government, several payments appear to have been made to Ross & Company, and these payments were made to Ross & Company to recoup them for advances made to Beemer to enable him to do the work, that is, for advances on the progress estimates.

I want this part of the evidence particularly noted:

Q. That is to say that Ross did not make the advances to Beemer until such time as Beemer handed to him the progress estimates prepared by the company's engineer and certified by the directors of the Construction Company?—A. Yes, and certified as such.

There was another point to which the hon. gentleman referred, with regard to what he called the extraordinary subsidy that had been granted, and granted through the interference of the Postmaster-General. The evidence on that point is as follows:—

Q. I see here that the second item in the statement of subsidies, exhibit (J S 16) says, "Short mileage

Mr. CURRAN.

25 miles \$80,000.00"?—A. I explained that in my evidence yesterday. The first vote of the subsidy that was given stated the mileage from St. Raymond to Lake St. John to be 120 miles. That was an error on the part of the Railway Department at Ottawa; the mileage was estimated afterwards to be 145 miles, and it was corrected the following session.

Q. So that that was simply a clerical error?—A. Yes, it was; Sir Charles Tupper was then Minister of Railways. We pointed that out to him and he had it corrected next session.

Q. You discovered the error soon after the first act was passed?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that 46 Vic. so passed for the purpose of correcting that?—A. Yes.

Q. What about this additional subsidy of \$96,000 for the 32 miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway Junction; how did that come to be an additional subsidy?—A. That portion of the road had been built, but there was something to do on it and some equipment to be put on it, and we applied to the Government for a subsidy for it and they gave it to us.

Q. Was that additional subsidy covering the same ground as subsidies by 45 Vic.?—A. Oh, no, that ground had never been covered before.

Q. That was a subsidy for a portion of the line which had never been subsidized by the Federal Government?—A. Exactly.

Q. How did you come to get that subsidy, do you remember having done anything?—A. Nothing special, except that we applied for it very frequently.

Q. Did you do anything better than that?—A. In what way?

Q. Did you have any person look over the road and see for themselves—any one of the officers or Ministers at Ottawa?—A. Yes, Sir John Macdonald went over that portion of the road.

Q. And who else?—A. Sir Charles Tupper.

Q. What position did he occupy at that time?—A. He was Minister of Railways.

Q. So that you brought the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways at the time, down, and they went over the road, and saw for themselves the necessity there was for this subsidy?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was after that, that the subsidy was granted?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you give anything to either of them?—A. We gave them a lunch.

Q. That is the extent of the corrupt process you applied?—A. Yes.

Q. I wish to have it right; that portion of the road never received a dollar before, and it received this \$3,200 a mile from the Federal Government when the work had been gone over by the then Minister of Railways and the Prime Minister?—A. Yes.

Mr. Beemer, in his evidence, repudiates any corrupt bargain, or even the suggestion of such, with the Postmaster-General, in regard to the subsidies. He says, at page 129 of the evidence:

Q. I presume you are well acquainted with Sir A. P. Caron?—A. Very well acquainted.

Q. You knew he was a director of the company with whom you contracted?—A. I think I did.

Q. Did you discuss the matter with him?—A. Never.

Q. Never discussed it with him?—A. Never discussed the question of the contract, or the wherefores of the work at all. In a general way, I might have spoken to him about the contract, but I never talked to him about any question of details of the contract.

Q. Never any question of subsidies?—A. Never, except when we went to Ottawa to ask for subsidies; we always went to Sir A. P. Caron, as the representative of the Quebec District, and to Sir Hector Lange-

vin. Generally we went to Sir Hector Langevin and then to Sir A. P. Caron, because we did not pass over Sir Hector Langevin.

Q. But all your discussions with the gentlemen was upon the capabilities of the country for supporting millions of inhabitants?—A. Yes, and the benefit it would be to the province at large and to Quebec city.

Q. And no question, you say, was ever raised between you as to the necessity of acting, further than the general question of the necessity of more subsidies, between you and Sir A. P. Caron?—A. No, sir.

Now, refer also to page 130, where you will find this very important evidence :

Q. Will you explain as closely as you can what was the nature of the discussion between you and Sir A. P. Caron about that subsidy in 1886?—A. I cannot, I never had any private conversation with him.

Q. Did you say that you discussed that matter with him?—A. I have, but I have discussed it with others as well.

Q. But with him?—A. Not with him personally.

I will refer on the same point, to page 131 :

Q. You were aware at the time that Sir A. P. Caron was a member of the board of directors?—A. I did not look upon that in any degree of importance at all.

Q. Do you say you do not think he would have any more influence than anybody else?—A. I did not say that, but I look mainly to the board. I knew he would do whatever he could.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. Certainly. Why not?

Q. Whether for the benefit of the country or not?—A. For the benefit of the country and for the road too. I have always found him act in that way, throwing aside his own personal affairs to benefit the country at large.

Q. Had you any private conversation concerning this matter with Sir A. P. Caron, that is concerning the subsidies?—A. I do not remember that I ever had; that is what we might call private conversation.

Q. I mean to say conversation between you and Sir A. P. Caron, whether it is private or not private?—A. I may have seen Sir A. P. Caron when he was alone, I cannot say as to that. I do not remember all these meetings.

Q. Do you remember ever going to Sir A. P. Caron to solicit his influence in getting subsidies when you were in company with anybody else?—A. It must only have been in dealing with some general result which was decided on by the board and Mr. Scott, simply action in concert with the directors and the board of the company—never on my own private account at all.

Q. Never on your own private account?—A. No, not in regard to the Lake St. John road.

Q. Never to promote, as far as you know how, the granting of further subsidies?—A. Except such as were endorsed by the company, and such as were first inaugurated by Mr. Scott.

Q. Such as were deemed necessary by the company?—A. Yes.

Q. And by yourself as the contractor?—A. Yes, and such as had been previously discussed by the com-

pany. Mr. Scott was always in advance with his demands, he is a very good secretary.

Q. I notice that a good many petitions were made?—A. Yes, Mr. Scott made them all, I never made any petitions.

Q. Did you not furnish him with materials on which to base the petitions?—A. No, he did not want any one to do that.

Q. Was Mr. Scott ever over the road?—A. Oh, yes; I do not know that he went over the location more than I did; the first time I went to the end of it was on a locomotive.

Q. Now, I have asked you, Mr. Beemer, whether you had ever personally seen Sir A. P. Caron in reference to these matters, and in regard to the subsidies and so on. Did you ever request anybody to see Sir A. P. Caron and to make any representations to him on your behalf, concerning these subsidies?—A. I do not remember, I may have done so, but while I do not remember it, I may possibly have asked some other Minister to say something in regard to these subsidies to the Minister of Railways; but I do not think I ever asked them to see Sir A. P. Caron, because I knew that Sir A. P. Caron would do everything in his power that was reasonable to get the assistance for the road, that was asked for by the company. I felt he would always do that, because he has always shown the utmost endeavour to do anything of that kind; he has always been ready to work for the interest of the country.

Q. What I mean, is, did you ever charge any mutual friend of the Minister, perhaps a member of the Board of Directors of the Construction Company, to see Sir A. P. Caron?—A. I do not think so.

Q. I wish you would give a little more positive answer to that question?—A. Well, I gave you the best answer I have at my command; you don't want me to tell you something I am not sure about.

Q. Did you ever urge any reason outside of the needs of the road and the fair demands of the district for the granting of subsidies to the road?—A. No, sir; emphatically no.

Now, we have had discussed here to-day the question of these \$25,000 of notes that were given by Mr. Beemer to Mr. Ross. That question is one of the utmost simplicity, as it is presented in the evidence. The testimony of Sir A. P. Caron—the testimony of Mr. Beemer, and the testimony of all those concerned in this transaction, shows that Senator Ross was an old friend of Sir Adolphe Caron. He had known him from his childhood; he had been a friend of his father and his family years before; he had been a Conservative all his life. He had been twice a candidate of the Conservative party; being a wealthy man deeply interested in the country and in its policy he had contributed large sums of money at various times, as a friend of the political party to which he belonged, to aid that party in the elections. Having been met in the city of Montreal by Sir Adolphe Caron he was asked there if he would not subscribe to the election, and he consented to give a subscription of \$25,000, which, he being several times a millionaire, was indeed not a very large one. Then Sir Adolphe Caron left him for the time being. Now, a great howl has been set up about this, and the attempt has been made to show that this money came out of the subsidies and was

part and parcel of those subsidies ; while the sworn evidence shows that the subsidies went straight to the railway. But I go further, and say—and I say it without fear of contradiction—that, in view of the evidence given as to the amount of money put into the railway, in view of the evidence showing that every dollar of the subsidies went into the railway, that \$220,000 of Jas. G. Ross's money had gone into it as the balance of a loan to Mr. Beemer, that according to Mr. Beemer's own testimony, \$83,000 of his own money had gone into it, over and above all those federal, provincial and municipal subsidies—I say, that if the money had gone straight as a donation from Henry J. Beemer himself, there would be no ground for condemning Sir Adolphe Caron in the matter. There is the most positive and conclusive evidence that he did not suspect the money to come from Beemer ; but I have no hesitation in asserting, from the evidence, that every dollar of the Dominion subsidy, and hundreds of thousands of dollars over and above that amount, went into the road, and, even if the charges as made originally by the hon. member for West Ontario were put in the most severe crucial form, there is no evidence to show that Sir Adolphe Caron was in any way guilty of the charges made against him. Now, he had no communication with Mr. Beemer at all. He saw Ross in Montreal ; and I will just direct your attention to page 223, where you will find the sworn evidence of Sir Adolphe Caron himself. Fault has been found with him because he appeared before the commission—because he went there without having been summoned. He was nobody's witness ; he volunteered his evidence ; and some observations were made as to that. But what criticism would have been directed against him if he had refrained from going before that Commission, and offering his evidence ? Here is what he said :

Q. Now, in February or March, a general election took place for the House of Commons of Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you apply to Mr. Ross, on the occasion of that election, for a subscription to the election fund?—A. I did.

Q. And what took place?—A. I had in 1887 more particularly charge of the district of Quebec. I called on Mr. Ross, as I have already stated I had already done very frequently ; I laid before him what I considered to be the position of the party in the district of Quebec. I pointed to him the importance of the fight which we had to meet, and I told him that I had come to him to ask him to help in providing the funds which I considered to be necessary for the legal and legitimate expenses of the campaign.

Q. What was the result?—A. We discussed the question together, and the result of it was that he told me he would give me \$25,000.

Q. What did he do?—A. The conversation took place one day, and the following day I had occasion to require some funds for the campaign, and I called on Mr. Ross. I got from him personally an amount which I would not be absolutely precise about, but it was between \$5,000 and \$10,000 on the first day.

MR. CURRAN.

From his office I drove up to the office of the Honourable Thomas McGreevy, a witness examined in this investigation. He was one of a committee composed of three—the Honourable Sir Hector Langevin and myself being two of the three and Mr. McGreevy being the third, and the treasurer for the purposes of that campaign. I took the money, which I had received from Mr. Ross, and handed it over personally to Mr. McGreevy, who received it from me. He gave me a receipt for the amount, and in a period of time extending, probably, over seven or eight days—or ten days possibly—I drew it out at different periods. The different amounts up to the \$25,000 which had been promised by Mr. Ross through me, and these different amounts I placed in the hands of Mr. McGreevy, as I had done the first instalment, and got receipts from him. The amounts were distributed after a discussion between the three members of that committee, Sir Hector Langevin, myself and Mr. McGreevy. They were distributed for what we considered to be legitimate and indispensable expenses of the various counties which we were looking after in the district of Quebec.

Q. You say you got these different sums of money, amounting in all to \$25,000, from the Honourable Mr. Ross himself?—A. I did.

Q. Personally?—A. Personally.

Q. In what form?—A. In bank bills.

Q. And you took it in that form to Mr. McGreevy?—A. Yes ; I drove from his office to Mr. McGreevy's. The amount never left my hands until it was deposited into the hands of Mr. McGreevy.

Q. Were you ever informed that this money was to be reimbursed to Mr. Ross by any person?—A. I never was. He never mentioned it, and I had no reason to imagine that it was not his personal contribution. I knew nothing at all about anything connected with that amount until the time that I heard the evidence that was adduced here.

Q. He never led you to believe it, or stated it to you?—A. Never, directly or indirectly.

Q. He never informed you otherwise than that this was his personal contribution to this fund?—A. No, he never did, never in any way.

Q. Was anything discussed at that interview at all between you and him about this being given on any other account than simply as his personal, individual subscription to the election?—A. Never. He never led me to believe, directly or indirectly, by anything that he said or did, that it was not his personal contribution.

Q. Had you any reason to believe differently up to the time the evidence was given here?—A. Never. I never had any reason to think that it was other than his private subscription. In fact, in the House of Commons, I denied having knowledge of anything else except what I stated here.

Q. Had you any conversation with H. J. Beemer with reference to this subscription of \$25,000?—A. Never, directly or indirectly.

Q. Did you ever make application to him for it?—A. I never did.

Q. Did he ever tell you he had to pay it?—A. He never mentioned a word of it to me, and I never spoke to him about it. The only conversations which took place were between Mr. Ross and myself. I knew nothing more about it.

Q. You are aware since the evidence was given here of certain entries which appear in a certain account in one of the books kept by Mr. H. J. Beemer, with reference to the payment of this subscription of \$25,000. You are aware that certain entries are in evidence of that kind?—A. I am aware of what was stated here, but I know nothing else about it.

Q. Were you ever aware, up to the time you heard that evidence given, that there were any such entries in any books of Mr. Beemer's?—A. No; I never had any reason to believe it.

Q. Were you ever aware that there were any notes given by Mr. Beemer or anybody else to reimburse Mr. Ross for that subscription?—A. I certainly never knew anything about it until I heard it here. I do not even know now that notes were given except from what I have heard.

Q. Did you ever, Sir Adolphe Caron, in the elections of 1882, 1887, or 1891, apply to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, or to the company called the Construction Company, or to Horace J. Beemer, for any subscriptions to any of these general elections?—A. I never did.

Q. Did you ever receive any such subscriptions from any of these parties?—A. I never did.

Now, Mr. Beemer confirms that statement in every particular. He gave the notes to Mr. Ross at his request. Why did he do so? Because Mr. Ross had obliged him with the money, by advancing to him moneys at various times, having advanced as much as \$900,000 at one time. I refer to page 146 of Beemer's evidence, in order to get a confirmation of the Postmaster-General's evidence:

Q. Now, did any other man than Mr. Ross, being a member of either of these companies, ask you to subscribe?—A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Ross asked you alone to subscribe?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he, at the time that he asked you to subscribe, tell you that it would be to the advantage of the railway with regard to the subsidies?—A. No, sir, he simply said to me what I have related to you in answer to your question previously.

Q. Did Mr. Ross on either occasion tell you that Sir A. P. Caron expected you to subscribe?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are sure of that?—A. Right positively sure.

Q. Now, Mr. Beemer, you, I suppose, have urged upon Sir A. P. Caron the necessity of granting your railway further subsidies?—A. I think I have talked with him in regard to it sometimes.

Q. Now, did you on any of these occasions point out to him that you had been rather liberal for election purposes?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was the amount of your subscription to election funds ever talked of between you and Sir A. P. Caron?—A. I do not remember anything of that kind.

Q. There was no person as a go-between between you and Sir A. P. Caron?—A. No, sir. I never used them; I always do my business direct. Whatever I have to do I do myself. The company, of course, did their part, and I tried to do mine.

Q. Mr. Beemer, how were these notes paid for the election purposes?—A. They were paid by cheques.

Q. I suppose you have those cheques by which you paid the notes?—A. I think so.

Q. Have you asked Mr. Wurtele to bring them up?—A. I did ask him to bring them up. I beg your pardon, I misunderstood your question. You asked me if I had asked him and I said I did; I meant to say that I would ask him. I have already asked him to bring up the notes but I will ask him for the cheques also.

Q. So far as regards the entries in your books concerning this matter, I suppose that Mr. Wurtele knows about that better than you do?—A. I presume so.

Q. Mr. Beemer, you have stated that when you gave these notes you did not expect to pay them when you did pay them. Did you protest?—A. I did not think anything about it. I mean that I did not know that I was going to pay them or what portion I was going to pay.

Q. When they became due did you express your surprise to Mr. Ross?—A. No, sir, I did not.

Q. You just paid them?—A. I did.

He gives his reasons why he paid these moneys without complaining. If you proceed to page 149 you find Mr. Justice Tait intervening. He asked:

Q. Did you ever, in speaking to Sir A. P. Caron with reference to subsidies you were anxious to obtain from the Dominion Government, promise, in any way, directly or indirectly, that you would contribute towards his election, or the election of supporters of the Government, or offer any political consideration whatever, to influence him in aiding you or the company in getting subsidies, or do you know of such thing having been done by anybody else?—A. No, sir.

This was in answer to the question of the presiding judge, and the evidence right straight through is exactly in the same line. I will give another quotation from page 151. After referring to these general matters he is asked:

Q. And you were at that time anxious and willing to help the Government then in power?—A. Yes, I was in sympathy with the policy of the Government as far as that was concerned, but non-political.

Q. Therefore, when I find in this account, exhibit HJB 2, entries in the following letter GEF and APC, these entries are not to be represented or to be construed so as to mean that this money was given by you to Sir A. P. Caron?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Nor to mean that to your knowledge the money went to Sir A. P. Caron?—A. No, sir.

Q. This is simply a book-keeping entry by which you charge the money to the general election fund, to which the money really went; and, Sir A. P. Caron being Minister for the district, you put his initials there?—A. Yes, I put his initials there.

Q. Now, the note for \$3,000 sent to the Chicoutimi Hardware Company, went for the general election fund also, did it?—A. I think so, it is my understanding.

Q. Whether Sir A. P. Caron saw that note or not, you do not know?—A. I do not know.

Q. You had different other sources of revenue at the time that these moneys were paid than what you had from the subsidies you were receiving from the Federal Government?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had at that time mills working?—A. Well, yes, in repeating the number of enterprises I had, I left out one of the most important, and that was the bringing of the Q.M. & O. Railway into Montreal under Government contract. It was afterwards sold to the C. P. Railway. I made a lot of money out of the building of that masonry entrance at Montreal.

Q. How much of your own private means, independently altogether of moneys you received from the subsidies, or moneys you received from the Construction Company, or moneys you received from Mr. Ross, did you put into the Quebec and Lake St. John Rail-

way, and had you in it at the time this transaction went on?—A. Well, the books will show that at that period, or just previous to that, I am credited with some \$83,000.

I consider that is a very important matter. Every banker, every man who could be thought of as knowing anything about these transactions, the brother of the late Mr. Ross, Mr. Ross himself, were examined. Everything that could be brought forward that might in any way, directly or indirectly, connect Sir Adolphe Caron with any corrupt transaction, was brought out, but no proof could be adduced to show what the hon. gentleman expected would have been proved out of the mouths of these witnesses. Now, I contend that, under all these circumstances, with the evidence that I have laid before this hon. House—and I could have given quotation after quotation from the sworn testimony—that we have utterly destroyed the contentions of the hon. gentleman with regard to Sir Adolphe Caron, as a member of this Construction Company, as being interested in its movements and watching and guarding its movements—we have disproved all that. We have disproved that one dollar of Dominion subsidy granted to this Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, ever went into any election fund or any corrupt fund of any kind. We have shown that the money went into the railway, that it was there, that the money was never paid over until it had been earned, ten miles by ten miles, and that, over and above all these sums of money paid by the Government, Mr. Ross and Mr. Beemer and others have sunk hundreds of thousands of dollars in excess of these Dominion, provincial and municipal subsidies. As for the Témiscouata Railway charges, I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should stand before this House and try to torture the evidence into anything like a proof of the charges that were made here. He has utterly failed to show from the evidence in the blue-book, that the subsidies granted by the Government did not go into the railway, were not applied to its construction, from the first dollar to the last. The men whose names he supplied himself to the prosecuting gentlemen in this charge, went there and held up their hands and thanked God that every dollar of this subsidy money had gone to the railway. Now, we have had the examination of Mr. J. J. Macdonald and Mr. A. R. Macdonald. We have the same charges made in connection with the Lake St. John Railway, made also in connection with the Témiscouata Railway, and the only persons pecuniarily interested were Mr. J. J. Macdonald and his partner, Mr. Boswell. Now, I challenge any hon. gentleman to take that testimony, as it has been given, and show that it establishes these charges. Mr. J. J. Macdonald and Mr. Boswell had taken up the building of this railway. Mr. Macdonald was a well-known citizen, only recently de-

Mr. CURRAN.

ceased, a man of honour and of first-class character. He and his partner were the body and soul of the whole transaction. He organized the whole thing, and for a time remained outside, in order to see if some other contractor would not take up and carry on this work. He got the contract because he and his partner were the only ones who would carry it out, and they got their contract for Dominion, provincial and municipal subsidies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Paid up—

Mr. CURRAN. I have said, and I say it candidly, these gentlemen were the body and soul of the whole business, and I think no imputation will be cast on the late J. J. Macdonald's character or memory by my hon. friend, from anything that came up in connection with these questions. There is nothing to show that Mr. J. J. Macdonald, or anybody else in connection with this transaction, did not act in the most honourable way. I do not know anything about the transactions of the contractors of this company. I do not care anything about that. What I have to deal with, and what I am dealing with, is the subsidies granted to the railways by this Dominion Parliament. Did any portion of those subsidies go for election purposes? Did Sir Adolphe Caron receive any of that money, or did he not know that the money was going for election purposes? And I challenge any man who will read the testimony from beginning to end, and wishing to speak impartially, fairly and with common justice, to say that there is the first tittle of evidence to indicate that the Postmaster-General had any connection with the transaction, from beginning to end. They tried to connect him in a general way. At page 187, I find the following from A. R. Macdonald's testimony:—

Q. Now, Mr. Macdonald, you said that you had no dealings with Sir A. P. Caron in this matter?—A. No, sir.

Q. Not in the interest of the railway?—A. No, sir.

Q. To your knowledge, did the Témiscouata subscribe any amount for the election of Sir A. P. Caron or any other supporters of the Dominion Government in this district?—A. I am positive that the company never did such a thing, at least when I was president.

Q. Are you ready to swear that any of the past members or directors did not subscribe anything?—A. Well, they will answer for themselves about that.

Q. But you do not know, yourself?—A. No.

Q. Are you aware that the company, directly or indirectly, has been asked, while you were the manager of it, to contribute for election purposes in 1887?—A. I am not.

Q. Was there to your knowledge any understanding between the company or any of its members and the contractors, that they would be obliged or invited to subscribe for election purposes in the event of obtaining any of the federal subsidies?—A. There was no such thing.

Q. There was no conversation between you, or to your knowledge, with any of the contractors to that effect?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are positive of that?—A. I am.

Now, I think that is pretty clear testimony from the president of the company who was so prominently identified with this enterprise. If members of the House will apply themselves to the study of this evidence for a short time, they will find that a dispute arose, not with regard to any Dominion subsidy, not with regard to any provincial subsidy, but with regard to the Fraserville municipal subsidy, which Mr. J. J. Macdonald alleged he had reserved for election purposes. He said that Sir Adolphe Caron had nothing to do with it; he most emphatically swore that he had nothing to do with it. He stated that there was a difference between him and Mr. A. R. Macdonald with regard to this amount, Mr. A. R. Macdonald being desirous of holding this sum for himself and applying it to his own purposes, and Mr. J. J. Macdonald stating that he had made a different arrangement, but an arrangement that Sir Adolphe Caron had nothing to do with, that he did not know anything about, and could not possibly know about, because it was a private affair of his own. Having sworn that Sir Adolphe Caron had nothing to do with it, he declined to answer questions about it, but they overruled his objection and decided that he must answer. They said: You must answer, whether it has to do with the matter or not; we will decide later; but you must give your testimony. And he did give his testimony on that point. In that connection, I will read one or two quotations. Mr. J. J. Macdonald having been examined, the other Macdonald is brought up, and he says:

Q. Mr. Macdonald, you have already been examined on this commission?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. J. J. Macdonald was examined yesterday, and referred to a certain agreement between you and himself, in addition to the contract between the Témiscouata Company and the contractors, which you have already filed in this case. Will you explain the nature of this agreement?—A. Well, it is a private agreement. Am I obliged to state what it is? It has nothing to do with Sir Adolphe Caron or this investigation.

Q. Was there any political interest in this agreement?—A. No, sir.

Q. Will you explain what is the nature of this agreement?—A. It related to the construction of the Témiscouata Railway.

Q. Was Sir Adolphe Caron aware of any of the conditions of this agreement?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was there in this agreement any political interest for Sir Adolphe Caron or any members supporting the Government of which he was a member?—A. No, sir.

Q. Will you tell me, Mr. Macdonald, whether at the time of the contract between the Témiscouata Company and Messrs. Macdonald & Boswell it was stipulated that any sum of money or valuable consideration should be given by Messrs. Macdonald & Boswell to promote the election of Sir Adolphe Caron or any other members, supporters of the Government of which he was a member?—A. No, sir.

Q. There was no mention of it at the time?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were the negotiations for the contract made chiefly by you with Mr. J. Macdonald?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you say whether, when this contract was passed, it was understood in any way by you and Messrs. Macdonald & Boswell that any of the considerations mentioned in this contract should go for political purposes to promote the election of Sir Adolphe Caron or any other members supporting the Government of which he was a member?—A. No.

Q. There was no mention of it?—A. No.

Q. There was no discussion about that when the contract was passed?—A. No, sir, no such thing was mentioned.

Q. Have you any explanation to offer, Mr. Macdonald, in reference to that private agreement with Mr. J. J. Macdonald that you have mentioned?—A. I see by the newspapers that Mr. J. J. Macdonald said that I wanted to get the whole amount of the \$25,000 from the Fraserville municipality. I must say that I do not know what he has done with it. He said he used it for political purposes. I must say that I do not know if he kept it or used it, as I would never get any statement of account from him. I just mentioned this because I supposed there was no necessity for him to say what he did. He was not asked for that and that is the reason I mention this.

So that we have a dispute between those two gentlemen as to what was done. We have nothing to do with that dispute. This Fraser-ville municipal subsidy was altogether beyond the scope of this inquiry, and I think the hon. gentleman who alluded to it, did not act fairly, more especially when he contrived to make an attack upon the counsel conducting the case. He brought up this irrelevant evidence, although in the eyes of the public it might be interesting as an election matter. He cast reflections upon the counsel in the case, and blamed them because they did not go still further and probe into this matter which in no way was connected with the subject of this inquiry. Now, we have the testimony of my hon. friend, Mr. Grandbois, the member for Témiscouata, who was supposed to be able to give testimony in this matter; and he positively and emphatically swears that so far as the Postmaster-General was concerned, to his personal knowledge, there was no ground whatsoever for the charge. We have further the evidence of another hon. gentleman who was expected, no doubt, to give testimony of great importance in this case, I refer to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). That hon. gentleman was examined in connection with these subsidies. He knows all about the Témiscouata Railway. He was connected with it from the beginning, he wrote the matter up in the press, and came to Ottawa to interview the Ministers, and did everything possible to promote it. He says:

Q. To your knowledge, did Macdonald & Boswell, out of the subsidies, or out of the credit of the subsidies, give any money for electoral purposes?—A. Never; not to my knowledge. Thank God, the subsidies granted went to build the railway.

Sir, I think that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen, that ought to convince them so com-

pietely that they will never again raise their diminished heads in connection with these charges. Here is a witness, brought in at the suggestion of the member for West Ontario; he is sworn and gives evidence; and not satisfied with stating in an ordinary way that these moneys were not misapplied, not satisfied with telling the court, and the country, and especially this Parliament, before whom he knew all this evidence must be brought, that the money had all gone into the railway, that the Dominion subsidy had not been diverted from its legitimate purpose, he, like a true and pious man, raised his hands to Heaven and thanked God that the subsidies went to build the railway. Now, I do not think I need to go any further into this testimony so far as the Témiscouata charge is concerned. When the hon. gentleman opened his speech and said he was going to deal with the matter impartially, I thought the first thing he would do was to tell us that in connection with this Témiscouata Railway charge, the case has absolutely failed for want of evidence. There is not the first tittle of evidence to justify a demand being made upon this House for a condemnation of the Postmaster-General. Although I have dealt with this subject very imperfectly, and feel that I should apologize to this hon. House for the tediousness of my remarks, still I am satisfied that I have said enough to convince the country that these charges are without foundation. I desired to quote the exact words of the witnesses in order to put the House in possession of the facts so far as time would permit, and I am satisfied that I have convinced hon. gentlemen here that the charges introduced with such a flourish of trumpets last session, that have been sent to a tribunal which the hon. gentleman himself admits did its duty, although he most unjustly charged the counsel for the prosecution with not having done theirs—I say I am satisfied that the impartial judgment of this House will be that the charges have fallen to the ground for want of evidence. I believe both the House and the country now breathe more freely when it is established by sworn testimony of every witness that was examined, that not a dollar of the Dominion subsidies voted to either of these railways, was diverted from its legitimate purpose. It has been proved by sworn testimony that every dollar of the Dominion subsidies granted to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and to the Témiscouata Railway, was earned, ten miles by ten miles, before it was paid out, and it was paid only upon the certificates of the engineers that the work had been properly done. It has been proved that upon many occasions the payment was stopped and the money retained in the hands of the Government for the most trivial reasons, showing that the Government of Canada, in dealing with both these roads, proved themselves worthy of the position

Mr. CURRAN.

they occupied. They performed their duty well, they were strict in their observance of the spirit and the letter of the law which was to guide them, and I am satisfied that this motion brought in by my hon. friend from West Ontario, will be rejected by this House by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. HAGGART moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DENISON moved:

That the time for presenting reports of the Private Bills Committee be extended to Tuesday next, the 28th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That, owing to the advanced period of the session, private Bills reported to the House yesterday and today from committees on private Bills be placed on the Orders of the Day immediately after routine proceedings for consideration of the Committee of the Whole, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the ninth report of this committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a most unusual proceeding.

Mr. LAURIER. I must tell my hon. friend that I very strongly object to this motion, and cannot, unless there be very exceptional circumstances, agree to it. Private legislation is governed by certain rules of procedure, and any departure from those rules may take some parties by surprise who are interested in this legislation. Moreover, the rules of the House ought to be followed unless there is some very strong reason to the contrary, and no such reason has been given. I remember only one instance, when Sir John Macdonald on one occasion had a Bill passed through its three readings at the one sitting.

That was a case of a charter of a bank which was just about to expire, or something of that kind. In such a case, the rules of the House may be deviated from, but when such a case is not made out, we should follow our rules.

Motion negatived.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 111) respecting detective corporations and mercantile agencies.—(Mr. Sproule.)

VICTORIAVILLE, ETC., INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, What is the number of manufacturers, according to the last census, in the following places:—The town of Victoriaville, and the villages of Arthabaskaville, Princeville and Warwick?

Mr. FOSTER. The manufacturers in Victoriaville are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
Joseph Michel	1
Octave Morel	1
Jos. Faucher	1
Basket Maker—	
John Lafleur	1
Blacksmiths—	
David Désilets	2
Zépherin Auger	3
Félix Roberge	1
Eugène P. Tourigny	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Etienne Métauier	2
Pierre Côté	1
John Fournier	1
Brewer—	
Emile Legrist	1
Brick and Tile Maker—	
Léon Maheir	4
Cabinet Furniture—	
Théo. Désilets	1
Knitting—	
Adélaïde Denoncourt	
Photographic Gallery—	
Cléophas Gendreau	1
Plaster, etc.—	
Séraphin Morgan	2
Saddle and Harness—	
Elzéar Richard	2
Amédée Béliveau	2
Saw Mills—	
Tourigny & Vézina	2
Napoléon Mercier	58
Tailors—	
Amanda & Léontine Demers	2
Edwidge Béliveau	4
Léda Lavigne	6
Billy Francis	2

Industries.	Hands employed.
Carpenters and Joiners—	
Sirios Linbard	1
Octave Barrette	1
Jutras Vincent	1
Geo. Guilmette	1
Pierre Liberge	1
Abraham Roberge	1
Antoine Paquet	1
Zoel Croteau	2
Julien Béliveau	1
Carriage Makers—	
Nazaire Drouin	1
Charles Dubois	2
Dominique Faucher	2
Théo. Désilets	1
Dressmakers, etc.—	
Flore Gaudet	2
Eulalie Bellerose	2
Mary Letarte	3
Dme. Esther Désilets	1
Founders—	
Vézina & Co	10
Jewellers, etc.—	
Emile Lebel	1
Tanners—	
Achille Gagnon & Co	25
Tin and Sheet Iron Workers—	
Cyrias Thibeault	4
Octave Gaudet	1
Stone and Marble Cutters—	
Zépherin Ducharme	1
Sashes, Doors and Blinds—	
Edmund Audet	1
Shingle Maker—	
Paul Tourigny	6

WARWICK VILLAGE.

Bakers—	
Edgar Comtois	1
Arcade Richard	2
Blacksmiths—	
Wm. French	1
Camille Carrier	1
Joseph Binette	1
Onésime Beauchemin	2
Boots and Shoes—	
Evariste Métivier	1
Zépherin Deshamois	1
Pierre Blais	1
Brick Maker—	
Alfred Desroches	6
Cabinet and Furniture—	
Joseph Descoteaux (chair maker)	1
Carriage Maker—	
Ferdinand Gingras	3
Cheese Maker—	
Jos. N. Allard	2
Seamstress—	
Ernestine Baillargeon	2
Henriette Leclerc	2
Dressmaker—	
Marguerite Corneau	4
Flour Mill—	
Raphael Hamel	1
Saddle and Harness—	
Nap. Rousseau	2

Industries.	Hands employed.
Saw Mill—	
Raphaël Hamel.....	2
Shingle Maker—	
Frédéric Bélanger.....	12
Tailors—	
Narcisse Corneau.....	4
Jos. Arthur Roy.....	7
Tanner—	
Barthélemi Lachance.....	2
Tinsmith—	
Jean Pouliot.....	2
Sashes and Doors—	
Geo. Paradis.....	4
Michel Roy.....	2

ARTHABASKAVILLE

Bakers—	
Hector Pepin.....	2
Abraham Robidoux.....	2
Blacksmiths—	
Ferdinand Gingras.....	1
Edouard Vallière.....	1
F. X. Beaudette.....	1
Jos. Labbé.....	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Louis Lehouillière.....	1
Félix Pinze.....	1
Jean-Bte. Binnette.....	1
Jos. Blanchet.....	1
Arthur Galarneau.....	1
Box Makers—	
Baril & Frère.....	2
Brick and Tile Maker—	
Salomé Bourbeau.....	8
Broom-handle Manufacturer—	
(No names distinguishable).....	3
Cabinet and Furniture—	
Baril & Frère.....	3
Thos. Baril.....	3
Carpenters and Joiners—	
Geo. Spinard.....	1
Gédéon Bergeron.....	1
Eleusipe Beaudet.....	3
Carriage Makers—	
Ludger Lavigne.....	1
Philippe Lemay.....	3
Cheese Factory—	
B. Lavigne.....	1
Dressmakers, etc.—	
Ursule Gaudet.....	3
Zéline Croteau.....	1
Rosalie Girouard.....	1
Adélaïde Spinard.....	3
Julie Lavigne.....	5
Sara Lavigne.....	2
Céline Dion.....	1
Marie Théroux.....	1
Zénaïde Bergeron.....	1
Philomène Rousseau.....	1
Léda Spinard.....	2
Knitter—	
Marie Théroux.....	1
Printer—	
Arthabaskaville Printing Co.....	5
Saddle and Harness—	
Philiat Blanchet.....	2

Mr. FOSTER.

Industries.	Hands employed.
Saw Mills—	
Thos. Baril.....	3
Shingle Maker—	
Thos. Baril.....	4
Soap Manufacturer—	
Piché & Co.....	2
Tanneries—	
John Caro.....	2
Tin and Sheet Iron Worker—	
Cyprien Thibeau.....	3
Weaver—	
Marie Vézina.....	1
Flour and Grist Mills—	
Philippe Hamel.....	3
Jewellers and Watchmakers—	
Fidèle Spinard.....	1

YARMOUTH, N.S., INDUSTRIES.

Mr. FLINT asked, What is the description of each of the fifteen manufacturing industries established in the town of Yarmouth, N.S., in 1881? What were the names of the several manufacturers, and the number of hands employed in each such establishment at that time? What is the description of each of the 151 manufacturing industries in said town in the year 1891? What are the names of the several manufacturers in said town in that year, and the number of hands employed in each such establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In Yarmouth, N.S., the following industries were established in 1881:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Boots and Shoes—	
N. Strickland.....	1
Boat Builders—	
S. Gardner.....	3
A. Butler.....	3
N. G. Dane.....	2
Blacksmiths—	
A. W. Potter.....	2
James Porter.....	2
W. H. Gridley.....	5
R. Killam.....	1
D. Chipman.....	1
Block and Tackle—	
Jas. D. Horton.....	3
Coopers—	
J. Silver.....	1
F. G. Allan & Co.....	15
Foundry and Machine Shops—	
Burrell & Johnson.....	90
Wilson, Clark & Co.....	25
E. Scott.....	5

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Flour and Grist Mill--		Bakers--	
Geo. W. Robins.	3	R. Snow.....	3
Gas Works--		G. Collin.....	2
Yarmouth Gas Co.	3	Blacksmiths--	
Sashes, Doors and Blinds--		J. Judd.....	2
Kinny, Haley & Co.	25	J. Proudfoot.....	1
Tanneries--		G. Ayers.....	2
J. W. Robins.....	8	W. Waterhouse.....	1
Wheelwright--		T. Rice.....	1
M. R. Crawley.....	2	Boots and Shoes--	
Cabinet and Furniture Factories--		W. Burns.....	3
J. Sweeny.....	1	R. Johnston.....	1
Huestis & Co.	4	J. Tomlin.....	1
Carriage Manufacturers--		C. Fox.....	2
Ray & Co.	6	H. Kerr.....	3
		G. Smith.....	1
		M. Collins.....	3
		T. Whelan.....	1
		J. Nodder.....	1
		Cabinet and Furniture Factories--	
		Wm. Tell.....	2
		E. Johnston.....	2
		Carpenters--	
		W. Noble.....	3
		R. Yarnold.....	1
		J. Ballantyne.....	1
		W. Barnes.....	5
		Carriage Makers--	
		J. Elliott.....	2
		T. McKinnon.....	1
		Toms & Newport.....	6
		M. Donovan.....	10
		Confectioner--	
		J. McDougall.....	4
		Coopers--	
		F. Withers.....	1
		J. Luke.....	2
		Dressmakers and Milliners--	
		M. & S. McIntyre.....	10
		M. J. Allan.....	10
		E. Rogers.....	8
		M. Wilson.....	2
		S. Hand.....	3
		C. Steward.....	4
		Flour and Grist Mill--	
		W. Warden.....	1
		Foundry and Machine Shop--	
		M. Harper.....	5
		Knitting Machine--	
		B. Steers.....	1
		Musical Instruments--	
		Chas. Gortzeof.....	1
		Painters and Glaziers--	
		A. Wilson.....	4
		M. Caldwell.....	2
		M. Terrace.....	4
		T. Stegle.....	1
		S. Palmer.....	1
		Photographers--	
		A. Barrett.....	4
		J. W. Ropert.....	2
		Planing Mill--	
		S. Grose.....	10
		Printers--	
		W. H. Higgin.....	6
		Campbell & Rayley.....	4
		C. Sarney.....	4
		Robertson Bros.....	
		Pump Factory--	
		H. Thompson.....	1

I ask leave to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this is for 1881 only.

Mr. CHARLTON. I don't see any "dress-maker-1" in those returns.

Mr. FOSTER. They have grown up since.

Mr. FLINT. Might I ask the Finance Minister if he will answer the other half of the question later--in reference to 1891?

Mr. FOSTER. I give my hon. friend all I have. He must take it as I get it--by instalments.

WHITBY, ONT., INDUSTRIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. What was the nature or description of each of the seventy manufacturing industries existing in the town of Whitby, according to the census of 1891? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufacturing industries? How many hands or employees were employed in each of such manufactories? 2. What were the number and nature or description of each of the manufacturing industries in the town of Whitby, according to the census of 1881? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufactories? How many hands were employed in each of said factories?

Mr. FOSTER. In Whitby (1881) the following statement gives the description of the industries then in existence:--

Industries.	Hands employed.
Aerated Waters--	
J. Nesley.....	2
Agricultural Implements--	
Brown & Patterson.....	50

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Saddle and Harness--		Dressmakers and Milliners--	
R. Philp.	1	Margaret McIntyre	9
W. Thompson.	5	Mary J. Robinson	2
Stone and Marble Cutters--		Charles F. Stewart	3
J. & R. Walfender	6	Sarah Webster	1
Tailors and Clothiers--		Margaret Murphy	1
G. B. Powell & Co.	12	Mary E. Jackson	1
R. & J. Campbell	6	Mary Smith	1
Ross Bros.	6	Emily A. Crosby	1
Hamilton & Hanrower	8	James B. Powell	5
J. Ferguson	4	Mary Hayes	1
C. Stewart ..	5	Eliza Ann Piper	2
Tannery--		Margaret Woodcock	3
King Bros.	32	Matilda John	1
Tinsmiths--		Almira Addison	2
B. Bryan	2	Eliza Rodd	2
J. Barnes	1	Kitty N. Moon	2
J. Bryan ..	1	Norah Sheehan	2
Hatch Bros.	1	Mary Jordan	2
Watchmaker and Jeweller--		Electric Light Works--	
J. Barnard	1	George Madill	3
Wood Turner--		Foundry and Machine--	
Geo. Connack	11	Harper, Major & Co	12
		Furrier--	
		Sarah Harvey.	1
		Fancy Goods--	
		Mary J. Allin	4
		John Arnall	1
		Harness and Saddlery--	
		William Calverly	3
		William Thompson	4
		Martin Manufacturing Co	52
		Knitting Factory--	
		Emma Grandin.	1
		Leather Lace Factories--	
		Leather Lace Co	7
		Marble and Stone Cutters--	
		Matheson & Hawken	1
		Richard Wolfenden	2
		Painters and Glaziers--	
		William Devlin	2
		Thomas E. Pennell	1
		Peter B. Warcorn	3
		Alex. C. Wilson	2
		Printing Offices--	
		Henderson & Graham	6
		Seville M. Newton	2
		Piano Worker--	
		Charles Gortzig	2
		Photographer--	
		William E. O'Brien	4
		Chemical Establishment--	
		James Willis	2
		Pump Factory--	
		Henry Thompson	1
		Sashes, Doors and Blinds--	
		Christopher Johnson	2
		William Noble	3
		Meat Curers--	
		William J. Thompson	1
		George Beall	1
		Tannery--	
		Charles King	50
		Tailors--	
		Rose Bros	7
		Andrew M. Ross	1
		Charles F. Stewart	4
		James Campbell	3
		John D. Wakely	3
		Charlotte Hawley	2
WHITBY (1891.)			
Aerated Waters--			
McCroben	2		
Agricultural and Implements--			
Mowat Manufacturing Co	30		
Bakers--			
Thomas E. Robinson	2		
William C. Smith	1		
Richard Snow	2		
Boots and Shoes--			
Matthew Collins	3		
W. Matthew Collins	1		
William J. Burns	1		
William Burns	3		
John Saunders ..	1		
Robert Johnston	1		
Joseph Nodder	1		
Castle Fox	1		
Blacksmiths--			
William Ayres	1		
Thomas Rice	2		
Thomas Toms	1		
Carpenters--			
Arthur Ellis	1		
William Barnes	4		
Martin Jordan	2		
Carriage Factories--			
William Newport	7		
Thomas McCann	1		
Cabinet and Furniture Factories--			
James Sadler	1		
Edward J. Johnson	2		
Benjamin Madill	2		
Cooper Shop--			
Joseph Luke	1		
Dressmakers and Milliners--			
Jane Baine	2		
Mary Jackson	6		
Elizabeth Borrowman	5		
Bessie Woodcock	1		
Mary Wilson	8		
Mr. FOSTER.			

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Tailors--		Cabinet Makers--	
Charlotte Whitney	1	D. A. Grant & Co.	35
John Ferguson	2	Coffin and Casket--	
Anna Smith	1	J. Vanwart	2
John Pringle	6	J. R. Tupper	1
Jane Hern	2	Dressmakers, etc.--	
Tinsmiths--		S. J. Camber	2
William Bryan	1	Sophia Ganong	3
Jacob McIntyre	2	Lellian Murray	1
Weaver Shop--		Caroline Snow	4
Johanna May	1	Mrs. Jewett	10
Watchmakers and Jewellers--		Mrs. A. C. Irwine	1
John S. Bernard	1	Mrs. S. J. Baker	1
Philip Taylor	1	Mrs. McClasky	1
		Miss A. Sutton	1
		Mrs. Williams	2
		Miss M. S. Adams	1
		Mrs. W. Loane	1
		Mrs. F. W. Dibble	2
		Miss R. Gallagher	2
		Mary Wright	1
		Miss Maggie Price	1
		Mary McCaferty	1

WOODSTOCK, N.B., INDUSTRIES.

Mr. COLTER asked, What is the description of the twenty-nine manufacturing industries established in the town of Woodstock, N.B., in 1881? The names of the several manufacturers, and the number of hands employed in each at that time? What is the description of the sixty-two manufacturing industries established in the town of Woodstock, N.B., in 1891? The names of the several manufacturers, and the number of hands employed in each at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. The census of 1891 gives for the town of Woodstock the following:--

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths--		Electric Light--	
John Loane	3	John Fisher	2
Wm. McGinley	1	Flour and Grist Mill--	
C. E. Stey	3	Mrs. Hugh Davis	2
C. R. Grant	1	Foundries and Machine Shops--	
J. C. Arnold	1	J. & W. Fisher	30
P. Ryan	1	James Hayden	9
David Jones	1	Connell Bros.	9
H. A. Connell	2	Gold, Nickel and Silver Plating--	
Boots and Shoes--		T. H. J. Dibble	1
J. D. Dickinson	4	Lock Maker--	
Bailey Bros	6	Leonard Irvine	1
Britton Bros.	3	Planing and Moulding Makers--	
E. R. McLemants	2	Connell Bros.	10
J. A. Movers	2	Plumber--	
Cabinet and Furniture--		C. S. Woodling	7
John S. Marcy	2	Printing Offices--	
Thos. S. Donohue	5	Geo. L. Holyhoke	7
A. Henderson	5	C. & J. Watts	6
Carding Mill--		Saddle and Harness--	
Mrs. H. Davis	2	Jacques Bros.	1
Carpenters and Joiners--		Richard Cluff	2
Connell Bros. (Wood Shop)	5	C. E. Smith	1
Carriage Makers--		H. N. Movers	3
John Loane	3	F. L. Atherton	2
Chesley Estey	3	Sash and Blind Factories--	
		W. M. Drysdale	9
		R. K. Jones	23
		Saw Mills--	
		Jas. Hayden	22
		A. H. Sawyer	40
		Mrs. Hugh Davis	2
		Shingle Makers--	
		Fred. Moore & Son.	160
		Stone and Marble Cutting--	
		J. Gallagher & Son	1
		Tailors--	
		R. B. Jones	10
		J. Walker	10
		Geo. McHarg	10
		S. McLeod	4
		Jas. McRea	10
		W. B. Nicholson	9
		Mrs. J. W. Ganong	1
		Tanners--	
		John McCormack	3
		J. Dickinson	15

Industries.	Hands employed.
Tinsmiths—	
John McAfee	2
Churchell Scott	1
Connell Bros.	1
Mop Makers—	
Henry Price	1

Mr. COLTER. I desire to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that he did not answer the first part of the question. Will he let that part stand?

Mr. FOSTER. I have only half the answer here. The whole question might stand.

RIDGETOWN, ONT., INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Casey) asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries? 2. The names of each manufacturer? 3. The number of hands employed by each? 4. The value of the annual output of each; in London, Ont., St. Thomas, Ont., Ridgertown, Ont., and Aylmer, Ont., respectively?

Mr. FOSTER. I have the answer for Ridgertown alone. The question will have to stand for the remainder. In Ridgertown the industries are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Agricultural Implements—	
W. H. B. Morgan	1
John Lecom	2
Blacksmiths—	
John Jones	2
James Page	2
Daniel O'Loane	2
Faxon Kennedy	2
Boots and Shoes—	
Michael Grose	2
Isaac Cates	2
W. Lyman Fish	2
W. Came	2
Carriages—	
W. H. Watters	4
David Simpson	5
Cabinet and Furniture Factory—	
John C. Locke	4
Coopers—	
Watson Bros.	18
Coffin Factory—	
Ontario Casket Factory	51
Dressmakers and Milliners—	
E. E. Baker	2
Annie Armstrong	2
C. McPherson	3
Exliston & Scare	5
Elsie Havers	4
Myers & Schwember	3

Mr. FOSTER.

Industries.	Hands employed.
Dressmakers and Milliners—	
C. Ashford	6
Elizabeth Ford	3
Mary Hall	1
Margaret Brien	1
Misses Shaw	2
Foundries and Machine Shops—	
James Watt	5
Geo. Middleton	13
Flour and Grist Mill—	
Milton & Wakeford	5
Harness and Saddlery—	
John McGregor	3
Knitting Factory—	
Agnes Jackman	1
Marble and Stone—	
James E. Thatcher	6
Printers—	
E. McKay	4
P. H. Boyer	4
Pump Factory—	
Peter Cole	2
Sashes, Doors and Blinds—	
Scan & Buller	14
John Leitch	7
Tailors—	
Wm. Bowman	6
Hagerman & Jull	10
Thos. Craig	8
Robt. Davidson	15
Tinsmiths—	
Henry M. Green	2
Robert Moore	1
Joseph Laing	2
Weavers—	
Catharine Watt	2
Annie Martin	1

MEAFORD INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Meaford? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. The industries in the town of Meaford are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—	
Amos Tate	2
Henry Leach	2
Alex. Hall	3
R. A. Vanyke	1
Boots and Shoes—	
T. C. Wilson	2
Herbert Love	2
Hoppinstall Spike	3
Chas. Burns	1
Brick and Tile Makers—	
James Scott	3

Industries.	Hands employed.
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
R. Nellstropé.....	2
Laton & Co.....	2
Lenton & Knight Bros.....	7
Carriage Makers—	
Jesse Tate.....	1
Alex. Hall.....	1
J. D. McGee.....	1
Cider Press—	
James Johnson.....	1
Coopers—	
John Garver.....	6
Geo. Haines.....	1
John Vail.....	1
Fred. Carnahan.....	2
Dairy—	
James Johnson.....	1
Dressmakers—	
Sarah Johnson.....	2
Miss Walker.....	3
Oscar Boden.....	3
Miss Sheppardson.....	3
Miss Vader.....	4
Mrs. Perry.....	2
Mrs. Mitchell.....	4
Mrs. White.....	4
Mrs. Benson.....	6
Mrs. Watt.....	2
Mrs. Owens.....	2
Electric Light—	
Moor & Sons.....	2
Fish Curer—	
J. P. McIntosh.....	4
Flour and Grist Mills—	
Moor & Sons.....	8
Foundries and Machine Works—	
Barter & Bates.....	14
Wilson Lynn.....	4
Organ and Sewing Machine—	
Wm. Pilgram.....	4
Photographic Gallery—	
W. J. McCalken.....	1
Planing and Moulding—	
D. McCa & F. Sparling.....	1
Dodson, Day & Bows.....	10
Printing Establishments—	
Alex. Faunter.....	4
James Patterson.....	4
Pump Factory—	
Jesse Taylor.....	1
Saddle and Harness—	
J. W. Horsley.....	3
Henry Hilstrop.....	3
Saw Mills—	
Wm. Rose.....	1
Marble Shop—	
James Anderson.....	4
Tailors—	
Charles Little.....	8
Charles Rye.....	2
J. W. Bridgett.....	10
Wm. Stewart.....	7
Tanners—	
Andrew Todd.....	2
Carson & Perry.....	10
Tinsmiths—	
James Cleland & Sons.....	6
Wm. Butchart.....	4
Weavers—	
Miss Branchard.....	2
Geo. Boon.....	1
Woollen Factory—	
James Brandle.....	22

LOUISEVILLE INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LEGRIS asked, 1. What is the nature of each of the fifty-two manufactories in Louiseville, mentioned in census bulletin No. 12? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of workmen employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. The industries, &c., referred to in Census Bulletin No. 12, in Louiseville, are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
Joseph Trépanier.....	2
Trefflé Savoie.....	1
Pierre Lefebvre.....	1
Hormidas Fréchette.....	1
Isidore Voisard.....	1
Blacksmiths—	
Hormidas Désaulnier.....	2
Edouard Lebel.....	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Lactance Plourde.....	1
Indé Lesage.....	2
J. Bte. Béland.....	2
Ludger Désaulnier.....	1
David Girard.....	1
Ludger Plourde.....	3
Cabinet and Furniture—	
Irénée Béland.....	1
Alfred Lupien.....	3
Henri Clément.....	2
Carriage Maker—	
F. X. Thérien.....	2
Cheese Factory—	
Pierre Béland.....	1
Carpenters and Joiners—	
Marc Lorion.....	3
Alfred Houde.....	1
Edouard Frigon.....	1
Louis Plante.....	1
Prudent Bélanger.....	1
Antoine Damphousse.....	1
Louis St. Pierre.....	1
Louis Lambert.....	1
Dressmakers, etc.—	
Elise Caron.....	1
Vve. Oliva Martin.....	1
Vve. Marie Carbin.....	1
Eliza Lambert.....	1
Desauges Ringuette.....	2
Flour and Grist Mills—	
David Gaucher.....	2
Foundries, &c.—	
O. & A. Desrosiers.....	25
Trefflé Blais.....	4
Match Factory—	
Ind. Match Co. (Louiseville).....	85
Jewellers—	
F. N. Masse.....	1
Aldéric St. Jean.....	1
Painters and Glaziers—	
Hercule Paille.....	1
Jos. Edouard Barber.....	1
Photographic Gallery—	
Arthur Ringuette.....	1
Saddle and Harness Makers—	
Caurade Martin.....	2
David Pichette.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.
Sashes, Doors and Blinds—	
Auguste Desrosiers.....	6
Tailors—	
Gustave Gravel.....	4
Alfred Ringuette.....	2
Adéland Bergeron.....	2
Tanners—	
G. H. Yale.....	15
Edouard Laurent.....	3
Hercule Chevaliers.....	1
Tinsmiths	
François Trépanier.....	3
Onésime Veillet.....	3
Louis Asselin.....	1

QUEBEC DRILL HALL REPAIRS.

Mr. FREMONT asked. Whether the contract awarded for repairs to the drill hall at Quebec, in September and October last, was so awarded after tenders had been called for? If so, what are the names of the parties who tendered, and the price asked by each of them? What is the name of the contractor to whom the contract was awarded, and the amount and date of said contract? On what date was the said contractor paid, and for what amount did he give a receipt?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Work upon the repairs of the drill hall at Quebec was let out to a contractor but not by tender, the character of the work was such that it could not well be specified, consisting of repairs and pointing the walls. The contractor did it by day work, and he got his remuneration, over and above the day work, by a payment of 20 per cent upon the total amount. The total amount paid out, for which he gave a receipt, was \$496.83, and that amount was paid to him upon the certificate of the Clerk of Works, Mr. Matthieu, that the work had been satisfactorily done. The money was paid on the 12th of October last.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. HAGGART moved that to-morrow the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the Railway Companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the east end of the line subsidized by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St. Grégoire, towards the Chaudière Junction Station on the Intercolonial Railway, in the province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$64,000.

Mr. FOSTER.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway, from a point at or near the town of Iberville to St. Hyacinthe, and thence towards Sorel, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, for a railway from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$102,400.

To the Ontario, Belmont and Ottawa Railway Company, for 10 miles of their railway, divided into two sections: *first*, from the Belmont Iron Mines to Marmora Village; *second*, from Marmora Village to the junction with the Ontario Central Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$32,000.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from Coe Hill or Gilmore to Bancroft, *viz* L'Amable, or as near thereto as practicable, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$64,000.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Lake St. John towards Chicoutimi, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$81,040.

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway, from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the village of Bancroft, in the county of Hastings, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, and again granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$145,000.

To the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from St. Martin towards St. Anicet, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, not exceeding in the whole \$3,500.

To the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, for 3½ miles of their railway, from the town of St. Stephen to the town of Milltown, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$11,200.

To the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from the East Bank of the River St. Charles, to or near Cape Tourmente, in the province of Quebec, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$30,400.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company, for 62 miles of their railway, from Hull Station toward Le Désert, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$89,248.

To the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from the village of Tara, or some point between Tara and Hepworth, to the town of Owen Sound, in the province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, not exceeding in the whole \$48,000.

To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway, from Lunenburg, on the east coast of Nova Scotia, westward to a point in the district of New Germany, together with a spur about ½ mile long to Bridgewater Railway Wharf, and from a point 3¾ miles from Lunenburg and running to Middleton on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, and 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$4,500.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 18 miles of their railway, from a point at or near New Glasgow or St. Lin, to or near to Montcalm, in the

province of Quebec, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 54-55 Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole \$25,600.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from at or near Montcalm to the Canadian Pacific Railway between Joliette and St. Félix de Valois, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$48,000.

To the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, for 21 miles of their 3 feet gauge railway from La-Grève, St. Jérôme, or a point at or near St. Sauveur, on the line of the Montreal and Western Railway, to Montfort and westward, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$67,200.

To the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Maskinongé or Louiseville, towards the parish of St. Michel des Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the province of Quebec, and for fifteen miles of their railway from the north end of the fifteen miles afore referred to, towards the parish of St. Michel des Saints on the River Mattawa, in the province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidies granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$96,000.

To the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company, for 40 miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sundridge, or some other point on the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the province of Ontario, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$97,600.

2. *Resolved*.—That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, which agreement the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized,—except the subsidy to the Ontario, Belmont and Ottawa Railway Company, which shall be paid as follows: On the completion of the first section an instalment proportionate to the value of the said section in comparison with that of the ten miles hereby subsidized, to be established as aforesaid, and the balance of the said subsidy on the completion of the second section.

3. *Resolved*.—That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for

securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

Motion agreed to.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he has not yet laid on the Table the papers with regard to the French Treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. They have not been placed in my hands yet, I am sorry to say.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman is not responsible for what goes on in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to speak to the Senate.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Finance when he expects to place the Supplementary Estimates, if there are any, for 1893-94, in our hands? It is desirable we should have them at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope to have them down not later than Saturday, if we come to the conclusion to meet on Saturday. If my hon. friend has no objection, I think we might meet from three to six o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objections at all.

SUPPLY—THE CARON COMMISSION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That the Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. Edgar in amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The circumstances under which my hon. friend the Solicitor-General addressed the House last night, were of a somewhat disheartening kind. The hon. gentleman, with his warm Irish temperament, is most eloquent when he is in the midst of a congenial assembly. The hon. gentleman endeavoured last night to deliver what was intended to be a rather impassioned address to cold and empty benches. Speaking personally for myself, I sympathized with that hon. gentleman very much in the want of appreciation which seems to have been shown him while he was making his maiden effort as Solicitor-General, by the colleagues who usually cheer his utterances. For some cause, those who have been accustomed heretofore to hang upon his utterances, were conspicuous by their absence, and if he had not fixed his glittering eye upon the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), I doubt if an hon. gentleman on that side of the House would have listened to him at all. On this side of the House we were more

kind, and the hon. gentleman had an audience here which certainly, if he did not convince, did him the courtesy of listening to his arguments. Notwithstanding these discouraging circumstances, the hon. gentleman gallantly struggled with that brief of his for the space of nearly two hours and a half. I think he had a little suspicion in his mind that the strength of his argument would depend somewhat upon the quantity of evidence he read. The hon. gentleman deluged us with page after page of the evidence in the blue-book, and notwithstanding the closest attention that I paid to him from beginning to end, I failed to appreciate the relevancy of nine-tenths of what he read in so far as it affected the resolution which my hon. friend proposed.

Mr. CURRAN. I am sorry for you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may be sorry for me, but his sorrow does not half equal the depth of my sorrow for him, and the sorrow is shared all round. However, let us see what the hon. gentleman undertook to establish, and how far he met the resolution of my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Now, it is important to understand that my hon. friend from West Ontario did not say in his resolution that the evidence given before this Caron Commission had established all the charges he made against Sir Adolphe Caron; he simply submitted to the House that the evidence which was returned to this House contains in itself

And establishes facts which should have prevented the subsequent appointment of Sir A. P. Caron to be an adviser of the Crown, and also render it highly improper that he should continue to hold such office.

So that it is not a question so much as to whether the identical charges preferred in the first instance by the member for West Ontario, but afterwards seriously altered and fathered by Senator Bowell and adopted by this House—I say it is not a question whether those charges have been proved, but the question is whether the facts contained in this blue-book establish sufficient to justify the House in voting a censure upon the Government for asking Sir Adolphe Caron to take a seat in the Government, and for continuing him in that position. Now, what is the position taken by the Solicitor-General? He addressed himself to some few statements that he alleged had been made by the member for West Ontario which were not completely proved. He contended in the first place that no evidence was given to show that any subsidies voted to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway were diverted from that road. He said the evidence was conclusive that all the subsidies had been voted and were received by the proper party connected with that road, and were spent on the road. He also contended that so far as this \$25,000 was concerned which was paid to Sir A. P. Caron by the late Mr. Ross, that

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

it was Mr. Ross's private contribution, given from his own purse, the result of his personal and political friendship towards Sir Adolphe Caron and the National Policy Government, of which Mr. Ross was a supporter. Those were the points made by the hon. gentleman, and I intend to examine them. In doing so, however, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House by reading any dozen pages of this blue-book, not two pages of the book, because it is all contained in the admissions made by Sir A. P. Caron, and the evidence given by the contractor of the road and his two colleagues. Before I come to these two crucial points, allow me to say one word to the hon. gentleman on the remarks he made about the challenge which was extended to Mr. Edgar by the counsel for the Crown. The hon. gentleman knows that when the member for West Ontario preferred his charges in this House last session, they were altered and emasculated by the Government of which he is a minor member, and when the emasculated charges came down here, the hon. member for West Ontario properly refused to father them. The hon. member for West Ontario then told the House: You have altered those charges, and you make me charge that Sir Adolphe Caron received this money from the company, or from the contractor. The hon. gentleman said: I will not father the charge; I know he did not do so; I know Sir Adolphe Caron can deny it and can prove his denial, and, therefore, the Government are attempting to put a charge in my mouth that I never did make, and I do not make now, a charge that I knew was untrue at the time it was made. My hon. friend said: I will not make that charge; and he washed his hands of it. But the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) insisted that the new charge thus preferred, with all the important words on which my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) relied, stricken out, was referred to the Royal Commission. We had that emasculated charge referred to the commission, and we have its report involving an expenditure of nearly \$6,000 to the country; and we are now asked not to vote that the evidence proves the truth of the charge that Mr. Edgar originally made, because it would be monstrous to imagine that the evidence could do so; but that the evidence contained sufficient to show that Sir Adolphe Caron's conduct was such that he should never have been asked to enter the Ministry last January, and that his continuance in the Ministry, with these damaging facts before the House, is inconsistent with the dignity and independence of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says, however: Oh, but Mr. Edgar had an invitation from counsel, if he wanted to put in evidence, to come and do so. That statement was very easily made, but the hon. gentleman, in common honesty, should have told the House that the letter was written to Mr. Edgar after the commission

had finished its sittings and all the evidence had been taken. Let that go for what it is worth, and I do not think it amounts to much, because the hon. member for West Ontario had already told the Government that he would not father the charge; but, in so far as the offer of counsel was concerned, if counsel had written a letter before any evidence was taken, and had told Mr. Edgar, that no matter what the exact terms of the charge were, he would be permitted to go into any evidence to prove the truth of his case, it might have put a different face on the matter. The hon. gentleman made another discovery. He said the charge made by Mr. Edgar is seriously incorrect, because he stated that \$1,000,000 were paid by the Dominion Government to this railway, whereas, says the hon. gentleman, in tones of triumph, only \$844,000 were paid, and, therefore, my hon. friend is astray \$156,000. Sir, that does not contain the exact truth in regard to this matter. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the official statement of the railway statistics of Canada, lately laid on the Table of this House, he will find, on page 48, in a statement of aid granted to railways by the Dominion of Canada, that the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway is entered as having received \$1,003,495. The hon. gentleman is welcome to the book, and he may correct my statement, if he can. I will tell him where he got his figures. Up to last June, of the amount voted by Parliament to the road, only \$844,000 were actually paid over.

Mr. CURRAN. That was what I said.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there were thousands of dollars in process of being paid over, and that have been paid over since the hon. gentleman made that statement, as can be seen by any one who will look at the book, \$13,000 being paid over and other amounts being paid when earned, according to the conditions of the subsidy. So the statement made by my hon. friend is substantially true, that Parliament has voted, in aid, and that the credit of the country is pledged to pay the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, not less than \$1,003,495. Then, the hon. gentleman said that, neither directly nor indirectly, was any money paid to Sir Adolphe Caron politically, nor were any of those subsidies diverted from their original purposes. I think that is what the hon. gentleman charged, and what he claimed to have proved, that every dollar went into the actual road-bed; and he read some evidence to show that such was the fact. Did the hon. gentleman imagine he was talking to a lot of ignorant jurymen; did he imagine that any human being supposed that the identical sums of money, \$20,000 or \$30,000, which were voted by the Government of Canada and were paid out by the Treasury Department, on account of the subsidy, were ear-marked, that the identical bills were transferred? Not at all. Who cares

whether the identical notes, or notes for similar amounts were taken from the company or those largely and chiefly interested in obtaining the subsidies, and paid over to Sir Adolphe Caron. Does it make any difference? We will see, when we come to analyze the evidence, that the charges made by my hon. friend, that those who were chiefly and mainly, if not altogether, interested in the receipt of the subsidies from the Government, took of their money \$25,000 to pay Sir Adolphe, and they hoped to get, and, I think, it will be shown they did get, that money refunded to them from the Dominion of Canada. It is nonsense to say that the identical money or notes did not go into the hands of Sir Adolphe Caron, but other notes of similar amounts passed. We want to see, substantially and practically, whether out of the moneys, whether the original subsidies or other moneys equivalent to the subsidies, the persons who were interested in obtaining those subsidies, paid out money to Sir Adolphe. But the hon. gentleman says: If money was paid, it was paid by Mr. Ross and was a personal contribution of his own from his own private means, and was given because of the friendship, political and personal, he entertained for Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir Adolphe Caron's late lamented father. Sir, the hon. gentleman, before he sat down, himself proved that was not true. I will take the opportunity to ask the hon. gentleman if I am incorrect when I come to that crucial branch of the case. If I satisfy the House that the money was not paid by Mr. Ross from his personal feeling towards Sir Adolphe Caron, that it was not paid on account of his political friendship for Sir Adolphe or his political friendship for the Government as such, but if I satisfy the hon. gentleman and the House that it was paid out of moneys belonging to Mr. Ross' foreman and out of moneys which the company were receiving in subsidies from the Government, then I think the hon. gentleman will have to withdraw what he said. I do not think I will do any injustice when I say that those are the points the hon. gentleman made, and he supported them by very voluminous extracts from the testimony contained in this book. Let us see what the facts are. I will rapidly recapitulate them. We differ as to whether Sir Adolphe Caron was morally right or wrong as to what he did; but let us get at the facts first, about which there is no difference of opinion. I will aver to the House that, in the recital of the facts I am about to make, there is no difference of opinion on either side; what conclusion you may draw from them may be open to argument, but let us get at the facts. Is it a fact that before Sir Adolphe Caron entered this Government he was a shareholder in the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway? That is admitted. Is it a fact that he was a director of the company? Is it correct that he paid \$2,500 into the com-

pany? My hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) reminds me that we must draw a distinction between the legalized company to which the subsidies were voted and the Construction Company, formed to carry out the building of the road. Sir Adolphe was not a member or a shareholder of the original railway company which was a myth, the actual company which received the subsidies being the Quebec and Lake St. John Lumbering and Trading Company, which, for the purpose of this argument, we have agreed to call the Construction Company. The other company does not appear; it is a mere myth, and it is with the Construction Company that we have to deal. That is the company of which Sir Adolphe Caron was a shareholder and director. He had paid in \$2,500 either of his own private money or money of himself and his partners, and he was largely interested in that company. Up to the time he entered the Government, while it is alleged that the Construction Company had expended large sums towards the building of the road, it appears the company had not received one dollar in subsidies from this Government. As a matter of fact, we need not dispute about a few hundred dollars one way or the other, but this Government has voted, since Sir Adolphe Caron became a member of it, over \$1,000,000 in subsidies towards the construction of the road, and the company has received over \$850,000 in hard, cold cash. In 1883, about a year after Sir Adolphe entered the Government as Minister of Militia, this Construction Company assigned its work of construction to one Beemer. That is important. It is admitted on all sides. It is a fact every one must bear in mind, if they want to draw a proper conclusion. When they assigned that contract to Beemer in 1883, it is important to know what were the terms of it, and how far Sir Adolphe Caron was cognizant of these terms, because we must remember that, at that time, Sir Adolphe was a member of the Government from whom this company hoped to obtain subsidies. As a matter of fact, the substantial terms of the contract were these: That Beemer, to whom their work was assigned, was to get all the subsidies that the company then had, or which should be thereafter granted to it, and, in addition to that, it was explicitly provided, in the 29th clause, that the Construction Company, —of which the late James G. Ross was president, and one of the largest shareholders, and of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member and director, while, at the same time, a member of the Government, should use every diligence and effort in their power to procure additional Government or municipal subscriptions or subsidies for the benefit of the contractor, and do all and every thing to that end in as energetic a manner as though the company were building the road, and more especially to endeavour to procure the following:—The extension of the Dominion subsidy of \$2,300 per mile

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

for the first thirty miles of the road, as well as provincial subsidies, which I need not refer to now. At that time Sir Adolphe Caron was a member of the Government, and I think I am correct in saying that before this agreement was mentioned, the Government had voted \$384,000 and \$80,000; and these amounts were assigned over to Beemer with a further undertaking by Sir Adolphe Caron, as a member of the Construction Company, that he would undertake to use every diligence and effort in his power to procure additional Government aid. That was the position in which that matter stood. Now, we must ascertain exactly what the actual relations were between Beemer and the Construction Company and Sir Adolphe Caron. The Construction Company submitted also that they had put \$450,000 of their own money into this road. Sir Adolphe Caron was a shareholder in that \$450,000. Sir Adolphe Caron hoped to get that money refunded to him and so did James G. Ross, no doubt, who had an enormous interest in the \$450,000; and it was provided that the \$450,000 was to be returned to these men by Beemer. How was he to return the money? Where was he to get it? He was to get a provincial subsidy from Quebec and Dominion subsidies from this Government, and he was to build the road, and out of the road, when he had it built by these subsidies, and had it bonded, he was to refund this \$450,000 to the company. And who were to be the beneficiaries when that money was paid over? Sir Adolphe Caron was one, and Mr. James G. Ross was another; for Mr. Ross and his brother were to receive one-half of that sum, and Sir Adolphe Caron was to receive a sum proportionate to the amount of his stock in the road. This is one of the few extracts that I will trouble the House with, and if hon. gentlemen will turn to page 112, in Mr. Scott's testimony, they will find this evidence given:

Q. And up to that time you state that there had been expended by this Construction Company \$450,000?—A. About that.

Q. Which they had no hope of being able to get back in the condition in which the road was then?—A. Not unless the road was finished.

Q. And until such time as the road was finished \$450,000 were absolutely lost, as far as they were concerned; you say that from the practical knowledge you have of the whole enterprise?—A. It would be difficult to say that it was absolutely lost, but the chances were that way.

Q. There were very few chances of getting the money back, as far as your practical experience goes?—A. I would not think so.

Q. So that the only chance there was of the Construction Company getting the \$450,000 or any portion of it back, in your opinion, depended on the completion of the road to Lake St. John?—A. Yes.

Now, then, the House will see that, at the time Sir Adolphe Caron and his colleagues in that Construction Company were assigning this road to Beemer, they stipulated that Beemer should pay them the \$450,000, and that they should use their strongest influence

to obtain for Beemer further Dominion subsidies in addition to those he was already getting, and it is proved in evidence that the only hope they had of getting that money paid back to them was by having the road completed, and there was no possible way of completing the road except by the obtaining of Dominion subsidies. I am putting this apart altogether from the \$25,000 paid by Mr. Ross. Hon. gentlemen can see that Sir Adolphe Caron was occupying a position which I question any hon. gentleman in this country would like to assume. A shareholder in the Construction Company, with his money invested in it, having a vested interest in the \$450,000, and also a member of the Government, he knew that his only hope of getting his money back was to obtain subsidies from this Government so that the road might be built and bonded. He occupied these two inconsistent positions. A recipient of the subsidy, on the one hand, and a voter of the subsidy on the other. I take the ground here that a member of the Government who is charged on his honour and his oath, only to vote money out of the public Treasury in the public interest, occupies an invidious position—I was going to say a position which was not honourable—if, while he remains a member of the Government he votes moneys towards a public work in which he has a large pecuniary interest, which never could be recouped to him unless out of those subsidies, or in consequence of them. The hon. the Solicitor-General saw the force of that. He saw it was almost irresistible and he tried to weaken it, and how did he try to weaken it? He said: It is perfectly plain that Sir Adolphe Caron in this matter was a mere dummy, and that after he became a member of the Government he did not attend the meetings of the directors at all. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman was partially correct in that, because Sir Adolphe Caron did not attend many meetings, but let us see what he did do. He attended those meetings of the directors of the Construction Company, of which he was one, at which the arrangement was made with regard to Beemer; and the agreement which was made between the Construction Company and Beemer providing for the giving of these subsidies, and providing for the return of this \$450,000 to Sir Adolphe and his friends, was canvassed, read and agreed to at the two meetings which Sir Adolphe attended. I will ask hon. gentlemen who are following this matter, if they have a desire to get at the facts, to turn to pages 452 and 453 of the exhibits put in evidence before that commission. We find there that there was an extended meeting of the directors lasting for two days, in which this most important transaction the transfer to Beemer, and the obligations incurred respectively by Beemer and the Construction Company, were canvassed from beginning to end, in which this very agreement containing these clauses that I am speaking of was read over,

passed, and agreed to by those several directors; and I tell my hon. friend the Solicitor-General that Sir Adolphe Caron was present at both of those meetings and was one of those who carried the adoption of that agreement with Beemer. What does that prove? It proves that however irregular Sir Adolphe's attendance may have been at other times, at this particular crucial moment, when it was necessary to make this transfer to Beemer, Sir Adolphe was present, had the agreement read clause by clause, agreed to it, and knew the responsibility and liability that he was undertaking as a member of the Construction Company and a member of the Government. Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen to pause here for a moment to ask themselves, is it consistent with the dignity of one of Her Majesty's Privy Counsellors that, being a largely-interested shareholder and a director of that company, he should go from the Privy Council office at Ottawa down to a directors' meeting at Quebec, enter into a secret agreement to transfer from his Construction Company to Beemer the work of building that road, pledge himself, as a member of that Construction Company and a member of the Government, diligently to apply himself to getting further subsidies for the company, and then provide that that very company should refund to himself and his colleagues the \$450,000 which they had already invested? Why, Sir, to my mind the thing is absolutely inconsistent with any ideas of public honour. I know that our ideas of public honour in this country do not square with those held in the mother land; but I think there is yet some respect entertained by many of the hon. members of this House for those traditions of the mother land which have kept her public men pure and unsullied on both sides of politics. Sir, no such charge ever was or ever could be preferred against a member of a British Government; and if it were preferred, I venture to say that the very first action taken would be the resignation of the gentleman against whom it was preferred until his skirts were cleared and his hands shown to be clean. What have we in this country? We have a man charged with a political offence of a very glaring kind, retaining his position in the Government of the day while so charged, and at a subsequent stage being actually asked to enter in a new Government which was being constructed at a time when the new Premier had before him evidence which showed that the charge had been proven. Now, I want to ask the hon. Solicitor-General to whom the subsidies were practically paid. Sir Adolphe Caron and his Construction Company assigned those subsidies to Beemer. What is the next act in the drama? Beemer assigns the subsidies to James G. Ross, the president of the company. Is that true?

Mr. CURRAN. That is true, after they were earned, not before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will give the hon. gentleman evidence to show beyond peradventure that the subsidies which had been transferred to Beemer were afterwards assigned by Beemer to James G. Ross; and, so far as this evidence shows, Beemer was a mere foreman of James G. Ross, producing his progress estimates from month to month and receiving payment upon them; and his clerk said that Mr. Ross was taking his chances of getting his pay out of the subsidies. I will prove that up to the hilt. I will call as the first proof, Mr. James G. Scott, his confidential clerk. What does he say at page 97:

Q. I perceive that only the first of those subsidies appears to have been paid (as entered upon the statement which is produced) to Mr. Beemer, for the amount of \$24,355.55?—A. Yes.

That, mark you, is the first and only subsidy which was paid direct to Beemer. Now, this follows:—

Q. What is the item of \$7,644.45 which appears to be here?—A. That was some duty which we owed to the Customs Department at Ottawa.

Q. Was it owed by the Construction Company or the Lake St. John Railway Company?—A. The Construction Company.

Q. All of the rest of the subsidies appear to have been paid to Ross & Company?—A. Yes.

Q. How was that?—A. Because Ross & Company advanced Beemer money; the amount of the estimates as they were earned by the Engineer monthly.

Q. What evidence has the Construction Company got to justify them in paying these moneys to Ross & Company; what writing have you?—A. We have a transfer of these subsidies by Beemer.

With the exception of one, as I said, every one of the subsidies was paid direct to Ross.

Mr. CURRAN. After they had been earned by Mr. Beemer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.):

Q. Will you please produce it?—A. There were several transfers made from time to time. I will produce them later.

Q. Who are Ross & Company?—Well, the late James G. Ross was in it.

Q. Was he sole member of the firm?—A. I think so.

Ross & Co., you will recollect, was James G. Ross alone, and James G. Ross was the assignee of the subsidies, and the man who paid the \$25,000 to Sir Adolphe Caron. But it is asked, did Sir Adolphe Caron know of all that? Undoubtedly. Sir Adolphe Caron was thoroughly cognizant of the relationships, pecuniary and otherwise, which existed between Beemer and Ross. What were those relationships? Beemer had no money; he could not pay out enough money by the month to keep the work going on, and he assigned the subsidies to Ross as security for the payments which Ross made month by month upon his progress estimates, and then Ross drew the subsidies from the Dominion Government. Now, hon. gentlemen want to know whether Sir Adolphe Caron was cognizant of all these facts. Turn to his own admissions at page 227:

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Q. Sir Adolphe Caron, when you applied to the Honourable James G. Ross for a subscription, you knew he was the president of the Lake St. John Railway Construction Company?—A. I did, sir.

Q. Did you know that at the time Mr. H. J. Beemer was obtaining advances from Mr. Ross?—A. I must have known it. I should imagine I knew at the time. I cannot precisely say the nature of the agreement or understanding.

Q. Of course, you knew that Mr. Beemer was actually constructing the road?—A. I knew that.

Q. Under a contract with the Construction Company?—A. Yes; I knew that.

I have already proved that he was present when the agreement was entered into—that he knew all about it; and, as he says himself, he must have known that Beemer was obtaining advances from Ross to construct the road. Now, what have you got? You have the fact that the subsidies were voted to the Construction Company, that the company assigned them to Beemer, that Beemer assigned them to Ross, and that these facts were known to Sir Adolphe Caron; and when he wanted money to carry on the elections, to whom would he go? To Beemer? To the Construction Company? No; that was only another name for himself and James G. Ross. To the man who was getting the subsidies which he voted. What did he do? Now, mark, Sir Adolphe Caron went to this gentleman to obtain moneys to carry on the election. That gentleman was Mr. Ross, the president of the Construction Company. He was the financier and the transferee of the Dominion subsidies. He had invested, including his brother's money, which was said to be his own, jointly with Sir Adolphe Caron, about one-half of that \$450,000, which he could only be repaid by obtaining the subsidies voted to finish the road, and then bonding it. He was, besides, Mr. Beemer's creditor—and this is a most important point—at that very time, to the extent of \$220,000. Hon. gentlemen will find that proved by Mr. Scott at page 114, so that there was one man more interested than all the rest of the world in obtaining subsidies from the Government for the construction of that road, one man into whose pockets those subsidies must naturally gravitate. Why? Because the contractor who was building the road owed him \$220,000, and because the road was bonded to pay him the \$240,000, due to him and his brother by this company, so that he had more interest than anybody else in obtaining subsidies from this Government. Sir Adolphe Caron, viewed in the light of subsequent events, had more interest in having these subsidies voted than anybody else. Why? Because he could not carry the elections without money, and could not get money except from those who received it from the Government. I now come to the third phase of my indictment, and I want to point out to the Solicitor-General that the assumption on which he justified the Postmaster-General cannot be maintained for a moment. I ask the hon. gentleman to follow up the evidence

for one moment, and give me the answer. Was this a private subscription of Mr. Ross or was it not? It was not, and I will prove that it was not. As my hon. friend to my left reminds me, even if it were, that would not alter the matter very much, but I want to show that it was not. If the House will look at Mr. Beemer's testimony, on pages 133 and 134, they will see the circumstances under which this money was given. Now, the Solicitor-General advanced the argument that this was a private sum paid by Mr. Ross out of his own pocket, because of his personal friendship for Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir Adolphe Caron's father, and because of his great admiration of the Government. Now, what does he say here? I will ask the hon. gentleman to read the statement of Mr. Beemer, given on pages 132 and 133. Mr. Beemer was a foreigner; he was not even a British subject; he had no interest in our political squabbles, as he calls them; he knew nothing about our politics. He was a foreigner who came here to make money. He had no politics, but he was the assignee of the work which the Construction Company had to do. He was the man who received his monthly dole from Mr. Ross to carry on the work. He was, in point of fact, Mr. Ross's foreman—nothing more or less. I will not read what he says about being a politician and so on, but at the foot of page 133, he gave the following evidence:—

Q. Well, Mr. Beemer, you have stated that you expected to receive at the time you passed your contract, out of the subsidies thus voted, \$1,961,000, and subsequently you did receive these subsidies, did you?

A. I suppose they did; I never received any subsidies direct, I always received the proceeds of my estimates; you see these subsidies were given on one assumption in the contract. Then a different mode of operations was carried out eventually; first it was decided that I should take the road, and work the road, but that was never done; that was changed, and the result was that, not being able to sell the bonds, we had to adopt a different course of procedure, and had to get money as best we could; that embodied financing, which I did through Messrs. Ross & Company, by transferring the subsidies to him. Mr. Ross advanced me on my progress estimates and ran his chances of getting the subsidies.

That was a quotation I should have made with reference to my argument a moment ago. I am now going to read Mr. Beemer's evidence with reference to the interview which Mr. Ross had with him, to show that Mr. Ross did not pay this as a personal, private contribution of his own:

Q. Please look at the statement, exhibit H J B 1, and explain what you mean by the letters "G.E.F.?"

A. I mean general election fund.

Q. And what by the letters "A.P.C.?"

A. Simply to identify the account myself. It was in the way of identifying the account, and only as I understood Sir A. P. Caron was the representative of this district; not that these moneys went into his hands at all, but that he was the head and front of the Quebec district.

Q. But the letters "A.P.C." refer to Sir A. P. Caron?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you explain how these moneys were furnished; there are some notes talked about in that document there; will you explain what that means?

A. I believe these notes were my notes given; they were notes, whether they were my own or the Honourable Mr. Ross's notes, discounted by him.

Q. Discounted by Mr. Ross?

A. Yes, sir. The understanding was that we were to give our notes and he was to furnish the money that was required. Previous to the election of 1887, Mr. Ross sent for me to come over to the St. Lawrence Hall to see him. I went over there and he broached the subject in hand and stated that the friends in Quebec wanted some contribution to the election fund, and asked me what I would do.

Does this look like Mr. Ross giving a private, personal subscription?

I stated I could not do anything, for I had not the money. He said "well, we will take our notes and I will discount them," which was done; \$15,000 given at that time.

Q. \$15,000 in notes?

A. \$15,000 in notes given at that time; there for \$5,000 and two afterwards in Quebec, making \$25,000. I do not know where the money went or anything about it. I did not realize at the time that I was even to pay that money. There was nothing said about it.

So that this money was obtained by Mr. Beemer giving to Mr. Ross notes for \$25,000. Mr. Beemer says he did not know what Mr. Ross did with the money, but we know, because Sir Adolphe Caron, in his statement, says that he himself received the \$25,000 in bank bills from the hand of Mr. Ross. Mind you, Sir, this large amount of money was not paid, as it would be in ordinary transactions, to which there is nothing wrong attached, by cheques on a bank, but the money was actually drawn out by Mr. Ross and paid over in bills by him to Sir Adolphe Caron. Sir Adolphe Caron's account of it is really worth referring to. What does he say?

Q. Now, in February or March, a general election took place for the House of Commons of Canada?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you apply to Mr. Ross, on the occasion of that election, for a subscription to the election fund?

A. I did.

Q. And what took place?

A. I had in 1887 more particularly charge of the district of Quebec. I called on Mr. Ross, as I have already stated I had already done very frequently; I laid before him what I considered to be the position of the party in the district of Quebec. I pointed to him the importance of the fight which we had to meet, and I told him that I had come to him to ask him to help in providing the funds which I considered to be necessary for the legal and legitimate expenses of the campaign.

Q. What was the result?

A. We discussed the question together, and the result of it was that he told me he would give me \$25,000.

Then, in the next paragraph he goes on to tell how, in a few days thereafter, he went back and got the \$25,000 in bank notes and carried them with his own hands—and he seems to think this a very important business—and the money never left his hands until he had transferred it to Mr. McGreevy. These are the facts admitted by Sir Adolphe Caron and by the book-keeper of Mr. Ross and Mr. Beemer himself. So the money was

paid and Mr. Beemer says he did not think at the time that Mr. Ross would make him take up these notes, but it seems that afterwards Mr. Beemer did take them up. What becomes of the story then that this was a voluntary subscription by Mr. Ross. It was nothing of the kind. It was money which Mr. Ross was taking good care to get out of the railway. He took care that this foreman should sign a note for it, and, as a matter of fact, the accountant of the road believed it to be payable out of the road and charged it, as he says, to No. 2 account that it should be reimbursed out of these subsidies. Afterwards it was taken out and it was paid by Mr. Beemer some years after by notes of hand from time to time. What does that show? Is there a doubt that the money was paid? Is there a doubt of the person from whom the money was obtained? Is there a doubt as to the source from which the money was intended to come? Then follows that which shows what was the real meaning of the parties at the time; then follows the carrying out of the contract on Sir Adolphe's part as to the refunding of the money. The money was taken and the money spent. And how was the money spent? In corrupting the electors. My hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) showed that while Sir Adolphe Caron returned \$900 as his legal and legitimate expenses, he states that he spent \$5,000 out of this very money, so that over \$4,000 was corruptly spent according to his own showing. And what did the Government of which he was a member do? They voted, at the very next session, \$28,800 to this railway. What for? If hon. gentlemen will turn to the evidence they will find that it was discovered there was a mistake made in the mileage and that they had nine extra miles, and on this account they were voted \$28,800. And that was so thin that a row got up between the engineers of the Government and the contractors as to whether this was 'bona fide' or not, and, to this day, the Government have not paid the subsidy of four of those miles. If we are not allowed to draw all legitimate and fair inferences—but I say we are bound to draw such inferences in this court as a judge would draw in a trial before a jury—you cannot have everything proved in black and white in a matter of this kind. You cannot have witnesses come forward and say: I did this, I did it from a corrupt motive—this was a corrupt act, and that—

Mr. MULLOCK. There are witnesses dead.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And some witnesses are dead, as my hon. friend says. But you have got the facts, and, if the irresistible inferences are to be drawn, if the fair, honest inferences are to be drawn from them, they show a corrupt act on the part of a Minister of the Crown, a corrupt compact made between him and contractors receiving money, and in this court we ought not to be afraid

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

to draw such inferences. In addition to the \$28,000, this company have received \$262,450 since the money was given. Why, Sir, the gentleman could well afford to give \$25,000. He could afford to give it; he had everything at stake, and so had Sir Adolphe Caron. Sir Adolphe himself says in the evidence: I pointed out to Mr. Ross the importance of the fight. Of course it was important from a personal stand-point, and from the amount of money they had at stake, which could only be recouped by the granting of subsidies by the Dominion Government. I have shown that Mr. Beemer was not a politician, that he had nothing to do with politics. I have shown that Mr. Ross did not give this because he was a friend of the Caron family, as the Solicitor-General contended. I have shown where the money came from, and I think the irresistible inference is that it was understood between these parties that it should be refunded to them out of the Government exchequer. And so the case is proved up to the hilt, unless you repudiate the facts in the sworn testimony. So, what are you going to do about it? Sir Adolphe Caron remains a member of the Government, though he took \$25,000 from a contractor who was expecting favours from him as a member of the Government, and he acted up to his word like a man and repaid the money twice over. There is a member of this House whom none of us can look upon without a feeling of sympathy of a certain kind. He was mixed up in the obtaining of money from Government contractors. He received the money, not in his own hands, but he was instrumental in the transfer of it and it was thought he knew something about it. This money was taken from a contractor in the province of Quebec, in the city of Quebec, and handed over to the same general election fund to which this \$25,000 was paid, placed in the same hands and paid out on the same orders and for the same corrupt purposes. And, Sir, his conduct was brought before the House and a majority of the House, of which I am happy to say I was not one, voted that:

The charges against Sir Hector Langevin, as already intimated, having been as above set forth, the Committee would observe that in course of the investigation an effort was made to connect him with the wrong-doing of others who have been reported against as directly connected with fraudulent conduct.

Your Committee, therefore, report that the evidence does not justify them in concluding that the Minister knew of the conspiracy before mentioned, or that he willingly lent himself to its objects.

The House reported in his favour, but still the hon. gentleman was compelled by the force of public opinion in his own party and by an influence outside that has been superior in one sense to certain powers of the House, to resign, to leave his office and his emoluments, to forego the hope of promotion and the hope he had of becoming the leader of his party, and to retire, if not in

disgrace, at least covered with suspicion. The hon. gentleman retired. He never saw a dollar of the money, in the opinion of the majority of the House. But what about this hon. gentleman? He received the money in his own hands, in crisp bank bills. He went straight with the money to Thomas McGreevy, the treasurer, and disbursed it afterwards in corruption in the several counties. He tells us how he did it; there is no mistake about the facts. He falsified his own election returns. He, as a member of the Government, repaid the man who had paid him the money, five and ten times over the amount he received. And we are asked to say to-day that this conduct is conduct the House of Commons will approve, that the House of Commons of Canada, having in charge and keeping the honour and integrity of the electorate of Canada are prepared to say that members of the Government, having large interests in public contracts, being members of construction companies themselves, may, as members of the Government, vote themselves, as contractors, large sums of public money, take that money and spend it in political corruption and still remain the trusted advisers of the Crown, their conduct ratified and approved by a majority of the people's representatives. It may be so; I wait to see if it will be so. Perhaps there may be influences, as I have said, above those in this House of Commons which compelled the hon. gentleman who once led the House, and now sits on the cross-benches, to retire. Is it possible that these influences may have to be invoked again? Is it possible that there is a power which may compel those who have been guilty of this conduct, to do what the House of Commons refuses to ask them to do? Sir, I appeal to hon. members of this House, so far as their votes and voices can do it, to wash their hands of this turpitude. The time has come when Canada must declare that if there have been politicians who have proved themselves false to their trust; if there have been politicians who have steeped their arms, metaphorically, in the Treasury up to the elbows, and abstracted public moneys for corrupt purposes, and debauched the Dominion electorate, these politicians should no longer enjoy the confidence, and the esteem, and the privilege of the people's representatives. If it be so, we will emerge from this contest, in which heretofore our name has been tarnished so badly, with some degree of personal honour. If it be otherwise, we must share with those men the obloquy, the reproach, and the odium which attach to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if it is possible, after such a speech as you have heard from my hon. friend, that no colleague of the Postmaster-General has a word to say on his behalf, all I can say is that in view of such unchivalrous action on their part, I feel that I would be false to the bonds of knighthood if I did not say a word

in his defence. Sir, I have always liked the Postmaster-General. He may have been on some occasions a naughty boy, but, at least, he has shown himself a plucky one. I entirely approve of one part of his conduct, at any rate; I entirely approve of the action of that hon. gentleman in practically stating to his colleagues: If I go, you all go; I have borne the heat and burden of the day, it is to me that you owe your political existence, and if I have transgressed the eleventh commandment and have been found out, for all that you shall not throw me overboard. Sir, I must say that for once in my life, I differ somewhat from my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Davies). I do not deny the truth of one statement they have made. I must admit that, as my hon. friend declared, these statements have been proved up to the hilt; I must admit that there does not appear to be a shadow of doubt that the present Government owes its existence, as its immediate predecessors did, to having organized, skilfully and successfully, a colossal system of corruption, that the Treasury has been looted, that the Treasury has been plundered, that the Treasury has been despoiled for the purpose of debauching the electorate of Canada; and that it matters very little for the purposes of this argument, whether it has been done directly, or by the roundabout fashion of conspiring with manufacturers in the Red Parlour, or by obtaining percentages of railway subsidies, or by sweating contracts, or by any other of the many modes that are known to us to exist. But my hon. friend, before he sat down, put one most significant question—what are we going to do about it? Now, my own advice to my hon. friend is this: Let us recognize the situation, let us accept the facts, let us, as a majority of this House has declared, and as, I have no doubt, the majority of this House will again declare, practically, let us recognize the facts that, to-day in Canada, in the year 1893, the accepted mode of carrying on the Government of Canada is by deliberate and organized corruption. Now, that being so, what is the course he asks us to adopt? Sir, I have a proposition to make to this House, which I hope the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as well as the leader of the Government, will see it within his power to accept. Sir, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as everybody knows, are loyal, loyal beyond all compare. They are nothing if they are not loyal. They are, as the French proverb goes, more loyal than Her Majesty itself. If they propose, or any one of them proposes, to levy war against the Crown, they do it from motives of the very highest loyalty. This being the case, I appeal to the loyalty of these hon. gentlemen. They desire, as they have told us, above all things, to be true to British principle, to follow British precedent. Now, I have noticed on several occasions that those hon.

gentlemen are so apt to discern treason that they will absolutely scent treason in statements made on this side of the House, which statements have already been made by members of the British Parliament who afterwards—and indeed I believe were at the time they made them—sworn advisers of the Crown. These gentlemen, I may say, are “*Britannicis Britanniores.*” These gentlemen can do no act without parading their loyalty. Do they pass an Act to disfranchise a large number of Her Majesty’s subjects? Do they pass an Act to lay prohibitory duties on goods which we import from Great Britain? Sir, it is impossible, as this House well knows, for these hon. gentlemen to perform these great acts without commemorating them to the loyal tune of “*God Save the Queen.*” They are always waving the old flag; they are all for the old flag and an appropriation; and it is my sad and sober conviction that if you take away the appropriation, the old flag, so far as they are concerned, will wave only half-mast high. But, under all circumstances, these gentlemen feel themselves obliged to adhere to British principle and British precedent. Now, I am going to give them an opportunity to show their heartfelt devotion to British principle. If there be one British principle that is better established than another, it is that in the eyes of British law, all men are entitled to equal rights. It is the pride and the glory of the British law, that peer and peasant have alike equal privileges in all courts of justice, that every man, be he a member of the Dominion Penitentiary, or a member of the Dominion Privy Council, if accused, shall have equal rights and equal justice. Now, we have established a precedent here of very great importance: we are, as my hon. friend has truly said, sitting as a high court of justice in this Parliament, and my proposition is, as I have said, that we recognize the fact, that we crystallize that magnificent precedent which we established last session in regard to the motion then made by my hon. friend. I propose that we amend our criminal code, and that we provide, in the future, to administer equal justice to all classes of Her Majesty’s subjects; I propose that we wipe away from ourselves the reproach that there is one law for a member of this House and another law for an accused person not being a member of this House. What I have to propose to the Solicitor-General in the absence of the Minister of Justice, whom I would greatly like to see here to-day, is that we remedy that defect in our criminal code at the earliest possible moment. I have ventured, under correction, to draw up a short Act which, I think, will meet the case, which will afford a happy means of reconciling my hon. friend beside me and my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), with my hon. friend the Solicitor-General. With your permission I will read the Bill:

An Act for the Purer and More Equal Administration of Justice to all Classes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

R

Whereas, it appears from the Journals of the House of Commons of Canada, that one James D. Edgar, member thereof for the West Riding of Ontario, did, on or about the 6th day of April, 1892, prefer certain charges against the Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron, Postmaster-General, also a member of the said House; and whereas the said House did, on the 4th day of May, 1892, order and direct that the said Sir Adolphe Caron and his colleagues should be permitted to substitute certain other charges prepared by themselves, for the original charges preferred by the said James D. Edgar; and whereas it further appears, from the said Journals, that the said James D. Edgar proposed to cause the aforesaid charges to be investigated before a committee of the said House, on which committee both the political parties whereof the said House is composed, would be represented, and that the said House did, on the said day of May in 1892, further order that the said substituted charges should not be investigated by a committee of the said House, but that they should be referred to certain judges to be thereafter selected by the said Sir Adolphe Caron and his colleagues:

And whereas it is expedient that the rules and procedures of the other courts of justice in this Dominion should be assimilated to those established by the High Court of Parliament, and that an equal and uniform justice be administered to all classes of Her Majesty’s subjects in this Dominion: Now, therefore:

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

1st. This Act may be cited as “An Act for the Uniform Administration of Justice.”

2nd. From and after the passing of this Act, whensoever any person (not hereinafter excepted) shall be accused of any offence in any court of justice, the said person so accused shall have the right to appoint the judges by and before whom he is to be tried, with or without a jury, in the discretion of the accused.

3rdly. That the said accused party shall be furnished with a copy of the charges intended to be preferred against him, a reasonable time in advance of the day of trial, and shall be at liberty to alter, amend, transmute and vary the same, as to him shall seem best.

4thly. That it shall henceforward be a good and sufficient defence, in answer to any charge of felony or other criminal offence for the person so accused to allege that he did not commit some other crime, or felony; e.g.: in the case of any person accused of committing murder, it shall henceforward be a good defence to plead that the said party did not commit adultery—or, if accused of horse-stealing, to plead that he did not commit forgery—or, if accused of burglary, to plead

that he is not guilty of coining false money—and generally, it shall be held sufficient, in any case, for the party accused of any particular offence, to show that he did not commit some other and different offence.

5thly. That henceforward any person who brings a charge against any other person, but who fails to secure a conviction under sections 3 and 4 of this Act, shall, 'ipso facto,' be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be subject to fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the party so accused.

I know ours is a law founded largely on precedents. I am aware that, while we were establishing this precedent, another, though perhaps an inferior tribunal, was establishing a somewhat different precedent. I refer, not to the famous case of Edgar vs. Caron, but to the equally famous case though conducted on different lines, of Angers vs. Mercier. I am desirous, in the Act, to prevent a conflict of precedents, and, therefore, section 6 will read:

6thly. No member of any Liberal Administration, Local or other, shall be entitled to the benefit of this Act.

7thly. God save the Queen.

Mr. FOSTER. When do you propose the second reading?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I entertain the hope that, before I have done, I will lay such excellent reasons before the leader of the House that my hon. friend, the Solicitor-General for the Dominion, will be instructed, if my hon. friend accepts my proposition, to take charge of this as a Government measure. So my hon. friend can fix a day for the second reading. I want to call the attention of the House not merely to the vindication of British principle which underlies this Bill, not merely to the affirmation of the great truth that the procedure in this High Court of Justice should be as similar as possible to the procedure in other courts of justice, but to point out other very important though secondary considerations which have led me to submit this suggestion. This Government is, as everybody knows, an economical Government. It will not pay as much as one dollar into the treasury without paying another dollar or even two or three others into the pocket of some well-deserving citizen or other. It is most anxious to be economical; the Minister of Finance has assured us of that innumerable times. Consider what an opportunity for economy we have here. I stake my reputation as a legislator that if this Bill becomes law you will almost immediately be able wholly and entirely to dispense with all those expensive penitentiaries that now adorn the face of Canada. Think what a saving would be there. Moreover, what a saving there would be in the labours of the judiciary. I will venture to say that if you pass this Bill you will be able to dispense with half our

judges, who will have very little criminal work to do, and thus save not merely their salaries, but also their pensions, which will be a source of unfeigned pleasure to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Then, for a secondary consideration, think of the hard labour heretofore performed in our legislative halls. Think of the freedom from scandals, from recrimination, from mud-throwing, from a recurrence of those unfortunate scenes which in times past have gone far, I fear, to leave a stain on the fair name of Canada. We will elevate the tone of Parliament; but more than that. Sir, it is well known that one of the greatest problems to which the Government have been for some time addressing themselves is the difficulty, not so much of bringing immigrants here as of retaining immigrants. Pass this Bill, and apply it to strangers who seek our land, and you will encourage a truly selected immigration. You will make of Canada, as was made of certain cities under the Israelite regime, a true city of refuge, to which every man who is distressed or oppressed or at variance with the oppressive laws of other lands may come with perfect certainty that he cannot be extradited. They will come with money in their pockets. These men, if you get them here, will be safe to stay, and they may even supply pointers to a good many members of the Government. More than that. As my hon. friend opposite has been wrestling, rather under difficulties, with the census statistics for a long time, I want to call his attention to another matter of great importance to Canada. Our reputation has suffered, there is no doubt about it, more or less, from all these unfortunate scandals. Now, I want the hon. gentleman to consider this: make this Bill law, and you may depend upon it that there will be the greatest possible improvement thenceforth and for ever in the moral statistics of Canada. I will undertake to say that Canada will be able to show a smaller percentage of convicted criminals, if this Bill becomes law, than any other country in the civilized world. And only consider what additional importance would be given to the census or those numerous tables which the hon. gentleman is so fond of bringing down, if he could show as regards moral statistics so absolutely a clean sheet as would result from the action of this measure. I have never seen so short a Bill for which so much could be said. There is but one flaw—I must admit there is one flaw which I see myself in the Bill. I confess that on ordinary principles of justice I felt when I drafted this measure that I was doing an injustice to two worthy members, or former members of this House. I felt that if this Bill became law, undoubtedly it would be fair to introduce a clause in it under which our late colleague, J. G. Rykert and the hon. member for Three Rivers, might have an opportunity of once more revindicating themselves and regaining the positions of light and leading they so well deserve to hold in the Con-

servative ranks. But I am free to say, although I did not see my way to complicate matters by introducing retroactive provisions in the Bill, that when it gets its second reading I will be disposed, if amendments are placed in my hands, to consider with an open mind any proposition to extend the provisions of this Act to the member for Three Rivers and J. G. Rykert. I must say that it does appear to me that the claims of justice, do certainly demand of us that if we are going to administer this justice to the Postmaster-General, a like measure of justice should be administered to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin). Why should we make dead meat of him, and allow the other fowl to fly rejoicing to the four winds of Heaven? Now, Sir, my proposition in brief is this: Let us face the situation; let us admit the necessity of carrying on the Queen's Government in Canada by the well understood constitutional methods discovered and practised by the hon. Postmaster-General; let the Government agree to give this measure precedence on their Order Paper, and I dare say my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) will willingly withdraw his motion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, after the understanding that has been arrived at, I have no desire or intention to take up the time of the House by any lengthy argument or reasons, with reference to the very important amendment that has been placed in your hands. But, Sir, I desire just an opportunity of briefly stating why it is that under the evidence that has been adduced, and the papers that have been submitted to us, I feel compelled to vote in support of the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). The circumstances which these papers disclose are, as I understand, briefly these: That this railway company had in the first place made a contract with the Construction Company for the building of the road, that that contract provided that the Construction Company were to have all the bonds of the road and all the subsidies which had been then obtained, and all the subsidies which might from time to time thereafter be granted by the Dominion Government, or by the Local Government, or by municipalities. Subsequently the Construction Company transferred the contract—so to speak, though not exactly in terms—to Mr. Beemer, and Mr. Beemer undertook to do the building of the road, and he was to receive in consideration for the building of the road all the bonds and all the subsidies then voted, and all the subsidies which might thereafter be voted. The House will see that this contractor, Mr. Beemer, undertook to do this work for the bonds which the company was authorized to issue, namely \$20,000 a mile, and for the subsidies which had then been granted; and whether any subsidies were granted subsequent to that made no difference in his obligation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

because he was required and bound to build the road. The company undertook on their part, and the Construction Company afterwards undertook on their part, to use every influence with this Government in order to induce the Government to grant additional subsidies, but whether those additional subsidies were or were not granted, nevertheless contractor Beemer was bound by this contract to build the road. It is only proper to say that the hon. Postmaster-General was a shareholder in the Construction Company, though not to a very large amount, and I for my part do not believe that any personal interest the Postmaster-General had in this matter, influenced him in the slightest degree in the course which he afterwards took in the promoting of the granting of these subsidies. It is only right for me to say that I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the personal interest of that hon. gentleman had the least bearing on his conduct either as a member or Minister, with reference to these subsidies. The fact does remain, however, that the company had reserved to themselves \$450,000 for money expended, for time that had been put in, and by the agreement between them and the contractors, they had reserved to themselves this sum, out of whatever should come to Mr. Beemer, under the contract which I have briefly outlined. There was, therefore, a pecuniary interest, and a substantial interest on the part of the Construction Company, of which the Postmaster-General was a member, in the granting of the subsidies so as to enable Beemer to carry out the agreement he had entered into and to restore to the company, from one source or another, this sum of \$450,000. Now, Sir, what do we find? We find that immediately before the election of 1887 subsidies were granted by this House. They were granted apparently to the railway company. They were granted, so far as I can see, in ignorance of the fact that this Construction Company existed, or that the Construction Company had anything at all to do with carrying on of this work. The subsidies were applied for from time to time in the name of the railway company, and not in the name of the Construction Company, and, after the election of 1887, further subsidies were granted from time to time. The figures have been given by hon. gentlemen and I need not repeat them. Now, at this time, the Postmaster-General approaches, as he tells us, the late Hon. Mr. Ross, and he obtains the sum of \$25,000 from him or from Mr. Beemer. I am not at all satisfied that there has not been some confusion in the evidence, and that two sums were not obtained. It is impossible to reconcile the statements we have here, and to suppose that there was but one sum of \$25,000 obtained at that period. It is perfectly plain that Mr. Ross did not contribute this \$25,000; it is perfectly plain that the way that sum was obtained was by Mr. Ross discounting for Mr. Beemer Mr. Beemer's five promis-

sory notes for the \$25,000. The net sum, that is the amount less the discount, of which he handed over, and as Mr. Geggie, his clerk, tells us, not to the Postmaster-General but to Mr. Beemer himself. It is the only paragraph I will trouble the House to read because it appears to me a matter of very great importance to which I do not think attention has yet been directed. Mr. Geggie, Mr. Ross's confidential clerk, tells us on page 179 of the evidence :

My knowledge regarding these notes is this : Mr. Ross gave me the notes and said, "I have agreed to discount these notes for Beemer, and when he comes you can give him the money." Mr. Beemer came over, or he sent over, I cannot remember which now, but the cheques were given at different times, and I understood then that it was simply a discount that we were making for Beemer.

Now, that account does not square with Mr. Beemer's account. Mr. Beemer says that Mr. Ross asked him to contribute to the election fund, that he offered to discount his notes in order that that sum might be obtained, and that he (Beemer) did not know who the money was given to or anything more about it. But, Sir, it is a most extraordinary circumstance that Mr. Beemer, who tells us that he did not know to whom the money was given, actually marked—as hon. gentlemen will see if they look at the second part of the evidence, page 567—marked on the notes when he retired them, these words :

The 28th June, 1887, extraordinary account, paid Ross & Company note on account "G. E. F.," date 3rd February, 1887, A. P. C.

Asked what these letters meant, he said that "G.E.F." meant General Election Fund, and that "A.P.C." meant the Postmaster-General. We find that while Mr. Beemer tells us he did not know to whom the money was given, that he did not know more than that it was to be contributed for election purposes, yet Mr. Beemer marked down on the cheques which he gave to retire these notes, or rather he marked down on three of them, the initials of the hon. the Postmaster-General. Couple that with the statement of Mr. Geggie, the book-keeper, who swears that the money was discounted by Mr. Ross for Mr. Beemer, and paid either to Mr. Beemer or his clerk ; and I am unable to understand or accept the statement that the \$25,000 with which Mr. Beemer was charged was the same \$25,000 of which the hon. Postmaster-General has given us an account in his evidence. But whether it be so or not, the position is this : Here was Beemer, a contractor, who had agreed to do this work whether he got a single dollar more or not, who had agreed to build the Lake St. John Railway for the \$20,000 a mile, the bonds issued, and the subsidies already obtained. Here was Mr. Ross, who was his financier, interested largely in these subsidies, so as to enable him to carry the work through, and to enable him afterwards to restore the \$450,000

to those gentlemen who were interested in the Construction Company, the hon. Postmaster-General being one. Under these circumstances—at a time when the House was voting the money, when more money was expected, and when these gentlemen were to use their influence, the Senator in one Chamber, and the hon. Postmaster-General in the other, to induce the Government to grant this money—we find the Postmaster-General obtaining \$25,000 from that source for the purpose of promoting his own election and the election of his party in the district of Quebec. Sir, I do not pretend to be any better than my fellow-members. I do not pretend to say that, in the course of our political life we have not been guilty of acts in contravention of the election law. But we have this fact now brought under the notice of this House, after a commission has been solemnly appointed to take the evidence and report to this House ; and having it placed upon the Table, is it possible that we can refuse to take notice of it, while the hon. gentleman accused holds the high and distinguished position which the hon. Postmaster-General holds as a Minister of the Crown ? For my part, Sir, I shall vote for the amendment without discussing the matter on any other ground.

Mr. OUMET. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say very much on this question. I wish only to draw the attention of the House to the change of ground brought about by this resolution since the beginning of the discussion, and especially since last year, when the question was first brought forward. The House will see, from the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), and also from the arguments advanced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that the questions now before the House are two-fold. The first is, whether the conduct of the hon. Postmaster-General in being a member and director of the Construction Company of the Lake St. John Railway was improper, and ought to have prevented the Premier, when he formed his Cabinet, from calling the hon. Postmaster-General to office. Was the conduct of the hon. Postmaster-General improper, illegal, unlawful or criminal ? An act cannot be a criminal one, it cannot be an illegal one, it cannot be an unlawful one, when there is nothing in the law to prevent it. The same argument may be applied to a member of Parliament as well as to a member of the Government. Is it proper for a man to occupy a position in a joint stock company, as a shareholder or director, who has anything to do with the Government, and who hopes or expects any subsidies to be granted to his company ? Is there anything in the law to prevent it ? Sir, there is nothing that will prevent that, either at common law or in the Independence of Parliament Act, which controls the conduct of members of this House on such matters. Therefore, there was

nothing improper in the hon. Postmaster-General being a member of that company. Besides, I may add, not only was it not improper, but members of the Government and members of this Parliament are very often placed under the necessity of forming part of companies, railway companies or otherwise, formed for the purpose of benefiting their own county, or the section of country which they specially represent. When the hon. Postmaster-General was asked to form part of that company he was a member of the House, it is true enough, but he was not a member of the Government; and when the House takes notice of the admission made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that he, for one, has no doubt that the hon. Postmaster-General never did anything to benefit himself personally, this ought to dispose of that part of the accusation in toto. If there is an hon. member of this House who is ready to rise in his seat and say that the hon. Postmaster-General has put into his pocket a single cent of that money coming from the subsidies, then it will be time enough to discuss the matter, as a question of evidence, and see if the conduct of the hon. Postmaster-General was illegal or improper, or of such a nature as to oblige the Prime Minister to take notice of it; because the question now before the House is this: Whether Sir John Thompson, the Premier of this country, was right or wrong, and whether he is to be censured or not, for having done what he has done, that is, for having taken the hon. Postmaster-General into his Cabinet. This vote involves a vote of censure against our Premier personally; it is not a vote of censure against the leader of the House, or against any other member of this Government here; it is a vote of censure against Sir John Thompson, personally, for having done what the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is pleased to call an improper thing, and what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is pleased to call an outrage on the constitution of this country. It is the most open and the most formal censure against the conduct of the Premier of this country; and, Sir, it will strike every supporter of our Premier in this House that this motion was placed before this House only after he had gone away, and when he could not defend himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OUIMET. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a second question: Was the money obtained corruptly by Sir Adolphe Caron from the late Mr. Ross? As to that, there is not a tittle of evidence that will lead any hon. member of this House to say that Sir Adolphe Caron went to the late Mr. Ross and made any bargain with him, or solicited him to furnish that money, and promised him that he would be recouped in one way or another. Not only that, but there is not a tittle of

Mr. OUIMET.

evidence to show that Sir Adolphe Caron knew, at any time, that that money was to be recouped to the late Mr. Ross by Mr. Beemer; and I say more, even if he had known that Mr. Beemer would be called upon afterwards to repay it, this would not constitute an evil or corrupt intent which would make the act illegal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. I say that until you prove that there was an understanding between the Postmaster-General, the St. John Railway, the late Mr. Ross, who was president for some time of the company, and Mr. Beemer, the contractor, or any other person who might have acted as a go-between—you have no case against the Postmaster-General. If there were any evidence of that, I would say that my hon. friend from West Ontario had proved his charges, but there is nothing of that kind proved. The hon. member for Simcoe found, from the evidence of Mr. Geggie, the accountant of Mr. Ross, that the \$25,000 were the proceeds of the \$5,000 notes which were given by Mr. Beemer to Mr. Ross to be discounted at the bank. Well, these notes were discounted at various dates, and the hon. gentleman's contention is rebutted by the very fact that the \$25,000 were, according to the evidence of Mr. McGreevy, handed to him in bills, for which he gave his receipt. How could it be the discount of the notes? All the evidence points to the fact that the money was got from the bank by Mr. Ross, or from his safe, or elsewhere, independent altogether of the notes, and handed to the Postmaster-General, who afterwards brought it to Mr. McGreevy to form part of the General Election Fund.

Mr. EDGAR. There were five different notes.

Mr. OUIMET. The same argument applies to the \$5,000 note. When that was discounted, it did not represent \$5,000 in money. The hon. gentleman knows that and so do a good many of us.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 177, he will find that I am right. There were different cheques, the first for \$5,000, the second for \$4,750, the third for \$5,250, the next for \$5,000, and the fifth for \$4,406.49, the difference between that and the \$5,000 being the discount. The total is \$25,000, less the discount.

Mr. OUIMET. You have the evidence of that witness.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand these are the cheques produced.

Mr. OUIMET. And you have the evidence of Mr. McGreevy.

Mr. McCARTHY. But these cheques are produced.

Mr. OUIMET. That does not matter, because the \$25,000 may have been handed by Mr. Ross to the Postmaster-General, and handed by him, as they were immediately afterwards, to Mr. McGreevy, and then the notes sent to the bank and placed there to the credit of Mr. Ross or of Mr. Beemer for the amount of the discount. But the evidence remains all the same that the \$25,000 were handed by Mr. Ross from his own private funds to the Postmaster-General, who handed it to Mr. McGreevy in bills intact, forming the sum of \$25,000 altogether. Now, I shall only add this that there is no evidence that the Postmaster-General knew, at the time he got the money from Mr. Ross, that it was to be charged to Mr. Beemer. It may be, in the opinion of a good many people, improper that the law concerning the independence of members of this House should allow any member to hold the position of shareholder or director of a joint-stock company, which has anything to do with the Government. That is a fair proposition to discuss? I know that a good many members on this side or the other side may be influenced by this very consideration, that they do not think it is proper for a member of this House to belong to any company whose interests are intimately connected with politics in the shape of Government subsidies. But is that a reason why the Postmaster-General should be censured, or why the Premier of the Dominion should be censured? There was nothing done contrary to law, though there may be a certain opinion that what was done should not have been done. In concluding my impromptu argument, let me ask the House not to be caught by the argument of my hon. friend from South Ontario. How changed he is from what he was last year? How much he has shifted his ground?

Mr. EDGAR. You members shifted it for me, and I take you on your own ground.

Mr. OUIMET. We have granted to the hon. gentleman more than he ever wanted. I know that he did not intend to go any further than charging the Postmaster-General of having acted as a director of the company while a member of the Government, seeking to convey to the House the impression that the relations of my hon. colleague with the company and the Government were corrupt. I know that was what he intended. He was aware that he could not prove any conspiracy as charged by his friends on the floor of the House, and he would not go so far as to charge the Postmaster-General of having done an unlawful and corrupt act. The question to-day is whether or not it is proper for the Postmaster-General to hold the position of director of a company and also of a member of the Government which gives subsidies to that company. Is it proved that Sir Adolphe has benefited to the extent of one cent by these moneys? It has been admitted by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that he has not. My

hon. colleague and his two partners had an interest of \$2,500 out of \$450,000! Is it then to be said that a member of this House would allow himself to be influenced by a consideration of that kind? And I hope that, after the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe, the House will be convinced that the First Minister of this Government does not deserve censure for having taken into his Cabinet the Postmaster-General.

Mr. IVES. I rise simply for the purpose of giving notice of an amendment which I intend to move in the House when the House goes into committee on the proposed Bill of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I propose this as an amendment: "Inasmuch as the Liberal party of Canada have always claimed extraordinary purity in the conduct of elections, therefore be it enacted that after no general election shall the judges of the country have power to unseat for bribery or corruption more than fifty per cent of Liberal candidates elected."

House divided on amendment (Mr. Edgar):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchar, d,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Borden,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lowell,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	McCarthy,
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Bruneau,	McMillan,
Calvin,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	O'Brien,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand,
Fauvel,	Sunborn,
Featherston,	Scriver,
Flint,	Semple,
Forbes,	Somerville,
Fraser,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Tarte,
Gibson,	Vaillancourt,
Godbout,	Weldon,
Grieve,	Welsh,
Guay,	Yeo.—69.
Innes,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Leclair,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lépine,
Baird,	Lippé,
Baker,	Macdonald (King's),
Barnard,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Belley,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Macdowall,
Bergeron,	Mackintosh,
Boyd,	McAlister,
Boyle,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Bryson,	McDonald (Victoria),
Burnham,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McInerney,
Carignan,	McKay,

Carling,	McLean (King's),
Carpenter,	McLennan,
Carscallen,	McLeod,
Chesley,	Madill,
Cleveland,	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Metcalf,
Corbould,	Miller,
Corby,	Mills (Annapolis),
Costigan,	Moneriff,
Craig,	Montague,
Curran,	Northrup,
Daly,	Quimet,
Davin,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davis,	Patterson (Huron),
Denison,	Pelletier,
Desaulniers,	Pridham,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Rosmond,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Dundas),
Foster,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fréchette,	Ryckman,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Simard,
Grandbois,	Smith (Ontario),
Guillet,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Stairs,
Hazen,	Stevenson,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Temple,
Hughes,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Turcotte,
Ingram,	Tyrwhitt,
Ives,	Wallace,
Jeanmotte,	White (Cardwell),
Joncas,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wilson,
Lachapelle,	Wood (Brockville),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—119.
LaRivière,	

PAIRS:

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Sir Donald Smith,	Gilmour,
Macleam (East York),	Lister,
Gillies,	Casey,
Sir John Thompson,	Campbell,
Hearn,	Frémont,
Pope,	Préfontaine,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),	Carroll.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbours and Rivers -- Nova Scotia—Digby—New Pier at Raquette	\$19,000
---	----------

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would call your attention, also the attention of the Minister of Public Works, to this grant for Digby Pier. In 1890 a grant was placed in the Estimates of \$40,000 towards building a pier on the north side of the Raquette. The proposed work was to be 780 feet long, 50 feet wide on top and to extend into 16 feet of water at low tide. The contract was let to the late John Nicholson, and all its exposed faces were to be constructed of squared timber, birch being used for the lower portion to within 18 feet of the cap. The pier was intended to meet the requirements of both railways and steam-boats and to be provided with all modern requirements. But the contract was never finished, as the contractor surmised that he had taken

Mr. IVES.

it at too low a figure, and put it off, and by the figures given in the Auditor-General's Report and the Minister of Public Works show that the Government has undoubtedly taken over a great deal of the timber purchased, and is allowing the same to rot and spoil by the action of the weather, as it has been exposed for the last two years at the head of the Raquette. The end of the old pier, for a length of 200 feet, was destroyed some years ago, and has since been rebuilt. The worms eat up the logs very rapidly, and piers built at Digby and adjoining waters should always be constructed of hard wood. Instead of this I presume that the Government have purchased the soft wood and allowed the hard wood to be taken to St. John to fill contracts made there by the Connollys. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if I am right.

Mr. OUIMET. We purchased part of it, that is we accepted part in settlement of accounts we had with the estate of Mr. Nicholson.

Mr. BOWERS. Did the Government purchase any hard wood for this work?

Mr. OUIMET. Very little.

Mr. BOWERS. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that soft wood is not fit for this pier, that hard wood only is fit for piers in Digby and adjoining waters. By the report of the engineer made for the fiscal year 1889, the inside end was very old and much decayed, and although it was placed after this in fairly good condition, he said that owing to the piles being eaten by worms that it was liable to damage by storm at any time. I find that in the report of the Minister of Public Works for 1890 and 1891, that \$2,388.02 was expended on the new pier, and \$111.56 on the old pier, and in 1891 and 1892 there was expended on the new pier \$9,804.78, and on the old pier \$29.76. Now, I should conclude by this, that the money expended on the new pier, was laid out in the purchase of logs. I hope the hon. gentleman will have the contract let early this year, so that the logs that have been purchased, will not be allowed to spoil. The hon. gentleman will remember that this pier at Digby is a place of call for the steam-ships of the Bay of Fundy Steam-ship Company, and also for vessels sailing to United States ports, and from this port is yearly exported a large quantity of salt and fresh fish and other products. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, whether it is intended to repair the old pier, or whether he is going to have a new pier, with a solid abutment, put down on the north side of the old one?

Mr. OUIMET. Our intention is to renew the pier entirely and to make it as good as new. I understand from my engineer, that we have purchased all the hard wood that is necessary for the cribwork, that is to say, that part of the cribwork which is exposed

to worms. As to the other part, the piling, for instance, soft wood is considered to be more suitable and is cheaper, and hemlock is the wood that we shall use. I may tell the hon. gentleman, that the wood that has been purchased from the late contractor, was selected from a large quantity that was brought in there, and, I think, from the report, that it will be of the best quality.

Mr. BOWERS. The hon. gentleman says that soft wood is better than hard wood for piling.

Mr. OUIMET. Soft wood for piling and hardwood for cribwork.

Mr. BOWERS. The hon. gentleman would change his opinion, if he could see the way that soft wood has been eaten away by worms. I think that hard wood is better for all purposes than soft wood. Hardwood will last ten or fifteen years, and soft wood only a few years.

Mr. EDWARDS. So far as the use of wood under water is concerned, any wood at all will last for all time; but, above water, there is a great difference in the durability of woods, and hemlock is one of the most useless woods above water that you can find, and one that lasts the shortest time. Hemlock is perfectly useless for piers or piles, unless it is protected by water.

Mr. BOWERS. The hon. gentleman from Russell (Mr. Edwards) knows very little about the action of salt water upon wood, when he says that any kind of wood will last under water. The teredo worms eat wood under water so rapidly that no kind of wood will last very long. It may last in fresh water, but not in salt water.

Mr. EDWARDS. That does not alter the fact, that above water, at least, hemlock is perfectly useless for the works I have mentioned. As to the action of salt water on wood, I know nothing at all about it, as I do not happen to be a salt water man.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I cannot agree with the last speaker. According to my experience, I would prefer hemlock above water, even at twice the price of hard wood.

Mr. BOWERS. I would remind the hon. gentleman, that even above water hemlock is soon destroyed by the action of frost, which enters the pores of the wood and, when the latter thaws causes the wood to split and disintegrate. It is a loose, open-grained wood. You must remember, also, that at Digby the tide rises from twenty to twenty-five feet, and the action of worms under water destroys soft woods very rapidly.

Mr. FRASER. If the wood is creosoted, although it will cost a little more at first, it will last a great deal longer. They did that with the bridge crossing at Bear River, with very satisfactory results. I think the

wood will last four or five times as long. I am satisfied that hemlock above the tide will rot in six or seven years; underneath it will probably last longer. Hemlock may be used to advantage inside the cribwork, where no water gets in.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the hon. Minister intend to commence the work this spring?

Mr. OUIMET. The specifications are now being printed, and tenders will be asked for in a very few days.

It being six o'clock, the committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Nyanza Wharf \$1,800

Mr. McMULLEN. How does it occur that this item has been revoted during three years?

Mr. OUIMET. A great many difficulties have been encountered with respect to obtaining the right of way, and only during the last few weeks the Government have obtained the land to make a road to the wharf.

Pictou Island Wharfs \$1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has been spent, and how much is proposed to spend on these wharfs?

Mr. OUIMET. This is a revote, and \$1,500 will be sufficient to complete.

Bayfield new Wharf \$19,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation of this item?

Mr. OUIMET. This work is under contract. Of the \$19,000, \$3,500 is a revote. The total cost of the wharf will be \$25,000. Bayfield is situated in Antigonish county on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and is one of the principal harbours in Nova Scotia. There is considerable shipping there, and the port is largely frequented by the fishing fleet. The wharf will be 442 feet long, with an "L," and it will extend into nine feet of water at low tide. This work will be completed during the present year.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the original estimate of cost?

Mr. OUIMET. The estimate of the engineer was \$25,000. After receiving tenders, the departmental officers came to the conclusion that the cost would be \$25,500. This wharf will take the place of an old wharf which was destroyed by storms.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long has elapsed since the old wharf was destroyed?

Mr. OUIMET. Two years. Of sea-going ships, eleven entered and thirteen sailed last year, and of steamers, sixteen left the port. It is a harbour of refuge and a shelter for a large fleet of fishing vessels.

Bayfield Breakwater \$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. This is another case of a revote during three years. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the reason.

Mr. OUIMET. The breakwater is part of the work, and it was useless to repair it until the wharf was under construction. Now that the wharf is being built, the breakwater, which is to protect the harbour, is being constructed.

Cape Sable Island Breakwater... \$1,400

Mr. OUIMET. We experienced the same difficulty here with regard to the right of way for a roadway, but now that matter is settled and we are going to build a wharf. It is an evidence that we do not hasten to spend the money Parliament has voted us until we have taken measures to secure that the work is done in the best possible way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the hon. gentleman hurries the voting of the money shortly before an election takes place, but he is in no hurry expending it after the election is over.

Mr. OUIMET. If I did not give the hon. gentleman a very good reason for not building the wharf, I might be open to that charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. This was voted three years ago, before an election, when it was thought well to get a lot of these things on a string to dangle before the electors, and to tell them if they are good boys and vote right they would get a wharf. Of course, now that the election is over, they are not in a hurry to spend the money.

D'Escousse Wharf..... \$4,280

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that this vote is growing from year to year. What is the reason of it?

Mr. OUIMET. The reason is that, as a rule, we do not ask for more money than we can expend. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, notice that when we fail to get enough in one year to carry out the work, we always wait until the full amount is voted to complete the work, but in the meantime we go on with the work, and build it in the shortest possible time. I think that policy is the best.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would suggest a better policy to my hon. friend. It would be better not to ask the House to vote any money until there is some idea of the ultimate cost of the work.

Mr. OUIMET. In almost every case we have an estimate made of the cost of the work, but sometimes it is thought advisable

Mr. McMULLEN.

to, as it were, consult the House as to the expenditure. Since I have occupied the position I do not think I have ever been open to the charge of not giving correct estimates of the final cost, when I propose to enter into any work of importance.

Mr. McMULLEN. I trust the hon. gentleman will carry out the principle he has announced now.

Ingonish (south)—Pier to complete..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount of money has been expended on this work up to the present date, or are there any contracts given out?

Mr. OUIMET. No contract has been given out. I am informed that some timber has been bought. We have spent, up to the 31st December, \$158. for the purchase of the land necessary for the roadway leading to the wharf.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that no public money otherwise than this \$158 has been expended?

Mr. OUIMET. Up to the 31st December, from the statement before me. The first vote was taken two years ago, and some timber was purchased, but we could not utilize it because we had not the right of way. There was some difficulty as to the title, and, as we are very particular to have perfect titles, we did not go on with the work until we had a title as perfect as possible.

Mr. FRASER. Surely the Government would not get the timber until they knew where they are going to put it. The first thing, before building a house, would be for a man to know where he has real estate on which to erect it. Could the Minister tell me under what circumstances the timber was bought before the Government had the right of way?

Mr. OUIMET. In this case we were in the position of a great many young girls. We were promised the right of way, but after some time the promise was broken. Then we had to go to law and have an expropriation.

Mr. FRASER. Was not the timber got in the meantime in order to get the promise of certain votes?

Mr. OUIMET. Well, I do not know. I suppose not.

Mr. FRASER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will say that. But this is a matter that he should look after. The timber was got without any reference at all to the question whether it was going to be used or not. There was no contract, but somebody was asked to get timber, and it was got, and it has been lying there rotting for two years; and now, it is said, there was some little difficulty about the right of way. I should

have supposed that a wise Government would see to that before they got the timber.

Mr. OUIMET. We are growing wiser.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad of that. I hope it will not occur again.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a great deal of room for more wisdom. I presume that about that time there was an election to be held, that a promise to build this particular pier had been made before, and that when the people found that the Government had not implemented that promise they were not disposed to accept another; and, in order to persuade the electors that they were going to carry it out this time, they got the timber and had it laid on the ground, and it has been left there to rot for two years. And now the Minister wants to get this vote in order to humbug the people a little longer; or is he going to implement the promise this time?

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I have been pressing for this work for two or three years, and I have found a good deal of fault with the department for not going on with it; but now that the land is expropriated, it seems in a fair way of being proceeded with. At first there was a free site granted, but the engineer found that it would cost about \$1,600 more to build the wharf on that site than on the site which has been chosen, and which will better accommodate the public. I am very glad that the work is going to be pushed on as soon as navigation opens. I think the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) should withdraw the remark he made about getting votes. He has been down in that locality, and he knows much better than to insinuate that, though he does not say it openly.

Mr. FRASER. No; I will not withdraw that statement. I wish to insist on it, and the statement of the Minister of Public Works has satisfied me now on that point, if I had any doubts about it. The lame excuse he sets up proves it, although he was not the prime mover. I venture to say that the timber, which has been lying there for two years, will be almost worthless. I do not say for a moment that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) knew anything at all about it—certainly not. Everybody who knows him knows that he would not do anything, either with his own money or with anybody else's, to get votes.

Meteghan Cove—Repairs to
Pier..... \$2,700

Mr. BOWERS. I would ask whether this work will be proceeded with immediately? I notice that receipts from the pier have fallen off from \$120 or \$130 down to \$16 last year. I called attention last year to the fact that this wharf was falling to pieces, and urged the Minister to have it repaired. I believe he expended about \$300 on it last year. It is a very important work, and I hope he will see that this money will be expended this year.

Mr. OUIMET. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the work will be done during the summer.

Mr. BOWERS. I would also call the attention of the hon. Minister to the breakwater at a short distance from that pier. The end of it needs a little repairing; probably \$15 or \$25 would be sufficient to save it from further loss. As we are on the subject of breakwaters for Nova Scotia, and I may not have another chance to speak about them, I would call the hon. Minister's attention to Church Point breakwater. I would ask him if he thinks, in the light of the representations that have been made in regard to it, that any money will be expended on that wharf during this summer. The engineer, in his report upon it made in 1891, says:

Church Point, Digby county, is one of the most important shipping places on St. Mary's Bay.

It is nine miles south from Weymouth, and almost directly opposite Petite Passage, Digby Neck.

This work was begun many years ago, and the pier has been extended from time to time, as the gravel collects in large quantities on the back of the work, and finally overlaps its outer end, and forms a bar which prevents vessels reaching or leaving the dock or sheltered area.

Several methods have been tried to remedy this evil, but extending the work seemed the only way of reaching a satisfactory result. The work, however, at last became so long that an extension was made at right angles instead of continuing the work in a northerly direction. This worked admirably for some four years, and an immense amount of gravel collected behind it, but it finally also overlapped the outer end, and it was necessary to again extend the work in a northerly direction. The gravel has lately got past this last piece of work, and has caused much trouble during the last year or so.

The river face of the older portions of the work, having become very much decayed, and in places falling down into the dock, the department during the last fiscal year expended the sum of \$1,500 in repairing it, and in removing the highest part of the gravel bar, so that vessels could utilize the pier.

The wharf was not extended in the proper direction. Instead of being carried out at right angles, it should be made to slant towards the south-west, so that the gravel will be thrown up behind it. If it is carried out at right angles the gravel washes around the end, which is of great detriment to the place. On this subject I will read a letter which I have received from Mr. John B. Beliveau:

CHURCH POINT, 24th February, 1893.

E. C. BOWERS, M.P.

DEAR SIR,—We shall send you in a few days a petition from Church Point asking for a grant to build an L to our breakwater, so as to prevent the gravel from destroying the usefulness of the wharf. It would cost about \$2,000 and will last twenty or twenty-five years. I have had to sell the brig *Venus* and the schooner *Fury*, as I was detained so many times in coming into and leaving the wharf on account of the gravel. Every gale of wind it heaves around the end and closes up the channel. Louis A. Melançon's three-masted schooner grounded on this gravel a short time ago and injured her copper and keel to the extent of \$1,200. We have a good college here,

and it is a large shipping port, and the only accessible one in the winter months for a long section of this coast. It would require to be about 100 feet long, 20 feet wide and 25 feet high, and built solid, that is, filled with ballast, so as to stand the enormous waves that break on our shore. It would be a good fishing station, and some of our fishermen, who are now forced to go to the States, would embark in this industry and stay at home. Try and press the great necessity of this work being done on the Government. If not, we will have to close up business and clear out.

I am, yours very truly,

JOHN B. BELIVEAU.

Last week I also received a letter from Louis Melancon himself, as follows :

In February last my schooner returned from the West Indies in ballast, and while trying to come in to wharf, caught on gravel bed outside of wharf, and the next tide, a south-west gale and heavy sea threw her on bar where she rolled and pounded heavily for two or three tides. I got her to the wharf after a great expense, and have her now on the slip repairing. She is very much damaged and will cost a large sum of money to repair, besides the detention and loss I will have in selling my cargo, as lumber will be lower by the time she returns to West Indies. Now, I think the Government is responsible for my loss, and I would like to have your opinion on this matter. This gravel bar outside of wharf, is some distance from wharf by water coming from pond and passing through gate, which is done every time the wharf fills with gravel. The water clears the gravel for a time, but carries it a distance and forms a bar, where my vessel caught. I have always paid wharfage, both top and side, and have also done considerable help in clearing gravel, and if an ell had been built when we asked for it, I would not now have this loss. My opinion is that the Government should be made to pay the loss.

Then he goes on to say :

Another thing I would ask you. How is it that at Meteghan River the top wharfage on lumber is 5 cents per thousand, and here I am obliged to pay 10 cents. We always paid 5 cents here until lately. We have a new wharfinger who makes us pay 10 cents.

Mr. OUMET. I could not give an answer to the hon. gentleman because after the wharfs are built they are transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the question would have to be answered by that department.

Mr. BOWERS. With regard to the wharfs in Digby county, I have taken the trouble to make a list of them, which I wish to submit for the information of the Minister and those of my constituents who pay wharfage at these breakwaters :

WHARFAGE IN DIGBY COUNTY.

Years ending 30th June	1890.	1891.	1892.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Beliveau's Cove	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Cape Cove	20 42	50 94	29 19
Centreville	24 03	34 37	69 04
Church Point	61 15	111 10	36 06
Digby	1,005 24	573 02	623 21
Meteghan Cove	122 45	132 00	16 09
Meteghan River	68 44	180 28	119 31
Plympton	12 63	11 28	13 03
Salmon River	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Saulnierville	29 42	25 40	33 21
Grosses Coques	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Little Brook	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1,343 78	1,118 80	905 93

Mr. BOWERS.

The county of Digby pays about 25 per cent of the amount collected in Nova Scotia, and about one-eighth of the total collected in the whole Dominion, the total in the whole Dominion being \$8,145.65. Now, with regard to the other breakwaters in Nova Scotia, I would call the Minister's attention to the fact that Cape Cove breakwater requires small repairs, amounting to \$75 or \$100, which expenditure would save a larger outlay in some future time. The Salmon River breakwater I have called attention to for many years, and I hope this year something will be put in the Supplementary Estimates to repair that work. Centreville requires small repairs, from \$50 to \$100, to save larger future outlay. I also presented a large petition from Rossway about three or four weeks ago, asking for three or four hundred dollars towards building a breakwater at this place. If the Government will expend that amount on this breakwater the people there are prepared to put it under Government control and find all the logs and material necessary. This, besides being a great help to the hardworking people of Rossway, will, I am sure, be a good investment for the Government as there will be a large export trade in wood and produce while the outlay will be small. Beliveau's Cove also requires repairs to the wharf there, which is in very bad repair. No wharfage has been collected there, for what reason I do not know. The hon. gentleman who preceded me, as representative of the county, lives or does business there, and although moneys seem to be spent in some parts of the county, this port in some way is neglected.

McNair's Cove Pier--Repairs.... \$3,700

Mr. FRASER. What work has been done at that pier ?

Mr. OUMET. Work has been done to the amount of \$51,074.

Mr. FRASER. Is the present appropriation for an addition or for repairs ?

Mr. OUMET. It is only for heavy repairs and dredging.

Mr. FRASER. What kind of work was the last work done there ? Was there not a very large outlay to repair it not more than a year or two ago ?

Mr. OUMET. That is not an extraordinary case. In many of these works heavy damage is caused by the sea within a very short period of time.

Mr. FRASER. Who was the inspector ?

Mr. OUMET. It was L. McEachran. He has had charge since 25th July, 1892.

Mr. FRASER. Who was there before ?

Mr. OUMET. I cannot say, but will let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to make some remarks on this, but wish to know who was the inspector before doing so.

Mr. OUMET. There will be Supplementary Estimates down for Nova Scotia, and the hon. gentleman can bring the matter up then.

Repairs to Piers and Breakwaters,
P. E. I. \$6,000

Mr. PERRY. If that \$6,000 includes repairs expected to be made and required to be made at Souris, Rustico, Malpeque and Tignish, these four important harbours, the amount spent upon each must be too small. It will take four or five times as much as this to repair these harbours.

Mr. OUMET. It is not intended to include these. There will be a special estimate for Souris and for some other works in Prince Edward Island. I will give the list of those it is intended to repair: Annandale, Clifton (New London), Georgetown, Hurd's Point, Keir's Shore, Lewis Point, Miminigash, Pinette, Pownal, Souris, Stephen's Pier, Victoria (Crapaud), Vernon River.

Mr. PERRY. Some of these are very small. Looking over the report of the Public Works Department it appears to me it does not give the information we ought to get. It states when the work was commenced, and, in some cases, what amount of money has been spent; but it does not state the actual condition of the work. I have to ask for information from the Minister of Public Works, and half the time he has not the information. I do not know what business we have with engineers, if they do not give us this information. It ought to be part of their business to inform this House of the actual condition of these works. The hon. Minister has spoken of Miminigash. I see there is an item here for \$2,950, and for 1893-94, \$1,000, a total of \$3,950. I presume this will make a good work if the money is properly expended. I would like to know if the hon. Minister is aware that there is a great deal of fault-finding by some of the people, including some supporters of his own Government, who say that the inspector is not a competent inspector. I am informed that at a public meeting at Miminigash his appointment was condemned, and the people even went so far as to make an effigy which they called by some name and burnt. I do not say that it is a fact; but, Sir, I give as my authority the names of William Callaghan, Michael McElroy and James Farmer and others, rabid Conservatives, who never gave poor me or any Liberal candidate a vote. There must be some great wrong when the people went so far as to burn this effigy, and when it comes to this it is time the Minister should be made aware of the facts. I am aware this gentleman was not appointed on account of his great capacity as an inspector, but because he had run two elections, one for the Local Assembly and one for the council. I know that when he ran the last election he was promised an inspectorship, and, to carry out their promise, they had to appoint him regardless of whether he was com-

petent or not. When such a man as William Callaghan an officer in Her Majesty's Customs, the owner of a large property there expresses his dissatisfaction, it is time to investigate. I hope no mistakes will be made and that the Minister will inquire whether this person is incompetent, whether he is guilty of the charges laid at his door by this great meeting at Miminigash. Now, there is a breakwater at Malpeque. I see nothing here for that breakwater. It is well known that the harbour of Malpeque is in a bad condition. I think it has been stated in the House before that last fall a vessel going out, a vessel worth several thousands of dollars, with a cargo for some port in Europe, got aground in the middle of the harbour. The pilot was aboard, but this sand had gathered there unknown to him or to anybody else. I do not know whether the department is taking steps to clear out that sand. There is a work going on at the Brae. The people had taxed themselves \$500 or \$600, which had been supplemented by the Government with \$1,000, for which I felt very thankful, being representative of that place. But when the Government could afford to spend \$1,000, they could surely afford to spend \$500 or \$600 more and complete the work. If it were the commencement of a new work, there might be some argument against it, but it is necessary to spend this further sum in order that the people may get any good of what has been already voted. I hope this item will be covered in the Supplementary Estimates. I want to know if the Minister has received application from the inhabitants of Campbellton, township 4, Prince county, to complete a small breakwater. Campbellton is a central place, and there is no harbour. Of course, you will understand the trouble that fishermen have in hauling their boats on shore at night and launching them in the morning. Now, these men have taxed themselves \$700 or \$800, they have got a lot of fine timber on hand, which I think is not like the Nova Scotia timber, and the worms will not eat it. I ask the Government to supplement that sum by a certain amount of money to enable them to carry out this work. I see nothing in the report of the Commissioner of Public Works with respect to Summerside. We know that a few years ago an important survey was made at Summerside harbour, and a report was made of the work which will be required to make that harbour more beneficial to the public than it is. We have heard nothing of that. It appears to me the Government are sleeping soundly on that question, although they must know the great importance of that harbour to the people of Prince county. It is the outlet in summer for the whole of Prince county, and a portion of Queen's county. We know that a breakwater built at Summerside would protect the harbour and give the needed facilities for navigation. Now, with respect to the Rustico pier, or any other public work in

Queen's county, or King's county, I am not going to say anything. Those counties are represented by gentlemen who have large interests in those places, more particularly the gentlemen who represent King's county, and they are able to speak for themselves. But I must draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that Tignish breakwater wants repairs. The sand is rapidly accumulating there, and in a short time the harbour may be useless altogether. It is a harbour of great importance for the north side of the Island. I also want to inform him that Cascumpec harbour needs to be looked after. I would also like to know whether an inquiry has been made into the charges that have been made against the inspector at Miminigash. I know the gentleman as a politician, and I believe he is a gentleman of ability. I hope the Government will look after that matter also.

Mr. YEO. I am sorry to see so small an appropriation for breakwaters in Prince Edward Island, particularly in Prince county. My hon. colleague has drawn the attention of the Minister to several important breakwaters and piers that I hope will be attended to. I would particularly draw the Minister's attention to Brae. This work there has been begun, and unless a new contract is let, the work already done will be almost useless. I trust the Supplementary Estimates will contain a vote for this work. I would also draw the Minister's attention to the pier at West Point. It has been spoken of before; but it may have escaped his recollection. It is a work of great importance to the people living in the neighbourhood of West Point, who have petitioned for it time and again. I think there is no possible reason why a sum of money should not be granted to erect a pier at this place. My hon. colleague has also spoken of Campbellton. I understand the people of that locality have subscribed about \$600 to commence a pier, and if I am correctly informed, they have petitioned the Department of Public Works for a sum to aid them in extending the work. I hope that their petition will receive favourable consideration by the Department of Public Works. While I am speaking of breakwaters, I will also draw the Minister's attention to the breakwater at Malpeque. I do not know that it needs any repairs in particular, but it is being sanded up. It is a breakwater of great importance, as a great deal of shipping is done there, but during the last two seasons it has become sanded up and is almost useless. I trust these two or three very important works will be attended to by the department, and that when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down it will be found the Minister has decided to improve them.

Nine Mile Creek—Repairs to Pier. \$800

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any hope that the hon. gentleman will do anything for Queen's county in the supplementaries?

Mr. PERRY.

Mr. OUIMET. There is some hope.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that in the arrangement of these appropriations, the strictest impartiality can hardly be said to be observed by the Government. I understand that my hon. friend who represents Queen's county (Mr. Davies), a county having a shore front on the Straits of Northumberland and another on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and necessarily requiring a large appropriation in the public interest, has the magnificent sum of \$800. That is a greater slight than if he had not received a cent. I cannot divest myself of the impression that the Government, in the distribution of its amounts for harbours, piers, etc., is governed rather by a desire to promote political interests than by a desire to promote public interest. So glaring an instance of partiality as that in the case of Queen's county, I think calls for a remedy. The Government should at least show some degree of sense of fair-play in the appropriations they make. As my hon. friend from Queen's is somewhat modest, I rise to solicit in his behalf a fair degree of consideration for the people inhabiting the riding he represents, not because they are represented by so able a gentleman as he is, but because they are Canadians, and have a right to look to the Government for that and such share of appropriations and attention as they are entitled to as citizens.

Mr. FRASER. I must speak for myself. My county has a continuous shore district of 200 miles, and for the last twelve years we have received nothing at all. Although the county is represented by one of the best dispositioned men in the world, a man charming in his manner, so far as his action towards the present Government is concerned, still, there is not a single dollar for that county. I have had promises, and I hope the Supplementary Estimates will contain a fulfilment of those promises. Here we have 200 miles of coast, from the boundary of the county of Halifax, round to Canso, up the bay, and back again to Antigonish, with a number of harbours, and one particular case to which I called the Minister's attention, where fishermen are kept out for two days, sometimes with their boats, and where the Government made an expenditure some fifteen years ago. These fishermen largely vote against me, but I trust the Government will make an expenditure at that point, when by an outlay of \$1,000 upon a work which the Government have themselves built, but allowed to fall into decay, the fishermen would be able to enter and leave the harbour. This is a case, in regard to which I appeal to the Minister and to the House. I do not want any credit for appealing to the Government to have this work carried out, and if it is done, I will give the Government the credit for doing the right thing. The Government should themselves make investigation after cases are brought

to their notice. It would be a curious commentary on the methods pursued if a statement were brought down showing the counties in Nova Scotia in which money has been spent on public works during the past fifteen years, and also the representatives of the counties at that time, and I venture to say that hon. members would be surprised at the result. When a strong case like the present one is presented, the Government should abandon their usual rule of only helping their friends, and make the grant asked. If the statements I have made are not borne out by any engineer, following up the petition presented by the fishermen, I will not ask that the grant be made, but if the statement contained in the petition, and the claim I am now making, are well founded, the Government should, even if only for the sake of a change, grant the small sum necessary for this work in this county, notwithstanding the fact that it sends a Government opponent here. I hope the Government will attend to this work at White Head.

Mr. YEO. I desire to ask the Minister whether we may expect a grant for works at Brae and at West Point.

Mr. OUIMET. So far as Brae is concerned, it is one of the places on the list where repairs will be made out of the general vote. As to West Point, a new structure is required, and it is a question whether the Government will be able to appropriate the necessary amount this year.

Negro Point Breakwater, St.
John Harbour, \$5,000

Mr. BOWERS. Was any work done at that point last year?

Mr. OUIMET. Two thousand one hundred and ninety-four dollars appear to have been spent there last year. This is a large breakwater built to protect the harbour of St. John. It is of the greatest importance to the harbour that money should be expended there.

Mr. BOWERS. I have noticed in going in and out of the harbour that some portions of the breakwater appear to be out of repair. It does not appear to have been properly built in the first place, and the repairs do not appear to have been successfully carried out since. A large amount has been expended on the breakwater, but it does not appear to have been built by any one who had any idea of building breakwaters.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is striking at the wrong man. The construction of the breakwater was commenced in 1874, and it was placed there by the hon. gentleman's political friends. I am glad the hon. gentleman's opinion coincides a good deal with the opinion of my chief engineer, who says the work was so badly built that repairs are both very difficult and very costly.

Mr. BOWERS. Was it finished and accepted under the regime of the Mackenzie Government?

Mr. OUIMET. The expenditure commenced on 1st July, 1874, and from that date to January, 1890, there has been expended on that breakwater \$435,000.

River St. John \$10,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What improvements are being made in the River St. John and its tributaries?

Mr. OUIMET. This amount has been for some time voted every year for dredging and keeping the channel open from the mouth of the river to Fredericton and Woodstock, and also one of the tributaries of the Tobique River to Grand Falls.

Mr. COLTER. When this item was under discussion last year, I called the Minister's attention to the fact that the item was in the Estimates for several years, and only a small amount spent for each year. If my memory serves me aright, and I think it does, the hon. Minister told me that he would send an engineer there last summer. Has he done so, and has there been a report from that engineer?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Allison made a survey there, and he is now preparing his report, and as soon as it is ready I will communicate it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COLTER. Has the Minister any idea as to whether or not it is feasible to so improve the navigation of the River St. John that boats can run between Fredericton and Woodstock? I can assure the Minister that it is very important to the people of the Upper St. John. We have only a line of railway from the upper part of the county to carry the produce of that county out, and I am assured by shippers that the rates on that railway have been exorbitant and are increasing every year. If the navigation of the river could be so improved that boats could run, even for a short season, it would be a great relief to the people. I am told by a shipper that it costs more to send a car load from Woodstock to St. John, about 150 miles, than it does from Montreal to St. John. Could the Minister inform me if the report of the engineer will be brought down in time for the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed that it appears from the report that the channel may be kept up to five feet deep through part of the season. During the greater part of the season, in the spring and well into the summer, there could be a channel of three feet.

Mr. COLTER. If that could be done I think that would be about all that could be required. The present boat plying between Fredericton and Woodstock draws from three and a half to four feet, and there is considerable talk about putting on a boat that will

only draw two feet of water. If that could be done, I think navigation would be assured.

General Repairs—Harbours and Rivers, Maritime Provinces... \$10,000

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister whether it is his intention to spend any portion of this vote for the repair of the breakwater at Chipman's Brook, on the Bay of Fundy shore? I have already called the Minister's attention to the fact that during a storm in November last, a portion of that breakwater was carried away, and that unless it was repaired very soon the whole structure would be in danger. About fifteen years ago the Dominion Government expended about \$3,000 in extending that breakwater and building a piece on the outer end of it. That structure remains perfect, but a portion of the breakwater between the shore and it has been carried away, rendering, I am informed, the whole pier useless. This is a very good harbour and is much used by fishermen during the season. The Dominion has spent some \$4,000 or \$5,000 on it. It is a work which was taken over by the Dominion from the Local Government. I would again urge upon the Minister—I have already done so by letter and by private conversation—the importance of investigating this matter, and of expending a portion of this, or some other grant to repair the work during the present season.

Mr. OUIMET. Chipman's Brook is on the list of places requiring expenditure of money for repairs. In fact, I have a very large list. The works demanded and recommended by the engineers amount to \$32,500.

Mr. BORDEN. To be done with \$10,000?

Mr. OUIMET. We are not going to do impossibilities. We will do all we can, and we will try to do justice to all.

Mr. FORBES. Is it proposed to make any improvements on the Melway River?

Mr. OUIMET. We have no report as to that.

Mr. FORBES. Alas! alas!

Tadousac Pier, P.Q. \$2,500

Mr. LAURIER. I have seen a grant for that pier for, at least, without exaggeration, ten years. Is it ever to be finished?

Mr. OUIMET. I hope it will be finished this year. As the hon. gentleman knows, it is a very important point for navigation.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not complain at all, only I wish it would be completed some time.

L'Etang du Nord—Repairs.... \$1,500

Mr. LAURIER. This is another pier that has been under repair for a great number of years.

Mr. COLTER.

Mr. OUIMET. That place is very much exposed to the sweep of the sea. It is on the Magdalen Islands. The whole of the breakwater built two years ago was carried away. We expect that the amount now voted will be sufficient to provide accommodation to the fishermen there.

Isle Verte Pier... .. \$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. Is this for repairs?

Mr. OUIMET. This will be applied to the completion of the pier.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the work done by contract or by day's labour?

Mr. OUIMET. Day's labour.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that there was a law-suit about the lumber used?

Mr. OUIMET. Not at that place.

Laprairie—Works in connection with Ice Piers..... \$2,500

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this an expenditure of the same character as that on the post office at Laprairie?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. LAURIER. How much has been expended on these ice piers?

Mr. OUIMET. The ice piers and the wharfs for purposes of protection are of the same description. \$34,000 has been expended up to date, and \$6,500 more will be required after this year to complete.

River Ottawa—Improvement of channel at Mille Isles..... \$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. What kind of improvements are you going to make?

Mr. OUIMET. This is to make a channel from three to four feet deep between the railway bridge at Ste. Rose and St. Eustache.

Roberval Pier, Lake St. John.. \$5,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of this work, how much has been expended on it, and how much will be required to complete?

Mr. OUIMET. Lake St. John is a very large lake. I should think there were about fifteen parishes around it, and Roberval is the principal outlet, being one of the important stations on the Lake St. John Railway. In fact, it has been for many years the terminus of the railway, and there is a large trade done on the lake in passengers and also in lumber and other freight. This is to build a wharf for the accommodation of all those different parishes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this the first appropriation?

Mr. OUIMET. It is the first appropriation, and I hope it will be sufficient to complete

the wharf. This amount is to complete that wharf which has been under way for many years. In fact, it is beginning to deteriorate before being completed, and I think it is high time we should finish that work, which has already cost \$20,000.

Mr. LANGELIER. There is a great waste of money going on there. Have the Government decided to make that wharf at Cape aux Corbeaux accessible to steamers plying between Quebec and Chicoutimi, or are they going to complete the pier commenced a great many years ago in front of the village of Baie St. Paul? Steamer captains have told me that their vessels could never touch that wharf, and that it is perfectly useless. There is a ledge of rocks at a certain distance between the wharf and the main channel, which prevents steamers going there. If the Government will not prolong the wharf so as to make it accessible, any money spent on it will be wasted. Have the Government decided to prolong the wharf so as to make it accessible to river steamers?

Mr. OUMET. \$11,000 will complete an addition to the present wharf of 175 feet towards the south in an inclined direction.

Mr. LANGELIER. From the information I have got from captains of steamers, there is a regular chain of rocks at some distance from the present wharf, which prevents the steamers touching it. If it was only boulders they could be removed easily, but to remove the ledge of rock would be a very expensive business. One of the captains told me it would cost infinitely less to complete the pier, which is built opposite the village of Baie St. Paul, much nearer that important place, than to prolong this wharf. Have the Government made an estimate of the cost of lengthening the wharf sufficiently to attain the object they have in view? The present wharf to which steam-boats go is 5,240 feet from the shore, so that you would have to build out that distance to extend the old one, which would cost a very large amount of money. At the present place you reach deep water 850 feet. I am told that after passing the present wharf there is very deep water for a certain distance, and then there is that chain of rocks which will have to be removed, or else you will have to prolong the wharf beyond the chain of rocks. Those I spoke to last summer told me it would cost infinitely less to complete that pier. I asked why the Government did not do that in the first instance instead of building this new wharf, and I was told that Mr. Cimon had a hotel on the hill opposite the wharf, and he got the wharf built thinking it would be accessible to steamers and give value to his property. But it was found that the steamers could not get to the wharf without running great risk, and it was practically useless. True, you have to go a long distance to reach the shore. At present passengers are landed alongside the pier, where it is very difficult to moor a steamer.

From the pier they are put on board a schooner which goes a certain distance, then they are put into scows, and then they are transferred into carts to reach the shore. Although the distance is very long it would be very inexpensive to build a wharf. You would not require a solid wharf the whole way, as piles could be laid and the wharf built over them without any danger from the ice, which has no strength there. I was told by steam-boat captains that it would not cost one-half the money to build the pier. The hon. gentleman knows there is no comparison, as regards cost, between building a solid wharf in deep water and a crib-wharf only partially filled, or a wharf on piles driven into the same. I was told that such a wharf would be perfectly effective in that place.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a promise he made me last year with regard to certain damages caused by the dam at Yamaska, and which he appears to have altogether forgotten. Last year when we were in Committee of Supply I put this question to the hon. gentleman:

My hon. friend is aware that during the construction of these works on the Yamaska River the lands in the commune of Yamaska were flooded, and the owners of the commune have been petitioning the Government to have an investigation into the extent of their damages, and to be compensated for the same. I have good reason to believe, in fact I am informed on good authority, that an investigation had been promised by the predecessor of my hon. friend in the administration of the department. So far nothing has been done. Can I hope that the hon. gentleman will do what was promised? The only thing that is asked for at this moment is that an engineer should be sent, so as to have the complaint investigated, and to see whether or not damages have been suffered on account of the dam.

Mr. OUMET. I shall order an investigation to be made.

The hon. gentleman has forgotten that promise he made last year, because he has not carried it out.

Mr. OUMET. I promised that an inquiry should be made and it has been made. I never promised that any money should be paid unless it was reported that the damages claimed existed. The report shows that there has been no damage caused by the construction of the dam. If the hon. gentleman desires it, I will bring down the report.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what condition this dam is in? Is it in good condition, or is it out of repair?

Mr. OUMET. It is in good repair.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that some years ago it suffered from an inundation. Was it repaired?

Mr. OUMET. Yes; the repairs were begun two years ago, and finished during last summer.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the engineer who made the report?

Mr. OUMET. Mr. Berlinguet.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. Minister promises to bring down the report?

Mr. OUMET. Yes.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) As regards this dam at Yamaska, I invite the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the fact that, on the eve of the late elections, in 1891, or later on, an engineer had been sent by the Public Works Department to estimate the losses; this statement could be corroborated by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mignault) if he was in his seat.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) A survey or examination was made on the spot during the course of the summer, at the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that in 1891, previous to the elections, an engineer had been sent by the department to make an inquiry. Why did he not go on with this inquiry? Beyond a doubt, the farmers whose lands are on the banks of the Yamaska river have suffered further losses, inflicted on them by the building of this dam. They have suffered damages to the extent of \$25,000, and the Government have done nothing to compensate them for their losses, although the owners of the commune had kept petitioning the Government to have an investigation into the extent of their damages and to be indemnified for the same. There must be in the Public Works Department several petitions to that effect.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) I have just stated to the hon. member for Richelieu that an inquiry has been made, in the course of last summer, by a Government engineer, who reported that no losses had been inflicted on them by the building of the dam. I have the engineer's report, stating that the dam is in good repair.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I understand that no appropriation has been made to finish the breakwater opposite the church of Ste. Anne of Sorel. This breakwater was commenced, I think, a few years ago; it is some twenty-five or thirty feet distant from the beach. The hon. Minister had promised, last year, if my memory serves me right, to make an appropriation of \$1,000 towards the completion of these works. I should like to ask him to inform me whether this breakwater is soon going to be finished?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) I would remind the hon. member that the work in question is not a breakwater, but merely an ice-breaker, for the purpose of affording protection to the church and the village, at the breaking up of the ice in spring. This ice-breaker is an isolated block, having no con-

Mr. OUMET.

nection with the bank of the river. The citizens of Ste. Anne wanted to make a wharf with it, or, rather, they wanted the Government to build a bridge connecting the main land with the isolated block. In the course of last year, as there remained a balance on the appropriation of \$600, I had the offer made to the citizens of Ste. Anne to give them an allocation of \$600, on condition they undertook to construct the wharf. I fancy they had been somewhat spoiled up to that time, and they thought it was not enough, and that the Government ought to do all the work. Now, as I do not look upon such a work as a work in the public interest, except in so far as the ice-breaker is concerned, which is built with a view to protect the citizens against the damages which may be inflicted on them by the River St. Lawrence—and as they had declined to accept my offer—the matter is still at a stand.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I consider the hon. Minister's remarks are quite unfair towards the people of Ste. Anne, and chiefly towards his friends in that locality.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Of course.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I do not look upon the matter in the same light as the hon. Minister. I say these remarks are unfair, for the hon. Minister ought to know that the population, for the most part, is made up of fishermen, who are, through the Government policy, prevented from earning their living; he ought to know, further, that these people are not wealthy, being small farmers with parcels of land and forced to pasture their cattle on the neighbouring islands. The parish has received many Government grants, but I consider that if this breakwater has not been finished it is not owing to the fact that the inhabitants of Ste. Anne have declined to accept the Government grant, but rather on account of a certain amount of rivalry existing among the Government's friends in the parish; if my information is correct, such is the reason to which may be ascribed the state of affairs prevailing at present. At all events, whatever may be the grounds for this delay in the carrying on of the works, I should like to know whether an extension of the ice-breaker up to the beach may be hoped for? The hon. Minister is quite aware that the Catholic population of the province of Quebec is much given to pilgrimages; pilgrims resort not only to Ste. Anne de Beaupré and Ste. Anne de Varennes, but also to Ste. Anne de Sorel. Pilgrims resorting to Ste. Anne de Sorel find no quay to land on. The hon. Minister of Public Works has been repeatedly urged by the parish priest of Ste. Anne to finish those works. Under these circumstances, I consider I am entitled to require from the Minister an explicit answer as to whether the quay or ice-breaker will soon be finished.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The ice-breaker is completed.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Is the extension of the same up to the shore under contemplation ?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Well, it depends a good deal as to whether it may be built through the intercession of Ste. Anne or not ; but no appropriation for any such work is provided by the Estimates of the present year.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I should like to know when this work will be done ?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Should the hon. gentleman be able to tell us whether or not we shall be in power next year, I might then give him an answer.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I should wish to call the attention of the Minister, in connection with the ice-breaker at Ste. Anne, to a fact which has come within my knowledge : The construction of this work was commenced, I think, in 1890 ; the carting of the stone was done by sailors from the parish of Ste. Anne. The hon. Minister, who has done me the favour of paying a visit to my constituency during the last electoral contest is quite aware that there were certain claims of his friends in connection with this ice-breaker still pending, and so well established that, on the eve of the polling day at my election, he was obliged to pay the following instalments : \$207 to Mr. Napoléon Mongeau ; \$165 to Mr. Dolphis Millette, and \$75 to Mr. Maurice Mongeau.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The accounts, then, have been settled.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) These were only instalments. Now, on the 23rd February, I inquired from the hon. Minister whether any accounts had been sent to the Government in connection with these claims. He answered negatively as to this ; but that on the 10th January, a cheque had been given for \$162, payable to the order of Dolphis Millette, for stone delivered at the dam at Yamaska. Now, I may remark that the 10th January was a Sunday ; voting took place on Monday, the 11th. Mark well that the stone delivered by Millette was not for the locks at Yamaska, but for the ice-breaker at Ste. Anne. There are still due five or six hundred dollars for carting of stone towards the construction of this work. Now, during the electoral contest, the leaders of the Conservative party of the parish of Ste. Anne almost held the pistol at my opponent's throat, in connection with the settlement of these accounts. They were pacified at the time by being paid the small amounts just mentioned. The department went further : \$162 were paid to Dolphis Millette, and there must be still left a certain number of claims unpaid.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) There are no demands before the department in relation

to this stone. The department has paid all the accounts passed by the residing engineer, Mr. Berlinguet, upon delivery. This stone was not for the ice-breaker of Ste. Anne, but for the construction of the dam at Yamaska. Now, the hon. member makes quite an uproar about this incident ; he is perfectly aware, however, of the circumstances under which he has been returned to this House. He is indebted for the seat he now occupies, not to the Liberals, but to our friends.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) He is a Tory, then ?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Yes ; he did not run as a Liberal, and he may hear in this connection from one of his friends a rather amusing story. So soon as they began talking of politics in presence of the hon. member, he would draw near to the speaker and whisper in his ear : Enough of politics, now, a word in my favour. That is to say, the hon. member ran as an independent candidate ; and it was on such a ground that some of our friends, led by high authorities in the ranks of the Conservative party, felt warranted in voting for him and having him selected.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) We are all independent.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Yes, independent after the style of "La Sentinelle." Independent, and exerting themselves to bring back the Liberal party into power. Now, when one is elected through the Conservative vote, with the help of the Conservative party, and further, when one has succeeded, as in the instance mentioned, in bringing forward at the decisive hour claims which would undoubtedly have been settled in the proper time and place, as no doubt they have been ; holding that the Government were failing in their duty by not settling the same when, with the help of such like grievances, one has succeeded in having his candidature endorsed by false friends of the Conservative party ; then, I say, it ill-becomes one to cry aloud that one represents the grand liberal ideas, the ideas which have been bequeathed and handed down to us by the great Papi-neau. It ill-becomes one, I say, to boast of being—I shall not say the presumptive heir—but the direct heir to the great patriot of 1837.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Quite an excellent member, in short.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Not an excellent member, but a good fellow. But to 1893 will succeed 1894 and 1895, and in due time we will square up accounts.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I beg to thank the hon. Minister for the encomium pronounced, but I must deny the statement that when running as an independent candidate, I sailed under false colours. I squarely

opposed the Government's fiscal policy and protection; I nailed to the fore-mast the flag unfurling the reciprocity programme of the hon. leader of the Opposition. It is a matter of fact, the battle was fought on that single issue, that is to say, protection and unlimited reciprocity. I ran as an independent candidate, pledging myself to fight the Government in their general policy; reserving, however, my liberty of action, ready to support the Government when they were in the right, and oppose them when they were in the wrong. One would fancy the hon. Minister meant to frighten me, when threatening to come down into Richelieu in 1894 or 1895. He came down in 1892 in that county, not from a desire, I fancy, to further my candidature or my return to this House, but I venture to trust he will come down again to tell the Sorel workmen that if willing to work, they may still eat their three meals a day. Let him take up that election cry again, and he is sure to be defeated. At all events, having disposed of this matter, I would beg now the hon. Minister to tell me how it came to pass that on Sunday, the 10th January, 1892, on the eve of the polling day, during the electoral contest from which I came out victorious, the Government paid to Mr. Dolphis Millette a sum of \$162.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) There is no report on the matter in the department, and as this occurred previous to my taking the control of the department, I never had any personal cognizance of the fact.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The hon. Minister is not in earnest surely when he asserts that there is no report to be found in the department; such deeds are not registered in the records of the department.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) The hon. the Minister of Public Works has just stated, in reply to a question put to him by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that an investigation had been made into the damages inflicted on the owners of the commune of Yamaska. I do not recollect that an investigation has been made into the matter. At all events, the president of the trustees of the commune of Yamaska has not been notified as to the holding of such an investigation, as he called at my office but a few days ago to inquire when it was going to be held. He also asked me whether the question had come up in this House. I am quite surprised now at hearing the hon. the Minister of Public Works state that an inquiry has been made in connection with these losses. I would like to ask the hon. Minister when such an inquiry was held?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The hon. member is utterly mistaken as to the meaning of the word just made use of by me. The word inquiry does not convey the same meaning in English as it does in French. I may say that it was only an examination which was made

Mr. BRUNEAU.

by the department engineer. This examination was made from a technical stand-point, with a view to determine whether possibly the lands could suffer any damage from the fact that the level of the water rose owing to the construction of a dam on the Yamaska river. A report was sent to the department, and it appears from the same that no losses were suffered.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) The hon. Minister is wrong. There was no inquiry petitioned for as to whether any losses had been inflicted on the owners of the lands on the banks of the river which had been flooded; the inquiry petitioned for was not for that purpose at all, but as to whether any losses had been inflicted on the commune of Yamaska. These lands, quite distant from the dam, have been flooded by the waters which flowed away through a small channel existing above the dam. These lands were flooded for several months, and at last, two years ago, a dam having been constructed at the entrance of this small channel, the flooding was thereby effectually prevented. I would like the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) to tell me why no compensation was granted to the trustees of the Commune of Yamaska, when private parties had been indemnified. The fact is the latter were Conservatives, and so far as I know, they have been largely compensated for any losses inflicted on them.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The hon. member seems to have no more accurate information on the matter than his neighbour, the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau). My engineer states that not a cent has been paid for damages.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Oh, I beg your pardon, the hon. Minister himself is no better informed; for, within my recollection, a report has been submitted, granting compensation to a certain number of persons, namely, among others, Messrs. Cardin and Tenancourt.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) I understand that this money has been paid to owners of lands bought by the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) Let us wait for the report; it is the surest way.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) I avail myself of the opportunity offered me to beg of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) that, whether, in case he should send some one to investigate into the matter and procure accurate information on the same, this party be directed to notify the trustees of the Commune of Yamaska of the examination about to take place, with a view to enabling them to show which are the lands that have suffered from the flooding and as to how the flooding originated and took place. The flooded lands for which

certain parties were compensated are situated above the dam, and, beyond the least doubt, did not belong to the Government. I am as well posted upon the matter as the engineer sent on the spot, having spent 30 years of my life in that locality. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my demand to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), to the effect that the party commissioned to inquire or to investigate into the matter, be directed to notify to that effect the interested parties—I mean to say the trustees of the commune of Yamaska.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), will join issue with me when stating that the examination which has been made was far from being satisfactory to the interested parties of Yamaska. From the statement of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, it would appear that it was ascertained by the engineer sent to investigate on the spot that the grievances of the owners of the lands situated on the banks of the Yamaska river were unfounded, as no losses had been incurred. Such is not the case. The dam which has been constructed obstructs the passage of the water. Now, as the level of the ground of the commune is lower than that of the river, the examination or survey of the engineer, instead of bearing on the lands of the owners of lands on the banks of the river, should have been directed to the losses incurred by the commune. A channel, situate above the bar, constructed on the Yamaska river, gave issue to the water of this river on the lands of the commune; and about three years ago, a dam had been constructed at the entrance of this channel. I gather from all this that the survey in question is far from satisfactory, and I hope that another survey will be made in presence of the interested parties.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The survey was commenced in 1888, the very year when the losses occurred, and has been prosecuted yearly for two or three years.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) In 1870, if my memory serves me right, somebody was sent, I do not recollect the name of the party,—it was Mr. Berlinguet, I think—to begin a survey, in order to ascertain the best steps to be taken for the prevention of the flooding. Mr. Berlinguet, the Government engineer for this district, sent, in February, 1871, a telegram to the chairman of the trustees of the commune of Yamaska, informing him that he would proceed thither within a few days, to investigate into the grievances, but I think he never came down and no investigation has ever been made by him. I consider that no inquiry has been held at that time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) There will be, I presume, other Supplementary Estimates for public works in the province of

Quebec, the hon. the Minister of Public Works may avail himself of the opportunity to give all the information asked for by the hon. member.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I would now call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) to another matter. He has, no doubt, just like myself, taken cognizance of the representations made to his department as regards the deepening of the entrance of the Richelieu River, at the place where this river empties itself into the St. Lawrence. Every one knows that there is at that place a point, which is the prolongation of the parish of Saint Joseph, and projects into the entrance of the Richelieu, rendering navigation at that spot extremely dangerous. Representations have been made to the Department of Public Works for the deepening of the entrance of the river, in order to do away with these obstructions. Has the department taken the necessary steps to carry out the work of deepening the river?

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The question would have been more appropriate if put when the items for dredging were submitted to the committee. I, however, have no objection to answer now the query of the hon. member. The representations mentioned by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) have been made to the department, for the purpose of deepening the bed of the Richelieu River at its mouth. These works are but an insignificant portion of the immense amount of necessary works of all description to improve the navigation of the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, and the department does not yet see its way to approach this question so as to examine it in its ensemble.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) I would offer the following suggestion to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet): It is a well known fact that the ice on the Richelieu breaks eight or even fifteen days earlier than the ice on the St. Lawrence. Now, as the Government fleet is at Sorel, and has nothing to do during the last days of April, though the men are ready to set to work so soon as navigation is open, the Government dredges being on the spot might be made use of during the fifteen days for deepening the river. I gather from reliable sources that fifteen days would be quite sufficient to carry out the works and do away with the obstructions which render navigation dangerous at that point. Such, at least, is the information I have gathered on the matter.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) That is, indeed, an excellent suggestion.

Toronto Harbour—Works at eastern entrance, &c., the City of Toronto having contributed
\$100,000..... \$75,000

Mr. COATSWORTH. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the necessity

of amending that so as to read "eastern and western entrance."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister might, at the same time, give us a sketch of what is being done there, and what position are these works in. A very large amount of money is being expended and he is aware that a great deal of exception is taken by residents of Toronto to the way the work has been done.

Mr. OUIMET. I know that some discussion has taken place in the newspaper apropos of these works, but I am also aware as the hon. gentleman must be, that the accusations made against the contractor had to be withdrawn by the paper that made them. I may say that the department is not open to any blame as regards these works. The contract was given after tenders were asked; the work has been carried on and has been done in the best manner. The work done at the eastern entrance consists of two breakwaters or parallel piers, between which there is a space of about 400 feet. This gives to the harbour of Toronto a very good and a very safe entrance, and, when the work is completed, I think the harbour of Toronto will be in first class condition. The work is well done. It is of great usefulness, and I hope will soon be completed, and that it will be of permanent benefit to the harbour and city of Toronto. I move that the words "and western" be added after the word "eastern," making it read "eastern and western entrance."

Amendment agreed to.

Ontario - General repairs and improvements to harbour and river works, also to bridges...	\$5,000
---	---------

Mr. McMILLAN. Before this item passes, I would like to ask if any portion of this amount is to be spent at Bayfield. The Minister promised me last year when the dredging of harbours and rivers was under consideration, that the dredge would be sent to Bayfield to clean out the river, and enable the fishermen to enter with their boats. That was not done. He said the improvements to the pier could not be made then, but I understood they would be proceeded with this year. I would like to ask if any portion of this sum is to be spent at Bayfield, or if there is to be an item in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. OUIMET. We have been unable to send the dredge to Bayfield during the past year, not because of any ill-feeling against the hon. gentleman, but because dredges have been occupied elsewhere. I hope that some of the first work done will be that demanded by the hon. gentleman. Our fleet has been fully employed, and will go to work again early in the spring.

Mr. ALLAN. I wish to ask the Minister, whether it is his intention to bring down
Mr. COATSWORTH.

further Supplementary Estimates in connection with wharfs and harbours? The town of Leamington, in the county of Essex, has for a long time been asking for harbour improvements. The question comes up at almost every election. The Government have promised to make that town a grant for a breakwater or a wharf. I would like to know what the Minister's intentions are with respect to that?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman now. This is the first time my attention has been drawn to that place, but I will take a note of it.

Mr. ALLAN. I called at the office of the Minister and brought this matter before him, and he stated that local parties had been down and presented their views to the Government. It is an important place and has far more right to consideration than some other places that are getting grants. I would like to know whether this matter is merely to be kept hanging over the heads of the people for election purposes, or whether the Government really intend to do something? The matter has been brought to the attention of the Government in such a way that the Minister can tell us something about his intention. A survey has been made in reference to this proposed grant at Leamington.

Mr. OUIMET. A survey has been made, and it is estimated that \$21,000 will be required to do the works that are necessary.

Mr. ALLAN. What does the Government intend to do?

Mr. OUIMET. At present, we do not see that we have money for that purpose.

Dredging—New Dredging Plant. \$50,800

Mr. FORBES. What is that new dredging plant for?

Mr. OUIMET. It is to build an elevated dredge for the ship channel. One of the items is the rebuilding of an old dredge, No. 9, for the ship channel. The balance is as follows: New boilers for dredge "Prince Edward"; two new scows for dredge "Charles Mackenzie"; one special separator and steel trap for the "Canada"; reconstruction of the tug "Trudeau"; new hull and repairing and placing machinery in the new hull of the same; two new scows for Manitoba dredging; new boiler for the boat "Simpson." Then, repairs to the "Canada" for the St. Lawrence, and the scows in the Maritime provinces; repairs to the dredge "New Dominion."

Mr. FORBES. I presume the Minister's remarks are confined entirely to that item of \$50,800?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. FORBES. I see in that statement you go from British Columbia down to the

Maritime provinces, and all those three Maritime provinces get is a new scow, out of that \$50,800. I must enter my protest against that treatment. We have always had a special dredge for the shore of Nova Scotia, running as far as the northern shore of Cape Breton, and as far south and west as Yarmouth and the Bay of Fundy. Three or four years ago, that dredge was lost and destroyed, and about the same time a dredge on Lake Superior was also lost. The Government immediately asked for a subsidy to replace the dredge on the lake. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised me in Parliament, and the Minister of Public Works also promised me, that the following year—that would be last year—Parliament would be asked for a sum to replace the dredge for the Maritime provinces. Now, I regret to learn that the Minister, although I drew his attention to it a few weeks ago, has declined to put a sum in the Estimates for a dredge for Nova Scotia. There are places in that province which absolutely require dredging in the interest of general navigation, altogether apart from any local interest. Counties which have no railway facilities, such as Shelburne and Queen's, have actually not a sufficient entrance to their harbours for the regular steamers which call there for freight and passengers. In the harbour of Liverpool it is impossible for a large or loaded steamer to cross the bar at low tide, although she only draws seven feet and a half of water. This forms a serious impediment to trade. I do not think it is fair to the Maritime provinces that of this large expenditure only a scow will go there. If I were asking for a new dredge, the request might be declined by the Minister, but I merely ask that the department will replace a dredge which belongs to that portion of the Dominion, and which has done fairly good work hitherto. I have already presented petitions for dredging in this locality. The harbour of Liverpool also requires attention, because the bar has not been dredged for ten or twelve years, and the low water on the bar causes trade to be handicapped. I trust the Minister will arrange that this dredging will be done, and if necessary insert an item in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will any portion of the sum voted for Quebec and Ontario be applied to removing obstructions to the navigation in the River Sydenham?

Mr. OUMET. The navigable part of River Sydenham will be attended to.

Telegraph Lines \$1,500

Mr. MULOCK. I think this is an item that requires some explanation.

Mr. OUMET. We have a telegraph line running from Bale St. Paul to Pointe aux Esquimaux, and \$1,500 are required to keep the line in repair. It is necessary to keep

the road in good order, because there is no other way by which the repairers can reach the line, and this amount covers all the expenditure connected with its maintenance.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the mileage?

Mr. OUMET. Four or five hundred miles.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this an annual grant?

Mr. OUMET. Yes, and the same amount has been voted for some years.

National Art Gallery..... \$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. How is this money applied?

Mr. OUMET. It is to buy pictures. We do not go very far in that direction or pay very large amounts. I do not think we will have a Louvre to offer to visitors for many years to come, but we are doing what we can. Pictures of well-recognized worth by Canadian artists or others are brought, when possible. No doubt the vote is a niggardly one, but we are doing pretty well with the amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What pictures have been bought during the last year?

Mr. OUMET. I think we have only bought one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So practically we do not vote anything for the purpose of purchasing pictures. We have some very nice pictures at the room, and if we desire to form a national gallery, we should from time to time appropriate a reasonable sum for the purpose of purchasing pictures. We have some very good Canadian artists whose works are not to be despised, and although I am not given to encouraging extravagance in any department, still I would be glad to assist the Government in voting a reasonable sum every year for purchasing one or two of the best Canadian pictures. It is not creditable to the country to have a room called a National Gallery without any pictures being added to the collection year after year. We have under any circumstances to pay the expense of keeping up the room, which amounts to nearly \$1,000 a year. Very many visitors call in to examine works of art in the gallery. I regret exceedingly that these works of art are not added to year after year. We have half a dozen, at least, very good painters in the Dominion of Canada, and when exhibitions are held, the paintings which take the highest prizes should be looked after by some person representing the Government, and a reasonable price paid for them. I do not think it is desirable that the best pictures painted by Canadian artists should pass out of the country entirely, or into private galleries. I think the gallery should be recognized as a national one, and that can only be done by appropriating a reasonable sum each year. Is there any officer of the Government whose duty it is to look after paintings, and under what department is it?

Mr. OUMET. It seems to be in my department, but I must say that I have not given it very great attention. I know that Mr. Watts, who is an architect in the department, takes a great interest in the gallery, and he advises as to the purchase of these pictures. I will be very glad to repeat to my colleagues what has been said by hon. gentlemen, and I really think that it would be worth while to have at least a couple of thousand dollars placed at the disposal of the department, under efficient officers, assisted by some outside persons, who are connoisseurs of art, for the purchase of these pictures.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that by far the best method would be, if you would devote, say, \$2,000 a year as a prize to be paid for the best work of art produced. I think this would be the best encouragement to Canadian art.

Mr. OUMET. We have heard so much lately about ministerial responsibility, that I should not care to undertake that.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is not correct in that. When he does anything right we are only too glad to support him.

Mr. FRASER. Nobody would expect that the Ministers would act in a judicial capacity on pictures, and for myself, I would not care to accept this judicial authority in that respect. We have been lavish in our expenditures in other directions hitherto Canada has seen fit to expend tens of thousands of dollars in railways, canals and other things, and thousands of dollars more than ought to, have gone into the pockets of private parties. If we are ever to be a nationality, we must lay the foundation in art, as well as in other matters, and it is time we should pay a little attention to it. I agree with the hint thrown out by the leader of the Opposition. It is well known that some of the best pictures painted in Canada go to Europe. We have very fine paintings of scenery here, which might be purchased, nor would I object to portraits of persons, provided always that they were calculated to show the best art in the country. At any rate I think we should add to the collection, because, when a person goes to the gallery once, there is nothing new to attract him there a second time. The expenditure of \$1,000 a year is now almost worthless. Large amounts have been spent by the English Government in bringing out the genius of their artists and that has been one of the best expenditures made. Our rich citizens buy pictures costing \$30,000 or \$40,000. We cannot afford that, but I think that a country which grants all these handsome subsidies, by which these gentlemen are enabled to obtain these pictures, ought not to be forgotten herself. I will be ready to vote any reasonable amount to lay the foundation of a National Art Gallery in this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. FLINT. I do not wish to throw cold water on the generous feeling of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House which prompts them to advocate the expenditure of a large sum of money for the establishment of an art gallery under the auspices of the Government. At the same time I think I will be within the sympathy of a large number of hon. members, if I intimate to the Government that I think they would find themselves getting into very deep water if they undertake to give Governmental assistance to anything like an art gallery, without having their minds somewhat enlarged as to the expense they will be necessarily under. \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$10,000 a year would be simply sunk without any benefit accruing in the attempt to establish a gallery under the auspices of the Government in Ottawa. The amount required for such an object is, I think, much beyond the means at the disposal of this Government, and the condition of the country is not such as to permit it. If the capital of the country was also the commercial metropolis, and the Government had at its service a large volunteer staff of artists, and ladies and gentlemen artistically inclined, together with a great popular support for works of artistic merit, they might possibly enter into such an undertaking. The establishment of anything like an art gallery could not be undertaken for less than \$200,000 or \$300,000, and then it would be very much inferior to those that exist in the old world, and in some cities on this side of the Atlantic. I think the least the Government ought to do before asking the House for any appropriation beyond that which they receive each year, would be, in the first place, to appoint a competent commission, consisting of persons having a thorough knowledge of art, to advise them, before they ask the House to appropriate one cent for any such expenditure. Unless we are prepared to do something, which I believe the finances of this country will not permit us to do, it would be better for us to go on as at present. My idea is that with a small sum something should be done towards promoting the fundamentals of an art education rather than by purchasing those finished works. An appropriation of \$1,000 or \$2,000 to promote the study of the primary principles of art might possibly be of some advantage. But the subject is a very wide one—one which concerns not merely the Capital, but the whole Dominion. I believe that, if an art gallery is to be established under the auspices of the Dominion, it should be established in Montreal, and that the assistance of wealthy volunteers should be enlisted in the work. In that way we might possibly, after a long period of time, and after persistent endeavours, accomplish something worthy of a great country. I do not join my friends in the suggestion that, at any rate, without a great deal of consideration and without the assistance of persons specially qualified to pronounce on this question, the Government

should hasten into petty appropriations of \$1,000, or \$2,000, or \$3,000 for works of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not of the opinion that it is necessary, in order to promote the development of art, that we should incur so large an expenditure as my hon. friend has just suggested. I think, however, that we could afford to make a larger appropriation than one that is barely sufficient to keep open the room where the few pictures which have been collected are now to be seen. When the hon. Minister made the statement that we appropriated \$1,000 a year towards the establishment of a picture gallery, of which sum about \$800 went to pay the caretaker in charge of the room, I could not help thinking that we were acting upon the same principle as the people in London who undertook to take care of Jinx's baby, who secured subscriptions amounting to \$5,000 or \$6,000 to support the youngster, and then spent a considerably larger sum than we are voting in advertising a meeting at Exeter Hall and in employing a treasurer, a collector and other assistants. I think we could afford to appropriate a larger sum, out of which we might purchase each year one or more of the best Canadian pictures, besides adding to our gallery by obtaining, as has been done elsewhere, copies of a few of the best pictures in the art galleries in Europe. A very fair collection of such copies were gathered a quarter of a century ago by Dr. Ryerson from galleries in Vienna, London and Paris. My hon. friend suggests that they are not of the very highest orders. Still, they are better than no collection at all, and they are of some value as being suggestive to Canadian artists. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has suggested that a sum of money might be offered as a prize for the best picture. I think the suggestion is a very good one, and I think the Minister, after having heard the discussion that has taken place this evening, may venture to ask for a larger appropriation.

Mr. DALY. I simply rise to say that I endorse the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and those made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I do not think art has received that encouragement in Canada to which it is entitled. We know that the Ontario Society of Artists has been struggling for a number of years and has succeeded in carrying on its work by means of private subscriptions and prizes offered by persons interested in art. I think the idea suggested by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we should offer one or two prizes for the best picture, to be selected by judges appointed at the annual meetings of the different academies in Montreal and in Toronto, is a good one. I do not agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that the expenditure of a large sum of money would be necessary. Our National Art Gal-

lery, I understand, is simply the nucleus of what in time will form a gallery, not only for the edification of those who visit it to look at the pictures, but as a means of instruction to rising artists. I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that I will back him up in any effort he makes to obtain the assent of his colleagues to a further grant in this direction.

Mr. MULOCK. Some hon. gentlemen have dwelt on the question of subject. Some have declared that it would be very difficult to determine what works should be selected. The hon. Minister of Public Works, for example, states that he would decline to take the responsibility. Some hon. gentlemen have suggested that Canadian subjects should be selected. I am by no means a nativist myself. There are many matters connected with the history of our forefathers, which have been reduced to canvas, and which would be most instructive in many ways in an art gallery. For example, I would suggest that some of the members of the Cabinet who are well versed in the history of the old land and the struggles that have brought us to our present position—for example, the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. Controller of Customs—should be chosen as a committee. I have not the slightest doubt that, not being limited as to the subject, they would be able in time to select some pictures that would be suggestive of the past, and would perhaps be instrumental in keeping alive some of the fires that have not gone out yet.

Monument to the late Sir John

A. Macdonald..... \$9,000

Mr. LAURIER. This is a revote. I see. \$1,000 has been expended—in what manner?

Mr. OUMET. We have been getting photographs, and copies, in French and English, of the life of the late Sir John Macdonald, to be distributed among the artists who propose to compete for the best model of the monument to be erected. The one who will present the best model will be given the work. This \$1,000 has not all been expended yet, but it will be expended before the 1st of July next. The balance \$9,000, will be used to pay for the work.

Mr. LAURIER. When are the artists to send in their models?

Mr. OUMET. I cannot say exactly. I do not think there has been any advertising yet. We are just attending to the preliminaries. We will advertise in Canada, the United States, England, France and Italy.

Rideau Hall—Repairs, &c. . . . \$15,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount was spent on repairs during the past year?

Mr. OUMET. We spent \$11,394.52 in 1891-92, and during the current year, up to 30th November, we spent \$8,393.90.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is there such a large increase this year?

Mr. OUIMET. That is owing to the installation of a new Governor, which always entails additional expense, just as a change of domicile does. Some new furniture, of course, will be required and a good many things will have to be renewed. We had an inventory made in May, 1890, and will have another one made before the present incumbent leaves, so as to guard against things being taken away by employees or others.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was proved at the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. OUIMET. Precautions will be taken to prevent that.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to call the attention of the committee for a few moments to the expenditure of the department, if we can call it such, connected with the office of Governor-General. A short time ago, the House voted a return which I have in my hand. I have summarized the figures, and would like to show what this institution has cost us since its establishment in 1868. The annual salary paid to the Governor-General is \$48,663.63; and I will venture to say that when the country agreed to do that, which I think is a very large salary, it did not contemplate the growth of the expenditure by special allowances to that officer such as have grown up. I am not charging this Administration with being to blame, because every Administration since the establishment of the institution has followed in the same direction, and there is nothing to the credit even of the Mackenzie Government in that regard. The salary of the Governor-General during that period amounts to a total of \$1,216,660.05. During the same period there was allowed to him for travelling expenses the sum of \$145,903.45. The average annual expenditure or allowance, for in some cases there was a fixed sum allowed to him and in other cases the bills were paid, has been \$5,826.13 for travelling expenses per year. Then there is the Governor-General's office, as it is called, with a certain staff—some of whom accompanied him, I understand, when he came to the country, and some being permanent officials appointed here—but in every case they are paid for by the country, and the salaries of these officials, during the period in question, amounts to \$270,353.14, or an average expenditure on this account of \$10,514. There is an item in this return entitled "contingencies in connection with the Governor-General's office," amounting to the sum of \$217,426.60, or an average expenditure for contingencies in connection with that office of \$8,697.04. Now adding up these items, we find we have expended in connection with the salary of the Governor-General, travelling expenses of the Governor-General and salaries of his office and contingencies of his office the sum of \$1,850,346.24.

Mr. REID. Since what year?

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. MULOCK. Since Confederation.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. Who says "Oh"? That is a very intelligent criticism. The average expenditure during this period has amounted to \$74,010.80. Then take the expenditure on Rideau Hall. For a short time the country paid rental, which amounted to \$7,854. Then, it appears, the Government purchased a certain property, now known as Rideau Hall, for \$82,000. Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that this rookery, as it is often called, was purchased for \$82,000, and I fancy it is in no better condition than when it was purchased. Now, let us see what it has cost to maintain this institution since that date. According to the official returns, there have been expended upon Rideau Hall, for additions, alterations, repairs and maintenance (keeping up the old and original glory of the place) sums amounting to \$547,143.45.

Mr. REID. For how many years?

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that I am speaking of the period since Confederation. I suppose he is aware of what period is covered by that. There has also been expended upon furniture of Rideau Hall sums amounting to \$118,853.01. So the average yearly expenditure for furniture during this period has been \$4,754.12. We have paid for furnishing Rideau Hall nearly \$5,000 a year. Then there is another item in the public accounts in connection with Rideau Hall—gardens and grounds; and there has been expended under that head a total sum of \$94,349.86, or an average for each year of the period of \$3,773.96.

Mr. REID. For how many years?

Mr. MULOCK. I will give that gentleman a little attention if he does not give me his, and perhaps he will regret his irrelevant interruption.

Mr. FOSTER. You ought to have sympathy with him.

Mr. MULOCK. He had better not be too demonstrative or he will provoke something. There has been expended in the same period for fuel and light for Rideau Hall \$151,371.10, or an average for each year of \$6,050.84. In all there has been expended on Rideau Hall in purchase money, repairs, alterations, furniture, gardens, fuel and light, \$1,001,571.52, or an average expenditure of \$40,058.82 a year. The average expenditure on the Governor-General's department for the same period is \$114,069.62. Adding together the two sums so expended we find that there has been an actual cash outlay by the country in the maintenance of this office of \$2,851,917. Looking at it as to what this costs the country, I think it is fair, in order to bring the matter up to the present time, to see how much the country has lost by this annual average expenditure.

Mr. REID. Does the hon. gentleman object to a Governor-General?

Mr. MULOCK. I am discussing the cost of the institution at the present time, and I say, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to assume that this expenditure has cost us an annual rate of interest not less than 4 per cent. If you add 4 per cent simple interest to this expenditure during the period in question, you find that this office has cost us no less than \$4,225,069. The hon. gentleman asks me if I object to a Governor-General. I am not now carving out a constitution for the country; but I do object to the office of the Governor-General being made so expensive and burdensome as to render that office unpopular.

Mr. REID. Then you are an annexationist?

Mr. MULOCK. I am a British subject, and I propose to live and die a British subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Die quick.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance will also get a little attention if he does not observe order. I say, Mr. Chairman, this country cannot afford the burden of this office as at present conducted.

Mr. REID. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he objects to a Governor-General? I would like to have that question decided. You say you wish to abolish the office?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not aware that I said that. The hon. gentleman's imagination is carrying him away. I think I am the best friend of the office if I try to prevent abuse growing up about it and rendering the office itself unpopular. The best way to popularize the office is to see that it does not become burdensome upon the people, and that it meets the needs of the people. I object to the enormous cost of it. I doubt if the country ever expected this expense would grow to the present proportions, and I submit to the committee that it is our duty either to confine the expenditure of a personal character to the salary fixed by the Confederation Act, or, if we are going to allow perquisites, to reduce the salary. I do not think we should ever have made an increase on the original statutory allowance of £10,000 sterling to do so. I think it is wholly contrary to what was understood at the time the people of Canada consented to a clause like that going into the Imperial Act. I myself want to see the House now return to an economical view of the case before we have a new Governor-General enter upon the office. The present Governor-General is retiring, and a new one will be here before Parliament meets again. At the earliest moment in the session I invited the attention of the House to the subject, and took a vote of the committee on

one item, but was not sustained by the committee. I now present to the committee figures in connection with the subject, and ask them to deal with the matter in settling the appropriation. The incoming Governor-General has not yet been appointed, and therefore it cannot be said that would be in the slightest degree acting unfairly with him; therefore, I say, while we are in this state, and the decks are clear, let us have a distinct understanding as to what shall be the cost of this office during the incumbency of the new Governor-General. If we proceed in that way before he is appointed, he knows full well what to expect. There will be no embarrassment on the part of this House in dealing with the appropriation, and the office itself will continue to be a popular one. I would say further, that I have not been able to find out what advantage there is to the country from having to choose a Governor-General from abroad. I believe that we can have that office as well filled by a Canadian as by an Imperial officer. We have been filling the offices of Lieutenant-Governors from time to time, and there has rarely been a case of complaint. The most extreme party men have been sent to the various provinces to fill the office of Lieutenant-Governor, and have been called upon to discharge those delicate duties in connection with Cabinets not of their own political thinking, and I am not aware that there has been any serious difficulty discovered up to this moment, with an odd exception. But there is no system that is perfect. I would like to know what advantage Canada has received from the millions of dollars expended in connection with the office of Governor-General? What are the duties of the Governor-General of Canada? He can do nothing; if he does anything he acts unconstitutionally. I think we may look forward to the time when our Governor-General will be chosen from amongst the Canadian people. I feel perfectly satisfied that the interests of the Empire in Canada will be quite as safe in the hands of a loyal Canadian, as in the hands of an Imperial officer, because, in fact, they have to come to Canada now to get the true loyalty. I am afraid it has received a black eye at the hands of the Administration the other night; but perhaps it will recover. But I think the appointment of a Governor-General from our own midst will in no way endanger British connection; that a Canadian officer would be quite as intelligent, and quite as able to have regard to Imperial interests, as one who comes from abroad. Moreover, I think a person chosen from among the people of Canada would be in all likelihood better able to understand the requirements of the country, and altogether better fitted to fill the office and discharge the duties devolving upon him. I submit that Canada has not received value for the millions of dollars she has expended in connection with this office. In view of the enormous expenditure in connection with conducting the affairs of Canada, I submit that

we should apply the pruning knife wherever it reasonably can be applied, and this is one point where it can be applied without, in the slightest degree, impairing the public interests; but on the contrary, as I believe, promoting economy and popularizing the system that now obtains. I make these remarks without suggesting any changes at all except a change that will postpone to the remote future, probably, the feature that I have referred to, namely, the selection of a Governor-General from our own midst rather than having one sent to us from abroad. I say it is quite as competent for the Imperial authorities to make that selection from one of our own citizens as from the citizens of Great Britain herself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do think this is the proper time to discuss the whole question of the expenses connected with Rideau Hall, and I fully endorse the remarks of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I think that at this juncture, when we are about parting with a Governor-General who has discharged the duties of that office for several years, and are now likely to receive from Great Britain a new incumbent, it is right that we should define what shall be the expenses connected with that edifice in future. I do not think we should be called upon to continue the enormous and ridiculous expenses that have been outlined by my hon. friend. This country cannot afford to continue this extravagance, as exhibited by the figures he has submitted. Before we are called upon to install a new incumbent to the office, we should closely and carefully outline what shall be the expenses connected with the refurnishing, and with all the different supplies that are provided by this country for that very expensive establishment, known as Rideau Hall. Now, we have been in the habit of granting to a Governor-General \$5,000 a year for travelling expenses, and \$8,000 for fire and light. In my humble opinion, it is not at all necessary that we should pay for the fire and light of Rideau Hall. We provide a house for the Governor-General to live in, and we supply the necessary furniture, which, I think, is all that should be expected of this Dominion. He should provide for himself all the other necessaries, in the way of fire and light, in the way of gardeners and other servants that are employed about the Hall. Any person who will take up the list of employees that we supply to that establishment, must come to the conclusion that a very large number of them are really unnecessary. We had an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee some years ago, of which I happened to be a member, and the person in charge testified before the committee that a number of men were sent to him to find employment and he was driven to his wits' end to find them anything to do. He set them at gathering leaves and removing stone and all that kind of things from one

Mr. MULOCK.

place to another, in order, if possible, to keep them employed in any shape or form. He inquired from the Minister of Public Works, why he was overloaded with men of that stamp, and the reply he received was, that they had to find employment for those sent there. It was quite clear that it is a source of unnecessary expense connected with the management of that establishment. I contend that if we supply the House with furniture, the Governor-General should be led to understand that additional expenses, connected with maintenance, should be paid out of the salary he receives, of \$50,000 a year. We do not want Governors-General to come here and live entirely at the expense of the Dominion, outside of the salary of \$50,000 a year. We have reason to believe, and I have heard it on good authority, that the incumbent of the office previous to the present occupant, left Canada with a cheque in his pocket for \$200,000, the balance which he had been able to save during his five-years term as Governor-General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. If that is a fact, and I have no doubt in regard to it, it is absurd that the people should be called on to pay such an enormous sum.

Mr. REID. Does the hon. gentleman want the Governor-General to board out on Sussex street?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is evidently not himself to-night. This is not a question to be dealt with in a jocular manner, for it is a matter of positive seriousness. This is the proper time to deal with the whole question, and I contend that the evidences of recklessness and extravagance connected with the expenditure at Rideau Hall, from Confederation to the present time, as produced before the committee to-night, are proofs beyond question that now is the time we should deal with this whole subject and settle whether the people are going to be called on to pay such enormous sums, year after year, for the support of this institution, as they have been in years past. Some change should be made, and the Government are shouldering a serious responsibility, if they allow the future incumbent to come to Canada under the impression that the extravagance which has characterized the management of Rideau Hall in the past, will be continued for the term during which he will discharge the duties of Governor-General. There should be some change made and some understanding should be arrived at, so that the people will not be called upon to bear these heavy burdens.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend has referred to the extravagances in connection with Government House. It is but fair to say, that as regards the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, and also from what I have learned in this House, that

the occupant of Government House is not responsible for any of that extravagance, either the present Governor or his predecessor. I know there was very gross and culpable extravagance in regard to expenditure connected with Rideau Hall, some years ago. That expenditure was investigated before the Public Accounts Committee; but, in common justice, it should be stated that the extravagance consisted entirely of expenditures incurred by the Public Works Department, political extravagances. It is not fair or right to hold the Governor-General responsible, or any of his subordinates, those who are under his direct control, for any such extravagance. I remember very well it was stated that sometimes without his knowledge, and several times against his will, employees were sent down by the Public Works Department, in large numbers, to paint and repaint the walls and conservatories, thereby incurring expenditures which were not required, and for which the Governor-General did not ask, and in regard to which he was somewhat annoyed at their being made, but, of course, he could not help it. If we have gentlemen filling positions in the Public Works Department, who find it necessary, for political purposes, to employ 100 or 200 men at election times, for the purposes of obtaining votes, it is not fair to charge the occupant of Rideau Hall with that expenditure. Let us condemn our political opponents, when they go wrong. If they spend money improperly, let Parliament condemn the Government and their officers, but let us deal fairly with those who were not responsible, in any sense or way, for this extravagance.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true. I am glad my hon. friend drew the line of criticism from the occupant of Rideau Hall to the management of it. But when my hon. friend is going to hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for this extravagance, he should turn and take a retrospective glance at the actions of hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House, during their Administration. If the hon. gentleman takes a view of history, he will find—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not here then.

Mr. FOSTER,—that matters have been gradually improving. They have been moving in the direction of reduced expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They were very bad during 1887, 1888 and 1889.

Mr. FOSTER. They were very bad from 1874 to 1878. I happened to see the report which the hon. gentleman holds, and I jotted down two or three comparisons which will prove interesting to members of the House. The travelling expenses of Rideau Hall commenced in 1874. From 1874 to 1878 \$51,741 were spent for travelling expenses alone.

an average, in these five years, of \$10,350 annually. From 1879 to 1892 there were spent \$114,000 for travelling expenses during those fourteen years, an average of \$8,000 annually as against \$10,350 yearly during the preceding five years. From 1885 to 1892, taking a more modern period, the amount expended was \$40,000, an average of \$5,000 annually. That shows the real benefit we obtained from granting a stated sum for travelling expenses, \$5,000 per year. In the first period, 1874 to 1878, the travelling expenses were \$10,350 a year; in the period from 1879 to 1882 it was \$8,000 annually, and since 1885 the arrangement has been the payment of a sum of \$5,000, and the payment has been kept at that sum for travelling expenses. Suppose you take contingencies. From 1874 to 1878, \$51,000 were expended, or an average of \$10,300 annually; from 1885 to 1892, the amount was \$53,000 or an average of \$6,600, being a saving, as compared with the preceding periods of \$4,000 a year. The amount expended for repairs and maintenance, from 1874 to 1878, was \$149,000, an average of \$29,200; from 1888 to 1892 it was \$66,000, or an average of \$13,200. For furniture the amount from 1874 to 1878 was \$27,000 or \$5,400 a year; from 1888 to 1892 it was \$16,000, or an annual average of \$3,200. On gardens the expenditure from 1874 to 1878 was \$16,000, or \$3,200 annually; from 1888 to 1892 it was \$23,000 or \$4,600 annually. There has been a comparative increase in the cost of the gardens annually, owing, I suppose, to the greater aesthetic taste of the present Public Works Department during the latter period, as compared with the former, due entirely to the progress of the country. Fuel and light involved an expenditure, from 1874 to 1878, of \$37,000, or an average of \$7,400; from 1888 to 1892 the amount was \$40,000, or \$8,000 annually. So that, in all respects, with the exception of gardens and fuel and light, there has been a great paring down and saving in the expenditure as compared with those of preceding years. In those two items there has been a slight increase; but all this goes to show that Rideau Hall with its expenditure and all that is incident to it is somewhat difficult to manage, and whatever party is in power they will find the expenditure will be pretty large. But I think the comparative view of it will show that there has not been a greater expenditure during late years than in former years, and that, in some particulars, it has not been so large. However, what I rose chiefly to say was that I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) that if there are extravagances at Rideau Hall, it is, in no case the fault of the incumbent. We have the expenditure in our own hands; at the same time so long as we have our Governor-General, and I hope we shall have one for a long period, and I think such will be the case, we must expect that he cannot be boarded out on Sussex street.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have no right whatever to be guided by the expenses that have been incurred in 1878. A number of members on this side of the House were not in Parliament from 1874 to 1878, and we have no right to be held responsible. All that we have to do is to criticize the present expenditure. There possibly may have been some expenditure during these years that should not have taken place, but at that time the prospects of the country were brighter than they are to-day. We should cut our cloth according to our measure, and the necessity of economizing in the public expenditure is brought more forcibly before our eyes as members of Parliament at present than it was in the years 1874 to 1878. I find, from the Auditor-General's Report, that we have some very ridiculous charges. Mr. Hutchinson, the clerk of works, gets \$90 a month. We have a watchman who put in 365 days in the year, and gets \$549. We have half a dozen carpenters and repairers and plasterers, and we pay a fireman for 365 days at \$1.50 a day. I would like to know why it is that we should employ a fireman?

Mr. REID. Do you expect the Governor-General to shovel the coal himself?

Mr. McMULLEN. If he was as well heated as my hon. friend he would not require a fireman. Then we pay a carter for the whole year round. I wonder what that carter is doing? We supply 784 pieces of ice at 6½ cents apiece. We pay A. Ferguson, of Ottawa, legal expenses, \$75. I wonder what in the world Ferguson does in the Governor-General's residence that he draws \$75 for legal expenses. Then we have the care of the grounds for twelve months, \$2,490. We have also petty disbursements, \$40.30, repairs to pianos, \$178.44, and we have any amount of Brussels carpets supplied, no less than nine different items. I contend that this shows of itself a positive evidence of extravagance in the management of Rideau Hall. It is a white elephant on our hands, and I think we had better try and make some change in the direction of economy.

Mr. MULLOCK. I was in hopes that, after having pointed out the cost of this institution, the Government would have relieved me of the necessity of making a proposition, but since they are not inclined to do so, I move that the item of \$8,000 for fuel and light be struck out. I stated, at the commencement of my remarks, and I state so again, that I had not the desire to make any political capital out of the matter. I had looked through the accounts and I stated that there was nothing to the credit of the previous Administration with regard to the management of that department. I think that the Minister of Finance has not given a complete summary of the average expenditures. I have not myself analysed the re-

Mr. FOSTER.

turn in all its details, but I think that there are many increases. However, it was his business, I suppose, to select only the items that were favourable to his contention, and it would be mine, if I choose to become an advocate in defence of previous Administrations, to see what I could find that would be an argument in their favour. But I am not dealing with it in that spirit. The country has to pay the bill, and in dealing with the future it will not help us at all to find fault with other Administrations in the past. I submit that the expenditure at the present time of \$114,000 a year in connection with the office of Governor-General, is in excess of the needs of the office, and is more than the people of Canada should be called upon to pay. I say that, with all respect for the office, and I yield to no person in my respect for it, and, saying that, and believing that, and since no person representing the Government is prepared to deal with the matter, I move that the item of \$8,000 for fuel and light be struck out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is an item of \$15,000 for Rideau Hall. You will have to move that it be reduced by \$8,000.

Mr. OUMET. There is a special allowance for fuel and light of \$8,000, and that was adopted. This item is for repairs and maintenance of buildings, &c.

Mr. MULLOCK. Could the hon. gentleman say what part of that \$15,000 is for labour on grounds and conservatories and so on?

Mr. OUMET. It is pretty hard to say, because the labourers also take care of the grounds. I have tried to reduce that expenditure as much as possible, but found it impossible to make more reductions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the care of the grounds last year cost \$2,340. I think the Governor-General should take care of his own grounds, and make his own flower beds and flower gardens. I move that this sum be reduced by \$3,000.

Mr. REID. It is pretty small for the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to expect the Governor-General to take care of his own grounds. I think that the fact of the hon. gentleman objecting to a Governor-General shows that he is disloyal to Canada.

Pictou Post Office— to complete. . \$14,000

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government was to give some information with regard to the necessity of this vote. We have a public building in Pictou as a post office and a custom-house, and we want to know why it is thought necessary to construct another. Is it because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries happens to represent that particular county?

Mr. OUMET. We have a custom-house there now. It is situated, I understand, near

the harbour, and it includes, besides the custom-house officials, the office of weights and measures, the excise office, and a kind of marine department, and it is fully occupied. The post office will be nearer the centre of the town, and the lot that has been bought is a corner lot, having sixty-eight feet frontage on Water street, the principal business street, by 158 feet on Clarence street. The present post office, I understand, is in a rented building, and it has been thought necessary, for the accommodation of the people, to provide a new post office.

Mr. FRASER. Well, the explanation is rather meagre. I do not think that it is necessary to make this expenditure in the town of Pictou, where the population is not as large as it used to be. I want to call the Minister's attention to the fact that a public building has been erected in New Glasgow, in the same county, at a cost of \$40,000 or \$50,000, the present public building in Pictou cost between \$20,000 and \$30,000 and if the proposed building is constructed, it will probably make \$100,000 expended in public buildings in that county. The population of the whole county of Pictou is only double that of the county of Guysborough, and never a dollar has been expended there for a public building at all. I am a native of the county of Pictou, and live there, and I would like to see as many buildings as possible erected in it, consistent with the justice to other counties; but I do not think this is necessary. I would like to ask what the lot cost?

Mr. OUMET. \$4,500.

Mr. FRASER. I venture to say there is no lot in the town of Pictou of that size that is worth the money. From whom was the lot bought?

Mr. OUMET. I have not the name.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask us to pass this vote until we know the name of the person from whom the lot was bought.

Mr. FRASER. Land, in the town of New Glasgow, is worth a good deal more than in the town of Pictou, and a larger lot, just opposite the public building there, has been purchased for about the same money. Will this \$10,000 be sufficient to complete the building?

Mr. OUMET. It is put down to cost, with the site included, \$23,000.

Mr. FRASER. The population of the town of Pictou is less than 3,000. According to the last census, it is now a village, although it used to be a town, and its population is decreasing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the postal revenue there?

Mr. OUMET. \$5,257.

Mr. FRASER. I want to enter my protest against this expenditure in the county of Pictou, while not one dollar has been expended for any kind of building in the county I represent, and other counties in Nova Scotia are in the same position.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). I desire to say that the public building erected in the town of Pictou was erected in 1874 by the Mackenzie Administration. There is no post office in Pictou, except a building rented for the purpose. The first vote was in 1872, the expenditure was completed in 1876, and this is the report which was submitted by the Mackenzie Administration. It is dated 30th June, 1873:

A site having been determined on for this building, namely, the steam-boat landing forming the town terminus of the Pictou Extension Railway, now forming part of the Intercolonial Railway, plans were at once prepared, submitted and approved. On tenders being asked, it was found that the cost would far exceed the appropriation, the plans, therefore, had to be altered and reduced, and yet the amount of appropriation was exceeded. The amount was, in the first instance, too small to build a custom-house of the size required to accommodate the staff, and the question submitted to the department is whether the building is to be of less dimensions or the amount of appropriation extended.

Then, as to the revenue. The revenue at that time, when this report was made, of the post office at Pictou, was \$3,607. The revenue last year was \$5,257, an increase of nearly 50 per cent. I think, under the circumstances, the House would be justified in voting the appropriation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to quote, in reply to my hon. friend, some places in Ontario which have not yet received public post offices. Take the town of Woodstock, which has a postal revenue of \$14,964, and which has no post office. Is it dealing fairly with a town like that to build a post office in a little place like Pictou, in addition to a public building which has cost \$75,000? It is nothing short of a scandal. I could cite many other places in Ontario where the postal receipts are very much in excess of \$5,200, and yet which have no post office. Not only that, but the population of the town of Pictou has been falling off, while these other places are increasing.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister of Public Works must have made some mistake about the cost of that land. Surely land in Pictou is not worth as much as the most desirable locations in Halifax. In South Park street, Halifax, land has been sold, within the last twelve months, at \$40 per front foot, while this land in Pictou is costing \$70 per front foot. I am informed there is ample room in the present public building for the post office. There are only 2,999 people in the town, and it lost 404 people since ten years ago, while the little town of Liverpool has a population of 2,465, and has gained 115 people during the last ten years, and yet the Gov-

ernment will not even spend \$1,200 or \$1,500 a year to give the latter town the necessary custom-house and post office.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). I would like to read the statement made by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in 1891. The following is the debate which took place :—

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend from Pictou tried to show that it was under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie that the building in Pictou was erected.

Mr. TUPPER. So it was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not, you are entirely in error : the vote was taken for that building in 1872.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Mackenzie built it in 1874.

On the same occasion the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) used these words :

Mr. MILLS. I am told that in the town of Pictou there is a very large public building and that the inhabitants of that town have under serious consideration the propriety of abandoning their own houses and moving into that public building to live.

This building is quite large enough to contain the inhabitants, and the hon. gentleman can furnish them with fuel and light probably without any cost to the parties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman is treating this committee as it has a right to be treated by him. We are here as business men to discuss whether we should spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 in the erection of a building in the town of Pictou. If the building there now is ample for all requirements, what does it matter whether it was built under the Mackenzie or any other regime. It was built out of public money, and what we want to know is whether it is large enough for all requirements. The population of that town has gone down steadily. The building there, however, which is a large, handsome and commodious structure is, in my humble judgment, large enough to provide sufficient accommodation for the Customs, Weights and Measures and Post Office Department of such a small town. It is a little more than a village now, between 2,000 and 3,000 people, and the population is steadily decreasing, notwithstanding the fact that you run a railway there. In Charlottetown, a place of 13,000 people, we have all these offices in the one building, and it is very convenient to have them so. The Minister of Public Works ought to be able to inform the House about the accommodation existing in the town of Pictou now. And I do not think that on either side of the House there is a disposition to squander public money just at present. For my part I would like to know who this lot is to be bought from. You talk about accommodation. I only live a short distance from Pictou, and pass through it very often on my way to and from my home. The building is nearly in the centre of the town, in a good place on Water street, and in a good lot with plenty of room about it. The town is only a small

Mr. FORBES.

town. Talk about this being in the centre, why it is only five minutes walk from one end of the town to the other. The present public building is large enough to accommodate the people of the place I should say. If not, I would like to have some report from some person in authority, pointing out that the building is already filled up, and that more room is required. I do not like to have the hon. gentleman answer that this building was put up under Mr. Mackenzie's Government or anything of that kind. The building was put up with public money. I understand the hon. gentleman to say the item can stand until we can get the information as to whom this lot is to be purchased from.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. Minister will not find another instance in all Canada in which it is proposed to erect two separate public buildings for one town of the size of Pictou, which has about 700 families, more or less. If there is any other place in which such an extravagance has been committed I would be glad to have the hon. gentleman name it. It does appear to me, as my hon. friend has said, about as imprudent a proposition as has ever been made, and it never would have been made had it not been for the fact that the town happens to be represented by a Minister and a colleague of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OUMET. I will give the information I have :

The present custom-house has four rooms on ground floor and six rooms over. The four rooms on ground floor are occupied by customs, inland revenue and shipping officials. Four rooms on upper floor are used by inland revenue, and one is used sometimes by quarantine officer, leaving only one room that might be available for other purposes. The arrangement of building would be unsuitable for post office. The position of custom-house is too far from the business part of the town. The present post office is a third of a mile from custom-house.

Here is a telegram from the post office inspector at Halifax about this building :

HALIFAX, N.S., 17th March, 1893.

Deputy-Postmaster-General.

Owing to large accumulation of Prince Edward Island mails at times and increased volume of business because of opening of short line railway, present accommodation inadequate at Pictou and building inadequate.

CHARLES J. MACDONALD.

I would like to add that \$77,648 was the amount of money orders issued ; the Customs duties collected amount to \$86,000 ; the excise to \$14,311 ; weights and measures, \$762. The value of exports was \$114,332, and the imports, \$438,484.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why we export more than that from one factory in our town.

Mr. FRASER. I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his statement. I find the statement of customs duties in the returns of Trade and Navigation given at

\$20,000 for Pictou, and \$65,000 for New Glasgow; and one room in the public building at New Glasgow served for all that business. The public building in New Glasgow is not much larger than the one in Pictou, and the lower part is used for the post office and the upper floor is used, one room for the collector of customs, and he collects three times as much revenue as the collector in Pictou. And the Dominion Savings Bank is in the same building. I cannot understand how these four rooms are required in the public building of Pictou for customs collection.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). Hon. gentlemen should remember that Pictou is the centre port of the district, and that the business of the district has to be done at Pictou. I know very well that a larger revenue is collected at New Glasgow, but it is only a sub-port. To supplement the statement of the Minister of Public Works I desire to call attention to this report written by Mr. Mackenzie and presented to the House. This referred to the appropriation for this building in Pictou at the time when it was proposed.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the date of that report?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The 30th of June, 1873, presented by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Mackenzie was not in office then.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). It was presented in 1874.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. junior member from Pictou (Mr. McDougald) knows that in 1873 Pictou was a thriving town and promised to grow more and more every year. Since that time New Glasgow has sprung up at some distance. We all regret the fact, but it is the fact, that Pictou is a decaying town. You have spent an enormous amount of public money building a new railway into it, but it has done no good. You cannot revive it. The hon. gentleman talks about a paltry \$20,000 collected and of the necessity for more room. What is the size of these rooms? To talk about four rooms for the accommodation of a couple of customs officers collecting \$20,000 is perfectly ridiculous. The upstairs part of the building can be utilized for customs and inland revenue, as is done in Charlottetown, with the post office and savings bank down stairs. It is simply too bad to have this \$30,000 spent in this way.

Mr. FORBES. The junior member for Pictou claims that Pictou is entitled to have this large expenditure because the public building there does not give sufficient room and is unfavourably located. For the interest on the money he could hire five letter-carriers for the town of Pictou at the highest salary paid to the most efficient letter-car-

riers and could have a free delivery of mails to the citizens, and he would still have the capital left. If he took simply \$5,000 he could hire two letter-carriers and have his post office at the head of the steam-boat wharf if he wanted to, with better accommodation for the people of Pictou county.

An hon. MEMBER. And open the mails on the wharf?

Mr. FORBES. Yes. And he could carry on the distribution from there and lay the mails on the people's breakfast tables and on their luncheon tables and on their dinner tables if he chose. As a Nova Scotian I do not depreciate the expenditure of public moneys, if done in a business like way. But much more good could be got out of this sum than under the system pursued by the present Government. In the county of Pictou alone, I understand, over \$100,000 is being expended for public buildings. Now, it is nonsense for the junior member for Pictou to try and justify this transaction on the grounds he has given. We all know that a public building is there, it was put up by the Mackenzie Administration, and was intended to meet all the requirements. There can be no reason that I can see why this additional expense should be made at the present time. It cannot be justified from the amounts of customs revenue and postal revenue. I can name half a dozen towns in Nova Scotia whose exports are far in excess of those of the town of Pictou; we have shipping ports returning a revenue two or three times as large, and with no better public buildings. I do not mean factiously to oppose any necessary expenditure of public money, but I think it should be done with proper care, and only when there is a public need for it. Under the circumstances, I would suggest to the Minister to let this item stand.

Mr. OUMET. The hon. member for Guysboro' stated that the receipts from customs were only \$20,000. The figures I have in my book, taken from the Auditor-General's Report, at page F-12—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the county of Pictou. Turn to the Trade and Navigation Report, page 531, and you will find \$20,567.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the Minister of Public Works give us an idea of the cost of those two railways that were built to Pictou? The village has fallen away in population, and still it must have these two railways. It does seem extraordinary that the Government are obliged to cower down to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the High Commissioner, and build a post office where a post office is not needed. Are they afraid to go against their masters? Is it necessary for the existence of the Government to build a public building where none is required, to build railways where none are required? A blight seems to be on the

whole place ever since they began to debauch people with the people's money. The place has gone down, the population has diminished, and still you propose to build another building where it is not needed. It is indeed, it is one of the most outrageous things that has ever been put into the Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We want to get the name of the party. Is it the Arnison Estate, or is there any man living there now of that name?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I do not know that the lot has been bought yet. It is offered by the Arnison estate. The estate is represented by Mr. Harris.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is evidently better posted than the Minister of Public Works. The lot is not yet bought at all. Now is the time to stop. If it is proposed to pay \$4,500 for this lot, which is evidently far in excess of its value, we had better not purchase it. We had better advise the people of Pictou to put up with their present accommodation. It is evident that their present building is quite sufficient for the accommodation of the town of Pictou. I think the Minister had better drop the item, and reconsider the whole question of the construction of another public building there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would it not be desirable in the public interest to have a further examination and report upon the accommodation which the present building can be made to afford? I suppose no one wants to go to this large expenditure if the existing building is sufficient, and I believe it is.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble, I suppose, is not with the present building, but with the position of the building, as being inconvenient for the public.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You can walk from the present building into almost any part of the business portion of the town, within two and a half minutes. I do not know where you could place the building in a better position. It is right at the head of the wharf, alongside the railway station, and I am sure you can walk in three minutes into almost any shop in Pictou. In Charlottetown, where \$150,000 is collected in Customs, there is only one large room for all the offices, and a private room for the chief man.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not be disposed, under ordinary circumstances, to examine into such an item too critically. But we have adopted a rule some years ago with regard to these public buildings, and if we apply that rule to this item, it cannot be defended upon any ground whatever. Here is a town of 3,000 souls, affording a customs revenue of \$20,000, a postal revenue of \$5,000, and an inland revenue of \$700. Now, this town is already supplied with a public building. Are you to lay down the precedent to-day—because this will be construed as a precedent—that a town of this size, and returning this

Mr. LANDERKIN.

revenue, which has already a public building quite sufficient for its purposes, is to be supplied with a second building? No reason whatever has been given to justify the proposition, and I say that in face of the country to which the Government is responsible, and to which Parliament is responsible, this item cannot be justified.

Mr. MULLOCK. Surely the Minister of Public Works is not going back on his pledge given only a couple of meetings ago, when he defended a couple of old propositions, simply on the ground that they began before he took office. He told the committee that under other circumstances he would not have recommended them, and in fact promised that he would be himself a good boy. Here we find that the scheme has not yet been entered upon, there has been no land purchased. When the Minister invited our attention to the matter at an earlier stage, he gave me the impression that the land was purchased. Might I ask him, Does he agree with the member for Pictou that the land has not yet been purchased?

Mr. OUMET. I read from my book that the amount put down for the site was \$4,300. I did not say whether the site had been bought or not.

Mr. MULLOCK. Then if the land is not purchased, and everything is in the future, we are free to go on or not. Therefore, if the Minister wishes the House and the country to rely upon his pledge, here is an opportunity for him to make it good.

Mr. OUMET. It is not my promise. The vote was taken for the first time three years ago.

Mr. MULLOCK. Nothing has been done.

Mr. OUMET. The House has decided it.

Mr. MULLOCK. The House is seized of the matter now. Nothing has been taken out of the people's pocket so far, although it is now proposed to make a raid. Will the Minister give the committee a statement showing the space in the public building at Pictou, the areas of the various rooms.

Mr. OUMET. I cannot give them.

Mr. MULLOCK. Then it is quite impossible to decide whether the present building is adequate or not.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The late Mr. Mackenzie said it was not, and that was twenty years ago.

Mr. FRASER. The statement Mr. Mackenzie made was that the size of the building for the various purposes contemplated was not sufficient.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). That is the size now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The revenue has decreased very much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of Mr. Mackenzie was not a statement that

there was not sufficient accommodation for postal purposes. It had reference to the building in which customs were being collected, to the old building that was used as a custom-house, which, he said, was not adequate, and that a new building would be erected.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This building was not in existence, when the statement was made.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). It was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Mackenzie was asking a vote for it.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). It was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken; he is speaking of the old building.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I read from a report, preparatory to constructing the building.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The appropriation was for the construction of a building for customs, not for the construction of a post office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This was for accommodating both customs and post office.

Mr. KENNY. I do not pretend to have a very intimate knowledge of this matter, but a statement was made by Mr. Mackenzie, in regard to this building, in which it was stated that there was not room for a customs-house.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In which building?

Mr. KENNY. In the present post office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was not built.

Mr. KENNY. If there had been room in that building for a post office, a practical man like Mr. Mackenzie would have put the post office there. Mr. Mackenzie stated that there was not room in the building even for the custom-house. It was not a proposed building to which he was referring. I understand this is simply a revote, and the objection is taken to it on the ground that the title has not yet passed, although all the other arrangements have been completed. The hon. member for Guysborough may know in regard to this matter.

Mr. FRASER. I understood the junior member for Pictou to say that the department had an offer from the Arnison estate.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The title has not passed.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is the present site reasonably convenient for public purposes?

Mr. KENNY. I do not know enough of Pictou to venture an opinion on the subject.

Mr. FORBES. Let the matter stand over until the French treaty is confirmed, because the Ministry may resign in the meantime.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the junior member for Pictou state whether the present site is inconvenient for the public?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). It will not be acceptable and is not suitable for the purpose for which it is required.

Mr. MULLOCK. In what respect is it inconvenient? It has been stated that it is within two or three minutes' walk of the leading business places of Pictou. Is that correct?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). The lot is not in a convenient place and is not suitable for a post office.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. member for Queen's has stated that the present building is within three minutes' walk of the business part of Pictou. Is that statement correct?

Mr. McDOUGALD. Why do you doubt it?

Mr. MULLOCK. I ask the junior member for Pictou, whether he concurs with the hon. member for Queen's on that point?

Mr. FLINT. The committee has not the information before it to enable it to pass judgment on this question. If there is not sufficient room in the present building, are there no means by which, at a very moderate expense, additional accommodation could be had for post office service? In Yarmouth, which is more than twice the size of Pictou, and which is a growing town, the public offices are accommodated in one building. The revenue of Yarmouth is \$125,000, while the revenue collected at Pictou is \$27,000. If full information was given to the committee, hon. members would be reluctant to vote an additional sum for the building in Pictou, which has a population less than 3,000. I quite understand that at election times the charge will be made that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have acted unfairly in opposing this grant. Of course we know very well that if we had an overflowing treasury nothing would give hon. gentlemen on this side of the House greater pleasure than to second members of the Government in making handsome appropriations for buildings from one end of the Dominion to the other. But when we look at the condition of affairs, and compare the circumstances of this town with large communities scattered all over the Dominion, collecting five times as much revenue, we have their requests for public buildings persistently refused by the Government, mainly upon the ground that they do not return supporters of the Government here; then we are right in insisting upon exact justice being meted out, and that some intelligent principle should be adopted in this matter. We are really the friends of the Government in advising them not to make these grants on political grounds. I think the vote in the present instance indefensible, and I think the town of Pictou would be well satisfied with some small addition to the present building for necessary post office accommodation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A good deal has been said about the time that this appropriation

was first made. I find that in 1872-73 an item of \$12,000 was put in the Estimates; but in 1873-74 it was reduced to \$10,000, and Mr. Mackenzie was simply carrying out what was done when he came into power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to put it to the leader of the House, whether he thinks that this is fairly carrying out the proposition upon which we agreed three years ago: that expenditure should be made only in these places where the revenue warranted it. My friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) states that the present public building in this town is adequate, not only for a custom-house and inland revenue office, but also for a post office as well. Why then should there be this large expenditure which will entail other annual charges? Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, as well as gentlemen on this side of the House, profess to be anxious to adopt a policy of economy. How can you economize if you make large expenditures on public buildings that necessarily entail large additional annual charges to keep them in repair, and to light and heat them? I am perfectly sure there are scores of places in the province of Ontario, and I dare say in the other provinces, where there is a greater necessity for expenditure on public buildings than there is at Pictou. It does seem to me that the Government would be acting, not only in the public interest but in their own interest, if they were not to press this appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has directed some of his remarks to me with reference to this matter. One thing that may be remembered with reference to this vote is, that it does not appear for the first time in these Estimates. The first vote was made three years ago, and a promise was held out to the people that a post office would be erected. That is, say what you like about it, a tacit pledge, and it is something that the Government feels bound to carry out as far as the Government consistently can. I have no doubt about it, that although the town is not a large one, that the position of the custom-house is not convenient for a post office. The people have had their post office in a different place, and one which suits them better. Taking these two things into consideration, and the fact that the vote asked for is not large, the whole expenditure would not be more than \$20,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Public Works says \$25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. \$20,000 is the amount voted, and I think the Minister is prepared to finish the building for that.

Mr. MULLOCK. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that he had not the same regard for an old vote a short time ago. He will remember having moved to strike out the revote for Cobourg harbour in 1891.

Mr. FOSTER. Cobourg harbour was built.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Mr. MULLOCK. But Cobourg harbour had to be dredged, and I remember the hon. gentleman moving to strike out the item.

Mr. FORBES. I know of two similar cases. One for improving the harbour at Liverpool, and one for a post office at Kentville.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not wish to revive a discussion which took place a short time ago, but really after the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance the Government can possibly have no excuse whatever for refusing to restore to the Estimates the vote which was made for post office in the town of Kentville in 1886, and which was allowed to lapse. The leader of the House has stated here that from the fact that this vote has been in the Estimates since 1889, the faith of Parliament was pledged to the people of Pictou, that the building should be constructed. Now, I want to understand from the leader of the House upon what principle he proposes to carry out the pledge of Parliament to the county of Pictou and to refuse the pledge of Parliament made in precisely the same way to the town of Kentville. I would like him to state this, so that we may understand at once where he finds the distinction between these two places.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has answered himself. Once an item drops out of the Estimates it is very difficult to get it back again. This item has not been allowed to drop out, and the contention on this side is that we should keep it here, because once it goes it will be difficult to get it back again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say, once you have broken your word, it is broken.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a case where I think we should draw the line and give effect to the resolution introduced in the previous session by the hon. member for Bothwell. This town is not entitled to the building proposed, when there are so many other places in the Dominion much more entitled to public buildings, and when such large amounts of money have already been expended in the county of Pictou in building railways, harbour improvements and public buildings. I think we should drop the item.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—PRECEDENCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That when the House adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned until Saturday following at 3 o'clock, and that Government orders have precedence on that day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th March, 1893.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the inspection of petroleum.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

LAND IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. **FOSTER** (for Mr. Daly) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to consolidate and amend the Act respecting land in the Territories.

Mr. **LAURIER**. Will the hon. gentleman please explain?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I move that in the absence of my colleague simply to get ahead one stage. It is a Bill, I think, which he does not intend to press through this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

House resumed consideration of Bill (No. 43) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. Before the third reading of the Bill is proceeded with, I desire to call the attention of the Solicitor-General and the House to clause 729 of the Criminal Code, which is as follows:—

The taking of the verdict of the jury, or other proceedings of the court shall not be invalid by reason of its happening on Sunday.

Now, this is subversive of our usual practice in judicial matters, that process shall not be served on Sunday, that a trial shall not be held on Sunday and that legal proceedings shall not be taken on Sunday. This would permit the rendering of a verdict, the filling of a court-house with spectators, an ovation, if necessary, to a person acquitted, and is quite inconsistent in very many ways besides these I have indicated with the usual law and custom and practice in the Dominion of Canada; and I move that this section be repealed, so that no provision shall be allowed in the Criminal Act to permit the rendering of a verdict on Sunday.

Mr. **CURRAN**. With reference to this section, I desire to say that it was fully considered by the joint committee of both Houses before being adopted by Parliament. The hon. gentleman seems to consider that it is the intention to some extent to hold court on Sunday. Now, any one who is acquainted with the proceedings in law courts must be aware of this fact, that a case may be on a point of being finished as the week closes. The only meaning to be attached to

the clause is that the jury might render their verdict say at half-past twelve or one o'clock on Sunday morning and not be locked up all day Sunday and thus entail loss and trouble and great inconvenience. I do not think the conscience of any person in the Dominion of Canada will be shocked because the law makes it competent to take a verdict shortly after midnight on Sunday morning. That is the only meaning that can be attached to this section, and I do not think the objections entered by my hon. friend apply, nor do the other objections, which, he says, are still more numerous, but which he has not specified. I think the sense of the House will be that the law should not be disturbed, as it now stands.

Mr. **LAURIER**. I may say to the Solicitor-General that the views that have been expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have the concurrence of one of the most eminent judges of the land. The objection is not so much because of the propriety that may result, but of the excessive propriety which sometimes may be the result. Suppose, for instance, there is a case of a political nature before the court, and the jury has been locked up for one or two days. In the meantime a crowd of perhaps thousands of people may be standing about the court-house waiting for a verdict. After the jury have been locked up for some time, they send word that they will be ready to give their verdict at ten o'clock on Sunday morning. At that hour a great crowd of people will, perhaps, be assembled about the court-house, waiting for the verdict, and whatever the verdict be, whether an acquittal or a conviction, it is sure to be received by a great many excited persons with demonstrations, which might easily lead to a disturbance. This is not my own view, but it is that of a very eminent authority, recognized by all as one of the most eminent judges in the land. These views are pregnant with meaning, and I believe, also, with common sense. First of all, I think it is an objectionable proposition that the court-house should be liable to be opened on Sunday. There may be some inconvenience to the jury in being detained for a longer time, who may be anxious to get away and resume their occupations. That is one consideration; but, at all events, there is another consideration, that the public at large would be much inconvenienced and liable to disturbance from the fact of the court-house being opened, and the verdict being given on Sunday; and these circumstances would lead to the desecration of that day.

Mr. **CURRAN**. As for myself I agree entirely with the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. We are all of the same mind with regard to the sanctity of the Lord's Day. I think, however, the objections that have been raised are not likely to be realized as regards trials of a political nature or otherwise. The only idea, I think, that actuated

the joint committee of both Houses when they passed this section of the code, was that of securing the greater good to the greater number. However, after consulting the leader of the House, as no great inconvenience can result one way or the other, the Government will allow this motion, as amended, to be carried, if it be the desire of the majority.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before that motion is carried, I think it would be well for the committee to consider what they are doing. Every one knows that under the law as it now stands, a jury which is once empannelled on a charge of felony, cannot be discharged until a verdict is reached. Now, we have to consider that everything ought to be done to allow the jury full time to deliberate and come to a final conclusion. It frequently happens that a jury is sent up to their room on Saturday evening at six or seven o'clock. This section is simply a permissive section, it can only operate in rare and exceptional cases, and may not operate at all unless with the sanction of the presiding judge. You insist by this proposition to repeal the section that the jury must either come to a hasty verdict and render it before twelve o'clock, or they shall be locked up for twenty-four hours longer. You may say that is a matter of inconvenience to the jury, which may happen but rarely, that the jury will seldom be called upon to ask that this section shall be brought into operation. If the jury is sent up by seven o'clock, by one or two o'clock on Sunday morning they might agree upon a verdict, but the judge is not bound to open the court on Sunday. I presume, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, most judges would not open a court on Sunday, at any rate during divine service. But if the jury had agreed to a verdict by one o'clock, the judge might open the court then and receive the verdict, or even early on Sunday morning. You must remember that as the law now stands the judge is not bound to open the court. The section merely says that the verdict shall not be invalid by reason of its being received on Sunday morning. I think, when you come to balance the advantages on both sides, the rare occasions on which this will ever be exercised, the infinitesimal chances there are of the public peace being endangered or being interfered with, and, on the other hand, the desire of those who want to see Sunday properly observed, I think you will find that the advantages are in favour of leaving the section as it is. I am as strongly in favour of Sunday observance as any man in this House; I do not want to see the Sabbath interfered with in any way at all; at the same time, I plead for common sense, and, in a matter of this kind, where the jury is empannelled and sent up at eight o'clock, you

Mr. CURRAN.

compel them either to bring in a verdict before twelve and refuse to give them time for deliberation, or they are told that they shall be imprisoned for twenty-four hours longer. It seems to me the matter is not all on one side. I know judges can suggest possibilities that there may be an election trial, and the jury may bring in a verdict on Sunday, but the judge is not bound, if there is a great deal of excitement, to open the court at all.

Mr. CURRAN. He won't do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He won't do it if the public interests are going to be endangered. But in the thousand and one cases where no political interests are involved, where a serious murder trial, perhaps, is given in charge of a jury, and they want a few hours more to deliberate, you are forcing them either to come to a hasty conclusion, or be locked up for twenty-four hours.

Mr. McMULLEN. The remarks of the hon. member for Queen's would apply if the clause stopped at taking the verdict of the jury. That is not the clause at all. The clause is touching the verdict of the jury, or other proceedings of the court. If the clause was what was outlined by the hon. gentleman, no person would raise any particular objection; but taking other proceedings on Sunday is a circumstance that is objectionable, and I cannot understand how it escaped the eye of the committee of this House and of the Senate. While I admit that there are few judges who would desire to hold court on Sunday, still that portion of the clause permits them to do so, if they please, and while our judges are very respectable men, still there might be cases in which they might be disposed, in order to promote the personal convenience of individuals attending the court, to sit on Sunday, if they had not disposed of the business on Saturday. I am willing that the clause should remain so far as regards cases of jurors being empannelled on Saturday, that it should be within the power of the judge to accept the verdict on Sunday, if he considered it necessary to do so. But to leave the judge power to conduct the proceedings of the court on Sunday is a provision to which I decidedly object.

Mr. CHARLTON. I object to any judicial proceeding whatever being conducted on the Lord's Day, whether it is the proceedings of the court or the receiving of a jury's verdict.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose there were twelve fathers of families on the jury who desired to attend divine service on Sunday. Do you mean that you would absolutely prevent them from attending worship at their churches?

Mr. CHARLTON. The case suggested by my hon. friend may occur, or it may not. A jury receiving a case on Saturday night consider it with the view before them that

they might arrive at a verdict without infringing the sanctity of the Sabbath. Even if the difficulty and hardship were as pointed out by my hon. friend, and even if the twelve men arrived at a verdict in the early hour of Sunday morning and were compelled to remain in the jury room all day, it would be better to subject them to that inconvenience than to be guilty of an action that was a public desecration of a day which the Christian public respect. You have to draw the line somewhere, and you must either respect the sanctity of the Sabbath or you must take down the bars. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says we may give discretion to the judges, and assume that this proceeding will not be followed in all cases. We may give permission to this extent at this time; but it must be remembered that judges who may not have very much regard for the Sabbath may take advantage of this provision and take other judicial proceedings than those contemplated. There is no safe course except that of sailing up to the line. If we lay down the rule that juries can render decisions and judicial proceedings can be continued on the Lord's Day, the worst consequences will follow. We cannot surrender the principle of Sabbath observance, even if it works inconvenience to individuals. I do not think the arguments in favour of a modification of the principle, that there should be no judicial proceedings conducted on the Lord's Day, are sound and effective. If we are going to have the Lord's Day respected, and if our courts are to abstain from judicial proceedings on that day, it is necessary to do so entirely.

Mr. TISDALE. I quite agree with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that if there is any doubt in regard to this clause, that if it imposes anything more than necessary proceedings, such as receiving and dealing with the verdicts of juries, it should be amended. But as I read the word "proceedings," it is inserted with a view to indicating such proceeding as may be necessary to receive and deal with the verdicts on that day. I am in favour of Sabbath observance, and on this very ground oppose the change he suggests. I look upon the question, however, from a somewhat different stand-point from the hon. member for North Norfolk. I look upon the law as it stands in this Bill as being in accordance with the broad principles of Christianity and the better observance of the Sabbath, and I hold that to shut up twelve men in a room and compel them to be separated from their families during the Lord's Day, because they are unable to agree upon a verdict before midnight on Saturday night, would be a greater breach of the proper advance of the Sabbath than if they were able to submit a decision to a judge on Sunday, who would be able to consider under all the circumstances of the particular case, whether he would receive it on that day. I may say further that I consider it a reflection on the judges of Ontario to suggest any improper use to be

made of this provision. I have yet to learn that in my province there is one judge on the bench, either in the Superior courts or county courts, who the people of Ontario would believe would fail to carry out such a law in a Christian spirit and in a Christian manner. I wish to emphasize what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, that it is unfair and an undue interference with the conscience to compel men who are in the jury-box to agree by a certain hour, failing which, by even one minute, they must remain shut up twenty-four hours. I desire to look at this question from a Christian stand-point, and from the stand-point of jurors. I protest against the observance of the Sabbath as defined by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and contend that the proper observance of the Sabbath as provided by the great book and divine law, under which we believe in the Sabbath at all, is one under which some allowance is made for works of necessity, and its observance is a duty which a man owes to the well-being of society and for the perpetuation of divine and sacred truth. Any other view is contrary to the advanced sentiment of Christianity in any free country, and it is contrary to the Christian view of the Sabbath in these days. I protest on these lines in the hon. gentleman's amendment to what is a reasonable proposition under the circumstances.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. gentleman seems to forget that works of charity and necessity are allowed to be performed on the Sabbath. Even under the Jewish dispensation, it was permitted to rescue a poor man's ox or his ass. That being the case, I cannot see why an unfortunate jurymen should not be discharged after he had rendered his verdict.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not regard the proposed amendment in any other light than in one of common sense. I heartily concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk is to repeal the section, which reads: "The taking of the verdict of the jury or other proceeding of the court shall not become invalid by reason of its happening on Sunday." That does not contemplate the originating of any proceeding of a legal nature on the Sabbath. The whole spirit of that clause is the concluding of a proceeding which began before the Sabbath.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does it not permit the continuance of proceedings?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes; and finishing them, I grant; but it would not justify any judge, and, in fact, it would be a scandal, in continuing the proceedings any length. In my opinion this section is very necessary, even from the extreme stand-point of Sabbath observance as viewed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We need not be so very much better than

the people in England. A similar provision was enacted in England in 1880. Speaking for myself, I think it would be most inconvenient to deprive the courts of the opportunity to close their proceedings a few hours, or a few minutes even, after the Sabbath had commenced. To keep men in custody all over the Sabbath until Monday morning, when the verdict arrived at within one hour or so after Sunday commenced, might be submitted to the courts, is, to my mind, ridiculous; and while I fully believe in the proper observance of the Sabbath, I do not believe in carrying it to such an extreme limit as does the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see any violation of the Lord's Day in the law as it stands now. It seems to me that the provision of the law is reasonable. The law does not intend that a court shall continue to sit and carry on the conduct of a case on Sunday. However, if a jury, trying a case on Saturday are sent out for purposes of deliberation, and do not succeed in coming to a conclusion until after twelve o'clock on Saturday night, they are to be at liberty to come into the court after twelve o'clock and state the conclusion at which they have arrived. I fail to see any difference between a jury being allowed to come into court, and a jury being locked up and compelled to continue their deliberations, so far as regards the observance of the Sabbath. It seems to me you are violating the Sabbath in that sense in the one case as much as in the other. But, Sir, I supposed our legislation with regard to Sunday was purely police legislation. I never supposed for one moment that Parliament assumed that it could compel a community to keep the Lord's Day as the Lord himself intended that it should be kept. I do not know how that is to be accomplished by an Act of Parliament. I suppose that the keeping of the Lord's Day is an individual act on the part of every one, and that our legislation went only to the extent of compelling people to conduct themselves decently and with proper decorum on the Lord's Day, and not to offend against the moral sense of their fellow-members of the community. I remember very well that it was said, that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, and that it was lawful to take a beast out of the ditch on a Sunday, and I supposed it was lawful, if a person was sick, to send for a doctor on Sunday. I want to know whether it would not be as much relief to a man's wife or his children, to have it announced that he is not guilty of an offence of which he is charged, after 12 o'clock on Saturday night, as to have a doctor come and say that the sick man's case is not a hopeless one? Is there not as much mental anxiety connected with one case as with the other? It does seem to me that in this we are acting strictly in conformity with Christian principles, and we are doing no violation to the Sabbath day in the sense

Mr. Wood (Brockville).

in which one understands that day shall be kept, in permitting a jury that has retired,—when it has so happened, they have not agreed when the clock points to 12,—to come back to court and to say, that they have come to a conclusion in the case over which they have been deliberating. Why, Sir, we might in time to come, consider the question as to the hour at which the Lord's Day is to begin. I know that throughout the whole history of the Jewish community the day commences in the evening at 6 o'clock, and not at 12 o'clock. We have assumed, and I think rationally enough, that it is no great difference as to the particular hour at which the day shall begin, so long as we adopt a uniform time, and it does seem to me that we are doing no violation to any Christian principle, nor are we doing any violation to the best interests of the community, to permit a jury who have been deliberating on Saturday, and have not succeeded in agreeing before 12 o'clock that night, to come in and say: That the party on whose case they have been deliberating is not guilty of the crime of which he is charged, and to permit the party to go free from jail, and the jury-men to return to their homes, and to worship in the ordinary way; instead of compelling them to be locked up as prisoners for 24 hours.

Mr. CURRAN. I am very glad that this discussion has occurred. I think my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did not express himself as being particularly favourable to the repeal of this law. As I understand, he merely stated what views had been urged against the change.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. The question is one for the determination of this committee as a whole. At the time this law was discussed by the joint committee, there was no ground urged more strongly than that put by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) to-day, with reference to the fact that a jury, knowing they were going to be locked up until Monday morning, might come to a conclusion so as to do a grave injustice to a prisoner, when, if they had an hour more to consider it, the issue might be decided favourably to him. If they wanted to get rid of the case, and go home before 12 o'clock at night, as they naturally would, the prisoner might suffer very grave injustice. In my own experience not very long ago, the jury not wishing to be locked up all night on a week day, came to what I believe was a hasty conclusion, and, because they wanted to go home, convicted a man who, in my opinion, should not have been found guilty. We certainly might have a grave injustice perpetrated, if this law is not allowed to remain. The other proceedings of the court may be perhaps the pronouncing of judgment and rendering proceedings. I would ask, would it be right that the judge should be prevented from pro-

nouncing judgment and returning to his home, should he be on circuit? It is not a matter of any desecration of the Sabbath that I can see, and in view of all that has been said, I sincerely trust that we shall make as few amendments to this code as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. It should be abolished altogether.

Mr. CURRAN. Indeed. The hon. gentleman did not say so when it was passed.

Mr. LAURIER. I said so last year.

Mr. CURRAN. I am under the impression that my hon. friend, no more than myself, has had much time to look into it since it was passed.

Mr. MULOCK. Nor while it was passing.

Mr. CURRAN. I claim to have followed the committee day after day. My hon. friend did so for a week or two and then he abandoned us.

Mr. MULOCK. Because I found you were not open to reason.

Mr. CURRAN. At all events, I think the sense of this committee ought to be, to allow the clause to remain as it is.

Mr. MULOCK. The Solicitor-General says that if this law is repealed it is going to injure the liberty of the subject and to open the door to grave abuses. He might remember that the clause we are talking of repealing has not come into force yet, and that these grave abuses are therefore happening all along. The law has been such as it is now ever since British justice has been administered, and even in that country known to my hon. friend where there is always a packed jury and a prejudiced judge to send prisoners to British dungeons. Since we have had British justice this has been the law, and it is the law to-day; and the serious consequences that are going to happen without this provision have not happened up to the present moment. Now, if this is going to be the law, Sunday will be added to week days at every assize court where a felony is to be tried. If the matter is to be left to the discretion of the presiding judge for the time being, the judge will say: The Legislature decided so and so; I read the words of wisdom of the Solicitor-General and the hon. member for South Norfolk, and they told us that twelve jurymen were not to be deprived of their liberties on the Sabbath day, and the law was changed, and the mandate given to the jury to exercise their rights. So the judge will exercise his option, and will summon the court on Sunday. What will follow? There are always a number of court followers who frequent courts: the officials, the witnesses, the jury, the press, the whole public, will be in attendance on that day. Now, up to this moment no evil has arisen warranting this departure. The hon. Solicitor-General says that this Act has been well considered

in committee. It is quite true that I did not attend that committee for a week or two; but I am not aware that my attendance would have been of any great value had I continued to attend to the end. But I told the committee that I withdrew because I found that there was no disposition on the part of the committee to give that fair consideration to various clauses which I thought they ought to receive. What has happened since has, I think, justified my withdrawal, because a great many clauses had to be materially modified or dropped when the Bill came to the House. I am not aware that this one received any attention. It was towards the close of the Bill, and I doubt if there was a word of discussion upon it in the Committee of the whole House. So that now for the first time this clause is being considered; and inasmuch as there has been no public demand for it, I think we had better consider it as never having passed; and if grievances should arise at any time under the existing law, it will be time enough for us to deal with them when they do arise.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 24; nays, 57.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to move that the section be amended by striking out all the words from the word "or" in the first line to the word "court" in the second line, inclusive. The clause will then read as follows:—

The taking of the verdict shall not be invalid by reason of its happening on Sunday.

I think we should amend the clause so as to make it clear that the proceedings of the court cannot be proceeded with on Sunday. By this amendment we shall enable the jury to render their verdict and be dismissed, but no other proceedings be taken. I think we should preserve the sacredness of the Lord's Day at least to this extent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the clause can be amended in that direction. Suppose a verdict were brought in at ten minutes past twelve on Saturday night acquitting a man who had been in prison for six months. Surely the hon. gentleman would allow the judge to act upon the verdict and discharge that man from custody. I take it that the meaning of the section is that proceedings may not originate on Sunday, but the verdict may be recorded, and the proceedings consequent upon the verdict may take place.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that the amendment should carry if we wish to bar the door against indiscriminate proceedings of a court. As the section stands, there is nothing to prevent a judge proceeding with a trial on the Lord's Day. There is nothing to prevent proceedings being instituted on that day. Therefore, I hold that the striking out of these words is necessary. The

whole clause should be dropped, but, to minimize the evil, I think we should permit nothing more than the recording of the verdict of the jury. Even if a man should have to remain in custody for a few hours longer, that would be a smaller evil than the evil of disregarding the Lord's Day. It has been said that the state has nothing to do with the Lord's Day, that it cannot make men religious. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) takes that ground. But the state is not warranted in perpetrating any irreligious act itself. It is under the same divine law as the individual is, and it must not violate divine law. There is an old adage in the Scriptures which says: "By me kings reign and princes decree justice;" and Paul says that the powers that be are ordained of God.

An hon. MEMBER. Amen.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some one says "Amen." The Bible is always a subject of ridicule in this House, I know, but whether it is or not, I repeat that the state has no right to violate divine law. I repeat that the state has no right by its Act to desecrate the Sabbath, that this 729th clause of the Criminal Act is such a desecration of the Sabbath that it is inconsistent with the character of a Christian nation, that the motion to expunge that clause should receive the support of every member of this House, and that it is a disgrace to this House that this clause should be allowed to remain in the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. And it has been pointed out that we have all along in our civil and criminal jurisprudence, since the Dominion has existed, done without that clause, and have never felt the necessity for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, we have.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no necessity for it. There is no demand for it, it is put in without proper demand, and now that the matter is brought to the attention of the House, this clause should be dropped, so that this Dominion shall not, as a Dominion, violate God's law and discredit the Sabbath. It is a very sad commentary on the state of religious sentiment in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, hon. members may laugh and jeer, but we profess to be a Christian nation. The United Kingdom has had Sabbath observance laws on the Statute-books for more than a thousand years; and there is not a colony, I believe, which has sprung from the loins of the mother country except the Dominion, which would not treat respectfully a proposition to observe God's laws. It has not been treated respectfully in this House to-day or during this session, and I say that clause ought to be withdrawn, and if you will not drop the whole of it, at least drop

Mr. CHARLTON.

that portion which will permit proceedings on the Lord's day.

Amendment negatived, and Bill reported.

Mr. CURRAN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there is a rule that when a Bill is amended in committee, it should not receive its final reading at the same sitting.

Mr. CURRAN. There has been no amendment at this sitting. At the suggestion of the hon. gentleman opposite we left the third reading over until to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. We want it left over until Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule of the House is that every Bill shall receive its three several readings on different days previous to its being passed, but that on extreme occasions it may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in the one day. It is for the House to say whether the Bill shall be read the third time now or not.

Mr. LAURIER. I can see no objection to the Bill being read a third time to-day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what is the reason of this Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. There are debentures now running which will mature in 1894, to the amount of about \$321,000, and which are bearing 6½ per cent interest. It is simply to give the commissioners power to borrow money to meet those debentures.

Mr. LAURIER. Have they not got the power under the Act?

Mr. FOSTER. They have not.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

WORLD'S FAIR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into committee to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to provide for the payment to two commissioners to represent Canada at the World's Columbian Exposition, to be held at Chicago in 1893, of such sums for their services as are determined by the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. I would expect some explanation from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. In the carrying on of the exposition at Chicago, two things must be

considered. There is the management of it from a business point of view, and then there is the representation at that exposition of almost all countries of the world by distinguished personages, named as commissioners; and at present it will be impossible for the Government to appoint a member of the House of Commons or the Senate as honorary commissioner. It is proposed to take away that disability, and allow the Government to appoint a member of the Senate or House of Commons to represent it in the capacity of representative of the Dominion.

Mr. LAURIER. You have already got commissioners who are in charge of organizing the exposition?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. It is proposed now to appoint two honorary commissioners?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I would see no objection to appointing honorary commissioners, but does not the hon. gentleman believe that it is a misnomer or contradiction in terms to appoint "honorary" commissioners and give them emolument?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not in the Bill or resolution call them "honorary." I used that term in explanation. They are not so much to carry on the business as they are—

Mr. MÜLOCK. To draw the pay.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman does not like the term, but he adheres to the idea.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman who is leading the House. According to the resolution which I find on page 254 of the Votes and Proceedings, it is declared:

That it is expedient to provide for the payment to two commissioners to represent Canada at the World's Columbian Exposition, to be held at Chicago in 1893, of such sums for their services as are determined by the Governor in Council.

Is that the whole resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. It is all given on the Order Paper.

Mr. McCARTHY. That does not seem to authorize the payment of members of this House or members of the Senate as commissioners. It provides that the Governor in Council may appoint commissioners, and fix their salaries, but it does not do away with the Independence of Parliament Act, and I hope it is not intended that it should. I certainly should be very strongly opposed to any attempt to weaken the Independence of Parliament Act and to put more placemen in the House than we have already. We have a great number as it is, a large increase on the former number, with the addition of Controllers and others, and it is contrary to the best interests of Parliament, I think, to

have gentlemen sitting here who are in the pay of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Gentlemen will not be sitting here who are in the pay of the Government. The exposition commences on the 1st of May and ends in October, and if a gentleman from the Senate or a gentleman from the House of Commons is appointed to represent the Government and do the honours of the exposition, he will not be exercising those duties whilst the House is in session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, as my hon. friend intimates, if you take the extreme view, you may say it might influence the action of a member in the Upper House or in the Lower House. I think, however, under the circumstances and for the purpose for which it is required, it is carrying it to rather an extraordinary length to suppose that it would unduly influence any member of this House or any member of the Senate. These commissioners appointed to represent Canada will be at some expense. They are not to be paid salaries, but the expenses they incur in Chicago will be paid. The payment is not in the way of salary; it is an indemnity.

Mr. McCARTHY. But it says "for their services."

Mr. TISDALE. It is precisely what we did in the province of Ontario, and nobody thought of objecting to it. Mr. Awrey was appointed, and an excellent commissioner he has made, too.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But they passed an Act.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, but the principle is exactly the same. I thought it was a right thing for the Ontario Legislature and Government to do, and I have yet to learn that any objection has been raised. It was the case of a political opponent, but I favoured it at the time and I still see no reason to object to it. Surely our party politics have not got so bad that hon. members of this House or of the other are not to be trusted in a matter of this kind. This is an honorary position, and surely a member of Parliament can be appointed to it without leaving him open to the suspicion of being influenced. The appointment gives him a certain position. That is about all, as a rule, I believe, the ordinary member of Parliament does get for coming to Parliament. I thought this proceeding in the case of the Ontario commission was a perfectly proper one, and I do not see why it should be objected to here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Sir, that nothing could be more objectionable than to undertake to give a member of either House a salary for the discharge of any duty other than that as a Minister of the Crown. We have drawn the line here, as it is drawn in the United Kingdom, in this matter. Those

in the service of the Crown are divided into two classes: permanent officers, who are non-political, and political officers, who advise the Crown and have seats in one House or the other. The hon. gentleman seems to see no violation of the principle of the Independence of Parliament Act in conferring this office and bestowing the salary incident to it, upon a member of this House. I think, Sir, you might as well abolish the Independence of Parliament Act altogether. If you appoint persons to represent the Canadian Government at the Chicago Exposition, they should not be members of this House, they should not be persons who can be influenced by the amount of salary they receive in connection with the office. If the appointments are to be made, if they are thought to be necessary, let the persons to fill them be chosen from the four and three-quarter millions of population outside of this House. The whole brains and capacity of the country are not confined to the two hundred odd men who sit here, or to the seventy-five who sit in the other Chamber. There are men competent for the discharge of these duties, who are not members of either one House or the other, and so the Government have a large number from whom to make their selection. There is no necessity to come to this House and ask Parliament to bestow upon the Government power to set the Independence of Parliament Act at defiance. That is what the proposition means. Then, Sir, there is a further objection to this, and that is, that the hon. gentleman asks that the amount these commissioners are to receive for their services shall be determined by the Governor in Council. Here the Governor in Council may undertake to conciliate a party who is discontented. They may undertake to secure the support of one whose independence is such that they cannot depend upon his support, and the amount of remuneration would in a large degree be governed by the question of conciliation. If the hon. gentleman will make his selection from the 4,800,000 people who have no seats here, a larger discretion might be allowed than when he asks to make a selection from among the members of Parliament. But, Sir, I think the choice of a member of Parliament as a salaried officer for any such purpose, is an improper proceeding. It is a violation of the principles involved in the independence of Parliament, and there is danger, if you once permit the barrier to be broken down which is drawn at the point I have mentioned, the point which separates the permanent, non-political officials that are in the service of the Crown, from those that are political and who are the advisers of the Crown. That being so, it seems to me, Sir, the Minister should not come down and ask from this House an appropriation to be bestowed upon a member of this House or upon a member of the Senate. This whole subject was carefully considered

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

when the last Independence of Parliament Act was before the House; and the conclusion arrived at was the same as the conclusion arrived at in England long ago, that a member of Parliament ought not to be taken for any such purpose. There are cases in the political history of the United Kingdom where parties have been appointed on commissions, but they have received no salary. In some instances they have paid to them the actual expenses which they incurred; nothing beyond that has been given or received. We know that a few years ago a member of this House was appointed as commissioner to the West Indies. It was understood that because he was a member of this House he would receive no compensation beyond the actual disbursements that were incident to his appointment; but after his return, and after he had ceased to be a member of this House, a large sum was paid him as an ordinary officer in the service of the Government. I think that is a most improper proceeding, and the House should take care that it should not be repeated. It is important that the members of the House should be free from improper influences, that they should not be converted into place-men instead of being representatives of the people; and to that end it is important that they should not only be free from actual dependence upon the Government, but they should be free in the public estimation from any suspicion of that sort. No such suspicion should be attached to them. Surely the Government have a sufficiently large field to choose from; they can surely find parties competent to act as commissioners if they desire them, without invading either the Senate Chamber or this House for that purpose. If they feel that it is necessary that a member of this House should be taken, before he is appointed to that office, let him tender his resignation, or let him remain subject to the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act; so that when he accepts the position he shall cease to be a member of this House. I think the rule is a proper one, it is a rule that is in the public interest, which we ought strictly to observe, and which we ought not to permit the Government to violate whenever the occasion arises, as in this case, and the case of the Jamaica Exhibition. Sir, it was said at the Centennial Exhibition parties were paid. Who was paid? Why, parties who were not members of the House. Mr. Perreault was not a member of Parliament. The Minister of Agriculture represented the Government there, but he received no compensation, he received his salary as a Minister of the Crown; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Letellier. He acted on behalf of the Administration to a limited extent, but he was not a paid officer in any other sense than that he was a member of the Government and a Minister of the Crown. Now, this proposition is to give compensation to a party who would not receive compensation otherwise. As I understand

the Minister, he proposes to invade Parliament for the purpose of making choice of a party, and he asks that discretion should be left to the Governor in Council to make the salary such as he may see proper. I am opposed to a member of the House being taken for such a purpose, because the room for choice outside the House is ample. I am opposed to the violation of the Independence of Parliament Act in proposing to ask compensation for a member so taken.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The pith of the hon. gentleman's remarks is that he objects to any member of this House being appointed to any position such as it has been hinted a member of this House might be appointed to fill. All the rest of his remarks relate entirely to the spirit of the Act known as the Independence of Parliament Act. Nobody, I am sure, objects to that. But I never supposed it was contemplated by that Act that the services of a member of this House could not be utilized, however important might be the mission or however necessary in the best interests of the country it might be that a member of the House should be selected. Suppose that it is found necessary to represent Canada in some foreign country upon a mission of importance, and the individual whom of all others it would be most wise and judicious to choose to represent us, happened to be a member of this House. Was it ever supposed or contemplated by the Independence of Parliament Act that it would be wrong for us to pass an Act excepting that particular individual and his mission from the operation of the Act? If so, I am greatly mistaken. With regard to the objection made by the hon. member for Simcoe, it appears to be fairly well taken; and I have this suggestion to make. It has frequently happened that a resolution was laid before this House which we had to amend in committee. We can easily amend this resolution in committee to meet the objection raised by the member for Simcoe.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman must see that he has not attempted to answer the argument of my hon. friend from Bothwell. He suggests a possible case in which a member of Parliament, from his peculiar education and qualifications, is better fitted than anybody else to attend to some official duty; and that it would not be inconsistent with the general spirit of the Act referred to, under these special circumstances, that Parliament should be asked to make this case an exception. Has the hon. gentleman told this House who the individual is that possesses these special qualifications which should induce Parliament to alter the Independence of Parliament Act? We have not been informed by the Government that there is any such individual here who possesses special qualifications for this honourable position, qualifications which cannot be found elsewhere. The hon. gentleman sees it will

be time enough to discuss that when the suggestion is made. At present it is not made. But the danger lies in a Government existing at a time when there is a great deal of disquiet and unrest in the country, with defections from their ranks from day to day, with a great many gentlemen who have searchings of heart on some most important questions of the day, and are not thoroughly satisfied. The danger lies in the principle of allowing such a Government to placate and please from time to time some supporters who may not be quite satisfied, by giving them positions to which is attached very large pay. I say it is striking directly at the principle of the Independence of Parliament Act. The principle of the Independence of Parliament Act is that when men accept high and responsible positions of trust in this House, they should hold themselves independent of the patronage and pay of the Government. Parliament has provided, and well provided, and its wisdom has been justified by experience, that gentlemen sitting in this House as representatives of the people shall not accept pay at the hands of the Government of the day, without vacating their seats. But this resolution is still more offensive from the way in which it is introduced. Not only is some member of Parliament to be qualified to accept this pay, but that pay is to be fixed, not by the House, not by Parliament, but by the Governor in Council; this Parliament and this committee is to delegate its powers to the Governor in Council, and they are to pay just such a sum of money as they may, in their wisdom, see fit. I say it is not right that we should throw off from ourselves responsibilities which properly attach to us, and delegate to others the power of fixing what this remuneration shall be. If you are going to appoint an honorary commissioner, let the House decide the amount which the fee shall not exceed; let the House retain control of the matter and not delegate the control to Council, which is at the present time too much the rule. I have always opposed the delegation of powers to Council which this House should exercise, and the proposition of the hon. gentleman, in my opinion, involves a direct violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and the suggestion made by the Controller of Inland Revenue does not improve the case because he does not venture to name any gentleman who possesses these extraordinary qualifications for the position. The hon. gentleman has said that there is a member of Parliament attached to the Government without portfolio who may be appointed, the hon. member who represents London (Mr. Carling). The semi-official press also mentions the name of that hon. gentleman. Does the Controller of Inland Revenue wish the House to accept his statement that that hon. gentleman who for years distinguished himself by the luminous manner in which he explained to the House the duties

he had to discharge as head of the Department of Agriculture, and he alone is qualified to represent Canada? Does the hon. gentleman suggest that his qualifications have been proved in this House so clearly that hon. members will at once accept his appointment? If he possesses these wonderful administrative powers, why did hon. gentlemen turn him out of office? Why does he sit here to-day like a ghost of his former self, wandering about from one place to another without any ostensible duties to perform? The position in Chicago! Is it a solace for his wounded feelings?

Mr. HAZEN. It seems to me that the important question is as regards the salary that the representative of Canada shall receive. I for my part cannot see any objection, if there is any member of this House or member of the Senate who is thought by the Government to possess special qualifications for the discharge of the duties of Canadian representative at Chicago, to his being appointed, provided he discharges those duties without remuneration. If his expenses only are paid, I can see no objection to his appointment. In fact I can see that it might be desirable, in consideration of the high and important office to be filled, that some hon. gentleman who has the confidence of the people of a certain section of the country at all events should go there, because he would, in a certain sense, occupy a representative position; but it does seem to me that it would be altogether improper for the Government to appoint as commissioner to Chicago a member of this House or a member of the Senate and pay him for the services he may perform. I think that would be open to serious objections. It might very reasonably be said in that case that he was influenced in supporting the Government during this session and during other sessions by the fact that he was receiving pay for the position, or anticipating that he would secure the position. It would be a dangerous and improper course to take; but if the commissioner were paid only his legitimate and proper expenses there could be no objection to the appointment of a member of the House or the Senate. What the Government has in view I do not know, and as they have not yet made any appointment I think it was very bad taste indeed for the member for Queen's (P.E.I.) to reflect, as he has done, upon the hon. member for London.

Mr. FOSTER. There appears to be a more serious view taken of this matter than I think it warrants. The objections are two-fold. The objection made on the other side of the House can be easily met, as my hon. friend has stated. There is no idea, no concealed or other design, to appoint any member of Parliament, be he of this House or of the Upper House in order to give any person a salary. The only object is that there should be freedom of choice allowed as regards the appointment

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

of any member of this House or of the Senate; so that we may, if we think it best in the interest of Canada, have our choice unlimited in that respect. The person who goes to the exposition will proceed there as the representative of Canada in an official capacity. He would, of course, be subject to expenses and outlay which we would not expect him to pay out of his own pocket, and it is far better for the Government to come to the House and obtain authority from the House for the payment of those expenses, than either to have their choice curtailed or to pay the expenses in some way that was not strictly straightforward. I have no objection to placing a limit if hon. gentlemen opposite desire it. The Governor in Council has not money to expend lavishly, and does not propose to expend large amounts, but it is proposed simply to pay the expenses which any one representing Canada would necessarily involve. This is no violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. It would be a violation of that Act if we were to appoint a member of this House or the Senate without coming to Parliament and asking its authority; but the moment we do so, and obtain the authority, that becomes an Act of itself, and surely it would never be conceived that any Act we pass here is a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act as regards any one of the members of this House. This Act does bind outside of Parliament certainly, but if Parliament has sanctioned such an appointment after authority, then the Independence of Parliament Act has not been violated.

Mr. MILLS (Bethwell). Suppose you were to apply this argument to every office, what would be the result?

Mr. FOSTER. That is an extreme view to take; it is not proposed to apply it to every office. This is a matter which occurs seldom; it is an exposition in which Canada has to be represented and at which her representative will meet with the representatives of other countries. It is not proposed to extend the principle. Even other countries entertaining equally as strong an idea of maintaining its parliamentary purity as we entertain, have already acted in this way. I do not think I am incorrect in believing that when Mr. Chamberlain visited Washington as a negotiator for the British Government of the Washington treaty, he was at that time a member of the British House of Commons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was he paid for his services?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. But you stated you were going to pay a salary in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not propose to pay a salary. If the hon. gentleman will look at the financial returns of the British House of Commons, he will find that Mr. Chamber-

lain did expend a very large amount of money as he necessarily must have done, in the interest of the country. He did not receive a salary, nor do we propose to pay the gentleman we appoint. I sent it to the law officer of Parliament to draw it up. It may be that some change should be made in the resolution, and we will do that in committee. I am inclined to think that the Ontario Government has already appointed as its commissioner a member of the Legislature, and I think Sir George Baden Powell was also a commissioner and a member of Parliament.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not paid a salary.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to make it clear that it is not the intention of the Government to pay a salary, but to pay expenses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Finance has announced a very strong precedent; that is the action of the Ontario Legislature as recommended to them by the Administration of Sir Oliver Mowat in connection with this same exposition. The representative of the province of Ontario is Mr. Awrey, a very good one, and I have no fault to find with him. He is a member of the Ontario Legislature, and if I mistake not, by a vote of that House he will receive \$3,000 for his services in connection with the exhibition.

Mr. LAURIER. That is different from the proposition here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it is very much the same.

Mr. LAURIER. You do not particularize here the person who is to be appointed; but you give power to the Government to do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes; but the principle is just the same. I understand that the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is that it is a dangerous practice to appoint a member of this House and to pay him out of the public funds. I have called the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the Ontario case is exactly in point; that they have appointed a member of the Legislature to perform public services on the part of the province, these services to be paid for out of the treasury of the province of Ontario. My hon. friend will see that the cases are on the same footing.

Mr. LAURIER. Paid for his services?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I believe so.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am glad to find that the Minister of Finance has receded from the position he took when he introduced the resolution.

Mr. DALY. Not at all.

Mr. MULLOCK. The Minister of the Interior says "Not at all;" but I listened to the Minister of Finance, and he first intimated that these two commissioners might be

members of the House or of the Senate, and should be paid, not merely expenses, but for their services—I think he used the word salaries. However, he has repented since, and I congratulate him.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not necessary.

Mr. MULLOCK. It may not be a source of pleasure to him; but I congratulate the country that he is so apt at taking instructions. I have made an examination of the list of members of this House, and I think I am perfectly within the mark when I say that at this very time there is a large number of the members, not occupying seats on the Treasury benches, but supporters of the Administration, who are practically carrying appointments around in their pockets. These gentlemen are standing up day after day and apparently giving their judicial opinions and votes upon all matters of importance; but they are not unbiassed. The Independence of Parliament Act was meant for a purpose, and it is quite clear that no man should be biassed by personal considerations in the discharge of his representative duties. This demoralization of public opinion in this House is most detrimental to the best interests of this country. If, for example, there are, as I think there are, twenty-five members supporting the Administration, who have the hope of positions at the hands of the Government in the near future, think of the influence of these twenty-five scattered throughout the remaining 120 of their colleagues; not 120 even, for we must take out of that number the thirteen members of the Cabinet and the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker, so that there are probably forty members on the Government side who at this moment are not in a position to be independent.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. the Deputy-Speaker smiles. But if it were not offensive to do so I could give the names of them all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MULLOCK. You know the names well, and when the next election comes round we will see twenty-five at least of the gentlemen who are now supporting the Administration quietly withdrawing to comfortable berths provided by the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. As in 1878.

Mr. MULLOCK. I dare say it happened before, and I dare say the case cited by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is an apt precedent. But I decline to be bound by any bad precedent. If the Ontario Parliament chooses to go against the true spirit of representative government, then I decline to be bound by such a precedent. If the previous Liberal Administration disregarded the spirit of the law, surely it is our duty to improve upon old records, and let us be better, if possible, than those who preceded us. I say that, if it is proposed by

this resolution to afford remuneration to any supporter of the Administration, it is vicious in principle and it is a direct violation of the constitution. I remember very well, when the present High Commissioner was a member of the House and was appointed to that high office. I only wish that the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) had been a member at that time, and he would not then have voted in favour of legislation vindicating the commissioner from the consequence of his violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. The High Commissioner, when he sat in this House, had the patent of his office in his pocket, and he sat on the Treasury benches as well. I myself think that it is time to interfere with this growing evil of having placemen in the House supporting the Government, with their appointments in their pockets. One remedy for this is, that there should be legislation providing that no member of this House should be eligible for appointment to any office of emolument under the Crown, until at least a certain time had elapsed between his being a member of the House and his receiving such an appointment.

Mr. TISDALE. May I be allowed, by way of explanation, to read the Ontario Act with reference to the appointment of their commissioner to the World's Fair. It says :

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act respecting the Legislative Assembly it shall be lawful for the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint any member of the Legislative Assembly as commissioner to represent the province of Ontario at the World's Fair or Columbian Exposition to be holden at the city of Chicago, in the state of Illinois, in the year 1893, and to direct the payment to the said commissioner for his services of such reasonable sum as may be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council out of any moneys which may be voted by the Legislative Assembly for that purpose, and the said commissioner shall not by reason of such appointment or remuneration or the acceptance thereof, void his election or vacate or forfeit his seat, or incur any of the penalties imposed by the said Act for sitting and voting thereafter as a member of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does that make it right?

Mr. SPROULE. Mowat thinks it does.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I move that after the words "two commissioners," the following be inserted: "who may be members of this Parliament."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are both to be members of this Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. It may be.

Mr. LANDERKIN. One from each side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be taken into consideration.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. LAURIER. Are you going to leave the word "services" there?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I cannot see any objection to the word "services."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) read us a lecture about the disposal of patronage; but the hon. gentleman had better read that to Mr. Mowat, in the province of Ontario. But what is the use of this House professing one thing and actually doing another? It makes no difference whether the word "services" or the word "indemnity" is used. The intention of this House is to pay the men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, let us not pass the resolution at all. The hon. gentleman should object to it altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do object to the resolution. I object to the very word the hon. gentleman wants retained. I do not object to any reasonable allowance being made to these gentlemen considering the position they are to occupy; I am not going to cavil at the amendment; but I say that the Government should not do violence to the meaning of the word "allowance," and, under it, make payment for services.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I object to the word "allowance." I say that the proper course is for the Government to intimate to the House what they propose to grant these men, and I understand that my hon. friend is willing to do that.

Mr. OUIMET. I think it is better to use the expression "indemnity for services and expenses." Not that the Government has any intention of paying these gentlemen for their services. It is only intended to pay their expenses liberally, and we wish to provide that no question shall be raised afterwards in regard to these members being disqualified owing to the fact of their having received a few dollars over their actual expenses. Suppose we allowed them \$10 a day, and some people outside of the House raised the question that they had expended only \$8 a day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, the object is simply to remove this special case from the operation of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we are all fairly well agreed so far as we have gone. The amount to be paid will have to be left to the Government, which is responsible to the House. I would suggest this form of words: "such sum for their expenses as shall be determined by the Governor in Council."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would be proper enough. Members of Parliament in

England have often been members of commissions, as Mr. Gladstone was on the Ionian Commission, Sir Stafford Northcote on the Joint High Commission, and Mr. Chamberlain on the commission that negotiated the treaty of 1887; but they were never paid for their services.

Mr. RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be no disposition to carp at any reasonable expenditure that is made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to offer an amendment to the resolution, to add the following words:—

And further, that it is expedient that such payment shall be provided for under the express condition that the Canadian Department of the said exhibition shall be closed on Sundays.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. The amendment is not in order. It is on a distinct matter entirely.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are we to be told that this is one of the laws of the Medes and Persians that cannot be changed? Is it not a function of this House to vary the conditions of a resolution which it passes? Can it not, in the public interest, do anything it pleases in regard to this matter?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Although I do not support the motion, I would be very sorry to see it ruled out of order. If this House votes a certain sum of money, I do not see why it cannot attach any reasonable condition to the vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. In the United States Congress there was a condition exactly of this kind, that the exhibition should not be open on the Lord's Day, attached to an appropriation made by Congress for the exhibition.

Mr. LAURIER. It is well understood that riders are always objectionable. I would vote against this motion if it were pressed to a vote, but it seems to me that it is not out of order. When we are voting money, we may attach any condition to the vote.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. The motion is not at all relevant to this resolution. The object of the resolution is to enable the Government to pay the expenses of certain members of Parliament at the exhibition. The closing of the Canadian exhibit on Sunday is a different matter entirely.

Mr. CHARLTON. This House is at perfect liberty to decide whether it considers it proper or desirable to send a commissioner if the exhibition is opened on the Lord's Day. It is perfectly pertinent to the resolution. There is a very large proportion of the population of this country, I believe a majority, who hold that the Canadian exhibit should be closed on the Lord's Day, and I say that any money grant made in connection with

that exhibition should be made on the condition that the honour of this country shall be preserved.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Moreover, there is already on the Order Paper a motion in the very same sense as the hon. gentleman's present motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. That motion does not apply to money, but is the assertion of an abstract principle, while this resolution voting money is a practical application of the principle. There is a motion on the Order Paper which has been regulated by the Government to the limbo of obscurity, where it will not be reached again; but even if it were to be reached to-morrow, I hold that it does not debar a member of this House, on a resolution proposing to take action, moving to attach a reasonable condition to that resolution.

Mr. MULOCK. One of the very conditions of this vote is that this expense shall be incurred provided that the commissioners go to Chicago. The whole vote is a condition. So that if you attach one condition, you may attach another.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. I declare the amendment out of order.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to, and reported.

THE INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 100) further to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MULOCK. I think the Finance Minister should explain this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that a number of insurance societies and kindred companies have, in their special Acts of incorporation, such a clause in order to prevent any one person too largely controlling the stock and business of the company. The Canadian Life Insurance Company had a Bill before the Banking and Commerce Committee this year, to which an amendment was moved in the same sense; and after some consultation, it was thought better to make a general clause of this kind applicable to all insurance companies. To this amendment the insurance companies, so far as I am informed, are favourable, and it has been introduced with the object of doing away with the necessity for a special clause in company charters.

Mr. MULOCK. It is unfortunate that a measure of this importance should be introduced and pressed to a second reading within a little over a week from the time it received publicity. This Bill was only introduced

eight days ago, and it affects institutions doing business over the whole Dominion. I therefore think the Government would be wise in not pressing it to a final reading this session. There is no urgent necessity for it. I disapprove of the House interfering with the rights of persons except for the most justifiable reasons. I am in favour of every measure calculated to render insurance companies more secure, but I do not think that this Bill accomplishes anything in that direction. It says that no shareholder shall own more than a third of the votes of a company, and shall not control more than one-third. Well, in most cases there are other difficulties in the way of passing measures of this kind. It is a very rare thing for a shareholder to own more than a third of the stock of an insurance company. And it may be that the shareholders have acquired certain rights under the Act of Parliament, which would now be interfered with, without any notice being given them. This Bill has only been before the public for a week, so that we can not know what arguments might be advanced against it, and it is a vicious practice to rush through legislation without giving, previously, every publicity to it. For instance, this morning a gentleman came here representing large railway interests, who said that only by accident he heard yesterday that in another Chamber a most important piece of railway legislation had been introduced two days ago, and was to receive the third reading to-morrow, and be proposed for the consent of this House on Monday, and yet no publicity has been given that measure. The railway companies do not know of it except in an accidental way, such as I have just mentioned. Well, here is another measure affecting shareholders, about which they know nothing, and to-morrow we may have a measure affecting policy-holders. I was going to suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he wants to strengthen the position of the policy-holders, which is a very commendable object, there are other ways in which that may be done. I am not satisfied with our insurance law. We have insurance companies—I refer to life companies entirely—on very little capital doing business amounting to, perhaps, \$60,000,000. Their liabilities will mature in the remote future, but sooner or later they will mature, and I think there is a limit to the power of any one company successfully managing business. My own opinion is that the department ought to consider whether there ought not to be an outside limit as to the volume of business that any one insurance company should be allowed to do. A life insurance company has a large amount of money coming in every year, which it finds difficult to invest, and we see them making improvident and unwise investments of these funds which should be available for the future to protect the beneficiaries. For example, would the interests of the assured—and they are really the class about which we are concerned—be promoted

Mr. MULOCK.

by their funds being permanently withdrawn and invested in bricks and mortar, which are not going to be reasonably productive?

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the hon. gentleman in order?

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps not strictly in order. I say I take advantage of this occasion to call the attention of the Government to the state of the insurance law; because I think there is no one subject that more demands the attention of Parliament than this. There are policies in force in Canada to the amount of, perhaps, \$150,000,000, possibly more. That is an enormous interest in our trust, and here we are commencing to tinker with the law without notice to the public. True, this is a question affecting the rights of shareholders. But next year, probably, the department will, at the last moment, send down some other Bill dealing with some other feature of the insurance law. For these reasons I think the Government should not press this Bill to a third reading now, even though one or two companies have expressed approval of it. If the Minister of Finance says that the insurance companies of Canada generally are in favour of it, that is another matter. But until he can do so, I do not think he ought to press the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the House should be in such a hurry to interfere with vested rights of shareholders in insurance or any other companies, without a good deal stronger reasons than we have heard to-day for doing so. I would like to know from the Finance Minister whether any general meeting of shareholders of any insurance company has considered this Bill and asked the Government to pass it. Possibly there may have been a directors' meeting, but those present might not represent one tithe of the stock or any of the policy-holders. If so, what right has Parliament, by violence, to deprive them of what may be of very considerable value in their property? I can conceive of a case where a man might have paid for stock in an insurance company at the market price, with a very natural desire to have a certain influence or weight, and even to get a majority. To say that, without the shareholders being consulted, they should be deprived of that right which attached to the stock when they bought it, that that vested right should be taken absolutely from them by the force of this law, is not right, unless some very general assent or some very grave public reason is shown to the House for the adoption of such an amendment. Why, Sir, under this law, though no person could control a public company, because he could cast only one-third of the vote, two persons could control it by joining and working together. And, if there is great weakness in one man controlling a company, there is probably nearly as much in two controlling it, and, if there is an evil to be feared in this respect at all, some much

better-considered proposal than this should be laid before the House. I do not think the House should be asked to pass this Bill. I think this should be allowed to stand over as a notice to the people, for another session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman's proposition is; but, judging from the wording of the Act, I suppose the evil the Minister of Finance wants to guard against is the evil which does sometimes exist of one or two parties getting control of the majority of the shares, and then absolutely dictating the policy of the company without the least regard to the interests of the minority. Am I right in supposing that to be the evil to be guarded against?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the idea.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not prepared to say that that is not a worthy object. But I think it would be well, in a matter of this importance, that we should not pass this Bill hurriedly. I have a suggestion to make to the Minister and to the House, which might be worthy of consideration. I have had brought before my notice, as every gentleman must have had, this very evil to which I have referred, that is, the evil of a clique of men getting control of a majority of the votes and deliberately trampling on the interests of the minority. Now, Sir, it is possible to avoid that to a very great extent by the simple expedient of providing that the minority shall be entitled to a proportionate representation on the board, much as we elect committees of this House. As everybody knows, our practice (and a very proper practice) is that when a committee is named every man has his separate vote and, though the majority have, as is quite right, the majority of votes on the committee, the minority are always represented. I present the suggestion for consideration. There is a good deal to be said pro and con, but my own belief as regards these same joint stock companies is that a great safeguard would be given to the public if it were provided that boards of directors should be elected in the same way as we elect our committees. A good many things are done by a board of directors who only represent a majority which would never be done were the minority represented as well.

Mr. DENISON. It appears to me that the Bill is clearly in the interests of the policy-holders. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) seemed to be anxious particularly about the shareholders. But we must not forget that in all these insurance companies the proportion of interest of shareholders to policy-holders is almost infinitesimal. I know some cases where the policy-holders are interested to the extent of millions, while the interest of the shareholders is only a few hundred thousand. It is clearly the duty of this House to protect if possible the interests of this large mass of policy-holders. As was pointed out by the hon. member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it is possible that one man may gain control of a whole vast corporation through holding a small majority of the stock. Now, with that power in his hands the temptation is great for him to exercise it; the temptation is great for him to take hold of the company and turn it entirely to his own use. It is equally possible, as pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford, that two or three individuals might do the same thing. It appears to me that the Government should press this Bill to a conclusion.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably a very important matter. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that it is highly desirable we should by legislation endeavour to reach the case of men disposed to monopolize and turn to their own use and benefit the assets of an insurance company. All people in this country are not in a position to judge as to the financial stability of any particular company, and they are largely dependent upon the legislation that these companies receive within this Chamber. Now, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is an exceedingly important matter; but I would suggest that if we are going to provide legislation to meet the case it is unquestionably desirable that the insurance companies should have an opportunity of presenting to a committee of this House their side of the case regarding the provisions of this Act before it becomes law. If we go on hastily and pass this short Act, the probabilities are that very decided objections may be taken to its provisions after all; and next year we may have to commence again and alter its shape and enact other provisions. I think something in the shape of a model Act for the incorporation of life insurance companies should be passed, with which all Acts should be required to comply. I think it would be better to have something of that kind, instead of giving special legislation to each company, that would reach cases such as have been outlined by the member for South Oxford. But, in my humble opinion, there is not time, if the Government intend to prorogue at the time indicated, to give sufficient consideration to this Act, and also to permit the insurance companies, by their boards or managers, to be represented, and to give the examination which ought to be given to so important a measure. It does not appear that any deputation from any insurance company has waited upon the Finance Minister urging the passing of this legislation, and it ought not to be passed until it has been fully considered by the companies who are unquestionably interested in the passing of such a law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say to the Minister of Finance, that, when the Insurance Act was originally passed, the course pursued by the then House was to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which sat, after

full notice to the various insurance bodies throughout the country. If the same plan was pursued here, I think it would tend to secure careful and well-considered legislation.

Mr. COCKBURN. I was about rising to propose a course similar to that which has been suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford. I remember when we had the Banking Act before us, and the benefit that accrued to that Act from its consideration by those who had devoted a great deal of attention to the subjects of banking. I am averse at all times to interfering with the ordinary current of business, with the ordinary rules which have been established. I cannot but think that it would be wise, if we let this amendment to the Insurance Act lie over until next session. The diversity of opinion which has been expressed to-day by members of the House, shows the wisdom of that course. The hon. member for South Oxford, who is conversant with financial subjects, has proposed that representation should be given to the minority. It looks fair enough, but, practically, he must be aware that, if any gentleman in any insurance company owns one-third or one-half of the stock, and he is not allowed to have his full vote on that stock, he will simply evade the law by passing over temporarily so much of his stock as may be necessary, to some of his friends, who will vote in accordance with him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman permit me? Under the proposition I make, every man would have the full power of voting on his stock. If he had nine-tenths of the stock, he would be able to name nine-tenths of the directors, but he could not name the whole, even if he had nine-tenths of the stock.

Mr. COCKBURN. But this proposal is to limit him, apart altogether from the stock; the proposal is to limit him to one-third or one-fifth of the whole. Practically, we would find it impossible to do that, because, if a person actually possessed that stock, actually had that responsibility in the company, and you were to limit him to one-fifth, whereas, perhaps, he would have three-fifths, he would be careful to take his other two-fifths and divide it among his friends, whose votes he would have, if the occasion required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt.

Mr. COCKBURN. You cannot alter that by this proposition. I think, therefore, it might be wise to leave this subject over for twelve months and let the various insurance companies consider the question. As has been remarked by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), we have only had eight or nine days to consider this matter. I myself had not read the Bill until a moment ago. If we pass this amendment at once, there might be a great deal of objec-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

tion to it hereafter. It may be that some persons do obtain a controlling influence in a company, and, while that is a matter to be guarded against, I cannot agree with the hon. member for North York, that limits should be put to the insurance companies. I would put them under the same rules as any other company, that is to say, that a man or company may do just as much business as they are able to do. You will find that the larger the business done by these companies, the better are they managed. We have seen that in some of our best life insurance companies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree, to a great extent, with what the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) has just stated. The insurance companies have special Acts, private Acts. They come here with private Bills, and those Bills become private Acts. When we have to amend a private Act, or when a private concern promotes a Bill, we require, by the rules of the House, that certain delays must be given. The other day we tried to curtail the delay, in one or two cases, and the House objected, on the ground that we might be changing entirely the rights of a corporation, who should have a right to be heard. Other parties also may have claims to lay before Parliament and desire to be notified in good time. Although this Bill is a public Bill, it will affect all private Acts under which insurance companies are now working, but this House knows nothing about that. A number of these companies are at a distance and have not been notified, because this Bill was introduced on 16th March, only eight days ago. Even suppose the Bill was printed the next day, that gives us such a short time that really these companies cannot become acquainted with the provisions of the Bill. Now, I want to make a remark about the proposition dealing with the number of shares. Suppose there are 600 shares. By the first provision of this Bill, no individual can have more than 120 shares to vote upon. Well, if the shareholders present at any meeting represent 300 shares, no shareholder will be able to vote on more than 100 shares; that will be a third. Now, you want to avoid one shareholder getting control of the company. As the hon. member for Toronto stated just now, it is a very easy thing for any shareholder, or friend of his, to transfer his shares to others, so that one individual may be able to control them. Suppose one shareholder has sixty shares, and another has 100; between the two they may be able to control the election, or the proceedings of a meeting. This Bill will not have the effect you expect from it. Under these circumstances, I think it would be wise to postpone the measure, so that, during the recess, the companies may become acquainted with its provisions; and next session, probably, we will have a measure that can be discussed

and adopted by Parliament to the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. HAZEN. It is doubtful to my mind, whether this measure will be a remedy for the evil complained of. This Bill provides that no one shareholder shall have votes representing more than one-fifth of the stock. Suppose the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), or any of his friends, held four-fifths of the stock, this provision would limit his voting power to one-fifth of his holding. But it would be an easy matter to avoid that restriction, because on the morning of the meeting he might assign one-fifth to his son-in-law and one-fifth to another friend, and so on, and those gentlemen would all go to the meeting and vote, and vote as he wished. In dealing with this difficulty it is to be regretted that this Bill does not provide a remedy. I do not express any opinion as to whether the matter is one that requires remedy, but if it requires to be removed, it certainly cannot be removed by the measure now before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I recognize the truth of the fact that the man who controls the majority of the shares not only will control, but has a right to control a majority of the directors. The point for which I contend, and it is a point worth considering, is, whether we could recognize another principle, namely, that if, for example, I own one-tenth of the stock I would have a right to be represented by one-tenth part of the board, and supposing there were ten directors, I would have a right to be represented by one.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not quite agree that this Bill will be inoperative, as the hon. member for Centre Toronto and the hon. member for Three Rivers appear to think. Undoubtedly you can avoid almost any law, but if you have a positive enactment that a person shall not directly or indirectly record more than a certain number of votes, and that person does indirectly attempt to do so, certainly the provision of the law can be enforced as regards the election of directors.

Mr. COCKBURN. This is done at every meeting by persons who have large holdings. They make over shares, and have them duly transferred for the time being to different persons before the annual meeting, and within a month or so afterwards the shares are again transferred. At the next annual election they are transferred again.

Mr. McCARTHY. The point is this: is it important in the interest of insurance companies, by which enormous sums are held and sums in which not the shareholders but the policy-holders are interested, enormous sums held by companies not perhaps due now, but due in time to come, that we should do something to prevent the possibility of any one man gaining control over the assets

of the company? I know this matter has caused some anxiety among the people, and no doubt that is the reason why this Bill has been introduced. If it be a fact that we ought to safely guard and protect the interest of the policy-holders in these large companies, many of them having but very little capital—and I think if you take the insurance companies within the Dominion of Canada it will be found that their capital is proportionately very small, while their liabilities are enormous—the question arises whether we should not adopt some measures to protect the policy-holders. If that be the case, what course should we adopt? There is very much to be said in favour of the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); but I do not think that would meet the whole difficulty. In the meantime is there any great objection to our enacting that no one shareholder shall influence the election of directors by controlling more than one-fifth of the stock? Of course such a proposition undoubtedly to some extent interferes with the rights of property; but we are constantly interfering with the rights of property in matters of public interest. The question is whether in a matter of such importance, and when there is the liability of great wrong being done to individuals, we should not waive that principle, and declare that it is not desirable that the assets of an insurance company should come under the control of one man, no matter how trustworthy he may be.

Mr. COCKBURN. How will you prevent it?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Bill proposes a remedy. If the stockholder passes over his stock in the morning to another individual who is able to vote on it at the general meeting, he does indirectly what the statute declares shall not be done, and the election of directors under such circumstances would certainly be set aside by the courts on proper application being made. The law could not be evaded in that way.

Mr. COCKBURN. It will be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman can suggest a better remedy let him submit it to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The provisions of the Bill are drawn so as to appear to aim at some particular individual. If the Bill laid down a general plan, one would suppose it was a measure intended to cover a general grievance; but when it is provided that a person, no matter what amount of stock he holds, shall not represent more than one-fifth you are adopting precautions in regard to one individual that you are not adopting in regard to two or three. Why should not one individual be able to do what two or three persons are able to do under the same circumstances? It seems to me the only proper way of dealing with this question is that suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford, and declare that while an individual

may hold a majority of stock and control the entire stock, stockholders should be represented in proportion to the amount of stock they hold.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill covers several questions which are of very great importance to policy-holders and to those largely interested in insurance companies. It has been urged that a company's interests are likely to become seriously affected because one person might hold a majority of the stock. What I desire to point out is, that the majority of the successful financial institutions of this country, both insurance and otherwise, are those that have been under the control of very few persons. This is undoubtedly true here, that the successful concerns are those who have few shareholders and where two or three individuals have controlled the company. It is said that no one person should represent over one-fifth of the stock. But I can quite understand the creation of a combination of small holders who would have very little to sacrifice, and who by this combination might wreck the company. This amendment is an interference with vested rights. In many cases stocks have risen to high values from the very fact that they have been held by few individuals and been perfectly under their control, and in this way they have been able to control them so that the stock has not been manipulated by speculators or interested parties. If this amendment should be adopted, a person will not have a right to represent his interest, and I desire to point out to the House that this would undoubtedly injuriously affect companies, persons with small or with large interests, persons who have taken and invested all their capital in one company, and whose sole object is to see that the company is successful. I would point out to the hon. member for Simcoe that this Bill will not effectively prevent control being retained by one or two individuals. The Act declares that a person shall not secure control of a majority of the votes at the annual meeting; but if any holder desired to act against the interests of the company or those involved, he will not hesitate to transfer the stock to other friends, who will vote according to his dictation, and afterwards retransfer the stock. On the other hand, if he is a man who has the interest of a company at heart, and has perhaps his all invested in it, he for one will only be too glad to have the advice and assistance of the minority of the stockholders and directors of a company in which he may be so largely interested. I say that the Government should take this into their serious consideration, and they ought to refer this Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee, so that it may be dealt with as all important changes in this law are dealt with and should be dealt with. We ought to have an opportunity of hearing from those who are largely interested in these companies. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

whether or not any representations have been received by the stockholders or policy-holders of insurance companies, asking for legislation of this description?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; representations have been received from some of the insurance companies with reference to this very matter, and some of the largest of them have passed resolutions favouring the provisions of this Act.

Mr. EDGAR. From the shareholders?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember now whether from the shareholders or directors.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you heard from the policy-holders?

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a difficult operation to hear from them. If this Bill is a benefit to any one it is to the policy-holders.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I question that. The Minister ought to give us the names of some of the companies who have so petitioned, because many of us are interested in stocks of insurance companies. I never remembered hearing of any meeting of the directors or shareholders of insurance companies where resolutions were passed favouring this legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the resolutions with me, but I will bring them down before the Bill is passed to its third reading. I think, after the discussion, we might pass the Bill through committee now, and then it can remain for some time for the consideration of the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why do you not refer it to the Banking and Commerce Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I question very much whether this legislation is in the interest of the policy-holders. If the principle is good, then we had better destroy stock companies altogether and say that they shall be mutual companies. Every man with any experience knows, that the companies which have been wrecked in Canada, the United States and England, have been mutual companies, where there were a large number of stockholders or policy-holders, and where schemers could go around and get by proxies, or otherwise, the control of the company. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) has had experience in insurance matters, and he will know that, especially in the United States, what I have stated is the case. In my humble judgment this is a Bill which should be carefully and seriously considered, both by the Government and by the House. The men who wreck companies of this kind do not put their money into them, but by representations, or by bonuses given for the use of the proxies, they were enabled to put themselves in a position to make money and to ruin the company. I believe that the Min-

ister should not press this Bill on the House without giving us some information. I think he should state to us if the stockholders or policy-holders or directors of any leading company have passed resolutions in favour of this legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember for one, that the Canada Life has passed such a resolution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The stockholders of the Canada Life ?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the directors of the Canada Life have passed a resolution asking for this.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is one company of very great importance in which I am interested myself.

Mr. FOSTER. They asked for it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am interested in that company and I never noticed any resolution of that kind. Be that as it may, the Minister will see that it is a matter of great importance for us to consider whether or not this is legislating on a right principle.

Mr. FOSTER. A large insurance company like that will be good judges.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They might have had some special reason.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose they had.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In these mutual companies where every one has a say ; we all know that they are the easiest wrecked. This Bill affects vested rights. As the hon. member from Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), one of the most experienced men in connection with private legislation in the House, has stated, men have invested their money on the strength of an Act guaranteed by this House, and all at once, without any notice or due consideration, we are asked to vote away the rights under which they invested their money. I hope the House will insist on this Bill being referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee, so that we may have an opportunity of discussing an important matter of this kind, and of hearing experts express their views in regard to it. As far as I am concerned, I believe that this legislation is moving in the wrong direction, and as far as I am concerned I am opposed to the principle of it. I am sure that hon. gentlemen who take an interest in these matters will agree with me that the successful institutions are those in which the stock is held by a few. I think I have shown clearly that in the case where a man is desirous to advance the interests of an institution, it is just as well that he should hold the majority of the stock. If an institution has to deal with a schemer, the provision now proposed will not affect him at all. I again trust that the Minister will refer the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Finance has at last told us of one company whose board of directors has suggested this legislation. Now the board of directors may or may not represent the feelings of a shareholders' meeting, which ought to be specially called to consider this subject. If a board of directors had undertaken on its own option to ask for legislation, depriving the shareholders of certain vested rights, they have taken a most extraordinary course. This House will not empower any board to issue bonds or debentures or do anything that will interfere with vested rights of shareholders, without having first called a meeting of shareholders by due public notice, and requiring generally a two-thirds majority of the shareholders to agree to denude themselves of their privileges, powers and priorities. When a measure of this kind is proposed, it is much more reasonable that the shareholders should have something to say about it. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) was good enough to say that I did not consider about the rights of the policy-holders at all. The Minister of Finance has mentioned the name of the Canada Life Company. I am sorry to say that I possess none of the stock of that company ; but I hold a couple of life policies, of \$10,000 each, in that company, and I would like to know, as a policy-holder, how far our rights are to be affected. Anything that will affect the stability of the company or unsettle its stock, will disturb its market value and will, perhaps, indirectly affect the interests of the policy-holders. It would be much more sensible, in the interest of the policy-holders, to pass a general law, giving them the right of representation on the board of directors. There are insurance companies in Canada in which that is the case. I am sure that the hon. member for West Toronto will agree with me, that a provision of that kind would be much more in the interest of the policy-holders than is the provision before us ; but, of course, that could not be done without the most ample notice to all the companies and to all parties concerned. We have not been told by the hon. Minister of Finance how many companies this legislation will affect, or how many companies have it now ; but there must be a large number of companies throughout the country that will be affected by it. It is proposed by this Bill absolutely to deprive stockholders of their rights. I do not think it should be passed without the most due and ample notice. This is not a question of public policy. No evils have been shown to exist, calling for such legislation, and, therefore, I think this Bill should at least be held over to another session. It is an improper measure, and I shall feel disposed to oppose it at all stages, until I know what those interested in the subject will say about it. To wait until the third reading is not a fair way to have the matter discussed. I think the Bill should be allowed to remain in the committee until it is properly threshed out.

Mr. DENISON. The last speaker, and the one who preceded him, appear to be looking after the interests of the shareholders, rather than the interests of the policy-holders. As most of us know, the stock of the Canada Life is about \$100,000, paid up, while the policy-holders hold policies in the company about \$60,000,000, and I should think that the invested capital of the Canada Life must be \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. Therefore, one can easily see that the policy-holders have a greater interest in the company than the stockholders. If the Bill is not passed, it is quite possible that the stock of the company, or the majority of it, may fall into the hands of one man. In that case, one man would control the company; he could put in a board of directors who would do exactly what he wished—declare larger dividends and bleed the policy-holders right and left. It is said that the interests of the stockholders must be looked after; but we must also look after the interests of the policy-holders, whose interests are twenty-fold greater than those of the stockholders. It appears to me that the arguments advanced by the hon. members opposite, are fallacious and more in the interests of the shareholders than those of the policy-holders.

Mr. MULOCK. The more one thinks of this proposition, the more it suggests caution. The Minister of Finance proposes to hand over the management of the life insurance companies to a minority of the shareholders. That is what it amounts to. He proposes that, if one man gets a majority of the stock, the minority shall rule. I am not prepared to pass an opinion upon that proposition, without the advice of those interested. We are intrusted with the interests of the policy-holders, and it is in their interests, principally, that I am now halting. I am, unfortunately, not in the position of being a shareholder in any life insurance company; I never had a share; but I feel interested, for the sake of the policy-holders; and, late as it is, I think it is due to them that they should be heard on this question. It is proposed that Parliament shall declare a grievance that does not exist; and if a company should be wrecked in consequence of a minority of the stockholders using the power here granted, the policy-holders would have a good claim upon Parliament for compensation, because of its unfair and unwise interference with the insurance law. Will the Minister tell us why this measure was not introduced in ample time to permit us to consult with the policy-holders? They represent \$150,000,000, if they represent a dollar, of claims to mature in the future. How comes it that not one of the policy-holders has been consulted on this subject? Is this a species of legislation which the public have a right to expect from Parliament? Is this a Government of the people? Are the people going to have no voice in the making of their laws?

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just what they have.

Mr. MULOCK. We have a young Minister of Finance, who has suddenly jumped into the position of leader of the House, and he endeavours to rush a Bill through the House which a more matured Premier would halt before taking up. There he sits, smiling, while a grave interest like this is before the House, saying that he will not allow the country to know anything about it. He is clothed, for the moment, in some brief authority, and he proposes to make use of it while it lasts. If he has no regard for himself and his own political influence, perhaps he would be good enough to have some regard for those whose interests are temporarily in his hands.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 83) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DENISON. I wish to bring to the attention of the Government a matter in connection with the road between Toronto and Hamilton. The city and the Government have recently come to an arrangement and purchased a piece of ground for the right of way. The road now in question cut right through the right of way and destroyed its usefulness. I would like to ask the Solicitor-General if any arrangement has been made to protect the interests of the Government and the city?

Mr. CURRAN. I do not know of any arrangement having been made. My attention was drawn this afternoon by the acting Minister of Justice to the subject. The Railway Act provides in section 99 that no company shall take possession of, use or occupy any lands vested in Her Majesty, without the consent of the Governor in Council. Now, this property, to which my hon. friend refers, is held under an ordinary lease, I am informed, and the proviso in the law which follows, is:

But with such consent, any such company may, upon such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, take and appropriate, for the use of its railway and works, but not alienate, so much of the lands of the Crown lying on the route of the railway as have not been granted or sold, and as is necessary for such railway.

Vested in Her Majesty would thus appear to mean belonging to the Crown. The words "lands of the Crown" indicate that the question is this. Does an ordinary lease vest in Her Majesty the land so leased? In my opinion, it does not, and I have looked up the authorities upon the subject. The Railway Act would, therefore, have to be overridden in order to achieve what my hon. friend wishes, that is to say, to divert the line of railway from the land in question, which is used as a rifle range. As the matter stands, I do not think it is in the power of the Crown to object.

Mr. DENISON. I might mention to the committee that the range is somewhere about 1,000 yards in length lying between the lake and a road. About a quarter of a mile north of the road is the Grand Trunk Railway, formerly the Great Western. No new railway can get any extra business by running south of the Grand Trunk Railway, or through the range. The only object possible to be gained by carrying the line through there would be some advantage of route in crossing Etobicoke Creek, but that must be of minor importance, as the Great Western carried their line a quarter of a mile north of the range, and if they got over the Etobicoke River satisfactorily, there is no reason why the new road should not. It ought to be in the interests of the new road to follow directly along the southern boundary of the Grand Trunk, because they would then avoid claims for damages sustained by the farmers, which would be made if they carried the road south of the Lake Shore road, thus cutting their farms in two parts. I would suggest that we might add something like this to the Bill: That the portion of the said railway lying between Port Credit and Mimico should be carried north of the rifle range leased to the Government.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I must oppose that for several reasons. In the first place, this Bill has no reference whatever to right of way. Its object was to confirm two by-laws which have been passed by Hamilton and Brantford for the extension of time for beginning the operations of the road, and to give power to extend the road down to Lake Erie. Therefore, I say that the present Bill has no connection whatever with the right of way between Hamilton and Toronto, and I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion at this stage, because it certainly—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It cannot be pressed. No notice was given of it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If the hon. gentleman cannot press it, there is an end of the matter. I know my hon. friend only received notice of this to-day, so he is not responsible for notice not being given. I think it is too late for such a proposal.

Mr. DENISON. Well, Mr. Chairman, there should be some way to effect the object

desired. Here is a Government interest being assailed, and I think this House to be, in some way, able to protect itself as represented by the Government.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No Government interest would be assailed. The question of right of way between Hamilton and Toronto has never come up. This Bill has nothing to do with this question. The Bill has been fought out in committee two or three times, and not a word was said about this question of right of way. The sole object was to extend the time for confirming these by-laws. In regard to the right of way, I may say, in answer to my hon. friend, that if this is Government land, we cannot expropriate it, there is no question about that; but if it is not Government land, I do not see why the city of Toronto should be placed beyond the reach of expropriation any more than any other proprietor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Notice has not been given of this amendment, and it cannot be entertained by the committee without unanimous consent.

Mr. DENISON. We might get the unanimous consent of the House. I might mention that a letter was received from the city solicitor of Toronto, and he has put us in possession of these facts. If the railway should run through this land, it would seriously interfere with the use of the range, if not spoil its usefulness altogether. If we could now have a clause put in this Bill it would be better than to fight it out afterwards in some other way.

Mr. EDGAR. No doubt the hon. gentleman regards this as a very important matter. If he could succeed in carrying a motion to have the committee to rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, he would have an opportunity to give notice before the Bill came up for further consideration.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not think that is fair, and I will not consent to it.

Mr. DENISON. I will ask that the third reading be stayed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That can be done.
Bill reported.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DENISON. I would ask the House to allow the Bill to stand in order that I may have time to give notice.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think at this late hour of the session, when no amendments were made in committee, the Bill ought to be read now.

Bill allowed to stand.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Calgary Street Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Drummond County Railway Company.—(Mr. Cleveland.)

Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No 106) respecting the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

J. FREDERICK DORAN RELIEF BILL.

Mr. DICKEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 107) for the relief of James Frederick Doran.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know from the law officers of the Crown whether they have read the evidence in this case, and whether they think it is of such a character as to justify the House in passing this Bill. I have read the evidence very carefully and I have come to the conclusion that it is a doubtful case indeed. There is no doubt whatever that the parties were married, and that the woman has been ostensibly married to another man since. That part of the case is very plain, but it appears to me there is no evidence of the absence of collusion or consent on the part of the husband, but on the contrary the inference which may be drawn from the evidence is that there has been collusion on his part. The evidence is of a most unsatisfactory kind, and I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that it is a Bill this House ought to pass. The parties were married in Winnipeg, Man., and lived together for a little while. The husband then moved to Montreal, and afterwards to St. Paul, Minnesota, and wrote for his wife who declined to go, saying her mother would not let her. It appeared she never joined him afterwards, and he never heard from her after the time he wrote to her from St. Paul. He was a man of some expectations from his grandfather, and these expectations were not realized as quickly as were expected. He afterwards met his wife in a Pullman car travelling with another man, but did not speak to her, and he again met her at a ball in the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, and he made no attempt to reproach her and exhibited no uneasiness or annoyance at the new relationship into which she had entered and appeared to be perfectly satisfied with it. I am not at all satisfied that there has been evidence of the absence of collusion which we ought to demand before we grant Bills of divorce of this kind. On the contrary, I am satisfied that if there was not active connivance there was at least passive connivance on the part of the man. If the House determines that whenever the offence which we alone grant divorce for has been committed by either parties, that we will grant divorce irrespective of whether there has been conni-

Mr. COATSWORTH.

vance on the part of the petitioner or not, then well and good. This is one of the cases of continual recurrence which convinces me more and more of the absolute necessity of some judicial tribunal being established by this Parliament to take evidence and pass upon it in these cases. I venture to say that there are very few members in this House who will contend that they are in a position to give a judicial vote here to-night, because of having studied this evidence. In the absence of any proof of want of connivance I cannot bring myself to vote for the Bill.

Mr. CURRAN. I may state that I have read the evidence in this case very carefully, and that in so far as the petitioner is concerned, it seems to my mind that after being married to his wife for a short time, he allowed her to go her way. He was simply told that the family of his wife did not wish that she should have anything more to do with him. He took no pains to secure her consent to come back and live with him. He met her on more than one occasion, apart from that which my hon. friend has referred to when he travelled with her in the same Pullman car to New York when she was with another man, to whom she was subsequently married in Paris. I have not the slightest doubt that he took no pains whatever to patch up any little difficulty that might have existed, or assert his rights in any manner or form. Under these circumstances the evidence is very unsatisfactory. Of course this woman is now married again, having gone through the form of marriage in Paris where she is living, and the House has merely to decide whether in the absence of any satisfactory evidence that there was not an understanding between these parties to separate, this divorce should be granted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have read over the evidence also, and I must say I differ from the view taken by the hon. the Solicitor-General and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). In the first place, the parties were duly married in Winnipeg and they lived together for three weeks. Her mother came from Winnipeg to Montreal, and, with her husband's consent, took her away to the eastern provinces. She went away on a visit. The husband had no intimation whatever that she had no intention of returning. She did return to Montreal, but she would not have anything to do with her husband, and her mother objected to her having anything more to do with her husband, until he was able to provide for her. According to the evidence, she afterwards stopped two days in Montreal and then accompanied her mother to Winnipeg. No doubt he went to the train and saw them off; but he did not anticipate an absolute separation. The only intimation he had was that her mother would not allow her to live with him until he was able to provide for her. He followed his wife to Winnipeg, but when there he could not obtain

work. He afterwards secured employment in St. Paul, and wrote to his wife to come to him. She never answered his letters. He wrote and received no reply, and the first thing he knew after that was that she went off with another man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He received two replies from her.

Mr. McMULLEN. He wrote two or three times, but he obtained no reply. Nothing further passed until it was found that this woman was in the company of and had intercourse improperly with another man. It may be said that the husband did not make proper efforts to induce her to return—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The plaintiff met his wife in Montreal at the Windsor Hotel in 1886, and did not even speak to her, did not even attempt to speak to her. There was nothing charged against her then.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under the influence of her mother, she had positively refused to have anything more to do with her husband; and she went away with her mother, leaving the husband under the impression that nothing further would occur.

Mr. CURRAN. What steps did he take—did he submit to this state of affairs?

Mr. McMULLEN. No. He was so anxious to secure a re-union, that he followed his wife to Winnipeg for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation.

Bill read the second time, on a division.

SECOND READINGS—ON DIVISION.

Bill (No. 108) for the relief of Annette Marian Goff—(from the Senate)—(Mr. Dickey).

Bill (No. 105) for the relief of John Francis Schwaller—(from the Senate)—(Mr. Dickey).

HARBOUR AND RIVER POLICE.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the province of Quebec.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman give a brief explanation of the Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object of the Bill is to amend section 2 of the present Act regarding the harbour and river police of the province of Quebec. Section 2 provides that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, establish a force in Montreal and Quebec to be termed the harbour and river police, and may, from time to time, appoint one or more superintendents as may be defined by the Governor in Council. By the first section power is given to appoint har-

bour and river police. Section 7 levies a tax and provision is made for the levying of a fee on every vessel entering the ports of Quebec and Montreal, amounting to three cents per ton register for the purposes of this Act. It is now intended to do away with the police; but the Governor in Council having at any time dispensed with the services of the police, has no power to relieve the vessels of the dues imposed under section 7. The amendment proposed is simply to provide that no such tonnage dues shall be levied on vessels when no police are employed. While they are employed, vessels shall be liable, but when not employed, vessels shall not be liable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Has any time been fixed within which the harbour and river police shall cease to exist?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understand the policy of the Government is that the police force shall not be continued after 31st June.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers. He said: The object of the Bill is to remove doubts that have arisen in regard to the construction of the first section of the present Act so far as the issue of commissions is concerned. That section provides that the Governor in Council may make regulations declaring what officers or classes of officers in the Civil Service shall receive commissions. Some officers have taken the ground that not being in the Civil Service they are not liable for the fees chargeable for these commissions; and this Bill provides that the Governor in Council may make regulations declaring and determining what persons, dignitaries, officers or classes of officers in the public service of the Dominion shall receive commissions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is the object to increase the number of officers who are to receive commissions?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, no.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the officers entitled to receive commissions be obliged to take these commissions and pay the fees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I think not.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House resolved itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 2887) to authorize the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies and to the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I have not looked at these resolutions very critically, but I understand that they are all renewals.

Mr. HAGGART. They are all renewals. I will explain each of them as they come.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some of them are very old renewals, extending back as far as ten years ago, and this is the second or the third time that they have been renewed. The question is whether it is wise to continue to renew subsidies to lines on which virtually nothing has been done, and hold out temptations to those sections of the country to embark in the construction of railways that are evidently not needed. I think a great many of these subsidies have been made for the purpose of influencing the constituencies, and now they should be dropped. In adding up these grants, I find that \$500,000 or \$600,000 is granted to the province of Quebec, about \$300,000 to the province of Ontario, and a very small sum to the Maritime provinces.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the east end of the line subsidized by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, at St Grégoire, towards the Chaudière Junction Station on the Intercolonial Railway, in the province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$64,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This road is designed to run from Montreal to connect with the Intercolonial Railway to Chaudière Junction. It is said that it will have very light grades, and that it will be shorter by 40 miles than any existing road between Montreal and Lévis. Two of the sections of this road are being constructed under the Subsidy Act, namely, from Yamaska to St. Francis river, 6½ miles, and from Nicolet bridge to St. Grégoire, 6 miles, and the work of the construction of the Nicolet bridge is far advanced. From St. Francis to Nicolet bridge, the balance of the section subsidized, a distance of about 20 miles, some grading has been done.

Mr. FORBES. When was that subsidy first granted?

Mr. HAGGART. It was first subsidized by 50 and 51 Victoria, and then there was another subsidy, 52 Victoria, chapter 3.

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing, as far as I am aware, has been done recently.

Mr. HAGGART. The only work I have information of that has been done is that I have first mentioned.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not seem to me a sufficient reason for asking this House to vote this subsidy again, to state that a subsidy was already granted some five or six years ago, and that a small portion of the work has been done. We ought to know why more work has not been done, and why it is that this company, to which this charter

Mr. COSTIGAN.

was granted, has not been able to comply with the conditions on which the original grant was made. Otherwise there would be no object in limiting the time or imposing any conditions, and it would follow logically and naturally that because a subsidy was once granted the railway company has a vested right, and can have that subsidy renewed, whether it complies with the conditions or not.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot inform the hon. gentleman why it has not been done. All I know is that the road has been graded a portion of the 20 miles.

Mr. LAURIER. Who are the promoters of the road?

Mr. HAGGART. A Mr. Ball is primarily interested and is the president of the road.

Mr. LAURIER. My information is that the company is purely a bogus one. That may be the reason nothing has been done.

Mr. OUMET. I would be very sorry that the name of Mr. Ball should be connected with anything the hon. gentleman calls bogus. He is a most respectable man of large means, and has the best reputation and position as a business man.

Mr. LAURIER. I grant all that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why has he not gone on with the road?

Mr. OUMET. No doubt because he could not secure all the capital necessary for the undertaking; but he has done all he could.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Ball is everything he is said by my hon. friend to be. He is a very respectable man, and I have always understood that he put the cloak of his respectability around this company. In my information, no capital has been subscribed and no money has been put into the enterprise. During the last ten years the company have not built 20 miles of railway.

Mr. OUMET. The hon. gentleman knows that no railway can be built with the subsidy alone, and every time a road is built, with the assistance of that subsidy, it is because there is good reason for its existence. This is one of those roads that deserve to be encouraged. It will certainly be of great advantage to the province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. I have nothing to say against the road. I believe it is one that ought to be constructed; but I question very much if it will be, so long as it is in the hands of the present company. The history of the past is not at all a guarantee that the company will do better in the future.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has Armstrong anything to do with the road?

Mr. OUMET. I do not think so; he had at one time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When did he cease connection with it?

Mr. OUMET. I cannot say exactly. I understood from Mr. Ball that there was nothing in common between him and Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has been subscribed, and how much cash paid?

Mr. OUMET. I cannot say.

Mr. LAURIER. Is Mr. Vanasse connected with the company?

Mr. OUMET. I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is exceedingly foolish to go on renewing subsidies to bogus companies. The Minister is not in a position to say whether any stock has been subscribed or any money paid in. Can he give us any information as to the financial position of the company now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As a matter of general principle, it is well known that some years ago this House voted these railway subsidies right and left on the recommendation of a Minister of the Crown, and with very little information granted to them, and perhaps very little exacted from the Minister. It was the policy of the Government then to grant almost generally these railway bonuses or subsidies. Now I think it is fair that when bonuses have ceased to be utilized, and the company comes back to ask for a renewal of the subsidy, the House ought to be placed in full information as to the status of the company and the circumstances under which the grant lapsed. If we are to go it blind and give what we are asked without comment, well and good, but if we are to act as business men disposing of millions of dollars of public money, we are entitled to some little information, so that we may be able to give some reason for our vote when we return to our constituents.

Mr. HAGGART. The full information was in the railway statistics, which will be down in a day or two. I am sorry they are not here now.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, let it stand a day or two.

Mr. HAGGART. I think full information in reference to this road will be in last year's statistics—all the information the department has.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister ought to have at his command, to present to the House, all the information necessary with respect to this road. He asks the House to vote \$64,000, and he should be able to give the reasons why. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says, it is hardly right to ask the House to vote the people's money without knowledge of why it is done and without some justification, on the part of the Ministry, in asking it.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount will not be paid until the work is completely done. And I want to say that it is not a great deal of

benefit to a railway company to receive a bonus from this House. The requirements of the Government, as to the construction of the road, the standard required for the superstructure, the drains and so on, are such that it is not much advantage to a railway to receive a subsidy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That means that we ought to have a general Statute, saying that any railway may have a subsidy, if it cares to take it on the conditions imposed. I do not think the House is quite prepared for that yet. I should imagine that after the subsidy lapsed, the promoters must have petitioned the Government for the renewal of it, and that that petition would contain the facts on which they based their claim for a renewal, and these facts should be communicated to the House. They have satisfied the Government that they were in such a position as would justify the Government in recommending the vote. The House should now be placed in possession of the facts.

Mr. IVES. I happen to know that there is some heavy bridging on this line, particularly at the crossing of the Nicolet River, and great difficulty has been found, as I have been informed, in financing to construct these very expensive bridges. I believe the one across the Nicolet will cost over \$100,000. I happen to know that men of standing and position have put some money into the construction of this road.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much?

Mr. IVES. I think, in the neighbourhood of \$50,000. And it would be a hardship to these people, if, suddenly, Parliament were to withdraw this grant, upon the strength of which, more or less, they have put their money into the scheme. I think it would be only right to give them a reasonable time to complete arrangements for the construction of the road, if it is possible for them to do so.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much time is a "reasonable" time?

Mr. IVES. These resolutions generally give them two years. I have no interest in the road; it is not in my district. But I know what I do about it because I have taken some interest in a road in the same neighbourhood, and I know that they have exceedingly expensive bridging and that they have had great difficulty on that account in making financial arrangements. I know that Mr. Ball and other gentlemen have involved themselves to a certain extent and have put money into the scheme, and it would mean a very serious loss to these people, if the subsidy were withdrawn at the present moment. I think it is reasonable that they should have another two years to save their money by the completion of the enterprise, because, if the subsidy were withdrawn, this road, which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier)

says is a worthy enterprise, could not be completed. These people have been induced to put their money into the scheme. Mr. Armstrong's name has been mentioned. They were induced by Mr. Armstrong to put their money into the scheme, and, if this assistance were withdrawn, they would lose their money. Mr. Armstrong is now out of it, and these people are trying to make financial arrangements to complete the scheme, and I think it would be a hardship if the House were not to give them another opportunity to make their financial arrangements.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be quite true. We do not say that the subsidy ought to be withdrawn, but we do say that, before you ask Parliament to vote money, you ought to put Parliament in possession of the necessary information. My hon. friend has the advantage of us in this respect. He has information about the road, but we have not. The hon. Minister of Railways says we shall have it in a day or two. But this is the moment when the information should be here. If he cannot give us the information, let the matter stand until he is ready. This is so reasonable that I cannot see why it is not acceded to at once.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is an application to grant a subsidy. We do not know whether a contract has been made, or what application was made for the subsidy, or what the grounds of it were. The Minister of Railways asks us to vote this \$64,000 and states that some small part of the work is done. I am opposed to the continuation of the granting of these railway subsidies, and I think we ought to critically examine every application made for a subsidy. Where there has been a considerable expenditure, or where there is reasonable excuse for delay, for my part, I think we ought not to be too strict; but if nothing has been done, or if nothing substantial has been done, or if there is no good ground for the loss of the chance to earn the former subsidy, I do not see why the subsidy should be renewed.

Mr. HAGGART. The House will remember that we passed a Bill to amalgamate this company with several others. Evidently they have a grand scheme of railway communication from Gaspé to Parry Sound up to Parry Sound. There was a Bill to amalgamate the Parry Sound Railway, this railway and two or three others for the purpose of making communication between Georgian Bay and Gaspé.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was the Canada Atlantic part of that scheme?

Mr. HAGGART. This is one of the roads and then there is another road contemplated in the connection between the Lake St. John crossing the Ottawa River and running to Parry Sound Inlet, and the Bill I speak of contemplates the purchase of a part of the Intercolonial Railway and the using of that celebrated road the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. IVES.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is that link to run across the northern part of the province of Quebec, direct for Parry Sound?

Mr. OUMET. They go by way of Rimouski.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If this great, magnificent scheme is one which meets the approval of the Government they must have had a great many facts before them before they decided to support it. I do not think there has ever been a disposition to refuse a railway grant to a bona fide scheme to build a road where the country will be benefited. But there is a growing disposition on the part of the House, and this debate shows it, to refuse aid to companies which are merely established for the purpose of speculating upon the Government grant. I do not think the House should be asked to vote this subsidy without full information on the subject.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister of Railways say if there has been municipal aid granted towards the construction of this road, or has any provincial aid been given?

Mr. HAGGART. I think there has been provincial aid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman say how much?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot say. I can send out and get the details in last year's book showing the provincial, municipal and Dominion aid granted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has anything been done since last year?

Mr. HAGGART. Nothing has been given, I believe by the province of Quebec or by the municipalities since last year's statistics were published.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister states that about \$50,000 has been expended. What proportion of this has been contributed by rural municipalities or the towns on the line?

Mr. IVES. I referred to the money which individuals put into the scheme.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us something of the financial condition of the company?

To the United Counties Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway, from a point at or near the Town of Iberville to St. Hyacinthe, and thence towards Sorel, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, for a railway from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$102,400.

Mr. HAGGART. The change proposed is this: By 55-56 Vic., chap. 5, the subsidy asked is described as granted for a railway from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie. It is now proposed to change it for a railway from Iberville to St. Hyacinthe, and in this way the heavy bridges required over the Richelieu and Yamaska rivers will be avoided.

Mr. LAURIER. I know a good deal of the work has been done.

Mr. HAGGART I have so far paid no portion of the subsidy; but 20 miles have been built.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway, from a point at or near the Town of Iberville to St. Hyacinthe, and thence towards Sorel, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, for a railway from St. John's to Ste. Rosalie, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, not exceeding in the whole \$102,4000.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that last year, when this subsidy was granted, my hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe, and the hon. Secretary of State for the time being (Hon. Mr. Chapleau), both claimed that the United Counties Railway Company was entitled to the subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, although it had already an equal subsidy from the Local Government of Quebec, on account of the company having to build two heavy bridges, one over the Richelieu river and the other over the Yamaska river at St. Hyacinthe. I was not contradicted when I stated that this road was among the easiest to build, inasmuch as the cost of construction ought not to amount to much, owing to the nature of the country it went through, but they alleged the great cost of the building of these two bridges so as to reach the county of Drummond Railway, at Ste. Rosalie, in the county of Bagot. I cannot see how it is that, this year, they come and state, by this resolution, that this company is given leave not to connect with the Drummond Railway, and is therefore not compelled to build these two bridges. Both the termini were changed so as to avoid the building of these two bridges, which, last year, were used as a ground to make good the granting of so large a subsidy to this United Counties Company. But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. The company, not satisfied with these two subsidies, did all it could to get money from one of the parishes run through by this railway. This same company, during last summer, applied to the citizens of the parish of St. Damase, and brought pressure to bear upon these citizen-ratepayers, in order to extort from them a grant of \$3,000, under the pretense that it was to build a station in that parish. This very same company, either directly or by its agents, said to the ratepayers: Should the parish decline to grant a bonus of \$3,000 to this railway, it will have no station. So this company was not satisfied with the enormous subsidies it had obtained from this Parliament and the Quebec Legislature; it wanted still \$3,000 from the ratepayers of St. Damase to erect a station in that parish. I will not further point out to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet), as well as to the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), that the contractor for this railway played the tyrant, by every possible means, over the parishioners of St. Damase,

because they had declined to grant this bonus of \$3,000. Thus they placed the farm crossings and the ditch crossings on each side of the track in places altogether inconvenient to the owners of these farms, and far from complying with the just and legitimate demands of these farm-owners, they put these crossings in places which they knew would not be convenient to them, and that against their expressed will, to their injury and inconvenience, and in order to take vengeance upon them for their refusal to grant the bonus of \$3,000. I hope this large subsidy will not be paid until the Government ascertain that the company has fulfilled its obligations, not only in the parish of St. Damase, but also along the whole length of this railway. I hope the Government will see that due measures shall be taken in order that the farmers whose farms are run through by this railway should not be compelled to tax themselves with sacrifices, and to appear before them in order to get justice from the company. Before this money is paid to the company, I also hope that the Government engineer who will inspect the works will be instructed to give notice to the citizens of St. Damase, who might have laid their complaints before the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) in connection with the carrying on of these works, and that this engineer will hear the owners of the farms run through by this railway as to the claims they might have against the company. I further hope that the Government will compel the latter to fulfil all its obligations.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is true that last year, as you remember, no doubt, I seconded the request made to the Government for a subsidy to the United Counties Railway Company. In the resolution moved last year no particular company was mentioned; it was merely stated that a subsidy of so much would be granted to the company who would build a railway from St. Jean d'Iberville to Ste. Rosalie, in the county of Bagot, through the city of St. Hyacinthe. The then Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), who, of course, supported the granting of this subsidy, had stated that the company who would build that railway would also have to build two heavy bridges, one over the Richelieu river and the other over the Yamaska river, so as to connect that railway with the railway system ending at Ste. Rosalie. I thought it my duty to support the granting of this subsidy, as I am still happy to do it now, and that, in the interest of the county of St. Hyacinthe, which I have the honour to represent. I must state, as I did last session, that I never asked for any subsidy to that company, and that, moreover, I ceased having any interest in that company, either directly or indirectly, prior to the granting of any subsidy by the Government. Before coming to the point, I wish to briefly consider. I will say a word as to

the troubles that happened in the parish of St. Damase. This is no time for giving the history or a recital of the causes that brought about these difficulties in St. Damase, but I beg to state that if the hon. member for Bagot should be willing to take the House into his confidence, it would learn that he is the promoter of these troubles. He would state to us how many nights and hours he spent in raising the citizens of the parish of St. Damase against the United Counties Company. I said to the citizens of St. Damase, and I repeat it here, that I had nothing to do with the United Counties Company, that I was expecting nothing from them in the way of benefits or advantages whatever, that I had no benefit nor advantage whatever to expect either from the builders or contractors, or from any of the members of that company. These difficulties, at least the greater portion of them, have been settled. I know that some farmers rightly complained that farm crossings had not been placed where the owners wished them to be. I mentioned this to the contractor, who is at the same time the president of the company, Mr. Maze, and on my representing it to him, he told me it had been done without his knowing it. Here is how he explains it: the contractor had let the contract for the construction of the fences on each side of the track to other contractors. He claims that the points where the crossings were to be put were shown on the plan of the road, but the sub-contractors, to avoid putting a few posts, changed the points of these crossings and placed them elsewhere. After being informed of it, Mr. Maze promised to remedy it and having the crossings set where they originally should have been. The hon. member for Bagot referred to undue pressure having been brought to bear on the people of St. Damase to induce them to vote for a bonus to the United Counties Company. It is true that a by-law granting a bonus of \$3,000 to the company was submitted to the electors, ratepayers of St. Damase, but this bonus was requested for the following reasons: In the first place, to help the company in the building of a station at a cost of \$1,500; in the second place, the company was bound to lay a siding 1,100 feet long. Moreover, they were to erect buildings intended to receive the freight and goods shipped by express, and there were other conditions mentioned in the by-law. The majority of the ratepayers of St. Damase thought it their duty to vote against this by-law. Those who opposed it said to the voters that the company would build a station in any case, that they were bound to build one in every parish run through by their road. They succeeded through this argument. They used this further plea; they said to the parishioners of St. Damase: You have nothing to fear; those who are all-powerful with the Governments in Ottawa and Quebec will compel the company to build that station. I do not know,

Mr. BERNIER.

Mr. Chairman, whether these powerful men are those who prove to be adverse to this railway. If by such means they can get favours, if they can compel the Government to cause advantages to be given to the ratepayers of St. Damase, I will be very happy, as much and even more so, than the hon. member for Bagot. I never had any knowledge whatever of this undue pressure which he referred to. And then, I can assure him, that undue influence never had any hold upon the people of St. Damase. They voted with freedom, the majority declared against the by-law, and in the meantime had the hon. member for Bagot gone as far as St. Hyacinthe he would have ascertained that not a single citizen of that city, not a single prominent man, except Mr. Maze, who spent a moment in the parish of St. Damase, interfered to induce the citizens of that parish to vote for the by-law. The fact is, that I myself stated publicly to the electors, at the church door that if they were willing to vote against the by-law, they were at ease to do it. But I added that were the road put into the hands of another company, it might happen what happened at St. Hugues, where the people were compelled to assess themselves in order to have a station. If the company has not yet built a station there, it is because it was too late in the season, but I can assure the hon. member for Bagot, on the faith of the president of the company, that should he join in an excursion trip to St. Damase, in the month of June next, he will see there a fine station built at the company's cost. As I said in my early remarks, the subsidy voted last year was voted in favour of a company who were to build a railway from St. Jean d'Iberville to Ste. Rosalie. I do not know whether the hon. member for Bagot is responsible for the change made by the resolution now before the committee, but I beg to say that it appears to me he is not anxious that this railway should reach his county.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Provided a less subsidy be granted to this company.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) As regards the subsidies, I have already stated that it was the company who asked for them. This company was formed in 1883. Its Act of incorporation was renewed in 1886 and in 1889, and they were to build a road exactly as stated in the resolution now before us, that is, from Iberville through St. Hyacinthe, St. Barnabé, St. Jude, in the county of St. Hyacinthe, St. Louis and St. Aimé, in the county of Richelieu. The resolution of last year did not apply specially to this company, but applied to any company who would build the road. It is true that, in the course of the debate, the then hon. Secretary of State and myself referred to the United Counties Railway Company. I am even free to state that I understood this last company were to get this subsidy if they should build

the road. As pointed out by the hon. Minister of Public Works, the change asked for is justified by the fact that it is this company who built that part of the road, that is the eighteen miles built last year from St. Hyacinthe to near Ste. Angèle; the Government had an understanding with the company or its president, to the effect that they would give to this company the subsidies now asked for. I beg to state further that the eighteen miles of the road already built were inspected by the officer of the Quebec Government charged with that duty, and by the inspector of the Federal Government railways, and were found satisfactory. I will not say that the hon. member for Bagot is not in accord with these gentlemen; I have not seen their reports; but, from the information I had, the building of the railway was found satisfactory, and, if I am well informed, the Quebec Government paid, if not all, at least the greater portion of the subsidy. As for the Federal Government, the contractor received no advance from them on account of the subsidy. With respect to the difficulties which the hon. member for Bagot says he found out in the parish of St. Damase, in connection with the tyranny played over those who sold lands to the company, I think this information is not correct, that, on the contrary, the company did all that they were bound to do to give satisfaction to those who were bound under the law to give them a right of way. There was not a single case of compulsory expropriation in the parish of St. Damase. The only expropriation there was took place within the limits of the city of St. Hyacinthe; and my hon. friend knows the party who requested the expropriation. I would extend these remarks were it not that the usefulness of this railway is admitted, but I think this is out of the question for the moment. The ratepayers of the parish of St. Michel de Rougement, on the concession of Grande Caroline, paid a rather large sum to get this railway to run through the concession called Petite Caroline. They did it voluntarily. The contractor consented, at the request of the inhabitants, to run the line through the concession called Petite Caroline, where there was no dwelling, just to accommodate and gratify them. Without any pressure, without any tyranny on the part of the company, the ratepayers of Grande Caroline paid voluntarily a sum of \$800 or \$900; and the contractor generally paid \$75 an acre. Therefore, the information of my hon. friend in this respect is again incorrect. I also find by these resolutions that the subsidy voted will apply to the section from Iberville to St. Hyacinthe and thence extending to Sorel. As I stated a moment ago, this is altogether according to the Act of incorporation of the United Counties Railway Company. The contractor, who is president of the company, is just trying, according to my information, to come to an understanding with the munici-

palities of the county of Richelieu, so that he might, as early as next summer, build the remaining portions of the road. And, but for contingencies which he cannot foresee, the whole road from St. Athanase to Sorel, will be completed and put into working order.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has at last granted that, last year, the pretext alleged for so large a subsidy was that there were two bridges to be built; which, in the estimation of the then hon. Secretary of State and of the hon. member himself, would involve an expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars. The agents of the company, which to-day is released from the obligation of building these two bridges, and which probably never intended building them—without my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe offering much opposition to it—the agents, I say, came down to St. Damase and strongly urged the municipal council of that parish to pass a by-law, which, when submitted for ratification to the electors, was voted down. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe said that whenever it pleases me to take the train and pay a visit to the parish of St. Damase I will find, on coming down from the train, a station built by the company; but granting that, Mr. Maze could well afford to defray the cost of building this station. It does not follow that he did it out of pure devotion to the public interest, for roads are built with a view to ensuring railway communication with villages and parishes situated along the line. I could not do my hon. friend the injury of comparing the railway he is interested in, to the uncivilized Indian who turns off from the thickly settled centres of population. It was, therefore, in the company's interest that a station should be built in the parish of St. Damase. Now, not satisfied with the grant of subsidy of more than sufficient to secure the building of the road, the company sent their agents canvassing among the citizens of that parish, and spared no entreaties nor threats to extort from them a sum of \$3,000. The citizens of St. Damase did, in fact, apply to me, asking me whether it was fair to require so heavy a sum from them. I told them that the company had been granted cash subsidies quite sufficient to ensure the building of the road; and, further, that to try as they did to screw out of the parish such a sum was a melancholy exhibition, discreditable to the company. It is a fortunate occurrence for the citizens of St. Damase that through a salutary fear of the electorate, the member for St. Hyacinthe thought it his duty to oblige Mr. Maze to build a station. But I should state that my hon. friend did not protect his electors against the attempts of Mr. Maze at extorting money from them; he rather gave it to them to understand that it was very doubtful whether they should ever get a station should they

decline paying the sum required of them. The hon. gentleman stated from his seat that the subsidies are to be paid only on the completion of the work, to be established by the report of the Government engineer, and that such report is all that is required. I for one think that too much precautions cannot be taken. The hon. member also stated that the parish of St. Damase was about being given a station, although the citizens had declined granting a bonus looked upon as necessary to enable the company to build the station. I gather from this statement that the citizens were right in declining to grant such a bonus. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has also conceded that the citizens of his riding complained of the farm crossings not having been located in the right places, and that Mr. Maze had pledged his word to remedy this. If, through his exertions, justice is meted out to those who suffered from the doings of this company, so much the better. By the resolution before us, the location of the line is changed so as to do away with the obligations the company were under of building two bridges for which they wanted such a large subsidy. I consider it is unbecoming to grant the company such advantages. I consider it my duty to warn the Government that too much precaution cannot be taken prior to paying to the company this cash subsidy; and that it is their duty to see that all the obligations are fulfilled. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has been lavish of promises; he stated that the company intended prosecuting the works on the road as rapidly as possible, and that, next summer probably, the railway would be built up to Sorel. I would rejoice at this result with the interested parties, but I am afraid of history repeating itself again with this section of the road, as with the bridges which will never be erected by the company. I am afraid of witnessing the company coming again, next session, before the Parliament, and stating their readiness to construct that section of their road on the condition of their being subsidized to the tune of \$3,200 per mile, with an equal subsidy from the Quebec Government. After which the company will, I presume, do as in the past, asking subsidies from all the municipalities on the line, threatening to withhold from them such and such accommodation; and finally they will succeed in screwing out of them hundreds of dollars, as, for instance, at St. Michel de Rougemont, where a certain number of citizens had to pay \$900 to obtain from the company that the line be located in the most convenient locality. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the road being largely subsidized, in addition to the Government paying enormous sums to assist the company in carrying out their operations; in addition to the municipalities contributing their share of sacrifices, the citizens will be called upon, in order to secure the best location for the road, to contribute some eight or nine hundred dollars towards assisting

Mr. DUPONT.

the company. I trust that, should the company be granted subsidies by the Government, the latter will take the necessary precautions and see to it that no undue influence be exercised to screw out of the citizens additional grants, through various threats, as, for instance, being deprived of the advantage of a station, or again locating the farm crossings so as to afford the least accommodation possible to the owners of these lands, and, finally, forcing them to contribute certain sums to avoid these drawbacks. I hope the Government will take the necessary steps to prevent the recurrence of such doings as happened at St. Michel de Rougemont. I hold that when Parliament votes subsidies in assistance of a railway it should be expressly stipulated, in the case of roads traversing a colonized or settled territory, that the company which is granted such subsidies shall be bound to build all necessary stations, in such localities as may give better accommodation to the people. Such a course would not offer the least difficulty, as our villages are so well known. The citizens who grant such large subsidies to these works ought certainly to be entitled to some protection. The subsidies granted to the United Counties Railway Company are large enough to secure to the citizens of the county the protection they are entitled to at the hands of the member for St. Hyacinthe. On the contrary, he seems to have come to an understanding with the builder of the road to allow them to renew the extortions practised elsewhere. From the hon. member's very confession, the citizens of St. Hugues were obliged to build a station and to expend therefor \$400; quite different from the \$3,000 the ratepayers of St. Damase were asked to pay. The South-eastern Company soon after became insolvent, and the road was operated by some parties interested in the company. To have a station, the citizens were obliged to assess themselves and pay a sum of \$400. The hon. member should acknowledge that the South-eastern Railway Company had not been granted subsidies to the amount of \$6,500 per mile like the United Counties Railway. In addition to that, the company by whom this road was built had large bridges to construct. The cost of railway construction at that period was much greater than last year. Rails, for instance, cost much more at that time than at the present time; last year steel rails sold at \$21 per ton, whilst in 1875 iron rails were sold at \$35 per ton. With such differences in prices no comparison can be instituted between the two roads. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe admitted, last year, that this pretended obligation on the part of the company to build the two bridges in question was put forth with the express view to obtain subsidies. How is it possible, somebody would say, for the company to dispense with these subsidies when you oblige them to build two bridges involving considerable cost? And now that the location of the line is changed

the building of the bridges is no longer mentioned; the same subsidy, however, is kept both from Ottawa and Quebec. Not satisfied with this, the company, through their agents or representatives, have done their best to extort from the ratepayers of the St. Damase the sum of \$3,000. An attempt was made at this latter place to repeat what had been done at St. Michel de Rougemont, when the ratepayers had been forced to pay in order to obtain a change of location. Were the road to pass through a locality offering every disadvantage to the land owners, the latter would consider themselves most happy to make a small outlay with a view to protect their properties. But being given the fact that the company have had their road newly laid out, I do not see why this new location of the road could not be carried out without it being necessary to extort money under false pretenses. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe stated that should the extension of the road to the county of Bagot not take place, it will be owing to the member for the latter county who did not evince any sympathy for the enterprise. My course has been confined strictly to follow attentively the doings of the company and to denounce them when judged necessary. The company have obtained grants under false pretenses. Last year, in order to justify the grant of so large subsidies, it has been stated on the floor of this House that the company were about building two large bridges. I had my own suspicions at the time about these bridges being ever built and I was so induced to oppose the grant to the company of a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile. To-day I have full evidence as to the truth of my suspicions, that the company never intended building these bridges. That which I could not state positively last year owing to the absence of evidence, is fully confirmed to-day by the legislation now before us. But to-day the position is well and clearly defined, and the resolution now before the House shows conclusively that never did the United Counties Railway Company intend to build the bridges; and still it was the very consideration relied upon and alleged to justify the grant of the subsidy. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe perseveres in his defence of the company and he looks around for palliatives of his course of extortion of subsidies under false pretenses. I hope the Government will pay attention neither to the hon. member nor to Mr. Maze, but will persevere in its determination to give full and complete justice to the parishioners of St. Damase. I may tell the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), that I entertain no feelings of animosity towards him. I do not care to know whether he possesses, directly or indirectly, any interests in the road. He protests with all his might against the imputation that he might possibly have any interest in the road, and he

endeavours, by all means within his power, to convince his hearers that he is quite disinterested. He ought to recollect the proverb: "Who excuses, accuses himself." This may also account for the opinion of some of his electors, who find the course followed by the hon. member quite extraordinary. Mr. Chairman, the company are about giving the contract for the erection of a station in the parish of St. Damase; but they have been prevented from extorting from citizens of this parish the sum of \$3,000; and I may say to my hon. friend of St. Hyacinthe, that if, through my influence, I have been instrumental in bringing about this good result, I congratulate myself upon the fact that I have succeeded in inspiring my hon. friend with this salutary fear of his electors whom Mr. Maze attempted to take advantage of.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation). I have not the intention to take up the time of the House, but my hon. friend from Bagot has been exceedingly unhappy in his remarks. He talked of nothing else but extortion, obtaining money under false pretenses, bribery at elections, etc. High-sounding words often made use of in election times, should be avoided as unparliamentary. I may tell the hon. Ministers who know the docility of the hon. member for Bagot that they need not be frightened beyond measure at his menaces and high-sounding words, for, so soon as the present measure will be passed, the hon. member will hasten to fall in the ranks again. I, nevertheless, would call the attention of the committee to the persistency with which the hon. member opposes any subsidy to this railway. For several years he has voted for subsidies granted to various railway companies in the North-west, Manitoba, in the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, without raising the smallest objection; but, when the province of Quebec is to be dealt with, when a railway by which the majority of his electors will be benefited, is before the House, he finds nothing but pretenses to oppose it. I may tell the hon. member for Bagot, that, if, instead of spending his time in sowing dissension, he had inquired from the inhabitants of St. Damase, he would have learned that in all my public or private utterances I advised them to vote to the best of their judgment, that I was quite indifferent in the matter; but that I wished to incur no blame, in case the road were handed over to another company, who would ask for a larger subsidy or would refuse to build a station, as it had happened elsewhere. Neither at St. Hyacinthe, nor elsewhere, do I enjoy the reputation of being in favour of extortion. And it is not within my knowledge or my recollection, that extortion has been practised or attempted against the ratepayers of St. Damase. But should there have been extortion or obtaining of money under false

pretenses, the hon. member ought to address himself to the men who have profited by it. As for myself, I have had nothing whatsoever to do with the granting of the subsidy. The hon. member for Bagot dares again style himself the protector of the parish of St. Damase, which he tried to annex to the county of Rouville at the time of the redistribution of seats, in order to drown them in a Liberal riding. He talks of the fear of the electorate. I would like to ask him—if allowed to—why he caused to be annexed to the county of Rouville, the parish of St. Pie, where he had a minority of 160, in order to annex to the county of Bagot the parish of St. Marcel, where he hopes to take a majority of from sixty to seventy? The hon. member speaks of extortion. He ought to recollect that, such as laid out by the company, the road was to pass through the concession called "La Grande Caroline." The owners of the lands said to Mr. Maze: If you consent to lay out the road through the "Petite Caroline," we are willing to pay the costs of the land. And this is what the hon. member calls extortion! He ought to recollect that, when a road was to be built through his riding, the parish of St. Pie was taxed to the amount of \$25,000! Was the hon. member then heard to protest? Was any extortion threatened also at that time? Will he be bold enough to tell us what kind of road had been built? Wheel-barrow road, of three feet gauge?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Just like yours.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) As ours. Go and see the United Counties Railway,—a road of ordinary gauge—and well built. The engineers of both Governments have so pronounced upon it. I have conceded that there were certain connections to be done, certain grievances to redress. I gave the reasons why the crossings had not been located in the right place. The hon. member finds that the electors of St. Damase have been martyred. For the use of these people who are not acquainted with the place, they have plotted in their imagination a revolution. I may say that the electors voted quite freely, without any undue means or false representations being used; no thief came up from the United States; no case of corrupt practices has been signalized, and the result, far from being controverted, has been taken as the expression of a free opinion with a great majority of electors. Now, as regards the building of the road up to Sorel, the hon. member for Bagot says the work will not be prosecuted.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I did not say so; but that I should not be surprised if it were not continued. I am no more astonished at this than at the famous bridge not being built.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) The hon. member will admit that it is easier to build

Mr. BERNIER.

a road on land than on a river. I have good ground to hope that the road will be built up to Sorel, for I am of opinion that the company have a right of receiving a subsidy for the whole road mentioned in the charter. The hon. member said there was no station at St. Damase. Quite true. He ought to know there is none at St. Hyacinthe; and for the information of the hon. member, I may say that the president of the company is about asking the city of St. Hyacinthe a bonus to construct a station in the city. The hon. member contends that the subsidy was sufficient to build all the stations. If he will take the trouble of referring to the statistics of railways he will find, I think, that the financial firm which advanced the funds have expended in the neighbourhood of \$8,000 per mile for the building of the road. The hon. member thinks I am wrong when I say I have no interest in the road, and in saying so, I incriminate myself. I thought it my duty to state before this House what the hon. member dare not say here. I am aware that in the city of St. Hyacinthe, the very same persons who scattered accusations through the parish of St. Damase, have made affirmations which they dare not repeat here, had they a seat. I know that in certain quarters, assertions have been made, which reached the ear of the Ministers in relation to the subsidies granted the company. I will refrain from pressing this point further, and I am not the only one accused; but persons occupying more exalted positions than myself, near the Queen, have equally been accused. And in spite of the opposition of the hon. member for Bagot, the present resolution, I hope, will be adopted. In conclusion, I beg to apologize to the House for having detained it so long on a subject which, having been discussed last year, should not have called for such a long debate to-day.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest against the manner in which the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe thought fit to distort my arguments. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) stated that I am opposed to the grant of a subsidy to this railway. I say, again, Mr. Speaker, I am not hostile to subsidies. I am rather inclined to favour reasonable subsidies, but I say that, considering the work to be done, the subsidies granted are too large. Last year, Mr. Chairman, I brought into the discussion statistics which no one could challenge, data I had been supplied with by an engineer who is looked upon as an authority in the matter of railway construction. No reply has been offered to the arguments based on this data, and let it be remembered that the engineer who had supplied me with these figures had taken as a basis a recently acquired experience. The hon. member from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), feeling he is unable to reply to my arguments, thought it his duty to make an allusion to the Redistribution Bill, accusing me

of an attempt to get rid of the parishes of St. Damase and St. Pie. Let me tell him that those changes were made, not at my demand, but at the request of his chief and of the Ministers. It is through a compromise made by both parties that the parish of St. Pie has been thrown into the county of Rouville. At all events, this Redistribution Bill matter has nothing whatsoever to do with the subsidy question. I am not hostile to the undertaking, but I want justice to be meted out to the ratepayers. However, as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) has hinted at redistribution, I will just say a few words on the matter, with a view to bringing to the recollection of the hon. leader of the Opposition the fact that he did not reply to the argument produced last year in favour of the Government measure, namely, that, owing to an unfair distribution of the representation, he happened to reckon in the House ten followers more than he is entitled to. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), having no valuable arguments to produce, uses arguments irrelevant to the question, such as the Redistribution Bill, his election, which have no bearing on the resolutions now before the committee. I am accused of being hostile to this railway project, which I deny. Never have I been opposed to a reasonable grant in aid to this road. Let the ratepayers be given the just treatment they are entitled to. This company receives a subsidy from the Quebec Government and the citizens of that province will be called upon to pay their quota of taxation for this subsidy which is not necessary for the company to carry on the work. The tax-payers of St. Damase and others will have to pay their share of these taxes. Should the company persist in sticking to the provincial grant they ought to renounce the federal subsidy. I contend that with a grant of \$3,200 per mile, adding thereto a portion of the capital, the company has sufficient means to build a railway which meets with no obstacle worth mentioning on the line, with hardly a bridge 100 feet long to build. It has been given to understand that the road would be built up to Sorel, in the course of next summer. I hardly believe in the realization of such a hope; and, next session, should the road not be built up to Sorel, it will be ascribed to the want of a subsidy. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) has misrepresented my views when he contended that I objected to the building of this road on the ground that it favoured the city of St. Hyacinthe. Never, in my life, have I evinced the least hostility to the progress and welfare of this city; and, whenever I could give them a lift I have done so with heart and soul. I consider the United Counties Railway Company should waive their claim to the subsidy granted by the Quebec Government, and stick to that of the Federal Government. A last word, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the hon. member from St. Hya-

cinthe (Mr. Bernier) to spare himself, in the future, the trouble of distorting and disfiguring my arguments; he may also dispense with mentioning my controverted election trial, and such questions as are irrelevant to the question. It is not by resorting to such tactics that he will justify his demand in favour of the company he has taken under his protection, and whose defender he has constituted himself before this House.

To the Ontario, Belmont and Ottawa Railway Company, for 10 miles of their railway, divided into two sections: *first*, from the Belmont iron mines to Marmora Village; *second*, from Marmora Village to the junction with the Ontario Central Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$32,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why are two sections necessary?

Mr. HAGGART. The object is to reach the Belmont iron mines at the earliest possible moment, and it can be accomplished by making two sections of the road.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it a broad-gauge road?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from Coe Hill or Gilmore to Bancroft, *via* L'Amable, or as near thereto as practicable, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$64,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I propose to change the description from Coe Hill or Gilmore to Bancroft to this description, "or some point between Coe Hill and Gilmore to Bancroft."

Mr. McMULLEN. Is Bancroft named after the individual who was connected with the graving dock at Kingston?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will be able to trace out Bancroft, which he found difficult in times past.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Lake St. John towards Chicoutimi, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$81,040.

Mr. HAGGART. This is for 30 miles of the Chicoutimi branch of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company. The first 23 miles are almost completed, and considerable work has been done on the other 8 miles. The total subsidy granted is \$90,000, of which \$30,060 have been paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this a broad-gauge line?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the village of Bancroft, in the county of Hastings the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by

the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, and again granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$145,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What portion of the road has been finished ?

Mr. HAGGART. Ten miles of the road have almost been completed, and a considerable amount of work has been done on another ten miles. \$15,000 of the subsidy has been paid. The hon. gentleman will get full information in the Railway Statistics. They show the location of the whole railway.

To the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from St. Martin towards St. Anicet, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, not exceeding in the whole \$3,500.

Mr. HAGGART. This road runs from St. Martin towards St. Anicet, through the county of Beauharnois, a distance of about thirty miles. The road is now completed and in operation, being worked by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The original subsidy amounted to \$96,000. It is all earned and paid except \$35,000, which lapsed before the road was finally completed. Part of the present resolution is a revoke.

To the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, for 3½ miles of their railway, from the town of St. Stephen to the town of Milltown, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$11,200.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this three miles a spur from the main line of the road, or is it part of the main line ?

Mr. HAGGART. This road is situated near the western boundary of New Brunswick, near St. Stephen. It is merely a revoke of the subsidy already granted.

Mr. HAZEN. Milltown is a suburb of the town of St. Stephen, situated on the River St. Croix, in the county of Charlotte, on the border between New Brunswick and the state of Maine. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs into St. Stephen. There is a large cotton mill at Milltown, and extensive lumber interests, and this road would, I presume, extend from St. Stephen up to Milltown. It will practically be a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it necessary to make this grant in order to secure the building of that extension ?

Mr. HAZEN. Evidently, the road has not been completed with the grant.

To the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from the east bank of the River St. Charles to or near Cape Tourmente, in the province of Quebec, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$30,400.

Mr. LAURIER. How much of this road has been completed ?

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HAGGART. The road starts from the city of Quebec and runs down along the north bank of the River St. Lawrence to Cape Tormentine. The subsidy granted by 52 Victoria, was \$96,000. The first twenty miles of the road is about completed, and the work is in progress on the last ten miles. The company have earned and been paid \$65,600, leaving a balance of \$30,400 now sought to be revoked. The subsidy was \$3,200 per mile.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company, for 62 miles of their railway, from Hull station towards Le Désert, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$89,248.

Mr. HAGGART. This road starts at Hull, and runs up towards Le Désert. The subsidy voted by 52 Victoria was for sixty-two miles. The road passes through a rough, heavy country, but good progress has been made with the work. The company have earned and been paid \$230,752. About half of the road is under traffic, and fifty miles about completed, leaving twelve miles to complete.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the subsidy per mile ?

Mr. HAGGART. I think \$5,000,

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the distance to Le Désert ?

Mr. HAGGART. Sixty-two miles. Fifty miles of it is completed, and the remaining twelve miles are in progress.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not intended at present to extend it beyond sixty-two miles ?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

To the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from the village of Tara, or some point between Tara and Hepworth, to the town of Owen Sound, in the province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$48,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is work upon this in progress ?

Mr. HAGGART. Nothing has been done upon this road. It runs through the county of Grey, in the province of Ontario, to Owen Sound.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the prospect as to the construction of it ?

Mr. MASSON. By-laws have been passed by municipalities granting \$98,000. The cause of the delay in commencing the construction was that the town of Owen Sound and the other municipalities that passed these by-laws, insisted on having a clause that the Grand Trunk, which has control of the rest of the Georgian Bay line, should operate this road and make it part of their system. Owing to the unfortunate position the Grand Trunk took in reference to their branches a few years ago, that company has refused

from time to time to come into that arrangement. The by-laws were extended a few months ago with the view of presenting the matter before the Grand Trunk meeting in April next. It is hoped that at that meeting they will adopt the recommendation of their manager and take hold and build the road. This subsidy and the municipal grants have hardly built fifteen miles of the road. Surveys have been made. Many years ago the line was laid out from Tara; and a branch was made from Tara to Hepworth.

To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway, from Lunenburg, on the east coast of Nova Scotia, westward to a point in the district of New Germany, together with a spur about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile long to Bridgewater railway wharf, and from a point $33\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Lunenburg and running to Middleton, on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, and 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$4,500.

Mr. FORBES. May I ask who is it that is making application for that subsidy?

Mr. HAGGART. The Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, I suppose.

Mr. FORBES. Is the Minister sure of that?

Mr. HAGGART. I think that is the company. They petitioned for more than this; they say more than this is due them; but this is all the department will give. I wish to amend the clause so as to add the words, "upon the paid subsidy," after "the Windsor and Annapolis Railway."

Mr. FORBES. What line is that?

Mr. HAGGART. This road is built and in operation. It is a first class railway as regards construction and rolling stock.

Mr. FORBES. Is the Minister aware that that road has passed out of the hands of the company?

Mr. HAGGART. No; I do not think it has passed out of the hands of the company. I heard that it was in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister is not fully informed on the subject, then. Has any protest ever been filed on behalf of other claimants for this subsidy with the department, or has any caveat been lodged against the payment of this sum to the company?

Mr. HAGGART. Other claims have been made for the subsidy. I think no caveats have been issued.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister will allow me to tell him that the road was originally subsidized for this company under another name, which was changed to the Nova Scotia Central. They mortgaged it for \$1,000,000, and issued their bonds and raised a portion of the money on the strength of those bonds. They subsequently failed to go on with the work to a satisfactory conclusion, and some of the inhabitants of the county of

Lunenburg, including two capitalists, stepped in and got an assignment of these bonds. They approached a bank and raised the necessary capital to build the road. Then the original company failed to redeem these bonds, default was made in the interest, a sale took place under the mortgage, and under foreclosure powers, the road passed out of the hands of this company entirely, and became the property of another company, a company not having anything whatever to do with the present applicants for this balance of subsidy. Those bonds were tendered in payment of the road. The road passed out of their hands by order of the court, title was given, the deed was made, and everything in connection with the road was passed over to these subsequent purchasers, representing the bank who held the bonds, and had advanced money for the completion of the road. Up to that time, probably, the company had a right to make a claim for the subsidies. About that time, as the Minister himself has said, a claim was made that the subsidies be paid to these purchasers, these third parties, the owners of the road. The Minister will see, therefore, that the company has no right whatever to a single cent of this subsidy. I find on page 45 of the Report of the Railway Department:

By the Subsidy Act of 1887, 50-51 Vic., ch. 24, the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company were subsidized for 34 miles of their railway, to an extent not exceeding \$108,800. Under an Order in Council of the 16th September, 1887, the company were admitted to contract on the 17th of October, 1887, the works to be executed being a line of railway from Lunenburg, on the east coast of Nova Scotia, westward, to a point in the district of New Germany, together with a spur, about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile long, to Bridgewater railway wharf, the whole to be completed by the 31st of December, 1889.

By the Act 51 Vic., ch. 3 (1888), the grant of a further subsidy, not exceeding \$147,200, was authorized for 46 miles of the company's railway, and under an Order in Council of the 9th October, 1888, a contract, dated the 15th October, 1888, was executed covering a line of railway $39\frac{1}{2}$ miles, starting from a point $33\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Lunenburg, and running to Middleton, on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway; the work to be completed by the 31st of December, 1890.

During the past fiscal year, July 1, 1890, to July 1, 1892, payments were made to the extent of \$8,300, bringing the total payments to this company up to the sum of \$230,700 at date, 31st December, 1892, covering the distance from Lunenburg to Middleton and the spur to Bridgewater, a total of $73\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister how it is that that subsidy of \$8,300 was paid after notification to the department that there were other claimants than the company entitled to this subsidy, and whether the Minister himself or any member of the Government is aware where those subsidies went?

Mr. HAGGART. In what year was the payment made?

Mr. FORBES. Just a few weeks after the general election of 1891.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of it at all.

Mr. FORBES. Your own blue-books say it was made.

Mr. HAGGART. It must have been before I entered the department. All I can say is that if the parties are not entitled to it, they will not get the money. The money will be paid on the advice of the Minister of Justice to the parties who are entitled to it.

Mr. FORBES. An error has been made in the past, and I want to caution the Minister about the future payment. Will the Minister ask his deputy when that payment was made? It is on page 45 in Roman figures.

Mr. HAGGART. We do not pay subsidies in my department at all. We give a certificate to the Finance Department or the Auditor-General that the work has been completed according to contract, and the Finance Department pays the amount on the advice of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FORBES. I want to know what date the payment was made.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not got it.

Mr. FORBES. I am informed by those who own the road and are entitled to the subsidy that they never got a dollar of it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It has been decided in the Justice Department that the parties who now have control of the road are not entitled to the subsidy. I was employed as attorney by the parties who now have control of the road, to apply to the Minister of Justice to get the subsidy paid to them, and it was decided by the Justice Department that they were not entitled to the subsidy under the lien they had upon the road, and under that lien the road was sold; and under that lien by which they got their title they had no right to the subsidy that was remaining unpaid. After having got that information from the Justice Department I so informed my clients Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who gets the money?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It goes to the Central Nova Scotia Railway Company, the original builders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who gave the lien?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes, but the lien did not cover the subsidies that were remaining unpaid. The matter is in law yet, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. FORBES. I am aware that the member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is familiar with these things, and he probably could tell where these subsidies have gone. The hon. member knows as well as the Minister that this road was actually built by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, who advanced the money for it.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Wade & Eisenhauer never advanced a dollar; they advanced some credit.

Mr. FORBES. Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer borrowed from the banks, but they did not advance from their own pockets all the capital necessary. The lien was given upon this road for their benefit, as the bonds were held as collateral for advances to them and they advanced the money.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The lien was not given to them.

Mr. FORBES. The lien was put upon the road by the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is correct.

Mr. FORBES. It is only quibbling for the hon. gentleman to raise that point. A trust company in New York held the lien, but the money was advanced by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer upon the strength of the bonds for which this lien was given. The mortgage was made to the trust company in New York, and the bonds were put in the safe of the Halifax Banking Company, of Halifax. Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer discounted their notes with these bonds as collateral. The money was paid to Wade & Eisenhauer, and they checked it out to pay the labourers on the road. The subsidies were really assigned to these men, and the company was bound to give them the subsidies, but the latter subsidy never reached the parties who advanced the money to build this road.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The hon. gentleman had better learn something about the road.

Mr. FORBES. I do not want to find fault with the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, but I want the railway policy of Nova Scotia kept clear of all shady transactions, such as I believe has cast a certain reflection upon the construction of this road. And there is no one knows more about where the subsidies have gone to than the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills).

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I know all about it.

Mr. FORBES. I am told by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer and by the Halifax Banking Company as well, that upon the strength of getting the subsidies from the Government, the bank made these advances and Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer undertook to become security. Part of the subsidies paid by the Government during the construction went to the bank to relieve Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer's security. After the road was about completed, the company made default in its bonds, and therefore, it became necessary for Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer to look for their money. They only held the bonds of the road as collateral, and the Nova Scotia

Railway Company did not pay up the loan. The bank called upon Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer; they, in their turn, called upon the company to pay the money they had advanced. It was repudiated by the company, and they, Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, in their turn, called upon the trust company in New York to foreclose the mortgage. This was done at the request of Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer. The road was sold and bought in by them at sheriff's sale under this mortgage. The company protested and took an appeal to the Nova Scotia Supreme Court and then to Ottawa. They lost their case, and the Supreme Court of Canada has decided that the road, together with all the securities had passed to the purchasers, Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer. After that date this subsidy of \$8,300 was paid to the company and neither Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer nor the bank ever got a dollar of it. I understand from the Minister that the same company is making another application for this subsidy of \$4,500 with which we are dealing, and I also understood him to say that Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer had filed their protest against payment of this subsidy to any person but themselves or the bank. I trust, with these facts before the Government, with regard to this subsidy, that they will be on their guard. The Minister has said that he will not pay out a dollar without the authority of the Minister of Justice, and I want further inquiry made by the Government into this matter. Perhaps the Minister of Justice, acting under the advice of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) together with such advice as the Minister of Railways gives, which he in turn gets from the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), will not inquire further into the facts concerning the subsidies for this road. The money which is being voted to-night does not belong to the applicants for it. That is a fair and square statement, and I believe that the documents in the department will prove it. This subsidy of \$4,500 should go to Wade & Eisenhauer or to the Halifax Banking Company. I would ask the Minister if he is granting this money upon the petition of the railway company that he should stay the payment of it, or else let the vote stand over until he makes further inquiry.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I can only say that I do not wish any one to have the impression that these nasty little insinuations that have been made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) have any foundation in fact whatever. They are nothing but dirty little insinuations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Well, I will take back the word "dirty" and I will say first-class insinuations, well worthy of the party from whom they emanated.

Mr. LAURIER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Well, I will say that everything is first-class that comes from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes).

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has no right to use any such language. It is utterly unparliamentary; and I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, that no such insinuations should be made.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). What shall I take back?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better take back everything about insinuations.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Suppose I say he did not insinuate anything?

Mr. FORBES. I made a bold and clear statement.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The bold statements, which I said before were insinuations, are utterly unproved. If there was anything shady it was not on the part of the railway company. The company have acted in a square, "bona fide" manner with reference to the country and with reference to the reception of these subsidies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Who are the receivers?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Wade is the receiver at the present time.

Mr. FORBES. He was your client.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). He was my client. I billed him with his bill and he refused to pay it, and I intend to sue for it. He sent me a telegram at one time and asked me if I was at liberty to be employed by him on the Nova Scotia Central Railway matter. I replied that I was. Then he wrote to me to see whether this subsidy was to be paid to his firm or to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company. I got the very best information I could, and laid their claim before the proper authorities, and it was understood that they were not entitled to it, but that the subsidy should be paid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, of which Mr. Wade was duly informed, and he was called upon to pay his bill, which he did not pay, and which I intend to sue him for. The way the matter stands now, and has been decided, is this: The Nova Scotia Central Railway Company is entitled to this balance, and the department has been advised of that, and that is the reason why this resolution is on the order paper. This road is regarded as the best built subsidized road in the Dominion. Where only wooden bridges were asked for, iron bridges have been built; where culverts were made, they were made with granite and fillings-in; there is no trestle work on the road at all. And, so far as shady transactions are concerned, there are none, because the money has been well ex-

pending, as you can find by referring to the reports of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may briefly state that this is simply the balance of a subsidy that has been earned. The department certifies to the performance of the work before the money is paid. If any one has a better claim than the railway company, it has to pass through the Auditor-General's department, and the Auditor-General advises the Finance Department to whom the money should be paid.

Mr. LAURIER. The Auditor-General cannot have anything to do with this.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly. Not a single account is paid to any parties unless he sees that they are entitled to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Auditor-General has simply to see that those to whom the House votes the money get it. Did I gather from my hon. friend from Annapolis that he is the solicitor of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes; I am now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman seems to have been the solicitor for both sides. Some people think that it is not in accordance with professional etiquette to hold briefs for both sides.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Not at the same time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not discuss it with the hon. gentleman; but I would not consider that I had a claim against a client if I had taken a brief on the other side. As a matter of pure professional etiquette, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, whether he thinks it right to speak of a shady transaction when he speaks of a client upon information that he must have received in confidence.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I say that if there were any shady transactions they must have been before I was employed.

Mr. FORBES. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Annapolis, I treat them with the scorn they deserve, remembering the sources from which they emanate. With regard to this subsidy, it has been earned, for the railway is one of the best built in Canada. It was built on the credit of Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer for the railway company. The company became insolvent, and now they come back and ask that this balance of the subsidy be paid to them. It is not the whole balance, according to the blue-book of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the contention of the railway company, but the contention of the department is that it is the whole.

Mr. FORBES. As the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) has well said, the Auditor-General's duty is only to see that the money

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

is paid to the parties authorized by Parliament to receive it.

Mr. HAGGART. I think his duty is further, to pay the money to the parties entitled to it according to law.

Mr. FORBES. According to the law of Parliament. The hon. Minister should not evade the point in that way.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not intentionally evading it.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. Minister knows that if Parliament directs the payment of the subsidy to any particular person or company it must go to that person or company, and the Finance Department has nothing to do but to pay it. If the hon. gentleman looks at the reports of the Supreme Court of Canada, he will know that the Nova Scotia Central Railway, together with all its claims to this subsidy, has passed out of the control of the company, and has gone into the hands of Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer; and they are entitled to every dollar of this subsidy, and it should be paid to them. The hon. member for Annapolis is now in the employ of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, after having discharged his old clients, Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer. There are two sides to that question, and I leave it to the hon. gentleman and those gentlemen to settle between themselves. But I want to point out that one of the subsidies was paid about election time, some time between the 1st of July, 1890, and the 1st of July, 1891. I say that that subsidy never reached the parties who were entitled to it, who advanced the money to build the railway, and, I believe, on the statement of the Minister of Railways, that the same parties are applying for this subsidy who got the former subsidy, and who are not entitled to it. I do not deprecate the payment of the subsidy, if it is fairly earned; but all I want to do is to keep these railway subsidies clear from any improper transactions. I want the people of Nova Scotia to feel when they make a contract with the Government, that it will be carried out by the Government in good faith, and that the Government will pay the subsidy to the parties who are entitled to it. The history of this railway is a history of negligence on the part of the department. A great deal of the money has been lost, purely for want of caution and care. The road could have been built for one-third less per mile than it cost. Now, if we can show that the reason of this—

Mr. FOSTER. We paid nothing more than the subsidy.

Mr. FORBES. It has not reached the parties who are entitled to it. That is not the point. Perhaps the subsidy is not half large enough. If it be necessary in the interests of the province the subsidy should be increased, but I want the subsidies to go to the persons entitled to them. The hon.

member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has spoken warmly. If he could speak out his mind freely, he could assist the Minister of Railways in showing to whom these subsidies should go.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It has been stated that these subsidies, or the Dominion subsidy never reached the parties to whom they should go, and that the road has cost much more than it should have cost. It is true the road has cost more than it should, but it never got properly straightened out until the Dominion Government got hold of it. It never got into good working order until the subsidy was granted by this Parliament. When that was granted, the construction immediately commenced, and the road was put through with all speed, and the work was done in a most thorough and substantial manner. I know that this was done and that is the report of the engineers in the department. For fifteen or sixteen years, under the Nova Scotia Government, it dragged along with one man, one wheelbarrow, one spade, one ox, and one horse, doing the work and hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted. When the present company applied to this Government and got the subsidy, the road commenced to go ahead, and good solid work was put in, a substantial road was built, and the public got good return for their money. It is a matter of law entirely who gets the balance of the subsidy. It is the bank that advanced the money, and the subsidies were paid to the bank in order to cut down the liabilities of the Nova Scotia Central Railway. Wade & Eisenhauer backed the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company besides having these subsidies lodged in the Halifax Banking Company. Then, as has been said, Wade & Eisenhauer did not foreclose that mortgage, for it was the Trust Company of New York who held the mortgage. They foreclosed it, and that mortgage did not include these subsidies, as I am told by those who investigated into and had the deciding of this matter. And that lien, not including these subsidies, then the present receivers had not a legal title to the subsidies, but the subsidies, or whatever remains of them—I do not know the exact sum—go to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. An insolvent company.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). No; they are not insolvent. They have got a lien upon their road. They are endeavouring to sell their bonds, and just as soon as the company attempts to sell their bonds, then the receiver, or somebody else, attacks these bonds and they cannot sell them, and the thing has been in abeyance for three or four years, the one party trying to get ahead of the other with reference to the sale of the bonds. It is a mere matter of law as to who gets the balance of the subsidy. It has been decided that the receivers, Wade & Eisenhauer, do not get it.

Mr. FORBES. By whom?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). By the Department of Justice.

Mr. FORBES. When?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Some months ago. The Minister of Justice met Mr. Wade himself in Halifax and gave him his decision upon the matter, and it was upon that decision that I gave up working for Wade & Eisenhauer with reference to it. And now it is just simply a mere matter of law. If the law says that Wade & Eisenhauer are entitled to this subsidy, they will get it. If the law says the Nova Scotia Central should have it, then they will get it. The subsidy has been earned.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been earned and must be paid, but the resolution asks Parliament to pay it to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, which is insolvent. The hon. gentleman disputes that statement, but the very fact that the road is in the hands of a receiver shows it is insolvent. Why is it in the hands of a receiver? Because it could not pay its liabilities. Simple justice requires, under such circumstances, that the money should be paid to the credit of the company and not to the company itself. Otherwise a cheque will be issued by the department in favour of the company which is insolvent, and the creditors who ought to be recouped for what they advanced will be defrauded. The hon. gentleman says there is a question of law. There may be; but from the statement which he has made, I do not really know to whom the money should be paid, whether to Wade & Eisenhauer or to somebody else. At all events, one thing is certain, the money should not be paid to this company, which is insolvent and has no right to receive it. Therefore we should not pass this item until the Minister of Justice brings the documents to show to whom the money should be paid. But one thing is certain, the money cannot be paid to this company but to the creditors.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) said that six months ago the Minister of Justice told him that Wade & Eisenhauer were not entitled to this. But at that time a suit was pending as to the right of the mortgagee to foreclose, and the bonds were, I think, "in escrow" for the Halifax Banking Company. Subsequently it was decided that the foreclosure must proceed, and the title passed to Wade & Eisenhauer. Therefore, I think, the decision of the Minister of Justice should be taken as it would be given under the facts existing to-day and not those existing six months ago.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has made some strictures which, I think, were unfair, unmerited and ungenerous, with reference to the gentlemen who have control of this railway, Messrs.

Wade & Eisenhauer. He stated that if there were any dark doings in connection with this road, they were due to these gentlemen. Later on he told us that this road would never have been built had it not been for the Dominion Government, that it was in a languishing condition up to the time the Dominion subsidy was granted. Will the hon. gentleman say that the Dominion subsidy built that road?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If it were not for the Dominion subsidy that road would not be built to-day. That I am sure of.

Mr. BORDEN. If it had not been for the subsidy of the provincial Government, which was very much larger than the Dominion subsidies, and if it had not been for Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, who took their financial existence in their hands to build this road, it would never have been built. The hon. gentleman makes nice distinctions between what he calls "pledging their credit" and "finding the money." He took exception to the statement made by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Forbes), that Messrs. Wade and Eisenhauer found a large portion of the money with which this road was built. He said that it was not so; but that they had pledged their credit for it. What is the difference? These gentlemen are liable to-day to a banking company for a considerable portion of that money. I believe that something like \$500,000 was advanced by these gentlemen towards the construction of this road. It was well known that this was a difficult and expensive road to build, and it could not have been built, even by the large subsidy given by the Provincial Government and the ordinary subsidy given by this Government, unless these were supplemented by this large sum which Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer provided for this company. When they did that, they took, as they believed, certain security. I believe the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) himself will not deny that on at least one occasion, perhaps more, he was employed by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, and succeeded at different times—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). No; never.

Mr. BORDEN—in getting from this Government certain portions of the subsidy which were paid over to the credit of Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer or paid to the Halifax Banking Co—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Never.

Mr. BORDEN. Very well, then; he got certain portions of the money paid into the Halifax Banking Company.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I never was employed by Wade & Eisenhauer, with the exception of the time I tell you.

Mr. BORDEN. On one occasion, then, the hon. gentleman was employed by Wade & Eisenhauer. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he never was instrumental

Mr. BORDEN.

in procuring from the Dominion Government, from the Dominion Treasury, any payment of any portion of this subsidy to Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer or to Mr. Wade or Mr. Eisenhauer?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). There never was a dollar paid to Mr. Wade or Mr. Eisenhauer.

Mr. BORDEN. Or to the Halifax Banking Company? That is the same thing exactly, because Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer were pledging their credit to the Halifax Banking Company.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The money was paid to the Halifax Banking Company.

Mr. BORDEN. Which had previously advanced on the credit of Wade & Eisenhauer.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). They would never have got their credit but that the subsidy was to be given.

Mr. BORDEN. Exactly; the hon. gentleman admits the point. That is the very point I am trying to make. They took every security they could take, and which they had a right to have. They completed this road out of their own money; advanced half a million of money, and now it is proposed to divert this subsidy away from these men and give it to a company which has ceased to exist as a company, which is, in fact, insolvent. I say this is a most extraordinary proceeding; I cannot understand it, and it seems to me the course pursued by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is an extraordinary one. He says that up to a certain point he was working for Wade & Eisenhauer; but when he discovered the view of the matter taken by the Department of Justice then he thought it would be wiser to become attorney for the people who were likely to get the money. This is the position the hon. gentleman occupies, and a most extraordinary position it seems to me for a professional gentleman to admit that he occupies with reference to parties engaged in law on opposite sides.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I can say this: I think Mr. Eisenhauer went into this enterprise with good motives to get that road built. I am quite sure he did. I think he would do his best to get out of the matter to-day with just the amount that his credit is pledged for.

Mr. BORDEN. That is all he wants.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). However, he has been led on a little further than he thought he was going in the first place, I think. So far as my employment by Mr. Wade is concerned, after the foreclosure was made, he telegraphed me to meet him at the station. I met him, and he asked me if I was at liberty to be employed by him in reference to the subsidy, to obtain the balance of the subsidy for him. I told him I was. This was the fact. I then did everything I could. I put their case fairly before the parties who

had this matter in hand to get it for them. It was decided that they were not entitled to this money, and I asked Mr. Wade for further instructions. I got no further instructions. I sent in my bill to Mr. Wade; he did not pay it, and I dropped him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And took a retainer on the other side.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have not taken a retainer on the other side.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say he had.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I said I had been acting for the Nova Scotia Central.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And so the hon. gentleman has had a retainer on both sides.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Not in the same case; they are two different employments entirely. So far as that is concerned, I know the duties of a professional man just as well as any hon. member of this House, and my character as a professional man is before the public in Annapolis, and as I am ready to have it criticised at any time, notwithstanding anything that may be said in this House, or anywhere else, with reference to it. I do not care one snap of my finger where this money goes. I consider it a proper thing that it should be voted, because it is money earned. It has lapsed, and it should be brought back, so that it can be got by the proper parties, whoever they are.

Mr. LAURIER. Who are they?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It has been decided they are the Nova Scotia Central Company.

Mr. LAURIER. Why do you pay it to them?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I don't have anything to do with paying it.

Mr. LAURIER. When I say "you," I mean the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I don't know; the Government can answer for that themselves. The Minister of Justice has decided, or his department has decided—I know that of my own knowledge—that, so far as this lien is concerned, and so far as the title that Messrs Wade & Eisenhauer have upon this road, it does not cover the balance of this subsidy. That is all I know about it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not attempt to give any opinion upon the question, one way or the other, not having the facts before me. But the money appears to be due by the Dominion of Canada to some one. The question is, to whom it shall be paid. It appears plain that the company we are paying it to, is an insolvent company, that they originally built this road on advances made by the Halifax Banking Company, which advances were guaranteed by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, that they gave bonds to cover the payment of these moneys, and that the trustees sold the road

under the trust deed, and that it is now in the hands of a third party. I would imagine that the road, the franchise rights, would pass to the assignee. Of course, I would not give an opinion upon that, not having seen the papers. But I would suppose that, at least, in view of the contradictory statements made here, the hon. Minister would bring down the opinion of the Department of Justice, and the facts upon which it is based. And if the Department of Justice has decided, on a properly submitted case, that this Nova Scotia Central Company is entitled to the money, and not the assignee of the road, who received it on the sale under the bonds, we will have to pay it. But it would certainly be a very curious thing if the Nova Scotia Central Company, owing this money, as they do, to the parties who advanced it, are to get the money, and the parties who advanced it are to lose it. That would seem to be a moral wrong. "Prima facie" it would seem morally wrong, and I hope the hon. gentleman will settle the matter by agreeing to let this stand and bring down the opinion of the Minister of Justice, with the case on which the opinion was given; because the hon. gentleman knows that no one can accept a casual statement which the Minister is reported to have made in a Halifax hotel. No doubt, the hon. gentleman sincerely believes that the Minister made some remark, that some decision had been given in favour of one party or the other. But we cannot accept these hearsay statements. There must be an official statement given by the Department of Justice, to justify the Government in paying this money to a bankrupt company.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I am entirely wrong in my opinion, but I will give it for what it is worth. The contract was made with the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company. Under that contract we are bound to pay them a balance of \$4,500; if not legally, we are morally bound, because they performed their part of the contract. It may be true, as the hon. gentleman said, that the company's interests have been sold out and passed to another party. It is true, that that party may not be able to enjoin the Government to pay them the amount which is voted to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company; but surely, if any other party has a claim upon the money, or if the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company have a claim upon the money, they cannot be enjoined from receiving it. Then, it is simply a question for the Minister of Justice to decide. It may be, as the hon. gentleman says, that it can only be given to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company; but if the receiver has a right to the money, surely he can enjoin the railway company from receiving it from the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I give no opinion upon that point. It is plain that the exchequer here can be enjoined from paying it.

Mr. HAGGART. But if the Nova Scotia Railway Company have no right to receive the money, they can be enjoined from receiving it. Therefore, it is simply a legal question for the Justice Department to say whether the Nova Scotia Railway Company, not being enjoined from receiving the money, are entitled to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has stated that the Justice Department has given an opinion. I want that opinion, and I think we are entitled to it.

Mr. HAGGART. I will bring it down in a day or two. The hon. gentleman must remember that I have not stated that the Justice Department gave any opinion at all. My department says that the duty is simply mechanical, that, after finding out that the work has been completed, they send a statement over to the Finance Department, and, when the Finance Department have consulted the Justice Department, and are satisfied that the money should be paid, it is paid. As I am bringing down a couple of other resolutions in a day or two, I have no objections to let this matter stand.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 18 miles of their Railway, from a point at or near New Glasgow or St. Lin, to or near to Montcalm, in the province of Quebec, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 54-55 Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole \$25,600.

Mr. LAURIER. How much of this has been completed ?

Mr. HAGGART. This section of the road runs from New Glasgow towards Quebec, 18 miles. The first 10 miles is completed, and the subsidy, amounting to \$3,200 a mile, has been paid. The whole subsidy granted is \$57,600, leaving the balance now asked for \$25,600.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from at or near Montcalm to the Canadian Pacific Railway between Joliette and St. Felix de Valois, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$48,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This is another section of the same road. It is run from Montcalm, connecting with the Joliette branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No work has been done. It is purely a revote of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria.

To the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, for 21 miles of their 3 feet gauge railway from Lachute, Jérôme, or a point at or near St. Sauveur, on the line of the Montreal and Western Railway, to Montfort and westward, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$67,200.

Mr. HAGGART. This road runs through a very difficult country, and is purely a colonization road. I was unable to enter into a contract with them, because, as I stated last session in reply to an hon. gentleman

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

who asked me, all these grants can be given only to roads that are built on the ordinary gauge of the country. This is for the purpose of enabling me to enter into a contract with them for the three-foot gauge.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any person who has had any experience with narrow-gauge railways, will admit that they have been failures. If this road is to be of any use in the way of an extensive carrying trade, it will be necessary to widen the gauge.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McMULLEN. We had an experience in our section of country with narrow-gauge roads, and in every case they were nothing short of a nuisance. They all had to be widened to four feet and a half gauge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that amount paid to narrow gauge roads ?

Mr. HAGGART. We have paid that amount to narrow gauge roads where they are purely colonization roads.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister say what are the gauges and alignments of this road ?

Mr. HAGGART. When they entered into the contract they are limited to certain gradients and a certain curvature. Sometimes the contour of the country does not permit them to come within the cast-iron contract. We have to have a special report from the head engineer of the department, showing reason why it is impossible, without great expense, to construct them in that manner ; and sometimes the contract is altered by Order in Council. They have filed a location survey. I understand from the chief engineer that the gradients are very heavy indeed, some being as high as 100 feet or over to the mile.

To the Maskinonge and Nipissing Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Maskinonge or Louisville towards the parish of St. Michel des Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the province of Quebec, and for 15 miles of their railway from the north end of the 15 miles afore referred to towards the parish of St. Michel des Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidies granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, and 53 Victoria, chapter 2, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$96,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Nothing has been done on this road. It is simply a revote of the original subsidy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have you any reasonable ground for believing that this will be built ?

Mr. HAGGART. They seem to have an idea that the road will be built. They give all the verbal assurance that can be given.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the promoter of the road ?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Parker, who has an establishment back in the country. The other people connected with it are all local men, who are interested in the lumber trade and colonization in the district.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is any company formed and stock subscribed and paid up, so as to afford the basis for entertaining the hope that the road will be built?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not surprising that the road has not yet been built because a Government bonus of \$3,200 per mile would not go very far in building a road in that difficult country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the road serve a valuable tract of country when built?

Mr. OUIMET. It will be a valuable district when opened up, but it is difficult to reach; it lies towards the Laurentian Mountains.

To the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company, for 40 miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sundridge, or some other point on the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the province of Ontario, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$97,600.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman explain this proposed subsidy?

Mr. HAGGART. This road extends from the Northern Pacific Junction Railway to Parry Sound. A contract has been entered into. Ten miles are almost completed and ten other miles are far advanced towards completion. \$30,400 have been earned and paid, leaving a balance of \$97,600 to be devoted.

Mr. CHARLTON. By what company will it be operated?

Mr. HAGGART. I think Mr. Booth has obtained control, and it will become part and parcel of the Parry Sound Railway. I have now the particulars regarding the Great Eastern Railway. The Great Eastern is a railway from Dundas, in the county of Huntington, to Lévis, the length under construction being sixty miles. There is a branch from St. Lambert's to Rouse's Point, thirteen miles, and other branches, which are described in the railway statistics.

Mr. LAURIER. That explanation cannot apply to this road. This road runs from Sorel east, and all the information the hon. gentleman has given is respecting a line west of Sorel.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the information in the department. Municipal bonuses were given to the Great Eastern.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it, the Great Eastern runs east from Sorel.

Mr. HAGGART. This road runs from Montreal to Sorel.

Mr. OUIMET. The control of the whole line now rests in the hands of Mr. Leduc and his associates.

Mr. LAURIER. The road now owned by Mr. Leduc and others is the Montreal and Sorel, running from Montreal to Sorel. The road for which a subsidy is now demanded is a road supposed to run from Sorel east towards Quebec, crossing Yamaska, Nicolet and other counties. None of the information supplied by the Minister applies to that road, but only to the Montreal and Sorel.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes; but the same men have control of the other road for the purpose of having a through line from St. Lambert to Point Lévis.

Mr. LAURIER. What does it matter whether the same gentlemen have control of the road or not? We are asking information with respect to this particular company, and as to what work has been done.

Mr. OUIMET. A description of the road has already been given to the House. I understand the point the hon. gentleman wants to ascertain is whether this road is controlled by men who are able to build the road and not by men of straw, that is to say, men who would do justice to that part of the country, which the leader of the Opposition has stated to be a rich farming country, deserving of railway accommodation.

Mr. LAURIER. But Mr. Leduc and his associates do not own this part of the road.

Mr. OUIMET. He, with Mr. Ball, Mr. Shaughnessy and others, control it.

Mr. LAURIER. There is absolute confusion in the explanation given. What we wanted to know was the names of the promoters of the company. We have been given the names of the owners of the Sorel road, and I would like to ask what they have to do with the present application? What work has been done on this road?

Mr. HAGGART. I have given the details.

Mr. LAURIER. The second explanation did not agree with the first.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a misunderstanding.

Mr. LAURIER. The only work which has been done by this company is some work between the Richelieu and the Yamaska rivers, and between the Yamaska and the Nicolet rivers. What I want to know is what are the names of the promoters of this company? and now we are told that Mr. Leduc and Mr. Tourville and Mr. Fortier, all men of great financial ability, are in possession of the Montreal and Sorel Railway. What in the name of common sense has that got to do with it?

Mr. OUIMET. I said that these gentlemen in possession of the Montreal and Sorel Railway also have a controlling interest in

this company which is to build that line from Sorel to Point Lévis, and the Montreal and Sorel and this other road are to be joined together and form a through line from Montreal or from St. Lambert to Point Lévis. That is what I want to explain.

Mr. LAURIER. When I asked him who are the promoters, the hon. gentleman said Mr. Ball, and now he names Messrs. Tourville, Leduc and Fortier. Who asked for this subsidy? Is it Messrs. Tourville and Leduc of the Montreal and Sorel Company or is it the Great Eastern Company?

Mr. OUMET. It is the Great Eastern Company. Nobody can apply for the renewal of a grant except those who applied for it first. As the hon. gentleman knows, a company may change every year or every six months, depending as it does on the parties who have a controlling interest in it. I say now, this is to be a through line, controlled by men of large means and ultimately, I think, it will be a much more useful road than if it were controlled by the old company, of which Mr. Armstrong was the director, and who perhaps has had to release his interest in it. The people who control the whole scheme are men of means and capital, who will certainly make a success of the enterprise.

Mr. LAURIER. It is because companies are constantly changed that it is very important for us to know who are the parties who compose the company when a subsidy is applied for. I told the hon. gentleman when he applied for the subsidy this afternoon that the company, as far as my information goes, was a bogus one. The hon. gentleman told me Mr. Ball was in it. Well, Mr. Ball is a responsible man; but my information is, and I still believe it, that Mr. Ball has clothed with his own respectability a bogus company. Now, at the eleventh hour, the Minister tells us that it is no longer Mr. Ball, and no longer the Great Eastern Company, but Mr. Leduc and Mr. Tourville who at present control the Montreal and Sorel, who are interested in this road. If Messrs. Tourville, Leduc and Fortier are really the applicants for this subsidy it places a very different phase upon the application; but if it is the old company who apply I object in toto to granting this subsidy. If, on the other hand, the applicants are responsible men, well and good, but let us have the information. I am not satisfied with a mere verbal statement at the eleventh hour, and which is in contradiction of what was said before. Let us have the application and the names of the applicants and then we will deal intelligently with the question.

Mr. OUMET. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be satisfied if I tell him that we will give him the information when the resolution comes again before the House. I would just point out that bogus companies

Mr. OUMET.

cannot build the road for a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile. This subsidy will be utterly useless in the hands of any one who has not the means to supply the necessary capital which will be about \$14,000 per mile, and if you include the building of bridges, I should say that sum would not be sufficient to build the first-class road demanded by these resolutions. There may be names in this company to whom the hon. gentleman would object, but, after all, what have we got to do with that, when he has stated himself that the country through which this road is going to pass, is a country that can support a road and which deserves subsidies from the Government. I really do not see the great interest the hon. gentleman has, beyond the expectation that this road will be built as soon as possible by men who will have the money to build it. If there is a man amongst the shareholders of the company to whom the hon. gentleman objects, I do not think that the committee should take that as a real objection to the granting of a subsidy. If men have come in as stated, like Messrs. Tourville, Fortier and Leduc, it is with the intention of making the enterprise a success.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says it is immaterial whether we give the subsidy to a bogus company or not. I say it is very material, and the very history of this company shows it. This is a most deserving road, I admit. It will open a large and fine section of country which has no railway communication at present, but here is this old company possessed of the subsidy year after year since 1885, and in that six years that bogus company has built about ten miles of railway, but have not even laid the rails upon it. The hon. gentleman told us to-day that we are going to continue to give subsidies to that bogus company. I say it would be an outrage to do so, because that company stands in the way of having this railway completed. Let a good sound company come before Parliament for a subsidy which would guarantee that the road would be opened; but do not let us give any more subsidies to this bogus company. The hon. gentleman has not reflected, when he says that it is immaterial whether we give the subsidy to a bogus company or not. If the Minister satisfies me that this subsidy is applied for by such substantial men as Messrs. Fortier, Leduc and Tourville, I, for my part, have no objection to granting it, but unless he satisfies me of that I shall oppose it as far as I can.

Mr. HAGGART. I have given all the information I possibly could to the hon. gentleman about this railway. I have given him the distance built, the amount under construction, the line they leased, and the subsidies from the Quebec Government and the municipalities.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. He stated that the parishes

of St. Antoine and St. Denis are giving subsidies. They have not given a cent to this road, because they are not upon the line of this railway. The information of the hon. gentleman is in regard to the Montreal and Sorel line, and they are quite different.

Mr. HAGGART. The information I have given to the hon. gentleman is in regard to the Great Eastern, as stated in the Railway Statistics. The Great Eastern is under construction 60 miles. Between Yamaska and St. Francis, 6½ miles have been built, and 6 in the other direction. They have leased the Montreal and Sorel Railway, 45 miles. I may state to the hon. gentleman that the information that is given in these statistics as to the amount of subsidies given by the different municipalities to the Great Eastern Railway are furnished to the department upon sworn statements, as I am informed by my deputy. I can give the hon. gentleman, if he desires, the names of the directors.

Mr. LAURIER. Who are they ?

Mr. HAGGART. They are filed in the department. In every instance we require the applicants to give the names of the directors, and I think also the amount of stock and bonds subscribed and the names of the subscribers. I know nothing about the directors, whether they are men of means or not. The application was made by the Great Eastern Railway Company for the renewal. I will let the resolution stand, and I will furnish the hon. gentleman with all the information we have.

Committee rose and reported progress.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS — PRECEDENCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That Government Orders shall have precedence on Monday next after questions put by members, and that one hour shall be given to private bills after routine proceedings on that day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose that motion is made on the expectation that we shall close by Easter ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the importance of taking up at an early day the Bill to amend the law respecting the Electoral Franchise, because the time for the annual revision of the lists is approaching, and if the law is to be amended, it is most important that parties throughout the country should be informed at once of the changes that are to take place in the law.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give my hon. friend the information to-morrow, or at the latest on Monday.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12 midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 25th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH AMERICAN CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. MASSON moved that owing to the advanced period of the session Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the North American Canal Company, be placed on the Orders of this day for consideration in Committee of the Whole, immediately after routine proceedings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why should this be done ? I understood the leader of the House fixed an hour on Monday for private Bills.

Mr. MASSON. It is only with the object of getting it before the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is well not to violate the rule.

Motion withdrawn.

LEGISLATION FOR THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. I move the suspension of Rule 31. I want permission of the House to present two small Bills. At this stage of the session it will save two days. I have good reason for wishing to have them printed. I had intended to bring them forward early in the session, but owing to certain circumstances I did not do so. One is a Bill to repeal chap. 52 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, an "Act respecting homestead exemptions in the North-west Territories." Another is an "Act to amend the Act entitled the Territories Real Property Act." I may say that these Acts refer to the one subject, a subject of great importance, and no harm will be done if Government legislation goes on the same lines. It may be of some advantage to have them printed. I have given a great deal of thought to this subject, and if the Bills commend themselves to the Government the Government can adopt them and incorporate them in their legislation, or place them on the Government Orders as the case may be.

Motion agreed to, and Bills read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) to further amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of timber down rivers and streams.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Speaker of the Senate.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 116) to repeal the Homestead Exemption Act.—(Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No. 117) to amend the Territories Real Property Act.—(Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No. 120) further to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Canned Goods.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 121) to amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. Daly.)

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College. He said: It is to legalize the appointment of additional professors who have been employed for some years, but not strictly in accordance with the original Act.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a very late period in the session to introduce such a Bill.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will send my hon. friend in advance a copy of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House do, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Company, for extending and completing their railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy of \$20,000.

To the Oshawa Railway Company, for a line of railway as follows:—From Port Oshawa to a point at or near Edmonson's mill site, near Mill street, in the town of Oshawa, (this portion being known as the "Lake" section of the said railway); thence to a point at or near the town hall, in the town of Oshawa, and thence to the Oshawa station of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, (this portion being known as the "Town" or "Northern" section of the said railway)—the amount remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 54-55 Victoria, chapter 8, not exceeding in the whole \$22,400.

2. *Resolved*,—That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Council be granted to such companies respectively; the other

Mr. DAVIN.

subsidies may be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, which agreement the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized,—except the subsidy to the Oshawa Railway Company, which shall be paid as follows: \$12,400 on the completion of the "Town" or "Northern" section, and the balance of the said subsidy, being \$10,000, on the completion of the "Lake" section of the said railway.

3. *Resolved*,—That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connected with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

Motion agreed to.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman informed the House that to-day he would give us information about some more correspondence concerning the treaty with France.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House additional correspondence. I do not think this correspondence is very important. The hon. gentleman can look at it. I think it would be well not to order it printed until he sees whether it is necessary.

Mr. LAURIER. As we are sitting on Saturday, it means that prorogation cannot be very distant; therefore we are entitled to know from the Government whether they intend to ratify the treaty with France.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to defer that question until Monday. If he will ask the question on Monday, I think I will be able to tell him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You want to sleep and pray over it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That would be a desecration of the Sabbath.

FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman last evening, in answer to a question from me,

told us that he would give us some information to-day as to what he intended to do with the amendments to the Franchise Act.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the Bill on the Paper in relation to the Franchise, I may say that after considering the matter, and seeing the end of the session so near, the Government has decided not to go on with the Bill this year.

Mr. LAURIER. Matters are to stand as they are?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It is intended to introduce a short Act to do away with the necessity of revising the list.

SUPPLY—TWO CENT POSTAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to make a few remarks upon a question of which I gave notice in the early part of the session, that notice having been dropped from the Order Paper, namely, the propriety of reducing the rate of letter postage from three to two cents. I wish to lay before the Government some of the reasons which I think would warrant them in adopting this reform. It will be a change very greatly in the public interest, a very popular change with the public. If we examine into the circumstances of countries who have taken this step and compare them with our own, we will be able to arrive at the conclusion that the change would involve only a temporary increase of the deficit, and would result not only in the restoration very speedily of the revenues to the old standard, but would result immediately in benefit to the public of Canada to a very great extent. If we examine into the statistics following the British reduction of postage in 1840 to one penny, it will be seen that the result was vastly to stimulate correspondence. Under it the number of letters passing through the British Post Office in 1840 was 75,908,000. That number increased seven-fold in seventeen years, the number rising, in 1857, to 504,421,000. In 1892 the number increased to 1,767,500,000, or twenty-three-fold, from 1840. In addition to that number of letters, there were 241,500,000 postal cards, 495,000,000 books, and 162,000,000 newspapers. If the business of the British Post Office was so greatly stimulated by the reduction of the letter postage that the number of letters increased twenty-three-fold, while the population of the country increased less than 100 per cent, if the operation of that reduction was, as it is shown to have been, to increase the number of letters posted to each individual in the United Kingdom from 34 in 1881 to 46 in 1892, I think we may be warranted in saying that the result of the British experience in this matter would certainly warrant us in giving favourable consideration

to a proposition to reduce the domestic rate of postage in Canada. But we have the experience of a country nearer at hand whose circumstances are more nearly identical with our own, and whose experience would prove a better criterion by which to conduct our postal affairs than that of Great Britain. I refer to the United States. In 1883 the rate of postage in the United States was reduced from 3 to 2 cents. In 1885 the weight of letter postage was increased from $\frac{1}{2}$ an ounce to 1 ounce. Another change made in the United States was in the direction of greatly increased free delivery. The revenue for 1883 was \$45,508,000. That was the year of the change. In the following year the revenue was \$43,325,000, a reduction of \$2,283,000, or 5 per cent. The reduction shown in the second year, which was the first full year of the reduction, brought the revenue down to \$42,560,000, or a decrease, as compared with the last year under the 3 cent postage, of \$2,948,000, or $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In 1887, four years after this change was made, the revenue was \$48,837,000, or an increase of 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent over the revenue under the 3 cents rate. Last year the revenue of the Post Office Department, instead of being \$48,000,000 odd, was \$70,930,000, an increase of \$25,420,000, or 56 per cent increase in the gross revenue of the Post Office Department, this increase being the result of a decrease of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent in the rate of postage, and an increase of 100 per cent in the weight of letters chargeable with single rate. The increase for the nine years previous to 1883, when the reduction took place, was as follows: Revenue for 1874, \$26,471,000; 1883, \$45,508,000. This increase, \$19,037,000, or 70 per cent, occurred in nine years without change or break in rates. The increase during the subsequent nine years amounted to \$25,422,000, or 56 per cent, with 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent increase of weight liable to single rate. The revenue in 1874 was \$26,471,000; expenditure, \$32,126,000, or a deficiency of \$5,655,000, the percentage of deficiency on revenue being 21 per cent. The revenue in 1883 was \$45,508,000; expenditure, \$43,282,000, showing a surplus of \$2,226,000, the percentage of surplus over revenue being 5 per cent. The revenue in 1892 was \$70,390,000; expenditure, \$76,980,000, showing a deficiency of \$6,050,000, the percentage of deficiency on revenue being 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, as against 21 per cent in 1874. This deficiency is largely explained by the great improvements that have taken place since 1883. Letter delivery in cities and towns has increased as follows: 1883, free delivery offices, 154; 1892, 568, increase 414, or 268 per cent. In 1883 the carrier force numbered 3,680 men; in 1892, 10,737 men, the increase being 7,057 men, or 192 per cent. In 1883 the expense of free delivery was \$3,173,000; in 1892, it was \$9,966,000, an increase of \$6,493,000, or 200 per cent. The railway post office car statistics were as follows: 1883, expenditure \$1,599,000; 1892, \$2,930,000, being an increase of \$1,331,000, or 83 per cent.

The railway post office clerks show an increase of 66 per cent, the number in 1883 being 3,855, as compared with 6,417 in 1892. The railway post office clerks' expenses were, in 1883, \$3,688,000, as against \$6,319,000 in 1892, an increase of 71 per cent. The Postmaster-General of the United States, Mr. Wanamaker, refers in his report to the efficiency of the staff, and says that the army of post office clerks, 6,000 or 7,000 in number, equal in discipline the best army in the world. The aggregate increase in free delivery, railway postal cars and railway postal clerks' expenses, was as follows:—1883, expenditure, \$8,460,000; 1892, \$19,215,000, an increase of \$10,755,000, or 127 per cent. The cost of the department in 1874 was \$32,126,000; in 1883, \$43,282,000, an increase of \$11,156,000, or 35 per cent. In 1883 the expenditure was \$43,282,000; in 1892 it was \$76,980,000, an increase of \$33,698,000, or 78 per cent. To state these facts in summary form, I may say there was 33½ per cent reduction in the rate of postage of 1883, and 100 per cent increase in weight liable to single rate in 1885, and there was 5 per cent surplus in 1883 and 8½ per cent deficiency in 1892. There was 78 per cent, or \$33,698,000 increase in expenses since 1883, against 35 per cent, or \$11,156,000, for the nine previous years. I have already drawn attention to the fact, that a very large increase has taken place in the number of free delivery offices, the number being increased from 158 to 546. It is now proposed to introduce the system of free delivery into villages, and even into country districts in the United States. The estimated receipts of the department for 1893 are \$78,742,000, and the estimated deficiency, \$1,552,000. While that deficiency exists, the people are getting their letter postage for \$35,000,000, in round numbers, less than they would have had to pay for it under the 3 cent rate of 1883. The estimated receipts for 1894 are \$85,120,000, and it is estimated that there will be a surplus in the same year of \$872,000. It is then proposed to take into consideration the propriety of adopting a 1 cent postal rate for the United States; and, whether it is adopted then or not, it is certain that in the very near future there will be a 1 cent rate, with village and country free delivery.

Now, I would ask whether this experience of the United States would not richly warrant us in reducing our postal rate from 3 cents to 2 cents? Last year our expenditure was \$3,316,000, and our revenue, \$2,652,745, a deficiency of \$663,375. Now, on the basis of the American experience of 5½ per cent deficiency in the first year of the reduced postage, 6½ per cent deficiency in the second year, and 7½ increase in the fourth year, I wish to point out the probable effect on our revenue of a change in the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents. In the second year there would be an increased deficiency in the postal revenue of

Mr. CHARLTON.

\$172,400, but in the fourth year we would recover and would have a reduction in our deficiency of \$193,600. While we would secure the reduction in the postage rate at the cost of \$172,400 in two years, on the basis of the American experience, we would at the outset give to the public of this country an advantage amounting to nearly \$1,000,000, in a lower rate of postage. We would obviate another difficulty. There is another feature of the proposed reduction in the rate that would still further reduce the deficiency, and that is the fact, that vast numbers of Canadian letters are posted in the United States. This is done all along the border. A very large proportion of the business correspondence of Windsor is posted in Detroit, simply because there is a saving of 33½ per cent effected by doing so. The same is the case anywhere along the border between the two countries; and I am told that, besides this, a very considerable proportion of the business correspondence of Montreal and Toronto is sent to be posted in the United States. I imagine that we have very little idea of the shrinkage of the Canadian postal revenue, resulting from this practice. This would be obviated, if the lower rate were adopted. We would have our letters posted at home, and that loss, whatever it may be, would be saved to the revenue of the Post Office Department. But, leaving that matter out of consideration altogether, I repeat that judging by the experience of the United States, though we would have an increase in our deficiency in the second year of \$172,400, in the fourth year we would have \$193,600 more revenue. There is no doubt that this change would be a boon to the people of Canada—one that would meet with universal favour; and even admitting that the charge upon the revenue would be increased, as it would temporarily, the advantage to the public would be so infinitely greater than the increased charge upon the revenue, that we ought to make the change without delay. We naturally feel a little pride in keeping abreast of our neighbours. The fact of the United States having the 2-cent rate while we have the 3-cent rate, does not flatter my pride as a Canadian, however others may regard it. We are carrying at 2 cents all the letters from the United States delivered in Canada, and we are charging 3 cents on all the letters sent from this country to the United States.

Now, if the Government are afraid of incurring the inconsiderable expense involved in changing the rate of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, I think I could set them on a plan by which they could save money. If they would repeal that useless and objectionable Franchise Act it would pay the deficiency in a year. We have spent a great deal of money in useless railway subsidies, for the express purpose of securing political influence a great deal more money than would give the people of Canada this

great boon. We take more money out of sweating contractors for election funds, ten times more, than would be necessary to give the people this boon. In these ways, by honest and economical administration, by lopping off abuses that exist, we could give the people of Canada the letter rate of 2 cents; and we have the experience of the United States showing that the revenue would speedily recover the loss resulting from the change and in the end yield a surplus. In the United States, in 1883, the postage rate was reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents, and since that time the revenue has increased, in round numbers, \$25,500,000. If the result has been so satisfactory that the Americans are now discussing the propriety of again reducing the rate 50 per cent and putting it at 1 cent instead of 2 cents, I think their experience warrants us in taking the same step at once, and it is only lack of courage and public spirit on the part of the Government that prevents them doing so. Therefore I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "this House is of the opinion that the domestic, and the American rate of postage may with due regard to the public interest, be reduced to two cents per letter of one ounce, or less, in weight."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, the question which the hon. gentleman has just brought to the notice of the House is one of great importance; and when I became Postmaster-General I considered it my duty to look into it with the view of ascertaining, from what had been done in other countries, what might possibly be done in Canada in the direction of reducing the postal rate upon letters in Canada and letters sent from Canada to other countries. I must, however, call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, which I do not think he will dispute. I claim that, proportionately to our population, Canada has more and better postal facilities than any country in the world. I claim that we have, in proportion to our population, a larger number of post offices than they have in the United States, and I claim, further, that in localities where, in the States, they have postal service but once a week, we have, in similar localities here postal service twice or three times a week. The hon. gentleman knows that we cannot compare a people of 75,000,000 letter writers with a population of 5,000,000 such as we have in Canada. In the United Kingdom the change was not made upon the ground that the previous postage rates were too high, but it was really and practically a readjustment from a departmental stand-point of the postage; and it was considered, under that rearrangement, that the postage should be reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents. With regard to the United States, I can tell the hon. gentleman that when the change was made there, the postal revenue was far in excess of the expenditure, the surplus amounting to \$2,091,992, and great pressure was brought to bear

upon the Government to reduce the postage, on the ground that the people should benefit by the surplus revenue. What was the result of that reduction? Immediately after the rate was lowered from 3 cents to 2 cents, there was an enormous deficit in the revenue. The result was quite different from what had been anticipated, and instead of equalizing the revenue and expenditure, it left the department with a deficiency for nine months of \$3,079,000. The next year there was still another deficit, the excessive expenditure being \$6,756,000; and there has been an excess of expenditure over revenue ever since the change took place. It will be seen, from the statistics which are submitted to the House, that the circumstances under which the reduction took place in the United Kingdom and those under which the reduction took place in the United States were quite different. In England the reduction took place as a matter of arrangement from a departmental stand-point; in the United States it took place from the fact that the revenue was far in excess of the expenditure. When we come to Canada I find, from information collected in the Post Office Department, that our revenue would suffer a loss per annum of about \$750,000 if we were to reduce the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman make any allowance for increase in business?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes. No doubt the increase of business would reduce the deficit; but in the United States, where there has been a large increase in business, the result is quite different from what was anticipated by those who went in most earnestly for this reform.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is different in this respect, that it is more favourable than was anticipated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. More than was anticipated by the hon. gentleman, perhaps. But I can assure him that that reduction resulted in a deficit of \$6,000,000 a year, compared with a surplus before the reduction. If that is a favourable result, the hon. gentleman is more easily satisfied than I am. Instead of revenue coming into their public coffers, the United States found themselves facing a deficit of \$6,000,000 a year. Now, there is only one way in which that deficit of \$750,000, which the change in our postage would bring about, could be reduced or minimized. Suppose Parliament decided to reduce the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, the only way of reducing the deficit would be by reimposing postage upon the newspapers and printed matter, and I must confess I know of no reason, from a departmental stand-point, why this should not be done. I believe that the state is put to enormous expense in carrying this printed matter all over the country without postage. Not only do we lose the postage, but it becomes necessary for the department to

increase the room on railway cars and carriages which carry this bulky matter. Every regulation of the department has been framed by men who have vast experience in postal matters, such as my deputy, Lieutenant-Colonel White, but it is impossible, with the best possible regulations, to prevent a large quantity of printed matter being carried through the post office, which really is not entitled to be carried as newspapers. I see no possibility of framing regulations such as would prevent this fraud taking place. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that along the border between the United States and Canada, a lot of letters are transferred from one place to another which are not paid for. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, under the postal convention existing between the United States and Canada, provision has been made for that. It is provided that :

Where mail matter is posted in either country in order to avoid payment of the rate of postage paying in the other country, the country to which such correspondence is mailed may charge an additional rate. That regulation has been carried out and acted upon in every case which has come under the notice of the officials, and it has been treated in the same manner by both countries. Now, Sir, however anxious I may be to reduce the postage rate and give every possible facility for the exchange of written communication between the people of Canada at the most moderate possible price, I claim that when it is established, as I have satisfied myself it is, that there would be a loss of about \$780,000 a year to the Dominion treasury, it would be a most imprudent step, from the stand-point of the monetary interests of Canada, to make this reduction. Under these circumstances, I fear we shall have to wait until a change of circumstances, which may, and, I think, will come, enables the department to suggest and carry out this reform.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I feel disposed to believe that if the reform I find in this motion were carried into effect, it would result in materially increasing the revenue from the postal service. I see that in England, where they have the penny postage service, they have a very large surplus. Of course conditions there are more favourable than here. I will just read to the House the condition of the revenue and expenditure, showing the surpluses they have had in England for several years past :

	Gross Revenues.	Working Expenses.	Surplus Revenue.
1887.....	£8,471,198	£5,580,141	£2,591,057
1888.....	8,705,237	5,933,820	2,771,517
1889.....	9,102,776	6,062,902	3,039,874
1890.....	9,474,774	6,286,263	3,208,511
1891.....	9,851,078	6,687,089	3,163,989

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

These figures might encourage us to establish the reduced rate of postage here. Another matter, which I think deserves attention, is the registration fee of 5 cents. I think this fee should be abolished. It is not in the public interest, and it does not guarantee any greater safety to the letter. This enormous fee should be diminished ; it would be a benefit to the public, and I believe the revenue would be improved.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the indulgence of the House to reply to one or two points in the address of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman had better adhere to the rule. Something may be said by the hon. gentleman which would be likely to provoke a reply.

Mr. CHARLTON. I supposed I was entitled to a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say that I am in favour of the motion of the hon. gentleman, if the revenue of the country can at all sustain his proposition, and the hon. gentleman's statistics of the experience of the United States seems to point in that direction. I think the principal point upon which we proceed in the matter of postal accommodation is to try to make the postal service as nearly as we can self-sustaining, because it is not a tax in the sense in which any other imposition upon the community is a tax. The charge for postage is the payment for service which the Government render to the public. The Government undertake the duty of carriers with regard to a specific matter, and for the service they perform in the interests of those who send letters by mail a certain charge is made. Now, the position taken by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is that this charge is at such a figure that it prevents many from using the Post Office Department for the purpose of communicating with friends on business or private matters to the extent they would if the postal rate was more moderate than it now is. I would be sorry myself, Sir, to vote for a reduction that would have the effect of preventing the reduction, to any very considerable degree, of general taxation ; because if we were obliged to make a choice between a reduction of postage for service actually rendered to the parties and a reduction of taxes which are a burden upon the community, I think you should choose a reduction of the taxes. But, as I understand the figures given by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), they go to show that the increase in the business of the postal department in the United States is very much larger than the increase of population or the increase of wealth during the same time. If that is so, then it goes to show that there can be no very great risk in reducing the postal charges. But if the reduction should impose a permanent deficit on the earnings of

the postal department compared with the services rendered, then I quite admit that it is a reduction that we ought not to make. But, so far as I can judge, from the information given us by the Postmaster-General, and the information given us by the hon. member for North Norfolk, I think we are safe in supporting the proposition.

Motion negatived on a division.

MILITARY PENSIONS.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to a matter on which I feel confident of securing the endorsement of the hon. members present, because it is a subject which must appeal strongly to their sense of justice—I refer to the necessity that exists for the Government to devise some scheme to give the permanent corps of the militia adequate pensions. I am sorry this matter has not fallen into more able hands than mine, but I will try to place the matter favourably before the House, and rely more on the strength of my case than on any argumentative ability I may show, to obtain a favourable verdict at the hands of hon. members on behalf of the men for whom I plead. As we all know, the policy of this Government, and of all Governments, and it is also the wish of the people, has been, and is still, against maintaining a standing army, as they do in most other countries; but they are perfectly willing to rely on the protection and assistance of the militia force of Canada. This being the case, it was deemed necessary by the proper authorities that a certain number of men should be duly enrolled who should be properly trained and drilled in all the duties of a soldier, so that they might be capable of instructing the ordinary militia of the country; in fact, be able to turn the raw recruits that enlist in the militia of Canada into effective soldiers. In 1871, when most of the Imperial troops were withdrawn from Canada, two batteries of garrison artillery were formed, named A and B Batteries, comprising 100 men each, I believe, which were stationed, respectively, in Quebec and Kingston. Since then it has been found necessary to establish several more companies and batteries in different parts of the country, until now the whole permanent force of Canada comprises a thousand men, whose duties are to train and teach the militia men of the city and rural corps, and also to act with them in case any trouble should arise, either within our own borders, or from without. These thousand men are the permanent corps of Canada, and it is of them that I wish to speak to-day. The distinction between the permanent corps and the ordinary active militia of Canada must not be lost sight of. An ordinary active militiaman who is enlisted in a city corps, is obliged, by Act of Parliament, to put in twelve full drills of three hours each during the year. He does this, as a rule, in the evenings, and

also on Saturday afternoons; so that the hon. gentlemen can see that his connection with the militia force is very little detriment to him and interferes but little with his usual profession or occupation. The men enlisted in the rural corps, as a rule, are called out for twelve continuous days of drill, once in a year, and, therefore, are taken away for only a short time from their ordinary occupations. As a matter of fact, the majority of these men put in far more drills than they are obliged to do by law, but that number of drills they must put in. Now, the permanent corps are situated quite differently. They are on duty, day in and day out, for the whole year. They live in barracks; they pass all their time in making themselves efficient and in training the officers and men of the ordinary militia force. They are, to all intents and purposes, regular soldiers, just as much so as the men who enlist in the English, French or German armies. It is their profession. It is impossible for them to follow any other employment in which to make money for themselves and their families; and so they are totally dependent upon the pay they receive from the Government. This being the case, will any hon. gentleman here, deny their just claim to be treated as fairly and as liberally as other men of the same position in this or any other country? Of course, we must take into consideration, also, the financial ability of Canada. Now, let us look for a moment and see how the officers of these corps are paid, in comparison with officers in other similar positions. I have here a table showing the approximate pay of officers in the English army, the United States army, the North-west Mounted Police of Canada, and the permanent corps of Canada. I find that a lieutenant-colonel, after he has served for twelve years in the British army, gets pay amounting to \$133.25 per month, and may retire on a pension of \$101.25 per month. In the United States army, a lieutenant-colonel, after twelve years' service, gets \$225 per month, and can retire on \$120 a month. The Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police, a position of about the same rank as a lieutenant-colonel, gets \$216.80 a month, and can retire on a pension of \$52 a month; whereas, a lieutenant-colonel in the permanent corps only gets \$120 a month, and gets no retiring pension at all. A major in the English army, after twelve years' service, gets \$117 a month and a retiring gratuity of \$5,832. A major in the United States army gets \$250 a month, and can retire on \$187.50. An Assistant Commissioner in the North-west mounted police gets \$133.33 per month, and can retire on a pension of \$32 per month; whereas a major in the permanent corps of Canada only gets \$105 per month without any pension whatever. A captain in the British army, after twelve years' service, gets \$84.60 per month, and can retire on a gratuity of \$5,832. A captain in the United

States army gets \$180 per month, and can retire on \$150 per month. A superintendent of the North-west mounted police gets \$116.66 per month, and can retire on \$28 per month; whereas a captain in the permanent corps only gets \$105 per month without any pension. After twenty years' service, a lieutenant-colonel in the English army gets \$133.25, and can retire on a pension of \$121.50. In the United States army he gets \$333.33 per month, and a retiring pension of \$250 per month. A commissioner of the North-west mounted police receives \$216.80 per month, and a retiring allowance of \$86.64; whereas a lieutenant-colonel in the permanent corps in Canada only gets \$120 per month, and no pension, just the same pay as when he has served only five years. A major in the English army, after twenty years' service, gets \$117 per month, and a pension of \$81. In the United States a major gets \$291.67 per month, and a pension of \$213.75. An assistant commissioner of the North-west mounted police gets \$133.33 per month, with a retiring pension of \$53.32; whereas a major of the permanent corps gets \$105 per month and no pension. Now, I have shown the pay that officers in the different ranks get in those different services. I may state that the figures I have given are based on infantry pay. In the English service, and in the American service, the engineers, cavalry and artillery are paid on a far higher scale; but in our permanent corps, the pay is exactly the same for those arms of the service as it is for the infantry, which is, to say the least of it, a little hard. Now, let us look at the district staff. I find that an assistant adjutant-general of Imperial troops stationed, say, at Halifax, or some other foreign station, is paid at the rate of \$3,500 per annum, besides having a pension according to the length of service and the rank he holds; whereas the pay of one of our deputy-adjutants-general is \$1,700 per annum, and no pension. That is \$3,500 and a pension, against \$1,700 and no pension for the same service. A brigade-major in the Imperial service is paid \$3,000 a year, with a pension, according to his rank and service; our brigade-majors are paid \$1,200 a year, and no pension, or \$3,000 a year and pension, against \$1,200 a year and no pension. A staff paymaster in the Imperial service is paid \$2,230, with a pension, according to his rank and service; and a district paymaster in our own service gets the magnificent sum of \$600 per annum, for which he has to give bonds for \$20,000, himself in \$10,000, and two sureties in \$5,000 each. He is also supposed to be superintendent of stores, for which in many cases he is paid nothing extra. Besides the pay that I have quoted, these officers receive certain allowances, which, however, amount to very little, such as fuel and light in barracks; but as these allowances are based on the English allowances, it makes no difference whatever in the comparison between the two services.

Mr. Prior.

I think I hear some hon. gentlemen say: "Well, they should get along on that." But those hon. gentlemen should reflect upon the peculiar position in which an officer in one of these permanent corps is placed. In the first place, he must live as a gentleman. He must dress well, be neat and tidy at all times, in order to give an example to the men who are under him. Then he is obliged to do a certain amount of entertaining. As we all know, there is a continual stream of callers upon officers in barracks, and it is impossible to let them go away without offering them some sort of civility, the expense of which is drawn out of the officer's pocket. Then again, he is supposed to be present at all official ceremonies in the neighbourhood, and he is put to a certain expense in that way. He is also, if he is an energetic officer, always anxious that his men should be foremost in all manly sports, such as rifle shooting, cricket and football; and in order to enable his men to make a good appearance, he is often obliged to put his hands into his own pocket. Last of all, there is the item of the uniform, which is a very serious one. When I state that a uniform for a lieutenant-colonel, say, in the artillery, costs between \$500 and \$600, you will readily see that it is a most serious item for a man who is on small pay. Moreover, I have always observed that officers in these permanent corps seem to run on the same rule as curates, the smaller the pay the larger the family they have. Under these circumstances the uniform is a most serious item in the housekeeping. How different are the cases of a man in the Civil Service, or an ordinary business man? These have no uniform to buy, and unless they wish, they need not spend one cent in entertaining the public, or even their own friends. Now, let us see how the non-commissioned officers and men fare in a permanent corps. The men enlist for three years, and as soon as they are enlisted they are provided with a uniform and a complete outfit of clothes and boots. They have their rations provided them, of course, and they live in barracks. They get the large sum of 40 cents a day as pay. They also get from 2 to 7 cents a day as good conduct allowance, which, taken in connection with their daily pay, amounts, we will say, on the average, to about 43 cents per day. If a man behaves well and gets promoted to be a corporal, he gets some 70 cents a day; a sergeant, 80 cents a day; a staff-sergeant, \$1 a day; and a sergeant-major, \$1.25. It is not quite so bad for non-commissioned officers, although they have a lot of things to buy; but take men on 47 cents a day, and that is all the money they have to buy tobacco and sometimes a glass of beer, and any light articles of clothing they want, and it is readily seen that they have no chance to put by anything for a rainy day, or even to pay insurance on their lives. Now, let us take the North-west Mounted Police, a force that was brought into

existence four years later than the permanent corps of which I have been speaking. The officers of the North-west Mounted Police are on the superannuation list the same as the Civil Service. They are paid in proportion much more than the officers of the permanent corps, and therefore they can afford to pay into the superannuation fund. But the constables in that force are far better off than the men in the permanent corps. In that force a constable, if he behaves himself well, and stops with the colours for twenty years, is entitled, on retiring, to a pension of \$102.20 per annum. If he remains twenty-four years he gets a pension of \$132.56, and after thirty years he gets a pension of \$188.85. It is not very much, but still it is something to men of that class. So we see that there is a strong inducement for good men to remain in the service, if only for the pension. In this connection I may state that anybody who is at all conversant with a military organization, knows perfectly well—and I am sure that the military gentlemen who now hear me will back me up in the statement—that good, reliable non-commissioned officers, are the backbone and mainstay of any military organization. You cannot do without them. You may have poor men in the ranks, but you cannot do without good non-commissioned officers. As matters stand now in the permanent corps, it is found almost impossible to retain a good non-commissioned officer, as they have nothing whatever to look forward to. Take, for example, a young man joining at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three. After five or six years service, he may be promoted as sergeant. He is well up in everything that goes to make a soldier, and is simply invaluable to his regimental officers and to his company. But what outlook has that man got? He is in the prime of life, but the longer he remains in the force the more and more unfit he becomes for taking up and pursuing successfully any of the civilian occupations. That is equally true of officers as well as of the men, for the very nature of their occupation totally unfits them in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred to take up the ordinary routine of a civilian's life and make a livelihood for themselves and families. If these men saw a pension in future for them, even a very small one, they would be willing to stay in the service as long as they were physically and mentally fit to be there. They would make a splendid lot of non-commissioned officers, men of mature years who would command the respect of the men under them, and would be, in every way, qualified for the positions they held. The mere knowledge of a pension in the future would keep many men right who now go to the dogs when they join the ranks. This is one of the strongest arguments I can bring before the House, this keeping of good non-commissioned officers in the force, and it is one of the strongest arguments that can be brought forward in favour of a pension scheme for this

organization. As it is now this man is no lung ahead of him. He is totally unfit to fight his way in the world if he leaves the ranks. I know that in some of the corps the officers find it almost impossible to get good "non-coms" to take such positions as canteen-sergeants and pay-sergeants. The officers themselves are responsible for the money that these men handle, and unless you have a first-class man to take those positions, the officers almost invariably have themselves to meet certain losses incurred by those men. Now, Sir, a soldier in our days is in a very different position from a soldier of twenty-five years ago. In those days a young man of position who had got plenty of muscle and money could take his place in front of his men with an old non-commissioned officer behind him who would whisper the word of command in his ear, and push him into his place at every turn. But now-a-days when we have these breech-loading guns, with all their scientific paraphernalia, almost as hard to understand as an electrical engine, an officer must work and drill and study from morning till night, if he intends to keep up to his work, and be fit for the position he holds. This is also the case with the men—a much higher grade of intelligence is now required, and I think every inducement should be held out by the Government to enlist the best class of men possible. This House has approved of pensions being granted to members of the North-west mounted police, and what is the result? The result is that we have in the North-west to-day, if not the very finest, one of the finest bodies of men to be found anywhere in the world. The Civil Service are granted superannuation allowances, and this is one reason why the ranks of the service are filled. The United States Government give pensions, and very liberal ones, to their soldiers, although they do not grant any to the Civil Service. England and every other civilized country grants pensions, and therefore I feel the greater confidence in making an appeal for pensions to be granted in this country. Let us look at the Military College at Kingston, a college of which we are all proud. The Imperial Government grant a certain number of commissions in Her Majesty's army to graduates of that college. Take two young fellows as examples of graduates of that college. One takes a commission in the Imperial army and the other joins a regiment in his native land. The graduate who goes to England is sent to different parts of the world and obtains promotion more or less rapidly, and knows that when the time comes he will be able to retire on a comfortable pension for the rest of his life. How different is the other case. Although he possesses equal ability, promotion comes to him very slowly, and all the time he is haunted by the idea that after serving the best years of his life he may be thrown out of employment any moment, and he may not have a dollar on which to sustain himself the rest

of his life. I ask the Government if they do not think this is a stain on our national honour. Let us treat our militia force as liberally as we can. If the permanent corps are not worth maintaining, let us do away with them; if they are, let them be granted some pension in their later years of service. It is the fashion for a great many people to pool-pool the militia. I have heard that time and again, but those are the very men who, if any trouble arises, take precious good care to keep in the background while other men are turning out to fight. Rudyard Kipling says:

Oh makin' mock o' uniforms that guard you while you sleep,

Is cheaper than them uniforms, an' they're starvation cheap;

An' hustlin' drunken sodgers when they're going large a bit,

Is five times better b'usiness than paradin' in full kit. Then it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy ow's yer soul?"

But it's "Thin red line of 'eroes," when the drums begin to roll.

We aren't no thin red 'eroes, nor we aren't no blackguards too,

But single men in barricks, most remarkable like you;

An' if sometimes our conduct isn't all your fancy paints, Why, single men in barricks don't grow into plaster saints.

While it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' Tommy fall be'ind;

But it's "Please to walk in front, Sir" when there's trouble in the wind.

I do not pretend to say on what lines a pension scheme should be drawn up by the Government. When the first batteries were formed Sir George Cartier told several of the officers they could not do wrong in joining the force because the Government were bound to look after them. Since then they were led to believe that pensions would be granted them, and if rumour be true, not long ago a pension scheme was drawn up in the Militia Department; but the plan was never made public. But be that as it may, the hon. Minister of Militia and the General Officer commanding the forces could, if they would devote an hour or two to the subject, draw up a scheme that would be fair and equitable to all concerned. I hope they will do so without further delay. Before, however, such a scheme is put into force, I trust it will be generally understood that all the appointments to and promotions in the permanent corps will be made upon a strictly military basis. Let us eliminate politics altogether, and let "merit" be the only word by which they can obtain admission. In no other way can the service be brought up to a proper state of efficiency. Let the Government pension off some of the older officers, officers connected with the headquarters and district staffs and the permanent corps, men who have served their country faithfully and assiduously for a life-time. Let other officers in this way secure promotion, who, if they had been employed in any other service, would have secured promotion long ago, and

Mr. PRIOR.

let the vacancies be filled by graduates from the Royal Military College, or young officers connected with the active militia who have shown by examinations that they are qualified to take these positions. If that course is adopted, the country will see a wonderful advance in the efficiency of these militia corps. In conclusion, I desire to appeal to the Government and this House not to allow such a gross injustice to be continued in regard to a body of men who, if any trouble should arise, are the head and front of the militia force of Canada. The cost of such a scheme is comparatively small, and would be amply repaid by the increased efficiency of the force, and the money would be spent on men who, if ever, unfortunately, their services are required for the defence of our homes and country, will give a splendid account of themselves, worthy to be read side by side with the annals of the glorious deeds performed in the past by the grand old regiments of England. I had intended to move a resolution, had I not been prevented by the hon. member for North Norfolk's amendment, which was as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that a scheme should be devised by the Government whereby the permanent corps of the Canadian militia, the headquarters and district staffs, should, after a certain number of years' service, become entitled to receive from the Government pensions, so as to place them on a similar footing with similar organizations in other countries and with the Civil Service of Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the absence of my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia, I may be permitted to say a few words in regard to the question which has been submitted in a manner so very interesting to those who have listened to my hon. friend. I am quite sure if the Minister of Militia were in his place he would agree with me in expressing to my hon. friend his gratification at the manner in which he has presented the motion which he has just read to the House. The hon. gentleman's statement fairly bristled with information and statistics. When it was my privilege to preside over the Department of Militia, I was particularly interested in the subject that is now receiving the attention of hon. members. From the experience that I had acquired in the department, and from the opportunities which I had of studying the manner in which a measure of the kind spoken of by the hon. gentleman would affect the efficiency of the service, I felt at that time, as I feel to-day—and I am expressing my own personal views merely—that nothing could be done by the Government or the Parliament of Canada which would more increase the efficiency of the force than granting to those who are really the instructors of the whole force of Canada, as our permanent corps are supposed to be, pensions which would remunerate the men who had served their country in that capacity for the continued sacrifices which they had made in the profession they had adopted. Now, Sir, the ground has been

so fully covered by my hon. friend, whose experience in the matter of which he has spoken is probably as great as that of any other member of the Canadian force, that it would be useless for me to go into details. But, Sir, so important did I consider the question from the stand-point of the efficiency of the service, that when I was Minister of Militia I felt it my duty to prepare a Bill, which I should have liked to submit to the House, providing for pensions for the different members of the permanent corps, and I may say without betraying any secret that the basis upon which that Bill was formulated was the Imperial list of pensions. While taking the Imperial pensions as a starting point, in framing the Bill I reduced considerably the rate of pensions which I should have liked to propose to be given to the Canadian force. Now, Sir, under the system which obtains in Canada to-day, in the absence of Imperial forces, we have no other means of training the militia force of Canada than the permanent schools, which are practically schools of instruction for the different branches of the service. In the old days, when the old garrisons of England were to be seen in all the fortified places of Canada, the Imperial soldiers were the material used for the purpose of training our militia force, and those who, like myself, took an interest in militia matters years ago, remember well that the training to be had in the old schools under the old system was an excellent thing. But since we ceased to have the advantage of having in Canada garrisons of the Imperial army, it became a necessity to form the nucleus of a permanent force composed of trained men, who, in a moment of urgency might be used as pivot men, so that around every trained man you might train eight or ten men of the militia force, and in that way lay the foundation of a force that would be invaluable in defending Canada against any attack that might be made against her frontier. There is no other way of keeping up these permanent schools than by having connected with them men who will give up their whole time, as my hon. friend suggests, to studying the intricacies of the profession which they have adopted, and I venture the opinion that to the soldier who wishes to become efficient in his profession, it is a study of every day, almost of every moment, and the whole of his time must be given up absolutely and completely to military matters. If that be so, it is evident that the man who has given the best years of his life to that profession, serving his country in the training schools of Canada, is incapable at a given moment of going back to the ordinary pursuits of life. He is unfit for them; he has lost the habits without which a business man cannot succeed in commercial life, and he has arrived at that age when it is impossible for him to strike out afresh and carve out for himself a new career. Under these circumstances, I think it only right that Canada should provide for these men in some such way as she provides

pensions for the mounted police force in the North-west. I ask hon. gentlemen how they can draw a division line between a military force of mounted police and such a military force as our permanent corps? I say there cannot be any difference in these two forces, and if it was thought right and proper that pensions should be provided for the mounted police, I fail to see how it is possible to deny that the same liberality should be extended to the men who perform a service to Canada in another direction. Although at this late period of the session my hon. friend hardly expects that this question can be taken up, I do hope—and, I repeat, I am not speaking on behalf of the Government, but am expressing my own individual opinion, as one who has been for a number of years in the Department of Militia and has had an opportunity of studying the question of how best to increase the efficiency of the service—I hope that my gallant friend will bring up this question again next year and submit it to the judgment of the House. If he does, and presents to Parliament the views which he has presented to-day and the strong reasons he has urged, I think he must succeed in obtaining for the permanent corps of Canada that measure of relief and liberality to which I think they are fairly entitled at the hands of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I had not the good fortune to hear the speech of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior); but I have no doubt that it was an elaborate presentation of the views which he has repeatedly pressed upon me privately during the present session, and to which I have listened with considerable respect, as I always do, to what he has to say. Of course, my hon. friend understands, as the House does, the economical spirit of the present Government, for we must consider the question from a financial point of view; but I shall have great pleasure in weighing the matter, and if I can see my way to making such provision for the old age of the members of the permanent corps, I will lay it before my colleagues, and, if we decide on favourable action, something will be brought down at the next session of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway Construction, \$2,000

Mr. HAGGART. Before, Mr. Chairman, you consider any items of railway expenditure, I may be permitted to explain, as briefly as possible, the position of the Government railways which have been under my charge for some time past. The House will remember the numerous discussions about the large expenditure over the receipts, and the many suggestions made that there should be an equilibrium restored some time or other between them. I took the management of the department in January, 1892, and found that the deficit for the fiscal year ending July

previously, on the Interoceanic Railway was \$767,379.17.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is for 1891 ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; and for the seven months ending 31st January, 1892, the net loss was \$751,828.06. This was an alarming deficit, and I concluded that if things went on at that rate to the end of the year, the deficit for that year would be at least \$1,000,000. I may state that I had been in the House for some time previous, but had not, before taking charge of the department, studied the question, and not being acquainted with the details, I was not able to speak authoritatively on the subject. I immediately called upon all the officers of the department, and, after consultation with them, I came to the conclusion that there could be a different state of affairs established in the management of the road. They advised me that if the Interoceanic Railway were managed by a firm hand, and if the economies recommended by them were practised, the result would be a large saving in the expenditure. I determined that this should be done, and asked the chief officers to report to me the particular plan under which these savings could be accomplished. I received their reports, and acquiesced in their suggestions, and directed that steps should be taken at once for the purpose of carrying out these economies. The first result was a reduction in the regular staff of men employed by the railway, of 300 men on the Interoceanic Railway, and twenty men on the Prince Edward Island division. I also resolved to remodel and make a reduction in the train service, which would not interfere at all with the rates charged, and afford to the different portions of the Maritime provinces the full accommodation it was necessary they should have in order to carry out all the requirements of traffic. In this way, I was enabled to make a considerable saving, the figures of which I will give later. In 1890-91, as I said before, the net loss on the railway was \$767,375. In 1891-92, the net loss was \$612,204.20, showing an improvement in that year of \$115,170.93. I resolved that it was important to keep the road in first-class condition. Upon going over it, I found that the road bed and everything required to constitute a first-class railway they had down there. They have as good a railway track, alignments, and gradients, as any road in Canada ; and everything in connection with the railway I found to be in first-class order. In order to maintain that road in that state of efficiency, I decided there should be no reduction in the number of regular track men employed. On the other hand, on looking into the mechanical department of the road under Mr. Whitney, I found the staff was largely in excess of the requirements, and I resolved that a change should be made in the management of that particular branch. I recommended the superannuation of Mr. Whitney, and appointed

in his place a man named Mr. Brown, who had been a long time superintendent of the mechanical department of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and occupied the same position in the Grand Trunk Railway, and who came to me besides with excellent references. I put him in charge of the mechanical department, and I find that all its requirements are fulfilled as well now as before, with a reduction of the staff of 300 men. The staff of the employees in that department is less by 500 than it was at the close of the calendar year of 1891, and, as I anticipated, the present staff is performing all the duties required and which were performed by a much larger staff before. That has enabled me to save in wages alone, in that department, the sum of \$124,000 a year, besides a large saving in material. For when you have men in excess of the requirements, they are kept at work some way or another and material is wasted. For instance, if a locomotive comes in with perhaps a broken wheel, it may be found that a dozen other places require repairs, though they may not be absolutely needed ; and when you have a force of 300 to 350 men in excess of requirements, the engine will be patched up all round, probably, more than necessary. This requires, besides the wages of the men, an expenditure of material in excess of what would be absolutely necessary to keep the engine in repair. In other departments of the railway the number of regular men is reduced by eighty-three, resulting in a further reduction in expenditure of \$32,000. Then the regular train service was remodelled. There are less trains running, and I have been enabled to make a saving by this means of \$160,000 a year, and besides, I have given strict orders that no unnecessary sidings, stations and all those things, which have, perhaps, been indulged in in a lavish manner hitherto, should be constructed or should be made in as economical a manner as possible, so that the material is considerably reduced and the expenditure hitherto made in that direction is saved.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman given all the savings he has made ?

Mr. HAGGART. I have given the savings in wages of the men, the reduction of the regular men and the saving in train mileage. I will give the savings in detail later on. There is another branch, the Prince Edward Island Railway. The traffic upon this railway is light, and the earnings as a consequence are very small in proportion. I went over that with my officers, and very carefully looked into it, and I find it impossible to make much saving there. The loss on this road is about \$80,000 a year. There may be a saving of \$30,000 a year. I expect to make a saving of at least \$20,000 a year. I do not like to be too sanguine in my expectations ; but I will give the state of affairs for the last seven months, for which I have the figures, and I can give an estimate

Mr. HAGGART.

of what it will be to the end of the year. I think the result will show that in no future year will there be a greater loss than about \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year. I think you may expect that the receipts and expenditure up to the end of the present year will about balance, and that the loss on the two systems will be apparently equivalent to the loss of \$80,000 which has hitherto been sustained on the Prince Edward Island section of the road. For the half year ending the 31st of December last, the working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway were \$1,597,757.72, and the earnings \$1,595,047.13, showing a small loss of \$2,700.59, and, as regards the Prince Edward Island Railway, for the same period the working expenses were \$130,391.43, and the earnings \$92,073.90, showing a loss of \$38,377.53. I may, perhaps, compare that with the corresponding six months of the year previous. The Intercolonial Railway working expenses were \$2,164,715.78, and the earnings \$1,582,763.60, showing a loss of \$581,953.18.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can the hon. Minister tell us how the mileage expenses of the Prince Edward Island branch compare with those of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. They are a little higher; it costs a little more to run the road. You will see a thorough comparison made in my report, not only between it and the Intercolonial Railway, but also between it and every other road in Canada, and you will find that the mileage expenses on the Intercolonial Railway are less than on any large railway in Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are speaking of the expenses under the new system?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The expense of running the Intercolonial Railway is less per car mile than it is on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, and we are carrying freight and passengers on the Intercolonial Railway for what it actually costs any other railway in the country to carry them. For the corresponding six months of last year, the working expenses of the Prince Edward Island Railway were \$198,433.85, and the earnings \$93,774.51, showing a loss of \$104,659.34. The total loss on the two branches was \$686,611.52. As hon. gentlemen may notice, after I took charge of the road in January, there was a surplus in its operations between then and the end of the fiscal year. I do not expect that the surplus will be as great between January last and the end of this fiscal year as it was the year before. If it were, the receipts on the Intercolonial Railway for this fiscal year would be largely in excess of the expenditure. The loss on the Government railways for the last six months of 1891-92 was \$681,611, while the loss for the corresponding period for 1892-93 was \$41,028.12. I will give how the details, which I have no doubt will be interesting, showing the economies effected in the different

branches of the railway service. I have not got the returns to the end of December, so I will give them up to the end of November. The mechanical department for the five months ending November, 1891, the expenditure was \$919,135.96, and for the five months ending November, 1892, \$761,964.62, a reduction in the five months of \$157,441.31. In the traffic arrangement the expenditure for the five months ending November, 1891, was \$261,204.87, and for the five months ending November, 1892, \$254,228.03, a reduction of \$6,976.84. In the maintenance of way and works, the expenditure for the five months ending November, 1891, was \$869,465.43, and for the five months ending November, 1892, \$465,617.60, a reduction of \$403,847.83. In explanation of the large saving in this last department, I ought to say that a large portion of it, \$129,141.29, is due to the charge for rail renewals, being less by that amount for the five months than for the five months of the year before. It is possible that the rail renewals between January and July next, the end of the fiscal year, may be far in excess of the same period last year, and the total expenditure this year may be nearly as large as last.

Mr. CHARLTON. What weight of rail are you using in your rail renewals?

Mr. HAGGART. Sixty-seven pounds. At the end of the current year I do not think there will be any loss in running the Prince Edward Island Railway; I may be too sanguine, but I think perhaps that I will be able even to make a better showing than that, and that I will be able to establish an equilibrium between receipts and expenditure. I have no doubt that if the economies which have been practised are persisted in there will be no deficit on the running of the Intercolonial Railway, certainly no deficit greater than the amount that is lost in running the Prince Edward Island Railway. This can be done, and the road still be kept in as efficient condition as it is at present, the track in as good order, the superstructure in as good order, the stations in as good order, and the rolling stock quite as efficient as at present. When I went over the road I found it was one of the best built and best equipped roads I had ever seen. I found no rolling stock in excess of the requirements of the road, and I believe that with proper economies this road can be kept in as efficient a state as it is at present without any serious loss, or with but a small loss, to the country. This has been accomplished by the parties themselves who have been in charge of the road. I have transferred the management of the road to Mr. Pottinger, under a set of instructions which I have laid on the Table of the House. I have every faith in his management of the road; I believe that it will be acceptable to the people of the Maritime provinces, and especially so to the people of the Dominion. I believe he will manage the road in an economical manner, and at the same time, attend to the reasonable wants of

the people of the Maritime provinces. I think he has an excellent staff under him. I have been obliged to superannuate two gentlemen. Mr. Busby and Mr. Taylor. Both were faithful, hard working men, but they have grown old and were no longer able to perform their duties properly. They have been very faithful servants of the Intercolonial Railway. I have put in their place two younger and more active men. I think that the staff of the Intercolonial Railway now is in an excellent condition. The officials take a pride in the road, and there is an "esprit de corps" among them which augurs well for the efficient management of the road. Now, Sir, I have given a general résumé of the principal economies we have adopted, and when the items come up separately I will be glad to explain them in detail, and to answer any questions hon. gentlemen may ask.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman give us his figures again? I have got the machine department, 300 men, and \$161,000; in the mechanical department, \$124,000, and in the other departments, \$32,000. Is that right?

Mr. HAGGART. There is the train service remodelled, that is \$160,000. There is a saving in the mechanical staff of wages alone of \$124,000. We have reduced the regular staff by 82 men, at a saving of \$32,000; and there is a saving in the reduction of train mileage of \$160,000. The books show all this in detail. The accounts are kept under three general headings, mechanical, traffic and maintenance of way and works. You will see in the railway report what each of these items consists of. I gave you in detail the reductions for the five months ending in November.

Mr. PERRY. I am sure the House and the country will be glad to know, from the statement just made by the Minister of Railways, that a great saving has been effected in the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and that it has been done without the country sustaining any loss as to the efficiency of the road. That is very commendable, and I am much pleased that such a large saving has been effected and that the railway is not going to be a burden on this country. Economy is always commendable; in fact, we might economize all around. I am also well pleased that a saving has been effected in the working of the Prince Edward Island Railway. But I am not so well pleased with the management of that road, under the administration of the hon. gentleman. For instance, before the hon. gentleman took charge of the Prince Edward Island Railway, there was a special train leaving Summerside in the morning about six o'clock and arriving in Charlottetown at ten o'clock, and it would leave Charlottetown at three in the afternoon to return. Now, that enabled any person to visit Charlottetown and do their business and get back again in good time. But the hon. gen-

Mr. HAGGART.

tleman has done away with that special train, and now if people want to go to Charlottetown from Summerside they have to wait for the regular train, and very often it is four or half-past four o'clock when that train gets into Charlottetown, and as the offices are closed at four o'clock, they have to stay there the remainder of that day, the whole of the next day, and leave Charlottetown the next morning at eight o'clock, and get back to Summerside about eleven or twelve. The consequence of that is that persons who want to visit Charlottetown prefer to drive their own teams, if they have any, as they can make the journey in a shorter time than by railway. There is another thing. The special train leaves Charlottetown for Tignish at six o'clock in the morning, and it passes Emerald Junction about an hour before the Cape Tormentine train arrives there, so that passengers and the mail from Cape Traverse going to Summerside, instead of having the benefit of that train, have to remain in Summerside the whole day. Now, last summer under the present arrangement, the train that left Charlottetown for Tignish in the morning at eight o'clock did not reach Tignish, as a general rule, till twelve o'clock the same night, or two o'clock the next morning because a freight train had been taken off between Summerside and Charlottetown, and this train had to do the whole work. Just fancy a lot of these small flag stations on that road without a lock to the door, with barrels of flour and molasses and goods of all kinds exposed. If it rains the flour is spoiled. Any hon. gentleman can see at once the hardship which individuals must suffer who have to use this railway. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways complains that the Prince Edward Island Railway is not paying. Well, perhaps, it is not; but we must remember that the Prince Edward Island Railway is not the only public work in Canada that does not pay. How many canals have we in Canada that do not pay? It would take me hours to enumerate all the public works in Canada that do not pay. It was the Government of Canada itself that was anxious to take the railway off the hands of Prince Edward Island. That railway was entirely built by the people of the Island themselves, and the only thing this Government has ever done for that railway are the repairs they have made to it since. In 1873 every possible inducement was offered to the people of that island to enter Confederation, and one of the inducements was that the Government of Canada would take the railway off their hands and pay them \$3,500,000. The interest at 5 per cent upon that capital would be enough to pay the expenses of running that road, if we had it in our hands to-day. One would think from the speech made by the Minister of Railways, that that railway was built by the Government of Canada, and that Canada made a present of three millions and a half to the people of Prince Edward Island, when such

is not the case. I believe myself that if the road was in the hands of a company who would run it in the interest of the Island, it could be made to pay. The hon. gentleman says he went over the road. I dare say he did, but I am doubtful if he got out of his car while on the Island. I believe he ate and slept on the car, and did not come into contact with any one who could tell him of the wants and needs of the road, and the proper way to work it. He knows we had two trains between Charlottetown and Summerside, and now we have only one. The Government tell us by the census returns, that the people of Canada are progressing, but how is it in Prince Edward Island? The simple fact that he has cut off train accommodation in Prince Edward Island, gives the lie to the census returns now before the House, so far as they relate to Prince Edward Island. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with cutting off one train, but he closed a station at Miscouche. That is a thriving settlement inhabited mostly by French Acadians. Their treatment by the hon. gentleman reminds one of the fate of the man who, in travelling from Jerusalem to Jerico, fell among thieves. The station at Freetown, also a beautiful and thriving settlement, has been closed. The people had the accommodation of a station agent, and telegraphic communication, and all this induced several capitalists to invest their money in putting up warehouses and building stores in the vicinity of Freetown station. But now the station is closed, and there is no one to receive the freight, there is no one to receive or send telegraphic messages, and there is no railway business done. Why did the hon. gentleman close this station? Because almost every man around that station is a Liberal. It would be nearly as hard to find a Tory around Freetown station as to find a needle in a haystack. That is the reason why the people must be punished. If the hon. gentleman has any other reason, let him state it. If he was asked to build a new station and refused, I would say there was some sense in it; but here was a station built at a cost from \$1,500 to \$2,000, and a telegraph operator and station agent placed there. The people were induced, after many years, to invest capital in putting up buildings and going into business, but as soon as the present Minister of Railways comes into power he says, in the interest of economy, I am not going to give station accommodation to those Grits around Freetown. I do not believe he has any other reason for closing the station. He says it is in the interest of economy. Well, let us have economy all around; let us have economy in canals, let us stop expending money on canals and railways that are not paying. I would like to know how much these canals have paid for which we are asked here to vote \$150,000. How much has the Tay Canal paid? What is it worth to Canada? I doubt if it is worth more than the Prince Edward Island Railway. If the hon. gen-

tleman is sick of the railway, and does not want to work it, and afford that accommodation to which the people are entitled, let him return it to the people of the Island and they will find means of working it. The whole trade of the railway is confined to the Island, and if a continuous communication could be opened with the mainland, the road would pay well. Why did it pay in years gone by, better than it does now? Will hon. gentlemen compare the general expenditures and receipts for 1874 with those of recent years? If they will make such a comparison, they will find that we have not the same traffic now as we had then. The truth is that we are hemmed in by duties on everything that goes out of and comes in the Island. When our people ship products they are met not only with freight charges, but with heavy duties. The 1,250,000 acres of land in the Island are more fertile than an equal number of acres in any portion of the Dominion. Why, then, are the people not more prosperous? It is because we have not markets there. The Government have placed such restrictions on our trade that we have no markets. If we had a large city like Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, St. John or Halifax, it would afford a home market. But we know that, under our present arrangements, the Island does not possess any manufactories, and will not do so for a number of years, although no less than 173 boot and shoe factories appear in the Island census. But if we cannot have manufactories, we can feed the people who are employed in them. As regards the savings effected by the Minister of Railways, I am glad he has been able to effect these economies, and I shall be glad if he is able to carry out such a policy on the Island Railway, provided he affords the accommodation to which the people are entitled. At the present time, however, any one going from Summerside to Charlottetown to transact business in any of the public offices occupies the best part of three days. The train from Cape Traverse to Emerald Junction on the main line arrives one hour too late to meet the express from Charlottetown to Tignish, and a passenger must remain at Summerside before he can cross to Pointe du Chêne. If the train were started one hour sooner, it would be able to reach Summerside in time to meet the boat crossing to Pointe du Chêne, and from that point a passenger could travel to Montreal. Time is precious with the people of the Island as it is with persons in other parts of Canada. Moreover, our people desire to secure the best accommodation possible. On no railway is there a higher tariff paid than on the Island road. I desire also to point out to the Minister the desirability of running a special train from Summerside to Charlottetown, which would allow people to do business in a day and return.

Mr. McALISTER. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the

lack of accommodation that exists in different sections of my county for want of proper facilities for loading freight. Several mill-owners who ship from three to six car-loads of lumber per week during the summer season, are obliged to haul it three or four miles to the nearest loading place, which involves larger expense as well as inconvenience. All this expense, or at least a large portion of it, would be avoided by placing short sidings in the railway track. These sidings would not only be convenient to mill-owners, but would also tend to increase the volume of trade over the road. These sidings could be put in at a very small expense, and I think the increase in trade arising therefrom would far more than compensate the Railway Department for any expense that would be incurred in putting them in. As we know, the lumber industry is one of the most important in the province of New Brunswick, and I think it is the duty of the Government to stimulate that industry as far as possible. I have made application on several occasions for these sidings and have hitherto been refused; but I hope that the hon. Minister of Railways will now take the matter into his favourable consideration and have them put in. I may say, that these sidings do not come in the same category as those the hon. Minister referred to as being unnecessary. I assure him that they are absolutely necessary. I desire to refer to another matter that has given a great deal of dissatisfaction and given cause for many complaints in my county—that is the train service. There is only one express running daily each way, between Moncton and Rivière du Loup. These trains run through the northern part of the province of New Brunswick about midnight, and only stop at regular stations, and consequently they afford no convenience at all for local travel. No complaint is made of this. There are, in addition to these, two regular trains running between Moncton and Campbellton, one being a mixed train and the other a freight train. The mixed train for the south leaves Campbellton about half-past five in the morning, and the other an hour later. Returning, the freight train gets in from Moncton about 7.30 in the evening, the other about 8.30. The result is, that people doing business in Campbellton and Dalhousie, have to leave their home at night, remain over night at Campbellton or Dalhousie, do their business the next day, remain the next night; whereas, if a regular freight train were put on, leaving Moncton in the evening, and reaching Campbellton and Dalhousie in the morning, and one going south in the evening, people could leave their homes in the morning, do their business during the day, and return the same day. The trains I have referred to, were running several years, and were only taken off a year and a half ago; and if they were replaced every cause of dissatisfaction and

Mr. McALISTER.

complaint would be removed. The extra cost of putting them on would be very little if any. Special freight trains are constantly running, and the regular freight trains would take part of the freight which is carried by the specials, so that the number of specials could be reduced. People from the north, for a distance of about sixty miles, going to Campbellton or Dalhousie to do their business, have to come down at night and spend two nights and a day, just as people have to do coming from the south. One freight train from the north in the morning would remove the difficulty experienced by people from that section. I hope that the hon. Minister of Railways will see his way clear to have these trains restored, as soon as possible, and in that way remove the great inconvenience and the great injustice that the people suffer under the present arrangement. I must congratulate the hon. Minister upon the able manner in which he has managed the railway during the short time that he has had it under his charge, and succeeding as he has in reducing so materially the deficit that so long existed. While I admit that economy is necessary in the management of the railway, as well as in everything else, yet I think that, in economizing, the rights and claims of the public should be kept prominently in view, and nothing should be done to infringe on the rights or privileges of the people. Before taking my seat, I would bear testimony to what the Minister of Railways has said regarding the manager at Moncton. I have had the pleasure of being acquainted with him for the last ten years and have had a great deal to do with him, in a business way, and in every instance I have found him upright and prompt; and, from his extensive experience in railway management, together with his ability, uprightness and promptness, I am sure his management will give every possible satisfaction.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a few words on this question. I do not wish to detain the Committee at any great length, but this is undoubtedly a very important subject. I am glad to have heard the statement which the hon. Minister of Railways has made this afternoon. I congratulate him on the reduction of expenses that he has accomplished; but at the same time I want to bring to his notice the proof which he has given us to-day of the statements that have been made in this House from year to year that gross extravagance characterized the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Members on this side of the House have drawn the attention of the Government to the fact that the number of hands employed on the railway was altogether in excess of what was required, and we have to-day from the Minister of Railways the open and frank confession that these charges of ours were true; because he has informed us that, al-

though the earnings of the road have not increased, save and except \$17,000, this year over last year, yet he has been able to make a reduction of some 300 in the number of hands in the mechanical department. I presented a statement to this House, pointing out very clearly and distinctly where the drain was, and where the screws were loose, and the hon. Minister of Railways challenged the correctness of my statement. Now, what was my statement last year? I stated that on the Canadian Pacific Railway it cost \$102 per mile for the repair of cars, while on the Intercolonial Railway it cost \$460 per mile, and on the Grand Trunk Railway, which has double the passenger traffic and double the tonnage per mile of the Intercolonial Railway, it cost \$425 per mile. The hon. Minister shakes his head.

Mr. HAGGART. I think your figures must be entirely incorrect.

Mr. McMULLEN. Probably when he comes down next year he will have the verification of the statement I make to-day, just as he has to-day the verification of the statement I made last year. I charged last year that there was gross extravagance in connection with the management of the mechanical department. Now, Sir, it is clear that there was gross extravagance in connection with that very portion of the service, and we have the confession of this by the Minister's statement that he has very considerably reduced the staff in the repair shops. This proves that for years we have been indulging in a course of extravagance and recklessness in the operation of the road, which hon. gentlemen have equally for years denied when we pointed it out to them. The admission of the Minister of Railways that he has been able to reduce the staff by some 300 men gives us some idea of the mismanagement of this road. The total expenses per mile of the Grand Trunk Railway are \$4,113, the total expenses of operating the Canadian Pacific Railway per mile are \$1,853, while the total expenses of the Intercolonial Railway are \$3,211 per mile. The Grand Trunk Railway carried double the number of passengers and double the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and yet the Intercolonial Railway cost for operation within \$900 per mile what it cost to operate the Grand Trunk Railway. I believe there is yet room for considerable reduction. I think we have no less than three auditors on that line, unless the hon. gentleman has reduced the number. The principle of keeping the accounts of this road was altered some years ago. The late Mr. Mackenzie only charged to capital what really should be charged to that account, but when Sir Charles Tupper got control, he charged all the additional rolling stock to capital and not to working account. When an engine broke down, he put on a new one in its place, and charged it to capital account. I would like to know if any new engines were put on in place of those worn out. The hon. gentleman has told us that

the rolling stock is far in excess of what is required, which would not have been the case had the road been properly managed. In that case, we would not have had rolling stock going into decay on sidings, as, no doubt is the case now. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the number of engines put on the road this year in place of the engines which have been used up?

Mr. HAGGART. There are no charges to capital account for any engines put on this year. The only charges against capital account are what will be voted direct by this House. I am putting on two very large and powerful engines, and am asking a vote for that to be applied to capital account.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many new engines have been put on in place of those used up?

Mr. HAGGART. We did not put any on.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the Minister made any allowance in his Estimates for the wear and tear of engines in use? He claims a reduction in working expenses. Has he estimated in that calculation the wear and tear of engines?

Mr. HAGGART. My instructions are that the rolling stock shall be kept in as good order at the end of the year as in the beginning.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the rolling stock at the end of twelve months cannot be as good as it was at the beginning.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be a great deal better though no new stock put on.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman must admit that the rolling stock wears out and cannot be better after use than it was before. What is the number now under repair at Moncton?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will wait till the different items come up I will then have all the details.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman intimated that he had not reduced the number of track hands. What is the number per mile on the road?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is from three to four men on each section of six or seven miles, or about half a man to each mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any reduction in the staff of baggagemen about the stations?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been a reduction of about eighty men around the stations, baggagemen and others. The truckmen have not been reduced at all. We make engines down at Moncton to replace those worn out. We are constantly building new engines in the shops?

Mr. McMULLEN. How many were worn out and how many were built to replace those last year?

Mr. HAGGART. There is an average of about two per year worn out and they are replaced.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any reduction made in the staff of telegraph operators, train despatchers and so on?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a reduction of one operator in the despatch office at Truro, one clerk in Moncton, etc. The list is a very long one, and I will have it copied and laid before the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I merely wanted to find out what reductions were made in the different classes of men engaged. The hon. gentleman has told us that he dismissed eighty men employed around the stations and I would like to know what men he has dismissed from the telegraphic service.

Mr. HAGGART. In the traffic department there has been a reduction of thirty-eight, in the stores there has been a reduction of twenty-one, in the water service there has been a reduction of eleven, in the architect department there has been a reduction of ten. That is all outside of the mechanical department. In the mechanical department there has been a reduction of 290.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad these reductions have been made. My reason for asking with regard to the telegraphic department was that there appeared to be men employed there in excess of what was absolutely required. I hope the Minister will continue his investigation, and I congratulate him upon the reductions he has made. I believe that he deserves credit, and I hope he will succeed in bringing down the expenditure so that the country will not have to suffer an annual loss on the working of this road. I hope the day will come when the Intercolonial Railway, instead of being an annual loss, will yield the country some revenue.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I would like the hon. Minister to explain upon what principle the superannuation allowances are fixed? When Mr. Whitney was superannuated, I am informed, he was allowed twenty years service. But Mr. Whitney has been in the service since 1861, upwards of thirty years, and under the Superannuation Act, I understand, that service previous to Confederation is counted in estimating superannuation on allowances. It is said also that Mr. Taylor, who was superannuated at the same time, was allowed half his salary, which would be an allowance of twenty-five years service. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman could give some explanation. A petition was sent to the Minister of Railways some time ago by a number of the employees at Moncton who desired to be admitted to the outside civil service. That petition has some seventeen names appended to it. Many of the signers are district superintendents, and they comprise the assistant freight agent, the assistant auditor, the assistant engineer and some of the chief clerks and others. They occupy positions of great responsibility, and, as far as I can understand, they are entitled to be admitted to the Civil Service just as well as the heads

Mr. HAGGART.

of departments and others now on the list. What has been the decision of the hon. gentleman with regard to that petition?

Mr. HAGGART. I inquired into the case of Mr. Whitney, and find that he has been allowed the full amount of superannuation to which he is entitled under the law. Although he was in the service of the Government from 1861, yet he did not contribute to the fund during all that time, and he has only been an officer, entitled under the Act of superannuation, from the time we began to count his years of service. I referred his case to the Department of Justice, because on first intimation I thought he had been done an injustice, but the Department of Justice informs me that he has been given his full superannuation allowance. I addressed a letter to the hon. gentleman yesterday in which I gave all details and all the reasons for the course I have taken.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I have not got that letter.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman ought to get it some time to-day. With regard to the application of certain employees to be admitted into the outside Civil Service and entitled to superannuation, I will bring their request before Council, but I have talked to the Finance Minister about it, and I am afraid that our superannuation fund is so loaded down at present that it will be very difficult to grant their petition.

Mr. KENNY. As we are dealing with the superannuation of the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the case of Mr. Johnson, who, I think, was as long in the service of the Intercolonial Railway as Mr. Whitney. He was in charge of the mechanical department of the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax. In view of the circumstances under which the committee is detained, I do not presume, at this moment to go into the general policy of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, as at present conducted by my hon. friend; I wish simply to say that to me, personally, it would have been more gratifying if the Minister had been able to show that under his management the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway had increased, or that the number of passengers carried over it, had increased. To my mind that would have been of more consequence than the saving of a sum of money—not that I am disposed to underestimate the necessity which exists for economy. But looking at the circumstances under which the Intercolonial Railway was built, its main object being to encourage and to develop an inter-provincial trade, I must certainly say that whilst I am ready to accord every measure of praise to my hon. friend for the zeal with which he has undertaken the duties of his office—yet, to me, personally, it would have been more gratifying if he could have shown that the inter-provincial and ex-

port trade over the Intercolonial Railway had increased. I regret to see that his report shows that there has been a decrease in the quantity of freight carried over that road, and in the number of passengers. I think that one of the great difficulties which my hon. friend has had to deal with in this matter, is due largely to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway does not control the freight at points where it initiates in the West. I am told that the Intercolonial Railway has traffic arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. I know, as a matter of fact, that when shippers of grain had made contracts with steam-ship owners to ship grain by way of Halifax during the month of November last, from points west and north of Stratford, when the shippers applied for cars at those different points, both these railways replied that they would not give their cars to the Intercolonial Railway. That proves conclusively that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, through their agents, wished to divert that traffic from the Intercolonial Railway to other points. When these shippers of grain went to the Intercolonial Railway, the officials of that road, informed them that the Grand Trunk Railway Company at that moment had 400 of their cars. The shippers applied again to the Grand Trunk Railway, and repeated the statement which had been made to them by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Grand Trunk's reply was: Possibly we had those cars, we may be responsible for them, but they passed out of our jurisdiction. As a consequence of the inability of these shippers to get cars for their grain, they could not get the grain to Halifax in time for shipment in November, and they were, therefore, subjected to penalties, and the expense of storing that grain. Now, I am not disposed to blame the Intercolonial Railway for the refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway to supply cars, but I point it out as one of the difficulties which exist in the management of that railway.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN LIVE STOCK INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. HAZEN moved that Bill No. 119 (from the Senate) to incorporate the Canadian

Live Stock Insurance Company be read the first and second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that Rule 60 be suspended.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIERE moved that the fourth report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better explain the recommendations contained in the report. I observe there are some increases recommended, making quite an additional expenditure.

Mr. LARIVIERE. The only increase recommended is with respect to the salary paid to Mr. Boyce, the proof-reader and assistant to the Chief Stenographer. Mr. Boyce, who has a great deal of work to perform not only during the session but after the session in preparing the index and completing the work, has only received so far \$1,000 per annum as salary. On his application, and on full examination of the case made by the committee, it is recommended that his salary be increased by \$200. It is now asked that the House will allow this salary to be paid to Mr. Boyce and that the report of the committee be concurred in.

Report concurred in.

STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That the eleventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines be concurred in, and the Clerk of the House ordered to have a copy of the amended Rule 49 sent to those persons giving notice in the "Canada Gazette" of their intention to apply to Parliament for the passing of a Private Bill, together with a notification that the said Rule will be strictly adhered to for the future.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That the resolution reported from the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines on Saturday, the 25th March last, be made a Standing Order of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CARLETON BRANCH RAILROAD.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) to confirm the sale of the Carleton, city of St. John, Branch Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill is simply for the purpose of confirming an agreement which provided for the amount to be paid and which was authorized by chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes of 1891.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Voters' Lists of 1892.—(Mr. Foster.)

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he recollects what he told us in the House on the 13th of March, the day he first explained the French Treaty to the House. In reply to a question which I brought up he said :

We propose to discriminate neither against Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Belgium, nor, under our present intention, any other country in the world. My hon. friend wondered if France knew it. She knew it, and agreed to the treaty under that very well-known proposition.

The hon. gentleman on several subsequent occasions said that he would bring down papers which would show that. Several assortments of papers have been brought down, and I think I have looked through them pretty carefully, but I do not find anything among them which would show that France knew of this intention of the Government. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether we may expect any papers to be brought down that would show that ?

Mr. FOSTER. The last papers were laid on the Table on Saturday, I think.

Mr. EDGAR. I saw those and they do not explain any contention of that kind. I would like to know when the hon. gentleman will bring down any such papers ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there are any other papers to be brought down. I do not recollect just now what the words are. As I heard them from my hon. friend, probably they were a little wider than I had intended. What I meant to say was that the treaty did not give France any exclusive advantages over any other country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Finance told us on Saturday that he would to-day make a statement in regard to the treaty. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he will do so to-day ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition asked me if I would be able to state to-day whether we propose to ratify the treaty this session or not. I said that I thought I would be able to tell him on Monday. I can only say, as I have stated before to the House, communications are going on between ourselves and the authorities in Great Britain, but they have not come to a point at which I can make a definite statement yet. I hope to be able to, to-morrow or Wednesday, and so I would not like to say anything further than I have already said.

Mr. HAGGART.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask when we may expect the return that was ordered on the 6th February with regard to the nationality, religion, and so on, of civil servants ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know. I think my hon. friend will have to be prepared not to get that this session. We have no documents in Ottawa that would show the information that he requires. The civil servants will have to be asked for the information, and, as my hon. friend will see, that will take a good deal of time. It is in course of preparation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he will be able to lay on the Table of the House the certificates of the commanders of the fishery protection service ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am informed by the department that the full information asked for will take some time, as some of it will have to be got from abroad. If the hon. gentleman finds that the delay is too long in getting the complete returns, I will be able to give him the information obtainable here either to-day or to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1894, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

OTTAWA, 27th March, 1893.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO
RAILWAY.

Mr. TAYLOR moved third reading of Bill (No. 83) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

Mr. DENISON. I wish to bring before the committee an alteration I would like to have made in this Bill. One of the Toronto city members received a letter from the city solicitor of Toronto, in which he says :

Will you kindly see that the Bill is so framed as to make it impossible for the railway to go through the new rifle ranges, which you have had so much a hand in obtaining for the citizens of Toronto, as this would utterly destroy their usefulness.

I may say that the city of Toronto in the interest of the Industrial Exhibition Association

purchased a farm on the Lake Shore road lying between the lake and the road, and leased it to the Dominion Government for a rifle range, in exchange for the use of about ten acres of land belonging to the Government, a portion of the Garrison Common. The Government have also granted them the right to use for exhibition purposes a large portion of the common. I may mention also that the Grand Trunk Railway, between Port Credit and Mimico, passes along about a mile from the lake and about a quarter of a mile north of the Lake Shore road. If I thought it would materially injure the railway to carry it north of the rifle ranges, I would not make this motion, but I cannot see how it can do so. I am not certain even now that the road may not be planned to run north of the ranges; but it is with the object of making it absolutely certain that the usefulness of the ranges will not be destroyed by running this railroad through the centre of them, that I wish to make the motion. I move, seconded by Mr. Tyrwhitt:

That the order for the third reading of the Bill be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions that they have power to amend it by adding thereto the following thereto as clause 6:—

“That the portion of the said railway running between Port Credit and Mimico shall be carried north of the rifle ranges leased to the Government.”

Mr. COATSWORTH. Before that motion is put to the House, I would like to say a few words about it. It would certainly, if it should pass, be a very exceptional piece of legislation. This Bill has no reference whatever to the right of way. All that is asked by the Bill is the confirmation of certain arrangements which have been made between the city of Hamilton, the city of Brantford and this railway company, the right to extend a branch of the railway from the village of Waterford down to Lake Erie, and an extension of the time for the completion of the work. Therefore, it is not right at this stage of the Bill to introduce what is certainly a piece of exceptional legislation. In regard to the clause proposed, it seems to me to be extremely objectionable for many reasons. The facts of the case are these. Two or three years ago the city of Toronto purchased a piece of property on the lake shore for the purpose of providing the militia with a rifle range. This was done in order to get possession of a certain property in the city belonging to the Government for exhibition purposes. There is a provision in the law that if a railway company desires to pass through Government property, it has to get the consent of the Government. Therefore, I do not see that there is any possible basis for my hon. friend's motion. The fact is that it is an effort to take what is practically private property by special legislation. This property belongs to the city of Toronto, and a motion such as my hon. friend has made might just as fairly be made with reference to any farmer who lives in that

district, if it were thought necessary that the railway should pass through his lands. Therefore, I submit that the motion ought not to pass. I do not know whether or not the railway company intends to project its line through this property. I am inclined to think that it does not. At the same time, I would certainly object to any such clause being added to the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. This matter was not brought before the Railway Committee at all, and I think it would be highly objectionable to allow a special provision of this kind to pass, more especially as the Bill in no ways deals with the question of right of way.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the North American Canal Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

The following Bills were reported on division and read the third time on division:

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of James Frederick Doran.—(Mr. Dickey.)

Bill (No. 108) for the relief of Annette Marion Goff.—(Mr. Dickey.)

Bill (No. 105) for the relief of John Francis Schwaller.—(Mr. Dickey.)

YARMOUTH INDUSTRIES.

Mr. FLINT asked, What is the description of each of the fifteen manufacturing industries established in the town of Yarmouth, N.S., in 1881? What were the names of the several manufacturers, and the number of hands employed in each such establishment at that time? What is the description of each of the 151 manufacturing industries in said town in the year 1891? What are the names of the several manufacturers in said town in that year, and the number of hands employed in each such establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In Yarmouth the industries, etc., established (census of 1891) are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Boots and Shoes—	
J. Rogers.....	1
Eleazer Comeau.....	1
Reuben Mace.....	1
W. C. Purney.....	1
P. E. Keep.....	1
Enos W. Purdy.....	1
John S. Bailey.....	1
William Whalen.....	1
Raymond Saulnier.....	1
Bay Ellenwood.....	1
Jas. Lewis.....	1

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—		Dressmakers and Milliners—	
William Grant	2	Sarah Morris	1
Richard Killam	1	Kathleen Honey	1
William Gridley, jr	2	M. Campbell	1
James Lent	1	Mrs. W. Graham	1
Charles G. Pollard	1	Josephine Swain	1
W. H. Gridley	2	Mary Gardner	1
Edward Freeman	1	Ruth Crawley	1
James A. Porter	2	Daisy D. Danris	1
Charles Sherman	1	Helen W. H. Porter	2
Block and Tackle Factories—		Mary W. Crowell	3
James Horton	2	E. S. Danris	2
Nathaniel Currier	1	Anna A. Ellis	2
Bakers—		Elizabeth Pitman	1
Anna Cain	1	Dye Works—	
Jane Carter	1	Charles Moody	1
Frederick Miller	2	Dentist—	
Confectioners—		James E. Crosby	1
James Boyce	4	Electric Light—	
W. B. Horner	3	Yarmouth Electric Light Works	3
James Boyce, sr	2	Merchants and Manufacturers Co.	10
Bookbinder—		Foundries and Machine Shops—	
J. Murray Lawson	5	Pendrigh & Crawford	3
Carpenters—		James Horton	3
James G. Baker	4	Frank H. Wilson	28
Charles Kent	2	Burrell & Johnson	95
Richard Raymond	3	Fish Curers—	
Cotton Factory—		W. A. Kilham	1
Duck & Yarn Co., Ltd	133	Frederick Hatfield	1
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—		Parker, Eakins & Co	19
Joshua Huesitse	1	H. Bradford Cann	12
James B. Gray	1	Louis Potier	1
James R. Wyman	9	R. Ellenwood	19
Jacob Sweeney (coffins, etc.)	5	Jacob Harris	2
Carriage Shops—		A. F. Stonelham & Co	35
H. H. Hulsman	2	Prince W. Kinney	1
Ray Bros	5	Gas Works—	
Dermot Cole	1	R. S. Eakins	5
John H. Robbins	2	Harness Makers—	
A. Redding	1	J. Harvey Eldridge	1
Aaron Stubbs (wheelwright)	1	John Rodgers	3
Coopers—		George T. Grant	2
A. F. Allen & Co	12	Knitting Factory—	
Robt. McConnell	1	Dodds & Jolly	39
James Thompson	1	Meat Curers—	
Edward B. Smith	1	F. L. Hatfield	1
Dressmakers and Milliners—		John Cain	1
Mrs. J. H. Rhodes	2	Marble and Stone Cutting—	
Mrs. Tilly	2	Oliver McGill	2
Mrs. Powell	4	Organ Factories—	
Miss Hattie Wyman	4	Chute, Hall & Co	17
Alva Stanwood	3	Picture Framers—	
Fannie Goldsmith	1	C. W. Saunders	1
Hannah Gorman	3	Photographers—	
Miss Poweil	6	Geo. Parker	5
Lydia Harris	3	Patent Medicine—	
Miss Durkee	4	C. C. Richards & Co	6
Emily Churchill	1	A. J. McCallam	2
Ellen Brown	2	Printers and Publishers—	
Annie Harris	2	A. Lawson (Yarmouth Herald)	8
A. Higby	1	Yarmouth Times	13
Annie Noonan	2	Charles Carey (Yarmouth Light)	8
Dorcas Burrill	1	A. W. Kinney	2
Jane Graham	1	Painters and Glaziers—	
Ettá Murphy	1	John Murphy	4
Lizzie Rogers	1	Sash and Door Factories—	
Sarah Hilton	5	Milton Mfg. Co	15
Sarah Robbins	1	Kinny Haley Mfg. Co	22
Beatrice Langtry	1	Shipyards—	
Sophia Gowdy	1	Hugh Jenkins	10
Misses Gammon	1	Bradford Cann	12
Mr. FOSTER.			

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Sail Makers--		Blacksmiths--	
Alfred Sybertson	2	George Philips Thompson	1
William Weddleton	4	William Tuck	1
Jas. B. Weddleton	4	Francis Johnson	1
Tailors--		Boots and Shoes--	
Ada Hatt	1	William Thompson	1
M. Strachan	1	John McCullough	1
Dan Sullivan & Co.	18	William Wordington	1
T. B. Dane & Son	38	Joseph Reeves	1
E. B. Cann	17	William Powell	1
George Taylor	45	Benj. Clemance	1
Dominic McDevitt	3	Carpenters and Joiners--	
Kinny Drodiner	2	William Johnson	3
Tinsmiths--		Edgerton Anderson	6
John Ritchie	1	Henry Hillington	1
W. H. Leonard	2	Brick Yard--	
Lincoln & Williams	4	James Dramond	4
William Churchill	1	Block and Tackle--	
Henry Miller	2	Levi Jones	2
Taxidermist--		Carding Mill--	
Benjamin Doane	1	Alex. Graham	1
Tanner--		Refrigerator Manufacturer--	
George Robbins	6	John Garnet Vicars	1
Watchmakers and Jewellers--		Carriage Makers--	
Thomas Guirk	1	William Tuck	1
S. C. Hood	2	Edward Etwell	1
Henry Hood	2	Joseph C. Raham	3
R. B. Brown	1	Charles Stewart	2
Wood Turners--		Sam. B. Todd	3
Edward Rayson	1	Cooper--	
Charles B. Reid	6	David Dowling	1
Woollen Mills--		Dressmakers--	
Yarmouth Woollen Mills Co. (Limited) ..	55	William Henry	2
Brass Founders--		Ed. Alfred Wood	10
Pendrigh & Crawford	2	Margaret Hamilton	1
Boat Builder--		Flour and Grist Mills--	
Albert Buttler		Alex. Graham	3
		Harvey James Gould	4
		Foundries and Machine Shops--	
		Ruban P. Harmoan	5
		Joseph Huggas	5
		Harness--	
		Charles Henry Nix	5
		Charles Kelley	3
		Pump Factory--	
		James Anderson	1
		Pianos and Organs--	
		John McGuire	64
		Stone and Marble Works--	
		William Lapp	4
		M. Beaven	3
		Saw Mill--	
		J. James Gould	6
		Sash, Door and Blind Factories--	
		Joseph Vicars	6
		Reid & Thurk	4
		Tailors--	
		William Combe	7
		William Welsh	3
		Thomas J. Henderson	12
		William H. Vivian	3
		Duncan Campbell	13
		Tanner--	
		Andrew Patterson	20
		Tinsmiths--	
		Thompson McGrattan	2
		Henry Thompson	1
		Henry Jones	1
		Agricultural Implements--	
		B. Davis (son)	2
		Button & Moore	9

UXBRIDGE INDUSTRIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. What was the nature or description of each of the thirty manufacturing industries existing in the town of Uxbridge, according to the census of 1891? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufacturing industries? How many hands or employees were employed in each of such manufactories? 2. What was the number and nature or description of each of the manufacturing industries in the town of Uxbridge, according to the census of 1881? What were the names of each of the proprietors of such several manufactories? How many hands were employed in each of said factories?

Mr. FOSTER. According to the census of 1891, the following industries were established in the town of Uxbridge:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Agricultural Implements--	
Benjamin Davidson	3

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmith—		Agricultural Works—	
H. Cooper	2	Tolton Bros.....	12
Boots and Shoes—		Chas. Thain ..	4
W. Thompson	2	The Gowdy Mfg. Co.....	35
Cabinet and Furniture—		Bakers—	
J. McGuire.....	24	John Harris	5
Carriage Makers—		Geo. Williams	2
E. Etwell.....	4	Geo. T. Webber.....	2
D. Conboy.....	16	Henry Weatherston.....	2
Flour and Grist Mills—		Wm. Buckle	3
G. Peers	3	Kenny & Co.....	9
G. Wheeler.....	4	Wm. C. Krong	1
J. Somerville.....	1	Confectioners—	
Foundry and Machine Shop—		Jonathan Stovel.....	1
W. B. Stewart.....	8	Geo. T. Webber.....	1
Planing Mills—		Blacksmiths—	
R. P. Harpman	5	Wm. Sallows	4
M. Vickers.....	5	Jas. Dow	1
J. Baker.....	6	Geo. R. Wilson.....	1
Printers—		Duncan Mackenzie.....	4
W. Pemberton.....	4	Henry Nesslin	1
Keller & Graham.....	4	Bookbinder—	
Pump Factory—		Frank Nunan	5
O. Wilson.....	3	Boots and Shoes—	
Saddle and Harness Makers—		Wm. Goetz.....	4
J. Harrison.....	2	William McLaren.....	3
J. Neviston.....	3	Jas. Tindal	1
N. Charles.....	2	J. T. Brown & Co.....	2
Saw Mills—		Frederick Borsh.....	4
G. Wheeler.....	6	C. W. Dempsey.....	4
J. J. Gould.....	8	Geo. Parkins	1
Stone and Marble Cutters—		Sam. Powell.....	1
W. Lapps	4	Brewers—	
F. Beaven.....	3	Thomas Holleday.....	8
Tanner—		J. Steel (Malt House, Sleemans)	4
A. Patterson.....	9	Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
Tinsmith—		Robert Barker	1
T. McGratton.....	3	J. G. Morlock (upholsterer).....	12
Watchmaker and Jeweller—		Burr Bros	128
J. Maynard	1	Carpenters—	
Weavers—		James Jarrett.....	2
S. Gilson.....	2	Geo. Bruce	4
A. Campbell	5	L. C. Wideman.....	10
Woollen Mill—		Ed. Smith.....	2
S. S. Sugden.....	6	Alex. Bruce & Co.....	15
		Richard Mahony	7
		Geo. Stephens.....	6
		J. S. Lepand.....	4
		Geo. Daniels	1
		Geo. Wilson	5
		David Young.....	3
		Walter Cowan.....	1
		Hugh Cuthbertson	1
		Carpet Factories—	
		Wm. Craig	1
		Armstrong Carpet Co.....	27
		A. R. Burrows.....	15
		Burrows Bros. (Royal Carpet Co.).....	15
		Finlay Nicholson.....	7
		Hudson Co. (carpet weavers).....	4
		Carriage Makers—	
		Mathews, Reid & Co.....	6
		Robert Parker.....	5
		John Kelly.....	3
		S. & G. Penfold.....	10
		John McConnell.....	10
		Guelph Carriage Top Co.....	37
		J. B. Armstrong (general car. supplies).....	50
		Coopers—	
		Geo. Webber	6

GUELPH CITY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. INNES asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the city of Guelph? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In Guelph, Ont., the names and description of the different industries are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Aerated Water Makers—	
Wm. Kellett	2
Alex. Matthews.....	1
MR. FOSTER.	

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Dentists—		Printers and Publishers—	
Robert Campbell.....	1	J. Davidson.....	16
Wm. M. Foster.....	1	Pump Factories—	
Chas. W. Parker.....	1	Thos. F. Grant.....	1
J. Stirton.....	1	Philip Grant.....	2
Dressmakers & Milliners—		Fancy Goods—	
M., C. & E. McCuen.....	1	John J. Hazelton.....	1
M. & G. Heven.....	8	Saddle and Harness Makers—	
Margaret Simpson.....	9	Joseph A. Tovell.....	2
Ann Kernighan.....	2	Henry Metcalf.....	1
Mary L. Carroll.....	6	Geo. Beaty.....	2
G. B. Ryan & Co.....	19	Wm. Dyson.....	1
A. J. Little.....	10	John Bergin.....	1
Eliza Austin.....	8	Archibald Campbell.....	1
Maria Graham.....	3	Sewing Machines—	
E. Donohue.....	8	Chas Raymond.....	162
Kate & M. Hadden.....	8	Shirt Makers—	
Maud Emory.....	2	Stewart & Co.....	3
W. A. McKinn & Co.....	18	Soap Manufacturer—	
Martha Ross.....	4	Adam Linton.....	3
Kate Wisenborn.....	5	Spring and Axle Works—	
Mary Stronach.....	6	T. Pepper & Co.....	14
Johnston & Fairbanks.....	1	Stone and Marble Cutters—	
Edith Gausby.....	3	Stake & Kelsher.....	11
Alice Palmer.....	2	David Kennedy & Son.....	2
Reb. Laird.....	3	Clark & Carter.....	2
Ernest R. Bollert.....	15	John H. Hamilton.....	5
Guelph Electric Light.....	3	Tailors and Clothiers—	
Dyer—		John Farrell.....	1
Thomas Gemmell.....	10	Ernest R. Bollert.....	15
Edge Tool Manufacturers—		Shaw & Gundry.....	28
Auld & Woodyatt.....	50	Zeigler & Smith.....	12
Flour Mills—		King & Sullivan.....	10
Edward Present.....	3	Thomas Hall.....	1
James Goldie.....	60	Richard E. Nelson.....	11
Oatmeal and Peas Mill—		Kelcher & Headley.....	24
Henry Murton.....	10	Wm. Watson.....	9
Flax Mill—		Wm. Mitchell.....	6
S. J. Taylor.....	6	Robert Galbraith.....	1
Founders—		J. D. Williamson & Co.....	21
Thos. Griffin.....	7	Tanner—	
Adam Robertson (Guelph Foundry).....	7	Geo. Stull.....	3
John Crowe (Iron Works).....	39	Tin and Sheet Iron Workers—	
Guelph Gas Company.....	7	Wm. Sunley.....	5
Knitting Factories—		Wm. M. Kerr.....	3
Sam. Carter (Royal Knitting Co.).....	16	Geo. Howard.....	4
James E. Lewett.....	15	Andrew Mills.....	2
Hosiery—		Richard Pigott (stoves and tinware).....	2
Archibald Galbraith.....	7	Daniel Rudd.....	3
Joseph Cartledge.....	5	Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
Thos. Blanchfield.....	2	Benjamin Savage.....	4
Lime Works—		Wm. A. Clark.....	2
Thomas Birmingham.....	5	Geo. D. Pringle.....	4
David Kennedy & Son.....	16	Weaver—	
Pork Packers (Meat Curers)—		Lucinda O'Neil.....	1
McHardy Bros.....	4	Wire Works—	
Organ and Piano Factory—		James Hiele.....	1
Bell.....	346	John Dooly (Guelph Fence Works).....	2
Paper Bags—		Woollen Mills—	
W. F. Mitchell.....	2	David McCrea.....	106
Photo Copying—		Wringers and Washing Machines—	
E. D. Clark.....	7	Working Machine Royal City Mfg. Co....	3
Picture Frame Makers—		Underwear—	
Florence Watters.....	1	Matilda Orr.....	2
Robert Brydon.....	1		
Planing Mill—			
Robert Stewart.....	20		
Printers and Publishers—			
James Haugh, jr.....	18		
H. Gummer.....	27		
John J. Kelso.....	3		

Industries recorded by enumerators, but not included in compilation, as no products were given, and are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—		Carriage Factories—	
Caleb Chase.....	1	John Loane.....	7
Wm. Payne.....	1	Baker Bros.....	5
John Harper.....	1	Thos. Donohue.....	5
Bartholomew O'Connor.....	1	Foundries and Machine Shops—	
Boots and Shoes—		Henry A. Connell.....	36
Donald McLaren.....	1	John Fisher, jr.....	20
Wm. Noble.....	1	Harness Makers—	
Frederick Wilson.....	1	Philip Davis.....	4
Egid Hunt.....	1	T. L. Estey.....	3
Cabinet and Furniture—		James D. Paul.....	
Henry Hall.....	1	Printers and Publishers—	
Carpenters—		S. & T. Watts.....	5
Ed. Forrell.....	5	Sash and Door Factories—	
Thos. Simons.....	1	Drysdale & Co.....	8
Dressmakers—		R. & S. Smith & Co.....	7
Mary E. Copeland.....	3	Saw Mills—	
E. & H. Ross (Ladies' and children's under- wear and fancy goods).....	1	Craig & Co.....	10
Frank Dowler.....	8	Wm. Craig.....	30
Gunsmith—		James Hayden.....	10
Wm. Newby.....	1	Stone and Marble Works—	
Hair Goods—		John Gallagher & Son.....	2
Annie Soden.....	1	Tailors—	
Hosiery and Fancy Goods—		Simeon McLeod.....	9
Wm. Marshall.....	2	Tanners—	
Sewing Machine (Repairs)—		Duncan Dickerson.....	20
John Groom.....	1	Geo. Marshall.....	1
Show Case Manufacturer—		John McCormic.....	3
Geo. Fenwick.....	1	Tinsmiths—	
Tinsmith—		Scott & Churchill.....	2
Wm. Heather.....	2	John McAfee.....	2
		Wm. Hamilton.....	1

WOODSTOCK INDUSTRIES.

Mr. COLTER asked, What is the description of the twenty-nine manufacturing industries established in the town of Woodstock, N.B., in 1881? The names of the several manufacturers, and number of hands employed in each at that time? What is the description of the sixty-two manufacturing industries established in the town of Woodstock, N.B., in 1891? The names of the several manufacturers, and the number of hands employed in each at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. The industries, &c., in Woodstock, N.B., in 1881:

Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—	
John Cerrigan.....	1
Peter Ryan.....	
Boots and Shoes—	
James Baker.....	4
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
Jacob Vanwort.....	5
Garrity, Pickles & Co.....	7
H. & F. W. Bourne.....	6
Carding, Sawing and Grist Mill—	
Hugh Davis.....	9
Mr. FOSTER.	

AYLMER INDUSTRIES.

Mr. CASEY asked, (1) What is the description of each of the industries; (2) the name of each manufacturer; (3) the number of hands employed by each; (4) the value of the annual output of each; in London, Ont., St. Thomas, Ont., Ridgetown, Ont., and Aylmer, Ont., respectively?

Mr. FOSTER. Town of Aylmer, Ont., according to the census of 1891, the industries, &c., were as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Aylmer Canning Co—	
Marshall & Nairn.....	115
“Aylmer Express” (Printing Office)—	
D. H. Price.....	5
Neelands & Monteith.....	3
Aylmer Planing Mills—	
Geo. M. Smith.....	6
Bakers—	
Weisbrod Bros.....	4
C. B. Laur.....	3
Blacksmith Shops—	
Gerald Monteith.....	2
Andrews & Stanley.....	3
David Liddle.....	2

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries;	Hands employed.
Blacksmith Shops—		Spring Beds—	
James Orton	2	James Cairn	1
W. Jamison	1	Tailors--	
R. Royl	2	Darling & Son	4
J. M. Campbell	2	James Lees	2
Bowl Factory—		Benj. Paupst	6
Jas. Emmerson	8	M. Halton	4
Boots and Shoes—		J. M. Farthings	6
William Lindsay	1	George Dickhout	5
Nelson Burgess	3	Youell & Wrong	6
Hodges & Turill	2	Tin Shops—	
S. W. Laud	2	Wright & Allen	4
Carpet Weavers—		W. Conn	2
Harriet Chute	1	Watchmaking Shops—	
Amanda Murray	1	R. Rastall	2
Deborah Robias	1	Robert Barclay	1
Carriage Shops—		Solon Chambers	1
R. Dawson	4		
J. D. McDiarmid	15		
Neil Beeton	3		
Moses Leeson	3		
Cooper Shops—			
J. N. Baughner	8		
Jas. McNally	7		
J. G. Kaiser	3		
Dentists' Offices--			
John R. Woods	1		
W. J. Fear	1		
Dressmakers--			
Enid Parker	1		
Mary Clarke	1		
Matilda Card	2		
John McMaster	3		
Jennie Tilton	5		
Youell & Wrong	5		
Misses Thomas	4		
Jennie Sneyd	3		
Ada Keiller	7		
J. M. Farthings	5		
Ritta Adams	7		
Minnie Haggan	2		
Misses Howey	4		
Mrs. R. H. Main	1		
Electric Light Co.--			
McDiarmid & Co.	2		
Foundry and Machine Shop--			
N. N. Sheldon	3		
Furniture Establishments--			
J. L. Lambert	4		
Joseph Gill	1		
Grist Mill--			
J. H. H. Ingram	4		
Harness Shops--			
E. N. Draper	3		
Lewis W. Whitney	1		
R. M. Carey	3		
Marble Shop--			
Hutchinson & Miller	9		
Organ Factories--			
J. T. Rowe	2		
J. Low	5		
Photograph Galleries--			
E. S. Phillips	3		
Webster Newcombe	2		
Pork Packing Establishment--			
John Marlatt	12		
Aerated Water Factory--			
D. H. Gooding	2		
Sash and Doors--			
W. H. Goff	2		
Pierce & Co.	6		
C. A. Price	3		

OWEN SOUND INDUSTRIES.	
Industries.	Hands employed.
Boat Builder--	
William Dunn	1
Brick Yard--	
White Bros	16
Broom Factory--	
Joseph J. Wilson	3
Brewers--	
William Schuan	3
George R. Wilkinson	1
Christopher Easton	9
Carpenters--	
John Cockburn	8
Robert Clarke	5
Cement Mill--	
North American Chemical Mining and Manufacturing Co.	20
Bakers--	
C. W. Speer	4
Benjamin Hubart	3
James D. Ledmon	2
Jas. McLoughlin & Son	31
Edward Neving	1
Blacksmiths--	
George Rankin	1
Samuel Ankcorn	1
John Brown	3
William Smith, jr.	4
Robert B. Atkins	1
S. Spencer	2
Joseph Ramsay	2
James Wilson	3
James Sharp	2

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, (1) What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Owen Sound ; (2) what are the names of the several manufacturers ; (3) what is the number of hands employed in each establishment ?

Mr. FOSTER. The census of 1891 gives the following for Owen Sound :—

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Blacksmiths—		Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
William Ferguson	3	Abraham Creighton	2
William Humstreet	1	Robert Breckenridge	1
Boots and Shoes—		James Culton	2
James Doyle	1	King & Wilson	3
Joseph J. Merrill	1	Alex. Geo. Ross	12
Edward Berberich	1	Weavers—	
Malcolm McPhee	1	Martha Campbell	2
James A. Frost	1	Jane Burk	1
Nicholas Hopkin	1	George Denoon	1
Sreabald B. Dick	1	Watchmakers—	
Joseph J. Merrill	1	Edward H. Newman	2
John Thompson	1	Michael Tochan	1
George Crozier	1	John J. Douglas	2
Coopers—		John P. Breck	1
Jarius Hull	5	Alfred J. Frost	4
J. S. John	7	Woollen Mills—	
Creamery—		W. M. Harrison Woollen Mills	8
James Struthers	11	Photograph Galleries—	
Plaster and Stucco Works—		William Gould	1
Jos. McClelland	1	William Craig	2
Thos. McClelland	1	Inglehart & Co.	1
Tannery—		Sash, Door and Blind Factories—	
McQuay & Kenny	6	James McLean	5
Meat Curers—		John Harrison	20
Samuel Lloyd	5	David Young	3
McLean Bros	6	Saw Mills—	
Carriage Works—		John Harrison	9
Owen Sound Carriage Works (Walter Spencer)	5	Rison, Maitland & Co	40
Arthur E. Pratt	3	Gates, Murphy & Co	20
Frederick Clover	1	Tailors—	
David Rutherford	3	William Arnott	4
Daniel McKenzie	2	Mary Denoon	4
Thos. B. Dowsley	3	Henry Taylor	2
Samuel F. Fulton	3	Thomas Stewart	8
Cigar Factory—		George Everts	14
Charles Bethuam	7	James Hall	16
Dress and Mantle Makers—		James Douglas	6
Miss Plante	6	Adolph Gutter	9
Misses Struthers	3	Thomas Douglas	21
Mrs. E. Graham	2	Marble Works—	
Mary Campbell	4	H. B. Harrison	6
Mellisia Hill	4	B. H. Williscroft	3
Ellen Glover	2	Machinist and Gunsmith—	
Mrs. Oliver	2	John Waites	5
Alvince White	4	Printers—	
Miss Easton	4	'Times' Newspaper Office, David Creighton	11
Melville & Co.	4	Joseph Lang	7
Mrs. G. Staples	4	'Sun' Printing Office, Chris. Fleming	13
A. Munro	1	James H. Little	26
Mary Munroe	1	John Rutherford	11
Mary D. P. Prince	1	Paint Shops—	
Rosanna Agur	6	C. D. Strenhoff	3
Mary Sullivan & Co.	2	Miller Bros	3
Mary Bigger	10	— Rogers	3
Mary Boyd	3	John Hill	2
Flora Sinclair	6	Pump Shops—	
Jane H. Brown	7	Webster Keith	1
Penelle Mathew	2	C. R. Barnes	8
Mrs. Grant	3	Pottery—	
Wood Turner—		White Bros	4
John Spilk	1	Harness Makers—	
Tinsmiths—		John McD. Coats	1
R. P. Butchard & Bros	8	Eliza W. Bishop	3
Paulis & Co.	5	Milton A. Bebee	8
Redfern & LePau	11	Joseph Lee	4
T. J. Thompson	3	Wig Maker—	
Chousty & Ayar	8	— Johnston	1
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—		Lime Kilns—	
Francis Brown	8	Oliver Brown	6
Mr. FOSTER.			

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Lime Kilns—		Confectioners—	
Samuel Holmes.....	4	John Jack.....	1
Musical Instrument Establishment—		Cabinet and Furniture Factories—	
John Sloan.....	1	Ford & Sons.....	3
Chemical Establishments—		Labadie & Kilpatrick.....	1
John Parker.....	4	Dentistry—	
Robert Wightman.....	2	George Gibb.....	1
— Taylor.....	2	Dressmaking and Milinery—	
W. J. Manley.....	3	Maggie Meredith.....	4
Fish Packing House—		Elizabeth Ferguson.....	2
Donald McDonald.....	15	John Ward.....	2
Flour, Oatmeal and Grist Mills—		A. Matthewson.....	1
— Harrison.....	3	Janet Williamson.....	6
John Wright & Son.....	6	Sarah Collar.....	1
Foundries and Machine Shops—		Rebecca Ross.....	2
Polson Iron Works.....	250	Jane James.....	1
Kennedy & Sons.....	30	Chemical Establishment—	
G. Corbett & Sons.....	25	Francis Arkill.....	2
Gas Works—		Agricultural Implements—	
Owen Sound Gas and Light Co.....	3	Moses Climas.....	1
Ginger Ale Manufactory—		Flour and Grist Mill—	
Taylor & Pringle.....	4	Campbell, Rutherford & Sinclair.....	11
Glove Maker—		Foundry and Machine Shop—	
Robert Taylor.....	3	Alex. McArthur.....	1

BLENHEIM INDUSTRIES.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, What is the description of the manufactories in the town of Blenheim, according to the census of 1891? What are the names of the several manufacturers? What number of hands were employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. In the town of Blenheim, the industries, according to the census of 1891, were as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
William Shillington.....	2
William Grant.....	1
Blacksmiths—	
Robt. Williamson.....	1
John Graham.....	1
James Grist.....	1
Henry Williams.....	2
Boots and Shoes—	
Thomas Holland.....	3
George Taylor.....	2
John Sterling.....	1
Carriage Factories—	
James Cox.....	3
Jeddiha Duffy.....	4
George Flater.....	2
John Mulholland.....	8
E. A. Bryan.....	10
Coopers—	
Frank Hughson.....	1
John Ferguson.....	1
Andrew Irwin.....	15

Harness and Saddlery—	
Henry Faust.....	1
John T. Barge.....	3
Potash Factory—	
William Collar.....	2
Printer—	
Andrew Denholm.....	2
Planing Mill—	
Robert Nichol.....	3
Saw Mill—	
Alfred L. Bisnett.....	24
Sash, Door and Blind Factory—	
McBrane Dougald.....	3
Wood Turner—	
James Telfer.....	5
Stave Factory—	
John B. Coats.....	30
Shirt Factory—	
Carrie Dunlop.....	1
Meat Curer—	
Thomas Powell.....	1
Tailors—	
Wm. Aitkin.....	1
Wm. Robertson.....	13
Benjamin Shillington.....	7
Leaman Plummer.....	4
Tinsmiths—	
Edwin Spackman.....	1
Wm. D. Samson.....	2
Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
Wm. J. Gibson.....	1
Chas. VanGunten.....	1
Picket Wire Fencing—	
Montraville Auger.....	2
Thos. Coatsworth.....	2
Weaver—	
Marion Pickering.....	1

SOREL TOWN INDUSTRIES.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, 1. What is the nature of each of the 128 manufactories in the town of Sorel? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of workmen employed in each establish.

ment? 4. What is the amount of capital invested in each manufactory?

Mr. FOSTER. The census of 1891, for the town of Sorel, gives the following:—

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Agricultural Implements—		Carriage Makers—	
Beauchemin & Son.....	65	Arthur Chapdelaine.....	2
Rock Lamoureux.....	5	Alexandre Cotenoir.....	2
Bakers—		Casimir Villemaire.....	5
Théodore Paquin.....	1	Carvers—	
Joseph Boivin.....	3	Eutrope Chartier.....	1
Wm. Lunan & Son.....	4	Amédée Caravant.....	1
Hilaire Dupont.....	1	Ship Builders and Repairers—	
Albine Milotte.....	1	R. & O. Navigation Co.....	75
Victor Héroux.....	1	Sincennes & Co.....	2
Blacksmiths—		Cement Mill—	
Eusèbe Gauthier.....	1	Francis Gendron & Son.....	3
Edouard Portelance.....	3	Confectioners—	
Romuald Berthiaume.....	1	Philias Boucher.....	1
Médéric Laflamme.....	1	Wm. Lunan & Son.....	2
Jos. Berthiaume.....	1	Cooper—	
Louis Gauthier.....	1	Jos. Goulet.....	1
Joseph Garceau & Co.....	2	Dressmakers and Milliners—	
Zéphirin Chateauvert.....	1	Mrs. J. B. Lemoine.....	2
Geo. Laflamme.....	1	Miss Emma McGuire.....	2
Alexandre Cotenoir.....	2	Mrs. Ulric Chapdelaine.....	4
Gilbert Bourdelais.....	1	Miss Albina Martin.....	1
Casimir Villemaire.....	2	Mrs. Narcisse Robidoux.....	4
Boat Builder—		Mrs. Elie Gobeil.....	2
J. Bte. Vignault.....	1	Mrs. Malvina Chenevert.....	2
Boiler Makers—		Mrs. Lussier.....	3
J. A. Pontbriand.....	6	Mrs. Philippe Vigneau.....	5
R. & O. Navigation Co.....	20	Philomène Dulac.....	1
Bookbinders—		Octavie Gauthier.....	1
Albert Mouney.....	1	Jane Leith.....	3
Jacques Dambourges.....	2	Marie Delisle.....	3
Boots and Shoes—		Edwidge Lavallée.....	1
Marie Picard.....	1	Lucie & Marie Beaucage.....	4
Thos. Tobin.....	5	Marie Morin.....	3
Zéphirin Gauthier.....	1	Eloise Lecler.....	5
Louis Trempe.....	1	Ezilda Dubord.....	3
Sorel Manufacturing Co.....	90	Josephine Vilandré.....	1
Alfred Gravel.....	1	Elizabeth Houde.....	1
Edouard Blais.....	1	Engine Builders—	
Antoine Martel.....	1	J. A. Pontbriand.....	32
Arthur Moisan.....	1	A. Ovila Rondeau & Co.....	12
Victor Pelland.....	1	Flour and Grist Mill—	
J. B. O. Pontbriand.....	1	Joseph Bazinet.....	1
Adolphe Lamère.....	1	Foundries and Machine Works—	
Camille Lamère.....	1	J. A. Pontbriand.....	5
Brick Makers—		François Patenaude.....	8
Joseph Mathieu.....	6	R. & O. Nav. Co.....	25
Johnny Rouleau.....	9	Francis Gendroe.....	3
James Sheppard.....	20	Furrier—	
Cabinet and Furniture Factories—		L. S. Robitaille.....	9
Alcide Richard.....	5	Gas Work—	
Azaire Gratton.....	1	Corporation of Sorel Town.....	3
Carding Mill—		Jewellers and Watchmakers—	
Joseph Bazinet.....	1	Alfred E. Piette.....	1
Carpenters and Joiners—		John Hayden.....	1
Alfred Gauthier.....	2	J. Bte. Lavallée.....	1
Philippe Gagné.....	1	James H. Wright.....	1
Isaïe Brulé.....	1	Gun and Locksmith—	
Pierre H. Paul.....	2	Alcide Paradis.....	1
Wm. Boivin.....	10	Native Wine Making—	
Pierre Carter.....	1	Jos. Parent.....	3
Carriage Makers—		Photographic Gallery—	
Bruno Leclair.....	2	C. T. Desjardins.....	2
Louis Gauthier.....	1	Picture Framer—	
Mr. BRUNEAU.		Gustave Hardy.....	1
		Planing Mill—	
		James Sheppard.....	15
		Printers—	
		La Cie. de Publication du Sud.....	20
		Jos. Chenevert.....	2
		La Cie d'Imprimerie Richelieu.....	13

Industries.	Hands employed.
Saddle and Harness Makers--	
Stanislas Durocher.....	3
Jos. Bourdelais.....	1
Eugène Bourdelais.....	1
Saw Mill	
Jas. Sheppard.....	15
Saw and File Cutter--	
J. A. Pontbriand.....	15
Scale Factory--	
Arthur Chapdelaine.....	2
Soap Maker	
Bernard Gravel.....	1
Spinning-wheel Factory--	
Zépherin Paradis.....	1
Spring and Axle Factory--	
Philippe Beauchemin.....	10
Tailors--	
Arsène Champagne.....	10
D. Finley & Son.....	18
Francis Paul.....	8
A. E. Ethier.....	7
Paul Ethier.....	6
Fred. Vadeboncour.....	5
Geo. Veillet.....	10
Victor Duhamel.....	1
Ephrem Brassard.....	1
James Lavallée.....	1
Tannery	
Leon Leduc.....	3
Lafamme & Duhamel.....	3
Tobacco Working--	
Edward Wurtel.....	20
Tin and Sheet-iron Works--	
Gaudias Bernier.....	5
Mrs. J. B. Grégoire.....	3
Auguste Garceau & Son.....	2
Edouard Courchesne.....	3
Johnny Courchesne.....	1
Wm. Côte.....	4

ST. OURS INDUSTRIES.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked. 1. What is the number of manufactories in the town of St. Ours? 2. What is the nature of each manufactory? 3. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 4. What is the number of workmen employed in each manufactory?

Mr. FOSTER. In St. Ours Town (census of 1891) as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers--	
Hermidas Lusignan.....	1
Ernest Mathieu.....	1
Blacksmiths--	
Charles Rocing.....	1
Joseph Mathieu.....	1
Antoine Desmarais.....	3

Industries.	Hands employed.
Boots and Shoes--	
Paschal Ménard.....	1
Théodule Richard.....	1
Dressmaker, etc.--	
Sophie St. Aurent.....	1
Carpenters and Joiners--	
Norbert Millette.....	1
Cleophas Casavant.....	1
Carriage Maker--	
Philippe Larivière.....	1
Foundry--	
Zacharie Lamothe.....	2
Planing Mill--	
Théotime Marchessault.....	4
Photographic Gallery--	
Cyrille Jobidon.....	1
Saddle and Harness Maker--	
Ephrem Lacouture.....	2
Tailors--	
Joseph Papillon.....	3
Joseph Duhamel.....	3
Tanner	
Oswald Frechette.....	1
Tinsmith--	
Ulric Auger.....	1

CLINTON INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Clinton, county of Huron? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. The number of hands employed in each? 4. The value of land and buildings attached to each? 5. The value of the output of each industry?

Mr. FOSTER. Industries in the town of Clinton (census of 1891):

Industries.	Hands employed.
Dried Fruits--	
Cole & Tann.....	16
Carriage Factory--	
John Leslie.....	5
Phillips Heyward.....	3
Fred Rumball.....	6
Cider Mill--	
Jerome Andrews.....	3
Blacksmiths--	
John Fedford.....	1
Jacob Miller.....	2
Charlie Capps.....	1
Chas. Hillard.....	2
Geo. Trohill.....	2
Oliver Johnson.....	2
Robt. Downs.....	1
Thos. Hipling.....	4
Boots and Shoes--	
Felix Hanlon.....	1
John Jackson.....	1
Taylor & Sons.....	2

Industries.	Hands employed.	Industries.	Hands employed.
Boots and Shoes—		Tanners—	
Henry Beacon	1	O. S. Doan	5
C. Cruikshanks	2	Hugh Moore	2
Jas. Twichell	1	Watchmakers and Jewellers—	
John Steep	1	J. B. Rumball & Co.	1
Chas. Carline	1	Weavers—	
Coopers—		Decorah Emerson	1
David Dickinson	1	Margaret Kennedy	1
Jas. Fair	3		
G. Gilchrist	1		
Confectioners—			
Roderick McLennan	1		
James Anderson	1		
Dressmakers and Milliners—			
Myra Rye	2		
Miss Hoopes	4		
Jennie Stewart	3		
Beesley & Co.	9		
Estate of J. Hodgen	12		
Plumsted & Gibbens	8		
Mrs. Ganley	2		
John Robertson	8		
Electric Light (Clinton Organ Co.)	2		
Agricultural Implements—			
McMachie & Co	5		
McPherson, Hover & Farran	25		
Flax Mill—			
D. A. Forrester	36		
Flour and Grist—			
Jas. Fair	9		
Harness Makers—			
Johnson & Armor	2		
James Mitchell	3		
Knitting Factory—			
Catharine Lighte	1		
Marble and Stone Works—			
W. H. Cooper	2		
Peter Straith, (grindstone manufactory) ..	1		
Musical Instruments— Making Pianos and Organs—			
Blatchford Snaffield	10		
G. F. Oakes	2		
Doherty & Co	90		
Photographers—			
Horace Foster	2		
Picture Painting—			
Clara Mountcastle	1		
Planing Mill—			
S. S. Cooper	10		
Thos. McKenzie	1		
Pump Factory—			
John Stevenson	2		
John Ross	2		
Meat Curer—			
James Steep	3		
Printers—			
Whitley & Todd	4		
Robt. Holmes	9		
Saw Mill—			
James Fair	5		
Tailors—			
John Smith	3		
Walton & Morrison	6		
Thos. Jackson	4		
Estate Hadgew	9		
Jackson Bros	6		
Tinsmiths—			
Davis & Rowland	3		
Harland Bros	2		
Sam Wilson	1		
Mr. FOSTER.			

MONTMAGNY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What are the names of the thirty-seven manufacturers mentioned in the last census as existing in the town of Montmagny ?

Mr. FOSTER. The census of 1891 gives for Montmagny Town the following industries :—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
Albert Fiset	2
George Fournier	2
Blacksmiths—	
Francis Gagné	1
Auguste Rosseau	1
Eugène Boulanger	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Cleophas Côté	1
Edouard L'Espérance	3
Eugène Nicole	2
Butter Factories—	
H. Hébert (No. 1)	5
Montmagny Butter Factory (No. 2)	3
Cabinet and Furniture—	
J. Bte. Laflamme	1
Carpenters and Joiners—	
Edward Gendreau	1
Théophile Beaumont	2
Louis Fournier	1
Alphonse Laberge	1
Thos. Thibault	6
Jos. Thibault	3
Godfroi Talbot	3
Dosithé Fournier	2
Carriage Works—	
Michel Bernatchez	1
J. Bte. Mercier	1
Cheese Factory—	
Bernatchez & Co.	1
Fish Curers—	
Godfroi Létourneau	1
Grégoire Tremblay	4
Elzéar Couture	1
François Méthivier	1
Flour and Grist Mill—	
Albert J. Bender	3
Foundries and Machine Works—	
Anselme Normand	2
Amable Bélanger	9

Industries.	Hands employed.
Lime Kiln— Narcisse Lemieux	2
Saw Mill— Mrs. J. B. Proteau	1
Tailor— Achille Boulanger	2
Tanners— Edouard Lemieux	2
Narcisse Lemieux	3
Tinsmiths— Maxime Dubé	1
Paul Thibault	2
Jos. Mathurin	1
Noël Paquet	1
Télesphore Gendreau	1

SICK MARINERS' DUES—MONTREAL.

Mr. LEPINE asked, 1. Did not the Minister of Marine write to the secretary of the Montreal Shipping Interests, under date 1st February, "inter alia," as follows:—I * * * would request you to inform me what evidence you can place before the department that the ship-owners and agents of vessels navigating the St. Lawrence would be willing to take care of their own sick mariners, and what guarantee the Government would have that the patients would not be left in our own hands to be provided for after the vessels to which they belonged had left their loading ports. 2. Did not the Shipping Interests, in reply to this request, undertake as follows:—

MONTREAL, February 15th, 1890.

HON. CHARLES H. TUPPER,
Minister of Marine, Ottawa.

SIR,—We, the undersigned, owners or agents of steam-ships and sailing vessels trading with this port, having taken communication of certain correspondence between the Department of Marine and the Shipping Interest, beg leave to say that—

In consideration of your relieving the tonnage owned by or consigned to us from the imposition of hospital dues levied by virtue of the Act 49 Vic., chap. 76, we hereby agree and bind ourselves to afford adequate hospital care to the sick mariners belonging to each and every such vessel, and to relieve the Dominion Government from all costs or responsibility with respect to the said sick mariners; and we are ready to enter into such binding agreement in that behalf as the department may require of us.

The purpose of this undertaking is not merely to free our own vessels from this impost on their entry at a Canadian port, but it is taken as a further step in the direction of freeing the St. Lawrence route from Governmental dues and taxes of every kind, and of making Montreal a free port for ships.

We are, your obedient servants,
H. & A. ALLAN,
Allan Line.

ROBERT REFORD & Co.,
Agents for the Donaldson Line,
Thompson Line, and Ross Line.

DAVID TORRANCE & Co.,
Agents Dominion Line.

CANADA SHIPPING CO. (Ltd.),
by J. McLENNAN, President.

BLACK DIAMOND SS. Co. (Ltd.),
by KINGMAN, BROWN & Co.
MUNDERLOH & Co.
J. G. SIDEY, by D. D. SIDEY.
INTERCOLONIAL COAL MINING Co. (Ltd.),
by WM. NELSON, Secretary.
CARBRAY, ROUTH & Co.
J. & R. McLEA.
DICKSON ANDERSON,
Shipowner.
ANDERSON, MCKENZIE & Co.,
Agents Furness Line.
McLEAN, KENNEDY & Co.,
Agents MacLean Line.
HENRY DOBELL & Co.
F. W. HENSHAW,
For the S. & L. COAL AND RAILWAY CO.

3. Does not section 4, subsection 6, of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 76, give to fishing vessels the option of making voluntary payments, receiving hospital care in return; and is not a similar option denied to merchant vessels? 4. Are not Quebec vessels trading with the United States, besides being taxed 6 cents per ton per season at home and 15 cents per ton per season abroad, also required, in cases of sickness among their crew while in United States ports, to pay \$1 per day per man for hospital care in the Governmental hospitals of that country? 5. Do not the United States authorities care for their own sick seamen in their Governmental hospitals free of charge and without imposing any countervailing taxation on their shipping? Do not the Dominion authorities also arrange for the care of Canadian lake seamen in hospitals at Kingston and St. Catharines without imposing a countervailing tax on Ontario tonnage? 7. Will the Government consider the propriety of putting Quebec on the same footing as Ontario, and of reimbursing the tonnage owners of the former province the amount of the reprisal taxation which has been levied on their vessels in ports of the United States during past years? 8. Is the Government not aware that (in addition to the province of Ontario and the German Empire) the ports of the Netherlands and her colonies; ports in Spain and Portugal, in the British and Spanish West Indies, in the United States of Columbia, in Central America, and elsewhere, have been proclaimed free ports, having accepted the standing offer of the United States for the mutual abolition of tonnage dues on shipping? 9. Is not the present a favourable time to enter into negotiations with the United States for the mutual abolition of tonnage taxes on shipping, and will the Government consider the advisability of doing so?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries addressed a letter to Mr. A. Watt, of Montreal, of which the above question is a correct extract. 2. A petition was received by the department of which the above is a correct copy, with the following signatures—J. G. Sidey, per D. D. Sidey; Carbray, Routh & Co.; Black Diamond Steam-

ship Company (Limited), by Kingman, Brown & Company; J. & R. McLea; Dickson Anderson, shipowner; Anderson, McKenzie & Company, agents Furness Line Steamers, and McLean, Kennedy & Company, agents MacLean Line; H. & A. Allan, Allan Line; Robert Reford & Company, agents for the Donaldson Line, the Thompson Line and Ross Line; David Torrance & Company, agents Dominion Line; Canada Shipping Company (Limited), by J. McLennan, President. 3. Canadian fishing vessels only have the option of making voluntary payments and receiving hospital care in return. Many pay the dues under this clause as the owners of fishing vessels prefer paying the sick mariners' dues and receive hospital treatment in return. Foreign fishing vessels, including vessels of the United States, are not required to pay sick mariners' dues. Merchant vessels, under section 4 of the Sick and Disabled Mariners Act, are required to pay dues. 4. Vessels arriving in ports, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, are required to pay not less than 2 cents per ton per annum and not more than 6 cents per ton, and not less than 3 cents per ton per voyage if arriving at ports in the United States, and not more than 15 cents per annum. Sick seamen of Canadian vessels sent to marine hospitals whilst in ports of the United States are charged the sum of \$1 per day per man. 5. The United States authorities maintain marine hospitals for the benefit of their sick seamen and sick seamen of foreign vessels entered at United States ports. These hospitals are maintained out of duties on foreign tonnage. It is understood no countervailing taxation is imposed on American tonnage for this purpose. It is understood that American seamen are maintained free in the hospitals, whilst foreign seamen are charged \$1 per day. 6. Yes, to the extent of 90 cents per day for each seaman admitted to the marine hospitals at Kingston and St. Catharines, not to exceed \$500 per annum for each hospital. 7. Ontario ports being quite differently situated from the seaports in other parts of the Dominion, the Canadian Sick Mariners Act does not apply to them. The Government does not see the propriety at present of reimbursing the tonnage owners of Quebec the amount of taxation levied in United States ports during the past years. 8. The Government has no official knowledge in regard to the statement alleged in the above question. 9. No decision has as yet been arrived at by the Government of Canada with regard to entering into negotiations with the United States for the mutual abolition of tonnage taxes on shipping.

MANUFACTURERS OF ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS.

Mr. RIDER asked, What was the number, according to the last census, of manufacturers exclusively engaged in the manufacture

Mr. FOSTER.

of artificial fertilizers in Canada, and where located? The value of the plant so engaged in such manufacture? The number of employees engaged therein? The quantity and value of the raw material? The quantity and value of the output?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The total number of establishments is eighteen; value of plant, \$33,900; number of employees, 113; value of raw material, \$162,583; value of output, \$265,469.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

That it is expedient to provide that, for the present session, the deduction of eight dollars per day, mentioned in section 26 of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, shall not be made for six days in the case of members who have been absent from a sitting of the House or committee thereof during such number of days, but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons, nor in the case of any member elected since the commencement of the session shall it apply to days prior to his election.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Foster.)

COMMISSIONERS TO COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION—SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of two commissioners to represent Canada at the World's Columbian Exhibition, to be held at Chicago in 1893, be read the second time.

Mr. CHARLTON. At this stage of the proceedings, I wish to offer an amendment to this resolution. I move that said resolution be not now read the second time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend by adding the following words:—

It is further enacted that such payment is provided for only on one condition, that the Canadian Department of said Exposition shall be closed on Sundays.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am of the opinion that this motion is out of order. I do not think it is relevant to the resolution, and, therefore, it cannot be put as an amendment. In addition to that, I may say, that a motion almost identically similar to that which is now placed in my hands, stands on the Order Paper. For these reasons, I rule that this motion is out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. If permitted, I beg leave to question the justice of your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may give his reasons.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall refer to the rules in reference to this matter. I suppose I can appeal to the House and move an adjournment. I find in Rules 88 and 89 provisions which lead me to suppose that it is proper to move this amendment :

88. If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House shall think fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a committee of the whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereupon.

89. All aids and supplies granted to Her Majesty by the Parliament of Canada, are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all Bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit and appoint all such Bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

Now, Sir, in the United States Congress, a provision of exactly this character was attached to a grant of money to aid this same Columbian Exposition at Chicago, and that grant was made contingent upon closing the gates of that Exposition on Sunday. If it is a parliamentary proceeding for the House of Representatives of the United States to take that course, I am unable to understand why it is not a parliamentary proceeding to take that course here. I stand on my right as a member of this House in demanding to-day that the sense of this House, at all events, should be taken as to the proposition now before you, that there shall be a condition attached to that grant, and that the condition shall be, that the honour of this country shall be preserved in the estimation of the Christian sentiment of the country, by providing that the Canadian part of the Fair shall not be opened on the Lord's Day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is entirely mistaken as to the application of the two rules he has quoted. Rule 88 provides, as I have stated on former occasions, that no debate shall take place, and no consideration shall be given to a resolution of this kind, when first proposed to the House; but that the debate and consideration thereof shall be postponed to a future day. Rule 89 provides that the House of Commons only has the right to limit and appoint the conditions on which such grants are made, but, according to all the English authorities I have been able to find, amendments at this stage must be relevant to the question before the House. I may state that, in my opinion, it would have been competent, when the grant was submitted to pay the expenses of the Canadian Department of the Chicago Exposition, to have imposed the condition which the hon. member now wishes to impose. But this is undoubtedly an entirely different question. It is a question of the payment of salaries or expenses of two commissioners, and the effect

of the amendment which the hon. member for North Norfolk has placed in my hands, would be to open a new question entirely, and that, I think, is not in accordance with parliamentary practice. I can cite precedents, if the hon. member desires me to do so, to sustain the position I have taken in regard to this matter. The practice is laid down in the books as follows :—

The Speaker then proposes the next question—that these resolutions be read a second time. The procedure at this stage with respect to amendment and debate has been explained on more than one occasion by Speakers of the English Commons. When the question is put, “said Mr. Speaker Dennison,” it is open to any hon. member to make any general observations he may think necessary. But they should be relevant to the subject-matter. With respect to amendments, Mr. Speaker Brand said on a subsequent occasion: “The established rule of debate is that the observations of hon. members should be relevant to the question put from the Chair. There is one exception to that rule, and that is, when a motion is made that this House resolves itself into Committee of Supply; upon that occasion a relevance of debate—that is, debate not relevant to the subject-matter proposed to be discussed in committee—is allowed; but I am not aware of a irrelevant matter, generally speaking, being allowed upon any other occasion.”

The writer goes on to say:

The Speaker puts the question for concurrence in the resolution, and both amendment and debate must be relevant to the same in accordance with English practice. For instance, on the question for agreeing to a resolution providing a sum of money for printing in connection with the Queen's Colleges, Ireland, Mr. Parnell was proceeding to discuss the general subject, when he was interrupted by Mr. Speaker Brand, and reminded that “on the question of a vote for stationery, it was not competent for him to enter into a general discussion on the subject of those colleges.”

I might quote one or two instances as to the relevancy of amendments. The decision of the English Speakers is as follows :—

“The relevancy of an amendment to the motion is clear and complete.” Where the resolution before the House being “That Mr. Bradlaugh be not permitted to go through the form of taking the oath prescribed by the Statutes 29 Vic., cap. 19 and 32 Vic., cap. 72—Mr. Speaker allowed the following amendment to be in order on the grounds that the relevancy to the motion before the House was clear and complete. On the Order of the Day “that the conduct of Mr. O'Donnell be taken into consideration in the course of the debate.”

Amendment proposed and seconded to leave out all the words after “that” and substitute these words: “the chairman of committee, having named Mr. O'Donnell for obstructing the business of Parliament, he being absent from the House during the greater part of the sitting during which the alleged offence was committed, and not having previously received any warning from the Chair, this House is not prepared to take notice of the language imputed to the hon. member and passes to the next Order of the day.”

Objection taken as not within the scope of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This amendment does, by implication, if not directly, call in question the conduct of the chairman of committees, and in that sense, no doubt, is out of order. It is out of order, first, because it is scarcely relevant to the question before the

House, and beyond that it is out of order because it raises substantially the same questions that are proposed to be raised (by two other members). I do not, therefore, put this amendment as it is now framed.

The two reasons I give for my decision are, first: That the amendment is not relevant to the resolution, and second, that there is an Order standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) substantially the same as the proposed amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. I must bow, Mr. Speaker, to your ruling. The question does not admit of discussion when the judge has decided it. As there is a further vote proposed in the Supplementary Estimates for the Columbia Exposition, I give notice that I will, on the first occasion when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, move a resolution in the direction of the amendment I have placed in your hands.

Resolution read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER introduced Bill (No. 124) respecting the appointment of commissioners to the World's Columbian Exposition.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) to amend the Superannuation Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be well that hon. members should obtain a clear and distinct statement of the provisions of the Bill, and what the Minister of Finance proposes, in view of the expenditure which the country has been compelled to bear during the past fifteen or twenty years in connection with superannuation. I have already drawn the attention of the House to the expenditure during the last twelve years, during which the present superannuation system has been in force. The hon. Minister of Finance will, on examining the statistics I submitted find they are perfectly correct. I have shown that during those twelve years the country lost \$1,700,000, giving credit to the scheme for all the deductions made from the salaries of civil servants towards that fund. I now repeat that members of the Civil Service are well paid. They obtain as full remuneration for their services as do clerks of any other class. Accordingly, superannuation is unnecessary, and they should be allowed to provide for their future requirements out of their regular salaries. They can, at the present time, insure their lives at great advantage in different companies. I understand that it is intended to ask the civil servants who enter the service after this date, for an increased deduction from their salaries towards this fund. But the feature of the superannuation system to which I take most pointed objection, and which is the greatest evil, is the manner in

Mr. SPEAKER.

which it has been abused by the Government. It has not been directed towards helping old and faithful servants who have become enfeebled in the faithful discharge of their duties, and who deserve some consideration, if any of the civil servants deserve it at all, but it has been used to remove from lucrative positions, men who were quite capable of discharging their duties, men who were in the prime of life, and who had no desire or expectation of superannuation. This was done simply to make offices for others who were pressing their services upon the Government. The Superannuation Act has been so grossly abused by the Government for the last twelve years that the House should pause before they consent to the introduction of a new Act. I think that we should abolish the present Act, close up the superannuation account as rapidly as we can, and leave the civil servants to provide for themselves. I may say to the hon. gentleman that, for my part, I shall oppose every clause in this Bill from beginning to end, and in view of the loss to which the country has been put in this respect, I hold that it is not right that the consideration of this Bill should be forced upon the House at the closing hours of the session. This is a matter of serious moment. It is one of the most important Bills that have been introduced this session, and if the Bill is used the same as the Superannuation Act has been in the past, it is going to be a matter of very great importance and serious loss to the people of this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before I discuss the Bill I would like to ask the Minister of Finance how far this proposal will provide the necessary funds without a charge on the public revenues?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend, and the House will listen to me for about ten minutes, I think I can make clear what the position and intention of the Government is with reference to this matter. In the first instance, I must premise what I say by this observation: That the Government takes it up wholly with a desire of making the superannuation system—which it does not propose to entirely abolish—less burdensome on the funds than it has been up to the present time. As I said before, the present superannuation system commenced in 1870, and, remaining up to this date, it has not been a system which has been fairly tried upon its merits, and for two reasons. One reason was: That, although when the measure was introduced it had a fair abatement from the salaries, namely, 4 per cent on salaries of \$600 and over, and 2½ per cent for salaries under \$600; in a fit of mistaken sympathy, the House, three years afterwards, reduced that abatement to 2 per cent on salaries of \$600 and over, and 1¼ per cent for salaries of less than \$600. That immediately reduced these abatements below the percentage which

was necessary to carry even the best managed superannuation system. Again the system was begun with overloading it at the first end, and in this way : In 1870 we had a large number of civil servants who were then upon the list, and in the service of the country. They were landed upon this superannuation system, and the most of them paid either nothing, or at least a very small proportion, into the superannuation fund ; but they became entitled to the benefits of the superannuation fund, and have been charges upon it from that time up to the present. I desire to call the attention of the House to some figures in that respect which will show very clearly the amount of overloading of the fund, of which I have been speaking. I have in my hand a statement of persons who are to-day upon the superannuation list, who were in the service in 1870, and who have been superannuated gradually from that time up to the present, and who have paid comparatively little into the superannuation fund :

Of those who were superannuated in 1871, there are to-day eight living of an average age of 84 years, and drawing out of the fund \$3,265.72 per year ; some of them paid nothing into the superannuation fund, and the others paid from eight months up to one year and six months superannuation abatement. That is, with regard to these eight persons drawing that amount of money from 1871 up to the present time out of the superannuation fund, nothing was paid by two, and but an average of one year superannuation abatement was paid by the other six.

Of those superannuated in 1872, two are still living with average age of 78 years, and drawing \$1,172.52 per year out of the fund. Of these two, one paid an abatement for one year and eleven months, and the other for two years and eleven months.

Of those superannuated in 1873, there are thirteen upon the list with an average age of 79 years, drawing \$4,101.88 out of the fund, and of these not one paid more than three and a half years abatement into the superannuation fund.

Of those who were superannuated in 1874, four are upon the list with average ages of 74 years, drawing \$1,057.88 out of the fund per year, and of those not one paid more than four years and seven months abatement into the fund.

Of those who were superannuated in 1875, thirteen are still upon the list, with average ages of 74 years, drawing \$5,442.99 per year out of the Treasury, and of those the highest abatement paid was for five years and eleven months.

Of those superannuated in 1876, eight are upon the superannuation list, with an average age of 71 years, drawing \$6,163.60 per year out of the fund, and of these the highest superannuation abatement paid was for six years and five months.

Of those superannuated in 1877, thirteen are upon the list, with an average age of 74 years, drawing \$5,898 per year out of the fund, and of these the highest abatement paid was for seven years and six months.

Of those superannuated in 1878, nineteen are still upon the list, with an average age of 80 years, drawing \$6,887.94 per year out of the fund, the highest abatement paid being for eight years and six months.

Of those superannuated in 1879, nineteen are upon the list, with an average age of 74 years, drawing \$8,963.54 out of the fund per year, and the highest abatement paid was for nine years and seven months.

Of those superannuated in 1880, fifteen are still upon the list, average age of 75 years, drawing \$6,193.63 per year out of the fund, the highest abatement paid being for ten years and seven months.

Of those superannuated in 1881, twenty-one are still upon the list, at an average of 74 years, drawing \$8,116.92 per year out of the fund, the highest abatement paid being for eleven years and four months.

Of those superannuated in 1882, there are upon the list twenty-two, average age of 73 years, drawing \$11,665.48 yearly from the fund, the highest abatement paid being for eleven years and eleven months.

Of those superannuated in 1883, there are upon the list 33, average age 74 years, drawing \$13,219.50 per year from the fund, the highest abatement paid being for thirteen years and seven months.

Of those superannuated in 1884, there are twenty upon the list, average age of 68 years, drawing \$9,527.18 from the fund, the highest abatement paid being for fourteen years and five months.

Of those superannuated in 1885, there are sixteen upon the list, at average age of 67 years, drawing \$7,609.10 per year from the fund, the highest abatement paid being for fifteen years and five months.

Of those superannuated in 1886, there are twenty upon the list, with an average age of 73 years, drawing \$10,019.78 from the fund per year, the highest abatement paid being for sixteen years and four months.

Of those superannuated in 1887, there are twenty-six upon the list, with an average age of 70 years, drawing \$10,988.40 yearly, the highest abatement paid being for seventeen years and ten months.

Of those superannuated in 1888 there are upon the list twenty-nine, the average age is 70 years, the amount drawn yearly \$20,076, and the highest abatement paid eighteen years and six months.

Of those superannuated in 1889 there are upon the list thirty-five, the average age is 69 years, the amount drawn yearly \$21,659, and the highest abatement paid nineteen years and two months.

Of those superannuated in 1890 there are upon the list twenty, the average age is 65 years, the amount drawn yearly \$12,886, and the highest abatement paid twenty years and six months.

Of those superannuated in 1891 there are on the list thirty-nine, the average age is 67 years, the amount drawn yearly \$26,878, and the highest abatement paid twenty-one years and four months.

Of those superannuated in 1892 there are on the list twelve, the average age is 68 years, the amount drawn yearly \$10,047, and the highest abatement paid twenty-one years and eight months. Totaling up these figures, I find that the total number upon the establishment in 1870 who are drawing superannuation to-day is 391. Of these 387 are of the average age of 71 years, and the total yearly amount they draw is \$219,842, while the total number on the list in 1892 was 502, and the total yearly amount they draw is \$253,023. I have given this statement for the purpose of showing that the overloading of this superannuation fund is due almost entirely to the fact that old or elderly servants who were in the service of the country in 1870 were placed upon the superannuation list at that time, with either no payment of abatement, or a comparatively small payment into the fund, and have been a charge upon the revenue, some of them from 1870, and many of them for a number of years since. It will be seen, then, that there is cause why the superannuation system has been so burdensome; and if those who were old in the service in 1870 had not been put upon the list, and those who came in after that date and were put on had paid their abatements, there would have been a natural increment of abatements, and there would have been only the natural relative falling-in of superannuated persons to draw upon the fund. That, then, is the reason why the superannuation system has proved so burdensome. It has not been the fault of the system, but the fault of the action of Parliament—I am not going to say wrongly—in overloading the system at its commencement by putting on the list those who were made eligible for superannuation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say to the hon. gentleman that the Bill fixing the superannuation amount was introduced by Sir Francis Hincks when he was Minister of Finance, and he estimated 4 per cent as the amount necessary to supply the necessary annuities. The hon. gentleman is now fixing the percentage at a lower rate. Has he taken an actuarial estimate in arriving at the rate?

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that in a few moments. The other reason was what my hon. friend just stated, that although 4 per cent and 2½ per cent respectively as abatements were considered sufficient at that

Mr. FOSTER.

time to carry the annuitants, they were reduced a few years later to 2 per cent and 1¼ respectively, and these were far below what was necessary. These are two reasons why this system has been so burdensome in its results. Now, in the present proposition there are two elements. One is to commence de novo. Some may say, why not abolish the superannuation system compounding in some way with the present beneficiaries. I think there are two reasons why the House would be slow to do that. In the first place, the present civil servants have grown up in the service on the basis of a superannuation which they had in view when they entered the service, and to which they have loyally contributed, and after they have grown comparatively old in the service, I think it would be a harsh thing for Parliament to deprive them of the benefits of this system at the present time, and I do not imagine that Parliament would seriously consider any such proposition. So that, for good or for evil, we have to carry out the system with regard to those at present employed in the service. There is, however, a silver lining to the cloud in one respect, which we cannot rejoice in, but which in the order of nature we may be permitted to contemplate. Those servants who are now the large annuitants, and who draw largely on the fund, have an average age of 71 years, and many of them go up into the nineties. In the order of nature, these will pass away rapidly from year to year, so that a few years hence will see a large proportion of the present heavy burden taken away from the fund. Therefore, I do not anticipate that in the future the disparity between the income and the outgo of the fund will be so large. It will, I think, soon begin to diminish constantly and fairly rapidly. Then with reference to those who come into the service in the future the question is whether we shall have any superannuation system. There are two sides to that question. The one side which forces itself upon my attention, and which, I think, will also force itself on the attention of the House, is this, that after all a fair superannuation system is not the least economical system—is, in my belief, the most economical. There is a sympathy with men who come into the service at an early age, and grow up in the service, and when the time approaches that they are not able to do their fair share of work, or to do their work at all, there is a lack of desire to put these men out of the service without anything, and, without a superannuation system, the tendency of that sympathy would be to keep men on drawing their salaries as long as possible, whether they could do their work fairly well or not, and, as the work has to be done, to put other men on to do the work, and so to overload the service with people who are not active servants in the best sense, and who do not do the best work. On the other hand, there is this to be taken into consideration, that you have not at all exhausted this subject when you consider

the payments into the superannuation fund, and the payments out. You have also to take into account the question of the real economies effected by the superannuation of persons with high salaries and filling up their places with persons at lower salaries, or doing away with the offices altogether. I have not had a calculation made as to all the departments; but I have had some calculations made with reference to my own department, and I can fairly challenge the investigation of the House in regard to the superannuation in the Finance Department for the last ten or fifteen years. Any person who goes through it will see that the system has been established for the purpose of doing away with servants who had become unnecessary owing, not to less work but to better arrangements of the work, or to the appointment of persons younger, with less salaries, and who do the work efficiently. I will not weary the House with reading examples, but this is a side of the question we ought to take into account. Another thing which burdens the superannuation system is the taking into it of men at an advanced age, when possibly they will have but ten or twenty years of active service and then come in for the full benefits of the superannuation fund in proportion to the term of each. What the Bill proposes then is to commence de novo, without at all disturbing the present situation, so far as the civil servants now employed are concerned. It proposes to form a superannuation fund number two, into which shall go civil servants appointed after the passage of the Act. It is proposed to make the abatement what is considered a fair abatement, not so much as that proposed by Sir Francis Hincks in introducing his measure. We propose to make it $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent instead of 4, for salaries from \$600, and 3 instead of $2\frac{1}{2}$ for salaries under \$600. We propose to limit the age at which employees can go upon the superannuation list to forty-five. That is to say, no person who is appointed over forty-five years of age shall have the benefit of superannuation, and the idea of this is to encourage what we ought to encourage the getting into the service of younger men, who will be trained up to the work gradually, and will give to the country the best service they possibly can, and to discourage the taking in of men of advanced years whose term of service would be naturally short and who become more burdensome upon the superannuation list. So that one point in this Bill is that persons who are employed in the Civil Service of forty-five years of age and upwards shall not be eligible to be put on the superannuation list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nor charged.

Mr. FOSTER. Nor charged, certainly. Then I have had, as my hon. friend intimates, actual calculations made. I suppose my hon. friend does not wish me to read the

tables but merely to give the results. The results show that, on the basis of $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 and on the basis of not having any persons charged in the list who enter the service at forty-five years of age or over, and on the basis that we shall not superannuate under sixty-five years of age, this system would be completely self-sustaining, on the supposition that on the funds in the hands of the Government we shall allow an interest of 6 instead of four per cent. The contribution then which, under these circumstances, the Government will give is a contribution of 2 per cent on the moneys invested in the fund, and of which the Government will have the use. Under these circumstances, if the rules be rigidly adhered to—and they will be unless other legislation takes place—with reference to the percentage of abatements and with reference to the limit of forty-five years, there will be no charge upon the country with the exception of the extra interest charged which will commence with nothing and go up gradually. The interest on the first year will be estimated as our contribution at \$180; the interest for the second year will amount to \$558, and will go on accumulating as the fund increases. It may be said, in answer to this, that you cannot always keep the age of superannuation at 65, and that some will be superannuated below sixty-five. That is true. It often becomes necessary to do so, but even under the old superannuation system, taking the whole average, the age of superannuation has been between sixty and sixty-two, so that although superannuation sometimes takes place below sixty-five, by persons becoming disabled through accident or ill health, the majority of cases will not necessarily be very large, and the contribution which the Government will have to make over and above the 2 per cent interest I have spoken of, will be a contribution sufficient to make up for the fund what is necessary to keep it equal to paying all the prospective annuitants upon it owing to superannuations which may be made below the age of sixty-five, which will amount to an insignificant sum. So that, under this system for about twenty years, there will be scarcely any demand upon the country at all, with the exception of interest which goes into the fund. After twenty years, there will be the gradual accretion of superannuants; and at any time that the Government and the House wish to do away with the superannuation system there can be no one in the Civil Service who can get up and say, you have violated the compact, you must not do away with this as far as I am concerned; for the fund will be in such a position that if at any time the Government and Parliament come to the conclusion to have no superannuation and to stop the system, there will be a fund out of which to pay to every prospective annuitant what may become due to him in the course of his life in the service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the average age at which those who were superannuated were appointed?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very difficult thing to find out, and I do not think my tables show that. The returns on these matters have not been printed consecutively, and, in some years, have not been brought down. I asked for that to-day, and find that it would require a large amount of research and several days to get it. However, you can get a comparative idea from the table I have read.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Upon what age is that actuarial calculation based as regards parties entering the service? Is it an average age?

Mr. FOSTER. It is taken in this way. The average appointments for a number of years past are taken, and then the average of the whole and the average of their salaries and the like, and the average ages for appointments in the future are assumed to be about the same as that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. Minister the average age before him?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have the average. I might read one or two of these tables. The average number of appointments in 1891, was 207, the total ages 69,345, the average 33.5, the average salary, \$629. 1892, total number of appointments 237, average age 34, average salary \$531. Taking the two together, you find 444 appointments, average age 33.9, average salary, \$576, so that my hon. friend will see they very closely coincide in the two years which have been taken, and I think some other calculations were made of two or three years previous, and the average came out surprisingly close in all the years, as regards ages, and pretty close as regards salary. The average age may be put down as between thirty-three and thirty-five, and for the purposes of this actuarial calculation it has, I think, been taken at thirty-four, with the limit we propose to put upon the age for annuitants. Evidently the results will be liable to be better than in the past.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Supposing a man pays into No. 2 fund 3½ per cent? The Government has to pay in a certain other amount to the fund to the credit of that man?

Mr. FOSTER. It is paid into the general credit fund, and not put to the credit of each man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand the scheme then. I understood it differently. I think you will find it is not very well expressed in the section.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be to the interest of the service and of the country if the hon. gentleman did not press this Bill through at this session. The subject

Mr. FOSTER.

is one which requires a very great deal of consideration. The Minister of the Crown who presented this Bill and who has given us the explanation on the policy of the Government with reference to it, has referred to the burden upon the fund caused by the superannuation of a large number of old servants who had been in the public service for a long time without contributing anything, and whose contributions under the Superannuation Act had continued for a very short time before they were superannuated. It seems to me it would not have been an unreasonable policy, nor would it be an unreasonable policy now, to make parties superannuated before they have been for a certain number of years in the service contributors to the fund in the same way as those in the service. Why should a person who has been superannuated after a contribution of a few years to the fund be allowed to retire and receive his superannuation allowance and still contribute nothing after he has been superannuated? I think that a person superannuated, who is receiving \$1,200, or \$1,500 or \$2,000 a year, and who has contributed very little to the fund, could very well afford to contribute after he has been superannuated out of his superannuation allowance. I do not see that he would be subjected to any greater hardship than a person who, upon a small salary, has contributed after entering the public service. Under the plan I suggest those who are benefited will be called upon to bear a fair proportion of the burden. Let me suppose that a person after he has been in the service five years fails in health and is superannuated.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot be superannuated until he has been ten years in the service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman knows that many of them have been superannuated, a certain number of years being added to their term of service.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that has been done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That has been done over and over again. It does appear to me that these parties superannuated before the Act had been, say ten years in operation, might well have been made contributors to the fund.

Mr. FOSTER. But many of those superannuated early had given 35 years of service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I quite admit that, but I am speaking of the amount of their contributions. The burden, as the hon. gentleman knows, has been shifted upon the shoulders of the public at large, composed in great degree of parties who are as straightened in their circumstances, and who have quite as small an income as many of those who have been superannuated. There is another feature of the system which requires the serious consideration of the House, and

which leads me to the conclusion that a more satisfactory system in the interest of the parties, if not in the interest of the public at large, might be devised. The hon. gentleman has given the number added to the public service as between 200 and 300 every year. The number who are superannuated are about 10 per cent of those added; so that those who die in the service must constitute in the neighbourhood of 90 per cent, and none of those composing the 90 per cent or their families, though they have contributed to the fund, and are, in effect insurers and contributors to the income of the survivors, receive anything. You find parties who have been for 30 years members of the service and contributors to the fund, ever since it has been in existence, who die in the service. Their families receive nothing. All that they have contributed goes to the advantage of those who have been superannuated. Now, I myself know parties who have remained in the service until advanced age, who have served the public faithfully, who have contributed the amount required of them to the fund, and who have died in the public service, and their families have received nothing. The families sometimes get a gratuity of two or three months salary which the deceased was receiving, and beyond that nothing was paid them. Now it does seem to me that a system more advantageous could be devised if the Government were to impose 4 per cent, as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, and to allow compound interest at that rate, and when the party is retired from the public service or when he dies in the public service, hand over to him or to his representatives the amount of money he has actually earned. The public will lose nothing, and the family of the party who dies in the service will receive the advantage; there will be perfectly fair and equal treatment of all the parties who enter the public service, whether they die in the public service, or whether they are superannuated or retire. I think that such a course would be more advantageous than the one which is hitherto in use and which the hon. Minister seeks by this Bill to some extent to approximate to a self-sustaining system. I have no doubt the hon. Minister is giving these parties a larger amount than they could receive from any other institution, by allowing them 6 per cent on the moneys they contribute. I do not specially take exception to that. I doubt whether the fund he provides will prove adequate. I think a very careful calculation was made, when Sir Francis Hincks proposed 4 per cent. The hon. gentleman has named $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and 3 per cent on smaller salaries, but I believe these contributions will not yield as large a fund as was provided by the 4 per cent and 2 per cent, under the first proposition adopted at the time this policy was initiated. And so I think it would be advantageous if the hon. gentleman will consent, after the discussion

of this measure by the House, not to press it through this session, but to give the House an opportunity of carefully considering the whole subject and to find out if some other system, fairer to those who die in the public service, could not be adopted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry the rules of the House will not permit me to reply to some remarks the Finance Minister has made. I will avail myself of my privilege, when the House goes into committee on the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would join in the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this important matter, after it has been discussed by the House, should be left over for further consideration. I urge this upon the same ground as he has presented, first, the importance of the subject, and second, that it has not been threshed out in debate. I did not gather from the hon. gentleman, myself, that he submitted this report merely as a tentative measure. I did not gather that he had thoroughly exhausted the subject himself, or that he had reports from those competent to deal with the matter, which justified him in saying that this was the last word that could be said upon the subject. No great damage can occur from leaving the question over for another year, and there may be great good. I think it will be generally admitted, that the system for which the hon. gentleman proposes to substitute the present one, has not worked in the manner in which the public expected. In the first place, the evils of the existing system, the injustice of the present system, are not remedied at all. The present system will go on for another twenty years. The new system which is proposed, will not come into operation until twenty years have expired.

Mr. FOSTER. The new system begins immediately. Its fruits will be felt in the first twenty years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I want to point out to the hon. gentleman is this, that the evils and injustice of the existing system will continue during those twenty years, and he has made no attempt to deal with them at all. How do the facts stand to-day? We need not concern ourselves very much with a discussion as to whether one particular Government, or one particular party, are to blame for the evil that exists. We must deal with the facts as we find them. We find in the Public Accounts, as a matter of fact, that the amount of the annual allowances to which the present superannuated civil servants are entitled, is \$277,855; while the amounts they actually received, during the past year, was \$253,679, the difference arising from the fact that some of them only received two, or three, or four months, as the case may be, of their annual salary, having been superannuated during

the year. But let it be understood that the Civil Service pension list of the country is \$277,000; whereas, as a matter of fact, the contributions made by the civil service towards the fund, are only \$63,000; so that we are paying \$200,000 odd more than we are receiving out of this fund. Therefore, when you put aside altogether the idea on which the fund was originally founded, on which the system was originally established, that it would in some sense or way be a self-paying system, we know now that it is not, and never will be. That cannot be justified. The hon. gentleman knows that the present system is made, not only to cover a superannuation for those who have lived to a period of life when they can work no longer with efficiency in the public service, but it is made use of for political purposes, from time to time; and we have the disheartening spectacle of men in the prime of life superannuated and placed upon the pension list—a very odious list in this new country—with salaries ranging from a few hundred dollars up to thousands. This is a scandal and a disgrace, of course, and has tended very much to make this system nauseating. Now, for my part, I think the present system contains provisions which will operate most grievously and unjustly to a large portion of the Civil Service. Take the very case my friend instanced. A man goes into the Civil Service, and after contributing to the superannuation fund for ten, twenty, thirty, or forty years, he dies; the bread winner is taken away, a little helpless family is left behind, and they do not receive a single farthing.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you propose to remedy that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not pointing out the remedy at present, I am pointing out the injustice that exists, because many hon. gentlemen, including the hon. gentleman himself, spoke on the assumption that the present system was one which, at any rate, if it was injurious to the state, dealt out justice to the Civil Service. I say it does not. It is a most grievous and unjust system. In the first place, a man very often in the prime of life, is superannuated some times for good cause, and sometimes without good cause, and in that case he receives very much more than he ever paid in. But I say that the bread winner, who has paid in for twenty or thirty years, and dies and leaves a helpless widow and family, loses all the money he has paid in, and his family does not receive a cent. Now, that is a gross, and a grievous and a patent injustice. It ought not to exist. It ought not to be possible that two men, side by side, should enter the Civil Service and go on and pay the same amount for twenty years, that one of them should die, leaving a helpless family, and get nothing at all from the state; while the other man walks out, perhaps, in the prime of life, and receives \$1,600 or \$1,700 the re-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

mainder of his life. Therefore, I say the system requires a great deal of consideration. It ought to be changed, something ought to be done to remove that evil. I have not thoroughly studied the question, although I have given it some consideration. I have read the speech Mr. Blake made, I think, in 1883, in this House, when he proposed a new system of repaying to the public servant, when, at any time he went out, the sum of money which, up to that time, he had paid in, with interest upon it. That system seemed to me a good one. I also read the memorandum on superannuation which was prepared and submitted by the Civil Service Commission; and it will be seen by any hon. gentleman who takes up that memorandum, that those gentlemen do not suggest that they had exhausted the subject. They simply submit, as they say, a preliminary memorandum rather than a scheme embodying mature conclusions upon the subject. They have not come to any mature conclusions; they merely submit a memorandum of their present impressions. I do not suppose the House are prepared to legislate upon suggestions rather than conclusions arrived at after patient consideration. Now, I think myself that the present system could be very well repealed altogether. I do not think it is necessary to do an injustice to these civil servants, or to break the compact we have with them. Of course, every one knows that if the present Superannuation Act was repealed, it would necessarily involve, on the part of the state, a return to all those who have paid moneys in, of all the moneys they have paid in, with a reasonably large amount of interest, compound interest, it might be, upon those payments, so that injustice should not be done to those parties. You would then get rid, once for all, of the large number of pensioners which we have now "in prospectu." Of course, we have to pay those now superannuated during the remainder of their lives. They have paid in their money, and having been superannuated, are entitled to this pension for the rest of their lives. But with regard to the rest of the service, who are entering, as it were, on the superannuation system, you would get the element of finality; you are repaying them what they have paid in, with a reasonable amount of interest upon the payments, and then justice will be done to them as well as to the state. Now, I think myself, after considering the several propositions made, that perhaps the proposition suggested in 1883 by Mr. Blake, is the best one. There you would have repayment to the servant, on his voluntary retirement, of the amount he had paid in, with interest from the time he paid it in; you would have repayment to the servant who was compulsorily retired of the amount he had paid in up to the time of his compulsory retirement; and you would have above all, the repayment to the widow and children of the dead servant, when death called him away, of the

amount he had paid in, with interest upon that. I think myself that the several interests of the state, and of the civil servant, and of those who are dependent upon the civil servant, would be better conserved by the introduction of a Bill based upon those lines, than upon the one which the hon. gentleman has introduced. I admit that in almost any scheme you introduce, there will be the possibility of injustice being done to some one or more. That cannot be avoided, you cannot have equal justice weighed out, as it were, in a pair of scales; but you must come as near to it, on the average, as is possible. I do not think this Bill does. I think it leaves the present evil system untouched. The injustice inherent in it will exist for the next twenty years, and the new system which it is sought to be introduced, which will practically go into operation twenty years from now, is not one which will meet the demands of the public, nor is it, I think, based upon even-handed justice. I think the hon. gentleman would consult the interests of the state better if, after the conversation we have had on the features of this Bill, he takes the second reading upon it, and lets it remain over till next year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in regard to two of the suggestions he has made to the House. I consider this Bill is a great improvement on the present law. The question of getting rid of the present law altogether, as suggested by the hon. gentleman, involves a great injustice to the civil servants now in the employ of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is proceeding on the assumption that the proposed Bill applies to existing civil servants. Instead of such being the case, it only applies to civil servants who may subsequently enter the service of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I admit that. By the present law civil servants who have been appointed are entitled to superannuation according to the conditions of the law. They accepted their appointment, and the Government appointed them knowing that this law was in existence; it is in fact a condition of their employment. In some cases those gentlemen have vacated good positions elsewhere to enter the Government's service, and they are therefore entitled to the benefit of the law as it existed at the time of their appointment. That law is still in existence. If we were to retain that law and give the officers the amounts with interest thereon paid from year to year into the fund, it would not be doing fair-play towards them. They knew on entering the service that the law was in existence, and if they became unfit for work they could secure superannuation. If it had not existed, those officers, entering the service young, would in many

cases certainly have taken out insurance policies running over ten or twenty years, at the expiration of which term they would have received the insurance money. But the superannuation system being in existence they have relied on that; and the honour of the Government and Parliament, in my opinion, will not consent to wipe out that law and throw such officers on the street. The hon. gentleman has referred to officers remaining in their positions until the last moment and dying within a short period of leaving the service, all the amounts paid into the fund being thereby lost. Such cases undoubtedly occur. That has always seemed to me to indicate a defect in the law. Something should be done for the families of such officers. The civil servant probably paid into the fund during twenty or thirty years the amount for which he was taxed, and on his death his family receive nothing. That system is undoubtedly wrong, and something should be done for those families. I do not advocate that an allowance should be given to them at all equivalent to that which the civil servant would have drawn from the fund, but something certainly should be done, such as giving an allowance equal to the salary during three, four or five years received by the civil servant, in order that his widow and children might have some means of support for a time at least. Regarding the 4 per cent imposed under the first law, and the 2 per cent now collected, I may say that that change occurred within a short period, I do not remember how many years.

Mr. FOSTER. Three years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The suggestion was made by Mr. Joly, who was then a member of the Opposition, but he took a broad view of the case without respect to party, and he contended that 4 per cent was too high and it should be reduced to 2 per cent, and instead of 2 or 2½ it should be 1¼ per cent. The result of this change was that the fund was found to be too small to meet the allowances, and we find ourselves in our present condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Joly drafted the Bill for the reduction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say so. I said that Mr. Joly made the suggestion to the House, that it was supported by a large number of members, and the Government introduced a measure to carry out this suggestion, and it appeared at the time to meet with the unanimous assent of the House. In regard to the new tax of 3½ per cent and 3 per cent for officers who are to be appointed after this Bill becomes law, they being under forty-five years of age, I think the proposal is a good one, and it will replenish the fund, especially in view of the interest which the Government will pay on the amount paid in. I desire, however, to ask the Minister of Finance in regard to

officers who may be appointed, whose age at the time exceeds forty-five years. Under this Bill I understand they will not pay any superannuation contribution.

Mr. FOSTER. They will pay nothing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Suppose an officer is appointed, forty-seven years of age, to a high position such as deputy-minister of a department, and after ten years he becomes unfit to perform his duties, I understand that no provision is made for the superannuation of such an officer.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot be superannuated.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the old system, previous to the introduction of the superannuation system, officers were in the service no less than sixty-five, seventy or seventy-five years of age, and they were permitted to remain there because there was no superannuation system in force. Although they may have proved ornaments to the department, the work was really done by second officers who were necessarily appointed. Has the Minister of Finance made any provisions for such cases?

Mr. FOSTER. No provisions. You have to place a limit somewhere and look at the balance of the advantages. The balance of advantage in favour of the country, evidently is to appoint persons before they arrive at this mature age, and the effect of this will have that tendency greater than at present. I think my hon. friend if he will look at those who are deputy-ministers, will find that nine out of ten—there may be even a larger percentage—are not those who have been appointed at an advanced age, but who have grown up in the service; so that it would be but seldom that such a case as that would happen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under these circumstances, I think the Bill is a great improvement on the present law, and should we adopt the Bill as it is, that would not prevent the Government, during the recess, considering the other points, and, perhaps, provide for the families of those officers who die, after having been, perhaps, thirty or forty years in the service.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In my opinion, the present Bill is an improvement on the old law, but, at the same time, I think we are adopting a wrong step if we sanction it. It is all very well for the Minister of Finance to state that under the provisions of this Bill there would be no charge entailed upon the country, but we know from the working of the old law, that the expense on the Treasury has been very serious, indeed. I have no doubt that when the first Superannuation Act was passed, in 1870, that it was then supposed that the amounts received from the superannuation abatements would equal the amount that would be paid out, and it was intended that it should do that,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

at the rate of 4 per cent abatement then established. But as this system has gone on from year to year, we found that grave abuses had cropped up, until to-day we find that the country is losing \$200,000 annually. If the provisions of this present Bill, as laid down by the Finance Minister, could be rigidly adhered to, there possibly would not be so much objection to it, as there is to the present law. As I understand it, no person is eligible for superannuation who is appointed at an age over forty-five years, and he is not supposed to be superannuated under sixty-five years. Then the amount received into the fund would meet the payments out, less 2 per cent which the Government propose to pay as interest on the deposits. It would be utterly impossible to carry out these provisions. There would be a great many cases in which men must be superannuated before they reach sixty-five years of age, and, in every case where that takes place, a charge is made upon the country. Viewing this Bill in the light of our experience of the old Superannuation Act, I have no doubt that, in a few years, we will find a large expense fixed on the country. I do not think the country is prepared for this. I know that in the western part of Ontario, Conservatives and Liberals alike feel that the superannuation of civil servants ought to be dispensed with. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) a man may pay into the fund for twenty, or even forty years, and then, when death occurs, his family are cut off without receiving any return for the money so paid. This is, in my opinion a hardship. On the other hand, another man who is superannuated may retire, after ten or fifteen years, at a very large yearly allowance. I believe that a system could be devised by which this injustice would not be perpetrated. To my mind, the plan suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a reasonable a fair and an honourable way of meeting the difficulty. If 3 or 4 per cent of the salaries of civil servants is deducted each year, and the Government were to allow some interest on this fund, then, if death occurs or if they retire because of ill-health or old age, a certain amount will be coming to them, and it will obviate any reluctance on the part of the Government in dispensing with their services if they are not able to discharge their duties. I think it would be wise for the Government to postpone action on this Bill, and to take into their serious consideration the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). This is a matter which should be considered as a business transaction, and not from a party standpoint. It is one in which the interests of the public are one side, and the interests of civil servants on the other. No matter from what side of the House it emanates, the plan which would best carry out the wishes we all have in view is certainly the

one that ought to be adopted. In my belief, the scheme suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would meet the difficulties that have been raised, and ought to be accepted by both sides of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill now before the House, has, in my opinion, a good deal of merit, over the superannuation system which has obtained heretofore. It provides a larger payment into the fund, and, according to the proposal, the superannuation system is likely to pay its way without entailing much additional expense upon the country. But I think it is unfortunate that the measure does not provide, as the hon. member for Bothwell points out, for giving something to the widow, and perhaps orphans, on the death of the civil servant who has been paying into the fund. A man may be superannuated at a time of life that he can do a little work in many lines and when he is still able to earn something for his family, but if he drops off suddenly, after having paid his superannuation abatement for many years, there is no provision made for recouping to his family any part of the money he paid. The fact of his sudden death deprives him of his superannuation, and also deprives his family of what, had he lived, he might be able to earn in other walks of life after he had been superannuated. The family then become pensioners on the public and have to be provided for in some way. I think that this very condition of things was what gave rise to the necessity for a superannuation law in the first place, but although this Bill provides for the family during the life of the person superannuated, it makes no provision for his family after death, and unless there is something saved—which, in many instances, unfortunately, is not the case—they become pensioners on the public and must be provided for at the public expense or by charity. Therefore, I think, the Bill is defective in this respect. I regret to find also that it makes no provision to reduce that very large number of cases which have been growing up of late years, in which we have been paying a very large amount of money, that I think we should not pay, to superannuated officials. The system has grown up of late years of adding to the length of a man's service; in some cases one year, some two years and some a greater number of years, for the purpose of enabling him, when he leaves the service, to draw a much higher superannuation allowance than his years in office would entitle him to. That is an obnoxious principle; it is very unpopular in the country, and it ought to be remedied in some way or other. It is to be regretted that this Bill does not propose to remedy that evil. I do not know how that could be provided against, but I think it would be very easy to remedy it. It has been found very troublesome for members of Parliament to satisfy the people of the

country that they are not doing more than justice to those who are in the Civil Service. In my opinion that principle should be stopped in the future. If, in this measure, it were provided to put an end to the system of adding to the number of years of service, and also to refund the abatement to the families of civil servants who die in the employment of the Government, it would be a much better measure than it is at the present time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you intend to go through with the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman to let the matter stand until the leader of the Opposition is here. I do not think it will delay the matter at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say that I am very anxious to put the Bill through. If it is not a full measure such as hon. gentlemen would wish, it will, at least, correct an evil which would become almost unbearable, and it will prevent 240 or 250 more coming in, next year, under the present rate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman is determined to push the Bill through we, on this side, will assent to his going into committee.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. McMULLEN. In answer to the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister this afternoon, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the number of cases of superannuation within the last few years. The hon. Minister says that the average age at which civil servants have been superannuated is between sixty and sixty-two. Now, I have in my hand a number of returns that have been laid on the Table of the House, showing the ages of those who have been superannuated during the last few years, and I will read some of them in order to show the House that my contention is correct with regard to the number that have been retired, and the absurdly low ages at which they have been retired. I presume that the hon. Minister has left out those who were retired by gratuity, which would largely increase the average age of those on the list.

Name.	Age.
Mr. E. V. Bowell	59
Mr. Winter	43
Mr. Youill	25
Mr. Smith	38
Mr. Williams	24

Name.	Age.
Mr. Doane	56
Mr. Beatty	59
Mr. M. J. Peters	45
Mr. William Bowes	56
Mr. Walter Young	47
Mr. J. Dineen	55
Mr. Howe	44
Mr. McHugh	56
Mr. Ram	46
Mr. Hebon	50
Mr. Mason	57
Mr. William Burgeon	46
Mr. Dalton	44
Mr. Davis	37
Mr. Fairweather	36

These have all been retired within the last few years. Coming to the year 1888, we find that the following were retired:—

Name.	Age.
Mr. Shaw	44
Mr. Dineen	46
Mr. Bellaire	32
Mr. O'Hara	52
Mr. James Ferguson	54
Mr. Bowers	52
Mr. Laurence	46
Mr. Weatherstone	56
Mr. John Forsythe	52
Mr. Gordon	35
Mr. Ferguson	35
Mr. O'Connor	39
Mr. Mickleborough	46
Mr. Ferry	58
Mr. Hughes	41
Mr. Angers	49
Mr. Smithers	38
Mr. Chater	31
Mr. Reynolds	45
Mr. Heath	39
Mr. Freeman	58
Mr. Moran	56
Mr. Sherar	54
Mr. Burnett	48
Mr. Vallée	54
Mr. Jenner	57
Mr. Meneath	57
Mr. Howell	59
Mr. Lowe	49
Mr. Clay	46
Mr. Leathy	48
Mr. Harrison	40
Mr. Fosher	58
Mr. A. G. Bowden	51
Mr. Weir	53
Mr. R. Radcliffe	47
Mr. H. C. Hay	54
Mr. P. Bates	34
Mr. Simard	51
Mr. Armstrong	47
Mr. Borden	47
Mr. Morrison	49
Mr. D. R. Bruce	27
Mr. G. Roebuck	58
Mr. D. D. Belcher	37
Mr. J. Miller	59

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What is the hon. gentleman coming to?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister made a statement that the average age of those retired since 1882 was about sixty to sixty-two. I want to show that his calculation is not correct, because a very large number were retired at a much younger age, and he

Mr. McMULLEN.

does not include those that he retired under the Act by gratuity:

Name.	Age.
Mr. John Lane	59
Mr. T. J. Walsh	53
Mr. J. E. Bullard	45
Mr. S. P. Brecknan	34
Mr. W. J. McDowell	51

My reason for submitting those figures is to show that the Act has been abused by retiring a great many men who had not reached the age of superannuation and who were removed in order to make room for others:

Name.	Age.
Mr. Story	37
Miles Montgomery	46
J. W. McDonald	26
John Henry	26
E. A. Bent	37
Wm. Phillips	58
Thos. Fry	54
James Fraser	49
James Roy

1891.

John Wynn	59
G. B. Bonn	58
J. Taché	59
Wm. White	40
A. Sommerville	49
John Gore	59
D. Morris	55
R. Lennox	58
E. Brady	33
Thos. Watters	41
Wm. Brenton	59
R. W. Baxter	55
J. Tilton	55
E. T. Buchanan	47

I shall not further detain the committee reading the names of those retired, but thought it my duty to present those names to show that undoubtedly abuses have taken place in the administration of the Act. It is impossible to note the very large number of names retired at forty, forty-five and fifty, without concluding that, in a great many cases, these men have been removed from the positions they occupied so as to provide places for others. There is no necessity whatever why a superannuation Act should be continued. As I have said previously, they are well paid for their services, and it does not require a very high class education to pass the examination. All you want is to be specially educated in a certain line. Under those circumstances, the country is entitled to the services of those men at the competitive rates they would receive in any other employment. It is not right that the country should be called upon to contribute an excess in the value of their services, and in addition give them a retiring allowance for the balance of their lives. In many cases, men who have served their country long, have died in the service, and their families got no retiring allowance; and had the money deducted from their salaries been applied in securing a life policy in some responsible insurance company, their families would have something to depend upon. In cases of that

kind, the amount deducted goes into the fund, and is then paid out to others not entitled to it, who did not render the efficient and long service to the country which those who died in the service did. It operates very unjustly to those who are faithful and continuous servants in the employ of the Government, and it is only beneficial to those who are incapable of efficiently performing their duties, those whom the Government, in order to get rid of them, place upon the superannuation list. I have known of men in the service of the Government whom the Government, in order to get rid of them, have placed on the superannuation list, even adding years to their time of service to bring them under the operation of the Act, this being necessary because they had not served the ten years provided in the Act as necessary to superannuation. It is a gross injustice to those who die in the service, after having contributed for years, their representative receiving nothing at all. As I stated on a previous occasion, I do not believe that when the superannuation system was first introduced into England, civil servants had the same liberal opportunities of insuring their lives that they have to-day. The life insurance system had not then reached the perfection it has since attained. In place of debating the present Bill, I think the Finance Minister had better adopt the proposition made by Mr. Blake which was to take 2 per cent from the salary of each civil servant, placing the money at his personal credit and capitalizing it every six months at 5 per cent, the amount being kept as a guarantee of good faith and efficient service on the part of the contributor, and then, at the end of the time, when it became necessary, either through ill health or any other cause, for the person to leave the service that amount of money would be paid over to him and, in case of death, it would be paid to the family. The Finance Minister says it is not intended to admit to the benefit of the fund any who enter the service after the age of forty-five, and that none are to be superannuated until they are sixty-five. My hon. friend will find under the operation of such an Act, great difficulty in granting relief to some men who, through ill health, or some other cause are driven to the necessity of applying for superannuation. Under the present law superannuation is only permissible after ten years service, and on the certificate of the deputy-head of the department. The applicant has to give the certificate of a doctor showing that the grounds upon which he claims superannuation cover a correct statement of his case. But the cases in which the Government has pressed superannuation upon employees have been those of persons in the outside service, postmasters and others in receipt of lucrative salaries. We remember the cases of the Toronto post office, the Montreal post office and the Victoria post office. I could give

cases showing that postmasters have been changed every ten years or so, not because of ill-health, but because the Government wanted their places. Some irregularity occurs and intimation is given that in order to avoid investigation the person implicated had better apply for superannuation. When the application for superannuation is made, the person who has been applying for the place is appointed. That is the reason we have on the superannuation list such an enormous number, something like 550 persons, who are drawing about \$250,000 a year. Our experience under that Act should deter this committee and the House from again giving their consent to the introduction of a new scheme which will simply mean a double-headed superannuation system, because we shall have the old system which will drag its existence along while the present incumbents contribute to the fund. The Minister proposed to make a very largely increased deduction from the salaries of those who come in on this scheme, so as to make the fund self sustaining. But it will be found that the reduction of these contributions will be proposed, influence will be brought to bear by members of the Civil Service, petitions will be sent in and strong efforts will be made to reduce the amount from the salaries, and the result will be that we shall fall into the same difficulties that we have experienced in relation to the existing system and the superannuation under this scheme will become a burden upon the resources of the Dominion. This House should persistently set its face against any attempt to establish another superannuation system. We should immediately provide that those entering the service shall not be entitled to any retiring allowances under the Act, but, of course, we would have to deal fairly with those who previously entered the service and who have contributed to the fund. If the Finance Minister would apply to the present system the proposition he has made in reference to the other, that none shall be superannuated until they reach the age of sixty-five years, the amount the country would be called upon to contribute would decrease from year to year. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this is a matter of vital importance, that it is a matter in which this country has taken great interest. I appeal to Conservatives, as well as Reformers, to say if the farming and labouring community are not bitterly opposed to the continuation of this system. These men who have fought the battle of life with earnestness and determination and, in many cases without the success they are justly entitled to, are, in many cases, compelled to spend their age as dependents upon their families. There is nothing provided for them, while the civil servants draw large sums annually from the Dominion Treasury and live like princes. There is no feature about this system which commends it to the favourable consideration of this House. It is the duty

of the Opposition at every single stage to oppose the passage of an Act of this kind, and leave the Civil Service to provide for themselves. They get ample salaries to enable them to do it, and the country will be relieved of an enormous expense and burden upon our revenue.

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am certainly not in favour of confining this provision of the Bill to parties to be appointed in the future. The Minister who is leading the House, knows well that when the superannuation provision was made, the intention was to make those who were to benefit by the superannuation, the sole contributors to the fund. When the measure was introduced by Sir Francis Hincks into this House, he estimated that the charges then made upon the members of the Civil Service would afford an adequate fund for retiring those who were to benefit by it. Subsequently, the House made a reduction from that fund, and this reduced rate has continued down to the present time. Now, the contributions in the Civil Service are less than 40 per cent of the amount of money that is annually paid out for superannuation allowances. This is a most unsatisfactory condition, and Parliament certainly never would have agreed to that if it had been told that upwards of 60 per cent of the whole of the money given for the superannuation of civil servants was to be taken out of the public at large. Certainly that is a condition that would not have been, for one moment, entertained when the original proposition was submitted. Subsequently there was a reduction, and no one would suggest that when Parliament made that reduction there was any breach of faith with the civil servants. Every one of them was quite ready to accept the reduction which was made, and to contribute a smaller sum instead of contributing the larger sum which had been paid before. But I do not complain of that at all. The question is this: Is the amount of money which they are contributing adequate to the payment of the amount of money which they look for from the Treasury, or from the superannuation fund. I say that it is not, experience shows that it is not, and it would be, it seems to me, grossly unfair to make the new appointees contribute 4 per cent, or 3½ per cent, while you retain only 2 per cent from those who entered the public service before. We have to-day just the same right, on every principle of law, as well as every principle of morals, to increase the sum adequate to the requirements of the service, as we had to diminish the sum when we thought that the amount was larger than was absolutely necessary. I call the Minister's attention to this fact, that in twelve years a man who enters the service to-day will contribute a larger amount of money than the man who entered ten years ago: and that being so, he

Mr. McMULLEN.

will be entitled, if he were to be retired from ill-health or any other cause, only to the superannuation allowance on twelve years; while the other would be entitled to the superannuation allowance on twenty-two years of public service, although he will not have contributed a dollar more to the fund. I say that is a most improper condition of things. What the hon. Minister ought to do is to deal with the service as a whole. If experience shows that an increase is necessary, let that increase be made. I tell him that there is no measure on the Statute-book in the estimation of the public at large more unpopular than the measure of superannuation. The man who works upon his farm, or at his trade, or in his profession, has to look out for himself and save for himself. You pay the civil servants very liberally, considering the requirements of the service, but you retain a certain per centage with a view to their superannuation. Well, when you do that, you ought to see that there is some approach at all events, to the superannuation fund, meeting the public requirements or demands upon the fund.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 27) to amend the Superannuation Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the House rose for recess, I was expressing my opinion as to the impolicy of adopting section 3 as it stands. I see no justification whatever for making a distinction between contributions to be paid into the superannuation fund by those who may be appointed in the future and those who are in the service now. There is no compact or agreement, legal or moral, between the service as it now exists and the Government, representing the public at large, that there shall be the present percentage contributed by civil servants and that they shall be entitled to the certain superannuation allowance as at present fixed. The percentage charged was a percentage intended to be adequate to meet the charges on the fund. Experience has shown that it is altogether inadequate. Last year the parties entitled to superannuation received nearly \$260,000, while the amount contributed to the fund only reached \$60,000, leaving a charge of nearly \$200,000 against the public revenues as a contribution towards the superannuation of those parties. I repeat that there is no obligation, moral or legal, to continue this system. It is open to Parliament to increase the superannuation so as to make it nearly more what it should be, or we can, if parties are dissatisfied, return to them their moneys contributed, with interest. While the system may be amended

so as to become more fair to the public and not unjust to the civil servants by the adoption of the amendments I suggested were adopted, the system is not one that can be made satisfactory, because, if you relieve the public from the charge made in the interests of the service, the civil servants will hold the opinion that they can make better provision for themselves in other ways. A system established on the lines I suggested this afternoon, and which, some years ago, was discussed in this House, whereby provision would be made applicable to those who died in the service as well as those who were superannuated, would be in the public interest. I trust the hon. gentleman will withdraw this and other Government measures, especially in view of the generally expressed desire of the House to adjourn this week, and then let the Minister consider the matter during recess.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is scarcely reasonable on the part of the hon. gentleman to ask the Government to give up all our measures. We have not submitted many measures during the present session, and we are willing to make a fair arrangement for the "slaughter of the innocents" in order to get away this week; and it can hardly be contended that sufficient notice has not been given of this piece of legislation, for it has been on the Order Paper for over a month. I scarcely think it is fair to ask the Government, even for the purpose of getting away this week, to sacrifice all their measures, and I do not think we can do so. This, however, is not such a formidable piece of legislation that we will be unable to put it through. The hon. member agrees, in the main, with the Bill. He wishes, however, to have an additional provision whereby a civil servant may make provision for his family after death as well. By this Bill we cure one evil, the continuance, during successive years, with the present abatement, of the present expensive system, which is one becoming intolerable to the country. That much is safe certainly. But my hon. friend will be at liberty, next year, to suggest amendments to the Act in regard to other provisions. I have looked carefully into my hon. friend's proposition, as to the possibility of combining a superannuation system and annuity and allowance for the family or widow of the deceased, with a strong predisposition in favour of it. But I came to the conclusion that it is well-nigh impossible to combine the schemes. The present system is simply an insurance against disability. After a man's working days are over and before he dies, this superannuation system proposes to give him the benefits of superannuation, but no system of superannuation proposes to give a double benefit of insurance against disability and insurance against death. It is impossible to combine them in a workable or practical measure. Suppose we

undertook a system of giving an annuity to each family at the time of death. If worked out, it will be found that, in order to provide for the burden imposed on the public, the abatement must be abnormally high, in order to give anything worth while to the family or widow if the person dies. Then, there is an element of uncertainty as to the annuity which would be provided if the person died in the service. You have to take away, then, all that set-off which comes from those who have paid into the fund, and who have died before superannuation is granted them. When you calculate that up on the other side, you have to make the abatement so high that it becomes impracticable, and the allowance is, at the same time, so low as to be practically of no benefit. With this superannuation scheme—and to it I shall call the attention of the House to-morrow—there is the second part of the scheme. It is a plan under which the civil servants, for a minimum amount, and one which they can afford to pay, will be able to secure, with the greatest economy, an insurance provision. It will be the simplest and cheapest insurance that can be had, because all the expenses of management will be eliminated from it. So, the civil servant will be able to insure himself against disability, and, at the same time, he will have the opportunity of making a fair arrangement, so as to secure, after death, some provision for his family, by means of a most inexpensive, and, at the same time, a safe system of insurance. So these two desirable results are met. I believe they will be met at a minimum cost to the country, and with great advantage to the service as well. At all events, we must push this matter through, in order to get from under a load that, every year, is becoming more burdensome. I may say that I commenced my investigations with a predisposition in favour of the proposal of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to make the rise in the abatement uniform. I cannot say even now that I think there will be a great measure of injustice in that; but at the same time it was pressed upon me—and I think it is a view which may well be taken into consideration—that these men who went into the service under certain conditions, having fulfilled these conditions, have gone on looking to the permanency of the system under which they entered, and it was something of a burden and something of a hardship to come upon them in the midst of the working out of that system to increase the abatement. It was that consideration which prevailed. So I would suggest to my hon. friend, that seeing we are making a move in the direction of lightening the burdens and preventing them from being so heavy as at present that we should pass this measure. Another year we might take into consideration as to whether it would be wise to increase the abatement for any part of the service which is already under the system. Anyway, I think my hon. friend

would be reasonable in at least allowing that this will prevent a large abuse in so far as incoming servants are concerned, in comparison with that which exists, and that so far as that goes it is a decided advantage. I can say that the Government had no other desire in taking this up than in striving by some practicable and humane way, and one also which would not be uneconomical, to get out from under the burden at present existing on the Treasury.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The measure bears on the face of it evidence of undue influence on the part of some parties in the Civil Service?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I called the hon. gentleman's attention to what I think is the fair way to deal, if a measure of this sort is to be placed on the Statute-book, and I do not think it is the best form with which to deal with the subject. There are nearly 100 civil servants who have contributed on an average less than ten years to the fund, and who, had they been charged the same as those in the service, no injustice would have been done them. There are here on the list eight parties who are contributors to the fund less than one year; there are two who have been contributors less than two years, and there are thirteen who are contributors less than three and a half years. No wrong would have been done these, when the system was brought into operation, if the superannuation charge had been continued against them for a period of twelve or fourteen years.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the fund would not have been burdened to the extent to which it is burdened. But there still remains this point: that there are \$260,000 in round numbers paid out annually for the superannuation or the payment of the annuities for the superannuation of these parties, only \$60,000 of which are contributed by the parties themselves. Now, this whole arrangement is made partly in the interests of the public to secure the efficiency of the service, but mainly in the interests of those parties themselves, and when you propose to keep from them a certain proportion of their salaries that the fund may be formed, so long as the amount you charge them with does not exceed the amount of their contribution, there is nothing of which to complain. It does seem to me that the hon. Minister is increasing difficulties, if the system is to continue, by making these charges. But as I said at an early part of the discussion, I do not think the system is a satisfactory one, or that it will ever be made satisfactory in the public interest, and that it would be better to proceed in the direction of the repeal of the measure than to undertake to amend it in this way.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the evidence of Mr. D. Matheson, Superintendent of the Post Office Savings Bank Department before the Royal Commission on the Civil Service. The commission put some questions to him on this very subject of superannuation, and his evidence was as follows:—

Have you any views with regard to the Superannuation Act?—Yes; I have something to say. If we were constructing a service *de novo* I would not have a Superannuation Act at all, but instead of it a system of provident accounts, each man being obliged to contribute a fixed minimum sum monthly, which would be, as it were, the profit upon his own labour. I think that every man, during the working years of his life, is entitled to a profit on his labour to provide for those years when he cannot work. That is the theory in outside business, and the same should apply to the Public Service. The present Superannuation Act is justified on the ground—and it is only too true—that the present service has not been paid at rates that will admit of the men making a provision themselves for old age, and, therefore, it must stand as regards the existing employees. One of its provisions, however, should in all fairness be modified so as to admit of the contribution of men who die in the service being repaid to their heirs.

If you could by any actuarial process now place to every man's credit the value of his payment under the present Superannuation Act, and could commence over again, you would adopt this system?—No; you could not do that with the present superannuation payments. But under the proposed plan a writer, for example, contributing \$6 a month, at the end of 35 years would have at his credit \$5,400 of money, the result of just placing it in the Post Office Savings Bank and compounding interest annually at the rate of 4 per cent. That sum would be the legitimate profit of his own labour during those 35 years.

That is the annuity of \$72 with the accumulation of 4 per cent compound interest?—Yes; In the case of a book-keeper paying \$8 a month he would have \$7,069. A correspondent paying \$10 a month would have \$8,564. A junior chief clerk contributing \$15 would have \$11,853, a senior chief clerk contributing \$20 would have \$14,513. That is a substitute for superannuation, and, in my opinion, the proper one.

That was the very principle that was laid down by Mr. Blake in his resolution of 1885. He proposed to make these very deductions from the salaries of civil servants, and to have the sum placed to their credit, and paid to them when they retired from the service, or if they had died in the service, paid to their families. Then Mr. Matheson goes on to say:

1. That would cost the Government nothing?—Nothing; That is the man's own money.

2. And if he died in harness his family would have it?—Yes; and it is a guarantee for the man's good conduct while he is in the service.

I contend that in the face of the evidence given by Mr. Matheson, who is an important clerk in the Post Office Department, and who has certainly some considerable knowledge on this very point, it would be well that we should follow out that line. Another result of the passing of this Act in my opinion will be this: we will have a greater abuse of the old superannuation system than we have experienced in last years. Men that

are now in the service under the old Superannuation Act will be superannuated by the dozen, and the Government will say: we did it in order to bring them from under the operations of the old Act, that only takes from them 2 per cent and 1¼ per cent, and we have filled their places with men who are now contributing 3½ per cent. That would be used as an argument in favour of rapidly reducing the present staff, because the Government will say to the House and the country: We are bringing into operation an Act which we have recently passed, that will make the superannuation fund self-sustaining, and the sooner we wipe out the old Act and substitute the new, the sooner we shall relieve the country of the amount it is now called upon to pay. In this way they will use the new Act as an excuse for increasing the volume of superannuations. If this Act is passed, it should be subject to the voluntary action of the civil service, leaving to a man's option, upon entering the service, whether he will be a participant in the operations of this Act or not. If a man chooses to keep his own money and make provision for himself and his family by means of a life insurance policy, he should be allowed to do so. When you make it obligatory upon every servant to contribute to the fund, you make it a forced law, without any option. Therefore, I move that after the word "appointed," in the third line, the words "and who desires to enter the service under the Act," be inserted.

Mr. CASEY. I think this should not be considered by anybody as a party question. Therefore, I hope the Government will have their ears open to suggestions from this side of the House, and I do think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Wellington is extremely appropriate and sound. It does seem to me that the only provision we ought to make for superannuation, is that of a quasi-life insurance at cheap rates for those who enter the service; and although the amendment of my hon. friend does not cover the whole ground, I think it is a step in the right direction, and I hope the Government will consider it favourably.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not accept that. It would make the superannuation no superannuation at all. The superannuation system is not worth having as a half-measure—one that would make it possible to turn out a civil servant without anything.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister's idea is, that the superannuation is of no use, unless it leaves him the liberty of turning out men when he chooses.

Amendment negatived.

On section 5,

Mr. McMULLEN. I move that the time be reduced from thirty days to fifteen days. The present Act provides that the return

shall be laid on the Table within fifteen days after the opening of the session, and I do not see any need of increasing the time to thirty days.

Mr. FOSTER. All right. If the hon. gentleman will stop talking, I will make it fifteen days.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

MERCHANTS SHIPPING ACT.

Bill (No. 92) to repeal certain sections of the Merchants Shipping Act relating to load-lines, so far as they affect ships registered in Canada, was read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FLINT. Will the hon. Minister fully explain the bearing of these enactments?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think I can give any more practical explanation than is given in the preamble of the Bill. The sections to be repealed have been found inconvenient and objectionable from the point of view of Canadian shippers. The question was what remedy could be devised, and the Minister himself gave instructions to have this Bill prepared so as to take advantage of the clause in the English Act, which provides that the Legislatures in British possessions may have power to repeal sections found unsuitable to their interests, subject to the approval of Her Majesty in Council. This provides for the repeal of these three sections, subject to such approval.

Mr. FLINT. No doubt the shipping interests in Canada will agree that the movement made by the Government in this regard is a good one, because, without exception, it has been felt by them that the operation of the English load line Act was not fair to the class of ships which are built in the Dominion, and that when those ships had to go into English ports, they were heavily handicapped on that account. I believe I am expressing the opinion of the shipping interests, judging by correspondence I have received from men well acquainted with the subject, when I say that the Government ought to go a step further in the same direction and make a careful study of the other provisions of the English Acts, as regards their application to colonial built vessels. There is a strong impression among our ship-owners that the technical rules of the English Acts and of the English Board of Trade in the inspection of wooden vessels have been considerably to the disadvantage of Canadian wooden ships. Great complaints have arisen, from time to time, regarding the imposition of many expenditures in English ports, which would not be required in Canada, and which, in the opinion of our

owners and shipmasters, men just as competent to judge these matters as the agents of the Boards of Trade, are unnecessary. You are aware, Mr. Chairman, that the competition in the matter of ocean freights is terribly severe. I can appeal to the knowledge of every ship-owner in the House when I say that the value of wooden ships has greatly decreased during the past eighteen months, owing to the falling off of ocean freights and the severe competition of iron and steel vessels. Consequently any regulations which, to a large degree, must be based on a reference to iron and steel built ships built in England, and not always built on the models in use in this country, do not apply to wooden vessels built in this country. This tends to depress our shipping interests. I, therefore, invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the operation of all these laws, and would ask him to place himself in communication with the shipping interests of this country, with a view to having our vessels exempted more largely than they are now from the operation of English acts which prejudicially affect our vessels. If the British Government allow this Bill to pass, as, no doubt, they will, there will be a strong pressure, by the time Parliament meets again, upon this Government to see if they cannot obtain some further relief from what we consider a severe and unwarranted application of the rules in English ports to our vessels.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INLAND WATERS SEAMEN'S ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 102) to amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act. He said: The Bill is to amend the Act with regard to seamen on inland waters, and to make the same provision as in the British Seamen's Act for the recovery of wages and disbursements. At present no provision is made on this subject in relation to seamen on the inland waters.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on certain proposed resolutions (page 2887) to authorize the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies and the constructing of the railways therein mentioned.

To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway, from Lunenburg, on the east coast of Nova Scotia, westward to a point in the District of New Germany, together with a spur about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile long to Bridgewater Railway Wharf, and from a point $33\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Lunenburg and running to Middleton on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Acts 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, and 51 Victoria, chapter 3, not exceeding in the whole \$1,500.

Mr. FLINT.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood the hon. Minister of Railways was to place on the Table the report of the Minister of Justice with regard to this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I have the report here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before this is carried I would like to hear the report.

Mr. HAGGART. The first report is dated 8th January, 1892, and has reference to the payment of \$4,500. It says:

Sir John Thompson is of opinion that the subsidies should be paid to the railway company and not to Mr. Wade.

F. A. GISBORNE.

This is in reply to the question from the Finance Department:

To whom should the cheque be sent, to the company or Wade?

Then there is another one from Mr. Sedgewick approved by the Minister of Justice:

I have your file relating to the payment of subsidy due to the Nova Scotia Central Railway. The power of attorney of 5th April, 1889, given to the Halifax Banking Company, having been revoked, you should not pay any more money to the bank; it should be paid direct to the company. I have gone over the matter with Sir John Thompson, and he agrees with me in this opinion. Papers returned.

Yours truly,
ROBERT SEDGEWICK.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether these opinions were given with a full knowledge of the fact that the road had been sold under the trust deed?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; the whole of the papers are here; they are very lengthy and the hon. gentleman can examine them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to lay them on the Table; we will look them over. I understand the hon. gentleman to state that the Justice Department held that the sale of the road under the trust deed did not transfer to the purchaser any right to receive subsidies previously accrued and due.

Mr. HAGGART. The subsidy, first of all, was paid to this Mr. Wade through the Halifax Bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was under the power of attorney. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not catch the drift of my question. The subsidies were first voted to the Nova Scotia Railway. They could only be paid to the company or to some person duly authorized to receive them. That is perfectly clear. The Nova Scotia Central Railway Company appear to have given a power of attorney to Mr. Wade to receive the subsidies. The company afterwards revoked their power of attorney, and, therefore, it is clear that the department is right in giving an opinion that no further subsidy could be paid under a power of attorney which had

been revoked. But the point is this : In the discussion the other night it was stated by some hon. gentlemen on both sides that subsequently this road had been bought by the Nova Scotia Railway Company, a trust given to secure the bonds of the road sold under that trust deed, and it was acquired by a purchase. It would appear, therefore, prima facie, that the road and all its franchises and rights passed. The point I asked the other night was whether the Justice Department had advised that under that trust deed and the transfer which followed it, the right to receive the subsidy did not pass. Now, I did not understand from the hon. gentleman that that point had been touched at all.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes. The judgment of the court was sent up to the Finance Department, and was certified by the prothonotary down there, with the order of the Supreme Court, and the amended order between the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company and the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, and it was on those papers, filed in the Finance Department, that the opinion was given.

Resolution agreed to.

To the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Company, for extending and completing their railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy of \$20,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This is for the extension of the road. It gives them power to extend the road towards the Back River, having its terminus at—Sault au Recollet—I think, is the name of the place.

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Government and this House to the fact that the resolutions now before us include no subsidy to a railway in which I take a special interest. I find that these resolutions do not comply with the demands I have been making to the Government for several years. My friends and myself, in the county of Megantic, have repeatedly made these demands to the Government, but so far without avail. I cannot let these resolutions pass without giving utterance to my feelings of regret in finding that nothing is granted in compliance with these demands. As far back as 1887, a deputation from my county, whom I accompanied, came to Ottawa and had an interview with the Hon. Mr. Pope, then Minister of Railways, and the Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, then Prime Minister. The answer they gave to the deputation was this. They said to us : Get an Act of incorporation and subsidies from the Government of the province of Quebec, and then we will grant you the usual subsidy, that is, \$3,200 per mile. We took the necessary steps and made the necessary expenditure to get this Act of incorporation and these subsidies from the Government of the province of Quebec. After we got incorporated the Quebec Government

promised us a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile for the portion of the road that remained to be built.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) What is the name of this railway ?

Mr. FRECHETTE. (Translation.) It is the Hereford Railway, mentioned in the motion I put on the Order Paper ; it refers to the extension of the line from Lime Ridge to Lévis. As I stated, we got from the Quebec Government an Act of incorporation and the promise of a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile. That done, the Federal Government had promised they would get a subsidy voted to us. We were also requested to have surveys made of the proposed line. We had these surveys made, and the report of Mr. Ramsay, the party who made them, shows the direction of this railway is perfectly feasible, and the cost of building it would not be too large. This extension of the Hereford Railway is not a new line. I think the Government are mistaken when they presume, as they do, that it is a new railway. Fifty-four miles of the Hereford Railway are already worked out, over which Pullman cars are run. From the boundary of the United States to Cookshire thirty-five miles are worked out, from Cookshire to Dudswell thirteen miles, from Dudswell to Lime Ridge six miles, in all, as I have just stated, fifty-four miles are worked out. For these reasons I think the Government are wrong in considering that it is a new railway. There remains from ninety to a hundred miles of the road to build to extend it down to Lévis, through the counties of Wolfe, Megantic and Lotbinière, and connect it at Lévis with the Government railway, the Intercolonial. When connected with the latter, the Hereford line would become a feeder of the Government railway, it would feed its traffic and thereby the public chest would reap advantages by the increase in revenue it would give to the Intercolonial. Running through the counties of Lotbinière, Megantic and Lévis, this railway would be very beneficial to those counties. Moreover, it would be a short and very useful line, since it would be from thirty to thirty-five miles shorter than the two other railways, the Quebec Central and the Grand Trunk, from Quebec to Boston. It is a well known fact, Mr. Chairman, that the travelling public always take the shortest line, and this line would be from thirty to thirty-five miles shorter than the two other railways now run. And then by the building of that section of the Hereford railway, a fertile country would be opened up. Megantic has precious mines of asbestos, copper and slate ; there are also large quantities of limestone. Then there are rich and great forests. We have the cherry tree, maple, elm, ash and spruce in great quantities. The soil is very advantageous for farming. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think the Government should have given us subsidies before now. By the motion I put on the Order Paper, I asked

for copies of all communications, memorials, &c., addressed to His Excellency the Governor in Council, to the Government of Canada or to any member thereof, since 1888, asking for the grant of a Dominion subsidy to the Hereford Railway Company, with a view to enable that company to extend its line from Lime Ridge to Lévis, through the counties of Wolfe, Mégantic, Lotbinière and Lévis and to form a junction with the Intercolonial. Mr. Chairman, on April 5th, 1892, we sent a petition and a plan of the road to the Government. The plan was signed by the company's engineer. This petition was sent to the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and it was signed by one of the directors of the Hereford Railway, Mr. W. B. Ives, and by Messrs. C. C. Cleveland and L. I. Fréchette. We asked the Government for a subsidy in aid of this enterprise. On June 2nd, 1892, I wrote to the Hon. Sir John Abbott, then Prime Minister, asking again for a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile. Here is my letter :

OTTAWA, June 2nd, 1892.

The Hon. Sir JOHN J. C. ABBOTT,
President of the Privy Council,
Ottawa.

MY DEAR PREMIER—I include herewith, as requested, the petition concerning the railway in the completion of which I take such an interest. As you may see, fifty-three miles are already completed, the whole distance between Bucher's Falls and Lévis being one hundred and forty-five miles, which leaves about ninety miles to build. I eagerly take this opportunity to tell you that this railway would shorten by from thirty to forty miles the distance between Boston and Lévis. It runs through one of the most charming valleys of the province of Quebec and along four fine lakes. The building of this line would at last give their true value to some splendid water-powers and fertile lands. Whole mines are lying dormant there, waiting for the completion of this road to be worked out.

An Act of incorporation was granted by the Local Government; surveys were made, all of which gave satisfactory results.

We have often been promised this subsidy of \$3,200 per mile. In fact, since 1887, the various Ministers of Railways could not help admitting all the benefits the building of such a line would procure to the country.

Am I wrong in believing that you will consider attentively the reasons above given to you and that you will give a favourable answer to my request?

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
L. J. FRÉCHETTE.

Here is the answer I received at that time from the hon. the First Minister :

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE,
OTTAWA, 3rd June, 1892.

DEAR MR. FRÉCHETTE,—I am much obliged to you for the very complete statement sent to me respecting your railway extension. I assure you it shall receive the most careful consideration when the question of subsidies comes up.

Yours sincerely,
J. J. C. ABBOTT.

During this session, Mr. Chairman, I again wrote to the Railway Department in relation to this subsidy. The letter is under date of
Mr. FRÉCHETTE.

February 9th, 1893. It is signed by the hon. members for Compton (Mr. Pope) and Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland).

OTTAWA, 9th February, 1893.

The Secretary,
Railways and Canals Department,
Ottawa.

SIR,—We beg to request you will lay before the Minister the papers in connection with the Hereford Railway Company, consisting of a petition from the said company to the Honorable John G. Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals, a letter from L. I. Fréchette, member for Mégantic, to Hon. Sir John Abbott, &c., &c. The question of a subsidy to be granted came under consideration, but it was agreed to defer taking any action until this year.

We remain,

Yours truly,
(Signed) L. I. FRÉCHETTE,
C. C. CLEVELAND,
R. H. POPE.

Were the hon. member for Wolfe and Richmond (Mr. Cleveland) in his seat, I am quite sure he would bear me out in my statement, and strongly support my application for a subsidy in aid to this railway. On the 13th February, I received the following letter in reply to one I have just read :

OTTAWA, 13th February, 1893.

SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, requesting that the papers of record in this department in connection with the Hereford Railway Company's application for a subsidy in aid of the extension of their line of railway from Lime Ridge to deep-water terminus at Lévis, a distance of 100 miles, be again laid before the Minister for his consideration.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
JOHN H. BALDERSON,
Secretary.

L. I. FRÉCHETTE, Esq., M. P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

On the 3rd March, 1893, I wrote again to the hon. Prime Minister, Sir John Thompson, as follows :—

The Hon. Sir JOHN THOMPSON,
Prime Minister, Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—Kindly allow me to remind you that during the last session, Mr. C. C. Cleveland and myself had an interview with you for the purpose of soliciting a subsidy in aid of the construction of the Hereford railway. You positively promised us that our demand would be granted at the ensuing session of Parliament. On the strength of such a promise, I pledged my word to my constituents and told them that the Government were going to subsidize their road to the extent of at least some thirty or forty miles. Allow me to tell you that any subsidy to a new line is out of question here and that when petitioning for aid towards the completion of the road, I am satisfied I am not going against the Government's view.

In the hope that, in consideration of the motives which actuate my cause, I will be pardoned for troubling you,

I beg to remain, Sir,
Your devoted servant,
L. J. FRÉCHETTE.

The honourable Premier replied as follows :—

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE,
OTTAWA, 8th March, 1893.

DEAR MR. FRÉCHETTE,—In reply to your letter of the 3rd instant, I beg to say that I have not forgotten the conversation which we had during last session with reference to the subsidy of the Hereford Railway. I shall be glad to bring your request to the attention of the Minister of Railways, who, I am sure, will give it the best possible consideration.

Yours always,
JNO. S. D. THOMPSON.

Mr. Chairman, in 1891, when the subsidy question came up before the House, the Hon. Mr. Ives and myself called the attention of the Government to the fact that there had not yet been granted any subsidy to this railway, as petitioned for by us. We both gave expression to our regret that our petition had been lost sight of, and the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Bowell) replied as follows:—

I simply want to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Fréchette), that the line to which they have drawn the attention of the House has not been lost sight of by the Government, or the fact that they have strongly urged upon the Government that a subsidy should be granted during this Parliament in aid of the road. But, as I have explained to the House, the Government, for various reasons, have decided not to ask this session for any new subsidies for any new roads. At the same time, I intimated to the House that the policy of the Government had not been changed with regard to the principle of aiding roads, so far as the revenue of the country will justify it, without adding to the capital indebtedness of the country. There are many deserving lines, and the one referred to by the hon. members for Richmond and Wolfe and Mégantic is of that character that its merits will not be lost sight of.

I consider, Mr. Chairman, that the Government have positively pledged themselves, so to speak, to grant us a subsidy; nevertheless, the whole year has elapsed and still nothing has been done; and in the resolutions brought down this session there is not to be found even the remotest mention of a subsidy to our road. The ground on which such subsidy is withheld from us, namely, that it would be equivalent to a new subsidy, could not hold, had the Government acceded to our demand from the first. I understand that the Government have made it a part of their railway policy this session not to grant any new subsidies for any new roads. Had the Government granted the subsidy at an earlier date, they would certainly have been spared the trouble of stating this year that it is a new subsidy, the granting of which ought consequently to be postponed. As I do not look at it in the same light as the Government, I consider that it is unfair to withhold the grant to our road on the ground alleged. It is not a new work, as fifty-four miles of the road are already open to traffic. And although the subsidy to be voted for the extension of the line would be new, still the line cannot be looked upon as a new road. All we ask for is Government aid to finish the road. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to

place before you the following letter I received quite lately from California, in connection with the same matter:—

MENLO PARK, SAN MATEO CO.,
CALIFORNIA, 18th March, 1893.

MY DEAR MR. FRÉCHETTE,—I see by the "Gazette" that you moved in the House for "copies of all communications, memorials, etc., addressed to the Governor in Council, etc., since 1888, asking for the grant of a Dominion subsidy to the Hereford Railway Company, with a view to enable that company to extend its line from Line Ridge to Lévis, Quebec and Boston Air Line." I understood last year that the Federal Government had solemnly pledged their word to the effect that a subsidy of \$3,000 per mile would be granted this year to aid in the construction of this important line; which grant would result in opening up an important section of the country in the Eastern Townships, North Weldon, South Ham, North Ham, Wolfestown, Ireland, Halifax, etc., etc. I would feel much indebted to you, should you kindly if possible, send me a printed copy of the return to be furnished by the Government at your request, and tell me whether the building of this road is to be prosecuted, this year, and when. A new impetus would be, no doubt, imparted to many industries, such as the mining, lumbering and agricultural industries, etc. I am of opinion that the promise of the Federal Government to aid this road dates back from the time of the Honourable J. H. Pope, and has been frequently renewed since. Advantage may be taken of the subsidy previously voted by the Quebec Legislature, on the completion of every 10 miles of road. An answer at your earliest opportunity will much oblige.

Yours truly,
P. N. PARTRIDGE.

Coming from a rich capitalist, a former resident of Quebec, this letter shows the interest evinced in our road even by California people. It need be no matter of surprise then, if the member of the county should also take an interest in such an enterprise. I am willing to let the matter drop for this year, but at the same time, I wish it to be well understood that I do not waive any of my claims to the promised grants in favour of this railway. I do not desire to be aggressive, as I realize the Government's position, and I am satisfied that the best tactics for one to follow, when he wishes to obtain favours from a Government, is not to indulge in recriminations and in the use of vituperative language. Refraining from any such uncalled for tactics, I shall confine myself to telling the Government that it is time justice should be done to the interested parties. I will avail myself of this opportunity to submit again my petition to the hon. the Minister of Railways and tell him that I hope, at the next session, he will not again waive the question on the grounds alleged this year. By granting the desired subsidy in aid to the Hereford Railway, he will be doing justice to the people of Mégantic, and giving those at the head of this enterprise the means with which to complete one of the finest lines for the travelling public to be found in the province of Quebec and perhaps in the whole Dominion. The Government are not asked this year to subsidize the full length of the road which is to be built, but only for

a portion of it, including about thirty miles. By granting my demand, the Government will be doing an act of justice chiefly to the county of Megantic. We have not had our share of the public moneys, although fully entitled to it, as contributors to the general revenue, like the rest of the country. We have had no railway built at the public expense; nor any canals or wharfs built by the Government at a cost of some fifty or sixty thousand dollars every year, as done elsewhere, owing to the fact that there is no shipping in our county. But this is no reason for the Government to persevere in denying us our fair share of the public moneys of which we have never yet received a cent. I venture to hope my remarks will be taken by the Government into their most serious consideration and that, next year, the subsidy asked for will be voted.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman. I listened with much attention to the observations just made by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette) in connection with the Hereford Railway. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of this road, which was so well recognized by the Government of the province of Quebec, that I think I am not committing an indiscretion in stating that, had it not been for the "coup d'état" of Governor Angers, which threw down the Mercier Ministry, a subsidy would have been granted to that railway by the Government of that province. A few years ago, a deputation comprising many prominent citizens of the county of Megantic, and in which I myself had the honour to join, waited upon the Hon. Mr. Pope, then Minister of Railways; and that gentleman had almost formally promised to grant a subsidy for the building of that road. Some time later, at the time of the election of 1890, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Ives) went into the county of Lotbinière, during the electoral contest; he stated he was in favour of this road, he referred to the considerable interests he himself had in it, and he, in his turn, almost formally pledged himself to have a subsidy granted to it, if, at any rate, I am correctly informed. Notwithstanding all these promises, no subsidy was granted so far. I hope the Government will at last fulfil their promises and subsidize this road, the importance of which is at the least as great as that of any other road subsidized by the resolutions now before us. I will say no more on this question, for I presume the hon. member for Megantic, according to the statements he has just made, has come to an understanding with the Government, and that this line will be subsidized next year.

Mr. HAGGART. I have to compliment the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette) and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), who spoke so admirably in favour of the scheme. The Government are aware that for some years there have been a number of parties interested in completing

Mr. FRÉCHETTE.

the road from Hereford to Lévis. From petitions submitted to the Government, they are fully aware that this railway will run through a magnificent country, as graphically described by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette), which contains large deposits of copper, lime and asbestos, and is at the same time a well-wooded and fertile district. The Government would have been glad, if possible, to have assisted the construction of the road; but hon. gentlemen must be aware that it was decided to bring down no new subsidies this session. The remarks of the hon. gentlemen and the petitions presented in favour of the undertaking, will receive careful attention at the hands of the Government, with a view to meeting the wishes of those hon. gentlemen, when new subsidies are brought down to the House.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope these remarks will apply to all railway companies that have applied for subsidies.

Mr. FOSTER. You may take them generally.

Resolutions reported.

WORKS ON RIVERS AND STREAMS.

Bill (No. 115) to amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of timber down Rivers and Streams was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The object of the Bill is to change the charge to a price per 1,000 feet, instead of by the piece of timber, because it is considered unfair that a piece of timber containing 400 or 500 cubic feet should be charged the same price as a piece of timber containing only thirty or forty feet. The prices mentioned in the Bill are comparative prices. They bear due ratio to each other on fair prices, based on calculations made by those who are acquainted with the business and interested in this matter. Section 61 replaces section 61 in the old Act, and provides for supplying information as to the quantity of timber that has passed down rivers and streams.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say, in connection with this Bill, that I think it is a move in the right direction. It makes a much-needed reform in the matter of levying timber tolls, which were formerly levied by the piece, and which was a very inequitable basis. All practical lumbermen know that a drive of logs may require fifteen or twenty logs per thousand, while in other cases a drive may require but four or five to the 1,000 feet. This led to inequality and injustice in the measurement. I believe this Bill is almost precisely similar to a change

made in the Ontario law last session. The Ontario law formerly was of the same character as the law of the Dominion which is about to be amended, and the change was made from the imposition of tolls upon pieces by count, to the imposition of tolls upon lumber by so much per 1,000 feet. I think no objection can be offered to this Bill. There might perhaps be some minor changes suggested as regards the rule of measurement, but at this stage of the session, least I might delay the passage of this much-needed measure, I will not press those changes.

Bill reported from committee, read the third time and passed.

ORDERS DISCHARGED.

On the order for second reading of Bill (No. 29) to further amend the Civil Service Act, being read.

Mr. FOSTER. As there seems to be a very great desire to get the business of the House through, I move that the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

Order for House in Committee to consider the following resolution read:—

That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act, and to provide for the appointment of a Civil Service Board consisting of three members; two at salaries of four hundred dollars per annum each, and one who shall be supervisor of the Civil Service, at a salary on appointment of not less than fifteen hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to a maximum of two thousand dollars.—Mr. Costigan.

Order discharged, and resolution withdrawn.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 65) to amend the law respecting the Electoral Franchise, read:

Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

SUPPLY—SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the House into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to address a few remarks to the House with reference to the failure to secure an expression from Parliament with regard to the question of closing the Canadian department of the Columbia Exposition upon the Lord's Day. I think Sir, that it is discreditable to this House that the motion offered in connection with this matter should have been burked, as it practically was by the adjournment of the debate on the part of the Government, at a stage of the session when the adjournment of the debate meant the carrying of that motion to the foot of the Order Paper, where there was no human possibility of its being reached again this session. It was equivalent to a direct vote for the defeat of the motion, and it lacked the honesty of fairly meeting the question and getting the decision on it that a

direct vote would have had. As you well know, Sir, I endeavoured to-day to get an expression of the House upon the question; but I was ruled out of order. I presume that in the position that the matter stands now, with that motion and adjourned debate at the foot of the Order Paper, it will be impossible to dispose of it, and I suppose that motion stands there as a bar to any action whatever upon this question. I merely rise to-night to enter my protest against the action of the Government in this regard; an action deliberately taken by them, and the consequence of which they and the House were informed of at the time; an action which has prevented any direct expression of opinion by this House upon a question which a very large proportion of the people of this country deemed to have been one of much importance. A question of precisely a similar nature has received the consideration of the American Congress. A large sum of money was voted by Congress to aid the Chicago Exposition, upon the express condition that the exposition should not be opened upon Sundays. That grant was made the session before last with that condition attached. A great effort was made during the last session of Congress to secure the rescinding of that condition attached to the grant, and all the forces for and against Sabbath observance were arrayed against each other. Petitions were presented to Congress representing over 40,000,000 people in the United States in favour of the continuance of that condition imposed upon the grant. The efforts of the managers of the exposition, the efforts of the great mass of the people of Chicago, the efforts of many of the business classes, and the efforts of all the elements of society in the United States opposed to Sunday observance were used with great vigour in the attempt to induce Congress to remove the restriction and permit the opening of the exposition on the Lord's Day. Congress refused. Congress stands on record as having vindicated the principle of Sunday observance. The Canadian Parliament stands on record—a most shameful record, in my opinion—as having refused to meet the question, as having taken a course which, though parliamentary, is not manly, as having burked the question and relegated it to the foot of the Order Paper, where it cannot be reached again this session. I feel as the one having in charge a motion in accordance with the Christian sentiments and desires of the people of this country, in consonance with the action of the United States Congress and in harmony with the action of the British Government on all similar occasions, that the action of this Parliament and this Government is one that we cannot feel proud of, but, on the contrary, is one that we ought to feel ashamed of. I condemn the Government to-night for having burked action on the question, for having deliberately moved the adjournment of the debate on the last

day that it was possible to deal with the question as an item of public business, for having thrown that debate over at six o'clock, and having placed the motion at the foot of the Order Paper, where it cannot be reached again, and for now placing those who are in favour of action in the direction at the disadvantage of being utterly unable to reach the question in any other way. Their hands are tied. The ruling of the Chair is invariably against bringing up this question in any other shape so long as the motion is on the Paper, standing there beyond reach, and yet serving the purpose of barring action on the question in any other form. I say that this action is one that reflects no credit on the Government. Their course has not been a high or honourable one in my estimation. They should have met the question squarely, and in a manly way. If they were in favour of Sunday opening, they should have said so by their vote. But they shirked the question, they avoided action upon it; they leave the world to suppose that the Canadian Parliament stands lower, in moral tone, than the English Parliament or the American Congress; and they refuse, as a Government, to recognize the time-honoured principle that the Sabbath should not be desecrated and that its sanctity should be maintained. I shall not attempt to make a motion. I am informed that, under the rules of the House, I cannot reach the question again this session. I might make a motion expressing my regret at the conduct of the Government, but a motion of that kind would probably be purposeless. I have risen, however, to enter my protest against the conduct of the Government in placing the advocates of this motion in the position in which they stand to-night; and, having made this protest during the last hours of the session, I suppose the matter will have to be allowed to drop. But the impression must go abroad to the world that Canada is the only Anglo-Saxon commonwealth on the face of the globe that refuses to respect the sanctity of the Sabbath, that refuses to pass a resolution similar to that passed by Congress that the great World's Exposition at Chicago should be closed on the Lord's Day.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no wish to enter into a controversy with my hon. friend, but I do not think it is right for me to sit still and allow his last words to go without a protest. He has seen fit, with a great deal of self-approbation, to lecture us and to declare that Canada is the only Anglo-Saxon country in the world where the sanctity of the Sabbath is not thought highly of. He does that simply because this House did not see eye to eye with him on a certain resolution which he wished to put before it. If the hon. gentleman has not been able to get his resolution before the House, it is simply because he did not diligently look after it himself. If he had put it upon the Order

Mr. CHARLTON.

Paper at an early enough date, and had taken it up as soon as he had a chance—

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to correct the statement of the hon. gentleman. It is unfounded. I proceeded with the motion on the first public occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. That can scarcely be, Mr. Speaker, because if he had put his motion on the Paper at first, when, I suppose, his ideas on Sunday observance were as mature as they are now, he might have reached it half-a-dozen times over.

Mr. CHARLTON. I protest against the hon. gentleman's insinuation. I put the motion on the Paper on the first occasion that I had an opportunity. His aspersion on me is without foundation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot sit still any more than the hon. Finance Minister and let his statements go unanswered. The hon. gentleman lectures the hon. member for North Norfolk, who, he says, did not put his motion on the Paper in time. It was quite in time, and the question would have been reached, and the yeas and nays upon it recorded if it had not been for the action of the Finance Minister himself. In order to evade a distinct stand upon it by himself and his followers, he had the adjournment of the debate moved. He has the face to lecture the hon. member for North Norfolk that he did not bring forward his resolution in time, when, in reality, the Minister of Finance is responsible for the question not coming before the House.

IMPORTATION OF SETTLERS' CATTLE.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask the Minister acting on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, with reference to the Order in Council that has been passed with regard to settlers' cattle coming in from the United States, if there is to be any restriction as to the number of cattle that these persons may bring in; because, it seems to me, from a cursory glance at the order, that under it there may be a large importation of cattle, which may be exceedingly unfair to the settlers in the North-west, and to the people of this country, who are prevented from bringing in cattle except on the payment of duty. It seems to me that there should be some restriction as to the number of cattle those people may import, and I should like to ask the Government if it is their intention to impose any such restriction.

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to my hon. friend, I would state that the idea of the order is simply to allow bona fide settlers' cattle to come in. It was not supposed that that would be infringed upon with the purpose of bringing in herds of cattle. If it is necessary to fix a limitation so as to prevent any

unfairness of that kind, it will certainly be done.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the Government had better look into the matter.

THE INLAND FISHERIES.

Mr. ALLAN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to call the attention of the House to some grievances of our fishermen on the western part of Lake Erie, along the Detroit and St. Clair rivers, and around Lake St. Clair. In the fishing districts named the shore lines of Canada and the United States approach very close to each other, so that the waters of the two are practically the same. On the American side there is free fishing. People there are allowed to fish when and where they please unembarrassed by state laws as to close seasons or modes of fishing, while on the Canadian side our fishermen are hampered by various regulations which have very seriously crippled them in their operations. On the American side the whole coast is dotted with the nets of their fishermen. As many as thirty nets can be seen in a row on that side, while in the fishing district fronting the whole county of Essex there are only forty-five nets all told. The result of this policy has been that while we have been putting forth every effort to preserve our fisheries, while we have been expending a very large amount of money on our hatcheries, the Americans have for many years, in fact for all time past, been reaping the greater share of the benefits. This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of much more importance, perhaps, than many members of this House are aware. The amount involved is a very large one. The fisheries of Lake Erie are, in fact, the most important of our fresh water fisheries, and when I show, as I shall do, not only from our own Blue-books, but from American statistics, the importance of this interest, hon. members I think will be surprised at the magnitude of the figures and of the advantage the American fishermen and the American people have had over us in the management of these fisheries. As I have said, the Lake Erie fisheries are the most important of our inland fisheries, and in the western end of Lake Erie there is more fishing done than at any other part. Owing to the proximity of the two shores and the shallowness of water, the two sides of the lake, so far as fishing is concerned, are practically the same. I will read the statement of a Mr. Alpern in an American paper with reference to the fishing laws of Canada and the United States:

There has been no increase in the catching of whitefish, except owing to the greatly increased quantity of nets fished, on Lake Erie on the Canada side; in the years 1884, '85, '86, '87, '88, '89, '90 and '91 only 1,027 tons of whitefish were caught, and a total of only 29,000 tons of all kinds of fish during those eight years. This was the result of the bad laws in force in Canada, all kinds of restrictions being made

into law; and at the recommendation of S. Wilmot they have a close season. They close the season in November; they pay a license fee of \$50 for each pound-net; close season for pickerel, 15th May to 15th June; sturgeon, 5th April to 15th July. Compare above catch with the fish caught during the same years on the American side of Lake Erie of at least 200,000 tons of all kinds of fish. If figured at \$80 per ton it would show a value of \$16,000,000, as compared with 29,000 tons of the value of \$1,160,000, thus proving that the free American fishermen produced \$14,740,000 more fish on Lake Erie in the eight years than the restricted Canadian fishermen in the same time.

That is taken from an American paper, and, I presume, is approximately correct, verified to a very great extent, if not altogether, by the reference in our own Blue-book. I notice that the comparison of the fish caught on respective sides in 1880 and 1885 is as follows:—

	1880	1885.
Whitefish	205,600	186,080
Herring	*3,333,800	3,531,855
Sturgeon	854,000	5,935,400
All other kinds	*11,774,400	19,354,900
Total lbs.	213,400	459,260
Total value... ..	*1,970,000	4,727,950
	735,600	1,073,160
	*11,982,900	23,734,912
	2,008,600	7,653,900
	*29,087,300	51,556,517
	48,577	242,774
	*474,880	1,109,096

* Represents United States side.

Thus we see the great disparity of the catch of fish. While we have been expending very large sums of money in Canada on our fish hatcheries, the policy of the department has been to enforce very strict regulations as to catching fish. Now, I would endorse that policy, provided there was between the two countries a similarity of law, but for us in Canada to continue protecting our fish, and giving the Americans the benefit of it, is a policy which should not be continued any longer. Another thing: our men have been hampered by the frequent changes made in regard to the modes of fishing, as to the size of the nets, etc. Just now it has been ordered that a 4½ inch net is to be used in Lake Huron. What the definite instructions are in reference to Lake Erie I have not ascertained; but the fishermen there have been very much alarmed. Last year there was a 4-inch net used. It might not seem a very serious matter to change from 4 to 4½-inch net; but it amounts almost to the loss of the total value of the net. I am informed that in some cases the Americans have changed their nets, and that a loss of \$1,500 will be entailed, on some firms. Not only has this sort of thing been going on for years, but even in our own waters the Americans have practically had control of our fisheries. I will show you from the return brought down to this House that from the Rondeau westward our own fishery officers have been playing into the hands of the American fishermen and who are practi-

cally controlling the fisheries of the western part of Lake Erie. I have in my hand papers that were ordered to be brought down in connection with the inquiry into the conduct of William Prosser, overseer of fisheries for the Essex district, and I intend, in order that the public may see that not only have our fishermen been shut out of these waters practically by the Americans catching the greater quantity of fish, but lately in our own waters they have had almost entirely the control of our fisheries from the Rondeau westward. That has been the state of affairs up to within a year or so ago. What change has taken place since perhaps the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be able to inform the House. The report which I will read from is that of Overseer Kerr, of Hamilton, who was deputed to make inquiries as to the manner in which our fisheries were conducted. He says in his report to the department, dated December 10th, 1891 :

"The principal part of my duty is to ascertain how many nets were really fished during the month of October and the first half of November. This I had some difficulty in establishing, as it was rather late when I was ordered to the ground, and on my arrival there I found that owing to the continued stormy weather most of the twine had been raised and stored away, except the pound-nets fishing on the east side of Rondeau, which is a most sheltered spot. However, as the stakes remained I was enabled to form a pretty correct idea how matters really stood, and with various information received on the spot, I think I shall be able to give you a pretty accurate list of the actual fishermen. I shall also try and show up the tricks of Jas. Post & Co., of Sandusky, and the manner in which the above named firm is assisted by negligent fishery overseers.

The firm of Post & Co. has a large interest in the nets of this district, and, as a consequence, a strong grip and control over the fishermen, who make all sorts of efforts and resort to all kinds of dodges to fish as many nets as they can.

1. At Deal town, Isadore Laroche fishes six nets. Claims to be the only actual fisherman and sole owner. The licenses for these nets are issued in the name of R. J. Lipscombe, Insurance Agent, T. S. Arnold, Auctioneer, and David Woods. This last name presumed to be fictitious. None of the above are bona fide fishermen, and I dare say, never saw the nets. Mr. Laroche says he has been fishing for four years in this locality.

2. John Burton has license for three pounds; was informed he had stakes for eight, but found only six. When asked for explanations he said he kept moving his twine from one set to another, as became necessary according to the run of fish, but that may be true, or it may not. Anyhow, it is a dangerous practice which should not be allowed under any consideration.

3. Moody & Coulson fished three nets. Have license for two. The third net is in Mr. McLean's name, who sold out three years ago to one Lamarche, who in turn sold out to them. They claim to have applied to the overseer to have that net in their own name, but it was not done. This seems fair enough.

4. At Point Pelee there appears to be a good deal of confusion with regard to the bona fide fishermen.

Charles Fisher, an American from Sandusky, fishes three nets licensed in the name of John Mooney, Eth. Mooney, and William Haskins. None of these men fished for years as far as I could ascertain.

Mr. ALLAN.

5. Geo. Johnson, who fishes three nets, has a license for two. The other is in David Johnson's name. The latter is presumed to be a fictitious person.

6. F. Gardener fishes two nets in a string and another in Hezekiah Bickford's name, who has been dead ten years.

7. Adam Oper fishes seven nets; three in his own name, and two in John Loop's and one in Jas. Loop's name. Oper has a license for two nets, and the Loops for three. Excess in this case; two nets. Was unable to ascertain who were the licensees for the remainder.

8. W. A. Grubb fishes two nets; has license for one. The other one in the name of one Quick, who resides on Pelee Island--drove stakes for the third net.

9. The Deslauriers fish four single pound nets, which is according to their license.

10. Peter Ives fishes three nets, one of which is in Henry Loop's name. Both men hold licenses for only one net each.

11. Peter Gardener fishes one net. That it is all right.

12. David Wilkinson fishes three nets; one in his name, and the two others in Jas. & Jos. Lamarche's names, who hold licenses for one net each. The Lamarches, however have not fished since 1889.

13. Loop Bros. fish three nets; two in their name, and one in Thos. Robinson's name. This number tallies with the license.

14. Wm. Black fishes one net for which he holds a license.

15. Uriah Loop fishes three; one in his name; one in Scratch's name, and the third in Mallott's name. This agrees with the license.

16. Gavoreau & Lott have licenses for two pounds and fish two.

17. H. Bartram has license for one pound and fishes it.

18. Alex. Hackett fished three nets; has no license. Claims to be fishing in the name of Livingston who run away three years ago with another man's wife. Livingstone's name appears on the schedule for one pound. He also claims to have bought out Hillman and Johnson, who are down for two pound-nets.

19. Michael Allaire has license for one pound and fishes it.

20. John Goodchild has license for two pounds; was informed he had fished three; saw stakes for three nets. Called on him but he was away. His sons say he fished three nets, but this the old gentleman denies, claiming the third set of stakes were driven in case of storms, so that he could put up a third net without loss of time. I have proofs that he actually fished the three nets.

Remarks.

I experienced a great many difficulties in fathoming the above irregularities; ascertaining names and finding out particulars. All sorts of obstacles were thrown in my way; especially from such of the fishermen as were under Post & Co.'s control. This made it sometimes utterly impossible for me to get accurate or even reliable information in a great many cases, and I must come, therefore, to the conclusion that either Post & Co. own and control the whole fishery from Rondeau westward, or else that overseers McMichael and Prosser are in their favour doing their bidding in every respect, instead of taking the interests of the department into consideration, whose paid servants they are.

Overseer Prosser is sharp and intelligent, and would undoubtedly make a most desirable officer, were it not for certain failings which I am now going to detail.

In addition to a most serious charge of mismanagement in recommending for licenses parties who do not exist, thereby helping to place the pound-net fisheries of Lake Erie in the hands of Yankee firms,

I am also credibly informed that Mr. Prosser has been in the habit of granting permits for extra nets during the fall of the year, especially to such of the fishermen who dispose of their fish to Post & Co. Anyhow, the present investigation has convinced me that he was not the proper man for the position, and the sooner he and overseer McMichael are replaced by new blood, the better it will be for the protection of the fish, and the welfare of bonâ fide fishermen.

Pelee Island.

I would have wished very much to have continued my investigations to Pelee Island, where I am informed a similar state of affairs exists, but the late dates at which I received my instructions made it impossible for me to do so. The influence of Post & Co. is mightily felt among the fishermen on the island; more so, perhaps, than on the mainland, and, I am told, a total disregard of the law prevails there. However, I made particular inquiries from parties who were supposed to be well informed as to the pound-net fisheries on the island, as to the number fished this fall, who set it down as 24 nets in the names of the following persons:—

- 1st. Thos. McCormick. . . Eleven (11) nets.
- 2nd. Sandy Mahoney . . . Three (3) nets.
- 3rd. Pat Mulligan . . . Three (3) nets.
- 4th. David Gardener. . . One (1) net.
- 5th. Geo. Gardener. Two (2) nets.
- 6th. F. Mahoney. Four (4) nets.
- Total number. Twenty-four (24)
pound-nets.

I will not guarantee this statement as correct, but should the department deem it advisable another year to instruct me with a similar mission, I will do my best to get at the root of the evil, which no doubt exists here as on the mainland.

Conclusion.

These remarks have grown to a greater length than I expected, but this was necessary to enable you to distinctly understand how matters stood.

In my humble opinion the cause of the present lawless state of affairs in this district is due to the laxity of Overseers McMichael and Prosser, and to their anxiety to please Post & Co., instead of earnestly and conscientiously taking the department's interests. For this the remedy is very simple. Both these officers should be made to do their duty, or they should be replaced by better men.

A second cause is to be found in the fact that the former close season which permitted of fishing for herring during the close season for whitefish offered every inducement to fishermen, backed as they were by wealthy and unscrupulous buyers and shippers to violate the law. These men are poor, and being in the hands, so to speak, of wealthy firms, they felt no compunction in eluding the Fisheries Act, or deceiving the officers, so long as by doing so, they could make a little money, and redeem their indebtedness. Now that the close season for whitefish and herring has been made uniform, this state of affairs has no more reason to be.

The nets should not be set before a given date, and they should be lifted before the close season begins. This would obviate all trouble, and ensure by force a strict observance of the law.

Then, the overseer, if he were a conscientious and intelligent man, would easily put a stop to the traffic which is now going on, and see that no one but the actual, bonâ fide Canadian fishermen are granted licenses. And, above all, that no more nets are fished than the licenses allow. If this is strictly adhered to by the officers in charge, there will be no danger of creating a monopoly as now exists. And, once a fishery officer allows himself to get into the power of the

fishermen, or a Yankee clique, his usefulness as a servant of the department is gone.

Attached to this report is a sketch showing the exact number and position of pound-nets, with names of parties by whom fished during this current year.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) FRED KERR,
Fishery Overseer.

The Deputy-Minister,
Fisheries Department,
Ottawa.

OTTAWA, 15th December, 1891.

SIR,—Adverting to that portion of your report of 10th instant, in which you state that:—

“In addition to a most serious charge of mismanagement in recommending for licenses parties who did not exist, thereby helping to place the pound-net fisheries of Lake Erie into the hands of Yankee firms, I am also credibly informed that Wm. Prosser has been in the habit of granting permits for extra nets during the fall of the year, especially to such of the fishermen who disposed of their fish to Post & Co.” I am to request you to send here all the information in your possession in support of such a charge, so as to enable the Minister to decide whether it is sufficient to justify this department in taking further proceedings against the above named officer.

I am at the same time to impress upon you the necessity of being very particular in the charges which you bring forward on this head, as it constitutes a grave offence, involving most serious consequences.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed), S. P. BAUSET,
Acting Deputy-Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. FRED. KERR,
Fishery Overseer,
Hamilton, Ont.

HAMILTON, 22nd Dec. 1891.

SIR,—In answer to your letter of the 15th instant, file No. 777-91, in relation to a portion of my report of the 10th instant in reference to Wm. Prosser, Fishery Officer, granting permits for extra pound-nets during the fall of the year in Lake Erie, especially to those who disposed of their fish to Post & Co.

I therefore beg to state that, during my investigation, it accidentally came out that Mr. Prosser refused to grant the extra pound net this year as done heretofore. I then made inquiries as to this assertion, meeting with the following result:—

In the first place, in a conversation with Henry Loop, he stated in the presence of Henry Bertram and William Black, that in the year 1888 or 1889, he paid Prosser \$50 for an extra net for which he only received a receipt. Black contended he had done the same with him for some years until he had quit selling the fish to Post & Co. When he paid the \$50 for the extra net he only received a receipt, which I herewith forward to your department for your own information. You will please find a receipt wrote by Mr. Prosser on the back of fishery license for the year 1886, marked (13) for \$50 for two nets. Black says he paid Prosser \$100 that year and fished the two nets. You will also find a license marked (A) for the year 1887, paid on the 28th of April, and a receipt for \$50 for an outside net paid on the 3rd October of the same year 1887. He says this was received in year of 1888 and 1889, but was unable to find the receipt.

I have no doubt that Mr. Goodchild fished three nets this year, but whether he paid Mr. Prosser \$50 for the extra net I cannot say at present. I am quite certain that Grubb fished an extra net as I saw the stakes.

In fact Mr. Prosser informed me himself that he granted permits for extra nets during the fall fishing, and as I understood him to say, by permission from the department. I thought this assertion very strange and remarked, I supposed he remitted the money to the department; he said he did; if so, why cannot these fishermen produce licenses instead of receipts?

Remember I am not accusing Mr. Prosser of appropriating this money to himself. If he sent the money to the department, it will certainly show on the books whether licenses were transmitted to him or not. If the money on the receipts marked (A) and (B) are on the books, then Mr. Prosser clears himself; if otherwise, then I consider Mr. Prosser is in a very bad position. Understand, I do not rely altogether on Black's statements, as he and Prosser have been at dagger heads for some time. I think your books will tell the straightest story. I have no other information at present to transmit to your department in reference to the above.

Respectfully submitted,

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) FRED. KERR, F.O.

The Deputy-Minister,
Fisheries Department,
Ottawa.

I will now read a few extracts from Mr. Kerr's memo. for the Minister:

Adam Oper fished two-pound nets on the east side of Point Pelee, for which he holds license in his name. Adam Oper & Co. (A. Oper, J. T. Robson and Levi Girardin) fished five pound-nets for which they held license; J. Robson one pound-net, E. Mooney one pound-net, John Loop two pounds, making a total of seven pounds fished by Adam Oper and Adam Oper & Co.

In Adam Oper's case, I consider that Mr. Prosser's explanation makes things look much worse. According to his own version, Oper must have fished eleven nets, while I only heard of seven. Most of the men mentioned in regard to this charge, never fished. One in particular, John Robson, never fished a net in his life. The truth of the matter is, that the nets in question belong to Post & Co., and things have got into such a muddle that I believe Prosser himself does not understand how matters are with regard to names, &c. I consider Mr. Prosser's answer most unsatisfactory.

I will now read a report in reference to this subject, dated Hamilton, March, 1892:

HAMILTON, March, 1892.

SIR,—According to your instructions of the 5th instant, I proceeded at once to the place in question to take down evidence and to make inquiries in regard to certain charges of neglect of duty and other irregularities preferred against overseer Prosser.

I therefore beg to state that on my arrival at Kingsville on the 8th instant, I at once commenced to make the necessary inquiries and take down evidence bearing on the charges in overseer Prosser's case. I met with a great deal of difficulty on account of the terrible state of the roads, which hindered me much in procuring the evidence that I required most. How-

Mr. ALLAN.

ever, I think I succeeded in getting enough of evidence and statements that will fully convince the department that the charges on the whole are clearly proven. I will also show that the statements made by Mr. Prosser in his defence are incorrect, according to the evidence that I have taken.

I might, however, review the various evidence and statements on each of the charges in detail, and express my opinion as I go along, so as to enable you to understand the position of things, showing where the contradictions take place, etc., as follows:

Charge 1.—I was unable to drive down to Wheatly, where Moody and Coulson reside, on account of the bad roads. However, as this was not a serious charge I thought I would let it go for what it was worth.

Charge 2.—Mr. Prosser in his defence says he had heard that Chas. Fisher was fishing more pound-nets than he had license for, that he sent word down that he must pull up the extra stakes. He continues,—I went and seen for myself and found two pound-nets fishing only.

Now we will take the sworn evidence of W. A. Grubb, who positively swears that he saw three pound nets fishing and another one lying on the shore ready to be attached to the stakes, which were already planted. This evidence is corroborated by William Deslaurier, who fished the seine-nets the year before. These nets belong to Post & Co. Deslaurier says he fished four nets in partnership with one Cline, and according to his evidence paid license fee for three pounds only. This happened in the year 1890.

Charge 3.—I admit that I was in fault in my report on this case where I had stated that Frank Gardener fished a pound-net with a license in a dead man's name. However I find it was John E. Deslaurier who held the license in Hezekiah Bickford's name, now deceased ten years. I will thus explain the circumstance:—In the first place, Overseer Prosser states in his defence that John E. Deslaurier told him to make out the license in the name of H. Bickford, who is ten years dead, as he, Deslaurier, had no transfer. The evidence of Deslaurier denies this assertion. He positively swears that Mr. Prosser was aware of his having a transfer, which was produced for my inspection. He also states that he asked Prosser to make out the license in his (Deslaurier's) name, but Prosser thought it best to make it in Bickford's name. See Evidence.

Charge 4.—The Oper Case.—This charge is a very hard one to fathom although Mr. Prosser and myself agree as to the number of nets he fished, being seven. Still, that's not the point. He does not say whether they were double headers or not, or the names of the licensees were bona fide fishermen. The evidence of John Laird and W. A. Grubb go to show that he invariably fished three double headers. Some of the names he claims who held license for these nets are not fishermen, namely, Joe Robson, John Loop, E. Mooney. For instance, Joe Robson is an invalid who is completely paralyzed for years, whom I called upon, and he denied of ever fishing a pound-net in his life. I did not attempt to take his evidence as he was not a fit subject on account of his disease, but what he told me left me quite satisfied that he never fished a net in his life.

Charge 5.—This charge, known as the Goodchild case. It is clearly proven that overseer Prosser was cognizant of these three nets fishing during the whole season, and he was standing in with Mr. Goodchild. The evidence of Mr. Tofflemier and the statement of Alex. Hackett clearly prove this. Tofflemier swears he drove stakes for two of the three pound-nets fished, while Hackett distinctly says that he was aware of the three nets fishing altogether, seeing them in person. He also considers that Mr. Prosser must have known they were there as he observed him driving there on several occasions during the summer. I was unable to find one Anthony Marontate who fished for

Mr. Goodchild, who Tofflemier told assisted in driving the third set of stakes, he being away when I called, but his evidence can be obtained if desired. I can therefore safely say the evidence produced entirely contradicts Mr. Prosser when he states in his defence that after diligent inquiries he was unable to get any proof that he, Goodchild, fished more than two nets; in fact I fail to find any proof as to his making the least inquiries in the matter. *See evidence.*

Charge 6.—As to this charge: Wm. Haskins swears he was not in the habit of trading in pound-net licenses, as asserted by Overseer Prosser, nor had he applied for a license for himself or any one else for years back. He also claims he is ignorant of those transfers between Haskins vs. Mooney, Haskins vs. Wriggleworth, which Mr. Prosser claims took place in the years 1885 and 1887.

General Remarks.—In conclusion, I can only say that Mr. Prosser's division is in a very confused and demoralized state, and should be remedied as soon as possible. This state of affairs has been caused by the overseer himself, in his anxiety to please and to favour Joe Post & Co., and as things now stand he has got so much in the power of the Yankee firms, his usefulness as a fishery officer is gone. You can readily perceive by the recent reports that he and Post have formed a sort of a combination and endeavour to shut out as many as possible of those men who choose to sell their fish elsewhere. We will take the cases of Wm. Black, David Wilkinson and Bates Bros: Mr. Post went as far as to threaten these men, telling Bates that for the sum of \$500 or \$600 he would deprive him of his fishing rights. This was done because Bates refused to sell him any more fish. I also found many fishermen afraid to give me the necessary information that I was seeking, on account of threats, &c., made by Prosser and Post of taking away their license, &c.

One old gentleman remarked, after I had taken his sworn statement, that if Prosser knew it he would settle his license for this year. There is no doubt this lawless sort of work has been carried on for years. If a fisherman makes a kick as to the price of his fish, etc., the next year his outside pound is taken away from him. This, particularly, has caused much trouble, you can readily perceive, some enjoying the privilege of fishing double-headers, while others' applications are not entertained at all by Overseer Prosser, who contended to some that the thing was not allowed.

I encountered great difficulty in procuring the sworn evidence that I have obtained, the feeling being strong against giving it for the reasons stated before, but after I properly explained the matter, I am happy to say, I quickly overcame this erroneous idea, leaving them to understand that they would receive justice and fair-play in future from your department.

I might also state for your information that I was told by Mr. Harrison, the gamekeeper of the Point Pelee Game Club, last fall, when on my tour of inspection, Mr. Prosser as soon as he learned that I was around immediately sent word to the fishermen that I was around and to look out. This assertion is corroborated by William Grubb and others. This I consider was a great oversight on Overseer Prosser's part, he being a servant of the department as he was, and assisting me in this work; but instead it appears he was spying on my movements and throwing obstacles in my way, therefore retarding my inquiries. As far as I can learn from the information received during my inquiries, I have come to the conclusion that there were four more nets fishing in excess of the licenses granted, namely, John Goodchild, one; Chas. Fisher, two; and J. Johnson, one. I was unable to find out anything with regard to shipping whitefish during close season last fall, as the fishermen keep very close on this, but, however, I believe on Pelee Island there was a great deal of illegal fishing and irregularities carried on there which should be

remedied before pound net fishing commences this season.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

FRED. KERR,

Fisheries Overseer.

The Deputy-Minister,
Fisheries Department,
Ottawa.

Evidence of Wm. Haskins, Kingsville.

WM. HASKINS, sworn:—

I have not applied to Overseer Prosser for a pound-net license inside of two years, and I have never traded a license at any time. I think it was in 1885 I sold out my right to fishing station No. 16 to Joseph Post. I was compelled to, as Post held a mortgage on my twine and he closed down on me. I swear that I did not know that my name was on a license or connected with the same until I observed it on the schedule last fall. Mr. Prosser never informed me that a license for a pound-net was in my name, or did I authorize him to use my name in any shape whatever in connection therewith.

I also swear positively that I know nothing whatever as to the change in licenses stated by Overseer Prosser in the transfers of Haskins vs. Mooney, Haskins vs. Wriggleworth; if my name was used it was without my knowledge.

I applied twice for a license since 1885, but Mr. Prosser refused to grant me a license. I fish with others since but have not fished any for over two years.

(Signed) his
WM. HASKINS.
mark.

Sworn before me this 9th day of March, 1892, at Kingsville.

(Signed) FRED. KERR.
Commissioner.

Evidence of Philip Deslauriers, Fisherman, residing on Point Pelee.

Philip Deslaurier, sworn:—I have fished over 21 years on Point Pelee. In the year 1889 I had a license for one pound-net, but fished two nets. The second pound-net is what is commonly known as the outside net, or what some calls double header.

I paid Overseer Prosser one hundred dollars for the privilege of fishing the two nets. I received from Mr. Prosser one license only. It was for one net, for the first net. Did not receive a receipt or any acknowledgment for the \$50 that I paid him for the extra net. In the year 1890 Mr. Prosser refused to grant me a license for even an extra shore net that I had purchased the year before, which I had fished as the outside net, putting me to the loss of \$300, and I had to content myself with one, while others were allowed to fish double headers. I spoke to Mr. Prosser that it seemed strange that Adam Oper and Johnson were allowed to fish these kind of nets, while I could not get the same privilege. Mr. Prosser looked surprised to hear of such a thing, and threatened to go right down and tear up the nets, and I swear this conversation occurred in Leamington. He did not pull them. I met them afterwards and said they had a right to fish outside of the pound on the east side of the point. I saw Oper's nets this year. He had three double headers, two on the east side and one on the west. Johnson had also a double header and Frank Gardener had an outside net. I have not seen Prosser around during close season.

(Sgd.) PHILIP DESLAURIER.

Sworn before me this 10th day of March, 1892, at Point Pelee.

(Sgd.) FRED. KERR,
Commissioner.

Evidence of Wm. Black, Kingsville.

Wm. Black sworn:—I commenced to fish at Kingsville in the year 1884. I fished two pound-nets until the year 1890. Paid license fee for two nets up to that time; was refused the second net by Overseer Prosser in the year 1891.

I swear positively that I paid Mr. Prosser the money for two nets each year that I fish them, except in the year 1890. I only received one license each year that I fished two nets. The license was for one net only. Mr. Prosser gave me receipt for the money paid for the second net. I gave Mr. Kerr the receipts for the years 1886-87. I do not remember receiving receipts for the years 1888-89. If I did I am unable to find them. I will swear that I paid Mr. Prosser \$100 for the year 1888-89. I generally paid \$50 in the spring and \$50 in the fall, receiving a license in the spring for the one net, and the receipt in the fall for the other. I made application for the second net in the year 1890 in the usual form in the month of August. Mr. Prosser told me it would be all right. Under this arrangement I procured a new net and other fixing and went to the expense of driving the stakes, but did not receive the second license. I only fished one net last year. I fished the two nets a short time in the year 1890, but did not pay the extra fee that year. Mr. Prosser never asked me for it.

(Sgd.) W. H. BLACK.

Sworn before me, this 10th day of March, 1892, at Kingsville.

(Sgd.) FRED. KERR,
Commissioner.

Peter Gardener, Jr., Point Pelee.

Peter Gardener, sworn:—I have been fishing almost all my life. I have held license over five years. In 1888 I fished two pounds on lot No. 14, Point Pelee; I had a license for one from the department; I paid license for two nets, \$50 in the spring and \$50 for the outside net; the money was paid to Mr. Prosser. I received no receipt or any acknowledgment from Mr. Prosser for the outside net. I swear I paid him the money in the fall; when I gave him the money he told me to go ahead and fish, which I did. The next year I drove the stakes for the outside net, which I specially bought for the purpose. I had put the twine in, when Prosser came and ordered me to take it out, putting me to a loss of \$300. He led me to believe that it would be all right, or I would not have went to the expense of buying the net.

(Sgd.) PETER GARDENER.

Sworn before me this 11th day of March, 1892.

(Sgd.) FRED. KERR,
Commissioner.

I will now read the report to Privy Council, as follows:—

CERTIFIED COPY of a Report of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved By His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, on the 9th April, 1892.

On a Report dated 2nd April, 1892, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, stating, with reference to further inquiries which he caused to be made during the month of November last, relative to alleged violations of the fishery laws, and other irregularities said to prevail amongst pound net fishermen on Lake Erie, from Port Burwell to Colchester, that the facts brought to his knowledge in this connection are such as to justify him in recommending the dismissal of the fishery officer implicated in such irregularities.

The Minister, after having fully considered all the facts related in the very full report made by Fishery Overseer Frederick Kerr, of Hamilton, who conducted

Mr. ALLAN.

ed this investigation, a synopsis of which is attached herewith, has no hesitation in saying that Overseer William Prosser has been guilty of gross neglect of duty and of grave irregularities in permitting certain persons to fish in the name of others, for the benefit of American firms, and that the above named officer also appears to have been in the habit of issuing licenses in the names of parties who have been dead for several years, and that he, moreover, allowed fishing during the close season, and was also in the habit of granting "permits" to fish pound-nets during the fall, without authority from the Fisheries Department, and without accounting for the fees collected thereon; the immediate effect of such conduct on the part of a sworn officer being to completely demoralize the fisheries service on this part of the coast of Lake Erie, and to place these valuable Canadian fishing grounds in the hands of American firms.

The Minister, in view of the above facts, recommends that the services of Overseer William Prosser be dispensed with, and that such further steps be taken against him for the recovery of moneys unduly collected by him, and unaccounted for, as the circumstances of the case may seem to demand.

The Committee submit the same for Your Excellency's approval.

(Signed) JOHN J. MCGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable the Minister of
Marine and Fisheries.

I shall not detain the House much further, Mr. Speaker, in reading from this report. My only justification for going into so many details at this late period of the session, is that the question is a very important one to the people in Essex. It has been known for some time past that the fisheries have been under the control of Post and Company, but the evidence has never yet been placed before the public. My object in placing it upon the records of the House is not only that the House should know the particulars, but also that the public at large should have an opportunity of seeing them. Our fishermen in that part of the country have been oppressed for many years. We have only forty-five licenses in all, and most of those have practically been in the hands of American companies as is shown by this report. I will give the Government credit for having dismissed Prosser. So far so good, but I understand that Overseer McMichael is still in office. It is well known that at the other end of Lake Erie—although, perhaps, not to the same extent—the American fishermen have almost the entire control of the fisheries there, that they supply the nets to our fishermen, that they handle the greater part of our fish, and the regulations which this department has made from time to time, have been in the interests of the American fishermen to the detriment of our own people. That is the reason why I have detained the House by reading these reports. I will, if the House will permit me, continue to give further quotations from this report:

According to the evidence of Wm. Black, Peter Gardener, J. and Frank Gardener, Prosser must have collected a large amount of money for extra outside nets, giving receipts to some, and to others no acknowledgment whatever. The evidence on this point is explicit. Department knows whether money

claimed to have been paid to Prosser was remitted by him or not. Attached to this report will be found a license and receipt from Prosser to F. Gardener, who paid \$100 for two pound-nets in 1888. Prosser's division is in a demoralized state, which has been caused by his anxiety to favour Post & Co., and he is now so much in the power of Yankee firms that his usefulness as a fishery officer is gone. Reports show that he and Post have formed a sort of combine, and are trying to shut out such of the fishermen as chose to sell their fish elsewhere. Post threatened Black, Wilkinson and Bates Bros., telling them that he would deprive them of their fishing rights if they would not sell their fish to him (Post). Several fishermen were afraid to give information on account of threats, etc., made by Prosser and Post of taking their licenses away; one of them remarking that if Prosser knew of his giving evidence it would settle his license for that year. This work has been going on for years. If a fisherman kicks as to the price he gets for his fish, etc., next year his outside net is taken away from him. This partiality has caused much trouble. Some fishermen enjoy the privilege of fishing double headers, while the applications of others are not entertained, Prosser contending that the thing is not allowed. There was a strong feeling against the giving of evidence on account of reasons stated, but proper explanations overcame this erroneous idea, and the fishermen were led to understand that they would receive justice and fair-play in future from the department. Was told by Harrison, game keeper for Point Pelee Game Club, last fall on my tour of inspection, that so soon as Prosser knew I was around, he sent word to the fishermen telling them to look out. This assertion is corroborated by W. A. Grubb and others. This is certainly reprehensible on the part of a government officer. He should have assisted me as a servant of the department, but instead of doing so he spied my movements and threw obstacles in my way, retarding my inquiries. From information received I believe there were four nets fishing in excess of the licenses granted, viz.:—John Goodchild, 1; Chas. Fisher, 2, and J. Johnson, 1. Was unable to find out anything re shipping of whitefish during the close season last fall, as fishermen kept close, but think that on Pelee Island a great deal of illegal fishing and other irregularities are carried on which should be remedied before the beginning of pound-net fishing this season.

The following is the report of Mr. Kerr, fishery overseer:—

HAMILTON, 20th April, 1892.

S. P. BAUSET, Esq.,
Acting Deputy-Minister of Fisheries,
Ottawa.

In compliance with your directions, on the 11th instant, File No. 2661-92—requesting me to report on certain affidavits of Mr. William Prosser, relative to charges made against him; I beg to state that, after carefully reading his affidavit, and taking into consideration the evidences already transmitted to your department, I do not consider it necessary for me to again go over this case in detail, as it has been fully dealt with in my previous reports. I will, however, recapitulate each clause of Mr. Prosser's affidavit, to show the inconsistency of Mr. Prosser's and Mr. Louis Wigle's demands.

1st. Mr. Prosser swears;—That he never, in any way, either directly or indirectly, insinuated to any person or persons to whom they should sell their fish, &c., &c., or threatened to deprive them of their licenses should they not sell to Post & Co., &c.

In answer to this assertion I can only refer to the Black case. Why did not Mr. Prosser entertain this man's application for a second license, after Black gave up selling his fish to Post & Co.? Simply because Joe Post influenced him not to do it. Black states

that so long as he sold his fish to Post & Co. he never had any trouble in securing licenses for two pound-nets. Prosser's action which had the effect of depriving this man of a second license, no doubt put him to a heavy loss, and no one can blame him for complaining. Look also at David Wilkinson's case, who was unable to secure a license for an outside net after he had had the temerity to sell his fish to others than Post & Co. Again, how did it happen that those that were under the control of Post & Co. were allowed to fish double-headed pounds, while those who were independent of this firm were refused?

Since this investigation was begun, I understand that Mr. Prosser has publicly threatened that some of the parties who were complaining would never get a license, if he could stop it. This threat has been repeatedly made by Joe Post. The whole sum and substance of the matter is that Mr. Prosser had placed himself so much under the power of Post & Co. that it was impossible for him to get out of their clutches. This renders him entirely unfit for the position he holds.

2nd. Mr. Prosser claims that he never granted a permit for a net to fish during the fall, or at any other time, unless he immediately notified the department of his having done so; that he remitted the full amount for the same, and that not a single permit had been granted since he was notified a year ago, &c.

I believe Mr. Prosser did not give permits for extra nets since a year ago, &c., but he allowed extra nets to be fished without the written permit. For instance, in the Goodchild case, in the cases of George Johnston and Charles Fisher, who had five nets in excess of the number mentioned in the license. All the witnesses who gave their evidence in reference to this charge are quite prepared and willing to appear before any court of justice face to face with Mr. Prosser, and repeat the evidence which they gave before me. If Tofflemeur, Hackett, Grubb and Deslauriers are called upon to repeat their evidence, I guarantee there will be no hesitation on their part. The thing is altogether too plain, especially in the Goodchild case. Mr. Prosser himself admitted that there were three sets of stakes, but not until I had told him that three nets were fishing. And how was it that Goodchild wanted to settle the matter by paying the fee, if it was not true? Mr. Prosser told me he was not in the vicinity of Mr. Goodchild's nets during the whole season when I have witnesses to prove that he was seen passing up and down on several occasions during the year. None of the witnesses in this case are in any way hostile to Mr. Prosser or to Post & Co. They would have no object in swearing falsely against him. I do not, therefore, consider it necessary to dwell further upon this case. The charge is so clear, the evidence is so conclusive, that I cannot possibly see what Mr. Prosser would gain by having the case opened up again.

3rd. That no one has ever been allowed to fish in excess of the number of nets for which he had a license, except about two years ago, and then the Department was notified in every instance paid for it, and apparently satisfied.

I need not dwell on this point. As already remarked in my previous reports, the department's books will be the strongest affidavits. If Mr. Prosser paid the money collected for the extra nets used by Mr. Black (\$50.00), for the years 1886 and 1887, for which Black holds receipts, and for the years 1888 and 1889, which Black swears he paid (\$50.00 for each year); Philip Deslauriers, \$50.00 for the year 1889; Peter Gardener \$50.00 for the year 1888 and Frank Gardener for the year 1888, these moneys will surely be entered. But, as I understand it, they are not, and Mr. Prosser has nothing to show that the money was ever paid; while a number of the fishermen hold receipts from Mr. Prosser. Mr. Prosser swears in his affidavit that

this money was paid over to the department—then why does not he produce the acknowledgment generally received from department, which, according to the rule, is invariably given for such things. I apprehend that if Messrs. Wigle and Prosser press this matter too far, and have an open investigation, it will be worse for Prosser in the end, as these witnesses are ready to come forward and give evidence as they gave before.

4th. That not a single license was granted in the name of a dead man, except in the case of Hezekiah Bickford, and John Deslauriers, grand-son to the old man H. Bickford. Deslauriers requested him to send for the license as usual, in Bickford's name, which has never made any difference to any person.

This assertion is denied by John E. Deslauriers, who distinctly swears that he asked Mr. Prosser to change the name. Prosser declined, claiming that it would not make any difference. See John Deslauriers's evidence. He is ready at any time to swear the same thing again. Mr. Prosser must not forget that many licenses were issued to men who were not fishermen, and to others who never fished at all, as well as to men who were not in the country, viz.:—Harry Livingstone, Wallace Scratch, John Loop, sen., William Haskins, James Robson and others. The department is already aware, from my various reports, as well as by the evidence produced, that this was done simply for the purpose of procuring more nets for Post & Co. Mr. Prosser was perfectly cognizant of the position of these men at the time he forwarded the applications. I therefore cannot possibly see how he can clear himself of this accusation. These men are prepared to come forward at any time face to face with Mr. Prosser, and conscientiously give their evidence without fear or favour.

5th. That he always did his duty conscientiously; that he believes there has been and still is a systematic course of blackmailing against him, simply because he has done his duty, and would not allow certain persons to fish contrary to his instructions.

I do not agree with Mr. Prosser's statement regarding blackmailing, etc., etc. I am very sorry to add that I found Mr. Prosser a very deceitful man, and that his word is not to be depended upon. I must also mention that when I first met him he proved so affable and agreeable, that when I began this investigation I was strongly impressed with the idea that the charges would prove unfounded. But the irregularities were so glaring that there was no difficulty in getting at the bottom of the complaints, with the results already made known.

There is no blackmailing nor any hard feeling against him, nor any attempt to take advantage of him by the fishermen that I am aware of. True, there may be some animosity between him and Black, but Black told me he was quite satisfied with Prosser as an officer if he would only give him the same privileges as the rest of the fishermen, which was all he asked for. And all that Black stated in regard to the charges turned out to be correct.

I must say on behalf of the fishermen of this district that in all my travels I never came across a more respectable, decent, sober, and industrious lot of fellows. They are, I believe, above such a stigma as blackmailers, as Mr. Prosser designates them. All they asked was fair-play and justice from the local fishery officer, and no partiality to any one. My reports and the evidence produced showed that that has not been carried out by Mr. Prosser. Who then can blame these fishermen if they are dissatisfied at the manner in which he has been discharging his duties?

6th. That it is his desire that an investigation take place, and the Minister and all parties interested will then get justice, and the blame will be put upon those who should shoulder it.

I have not the slightest objection to Mr. Prosser's wishes being carried out; and I feel quite satisfied

Mr. ALLAN.

that all the parties who gave their evidence before me will not be slow in coming forward to testify and repeat what they said before, face to face with Mr. Prosser, although I consider this an unnecessary expense and trouble.

7th. From what he hears he believes Mr. Prosser thinks that the department has statements from fishermen here who will not repeat them in his presence.

In regard to this statement I do not believe that a single witness will go back on what he has already stated, unless it be through the influence of Post & Co., taking advantage of him in the supply of twine or something of this kind he has been in the habit of doing before.

8th. That he has done his duty and asks protection from higher authority, &c., &c.

I consider that Mr. Prosser has in no wise done his duty as he contends. Had he done so, his district would never had become so muddled as it has, being in a complete state of disorganization. This state of affairs, as I have often remarked in previous reports has been brought about by Mr. Prosser's eagerness and efforts to please Post & Co., so much so, that Post had got him completely in his power that he could not do anything in the matter of distributing licenses without first consulting him. On one of my trips last fall, he telegraphed Mr. Post to come over as I was there about licenses, &c., and I would venture to say that Mr. Post could explain and tell more as to who held licenses, fished and did not fish, than the overseer himself. Under these circumstances I claim that his usefulness as a fishery officer is gone.

In conclusion I may add that if the wishes of Mr. Louis Wigle are carried out, all the witnesses who gave their evidence before me will be on hand to substantiate their previous statements. I warned them, when taking their evidence to tell nothing that they could not confirm on some future occasion. Their answer was that they knew the responsibility they were assuming, and were prepared to stand by it. This is mentioned for the purpose of showing that no undue influence was brought to bear on them in order to get evidence necessary to sustain the charges. One man, John E. Deslauriers, was so careful that he drove 14 miles after me that I might read his affidavit over again to him, being afraid that he might have stated something that he would be unable to confirm if called upon on some future occasion. These are the witnesses whom Mr. Prosser thinks would be afraid to come forward face to face with him and repeat their evidence for fear of contradiction. And I do not think that if Mr. Wigle rightly understood the case, he would be so earnest in having an open investigation to take place, which I consider would place Mr. Prosser in a worse plight than he is at present.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) **FRED KERR,**

Fishery Overseer.

The fishermen in that section have been making complaints from time to time, and during the last week, numerous signed petitions have been sent to Parliament in reference to this matter. The prayer of the petition, I will read:

*To the Honourable the Senate and House of Commons,
Canada:*

GENTLEMEN,—

The petition of the undersigned fishermen of the Province of Ontario

Humbly sheweth that the fishery regulations at present in force in this province are unreasonable and vexatious and are calculated to hamper the fishermen in their operations and do great injury to this important industry. That favouritism rules the department

in the granting of licenses to fish. The present close season for different kinds of fish is unsatisfactory. For example, the close season for pickerel extends from April 15th to May 15th, that for sturgeon from April 15th to July 15th. If, while fishing with pound-nets or seines for pickerel on, say, May 20th, sturgeon is caught the fishermen are liable to have their nets seized and burned.

The weekly close season extends from 6 o'clock Saturday night till 7 o'clock Monday morning. It is a physical impossibility for lake fishermen to obey this regulation.

The attempt to artificially propagate whitefish and pickerel has, according to the opinions of our most prominent, practical and oldest fishermen, proved a total failure and the money used for that purpose squandered. There is no evidence that any of the 451 millions of whitefish fry put into our waters have come to maturity. The fish hatchery has now been in existence at Sandwich 15, years, long enough surely to demonstrate its success or failure. According to the annual report of the department for the year 1880, on the Canadian side of Lake Erie 295,000 pounds of whitefish were taken, while in 1890 only 204,322 pounds. During these years the netting had increased over 500 per cent. During these years, and previously, over 400 millions of whitefish fry had been deposited in this lake. Of other kinds of fish not attempted to be artificially propagated there were caught in Lake Erie in 1880, 902 tons, and in 1890, 4,083 tons.

That the regulations enforced in Canada have hampered Canadian fishermen, resulting in great loss to them, and consequently to the Dominion is easily demonstrated. We submit the following:—

CANADIAN SIDE LAKE ERIE.

	Persons employed.	Pound-nets	Gill Nets. Fathoms.	Seines.	White-fish.	Total Fish.
						Lbs.
1880	178	54	200	21	205,000	2,008,600
1885	346	132	6,500	32	186,080	7,653,900
			Fathoms.	Fathoms.		
1886	337	126	4,238	2,385	141,643	5,109,945
1887	343	143	9,322	4,030	331,406	9,274,270
1888	460	194	13,055	3,848	389,836	8,550,253
1889	465	195	8,392	5,933	306,213	9,265,753
1890	526	197	24,400	6,675	204,322	8,369,892
1891	479	206	27,610	5,427	349,874	8,256,724
					2,113,974	58,849,337

In eight years a total of 1,057 tons of white fish.
do do 29,425 tons of all kinds of fish.

AMERICAN SIDE OF LAKE ERIE.

1880	1620	{ 758 Trap, 1,000 928 1,169 }	577,500	1,800	3,333,800	29,087,300
1885	4298					
					6,865,555

(1885, set lines, 504,900 hooks used.)

1888	5,893	Increased number of nets.....	63,556,517
1881	7,198	do do (For 1891 is estimated.).....	75,800,000

It will thus be seen that the quantity caught in the eight years on the Canadian side was 29,425 tons,

while on the American side the total catch for the three years ('80, '85 and '88) was 72,100 tons. The Americans, it will be seen from the tables, caught in 1888, 2,353 tons more fish than the Canadians caught in the eight years mentioned. The fishing on the Canadian side of Lake Erie is admitted to be better than on the American side, and the difference in the catch is altogether owing to the restrictions placed upon Canadian fishermen. We need not go into an estimate of the great loss suffered by the individual fishermen, as well as by the Dominion, as shown by the figures quoted.

Your petitioners humbly pray that the granting of licenses be abolished. We believe the saving that could be effected by discontinuing the fish hatcheries and fishing overseers would more than compensate for the loss of revenue from licenses.

That the present close season for all kinds of fish, except black bass and brook trout, be discontinued and one general close season substituted, to commence on Nov. 20th and continue till April 20th following. This, in the opinion of your petitioners, would be all the protection required.

What our fishermen want is either uniformity of laws or uniformity of privileges. For many years past they have been led to expect that the states of the American Union, as it is a matter within the jurisdiction of the various states, would adopt the same laws as Canada. For the last twenty or twenty-five years that has been promised to them, and I believe that now there is a commission which is about to sit at Washington that will consider this among other matters. If uniformity in the fishery laws between the two countries can be secured, then the policy of our Government is all right, but in the meantime when you consider that the Americans are reaping almost the entire advantage of our fisheries in the West, I say there is only one course to be pursued. The people in that section of the country, Liberals and Conservatives alike, are almost unanimous on this question. If the Americans are allowed to fish at all seasons of the year and without restraint in these waters, which extend a distance of about 130 miles and which are identically the same as ours for fishing purposes, our people believe that our fishermen should have equal privileges. For my part, I do not believe you will ever secure uniformity in the laws until you go to the states of Michigan and Ohio and tell them that unless they conform their laws to ours, Canada will give the same privileges to her fishermen. In my judgment that is the only way in which uniformity can be brought about. The people who have lived there all their lives deeply deplore to see our men restrained and restricted, while the Americans are reaping this rich reward. I believe that no member of the House will sympathize with this present condition of things. I know that the Conservatives to whom I have spoken on the question are all agreed on it, but the Government seem to have depended for many years past on the opinion of Mr. Wilmot, superintendent of fisheries, whose opinion is altogether contrary to the opinions of the people in that section of the country, who surely ought to know something about

it. Men who have lived there all their lives feel that there must be something wrong in the law when we have only forty-five nets on the Canadian side, in the Essex district, and in eight years we have only fished 29,000 pounds on the Canadian side of Lake Erie, while in the United States they have fished over eight times that quantity. I had intended bringing this matter up on the Votes for the Fishery Department, but as it was so late in the session I have taken this opportunity to do so, trusting that Government will give the question their serious consideration. This is not a party question; nor is it one in which any person should desire to make political capital out of. Through the policy that has been pursued by the Government our fishermen have been outraged in the past, and no matter how good the intentions may have been, that policy has really been in the interests of American fishermen to the detriment of our own Canadians engaged in the same industry.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the acting Minister of Fisheries whether it is true, as reported, that an order was issued by the department prohibiting fishing on the shore of Lake Huron, between Goderich and Sarnia, and in the River St. Clair during the coming season?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know the nature of the instructions sent to the several districts. I am aware that instructions have been sent to prohibit fishing, but the question is now being considered by the department and by the Government, in two cases—that is the fishing on the River St. Clair, and the prohibition of fishing for “poisson mou” in the province of Quebec. As the fishing season is coming on, no time will be lost by the Government in arriving at a decision as to whether their regulations will be rigidly enforced or not.

Mr. LISTER. The Government has not decided, as a matter of fact?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; but it must very soon decide.

Mr. LISTER. The matter which the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allan) has brought before the House is one of very great importance to a very large and deserving class of people. He has not magnified in the slightest degree the importance of the fishing industry on the great upper lakes of this Dominion. As the hon. gentleman who is acting as Minister of Marine and Fisheries no doubt understands, there are upon the St. Clair River and upon Lake Huron two classes of fishermen, namely, pound-net fishermen and seine-net fishermen. For the past three or four years there has been a great falling off in the catch of fish in these waters between Point Edward and Blue Point. The seine fishermen say that the cause of this falling off is the permission

Mr. ALLAN.

allowed by the Government of the use of a large number of pound-nets. They claim that these nets are placed above the rapids on Lake Huron so as to intercept the fish, and that in this way large quantities of fish, not only those fit for food, but immature fish, are taken. The result has been that for the past three or four years the seine fisheries in these waters have been very unprofitable. I sincerely trust that the acting Minister will not enforce during the present season the regulations which he has spoken of. It would be a most unfortunate thing for the fishermen there, and if he understands the true position of affairs he will agree with me that it would be a very harsh measure for the Government to adopt towards those men. The fishing industry on those waters has been in continuous existence for fifty years. The men engaged in it have grown up in it. Every dollar they have in the world is involved in the business; and the proposition of the Government, made without due notice to the fishermen, is that the men who depend on this industry for their livelihood should be prohibited entirely from fishing during the coming season. As my hon. friend knows, the time of fishing commences on the 15th of May. In preparation for their business for the present season the fishermen have laid up their ice in large quantities, they have made their nets and repaired them, they have repaired their boats and got them ready, and they have been informed by the fishery overseer up there that they are not to be allowed to fish during the coming season. This information has caused them the utmost consternation. Their living and the living of their families depend upon their being allowed to go to work, and an intimation of that kind from an officer of the department has created a feeling among them to which it is impossible to give adequate expression. A large number of these men met and adopted a petition to the department asking that for this year at all events this harsh rule should not be put in force, and that they should have timely notice of the adoption of such a rule by the department, so that they would not be put to the very large outlay which they have incurred this year in preparing for their season's fishing. Now, I trust that the Minister will not, I am sure he will not, during the present year at all events, enforce the regulation which he has intimated to us. It would bring ruin upon hundreds of men engaged in that industry. I venture to say it would be a tyrannical act for the department to take advantage of the power they have to allow these men to expend large sums of money in making preparations for the fishing season, and, after all these preparations had been completed, to come upon them at a moment's warning and tell them that they must not fish under any circumstances during the coming season. I understand perfectly well the views of the officers of the department. I

understand that Mr. Wilmot, one of the officers of the department, and a worthy man, who has given this matter a great deal of study, believes that it is necessary to the re-stocking of these great lakes with fish, that there should be a cessation in fishing for one, two or three years. I have tried to point out to him that what he proposes to do would not have the effect of restoring to those lakes the fish that appear to be gradually disappearing, so long as the regulations on the other side of the line are not in accordance with our regulations, and so long as whatever regulations they have are not enforced. The hon. Minister of course knows that the states bordering upon the lakes have control of the fisheries, and that in the different states there are different regulations. In Lake Huron the fishermen use the pound-net, the gill-net and the seine-net, and it is notorious that there is no supervision at all by the state whereby the fish are preserved or are enabled to increase; and the contention of our people is that so long as that state of affairs exists it is useless for our Government to try to enforce the fishery regulations on this side. Mr. Wilmot contends that the Canadian fish never go to the other side of the lake at all, but remain on the Canadian side of the line, and that American fish are always to be found on the American side, so that no matter what rules may be passed in the United States, they do not affect the quantity of fish to be caught on the Canadian side. I take issue with him as to that. I say that the theory he raises has no foundation in fact. The winds drive the fish from one side to the other. It is notable in my section of the country that when the wind is from one quarter no fish are to be caught on that side of the lake while they are abundant on the other side, and when the wind shifts they are abundant on our own side while there are none on the other side. I have in my possession the proofs showing beyond peradventure that fish from the Canadian side are caught on the other side. This has been proved by catching the fish and marking them, and the marked fish have been caught on the American side. So that all our efforts to restore the fish product of the lakes must be futile unless we can get the Americans to agree with the Canadians upon fixed rules, and also to agree that those rules shall be rigidly carried out. Until you do that, you are depriving our fishermen of all their means of livelihood for the benefit of United States fishermen. Now, Sir, I say if there is any fishing industry upon the lakes which should be encouraged, it is that of the seine-net fishermen. They are the men who have the boats, who employ labour, and who spend large amounts in providing their outfits and so on. The pound-net fishermen are not in the same category at all. These men get their licenses, put in their pound-nets, and, as a matter of fact, employ but few hands. The fish are gathered by tugs going to the fishing grounds manned

by three or four men each. The pound-nets are pulled up, the contents dumped into a fishing boat, and the fish which are too small are cast to one side and lost without any effort being made to separate the small fish from those of commercial value. They are thus utterly destroyed and lost. Within the last four or five years, large numbers of pound-net licenses have been granted on the shores of Lake Huron. I think there are about twenty licenses granted now for twenty pound-nets. These nets extend far out into the lake and intercept the fish coming down the lake, so that, as a matter of fact, the fishermen to the south catch hardly any fish after the pound-nets are put in. The licenses are taken out in the names of individuals living in Canada, who are not fishermen, and the nets belong to Americans. The licenses are paid for by these Americans, and the fish taken out by them, in an American tug, and carried to the States, without any employment being given to our labour, and the result of licensing such a large number of pound-nets has been to almost entirely ruin the seine-net fishing industry. That is the contention of our fishermen, and it seems to be borne out by the facts that, as the pound-nets have increased from year to year, the catch of the seine-net fishermen have been diminished. Now, that these same pound-nets catch an enormous quantity of fish, there can be no doubt. If an investigation be made, it will be found that these pound-net licenses belong to Americans, that the whole outfit is American, that the whole catch goes to the States, and that few if any of our own people are employed, while our own fishermen, who use the seines, who employ Canadian labour, and who expend a large amount of money, find their industry becoming of less value from year to year. But the point I wish to make to the hon. Minister is this, that he should not allow any regulation to be issued by the department prohibiting fishermen from fishing until this question has been settled. I say it would be an almost inhuman act, at this season, to prevent these men from deriving any benefit during this year from the money they have expended in the way of preparation, and thus cause all that expenditure to be lost, so that they will be compelled to seek some other employment for the maintenance of themselves and their families during the coming year. If such a policy should be adopted, the Government should give these men one or two years' notice. The Government should say that their policy is that there shall be no fishing after a period of one or two years. But to come down upon them suddenly, as did the inspector, creating a panic among these people, is harsh in the extreme. They could hardly believe, and do not believe, that the Government would act that way towards them. They have made representations by petition to the Government, and I, on their behalf, humbly repeat the statements which are contained in those

petitions, and ask that the Government should not enforce so harsh a regulation as this which the Government propose to enforce. I would just say, furthermore, that, so far as the pound-net fisheries are concerned, it is impossible to keep a proper supervision. As a matter of fact, these nets are out on Sunday when they should not be, under the regulations, and these people go out at all hours in their tugs and empty the fish out of the pound-nets. The whole thing is loosened from the stakes, the large and small fish being pulled out together, causing a wanton destruction of the immature fish. There ought to be some plan devised whereby the system of fishing by pound-net fishermen will be so supervised that the small fish will not be destroyed, and only those of commercial value allowed to be taken. I desire to press upon the Minister the fact that the department is being deceived entirely, from one end of the lakes to the other, by being induced to grant licenses to people who really belong to Canada, but who do not hold the licenses or own any portion of the outfit, and are really used as a mere catpaw by the American fishermen, who are the owners of everything connected with the business. I trust the hon. Minister will reconsider this matter and do what is right towards this hard-working class of the community, and not deprive them of the means of making a livelihood for their families, without, at least, giving them ample notice.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I fully endorse all that my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Allan) has said, and also the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), with reference to our poor fishermen. If there are any people who really feel the oppression of our Ministers, it is the fishermen of the west, at the western part of Lake Erie and along the banks, etc. Along the banks of the Detroit River, there is only a short distance between the American and the Canadian side, when the fish run from one lake to the other, and our fishermen have an opportunity of making a catch, then is the time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries chokes to come down with his iron heel and say that fish cannot be taken during that season. It is unfair and unjust to our own people who have expended a very large amount in seines and boats and general outfit. When they are just ready for their season's work, the Minister forbids them to fish, while, across the water, 1,300 to 1,400 feet distant, the Americans can fish late and early without any restrictions whatever. I hope the acting Minister will see that the law is not put in force preventing our people from fishing in the Detroit River or Lake St. Clair. Well, Sir, I have the statement here, from the deputy inspector, that on the Detroit River and along the banks of Lake St. Clair, stating positively that no license shall be issued on one or the other during the pre-

Mr. LISTER.

sent season. As my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) has said, these fishermen have made their expenditure, they have their nets and boats, and are all prepared, and it would be a very heavy loss to them if they are forced to stop fishing. In all fairness, these people who are loyal, who are honest, who work hard, should be allowed to carry on their industry, and this law, which would restrict them, should be suspended for a time. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that we have presented a very large number of petitions having upon them some of the best names in our county, asking that this law shall be suspended, and the fishermen given fair-play. That is all we ask. We feel that the Czar of Russia is not treating his subjects as harshly as this Administration has treated our people in this matter of the fishing laws, and even if he treats the Jews as harshly as it is said he does, the treatment of our fishermen by this Administration is of the same character. On the banks of Lake St. Clair, our men can stand and see forty,—yes, fifty, fishermen with their nets lying early and late, while our men have to reel their nets and lie idle. Is that fair or just? It may be true that the lakes and rivers will be depleted of fish, but if the Americans are determined to deplete the lakes and rivers, why should we not have our fair proportion of the fish that are going? It is more than seventeen years since the law was placed on the Statute-book of this country that we should have a close season on the Canadian side, but while Mr. McLelan, Sir Albert Smith and others were Ministers of Marine the law was never enforced and the people were allowed to go on until within the last three or four years. If brother Wallace is to go anywhere, we ask him to come to Essex and help us, because we require help.

An hon. MEMBER. "Active aid."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, "active aid," and that at once. In 1858 a gentleman named Thomas Paxton purchased from this Government an island in the Detroit River, paying \$6,000 for it, though there was no more than 100 acres of good land. He bought it for fishing purposes alone, and it was used for that purpose from 1854 till last season. Then, what does the Government do? It sends up a party to take possession of the docks, the reels, the houses and all the fishing outfit belonging to the party. These officers said: You must not fish, but we will fish. And they have carried on fishing to the detriment of the occupant and the owner. We have appealed to the Administration in every way possible. They say we can go to the Exchequer Court. That is not the place for a poor man. Law is very expensive in this country, and those hon. gentlemen who know best its expense, will be best able to judge the uselessness to a fisherman of this appeal to the Exchequer Court. While you are giving large bounties in the east,

you put burdens upon the fishermen of the west. We do not ask for bounties ; we only ask to be let alone or to be treated as our neighbours across the water, not more than 1,500 feet away from us, are treated. Mr. Speaker, I prepared a few statistics with reference to the quantity of fish taken, and some statement as to the methods of fishing, which I would ask permission to read to the House :

All Canadian fishermen will soon have to move to the United States to fish. The Minister of Fisheries latest decree has been issued. That no licenses will be granted for Lake St. Clair Fisheries for 1893, and it is reported that all the fisheries on the River Thames will be closed. On the American side of Lake St. Clair about forty pound-nets and a number of seine fisheries are in operation. The result will be that the Americans reap the benefits of the Canadians fisheries being closed. On Detroit River the same result is apparent. Our splendid fisheries ruined by the orders of the Canadian Fishery Department, no fishing being permitted in November, the only month of the year that White Fish can be caught in our Noble River and the Americans within one-half mile distant from our shore, rolling the fish ashore by the thousands. Each Canadian fishermen have to desist from catching fish and the Americans reap the benefit of our restrictions. As a proof that the fish hatchery for whitefish propagation is a failure and a waste of public money, according to the annual reports of the Fisheries Department for Canada, in the years 1880, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890 and 1891 only 1,027 tons of whitefish were caught in Canada side of Lake Erie in the eight years. That in the year 1880, 205,000 lbs. of whitefish were caught in Lake Erie. That in the year 1890, 204,400 lbs. were caught. That in Lake St. Clair and Detroit River Division the quantity of whitefish caught in 1880 was 224,400 lbs. ; in 1885, 56,800 lbs. ; in 1891, 55,525 lbs., a decrease of over 400 per cent. Consider that from the Sandwich Hatchery, 451 millions of whitefish fry was deposited from 1876 to 1891 into Lake Erie and Detroit River, and you cannot come to any other conclusion, than that all the fry perish soon after being deposited into the colder waters of Lake Erie. The total catch of all kinds of fish, excluding whitefish, in Lake Erie, increased from 902 tons in the year 1880 to 4,100 tons in the year 1890. This is an increase of 400 per cent. The quantity of nets used in the year 1891 was four times greater than that of 1880. This is a clear proof that the fish hatcheries are a failure. Herring have not been artificially propagated, yet we find that according to the Annual Report of the Fishery Department of Canada for the year 1891, on page 4, on the fisheries of the Great Lakes, that in Lake Erie on the Canadian side of the Lake in the year 1880, 854,000 lbs. of herring were caught, and in 1885, 5,935,400 lbs. On the American side of the same lake in the year 1880, 11,774,400 lbs. of herring were caught, and in the year 1885, 19,354,900 lbs. This shows the increased catch of herring, as they average 60 lbs. to the hundred fish. About 24 millions of herring were caught in 1880, about 48 millions in 1885, and at the same ratio of increase about 100 millions were caught in 1890. As the suckers, mullets and sturgeon have been caught off, the herring increase, they are a nice fish when smoked. Thousands of tons are frozen each season at Sandusky, Toledo and Huron, Ohio. The great increase in the catch of herring and decrease in the catch of white fish, proves that the artificial propagation of white fish is a failure. The Fisheries Department have made a close season for sturgeon, which destroy vast quantities of the ova of whitefish, pickerel and other kinds of fish. It would be as reasonable to make a close season for suckers. They have adopted a weekly

close season from 6 p. m. Saturday to 7 a. m. Monday. No lake fisherman can obey this law. It makes them liable to have their nets seized and burned and themselves fined. It is an impossibility to obey the weekly close season. Granting that the fish hatcheries are some good, why not send the few million of ova from the Newcastle and Ottawa hatchery to Sandwich hatchery, which is able to contain them all, and bring them to life without the cost of an extra dollar. This would save \$7,500 annually. Consider that at Point Edward, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and Detroit River, Canadians cannot fish at certain seasons : when the Americans catch the fish we are deprived of taking. For fifty years previous to 1st of November, 1890, Canadians fished each season during the month of November for white fish in Detroit River, the only month of the year that they can catch whitefish in that river. Ministers of Fisheries Smith, McLellan and Foster would not enforce the close season for white fish in our river ; but Mr. Tupper, the present Minister of Fisheries, prevented Canadians fishing in 1890, 1891 and 1892, yet he licensed two Americans, a Mr. Clark and Mr. Reaume, both from Ecores, Michigan, to fish for whitefish in Detroit River in 1890 and 1891, and denied to Canadians the right to fish at the same time. Canadian fishermen desire to fish as in former years, before the license system or close seasons were adopted. The fishermen used to keep the fish in pens through which the water flowed freely from November until January, so as to obtain higher prices for the fish, which deposited into the pens their ova at spawning time. This came to life at the natural time, the fry drifted down into Lake Erie, came to maturity and replenished the Detroit River. This was much better than killing 20,000 to 30,000 mature fish annually, so as to obtain from 60,000,000 to 100,000,000 of ova for the hatcheries, all of which die and is lost to the river. This is the main reason for the decline of fish in Lake Erie and Detroit River. The following statement of fish caught in Lake Erie, and number of men employed, taken from the annual report of the Fishery Department for Canada. On the Canada side in the year 1880, \$2,008,600, men employed, 178 ; 1885, \$7,653,900, men employed, 346 ; 1891, \$8,256,724, men employed, 497. On the American side in the year 1880, \$29,087,300, men employed, 1,620 ; 1885, \$51,556,517, men employed, 4,298 ; 1888, fish taken, 63,556,517 lbs. The statements for the years 1880 and 1885 are taken from the annual report of the Fishery Department for Canada, for 1891, at page 4 on Fisheries of the Great Lakes, and for the year 1888 from page 79 of S. Wilmot's Report to the Minister of Fisheries. In the annual report of the Fishery Department for Canada for 1890 will be found the statement that between Toledo, Vermillion, Port Clinton, Sandusky, Bass Islands and Huron, the increase of quantity of fish for 1888, as compared with 1885, was 12,000,000 pounds, having a market value of \$300,000. The total catch of fish for the Canada side of Lake Erie, from 1876 to 1891, was less than 40,000 tons. The Americans caught about 350,000 tons in the same lake during the same length of time. At 4 cents per pound would make \$24,000,000 more than the Canadians produced out of the same water. The larger quantity of fish caught was owing solely to the greater number of nets used on the American side and men employed. The Americans having no license system or restrictions are free to fish as they choose. The license system, close seasons and all other restrictions at present in force in Canada should be abolished. A general close season should be adopted for all kinds of fish, from November 20th to April 20th. This would protect whitefish and herring in spawning time. It would protect pickerel in spawning time. Salmon trout do not require any protection, as they cannot be seriously depleted. The fishermen would be free men to fish during the open season. They would obtain

higher prices for fish, the fish dealers would freeze their surplus fish for winter months. For any infringement of the close season a heavy fine should be imposed, one-half to go to the informer. If the proposed changes were adopted, the increased catch of fish in Ontario would, in a short time, amount to \$5,000,000 annually more than at present. The license fees heretofore charged to Ontario fishermen have been excessive; \$50 for each pound net and corresponding amounts for gill net fishermen and seine fisheries. In 1891 the amount of license fees paid in Ontario were \$26,611.80. Expenditure on account of fisheries were \$15,540.40. Fish caught, \$1,806,389. Compare the above with Nova Scotia. Bounty paid to fishermen of Nova Scotia, \$90,000; for all the Maritime Provinces, \$166,967.22. License fees, \$5,891.65. Expenditure on account of fisheries, \$17,844.19. Fishing cruizers, \$83,950.16. Fish caught, \$7,011,300.53. This is very unjust to the Ontario fishermen. The money paid by the United States on account of the Washington Treaty belongs to the Dominion, as all the fisheries are the property of the Dominion, not of the provinces. The only market for Ontario fish is the United States, and Canadians have to pay duty on exporting fish to the United States. Nova Scotia ships a large portion of its fish to Brazil, Spain and Italy, and is better situated for a market than Ontario. All the conservative and reform members of parliament from Ontario should see that Ontario fishermen are made free men, and the fishery restrictions removed. Many applications for licenses have been refused by the Fishery Department, and the policy of the department in the past has been to restrict the fishermen and ruin the industry, whereas a board of practical fishermen of fifteen years experience should be appointed, whose duty it should be to encourage the extension of this great industry, and if the bounty for the Maritime provinces is continued, Ontario should receive \$90,000 annually the same as Nova Scotia. What benefit is it to the public to close our fisheries, to ruin our fishermen by unreasonable restrictions, to the end that the American fishermen will reap the benefits of an increased catch of fish? Hon. C. H. Tupper, in his report for 1890, stated that the lakes to the north west of Lake Winnipeg was filled with an inexhaustible quantity of whitefish, trout, pickerel and sturgeon, that 10,000 men could find employment in that district. Whitefish can be delivered at Toronto or Ottawa from said lakes at a cost of 4 cents per lb. Let us be free men. Let us fish free as in Ohio or Michigan.

We ask that either the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the acting Minister pay us a visit, that he may inform himself of our position and our difficulties. It is true that Mr. Wilmot and other gentlemen have been there, but they seem to be determined on one policy, and that alone. Now, we ask that the Minister, or the acting Minister, shall come there and look the matter over carefully, and we feel satisfied that they will deal fairly and honourably with us. In the meantime, we hope the acting Minister will allow the law to remain in abeyance, until he has looked further into it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have brought this matter under the attention of the Minister, and have presented to the House a petition signed by sixty-five fishermen engaged in fishing on the River St. Clair. This is a matter of considerable importance to them, and I agree with the observation made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that it is perfectly useless for
Mr. MCGREGOR.

the Government to undertake to establish in this country a different rule from that which prevails along the border of the waters which divide Canada from the neighbouring republic. It may be that the course adopted will exhaust the fish in the lakes and in the rivers connecting those lakes; but unless there is co-operation, unless the states of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York are prepared to adopt, along with Canada, a common regulation with respect to fisheries, we are simply imposing restraints upon our fishermen which may cause the supply to last a little longer, to the advantage of those who fish without restraint, but cannot protect the fisheries from destruction. I do not for a moment subscribe to the notion that the fish found on the Canadian side, are confined to that side and do not cross the lake or river to the American shore. I think that every fisherman who lives along the border, will tell the hon. Minister and those connected with his department, that that theory has no foundation whatever in fact. Now, it may be proper to establish a close season, to make strict regulation, if you can persuade your neighbours to adopt regulations such as you think is necessary for the protection of the fish. But until they are prepared to agree with you and to adopt the common system for their protection, it is simply useless on our part to make any effort to enforce any such regulations. We are imposing restraints and throwing obstacles in the way of those fishing on this side of the border, from maintaining themselves and their families, which are not imposed on those engaged in similar pursuits, on the other side of the line. I think there is but one course open to the Government, and that is to grant these licenses, to permit parties to continue to fish, and to impose no greater restraint upon them than is imposed on the fishermen on the other side of the line. I dare say, that the present policy will, in the course of a few years, exhaust the supply, but there is no help for it, because the whole fishery is not altogether under our control. In my opinion, the Minister would inflict a great hardship upon the fishermen, many of whom have invested whatever they have in their nets and preparations for fishing; and to prevent them engaging in this very ordinary pursuit, would be, in fact, like a regulation depriving them of all their possessions. I trust that the Minister will not undertake to carry out any such policy until our neighbours are prepared to adopt a similar line of action.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This matter is of very great importance to the people of the western part of the province of Ontario. I do not like the matter to pass without entering my protest against the recent order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, suspending the fishing privileges for the coming

year. I think, as has been stated by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and the member for Essex (Mr. Allan), that it is a very great hardship to the fishermen in that part of the country. They have invested their little all in providing themselves with boats, seines and fishing appliances, and to be stopped at a moment's notice from pursuing the business they have followed year after year, which is the only means they have of providing for their families, is a great hardship indeed. I have already brought this matter before the attention of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think that he ought at least to suspend that order for this year, and if it is necessary to suspend the fishing operation for another year, let him give the fishermen due notice, and they can govern themselves accordingly. Now, one word more as to the report of Mr. Kerr, that has been quoted, for South Essex. I think it is a perfect outrage that the Government should continue for one moment longer in office a fishery overseer who has been condemned by your own inspector, Mr. Kerr. This fishery overseer, McMichael, ought not to remain a single day longer in the employ of the Government. A man that has been censured, and has been proved to be guilty of malfeasance and of conniving with American fishermen against our own fishermen, ought to be discharged without a single moment's delay. Now, he has issued a license to a man named Arnold, a gentleman who never saw a seine in his life. Mr. Arnold is inspector of one of the largest insurance companies in Ontario, and it is absurd to think of a license being issued in his name. I do not think Mr. Arnold knows anything about it. Mr. Lipscombe is another gentleman to whom this man has issued a license. He is a general insurance agent and broker in the town of Blenheim, and I do not believe he ever caught a fish in his life; I do not believe that he knows that a license has been issued in his name. It is a shame that a fishery overseer should conduct himself in that way; he should be immediately discharged from that position. Now, a word as to the pound-nets. I am of the opinion of the hon. member for Lambton, that these pound-nets are a great injury and detriment to the fish in the lakes. I have here a report of the Ontario Fish and Game Commission of 1892, and I find in it the following remarks from Mr. James Nevin, Superintendent of Fisheries for the state of Wisconsin:—

The greatest evil that exists to-day in the matter of replenishing the waters of the various lakes with whitefish is the pound-nets, for the simple reason that they catch both large and small. As long as the pound-nets are allowed to remain in the waters in their present form there is no use in attempting to replenish the waters with whitefish. I have been in a trap-net boat when 2,500 pounds of small whitefish were taken out of one net, and of the 2,500 pounds there were not 50 pounds of No. 1 whitefish, and a No. 1 whitefish is a fish that will weigh one and a half pounds.

I had already brought this matter before the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and informed him that the people were complaining that the fish caught in these pound-nets were thrown overboard as waste fish, and floated upon the shores of the lake, and became a nuisance to the people along the shore. Fish are destroyed by thousands, and people complain very bitterly of the fact that pound-nets are used and small unmarketable fish are thrown overboard. If pound-nets are to be allowed, great care should be exercised in inspecting the nets to see that the meshes are sufficiently large to allow the small fish to pass through. I simply rise to confirm what has been said by my hon. friend, and to ask the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to suspend the order issued on 20th January in regard to fishing licenses on Lake St. Clair river, Thames and Detroit rivers. We know that on Detroit river, which is only half a mile wide, the Americans fish without hindrance, while our fishermen are restricted. On the River Thames, which flows into Lake St. Clair, there are forty or fifty fishermen who make their living by fishing, and it would be cruel if the Government regulations had the effect of depriving them of their living. If it is considered desirable to suspend the operation of the present system, let notice be given to the fishermen; but it is hard to deprive them of their present privileges without notice. I hope the Minister will look into this matter at once, and give the necessary orders at once, because the time is approaching for the season to open, and unless action is taken great injury may be done to the fishermen this year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have received letters during the past two or three years respecting fishing on the shores of Lake Huron. I have also received petitions respecting the use of pound-nets. I have received letters this season on the subject, and I have presented a petition not only from fishermen but also from merchants, mechanics and farmers, setting forth the great hardship that would occur to the fishermen in my district, if the present regulations were rigidly enforced. I hope the acting Minister will see that they do not go into force. After they had made all the preparations for the season's fishery it would be a great hardship if the fishermen who have been brought up on Lake Huron all their lives were deprived of their calling. In Bayfield they have a double complaint. For three or four years vessels could not enter Bayfield harbour. Two years ago I was promised that the river would be dredged, and that a dredge would be sent there in the following summer, so that the fishermen would be able to enter the harbour in rough weather. I hope in the interests of the fishermen, as well as the people in the locality, the regulations will not be enforced, and the Government will look carefully into the regulations before carrying them out as regards the fishermen of Lake Huron and

River St. Clair, so that they may not be allowed to suffer in comparison with the Americans. I think it will be admitted that it was a mistake for the Government to grant licenses for pound-nets to be used on the shores of Lake Huron. I hope the Minister will see that the regulations are not enforced this season, because they will inflict great hardship on fishermen who have followed this calling throughout their lives.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax. \$150,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Railways, when the House went into Committee of Supply the other day, made a statement with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, and I think it desirable that we should have a few more explanations, because I frankly say that I did not fully understand the statement he made. He was congratulating himself, and with good reason, if the prospects he held out are proved not to be baseless, on the success with which the Intercolonial Railway is administered by him. He told us that he hoped during the current year to be able to secure a balance between revenue and expenditure. Every hon. gentleman will unite with him in congratulations if that proves to be the case. We remember a few years ago that it was considered almost impossible to balance the revenue and expenditure on this road, and it will be remembered that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) submitted a proposition to vest the management of the road in a commission. The hon. member's proposal did not meet with great support on either side of the House; but there was a general disposition to believe that this railway was very extravagantly managed, and that it was impossible to make it pay. Last year, and every year, when the matter has come up for discussion, I have taken the opportunity of pointing out from the local knowledge I possess that the Intercolonial was a mere political machine. I stated to hon. members, what was well known in the Maritime provinces, that the entire road was managed for the purpose of advancing the political party in power. It was well known that Moncton, where the central offices are situated was a centre for political management, and political corruption existed there to no small extent. After the last general election every hon. member from the Maritime provinces on this side told the House that the Intercolonial Railway was used deliberately and openly, without any shame being felt about it, for the purpose of carrying Tory electors to the polls. I stated from my knowledge, which of course must be second-hand, but it was acquired from one of the parties themselves, that one of the agents gave books of passes to those engaged in carrying out their political machinations.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

and those passes were used to carry electors to the polls. It was known that if the election petition against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been proceeded with that fact would have been established. I remember a year or two ago examining the chief engineer on this subject before the Public Accounts Committee, and he informed me that so far as the department was concerned no more passes were granted over the road than would be granted by a private corporation. We told the Minister that Moncton office was a mere house of refuge for politicians, that two men were employed in doing the work of one, and that no doubt with ordinary supervision and economy a reduction could be made to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Our statements were received with incredulity by hon. gentlemen opposite, as mere political statements for the purpose of making political capital, and no heed was paid to them. What are the facts to-day? The hon. Minister comes down and reports that instead of their being a deficiency this year of \$767,000 as in 1891, or \$612,000 as in 1892, that for the present year he hopes to make ends meet, in other words, to effect a saving of \$700,000 on the running of the road. If \$700,000 can be saved in one year, that fact proves conclusively that there must have been gross and unparalleled extravagance in the management of the road previously. There is no getting over that. I listened with no small degree of curiosity to ascertain how the hon. gentleman had made that saving, and I confess to him frankly that I am in ignorance now. I watched his remarks very closely. I thought perhaps I did not understand them perfectly and I took precaution of reading them as they were reported, and as far as I can make out, the hon. gentleman while assuring the House that he will be able to make expenditure and revenue balance, only tells us where the saving is to be, in so far as \$316,000 is concerned. Where he is going to make the saving of the other \$400,000, I do not know, but I assume that he will put the committee in possession of that information. I may say, that so far from criticizing adversely the saving which the hon. gentleman proposes to make, I frankly and candidly commend him for his efforts in the direction of economy. He says he will dispense with the services of 300 men in the mechanical department and will save \$124,000; he will also dispense with the services of eighty men outside, amounting to \$32,000 a year, and he says that in the train service he will save \$160,000, making in round numbers a total of \$316,000. If I gather from the hon. gentleman correctly, in addition to that, he was going to save in the rail service this year, although he could not promise he would do the same next year, \$129,000. The total saving would be \$445,000, but that will not make things meet by a long way. I will await with some

curiosity the further explanations the hon. gentleman has to make in that regard. Now, Mr. Speaker, I merely want on this occasion to give some little evidence to the House that on this matter, as on all other matters on which we have made strong assertions in reference to the Administration of the Government of this country, we were speaking well within the mark, and that the knowledge we possess was accurate. The hon. gentleman last year gave four reasons why the Intercolonial Railway could not be made to pay. First, because it was a military road; second, because of the short line competition; third, that they were carrying freight at non-paying rates; and fourth, that the road was overmanned, on account of the pressure through political influence. The two first reasons are not referred to at all in his statement this year, nor do they enter into his calculations in the slightest when he tells us that he is going to make the line pay. The Royal Commission appointed a short time ago to inquire into the Civil Service of Canada, examined Mr. Schreiber, chief engineer of Railways. He was asked with reference to the Intercolonial Railway, and I want to put a few extracts from his evidence on record to show that the main cause—I was almost going to say the only cause—that the road has not paid heretofore, has been that it was managed altogether on political grounds, from political motives, and with the object of advancing the interests of a political party, and not at all in the interests of the country. At page 316 of the Civil Service Commission Report, Mr. Schreiber gives the following evidence:—

If you were the manager of this road and it belonged to a private company, could you take measures to increase the traffic or to increase your receipts, that you cannot take now? I think so, at any rate I am satisfied we could favourably effect the net results.

The balance against you last year was how much?—Including both the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, about \$775,000.

Supposing the road belonged to the Canadian Pacific Railway and was one of its unprofitable branches, such as every road has, they would take means to diminish the unprofitableness to the utmost degree, and to make it as little unprofitable as they could—Yes, certainly.

Now, what is there that prevents you doing that?—Politics are a great trouble, and I can see no way of getting over it, and so long as they are Government roads, it must necessarily be so.

We cannot quite see where the politics come in?—Perhaps I should say the policy of the Government.

It is perfectly evident to any person who reads these questions and answers, that although the chief engineer was as anxious as he could be, not to show to the world that the controlling power behind this railway was politics, yet when he was placed on his oath he had frankly to say so. Politics is the trouble, politics is the curse, politics has put two or three men to do one man's work, politics has made you pay more prices for oils and material for the road than ought to have been paid, politics has kept men in

power there who should have been dismissed years and years ago, politics has taught the men in power that if they bend their energies, not to advance the interests of the road, but the interests of the party, they will be supported and patronized and have their salaries increased; and politics being the curse of the road, has dragged it down until we were in danger of having a deficit of \$1,000,000 on that road in 1892, and then, and not till then, were the brakes put on. They went on to examine Mr. Schreiber, and in the next page we have the following evidence with reference to these tickets I spoke of some time ago:—

3168. When a passenger gets a ticket can there be any leakage?—Yes; there can.

3169. May there not be a leakage from people being passed on the lines without getting tickets?—Certainly, and in other ways, for instance, a conductor can collect tickets and not punch them, and then issue them again and again.

3170. Does not that happen on every road?—Yes; but you can quite understand that on companies roads, if there is pretty strong proof that this is being done, prompt dismissal of the conductors follow, but in case of Government roads the difficulty is that unless you have absolute proof of the wrong-doing, it is difficult to mete out punishment.

3171. Do you think there is more leakage on the Intercolonial in this respect than on any other road?—I am not prepared to say, but the leakage is no doubt heavy.

3172. Is not that leakage caused, to a certain extent, by the want of facilities to discharge suspected men?—I have no doubt of it.

3173. Are you describing what has actually occurred?—Yes; many a time, in many years.

3174. Do you suffer much on your lines through dead-heads?—Taking the regular authorized passes, I do not think we issue so many as they do on companies roads. But I am afraid there are a great many unauthorized passes given that we know nothing about at the time, and only find out occasionally.

3475. Do you mean that conductors passed them?—Yes; conductors passed them, and not long ago we discovered that one of our superintendents had been passing a great number of people by giving them small slips of paper.

3176. If he gives a regular pass you will know it, because they are issued from numbered books are they not?—Yes; it should be known, but he did not do that, he gave them on small bits of paper, which were torn up instead of being sent to the audit office.

3177. Surely that pass can be checked?—An effort is made to check it, but it is no easy matter.

3178. Then conductors must have instructions to recognize these bits of paper?—No doubt, from the party who gives them.

3179. Might you not have some conductors who would not recognize them?—Possibly, but it is very difficult for a conductor to dishonour them, as he is under the district superintendent's orders.

3180. Would the district superintendent dismiss him for that?—No; but he could make it very unpleasant for him.

There is a delightful state of affairs detailed, just bearing out what I said in the House after last general election. The district superintendents and other leading men issued passes by the score and by the book, which they did not call regular passes, and which were not returned to the audit office. Books of slips authorizing the conductors to carry

men over that road were issued, and these men were carried over the road at the public expense to vote for the political nominees of the Government. In other words, Mr. Chairman, to speak correctly and in proper English, so much public money was stolen from the people. That is the English of it. There was not an officer dismissed after the last election because he improperly granted these certificates or because he had, as I termed it, stolen the public money. I say that if it cost \$10 to go between two certain points, and it is an officer's duty not to give a ticket until he has received the \$10, then if he gives a ticket without receiving the money and allows his friend to travel over the road, he is a thief and he has stolen the \$10, and instead of being continued as a superintendent or district superintendent of the road, he ought to be dismissed and put in the criminal dock. That is the punishment that should be meted out to these gentry. But has it been done? Has a man been dismissed on that account? No, Sir, it has not been done. Now, we go a little further, and what does the chief engineer say:

3182. Coming to another source of revenue, are there special bargains made sometimes to carry freight?—Yes.

3183. Do you carry freight at any time at a loss?—Yes; we carry grain and coal at a loss, the grain rate is lower than that of coal.

3184. Are you carrying grain at a loss, in the interest of western freight?—Yes; in the interest of securing western freight for shipment for Europe.

3185. Where is the initiative of the transaction? Is it on a through bill of lading from Manitoba? It is on a through bill of lading from various ports of Ontario, and some from Manitoba, not a great deal. We have a stated rate from which we carry on the Intercolonial, which we merely add to the rate over other roads.

3186. That is a losing rate?—Yes, it is; two-tenths of a cent per ton per mile for grain, and three-tenths of a cent for coal. Half a cent is considered to be about the cost of transportation.

3187. Have not all roads to submit to more or less of that?—Yes, but our difficulty with the through coal traffic is that coal has to be carried in a special class of cars, in which other description of freight cannot be carried in the returning cars. The consequence is that for every mile the coal is hauled the car is hauled two miles.

The chief engineer gives as one of his reasons the matter that we have discussed in this House year after year, whether it is good policy or not to carry coal at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, his opinion being that it is not, as the car has to be hauled two miles for every one for which the Government gets paid. Now, I come to the main point:

3192. Do politics intervene in fixing these low rates?—As a matter of policy in some cases, as I have said, outside of the interests of the railway.

Well, that was a most diplomatic answer. Of course, the only inference that could be derived from it is that politics do intervene.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

3191. Are not the whole rates fixed by Order in Council?—The maximum rates are fixed by Order in Council, but the low rates for coal and grain are quoted by special order from the Minister.

3192. Which is a special Order in Council, is it not?—No, I think in these cases the order is given through the Minister.

3193. But the Minister gets the assent of his colleagues, does he not?—I fancy so. We get the order from the Minister.

3194. The great coal mines at Springhill and at Sydney have a good deal of political influence, it is understood, and probably they bring it to bear?—I am not aware of it. They are, of course, large employers of labour.

3195. A low rate is given, in the belief that they are encouraging the development of the mines—I think it is given with the view of inducing manufacturers in the west to use Canadian coal, and also, no doubt, as you state, to develop the mines.

Now, I leave that statement, and hon. gentlemen can see for themselves, from Mr. Schreiber's very cautious, diplomatic answers, whether there is any doubt as to the existence of political influence even in settling the matter of rates. Then he goes on to state, on page 322, that there are a large number of men whose service, in his opinion, could be dispensed with, and he is asked:

3257. Is the general expenditure susceptible of a considerable reduction?—Yes, I think so.

3258. This system of members nominating such a large number of officers as you mention has its disadvantages?—It has many disadvantages. I see no great objection to a man first entering the service on the recommendation of a member, but I think it would be better if they did not interfere in promotions. We would like to get rid of that.

It is perfectly plain from the chief engineer's statement that politics from the first to the last were the cause of the large deficits on the railway, and have been the curse of the road since it has been under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, we hear that there is going to be an improvement. There ought to be. This royal commission, which was brought into existence at the instance of hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of inquiring into the Civil Service, comment in their report to the Government on the evidence of Mr. Schreiber in these words:

To briefly notice a point brought out in the evidence of Mr. Schreiber, it appears that there are a large number of men whose services could be dispensed with; that the general expenditure is susceptible of a considerable reduction; that political influence is exercised in the nominations of the employees; that in the hands of a company the road could be made to pay expenses; that the trains stop at too many stations; that the traffic and receipts could be increased; that although the internal economy is much the same as that of other roads, yet it costs a great deal more; that the local revenue could be increased by bringing it up to the rates levied by other lines. The management also suffers from a difficulty, not experienced to so great an extent by companies, of not being able promptly to discharge inefficient or suspected servants.

I cannot make a stronger indictment against the management of that road than has been made by this commission, composed of non-political men—Mr. Hague, Judge Burbidge,

Mr. Barbeau and the Deputy-Minister of Finance. I could read more from the report in the same direction, but I do not wish to weary the House. I think I have read enough to prove beyond possibility of doubt, that the statements made year after year in this House were true and correct—that money has been recklessly spent and improperly squandered on that railway, and that instead of being run on business principles it has been run in the interests of the party; and now we have the Minister coming down and telling us that there has been such mismanagement of the railway that he is able to save \$700,000 in one year. I would like him to explain more in detail how he expects to make that saving. He has accounted for \$316,000, and he thinks there will be a possible saving this year of \$129,000 on the rails. The other \$300,000 he has not explained how he hopes to save. As he is a practical man I have no doubt he can do it, but the details would be of interest not only to the House but to the country at large.

Mr. HAZEN. I feel, Mr. Chairman, at this late hour of the night that I must ask the indulgence of the House for the remarks which I am about to make. I will endeavour to be true to the sentiment that actuated the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in his remarks, and to remember that brevity is the soul of wit. My hon. friend told us that he was going to be brief. When he said so I doubted very much whether he would or not, because it is not an unusual thing for hon. members of this House to rise in their places and say that they are going to make a few brief remarks, and then entertain us for a long time. However, as the hon. member for Queen's was true to the statement made, I will endeavour to be brief also. I think no statement has been made to the Parliament of Canada at the present session that will be received by the country with more delight than the statement that was made to the House by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on Saturday last, when he informed us that the period of deficits on the Intercolonial Railway had come to an end, and that in the future he thought we might fairly expect that the revenue and the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway would balance, and that any loss incurred would be simply on the line in the province represented by my friend who has just addressed the House. It seems to me that the statement of the hon. Minister must be satisfactory to the people of the Dominion. Year after year, under Conservative management, and under Liberal management, with the exception of a few short years after 1879, Ministers of Railways of both political parties have had to meet this House and say there was a very considerable deficit on the working of that road. therefore, I say it must be pleasing to the people to find that the Minister of Railways at present is satisfied that the period of deficits

has ceased. Now, I do not wish in any way to be considered skeptical. I do not wish to throw cold water upon the statement which the Minister of Railways has made, but I desire to say that I trust the hon. gentleman is not too sanguine in his views of the situation. I do not say this for the purpose of detracting, in any respect or in the slightest degree, from the ability, the firmness and the energy with which I feel the hon. gentleman has discharged the duties of Minister of Railways since he took hold of that important portfolio. Nor do I say so for the purpose at all of throwing cold water upon the congratulations which have been showered upon his management of the road. I might also almost say from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island. But it seems to me that we should not, so early in the discussion, make up our minds that the era of deficits on the Intercolonial Railway has come to an end. We must not forget that heavy expenses have been made upon the Intercolonial Railway during the last few years in the way of betterments, that is to say, in the relaying of the road with heavy rails instead of the lighter rails, which were previously there, in the replacing of wooden by iron bridges and the construction of permanent buildings—all of which, however, I think, should have been properly charged to capital, but which, under the system of accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, were charged to income—and it seems to me that after a number of years of heavy expenditure of this kind, we might fairly expect that no further expenditure of that description—which, in the case of other railways would be charged to capital account—would be incurred, to anything like the same extent, for some time. Therefore, while I do not wish to be considered skeptical at all, and while I, as a Maritime province man and a Canadian as well, sincerely trust that the opinion of the Minister of Railways that the era of deficits has ceased on this railway may be true, I may say that perhaps I will not be disappointed if, in a few years from now, I find that extraordinary expenses have to be again incurred in the way of putting new rails on the road and erecting new buildings and bridges, and perhaps we will find that further large expenditure of this kind, which will again become necessary, will prevent the balancing of income and expenditure. But although that may be the case, I feel satisfied that this House and country are indebted to the hon. Minister for the firmness, economy, and ability, he has shown in the management of the road. Now, the impression has seemed to prevail in the western part of the Dominion that the people of the Maritime provinces were anxious that this deficit should exist, or, as it was put by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that this road should be run as a political machine for the advantage of politicians and the Government of the day in the Maritime provinces. I desire most emphatically

to repudiate any idea of that sort. I desire to say here, from my place in this House, and as a representative of one of the largest constituencies in the Maritime provinces, that the people of those provinces are quite as anxious that road should be managed so as to keep the expenditure within the income as are the people of Ontario and Quebec or further west, because I have always felt that in charging this deficit against the people of the Maritime provinces, an injustice and a wrong was being done to that section of the Dominion which I have the honour to represent. Year after year has been put forward in this House, by some of our friends representing western constituencies, the opinion that this deficit was due, in a large degree, to the fact that coal was carried from the mines of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton at too low a rate, and that this was the reason why the deficit existed. I was able on a previous occasion in this House, to point out that such was not the case, and that the cause was quite as much due to the fact that the flour and grains of the west were carried to the Maritime provinces at a low rate; and, the fact, that during the last year the amount of coal carried from the Maritime provinces to the Chaudière junction was only 40,000 tons, shows clearly how little ground there was for the impression that the deficit was in any large degree due to the low rate charged upon coal. As I pointed out, we might as fairly, in the east, have charged that the low rates on coal were for the benefit of the consumers in the western part of this Dominion. The hon. member for Queen's spoke as if this road had been run really in the interests of a political party and was merely a political machine. I desire most distinctly to repudiate that idea; and I wish to say to him that if his party should at any time come into power, and if he should be a member or a supporter of the Government, he will wish from the bottom of his heart that the Intercolonial Railway had nothing whatever to do with the Government and was entirely independent of Government control. I think I voice the opinion of the members of the Maritime provinces who support the Government, when I say that one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with is the fact that it is constantly thrown in our teeth that the management of the Intercolonial Railway is against the interests of those provinces, that it is not conducted in their interests at all, and, further, if they happen to be Conservatives, it is thrown in their teeth that it is not operated or managed in the interests of the party to which they belong. The hon. gentleman has said that the department at Moncton was a great house of refuge for the Conservative politicians. Surely, he was not serious in making an assertion of that sort.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made the statement in reply to the hon. Minister of Rail-
Mr. HAZEN.

ways, who said that he had discharged 300 men from the Moncton department alone, because they were not required.

Mr. HAZEN. He did make that statement and on that the hon. gentleman illogically founded the argument that the Moncton shops and offices were a mere refuge for politicians. I will, in a few moments show how utterly illogical that statement was. I was about to say that, so far as the constituency which I have the honour to represent is concerned there are in it a number of employees in the shops and offices there, yet when the hon. Minister came to make his reductions in the number of men employed, cutting them down as close as he could, he found he could only make eight dismissals in that locality. That is a sufficient answer to the charge, at least so far as St. John is concerned, to the statement that the railway there was used as a house of refuge for politicians. I think I may fairly say that there never was a man appointed to a position on the road there for merely political reasons. From my own stand-point, I can say honestly that I never recommended a man for employment there unless there was really a vacancy which required to be filled. Coming down to Moncton, where 300 dismissals were made, my hon. friend will see that the immense amount of work done on the Intercolonial Railway in the past three or four years, owing to the great additions to rolling stock, the replacing of the lighter rails on the road by heavy rails, the replacing of wooden by iron bridges, necessitated the employment of a larger number of workmen than would otherwise have been necessary, but when that work was over, there was no longer the same need for so large a number of men, and that was the reason the hon. gentleman found he could reduce the number of employees at Moncton by 300. From a Maritime stand-point, I do not think there is a single member representing a Maritime constituency, I care not what may be his political creed, who desires that a single man should be employed on that road more than is absolutely required. We do not desire, Sir, that that deficit shall be rolled up year after year to be charged against us as if we were alone responsible for it, and, so far as Conservative members in the Maritime provinces are concerned, I desire to say they will give every assistance to the hon. Minister of Railways in any honest attempt to reduce the expenses on that road, so far as it is compatible with the interests of the road and the interests of the country. While my hon. friend was talking about this road being used as a political machine, the workshops being the refuge of political favourites, I could not help remembering that both parties had managed this Intercolonial Railway. I could not help thinking that from 1873 to 1878 we had a Liberal Administration, that Administration which, if we listen to hon. gentlemen

opposite, we would regard as an economical Administration that would never allow the expenditure on that road to exceed the income. In fact, I remember in 1891 hearing the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) saying that when the Liberals got into power, if they could not secure a balance of expenditure and receipts, they would close up the road and cease to operate it. But we have had experience of Liberal management on the Intercolonial Railway, and in 1891 I took the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to the deficit from 1874 to 1878, under Liberal rule, contrasting it with the record from 1878 to 1890, under Conservative management, and for fear my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) may have forgotten the figures, I will quote them again :

Year.	Deficit.	Surplus.
	\$	\$
1874-75	281,563 99	
1875-76	243,912 87	
1876-77	507,228 20	
1877-78	432,327 78	
1878-79	716,083 53	
1879-80	97,131 23	
1880-81		542 15
1881-82		9,605 18
1882-83		10,547 83
1883-84		9,068 17
1884-85	73,324 26	
1885-86	106,042 84	
1886-87	232,105 75	
1887-88	363,043 16	
1888-89	258,564 34	
1889-90	553,392 05	
Total.....	3,864,720 00	29,763 33
Less, surplus.....	29,763 33	
	3,834,956 67	

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course the hon. gentleman wants to be very fair. If he will look at the figures he will find that Mr. Mackenzie ceased to charge to capital account any expenditure in the years 1875-76, 1877-78. He charged \$500,000 spent on capital account to current expenses, spreading it over three years, making an average of about \$220,000 a year, which, under the present management, would be charged to capital account.

Mr. HAZEN. And what has the present management been doing? Charging to current account expenditures which I contend should have been charged to capital, amounts spent for the betterment of the road. When the light rails were taken off, and heavy rails placed upon the road, it would have been fair and right, under the system Mr. Mackenzie pursued, to charge the cost of that change to capital account. But, under this Government, it was charged to ordinary account.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This Government has increased the capital account \$12,000,000.

Mr. HAZEN. When they remove a wooden bridge and replace it with an iron bridge, they charge that to ordinary account. Had they followed the system pursued by Mr. Mackenzie they would charge the difference between the cost of the iron bridge and the cost of the wooden bridge to capital account. What the hon. gentleman says may be correct, but it is equally correct as relating to the present Government, and their management, and, therefore, he makes no point against the figures I have quoted. These are the only figures I have here. I do not wish to be unfair. We know that, for the last two years, there have been large deficits on the railway. But, taking these figures, the only ones I have before me, we find that the deficits on the road, during the sixteen years covered by these figures, amount to \$3,834,956.37, and, during the time the Liberal Government was in power, the deficits amounted to \$2,181,116.37; and, during the eleven years when the Conservatives were in power, the net deficit was \$1,653,840.30, or an average annual deficit, during the time of Liberal management, of \$436,223.67, the annual average deficit, under Conservative management, being \$150,349.11, or \$285,874 less under Conservative management than under the management of the Government which my hon. friend holds up as a model. I frankly admit that, taking the two last years, the annual deficit, under the Conservative management, would be a little more than by the figures I have read, but even allowing for that difference, it will be seen that, under the management of the Conservative party, the deficit was not half what it was under the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. HAZEN. Hon. gentlemen may say "oh," but this is the fact and the figures bear out the assertion. Now that the heavy expenditures have been made, now that these expenditures that may fairly be, and, on any other road, would have been charged to capital account, have been made, I feel like having more confidence than perhaps I had at the outset in the statement made at Toronto by the Minister of Railways and Canals to the effect that the time for deficits had ceased to exist. If such is the case, no one in this House will more cordially approve of it or be more pleased with it than the Conservatives representing constituencies in the Maritime provinces. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) indulged in some comments on what he claimed to be the abuse of the pass system. I do not know who used these passes. My hon. friend said that if the election petition against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Tupper) had been brought to trial, a dreadful state of affairs would have been brought to light. That.

Sir, is such a statement as any man might make about anything. Before election petitions come to trial in this country, whether filed by Liberals or Conservatives, we find strong statements made by partizans that when the trial comes a terrible state of corruption and wrong-doing and the wrong use of Government influence and boodling will be unearthed. But we do not always find that when these petitions come to trial. Petitioners are often only too glad when the party petitioned against will admit a single case of bribery and allow the election to be voided on that ground. It is easy for the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr Davies), in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to make assertions that, if the matter had come to trial, this would have been shown, and that would not have been shown. No one can pretend to say, in this country, that the Minister would have been unseated if that petition had gone to trial. It would have been more manly for the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) to wait till the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in the House before he made a charge of that sort. Sir, I think the Minister of Railways has satisfied this House that he is determined to manage the Intercolonial Railway in a prudent and business-like manner. I may say that my primary purpose in addressing the House was to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and the House to a wrong which, I think, exists in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. At the outset I desire to say that I do not do so for any political purpose. The men for whom I speak belong to both the Liberal and the Conservative parties, and I speak because I think injustice is being done to a large number of men who are giving valuable and faithful service to this country on the Intercolonial Railway. Two years ago, when this railway was up for discussion, I took occasion to say that I believed the salaries that were being paid to many of the officials employed on this railway were a disgrace to the Government of Canada. I desire, tonight, to repeat that assertion. In discussing it I can speak chiefly from a local standpoint, but, no doubt, what I say will apply to the whole road. In previous years when I complained to the Government that the officials were under-paid and were receiving almost starvation salaries, the answer was made: "You cannot expect us to increase the salaries of officials on the Intercolonial Railway while the income of the road is so much less than the expenditure." At that time that was a forcible argument to use against my contention, but it is not a forcible argument any longer, because, at present, the expenses and receipts of the road about balance each other. I wish to say again that the salaries that are being paid to the railway officials in my constituency are very much lower than the salaries that are paid to the officials in the Customs Department, the Post Office Department the Inland Rev-

Mr. HAZEN.

enue Department, or any other department of the Government. Not only are the salaries paid to them lower, but the railway officials do just as high a class of work as do the officials in any department of the Government that I have mentioned; they work every day, and many hours longer than do the officials in these departments. Only the other day in this House we saw hon. gentlemen on both sides denouncing the Civil Service Bill, which required the officers in the inside service at Ottawa to work an hour or two a day longer than they do at present. Yet we have the fact that there are a class of Government officials in this country, men of equal education, ability, and integrity, many of whom are working from daylight till dark, at salaries much less than those received by the inside officials of this country. I ask this House, if they consider that it is an injustice that the inside officials shall be required to work an hour longer than from ten o'clock to four o'clock, with an hour for dinner, do they not think that it is a still greater hardship that the railway employes on the Intercolonial Railway should be obliged to work from daylight to dark at a rate of pay far less per day and per month, than that received by the inside service in the city of Ottawa? Now, to show you that the statement I make is not exaggerated, I will give you a few facts. The station agent in the city of St. John, who every year handles the freight of the Intercolonial Railway and of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has the magnificent salary of \$60 per month. That man handles over two hundred thousand dollars of public money every year, he is there before daylight at his post and it is eleven o'clock at night before he leaves. When the Canadian Pacific Railway came into the station at St. John, they agreed with the Government of Canada to pay \$28 a month towards the salary of the agent there. Though they pay that money, the agent does not receive it; though his work is greatly enhanced in consequence of the Canadian Pacific Railway coming there, he gets not a cent additional. He still receives \$60 from the Government, and the Government of Canada gets back \$28 from the Canadian Pacific Railway; and all that man, who handles hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, receives from this country is the paltry sum of \$32 a month. I ask the hon. members if that is not a scandal and a disgrace to this country? I ask those hon. members who grow hysterical at the inside service at Ottawa being asked to work an hour a day more, whether their sympathy would not be much better expended on those officials who are receiving, as I have said before, starvation salaries? What is true of the station agent there, is true, among others, of the men in the freight department. It is true of the salary received by the cashier of that department. It is true of the gentleman who handles the whole

freight for the city of St. John, and who only receives \$52 a month for his service. He has been employed there for over twenty years, and is a gentleman of the highest character for honesty and intelligence, a man who, if he had given the same work, with the same integrity and ability, to any private business, would be receiving three or four times that amount. That is not only true as regards the salaries of the officials, but the whole system needs overhauling. In the freight sheds men are getting \$1.25 a day, labourers' pay, who are doing exactly the same work that other men are doing for \$50 a month. Some men are getting \$500 a year, men who have been many years in the service, and who are doing precisely the same amount and character of work as other men who are receiving \$600 a year, and there are many other causes of complaint to which time will not now permit me to call the attention of this committee. I want to impress now upon the Minister of Railways the necessity that exists for doing something to equalize the salaries. Now that he has made the expenditure of the road balance with income he should see that fair play is done to this large number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway. I know what the hon. gentleman will say; he will say: I have placed the whole executive management of the road in the hands of Mr. Pottinger, the chief superintendent. In doing that, the Minister has acted in strict accordance with my own views, which I have expressed in this House two sessions. It is very desirable that greater power should be in the hands of the chief superintendent than has been the case in the past, and I believe that he will be in a better position to work up a local traffic and to offer inducements to merchants to patronize the Intercolonial Railway rather than other roads. Therefore, I ask, not from a political stand-point, but in the interest of fair-play, that the Minister of Railways may give his attention to this matter during the recess, and give such instructions to the chief superintendent as will cause him to remedy the grievances which I have here brought to the notice of the committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways on the valuable assistance obtained from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), in passing these items through the House, and if they obtained the assistance of a few more after-dinner speeches, no doubt, they would be even more successful. With respect to the statement made by the hon. member for King's, that the Intercolonial had been made a refuge for political hacks, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) should have read the report of the Royal Commission in regard to the condition and the expenditure on operating the Intercolonial; and if he has not done so, he

should not have ventured to deny the statement made by my hon. friend. If he will turn to page 322, he will find how the station-masters, conductors, and, in fact, all the officials are appointed. Here is some of the evidence:

3236. How are the station masters, the conductors, the brakemen and all the other officers, appointed?—In the appointment of station masters, etc., the member for the district is consulted, and his nominee, as a rule, is appointed, unless some good reason is known why he should not be.

3237. How are the district superintendents appointed?—District superintendents are appointed by the Minister.

3238. And the member for the district nominates the station masters?—The station masters and station operators, section men, section foremen, and brakemen, as a rule, are taken from the nominees of the member for the district.

3239. Do you appoint them, or the Minister?—The Minister.

3240. Have you any sort of check upon inefficient men being appointed, or do you require any qualifications?—If we consider a man really of no use, we object to him, and we ask for another name.

3241. Do you find that you have to do this often with men who are not efficient, or not as efficient as you would like?—Yes; we have a large number of men now employed whose services we think could be dispensed with.

There is proof positive that hon. members representing constituencies on the Intercolonial nominate the whole men, even the trackmen, and that men are forced on the Minister at the time of the general election. At that time no doubt he was compelled to accept men who were not required, and the evidence shows that the officers of the road from the top to the bottom are the nominees of members who live along the line, and no doubt the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has had the privilege of nominating men to fill positions on the road. Yet the hon. gentleman says it is not so.

Mr. HAZEN. I did not say so.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman said the road was not made a refuge for political hacks.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman referred to after-dinner speeches; but I think he has made an after-restaurant speech. I said nothing of the sort suggested by the hon. gentleman. What I said was, that they did not put men into positions if there were no vacancies. If there were vacancies, I suppose the recommendations of those hon. members would be considered. As for myself, I state deliberately and clearly that I never recommended a single man, or attempted to secure for a man a position until advised by the chief superintendent that there was a vacancy to be filled.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman replied to the hon. member for King's, and said he should have hesitated before he declared that the Intercolonial was made a refuge for political hacks. The evidence of the commission shows that the road has been utilized for that purpose. Will the hon.

gentleman turn to page 322 and read the evidence? If not, he should withdraw his charge, for it there distinctly states that every official on the road was put there on the recommendation of the hon. member for the district. Is not that making the road a refuge for political hacks? The hon. member for St. John has further declared that the Intercolonial is operated in the interests of the producers in the west. Does he not know that a large portion of the surplus products that go from Ontario to the eastern provinces are not carried over the Intercolonial, but are sent by American lines to Boston and shipped from there to Halifax and St. John? It is well known that large quantities of Ontario flour are so sent. The Intercolonial has not been operated in the interests of western men, but in the interests of the coal mines of Nova Scotia and of local interests in the Maritime provinces, and further, the road has been overloaded by officials forced into the employ of the Government by men who hold positions similar to the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. McALISTER. The hon. member who has just taken his seat complains that the Intercolonial is operated solely for the benefit of the Maritime provinces, but I think it is operated largely for the benefit of western shippers. Freights from Toronto and Montreal to St. John and Halifax are lower than from the northern part of New Brunswick to the last mentioned places, so that western merchants can ship goods to the Maritime provinces upon much more favourable terms than the Maritime province merchants can ship to any part of their own provinces. If this is not operating the Intercolonial Railway for the benefit of the western men, then I do not understand what is. It is all very well for western members to denounce the management of the Intercolonial, and declare that it is operated for the benefit of people in the Maritime provinces; but the fact is that the greater portion of the benefit is derived by the western men. If the Intercolonial were cut off and western men were confined to shipments to the Maritime provinces via Boston, as the hon. member for North Wellington maintains is being done now, he would find that the trade from the west with the lower provinces would be very largely diminished.

Mr. FRASER. The question of the Intercolonial Railway is not a matter altogether of east or west, although it is largely a matter affecting the eastern portion of the Dominion. I join with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) in saying that I am not at all as sanguine of the result as is the Minister of Railways. I stated last year, and I wish to repeat the statement now, that I will not have very much to say against any Minister of Railways who shows no more than a fair deficit on operating the Intercolonial. The condition of entering Confederation so far as the lower provinces were

Mr. McMULLEN.

concerned was the building and operating of that road, and while a deficit is shown yearly on the canals, the Dominion cannot object to a deficit being shown on the Intercolonial, provided it is managed as it should be. But I hope the result will not be secured by our permitting the road to run down. I do not believe the Intercolonial, with the present population of Canada, or even its population ten years hence, can be operated by reducing the deficit to less than \$200,000 or \$300,000. There are very good reasons for this. I am not going to enter into the question as to how the Liberal or Conservative Government acted on the matter, but I am sure that every one is aware very different methods were used during the Mackenzie Government, and that the methods used were such that on their face nothing could be said against them. So far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned I think, perhaps, a remark inadvertently made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), is correct. He said that the whole system needed overhauling, and I suggested to the hon. gentleman to get the ear of the Minister elsewhere than in Parliament to show what that overhauling should be. I submit that if he had consulted the Minister, and had poured into his willing ear all he had given to this House, perhaps it would be more efficient towards having these changes brought about, than to have it urged here as a sort of grievance that these things were not attended to. I am sure that there is no man in the lower provinces, whatever his political views are, who does not wish to put these matters in a straightforward manner. We are interested in the Intercolonial Railway, and if ever the trade of this country between east and west is to amount to anything, it must be through the efficient working of the Intercolonial Railway. I am afraid that the Intercolonial Railway will run down. If you study the history of that road, you will see that a similar attempt to this was made after 1878, and the deficit was brought down low. But what was the result? In a few years the effect of that operation was such as to cause the large deficits which we have had, and I fear that the same operation is being employed just now. Unless indeed all the departments are carried on as efficiently as before, the experience of a year or two will let the people know that the Intercolonial Railway is not what it ought to be. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that hitherto the Intercolonial Railway has been largely used as a political engine, and especially about election times. I also agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) when he said that if ever the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) got into power he would find the Intercolonial Railway was not such a pleasant thing. I admit that. It is a very pleasant thing to put men in power, but after they are in power, they do find that the making of the Intercolonial Railway

to serve their purpose at election times, only causes their supporters to be more greedy for positions on the road. So far as the gentlemen about whom he spoke are concerned, I know very little about the salaries they receive, but I submit that there are salaries paid on the Intercolonial Railway which are too high. I submit that \$6,000 a year for some men on the Intercolonial Railway is too much. I speak on behalf of a class of men far more deserving than the men for whom the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has spoken. I speak for the men who have to bear in all weathers the hardships of running the Intercolonial Railway. I speak on behalf of the engineers, the firemen and the brakemen, and all officials on the trains. These are the men who are deserving the attention of the Government, and not the men who sit day after day in well-furnished rooms in the offices and the stations. I speak for the men who have to work out on the road in cold and rain. I know of no class deserving of such sympathy and who ought to receive better remuneration than these men. A good deal has been said in this House about the civil servants, but these are the civil servants that we ought to attend to; the men who, perhaps, go out in the morning and who come home at night, mayhap, with broken limbs, or are carried home to their families dead. For these men I speak, and they are more deserving of our sympathy than all the others. I say that if the Minister continues to square the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway and to run the railway as well as it has been run, I, for one, shall say that he has done a service for Canada, but let the danger not be forgotten that I have adverted to. So far as elections are concerned, I make the statement here, and I am ready to prove it, that those books of passes were in the hands of the political agents of the Conservative party at the last election. Although the chief engineer swore that a district superintendent had issued little pieces of paper as passes, is it not an extraordinary thing that not a word has been said against that superintendent up to this date? The Government know that he committed that act, and the chief engineer knows it, and yet not a word has been said to him, while many a poor conductor who has committed a comparatively small offence has been immediately put off the road when his offence was discovered. Yet the man who received the large salary and who uses slips of paper for passes, is treated as a deserving official on the road, and retains the confidence of the Government. Now, there is one thing to which I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways. A good deal has been said during the last six months about handing the Intercolonial Railway over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there are a number of people in this country who think that ought to be done. The management of the Minister of Railways for the past year shows that that need not be done,

and it shows also of what kind was the administration of those who preceded him in the department. I do not know whether his genius is so surpassing that of his predecessors, as to enable him to accomplish all that he claims on the same lines as they did; but if the leakage of the past years was not from just as honest an operation as his, then I submit that the Government should at once take measures to see that the money was returned to the Government that was taken from them for work that was not performed. My own opinion is that the Intercolonial Railway cannot be worked without a deficit. Indeed, I feel about it just now, as a friend of mine said about the conversion of a man who was not very good in his character. When he heard of the conversion of this person he said: Well, you had better shoot him. I think, perhaps, that the Intercolonial Railway is now in that position. For my own opinion is that it cannot be operated so successfully as it has been and make its accounts square. I for one wish to say that I will not object to any reasonable deficit if the hon. Minister can show that he has conducted the business of the country in that railway, on proper lines.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was perfectly correct in his statement in reference to the savings which I intended to make. There are \$124,000 in wages alone in one department, \$32,000 in another, \$16,000 by train service, and, I think, about \$150,000 on rail account. If the hon. gentleman remembered my statement he might have made out the difference. The difference was made up by the savings in the stores accounts. I stated that not only was there this amount of wages for 300 men, but they were actually using stores uselessly to that amount. I also stated that there would be a considerable saving by not erecting unnecessary stores and buildings, and I supplemented that by a detailed account from the books, of the savings for the five months on the different works. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not noticed that, and I may repeat it to him. For the five months ending with November, 1891, the mechanical department cost \$919,135, and for the corresponding five months of 1892 \$761,694, or a saving of \$157,441. In the traffic department there was a small saving of \$6,976, and in the maintenance of way and works a saving of \$403,847. I have a total account of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for the last eight months, showing that the total deficit during that time is only \$5,000, and I expect that by the end of the year it will not be much greater than that, if the account is not balanced. At this time of the night I hope other gentlemen will excuse me replying in full to the remarks that they have made on the vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman propose really to expend this money this year?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the land been purchased ?

Mr. HAGGART. No. The official referee of the court is down there at present making arrangements for the expropriation.

St. Charles Branch \$17,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any hope that the damages for the St. Charles branch will ever cease ?

Mr. HAGGART. It seems not. The amount required is \$17,200, there is available \$20,000, and the amount of the claims is \$37,200. The construction of this road has cost \$822,000 and the land \$900,000, \$1,722,000 altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the estimate by Sir Charles Tupper before its construction was that its total cost would be \$136,000

Trent Canal \$73,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just \$1,000 and no more was spent last year. It does appear to me that you might as well drop this item until the writs for the next elections are out, and then you can resume the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better keep it on, because if it is dropped, there might be danger that it would not be put on again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Minister of Finance will state that he intends to hold an election in the meantime, perhaps he could spend this \$17,000, otherwise it might as well be dropped. I would like to know whether he has any information to give us as to what is being done—not in regard to the canal ; I do not care in the least what is done about that ; I would like to know whether there is to be an election ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal \$1,609,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister please state what the position of this work is, and the estimated cost of expediting the construction of the canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. This amount is required to pay for the works now under contract. It is to finish the lock. I expect that it will be finished next fall, and that the gates will be put on so that it will be ready for navigation in the following spring.

Mr. DENISON. Last session I brought up the question of deepening the St. Lawrence canals, more especially the Soulanges canal, about to be constructed to a depth of 20 feet. The commissioners recommended 16 feet for the canals on the St. Lawrence instead of the depth of 14 feet, which is only now being

Mr. HAGGART.

contracted for. It seems to me that it is a great mistake to expend large sums in building a canal of only 14 feet in depth, when we have the recommendation of the canal commissioners, who went thoroughly into the matter, in favour of 16 feet depth, more particularly when we bear in mind the fact that we have a demand now for the depth of 20 feet, which demand is shown plainly by the fact that this particular year we passed an Act of Parliament granting a charter to a company to construct a canal, not of 20 feet, but of 22 feet. I rise for the purpose of asking the Minister of Railways, who promised last year to have some sort of a report here, whether he has had that made with regard to the deepening of the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. I ordered the engineers in the different portions along the line from Lake Superior down to Montreal to make an estimate of the cost of 20 feet navigation from Lake Erie down, and they estimated between \$130,000,000 and \$140,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are scarcely prepared to recommend that now ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; especially when we have an offer of a company to deepen it to the depth required, and to charge no more tolls than are charged at present on the canals, and which do not more than a quarter pay the men working on them.

Mr. BORDEN. Is it the intention of the Government to renew the lease which is about to expire for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway ?

Mr. HAGGART. The lease has expired and has been renewed, and it is a lease in perpetuity.

Mr. BORDEN. Have there been any changes ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; I do not think there are any changes of any account.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will the House take up to-morrow afternoon ?

Mr. FOSTER. Some Bills, and then Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which Bills ?

Mr. FOSTER. There are only three or four ; we will take up the Civil Service Insurance Bill and the Speaker's Bill.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th March, 1893.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. **FOSTER**. With the consent of my hon. friend opposite I move :

That the House do meet on Wednesday and Thursday of this week, at eleven o'clock in the morning.

Mr. **LAURIER**. Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

BRANDING OF CHEESE.

Mr. **FOSTER**. With the consent of the House I would like to introduce a Bill which is the outcome of a discussion we had in the House the other day in reference to the marking of cheese. The Minister of Agriculture, with Professor Robertson, looked into the matter and he has put his ideas in the form of a Bill. I would like to have it printed so that we may get it before the House. If there is time to get it through we can put it through, but if not, we can have the provisions of the Bill before us.

Mr. **LAURIER**. Very well.

Mr. **FOSTER** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) to prevent the manufacture or sale of filled or imitation cheese, and to provide for the branding of dairy products.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Canadian Live Stock Assurance Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. **LACHAPPELLE**. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government to bring down within a day the French text of the commercial treaty, signed at Paris, on the 6th February last, by the representatives of France and Canada. The grounds on which I ask the production of this document are the following:—First, because it seems to be a pretty well established fact that the English text of the treaty now before us is a more or less accurate translation; and, in the second place, it seems but fair and reasonable that we, the French-Canadian members of this House, should be enabled to read the text of the treaty in the very same language in which it has been drafted and signed—I mean in the French language. I beg, therefore, that the French text of the treaty be brought

down some time to-morrow afternoon, as it is the intention, I understand, to bring up the question before the House, and we could not afford to participate in the debate should the information bearing upon this debate be withheld from us.

Mr. **FOSTER**. So far as I understand my hon. friend, he asks for the French text of the treaty. That was laid on the Table, being printed in parallel columns with the English version. The correspondence is now being translated.

Mr. **LAURIER**. (Translation.) The French text of the treaty the hon. member applies for is already before the House; it was drafted in the very city of Paris, and not here.

Mr. **TARTE**. (Translation.) And in very good French too.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. **EDGAR**. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways if there has not been a mistake in bringing down the answer to the order in regard to Mr. Trudeau's superannuation. The order was for correspondence and papers, and I find nothing brought down except the Order in Council. There may have been no correspondence, but I fancy there has been a report of the Treasury Board on which the Order in Council was based, and I suppose the Minister has overlooked bringing that down.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I think the report is embodied in the order. I will bring it down to-morrow. There was no correspondence.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House proceeded to concur in resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means.

On resolution 2,

Mr. **EDGAR**. Perhaps the Minister of Finance can tell the House now whether he has any more proposals for changing the tariff this session. I refer to such changes as may be required if the French Treaty is ratified.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I have none to propose to-day. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. **LAURIER**. Are you going to discriminate in favour of France?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow me to answer that question another time.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. **FOSTER** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to make some remarks on this question. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his speech on the tariff, following mine of some days ago, made some personal allusions to myself and some charges with regard to my veracity in some statements which I had previously made in reference to the negotiations at Washington. In questioning my veracity, he referred to the fact in disparaging terms that I was a Presbyterian elder and a promoter of Sabbath legislation, and stated that under these professions I cloaked my attempt to deceive the people and to make false representations as to the motives and character of the operations of the Government. Now, I may say that I have the utmost contempt for thus dealing with the private character of a member of this House. I do not intend to retaliate on the hon. gentleman. If I were to do so, I dare say I might possibly find something in his record that would not be more creditable than being a Presbyterian elder; but it is not my intention to do so. I intend, however, to justify the position I took with regard to the course of the Government in their negotiations or their professed negotiations at Washington. The observations and charges made with regard to the course I took render it necessary for me to vindicate myself in this matter. Now, the hon. member has brought down a report in which he professed to give a history of the negotiations at Washington. In that report he simply reiterated and reaffirmed the statements he had previously made. I am unable to imagine what purpose was served by the bringing down of that professed report. The hon. member had repeatedly made the same statement, and it was somewhat significant—I think it was a little invidious—on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring that report down at a time when Secretary Blaine, one of the actors in that matter, was dead, and when another of the actors, Secretary Foster, had ceased to be Secretary of State, and had not only ceased to be an official and to act in an official capacity at Washington, but had left the country as well, and was at that time in Europe. I do not understand why the document should have been brought down at that time. However, it was brought down. The date of that communication was 15th February, 1892, it was laid on the Table of the House the 7th March, 1893. Now, I repeat that it was simply a reiteration of the statement frequently made by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and it might almost seem that there would be grounds for laying the charge that the writing of this communication was an afterthought, and that it had actually been written after these statements had been frequently made and reiterated, and after these negotiations had been made. However, whatever may be the conclusion as to the good taste of the hon. gentleman in making

Mr. FOSTER.

this statement after Mr. Blaine was dead, and after Mr. Foster had ceased to be Secretary of State, the document is not conclusive evidence because it was not confirmed by the American participants in the negotiations. It was a statement made by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and that statement happens to be in direct conflict with the statements made by Secretary Blaine and Secretary Foster and President Harrison. After a careful examination of that document, I have arrived at a conclusion, which will perhaps exonerate members of this Government and members of the United States Government from any intention to make misrepresentation, and I think I will be able to show to the House that there was a possibility of a misunderstanding, and that the Finance Minister had actually been labouring under a misapprehension in the statement he has made that the condition of the American Government was positively that there should be uniformity of tariff between the two countries. Mr. Blaine says, in his reports furnished to Congress:

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854, nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone, and that, in view of the great development in the industrial interests of the United States and of the changed condition of the commercial relations of the two countries, since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedule of articles for free or other exchange under any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

Now, the hon. gentleman will mark the language; not that there should be unrestricted reciprocity, not that there should be absolute admission into the markets of Canada of all American manufactures; but the condition laid down by Mr. Blaine was that the treaty should not be confined to reciprocity in natural products, but that there should be, in addition, a list of manufactured articles to be agreed upon between the commissioners of Canada and the authorities of the United States. The Canadian commissioners refused to recede, in the slightest degree, from the position they took. They came to Washington with the ultimatum: Give us reciprocity in natural products, or, if you will not, we will not talk the matter with you at all; we will have our way, we will make no concessions, we will engage in no diplomatic discussion to see whether we cannot arrive at an agreement; but we lay down our ultimatum, which is the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with modifications such as the hon. gentleman explained afterwards. And I will show what his explanations were. This was their ultimatum. Mr. Blaine's request that they should agree upon a list of manufactured articles—a list—not all manufactures—and that they should make propositions were not acceded to, and no attempt was made to see if there

was any possibility of making a reciprocity treaty. There was room for diplomatic discussion; there was room for an honest attempt, on the part of the Canadian commissioners, to see if they could possibly secure a treaty of commerce with the United States. It was not reasonable for those gentlemen to go to Washington and lay down an ultimatum which the Americans would have to accept. And it was not reasonable to lay down an ultimatum and refuse to discuss the question. Discussion was absolutely and peremptorily closed by our commissioners, and the negotiations broken by their own act. Had my hon. friend opposite any reason to suppose, when he went to Washington, that his proposition for a treaty of reciprocity, based on the treaty of 1854, would be accepted? Had he any reason to suppose it was worth his while going there to make that proposition? Of course not. The American Government, time and again, assured this country that no such treaty would be accepted. Only a few days before the dissolution of the House of Commons, Mr. Blaine had expressly stated that no such proposition would be entertained by the American Government. This was clearly stated in his celebrated letter of 30th January. The commissioners went to Washington. Well, they were aware that the proposition they intended to make was one which would be unacceptable and inevitably refused. It was a foregone conclusion that that would be the result, and they were simply trifling with the question and the people when they went to Washington for the purpose of making such a proposition. It is worth while inquiring, Mr. Speaker, whether it would not have been possible for the Canadian commissioners to have slightly varied their conditions, and whether they should not have receded from the position they took, that they must absolutely have reciprocity in natural products alone or else accept no treaty. Was it not possible for them to have accepted Mr. Blaine's proposition, and made proposals on the lines of his suggestion that there should be a list of manufactured goods agreed upon? They might have done that without discriminating against England at all. Why, Sir, they could have agreed upon a list that would embrace coal oil, barb wire, agricultural implements, nails, spikes, cars, locomotives, common cottons, twine, carriages, clocks, certain kinds of glassware, threshers, portable steam engines, sewing machines, type-writers, machinery, edge tools, picks, spades, leather, printing presses, musical instruments, white paper, wall paper, furniture and a great variety of other manufactured goods which we import almost exclusively from the United States. They could have arranged a wide list of manufactured articles, and given, if necessary, to the American people preferential treatment in our market in these articles, and, at the same time, have not been under the necessity of discriminating

against England, except, perhaps, to a very slight degree. If these commissioners had been honest in their professed desire to obtain reciprocity, if they had deigned to accept Mr. Blaine's proposal to talk the matter over and make propositions, if they had been willing to make the attempt to agree upon a list of manufactured articles, limited in extent, a list such as they likely will adopt in part before twelve months from this date, without reciprocity in view at all, they could have, in all human probability, secured access to the American market for our natural products in return for a concession which would have admitted a certain list of American goods which we do not import to any great extent from England, and which, if we give preferential treatment in our market, would not have affected England to any considerable degree. I repeat that they could have done this beyond all question, and the whole course of their operations at Washington demonstrated the truth of the assertion that they were not there to get a reciprocity treaty; that they were not honest in their professions in regard to it, because if they had been, beyond all human question they could have obtained a treaty which would have freed trade to some extent, and would to a very slight degree discriminate against England.

Now, Sir, I wish to point out, and to do it fully, my reasons for charging the Government with deception in this matter. The allegation was made in the first place by the Government that the United States had made overtures. That was the allegation upon which they went to the country. That allegation, I think I shall be able to show, was without foundation. In the next place they gave people to understand that there would be no trouble to get a treaty. That was the universal impression in the country, that was the language of the press upon the subject, that was the language of the platform upon the subject. They went to the country, I repeat, with an implied, if not a positive, promise that reciprocity with the United States would be the outcome of their negotiations, which negotiations, they claimed, had been instituted as the result of overtures made by that country. Their partisans were led to expect reciprocity; their partisans freely promised reciprocity, and that promise was founded upon statements and representations made by the Government. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to a despatch which appeared in the Toronto "Mail," in January, 1891, and which was answered by a despatch appearing in the "Empire" on the following day. On the 15th of January, 1891, the Toronto "Mail" had a despatch which read as follows:—

It is reported from Ottawa, on authority which leaves little reason to doubt that the rumour is true, that the Imperial Government is urging the Dominion Ministers to unite in a proposition to arrange all matters in dispute between Canada and the United States on the basis of a wide measure of commercial reciprocity.

To that despatch the "Empire" made the following answer:—

The "Empire" is authorized to give this statement an unqualified denial. Not only is it not true, but, on the contrary, it is learned from the very best sources that the Canadian Government has recently been approached by the United States Government with a view to the development of trade relations between the two countries and that our Government has requested the advice of Her Majesty's Government on the subject.

Following this and called forth by this and similar statements which appeared in the Canadian press we have a letter from Mr. Baker, member of the United States House of Representatives, making inquiry with regard to this matter of the Secretary of State for the United States (Mr. Blaine). Mr. Baker writes, under the date of 29th January, 1891:

WASHINGTON, D.C., 29th January, 1891.

HON. JAMES G. BLAINE,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR MR. BLAINE,—It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my state, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain with a view of partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures, and it is stated that Sir Chas. Tupper is on his way here as commissioner to negotiate for such modification to our tariff. I would be very glad if you would enable me to answer my constituents.

Very truly yours,
CHAS. S. BAKER.

To this inquiry Mr. Blaine replies on the same day:

WASHINGTON, D.C., 29th January, 1891.

MY DEAR MR. BAKER,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Chas. Tupper's coming to Washington.

Very truly yours,
JAMES G. BLAINE.

Now, the members of the Canadian Ministry were in possession of this statement of Mr. Blaine before the House was dissolved on the 3rd of February. They had the fact before them that these assertions were made with regard to their ability to secure reciprocity, and I repeat that they were guilty of duplicity and made representations to the people which they knew could not be redeemed. But this evidence did not silence their reciprocity assertions. They still continued to assert that they were able to get reciprocity, that they were likely to get it, that they were about to get it. On the 3rd of February the House was dissolved and the announcement of dissolution was made in the following terms in the Government organ, the Toronto "Empire":—

The sixth Parliament of Canada is at an end. Acting on the advice of his responsible Ministers, His
Mr. CHARLTON.

Excellency the Governor-General has been pleased to dissolve the House of Commons and issue his writs for a new Parliament.

Nominations take place on Thursday, 26th February, polling on Thursday, 5th March. The writs are to be dated 4th February and made returnable on 25th April.

In view of the foregoing important statement, the question will naturally be asked, what are the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present time? It is understood that the Dominion Government have through Her Majesty's Government made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to an extension of our commerce with that country. These proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people rather than with a moribund House.

It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after 4th March, the date on which the life of the present Congress expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the questions of the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries. This delegation will visit the United States capital, it is said, as the result of a friendly suggestion from Washington.

This notice that appeared on the 3rd of February, I may say, appeared simultaneously in the Montreal "Gazette." On the 4th of February the "Empire" published an official statement of the Government's proposals, and why they were made:

In view of the importance of the reasons which have induced the Government to appeal to the country at the present moment, the "Empire" is privileged to publish a copy of the despatch from His Excellency the Governor-General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, showing the nature of the Government's proposals to the United States, and indicating the earnest desire of the Administration for the development of trade between the United States and Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would inquire, if this official statement was not inspired by the Government, how came this Government organ to have an official despatch which could only have been obtained through the connivance of the Government, by the consent of the Government and by the primary action of the Government? When this question was under discussion a few days ago, the Minister of Justice said in explanation of this statement that the "Empire" had this despatch from the "Canada Gazette." The "Canada Gazette" contains no such despatch between the 13th December, the date of the despatch, and the 3rd of February, the date of the dissolution. The statement made by the Minister of Justice suggesting that the Toronto "Empire" took this despatch from the "Canada Gazette" was misleading, and must have been purposely misleading, because it does not appear there; and I ask the Minister of Finance if he will bear out to-day the statement made by the Minister of Justice on that occasion, that this despatch of the 13th December, 1890, was taken by the Toronto "Empire"

from the "Canada Gazette," and was obtained in the usual course of an examination of the Government publications, or whether it was furnished by the Government to that paper for the purpose of carrying forward a scheme of deception? Here is the despatch as it appeared in the "Empire" of 4th February:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 13th December, 1890.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to send to Your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message in cipher, of which the following is the substance.

With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., this Government is desirous to propose a joint commission, such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects:—

1. Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States.

2. Reconsideration of the treaty of 1888, with respect to the Atlantic fisheries, with the aim of securing the free admission into the United States markets of Canadian fishery products, in return for facilities to be granted to United States fishermen to buy bait and supplies and to transship cargoes in Canada, all such privileges to be mutual.

3. Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and in inland waters; also

4. Relaxation of sea-board coasting laws of the two countries.

5. Relaxation of the coasting laws of the two countries on the inland waters dividing Canada from the United States.

6. Mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

7. Arrangements for settling boundary between Canada and Alaska.

The treaty would, of course, be *ad referendum*.

The manner in which this proposal came to be made to the United States Government is briefly as follows:—Several weeks ago when negotiations were in progress between Newfoundland and the United States looking to a reciprocity treaty, the Canadian Government made representations that Canada should have the option of being included in any arrangements with that colony as to the fisheries or trade. This contention was based on solemn assurances given by the Newfoundland Government two or three years ago, and repeated on successive occasions, that if any special privileges were allowed to any country in regard to the purchase of supplies or bait in Newfoundland such privileges would also be granted to Canada. The Secretary of State for the United States, when he learned of the position of affairs, insisted that the negotiations should be carried on separately. He intimated, however, that he would not be unwilling to enter into negotiations with Canada, but preferred that they should be private and unofficial. The Dominion Government thereupon asked the Imperial authorities to remind Mr. Blaine that Canada had always been ready for a fair reciprocal arrangement and had made repeated offers to that effect, which, however, had been ignored or refused by the United States. It was further represented that the Dominion Government was willing, now that overtures had been made to them, to again negotiate, and that they would prefer that these negotiations should be official and under a commission from the British Government.

Now, Sir, the elections were brought on, the Ministers took the field, and let us see what their utterances were upon some occasions with regard to this matter. My charge, you

will bear in mind, is that the Government were all the time holding out inducements to the country that they could obtain reciprocity; they were asserting to the country that the United States had made overtures, and the United States being anxious for a treaty, there would be no difficulty upon their part in obtaining one. On the 7th February a great mass meeting was held in Toronto. That meeting was addressed, among other speakers, by the Minister of Customs, Mr. Bowell, by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster, by the Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson; and Sir John Thompson, in the course of that speech, made some reference to this matter which I beg to trouble the House with, as I deem it of importance in connection with this case. He said:

A little over three months ago it transpired that negotiations were being entertained by the United States for the making of a treaty of reciprocity with the colony of Newfoundland. These negotiations have not yet ripened into a treaty, but they were proceedings on lines which were not unlike, so far as they went, the lines which Canada would be willing to pursue in any trade negotiations with that country, and not, mind you, at the dictation of the British Government, as has been untruly asserted in the press opposed to us, but on our own line; on hearing that these negotiations were progressing, we insisted upon the British Government demanding at Washington that Canada should have the option, if she pleased, of having Canada included in any treaty which might be made with the colony of Newfoundland, but we indicated at the same time that the proposed treaty with regard to Newfoundland did not seem to be upon lines so extensive as would suit the wants and interests of Canada, and that it might be better to avail ourselves at the same time of entering upon separate negotiations on behalf of Canada. (Cheers.) Well, Sir, that intimation was promptly conveyed by Her Majesty's Government to Washington, and the answer made by Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of the United States on behalf of his Government, was an overture to reciprocity. Now, these gentlemen may assert in this country that it was all moonshine and humbug about Mr. Blaine's being willing to entertain our negotiations, but it will be proved to you when the time comes that, in response to that, Mr. Blaine, whatever his sentiments may be—and I am bound for the present to give him credit for candour—as the negotiations with Newfoundland would not suit the Dominion of Canada for a trade treaty between these two countries, he was willing to make a wide treaty for reciprocity and enter upon separate negotiations with her. (Hear, hear.) That statement being made, we are bound to avail ourselves of that to extend our trade. We have never declared our unwillingness to trade with them. On the contrary, we are seeking extensions of trade in every direction. The next request from Mr. Blaine was that preparatory to negotiations being entered upon, we would propound a basis upon which the convention should eventually proceed. We did so in a document which has been published in the press, offering to consider the renewal of a reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such modifications as the altered circumstances of the two countries might call for. We asked him to reconsider the abortive treaty of 1888, which settled the fishery dispute along with trade questions, and which expressed our willingness likewise to enter into trade negotiations which would settle the Behring Sea difficulties and all questions upon the Atlantic coast with regard to fisheries, and to continue the coasting and wrecking business as well between the countries. Now,

Sir, a good deal has been said to the people of Canada about the insincerity of all this. It is stated that having made that proposition to Mr. Blaine without any prospect of its being accepted, without any prospect of its being eventually entertained, Sir John Macdonald has sprung the elections upon the people of Canada under the pretense that he is going to enter into these negotiations, while in reality the Cabinet at Washington will have none of it. Let me tell you, so far from that being true, we had the proposition that was submitted to Mr. Blaine; that the answer that Mr. Blaine made to us was that he was willing to enter upon a preliminary discussion to precede the more formal commission; he was willing to enter upon that discussion and to consider all points embraced in it, but would not be prepared to do so until after the 4th of March, when the term of the present Congress expires. In the meantime, Sir, what would our position have been if we had not appealed to the country, if we had not gone to the people of Canada? It would have been said that in the very last hour of the existence of our Parliament, we were endeavouring to make a treaty which would entirely change the business of the country, and when we went to Washington we would have been comparatively weak in the hands of the men with whom we were negotiating, because the men with whom we were negotiating would know, that instead of being there with the confidence of the country behind us, we had to ask the assent of a Parliament which had already spent its last session before the negotiations had practically commenced (Hear, hear, and cheers.) We would have the Government entering upon the most important treaty negotiations without a Parliament behind us, and what we would propose is that, if you and the people of Canada accept the policy that we put before you now, we will go to Washington with the Parliament behind us, and we will be able to treat with Mr. Blaine with the assurance that the Premier of this country has the renewed confidence of Canada. (Loud applause.)

Now, Sir, what inference was to be drawn from that speech of Sir John Thompson with reference to the reciprocity question and negotiations at Washington? Did he not plainly state that overtures were had from Mr. Blaine? Did he not plainly state that in pursuance of those overtures the Government were proposing to send their commission to Washington? Did he not plainly state that the prospects for a reciprocity treaty were so good that it was advisable for the Government to dissolve Parliament, have a new election, and call a new House fresh from the people, so that this treaty that the Government hoped to negotiate with the authorities at Washington could be laid before representatives fresh from the people, and not before a moribund House? I assert that the course of the Government, that the language of the members of the Government, that the whole of the policy pursued by the Government in regard to this question was a policy designed and calculated to lead the people of Canada to believe that they were about to obtain reciprocity, and that the promises of the Liberal party with regard to this matter need not be entertained, for while the Liberals were telling the people that they would secure reciprocity sometime in the future, if they came into power, the Government had reciprocity in their hands, and in order to have a new Parliament ready to sanction the

Mr. CHARLTON.

treaty they were about to make they were holding a general election. There can be no question about that. If the impression prevailed in the country, as it assuredly did, and if this impression was not well founded, if the Government were not actually on the line of obtaining reciprocity, as the people were told and as they allowed their press and orators to assure the people, then, were the Government not pursuing an invidious and improper course in laying the case before the people, as Sir John Thompson did at Toronto, in permitting their organs and orators to talk about obtaining reciprocity and declaring that the matter was safe in their hands, when all the time the Government, although they sent commissioners to Washington to submit proposals, knew their proposals would be rejected and could not under any circumstances be accepted? They knew this from Mr. Blaine's letter of 30th January, in which he distinctly stated that propositions of that character could not for one moment be entertained by the United States Government. They knew from the whole history of the facts since 1866, when the reciprocity treaty in natural products was abrogated, that the declarations of the Americans on every occasion had been that no such treaty would be renewed, that the United States agents would never enter into negotiations for reciprocity confined to natural products, but would in any event insist on the admission into the markets of Canada of some products of their labour which they had to sell and could exchange with the people of Canada for the products of their labour here, namely, the natural products. I will be able to show that the Government in the pursuit of this plan which they adopted violated the confidence of the Washington Government, that they made known the fact and had it talked about that reciprocity negotiations were in progress, when it was distinctly understood, and an explicit pledge had been exacted by Mr. Blaine that all the proceedings should be considered private and secret, and that negotiations should not be known or alluded to until the preliminary negotiations or conferences or talks had taken place between the commissioners or agents from Canada with members of the Washington Administration, and it had been decided whether there was any possibility of effecting a treaty or whether it had been demonstrated that the negotiations would be fruitless. Did the Dominion Government observe that pledge? I have here a letter from Secretary Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote bearing on this matter. It will be found in the Sessional Papers of 1891, volume 24, No. 38, page 83. Mr. Blaine in that communication to Sir Julian Pauncefote, dated 1st April, says:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON,
April 1st, 1891.

MY DEAR SIR JULIAN,—I duly received the note which you did me the honour to address to me on the

20th of March. I regret that for many reasons I have been unable to make an earlier response.

For convenience sake I here quote the substantial part of your note.

The quotation appears here.

A copy of the basis of negotiation which you placed in my hands on the 22nd of December last is appended hereto.

You told me, if my memory is not in error, that you were instructed by Lord Salisbury to propose the topics to the United States for discussion, and, if possible, for agreement.

I answered that I felt sure that the President would be unwilling to appoint a commission to consider the propositions as they were stated, and, furthermore, that I should be unwilling to submit them to the President.

After some further conversation, in which you repeated that the propositions were merely the basis upon which a discussion might be instituted, I replied that in any event I had not a moment to give to the subject until after the adjournment of Congress in March, but that after that date I would be willing to respond to your request "to have a full but private conference with the British Minister, and one or more agents from Canada, and go over every point of difference, and consider every subject upon which a mutual interest could be founded.

"If an agreement is reached, all well; if not, no official mention is to be made of the effort.

"Above all things, it is important to avoid public reference to the matter.

"This the President will insist upon."

While no notes were exchanged between us I carefully minuted my modification of the paper you left with me containing Lord Salisbury's proposition, and did so immediately after you left the department. You will observe the private character which I wished to impart to the conference is recognized by you a month later in your note of 27th January, when you called the correspondence "confidential."

In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us—

Not a proposition from Mr. Blaine, but Sir Julian Pauncefote had come to the State Department with the proposal, and the subject was then for the first time mentioned between them.

—and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my minute. I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not "initiated" by me, but on the contrary that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States.

With this explanation it only remains for me to say that gentlemen representing the Dominion of Canada and proposing to discuss the commercial relations of the two countries may be assured of a courteous and cordial reception in Washington by the Government of the United States.

There is the statement of Mr. Blaine, a most explicit statement, and a most

damaging statement to the Canadian Government, if that statement is true. Is there any confirmation of that statement? Let us see if there is any mention made of the statement by any of the parties interested. Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Foster, Mr. Bowell and Sir John Thompson went to Washington, and this letter from the Secretary of State of the United States to Sir Julian Pauncefote was laid before Sir Charles Tupper. And what did Sir Charles say about it? In his communication to Sir John Macdonald, 21st April, 1891, Sessional Papers, 1891, volume 24, No. 38, page 67, he says:

I told Mr. Blaine in reference to these charges, that I wished at the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statements contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had sent in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding the reciprocity arrangements between the two countries.

That is what Sir Charles Tupper told the Hon. Mr. Blaine: That he wished to recognize and acknowledge the accuracy of this statement made in Mr. Blaine's letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote. That was simply an acknowledgment on the part of Sir Charles Tupper, that he and that Sir John Macdonald and that every party interested in that negotiation on behalf of Canada, had been guilty of duplicity, had been guilty of a breach of confidence in placing these facts before the people of Canada, contrary to their expressed pledges, and contrary to the arrangements made with Secretary Blaine; and in addition to that, they had made false representations, because they had stated that the negotiations were initiated by the Washington authorities, when the express declaration of Mr. Blaine, which was sanctioned and confirmed by Sir Charles Tupper, was: That these negotiations had been initiated by Sir Julian Pauncefote, and that for the first time they had been referred to, when he called upon Mr. Blaine in reference to the matter.

Now, let us see, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any other evidence upon this point. I have here a Minute of Council, passed on 18th December, 1890, which will be found in Sessional Papers for 1891, vol. 24, No. 38, page 13:

REPORT of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, on the 18th December, 1890.

The Committee of the Privy Council having learned that the Honourable the Secretary of State for the United States had expressed to Her Majesty's Minister at Washington his readiness to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty on a wide basis, and particularly for the protection of the mackerel fisheries, and for the fisheries on inland waters, and had subsequently stated to Her Majesty's Minister his great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty, they desire to take the opportunity afforded by these intimations from Mr. Blaine of suggesting the expediency of taking early steps to adjust the various matters that have arisen and now exist affecting the relations of Canada with the United States, or rather the relations be-

tween the Government of the United States and that of the United Kingdom on questions affecting Canada.

The most obvious means of carrying this object into effect, would be the appointment of a Joint Commission as in 1871.

The Committee of Council desire to suggest that such commission should be authorized to deal with all such questions without limitation as to range of discussion, and to prepare a treaty or convention as to such of those matters as they may come to an agreement upon.

The principal subjects for discussion would appear to be:—

1. The renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, subject to such modifications as the altered circumstances of both countries require, and to such extensions as the commission may deem to be in the interest of the United States and Canada.

2. The reconsideration of the treaty of 1888 respecting the Atlantic fisheries, with the view of effecting the free admission of Canadian fishery products into the markets of the United States in exchange for facilities for United States fishermen to purchase bait and supplies, and transship cargoes in Canada. All such privileges to be mutual.

3. The protection of the mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and on the inland waters.

4. The relaxation of the coasting laws of both countries on the sea-board.

5. The relaxation of the coasting laws of both countries on inland waters between the United States and Canada.

6. The mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

7. Arrangements for the delimitation of boundary between Alaska and Canada.

Such treaty to be, of course, *ad referendum*.

The Committee respectfully submit this minute for His Excellency's sanction.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE,
Clerk, Privy Council.

To the Honourable

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir, here is a formal Minute, which repeats the assertion which Mr. Blaine denies, namely, that the Washington authorities had stated to Her Majesty's Minister their great desire to conclude a reciprocity treaty with Canada, while the truth was, that Sir Julian Pauncefote, under the direction of his Government, prompted by representations from Ottawa, had himself gone to the Hon. J. G. Blaine and had initiated the proceedings, by proposing to open negotiations for reciprocity, and Mr. Blaine had told him then and there that it was useless to submit a proposal for a reciprocity treaty on the basis of the treaty of 1854, that, in fact, he would not submit such a proposal to the President at all, but that a private conference could be held to see if some common basis for agreement as to their views might be arrived at; and that statement made by Mr. Blaine, which is directly contrary to the affirmation of this Minute in Council and to the statement made by the Ministers upon the hustings, was afterwards confirmed by Sir Charles Tupper at Washington. When the letter of Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote was brought to his notice, he acknowledged that the statements of Mr. Blaine were true, and that he had been guilty of a breach of confidence and that Sir John Macdonald, as well, had

Mr. CHARLTON.

been guilty of making statements which were not warranted by the facts. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of statements made by the Minister of Finance. On the 11th December, 1892, the Minister of Finance granted to a newspaper (the "Empire") reporter an interview with reference to the Message of the President of the United States, and in that interview the Minister of Finance made this statement:

I need not say that it causes surprise and regret—surprise at the nature of some of the statements made, and regret at the unfriendly tone adopted towards Canada. The statement that Canada was only prepared to offer to the United States the admission of natural products is not full enough to convey an accurate idea of what took place. The Canadian representatives asked those of the United States if they were prepared to consider an arrangement on the basis of free admission of the natural products of both countries, as in the treaty of 1854, with such enlargements and modifications as the changed conditions of the two countries made necessary. The reply was a negative. With a view, then, to clear the ground for arrangement ~~wider~~ than that, if such could be done, Mr. Blaine was asked as to certain conditions of a possibly wider arrangement, among others, whether the United States would insist upon a uniform tariff and would demand preferential treatment in our markets as against British and foreign goods. The answer was that a uniform tariff would be necessary and that, too, on the line of the present United States tariff, and that the United States could admit of no arrangements which did not give United States goods favoured treatment as against foreign goods, especially those of Great Britain, who was their chief competitor. To these propositions the Canadian representatives declined to agree. The conference then broke off so far as regarded the consideration of the commercial question. What the conference plainly developed was that the Canadian Government considered the practical surrender of its fiscal powers and absolute discrimination against Great Britain, with all that this involved, as too high a price to pay for any advantage which might accrue from a possible treaty.

Here is a distinct assertion made by the Minister of Finance, that the United States authorities required as a preliminary, as a condition to a reciprocity treaty, a uniform tariff, and that, too, on the lines of the present United States tariff. That was the assertion made by the Minister of Finance in this interview on 11th December. Now, this interview was brought to the attention of Secretary of State Foster at Washington on the following day, and he reviews all the points taken up in the interview. I shall only refer to those matters relating to reciprocity. In his review with reference to the reciprocity negotiations, Secretary Foster of Washington says:

During the reciprocity conference of last winter, Mr. Blaine did not insist that in a reciprocity arrangement a uniform tariff would be necessary for both Canada and the United States, nor much less, that it should be on the lines of the present United States tariff. He did ask that the schedule should not be confined to natural products, but should include an agreed list [not an unlimited list, but an agreed list] of manufactured goods, and that the reciprocity should be confined to Canada and the United States; and because of these two conditions the negotiations were fruitless.

Now, here is a direct issue between the Minister and the Secretary. If Secretary Foster of the United States is right, Minister Foster of Canada is wrong; if Minister Foster of Canada is right, Secretary Foster of the United States is wrong; one or the other is mistaken. There may be an intentional misrepresentation; there may be merely a misunderstanding. I think I will be able to show that the probability is that there is merely a misunderstanding. The difference is an unfortunate one. It is greatly to be regretted that some record of the proceedings of that conference, attested by both parties, was not published. Then there could have been no question of fact or veracity, and no doubt as to the truthfulness of the record. There is one thing, perhaps, that might militate against Secretary Foster of the United States, in the estimation of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Secretary Foster is a Presbyterian elder, and I believe the Minister of Finance is not, and has a great dislike to them. This fact may, in the estimation of the Minister of Finance, make Secretary Foster an untrustworthy witness. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to make an extract from the correspondence published and laid on the Table of this House on the 7th day of March—the official statement of the Canadian Government relating to the negotiations which took place at Washington with reference to reciprocity; and I think I will be able to establish that the difference in regard to a uniform tariff on the lines of the United States tariff arose very naturally, and was probably simply a misunderstanding, and nothing more. This report says:

Mr. Foster went on to say that a third question arose at this point which was in its way not less important than the two already discussed; namely, granted that discrimination in favour of United States manufactures in the Canadian market was necessary, how should the standard of discrimination be fixed, and what should be its degree? Would the Canadian tariff have to be raised to an equality with that of the United States tariff upon these articles, or would the present Canadian tariff be accepted as sufficient, or would Canada be at liberty to fix the rate as and when she pleased, provided that the principle of discrimination were always maintained? He took the items of woollens and wool, and illustrated the above point by a comparison of tariffs on these in the two countries.

Mr. Blaine said that this was a vital point; that under the existing tariffs on wools and woollens in the two countries, a reciprocity such as he (Mr. Foster) contemplated would result in manifest disadvantage to the United States, whose policy was one of large protection on wools as well as woollens. Unless such points were guarded there would be no security on the one hand from smuggling along a border line of over 3,000 miles in length, or on the other of maintaining the present policy of the United States. This could, in his opinion, only be done by making the tariff uniform for both countries, and equalizing the Canadian with that of the United States.

Now, the mistake which the Minister of Finance has fallen into in connection with this matter is probably this: Mr. Blaine as-

serted that it would be necessary, with reference to wool and woollens, to make the tariff of the two countries uniform, and Mr. Foster accepted that assertion as applying to the entire tariff system of both countries. Now, why should Mr. Blaine raise this point as to the necessity of having a uniform tariff on wool and woollens? It is very manifest. The United States has a duty on wool of 10 cents a pound, while Canada admits wool free. If the woollen manufactures of these two countries under a reciprocity treaty were to pass interchangeably free of duty, it is evident that the Canadian manufacturer would have a vast advantage. He would be placing in the market of the United States goods made from free wool, while the American manufacturer would be obliged to compete with him in the markets of the two countries with goods made from wool charged with a duty of 10 cents a pound; and Mr. Blaine simply pointed out to Mr. Foster that it was necessary, in regard to wool and woollens, to have a uniform tariff. Either the United States should place wool on the free list or Canada should place wool on the dutiable list at the same rate as the United States. The necessity of this was obvious. You could not have reciprocity in wool and woollens unless both nations stood on the same footing with regard to the cost of their raw material. The same rule would be necessary with reference to the excise laws of the two countries. If whiskey, beer and tobacco were interchanged free of duty between the two countries, there must be the same excise laws in both; otherwise the two nations would not be on the same footing. This would be necessary in regard to any manufactured article made from imported raw material. If that raw material were admitted into one country free and taxed in the other, the two nations would not be on the same footing; and this is what Mr. Blaine unquestionably meant when he talked about a uniform tariff. If the hon. gentleman is willing to accept this explanation, it will settle the difficulty, and reconcile the difference between the two parties. He will simply have to say that he was under a misapprehension as to the scope of Mr. Blaine's reference to a uniform tariff, which was restricted instead of being unlimited, as he had supposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a communication placed by Mr. Blaine in the hands of the President with regard to these reciprocity negotiations. I have read that portion of the statement of the Canadian commissioners which bears on this case. I will now read Mr. Blaine's statement, but before doing so, I wish to speculate a little as to the possibility of our Finance Minister making a mistake. Of course if he is in any sense or to any degree infallible, we will have to accept his word without question, but I may, perhaps, refer to one or two circumstances for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was ever known to

make really glaring mistakes, and a mistake in his own department on a matter concerning which he ought to be thoroughly informed. I was looking over the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Petrolea on the 7th September last, where, speaking of our public debt, the hon. gentleman used the following language :—

The Opposition claimed that the Government of Canada was rolling up a debt. He would deal with that point. In 1889 the debt of the country was \$237,000,000, in 1890 it was \$237,000,000, in 1891 it was \$237,000,000, and in 1892 it was \$236,000,000. How was that for heaping up the debt? For four years the debt of the Dominion was not increased one dollar.

Now, that was the assertion of the Finance Minister, made on the 7th September. What does the blue-book show? According to the report of his own department, the net public debt on the 30th June, 1892, amounted to \$241,131,000, and the monthly return made the 31st August, just seven days before he made the statement, showed that the public debt of Canada amounted on that day to \$241,035,000; yet the hon. gentleman stated at Petrolea that the returns of the 30th June and the 31st August from his own department, with which he ought to have been familiar, showed a net debt of only \$236,000,000. He made a misstatement of about \$5,000,000. That, I think, settles the question of the hon. gentleman's infallibility. And I am afraid, after this evidence of financial weakness on his part, there may be something in the charge that he was equally subject to diplomatic weakness in the statement he made concerning the diplomatic conferences at Washington.

I propose to call attention to Mr. Blaine's official statement, contained in Executive document No. 14 of the 52nd Congress, 1st Session, made to the United States Senate. This communication was transmitted in a message from President Harrison, and President Harrison, in referring to the matter, says as follows :—

The result of the conference as to the practicability of arranging a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada, is clearly stated in the letter of Mr. Blaine, and was anticipated, I think, by him and by every other thoughtful American who had considered the subject. A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products would have been such only in form. The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government. A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact, and of mutual advantage, must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles, and have secured to the United States a free or favoured introduction of these articles into Canada as against the world; but it was not believed that the Canadian Ministry was ready to propose or assent to such an arrangement. The conclusion of the Canadian commissioners is stated in the report of Mr. Blaine as follows :—

“In the second place it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods a preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the

Mr. CHARLTON.

Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States, from the benefits of which Great Britain and its colonies should be excluded.”

It is not for this Government to argue against this announcement of Canadian official opinion. It must be accepted, however, I think, as the statement of a condition which places an insuperable barrier in the way of the attainment of that large and beneficial intercourse and reciprocal trade which might otherwise be developed between the United States and the Dominion.

And Mr. Blaine, in his communication, says :

This fact—that is, the fact that there was reciprocity negotiations in progress between Newfoundland and the United States.

This fact having come to the attention of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, a strong protest was forwarded by it to the British Government against the ratification of the action of the colonial minister of Newfoundland, and this was followed, in December, 1890, by a proposition initiated and made to me by the British Minister in Washington,—

Not a proposition initiated by Mr. Blaine :

for the opening of formal negotiations in this copy for a treaty embracing commercial reciprocity with Canada, the fisheries, and other unsettled questions with the Dominion Government. I declined to open formal negotiations, but stated that I would be willing to have a full and private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents of Canada, and consider with them every subject connected with the relations of the two countries upon which a mutual interest could be founded, with a view to formal negotiations should the proposed conference indicate a probability of agreement on any of the subjects discussed. This basis was accepted by the British Minister and the Dominion Government, but for various reasons of convenience to the members of the proposed conference it did not take place until 10th February, when the British Minister presented to me, at the Department of State, Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance, and Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Customs, as commissioners on the part of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to participate with him in the conference.

At the first conference, on 10th February, the commissioner stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 (which was terminated in 1866 by the action of the Congress of the United States), with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

I have often been curious to know what was meant by this extension and modification of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. I did expect at times that the Government would claim they meant that they were willing to go beyond natural products, and the language perhaps would have borne them out in that assertion. I do not think that I ever heard the assertion made; but expected at times that it would be made, as the ambiguity of the language left room for doubt. Mr. Blaine throws light on the subject. He seems to have been troubled also with a little curiosity on the subject, and he says :

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles should be confined to natural products and should not embrace manufactured articles.

So that settles our Finance Minister's meaning on that point :

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854 nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone ; and that, in view of the great development of industrial interests of the United States and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favoured exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favours to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty on their introduction into Canada.

The reply given them was that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States and Canada, and that other countries which are not parties to it should not enjoy gratuitously the favours which the two neighbouring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations and at a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.

Upon receiving this reply, the Canadian commissioners asked that the further consideration of the subject be adjourned till another conference, to enable them to consult as to the course which they would adopt in view of the foregoing declaration.

In the conference of the 11th the Canadian commissioners stated that they had given careful consideration to the suggestion that manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for exchange in a reciprocity convention, and to the desire expressed by the Government of the United States that such American goods on their introduction into Canada should be accorded preferential treatment over similar goods from other countries ; and they announced, with an expression of regret, that they did not consider it possible to meet the expectations of the Government of the United States in these respects. In the first place they encountered a serious obstacle in the matter of revenue. If any considerable list of manufactured goods of the United States should be admitted free into Canada, it would entail a material loss to the Dominion Treasury, and if the same favours were likewise extended to the merchandise of other countries the loss of revenue would be much greater. They felt that they would not be able to recoup these losses by other methods of taxation. In the second place, it seemed to be impossible for the Canadian Government, in view of its present political relations and obligations, to extend to American goods a preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was a part of the British Empire, they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial arrangement with the United States, from the benefits of which Great Britain and its colonies should be excluded.

The announcement of these conclusions of the Canadian commissioners was accepted as a bar to further negotiations on this subject, and it was not again discussed, except in connection with the fishing privileges on the Atlantic coast.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the documents I have presented to the House, emanating from American authorities, that the general assimilation of the tariffs of the

two countries was not proposed, that it was not deemed necessary. It is further evident from these documents that the American authorities at Washington were prepared to enter upon reciprocity negotiations, not upon the basis of unrestricted, but upon the basis of partial, reciprocity in goods. Mr. Blaine said to the commissioners, according to his own statement and according to the statement of Secretary Foster, that if the natural products of Canada were to be admitted free into the markets of the United States, the United States would require from Canada the concession of corresponding privileges, that they would require from Canada the admission into the Canadian markets, not of an unlimited variety of the manufactures of the United States, but a list of manufactured goods to be agreed upon, and he invited a proposal from the Canadian commissioners as to what list of manufactured goods they would be willing to concede. He invited their proposals intimating that he was ready to treat. He did not lay down the ultimatum ; he did not say : We must have admitted into the Canadian markets all the manufactured articles of the United States. He invited them to make proposals, and said it would be necessary to have a list of manufactured goods, etc. ; from all we can gather from the language of Mr. Blaine that list might have been an extensive one or it might be a restricted one. I believe it was possible for the commissioners of Canada to have secured a treaty at that time by the suggestion of a list of manufactured goods, little, if any, more extensive than the list embraced in the Brown draft treaty. And I repeat that they might have suggested a list of goods to be admitted free from the United States which could have received preferential treatment in the markets of Canada without great injury to British trade in this country. We import a great variety of articles from the United States almost exclusively. We import coal oil, barbed wire, agricultural implements, locomotives, cars, steam threshers, axes, spades and a great variety of tools and other manufactures, and we could have suggested an extensive list of manufactured goods. If the commissioners had acted upon the suggestion and invitation of Mr. Blaine and had proposed that list to him for his consideration, we could then have known whether we could have obtained a reciprocity treaty on terms admissible or favourable to this country or not. But the commissioners refused to open negotiations at all ; they refused to adopt a single diplomatic expedient. They said in effect : Here are our terms ; admit our raw materials free of duty or throw up the negotiation, as you please. That was the best possible way of securing the defeat of the purpose they professed to have in view when they visited Washington. Sir, I assert, as I have asserted repeatedly before, that we can get a reciprocity treaty with the United States upon fair and equitable terms. The

Government could have had it upon favourable terms, even from the Republican Administration at Washington, and still better opportunities are afforded now that the Democratic Administration is in power. I repeat that the Government trifled with the interests of this country, they deceived the people of the country, they went to Washington, not to get a treaty, but to make a treaty impossible. They did not want a treaty. They made such proposals as they knew would defeat reciprocity; they did it deliberately, with malice aforethought, without any intention, desire or hope of getting a treaty, and they spurned the proposition made by the American authorities, the reasonable proposition, inviting them to make a proposal. The American authorities said: We are ready to open negotiations; let us talk this matter over; let us see how far you would go in admitting our manufactures free into your country; suggest a list of goods and let us talk it over and see about it. But our representatives said: "No; we suggest no list; we will not admit into Canada a single article of your manufactured goods; we demand as an ultimatum that you shall accede to our terms *holus bolus*, or we will throw up the negotiations." Then the Minister comes back here with what Mr. Blaine said with regard to the difficulty as to wool and woollens; pointing out to him, according to his own statement, that it would be necessary to have a uniform tariff on wool and woollens; that it would not do to have Canada admitting wool free and the United States charging 10 cents per pound, and then exchanging goods manufactured from wool on a free trade basis; and when Mr. Blaine pointed out this and said there should be a uniform tariff in reference to wool and woollens our representatives come back and say that Mr. Blaine demanded a uniform tariff for the whole list, and that upon the lines of the American tariff. The assertion is absurd, especially in view of Mr. Blaine's express declaration that it is not true, and Secretary Foster's declaration that it is not true, together with the internal evidence contained in Minister Foster's report. It seems the most natural thing in the world that the difficulty between the parties is explained by the discovery that Mr. Blaine referred to a single article and that Minister Foster supposed his reference was to all articles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I believe the question of veracity is obviated. It was a most distressing and unfortunate position of things to have the Secretary of State of the United States, who is dead, and the Secretary of State of the United States who succeeded that great Secretary, Mr. Blaine, making a statement diametrically and exactly and positively opposite to the statement made by the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury-benches in this House. I am glad to have a loophole through which we can see how to

Mr. CHARLTON.

reconcile the differences and to establish the fact that that difficulty rests upon a misunderstanding on the part of Minister Foster and his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, we shall have this reciprocity treaty discussed again. The issue is not dead; the necessity of obtaining reciprocity has not ceased, the need of this country for a wider market and for its natural market is as great as ever; the people of Canada are as desirous of obtaining reciprocity as they ever were. The people have been misled; they have been led to suppose that difficulties existed surrounding this question, difficulties of an insuperable character, while, upon close investigation, we find that these difficulties vanish away. There is no difficulty in obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States in my opinion, but we cannot have it all our own way. We cannot have the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which worked so greatly to our advantage that we exported \$2 worth of goods free of duty that formerly bore a duty, where we imported \$1 worth from the United States formerly dutiable. We cannot expect to have a reciprocity treaty exclusively in our own interest. If we are to sell the United States untold millions of the natural products of this country, if we are to secure that trade which will increase millions upon millions annually, we have got to give something in consideration for the advantage; we have got to make a reciprocity treaty, and a reciprocity treaty means a mutually advantageous treaty, where the advantages are reciprocal between the contracting parties. If we obtain access to that market, we have got to give them access to some extent to our market, and it should be the care of the Government to ascertain if that can be done; when invited to make a proposition they should be ready to make one; they should endeavour to secure a treaty. They did not endeavour to do that in 1891 and in 1892; they made no effort to get a treaty; their whole course warrants me in asserting that they did not desire to make a treaty. That was not their object when they went to Washington. Their purpose was to deceive the country during the elections, in order to deprive the Liberal party of the advantage that an appeal to the country in favour of reciprocity, would naturally give them. Their object was to deceive the people, to make them believe that the Conservative party were as favourable to reciprocity and as likely to obtain it, as the Liberals were. Then, when they obtained power, they went to Washington ostensibly to carry out the purposes they professed to have in view, but actually to block the road to obtaining reciprocity, and they did do this by making proposals that were not admissible, asking for things that were unattainable; and they came back to the people of this country professing to have met difficulties

that did not exist, and now they are discredited as to their truthfulness and their honesty towards the people, by the revelation of facts that has subsequently been made.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Finance Minister speaks, I want to call his attention to one or two subjects that I hope he will deal with when we go into committee on this Bill. Knowing how anxious the House is for pro-rogation, I shall be very brief. I shall appeal to him as a gentleman who has occupied one of the most important positions that one can occupy, namely, that of a professor in a university. The item of the tariff, Departmental No. 760, and Act 245 C, reads as follows:—

Books specially imported for the *bona fide* use of free libraries, not more than two copies of one book, bound or unbound, which have been printed or manufactured more than twenty years.

Now, I would call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to the fact that this item works very harshly in regard to students engaged in the higher studies at preparatory schools, and in universities and colleges. As my hon. friend the Finance Minister knows, a classical book, an edition of a classic prepared for schools or universities over twenty years ago, is useless to-day. Any man engaging in the higher studies wishes to confine himself to the very best editions. Take Anthon's Horace, or Anthon's Homer, or any of the best books with which we are familiar. When my contemporaries were at school they studied these books, but they would be very ignorant men at the present day. The discoveries of Schleiman, the discoveries of the great university critics, have revolutionized classical criticism as much as the inventions of inventors have revolutionized the world of science. It would, I think, be quite out of keeping that I should enforce this proposition by illustrations when speaking in a practical and busy assembly like this. But, Sir, I think that probably my hon. friend will take my statement, and, in fact, he must be familiar with the facts himself. This item works harshly to our young men who are going in for the higher studies. They are nearly all poor young men, and yet they have to pay the duty on the best classical books. Now, what I shall propose when we go into committee, I bring forward now in this Ways and Means debate, because I think that probably I shall not have an equally favourable opportunity of calling the Minister's attention to it again. When we get into committee, I shall move to substitute the following for the clause I read:—

Books specially imported for the *bona fide* use of public free libraries—not less than two copies of any one book, and books bound or unbound, which have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years ago, and books of criticism on the Greek, Latin, Hebrew and Sanscrit literatures, or kindred literatures derived from these, and books relating to arch-

æology, philology and the mathematical, metaphysical, physical, chemical, geological and biological sciences.

Mr. FOSTER. What have you left?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, very little. Now, I want to point out to the Minister this anomaly: pictures, the great works of the pictorial art, are admitted free, although we know very well that persons who import these works of art are gentlemen like the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), great millionaires. It is a very beautiful peculiarity of the millionaire on this continent that when he becomes rich he becomes a connoisseur of pictures. It is one of the most beautiful results of the increase of wealth, that as a man's balance at his banker's increases, his aesthetic perception of the higher art increases accordingly. I say that that is a providential arrangement for which we may be very thankful, for the result is that pictures of the highest art are brought in. I believe it adds to the value of the picture that it should be expensive for these gentlemen, and we might as well get the duty. It would add greatly to the value of the picture if we put 25 per cent more on the fancy price that they have to pay now, for a great work of Correggio or Raphael, or any other of the great painters. But to charge this duty to the poor classical students who have very little money is doubly wrong. First, we ought not to charge them at all; but charging them as we do we infallibly relegate them to the study of obsolete books. I will just mention, as there are classical scholars listening to me, one fact by way of illustration. Two or three years ago, I think, Mr. Verrall published an edition of the Agamemnon of Eschylus. Prior to the publication of that book, the idea that prevailed in every university in Europe concerning the plot of this work, contained absolutely ludicrous and incredible elements. Mr. Verrall has scattered that completely to the winds, and he has shown that there was no large credulity demanded of an Athenian audience by the dramatist, who knew that critical audience so well. Now, that is one of the things in regard to which, when we get into Committee of the Whole, I shall ask the hon. Finance Minister whether he will not take off the duty. I hope he will consent to have the duty on agricultural implements lowered. I think if he will do that, it will be a great thing. I shall ask him to lower the duty on barbed wire from 1½ cents a pound to, say ½ a cent a pound; a ¼ of a cent a pound would be better. I have a number of resolutions here that I would certainly move in committee if it were not that the House is hurrying to pro-rogation. I may mention, however, that one of the things to which I intended to call my hon. friend's attention was the protection of the farmers in regard to pork. The Government is under a complete delusion in regard to the protection afforded to our farmers on pork. No doubt the Minister of Finance thinks he has given the farmers a great deal

more protection than they really enjoy. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. The item, barrelled pork, reads as follows:—

Barrelled pork in brine, made from the sides of heavy hogs after the hams and shoulders are cut off, and containing not more than sixteen pieces to the barrel of 200 pounds weight, 1½ cents per pound, the barrel containing the same to be free of duty.

What has happened in regard to this item? I do not think the Minister of Finance knows. The importing merchant has cut the pieces small, and sold that imported pork as if it were Canadian pork; and the consequence is that if you go in to protect the farmer at all you must give him more protection than is given under the tariff in regard to pork. I had intended to deal further with this subject; to speak on coal oil, sugar and cotton; but I fear if I were to draw too much on the good feeling of the House and of the Minister of Finance I might effect nothing. I hope that in regard to books especially, my suggestion will be considered. I have received letters from the presidents and professors of some of the universities throughout the country, and while it would naturally have escaped those hon. gentlemen, the predecessors of my hon. friend, yet the Minister of Finance has not any excuse, for he has had the means of knowing the great advantage to a man's education of classical erudition. Let the hon. gentleman, at all events, consider my suggestions in regard to books and barbed wire. In speaking at a previous period of the Ways and Means debate and on this tariff matter, I laid down the proposition that we should be placed in the position that if we made suggestions to the hon. Minister of Finance after he made his financial statement, he ought to be in a position to listen to us and act on our suggestions; whereas, the theory that obtains here is this: when the Minister of Finance has made his financial statement, it is a hard, iron wall, and there must be no breaking down and no bending in it whatever. I alluded at that time—and I ask hon. members to bear with me for a few moments, for I will be very brief—to a debate that took place in the English House of Commons in 1851. Lord Naas moved to reduce the duty on home-made spirits in bond. A discussion took place, and the Government were beaten. Mr. Roebuck rose and asked what the Government were going to do in regard to what had occurred in the House. He said:

At the commencement of the session we were told that certain things were to be done as to the tariff of this country. The Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave an intimation of what he intended to do.

Mr. Roebuck further stated that he wished to put a question to the noble lord at the head of the Government in regard to the extraordinary circumstances in which the Government of the country were placed. This is what Lord Russell said:

Mr. DAVIN.

I come now to the division which took place on the motion of the hon. member for Montrose (Mr. Hume). I do not consider that that division was of the nature of which the learned gentleman spoke—namely, a division declaring that he meant to take the Government into his own hands. I consider that all those questions of taxation and burdens are questions upon which the House of Commons, representing the country, have peculiar claims to have their opinions listened to, and upon which the Executive Government may very fairly, without any loss of its dignity, provided they maintain a sufficient revenue for the credit of the country and for its establishment, reconsider any particular measures of finance which they have proposed.

And still bearing in mind the suggestion I was presumptuous enough to make to the leader of the House and the Minister of Finance, that in future I would fain hope we might see the practice prevail, which prevailed in England, and which Mr. Gladstone said should always prevail—a statement made in Committee of Ways and Means, and made under circumstances that would not lead to angry discussion, but to friendly conference on the affairs of the country, which we are discussing as though we were a large firm, I will not say a firm in which there are many sleeping partners, but a large firm engaged in discussing important questions affecting the country. When Mr. Gladstone, in 1866, was giving notice of what he would do in regard to finance, he made this statement:

The House will therefore be good enough to understand that I propose on Thursday next, in Committee of Ways and Means to make the usual financial statement, and I will venture to offer an observation on that subject, which is intended entirely for the convenience of the House and which they will please to put in practice according as they see fit. The old and regular practice of the House, until quite recently, was this: That after a financial statement, an opportunity was given to hon. Members of rising in pretty quick succession one after the other, to put questions to the Minister with respect to any point requiring explanation. There was very great convenience in that practice, because it brought the whole matter into a very small compass, and enabled gentlemen to obtain at once whatever information they might desire.

Then the hon. gentleman said what I have indicated did occur. He continued:

Of late years there has been a tendency to substitute for that practice a general debate on the Budget, and the consequence is, that hon. gentlemen have often great difficulty in putting questions which, if they had an opportunity of putting, the whole plan would have gone forth to the country in a more complete and intelligible form.

What I want to call attention to is this—

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. DAVIN. Who calls out question? Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that it is very important to have a short session; but it is of much more importance to carry on the business of the country, and with the permission of the hon. gentleman, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will attend to the business I have now in hand, and to the

business of my constituents. What I want to point out is this: that the whole statement of the case contemplated here by Mr. Gladstone is a statement of the case comprised of the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of England plus facts brought out by questions from various parts of the House, from Ministerial members and from members of the Opposition—or, in other words, a presentment of the House itself to the country. On 3rd May, 1866, Mr. Gladstone made his financial statement, and that financial statement, which I have more than once read, and which I had the privilege of hearing, is one of his greatest statements. Here is the way in which he commenced that address. He said:

It will indeed be my duty to enter upon points in the course of the remarks I have to make, which, as I think, possess an interest to all in this House, and especially for those who are connected with the land and fixed property of the country. I hope, however, from the nature of the proposals I have to make, and indeed I feel convinced upon the matter, that it can only be through my own negligence or inadvertence if anything which falls from me should possibly come into conflict with the feeling or opinions of any hon. gentleman opposite.

I say that it is worthy of the attention of the House and of the Government, and especially worthy of the attention of the Minister of Finance, and the financial critic of the Opposition, whether we should not have our financial statement made under conditions that would permit its being discussed away from the heat and disturbing passions of any party conflict. But, Sir, I called attention at an earlier part of these few remarks, especially to the books, the agricultural implements and the barbed wire. I will not refer now to cottons, because I am afraid at this late period of the session to load up too much. I hope my hon. friend the Finance Minister will see his way, and it will be a graceful thing on the part of an ex-university professor, to be the first to get rid of this grievance on the part of classical students.

Mr. BORDEN. Before this Bill to amend the tariff passes its first reading, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance to explain to the House what provision it contains with reference to the transport of coal oil imported into this country, and as to which he promised in his Budget speech there would be an improvement. The hon. Minister used the following words in his financial statement:—

There is, outside of that, a condition imposed upon trade and transport which has the effect of protecting that industry to a large extent, possibly to the extent of 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon, arising from the fact that transport is limited to certain vessels and in certain directions, and that the oil is subject to inspection, of course. This is outside of the straight protection, and what the Government propose to do, and they have thought over this matter very carefully, is to propose to this House that the transport shall be free and that the straight duty shall remain for the present as it is. In that way, the abnormal and heightened protection, so to speak, will be taken away

and transport will be left free to modern methods, and at the same time a large, I acknowledge it, and, I hope, a sufficient protection will be left to the industry, enough to serve it for the present at least.

I think that by the term "modern methods," the House understood that the idea was intended to be conveyed, that instead of limiting the importation of coal oil to importation in casks as at present, upon which a large duty is charged as well as a large inspection fee per cask, that there should be freedom to import coal oil in bulk by tank cars or by tank steamers. I have learned however, that it is the intention under this Bill to restrict the importation to tank cars, and that the privilege is not to be extended to tank steamers. My attention was called to this fact by a large firm of wholesale oil merchants in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to interfere with my hon. friend's address on this subject, but I just wish to point out that the Controller of Inland Revenue has a Bill in reference to this, which is already printed in English, and which, by the consent of the House, I hope we will be able to take up to-day. Would it not be better for the hon. gentleman to defer the discussion on this subject until we come to the Bill, just for the sake of getting through the business?

Mr. BORDEN. I think what I have to say is much more germane to the Bill now before us, and I shall detain the House very briefly indeed. The statement made to me is this: That so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, if the importation of oil in bulk is restricted to tank cars, the advantage proposed to be given will be really no advantage whatever; that owing to the long distance from the point at which the oil is refined in the United States, the cost of bringing the oil by tank cars will be as great as the present cost of importing it in casks, after the duty is paid and the high inspection fee charged. There is no question but that the natural route for importing goods into the Maritime provinces is by water, and there seems to be no good reason, if these restrictions are to be relaxed in reference to coal oil, why the same methods should not be permitted in the importation of coal oil as are permitted with reference to other goods. That is to say, that the people of the Maritime provinces shall have the privilege of importing coal oil in bulk by water, just as they have the privilege now of importing all kinds of goods by water from the United States. It is also pointed out that the restriction against importing oil in tank steamers will be a direct discrimination against the Maritime provinces in favour of the larger provinces, and that the effect of the so-called promised reduction in the price of coal oil to the consumers in the Maritime provinces, as proposed by the hon. gentleman in his Budget speech, will be nullified. The consumers in the Maritime provinces would not benefit in

the slightest degree by this proposed relaxation in the mode of transporting coal oil, if it is not allowed to be imported in tank steamers. What possible reason can there be for restricting the importation to tank cars, unless it be for the purpose of discriminating in favour of the railways? Now, as I understood the hon. gentleman's Budget speech, it was that the people of this country should be relieved to a certain extent of the admittedly too high tax imposed upon coal oil, and that that relief should not be limited to any particular portion of the Dominion, but should be extended to all Canada. If that could be done by the importation of oil in tank cars, well and good, but it seems to me, from the facts that I have stated, that, so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, they will be denied the promised benefit. One word with reference to the relative quantities of coal oil imported into the Maritime provinces and into the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I desire to point out to the House that for every gallon of coal oil imported into the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, per head of the population, there are two and a half gallons of coal oil imported into the Maritime provinces per head of the population, and, therefore, at this moment, there is a direct discrimination against the people of the Maritime provinces with reference to the tax collected upon coal oil in this country. If the representations that are made to me, and of which I have given an outline, are correct, it is now proposed by the Government that that portion of the Dominion which imports two and a half times per head more of coal oil, and therefore pays two and a half times more per head into the Treasury than the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, shall be denied relief under the proposal now made to this House. I might point out also, in regard to binder twine, the only other article in which it is proposed to give any relief to the people of this country, that the Maritime provinces do not participate, in the slightest degree, in the proposed benefit, because they do not use binder twine. Their methods of farming are such that it is not necessary for them to use it. Therefore, if it be a fact that the people of the Maritime provinces are to be denied the privilege of importing coal oil in tank steamers, and not using binder twine, it would seem that the proposed relief from taxation, small as it is, will not benefit them in the slightest particular. I desire, as I said in opening, to get from the hon. Minister a statement as to what provisions are to be made with reference to a relaxation of the provisions as to the importation of coal oil.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it would be best to enter into a discussion of that question at the present time, inasmuch as it forms the subject of a Bill which will be reached in a few hours, and upon which the whole

Mr. BORDEN.

question can be discussed. The provisions of that Bill show what is intended. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I do not propose, at this late hour of the session, to weary the House by making a formal reply. His assertions have been strong. His imputations of bad faith and deception have been reiterated. My own position has already been stated to the House; the documents have been brought down; and I am quite willing to let my statement and those documents go to the country together, and leave the country to judge. After the dog days are over, and we shall have received the benefits of our invigorating autumn climate and come back here next session, there may be some hours to devote to this very interesting topic. As to my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), he is always reminiscent and always persuasive. He never fails to attack me on my weak point, and I was almost on the point of yielding when he went back and called up the classic ages and initiated me once more into the delights of my student days. I resisted the temptation, however, and all I can say to my hon. friend is that whilst the matters he has mentioned shall have the closest attention of the Government, I think the policy of the Government has been pretty well decided upon; so that all these matters, except those dealt with in the tariff Bill now before the House, will have to form part of the general question, and, if action is taken upon them, part of the general tariff which we hope to bring down next year. I would not like to go into new matters at this stage of the session; and, without saying that my sympathies do not go very much in the direction stated, I merely wish to put in the disclaimer as to whether, at this time of the session, it is possible for us to enlarge the scope of the tariff changes which have been made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, it was not my fortune to be present in the House, except for a short time, on the evening when the subject of discussion between the hon. Minister of Finance and my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was brought up, and, therefore, I was forced to refer to the newspapers to ascertain what happened, and when I read an account of the scene in one of the leading journals of the country, given by its correspondent at the capital—who, of course, in order to maintain his reputation for the descriptions he gives of the proceedings in the House, would be careful not to speak in extravagant terms—I have been led to wonder what has shorn the Finance Minister of his strength in not attempting to reply to my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Having read what took place on the previous occasion, I was prepared for an effort on the part of the Finance Minister to-day. I find that one of the correspondents, viewing the scene from

above, calmly and impartially, we will suppose, and careful of his reputation in describing it, was forced to refer to it in words like these :

I have never before seen a member of the Government, in reply, so thoroughly use up, so utterly paralyze, so completely jump on, drag out and whip both the leader and his chief followers, as was done to-night.

Well, that was not all. He took up the members of the Opposition in detail. In his reference to the leader of the Opposition, we are told :

No greater speech was ever made in the House of Commons than that of the Finance Minister in following the leader of the Opposition. A more thorough rejoinder could not possibly be conceived. He, too, struck straight from the shoulder, but his blows were those of a giant in debate as compared with a fledgling. He aptly characterized the Opposition leader's speech as a miserable apology for unrestricted reciprocity, upon which he and his party had been defeated before, and upon which they would be defeated again. He fairly scorned his opponent when he compared the breadth and width of his free trade utterances at Hamilton and Toronto to the smallness of his policy to-night. He took up every point of Mr. Laurier's address—some he ridiculed out of existence ; some he demolished with hard facts ; all he disposed of. He scored the new evangel of taxation to the quick, and scornfully asked him : When the United States and Canada had both reduced their tariffs to the necessities of revenue only, where did he expect to get his basis for a reciprocity ? It was a royal effort, and when he got through the Liberal leader's effort was a thing of shreds and patches, a thing to be remembered with pity, albeit with scorn.

But that was not all. He paid some attention to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has, this afternoon, reiterated the statement he made on a former occasion, that the Government had gone to the country on false pretenses at the last election. I have been amused that there is no answer to-day, because I find it stated that, on the previous occasion :

Mr. Charlton has a habit of making assertions which he cannot prove and of stubbornly refusing to withdraw them when corrected. Twice had he particularly offended in that respect during his speech the other day. To-night the Finance Minister turned upon him, and if ever a man had a bad quarter of an hour it was the truly good representative from North Norfolk. Mr. Foster simply nailed him to the cross and crucified him. That is the only way in which it can be described.

Shocking scene, Sir, to be enacted in the House of Commons. But that is not enough for this giant, whose passions had been aroused, for the correspondent tells us :

Mr. Davies had offended in somewhat like respect. Mr. Foster devoted ten minutes to him and flayed him alive. Next Mr. Paterson, of Brant, had made misstatements, and he received due and scarifying attention.

Now, there is hope, I thought, of finding some pity in the breast of this giant ; after crucifying and flaying he was content with scarifying. But it was only a lull in the tempest of his fury, for we read :

And while his hand was in the Minister took up the whole party as a body and gave them a roasting that made them howl. Oh, but it did hurt them. They could not stay out of the House, they could not sit still in the House. Even Sir Richard, usually impassive enough, was in a towering rage, and there was gnashing of teeth on all sides.

Contrast that description with the weak attitude of the Minister to-day in not venturing to make his position good. After having made an attack which this correspondent described as equal to the crucifixion of a man, we see him to-day sheltering himself behind the excuse that we have not time to discuss this question—a question as to which there was a dispute on a point of fact between the two gentlemen, in regard to which the hon. Minister said that the hon. member for North Norfolk had departed from the truth. Sir, turning from this scene of slaughter, one would naturally inquire what weapons were used to accomplish this mighty slaughter. We have read in sacred history the instance of a man of supernatural strength, who had, with a part of the anatomy of an animal, slain a thousand of his enemies at one time—part of the anatomy of an animal which, however docile in its nature, when alive, is somewhat stubborn also. But I do not want it to be understood that I make any personal allusion to the Minister of Finance in this. Far be it from me to do that. I would not like to give any one the impression that I do not admire an able speaker, and that the Finance Minister is one can be readily seen, but it would appear that it was by the words which issued from his mouth that he wrought this slaughter in the Chamber. I turned up "Hansard" to see what were the words of irony and scorn with which he slew my hon. friend. I found that he charged him with being an elder of the Presbyterian church, with professing to be a Christian, and with being a stickler for Sabbath laws. Well, I have not heard that my hon. friend has since resigned the position of elder of the church ; I have not heard that he is less careful in his observance of the Sabbath ; but I see him, undaunted and unchanged in these respects, challenging the statement of the Finance Minister, and adducing proof of his position, and the Finance Minister has not been able to find time in which to make a reply, but promises to renew the conversation at another time. Sir, I think it was worth the time of the Finance Minister to have attempted a reply to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Sir, that hon. gentleman charged that this Government went before the country under false pretenses at the last general election. He charged more particularly that the Finance Minister, in his mission to Washington, had not honestly attempted to secure a reciprocity treaty, which would be in the interests of this country, but had gone there knowing that he could not secure, on the lines he made up his mind to lay down, what he professed to be anxious to

secure ; and that, instead of helping forward a movement in that direction in the interest of the people of Canada, the Finance Minister and his colleagues rather attempted to injure and prevent the chances of any treaty being consummated in the future. I recognize the fact that the House is not desirous of hearing subjects discussed at any great length, but I think it was worth the while of the Finance Minister to have attempted to reply to the statements made and the proofs adduced in support of the position taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Resolutions authorizing the granting of subsidies to certain railway companies and the construction of the railways therein mentioned, were read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MILITIA LAND GRANTS.

Bill (No. 74) to make further provisions respecting Grants of Land to Members of the Militia Force on Active Service in the Northwest was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. How many in the active service will participate in the operations of this Act ?

Mr. DALY. I cannot give the number. This is to meet the case of those who became entitled to scrip since the Act of last session. The Act of last session provided that they would all have to select their lands and apply their scrip on or before 31st December, 1891. It was found that some of them have not done so, and this is to extend the time, in order to enable them to apply their scrip and select their lands.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the hon. gentleman no idea of the number entitled to that privilege ?

Mr. DALY. Speaking from memory, four or five.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

PATENT ACT.

Bill (No. 110) to amend the Patent Act was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. FOSTER. The object is to have an additional or third copy of the claim or claims to avoid copying in the department.

On section 2.

Mr. FOSTER. This empowers the deputy-commissioner to sign. Hitherto only the commissioner, who is the Minister, has been authorized to sign. And, as the number is very large, this becomes a great tax upon the Minister who has to sign them all.

On section 3.

Mr. FOSTER. Subsection 2 of the Act which was amended provides that if a partial fee only is paid, the proportion of the fee paid shall be stated in the patent, and the patent shall, notwithstanding anything therein or in the Act contained, cease at the end of the time for which the partial fee has been paid, unless at or before the expiration of the said term the holder of patent pays the fee for the further term of five or ten years and so on. This merely extends it to six or twelve years.

Mr. MULLOCK. You had better strike out the words "at or," because the holder should make application for renewal before the expiration.

Mr. FOSTER. This follows exactly the verbiage of the old Act.

Mr. MULLOCK. But it has been condemned by this House ; we have had to pass special Acts to arrange difficulties arising out of this phraseology.

Mr. FOSTER. What is your suggestion ?

Mr. MULLOCK. Strike out the words "at or."

Mr. FOSTER. I should not think there would be any objection to that.

On section 4.

Mr. FOSTER. This is simply to provide against an abuse. The Act as it is makes the fee to be paid with application for a patent \$2, and a practice is arising of a person making application at one time for more than one patent. I hold a letter in my hand in which a person gives notice that he is going to apply for eight or ten different patents and proposes to pay only \$2 for the whole. The idea is that he should pay a fee upon each separate patent.

Mr. MULLOCK. A large sum of money is collected in the patent office in excess of all disbursements and this represents a profit which may be said to come out of unsuccessful applications for patents. Applicants are now obliged to deposit a fee with their application in order to have their applications and specifications examined. This is all lost if the application is not successful. This is

in effect a fine on ingenuity which is none the less ingenuity because it makes its work known a little late in point of time. I believe \$40,000 a year is made in clear profit out of the department and I would suggest that the Government during recess should look into the matter and see if the return of a part of the fee cannot be provided for.

Mr. FOSTER. I will call the attention of the Minister to the point.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CARLETON BRANCH RAILROAD.

Mr. FOSTER (for Mr. Haggart) moved second reading of Bill (No. 122) to confirm the sale of the Carleton, city of St. John. Branch Railroad. He said: This Bill is printed only in English, but it is a merely "pro forma" thing with reference to the sale of this branch road which Parliament authorized three years ago and which has taken place. This is merely to confirm the sale.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. DALY moved second reading of Bill (No. 109) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: This Bill is to provide for the giving of homestead entries to a number of squatters on school lands in the province of Manitoba. These people squatted on these lands between the years 1874 and 1882; and under the provision of the Dominion Lands Act, it would be impossible for us to deal with these lands except by an Act of Parliament. The squatters had no other portion of the country at that time open to them for settlement, and we feel it would be dealing very harshly with them indeed if, after they have made large improvements upon those lands, the lands were sold at auction, because in many instances the property would pass away from them. In order to settle the long-standing grievance—I think there are sixteen or seventeen cases—we have decided to ask the House for legislation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to sell to these people at the price of ordinary vacant lands at that date, or to make a free gift of them?

Mr. DALY. We make them a free gift of the homestead entries. Of course, we will have to provide land in lieu of these different quarter-sections to make up the school lands.

Mr. DAVIN. I see there is nothing in this Bill dealing with the question of the exemption of a man's homestead. My hon. friend, I suppose, intends to deal with it in another Bill, which I hope he will do before this session terminates. It is a very important question in which our people in the North-

west, as he knows, are deeply interested. I called my hon. friend's attention to it early in the session, and I have good hope that before the session terminates, we will have a short Bill dealing with the subject of exemptions.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these lands that are now being handed over to the squatters withdrawn from the appropriation of lands for school purposes without any other lands being placed at the disposal of the fund?

Mr. DALY. No; the Bill provides for that in clause 2.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

On the preamble,

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is rather curiously worded. Here are a number of parties specially named, and without anything else in this Act to guide us this would be all a mere hypothesis. You say "upon proof being made." I should suppose before the Government took the responsibility of introducing such an Act, they would be thoroughly satisfied as to the "bona fides" of all these claims. Apparently, they have only doubtful evidence in their hands, or otherwise they would have used positive language instead of hypothetical language.

Mr. DALY. We have full evidence as to the facts of these people having resided upon these lands, cultivated them, and in every way coming within the meaning of the Dominion Lands Act, but in order that they may get homestead patents, they have got to prove this in the usual way. Consequently we require that they should produce that evidence, which means that they have to make the usual affidavits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is clear we are establishing a precedent here which will have to be followed if any other parties are in the same position. If you grant it to these men, you must also grant it to other parties. Now, are any steps being taken in order to assure us that no further applications will follow upon the passage of this Act?

Mr. DALY. I may say that a full inspection was made of all the school lands in Manitoba last year that were squatted upon, and evidence was obtained by the inspectors, and is now in the department. The hon. gentleman will see by these reports that we deal only with those who squatted prior to the 1st of January, 1880—there are no others in Manitoba to-day in the same position as these people are.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why is that arbitrary date fixed?

Mr. DALY. Because, after that date these lands and others were thrown open to settlement. After the 1st of January, 1880, there

were lands surveyed further west that were open for homestead entry. The reason why these people that are dealt with here squatted upon those lands, was that those lands were all withdrawn from entry in 1874, as the hon. gentleman will recollect. We had no other lands open at that time, and they squatted on these school lands. It has been a matter of continual grievance with them ever since they squatted on these lands, and we find that the only way to deal with them and settle the grievance is to give them homesteads upon their giving the usual proof required by the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Manitoba Government, I presume, had a sort of proprietary interests in these lands as trustees of the people of Manitoba ?

Mr. DALY. They were consulted, they have been communicated with, and there was no objection ; on the contrary, Mr. Greenway informed me that he was very glad indeed that I had taken the matter in hand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Were not these lands surveyed at the time these men entered upon them as squatters ?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We proceed upon the assumption that these men acted in utter ignorance of the law. The lands were surveyed and set apart as school lands, and I can hardly understand how they could ignorantly be settled upon.

Mr. DALY. They knew they were school lands. We do not say in this Bill that they were ignorant of the fact.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On which they went in good faith and in ignorance of the law. If so, we are making a recital that is contrary to the facts.

Mr. DALY. It is a fact that the people were ignorant of the law. They were ignorant of the law in this respect, that, although they knew they were school lands, they were ignorant of the conditions surrounding their acquirement. That is the information I have received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. Minister to say that the reason why these lands were settled was not ignorance, but the fact that there were no other lands on which to squat. The Minister found the parties there, and the lands had been surveyed and were known to the parties to be school lands.

Mr. DALY. That is very true, but the parties were ignorant of the law in relation to school lands. Even to-day people are ignorant as to the manner in which school lands can be disposed of. Only last week I received a letter from a man who has been a resident there for some time, and he asks how he could buy school lands, when, as a matter of fact, the law provides only one

Mr. DALY.

way in which they can be dealt with. That is the kind of ignorance of the people in regard to this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can understand that it may be proper for Parliament to act on behalf of those parties and ratify their claims as squatters, on the ground that those men, in ignorance of the school law, "bona fide" squatted on the lands, and, under the circumstances, they should obtain homestead entry. If the parties had done so, and if it turned out afterwards that they settled down on lands and cultivated them, which turned out, on some technical ground, to be school lands, and lands on which they could not settle, it might be well for Parliament to confirm their settlement. But I cannot understand that there was any ignorance by the parties in this case. Every one knew these were school lands, and not open for pre-emption, and yet we are reciting in the preamble that which we know is not true.

It being six o'clock the committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 109) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. The committee will require an explanation of this section. As I observe the Minister is absent, as well as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), it is desirable to take up some other business.

Committee rose and reported progress.

VOTERS' LISTS, 1893.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the voters' lists of 1893, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Would the Minister state what is the reason of this legislation, and why there should not be a revision of the lists this year ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can give that information to the hon. gentleman in a few words. The object of this short Bill is that there should be no revision of the lists during the present year. In view of that we propose to suspend the amendment of the Franchise Act. In addition to that reason, an amendment of the Franchise Act is a subject that always creates a great deal of discussion in the House, and the Act providing for that amendment is put over until the next year, when the House will have time to discuss

It thoroughly. I think myself that the postponement of the amendment to the Franchise Act will result in a mere perfect measure, inasmuch as more time for consideration can be given than at this late stage of the session.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the Minister of the opinion that there is a general wish that there should be no revision this year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I think so too.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). We will have enough to do to look after the Ontario lists next summer.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; and the Ontario lists are revised every year, and there is no wish that there should not be a revision, but this Federal Act is so cumbersome and so expensive, and is such a burden upon the candidates and the people at large, that there is always a sigh of relief when there is to be no revision. I ask, in all seriousness, why in the name of common sense should the Government continue on the Statute-book an Act which they dare not put in force according to the letter of its provisions? As the Minister says, there is a general wish that there should be no revision this year, but, after all the only reason for it is, as I said before, that the Act is cumbersome and expensive, and that every one wishes to be relieved of its burden. If the Government would act in accordance with the logic of events, they would repeal the Franchise Act and revert to the old system of municipal revision of the lists, as is done in Ontario and all the other provinces.

Mr. CASEY. If there is to be no revision this year, I suppose there is to be no election.

Mr. LAURIER. That does not at all follow, we have had experience to the contrary.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They will build up a new House on old lists.

Bill reported.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

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

It is expedient to provide that, for the present session, the deduction of \$8 per day, mentioned in section 26 of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, shall not be made for six days in the case of members who have been absent from a sitting of the House or Committee thereof during such number of days, but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons, nor in the case of any member elected since the commencement of the session shall it apply to days prior to his election.

Resolution considered in Committee and reported.

CIVIL SERVICE INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting Government Civil Service Insurance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave a short explanation of this Bill when it was introduced to the House, and I will now explain its principal provisions. It is a companion Bill to the Superannuation Bill, which was passed by the House yesterday. As hon. gentlemen will remember some complaint was made that a Superannuation Bill—as all Superannuation Bills—provides simply for disability, through a public servant who is unable to perform his duties, and receives an allowance for a time after being disabled, or after becoming unfit for work. But the superannuation system of itself affords nothing for the families of those public servants, who, though upon the superannuation list, die before they are superannuated, and so get no benefit. It was with a view of meeting that branch of the difficulty that the present Civil Service Superannuation Bill has been framed, the object being to give a cheap and safe form of insurance to those civil servants who pay the superannuation abatement; and the amount is limited as to the maximum, so that they shall not use it as a means of amassing wealth for their families whom they may leave behind them, but simply as a fair payment to them after their breadwinners have been taken from them. The contribution which the Government makes to this fund is, in the first place, the management of the insurance, and the buildings, which, although a very heavy charge in the case of an independent insurance company, is of slight or almost no cost to the Government. I went very fully into this feature of the measure with the officers of my department, and I am assured by them that they do not anticipate that much extra cost of a clerical nature will be necessary for a considerable number of years. The Bill puts the insurance matter under the care of the Superintendent of Insurance, and the working of it is confided to the Finance Department as a whole. The charge for expenses and buildings being lifted from this insurance system, it is made by that much cheaper and more profitable to the person insured. The second contribution of the Government, which is really a contribution, is this: Upon all the moneys which are paid in and which remain in the hands of the Government, the Government allow a rate of 6 per cent interest, being a contribution of 2 per cent above the rate at which money is borrowed, taking all charges into consideration—a little more, in fact. By these two means combined, first, taking off the charges for expenses and buildings, and, secondly, the contribution of 2 per cent or about 2 per cent upon the

moneys in the hands of the Government, cheaper insurance is given by a great deal than can be got from any of the regular line companies, taking security into consideration as well. The charge upon the Government at the inception of the scheme is nil, and the charge gradually increases as the number of policies taken out increases. But even when we shall have advanced so far as to have \$4,000,000 of insurance running, the whole charge upon the Government, it is calculated, will be about \$13,000. So that, if you place the two measures together, the superannuation measure and the insurance measure, you have, I think, very nearly a perfect system for the Civil Service. You have a superannuation system which is self-sustaining, or very nearly so, and you have along with it a cheap form of insurance, which costs the Government very little; and the two together entail a minimum charge on the public Treasury while giving a maximum benefit to the service as a whole. Thus we gain in two things—first, in the discipline of the service, and the power to dispense with the services of officers who become disabled by illness or infirmity—

Mr. LAURIER. Or political exigencies.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, if it is not fairly administered; but so long as the present Government has the administration of it, we do not look for anything of that kind, and I hope that the example set by us will be so good that when my hon. friend comes in he will carry on the same good method.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the meaning of the fifteenth section?

Mr. FOSTER. I neglected to state that this system of insurance runs "pari passu" with the new superannuation scheme, and is not open to those who belong to the service at present, and who pay their contributions to the old superannuation fund according to the old abatement. But in order to allow persons of that class, if they wish, to have the advantage of this form of insurance, it is provided by the fifteenth section that if they pay the added abatement they will be allowed the advantage of the insurance. The added abatement, taken in connection with the insurance, together with ages of those in the service, most of them having been in it for a long period of years, will pretty well preclude the great majority of those belonging to the service at present from taking advantage of this measure. Some of the younger men may, but if they do they will have to pay more into the superannuation fund than they do at present.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part, I receive with a great deal of diffidence the very optimistic remarks with which the hon. gentleman has just favoured the House. The Government is to go into the insurance business. I know that it has been often discussed by public writers whether insurance

should be in the hands of the Government, as well as telegraphs, the post office, and so on. We have not yet come to that, but I understand that the Government is going to enter into competition with the insurance companies in the business of insuring a certain class of the community.

Mr. FOSTER. Its own servants.

Mr. LAURIER. Whenever the Government of the country has undertaken to go into any kind of business, it has not generally proved very successful or economical, as in the railway business, but quite the reverse, and I fear that our experience will be the same in this instance. The hon. gentleman says that the Government contributes 2 per cent to the fund. What reason can there be why the people of the country should be taxed to any extent whatever for the support of one class of the community? I can see no adequate reason for it. Civil Servants may be well paid, or they may not; I do not raise that question at this moment; there is, however, no difficulty in filling the ranks. What reason can be adduced why Civil Servants should not pay their own insurance? The hon. gentleman has not given any reason. He has just made the blank statement that the Government intends to contribute 2 per cent to the fund. It is open to every civil servant to-day to insure his own life. The hon. gentleman has not told us what is to be the basis of the premiums which are to be exacted from the civil servants, under that system of insurance; and if I understand the Bill aright, the basis is to be found in the tables which guide insurance companies. Then, if the system is to be based upon these tables, the premiums should be the same. I cannot conceive, from the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the premiums are to be less than what are charged by other companies. The hon. gentleman has given us no figures to show where the economy comes in; and if there is to be an economy for the civil servants, it is to be at the expense of the Government, and I do not see why we should bear the expense. I submit that the whole system of superannuation is a vicious one; but, as we have discussed that already, I will not renew the discussion. The session is so far advanced that I cannot offer opposition to the Bill, which, I am sure, in any event, the majority with its usual leniency would adopt as well as any other piece of legislation introduced by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave no detailed figures, it is true, because I thought what my hon. friend asked for was the basis, and I have given him that. When an insurance company calculates its tables of premiums, it does so on certain bases. First, there are the mortality tables, then the expenses, which are of two kinds. In the first place, there are the expenses of management, which are with every company a very large item. They must have their head offices and their armies of

Mr. FOSTER.

paid agents, who go about the country soliciting policies and who are paid very heavy commissions; so that in the history of every insurance company these management expenses at the head offices and the agencies are a very large item and have to be taken into account when fixing the rates of premium. Then there is that part of the management which consists of the building of fine offices, etc., which are sometimes very expensive. One has only to look over the annual returns of any insurance company, to see what a very large amount these expenses are. In calculating these tables, as well, some regard must be had to the investment of money, and in this case the Government lays down two principles. First, that it does not load it with any expenses of management at all, and therefore the premium rate will become very much less on account of this saving of management expenses. We have no expenses of head office or agents, which is a great saving. Secondly, the Government gives an advantage in this respect: that it gives 6 per cent on the premiums. That is a steady investment; and although in some cases insurance companies may invest their moneys at a larger rate, such investments are intermittent and do not amount, perhaps, to a steady 6 per cent investment all round. These are the two items which make it possible to give members of the Civil Service cheap insurance. Now, for the figures my hon. friend required. Take the age of twenty. Under this arrangement, calculated on the healthy male mortality tables, upon the basis of 6 per cent, persons insuring at the age of twenty, would get a life policy for \$1,000 at \$9.97 per year. In the Confederated Life, without profits, he has to pay \$13.80; in the Standard Life, without profits, he has to pay \$16; in the Travellers' Life, he has to pay \$14.24; in the Canada Life, \$12.80. Take the age of twenty-five years. The insurer under this measure will get his policy for \$11.50 per year. In the Confederated Life he has to pay \$15.55; in the Sun Life, \$16.15; in the Standard Life, \$18.22; in the Travellers', \$15.97, and in the Canada Life, \$14.70. They get the safest kind of life insurance at the lowest cost. My hon. friend asks, what reason is there that the country should pay? There is no particular reason, except one of practical convenience, and, I think, of practical economy. My hon. friend says we may not be successful and that the clerks may not insure. Well, if they do not insure, the Government contribution will be by that much lessened, and if they do insure, our contribution can be no more than we pay by giving them 6 per cent interest on their investment, that is, 2 per cent over the common rate. So I have just this to say, that if you take the two systems and combine them—and they have both been worked out carefully by actuarial calculations by the Superintendent of Insurance, who is thoroughly a master of that matter—they in-

volve an excellent provision for the civil servants, in case of disability, old age, infirmity or sickness, and provide something for the wife and family after death, if death takes them away during their time of service. In those two ways they make good provisions for civil servants, and they do it at the very minimum of cost to the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it provided in the Bill that the insured cannot fail to pay his premiums?

Mr. FOSTER. They are deducted from his salary. If he wishes to retire, he can get his commutation or his paid-up policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If he contracts under this, he does not remain under the Superannuation Act?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, I would like section 15 explained.

Mr. FOSTER. This Act, in the first place, is meant as a companion Act to the one passed yesterday. The persons who come in after the passage of these two Acts, come in under a system of superannuation, and also under a system of insurance. The superannuation they will pay is 3½ per cent and 3, and the insurance they get is on the lines laid down here. It would be manifestly unfair to allow persons now in the service, and who pay only 2 per cent into the superannuation fund, to have the advantage of the second provision; so that they are debarred from being insured under this insurance scheme; but there is a provision by which, if they raise the abatement which they pay to the superannuation fund, they may become eligible for insurance under this scheme. This, as I explained to my hon. friend, would be valuable, on business principles, to a very few of the present civil servants. The young men might choose to accept it, but those who have been for a long time in the service, would not find it profitable to take it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you think the Bill carries out that idea?

Mr. FOSTER. That is what it is meant to carry out.

Mr. CASEY. This Bill involves a false principle. I do not believe that the Government should go into the insurance business for the benefit of members of the Civil Service. The hon. Minister has explained that the cost of management is not provided for, and that he proposes to insure the civil servants at the net cost of insurance, without the loading of which, as he knows, is put upon insurance premiums in ordinary insurance companies. Now, it seems to me that civil servants ought to be put upon the same platform as other people and allowed to make such provision for their families in case of death as they please, and I think that,

when the Government undertakes to insure these people for less than the ordinary rate, they are doing what it is not the business of any Government to do. Therefore, I object to the whole scheme.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not see anything here making the provision for medical inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; there is provision, but not sufficient in my opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. When we come to that clause we can discuss it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister did not give any explanation about that. The Bill provides that when a party applies for insurance he shall furnish the certificate of a doctor with regard to his state of health, etc. Is it the intention of the Government to keep a medical practitioner in the department to examine and pronounce on these certificates before the parties are admitted to the list of the insured? Because, if you are going to take the certificate of every doctor throughout the country, without a careful scrutiny and examination of these reports, you are going to have men placed upon the list as insured whom you may find, in a short time, to be very objectionable subjects for insurance. All insurance companies have a double inspection. First, there is the doctor in the village or town in which the person resides, who applies for insurance and who makes the medical examination. His report is forwarded to the head office, and there subjected to rigid scrutiny by the doctor in the employ of the company. What is the hon. Minister going to provide?

Mr. FOSTER. We can discuss that when we come to the clause.

On section 3,

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to amend this clause to make it read: "The Minister may contract with any person to whom the Civil Service Superannuation Act now applies."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the very point I wish to discuss. The Civil Service Superannuation Act is not yet law, and, therefore, it applies to no one.

Mr. FOSTER. I see your point; we will make that clear. There are two Acts, and, by section 15, under certain conditions, those to whom the present Civil Service Superannuation Act applies may come in. We want to cover the two.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to understand this matter. I have read that section

Mr. CASEY.

until I am tired and I do not understand the intention of it. As it stands, under the first section, this is limited to those who come into the service hereafter. The 15th section provides, "in the event of any person to whom the Civil Service Superannuation Act now applies taking advantage," and so on, a deduction is to be made. Therefore, as I understand it, it does not enable any existing civil servant to take advantage of it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is to meet that point that I propose this amendment. The object is that the Civil Service insurance shall apply to all who come in under the Civil Service Superannuation Bill we passed yesterday, and may apply to those to whom the present Civil Service Superannuation Bill applies on condition of their making a higher payment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose a civil servant to whom the existing superannuation system applies wants to come in under this, does he continue under both?

Mr. FOSTER. He continues under the old Superannuation Act, and takes advantage of this, and the increased abatement goes into the old superannuation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then this 2½ per cent is an additional abatement beyond the 2 per cent he pays under the old Act.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is an additional abatement of ½ per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is a matter that will require further consideration. It is well we should understand it before we go into it.

Mr. FOSTER. I move to amend this clause to make it read, "any person to whom the Civil Service Superannuation Act now applies."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But this Act is not yet passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is the name of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, which is already in existence.

On section 4,

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the Minister what objection there is to having it apply to the service generally?

Mr. FOSTER. Because the whole purpose of it is to meet the case of the civil servant who dies leaving a wife or children.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the man, by attaching a slip or memorandum on the insurance, can describe the manner in which he wants it divided amongst his children. Now, can he, from time to time, alter that description, whether the children are living or dead?

Mr. FOSTER. We have another clause for that.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That contemplates a subsequent declaration.

Mr. FOSTER. That would give a chance for a subsequent apportionment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose the intention is that he may do it in the insurance contract when he makes it, or subsequently.

Mr. FOSTER. Which you can do in any insurance company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Supposing he made that declaration, can he vary it from time to time?

Mr. FOSTER. I should think so.

Mr. FLINT. About how many persons is this likely to apply to after the Act is well in operation?

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot tell. It is entirely dependent upon the appointments.

Mr. FLINT. The Minister must have some idea of about how many there are in the Civil Service.

Mr. FOSTER. About 4,500.

Mr. FLINT. We might have to make it apply to more than 3,000 at the outset.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be a long time hence.

On section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. That gives no finality. I want to add these words:

And if all the persons so entitled die in the lifetime of the insured, the insurance money shall fall into and become a part of the estate of the insured.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose a man has a family and six children, and he insures for the benefit of his wife and children. Suppose that after a number of years none of them die, but one of the boys turns out very disobedient, and the father wishes to cut him off and not allow him any part of the insurance, is there a provision in the Bill that enables him to do that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think he can do that under this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He can do that under the 6th section.

On section 11,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As this is not a matter on which any discretion is capable of being exercised by the Governor in Council, I think the matter should be left in the hands of the Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a mere matter of calculation, and, therefore, can be left with the Minister.

On section 12,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What will be the cost to a civil servant 20 or 21 years of age, who insures his life for \$1,000?

Mr. FOSTER. \$9.97 per annum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do the Government think it is desirable to issue policies for \$500?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is a mere matter of option.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In my opinion, where the rate is so low as 1 per cent, \$1,000 is a sufficiently small amount.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the opinion of the department.

On section 13,

Mr. FLINT. Suppose an applicant should fail in the medical examination, could he make a further application?

Mr. FOSTER. The system will be carried on the same as that of any insurance company. The greatest care will be taken to appoint a reliable physician, who will be looked upon as representing the insurers.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is better to have these details prescribed under the Act. The hon. gentleman may not remain in office forever, and the physicians giving the certificates should be named.

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is a matter of detail.

Mr. McMULLEN. What investigation does the Minister of Finance intend to make in order to prevent imposition being practised? No doubt the hon. gentleman intends to appoint reliable physicians, which is, no doubt, very good in itself, but does the hon. gentleman intend to have the physicians go over the reports of individuals applying for insurance so as to afford another safeguard against imposition?

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever measures are considered necessary by the Superintendent of Insurance, and whatever measures are necessary in a first-class insurance company will be adopted and carried out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The form of certificate might be prescribed by the Superintendent of Insurance or by the Minister, instead of by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it should be by the Minister, and I will amend the section accordingly.

On section 15,

Mr. FOSTER. Let that section stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that this section 15 is intended to apply to the existing Civil Service, and that it is intended to charge any person in the present service who takes a policy, a half per cent more than any one who comes hereafter into the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to see whether that is enough or not. I will look into that.

On section 16,

Mr. LAURIER. I thought there were no new clerks to be appointed ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was just going to say that that is the way the public are not fairly treated in this matter. There is no doubt that you are providing a system of insurance, the best in the world for these civil servants, a lower rate, absolute security, and not charging them anything for expenses of management. Past experience teaches us that you will not go on two or three years before you have quite a staff of officers for this purpose. You will not get a man to write out a policy without extra pay unless the department is different from other departments, and I am pleased to say that the department of the Minister of Finance is in a great many respects an example for the other departments.

Mr. FOSTER. I will see that it is done as long as I am there.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention that the party applying for insurance shall pay the doctor's fees ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I join in the request made by several of the members that the hon. gentleman shall consider the question of dropping clauses 16 and 17. I have no doubt that if he puts in a clause in this Bill saying that the Government are to pay all the expenses that will be incurred incident to the carrying out of the Act, there will not be a man who puts his hand to paper who will not want extra pay. I do object to making express provision for the payment of salaries and incidental expenses at a time when you say you know there will not be any expense.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a bill were incurred in the printing office for printing forms and such like, we must have authority for paying it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman could take a little vote every year, and it would form a capital opportunity for testing from year to year the working of this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will think of that.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BELT IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MARA. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the dispute that exists between the Dominion and the province of British Columbia relating to the boundaries of the 40-mile belt within that province. By the terms of Union it was agreed that the Government of British Columbia should convey to the Dominion Gov-

Mr. FOSTER.

ernment, in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government might deem advisable in furtherance of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an extent of public lands along the line of the railway, throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed 20 miles on each side of the said line, as might be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion Government from the public lands in the North-west Territories and the province of Manitoba. One of the first acts of the Provincial Government, after our province entered Confederation was to withdraw from sale all lands in that province; and for two years after we entered the Union no lands were sold in the whole province. The agreement provided that the surveys should be completed within two years; but as a matter of fact, the time for the completion of the railway had almost expired before the work was commenced. In 1880, the province, at the request of the Dominion Government, conveyed to the Dominion a belt of land 40 miles wide extending from Burrard Inlet up the valley of the Fraser River to the mouth of the Thompson River, thence up the valley of the Thompson to Cranberry and Albreda Lakes, thence across to Tête Jaune Cache, and on to the summit of the Yellow Head Pass. In 1883, the Dominion Government abandoned that line, and asked the province to convey a similar belt of land through the Kicking Horse Pass, which was done in 1884. Previous to that time there had been several questions in dispute between the two Governments, and the Dominion Government sent the late Sir Alexander Campbell to British Columbia to adjust the differences that existed. A settlement was arrived at, which was reduced to a Bill, known in our province as the Settlement Bill. The signatures to that Bill were scarcely dry before the Dominion set up a claim to the precious metals within the 40-mile belt. A long and vexatious lawsuit ensued, which was finally decided by the Privy Council in favour of the Dominion. I find now that there is a probability of another expensive and vexatious lawsuit with regard to the boundaries of the 40-mile belt. At the opening of the present session of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor made the following statement:—

The boundaries of the 20-mile belt on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway remain undefined, notwithstanding the endeavours of my Ministers to arrive at an adjustment of the question with the Dominion Government. In the meantime, the Government of Canada, claiming a boundary largely, as the provision maintains, in excess of a just limitation of the railway belt, are assuming the status of a freeholder by issuing grants in Her Majesty's name for lands in the disputed boundary, as well as for lands admittedly within the belt. You will be asked to provide the necessary moneys for upholding the rights of the province before the proper tribunals.

Here we find the province has again to go to the courts of the country to enforce her just

rights; and I may say that if the province is wrong this time, it is the first time it has entered a claim against the Dominion which is not just and valid. The province has lived up to the letter and spirit of the terms of Union, and I am sorry that I cannot say the same for the Dominion. The position taken by the Attorney-General is practically this: that the Dominion has merely the right to administer the lands and appropriate the moneys arising from the sales, is not entitled to the status of a freeholder, and has no power to make grants of land in Her Majesty's name. The province only has that right, and has not parted with it, and when a sale is made the province must give the patent. The province also contends that the Dominion is claiming more land than it is entitled to, and intends submitting two points to the courts to decide upon, namely, first, is the Dominion entitled to the status of a freeholder? and, second, is not the extent of land claimed by the Dominion in excess of the terms of the Union and Settlement Act? I may say that when these disputes were settled by Sir Alexander Campbell, and when the Settlement Act was passed, the province conveyed to the Dominion a tract of 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River Valley to make up the deficiency of land in the belt that might have been alienated. So that after the province has conveyed this large extent of land to the Dominion, the Dominion is now setting up a claim for more than the province contends it is entitled to. What I would suggest to the hon. Minister of the Interior is that instead of entering upon another expensive lawsuit, which would keep the land virtually tied up from settlement, it would be better to refer the whole matter to arbitration. I am sure that an arbitrator could be found in our province, say the Chief Justice of British Columbia; one of the superior judges of Ontario could be selected for the Dominion; and a third man could be chosen from one of the lower provinces to act as umpire. In this way a cheap and easy method of settling the dispute could be adopted, in place of the expensive and tedious method of referring the question again to the Privy Council.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I can say that this matter has received the attention of the Government within the last three or four months. The hon. gentleman will remember that Mr. Davie, the Premier of British Columbia, visited Ottawa in November last, and, amongst other matters pertaining to his province, discussed at great length with the Premier, Sir John Thompson, this question of the 40-mile belt. It is a question fraught with a considerable amount of difficulty. Owing to the sinuosities of the railway through the Rocky Mountains and the Selkirks, there is great difficulty in making the 20-mile belt on each side of the railway satisfactory both to the province and to the Dominion. Two different plans have

been suggested. One is that we should take the centre line of the railway and select a belt 20 miles wide on each side, following the sinuosities of the line. Another is that we should take a number of lines, some parallel with each other on each side of the line, and others diverted to meet the windings of the railway, and by that means come to a conclusion. I may say to my hon. friend that I do not anticipate any difficulty whatever between the Dominion Government and the province of British Columbia with reference to this matter. I hope that in the recess, when we have sufficient time to deal with the matter, we will be able to come to an amicable arrangement, and it will be both in the interests of the province and the Dominion that such an arrangement should be come to. No doubt, in the event of our not being able to arrive at that conclusion, possibly a reference to arbitration will be the most satisfactory way to end the matter. I must say that I think, from the evidence the officers of the department have provided, we will be able to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion and end the dispute which has existed so long between the Dominion Government and the province of British Columbia in reference to this boundary.

QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Before going into Committee of Supply, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter of great interest to the North-west Territories, particularly that portion I represent, which is more than one-quarter the total area of the inhabited district. I notified the Minister of Railways that I was going to ask certain questions, and as he is not here, some other gentleman may be able to answer for him. The questions I desire to put to him are the following:—

How many acres of land are given to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company?

What annual subsidy is granted?

Is the above-mentioned assistance granted to ensure regular trains?

How many trains have been run into Prince Albert and how many from Prince Albert since 30th January?

What is the state of the weather at Prince Albert and what efforts are being made to run trains?

Has the train service since January served the needs of the country?

How many mails have reached Ottawa from Prince Albert since the beginning of the session?

Is this the adequate service required in return for the subsidy?

I would direct the attention of the House to this fact, that the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway has been granted over 2,000,000 acres of land, besides a subsidy of \$80,000 a year for twenty years, amounting in all to \$1,600,000. In return, it is understood that they were to give adequate train service and so furnish an outlet to the country, and at any rate carry the mails. I have to-day received a telegram from the Mayor of Prince Albert, in which he says:

Weather fine; railway evidently humbugging, making no effort to move; no train since 10th March. See P.M.G.

Since the 30th of January, only three trains have gone out of Prince Albert, and since I came down here only two trains went out. I desire to know whether that is considered an adequate service in return for the land and money subsidy granted to this company, and if it is not so considered, whether the Government intend compelling the company to give an adequate service?

Mr. HAGGART. I did not hear the first of the hon. gentleman's remarks; but he gave me notice a few minutes ago that he intended to ask these questions. I do not remember the amount of the land grant; but he will find it in the railway report. The subsidy amounts to about \$80,000 a year for a period of twenty years. My department has had no information at all with reference to the running of the trains, and I did not know whether they were running regularly or not until the hon. gentleman spoke to me a day or two ago. I cannot therefore give him information on that subject, and I have not had time to look into the legal obligations of the company and see what powers the Government have under the Railway Act to compel them to run more trains. I will inquire as soon as possible from the Justice Department and find out what powers we have. I think the grant to the company is conditional on their running trains at reasonable short periods. I will let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman received no notice whatever of that extraordinary state of things, there must be some strange negligence in his department.

Mr. HAGGART. They are not obliged to furnish any information to the department except their annual statement, and I am very sorry to say some of the railway companies do not even do that.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. TARTE. Will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to the administration of justice in the province of Quebec and to some of the judges in the same province. The vexatious proceedings taken against me prevent the carrying out of all the promises I made to the people of the county of L'Islet and elsewhere, concerning a number of judges, but, certainly what is postponed will not be lost. Mr. Speaker, I gave early in the session notices of motion to bring this matter before the House; but so many of my colleagues had precedence over me on the Order Paper that I was obliged to drop these notices so that I might avail myself of this opportunity to reach the end I had in view. The duties and the rights of Parliament in connection

Mr. MACDOWALL.

with the administration of justice are defined as follows in Todd:—

The great function of Parliament has been declared to be the maintenance of the law and the redress of grievances. Thus it is one of their principal duties and functions to be observant of the courts of justice, and to take due care that none of them, from the lowest to the highest shall pursue new courses unknown to the laws and constitution of this kingdom, or to equity, sound legal policy, or substantial justice.

I think it is an admitted doctrine that this Parliament has the right to watch the administration of justice. I think also that that duty is more imperative and more important in Canada, on account of the special nature of our constitution, than it may be in other countries. We are under the federal system; this Parliament is the supreme power. But our provinces have their rights and their privileges, and are self-governing communities. We appoint Lieutenant-Governors, who preside over their institutions. We appoint judges to administer them justice. Suppose that those high officials combine together against the liberty of one of the provinces, I do not think there is any Government strong enough to resist such a combine. I have no desire to allude to-night to any special political fact that may have taken place during late years. I intend confining myself merely to the question of principle, as far as it is possible; but it will be impossible for me to abstain entirely from comments on certain political events in which our judges have been mixed, not in the course of their official duties as judges, but in certain other positions. I shall be told, Sir, that against such a combination as I have alluded to, there might be a check in the removal from office of Lieutenant-Governors and judges. Those of us who have had experience know that when the Lieutenant-Governors and judges belong to the same party as that which happens to be in power, that check is of no use whatever. I have taken an active part in the dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor, and, as long as our political opponents were in power, we could not succeed. I do not know how much about the judiciary of the other provinces, but I think I know all the judges of the province of Quebec and that I know our judicial system also. I am very sorry to have to state here to-night that the judiciary of the province of Quebec is looked upon as a political organization. The reason for this opinion, which is held throughout the whole province, is that all the judges, or nearly all of them, have been chosen from among the most active partisans of the party now in power. Some of them, I have been told, have even paid for the high positions they occupy.

Mr. OUIMET. Order, order.

Mr. TARTE. I am called to order?

Mr. OUIMET. It is a well-known rule of this House, which has been enforced a great

many times, that it is out of order to call the judiciary to account, that is, to make charges against the judges of the land, without having resort to the procedure known as impeachment, which is the only procedure by which one can make charges before this House against the judges. I need not give the reasons for that rule, and for the continued practice which has been followed both in the English Parliament and in this. The reasons for it are obvious.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Speaking to the point of order, Sir, I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that, as I understood the statement of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), he did not make any charge against any judge or any act of any judge in his judicial capacity. He did charge, as I understood him, that some person or persons had received money for using their influence to secure the appointment of persons as judges, and that these individuals, before they were judges, had paid money to get the appointments. But I did not learn that any charge had been made by him, so far, against the judges acting in their judicial capacity.

Mr. OUMET. The charge is that these judges had paid money to get their appointment. If that charge is true, I am quite sure this Parliament would be willing to condemn that conduct very severely. It is said the charge has not been made directly, but it is worse to make such a charge through insinuation than to make it directly, because if the charge were made directly, the hon. gentleman's words might be taken down and he might be called to account.

Mr. TARTE. I do not wish to go outside the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice with regard to judges is laid down as follows:—

The rules of the two Houses are only intended to protect their own members, and consequently any reflections on the conduct of the members outside cannot be strictly considered as breaches of order. But the Speakers of the English Commons now always interfere to prevent as far as they can all personal attacks on the judges and courts of justice. They have always felt themselves compelled to say that "such expressions should be withdrawn," and that, "when it is proposed to call in question the conduct of a judge, the member desiring to do so, should pursue the constitutional course of moving an address to the Crown." Members have even been interrupted in Committee of the Whole by the Chairman when they have cast an imputation upon a judicial proceeding.

I was following the hon. member pretty closely, but I did not quite gather that he was making an attack upon the judiciary of the character spoken of by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Oumet), but I would warn the hon. member that if he does that I shall be obliged to call him to order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if that rule does not apply to a case

in which a particular judge is mentioned, and if it does not apply where a policy is criticized, as having the effect of destroying public confidence in the judiciary?

Mr. OUMET. It is still worse to make charges without giving names, because it brings dishonour and disgrace upon the whole judiciary of our province. I protest here not only in the name of the judiciary of the province of Quebec, but also in the name of the province itself against such accusations. We shall be very low in the province of Quebec before such charges can be made with truth.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have made some extracts from the English Hansard with reference to this subject. On 26th February, 1883, Mr. Callan made this statement:

Lord Bacon was a man of great legal ability but he was a corrupt and bad judge; and he (Mr. Callan) believed that prejudice and partizanship had made Mr. Justice Lawson far more corrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER BRAND—The hon. member is not entitled to speak in language of that kind of one of the judges of the land.

Mr. CALLAN—I did not say corrupt in a pecuniary sense.

Mr. SPEAKER—I must call on the hon. member to withdraw the expression.

On page 1143 of volume 268, I find the following; Mr. Beggin, speaking of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald:—

Mr. SPEAKER—The hon. member is now about to discuss the conduct of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald. The House is always very guarded in its language in reviewing the conduct of the judges of the land, and the hon. member is now, as I understand him, about to give the House some hearsay story with regard to that judge. I am bound to point out to the member that I think, considering that the House is not in a position to express its opinion on any motion before it, it is not becoming to the judge to give hearsay stories with regard to his conduct.

Further on, 17th August, 1882, Mr. Speaker Brand makes this remark:

The hon. member when he speaks of the judges of the land, must use temperate and moderate language. If he has any censure to pass upon a judge the law and the constitution point out the course to be followed. If he does not adopt that course he is bound to speak of the learned judge in temperate language.

In April, 1884, Mr. Healy said:

In the Republic of America it would be impossible to find a judge like Mr. Justice Lush who would sentence a man like Valentine Baker to only twelve months imprisonment, while he—

Mr. SPEAKER—Order, Order. The hon. member is not in order. He must not use language that is disrespectful to Her Majesty's judges. He may comment upon their conduct, but he is not in order in using language that is disrespectful towards them.

Mr. HEALY—I was referring to the American judges.

Mr. SPEAKER—The hon. member was using disrespectful language in regard to the judges of the land, and was contrasting their conduct with that of the American judges.

My impression with regard to the matter is that the hon. member may refer to the conduct of the judiciary in general terms, but if he makes a special attack upon any judge, that would not be in order.

Mr. TARTE. I have no intention whatever to go outside of the rules of the House. At the same time, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) should not enter so strong a protest before having heard what I have to say. I have just as much respect as he has for the judiciary of the province of Quebec. I have not attempted to use them as political tools. I have always tried to have them respected. But I think that you have interpreted my words rightly, Sir, and that I was not outside the rules of the House. I was stating that to-day public confidence is destroyed in the judiciary in the province of Quebec. I am surrounded here by members of the bar on both sides of the House. During the last six months I have received as a newspaper man, more complaints against the judges of the province of Quebec than I have received on any other question; and I may say that these complaints came from both political parties—from Queen's counsel of both political parties. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows, and my hon. friend the Solicitor-General knows, that in Montreal complaints are general; and, Sir, could it be otherwise? During the last two or three years one-half of our judges in the province of Quebec have accepted commissions, duties outside of their own official functions. Members of the bar have complained in vain, the people have complained in vain, and finally the press has taken hold of the question. What has been the answer of some of the judges? We have been threatened with imprisonment. Well, some of us have gone to them and told them to put us in gaol, but we were not put in gaol, and some of us who have been thus threatened, are to-day on the floor of Parliament. If public confidence in the judiciary is destroyed in the province of Quebec, it is because, in the first place, judges have been chosen nearly always from amongst the most active partisans, and especially on account of the political services they have rendered. If, after they had been appointed, whatever their political complexion, they had acted as judges ought to act, we would not complain. Unfortunately it is the fact—and I appeal to legal gentlemen on both sides of the House to bear out my statement—that the political leanings of the judges in the province of Quebec are in most cases known beforehand. There is not a contested election, there is not a libel case, in which the leaning of a judge is not known in advance. I have just alluded to judges who have accepted commissions. I was in the House the other day when my hon. friend the Solicitor-General told us in a very few words that judges who have sat on important commissions,

Mr. SPEAKER.

had not even asked permission to do so. We have seen judges accepting salaries from the Government of the province of Quebec, salaries of \$2,000 or \$3,000, for performing duties that are unbecoming to judges, doing things that have never been done by judges in any other country that I know of, and yet we are asked to sit silent and not to complain. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows right well that on many occasions of late years, judges in the province of Quebec have not only neglected their duty—if the word is not parliamentary I will withdraw it—but have actually conspired with some politicians in favour of one party against another; they have conspired, and they have been paid for so doing. I make this statement boldly to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going a little too far; I think he had better make his language a little more moderate. The statement that they have been paid for doing certain things is not quite parliamentary, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. TARTE. I am perfectly prepared to withdraw the words if they are not parliamentary; but I want to ask from you, Sir, and from Parliament, if a judge comes down from the bench to-morrow, if he goes on a political commission and receives a high salary therefor, am I not permitted to state that fact to the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; but the hon. gentleman went further than that. He said that certain judges had conspired to do certain things for which they were paid.

Mr. TARTE. I withdraw the words if, by the rules of the House, I am obliged to do so; but, Sir, the hard fact is there, that judges have come down from the bench, to the knowledge of the whole Dominion, and have sat on political commissions, and the public treasury of the province of Quebec has paid them for it. I want to know from you, if judges act in that way, if judges interfere publicly with politics, and if we cannot complain of that in this Parliament, what other place is there where our complaints may more properly be made? But, Sir, I am told—and I am quite prepared to abide by that doctrine—that when you want to attack a judge, you must impeach him. Well, my political career in this Parliament has not been very long, but I think that when I have pledged myself to a statement in the past, I have proved it. If time had allowed I would certainly, during this session, have impeached two or three judges; and if a kind providence smiles on me, and if I am here again next year, I pledge myself to impeach two or three judges of the province of Quebec. I have not risen in this House to make these statements without being able to prove them. I think we have suffered long enough. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who is an able lawyer, instead of lec-

turing me, should himself take the lead in the judicial reform that is so badly needed in the province of Quebec. I have myself witnessed conduct of certain judges that cannot be explained. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has represented the Crown for many years in the city of Montreal. He knows that the rule is that the Crown itself fixes the date of the trial, and the judge never interferes in criminal cases to fix the date of the trial. Well, Sir, in a certain case in which I was myself interested, one of the judges, did, on two occasions, fix the date of the trial of men who were not prosecuted by the Crown; he fixed the trial while there were prisoners in gaol. Why? The intention was to deprive me of two important witnesses, and to protect certain men who, since that time, have been punished by this Parliament. In a trial recently held in the province of Quebec, another rule was followed. The lawyer that was defending one of the accused was also defending prisoners in gaol at the time. He said: My clients are willing to let their trial go, after the trial of the accused now. The judge said no. Of course, the Crown is the master of the situation in all these cases. The object was the same—to attain a political object. Sir, I want to know if a judge, on the same question of principle, has a right to decide white and black to suit his political purposes. We have witnessed such cases during late years in the province of Quebec. We have seen more than that. During the last year or two, we have seen judges, after having come down from the bench, assisting at what we call in Quebec "petit banc," and sitting there side by side with honest men, no doubt, but men not trained in law, such as grocers. I wish to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works if a judge should have permitted himself to occupy such a position? Of course, a great many judges would not lower themselves to that kind of business; but, unfortunately, as I have said, a great many of our judges to-day have been chosen from amongst the most rabid partizans. I am sorry to say some of them are inferior men. When you have to do with high-minded men, you are satisfied that there is a chance that law and decency will not be violated; but when you have to do with inferior men who are occupying high positions, the chances are that both the judiciary and the law lose the respect of the masses. There was a time when judges went so far in their political actions as to be Ministers of the Crown at the same time. We, in the province of Quebec, are not very far from that state of things to-day, when you see judges agreeing to sit as commissioners on the official acts of politicians. Under these circumstances, I hold it would be even better if those judges came down from the bench and entered this House and sat with us. Although citizens are not allowed to attack the judges, these judges are becoming

more powerful than Ministers, they are becoming the real political arbiters of our destinies. On reading the celebrated speech delivered by Lord Brougham in 1828, it seems as if it had been written for us to-day. Here is what he said:

Now, what is the consequence of this carrying party principles into judicial appointments? The choice of judges is fettered by being confined to half the profession, so that you have less chance of able men, and those you get are of necessity partizans, and therefore less honest and impartial. Why should the whole bench be ministerial or Tory? No man can desire it to be so for the purposes of judging over a community, far, very far, from being ministerial or Tory. Yet it must be so unless vacancies should occur during those visits of Whig Ministries, "few and far between," when once in a quarter of a century power alights upon that party, and then spreads its wings and flies from them in a few months. Does not this arrangement instil into the minds, both of expectant judges and of men already on the bench, a feeling of a party fatal to strict justice in political questions? I speak impartially but unhesitatingly on this point, for it is perfectly notorious that, nowadays, whenever a question comes before the bench, whether it be upon a prosecution for libel or upon any other matter connected with politics, the counsel at their meetings take for granted that they can tell pretty accurately the leaning of the court, and predict exactly enough which way the consultation of the judges will terminate, though they may not always discover the particular path which will lead to that termination. While the system I complain of continues, while you suffer it to continue, such a leaning is its necessary consequence. The judges have this leaning; they must have it; they cannot help having it; you compel them to have it; you choose them on account of their notoriously having it at the bar; and you vainly hope that they will suddenly put it off when they rise by its means to the bench. On the contrary, they know they fill a certain situation, and they cannot forget by whom they were placed there, or for what reason.

Is it not a fact that, to-day, the whole judicial system of the province of Quebec is saturated with political partizanship? I have presented to this House a state of facts that cannot be denied. Where is the remedy to be found? If circumstances had allowed, I would have given the judges to whom I have alluded an opportunity of vindicating themselves, if they could do so; but I thought it my duty, without making a motion to-day, to call the attention of the House to these facts. Where, I repeat, is the remedy? It is a pretty difficult matter to inflict punishment on judges. They are protected in a great many ways. I will not offer remarks that might hurt the feelings of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), but I think a great many lawyers are afraid to complain of the judges. They are afraid that the judges might ruin them. I know, for example, some judges who do not reside in the divisions in which they are obliged to reside, but the members of the bar are afraid to complain. On many occasions the judges of Montreal have behaved in a manner that has been complained of privately by nearly every member of the bar. I could place on the Table of this House

dozens and dozens of articles and complaints made by leading lawyers in Montreal. When I asked one of these gentlemen to put down his name, he said: If I do so, I will lose all my cases. The true remedy rests in the hands of this Parliament. Would it be better to impeach two or three judges or even more, or hold a full inquiry into the administration of justice in Quebec? I am told, moreover, that these abuses are not altogether confined to Quebec. Parliaments have already made inquiries. I think, Sir, that we should not, after all, be too much afraid about talking of the judges. We must not, of course, destroy the respect that is necessary for the administration of the law, but, at the same time, the judges are not above the law. The judges are subject to the law as we are. They should be the first to observe the law, and when you see them, as we have seen them in the province of Quebec, scorning the law, laughing at the law, laughing at the people complaining about them, I think that the duty of this Government is to hold an inquiry. They would discover, for instance, —I am prepared to give the evidence whenever they like to have it—I am prepared to prove that judges have subscribed for political purposes—

Mr. BELLEY. No; no.

Mr. TARTE. I hear my hon. friend say "ha, ha." I never made a statement in this House that I did not prove. I will go out of this House if I do not prove it. Sir, let the judges be judges. We do not ask anything else but that, but it seems to me that the people have a right to insist upon this Government compelling the judges to be judges. I want to know from the Minister of Justice if he thinks that it is a thing to be allowed, that judges in active execution of duty can act as commissioners for the Local Governments? Are the judges wanted or not? If they have not enough of work, let us know it. If they have enough of work then when they spend months and months acting as commissioners, they neglect their duty. Sir, I know judges who, during the last two years, have made for themselves salaries varying from \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year. As my hon. friends to my right know, a certain number of judges in the province of Quebec are employed by the Local Government in doing work outside of their official duties. I do not know if it is the same thing in the other provinces; but what I do know is, that it is not becoming, and that it is not fitting for a judge to act in such a way. And, Sir, when I see that, among the judges that are acting to-day as commissioners, some of these judges have been tools in the hands of my hon. friends on the other side, I thought that I was within parliamentary rules in saying that they were paid for their services. I may be wrong, but the fact is so, and I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice, and of the acting Prime Min-

Mr. TARTE.

ister to-day to that state of things. Is it going to be allowed in the province of Quebec that judges will step down from the bench and interfere actively with politics? We have excluded the judges from Parliament after hard fights, and we had strong reasons for so doing. The same reasons exist to-day, and, Sir, if the same reasons exist the same rules are not applied. I am very sorry to have been obliged to call your attention to these facts, but I have been asked to do so, not only by my electors but by members of the bar. I do not know if a great many of them will rise after me in this Chamber. I know that it is a more pleasant duty for members of the bar to defend judges; even judges that have been denounced by them at certain times; but, Sir, we owe as a duty to our electors, as a duty to justice, to see that the judges are kept in the path of the law and of right. As I have said, if I am here next year—it may not be a very pleasant notice of motion that I will give—but if I am here during next session of Parliament it will be my duty to state specific facts that I would be prepared to state to-night; facts that I have got the proof of in my hands to-day, showing that judges have subscribed money for political purposes, showing that judges—I will not say conspired, since the word is unparliamentary—but showing that judges have agreed between themselves and with a certain number of political men to do certain political things. And, Sir, I hope that those facts upon which I again call the attention of the Government will be weighed by them, and that they will take the lead themselves as it is their duty to do so.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Tarte) has told us that if he be spared until next year, he will bring forward specific charges against certain members of the judiciary of the province of Quebec. I think it will be conceded by all members of this House, and by the people of the country, that it would have been far better for him to have waited until next year before making the general onslaught that he has just delivered; in fact slinging mud promiscuously at the members of the bench, not naming any one judge or another as having been guilty of very grave charges, I may say of the heinous crimes of which he has accused them. He has indiscriminately cast aspersions upon the whole bench of the province of Quebec, composed of thirty judges of the Superior Court, twenty-two of whom are his own fellow-countrymen, but without indicating any one of these distinguished gentlemen as the person against whom he has directed his accusations. I myself, Sir, have had the honour of being now for thirty years a member of the bar of the province of Quebec, and I must say, to the honour and credit of the judiciary of that province, that although poorly paid men—as is recognized throughout the Dominion by those who know the position

they hold and the status they have to maintain in society—to their credit be it said, that although these judges in the city of Montreal and elsewhere in the province of Quebec have been called upon to decide cases involving millions of dollars, we have never once yet heard the integrity of one of our judges attacked, or their honesty impugned in the administration of the law. Mr. Speaker, we are told by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) that he had been flooded with complaints by members of the bar on both sides of politics. Just as he told us a few evenings ago that he had been flooded with complaints against the clergy, so to-night he tells us that he has been flooded with complaints from members of the bar against the judiciary; but he says that when he asked those men who went to him with their complaints to give him the authority of their names, they declined. Well, Sir, I must say that it is the first time that I have ever heard such an attack made upon the courage and honour of the bar of Quebec, because I feel that the bar of Quebec is quite willing not only to assume the responsibility of purging its body of members who are unworthy of it, but I have seen the time in days gone by, when men were not afraid to stand up and make their accusations, and name the persons whom they charged with any particular offence. But, Sir, I cannot believe that the members of the bar of Quebec, or any number of them, holding prominent positions, would be so cowardly as to say behind the backs of the judges what they would not say in the face of the country. Now, Sir, we have been told that it is an extraordinary thing that judges should have been called upon to act upon certain commissions. Why, Sir, let us look to the mother country. Have we not seen there within recent years the political parties appointing judges upon various commissions—land commissions, investigations into political offences, and for many other purposes; and, to the credit of the public men of the Empire be it said, never was the ermine besmirched by accusations against those men such as have been launched against our judges in the province of Quebec. I say it is unworthy of any member of this House to stand up and cast aspersions upon our judges, unless he is prepared to make a charge and define his charge, and name the individual whom he accuses. To stand up here and indiscriminately asperse the character of the whole bench of the province of Quebec is taking an undue advantage of the position which the hon. gentleman holds as a member of this House. He told us that he has made two motions this year, and that he has not had an opportunity of bringing forward what he desired. I want to ask this hon. House what prevented the hon. gentleman bringing forward anything he had to bring forward? What prevented him impeaching any judge he desired to impeach? For months and months he made the province of Quebec and the whole Dominion ring with promises

that he was going to bring charges against our judges. Well, Parliament opened: he had just come from his constituents; he had been telling his constituents, and the public through the press, that he was going to bring those charges, that he was going to make certain judges tremble in their shoes if not to come down from their positions. Well, from the beginning to the end of this session what have we had? We had a motion on the paper with reference to the documents in Robert McGreevy's case. The Government might have in their discretion refused to bring down those documents, which were confidential; but in order to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity, if he had anything to say against one of the most distinguished judges in the province of Quebec, a gentleman who was a distinguished member of this House at one time, and a distinguished member of the bar, a gentleman who is a credit to his race and to the Dominion of Canada, we brought down those papers at the very first opportunity. With regard to the second motion of the hon. gentleman, there were no papers. The hon. gentleman was in the House three minutes before his motion was called; I was sitting here waiting to give whatever explanations were necessary; the hon. gentleman disappeared, and one of his friends called out "drop" when the motion was called. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that there was nothing to prevent the hon. gentleman bringing any charge he wished to bring against any member of the bench of the province of Quebec; and I consider that it is an injustice to the bench of that province, and to the people as well—it is creating a disturbed state of feeling in the minds of the people who have to go before those judges and have their interests tried by them—I say it is an injustice to those men, against whom no man can breathe any suspicion, to hurl against them these indefinite accusations, which, when the opportunity was given to the hon. gentleman, he did not lay before this House in definite terms, so that any charge might be dealt with according to the principles of justice. He says that he has not made any charge yet against any persons which he has not proved; but what charge has he made to-night? What judge has he mentioned? Talk about the bravery of coming before this House and making good his words. Why, Sir, what words has he used except general aspersions against a body of men who have not their superior in any other province of the Dominion nor upon this continent? The other day I had the pleasure of assisting at a banquet where Consul-General Knapp represented the United States of America.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say, let him say it. I am very glad to hear this interruption. This cackling like a lot of geese merely demon-

strates the humiliating position of these hon. gentlemen. I say that if any hon. gentleman has any interruption to make, let him make it like a man. I am here to defend no particular person. If there is any judge charged with an offence, the Government is ready to place him upon trial. Let him be impeached, and justice will be done; but in the name of common decency let us not have aspersions cast upon a body of men who do not deserve such treatment. Consul-General Knapp, I was going to say, only a few days ago, speaking at the banquet of the Board of Trade in the city of Montreal, said he would carry with him, amongst other memories of Canada, the fact that we had a judiciary of which any country might be proud. He said that, dealing with the affairs of Canada as he had found them during his stay here for the past four years. But there is no necessity for any such testimony. What gentleman in this country has attacked the bench of the province of Quebec except the hon. gentleman who has now raised his voice against them? For months and months we have had these attacks made; we have had public confidence disturbed; we have had the people in a state of mental turmoil; but there has been no good result. And tonight, in this House, we have simply this speech of the hon. gentleman, in addition to other speeches made and articles written; but we have no charge made in this Parliament against any individual of having been guilty of any corrupt act. We have no charge that this House can possibly deal with, and when the hon. gentleman asks the Government to take note of his remarks, I want to know what the Government is going to investigate. Has there been any petition laid before them? Has there been any document signed by any responsible person asserting certain things against certain individuals? Nothing; and yet the attempt has been made to asperse still more the characters of those honourable judges by an indefinite attack that will be carried through the province to-morrow by the public press. The hon. gentleman is therefore entirely in error when he says that he had no opportunity of making his charges here. He had every opportunity. His first motion was granted; his second motion was dropped. He has come before this Parliament tonight simply for the purpose of making one more attack of this indefinite kind upon the judiciary of the province of Quebec, and I am satisfied that the people of that province, seeing that he has failed to make good his words, will at all events wait until he lays his charges before this Parliament in proper form and in such a manner that they can be met by those who are charged, before they place any more reliance upon anything that the hon. gentleman may say upon the subject.

Mr. AMYOT. I fully concur in what the hon. Solicitor-General has said, and I wish
Mr. CURRAN.

only to add a few words, which I feel it is my duty, under the circumstances, to say. If we look at the "Canadien" of the 4th January, we find the hon. gentleman's programme to his electors, in which he said:

Scandalous abuses have introduced themselves into the administration of justice; too many judges have become political partizans.

Therefore, as far back as the 4th January, the hon. gentleman must have been ready to make his charges and give his evidence. He now pretends that it was not possible for him since then to bring down a regular impeachment before this House. Well, justice has been done to that pretence, and it is not longer tenable. The man who wants to attack such a body as the judiciary of our Dominion, the real rampart of our liberties, and who desires to retain his standing in public opinion, should be ready with his charges and evidence, and not trifle with the matter. The hon. gentleman has thrown a general accusation against the whole judiciary; but he has only mentioned two cases, one in which the judge would have himself postponed or fixed a trial, and another in which the judges sat upon what the hon. gentleman terms the petit banc or petty bench. Then he precised his accusations a little more, and brought them home to parties whom we cannot fail to recognize. I will not go into the details, but will remind this House that one of the enquêtes to which he alludes is the enquête concerning the Baie des Chaleurs. Who advised the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint three judges to investigate that matter? Who, if not the political leader of my hon. friend in the province of Quebec at that time, Mr. Mercier? Mr. Mercier took the responsibility of the enquête, he took the responsibility of the choice of judges, and among the judges the president of the court belonged to the Liberal party. But I never found a Conservative in this Dominion who accused him of corruption or neglect of duty because he was a Liberal. You will not find the Conservative party attacking any of the Liberal judges and going back to their career as lawyers in order to remind the people that they were of this or that colour. We have more respect than that for our judges. The three judges were appointed, and no one would accuse any one of them of partiality or neglect of duty. Now the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) says that the judges ought not to go down from their position to act as commissioners. But when the hon. members Mr. Casgrain and Mr. DeBoucherville wanted another inquiry they selected only one judge, and they appointed to sit with him a lawyer and a merchant. The hon. gentleman asks how can a judge go down and sit with a wholesale merchant. What can we do to please the hon. gentleman? If judges are selected he says they should not go down and sit as commissioners, and when lawyers and merchants are chosen he says they are unworthy of the position. What does he want? He

should know that there is a law in the province of Quebec which authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint commissioners. He must take somebody, and how many will he find in this Dominion who do not belong to one or the other of the different political parties?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. To whom do you belong?

Mr. AMYOT. Thank Heaven I do not belong now to the party in which we find the hon. gentleman, and in which men say something to-day and the next day flatly contradict themselves when brought face to face with proof. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) we know accused Dr. Montizambert, of Grosse Isle, of having told him many things. Dr. Montizambert is an honourable and serious man, who does not speak without knowing what he says. The next day he contradicted the hon. gentleman, and those heads which are very small and in which there is nothing should hold their tongues. Judge Mathieu was selected as the chairman of the second commission. Is there a lawyer in the province of Quebec who has not the law books of Judge Mathieu and his judicial reports in his library? Is there a judge who has worked more in the interests of the legal profession? Judge Mathieu fell sick, and Judge Pagnuelo replaced him.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. What was his illness?

Mr. AMYOT. What was his illness? Overworked, perhaps. I do not know; I am not a doctor; but he was reported sick. Perhaps there were cowardly accusations made by some papers, edited by irresponsible people, which may have tried him. Perhaps there were found in the press then some people, hiding themselves behind the responsibility of editors worth nothing, who would throw out all sorts of accusations against that gentleman, and as he has some nobleness of character, he may have suffered from those insinuations, I admit; but if any of those gentlemen know something against him they should have the moral courage to come before this House and indict him. It is not a fair way to fight a man when he is not here, and throw out all sorts of insinuations without daring to name any one, but hoping that the public will know who is meant. That is not a fair way, and certainly does not reflect to the credit of the hon. member for L'Islet.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did they not appoint Bancroft?

Mr. AMYOT. My hon. friend has found Bancroft, and he should thank me for that, because he could not find him himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. One rogue can find another.

Mr. AMYOT. You have heard, Sir, that nice expression, "One rogue may find another."

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary expression.

Mr. AMYOT. I take it from where it comes from, and it falls down to my feet. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) says that the judges should not interfere with politics. I hold in my hand a report of that bench which he calls the "petit banc." I read over that report and the evidence, and there is not a word of politics in it. It is the history of a robbery under the cover of law; it is the history of a conspiracy against public money; it is the history of people authorizing themselves, with the authority the law has placed in their hands, to take money from the public Treasury. It is the history of facts. There is no politics in that; there may be political consequences; but I do not find anywhere that our judges have interfered with politics. And when the Government wants to learn facts important to the public, I think that the best men to select for enquêtes are the judges of the land, who have the experience, are learned in the law and who know what questions are legal, their minds being trained to the consideration of these points. I must prefer them to act as commissioners—or call them what you like—than men whose study and experience are not in the practice of the law. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) says that some judges have paid for being appointed. I protest against any such insinuation, because, as it is put, it weighs against every one of the judges. Every one of the judges now may be suspected, after this accusation, of having paid for his appointment. And if the hon. gentleman—I hope it may not be the case—should disappear with his papers and his secrets, then, for the rest of their lives the judges would be suspected of having bought their appointments. That is not fair fighting; it is not worthy of the position of a member of this House. I may speak of the judges lately appointed. Take Judge Lacoste—Sir Alexander Lacoste—will the hon. gentleman leave the name of Sir Alexander Lacoste as one who may be suspected of having bought his position?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Nobody believes that. He is a most honest man.

Mr. AMYOT. There is the Hon. Justice Hall; will he be suspected of having bought his commission?

Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. AMYOT. Am I out of order?

Mr. TARTE. No; but you are putting questions to me. If I am not allowed to give names, I should not be asked for names. My hon. friend does not know what he is speaking about.

Mr. AMYOT. The Hon. Justice Blanchet has been appointed lately. Is he suspected of having paid for his appointment? It is

all very fine to cast suspicion in this general way, but when we come to the names, it is a different matter. I will not undertake to speak of the judges of the district of Montreal; I do not know enough of the Montreal bar, and I will leave that for the Montreal bar to deal with. I speak of the Quebec judges, and I deny the statement the hon. gentleman has made.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman who objects is not acquainted with one of our judges. Now, one of the judges lately appointed is Judge Bossé. I am speaking of the Appeal Court, because in the Superior Court we have had no changes lately. Will any one in this House pretend for a moment that Judge Bossé has bought his commission? The Appeal Court of the province, which sits alternately in Quebec and Montreal, is composed of the four judges of whom I speak, lately appointed; the others, like Justices Baby and Wurtele, have been appointed of old time. As the court is constituted, it is of such a character as would make it a source of pride to any country. More learned judges, harder-working judges, more experienced judges cannot be found anywhere, and it is a real pleasure for any lawyer to be at that court, when judgments are delivered. There is no better piece of legal literature to be found than the judgments delivered by the members of this court, and every lawyer who takes pride in his profession, will approve of my words. Now, we have our Superior Court judges, Justices Casault, Routhier, Andrews and Caron. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to attack any one of these judges? I am sure he will not do so. Then, why these accusations against our bench? They are like a shot from a hidden marksman, directed toward a crowd.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You refer to the North-west rebellion.

Mr. AMYOT. Well, in the North-west I should probably find some people much more polite and intelligent and witty than the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) complains of the way the judges are appointed. How does he want them to be appointed? Take them individually, and you find they are worthy of their high position. What does the hon. gentleman want, then? He is vexed because they have been finding facts which do not agree with his political views. And he says that the bench is falling into discredit. I say the bench has not fallen into discredit, generally speaking. It may have fallen into discredit in some quarters, where the ideas and writings of the hon. gentleman have reached. He is the cause of that discredit. The judges may not be held in high respect by the hon. gentleman and those who pull along with him, but, generally speaking, our judges are respected. If any one of the judges has done

Mr. AMYOT.

any wrong, let the person who knows it bring the facts before Parliament, and he will find, not one, but all the members of Parliament ready to give him assistance, because we want a good bench; we want honest judges, judges deciding questions according to their oath of office and the justice of the case. But, Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of the Dominion, more particularly a citizen of the province of Quebec, in conscience I feel bound to protest against the general accusation of the hon. gentleman against the whole of our bench. I say it is unfair; it is unworthy of his position as a member of Parliament. He has had ample time, he should have come here with a precise and definite accusation. He has spoken of a judge who he said was to be condemned because he fixed a trial. I never heard any such accusation against a judge before. I think I may guess at the circumstances to which he refers, and I invite him to bring the facts specially before the House. If he finds anything wrong in the judge's conduct, I invite him to bring the case before Parliament, I invite him to bring down the facts that they may be examined. In the name of the Bar of Quebec I protest against the insinuation that we, the lawyers, dare not give our opinions about our judges. In any law suit, one of the two parties always loses his case, and generally the lawyer who loses is not afraid of criticising. It is in Quebec as in every other country. But how can we complain of the honesty of our judges when we believe them to be honest? The hon. gentleman may remember a law suit that we had together in 1886, when the judge was strongly against me, but the jury was all in my favour. Did I complain of the judge? No; I differed in opinion from him, but I thought he was honest, and that he had charged the jury according to his convictions. The hon. gentleman never thought then of complaining against the judges.

Mr. LISTER. What was the case?

Mr. AMYOT. I took an action for libel against the hon. member for L'Islet.

Mr. LISTER. What was the libel?

Mr. AMYOT. I will send you the record, if you wish.

Mr. LISTER. We want to know what the case was about.

Mr. AMYOT. The jury declared the article to be libellous and defamatory.

Mr. TARTE. But no damage was declared to have been done.

Mr. AMYOT. But the jury decided that the hon. gentleman should pay all the costs, and the judge did not think fit to tell the jury that they had no right to mix up the question of costs with the verdict. The hon. gentleman then found that our judiciary was splendid, he admired the judiciary of the province of Quebec; but to-day, when

some of the judges have decided against him, they all become perverse, bad, rotten, and there should be an inquiry, and so on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Which side were you on ?

Mr. AMYOT. I need not say that I know how much weight to attach to these interruptions. They may have the effect of disturbing me, but they will not convince anybody that those gentlemen are serious. I never interrupt a speaker as they are interrupting me. Whenever I do interrupt I do it politely. But I take the general conduct of the members at your left—thank God they are not all alike, from their chief down. I can count dozens who are respectable, and are incapable of discourtesy—but, judging from the rank and file of the Opposition, there must be some amongst them who have received a bad education and who do not know how to conduct themselves in a respectable Assembly. Sir, I am sorry that the hon. member for L'Islet wishes the whole Dominion to believe that our judiciary is corrupt, is venal, is unworthy of the bench. I protest against those accusations; I protest against the mode he has adopted of making sweeping accusations without mention of any specific cases. He has had ample time to formulate his accusations, and yet he comes into the House at the end of this session saying that he has had no time to prepare specific accusations, and tries to justify himself on that ground for making these sweeping charges against the whole judiciary. I am of the opinion, and I know something about it, that our judiciary is equally worthy with the judiciary of any country in the world.

Mr. LAURIER. In the few words I intend to offer to the House on the subject brought up by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), I intend, so far as I can, to speak with the judicial calmness which the subject demands. It is a mere truism to say, as has been said by the Solicitor-General, that the bench ought to be treated with the greatest respect. That is a proposition that no one will contradict. But it is with the bench as with every other class of the community—the judges will be treated, not all with the same respect; there will be some degree in the respect which is given to them, but all will enjoy the respect, I believe, to which they are entitled, and which their conduct deserves. The Solicitor-General, a moment ago, made the absurd remark, that my hon. friend from L'Islet had attacked the whole judicial body of Quebec. Sir, no one supposes that my hon. friend ever had the intention of attacking, for instance, the character of the present Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals. I could name many other judges, also, who are held in the highest esteem and respect by all parties in the province of Quebec. But it would be equally absurd to say that the bench of the province

of Quebec to-day commands the same respect that it commanded some years ago. The reason is very obvious, it has been stated by my hon. friend from L'Islet; it is that all appointments to the bench made by the present Government, have been political appointments. I will not say that they have all been bad, but some have been bad simply because they have been made on political grounds. Sir, it is not on record that all the members of the bar in the province of Quebec who belong to the Liberal party would make good judges, but it is not on record that the present Government ever appointed a Liberal member of the bar to the bench in that province.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes; Judge Belanger, Judge Doherty. Judge DeLorimier was never much of a politician, but I think most of the time he voted with hon. gentlemen opposite. And Judge Pagnuelo.

Mr. LAURIER. Judge Belanger and Judge Doherty were appointed, if I remember aright, in 1873.

Mr. OUIMET. Will you name the Conservatives you have appointed ?

Mr. LAURIER. Sir, if the Liberal Government did not appoint a Conservative judge, it is because, when they came into power, they found none but Conservatives on the bench. They were five years in office, and I do not think they can be reproached with having made bad appointments. I do not say that all the appointments which have been made by the present Government have been bad, but I say unhesitatingly that the present Government, not the Government of twenty years ago, but the Government which came into office after Mr. Mackenzie's downfall, have appointed men who had no other qualification for the position than the fact that they had been mere party hacks. This Government have taken members from this House and promoted them to the bench for which they never had the slightest qualification. I do not make this fact a reproach against the Government, and I say that the same rule has not been followed in appointing judges in the province of Quebec that has invariably prevailed in the province of Ontario. In the latter province men have been appointed to the bench of the Superior courts, at all events.—I do not know as to the inferior courts—who were chosen for their merits, and invariably without regard to their politics. But the present Government have done with the bench in the province of Quebec as they are now doing with the Senate. It was one of the rules laid down at Confederation that the Senate should be a body representing both political parties in the Dominion. Has that rule been followed? Is it not a fact that for years vacancies in the Senate have been filled, with a few exceptions, by creatures of the Government; that not a Liberal, except, perhaps, Mr.

John Macdonald, has been appointed to the Senate ?

Mr. HAZEN. How about Senator Snowball ?

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Snowball, so far as I recollect, was not a Liberal when he was appointed. He may have been before his appointment, and he may be a Liberal now, but he was not when he was appointed. But if, out of all the appointments made by the Conservative Government, there have been two exceptions, they but prove the rule I have just laid down. I ask my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) if he is of the opinion that the Senate, as it is now constituted, fairly represents the political parties now existing in this country ? Sir, you might count the number of Liberal Senators on the fingers of one of your two hands. The Senate is now composed very much as was the Legislative Council of the province of Quebec at one time, when, out of twenty-four members, there was only one Liberal. This is why the work of the bench has been degraded, as it has been. It is asserted, and hon. gentlemen know the names as well as I do, that judges of the province of Quebec have paid for their appointments. It is asserted, and I believe the truth will be forthcoming some day, that judges contributed to the election fund of the Conservative party at the last election. This is a statement current in the streets of Montreal and Quebec, and I believe, moreover, the fact will be proved before many months have passed over.

Mr. LISTER. Inferior judges in Ontario have paid for their appointments.

Mr. LAURIER. These are the reasons why my hon. friend has spoken as he has to-night. Certainly the bench should be respected, but if the bench has to be respected, let the appointments be made, not for considerations of politics, but simply for legal qualifications. But the question involves a more broad and more useful consideration. The hon. member for L'Islet has alluded to a question which I think should receive the consideration of this House, that is to say, that the judges should not sit on political commissions. The Solicitor-General asserted that the judges were appointed on commissions in England. It is true judges are so appointed ; but it is to decide questions of a judicial or quasi-judicial character. Judges have been appointed to sit on commissions in Ireland on land questions, and very properly so ; but it is not on record that judges have been appointed to sit on political questions. I know but one instance, and that was the Parnell Commission. That is a precedent, if a precedent it be, in favour of the theory of the Solicitor-General. But the hon. gentleman knows that this action, this appointment was strongly resisted by Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party. Parliament, however, decided that judges should sit on

Mr. LAURIER.

that commission ; but everybody will agree, and history proves it, that it would have been better if the advice of Mr. Gladstone had been adopted, and the matter had not been dealt with by a commission, but it had been dealt with by Parliament. We have lately had three commissioners appointed. One, appointed by Lieutenant-Governor Angers on the advice, it is true, of Mr. Mercier, was composed of Judges Jetté, Davidson and Baby. As regards those three judges, I have nothing to say.

Mr. CURRAN. There was a Judge Dorion on the Laviolette case

Mr. LAURIER. It was a quasi-judicial case, the question being whether Mr. Laviolette had resigned his seat. This was properly a judicial case. It was not so, however, as regards the question into which Judges Jetté, Baby and Dorion had to inquire. It is true Mr. Mercier is responsible for that commission and not Lieutenant-Governor Angers. But though it was ordered by Mr. Mercier, I think it was a great mistake, and in my opinion Mr. Mercier would have acted more wisely for himself if he had insisted on being tried, not by the commission of judges, but before the Legislature and before the people. However, that is a precedent which is quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite ; but I do not admit its force, for I think it was a great mistake made by Mr. Mercier from a constitutional point of view.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was decided at Ottawa.

Mr. LAURIER. It may have been so, but we have no evidence of it, and it was kept dark. We had a commission appointed by the present Government, consisting of Judge Mathieu and two laymen. As regards Judge Mathieu, every one knows he is a jurist eminent in his profession. Then we had a commission appointed, consisting of Judges Routhier and Tait, and it is a pleasure for me to say that both of those judges are most able men and competent to perform their functions. Nevertheless, while I do not complain of the composition of the commissions in these instances, I contend that the principle is a wrong one, that no judge should be allowed to depart from his judicial functions, and especially he should never be allowed to do so in regard to political matters. We know what politics are, that they involve acrimony and discord to a certain extent ; and if the judges depart from their high judicial functions to act on such commissions, it is obviously adopting a principle which is wrong in itself, and which I am sure would not be tolerated in England. I protest against any such departure from the correct principle of constitutional government, which is that every political offence should be tried on the floor of Parliament. For my part, I would rather have any such offence tried, even by a hostile committee of the House of Commons, where at all events we have all the

advantages of discussion, than to have it tried by any commission of judges, because if you have all the advantages which result from a discussion on the floor of Parliament, you have ten chances to get at the truth more than you have even before a Royal Commission. Take the commission which has sat on the charge brought against the Postmaster-General. You have only to read the evidence to see that only half the truth has been revealed. I do not blame the judges for that fact. I think the judges decided properly the question laid before them; but it was because there was not such a discussion as would have taken place on the floor of Parliament or before a committee of this House. As regards the hon. member for L'Islet, I was surprised that the Solicitor-General should have reproached him with not having proceeded with his motion when he had an opportunity. My hon. friend gave the reason, namely, that if he had done so he would not have had the opportunity of discussing it, and so he let it drop in order to bring it on now. Accordingly, nothing in the direction of a reproach can be brought against him. It has been stated against the hon. member for L'Islet that he stated that he would impeach certain judges on charges which he would bring forward. Certainly, for my part, I would have much preferred if the hon. member for L'Islet had specific charges to make against any members of the bench, one, two or three of them, that he should make them in a specific manner. But it is not fair to him to say that he has not done his duty during this session. The session has lasted two months, and we are now within its closing hours, and it is well known that on account of certain procedures that took place, the hon. member could not take his seat at the opening of the House, and so he had no opportunity to bring the charges which he had said he would bring. But if the hon. member for L'Islet has one distinguishing quality more than another, it is that of courage—no man ever accused him of wanting in courage, and if the accusations require to be made, I am quite sure his accusations will be made in due time.

Mr. LANGELIER. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). I do not want to enter into a discussion as to the administration of justice in the province of Quebec, because I think I shall have another opportunity, but I cannot allow the hon. gentleman's speech and accusations to pass without comment. I was greatly surprised when I observed him last year make the somersault which he did. But of course I could not prevent it. His record recalls to my mind the history of Saul on the road to Damascus, perhaps the change was not due to the same cause, but whatever the cause may have been, the hon. gentleman who has so much zeal in behalf of the Government—as new converts gener-

ally exhibit—has no right to fling mud at the heads of the people who have been doing nothing else than he did, except that they have done it with less violence. His speech to-night brought vividly to my mind what I heard him say last year. He spoke to-night of the report of one of the Royal Commissioners—"small benches," as we call them in the province of Quebec—and he said there is nothing political in the report of that commission. I remember very well an occasion when he was not of that opinion, and that occasion was when all the evidence that had been adduced by that commission had been printed and published, and was before the public of the province of Quebec, and in the hon. gentleman's own hands. It was the day previous to the last election in the province of Quebec, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) will remember the circumstances. I was present at an immense meeting held in the Berthelot market hall, of the city of Quebec. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) made a speech there. He defended every act of the Mercier Government which had been brought before that Royal Commission, and he defended those acts much more strongly than any other member who was present. Not only that, but he made a most violent attack against the whole Conservative party, he called them a corrupt party, and a rotten party, and that was the very expression that he used. Well, of course it is his own business to go back to that rotten party if he likes, but he has no right to throw mud in our faces, because we have remained in the same party that we were in with him for some time.

An hon. MEMBER. Was Mercier in power then?

Mr. LANGELIER. Not any more in power; it was the day previous to the polling of the last election in Quebec. It is not at all a private affair, because it was spoken before an immense gathering of 2,000 electors in the city of Quebec, in my own division. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll) was there. I do not remember all who were present, but the audience included several members of this House, and we spoke in defence of our party in the province of Quebec. But none of us spoke so violently against the opposite party as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) did. I did not say one word against the Conservative party in this House, but the hon. gentleman went out of the time and circumstances to make a most violent attack against the whole Ministerial party at Ottawa. I do not know what that party has done since to deserve the support he is giving it to-night. But unless he has seen something very marvellous in the party since, he has no right to approve of that party which he then called a rotten party, and to throw mud at the Liberal party of the province of Quebec.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to give a personal explanation of these words. I completely deny what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) has said. At the meeting I only spoke of the Constitution, and I refused to speak of the acts of the administration of Mr. Mercier in any way, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) has as much memory as he has words, he will remember that.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, though I felt at first disinclined to take any part in the debate, still, after listening to the remarks just fallen from the hon. member for Bellechasse, and to the bold denial opposed by him to the arguments of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), I think it my duty to say a few words. The hon. member for Quebec Centre has just drawn the attention of the House to events well known by all those in the province of Quebec who have followed the fluctuating political course of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Not a word has fallen from the hon. member for Quebec Centre to-night, that did not tally and perfectly agree with the public utterances of the hon. member for Bellechasse on all the hustings of the province of Quebec, and with his written statements in the columns of his journal, "La Justice." The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has imputed as a capital crime to my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) the remarks passed by the latter on the conduct of the judges who have accepted to sit on royal commissions under the circumstances we are all perfectly familiar with. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking from my own personal experience, I say, fearless of contradiction, that never were the judges impugned with great severity—I should say, with great violence—on the hustings of the province of Quebec, than by the hon. member for Bellechasse, and no lawyer ever displayed greater eloquence in defending the interests of those accused before the royal commissions than the hon. member for Bellechasse. The most violent accusations launched against the judges sitting on those commissions we are now dealing with came from the hon. member. Still, what do we see to-day? We see this very same member standing up in this House and slinging mud at the Liberal party, to which he owes his political station, at least since 1887, and to whose aid he is indebted for his election; we see him to-day, I say, turning his back to the party which defended him, and siding with another party, and with the men whose ermine he has besmirched! Why, Mr. Speaker, at the very opening of this Parliament, the hon. member was seen siding with us, and taking part in a caucus held within the very walls of these buildings. At this caucus he was heard—I feel quite at liberty to make this statement to the House, without betraying the secrecy of our deliberations—he was heard, I say, hurling against the judges the same charges made

Mr. LANGELIER

by him at all the public meetings throughout the province of Quebec, and which we repeat here to-night, on the floor of this House, but with more sincerity than the member for Bellechasse at that time; for, unlike him, we still denounce certain judges who have come down from the bench to meddle with politics. I refrain from commenting too severely on the course of the hon. member for Bellechasse; for I consider he has received at the hands of this House a condign punishment in the ironical cheers and interruptions which have greeted him. As regards the judges, I must enter my solemn protest against the words fallen from the hon. Solicitor-General, to the effect that the hon. member for L'Islet had made a general onslaught and cast aspersions on the whole bench of the province of Quebec, while, as a matter of fact, the latter has plainly stated that his attacks were only directed against three or four members of the judiciary, who have laid themselves open to serious criticism. The members of the judiciary, in general, have all our respect, and their integrity and honesty in the administration of the law are above suspicion; and should it prove true, as stated by the hon. member for Bellechasse, that the public voice brings home to certain members of the bench the accusations brought forward by the member for L'Islet, it can be on no other ground than their enjoying in the public estimation an unenviable reputation, or, in other words, to use a vulgar saying, that the cap fits them. Certain members of the bench are afraid of the threatened inquest, on good ground; and when, at the next session, the hon. member from L'Islet will come before this Parliament and bring forward specific charges against certain members of the judiciary, I have no doubt he will be enabled to substantiate his statements of to-night. Coming to my own constituency, what are the facts in connection with the administration of the law? There happened to be there a certain judge sitting on the bench, who later on went to Spencer Wood, and is now in Ottawa, where he fills the position of Minister of Agriculture, and who in nearly all the cases submitted to him acted the part of a political partizan, to gain favour with his party, without any regard to the strict administration of the law. To substantiate this statement, Mr. Speaker, I need only refer you to a certain record to be found in the Supreme Court archives; and the judge, who had to deal with a controverted election case, was the same Mr. Angers who boasted in a public speech at Montreal, having jumped over the wall of the constitution, as the surest and quickest way of getting past a wall, and bringing his friends into power; you will find on record, I say, an affidavit bearing my signature, in which I charged the judge with having given judgment in the case to gain favour with his friends, and that too in his own private dwelling, without any legal counsel being present to defend the sen-

tenced party. I may also add, Mr. Speaker, that this judgment was reversed by the Supreme Court; that never did Mr. Angers dare lodge a complaint against me; that never have I been summoned to appear before the Bar of the province on the ground of having signed such a document, and that neither have I been sentenced for contempt of court. Why so, Mr. Speaker, if not that he well knew that I could substantiate all my charges? It was with this case as with the threats preferred by Mr. Justice Bossé against the hon. member for L'Islet; after threatening my hon. friend sitting next to me to have him incarcerated, Judge Bossé had to retrace his steps, and, as everybody knows, never was the member for L'Islet imprisoned. Why, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand certain legal proceedings, authenticated by the prothonotary of the court at Montmagny, containing further evidence as to political intrigues carried on by members of the bench, with a view to preventing a candidate from entering the field at the late local elections, against the party which Mr. Angers, in violation of the Constitution, and of his oath of office as well, had placed in power at Quebec; evidence will be found, I say, in these documents, that the counsel for the prosecution prevailed upon one of the judges to deliver up to him the papers on record in the case, with a view to the issuing of a judgment which would have enabled the defendant to run for the local House. These documents will be produced in the proper time, as also evidence, I think, will be brought forward, showing that this judge subscribed to the election fund. Although I did not, at first, intend to address the House in this debate, still I thought it well to take up the gauntlet thrown down by the hon. member for Bellechasse. This is not the first time we have been challenged by him. But let him, Sir, look up his own journal, "La Justice," on the date of the 27th April, 1891, at a time when he filled the office of attorney for the Crown, and let him read an editorial, no doubt penned by him, in which he insinuates the very opposite of what he holds now. Judge Bossé presided in the court. The article reads as follows:—

An unblushing Tory press condemns, in no uncertain tone, the postponement till the next term of the conspiracy trial. This postponement ought to be ascribed, they pretend, to the absence of a second panel, whereas it is well known that it has been ordered by the court, without the interference of the Crown, at the request of Messrs. Murphy and McGreevy.

As previously stated, this article was obviously penned by a lawyer, somewhat conversant with the business of the Crown. As it bears no signature, it cannot be strictly fathered upon the hon. member, though it evidently issued from his pen. I, therefore, say this, that of all men, the hon. member for Bellechasse ought to be the last to sling mud at his opponents, and that he, who was a member of both parties in this House,

should have the decency of refraining from condemning either one or the other. Let him, if he wishes to be entitled to the respect of his colleagues, never animadvert on the past career of the Hon. Mr. Mercier or of the Liberal party. When Mr. Mercier was driven from power, the hon. member for Bellechasse chose to abandon him, as he had a right to. We do not reproach him with it; we do not impute to him his desertion as a crime; no, on the contrary we would rather have him as an open antagonist, than see him play the part of a false friend; but, in the name of common decency, let him at least, out of respect to himself, not insult those with whom he has sided and to whom, I regret to say, he is indebted for his election to this House in 1887 and 1890, opposed though he was by the very men upon whom he now fawns in his new role of a sycophant. Another statement of the hon. member I might animadvert on, is when he asserts that Conservative newspapers were never seen to attack the bench; I need but refer him to the "Minerve," which, not long ago, attacked Mr. Justice Jetté. I could also point out to him a pamphlet entitled "A Disgrace," in which the author slings mud at the honourable Judges Plamondon and Dorion. The writer of this brochure, the Hon. Mr. Landry, now sits in the Senate: I do not question his right as to attacking the judges; but I ask the question: when he became a member of this House, why did not the Hon. Mr. Landry impeach the judges? The hon. member for L'Islet, did not attack the whole bench, but only three or four judges whose conduct cannot be defended on any reasonable ground. He censures the course of certain members of the Bench who, in the sight of the whole world, were seen leaving Montreal to go and advise the Lieutenant-Governor at Spencer Wood. As I said, I did not intend to address the House in this debate, and I seize this opportunity for saying that I profess the highest esteem for the judiciary of the province, that is to say, for such members of the Bench as deserve the esteem and the respect of those amenable to the tribunals. But I am sorry to say that some three or four judges are unworthy of such respect and I hope that, next session, we will have the opportunity of having an investigation made into the conduct of the latter before the House.

Mr. BRÔDEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this advanced stage of the debate, I only intend to say a few words in relation to a question I have previously put to the Government. It is a well-known fact, as stated by the hon. member for L'Islet, that, at the present time, in the district of Montreal, we are very badly circumstanced, owing to the snail-slow administration of the law, for which the Government is, in a certain measure, open to blame. As stated several times to-night in the course of this debate, the members of the Bench, instead of attending strictly to their judicial duties, have, of late

years, sat upon commissions which have taken up a considerable portion of their time. Whether these judges have acted wisely or not, is not now the question at issue; although I consider it would have been preferable had other parties than the judges acted on those commissions. This House is bound to see that the judges keep themselves out of all public affairs, and do nothing outside a judge's work. Judges move, to my mind, in quite a different sphere from ours; and I consider it to be a precedent, fraught with peril, to allow the judges of the land to meddle, directly or indirectly, with the political affairs of the country. The House recollects that a law was enacted with a view to make the judiciary power distinct from the legislative power. Under the existing state of affairs, brought about by the Conservative party, I am sorry to say, we are retrograding to the old system, and to the time when the judges of the land wielded legislative power. Now, Mr. Speaker, I rose, at this stage of the debate, to lay before the House a grievance of the district of Montreal, as to the insufficient number of judges. You are aware that a vacancy occurred in the Superior Court, some months ago, owing to the promotion of Judge Wurtele to the Court of Appeals, and that no appointment has as yet been made to provide for the vacancy. On this ground, I hold the Government are partly open to censure for not taking the necessary steps to insure a speedy administration of the law. My hon. friends from Ontario will realize our position, when I add that a cause entered this very day cannot possibly be heard till the month of December or January next, owing to the roll being so charged. Beyond a doubt this state of things is brought about by the insufficient number of our judges, and is owing to the fact that they hold positions outside of their official duties. I cannot see on what ground a new judge should not be appointed to fill the vacancy created by the promotion of Judge Wurtele. I am quite aware of the difficulties the matter is beset with, springing from a racial or national question, but I consider this is no reason why the citizens of the district of Montreal, amenable to the tribunals, should be left so badly circumstanced. Are the Government unable to cope with the difficulties of the situation? Or, are they attempting again to shift off any responsibility on the question, as they have done in the case of the Manitoba school question and a host of other questions? Mention was made, a little while ago, of the appointment of senators. Why do not the Government fill up the vacancy created in the Bedford district? Assuming that the Senate is to be retained, the vacancies in this body should be filled, so as not to allow a whole session to elapse without appointing a senator for this district. I contend, that as regards this appointment to the Senate, as also in the case of the Manitoba school question, and that of the appointment

Mr. BRODEUR.

of judges, the Government are unwilling to set to the task of redressing the grievances complained of. As regards the appointment of a senator for the Bedford district, I take exception to none of the candidates aspiring to the position. I do not object to the choice of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), one of the candidates aspiring to the position. He is an upright and honourable man; but, on the other hand, the seat he aspires to in the Senate should not fall to his lot, on the ground, I contend, that, under the circumstances, the Government ought to appoint a French Canadian for that district. The province of Quebec is entitled to twenty-four senators. Out of this number, the English-speaking element are entitled to, at most, four or five seats; as a matter of fact, they have seven seats. In the Bedford district, an English senator has just died. The French-Canadian element being in a majority in this district, I contend that a French-Canadian nominee should be appointed as its representative in the Senate. As just stated, on no reasonable grounds would I object, under ordinary circumstances, to the appointment of the hon. member for Missisquoi, nor to that of his competitor, Mr. Justice Foster, who both aspire to the position. But, in the present circumstances, the Government would only be acting fairly by appointing to the vacant position a French-Canadian as the English-speaking element of the province have more than their due portion of seats in the Senate, and as the French-Canadian element are in a majority in this division. Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who is proving quite entertaining by this time. I will not venture to say that I have felt any surprise at his somersaults, or at hearing him give utterance to opinions quite opposed to his statements of some two years ago on the floor of this House, and which he went on repeating on all the hustings of the province of Quebec. We all bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hon. Mr. Mercier was in power at Quebec, the hon. member held a position from the National Government. I will not venture to state that he supported this Government for the sake of this position, but I begin to realize that his course evidences that such was one of the motives which actuated his conduct. In 1891, the hon. member openly supported the Mercier administration, and went through the political campaign alongside with Mr. Mercier, in the general elections held that year. He was one of the most determined opponents of the royal commissioners set up, or the small benches, as they were then styled. But behold! now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member flatly contradicts his course of one year ago. The hon. the Postmaster-General (Sir Adolphe Caron) was perfectly entitled to say, in 1886, that the hon. member for Bellechasse was not to be relied upon. I gather from the "Hansard" in the session of 1886, from a speech addressed to the House by the hon.

the Postmaster-General, that the member for Bellechasse had extended his congratulations to the hon. Minister on the ground that he had been knighted by Her Majesty the Queen and also for the help extended by him to the battalion the hon. member was in command of. I find also letters from the hon. member concerning General Middleton in which he flatly contradicts himself in regard to his later statements. As regards Sir Frederick Middleton, the hon. member spoke as follows, in a letter addressed to the General, on the 26th August, 1887:—

DEAR SIR.—I should have written you sooner to join in the unanimous concert of congratulations which you receive from all parts, but a prolonged absence from the city prevented me. Your elevation to the Knighthood is only the first recognition of the services which you have rendered to the Dominion of Canada, and the honour which is bestowed upon you is reflected on all those whom you have encouraged by your personal bravery surely guided by your experience, and who have all largely benefited from the science which you have acquired during an honourable military career.

I deeply regret the attacks of a mean and malicious press against our general, but your reputation stands so high that these foolish slanders cannot reach it.

Allow me to present, through you, my respects to Lady Middleton and believe me,

Your very devoted,

G. AMYOT.

Shortly after this the very same man who had been fawning upon General Middleton, and extending his congratulations to him, attacked him most maliciously. I find in the same volume of the "Hansard" that he thus wrote to the hon. Postmaster-General, the then Minister of Militia:—

What an amount of gratitude the country owes you for the activity and zeal with which you have fulfilled your important duties during these days of trouble! Our soldiers, whose heroic courage during the recent campaign is now known far and wide, know how to appreciate, to their just value, the promptness with which you have acted, your vigilance and your anxiety for their welfare.

The very same man who wrote these encomiastic words, was seen a few months later to recant his professions of friendship and sling mud at the hon. the Minister of Militia, whom he attacked most maliciously. We also see by the "Hansard" that the hon. member sent to the Postmaster-General, telegrams which the latter was so happy in 1887 to read to the House. The member for Bellechasse wired to the then Minister of Militia:—

Arrived here all right. Found General Laurie perfect soldier. Advance of Middleton's troops too hurried; consequence being immense useless expense. Volunteers should be used for garrison and protection of place and ammunition. American scouts and Indians and half-breeds doing the same kind of fighting as rebels, should do the fighting and attacking. Part of Middleton's force exposed to be slaughtered. Troops hearty. Rely upon 9th.

Now here is another telegram dated at Calgary, 14th May, 1885:—

I add and I persist in saying that this war should be made by men fighting in the same way as rebels.

Volunteers are specially adapted for protection of forts and provisions.

I have given of the man but a brief outline, such as chalked out by himself. He is sent to the North-west to fight and he lacks the necessary courage. He took the trouble to send telegrams to the Minister of Militia to tell him that he was only fit for the guard of the forts and the provisions. As to the latter point, I begin to realize that it is his specialty. In 1891, he was siding with us, when the Hon. Mr. Mercier was in power and had patronage at his disposal, and as soon as Mr. Mercier had no more favours to dispense, the member for Bellechasse deserted the Liberal ranks to pass to the enemy. In so doing, he remains faithful to his traditional instincts and true to his character; now, as in 1887 he is guarding the provisions, I need not, I think, Mr. Speaker, expatiate any longer on the subject, as every one must be satisfied that the member for Bellechasse does not deserve henceforth to command the attention of the House.

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a very important question, not only to this part of the country but to Canada as a whole. I refer to the possibility of the re-imposition of the export duty on logs. The hon. Minister of Finance, in the course of his Budget speech, referred to the matter, stating that it was one that would be considered during the recess; and his remarks were such as to lead the House to believe that, at the next session of Parliament, the export duty might be re-imposed. Of course he did not say that it would be re-imposed; but he spoke as if the question were an open one. Now, I think that the hon. Finance Minister, in making that statement, committed a very serious error. If he had known how much he imperilled the interest of the lumber trade by making that statement, I do not think that he would have made it. This, however, I know right well, that there are a great many who are agitating this question, and who are urging upon the Ministry as forcibly as possible, the advisability of re-imposing the duty. The grounds on which the request is made are as follows:—First, the depletion of our forests, next, the loss of labour to Canadian workmen, and next, the loss to Canadians in the business of furnishing supplies to those engaged in getting out the logs that are exported. Now, so far as the depletion of our forests is concerned, I, as a lumberman, and as one interested in the welfare of Canada, do not desire, by any manner of means to see our forests unduly depleted. It is in the interest of every Canadian that our forests should be preserved. Now, Sir, these gentlemen who are urging the re-imposition of this duty see but one little district of the country. They see the

portion of country about the Georgian Bay on Lake Huron and they think that embraces the whole lumber interests of Canada, and that when, as they suppose, that small portion of the country is being depleted, the forests of Canada are being entirely ruined. The lumber interests of Canada, however, extend from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver, and cover a very large territory indeed, and in the whole territory we have great forest riches. Of that there is no kind of doubt. The re-imposition of the export duty upon logs might, perhaps, hinder a portion of them going to the United States, but, at the same time, the whole lumber industry of Canada would be imperilled and very seriously injured. There are those who believe that our pine lumber is very nearly exhausted. There are those who believe that our timber supply is being and has been most largely exhausted at the instance of the lumbermen. This, Mr. Speaker, is not at all the case. There is another source from which the forests of Canada have suffered, and far more extensively than they have suffered from the lumberman's axe; I refer to forest fires, and to fires which are brought about by the settlement of the country—not in every case by legitimate settlement, but very largely by illegitimate settlement. I can point to an instance not 150 miles from the city of Ottawa where over \$1,000,000 worth of pine was destroyed by one fire, while the benefit to the country from settlement was simply the raising of \$5 worth of potatoes. That is only one instance; but it is safe to say—and I am sure that every lumberman in this House will bear me out in the statement—that ten times the amount of forest wealth has been destroyed in Canada through that instrumentality than has been cut by the lumbermen; and those who desire to protect our forests should devote themselves to advocating the care of our forests and to discouraging, in every way, this illegitimate settlement. If this is done, I will venture this statement, that you may let our timber be cut, even as it is being cut to-day, and it will last this country for at least 100, perhaps 200 years to come. With regard to the loss to Canadian labour, I think a far greater loss would take place if the export duty were re-imposed, and why? Because I believe that the industry would be very much crippled, and that less labour would be employed by the lumbermen than is at present employed. In a great many instances, too, very serious loss would result to the country and the lumbermen, because a great deal of lumber would be burned up which otherwise would have been cut and realized upon, and have brought to the country a good return. Now, even with regard to the Georgian Bay district, I ask if there is the direct loss that is supposed? Not at all. There are a great many who suppose that the sawing of lumber is the great cost of producing it. Such is not the case. The great cost of producing lumber is

Mr. EDWARDS.

the production in the woods—the cutting of the timber, the hauling of it, and the driving of it to the mill. The cost of manufacturing lumber, after it is delivered to the mills, is just about one-fifth of the whole. While this is the case, and while I admit there is some loss, as far as the sawing is concerned, yet we do not make that entire loss, because the lumber is rafted by Canadian lumbermen, and the rafting of the logs costs about one-half as much as sawing them. Therefore, the total loss is simply about one-tenth. Those gentlemen who would have the duty reimposed for the sake of protecting a little bit of country up about Georgian Bay would imperil and very largely destroy the entire lumbering industry of Canada. In my humble opinion that would be simply absurd. It is also held that American labour comes over to perform the work of getting out these logs and takes the place of Canadian labour. Such is not the case. It is simply absurd to make such a statement, because Canadian labour takes out nearly all the logs taken out in Michigan and Wisconsin, and saws them as well. I have been through mostly all the important lumber districts of Michigan and Wisconsin, and I have never yet gone into one saw-mill in which half a dozen or a dozen of the men would not come up and ask me when I came from Canada. I did not know them; but they knew me, and when I asked them how they came to be there I was told at once that it was nearly all Canadians who were employed in lumbering in the States. So far as the question of supplies is concerned, the idea that the lumberman, who is taxed on almost every article that goes into the production of his lumber, will not buy his supplies wherever he finds them cheapest is simply absurd and preposterous. Do you suppose that a man is going to import his oats and hay and other supplies from the United States when he can get them cheaper in Canada? Not at all. The American lumbermen who come over here to manufacture are not fools, and they will buy their supplies where they get them the cheapest, and if they do bring over their pork, so do the Canadian lumbermen, because nearly all the pork used in the production of lumber in Canada comes from the United States. Now I do not want to take up too much time on this subject; but as a lumberman from this district, and one who ought certainly to know something of the subject, I felt it my duty to bring up this matter now, because during the recess I believe it is to be considered, and as I may not have an opportunity of referring to it again, I desire to bring before the notice of the Finance Minister my views upon the subject. Apart from all that I have said, I think there is another matter, and one of very considerable importance, to which I would like to refer. At the time of Confederation the lands in the various provinces and the timber thereon were handed over to the provinces to administer in their own interest. Each of

them administers its land affairs and timber matters as it considers best. Each province puts up its limits for sale under certain regulations, which are made known at the time of the sale. Surely these provinces ought to know what is best to do with their own property, and surely, so far as the administration of their land and timber is concerned, should be governed by their necessities. Now, supposing one of these provinces desired to realise upon its timber supplies, and the limits were put up for sale and to be operated, and that in the interest of the province they should be sold and operated. Now I hold this, that any Act of the Dominion Government, which would curtail operations or interfere in any way with the interests of the provinces in the management of their own property, in the operation of their limits and the selling of their lumber, would be a very great injustice to the provinces. Some of our provinces have greater necessity for disposing of their limits than others, and in fact it is the case that some of them have endeavoured to make it a condition in sales of timber limits that they must be operated. What would be the result if the reimposition of the export duty should have the effect of curtailing these operations and hampering the business of the provinces. Further it is often the case that the lumberman is unable to keep pace with settlement, that he is unable to cut the timber as fast as necessary in order that it shall not be destroyed, and in every way I think that the reimposition of the saw-log duty would be injurious to the general lumbering interest of Canada, and might very seriously effect the interests of the various provinces. For these reasons, I hope that the Government will consider well before they take a step which I believe would imperil the greatest industry in Canada, apart from the agricultural industry.

PROHIBITION OF FISHING.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will allow me to offer a few remarks in connection with the prohibition of fishing within the limits of the province of Quebec. I have received to-day from the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Costigan), the acting Minister of Fisheries, a letter stating that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Tupper), previous to his departure for England, had himself sent orders to the fishery overseers of the province of Quebec, prohibiting fishing up to 1st July, and that, under the circumstances, he did not see his way clear to accede to our request asking that the regulations prohibiting fishing be rescinded; but that, at all events, he would lay the matter before the Governor-General in Council. This prohibition of fishing is no new departure and the Government are well aware of the trouble they have experienced in the matter. I am anxious to spare not only the Government,

but the poor people who must suffer the evils resulting from such prohibition, all further trouble in the future. On the 11th April, 1892, the following proclamation was published in the "Canada Gazette," issuing from the Governor-General in Council:

In the province of Quebec, no one shall fish for, catch, kill, buy, sell or possess any bass or maskinonge between the 25th day of May and the 1st day of July, both days inclusive, in each year.

The taking of pickerel was already prohibited, the close season extending from the 15th April to the 15th May. The pickerel, the bass and the maskinonge are what is called hard fish, and the other species, soft fish. On the very same day when this proclamation was issued, the Department of Marine sent a circular to the fishery overseers, supplementary of the instructions they were to follow. Clause 5 of this circular reads as follows:—

The privilege heretofore granted as to the taking of soft fish during the close season applying to other fishes is withdrawn by order of the Minister, as it is considered that the judicious regulations enacted for the preservation of fish, during the spawning season, must be rigidly enforced.

This regulation was quite new. It was the first time that fishing was prohibited up to the 1st July in the province of Quebec. Fishermen, taken by surprise, continued fishing. Their fishing apparatus were seized, as also the fish sent to the Montreal market. It was upon that occurrence that petitions began to pour forth upon the Government. Delegations were also sent to prevail upon the Government to rescind the departmental regulation. Some fishery overseers told the fishermen, who were electors in their constituencies, to go fishing without fear, as the Government knew they were entitled to it; while other fishery overseers applied the stringent regulations in all their rigour. The result was that, last year, great hardship was inflicted on that class of people. In order to prevent the recurrence of such hardships, I asked the Government, on the 13th February last, what policy they intended to pursue on the matter this year. They said that they intended carrying out the same policy as last season. Numerous petitions have poured forth upon the Government. Several delegations, consisting of members from both sides of the House had interviews with the Government, with a view to prevail upon them stopping the department from putting the regulations into force. On the 22nd instant, the hon. member for St. Maurice asked the Government whether they had come to any decision on the matter. The answer given was as follows:—

The above petitions have been considered so important that the Government are now considering the subject to see if the said prohibitory regulations could be relaxed or not.

The session is drawing to its close, and I am happy to see the hon. Acting Minister in his

seat, in order to tell him that the members for the district bordering upon Lake St. Peter, that is to say the members for St. Maurice, Maskinongé, Berthier, Yamaska and Richelieu are anxious to know what line of action the Government intend to pursue on the matter. I dare say we are entitled to be informed as to whether the Government have decided upon a policy, and whether the regulations are to be relaxed or not. I call the attention of the Government to the importance of the question, and tell them that it is a matter of vital interest to that class of people who are affected by this regulation, on account of the great hardships that were inflicted on them last year and that are likely to occur again this year. I would also draw their attention to the great economical values of the fisheries affected by this regulation within the province of Quebec. The people in the neighbourhood of Lake St. Peter are a loyal, honest, hardworking class of the community, who, in the words of the great Lacordaire: "Beg of God to give them their daily bread, and ask of religion for an honourable life." Never have the overseers complained of their behaviour. I dare say there is not to be found in the department a single grievance or complaint lodged against them as to any infringement of the regulations. For over seven years I have practised at the bar of the Richelieu district, I may say that there has not been a single legal prosecution brought up against them for any infringement of the fishery laws. I know that these fishermen, who are subjected to so many hardships in following up their calling, are no richer to-day than the fishermen of old, the Apostles. In 1890, and even prior to that year, they petitioned the Government with a view to have the license dues removed from their fishing apparatus; very far from removing it, the Government increased it. Among the papers brought down on the Table of the House, under an Order in date of the 11th May, 1891, I see that the Hon. Senator Guévremont had been entrusted, in the spring of 1890, with the mission of investigating into the condition of fishermen in the Richelieu district. The report, which is drafted in English, will show what hardships were inflicted on them through the regulation preventing them from fishing up to the month of July.

Hon. CHARLES H. TUPPER,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

SIR,—I thought it my duty to obtain all proper information before answering your favour of the 4th of January last, and I am now in a position to lay before you the result of my investigation.

There is no question that the fishermen of our district belong to the poorer class, and that the slightest charge is a heavy burden on them.

I went first to Ste. Anne of Sorel on the 25th of January, when I called a meeting of all the interested parties, at which appeared Oly. Parré, Narcisse Lavallée and eighteen others. I ascertained that none of these fishermen sell out of the district.

Two years ago one Bénonie Tremblé sent a few barrels of fish to the United States composed of eel,

Mr. BRUNEAU.

pout, carp, sunfish and perch, but never tried the experiment again. He also sent a barrel of pickerel which he could not sell, and lost entirely.

On the 1st of February, I went to the Grand-Nord, where I met Delphis Pierre Dalcourt and 17 others. They all suffer every year from the rise of the river, having to save their cattle and goods by means of scaffolds or by taking them to the lofts. This means that they are very poor.

On the 3rd of February I called at Grande-Rivière where the following fishermen were assembled: Charles Barque, Octave Latour and 98 others.

On the 15th February, I met at St. François, Aimé Desmarais and 28 others.

They are all poor people involved in heavy debts and they hardly make their living out of the fishing season, having during the winter no other resources.

There is in no case any exportation of fish, it is all sold for local consumption.

It is impossible for them to pay any license. They are quite willing to submit to any regulations which might protect the fish, as they understand that strangers will be prevented from fishing in their waters, so that they are willing to take a license at a cost, let us say, of ten cents, but no more.

I hope you will take their unfortunate condition into your most serious consideration, and that you will find your way to suit policy to the sad necessities of their poor condition.

I might add that formerly they were allowed to fish for pickerel and bass up to the first of May.

Now they are limited to 15th April, that is to say, they are entirely forbidden to catch these fish at all, as the ice never moves before that time. Can you possibly extend the open season to the 1st of May?

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. B. GUÉVREMONT.

April 20th, 1890.

This report of Hon. Senator Guévremont, who is well acquainted with the situation of these people, has not been, I think, taken into consideration by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I just referred to the petitions sent up to the Government on the matter. I have before me one of those petitions, to which I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman acting as Minister of Marine. It gives the economical value of the different species, and bears the date of the 11th May, 1892. It is signed by Messrs. Montplaisir, Senator; by J. Bte. Guévremont, Senator, and by several others. In this petition particular stress is laid on the main objection raised against the prohibition of taking soft fish. It says:

It is most particularly to this portion of the regulations that apply the remarks the undersigned beg to submit. The undersigned do not question the fact that these regulations have been framed with a view to protect and develop the soft water fishing industries, in general; but inasmuch as the electoral divisions which they represent are concerned, these regulations are beyond doubt detrimental to a great many families; they are calculated to deprive some of them of the means of making a livelihood and to create discouragement among others, resulting perhaps in their being forced to leave their native country. Such was the result of former laws prohibiting the hunting of ducks, and more serious results may be anticipated from the rigid enforcement of the prohibitive regulations concerning the taking of soft fish.

Further on, the same petition continues in this strain:—

The undersigned beg to call your attention to the fact that the distinction between the *poor man's fish* and the *rich man's fish* convey no aggressive meaning towards the wealthy. The poor man's fish merely stands here for the common fish, on which the inhabitants of the banks of the river depend for the maintenance of their families; while the rich man's or sportman's fish is mostly caught with a golden hook. The former is a kind of manna which Providence yearly brings back to our shores, for the well-being and welfare of a great many poor people. It seldom happens that the poor man indulges in the luxury of catching the latter, as, when it appears in our rivers in the months of June, July, August and September, the poor, for the most part are busy with more remunerative harvest labour. At all events, through respect for the law, they generally set free the hard fish, when caught by surprise within their seines or their weirs, as, owing to the fact that they do not use any gill-nets, they run no risk of drowning it. Out of their catch of soft fish, in the spring season, many families realize an income quite insignificant for others, but quite considerable for them, of \$25, \$30, \$40, \$50 and perhaps occasionally somewhat larger, every year; and they feel happy and contented and become more attached to the native soil. How many poor people owe their happiness to the yearly produce of this soft fish catch, amounting to \$75,000? From a social and Christian stand-point, the happiness of such a deserving class of people, and the protection of fishes doubtless of a superior quality, but after all only an article of luxury for the wealthy, cannot be paralleled.

Not only is the question one of great importance, in so far as it inflicts hardships on a poor and deserving class of the community, but also in regard of the consequences inevitably resulting from the enforcement of these regulations. The petition I have just read, in fact, Mr. Speaker, evidences this state of affairs, and at the present time the ill-feeling and consternation caused by this regulation is such that no later than last week, seven or eight families from the Island St. Ignace passed through Sorel "en route" for the United States. Why this exodus? Just because the Government did not yet see their way clear to state their policy as to whether or not these regulations were going to be relaxed. A poor, hard-working and honest class of people, who depend on this industry for their livelihood, are deprived of their only means of maintenance during part of the year; for we must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that there are two classes of fishermen; those, first, who are engaged in the pursuit as a trade, and, secondly, those who have no land enabling them to live with the produce of the soil; and in the region bordering on Lake St. Peter many lands are flooded every spring, at the rise of water. It often occurs that water subsides only in the month of June. Now, during the interval, these people, owning these lands, must of necessity resort to fishing to earn their living and the bread of their families. The Government enforces the regulations prohibiting the taking of soft fish, on the ground that they do so with a view to the propagation of this fish. I may say, Sir, that among soft fish there are species which do not come under this rule and are an exception to it. Take, for instance, shad, which come up into our

rivers for about fifteen days, and never spawn in our country. As regards spawn, I will quote again from the memorial of the 11th May, 1892, signed by Senators Guévremont and Montplaisir among others, but which was obviously inspired by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Jones), who is an authority on the matter, or by Mr. Montpetit. In this memorial, the ichthyological question as to whether the spawning season is comprised within the period covered by the regulations is debated at some length. The following are the remarks submitted to the Government in connection with this matter:

The Statute enacts that no one shall fish for bass or maskinongé, between the 25th April and the 15th June; for pickerel, between the 15th April and the 15th May; on the ground that these fishes are then considered to be in their spawning season.

Now, is this season uniform everywhere? Is it the same for the rivers Yamaska, St. Francis, St. Maurice, and the region of Montreal, as for the heights of the Laurentian Mountains? It may well be called into question; but, beyond any doubt, the spawning season differs materially in Europe from that in America, under the same latitudes and for the same species. Have observations been repeated in sufficient number in the waters of Lake St. Peter and tributaries, to enable us to decree and determine the spawning season? Where does the pickerel spawn? Where does it lay its eggs? On stones and branches, in placid, running and deep waters; namely, in such places as are not within the reach of the seine and other fishing apparatus commonly used by our fishermen. The maskinongé, congenerous with the pike, shelters its eggs under the branches near the deserted and secluded spots which the seine fisher avoids or which are not within his reach. As to bass, it is well known that it spawns at a slight depth of water, in the middle of pebbles which obstruct the operations of seine fishing. The spawning season varies according to age, from May till the end of July. I may tell the hon. Minister, that speaking from experience, as a resident in this region—at the Bay de la Vallière, quite close to Lake St. Peter, parties who go fishing make an observation, confirmed by my own experience, that as there being many shrubs, as soon as the waters subside, thousand and thousands of eggs of fishes are found on the branches. To this cause may perhaps be ascribed the depletion of fishes in those quarters. I may tell the hon. Secretary of State that I took the trouble to study the question and that the remarks I have just made perfectly agree with the data of science. Deschanel and Pontillon, in their dictionary of theoretical and practical science, say:

The eggs of fishes, generally adhering to each other in masses of more or less magnitude, by means of a glutinous envelope, and discharged by the females in selected and sheltered places, with a convenient temperature, commodious shoals and water well adapted to their state. Speaking in general, fishes

inhabiting the open sea come from the depths of the ocean to the shores, while others run up from the ocean into the large rivers; some run up from the lakes to the sources of rivers and brooks; carps like to dwell in grass-grown bottoms; tenches, eels like best mud and stagnant waters; trouts, perches, gudgeons, loaches seek running waters on gravel. Large schools of salmon are often seen going up rivers, such as the Meuse, for instance, in quest of nests in the sand they have previously resorted to. At all events, the spawning season varies with the species: for instance, it extends from November to March for salmon-trouts, pike, loches, &c., &c.

As regards eels, the first school arriving in May, the general opinion is that they spawn in the open sea, about the month of December or January.

Under the word "nests," the same authors add: the customary period at which fishes establish their nests, varies not only for the genera of a same family, but also according to circumstances for members of a species.

As already stated, Mr. Speaker, from the author just quoted, I gather that there are fishes we are forbidden to take under the prohibition regulations, and which, however, according to the best authorities, spawn only in November or March. In the book just quoted may be found a nomenclature of all different species of fish, and of the spawning seasons of the principal species in Central Europe. From this list it would appear that spawning takes place as follows:—For pike, in February and March; for perch, in April and May, and for carp, in May and June. The conclusion I infer from all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the reasons alleged by the Government to forbid fishing up to July are certainly unfounded, and I call the attention of the Government to the following petition forwarded by me to the hon. Minister acting as Minister of Fisheries, and signed by the fishermen of my county. It reads as follows:—

They learned with regret that the Government intended prohibiting again this year, in the province of Quebec, the taking of soft fish, in like manner as was done last year:

That such a prohibition has inflicted on them in the past, real and numerous damages, and they also anticipate for the future, hardships which several fishermen will be unable to bear any longer, the consequence being that they will have to expatriate themselves.

That under these circumstances, they humbly ask the Government not to cause their ruin and that of their families.

That, further they do not believe that the Government will reach the anticipated result and that they do not see on what ground such a prohibition may rest, considering how they have always obeyed the fishery laws existing heretofore.

That the present petition be forwarded to the members for the counties of Richelieu, Berthier and Yamaska. They do so with prayers that they bring its contents to the notice of the Government and co-operate with the senators representing those divisions, with a view to take the proper steps to obtain justice.

Such justice, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of my constituency demand of the Government through my mediation, and that of the hon. members concerned in the question. I trust that, considering the reasons alleged in the petitions addressed to the department,

Mr. BRUNEAU.

not only will the hon. Minister of Fisheries lay the petition before the Council of the Ministers, but that he will, moreover, lend us his help and efficacious support. This prohibition will have no practical result beyond dealing harshly with the fishermen: it will also result in accelerating the exodus to the States which has already assumed such large proportions; it will also deprive poor families of the means of earning their livelihood: far from promoting the preservation of soft fish, it will only exercise a tyrannical and arbitrary power over the poor and the weak. I trust that the Government will not assume on themselves the responsibility and consequences of a narrow-minded policy as little justifiable as it is uncalled for.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) The hon. member who has just taken his seat has developed and elucidated the question in such a way as to prevail upon the hon. Minister of Fisheries to give us the assurance that the regulations prohibiting taking soft fish in the counties bordering on Lake St. Peter will be rescinded.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will ask the hon. member if he is rising with the intention of asking for information as to what the Government proposes to do on this matter, as I am ready to give him an answer at once; or whether he wants to speak at some length on the subject.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, supposing he does.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Minister what course he intends to pursue on the matter before the House, as I think I am entitled to put such a question; but, I want to show him, first, that the regulations now in force, respecting the fisheries, are neither more nor less than tyrannical to a class of men who deserve a far better treatment at the hands of the Government. The hon. member for Richelieu has just shown that the grounds on which the Government prohibits the taking of soft fish in the waters of Lake St. Peter are altogether unfounded, and we are still at a loss to know what are the true grounds of that prohibition. In 1890, when the Government imposed a tax on the fishing apparatus, their friends, both in the Senate and in this House, entered their protests against the imposition of such a tax, and left no stone unturned to show them that it was unjust and too heavy a burden on the shoulders of the people who had to bear it. The hon. Senators Guévremont and Montplaisir urged the Minister to remove this tax on the fishing apparatus. From the papers laid before the House, on the 11th November, 1891, it appears that the members representing this section of the province, Messrs. Vanasse, Boisvert and Dr. Coulombe, complained bitterly of this tax, which was by no means so onerous as the regulation now in force. The Government, instead of acceding to the suggestion of these members,

went still further. On the 11th April, 1892, a letter, signed by Mr. Bauset, was sent by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the fishery overseers. Among other clauses it contains the following :—

The privilege heretofore granted of taking soft fish during the close season as applying to other fishes is withdrawn, by order of the Minister; as it is considered that judicious regulations during the spawning season ought to be rigorously enforced.

The close season, as every one knows, against the different species of fishes, such as the pickerel, bass and maskinongé, extends to the 1st July. It also appears from this letter that the privilege of taking soft fish is withdrawn. Obviously it amounts to a total prohibition of taking soft fish, as, at such date, this fish has no value whatever. Owing to the high degree of the temperature and of the waters, this fish, at such a date, has no value as an article of immediate consumption, and is of still less commercial or marketable value. I would like to know on what ground the Government deprives these poor people of what I look upon in the light of an old vested right. These families represent an honest and hard-working class of the community, who succeed, through fishing, in having a competency; outside of the fishing season, these people, in general, are given to agricultural pursuits in the neighbouring parishes. These poor people are strictly entitled to the fishing, as they depend on this industry for their livelihood. From the section just quoted it would appear that the real ground of the prohibition is the protection of hard fish, as mentioned. The hon. member for Richelieu has just shown, from good authorities on the matter, that the preservation of fish is a mere pretense; but, were it well grounded on fact, I would like to know whether it is acting in fairness towards these poor people to deprive them of a considerable source of revenue, raised from the sale of the different kinds of soft fish, and with a view of preserving what is known as the rich man's, or sportsmen's, fish. As I have taken the trouble to examine the report of the Minister of Marine, I will just show that the value of the hard fish, which is the object of such protection, is quite insignificant in comparison with the varieties of soft fish among which the fishermen find their most copious supply of food, depending upon it for the support and maintenance of their family. From the report of 1890, I gather that the total value of fisheries for the counties of Richelieu, Three Rivers and Berthier was \$69,428.80. To be deducted from such sum is the value of 70,000 bushels of tom cod, amounting to \$15,000, leaving for all the other varieties an aggregate sum of \$54,428. Maskinongé, bass and pickerel, giving a yield of 15,000 pounds, at 5 cents a pound, this represents the small sum of \$755. So that the total value of soft fish is \$53,673. The following table will show the results for the years 1891 and 1892 :—

105

1891.	
Richelieu, Yamaska, Nicolet, Three Rivers and Berthier, total value	\$64,890 40
To be deducted tom cod, 50,000 bushels.....	25,000 00

All other fishes.....	\$39,890 40
Maskinongé, bass and pickerel, 13,000 lbs. at 5cts	650 00

Total value of soft fish....	\$39,240 40

1892.	
Richelieu, Yamaska, Nicolet, Three Rivers and Berthier, total value.....	\$38,852 80
To be deducted, tom cod, 15,000 bushels.....	7,500 00

All other fishes.....	\$31,352 80
Maskinongé, bass and pickerel, 29,185 lbs	1,459 25

Total value of soft fish....	\$29,893 50

We have, therefore, for three years, a total which is figured up as follows: Pickerel, bass and maskinongé, \$2,864; soft fish, \$122,807.65. I ask the House and the Government whether, with these figures at hand, and with the view, apparently, to protect the favourite fish of the sports, it is fair to deprive this hard-working and honest people of the community of a revenue amounting, for the last three years, to \$122,807.75. I think this question has not been taken into the serious consideration of the Minister. And the Government, far from yielding to the representations made by our predecessors in this House, and by the hon. senators above mentioned, praying that the tax be removed from the fishing apparatus, went to the further length of absolutely prohibiting the taking of soft fish. The hon. Minister asked, a little while ago, whether I desired to have a reply to my question. No doubt, Sir, I would like to have an answer, and by all means one favourable to the class of people to whom this prohibition inflicts such hardships. After listening to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for Richelieu, and to my own remarks, I may ask him, whether he does not see his way clear to give us an assurance that he will not wait till next year to have the prohibitory regulations relaxed, or whether he is going to let us understand that the matter is under consideration? There ought no longer to be any reason for Ministers now to answer: To-morrow, to questions put by members. All I want from the Government is fair-play and a just treatment to the people who only ask to be allowed to follow up their trade, in a legitimate and honourable way. As the representative of a constituency where are to be found a great many persons engaged in similar pursuits, I would be failing in my duty should I not seize this opportunity of showing, in as adequate a manner as possible, that the regulation complained of is tyrannical, arbitrary and unfair to those people.

The hon. Minister has in his possession a great many petitions asking for the repeal of this regulation, and I say again, it would be most unfortunate should he come and tell us that he is going to consider the question, and that, later on, he will see what steps may be taken in the matter. It may be quite convenient for a Minister to consider such questions at leisure, in the silence of his cabinet, with plenty of time at his disposition; but, as regards the poor people on whom these decrees inflict such hardships, and the wretched fishermen who, in consequence of these harsh measures, will be forced to leave their homes and expatriate themselves, I say, Sir, it would be an almost inhuman act for the Government to temporize, and come and tell them that, later on, their grievances will be righted. Later on, when several of these poor people will have betaken themselves to the United States, it will be no longer time to remedy this state of affairs. The evil will then be beyond redemption; an evil inflicted in consequence of the harsh rule enforced by the Government on a hard-working, honest class of the community, who obey the laws of the country and are fully entitled to the legitimate pursuits and to the calling they have inherited from their fathers.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I think it my duty, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words in reply to the remarks fallen from the hon. member who has just taken his seat. This soft fish question is one of those to which the attention of the Government has repeatedly been called to; and several members of this House have also submitted to the Government petitions in the same connection. It is quite easy to understand that the hon. members for Maskinongé and Richelieu at aiming at making political capital, with a view to telling their constituents that it was through their exertions and their representations that the Government have suspended the regulations prohibiting fishing. I am not aware what course the Government mean to pursue in connection with these regulations, and whether they are going to tell us that the fishermen's complaints will be reconsidered; all I know is that, of all the members who have exerted themselves, since the last seven or eight years, to bring this soft fish question before the Government, none have put forth so great exertions nor taken more effectual steps towards softening the heart of the Government, and prevailing upon them to temper the severity and harshness of these stringent rules, than the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). It being so, great was my surprise to hear the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) advocating before this House the free taking of soft fish. He has just mentioned the petition of the 11th May, 1892, asking the Minister to do right to the fishermen of the region bordering on Lake St. Peter, while it is a well known fact that this great defender

Mr. LEGRIS.

of the fishermen's cause cannot even boast of having signed this petition. It is signed by Senators Guévremont and Montplaisir, by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Cargnan) and several others, but the name of the member for Maskinongé is conspicuously absent from the list.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I was not asked at the time to sign the petition.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I know quite well that the hon. member will tell again his constituents, at Louiseville, that the Conservatives did not ask him to sign the petition. Should the Government yield to the pressing representations made to them, the hon. member will claim the merit of the settlement of this question, and will boast of it. But I tell him, fearless of contradiction, that he can claim no merit whatsoever in that connection, and that, among the members who may lay a just claim to this merit, the most conspicuous figure is the hon. member for Berthier, who has devoted all his energies to the settlement of this vexed question, without trying to make it a party question. The member for Maskinongé, previous even to the Government answering the question and making known their policy, hurried to heap reproaches upon them. Such a course was anticipated from the hon. member, who only rose to criticise the Government, not to advocate the cause of the fishermen of his country; for the hon. member makes the whole question subservient to his own political interest. I trust the Government's reply will be a favourable one to those who concern themselves about and take to heart the interests of the fishermen of this region. Unlike the hon. member for Maskinongé, my hon. colleagues, the members for Richelieu and Berthier (Messrs. Bruneau and Beausoleil) have taken an active part in the settlement of the question, have participated in all the steps which have been taken with a view to bringing about a favourable solution. But the member for Maskinongé, though he has not moved in the matter, will be the first to claim the largest share of merit. The hon. leader of the Opposition is welcome to smile, but he should bear in mind at the same time that his friend the member for Maskinongé is a new acquisition for the Liberal party; and that friends of the eleventh hour ought not to be too much relied upon. They are well known, chiefly in the Three Rivers district, those men who pose before the people as the vindicators of outraged morality, and who have to resort every time to Riel's spectre to get elected.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Riel's scaffold has also rendered you material service.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) It hardly availed to the Conservative party, but it has been of great avail to the Liberal party. These facts are well known in the district of Three Rivers, since 1887. Mr. Speaker, I

would have refrained joining in this debate, being satisfied with the exertions I have put forth to further the cause of the fishermen, had not these remarks fallen from the hon. member for Maskinongé. When he pays visits to his constituents scattered through the parishes of his riding, he misses no opportunity to sling mud at the Conservative party with which he sided not long ago. Though we, Conservatives, are, perhaps, open to the reproach of putting up too patiently with this kind of abuse, we claim, at least, the merit of not trusting to or reposing confidence in a party or a Government of false economy. I do not allude to the old Quebec Government, which is out of the question now, as they have been driven from power. I was one of those who insisted upon the Government relaxing the severity of the regulations, enforced with a view to the preservation of fish in our inland fisheries, and to the protection of that deserving class of the community who depend on fishing for their livelihood; and I feel happy to state that, should the Government alter their decision, such a result will have, in some measure, been brought about by the exertions and representations of the member for St. Maurice, as well as those of the hon. members for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), and for Champlain (Mr. Carignan), but not, by any means whatever, by those of the member for Maskinongé. While certain members busied themselves with the settlement of the soft fish question, the hon. member for Maskinongé was, no doubt, engaged in working in the upper regions of liberal politics, in the interests of his new allies of the day, the liberal-national party.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I would ask the hon. the Secretary of State to condescend to declare the Government's policy, previous to my addressing the House on the question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman states, apparently without knowing the answer I made to the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris), that before he makes his speech I should make my declaration. The only declaration I have to make, Mr. Speaker, is that, receiving the representations made last night, principally, I might say, from gentlemen representing constituencies in Ontario, I stated then that on account of the numerous petitions sent in and representations made to the department in connection with the regulations in Quebec and Ontario, as well as other provinces, on two points some change would be made; but I would have to ask the authority of Council. These two questions were as to the question of "poisson mou," and the question of the restriction on the River St. Clair. There were other questions more in the way of detail, as to changes in the size of the mesh of nets and the size of pound-nets, gill-nets, seines, etc. But these two questions I stated

clearly were matters of importance, and would involve a wide departure from the regulation, and that I would have to take the advice of Council. But I stated that, seeing that the fishing season was approaching, not an hour would be lost; and I have kept my word. On these two points no doubt instructions will immediately be sent to the officers, both in Ontario and in Quebec. The restrictions on the River St. Clair will be modified at once. I am keeping the word I gave when I stated that I would take the first opportunity to consult Council, when I would see how far we could meet the wishes of gentlemen on both sides. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has put the question rather unfairly in my judgment in regard to what they call "poisson franc," which is a superior fish, in stating to the House that the policy of the Government was to maintain the protection of this small quantity of fish in order to protect the larger quantity of the inferior fish. It is evident there is a reason for that. Why has the "poisson franc" decreased? Because the regulations have not been sufficiently stringent, and thus the only fish left is the "poisson mou," which also requires protection or they will be exterminated also, and the House must remember, while discussing the policy of the department, that this question strikes at the very deepest interests of these people, and that the department must adopt the policy of protection even for the inferior fish, because, until there is some system of restocking rivers with superior fish like bass, maskinongé and pickerel, the people must depend upon the "poisson mou," which, though they are an inferior fish, are of value. The policy of protection is thus seen to be in the right direction, though it operates harshly for a time.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I only wish to extend my thanks to the hon. Minister for the promise just made of sending instructions to the fishery overseers to suspend the regulations complained of. I declare my intention to avail myself of this declaration, and I thank the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister, I doubt not, is actuated by the best intentions and favourably inclined towards the class of fishermen, but were he anxious to have all causes of complaint removed, he should take one further step. There is another grievance in addition to the complaint with regard to the prohibition of fishing. The first of these grievances is as to the regulation imposing a license on fishing apparatus used in the waters of the St. Lawrence. This system of license is unfair to the class of people who have to bear it. The Act complained of dates back as far as 1888. This tax is a heavy burden upon the poor people who are unable to pay it. Already, I regret to say, several families have seen themselves obliged to leave the parish of St. Barthélemy and Isle du Pads in the county of Berthier. On a depth of four miles each year, the lands at St. Barthélemy flooded, and the water only

subsidies about the 15th or 20th June. The settlers, therefore, cannot begin sowing before that date and are forced in the interval to remain idle. Now, should these people be prevented from fishing, they will find themselves without any means of making a livelihood and as the result, they will be forced to emigrate, as it has often occurred since 1888, on account of this license fee or tax being imposed. I had ventured to trust, Mr. Speaker, that after the promise made by Sir John A. Macdonald, the Government would come to a favourable decision on the matter. I entertained the hope, I say, that the Government would do away with this tax. I must confess that I feel disappointed at the hon. the Secretary of State having left this point untouched and at the Government not being ready to redress this grievance. I desire also to call the attention of the Government to the order given in December last with regard to trout fishing. Under the old regulation it was prohibited to catch these fish from the 1st October to the 1st January. Under the order I have just referred to, the close season is extended to the 1st May, which is tantamount to a total prohibition of trout-fishing, and is calculated to inflict great hardships on the settlers. Trout-fishing is the only industry within reach of the settlers, as also the only one which constitutes for them a means of making a livelihood. By the extension of the close season for these fish, settlers are deprived of a much needed supply of food upon which they depend almost entirely for the subsistence of their families. In fact, at the approach of the Lenten season, they catch trout and bring it to the markets of the towns. But, by the order issued, in December last from the Fisheries Department, a poor, hard working, and most honest class of the community are deprived of a means of making a livelihood and of a valuable resource in critical times, such as the settlers, as we all know, often meet with. I, therefore, call the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to the hardships inflicted on these poor people by this regulation; and as he is kind-hearted, I have no doubt he will hasten to do right to them and redress their grievance. To my mind, the hardships consequent upon this prohibition need only be pointed out for the Minister to take up the matter and do away with the obstacles thrown in the way of the settlers. Instead of discouraging colonization, the Government ought to adopt such regulations as were calculated to facilitate the work of the settlers who undertake to open up our public lands and not to force them to give them up, after undergoing so many hardships to fertilize the soil which yields the food of their numerous families. It must be borne in mind that colonization is one of the surest means of increasing the wealth and prosperity of a nation. I would also call the attention of the hon. Minister to the regulation concerning seine fishing. I have in my hand a letter addressed to me by

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

a citizen of St. Barthélemy, to which I think it right to call, for a moment, the attention of the House. With the small seine an enormous quantity of small fish is destroyed, and in the writer's estimation (Mr. Pierre Choquette) in that single locality, over ten or twelve thousand small pike are destroyed. Fishermen use part of this small fish to bait their dead lines, and the rest is wasted. Mr. Choquette says :

Another demand which is, beyond a doubt, one of the most important for the preservation of fish, is the prohibition of fishing with small seines by means of which, here, in the single North Range, a daily catch of from ten to twelve thousand small pike takes place. Fishermen use this fish to bait their dead lines, as they are known here. This fishing with the small seine takes place from the 15th June to the 15th September, and the fishermen from the North are all agreed in view of the preservation of these fish to do away with this destructive engine.

Such is the subject to which I wished to call the attention of the hon. Secretary of State, trusting that he will take my demand into his serious consideration, and that he will strive his best to afford protection, first, to fishermen, and then to fish itself.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, with the intention of participating at any length in the debate, but merely to put a question to the Government. To save time, I will put the question without any further preamble, the length of my remarks depending upon the nature of the reply given. I understand that the regulation prohibiting the taking of soft fish applies equally to water-courses, to rivers, in short, to the inland waters in general, as well as to the counties bordering on Lake St. Peter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) Such is the right interpretation to be put on the regulation. Were it to apply to inland waters, the river Yamaska would then be included in and fall under the operation of the regulation. I may state that there are in the neighbourhood of St. Hyacinthe parties who, although not exclusively depending upon fish for subsistence, nevertheless catch a certain quantity which they bring to market for sale. I understand that, were those parties not to be allowed to catch fish during the close season now in force, they would lose all the benefit this catch yielded them. For, during hot weather, it is impossible to take this soft fish and to keep it in a saleable or marketable condition. This should also be remedied by the Government in the interest of those well-deserving persons. The Government have also given instructions to have migratory passes established at two places on the river Yamaska, the first one at Rapide Plat, the second in the very city of St. Hyacinthe. This is done with a view to enabling these fish to ascend the river for spawning, and then return to the waters of the St. Lawrence. Those who know well the fish which frequent this river, say that

they make but a short stay in the river Yamaska, within a space of about eight miles, and that, after fifteen days or three weeks, go away. So that there is no reason for prohibiting fishing with a view to protect the spawning of these fish. I trust the hon. Minister will favourably receive my remarks, and take the necessary steps to protect that class of people living on the banks of the river Yamaska.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Experimental Farm—Maintenance \$75,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before that item passes, I want a little explanation. How many labourers are kept on that farm?

Mr. FOSTER. About thirty at present.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find in the annual report that some \$5,000 was spent for labour upon the farm. I find there are thirty-six labourers, if you count the gardeners, stablemen and cattlemen, but there are twenty-three, apart from stablemen and cattlemen, and the wages they get is \$7,356. That is a large sum indeed for labour. I think the item for labour is excessive. I think we have not got a proper statement. That land should all be laid out into fields and sections, and we should know the quantity under timber, the quantity under trees, and the quantity under small fruits. I have spoken of that before, but it has not been done.

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed it is all laid out in plots.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then, why is that not in the annual report, so that we can go over the report and see how it is?

Mr. FOSTER. A statement is made of the amount grown on each plot.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is no statement made respecting cattle. There should be an annual statement given of the number raised, number purchased, number sold and an inventory of the value of the stock. There is no such statement given in this annual report.

Mr. FOSTER. All particulars are kept, but they are not all embodied in the report. We do not want to make this report a second Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The farmers should know the number of stock kept on the farm. What number of stock were kept during the winter of 1891-92?

Mr. FOSTER. From seventy to ninety head.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was told that only sixty-six head were kept. We were told on a previous occasion that the farm would be able to keep forty head of cattle on forty acres of land. When this experiment was

made, it failed. The same forty acres of land is referred to in this report, but no information is given as to the number of cattle kept on them. Such statements are only valuable when kept for a number of years, and the results of one year prove nothing. In this case, during the first year a hail storm struck the barn and did injury. Such unforeseen events will happen, but a strict account should be kept of the number of cattle on the certain number of acres, extending over a number of years. I desire to inquire how many cattle were kept on those forty acres last year?

Mr. FOSTER. Twenty-eight head of cattle were kept on forty acres last year, but the year is not up yet.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). How, then, does it come about that a statement was made in the annual report for the previous years, for more than a year has elapsed since then?

Mr. FOSTER. The statement was for ten and a half months.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It was stated that they kept the cattle ten and a half months. If they are able to keep twenty-eight cattle on forty acres, it was surely unnecessary to expend such a large sum for purchasing feed. Yet I find \$1,630 were spent on purchasing feed last year. The statement is made, from the report, that a large quantity of grain has been distributed. Was all this grain raised on the Experimental Farm?

Mr. FOSTER. Some was raised on the Indian Head Farm, in the North-west Territories.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). All the grain distributed could have been grown on thirty-five acres. Then, there are thirty-six tons of straw bought. I was on the farm in the harvest of 1891, and there was sufficient straw to have kept all the cattle comfortably, if properly taken care of. Yet we find \$165 spent for straw alone. Of course, this should not occur. There must be great waste on the farm. One of the benefits to be derived from the experiments conducted at the farm is to show farmers how many cattle can be kept on a small quantity of land. Large quantities of food have, however, been purchased, and it is apparent that these purchases should cease, except a little oil cake and linseed meal, used for purposes of fattening: but the cattle kept on the farm should be only such as can be fed from the farm. In my opinion, the farmers of Ontario derive very little benefit from the model farm. Why, in manure alone, \$5,600 were spent, the price of a good farm, and beside all that was purchased, there was the quantity made on it. So long as the present system continues, it is impossible that the farmers can be benefited. If the farmers are to receive benefits, an inventory of the stock should be taken and a valuation put on

it every year, as is done on every well-conducted farm. We have often been pointed to the cost of the Ontario Model Farm. But in their report the number of cattle purchased, the number bred and the value of the stock is stated yearly. It is impossible that farmers can learn how a well-conducted farm should be kept, when the stock is not taken every year and the value not given. I also see an item of \$600 expenses of men attending agricultural fairs. I understand the farm does not exhibit stock. What, therefore, were the men doing?

Mr. FOSTER. There were exhibits at Montreal, Toronto, London and Kingston.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Was any stock shown there?

Mr. FOSTER. No, they were grain exhibits.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). One man might have taken the exhibits to each fair and have left them there, as other farmers do. How many head of cattle were purchased for fattening during 1891-92?

Mr. FOSTER. Fourteen were fattened on the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is no item for purchasing animals. I find a statement of eight cattle being bought for experimental purposes, but the purchase does not appear in the Public Accounts. They should have realized from \$500 to \$600, and the only amount received was \$200 for cattle and beef sold. There is something wrong, when these statements are not complete and placed in the Public Accounts. What does the sale of beef mean—do they kill cattle and sell beef at the farm?

Mr. FOSTER. Cattle are sold to the butchers.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then, what is the reason of this small amount? If fourteen or eighteen head of steers were fattened, they should have been worth \$70 per head, and yet only \$242 altogether were received. How does it happen that there is no account in the Public Accounts, either of the purchase or sale?

Mr. FOSTER. We are buying these cattle young, and some of them are still being kept.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The statement is made in the dairy report that they were purchased at two years old, and that statement ought to appear in the Experimental Farm Report.

Mr. FOSTER. We will put it in next year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The report gives \$1,293 for cattle purchased, but when I come to the Auditor-General's Report I can only find for cattle, hogs and all, \$1.100. If everything was kept in proper order both reports should correspond.

Mr. FOSTER. The cattle are sent to other farms in certain cases.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then they should be credited from one farm to the other, as any business man would do.

Mr. FOSTER. They are bought for and debited to this farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then the cost put on them for the time they are on this farm should be added to the original cost and credited to the farm. There is not a single item of revenue entered in the farm report for this year, and only expenditure is mentioned. But, if we are to have a proper account of the farm, we should have revenue and expenditure. Although I am only a workingman myself I can show you the revenue and expenditure on my farm, and the Government farm should be kept in a businesslike manner. I stake my reputation as an agriculturist that there is not a practical man to conduct that farm, and from what I have seen from the management the whole thing shows it from beginning to end.

Mr. LAURIER. You farm to make a profit.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). And if the Government does not conduct the farm to make money there is no use for it. However, I suppose that it is too late in the session to go into the matter this year, but if I am spared next year, and if there is not a proper account kept on that farm, depend upon it the farmers of the province of Ontario shall know what this farm has cost them. The farm this year has cost \$16,000, although the statement is made that it only cost \$22,000. The officers on that farm, and the positions they occupy, should all be put down in the report as well as the cost of the buildings and the expense of running the farm. The farmers of the country want to know that, but it is not done. I can assure you that if there is not a proper account kept next year the country shall know it.

Dairying Interests... \$25,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). If you are going into that I want to know what became of the butter and cheese bought last year. I find that there are 80,000 pounds of that cheese, and only 20,000 sold, and we have no statement as to the difference. As far as cheese is concerned, it is something that the Dairy Commissioner ought to leave alone, at least as far as the province of Ontario is concerned. I think it is a mistake to purchase cheese to put it on the English market, because I find that the cheese which was purchased by the Government brought 11¼ cents per pound, and if you deduct from that freight, insurance and commission it will leave something less than 10 cents per pound. That is under the price the factory men have been selling their cheese for in western Ontario. A number of gentlemen engaged in the business, purchase their cheese and go to the old country every year and get what the market requires, and the Government should not interfere. I will admit that there

was a necessity for establishing creameries, but the way that should be done is for the Government to dispose of the products of these creameries and not to become traders.

Mr. FOSTER. Seventy-nine thousand seven hundred and twenty pounds of cheese were sold, and the deposit was \$7,516.56, which was equal to 9.42 cents per pound. Then there were 20,338 pounds of butter sold for which was deposited \$3,920.08, or 19.27 cents per pound. The Auditor-General for once was caught napping, and there was a mistake in his figures.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I observe that there was a mistake in the cheese that was sold. It is very questionable whether the butter put upon the English market raised the credit of Canadian butter even to the extent that our dairymen, who are running creameries, are doing at the present time, because I understand that a sum of money had to be taken out of the public treasury to compensate the patrons of the factories over and above the price that the butter brought in the English market. Unless the article sold by the Government is superior to what our private dairymen can put on the market it is injuring our market in butter to a greater extent than any private maker of butter could do. The butter sold by the Government should be first quality, but it must have been inferior to bring the price that it did. We have a gentleman who runs four creameries in the county of Huron, and he was able to give his patrons 18 cents a pound last year for the butter put upon the market. That was what they were not able to do with the butter in the Government creameries.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must remember that 20,338 pounds of butter were sold, and that the deposit was \$3,920, but that is not the full proceeds of the butter. The full proceeds brought that sum up to make to the farmer about 21 cents per pound for his butter, and the butter was sold on the English market at from 22 to 26½ cents per pound. All that is paid to the farmer is the net proceeds. The Government loses nothing. The 19.27 cents per pound does not show the income from the butter, but the net income to the farmer was 21 cents.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I rather think there is a mistake there, because Professor Robertson admitted before the Agricultural Committee that over \$200 had to be taken out of the public Treasury to pay the patrons of the factories on account of that butter.

Mr. FOSTER. That was for one very small shipment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that it is highly desirable that we should encourage the butter and cheese industry in every way we can. It is very satisfactory to find Canadian cheese taking such a leading position in the English market, and I am sure that if we can encourage the butter industry so as to

cause larger shipments than we now make it would be very desirable, for, in my opinion, there is more room for butter than for cheese in the English market. The creameries have been doing well, but I think if we offer a prize for the exportation of creamery butter, as is done in Australia, the money would be better spent than in speculating by purchasing butter and placing it on the market. However, it is gratifying to know that improvements have been made in both butter and cheese exportation.

Purchase of a new Steamer..... \$50,000

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister promised to bring down copies of the certificates of the parties in charge of the several Government steamers, in accordance with an Order of the House. I want to know why that return has not been brought down. I have a reason for asking for it, which I will tell the hon. gentleman when he brings down the statement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated to the hon. gentleman that as some of the information had to be obtained outside of the department, the return could not be completed up to the present time. But the deputy tells me that the full return will be ready to-morrow, when it will be laid on the Table.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should have an opportunity of examining the return, because I have some reason to believe that men are in charge of these steamers who do not possess the certificate.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may state that there is no officer against whom there can be any objection on the ground of his not having the certificate except one officer, that is, Officer Wakeham. He has been appointed according to the practice that has always existed of putting in command of the service a medical man, and having a certificated master for the sailing of the vessel. Every predecessor of Commander Wakeham has been a doctor, because these vessels touch at many out-of-the-way places along the coast of Labrador, and a medical man is supposed to be necessary.

Meteorological Survey..... \$62,900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far have you gone north?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Edmonton is the furthest station north.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will trouble the hon. gentleman to supply the House with a short memorandum showing the stations that exist north of parallel 50.

Fish-breeding..... \$51,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we let this pass, I must make this stipulation that should it be necessary to have a discussion on concurrence, it must be in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be all right.

Fishery Protection Vessels—To provide for the cost, maintenance and repair of fishery and protection steamers and vessels \$100,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you expect to spend all that money?

Mr. FOSTER. No; we do not generally spend that much, but we keep the round vote.

Miscellaneous \$289,070

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item, I think the hon. gentleman had better let it stand, or let one item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Let one item stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell you what you had better leave:

To pay for services performed by Customs and Fisheries Departments, and other expenses in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty and collection of statistics.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved first reading of Bill (No. 128) to amend the General Inspection Act.—(from the Senate.)

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STEAM-SHIP COMMUNICATION WITH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire, with the consent of the House, to introduce a Bill to amend the Act relating to ocean steam-ships. I would like to do that and to dispense with the usual form.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the purport of the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. To make a change with respect to the section regarding the Australian service, which was voted three years ago. That gave us the power to grant a subsidy for a term of ten years, \$25,000 for fortnightly steam-ship service and the proportionate amount for less than a fortnight. I wish to change that, so that the subsidy shall be granted to a steam-ship service not less than monthly. I will fully explain it tomorrow.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Wednesday).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. FOSTER (for Mr. Patterson, Huron) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College, and to provide that the salary of the Commandant shall not exceed three thousand two hundred dollars a year, that the salary of the Staff Adjutant shall not exceed fourteen hundred dollars a year, and that the salaries of the professors, instructors and assistant instructors shall not exceed the total sum of twenty-six thousand dollars annually.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the \$3,200 a year of salary granted to the Commandant in addition to his residence?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is. This resolution does not increase the salaries now paid by a single dollar.

Resolution concurred in.

DOMINION IRRIGATION ACT.

Mr. DALY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) The Dominion Irrigation Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of that Bill?

Mr. DALY. It is not my intention to press the Bill this session. Its object is to provide for the irrigation of a large portion of the North-west Territories that will require to be irrigated. It is intended that persons or companies who desire to irrigate lands will be allowed to do so under the conditions and safeguards provided in the Bill. The Bill will be printed and circulated for the use of members, and will not be pressed until next session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TILBURY CENTRE INDUSTRIES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) (for Mr. Campbell) asked, What is the description of each of the manufacturing establishments in the town of Tilbury Centre, according to the census of 1891? What are the names of the several manufacturers? What number of hands were employed in each of said manufacturing establishments?

Mr. FOSTER. The industries in Tilbury Centre, according to census of 1891, are as follows:—

Industries.	Hands employed.
Bakers—	
Palmers	2
Blacksmiths—	
John Watkins	1
Médard Goudreau	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Robert Strong	1
Louis Laplante	2
Brick-maker—	
Thomas Cox	7
Cabinet and Furniture Factory—	
Wm. C. Crawford	7
Carpenters and Joiners—	
Chas. Clark	2
James McDonald	3
Robert F. Smith	8
Carriage-makers—	
Mungo Stewart	3
Alex. Campbell	6
Dress-makers and Milliners—	
Eliza Kelly	3
Richardson, Van Bridger & Co.	6
James & Geo. Powell	10
Flour Mill—	
J. & R. Kidd	4
Harness-makers—	
Alex. Cassidy	1
Moses Hudon	1
Knitting—	
Matilda Dupuis	2
Meat Curer—	
Frederick Lee	3
Photographer—	
John James	1
Picture Frame Maker—	
Marie Benglet	1
Pot and Pearl Ashery—	
Francois Beausejour	1
Planing Mill—	
Smith & Clark	2
Printer and Publisher—	
William A. Shaw	3
Soap-maker—	
Gilbert Keith	1
Tailors and Clothiers—	
Jas. Creech	5
Geo. McLaughlin	6
Tinsmiths—	
Wm. C. Crawford	1
Mungo Stewart	1
John E. Scriver	1
Washing Machine Maker—	
Césaire L. Paré	3
Watchmaker and Jeweller—	
Frank Callandhill	1
Weavers—	
Marie Phaneuf	1
John Marchand, jun	2
Nancy Watkins	1
Henry Williams	1

PORT OF SANDY COVE, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, What were the amounts received for customs at the port of

Sandy Cove, Digby county, N.S., for the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1891 and 1892; also the amounts received from 30th June, 1892, to 1st December, 1892? The salary paid to the officer at that port? Have there been any charges preferred against said officer in connection with bounty claims?

Mr. WALLACE. The customs collections at Sandy Cove for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1891, amounted to \$10.55; for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892, 62 cents; and from the 30th of June to the 1st of December, 1892, \$33.40. The salary paid to the officer is \$150 per annum. Some 85 vessels entered and cleared at this outport during the year ended the 30th of June last. It is necessary to have this officer stationed at this point. Charges have been preferred against him, and the matter is now in the hands of Inspector Kinney, of Yarmouth, N.S., for inquiry.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. gentleman to make the statement he promised with regard to the French Treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to ask my hon. friend for further delay. A telegram has been received this morning which is now being deciphered, and I would not care to make an answer before knowing the purport of it. My hon. friend, I am sure, is anxious for all the information.

MACKEREL NETS.

Mr. FRASER. Early in the session I put a question respecting an Order in Council passed 21st March, 1892, relating to mackerel nets, and the acting Minister replied that the matter was under consideration. Can he tell me now what is the intention of the Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No definite decision has been arrived at on that point yet.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dominion Cartridge Factory . . . \$40,000

Mr. MULOCK. Before this item is passed I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia the grievance of a former member of the service, Sergeant Slater by name. This soldier was originally in the regular service and served with distinction for many years. After having left the service with good conduct medals and everything to his credit, he enlisted in the Canadian militia, becoming a member, I believe, of the Governor-General's Body Guard. During the rebellion he rendered valuable service to the country by serving in the North-west. At the end of his three years' service, he came into collision with the military authori-

ties, and I am sorry to say that, I think, he was very hardly treated. A demand was made upon him under the Militia Act for the return of his kit into stores. It is stated that this demand was not complied with as the law required, and he was summoned before a magistrate in Toronto, and sentenced to jail for thirty days. He served in jail for thirty days. It appears from his own public statement, whether well founded or not, that he had been making certain charges against the administration of the Guards in which he had been serving. These charges, he thinks, led to what he calls his persecution. I think myself that the treatment he received was harsh, to say the least of it. The charges have been formulated, I understand, and presented to the Militia Department, and Sergeant Slater has demanded an investigation into these charges. I do not intend to repeat these charges. I understand they are set forth explicitly in documents in the custody of the department. The sergeant has published his book, a copy of which I have here. No doubt the hon. Minister has seen it. This book sets forth the sergeant's record, and, I presume, the charges in question. In that respect I suppose this book would be a copy of the documents in the custody of the Government. Sergeant Slater says he has been informed that these charges have been investigated, but there is no evidence of an investigation, and it is alleged here that there has been no investigation, as there should have been. I rise now simply to suggest to the Minister that the charges should be taken up, and dealt with in a way that will satisfy the complainant that they are well or ill founded. Up to this time it would seem that he has received anything but justice at the hands of the militia authorities, from his own superior officer up to the head of the department, and, now that we have a new Minister of Militia, I would ask him to put his department into communication with the parties and see if the grievances set forth here have been adjudicated upon as required by law. It is hardly necessary for me to repeat what I said last session in regard to this soldier. I have no reason to change my mind, and I believe today, as I did then, that he is an honest, trustworthy, well-meaning, industrious and steady man, and that no charge can fairly be made against him to the contrary. That being the case, considering his record, considering that he has spent at least twenty-five years in the service of Her Majesty, and has fought on many a field, and that he left the regular service with honour, and with every badge of honour, I think it is not asking too much of the department to ask that the humble petition of a person in this position shall be treated with as much respect as if it came from the most powerful in the land.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to say a word or two about this matter, as the attack is directed principally against me. I might say that this man Slater was not in the

Mr. MULOCK.

North-west in our corps, and I never heard of him being on active service, though he has the long service medal. I think it is very unfair of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to bring this matter up again, seeing that it was brought up last session. I think the reason is, that he wants to call off this man Slater from himself, and induce him to confine his attentions to me. I may say that this man, through the excessive use of liquor, has had his mind very much weakened, and the course taken by the hon. member and others on this side of the House, who last year brought the matter up in the House, is having the effect of weakening the man's intellect to such an extent as to make him a regular crank. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) says about him, he is not a steady man. The hon. gentleman sees him only when he is sober and then his appearance is in his favour. He has been drinking so long that his mind is weakened and he has become nothing but a crank and that in great degree because of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. I may say that he has not only reported me, but I believe he has reported the hon. member himself. He reported the late Mr. Bigelow, the solicitor who defended him, to the Law Society, and asked that society to have him struck off the rolls, because, as he alleged, Mr. Bigelow had betrayed his case. He reported a letter carrier to the postmaster of Toronto on the ground that I had tampered with the letter carrier and had got his letters. The postmaster inquired and satisfied himself that I had not tampered with the letter carrier. Then he reported the postmaster himself to the authorities in Ottawa. The authorities here inquired and satisfied themselves that the postmaster had acted properly. He reported my conduct to the Governor-General and reported also to the Horse Guards in England, and they inquired into the matter, and I think they were satisfied of the style of man who made the accusation. As to the book itself, I have not read it and I do not intend to. I shall not waste my time looking into it. I leave that to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) when he is not better employed. I think the hon. member is taking a very unwise course in encouraging this man in his actions. The first thing he knows, he will drive him to a lunatic asylum.

Mr. MULOCK. I congratulate the gallant member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) on his manifestation of chivalry in dealing with a man who has served, as this man has, in many capacities. He has entirely misrepresented the case I presented to this House, and I doubt if such harsh and cruel words as these, coming from a high officer in the service, will reflect honour upon the hon. gentleman or commend him to the high opinion of the militia of Canada. I say that the hum-

blest individual in the land is entitled to justice, and from what I know of this inquiry and the treatment this man has received up to this moment, I believe he has not received justice; and as a humble member of this House I say that any man who appeals to me, who has a grievance, I do not care whether he has friends at court or not, will have my attention. It will be my duty as well as my pleasure, to stand up here and plead for those who cannot plead for themselves. Instead of hon. members throwing the target of unfair criticism against those who undertake such a cause, I think they should leave it, at all events, to the conscience of each one to judge as to the propriety and justice of his course. I will not enter into the details of the accusation which the hon. gentleman has made against this man. No matter whether he is a steady man or an unsteady man, it is immaterial whether he has made reports and complaints against officers; it is immaterial what he has done in other respects; the question is, has he received fair consideration in regard to the particular grievance that he is suffering under. That is the issue, and it is no excuse to say that he may find fault with other people. I am not aware, either, that this soldier sent a complaint against me. The hon. member for West Toronto knows very well that he is only suggesting an excuse in order to cover up his own lack of nerve or lack of generosity in this matter. This poor man applied to me, and gave me a petition on one occasion to present to this House; but it contained irrelevant matter, and charges against persons that I thought ought not to appear in a petition, and for that reason I declined to take the responsibility of presenting it to the House. I do not propose to be the medium of giving publicity to charges calculated to affect the status of people when those charges cannot be investigated; and to that extent I may have incurred the disapprobation of the soldier in question. But when, as I understand, he presented charges and asked them to be investigated in a regular way, and says they have not been investigated, it is my duty to present his case to this House and to the country, and I do so. I again repeat what I said last year, that having had many opportunities of meeting this man—he has called upon me, it is true, and then, no doubt, he selected only the occasions when he was sober—but I have had many opportunities of meeting him, and on the streets of Toronto his face is a familiar figure, but on no occasions have I ever seen him in the slightest degree under the influence of liquor. I have always seen him neat, tidy, respectful and respectable, and that being the result of my observation, which I think fairly represents his general conduct, I regret that the hon. member for West Toronto has chosen, in this way, to comment upon the habits of a man, which habits in the slightest degree would not disentitle him to justice, if such be his right, as I think it is.

Mr. DENISON. I will say just one word more. Last session, a few weeks after this was brought up in the House, I received a telegram from the Toronto police authorities telling me that this man Slater had threatened to shoot me, and asking me to put myself in communication with the police authorities here so as to protect myself. I took no action in the matter, because I am quite ready to take my chances in any danger of that kind; but at the same time it shows the kind of a man that the hon. member for North York is encouraging in his present course.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I know this man Slater to be one of the greatest cranks I ever met. He has persecuted me in my office day after day, and month after month, with his petition. I have conversed with him in regard to it, and have never been able to get an intelligent account from him. He did make threats of all sorts against the hon. member for West Toronto, and against two other members of this Parliament, and if there ever was a man that seemed to me to be like Guiteau, it is that man Slater.

Mr. COCKBURN. We must all have been delighted to see the disinterested way in which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) proposes to plead the cause in this House of everybody who has a grievance. He has declared himself ready to espouse on all occasions the cause of offended justice. He seems to take a particular interest in the case of the crank that he has brought before us. Whether it be that there is a certain affinity between those of crankish tendencies, I know not, but, certainly, when the hon. member puts himself forward as the Don Quixote who, with spear in rest, is ready to fight the battles, not only of every fair maiden, but of every impudent crank, I think such action ill-becomes members of this House, although such men may sometimes be useful in an election or otherwise. Still, talk of the kind he has indulged in does not contribute to the gentlemanly tone and feeling that one member ought to exhibit towards another in this House. We have been told that this man was so far lacking in the furnishings in the upper part of his head, that he has apparently reported every one with whom he came in contact as guilty of offending his dignity; and trespassing in some way on his peculiar privileges. The hon. member for North York has posed as the knight-errant of chivalry. I can assure him that if he takes up this task he will have enough to do for the remainder of his life, and one injurious effect of his entering upon this new and promising career, will be that we shall be deprived of the benefit of his services and advice in the more intricate and lengthened debates in which this House is apt to indulge. I may say that after the publication the hon. gentleman has made this morning to the House, that he is prepared to espouse the cause of every crank in the Dominion, I am sure that my hon. friend

from West Toronto, and many other hon. gentlemen in this House, will be glad to entrust to his care all the cranks that trouble them and usually pester members of this House.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not aware that I am indebted to this non-commissioned officer for any support in elections; if the hon. member for Centre Toronto suggests that, he is entirely mistaken. I know nothing of this man's politics, and I never spoke to him on the subject in my life. As to the attempt of the member for Centre Toronto to come to the relief of the member for West Toronto, I can only say that certainly the member for West Toronto is in need of supports, but it is unfortunate that he should have had to call the "bombasto furioso" of the House to his aid under such circumstances. Their remarks will not in the slightest degree cause me to depart from the line of duty. We all know that when men think that they are suffering an injustice they gradually come to feel that they have serious grievances which need to be redressed. What was the foundation of the charge? I think the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) must be of the opinion, if he will recall this case, that it is a disgrace to the administration of justice, and a disgrace to the militia service of Canada, that this man should have been treated as he was treated. He served his country with distinction, but unfortunately he came into collision with some of his superior officers. As soon as his time of service had expired, he was not even allowed to renew it. With that determination, they laid a "plant" in order to place him in a false position at the earliest possible moment. A demand was made on him to send in his kit to the stores, and in the most cruel way, advantage was taken of a supposed refusal on his part, which after all may have been an innocent matter of inaction, and he was summoned before the magistrate of Toronto to answer the charge. He was not defended; it happened that his counsel was not present when the case came before the magistrate. He was wholly unfamiliar with magisterial law. The magistrate of Toronto is an officer in the service, and no doubt sympathises, as he ought to do, with his brother officers, and he stepped down from the bench and allowed his deputy to take the case and adjudicate upon it. The relations between the police magistrate of Toronto and his deputy are such that the case should have been conducted with far more care than usual in order to prevent a grievance; and yet this trial took place, the man being undefended and his witnesses absent, and before he knew where he was, he was found guilty and sent to jail for 30 days to consort with the common criminals of the city. This was harsh and cruel action, and if there had been any spirit of chivalry among the officers, they would have been content to have secured compliance with the law and secured the kit, and have not subjected the man to such cruel treatment. This was an insult to every fair-minded man in the coun-

Mr. COCKBURN.

try, and being endorsed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the hon. gentleman has failed to place himself on a plane superior to that occupied by those who took this action. I venture to say that the volunteer spirit of Toronto will not endorse him in the attitude he has taken on this occasion.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for threatening me with his declaration that the volunteer spirit of Toronto would not endorse the position I have taken. I beg to tell him that when there is a matter of justice before me, it never enters my mind to consider whether my action will cause me to lose or to gain votes. That question is never before my mind, and I hope, with the increasing intelligence which will come to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with increasing years—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKBURN. Is there anything wrong in supposing that the hon. gentleman will become more intelligent? I yet entertain the hope that with his advancing years and growth in intelligence, we shall find him sitting on this side of the House. I, therefore, trust that with advancing years and advancing intelligence, he will be enabled to deal with a question of this kind, and be able to draw a distinction between a gentleman and a crank, and not insult members of this House by telling them that they have adopted a certain line of action simply with a view to gain votes. I am happy to state that in Centre Toronto I do not require to gain votes. Last time I appealed to the electors I never asked for a vote; I lay on my bed, and the Grit party were defeated by a majority of over 500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That accounts for the hon. gentleman's success.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia again to this item. The cartridge factory at Quebec has been in operation for a great many years, and has been admittedly a complete success. We now use the cartridges manufactured there all over Canada, and find them to be of very good quality, perhaps superior to those imported from Europe. If I am correctly informed, the cost of English ammunition we use is, landed, \$19.50 per 1,000. If we take those made by Eley Bros. for the Sniders, the cost is \$20. The Canadian article costs \$19.77¼. If we take the cost of the shells, there is a still greater difference. English shells cost \$11.57, while Canadian cost only \$8.42. The common shell, English, cost \$4.76, the Canadian article \$3.95. The cost of the 9-lb. shrapnel is, English, \$3.47, Canadian, \$3.81, but the common English shell costs \$1.42, while the Canadian only costs \$1.38. So, if quality is considered, it will be found that the Canadian ammunition is superior, and, moreover, it costs much less. If you look at the question from the point of view of home industry, it must be

admitted that it is a wise policy to manufacture the ammunition in Canada. As to the location of the factory: it is located in the first military city of the Dominion, all expenses necessary for the building has been incurred, and I do not see any reason why a change should be proposed. The Government have thought fit—I do not know why, but they must have been misled, perhaps, by the same man who had something to do with the Gatling gun—to diminish the appropriation by \$10,000. If we diminish the quantity of ammunition manufactured, we will increase the price. I do not see why the Government should change the policy they have been pursuing for so many years, especially when it has met with the satisfaction and approval of the whole of the country. I hope the Government will again look into the question. They are well aware that Major Prevost, who is at the head of the establishment, is fully competent, and has given the country an establishment of which it has reason to be proud. The Government should replace this sum of \$10,000, in order that the full quantity of ammunition may be manufactured at this establishment, and thus pursue the line of policy adopted many years ago, and carried out with general satisfaction, as well to the force as to the whole country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe in the Auditor-General's Report an item of 47,177 lbs. of pig iron, which was charged at the rate of \$42.75 per ton. What special kind of pig iron was used?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will look into it and inform my hon. friend. I may say to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that the policy of the Government has not changed in regard to the cartridge factory. In view of the fact that it is the intention to employ a new arm for the force in Canada, it would not be judicious to manufacture a large quantity of cartridges for an arm that was obsolete, and which it is intended to cease supplying to the force. For the coming year it is not intended to manufacture the Snider cartridge, but only the Martini-Henry cartridge. As regards the statement made by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), I can only say that if he will furnish me with the information, contained in that pamphlet, I will give the case my special personal consideration.

Mr. MULOCK. I will ask the hon. gentleman to relieve me from the duty of formulating the charges, but I will report to the man in question and perhaps he will communicate directly with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That will be all right.

Expenses in connection with Fishing Bounty \$5,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the acting Minister's attention to a letter I have just received on the subject of the distribution of these bounties. The system formerly was, that fishermen were allowed to make their

proofs of claim before magistrates, but last year the Government adopted the new system of sending around fishery agents to the different fishing establishments. I do not know whether they were unfortunate or not in the fishery agent appointed in King's county, Mr. McGinnis, but I think they have removed him since. I have received a letter from the manager of the largest factory in that part of the province, which I will read to the hon. gentleman. I am anxious to read it publicly, because I think the statement contained in it ought to be given to the Minister and to the House:

The fishing bounties have arrived here and there are quite a lot of complaints about them. There are three vessels that there is no bounty for. They put their claims in, but there is no bounty, and the consequence is that there are about 20 men who have fished, some of them all their lives, and still no bounty. This throws the owners and men who have fished in these vessels out of about \$300. The reason they have not received the bounties, I hear, is that the Government appointed Mr. A. J. McGinnis of Murray River to receive the claims and he lost them. I may say that the vessels are all owned in Murray Harbour and I thought I would drop you a line, so that you may be able to call attention to it.

The writer goes on to suggest that the old system of paying the bounty was better than the new one. I trust that the acting Minister will see to this. If these men made their proper proofs and the fishery officer lost their claims, of course they should not be punished for that. I know the writer of this letter very well. He is a gentleman of good standing, in whose word I would place absolute reliance, and I trust that the Minister will ask the officer of the department to make inquiries and see that these men are reinstated on the bounty list.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will send me the name of the officer I will have inquiries made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The name of the officer who is said to have lost the proofs, is A. J. McGinnis.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will see that inquiries are made. The new system of paying the bounties was adopted in order to prevent frauds which had been attempted, in some cases successfully, by false and irregular claims. Under the new system the inspectors were to visit the districts at certain times, and a rule was laid down which I must admit has since proved to be inconvenient, that where the parties did not appear to file their claims they were not in a position to have them paid. That of course was an experiment, but it has since been decided that their not being present to file the claims will not debar or prejudice those who are entitled to the bounty, and instructions have been issued to that effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The letter to which I called the hon. gentleman's attention, states further:

The fishery officer was only here for two days to receive claims, and it was at a season of the year when

the men were coasting in their vessels to Halifax and Pictou, and could not be home to enter their claims. Then A. J. McGinnis was appointed, and the men did not know it for a long time, and they were only given two or three days to file their claims. McGinnis lives about eight miles from the harbour, where most of the fishermen live.

I will write to the gentleman inclosing this letter and calling his attention to the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Nothing will prejudice the fair, legitimate claims of these men.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before whom will these men make their claims, now that the old ones have been lost?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We will arrange that they be sent to the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If they could make their claims before a custom-house officer or a justice of the peace, as formerly, the matter might be easily arranged, but under the new regulation the department will not receive the claim at all unless it is made before some special officer appointed by the department. That is why I call special attention to it. If the inspecting officer who was sent there lost the papers, the men of course must have another chance to make their claims, otherwise you would be punishing the men for the neglect of the officer. If the hon. gentleman would give the people in that locality a chance to make any "bona fide" claims they have before the customs officers, it might be sufficient.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the intention of the department is that these claims shall be recognized, and that a claim will not be rendered invalid because it has not been filed with the proper officer. I cannot tell what particular officer the hon. gentleman refers to, but the department will see that the claims shall reach the department and be paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is quite satisfactory. I could not ask more than that.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the unsatisfactory method in which the bounty claims are now paid. I think it is absurd to compel a fisherman to walk twenty or thirty miles, as some of them have to do, to get three or four dollars. Why should not the department send to each beneficiary a cheque payable to his own order, which would be a sufficient receipt? Many of these fishermen have no horses, so that they have to travel on foot, and very often they would probably spend the whole amount of their claim in going for it. I am glad that the Government are taking the greatest possible care that only those entitled to these bounties shall be on the list. I suggested last year that they should have the list posted in the offices of the collectors of customs in the various seaport towns, so that the fishermen themselves could see the names of those entitled to the bounty. If that were done, there would not be so many frauds. In this connection I would

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

like to know when the Government propose to bring down the papers ordered some time ago in reference to the frauds in the county of Victoria. But what I want to call particular attention to is the desirability of adopting some better method of paying the bounty. The Government might take 5 cents from each fisherman to cover the cost of registering the letter in which his cheque would be sent to him. The amounts are so small in many cases that the Government should make it as easy as possible for the fishermen to obtain them.

Mr. STAIRS. I would urge upon the Minister the desirability of adopting the suggestion made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that cheques for the amount of the bounty should be sent to the fishermen. I do not see any objection to that. It may be said that there is danger of the cheques going astray, and being wrongly endorsed. That would apply to any cheque, and you might as well say that a cheque should not be sent payable to the order of anybody. If a cheque went astray and were wrongly endorsed, it would be forgery, and there is a remedy for that. It would simplify the distribution of the bounty very much to adopt that method. In respect to the filing of claims, I would suggest that some better arrangement should be made than that in force last year. I think an officer should be appointed in each locality to receive bounty claims, and a little more time should be allowed to file the claims.

Mr. BOWERS. In regard to this matter I am perfectly in accord with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that the department should send a cheque to each man. It would be a cheaper method in the long run than the present method. With regard to the filing of claims, the fishery officer did not arrive at some places in my county until the last day of the month within which the claims could be filed, and a great many of the fishermen had gone away on their vessels, so that it was impossible for them to file their claims. I think that the papers might be given to the fishermen a month, at least, before the list is completed, so that each crew could sign their claims while on board the vessel. By 30th November a great many of the crews have left in their vessels; some of them are thousands of miles away, and it is impossible to get their signatures to the papers, so that a great many of them have to be signed by other parties. I congratulate the department on the means they have taken to stop the leakage and prevent frauds. When we find that the vessels which had been getting \$1.50 a ton during the last few years are this year getting \$3 per ton, it is evident that there must have been a leakage of at least \$25,000 a year in bounty frauds. I wish to call the attention of the department to a number of claims that have been rejected in certain counties. In Gloucester, the claims rejected during six years numbered 102 or .018 per cent, and in

1891, 677 or over 41 per cent. Bonaventure, claims rejected during six years, 94 or 1006 per cent; in 1891, 139 or 1 per cent. Gaspé, claims rejected in six years, 94 or 7¹/₁₀ per cent; in 1891, 47 or over 2½ per cent. Victoria, claims rejected in six years, 27 or 1¹/₁₀ per cent; 1891, 28 or 3 per cent. Richmond, last year, about 2 per cent. Cape Breton, about 5 per cent. while Digby, Yarmouth, Queen's and Shelburne were only about ⅓ of 1 per cent. This kind of thing has been going on for years, and I congratulate the Government on having at least been able to put a check to it. I would ask the acting Minister whether any attempt has been made in any of these counties towards investigating the bounty frauds. I find that in the county of Victoria several bogus applications were made, one man having filed a claim for his dog Peter. This is a matter which should be looked into, and the parties who have been defrauding the fishery bounty for the last four or five years detected and properly dealt with.

Mr. McALISTER. I would ask the acting Minister if it is the intention of the regulation that the fishermen engaged in fishing should, besides catching the quantity of fish required, have to be constantly engaged in that calling for three months? For instance, would a farmer who attends to fishing a part of the day, covering a period of three or four months, and who has caught the quantity of fish required by the regulations, be entitled to receive the bounty therefor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The intention of the regulation was that those entitled to it must be actually engaged in fishing for three months, and cannot spend part of the time in fishing and part of the time at anything else.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the acting Minister of Marine if he would, at the earliest moment, give his attention to the petition presented to the House on the 13th March on behalf of the Ojibbeway Indians. It is in the Votes and Proceedings of that day and sets forth certain grievances. The band in question is most industrious and worthy, is engaged in husbandry and making

rapid progress, and is in every respect deserving the consideration of the Government. I would like the hon. gentleman to look into their grievances and give them the relief warranted by justice. I have received communications suggesting that all the fishery regulations and orders referred to in that petition, not only as they affect the Indians but as they affect the white people, are in need of overhauling in order that the fishing industry may be put on a proper basis. I refer to the waters of Lake Simcoe, and my application for an investigation is not only on behalf of the Indians but of the people generally who use those waters.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will look into the matter.

Indians--Ontario and Quebec...\$67,956

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to call attention to what seems to be very grave irregularities which have grown up in the last ten or eleven years with reference to the Indian School Fund, the Indian Land Management Fund, and the province of Quebec Indian Fund. It will be remembered that the Indian School Fund was substituted for the old Imperial contribution to the Indians' arms and ammunition every year from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. When the hunting in a large degree ceased, the moneys that were formerly appropriated by the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada to the arms and ammunition fund were converted into a school fund. This fund in 1878 amounted to about \$143,000, and has varied very little from that time down to the present. For the past seven or eight years, it has been \$141,422.83. There is an income arising from the interest upon this fund and from the payments into the fund varying from \$14,000 or \$16,000 to about \$5,000 a year. The sum varies, and the charges upon this fund of course vary. It was the intention of the law that the expenditure should be kept within the income derived from the fund. The following is the statement showing the condition of the fund in the several years from 1878 to 1891:—

Year.	Capital.	Income.	Expenditure.	Excess of Income.	Deficiency of Income.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1878.....	142,912 83	2,138 27
1879.....	142,912 00	14,508 15	11,867 73	2,640 32
1880.....	142,912 00	16,318 93	14,036 62	2,282 31
1881.....	142,912 83	14,764 11	17,914 41	3,155 30
1882.....	138,267 53	12,510 40	21,177 28	8,666 88
1883.....	138,267 73	16,857 02	27,679 12	10,822 10
1884.....	141,422 83	18,018 00	30,674 82	12,656 82
1885.....	141,222 83	21,886 64	33,068 61	11,181 97
1886.....	141,222 83	19,636 30	37,053 96	17,417 56
1887.....	141,222 83	24,714 30	46,040 94	21,326 64
1888.....	141,222 83	{ L.G 19,318 10 }	45,656 15	24,736 56
		{ 20,919 59 }			
1889.....	141,222 83	20,393 44	49,781 74	28,388 30
1890.....	141,222 83	30,249 11	63,260 79	33,011 68
1891.....	141,222 83	{ L.G 25,291 75 }	45,740 76	40,968 32
		{ 4,772 00 }			
					211,932 13

So that, from 1881 to 1891, embracing eleven years, the fund has been overdrawn to the extent of \$211,932, nearly \$100,000 more than the amount of the fund itself. Now, I may say here that, in every one of the three funds I have mentioned, there has, during the past years, been a gradually increasing charge against it, and if the amount expended were charged against each fund, it would be far in excess of the capital that goes to constitute it. Now, the Indian Land Management Fund was created in 1855. It was made up, I think, of 10 per cent taken from the various sales of land and of timber and set apart as a fund to be charged with the cost of managing Indian property, and taking charge of the Indian interests. This fund, in 1878, amounted to \$115,000. It fell, in 1882, to \$103,669, and from that time it has risen until, at present, it is \$150,680; at least, in 1891 it amounted to that, and it is still at that figure for the last four or five years. Now, the income from that, of course, is the

interest of certain payments of contributions that have been made from sales of Indian lands and timber each year, so that the revenues derived from the Indian Management Fund have varied from \$31,000 to \$15,000 a year. Now, the management of Indian affairs has, it seems, been charged with a very considerable expenditure that ought, perhaps, to have been otherwise provided for. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that, in 1878, the income was \$31,000, expenditure, \$21,600, leaving a balance of \$9,400 of revenue not expended. In 1879 the income was \$28,600, expenditure, \$25,295, leaving a balance of revenue unexpended of \$3,227. But from that year, beginning with 1880, there has been a deficit, and that deficit has decreased each year up to the present. The following table shows the capital, income, expenditure and balance and income and expenditure for the several years of this fund:—

Year.	Capital.	Income.	Expenditure.	Excess of Income.	Deficiency of Income.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1878.....	114,865 57	31,022 66	21,616 01	9,406 65
1879.....	114,865 57	28,623 00	25,295 57	3,327 43
1880.....	108,308 57	21,011 93	26,741 12	5,729 19
1881.....	106,469 82	16,645 95	33,111 13	16,465 18
1882.....	103,669 82	15,989 97	46,311 18	30,321 21
1883.....	(102,669 82) (In. 10,410 70)	21,709 21	55,887 38	34,178 11
1884.....	(103,237 03) (In. 8,843 49)	23,610 71	60,821 48	37,210 77
1885.....	129,847 50	19,901 66	63,131 29	43,229 63
1886.....	(127,483 13) (8,883 49)	20,988 71	71,983 12	50,994 41
1887.....	145,250 11	28,613 49	81,182 33	52,568 84
1888.....	150,965 36	20,544 74	86,436 15	65,891 41
1889.....	156,680 61	27,077 32	103,410 09	76,332 77
1890.....	156,680 61	(25,728 05) (In. 9,652 21)	106,874 38	81,146 53
1891.....	156,680 61	22,990 14	109,776 40	86,776 40
					580,843 45

Now, during the eleven years up to 1891, the income from this Indian Land Management Fund was withdrawn to the extent of \$580,843 against the capital of \$156,680. Then, in the case of the Quebec Indian Fund, it is partly Imperial in its origin and partly Canadian. That fund, in 1878, and for a number of years before, amounted to nearly \$50,000, and it has continued stationary in amount down to the present time. The deficit in the expenditure with regard to the fund began in 1882. The following figures will show the capital, income, expenditure and balance between income and expenditure for the several years from 1878 to 1891:—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Year.	Capital.	Income.	Expenditure.	Excess of Income.	Deficiency of Income.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1878.....	49,776 30				
1879.....	49,965 72	8,741 41	6,734 24	2,007 17	
1880.....	49,965 72	8,887 66	7,299 08	1,588 58	
1881.....	49,965 72	8,703 10	7,959 62	743 48	
1882.....	49,965 72	7,815 76	9,127 68		1,311 92
1883.....	49,965 72	6,783 83	10,114 49		3,330 66
1884.....	49,766 00	6,281 00	12,442 55		6,161 55
1885.....	49,766 30	6,844 57	15,363 96		8,519 39
1886.....	49,766 30	6,374 16	19,954 81		13,580 65
1887.....	49,766 30	10,095 85	24,915 30		14,019 45
1888.....	49,766 30	6,303 44	29,474 30		23,170 87
1889.....	49,766 30	5,437 44	33,139 02		27,708 58
1890.....	49,766 30	1,056 20	32,340 40		31,340 20
1891.....	49,766 30	960 64	35,533 75		34,573 11
					163,716 39

So that this fund, having a capital of a little less than \$50,000, has been overdrawn during the last seven years, for which we have the figures, \$163,716. These three funds taken together represent a capital of \$347,669.74, and they have been overdrawn by \$956,491.97. Now I may say here that the report of the Indian Department for the last year does not contain any information in regard to either of these funds; but down to last year the statement of the amount was published in the report. What I wish to call the attention of the House to is, that the funds have been exhausted nearly three times over. There is no capital left, if you are to charge an income and capital with the expenditure that has taken place. The Minister will be able to explain how this large expenditure has been made. It has been made to a very large extent by parliamentary appropriations. I may say that the Indian School Fund in 1877 had a legislative grant of \$19,318. In 1890 again there was a legislative grant of \$25,000; but I have included both these legislative grants in the statement of revenue, and the deficit I have mentioned, amounting to \$212,000, in the case of the Indian School Fund, is over and above the appropriation made by Parliament in the two years which I have mentioned. So, with regard to the Indian Management Fund, I suppose this must have been the practice. The Finance Minister will be able to say whether it was or not. These sums are \$212,000 of the Indian School Fund, and \$581,000 of the Indian Land Grant Fund, and \$164,000 of the Quebec Indian Fund must have been provided by a general charge against the Indian annuities in these two provinces. But if that is so, I cannot see in what way the department has succeeded in obtaining the money to make these payments. If it is so, the Indians have, I think, good ground for dissatisfaction. I do not see how these accounts could have passed the Auditor-

General if they were provided for in any other way than under the previous consent of the Indians and an appropriation of a portion of the annuities each half year to which they are entitled. I think if that is so, it is very important that some change should be made. If Parliament wishes that Indian schools should be established, and that an expenditure should be made of a very large sum each year, it ought to be with the consent of the Indian population to be benefited, if the charge is to be made against the Indian Fund, and that fact ought to be known to Parliament, and the consent of Parliament had to the appropriation. I call attention to this fact, that the expenditure from the Indian School Fund in 1879, was \$11,867; in 1890 the expenditure was \$63,260, an expenditure of \$33,000 in excess of any income that could be derived from the fund. It does seem to me that in the administration of the department this answer should be made to every religious or other body applying for aid to establish a school under denominational care, and to take charge of the Indians: Gentlemen, there are no funds. That ought to be the conclusive answer. No expenditure ought to be made beyond what the income of the department would permit, without bringing the matter under the attention of Parliament and making an entirely different system; and that, it seems to me, could only be done by Parliament, after the consent of the Indians had been obtained. Now, with regard to the Indian Land Management Fund, the expenditure of that fund in 1879 was \$25,295. That, I think, will be found some \$4,000 higher than it has been at any time since Confederation down to that year. I make no complaint of that expenditure, because it was within the appropriation; but that expenditure from \$25,000, in 1879, became \$27,000 next year, then \$33,000, then

\$46,000, then \$56,000, then \$61,000, then \$63,000, and so on, till 1891, when it became nearly \$110,000. Now, I do not think there is any justification of a policy of that sort. I do not say how the money was expended, I do not say whether it was expended beneficially or otherwise, but I say there has been a large sum of money expended for which there was no proper authority. There have been moneys expended under the head of management that clearly cannot be for the purposes of management. Now, I will mention that in looking over the accounts I found in 1889, not many less than 100 newspapers which have advertisements charged against this fund. I do not remember the exact sum, but it was a large sum, and must have been not far short of the whole income for that particular year. I think that is a most unjustifiable expenditure, and there may have been many others of the same sort. I do not find in the last three or four years any charge of that sort against the fund, but there have been a multiplication of officers far beyond what is necessary. Now, let me mention this to the hon. Minister. Formerly, Mr. Mackenzie, and after him Mr. Watson, had charge of nearly all the bands of the west, but now you have four or five Indian agents where there was one before, and in this way you burden the fund with a cost for management in the form of salaries to agents that seems to be altogether uncalled for. If the Minister will look into the matter in that particular, he will find that he could dispense with three-fourths of the agents without, in the smallest degree, interfering with the efficiency of the service; or, if he desires to have an agent in the immediate neighbourhood, then more than one-fourth or one-fifth of the present charge is quite unnecessary. I do not like to mention names, but I know myself men who are receiving \$500 a year in connection with the management of Indian affairs, in my opinion a wholly unnecessary expenditure. I call the Minister's attention to these facts. I dare say they have been brought under his attention since he has had charge of the department, but I think the more he will investigate the matter, the more clearly he will see that there has been a serious misapplication of moneys that do not constitute any part of these funds. During the last eleven years there has been an expenditure beyond income from these funds of \$976,000. I say that that money belongs to the Indians; that it is no part of any parliamentary appropriation, and that that money has been kept out of the annuities of the Indians during these years. I do not see how it can fairly be said that there is any one of these funds now in existence. I have called the attention of the House to the fact that the funds amount to less than \$350,000, and that accounts have been overdrawn to the extent of nearly \$1,000,000. I do not intend, at this

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

period of the session, to trouble the House further with the matter, but I think it is important to bring under the attention of the House, and to have a proper supervision of these accounts, and to have some alteration made in the departmental management that will subject the Deputy-Minister, or whoever has charge of it, to the same limitation and control to which other public officers are subjected in expending the funds appropriated by Parliament.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the hon. member. I have only to say that this matter has been brought to my attention since I took office, and I find that in September last a report was made by a sub-committee of the Privy Council, who had under consideration the accounts of the Indian Management Fund, the School Fund and the Quebec Fund. It appears that this Land Management Fund has been, so far as I can see, used more for Indian management than for land management; because, as the hon. gentleman has stated, we find that so far back as 1872, and even prior, such charges as insurance, medicines, advertising, building of bridges, building of school-houses, and all that sort of thing, were charged to this fund. The hon. gentleman is in error in believing that the annuities of the Indians have been used in any way to make up this expenditure. Their trust fund is intact to-day. The only funds that have been used are this Land Management Fund, the Quebec Fund and the School Fund. I can better explain to the hon. gentleman the position that the Government has taken in the matter, by reading the report of the Committee of the Privy Council on the subject:

A Sub-Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration the condition of the province of Quebec Indian Fund, the Indian Land Management Fund and the Indian School Fund, and the joint memorandum from the Deputy-Minister of Finance and the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs dealing with the same subject which is hereto attached. The Sub-Committee observe that the interest accounts of these funds upon the 31st May, 1892, were overdrawn: Province of Quebec Fund, \$37,231.22; Indian Land Management Fund, \$114,992.34; Indian School Fund, \$44,987.41, and the interest producing power of the capital of these funds, has in consequence fallen so low that the necessary expenses cannot be met without some assistance from without. To furnish this assistance, and at the same time to avoid the possibility of making it a charge for all time upon the Consolidated Revenue, has been the subject of grave consideration. The only plan which seemed at all feasible, and of which the Sub-Committee could recommend the adoption, is the one which may now be briefly outlined. It is proposed at once to reduce the rate of interest upon that portion of the Indian Fund now bearing 4 per cent, to 3½ per cent. As this amount is \$1,860,000, the saving in interest would be for the year 1892-93, about \$9,300. The saving in this item of interest will constantly increase, as the amount on which 3½ per cent will be payable, will be augmented annually at the rate of about \$50,000.

This saving in interest will be an offset against the amount to be granted yearly from the Consolidated Fund, which, for the year 1892-93, will be \$19,000.

With the exercise of economy the Department of Indian Affairs will be enabled to reduce the expenditure gradually until a limit is reached, which will represent the lowest point at which the service can be managed without endangering its efficiency. It will, therefore, be possible to reduce this annual grant from year to year, and it is thought that for 1893-94, not more than \$15,200 will be required, and for 1894-95, not more than \$14,000. It is confidently expected that with proper economy in expenditure, and with this aid from sources outside the fund, the present debit balance may be reduced, and as any such reduction will at once be felt to the benefit of the funds, as it will increase the revenue producing power of the capital, it will be seen that the capital of the funds may, after the lapse of some years, be restored to their full amount. When this is accomplished, which may not be for a considerable time, all aid from outside sources will cease; but, in the meantime, the saving of interest by the reduction of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, would form such a valuable offset to the annual grant that, in the space of seventeen years the one will balance the other.

The Sub-Committee, with the hope that this plan will be found workable, recommend that authority be granted for reductions in the rate of interest paid upon that portion of the Indian fund now standing at 4 per cent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, the change to take effect on the 1st July, 1892, and that the sum of \$19,000 may be included in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year, to be submitted to Parliament at its next session, as a grant to the province of Quebec Indian Fund, Indian Land Management Fund, and Indian School Fund.

It would seem proper, in order to make the best possible use of this grant, and after the precise amount required by each of the interested funds has been ascertained, that it should be distributed annually at the close of the year, with the authority of Council, upon a joint report of the Deputy Superintendent-General and the Accountant of Indian Affairs.

The Sub-Committee further recommend, as it may be possible from time to time to make such changes in the manner of meeting the expenditure for the management of the land and timber as will result in a saving to the funds, that the authority of the Governor in Council should be obtained for such changes, based upon a joint report of the Deputy Superintendent-General and the Accountant of Indian Affairs, and that a similar joint report should be submitted for any change in existing appointments.

The Sub-Committee, in conclusion, are strongly of opinion that no new appointments of agents, physicians, or missionaries should be made if their salaries will become a charge upon the overdrawn accounts.

In pursuance of the recommendation made to Council, some changes have been made in the province of Ontario in connection with the agencies, and in the direction the hon. gentleman has indicated, and I hope before Parliament meets next session, to be able to effect further economies in the direction of doing away with the duplication of agencies. We have abolished three agencies already, and the work performed by two men is now performed by one. For instance, Mr. Stevenson, agent on the Georgina Islands, has been retired, and his duties will be performed by Mr. McPhee, the agent at Orillia. It is necessary that Mr. McPhee should be continued in office, because he has succeeded admirably in managing Indians, and the morals and good behaviour of the band under his charge have wonderfully improved.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will he get an increase of salary because of increased duties?

Mr. DALY. He has not got one yet.

Mr. MULLOCK. What are the arrangements made with him?

Mr. DALY. The arrangements have not yet been completed. Probably he will receive an increase of \$100 a year, but not more. The official who performed those duties formerly received \$500 per year, which was not too much.

Mr. MULLOCK. I have mentioned this for ten years past.

Mr. DALY. In some parts of Ontario other agencies have been abolished, and from time to time it will no doubt be found feasible to diminish the number, the policy of the department being to wipe out as much as possible the duplication of work which appears to have been going on in Ontario, and thus effect economies in that direction. I have here a long statement prepared by the officers of the department in regard to Indian lands management, and I would weary the House if I read it; but I will hand it to the hon. gentleman in order that he may have the opportunity of ascertaining exactly the condition in which the funds now stand. By taking in the Estimates of the year, the sum of \$15,200 and \$19,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, and carrying out the suggestion made by the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council, we will be able to overcome the state of affairs now existing in regard to this fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From what source did you provide the moneys required to balance the account?

Mr. FOSTER. Out of the capital of the fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By what authority was the capital used?

Mr. FOSTER. It was used by authority of custom. This practice has extended over a series of years. It is apparent that at a very early day, say 1872, there was an evident lack of appreciation of what ought to be expended properly for land management, and appropriations were made out of that source of income which could not properly come under land management. I went into the matter pretty carefully, and I came to the conclusion that at all events the expenditures were made for the benefit of the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you refer to the advertisements that cost thousands of dollars?

Mr. FOSTER. There may have been such cases, and there were probably mistakes committed in regard to inserting advertisements; but, as a rule, it will be found that the expenditures were for the advantage of the Indians, although some of them cannot be properly charged against Indian land

management. There was set apart at an early period capital for the different funds, and that capital has remained intact. The interest which accrued, together with certain other income made up the amount for expenditure which should not be exceeded each year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The first deficit was made in 1881.

Mr. FOSTER. No; the deficits began in 1872 and continued until 1891; expenditures were made in excess of the income that could properly be expended, and the overplus of the expenditure was taken out of the three funds.

Mr. MULLOCK. There was no custom up to that time.

Mr. DALY. Yes; from 1871 down.

Mr. MULLOCK. There was no deficit until 1881. By what authority could money be expended—you could not have any vote?

Mr. FOSTER. No vote was taken. I am simply detailing what occurred. The expenditures were made, and it was supposed that there was sufficient authority for making them. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in conversation asked me whether these accounts had been audited by the Auditor-General. I am informed that the Auditor-General has audited these accounts. Only within about the last two years has my attention been called to the matter, and an investigation has since been made. We ascertained exactly what was the state of the funds. A sub-committee of Council was appointed to go into the whole matter, and they found out a certain state of things to exist, and they submitted recommendations with a view to stop the excessive expenditure and to set right the funds. That is the condition of the matter at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have these matters had any effect on the Indians annuity fund?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the overplus was taken from other funds.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has stated that only since 1871-72 has the practice of making charges against the fund, which did not properly belong to it, prevail. I am not aware of any such changes. Of course, there is no necessity for coming to Parliament with reference to the management, so long as the income derived from the fund was not exceeded; and that excess did not take place until 1881 or 1882, with regard to some funds. With regard to roads and bridges that were built, that practice grew up in this way. We had in the department, Indian lands for sale, and sometimes the construction of a bridge or the siding of the construction of a bridge brought the lands into the market and enabled the department to make sales where otherwise they could not make them, and

Mr. FOSTER.

where there was a sufficient amount of money for the year on hand, sometimes appropriations were made in that way, and made for a very early period. It seems to me that was legitimately within the rules of management, but the difficulty I see in the explanation which the hon. Minister of Finance, and the Minister in charge of the department makes is that the expenditure within the period I have mentioned, in excess of the income or revenue of these funds amounts to nearly \$1,000,000, while the three funds together amount to a little less than \$350,000, so that upwards of \$600,000 have been expended during the eleven years in excess, not only of the revenue, but in excess of the entire capital.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes. I have gone through each year after year, and I have the figures with regard to that.

At one o'clock the Committee rose and the Speaker left the Chair.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain in what way these moneys were paid to the Indian Department?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the explanation is mainly this. You have to go back to the years before Confederation to find the creation of this fund. A certain amount of capital was set apart to form the Indian Land Management Fund, for instance, and the interest on this fund, together with the revenues which came in from the management of the lands, produced a certain revenue which was to be expended, the idea being without doubt when the fund was instituted that the original capital of the fund should not be diminished.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How was the fund created in the first place—out of sales made by the Indian Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Partly out of those and partly out of money voted by the Legislature for the purpose. In 1870-71 there was to the credit of the Land Management Fund a capital of \$195,225, the revenue in that year being \$18,539, and the expenditure, \$22,688. This over-expenditure was taken out of the capital of the fund, which left the capital balance at the end of the year at \$191,000. In 1874-75 the fund had been further diminished by over-expenditure to \$186,000; in 1876 to \$180,000; in 1876-77 to \$175,000, and in 1877-78 to \$129,000. There is a note opposite the entry for this year, which shows how that great decrease was brought about. It seems that more money was needed for the Indian School Fund, and in that year, by the authority of Council, \$44,000 was transferred from the capital of the Land Man-

agement Fund to the School Fund. In 1878-79 it further diminished to \$124,000; in 1879-80 to \$111,000, in 1881-82 to \$87,000, keeping at about that figure until 1885-86, when it decreased to \$84,000. In 1887-88 it rose to \$92,000; in 1888-89 it was \$85,000, and in 1890-91 it was \$75,534. That is the history in brief of the Indian Land Management Fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister has not touched upon the point I want to get at. I quite understand how the thing was done so far; but he knows, as I know, that this is merely a book debt, and what I want to know is, how did the Indian Department get hold of the additional money?

Mr. FOSTER. They took it out of the capital which stood to their credit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, the Government of the day—it does not matter whether it was the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, the Government of Sir John Macdonald or the present Government—must have allowed the Indian Department to overdraw from one quarter or another. The money must have been advanced to the Indian Department, and that would not be done without an Order in Council in each case.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very peculiar, but in looking into the transaction, I have not found that there was the authority of an Order in Council in any case.

Mr. MULOCK. On whose authority was it done?

Mr. FOSTER. It was simply done departmentally, and when the Auditor-General came in, he found that custom prevailing, and he raised no objection to it, and he has been auditing the accounts consecutively since that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I want to understand, and what is not yet clear, is this: I quite understand that they have been drawing on capital, but that capital had, in point of fact, no existence at all, except in the shape of a book debt.

Mr. FOSTER. It must have had a tangible existence. At least this is true. There were moneys in the hands of the Government to be used for the benefit of the Indians. What was spent, came of course out of the census and revenue and diminished by that amount the sum to the credit of the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It had, just as the funds in the savings banks have; but the hon. gentleman holds no securities for it. It is simply a book debt. In order that the Indian Department could get the actual hard cash, the Consolidated Fund must have advanced it. There is no other way that I can see that the money could have been got, and I want to know how the Indian Department managed to get

that actual hard cash out of the Consolidated Fund?

Mr. FOSTER. It must have been transferred to them through the Audit Department and the Finance Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, in what shape did the Finance Department make this advance? Was it done by the respective Ministers from time to time?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot find that there was the authority of an Order in Council in any case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because there is apparently nothing to prevent the Indian Department drawing the whole of this trust fund behind our backs, without Parliament or anybody else knowing anything about it. There is no check upon them. They could do this on their own sweet will and pleasure; and the Finance Minister does not know of a single document or Order in Council or order of his department under which this money was paid out. It must have come from the Government coffers, in some shape or form. We have Indian Funds at 6 per cent, at 5 per cent and at 3½ per cent, one amounting to \$1,100,000, one amounting to \$600,000 and one amounting to \$1,702,000, in all a matter of nearly \$4,000,000; and, to all outward appearances, the Indian Department could draw any portion of that sum and spend it just how it pleased, and there does not appear to be any sort of a sufficient audit or check or control over the matter in any shape or form, and we wake up some fine day and find—I do not know which is correct, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or the hon. Minister of Interior (Mr. Daly)—\$600,000 or \$200,000 or \$900,000 of these funds have disappeared and nobody seems to know who authorized that. All we know is that the department seems to have taken the money. That kind of thing is contrary to all proper system or order and all proper book-keeping. I do not see how they can have drawn against it without the concurrence of the Finance Department at least, or the Receiver-General's Department, as the case may be. That is what I want to understand. How did they manage to lay their hands on these capital moneys? As far as the income goes and parliamentary votes go, that is all plain enough, but these are not securities which could be sold piecemeal. They are sums in the hands of the Government, represented solely and simply by certain entries in our books, and the cash could not be got hold of, that I can see, without the concurrence of the Finance Department at least.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true, and it must have gone to diminish the revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is clear. Surely it must have come, in some form or other out of the Consolidated Fund

in the hands of the Government. What other possible fund could it have come from? You must have advanced the money to them out of their capital. There is no other way; and if it was advanced out of capital, the department which advanced it must have known all about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Langton, in his time, authorized it, and the same has been done under the present Auditor-General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never remember the matter—although I speak under correction, it now being a considerable distance of time—having been submitted to me in my official capacity, and if I had found that Mr. Langton or anybody else had authorized money to be paid, without my consent, his days in the land would have been very short as my deputy, and I can hardly think the hon. gentleman's deputy, who is a very worthy and punctilious officer, could have authorized the advance without consultation. I do not recollect a single case having been brought under my notice, in five years time, in which I was asked to authorize an advance on capital account of the Indian Management Fund.

Mr. FOSTER. The transfer from one fund to the other was certainly made in your time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but I do not recollect at this moment a single case having been submitted to me to authorize an advance on capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better allow me to refresh my memory about this. I have not had the time to look it up now, as it was two years ago when we looked into the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to understand in what precise way the Indian Department got hold of this capital money. Of course I quite understand, it was deducted from the capital account. That is plain enough, although I do not understand the extraordinary discrepancy between my hon. friend's statement and that of the Minister of Interior. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) makes it nearly \$1,000,000, and the Minister of the Interior made it about \$200,000. That is a question we cannot properly investigate without the aid of a special committee or the Public Accounts Committee; but the other point we ought to know is how the money has been got hold of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not hear the first part of the statement of the Minister of Finance, but there are certain facts of which the House of course has cognizance. In the first place, there is no actual money on hand. These capital accounts are simply liabilities on the part of the Government to these various Indian funds; and if the capital account is overdrawn, while you may

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

charge the Indian Fund with the amount so overdrawn, to the extent of the fund, the money itself must come out of the ordinary revenue of the country or must be borrowed. If it comes out of the ordinary revenue, it ought to appear as a charge against that revenue, and the amount should be charged against the Indian capital account. That is perfectly clear, and yet, so far as the report shows, there is no report of the Finance Department to show that the ordinary revenue was charged with this sum. I fail to understand how these sums could be charged to any other capital account but that mentioned in the report of the Indian Department. Now, I stated that in 1880 the capital account of the Indian Management Fund is represented at \$108,000. In 1891, it is represented as \$156,680. The Minister said it would be found that the capital was diminished to the extent of the excess of expenditure over revenue each year. But that is not the case. Any one who will go over the reports will, if these reports properly represent the accounts, see that that is a mistake. Let me give some facts by way of illustration. In 1881, the capital account of the Indian Land Management Fund was reported \$106,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is \$87,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am taking from the account as printed in the Indian Department report. All the figures I gave to the House were taken from that. In 1881, it is reported as being \$106,469.82. Now, the income for that year was \$16,645.95, and the expenditure was \$33,111.13. That would be an expenditure of \$16,465 in excess of the income. Yet the next year we do not find the capital diminished by this \$16,000. It is put down at \$103,669.82, and the report declares just in what way the capital was diminished. In 1889, the capital of the fund was reported to be \$156,680.61.

Mr. FOSTER. What fund is that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Indian Land Management Fund. Now, the expenditure in that year was \$103,410.09, and the income was \$27,077.32, leaving an excess to be charged somewhere of \$76,332.77. In 1890, the capital fund is exactly to the cent what it was in 1889, and the expenditure was \$106,874.33, and the income \$25,728, leaving a deficit of \$81,146.33 to be charged somewhere. Then the next year, the last year for which I have the figures, 1891, the capital is exactly to a cent what it was in the two previous years, \$156,680.61. The income is \$22,990.14, the expenditure \$109,776.40, leaving \$86,776.40 to be charged against either capital or some other fund. What I call the hon. gentleman's attention to is that the expenditure of these three years is \$80,000 in excess of the total amount of capital. I have taken all these figures from the report, so that the hon. gentleman will see that, unless there is something altogether mistaken in the re-

ports that have been brought down from time to time, these charges could not have been made against this capital.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will tell him where one explanation of the disparity exists. I notice that the hon. gentleman takes the year 1889, and states that the capital balance was a certain amount.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was \$156,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The capital balance given here is \$85,000. That is the amount of capital in hand. What does the hon. gentleman make the revenue in that year ; it is here \$32,792.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No ; the revenue is reported as \$27,077.32.

Mr. FOSTER. Then take the next year, 1889-90.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is \$25,728.05.

Mr. FOSTER. That agrees with this statement ; that is the revenue which arises from the fund itself, and the income from the parliamentary vote. Now, when my hon. friend speaks of the expenditure, he should remember that there have been the revenue of the fund as well as the parliamentary vote to draw upon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would say that in the Indian School Fund, I find for certain years a parliamentary vote added as part of the revenue, but, with regard to this Indian Land Management Fund, I do not find any parliamentary appropriation, and the hon. gentleman will see that if there is a parliamentary appropriation for 1890, it will require to be \$81,146.53 to square up the difference between the expenditure and the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. If nothing had been taken from capital as formerly.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) asked how these funds originated. The Indian Land Management Fund it appears arises from a deduction of 10 per cent from the sales of land and timber the assets of the Indians, that is, assets of the Indians in the old provinces, Quebec and Ontario. The School Fund was made up of appropriations made by the old Provincial Parliaments, and this Parliament. The School Fund, the hon. gentleman may recollect, was augmented, I think in 1876, by deducting \$44,000 from the Indian Land Management Fund. As far as I can make out, this is merely a matter of book-keeping. The Indian annuity funds are intact ; they have not been touched.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are they ?

Mr. DALY. They are made up of sales of their lands and timbers, less 10 per cent deducted for this fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not cover the question how this money was

got at. The only possible source I can see is that the Government must have advanced out of consolidated funds. That is the obvious way.

Mr. DALY. That is the way it was done, I think ; but I cannot give any definite information on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or there may be constantly sales of land going on and the department, instead of adding the amounts received to the funds and checking it out always under due supervision, may simply have appropriated the sums paid on account of current expenses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No ; the 10 per cent is counted in the revenue for the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of sales which are frequently made and which might cover a large sum of money. Would they not be allowed to appropriate these sums to ordinary expenses ?

Mr. DALY. No ; nothing is appropriated for current expenses except the 10 per cent. The Annuity Fund remains intact. I think it is from the consolidated revenue fund that this money has been taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that in 1876-77 there was still another transfer of \$102,000, transferred to the Indian School Fund, part from the Quebec Fund and part from the Indian Land Management Fund. That seems to have been done for the purpose of having a larger sum for the expenditures for Indian schools.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be merely a book-keeping transaction ; but these things are cash actually spent.

Mr. FOSTER. In part made up by parliamentary appropriations. Taking the three funds. The capital at the credit of the Indian Land Management Fund in 1871 was \$191,000 ; in 1890-91 it was \$69,000. It had diminished partly by the transfer of \$44,000 to the Indian School Fund and partly to over expenditure. At the present time this fund stands at \$69,000. When you come to the Quebec Fund, you find that the capital to the credit of the fund in 1870-71 was \$117,000. It began to diminish until in 1875 it was \$108,000. Then the transfer was made which decreased it by \$50,000 and in 1890-91 it had come down to \$15,000 but was not yet depleted. The Indian School Fund commenced with a capital of \$41,528, in 1871. In 1876, the capital became \$142,000, because \$102,000 was transferred from the other funds to the credit of this fund. Then it went on decreasing until in 1890-91 it reached \$100,000. Taking the three funds, they commenced in 1870-71 with about \$350,000, and in 1890-91 they amounted to about \$185,000 so that the capital which was \$350,000 in 1871 had been reduced to \$185,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister will see by looking at the reports of the department, that from 1880 to 1891 the Quebec In-

dian Fund remained almost stationary, as it was \$49,165.72 in 1880, and in 1891 it was \$49,166.30.

Mr. FOSTER. That totally disagrees with this. I have no doubt this is correct.

Mr. DALY. This is from the Auditor-General's Report, yours is from the departmental report. It appears that the Auditor-General deducts all the expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman speaks about the indiscriminate use of the moneys of this fund. I can understand how that might be with regard to the Indian Management Fund and the Indian School Fund, but the Quebec Indian Fund is a wholly distinct fund. The Quebec Indian Fund arose, I think, about 1849, when the Government, there being no extinguishment of the Indian title in the province of Quebec, by legislation undertook to make provisions for an Indian fund, and certain Imperial and Canadian funds were made the basis for the beginning of this fund. But to take the moneys of the Indian Land Management Fund, which were wholly Ontario funds, and use any portion of them in the province of Quebec, would be an appropriation of one man's money for another man's benefit.

Mr. MULOCK. It is certainly not creditable to the book-keeping of the Dominion that there is no proper public record showing how these funds have been managed from their inception to the present time; much less is it to the credit of successive governments that so far as appears, there has been a far greater laxity in dealing with these trust funds than the country requires in regard to the consolidated funds. It is certainly unfortunate, and I may say discreditable, that the funds have been handled with the laxity that appears to have characterized their administration. I presume the discussion to-day will not do more than call attention to the facts, preliminary to a thorough inquiry into the whole matter. According to the information that has fallen from hon. gentlemen, we are in this situation: There was an Indian fund which was to be the basis from which annuities were to be paid. That fund was derived from the sale of lands, and from timber on Indian lands. For the purpose of managing these lands, 10 per cent of the funds realized was set apart. Now, that 10 per cent was in the first place charged with the administration of the lands, and if there was any surplus, if the whole of the 10 per cent was not required for the administration of the Indian lands, I presume the balance would naturally lapse back again into the source, or the common fund, from which it came.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it would go to that fund that was absolutely set apart for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. That 10 per cent was absolutely set apart for the management of the lands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. FOSTER. If less was used one year, more might need to be used another year.

Mr. MULOCK. If there was any surplus it would certainly belong to the foundation fund itself.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; if it were ever closed up.

Mr. MULOCK. Because it came from the Indian property, and it was simply a provident way of managing. Instead of administering the whole income and dividing it up into annuities, the Government, I suppose, deemed it prudent to say: We estimate that it will take about 10 per cent of this fund to carry out certain other arrangements for the benefit of the Indians, and that will constitute a separate trust fund, and the first charge upon this 10 per cent will be the management of the property, and if any surplus should arise, that surplus will naturally fall back into the original fund, and thus increase the annuities of the Indians. The Indians are deeply concerned in the economical administration of the Land Fund. The same remarks apply to the School Fund, because the School Fund was also derived from the lands of the Indians. I wish here to correct a statement made by the Minister at an earlier period of the debate, when he said that it did not make any difference if the money was unwisely expended out of the funds set apart for the management of the lands, because it would not impair the income of the Indians. Quite the contrary, the less you draw out of the Land Fund and the School Fund, the more there ought to be over, and whatever is over, goes to the parent fund from which the annuities are to be drawn.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the surplus of 10 per cent.

Mr. MULOCK. So that the Indians themselves are entitled to an economical administration of those branches of the fund. It is merely a sub-division for the purposes of management, and they are the only ones to be benefited or injured by any maladministration or over expenditure. So that it was entirely erroneous to state that when the moneys were unnecessarily expended, as was shown by the hon. member for Bothwell, in allowing advertisements in connection with Indian affairs to appear in a hundred newspapers—

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will allow me to explain that. It appears the expenditure was made by publishing the advertisements of the sale of Indian lands.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what the advertisements were, nor do I know the amount, but I understood the hon. member for Bothwell to say that there had been an unnecessary expenditure of money on advertisements, out of these Indian funds. Well, if there was any wastefulness of money,

such wastefulness ultimately comes back and is charged against the Indian funds and reduces them. Now, we are face to face with this financial result. Twenty years ago there were to the credit of these three funds, the Land Fund, the School Fund and the Quebec Indian Fund, in round numbers, \$350,000, all the result of the 10 per cent taken away and transferred from the sale of Indian lands and timber at that time. What has become of that \$350,000? We now learn that the \$350,000 capital was set apart, which capital belonged to the Indians, and would ultimately inure to their benefit, and increase their annuities, if not expended. That \$350,000 has been impaired, and it now stands at the sum of \$164,000. There has been, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, an impairment to the extent of \$185,000 out of the capital derived from this 10 per cent, and that has taken place without the authority of Parliament, apparently without the authority of the Government, and, so far as appears, without the consent or the authority of any Minister of the Crown. That is the result of the admissions made on the floor of Parliament this day. It is a most unfortunate, if I wanted to use a stronger word, I would say, a discreditable state of affairs. The Parliament of Canada is the trustee of these funds for the benefit of the Indians, and I say it is most discreditable that that sacred trust should have been violated, as it appears to have been, by some maladministration somewhere. It is idle to say that this waste of funds does not affect the Indians. It does affect the Indians; it affects their income, for, if they do not receive it to-day, in the shape of annuities, they will be entitled to have it placed to the credit of the fund, and thereby increase it. If you lose part of the fund, the income decreases and, to that extent, you are neglecting the interests of the Indians. Parliament is bound to investigate these transactions, to restore this capital, and, in the restoration of it, to credit up to that capital a reasonable rate of interest on every dollar of capital withdrawn during those twenty years, and to restore that fund to that same amount it would have stood at but for those breaches of trust. Parliament is entitled to call for an examination and audit from the beginning, in order to ascertain what the fund should stand at; and it will be for Parliament next year to vote the proper sum of money to restore that trust fund, and also to go a little further and ascertain who is to blame for this breach of trust, because it strikes me as extraordinary that hundreds of thousands of dollars should be checked out of the Treasury of the country without a vote of Parliament, without the sanction of any responsible person.

Mr. LISTER. And without any evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be that explanations may be forthcoming; but we have, apparently in the House, in and around

it, all the persons who possess information, and, up to this moment, there is no satisfactory explanation forthcoming. If it were contended for a moment that the sanction of Parliament was not necessary to authorize the disbursement of the interest arising from the fund though I controvert that contention as well—still we have this result, that, last year, there was paid out of the Consolidated Fund, without the vote of Parliament, without any legal authority of any kind, the sum of \$162,000. There was over and above the income derived from those funds last year an amount paid on account of management of \$162,000, without the sanction of Parliament, which sum comes right out of the pockets of the people. This is the state of affairs with which we are confronted on the floor of Parliament to-day. I regret this matter was not brought up at an earlier period of the session, in order that proper inquiries might be made. It has been rumoured that there was this shortage. I have had communications on the subject, but I found it difficult to arrive at any facts from the records. It may be that the conclusions at which I have arrived may not be correct, but they are based on statements made by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury-benches and by private members of this House.

Mr. LISTER. Have the Government agreed on any scheme for the restoration of the fund; and, if so, what is the scheme?

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman had been present this morning he would have heard a full explanation as to the item of \$15,200, and that the Government proposed to restore the fund by appropriations each year, until we bring the fund to the condition in which it was when they commenced to impair it. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I think his remarks were too strong when he said that this was a breach of trust. The Indians have not suffered in any way.

Mr. MULOCK. They must suffer.

Mr. DALY. That is a matter of argument. I cannot see that they have suffered, because the money has been expended for their uses and for their purposes. Exception was taken by the hon. member for Bothwell as to expenditures made some years ago on advertising largely in the newspapers. On inquiry, I find that the amount was almost wholly spent in advertising sales of land of different Indian bands in Ontario. The mistake was committed far back, and I have not any information before 1871-72, but it will be seen by the Public Accounts and the Auditor-General's Report, that this system has prevailed during all those years. Parliament did not take action in the matter until two years ago. This money has been used, not to carry out the management of the land, but for paying insurance, legal expenses, advertisements, rents, medical attendance, telegrams, grants to school houses, surveys of

buildings and roads, salaries of Indian agents, and even clerks and temporary clerks employed in the department here. The Indians have had the benefit of the expenditure indirectly if not directly. I have here a statement of the expenditure in connection with the three different funds up to June, 1892, as prepared by the Deputy-Minister of the department. I shall have pleasure in submitting it to the House.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention to restore the fund out of the consolidated fund of the country?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Is it intended to make any charge against interest moneys of the Indian Fund so as to reduce the annuities of the Indians?

Mr. DALY. No, not at all.

Mr. LISTER. So the result is that this money has been spent, and the country has to make it good?

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose 10 per cent taken from the proceeds of sales of Indian land and timber, were not required for management of the land and for school purposes, what would become of the balance?

Mr. DALY. The balance would be paid to capital.

Mr. MULOCK. What capital?

Mr. DALY. The Land Management Fund.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose it was not required for the Land Management Fund, or for school purposes, what then?

Mr. DALY. Then it would go to the credit of the different bands.

Mr. MULOCK. It would go back to the source from which it came?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. So the Indians are interested in the good administration of the 10 per cent, although it may be as he remarked in the first place to meet certain charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance have stated that these irregularities began as far back as 1871-72, or even earlier. I do not know to what irregularities the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. FOSTER. The diminishing of the Capital Fund.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me call attention to this fact, that so far as the Indian Management Fund is concerned, the income in 1878, the first year in which I began my investigation, was \$9,406 in excess of the expenditure; and, so far as the Indian School Fund is concerned, it was \$2,400, and so far as the Quebec Fund is concerned, it was \$2,007 in excess of the expenditure.

Mr. DALY.

As hon. gentlemen will see, that period of expenditure in excess of income began two or three years later. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that in 1879, the first year of the present regime, the expenditure on the Quebec Fund was \$6,734, in 1891 it was \$35,533; on the Indian School Fund, it was, in 1879, \$11,867, and in 1890, \$63,260. So far as the Management Fund is concerned, in 1879 the expenditure was \$25,295, and in 1891 it was \$109,776. The hon. gentleman will see that there is no comparison between the expenditure when he began the administration of this fund, with the state of things that exists to-day. Every year our expenditure has gone on increasing. Let me just give one result more, and I do not intend to discuss the question further. In 1878 the expenditure from the three funds was \$43,897, and in 1890 it was \$202,475. That is as near as may be an increase of 500 per cent. It does seem to me that hon. gentleman will find that it is not simply a question of irregularity, but that it is a question of the growth of the expenditure out of all proportion to the fund upon which the department professes to rely. Here is an expenditure in a single year of \$202,000, as against a fund, the capital of which is \$350,000.

Indians—Manitoba and North-west Territories. \$777,271

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister explain this very large increase, amounting to \$8,401, under the head of live stock?

Mr. DALY. We are purchasing cattle to give to the Indians in Treaty No. 7, the Bloods, Piegiens and Blackfeet, in order that they may have the benefit of the increase of these cattle and have something to do. The country they inhabit is more of a ranch country than a farming country, and we find from experiments that have been made with the Duck Lake and other Indians in giving them cattle, that they take a great deal of interest in cattle raising, and that from year to year the cost of providing them with food is being reduced. We expect to decrease the cost of supplying them with food when they get the cattle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total number of Indians to whom bounties are paid?

Mr. DALY. The total Indian population in the North-west Territories is 15,327, and Manitoba, 9,388; total, 24,715.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that covers the entire estimate of the Indian population on this side of the Rocky Mountains? Because I think in former times that is put at a much higher figure.

Mr. DALY. It does not include the Ontario Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there Indians outside the treaty?

Mr. DALY. There are between 6,000 and 7,000 outside of the treaty, and they are not included in the figures I have given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose there are no other lands that the Government are desirous of acquiring from these Indians?

Mr. DALY. Except the Peace river country and the Athabasca region.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We can afford to wait for that. I was just about to observe that taking five to a family, these Indians cost us \$150 per year each family, which is steep, to say the least of it. You might almost maintain in absolute independence a number of white families for very little more than that.

Mr. DALY. I will give some figures comparing our Indian expenditure with that of the United States. The United States voted for their Indian Service for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1891, \$5,804,399. Divide this by the Indian population of the United States, which is placed at 246,000 souls, and you have a per capita per annum of \$23.76. For the same year the Canadian Government voted for the Indian Service throughout Canada, \$1,081,235.13. The Indian population for that year is put at 122,000, showing that our Indians cost the Government per capita, \$8.86. The United States Blackfeet, Bloods and Piegiens, resident in Montana, are similarly situated to our Blood Indians south of Fort Macleod. These Indians in Montana number about 1,900, and it is found that there is an item for food, etc., of \$150,000. This corresponds with our Destitute Indians Supply vote. The Canadian Blood Indians number about 1,700, and our expenditure on them for food, etc., was very little over \$50,000 for the same year. The United States voted in 1891, \$1,456,960 for educational purposes, or an average of \$5.90 per soul of the population. The Canadian Government voted \$208,119 for educational purposes, or an average of \$1.70 per soul. It will be observed that the United States Government voted for Indian children attending industrial schools, \$150, \$167 and \$175 per capita, to different schools very much better situated than our industrial schools, which receive \$100, \$115, \$120 and \$130. Take, for example, the Carlisle school in the United States country, where they have a good market for their manufactures, and where they receive contracts for harness, wagons and other supplies for army purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not, I think, a correct way of putting it. There are a great number of Indians in Ontario and Quebec who are practically self-supporting, or, at least, to whom we pay very little, except for interest on the fund. We must confine ourselves to the expenditures which we make under the treaty with

the Manitoba and North-west Indians, and which amount to about the sum I stated. I must say that this appears to be a pretty large expenditure, though it is a little reduced from former years. A great deal of it, I am afraid, does not go into the hands of the Indians at all, but practically into the hands of the white population.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say just a few words; I do not want to detain the committee very long. I do not hold the hon. Minister now in charge of this department personally responsible for the expenditures of last year, though the Government of which he is a member is undoubtedly responsible. But I hope that he will make a very determined effort to cut down the Indian expenditure in the North-west next year. The hon. gentleman has given quotations to show the cost of supporting the Indians in the United States. I have not the slightest doubt that they also have their national debt blood-suckers—persons who are employed by the Government, and who do not care, so long as they get Government pay, whether they get it in the Indian service or in any other service. Any person who looks over the Auditor-General's Report and examines the salaries, must come to the conclusion that Mr. Blake came to many years ago, when he said that the North-west was made a happy hunting ground for political hacks. Last year salaries and travelling expenses in Manitoba and the North-west cost \$188,174, of which \$19,562 was paid to doctors. The idea of paying very nearly \$20,000 to doctors for attending 25,000 Indians is absurd. Then, we have men drawing high salaries of \$2,400 or \$2,500 a year. One man who draws \$1,900 follows a lucrative profession in one of our large towns. I hope that when the Minister brings down his Estimates next year, we shall find that he has made enormous reductions. I can assure him that if I shall be here, I will devote my time to careful criticism of the expenditures under this head, and see if I cannot point out where considerable savings can be made. It is quite unnecessary for us to pay such an enormous sum for salaries and travelling expenses, and such an enormous sum for doctors. They can well afford to make a living for themselves without being hooked on to the Indian service, and sucking from the Dominion these large sums of money.

Mr. DALY. I think the hon. gentleman is a little hard on the officers of the North-west when he calls them blood-suckers. My experience is that they are a hard-working, self-sacrificing lot of men. As for the agents, he is very much astray if he thinks they have an easy time of it or enjoy many luxuries. The fact of a man being an Indian agent does not imply that he is living in the immediate vicinity of all the Indians under his care. Some of the agents have as many as nine reserves to look after, others have six and others four. These men are on the

alert from morning till night, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he occupied the position of an Indian agent he would think that he well earned his salary. I agree with him that the expenditure looks large, and it will be my duty to investigate it and endeavour, if possible, to reduce it. But I think it right that I should say one word in favour of men whom I have known for many years, and who are a hard-working, industrious lot of officials.

Mr. McMULLEN. I assert that there were some men employed in the service there who were blood-suckers. I take the name of Mr. Hayter Reed, who is the superintendent in the North-west. According to a return brought down in response to an Order of this House, we found that Mr. Reed got leave of absence, that he came to Kingston to see his friends, that he went from there to Toronto, and that all the time he was away he attempted to charge the country \$3.50 a day for his living allowance, as well as his railway fare to Kingston and from Kingston to Toronto; and if it had not been for the Auditor-General, he would have collected the money. When the account was produced here before the authorities, they docked off these items. Will the hon. gentleman say that he is not a blood-sucker?

Mr. DALY. Yes; I will.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I will show him the account, with the items struck off. I am prepared to prove it if the hon. gentleman calls the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DALY. I am satisfied that, next year, the hon. gentleman will be afforded every opportunity of bringing Mr. Reed before that committee. I may say that, so far as my knowledge goes, Mr. Reed is one of the most efficient officers in any department of the Government, and I cannot believe that he would attempt, in any way, to make money by charging travelling allowances or expenses to which he was not entitled. The visit which the hon. gentleman speaks of may have been made by Mr. Reed, at the request of the then Minister of Interior, and while down here on departmental business, he may have been at Kingston to see his friends; but I am satisfied that everything connected with Mr. Reed and his office will bear the fullest and freest investigation by this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the account he rendered, he certified these items as correct, and they were erased, with the words in the margin, "away on leave of absence." That account is now in the Public Accounts Committee room, and I will point it out to the hon. gentleman if he wishes to see it.

Mr. COCKBURN. I may say that I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Hayter Reed from his infancy upwards, and I am sure, from what I know of him, that he is perfectly incapable of any mean or dishon-

Mr. DALY.

ourable action. It may be, that he felt it within his duty to make certain charges which the Auditor-General objected to. The charges may have been strictly honourable on his part; he may have thought that he was entitled to make them. I do not like to hear it hinted that any gentleman of such high standing as Mr. Hayter Reed would attempt to do anything unworthy of a gentleman.

Mr. LISTER. Of course, it must be very gratifying to Mr. Hayter Reed to have the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) get up and testify to his character and reputation. I have no doubt that the hon. member is animated by the kindest motives and is perfectly sincere in the statement he makes. I would remind the hon. gentleman, that it is hardly consistent with the theory of perfect innocence, that when Mr. Reed was away on leave of absence, because that is the statement made in the account, he should have charged the country with his expenses and it is difficult to imagine he did so, with the entirely honest conviction on his part that he was entitled to that money. If it was a fact that he was away on leave of absence, he had no right to charge the country with his expenses. The overcharge was discovered by the proper officers and eliminated from the account, and that evidence in writing is the strongest evidence possible that Mr. Hayter Reed must have known, when he put in the account, that he had made a charge which he had no right to make, and if he had succeeded in getting the money, he would have got money to which he had no possible claim. I do not wish to speak harshly of that gentleman, but I cannot forget the fact that in a somewhat important investigation he appeared as a very important witness, and he did not give his evidence with that frankness which would carry conviction to the minds of those listening to him, that he was telling the whole truth. There is one thing connected with that investigation, and it is this, that Mr. Hayter Reed wrote two letters connected with the Brenner furs. He was implicated along with the General and the other men who were mixed up in the robbery of that unfortunate man of all he had in the world. And there is this important fact to be remembered, that a Hayter Reed wrote two letters. The one which would have convicted him he got possession of and substituted for it another bearing the same date and relieving certain gentlemen from the imputation or charge that might have been sustained against him, of improper practices during the rebellion. If he was capable of writing two letters, the one incriminating himself and friends, and the other relieving them from the charge made against them, we are bound to say that it is our duty to look with some suspicion upon any statement made by such a gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order that we may nail this thing home, so that the Minister of

the Interior can inform himself of the correctness of the statement I made, I will give him the dates of the amounts charged. Mr. Hayter Reed got four days leave of absence and charged his trip to the country, as follows :—

Fare, Kingston to Ottawa	\$ 4 10
Cab fare Ottawa	0 75
Brockville to Kingston	1 65
Pullman and Porter Ottawa to Kingston	1 75
Transport of Baggage, Kingston . . .	0 50
Cab, Kingston	0 75
Fare, Kingston to Toronto	4 00
Transfer baggage, Toronto	0 50
	<hr/>
	\$14 00

He also billed the Government for the living allowance of \$3.50 per day during the four days he was away on leave of absence, and his bill was cut down by the Auditor-General on this account. In striking out the items which he considered wrong, the Auditor-General marked on the margin of the bill, "off on leave of absence."

Mr. MULOCK. I do not rise to take part in the discussion on the question just closed. I can only express the hope that Mr. Reed will succeed in offering explanations which will entirely exonerate him from evil-doing. I remember some years ago making a pretty strong statement on the floor of this House against a gentleman, Mr. McDonnell, and I have found since that perhaps I overstated the case. And whilst I speak strongly on the floor when the persons I refer to are present, I am getting a little cautious about interfering in the cases of others who are not present. At the same time, all the explanations required should be forthcoming. There has, no doubt, been a great deal of laxity in matters comparatively small, but which amount to very large sums in the aggregate. I remember looking over the bill of expenses, in an investigation held in my own county, and seeing a charge of \$3.50 per day for board in a country village hotel, when the most fashionable hotel in that place considered \$1 a day very ample remuneration. I have received a communication from the region of Piegiens to the effect that the agent there has been stinted in his supply of food, flour and beef for some time, and the Indians have become hungry and restless. At last, driven by hunger, a few of the more vigorous of the band broke into the store-house and carried off a certain quantity of beef. The agent thereupon called upon the chiefs on the reserves for the surrender of the criminals. The chiefs denied all knowledge of the guilty parties and refused to admit that he or his band were responsible for the wrongdoing. Nevertheless the agent stopped all supplies in order to secure the surrender of the guilty parties, and I am informed that for about a week all supplies were withheld. As the Indians live in a hand to mouth way and depend upon the agency for their daily bread, they were reduced almost to a state

of starvation. At the end of the week, when disease was breaking out amongst the band, a few of the young men came forward to save the others from threatened starvation and acknowledged the theft. They were brought before Mr. Justice McLeod and sentenced to a term of imprisonment. Whether or not they were guilty, I do not know, but we may assume they were. The effect of this treatment has been, I am told, to create disaffection, not only among the Piegiens, but also among the Bloods and Blackfeet, so much so that some of the white people there at the present time are, I am assured, extremely anxious for fear of an Indian rising. I hope that the grievance, if any, has been entirely removed. Whatever economy is necessary in the management of the Indians, I think it is a mistake to deprive them of their food. Meantime the hon. Minister will observe that the commencement of the trouble was the cutting off of the supplies by the Indian agents. The question for the Government to consider is, in the first place, did they allow sufficient rations for the proper feeding of the Indians? If so, then in the second place, did these rations find their way to the Indians? and thirdly, if not, why were they withheld, and by whom?

Mr. DALY. I desire to say in answer to the hon. gentleman that the report he has received is considerably exaggerated. There was trouble amongst the Piegiens some short time ago. It occurred in the absence of Mr. Pocklington, the agent, who was absent on sick leave, and Mr. Nash, the assistant, was in charge. It appears that these people were receiving their ordinary rations and were getting the same food they had been getting all winter. They broke into the store-house, and Mr. Nash took it upon himself to discipline them by saying that they should not get food until they delivered up the perpetrators of the offence. It was a couple of days, and not a week, as my hon. friend says, that they were without rations, and as soon as the matter was brought to the notice of the commissioner, instructions were given to Mr. Nash to go on rationing the Indians as usual. Even while the rations were withheld the Indians had food; they were simply not getting the usual semi-weekly ration. They are very improvident. We might feed them three times a day. It is important to discipline these people; but no person would like to see them starved. They were not without food; but the action taken by the sub-agent was without authority of the agent or the department, and I am satisfied will not be repeated. There is no dissatisfaction; the trouble has all been settled and the Indians are perfectly satisfied. The trouble did not extend to the Blackfeet or the Bloods. I may say for the information of the House that considerable trouble is occasioned on Treaty 7, by the ranchmen and cowboys who try to impress the Indians with the idea that they are not getting enough food,

perhaps because the ranchmen would like to have the contract for more beef. I am glad the hon. gentleman has made the statement he has, because it gives me an opportunity to say that the trouble has quieted down, and that it is hardly possible that it will occur again.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am glad the hon. Minister is able to make this statement. The Minister is well aware how improvident the Indians of the North-west are. I doubt if they keep in stock food for one day ahead or even one meal ahead. He will see, then, what a cruel thing it must have been to deprive them of food for 48 hours, which according to the agent's statement was the case, unless they had something in stock, which is very doubtful. According to my information the period of fasting extended beyond two days, almost to a week. I hope my informant is in error in these points; but he is a most reliable person, and lives in the vicinity of these Indians, and he made no qualification of the statement. I have such confidence in my informant's accuracy that I think if the hon. gentleman inquires into the matter he will find that food was withheld from the Indians for more than two days.

To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary, and contingencies of his office \$3,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Has he furnished a report?

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will see Mr. Fabre's report in the Report of the Department of Interior.

Mr. McMULLEN. What particular service has he rendered for the last year?

Mr. DALY. I can only answer so far as immigration is concerned, that Mr. Fabre has been assisting the Government agent who has been over in the north of France and in Belgium. Mr. Fabre has been distributing literature and otherwise assisting in the usual work of his office.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he engaged in connection with Sir Charles Tupper in negotiating the French Treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. He rendered Sir Charles Tupper all the assistance in his power in negotiations for that treaty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He acted as an interpreter, I should judge.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper has very good knowledge of French.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I should be inclined to think.

Mr. DALY. Going back to item 217, I can now give the hon. gentleman the information he asked for. Schools, clerical assistance and printing, I find, comprise fourteen items, Mr. DALY.

and according to the estimate recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, were as follows: of that amount, \$123,836 was for schools; \$800 for light and fuel of legislative hall; \$2,000, probable cost of elections; \$650 travelling expenses of officials; roads and bridges, \$44,450; clerical assistance, \$14,730; contingencies, \$2,000; printing, advertising, \$4,000; newspapers, periodicals and magazines, \$500; management of the well-boring machine, \$2,000; caretaker and messengers of legislative hall, \$1,320; stationery, telegrams, etc., \$2,300; advertising sittings of the courts, \$100; books for the North-west Government library, \$1,000, making a total of \$199,686.13.

To meet payments to extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament \$5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What amount is required from year to year for this purpose, on the average?

Mr. FOSTER. More or less, according to the number of returns that are asked for by the House. For the last year or two the amount was quite small; this year it will be large, on account of so much extra work being required for the preparation of the returns asked for in connection with the census.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. (Payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the Civil Service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.) Revote, \$9,500..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When is this likely to be brought to a close?

Mr. FOSTER. All the preliminaries have been settled, and the arbitrators have had their first meeting, and are to meet again in April. The arbitrators are Judge Boyd, Judge Casault and Judge Burbidge. The questions for settlement are, first, as to the rate of interest which the Provincial Governments shall be allowed on their debts, whether it shall be 5 or 6 per cent. That is the main question. Then there are some questions in dispute between the Dominion Government and the two Provincial Governments as to certain items in connection with the Indian account, and others. Those are the two principal questions at stake. Then there are some differences between the two provinces themselves, which the arbitrators will also take in hand and decide.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what amount is the present claim?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not tell my hon. friend the amount of the claim at stake.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports :

Province of Nova Scotia.....	\$115,720
do New Brunswick....	90,260
do Prince Edward Is- land	19,475
do Québec.....	210,345
do Ontario.....	303,080
do Manitoba.....	33,300
do North-west Terri- tories.....	5,200
do British Columbia..	59,495

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a pretty large increase, and we require some detailed explanation—in the case of British Columbia, for instance.

Mr. WALLACE. Additional officers have become necessary on account of the increase of work. At Vancouver, for example, the work has increased 60 per cent. We have established a number of outports at New Westminster and along the boundary line between Canada and the United States, and of course these involve additional expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Controller say at what places offices have been established ?

Mr. WALLACE. Eleven new officers have been appointed at New Westminster, Kootenay and other places on the boundary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who are the officers ?

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot give the names of the officers. Four were appointed at New Westminster and seven at the outports.

Mr. McMULLEN. What salary is attached to those new appointments ?

Mr. WALLACE. They are only appointed temporarily ; they have not received permanent appointments, and their wages vary from \$2 to \$2.50 per day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have all of them passed the Civil Service examination ?

Mr. WALLACE. I think so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Controller prepared to say that such is the fact ?

Mr. WALLACE. It is not necessary according to the law. Some are preventive officers, and they are not required to pass the Civil Service examination.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is generally understood that those who have passed the examination should receive appointments.

Mr. WALLACE. For temporary positions the Government are not always able to obtain men who have passed the examination. In this case the law does not require it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When were these appointments made ?

Mr. WALLACE. During last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not a satisfactory answer. Will the Minister state

whether they were made within the last two or three months ?

Mr. WALLACE. They were made before I came into office.

Allowance to Chairman of Board of Appraisers

\$400

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who is the Commissioner of Customs now ?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Watters is acting Commissioner. He is the Assistant-Commissioner, and by law he has all the powers of Commissioner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then he will act as chairman of the board and draw this amount of \$400 ?

Mr. WALLACE. That is the intention.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the present salary paid Mr. Watters ?

Mr. WALLACE. \$2,800.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose he gets the yearly increase of \$50 ?

Mr. WALLACE. No ; the law limits the salary to \$2,800.

Mr. McMULLEN. And he receives this \$400 in addition ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes ; as chairman of the board.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is this officer obliged to attend solely to the business connected with the Department of Customs ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it a fact that this same officer is engaged in business outside of the department, and is this within the knowledge of the department ?

Mr. WALLACE. The department is aware that he has been so engaged in the past ; but since my assuming office Mr. Waters has done a great deal more than a full day's work each day in the department.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is not a satisfactory answer ; it is not even a reply to the question. I merely asked if the Controller is aware, or the department over which he has control is aware, that Mr. Waters at the present time is engaged in private business outside of the regular duties connected with his position as an officer of the department ?

Mr. WALLACE. The department has received letters and representations to that effect. A like inquiry was made in the House, and I stated then that so soon as the session was over, we would take up the matter and give it consideration, and arrive at a decision on the question raised in the correspondence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it be the case that this officer or any other officer of customs is engaged in any other business,

his services should be dispensed with at once. There is no better understood rule in England and Canada than that salaried officers in the customs shall, under no conceivable circumstances, engage in independent operations. I do not suppose any hon. gentleman opposite will dispute the soundness of that proposition, the reason being so obvious and clear; and if this person is engaged in any other business, then I say the Government are derelict in their duty if they allow him to remain in the service one day. Did I understand that instead of being dismissed he was to be promoted? If so, it sheds a very strong light indeed on the complaints, neither few nor far between, made in this House and out of the House, as to the manner in which the Customs Department has been administered by some of the officials connected with it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I object entirely to the making of additions to the salary of an officer who is already well paid. Mr. Watters now receives \$2,800 a year, and he should be willing to devote his entire time to the service of the country and to the performance of his official duties. He is now Commissioner of Customs, and also chairman of the commission, and he should be willing to serve his country on that salary without obtaining any additional income. This is another case in which an officer appointed to a position at a good salary finds some excuse for obtaining an increase.

Mr. WALLACE. The Act authorizes the appointment of the Commissioner as chairman of the board of customs appraisers. The allowance previously made to the chairman of the board was \$800, and we have reduced the amount to \$400.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand Mr. Watters is interested in some mica mines, and I am very doubtful whether the character of his business is of such a nature as to interfere with the performance of his duties. Certainly if an officer possesses some surplus money he should be allowed the privilege of investing it. Perhaps it would be as well to inquire into the matter before censure is passed on Mr. Watters, for I understand his business transactions are simply of the character I have indicated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That statement which my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) makes would undoubtedly put a different face on the matter, but as I understood my friend from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), this officer—I did not catch the name until he had spoken later—was carrying on an ordinary business

Mr. DEVLIN. I was not censuring Mr. T. J. Watters, I was putting a question to the Controller, so that when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) complains, he simply did not understand the position as it was put before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

What I was asking was simply this: Is it within the knowledge of the department that this gentleman is engaged in business pursuits outside of the duties of his office? It is a well-known fact to-day that the conduct of this officer has already been called to the attention of the Senate. I think the Hon. Mr. Clemow brought the whole matter before the Senate, and it is not a fact that can be concealed in any way, because the business in which this gentleman has been engaged has already been the subject matter of a report. I know that I have received letters from different electors of the county which I represent, asking me to draw the attention of the Government to this very matter. I have not done so, and I did not wish to do so at the time the matter was already before the attention of the Senate, as I thought the Government acting, upon whatever advice might be tendered by the Senate, would take some action. The fact is that this officer of the Department of Customs is, as I am informed, at the head of a large mining business in the county of Ottawa and elsewhere, which necessarily takes up a great deal of his time. I simply asked the Controller of Customs to give a reply to my question. Is the department aware, at the present time, that he is engaged in this business and is discharging whatever duties may be required of him by that business, in addition to the duties of his office?

Mr. WALLACE. After the letters had been received by the department complaining that Mr. Watters was engaged in outside business, I asked Mr. Watters to make a report to me as to the whole facts of the case. He has done so, and in that statement he says that he has large interests in the mica mining industries in the county of Ottawa, that he has large investments there, that the business is carried on by his son, that the head office is in the city of Ottawa, here, that the business is in no way conducted by himself, but that he has a financial interest in that business, and that he expected at an early date to be entirely clear of any financial or other interest in it.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is the answer I wanted.

Mr. BECHARD. I have nothing to say on the matter raised by my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), but I have to state that if the gentleman mentioned does not pay more attention to all the business submitted to him than he did to a matter I submitted to him a few weeks ago, he does not deserve to be longer continued in his office. I submitted a letter to him and he cast his eyes upon it but did nothing, and I may say that I afterwards submitted it to the Controller of Customs, who paid great attention to the matter and did full justice.

Mr. DEVLIN. With regard to the statement of the Controller of Customs, that Mr.

Watters is not at the head of the business, and that his son manages the business, I can say that all suits in the name of the company are taken out in the name of the father, who is Commissioner of Customs.

Customs—Testing of Sugars.....\$5,150

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The testing required with reference to sugars must be very small, compared to what it was some time ago. The only test is now for colour, I understand, and before it used to be tested for degrees of strength. What is the explanation of this item then?

Mr. WALLACE. There is not, of course, so much testing of sugar as formerly, but there is testing yet, as to whether it is under or over fourteen Dutch standard. All the mollasses and syrups that come into the country has to be tested, and this entails a great deal of work upon the department.

Excise—Salaries of Officers and Inspectors \$305,232.50

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the explanation of this increase of \$4,248?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That increase is made up largely by increase of salaries consequent upon promotion examinations from class to class. In reference to decreases in the department, during the year there were four deaths, representing a decrease of \$3,440. Three superannuations, decrease \$2,250. Reduction of vote for the North-west as compared with 1892-93, \$2,000. Decreased commissions to sellers of stamps for Canadian twist tobacco, \$50. Total decrease \$8,057. The increases are due to the operation of Excise regulations, being the percentage between the minimum and maximum salaries, \$1,932.50; increase due to class promotion, after examination, \$2,701.25; special increases, \$1,500; increase granted but not voted, \$672.50; new appointments, \$4,550; transfer from Preventive to Excise service, \$900; increase to collectors, commissions, showing the vote for 1892-93 was too small, \$500; increase in methylated spirits vote, due to changing the annual outlay in this line, \$74,515; total increase, \$87,221.25. The item with respect to the methylated spirits is simply the result of the difference in the system of book-keeping, and is not in reality an increase. Formerly the outlay in connection with the methylated spirit warehouse did not appear in the Estimates, and only appeared in the Annual Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, so that that is really no increase at all. If you deduct the decreases from the increases, the balance is just the amount mentioned in the Estimates.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturing factories..... \$79,515

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What absolute necessity exists for the department buying these methylated spirits? Why can-

not the manufacturers buy them for themselves?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The department, since 1888, has taken into its own hands the manufacture of methylated spirits. Prior to that date they were manufactured by licensed manufacturers in bond. The proportions then used were twelve gallons of wood naphtha to each 100 gallons of spirits of not less than sixty above proof. The department had reason to believe that these methylated spirits were being deodorized, the objectionable odour of the wood naphtha being removed by the use of essences or flavourings, and were being converted into a potable liquid which would pass muster in outlying places. Hence the privilege was withdrawn and the department undertook to carry on the trade. I am informed by my officers that a seizure was made in Montreal of spirits which has been converted into a potable liquor, and it was decided for the purpose of better protecting the revenue that the Government should undertake the manufacture itself. The result, I am glad to say, shows a balance on the right side of the ledger, amounting to \$23,345.65 for last year.

Weights and Measures and Gas...\$95,450

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of this increase of \$850 in the North-west?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The increases during 1892-93 were in two cases—Mr. Fitzgerald, of Hamilton, \$100, and Mr. Piper, of Toronto, \$100. For 1893-94, the proposed increases are \$1,050; but against these, an item included in the former Estimates, for two new offices in the North-west, is omitted, leaving the net increase on the inspector's salaries only \$50.

Adulteration of Food..... \$25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object to this item. It is a branch of the public service which may be made very useful. But I want to inquire of the Minister—it may not come strictly under this head—whether he will cause it to be understood that parties who suspect water of being impure can have the water supply of any town or village or city analysed by the Government inspectors. If this continent should unhappily be visited by cholera this year, it might be a matter of very considerable moment to the public health to know—and I think the hon. gentleman should take steps to cause it to be known in good time—that the roughly skilled officers would be allowed to inspect samples of water from various localities. If that were done, preventive measures might be taken in many places that would largely avoid the risk of cholera. I should be glad to have the hon. gentleman take that matter into his consideration.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I should be very glad to act on the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Post Office—Salaries, etc. . . . \$1,185,420

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the reason for the increase?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is owing to the increase of business, which necessitated an increase in the staff, and, as the revenue is now \$660,000 more than it was in 1888, or 24 per cent increase, and the expenditure has been increased but \$649,000, the hon. gentleman will see that the increase is justified.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention of the Government to place the other cities on a city basis?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not this year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it intended to extend the system of letter carriers to cities that have not got them?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the Postmaster-General, if there has been much improvement in the mail service during the past year, at all events, in the district of Ottawa?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I consider that the service is continually improving, not only in the district of Ottawa, but all over the Dominion, and I think our postal facilities equal those of any other country in the world, considering our population and the means at our disposal.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that any new post offices have been opened in the county of Ottawa, which is a very large and populous territory?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not exactly tell the hon. gentleman. Speaking merely from memory, we have, of course, opened some in that county. As the hon. gentleman said, it is a very large territory, almost a province, in so far as area goes, and I know that applications have been made for new post offices. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman made one himself, in the interests of his constituents. We, however, were not in a position to grant all the applications.

Mr. DEVLIN. I know that there is a disposition to put this item through, and I am not going to oppose it, but I wish to say that next session I will go into the matter more fully. I believe that inspectors were sent out to the county of Ottawa at times. What kind of reports they brought back or whether their reports were acted upon, I am not in a position to say. All I can say is, that we have more than once sent petitions, very largely signed, from important points in the county, asking for better mail service, and the invariable reply was, that the matters would receive consideration. I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

do not rise to complain, but I would ask the Postmaster-General's attention to this. It is true, I am in opposition to the Government, but I hope the mail service of the county will not be left in its present state on that account. It is one of the few counties in which population has very largely increased. That population to-day numbers nearly 70,000 souls, and the hon. gentleman will understand that a mail service, which may have been good ten years ago, is not adequate to-day. I press this upon the Postmaster-General, because petition after petition has been sent to his department, asking for simple justice, and to each one the invariable answer was that the matter would receive the consideration of the department. In hardly one instance, however, has justice been done, and, as we are taxpayers, as well as any other portion of the country, we are entitled to receive whatever is due to us in this respect.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I agree that justice should be done the hon. gentleman's constituency, as is done to other constituencies, and I agree also that the fact that he occupies a seat to the left of the Speaker, should not have any weight or influence in the department. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I shall be very glad if he will bring the matter up next session. In the meantime, during the recess, I will reconsider the application he has made, and, if it is within the power of the department to comply with the petitions referred to by him, he may be quite certain that we will do so.

Mr. BORDEN. I desire to say a word or two with reference to the mail route, about which I asked the hon. Minister a couple of questions during the session. I refer to the carrying of mails over the branch line of the Cornwallis Valley Railway. I asked him whether the service connecting the two stations of that railway with certain post offices were to be offered for public tenders, and his reply was that such was the general practice followed by the department. I further asked him if he was aware that a private citizen of the county of King's was making private negotiations with parties to carry the mails from the stations to certain offices, and he stated that no person was authorized to do anything of that kind. Now, the hon. Minister will perhaps be surprised to know that these mail services were actually hawked about by the gentleman who contested King's county in the Conservative interest in the last Dominion election, interviewing different parties to see who would take them and at what price they were willing to take them. I have in my possession letters from reliable men stating that this is the fact. It seems to me that the hon. Minister can scarcely approve of that sort of thing. I quite understand the principle upon which patronage is distributed by the Government to its friends. I quite under-

stand that when a post office is to be established and a postmaster to be appointed in my county I am not consulted; I do not expect to be; and that the gentleman who opposed me will be consulted. But when it comes to a gentleman who does not represent the constituency being permitted to go about the county and see what political capital he can make by the use of his power to distribute contracts for the mail service which should have been offered to the public for competition, to see who would carry them at the lowest rate. I think that if the Minister is made aware of that fact, he will take good care to see that it does not happen again. I state here in my place in Parliament, and I take the full responsibility of the statement, that the gentleman who opposed me during the last election was permitted by somebody (it must have been some person in connection with the Post Office Department) to go about and make arrangements privately with parties and to have those arrangements actually carried out and the parties he selected entrusted with the carrying of the mails from these different offices. My first question elicited the fact that no private person had been employed to do this. In the second question I asked I repeated this part of it, and the hon. Minister said that the inspector at Halifax was the gentleman who had made these arrangements. Now, I give the hon. gentleman information of what has been done and I take the responsibility of stating it here in my place, and I trust he will investigate the matter and see that such action on the part of officers of the department is not repeated. And, I would say further, as I understand the contract has not been given to these parties for any length of time, that it is a temporary arrangement, that I trust the hon. Minister will see that these contracts are offered by tender and the temporary arrangement terminated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have nothing to take back of the answer I gave in reply to the hon. gentleman's question, because the hon. gentleman knows that I was not Postmaster-General at that time, and I had merely to convey to the House the information I had.

Mr. BORDEN. But this happened within a month. This service was established on the 1st of March, this year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I still maintain that the answer I gave the hon. gentleman was the information which was given me by the officers of the department. The hon. gentleman knows that I do not know who these gentlemen are who apply for or who have got these contracts. I must tell the hon. gentleman that in ordinary cases we do ask for tenders, but very frequently (and this is not a precedent that I have established in the department, the Postmaster-General before me had the same system and it was found to work very well) if the contractor has carried out his contract properly

that contract is renewed without any tenders being asked for. That system generally meets the wishes of the public, who have grown accustomed to the contractor, and, very often, if there is a large contract the contractor has provided himself with horses and vehicles for the purpose of carrying the mail. But, as a rule, unless there be some such reason as I have given, we always call for tenders. It is quite a surprise to me to hear it stated here that any private gentleman should undertake negotiations about these contracts. If he has done so, he has done it upon his responsibility and we could not prevent him, and, if the contract happened to be given to the people with whom he negotiated, it must be that he negotiated with the proper people to carry out the contracts, because the department considers simply the interest of the service and not the interest of the individual. I will be glad to take up the whole question and see how these contracts have been given, and, according to the information I get, I will take such action as will be in the interests of the service.

Mr. BORDEN. It was a coincidence then, that the gentleman with whom my opponent negotiated should have been selected by the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; such accidents do happen.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad to know that the hon. Minister disapproves of the practice I have mentioned, and I hope that he will see that in the future nothing of the kind occurs. With regard to this service, and the fact that the different routes were not offered by tender and contract, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that the department has had ample time. I think it is fully eighteen months since negotiations were first begun with a view to having the mails carried over this railway and distributed to these different offices.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am glad to hear the Postmaster-General say that contracts are renewed without tenders being asked, because it is an intimation that the course followed two months ago in the case of the mail between Mercier and Notre-Dame du Rosaire is not approved by the department. Mr. Mercier, who is the postmaster, had the contract for \$80 a year, to take the mail from Mercier to Notre-Dame du Rosaire. The contract expired on the 1st February. Tenders were asked for. Mr. Mercier was not a very well educated man, and did not exactly understand the system of tender. He sent a letter to the department stating that he was ready to do the work for the price, \$80, but if somebody sent a tender lower, he would accept the contract at the price of that tender. I wrote a letter to the department explaining the circumstances, and stating that, although Mr. Mercier did not make a tender on the blanks provided

he had written the letter, as I have said. I received an answer that it was impossible to do anything for him because the tenders were asked and they must be considered, and that no contracts were renewed without tender. So what the hon. Postmaster-General has said is a condemnation of what has taken place in that case. I do not know if it is because it was in my county, and because I am opposing the Government, but there is something in the case very extraordinary. I was surprised that no better answer was given to my letter. This poor man who had bought a horse and vehicle was obliged to sell them, and, perhaps, will go away to the States.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend knows me too well to imagine that I would be wicked enough to interfere with a contract of that kind, because it happened to be in his county. I would never think of such a thing. But my reply to the hon. member is no condemnation of what I did in his constituency. I never meant to convey to the House the idea that it was an invariable rule in the department to continue a contract. I pointed out that in making contracts of that kind the department always asked whether it was in the interest of the public to continue the contract or to call for tenders. It was purely by accident, of course, that the contractor, whose case the hon. gentleman is defending so ably to-day, was not, perhaps, satisfactory to the department, and it is purely an accident that it should happen in his county. I certainly considered that question solely from the stand-point of the public interest, and from the information which I received from the inspector. Probably it was considered better to call for tenders. But I am certain the hon. gentleman will do me the justice to believe that I would not deal with this matter in the way I did, involving a sum of \$80, merely because it happened to be in the constituency of a member of the Opposition.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I did not say it was because it was in my county; I do not know that; but I may say that the hon. gentleman has in my county some very wicked counselors, who may induce him to do that in spite of himself. I will give him the names, if he wishes. The tender which was made was for the same price, \$80, and the department did not save a single cent, as the late contractor offered to do the work for the same price, or for a less price, if the same tender was sent in. This contract may be all right, according to the rules. There is another point on which I insist still more strongly. My hon. friend knows that for two or three years past petition after petition, signed by three-fourths of the inhabitants of Notre-Dame du Rosaire, has been sent to the department, asking that the post office be placed nearer the church. At present it is five acres from the church, on a concession line, where nobody passes, where there is

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

no road in the winter but a foot-path, and in summer the people are obliged to jump over fences in order to reach the office. I ask the hon. gentleman why he did not comply with these petitions and place the post office nearer the church? I asked for the papers, and they have been laid on the Table of the House; but I did not see the reports which have been made by Mr. Bolduc, the inspector, or by his assistants. If I am correctly informed, the inspector himself has recommended the change. I do not know if the reason why the change is not made is because it is in my county, or because the Minister has received bad advice from some of my opponents; but I know that reports have been made asking for the change in the interest of the public.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. About the case at Notre-Dame du Rosaire, the hon. gentleman complains that the report of the inspector was not laid upon the Table.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. That is not the real complaint.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am first dealing with the last reproach that the hon. gentleman has made against the department, and I tell him that the report of inspectors are never placed upon the Table. It would be almost impossible to conduct the affairs of the Post Office Department if these reports were laid upon the Table. That is a confidential report, and if the hon. gentleman could see some of the reports which are handed into the Postmaster-General he would understand the policy of not laying them upon the Table of the House. Now, regarding this case at Notre-Dame du Rosaire: I assure my hon. friend that nothing has been done by the department which I do not consider to be right and proper in the interest of the public in that parish. It is true that some petition was sent in asking for a change; but the hon. gentleman must recollect that there were no complaints against the old postmaster. It appears that since he became postmaster a new man, a stranger, a very respectable man, if you like, came in and built a house nearer to the church than the place where the present post office is situated. I was asked to dismiss a public servant who had done his duty faithfully, and to replace him by a new man who had come in and built a house nearer to the church where the friends of the hon. gentleman wished to have the post office established. Now, as a matter of principle, I hold that if a public officer has done his duty faithfully, very strong reasons indeed must be used to justify the department in dismissing him and replacing him by a newcomer. That is the reason that determined the course followed by the department.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not think that reason is a good one, because the post office must be placed where it will be most convenient for the people of the parish. I say

that the place where the present post office is situated is very inconvenient, so much so that the letters received and to be sent are deposited in another house. In the winter time there is no road passing the office, and in the summer time the people have to jump over the fence to reach a house which is five acres from the church. I make no complaint against the postmaster. He is a decent and respectable man; but the people want the office in a more convenient place. As to the reports, I think some of them which are not confidential may be laid on the Table of the House, and, generally speaking, I think that a report made to the Post Office Department should be laid on the Table of the House. We have a right to know when the report was made, and whether it was favourable to the change proposed, for I am told it is so. An officer of the department visited the place and made inquiries, and found the people were asking for the change, and it is quite unjust and unfair to allow these representations to go unanswered. If I happened to be a supporter of the Government, the change for which I ask would undoubtedly have been made long ago, especially as it is asked by every one in the locality. I know who are at the bottom of it, and who are asking not to have the change made, because these people prefer to punish the whole parish rather than I should obtain credit for having secured the change. In regard to the post office at Cap St. Ignace, I desire to ask if the postmaster has been appointed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A postmaster has not been appointed.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. One is going to be appointed, I suppose?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We will have to appoint one some day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I desire to direct the attention of the Minister to an answer given to a question I asked in February, in which the Minister stated that the postmaster had not resigned. The postmaster of this place is now living in St. Thomas, county of Montmagny, and has been there for some months, and so the hon. gentleman's answer was not according to the facts. I do not blame the Postmaster-General himself; I know he gave the answer to the House that he received from the department, but, at all events, it is not true and correct. I hope the Postmaster-General will grant the prayer of this petition and appoint a postmaster; I hope he will make a choice between the rival applicants as soon as possible.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is there any prospect of a daily mail being placed on the line between Gravenhurst and North Bay. There is at the present time only a mail every other day for the locality. The through mail passes through in closed bags, and only on alternate days is the local mail received. The popu-

lation has increased very considerably, and the business done is very large. There is not sufficient accommodation provided for this district. The postal clerks are scarcely able to do the work on a single train, and complaints are made in regard to the Government not furnishing the mail service to which the people are entitled. Every town and village has petitioned the Government for additional service, and I desire now to ask whether there is any prospect of their request being granted. I know the answer always given has been that the expense would be too great, that it would involve an additional mail car and almost double expense. At present the business is too large for a car running on alternate days, and the mail clerks are so overburdened with work that letters are frequently carried beyond the point to which they are addressed, because the clerks are too busy to look after them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I regret to be obliged to tell the hon. gentleman it is not contemplated to increase the expenditure by granting the service to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a post office at Paquette's Corners, the cost involved being \$50 a year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter has been considered by the department, and it is the opinion that the post office which the hon. gentleman asks is at present unnecessary, and consequently his request cannot be granted.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This matter has been under the consideration of the Government three years, and the total expenditure involved is only \$50. Trains pass twice a day; and, if this accommodation were provided it would prove of advantage and value to the people.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The expenditure asked is not very much, but we are economical in very small things.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think the Minister, at all events, can answer this question, which I will ask him. A short time ago, a deputation waited upon him in regard to the mail service between Ottawa and Montreal, that is, the service to points between those cities, the object being to have the service improved. Has improved mail service been given to Ste. Scholastique, Lachute and Buckingham?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter has not yet been decided. We had to get information, which the department is looking into at present. No decision has been arrived at so far. The hon. gentleman must know that, during the session, deputations wait on members of the Government and submit their claims. But this matter could not be

looked into at once, and I could not find time to do so. Again, the information required in regard to all these postal routes must be obtained from the inspectors, who are frequently not in Ottawa, but elsewhere, and time is occupied in obtaining information from them. In regard to this service, the matter will be taken up as soon as possible and looked into from the departmental stand-point.

Mr. DEVLIN. Has no decision been arrived at in regard to Ste. Scholastique ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to Ste. Scholastique, the grant was made as requested, but I direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that that application was made long ago, and that fact will explain why the matter has been considered, for the department had all the necessary information before the session commenced.

Mr. DEVLIN. I know the information just given was obtained by the Minister from the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Girouard). That hon. member, the hon. member for Argenteuil and myself approached the Minister in regard to this subject. At the time we approached the hon. gentleman nothing had been done in regard to Ste. Scholastique, Lachute and Buckingham. It was only after that interview a decision was arrived at, if I am correctly informed. At all events, nothing was done up to that time. Now, we know that the petition coming from Ste. Scholastique, backed up as it was by a member supporting the Government, has been favourably considered. The Minister also informs the House that nothing has been done in regard to the mail service between Lachute and Montreal. If I am correctly informed, the local paper of Lachute says that the Minister himself wrote to Mr. J. C. Wilson, formerly the Conservative member for Argenteuil, stating that the application from Lachute had been considered and granted out of consideration of the request made by the same Mr. J. C. Wilson. That, I understand, is the information conveyed in the letter written by the hon. the Postmaster-General to Mr. Wilson. We have him now admitting here that the application of Ste. Scholastique is granted but he states that of Lachute has not, although in the letter he states that it has.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have nothing to take back of what I have said in answer to the question put by the hon. gentleman. So far as Ste. Scholastique is concerned, the inspector reported to the department on the 23rd of January last. I cannot recollect whether I told the hon. gentleman when he called upon me as one of a deputation everything that the department had done so far as Ste. Scholastique is concerned, but the information which I am giving the hon. gentleman is the correct information obtained

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

from the department. Now, about Lachute ; I did not understand that the hon. gentleman travelled outside that enormous county of his which is equal almost to a province, and that he took a deep interest in Lachute. It is out of his beat altogether.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not think that is an answer to the question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to answer, he may criticise my answer afterwards. I am telling him that, in so far as Lachute is concerned, I did not consider that he attached any importance to that portion of the service, and I gave him the information which came to me from the department. With regard to Buckingham, the matter is not decided. The hon. gentleman, as he knows, has sent in a number of applications. As I have stated to him, it is almost impossible for me to be in my seat for any time during the sitting of the House, as I am called out continually, and I am quite prepared to meet any hon. gentlemen who may wish to see me on public matters. I mention this fact simply to indicate to the hon. member for Ottawa how impossible it is for me to look after departmental work during the session. The department is very large, and these applications come from every portion of the Dominion, and have to be inquired into and reported upon. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in so far as the Buckingham service is concerned, it is a very important one, and I am not prepared to say that it will not be granted, nor am I prepared to say that it will be granted. In so far as Lachute and Ste. Scholastique are concerned, I told the hon. gentleman exactly how matters stood.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. Minister tried to have a little fun at my expense, in saying that I travelled outside of the county to which I belong.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no fun about it.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have a perfect right, as a member of this House to question the Minister in regard to the mail service in any part of Canada. I was not questioning him, however, with regard to the mail service outside of Ottawa county, except in this much: That an application connected with mine, was also sent from Lachine and Ste. Scholastique. The hon. Minister told me that the matter was receiving the consideration of the department. I pointed out that it had received more than the consideration of the department, and that the application of Ste. Scholastique had been granted. I went further and I said that the application from Lachute, in accordance with a note which he himself had written to Mr. Wilson, had also been granted, and the only application that was not considered was that of Buckingham. My experience of the department is, that if that application is to be treated

as all other applications coming from the county of Ottawa, it will not be considered until the day of general judgment.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEVLIN. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was replying to the charge made by the hon. Postmaster-General, that I was interfering with business that did not concern me, in bringing up the question of additional mail service for Lachute. I do not propose to take up the time of the House on this matter, as I believe my hon. friend the representative of Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) will throw some light upon it. I was not at all interfering with the duties of that hon. gentleman, nor did I wish in any way to interfere with the business of the county he represents. What I did was simply to correct the statement made by the Postmaster-General in regard to the mail service between Montreal and Ottawa, which statement was erroneous from beginning to end. When I mentioned the matter, he said it was receiving the consideration of the department. I pointed out that it had already received the consideration of the department, as Ste. Scholastique, for instance, had already been accommodated. I will simply relate what transpired in connection with this whole matter, because the town whose claims have been overlooked, is a town long accustomed to have its claims, not only in this matter, but in other matters, overlooked by the present Government, that is the town of Buckingham. Three members of this House, the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Girouard), the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) and myself, approached the Postmaster-General. Two of those gentlemen brought petitions with them, whereas I accompanied the deputation. We were assured by the Postmaster-General that the matter would receive his consideration, and it did receive his consideration, so far as Ste. Scholastique is concerned, because he forthwith granted to it what the hon. member for Two Mountains asked. Afterwards, a local paper published in the county of Argenteuil, took great credit to Mr. J. C. Wilson for obtaining the accommodation, stating, that although the hon. member for Argenteuil had made representations to the hon. Postmaster-General at the same time as the hon. member for Two Mountains and myself, those representations had no weight with the Minister, but that it required the interference of Mr. Wilson to obtain what had been asked. As to that, I have nothing to say, but all this was intimately connected with the question of postal accommodation for Buckingham. I am told to-day by the hon. Postmaster-General, that so far as Buck-

ingham is concerned, the question will receive his consideration, that is, during the recess; and, no doubt, next session, when I bring this matter up again, I shall then be told that it will receive his consideration. I merely rise to contradict the Postmaster-General as strongly as I can, that I was interfering with the business of the hon. member for Argenteuil.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I had not intended to bring up this matter, but as it has been brought up, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster-General to an editorial relative to it which appears in the Lachute "Watchman," as follows:—

Lachute will in a short time obtain a great boom and one that her people have not taken much trouble in obtaining. We have time and again urged upon the inhabitants of Lachute the necessity of two mails each day and advised some organized effort in that direction. Such efforts were not followed by active work. A deputation waited on the Government some time ago representing the counties of Ottawa, Argenteuil and Two Mountains, but Lachute did not reap any benefits therefrom. Mr. J. C. Wilson, however, both during the time he was a member and since, although unsupported by petitions from the town, has been working energetically and urging every possible reason for this additional mail service. As a result the following letter, which we are permitted to publish will speak for itself.

OTTAWA, 14th March, 1893.

MY DEAR Mr. WILSON.—In accordance with the recommendation contained in your letter of the 13th instant, I have authorized that the exchange of mails between Lachute and Montreal be made semi-daily.

Yours faithfully,

ADOLPHE P. CARON.

J. C. WILSON, Esq.,
Montreal, Que.

Now, all that I know in connection with this matter I may state in a very few words. I can fully endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin). So long ago as the time of the Mackenzie Administration, I made an application for an evening mail service between Ottawa and Montreal. This session, however, the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Girouard) was the first to move in the matter. The hon. member for Ottawa county and myself co-operated with him. We were all anxious that our respective counties should obtain this evening service. We waited on the Postmaster-General on or about the 25th of February, and urged as strongly as we possibly could the necessity of an evening mail service, both for Ste. Scholastique, Lachute and Buckingham. The Postmaster-General received us very courteously, and promised to give the matter his immediate and best consideration, and to grant the request if he found that it was in the public interest. Three weeks afterwards, in order to ascertain what had been done in regard to our request, I called at the department, hoping to meet the hon. Postmaster-General; but his deputy kindly informed me that the application for an evening mail service to Lachute had been granted. Now, I simply wish

to draw the hon. Postmaster-General's attention to this statement in this editorial, which I think he will not endorse: "A deputation waited on the Government some time ago representing the counties of Ottawa, Argenteuil and Two Mountains, but Lachute did not reap any benefits therefrom." The idea conveyed there is that the united efforts of the three members and the petitions which we presented and which we supported with all the ability we could command, failed to impress the Postmaster-General. Now, I do not think that the hon. Postmaster-General will say anything of the kind, because it would be a complete contradiction of the policy which that hon. gentleman enunciated this afternoon, that in all postal matters he had no regard whatever to party or political interest. I do hope that that is the policy which has governed him heretofore, and that it will continue to be his policy. I do not wish to press the matter, but simply to give the Postmaster-General an opportunity of explaining it, because there seems to have been an attempt to make political capital out of this evening mail service which has been granted to Lachute and Ste. Scholastique, and I await the Postmaster-General's explanations with some degree of curiosity.

Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the remarks fallen from the hon. members from the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), and d'Argenteuil (Mr. Christie), and I may say these gentlemen labour under a false delusion. They stated that in the month of February last, we had waited upon the hon. the Postmaster-General, to ask him for a more regular postal service for Buckingham, Lachute and Ste. Scholastique, as I had previously asked for Ste. Scholastique. Owing to the fact that my demand had been granted prior to theirs, they seize this opportunity to censure the Government, and accuse the Ministers of intentional delays. I wish to set the facts in their true light, and bring back these gentlemen to better sentiments. I did, in fact, accompany them, as well as a delegation from Buckingham and Lachute, when we waited upon the hon. the Postmaster-General, in view of obtaining a more frequent postal communication for Buckingham, Lachute and Ste. Scholastique. But, as regards Ste. Scholastique, I must say that I have gained a great deal of ground on them, and that, as far back as the 15th of January last, I had presented a petition of the citizens of that locality, with a view of obtaining a more frequent postal service. It was on the 14th of February, I think, that, in company with these gentlemen, I called on the hon. the Postmaster-General, and a few days later, I was informed that the demands of Ste. Scholastique had been granted. The favour was not granted Ste. Scholastique through the interview we had with the Minister, one or two days before, but it was owing to

Mr. CHRISTIE.

the petition of the citizens of that locality having been sent to the Postmaster-General a month before. My petition in favour of Ste. Scholastique had been sent on the 14th or 15th of January, and on the 23rd or 25th of the same month, the post office inspector at Montreal, Mr. King, came down on an official visit to get the necessary information in connection with this postal service. The hon. members for Ottawa and Argenteuil complain of their demand not having been acceded to without delay. I quite understand the delay brought by the Government. The fact that Buckingham and Lachute have not yet been accorded their demand does not involve any idea of political capital or favouritism. This delay is owing to nothing else but the encumberment of affairs and to the additional work the hon. Minister has to perform during the session, and, I have certain reasons to believe, as I have been informed by the member for Argenteuil, that the more regular postal service asked for will soon be granted. The least favour the hon. Postmaster-General and his employees may expect from the public is, that they be given the necessary time to consider the matter, in order to organize a postal service which will prove satisfactory to all.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am quite satisfied with certain explanations which have been given by the hon. member for Two Mountains; but when he states that I charged the hon. Postmaster-General with political bias in connection with this postal service, I think he is altogether mistaken. I do not charge the hon. member alone with partiality, but I also accuse all the department of the Minister; and not only on the question now before us, but on a host of other subjects connected with the postal service. I would like to know from the hon. member for Two Mountains whether it will take long to settle the question now debated. The hon. Postmaster-General knows perfectly well how the case stands. He knows the revenue of Ste. Scholastique and that of Buckingham. He knows perfectly well that Buckingham yields to the postal department a much more considerable revenue than Ste. Scholastique; and that the postal service asked for has a far greater importance for Buckingham than for Ste. Scholastique. At Buckingham there are a good many manufactures, as well known, it is a great mining centre, and there are numerous mines scattered alongside the Lièvre River, and the working of these mines creates quite a bustle in that town. I have nothing to say against the village of Ste. Scholastique. I know it is a calm and peaceful village, but that there are no manufactures to be found there, and it does not yield to the Government the same postal revenue as Buckingham, which is an important mining centre. The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Girouard) charges me with having been unfair towards the Postmaster-General, for having said that he

showed political bias in settling these questions. I may tell the hon. member that, not having studied the question, he does not know all the circumstances of the case. The village of Lachute had not sent in an application before Buckingham, still, thanks to the intervention of Mr. Wilson, the postal department had already granted their request, while they refused to grant the demand I had made in favour of Buckingham. Such was the object of my complaint a little while ago, and it was well grounded. I have worked and I will continue to exert myself in the interest of my constituency, and I will continue to do so without minding what the hon. member for Two Mountains may think on the matter.

Mr. BERNIER. (Translation.) Before this item is adopted, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the hon. Postmaster-General whether he is now ready to give an answer to the demand I put in his hands a few days ago, in connection with the daily carriage of the mail between the city of St. Hyacinthe and St. Thomas d'Aquin?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I have inquired from the Deputy Postmaster-General whether these papers were ready, and I think I may be prepared to-morrow to give the hon. member the answer wished for.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) I would also inquire whether the demand I had made to the Postmaster-General, during the last session, with regard to the establishment of a daily postal service for the parish of St. Edouard is going to be granted. The name of this post office is Rivière Paquet. When I made this demand, the hon. Postmaster-General made answer that the question was under consideration. May I know now whether the hon. Minister has done considering the question and whether he is ready now to grant it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) The question mentioned by the hon. member has been taken into consideration, as I stated at the time. From the report drawn up by the officers of the department, we have not considered that we could grant the establishment of the daily postal service applied for by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Commercial Agencies \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is to provide for an extension of the system, as I have explained twice before this session. Commercial agencies have been during the past year formed in five ports in the West Indies, and reports have been received quarterly in bulletin form and a number distributed. All of them will be ready for distribution in a few days. Six bulletins altogether have been published, two or three from our commercial agents in Great Britain, where the immigration agents act as our commercial agents. This year I propose to take \$5,000 more to provide for the extension in other places.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you pay the agents?

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangements are chiefly tentative. They send quarterly reports and answer correspondence and the like, and we pay them for the first year a small allowance of \$250 each.

Steam Subsidy between Campbellton and Gaspé, and intermediate ports \$12,500

Mr. FOSTER. The contract has expired, and advertisements are out calling for tenders for a new contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The general impression was that the amount paid was out of all proportion to the service rendered. Is it proposed to pay the same subsidy?

Mr. FOSTER. We have invited tenders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose the hon. gentleman only gets one tender, and that at \$12,000, does he propose to give that subsidy?

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot allow that section of country to go without steam mail communication; and while we hope for better offers, it will be a question for us to decide, if we do not get lower tenders, whether we will not have to pay that amount.

For three lines of steamers running between the ports of Halifax and St. John, N.B., or either, and the West Indies and South America..... \$103,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many years are we bound to pay this?

Mr. FOSTER. Two years more.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) \$13,000 I think we pay the Jamaica boats.

Mr. FOSTER. \$15,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the quantity of goods she carries does not at all come up to expectation, and, in fact, is almost a burlesque.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is increasing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the information furnished me is correct, it is perfectly ridiculous. The steamer goes once a month and takes 25,000 quintals of codfish. That is the whole quantity that goes on board the steamer. Over 75,000 quintals are carried between the same ports by sailing vessels. For the carriage of these 25,000 quintals, we pay \$15,000, because what the steamer carries besides does not amount to anything. What makes the service intensely unpopular is the belief that the shares were quietly bought up by Pickford & Black at par, when they knew, as managing owners, that the boats were paying enormous dividends, so that they are now practically the owners of the boats. Until very lately there was competition existing between a line of steamers

running from Montreal and the rates were cut; but I understand some arrangement was made between these boats. I understand a new competing line is seeking a subsidy. I do not know whether the Government are considering the matter. As a matter of fact, I am told that it is cheaper for Halifax merchants to send their goods to New York and ship them by New York. Have the Government, considering they subsidize those boats so largely, any control over the rates charged by Pickford, Black & Co. on the goods they carry?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the Government has no control over the rates on any subsidized lines, and, so far as I know, it never has had. I do not see how it practically could have such control. I think that would have to be left to the competition in the trade, and to the general desire which I think all carriers would have to carry as much as they possibly could.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the general law of competition regulates these matters if left to itself, but when the Government steps in and gives a subsidy of about \$15,000, the case is altered. If I am not misinformed, this same boat gets a subsidy of \$4,000 from Turk's Island.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I believe that is the case, and when the boat was making 30 or 40 or 50 per cent, Pickford & Black bought up the shares at par and are now practically the owners. They do not need to cut rates, they can run everybody off the track. The moment a Montreal boat comes into competition, Pickford & Black can put their rates down to a non-paying basis, because they have the Government subsidy. I am not going to discuss the subsidy now; it is of no practical use at this time, as the Government is bound for two years. So far as I am able to gather from those who are interested in the trade, they do not think they get any benefit from the subsidy. Three quarters of the fish shipped from Nova Scotia to Jamaica go by non-subsidized lines, and only one-quarter, or 25,000 quintals by the subsidized steamer. That being the case, I bring the subject before the attention of the hon. gentleman, because, before this subsidy expires, the House will have to consider whether the results justify a renewal of a contract involving an expenditure of \$103,000 per year. For my own part, I unhesitatingly say that the results do not justify the expenditure. The trade which was expected to grow up has not grown up, and, when the time comes to consider the renewal I think it would be well, in the public interest, to save that money altogether. I think the hon. Minister of Finance was to give me a general statement of the cargo the vessel carries to Jamaica. I do not want the details, but a general statement I think would be valuable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. FOSTER. I have a statement here for the year 1891-92, and for the year 1892-93 up to date. I find that the vessel carries fish of different kinds, potatoes and other vegetables, coal (a large quantity of this), oats, corn meal, etc., butter, cheese, nails, drugs and medicines, liquors, cordage, canned goods, animals, and various other assorted merchandise. The average for the year, value of export per trip, was \$25,143, besides 3,195 packages of various articles of which no value is given.

Mr. MULOCK. How many trips?

Mr. FOSTER. One per month.

Mr. MULOCK. And it costs \$103,000 to sell—

Mr. FOSTER. No, you must not come to that conclusion. It is bad enough the way my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island put it. The amount of subsidy paid per trip is \$15,000. The total value of export is \$301,712, besides these 3,195 packages, the value of which is not given. I have here the statistics of five trips for this year, and they average about \$23,000. The last vessel took 1,250 drums of fish, also other packages of fish, and much the same assortment of articles as I have read.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have made the point I wanted, which no doubt the hon. gentleman sees, that we send 100,000 quintals of fish to Jamaica, and the quantity is not increased since the subsidizing of this line; this vessel carries about 25,000 quintals, and that 75,000 quintals go by unsubsidized ships. So that practically we are paying this \$15,000 subsidy for carrying a very small proportion of the exports which go from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Jamaica.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large assortment of other merchandise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there is no substantial development of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; from the first it has developed, but the best development is on the Windward route.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was confining myself to Jamaica.

To meet cost of litigated matters
(Justice) \$20,000

Mr. CURRAN. This item is to provide for lawsuits that may turn up during the course of a year. It is the same amount as was voted last year. The expenses incurred last year were \$19,993.53, and it is estimated that we may require the same amount next year.

To pay salaries of Extra Clerks at
head office, Ottawa; advertising,
ing, copying, &c \$6,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What position in the service does the late Minister of Interior's secretary hold, Mr. McGirr?

Mr. DALY. He is a second-class clerk. He has been in the outside service, but his services as secretary will be dispensed with after the 1st of July.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does he return to his former position?

Mr. DALY. No. He remains in the service here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood he was brought from the outside service.

Mr. DALY. He was, and he is now in the inside service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What position does he hold?

Mr. DALY. I think it will take a second-class clerkship. The item will come up in the Supplementaries.

Immigration--Salaries of agents
and employees in Canada. . . \$22,000

Sir RICHARD CARTRIGHT. Before this resolution is passed, it is proper that the Minister should give us a general summary of the mode in which he proposes to employ this vote, and what he expects to do. I need not tell you that the state of this department has been not only unsatisfactory, but extremely disgraceful to Canada for a great many years back. The grossest mis-statements have been perpetually made by the officers of the department, and the census shows conclusively that of all the immigrants brought here, not one-sixth have remained. Now, I desire to know what policy the new incumbent of the office proposes to adopt, and, in particular, how he proposes to make use of the general sum placed at his disposal for immigration purposes.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I will, as briefly as possible, outline the work that is being done at present in reference to immigration. I may say, in the first place, that we have dispensed with the services of the agents that used to hold office in Canada, that is in the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and in this way a saving has been effected of \$22,000. That saving was made in the Canadian agencies. There appears here to be an increase of over \$14,000, but that is providing specifically for salaries which formerly were taken out of the general vote. Then, as to the salaries of agents and employees in Great Britain and Ireland, it is my intention to dispense with the services of the present incumbent at Dublin, and the present incumbent at Belfast, who seem to have outgrown their usefulness. As concerns their remuneration, and the remuneration of the other agents in Great Britain, the practice which formerly prevailed of giving them a per diem allowance for travelling expenses, will be done away with, and they will be placed upon a direct salary and allowed only actual travelling expenses. Now, I will describe the work that is being carried on to-day in Great

Britain Mr. Bailey Stewart has been lecturing in the north of Scotland since last November. That gentleman spent some six months in this country last year, seeing it in both winter and summer, travelling from Cape Breton right through to British Columbia, and consequently, he has a splendid idea of the country and its resources. Mr. Stewart was highly recommended by leading people in Scotland, and seems to be giving great satisfaction to the Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, and we expect good results from his work in the north of Scotland. In the south of Scotland, we have employed Mr. Peter Lang, who was, for twenty years, connected with Australian emigration. He does the same work in the south of Scotland that Mr. Stewart does in the north of Scotland. We have employed these two men for one year at a salary of \$1,200, and so much for travelling expenses—I have forgotten the exact amount. They are provided with magic lanterns and different shades, containing views of this country from ocean to ocean, and are doing splendid work, according to the newspaper reports we receive from time to time from different parts of Scotland. In the south of England, we employ a Mr. Ritchie, a Scotch farmer, now settled in the county of Essex, who, with a party of Scotchmen, went to the south of England a couple of years ago, and came out to Canada last year. He spent the whole of last summer, and most of last fall, in Manitoba and the North-west, and has written a pamphlet describing his visit to Canada. He has been employed for the season in the south of England, delivering lectures and distributing literature. We have made an arrangement with the different steam-ship companies in Great Britain and Ireland to distribute our literature. In order to induce them to give the same attention to the booking of passengers to Canada, we raised their commissions by \$1.70, that is, the Government pay them \$1.75 for each booking to Winnipeg, after a certificate has been obtained that the passenger who is booked, has arrived in Winnipeg. The reason for giving that \$1.75 was that it brings up the commission that they receive from the steam-ship companies equal to the commission that they receive from Australian bookings. It was ascertained by our agents in Great Britain that these men were neglecting entirely the booking of passengers to Canada, simply because they could not earn the same commission as they could on bookings to Australia. In addition to Mr. Ritchie, in the south of England, we have Mr. E. I. Wood late of Holland, in the province of Manitoba, and a resident there for ten years, who has also been employed for one year at the same salary as Mr. Bailey Stewart and Mr. Peter Lang in Scotland. Mr. Wood has the advantage of ten years' actual farming experience in the province of Manitoba, where he has been successful. He is a man of unusual intelligence, and good education, is very well con-

nected in the old country, and he is doing good work for us there. Now, in addition to these, of course we have still our agent at Liverpool, Mr. Dyke, and the agent at Glasgow, Mr. Graham. In addition to these gentlemen, we have men in Scotland, in England and in Ireland to-day, who have farmed in Manitoba and the North-west for some years, and have been sent home for three or four months. Transportation is given to them by the steam-ship companies and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Government make them an allowance for travelling expenses. All of these men who are well connected and have relatives in different parts of the country, are going to work in Great Britain, and I may say that we find it is absolutely necessary for an agent to do good work that he should be connected with persons to whom he can refer as to character, and as to whether his statements can be relied on or not. Owing to the fact of Great Britain having been overrun with agents of American railways and the Australian colonies as well as the South American republics, the people are very chary of receiving as true statements made by agents seeking to induce people to emigrate to other countries. And, therefore, it is that any person endeavouring to work they should be able to refer to people of responsibility as to the facts he states. We have three of those gentlemen in the north of Ireland, a portion of the country that seems to have been neglected, because the number of people coming here from that part has been small indeed. Those men are all practical men, who have had practical experience in farming in Manitoba and the North-west, and, so far as accounts go, good work will be performed by them. In addition, Sir Charles Tupper has secured from the British Government the right to put up our posters in the 25,000 post offices in Great Britain and Ireland. In addition, we have advertised in every leading periodical and paper in Great Britain, and to-day Canada is a household word from one end of the country to the other. We have distributed all the English Farm Delegates' Reports not only to different parts of the country, but to almost every school there. Undoubtedly gross ignorance prevails as to our country. Our efforts are not directed alone to bringing emigrants to our western country, but we are endeavouring to bring before the people a knowledge of the whole of Canada. In order, if possible, to increase the effectiveness of our work, I communicated with the Premiers of the different provinces, calling attention to the machinery we possess in England, and asking their co-operation. With the exception of a reply from the Premier of Prince Edward Island, I have received no communication from the Premiers of the provinces. It is, in my opinion, a great oversight on their part. We have a number of farms for sale in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, and if we could obtain lists of

Mr. DALY.

vacant farms or be furnished with any information, I would be happy to distribute any literature the Local Governments might prepare or any lists of farms for sale through our agents in Great Britain. So much with respect to Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman a statement showing the number of emigrants from each district sent out by those agents during the past twelve months, and who have arrived, say, in Winnipeg?

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will find the figures in a statement I laid on the Table of the House some time ago. I have given up the idea altogether of keeping returns such as were kept in the Department of Agriculture of the number of emigrants coming into the country, and relying on them. The hon. gentleman will find in the report the number of homestead entries made by the people going into the North-west, either from Great Britain or the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The reason I asked was to ascertain how far each agent has been successful, and what results have been secured by agents in any particular district. Of course, some agents might send out many, and others no emigrants whatever.

Mr. DALY. Those agents of which I have spoken have only been home since October, and they have had no opportunity of obtaining results from their work. Statistics, however, will be kept as to the work done by each man; but, I repeat, that I have given up the idea of keeping a record similar to that kept by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a dangerous experiment.

Mr. DALY. Yes; I think so. All I propose to do is to keep a record in each Dominion lands office of the number of persons in the family of the individual making the homestead entry, and in this way we will have undoubted evidence as to the number of settlers. Passing on to speak of continental Europe, it will be remembered that we are met with considerable difficulty, many obstacles in dealing with the question of immigration. We are excluded entirely from Germany, being proscribed by name in the State papers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. DALY. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the reason; but in consequence of that fact, we are unable to send any authorized agents into Germany to do our work. The only way we can obtain a foothold is through the steam-ship companies, and we give a bonus of \$5 to every shipping agent making a booking for Winnipeg, this amount being payable on the arrival of the immigrant in that city. This course has to be adopted in order to meet the efforts put forth by the Australian colonies and the Argentine Re-

public and other countries seeking immigrants. We have, in fact, to meet the competition of other parts of this continent and of the Australian colonies in their efforts to secure emigrants. In the north of France we have an agent who has gone over for the season, a gentleman who has spent considerable time in Canada, living both in the eastern townships and in Ontario, as well as Manitoba and the North-west, and that gentleman is doing good work in Brittany, Normandy and Belgium. We have secured a comparatively large number of emigrants from Belgium and the north of France, and as those immigrants live not very far from me in Manitoba, I am in a position to say that they are a hard-working, industrious and excellent class of settlers, who seem to like life in the west and are doing very fairly well. In Sweden likewise we are under a ban, and can only work through passenger steam-ship agents, and also through people who have been settlers in the west and who return home to tell the story of their success to the friends they had left behind. In Norway we are permitted to go in and work openly and distribute our literature. In Austria we are shut out, as we are in Germany. In France we are distributing literature printed in the French language, through Mr. Fabre, and through the instrumentality of our other agents there. This is the work that has been done in Great Britain and in France and in the other portions of continental Europe. As the House is aware, some years ago the Department of Agriculture entered a new field of immigration, and that is the field to the south of us, the United States. We have been fairly successful in that, and the immigration from that country is growing materially. The work was first confined to Dakota and portions of Minnesota; but to-day we find large numbers of people coming from Idaho and Washington Territory. A great many of them are returned Canadians, and a great many are old country people who have lived in the States for a number of years, and who have accumulated money. We have people coming here who have settled in Vermont, Massachusetts and the eastern States, and have also been able to set aside a sufficient amount to justify their going to the west and taking up homes. Good work has been done in other states such as Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and even in the state of New York, and the reports that we are receiving from our agents indicate that there will be a large influx of Americans into our great North-west during the next few months. When we see from the newspapers that 7,000 people are waiting for the opening of the Indian lands in the western states we can see how great is the land hunger there. I think that the money that is spent in that work will bear good fruit. As regards what has been done in Canada, we propose this year that all immigrants shall land at the city of Quebec, as soon as the St. Lawrence navigation opens. There, they will be met by

our staff of agents, and they will be accompanied, if they are foreigners, by one of the interpreters speaking their own language as far as North Bay. At North Bay another agent will accompany them, so that they will have an immigration agent in charge of them from the time they get on the cars at Quebec until they reach Winnipeg. Our experience in the past has shown us that the American immigration agents are very active, and that they frequently endeavour to persuade our immigrants when en route to divert their course to the United States. It is absolutely necessary therefore that an agent of the department should accompany these immigrants on the trains. We have men in Winnipeg who speak the languages of the different continental countries, who will give these immigrants all information and send them to the different places they wish to go. The sum that is asked this year, \$200,000, is increased, as the hon. gentleman will see, by a sum of \$19,175. That increase is due to the fact that I have mentioned specifically here, the sums required for the services opposite which they appear. These moneys were formerly taken out of the large grant of \$150,000. I have now given a brief outline of the work proposed to be done by the department in reference to immigration.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am glad to hear that the Government has at last woken up to the necessity of making some effort to people our great domain in the west. If we do not get the people into that great country, the immense sums of money which we have spent on railways there, will bring us very little return for our investment. I am pleased also to hear that emigration work is being done in Sweden, Norway and Germany, but from what I have seen and heard and know, I am afraid that if we spend money in the United States, it will be to bring men over here who are of no value as settlers in this country. There are families coming to Canada who have been in the States for years, and who have been unsuccessful, and I feel, and I may say that I know, that a large portion of this money spent in the States is being lost. I am sure that the House feels anxious in every way possible to strengthen the hands of the Minister of the Interior, in bringing to this country men from the northern countries of Europe, who will make good settlers, but my experience is, that people who come here from the United States, are not at all desirable citizens for Canada. We, on this side of the House are disposed to assist the Minister in all his expenditures to promote desirable immigration to this country, but we feel that it would be very little use to bring settlers from southern countries to this northern climate. There is no country under the sun which offers the same opportunities to the new settlers as Manitoba and the great North-west does. The land is of the very best quality, the irrigation is good, and it has a most healthful climate. It is true that the

climate is a little severe in winter, but, Sir, we see that there the people are happy and comfortable, and that there is room for millions of good healthy settlers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister intends to turn his attention somewhat to the older provinces, which have been neglected in the matter of immigration in the past. I hope that every effort will be made to place before settlers the advantages of taking up land in the older provinces. I think that the hon. Minister will admit that our own people make the best settlers in the North-west. I am glad to know that he is about to turn his attention to the older provinces, and, as he says he will be glad to have a list of lands open to settlement, for circulation in the old country, I myself will be happy to furnish him with a list of such lands in my section. I think the Minister proposes a good change, and I trust he will press the consideration of the settlement of the older provinces on immigrants coming to this country.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, having been an eye-witness, within the last few years, of the losses resulting from the exodus in the rural districts of the province of Quebec, and as a representative of one of the counties where the ravages of depopulation are felt as in all the other rural centres of the older provinces of Confederation, I thought it incumbent on me to rise at this hour when the Government ask us to vote a credit of \$200,000, to enable them to pursue their foreign immigration policy so prejudicial to the rate-payers of this country, and to beg of the hon. Ministers to open their eyes to this lamentable state of affairs rather than throw away money to bring here strangers. It is quite obvious, that our farmers, feeling unable to better their position here, every day find their way over the border to strengthen our rivals. These emigrants, Mr. Chairman, would constitute by far the better class of settlers the Government might choose to people the boundless and fertile plains of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It is admitted that our own people make the best settlers in the North-west, and are a more desirable class than the newcomers brought here from Europe, and it seems strange to me that the wisdom of our Government, who are exerting themselves and spending thousands of dollars to settle the province of Manitoba and the North-west, can suggest no better course than bringing in strangers when they have ready at hand people of a superior class, much better fitted for the development of these new provinces, hundreds of whom are leaving the country to settle down in the United States. Is it not strange, I say, that the Government have overlooked these people, who are at any rate, a more desirable class of settlers for the colonization of these new provinces than the

Mr. MCGREGOR.

overflowing population of European towns? It would be idle to deny, Mr. Chairman, that within the last few years a stream of emigration from the older provinces has set in, and is still flowing in the direction of the United States. Should any one question this fact, I would refer him to the last census, which substantiates and proves beyond the shadow of a doubt this statement. We see, in fact, from the census that in a great many counties, and chiefly in the rural districts, the population has decreased. To begin with the province of Quebec, there are twenty-seven counties which indicate a falling off in the population. In the province of Ontario, the same state of things prevail; there are thirty-six counties where a decrease of population has taken place. In New Brunswick, seven counties happen to be in the same case. In Nova Scotia, population has decreased in eight counties. It may be further stated, Mr. Chairman, that the rural counties are the chief sufferers from this depopulation. Facts are stubborn, and there is no denying this statement. No man in his sober senses would deny it; there is no man, acquainted with the state of things in our rural districts, who will deny that a strong stream of emigration has set in from these centres towards the United States. This class of farmers who thus give up their lands in the older provinces to better their situation in the United States are the most desirable class of settlers the Government might plant in the North-west Territories, should they be anxious to have a class of settlers who will know how to avail themselves of the advantages and of the wealth of the new soil of these regions. I would draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the interesting statistics included in the report of the Auditor for the Dominion of Canada, as compared with the data found in the report of the Department of Agriculture. We are asked to vote a large appropriation for the purposes of immigration; let us see what has been the result in the past. Let us compare the expenses with the number of immigrants who have settled down in Canada. From the Auditor-General's Report, I see that in 1882 the sum of \$215,339.24 was expended for immigration purposes; it appears from the report of the Department of Agriculture that we brought into the country 112,458 immigrants. In 1883, \$373,957.71 was expended for immigration purposes, and we brought 133,624 immigrants. In 1884, \$516,208.83 was expended, and we had 103,824 immigrants. In 1885, \$423,860.90 was the expenditure, against 79,169 immigrants. In 1886, \$257,354.93 was expended for 669,152 immigrants. In 1887, \$341,236.39 was expended for 84,526 immigrants. In 1888, the expenses for immigration purposes rose to \$244,789.09, and we brought in 88,766 immigrants. In 1889, the expenses for the same purposes were \$202,499.26, against 91,600 immigrants. In 1890, \$100,091.76 was expended for 75,067 immigrants. Finally, in 1891, the amount expended

for immigration was \$181,045.38, and the number of immigrants was 82,195. During this decade we have expended a total amount of \$2,861,383.49, and for this sum we have brought into the country 920,351 immigrants. Last year we expended a considerable sum for the same purpose, and this year the Government ask a new vote of \$200,000 for the same service; and the Government do not consider that our countrymen in the meantime are leaving the country, that this country is bleeding to death through this exodus; that those who thus leave their native country are ratepayers who have been taxed to enable the Government to bring in these new-comers who have benefited by the advantages the country offers them. I say this system is most unfair to our own people. How is it, Mr. Chairman, that the Government, in their wisdom, have never offered our own people, our French-Canadian compatriots, the same advantages they offer strangers brought from Europe? How is it that we have given money, passage fares, board, etc., to strangers who are an inferior class of settlers, while our own compatriots are forced into exile? Why has not the same encouragement been offered to French-Canadians as was accorded Europeans, under the shape of transportation fares and money bonuses? A great number of immigration agents in Europe are paid large salaries for immigration purposes. How is it that the Government who, at such large expense, bring here strangers, do not see that lamentable exodus which is taking away so many of our worthy citizens from our provinces, bound for a foreign land? And the fact still remains that our countrymen are the best class of settlers the Government could choose to settle our immense North-west Territories. This suggestion of mine has already been offered by men whose opinion should have been law. Newspapers have published communications from persons of high social standing, good judges of the remedies best calculated to stem it, and to direct emigration to its proper channels. I happened to read of late, a letter from Abbé Dugas, which was published in a leading Montreal journal, in reference to this matter. This gentleman has devoted all his attention to this subject for a number of years. In this letter he met the objection of those persons who pretend that French-Canadians are coming back from the United States. He says:

Coming back, inquire about the fact of repatriation and you will soon learn that for one family that is repatriated, ten go away; this is no ground assuredly to rejoice.

Further on, he said:

A great many families from the United States would be willing to take up farms if assistance was given them to reach Manitoba. Several families in the province of Quebec would also be inclined to go, should they be afforded the means of going there.

Talk of good-will! Ah! Should only the Government be willing to spend for Canadians but one-half of the sum expended for bringing here people from the remotest quarters of the globe—for Mennonites, Irishmen, Swedes, Norwegians, Jews and so many others! The country we have to colonize was settled, at the outset, by our fathers, and it belonged to us.

In twenty-five years from now, Canadians, with a spark of patriotism in their heart and with some understanding of sound policy, will wonder at our own supineness and absence of true patriotism in this emigration matter.

I consider there is some truth in these remarks, and that the Government are not doing right to the people of this country. I read, of late, in a Montreal journal, the following article:—

Annexation in detail continues every day without awakening any emotion or alarm in the Conservative press.

Yesterday evening, forty-two poor farmers, for the most part from the Eastern Townships, were waiting at the Bonaventure Station to take the train for the United States. These compatriots on their way to a foreign land came partly from St. John, Lacolle, Sabrevois and Clarenceville. Seven of them were from Bord à Plouffe.

Thirty-one of these emigrants are bound for Dakota, five for Wallace, Kansas, and six for Pullman, Washington. Out of forty-two, forty are French Canadians, and I am told that a hundred more will follow them within a few weeks.

Another journal said, on the 11th instant:

The exodus to the United States is on the increase again. Railway ticket agents are quite busy. I was told by one of them, this very day, that hundreds of Canadians emigrate from the district of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we, impassive spectators, witness this exodus, which drains our rural districts, and with the census figures artfully arranged, the conclusion is reached that the country is in a state of prosperity, that Canada is growing fast. It may be that prosperity prevails in some corner of the country, but it is none the less true that our rural districts are being depopulated on a large scale. Meanwhile, the Government are throwing away the money of the very people of the very farming class who are forced into exile, to allow new-comers to take possession of the soil and partake of the wealth of the country. I charge that the French-Canadian Ministers are specially open to censure, for ignoring the miserable state of the province which they represent in this House. I dare say that the immigration brought here within the last decade has been prejudicial to the interests of the French-speaking people of the country. And the result of the immigration policy of introducing into the country a European population entertaining views hostile to the French population, is evidenced in the fact that they have reached this juncture in Manitoba, when both political parties agree in robbing our compatriots of their most sacred rights, secured by the Constitution, and which were, up to this moment, considered as out of the reach of a fanatical

majority. To substantiate my statement, I will quote figures taken from the report of the Minister of Agriculture, for the last decade, from 1882 to 1892. The following table will show the arrivals at the port of Quebec during the last decade, as also the proportion of French immigrants, compared with the English immigrants :—

ARRIVALS OF IMMIGRANTS AT THE PORT OF QUEBEC.

Year.	Total.	English, Scotch and Irish.	French and Belgians
1882	44,850	33,693	50
1883	45,965	37,972	306
1884	31,729	26,151	150
1885	17,030	14,717	140
1886	22,782	18,108	100
1887	32,749	22,256	147
1888	28,530	18,772	255
1889	22,091	15,662	166
1890	21,165	14,828	147
1891	23,435	14,666	307
	290,126	216,825	1,768

It is quite obvious, from the above table, that the immigration policy of the Government up to this day, was calculated to drown the French population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories in a wave of foreign emigrants. In view of such a policy, I think I am warranted in stating once more that the French-Canadian Ministers are open to censure for not better protecting the rights of the people they are representing in this Parliament. It is a most lamentable error to have thrown away millions to encourage and foster such an immigration, while our own citizens were leaving their native land for the neighbouring states. That such a state of things should have been brought about by the mere force of events, and that such a result was not foreseen as probable and inevitable, I cannot be prevailed upon to believe. I contend that this immigration policy was directed mainly against the French population of Manitoba. Such a policy was calculated, at the same time, to prevent our French-Canadian citizens from emigrating to Manitoba and the North-west. Meanwhile, our Ministers offered no resistance. To conclude, I may say that it is to be regretted that such large sums of money should have been thrown away to foster a foreign immigration, while no steps have been taken to stem the tide of the exodus that carried away so many of our French-Canadian citizens. I enter here my solemn protest against the policy of the Government. I protest also against the declarations made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly), as tending to the same end. The exertions of the hon. Minister are always directed to an

Mr. LEGRIS.

end prejudicial to the interests of the country; and the public money is not spent with a view to the development and the settling of Manitoba and the North-west. I think it would only be fair that the enormous sum of \$200,000, which the House is asked to vote for immigration purposes, instead of being expended in bringing here a foreign population, should be applied so as to check the tide of emigration towards the United States, and so that the stream of our emigrants should be set in the direction of the fertile plains of Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Immigration Expenses..... \$150,000

Mr. BRODEUR. Before this vote is passed, I wish to enter my protest against so heavy an expenditure for immigration. In view of the census returns that have been brought down, it is very unfortunate that the Government should ask us this year to increase the expenditure for this purpose. It is well known, that during the past ten years the emigration from this country, especially from the province of Quebec, has been very large. According to the census returns, the population of the province of Quebec has not very largely increased during the last ten years; but I do not think those figures give an accurate idea of the population of the province of Quebec. I have taken the trouble to look into a report made by the Provincial Government, giving the number of deaths and the number of births during the last ten years; and, comparing those figures, I have arrived at the conclusion that, instead of having an increase of population in the province of Quebec, we have had a large decrease. In the rural districts of the province there has been, according to the census returns, a slight increase in the population; but, taking into account the excess of the births over the deaths, we must arrive at the conclusion that during the last ten years the population in the rural districts has decreased by 163,114. I say that in all the rural districts of the province of Quebec, without any exception whatever, there has been a large decrease in the population. I will give the figures relating to every county. I may say, however, that these figures do not give the excess of births over deaths in the Protestant population; they comprise only the returns made with reference to the Catholic population. But I take for granted—and I think my assertion cannot be disputed—that during those ten years the Protestant population of the province has not increased. I find that the population of the county of Argenteuil in 1881 was 14,947, and in 1891, 15,158, an apparent increase; but during the same period I find that the excess of births over deaths was 1,440; consequently, adding these 1,440 to the 14,947, the population in 1891 should have been 16,387. Consequently, there was an emigration from that county of 1,229. In the county of Bagot the population

in 1881 was 21,199, and in 1891, 21,695; but taking the excess of births over deaths during the same period, numbering 3,300, the population in 1891 should have been 24,499; consequently, there was an emigration from that county of 2,804. In the county of Beauce the population in 1881 was 32,020, and in 1891, 37,222; but the excess of births over deaths was 9,680; consequently, there was an emigration from that county of 4,478. In the county of Beauharnois the population in 1881 was 16,065, and in 1891, 16,662; the excess of births over deaths during the ten years was 3,000; consequently, there

was an emigration from that county of 2,343. In the county of Bellechasse there was in 1881 a population of 16,914, and in 1891, 18,368. This is, perhaps, one of the reasons why our friend the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) left the Liberal party last year. He was, perhaps, convinced at the time that there was an increase of population in his county. Taking the excess of births over deaths during that same period in that county, we find it to be 4,400, and there has been an emigration from that county of 2,946. The following is a list showing the figures in all the counties:

Counties.	Population, 1881.	Population according to the census, 1891.	Excess of Births.	What the population should be in 1891.	Increase.	Emigration.
Argenteuil	14,947	15,158	1,440	16,387		1,229
Bagot	21,199	21,695	3,300	24,499		2,804
Beauce	32,020	37,222	9,680	41,700		4,478
Beauharnois	16,065	16,662	3,000	19,005		2,343
Bellechasse	16,914	18,368	4,400	21,314		2,946
Bonaventure	18,908	20,835	3,610	22,518		1,683
Berthier	21,838	19,836	3,130	24,968		5,132
Brome	15,827	14,709	1,200	17,027		2,318
Chambly	10,858	11,704	1,080	11,938		234
Champlain	26,818	29,267	5,450	32,268		3,001
Charlevoix	17,901	19,038	5,600	23,501		4,463
Châteauguay	14,393	13,864	2,250	16,643		2,779
Two Mountains	15,894	15,027	2,150	18,044		3,017
Compton	19,581	22,779	2,950	22,531	248	
Dorchester	18,710	19,017	3,840	22,550		3,533
Chicoutimi and Saguenay	32,409	38,281	9,440	47,849		3,568
Gaspé	25,001	26,875	4,400	29,401		2,526
Drummond and Arthabaska	37,360	43,923	10,320	47,680		3,657
Iberville	14,459	11,893	2,100	16,659		4,666
Huntingdon	15,495	14,385	1,530	17,027		2,640
Joliette	21,988	22,921	4,000	25,988		3,067
Jacques Cartier	12,345	13,832	1,930	14,275		443
Hochelaga	40,079	80,998	6,880	46,959	34,039	
Kamouraska	22,181	20,454	4,420	26,601		6,147
Laprairie	11,436	10,900	1,300	12,736		1,836
Laval	9,462	9,436	1,250	10,712		1,276
L'Assomption	15,282	13,674	550	15,832		2,158
Lévis	27,980	25,995	4,530	32,510		6,515
L'Islet	14,917	13,822	2,820	17,737		3,915
Lotbinière	20,857	20,688	4,420	25,277		4,589
Maskinongé	17,493	17,829	2,880	20,373		2,544
Montcalm	12,966	12,131	1,500	14,466		2,335
Montmagny	16,422	14,726	2,320	18,742		4,016
Montmorency	12,322	12,309	2,040	14,362		2,053
Megantic	19,056	22,233	2,850	21,906	327	
Napierville	10,511	10,101	1,190	11,701		1,600
Missisquoi	17,784	18,549	2,660	20,444		1,895
Montreal	140,747	182,695	27,400	168,147	14,548	
Nicolet	26,611	28,735	4,820	31,431		2,696
Ottawa	49,432	64,056	13,320	62,752	1,304	
Portneuf	25,175	25,813	4,910	30,085		4,272
Pontiac	19,932	22,084	2,980	22,912		828
Quebec County	20,278	19,503	2,900	23,178		3,675
Quebec	62,446	63,090	5,900	68,346		5,256
Richelieu	20,218	21,354	4,210	24,428		3,074
Richmond and Wolfe	26,339	31,347	5,760	32,099		752
Rimouski	33,791	33,430	4,350	38,141		4,711
Rouville	18,547	16,012	3,000	21,547		5,535
Shefford	23,233	23,263	4,010	27,243		3,980
Sherbrooke	12,221	16,104	1,400	13,621	2,483	
Stanstead	15,556	18,072	2,260	17,816	256	
St. Hyacinthe	20,631	21,433	2,450	23,081		1,648
St. Jean	12,265	12,282	2,080	14,345		2,062

Counties.	Popula- tion, 1881.	Popula- tion according to the cen- sus, 1891.	Excess of Births.	What the population should be in 1891.	Increase.	Emigra- tion.
St. Maurice.....	12,986	12,267	2,300	15,286	3,019
Soulanges.....	10,220	9,608	1,950	12,170	2,562
Temiscouata.....	25,484	25,698	6,040	31,524	5,836
Terrebonne.....	22,969	23,128	4,333	27,302	4,174
Vaudreuil.....	11,485	10,803	2,080	13,565	2,662
Verchères.....	12,499	12,257	1,810	14,309	2,052
Yamaska.....	17,091	16,058	3,080	20,171	4,113
					53,205	163,114 53,205
Total of emigration.....						109,909

What is the result of the last decade? As I have said, the census returns do not give us the exact amount of population. Instead of having an increase in the province of Quebec, we have a large decrease, as I have shown by the figures I have just given. In those last ten years, the population has decreased by 163,114 in the rural districts, and has decreased in all the province by 109,909. Now, it has been said by members on the other side that the decrease in the rural districts was compensated by the increase in the cities. Well, that large city of Montreal, which should show so large an increase of population, has only increased during those last ten years 14,000. Take for example my county, Rouville, the population of which in 1881 was only 18,000, it shows a decrease since then of 5,500. Take three or four counties, or rural districts, whose population is about 40,000, they show a decrease corresponding to the increase of the city of Montreal, with its population of about 200,000. I contend, therefore, that we ought not, under the circumstances, to vote anything for immigration. I do not at all see the necessity of doing so, when our own population is leaving the country, and I hope the Government will not, at all events, increase the money expended for that immigration, as they propose to do by the Estimate.

Administration of Justice - to provide for the salaries of two Circuit Judges of the District of Montreal. \$6,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is the meaning of this item?

Mr. OUMET. By an Act passed last session, it was provided that judges of the Circuit Court should sit as such exclusively, and the object of this is to provide their salary. I suppose the judges will be nominated by the 1st of July.

Mr. LAURIER. I am surprised at the change of view on the part of the Government. In 1889, if I recollect right, Mr. Mercier appointed two judges as district magistrates, giving them the same jurisdiction as

Mr. BRODEUR.

these judges, that is, up to \$100. This Act was disallowed; this Government would not allow it, though the province, under that Act, would have paid the salaries of the judges. The new Government of Quebec passes a law giving practically the same jurisdiction to two judges, under a different name. The only difference is that under Mr. Mercier's Act the judges would have been paid by the province, and under this Act they will be paid by the Dominion.

Mr. OUMET. It is rather late in the day to discuss the district magistrate courts. The district magistrate courts have been in the past under the jurisdiction of the Local Government. I am not discussing the wisdom of the then Minister of Justice in disallowing this Bill, because they were held to be an encroachment on the Circuit Court jurisdiction. The hon. gentleman knows that the Circuit Courts of Lower Canada are part of the judicial system that has existed since before Confederation. The only change is that until now the judges of the Superior Court had to hold Circuit Courts, and in order to provide for the speedy administration of justice in the city of Montreal, the Local Government has provided for the appointment of two judges who will receive about the same amount as one judge and will do twice the work. The judges of the Superior Court have been complaining for many years that they were obliged to hold that Circuit Court. Now, that this disadvantage is removed, no doubt there will be no further cause for complaint on this score, and I think the change will be to the benefit of the public of the city of Montreal.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will surely admit that he is altogether in error. The district magistrate courts had always been in existence in the province of Quebec since the year 1869, as the hon. gentleman knows. Their jurisdiction, from 1869 to 1889, was not \$100, but simply \$50. The only thing that Mr. Mercier did was, so far as the city of Montreal was concerned, to increase the jurisdiction of these judges to \$100, giving them practically the same juris-

diction as the Circuit Court. This Act was disallowed, and I could never see what was the reason of its disallowance. Certainly if the Local Government had power in 1869 to create a court with a jurisdiction of \$50, it had power to increase that jurisdiction to \$100. Now, the new Government abolishes the District Magistrates Court, re-enacts the same statute under a different name, and puts upon the Government of the Dominion, by creating a Circuit Court, the appointment and payment of these judges, which, under the law of Mr. Mercier, would have been paid by the province. That is the only thing that is gained, so far as the Government is concerned, by the operation. Nothing can better show the great anomaly which exists in reference to the Superior Courts under the British North America Act than the method of appointing judges. The creation of the court belongs to the Legislatures of the provinces, but the appointment of the judges belongs to the Dominion. So according to this theory, which the Government seems to accept, if the Legislature of Quebec increase the number of judges by two or ten, the Dominion would have to pay their salary. I think the Government have shown by their action that they were influenced by other considerations than public policy when they disallowed the Act in 1889.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think I can give the motive. The motive is the desire to get rid of the present incumbents in the District Magistrates Court in Montreal. These two incumbents are Mr. Barry and Mr. Champagne. The Dominion Government, by disallowing the law which had been passed by the Local Legislature in 1889, thought that they would remove particularly Mr. Champagne, but also Mr. Barry. But some alterations were made in the commissions of these gentlemen and they remained in their places. After their jurisdiction was curtailed, their salaries were raised by the statutory increases. Now, the present Government of Quebec wants to get rid of these gentlemen. They are very popular with the bar and the public of Montreal, and instead of simply removing them, which would be a most unpopular thing, the Government of Quebec provide for the repeal of the law concerning District Magistrates for the city of Montreal, and have enacted a new law establishing Circuit Court judges for the same court. The result of that alteration will be to change the name of the judges. Another important result will be—and in securing it both the present Quebec Government and the Dominion Government have been at one—they will get rid of the two present incumbents.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman is ever appointed a judge I hope he will be a better judge of law and of fact than he is of motives.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the Government intend to appoint to these new positions the same gentlemen who now occupy the position of judges in the Magistrates Court?

Mr. OUIMET. The matter will be taken into consideration in due time by the Government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the Government ought certainly to answer the question which I now put to them. We were told yesterday that the Government would only appoint judges of the same political persuasion as themselves, and consequently they make political appointments to the bench. I understand that the reason why the Government bears the expense of the appointment of two more judges in the city of Montreal is only that they may have an opportunity of appointing two more of their friends as judges. We remember that when Mr. Mercier appointed these two judges for the Magistrates Court in Montreal, all the Conservatives of the province of Quebec were angry, and were sorry to see two Liberals appointed judges in that province. They always supposed that the appointment of judges was exclusively in the hands of the Federal Government, although the law under which these two judges were appointed, was passed by the Conservatives in 1869. Consequently the only reason for which they objected to the creation of the Magistrates Court in 1887 was because Mr. Mercier appointed two of his friends to those positions. Now that their friends have returned to power in Quebec, they have passed a new law by which they are going to abolish that Magistrates Court and revive the Circuit Court, and the Federal Government is coming to the rescue of the Provincial Government in order to dismiss the two judges who have been appointed by Mr. Mercier, and appoint two of their own friends. The judges who now sit in the Magistrates Court give full satisfaction to the bar of Montreal, and I see no reason why these same gentlemen should not be reappointed, if the Federal Government is ready to take charge of their salaries. These gentlemen have given full satisfaction to the public and bar of Montreal, and if this Government does not appoint them to the new positions it will be only because they want to put two of their political friends in their places.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not aware that Mr. Champagne is still a member of the Liberal party, or that he has leanings towards the party of the hon. gentlemen; if he is, I would infer from what was said by hon. gentlemen opposite last night, that Mr. Champagne is now disqualified from being a member of a court of justice, because he ought now to have renounced all his partizan feelings after being on the bench for three or four years. I am surprised to hear that Mr. Champagne is still a warm friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that he was

once a strong Conservative, but for one reason and another, he turned in favour of Mr. Mercier, and rendered him very important service by giving his seat in the Legislature to a supporter of his (Mr. Mercier's) Government. But I thought that after three or four years of judicial life, he had given up all partizan feelings. The hon. gentleman is paying him a very bad compliment.

Mr. LAURIER. We can easily see through the reasoning of the hon. gentleman. He seemed to convey the idea that Mr. Champagne had been on the Liberal side. I understand that both Mr. Barry and Mr. Champagne have been very good judges, and have given satisfaction to the bench, the bar and the public; but I am much afraid the hon. gentleman will not put in practice the theory which he advocated last night, and that the gentlemen who ought to be appointed, will not be appointed.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman cannot dispute the fact that Mr. Champagne and Mr. Barry have given perfect satisfaction as judges of the Magistrates Court in Montreal. I never saw a complaint against them in the newspapers, and I never heard a word of complaint from any member of the Montreal bar. On the contrary, I have frequently seen the judgments of Mr. Champagne reported in the Law Reports of Quebec, a thing which has never been done for an incumbent of a Magistrates Court before. I think if the Government do not appoint these gentlemen as Circuit Court judges they should at least appoint men who have had some training.

Penitentiaries—Kingston Penitentiaries—For construction of a Female Prison and a Criminal Asylum—Materials \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what side of the penitentiary is it proposed to build this? This is a matter of some consequence, as there is some danger of these asylums for criminal lunatics becoming a nuisance if they are erected close to private dwellings. It would be well that the Government should understand what they are about. They have got a considerable area there on which they might erect this building without, I imagine, bringing themselves into collision with anybody. But, on the other hand, if the Government were going to build on the lower lake front, this would undoubtedly, I am advised, expose them to actions for damages of a rather serious kind, because any one acquainted with the nature of these lunatic asylums knows that the inmates are somewhat disorderly, and make themselves considerable nuisances to people living in the vicinity. I want to know where this building is to be placed.

Mr. OUIMET. I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. OUIMET.

Mr. MULOCK. I communicated with the Solicitor-General in regard to certain charges that were communicated to me with respect to management and discipline in the Kingston Penitentiary. I do not propose to read those charges publicly, because they attack individuals, and I think in justice to the parties they should not be published, except at the time of their investigation. At the same time the charges are of that gravity that warrants me in asking the Solicitor-General as to what action is proposed to be taken in respect to them.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman spoke to me some time ago, after he had made a statement in the House, and I listened attentively to what he said; but I failed to elicit from him anything more than this—

Mr. MULOCK. Permit me to say that the first interview I had was with the Minister of Public Works, who stated that he would send me a shorthand writer and I could dictate the charges to him. The shorthand writer waited on me, and I did as I had promised. The charges are therefore in the hands of the shorthand writer.

Mr. OUIMET. My secretary to-day read to me the notes dictated by the hon. gentleman. They have not yet been extended; but they will be, and I have no doubt when the Minister of Justice returns from Paris he will inquire into the whole matter. The charges conveyed to me by the hon. gentleman will be inquired into in the proper way.

Salary for Binder twine Foreman, \$1,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The committee should receive some information as to what is being done in regard to the proposed manufacturing of binder twine—as to what the intentions of the Government are, and as to how soon they expect to manufacture binding twine.

Mr. OUIMET. The machinery will be purchased in a short time and put in place. In the main Estimates we took a vote with which to buy machinery, and we have been in negotiation with a firm in Galt. There is an item here of \$25,000 with which to buy manila fibre. From inquiries made from brokers in that line of trade it is ascertained that we shall have to pay 7 cents per pound. Perhaps when the department communicates with the head offices in England, cheaper quotations may be obtained.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When is it the intention to engage the foreman?

Mr. OUIMET. As soon as the plant is bought.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In whose hands will be the duty of purchasing the fibre?

Mr. OUIMET. Some expert appointed by the department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will it be the foreman?

Mr. OUIMET. Some expert.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant). Manila fibre is subject to great fluctuations in price, and there will, of course, be danger that it may be purchased at the wrong time. Who is to be the judge? Is there to be one supreme authority, or is there to be departmental action?

Mr. OUIMET. I think it will be departmental action, with the advice of experts and of the foreman of the factory itself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The salary paid to the foreman will be sufficient to secure the services of a man to whom may be entrusted the power to buy this fibre. If we are going to have expert advice outside of the foreman it will be the means of increasing the cost of binder twine, and the expenses will become so large that the Government establishment will not be able to compete with ordinary manufacturing industries. The Government is taking this action with a view to employ prison labour, and at the same time keep the manufacturers of binding twine at Halifax from obtaining too high a price for their product.

Mr. OUIMET. This salary of \$1,500 is the same salary as the foreman is paid in the Central Prison, Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). On whose judgment and advice has the present expenditure been made?

Mr. OUIMET. On the advice of the department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With respect to machinery, where is it to be bought, and what will be the character of the buildings in which it will be placed? Certainly the Minister of Justice is not himself in communication with manufacturers of machinery, and therefore we wish to know who is in charge of the work.

Mr. OUIMET. The Inspector of Penitentiaries is responsible for the work indicated by the hon. gentleman. I understand he has visited the Central Prison, Toronto, and obtained at that establishment all the information possible. Probably he has also consulted other people who are experts in that line of manufacture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many convicts are likely to be employed in this work?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot tell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that is a matter of very considerable moment to know. Possibly the only justification for this would be that it will give employment to a large number of convicts, and if only a small number are employed, then the experiment is one of a very dubious character.

Mr. OUIMET. Three hundred tons of material are to be bought, and I suppose

the foreman will see to the employment of as many convicts as are wanted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is no information at all. There are about 600 men in the Kingston penitentiary, and from one cause or another, it has been extremely difficult to employ them. The question for the Department of Justice is, how to provide employment for a large number of these convicts. If this binder twine business is going to give employment to a large number, there is a good deal to be said for it, but if it is only going to give employment to a small number, then I extremely doubt the propriety of passing this vote. My hon. friend the Solicitor-General is the locum tenens and he ought to have made himself familiar with the details, he ought to know all about penitentiaries.

Mr. CURRAN. I saved a great many people from going to the penitentiary in my time.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) appears to think that the principal question is, how many people are to be employed in this manufacture? It seems to me that the principal question is, how is this proposal going to be reconciled with the great National Policy? If the Government start a manufacture of binder twine in the penitentiary, it appears to me to be a violation of the great principle that certain persons should be allowed to tax everybody else for their own benefit.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Where will the power be obtained to drive the machinery?

Mr. OUIMET. One of the present buildings is being prepared to receive the machinery. I do not know with reference to the power.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Have any tenders been asked for yet?

Mr. OUIMET. The department is in communication with a firm in Galt, and another firm in New Jersey for that plant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Have you not inquired of any of the English manufacturers?

Mr. OUIMET. I was told by the Prime Minister that negotiations had been made in England, as well as in the United States to procure the necessary machinery.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is it not true that in the United States there is considerable difficulty in getting that class of machinery?

Mr. OUIMET. I think so.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have been informed that it was under the control of the combination known as the National Cordage Company, and I apprehend there will be considerable difficulty in securing that class of machinery in the United States.

Mr. CARPENTER. I wish to know when the machinery will be in working order, and the binder twine turned out? If it is not ready until the 1st of July, as I saw stated in a Kingston paper, it will be of very little use to the farmers this season. Our wheat crop in Ontario is ready for the harvest about the 10th July, and if the machinery is not in operation before the 1st of July, there will be very little twine ready for the crop in the coming year.

Mr. OUMET. It seems to be impossible to get the machinery ready for the present harvest.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It is plain, from the statement of the Minister that the farmers will not be benefited by the production from this machinery this year. It is also plain that whatever action the Government may take, a very limited quantity of raw material will be necessary so far as the current year's harvest goes. The goods would have to be put in the hands of the wholesale dealers, to be of any use at all this year, before the machinery can be placed there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a new departure and one of considerable importance, and we ought to be advised better as to the details. I am advised by some of my hon. friends, who are better acquainted with the matter than I am, that as a matter of fact, a comparatively small number of hands are likely to be employed, and they tell me that female labour is largely used in other factories, which I do not suppose the Government will introduce here. Convict labour is not of very great value, but if we are to make this experiment at the cost of at least \$50,000, we ought to be advised as to whether it is going to give any adequate results in the way of affording employment. If the item is allowed to pass now, I must ask the Minister to make certain that he will obtain this information.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, I will see that it is got before concurrence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to know in what way it is proposed to purchase this machinery. Will that power be vested in the Inspector of Penitentiaries? I suppose the duty of the foreman will be to superintend the work of manufacture; but what may be called the business part of the arrangement, the purchase of machinery and material, will, I suppose, be entrusted to some individual, and if so, who will that individual be?

Mr. OUMET. We will give all these details to-morrow before going into concurrence.

Mr. CASEY. I may suggest to my hon. friend that these matters will be managed in the same way as the purchase of material for the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

House of Commons \$6,150

Mr. AMYOT. I take the opportunity of this vote to call the attention of the Government and the hon. the Speaker to a matter which may not seem important, but which is one of justice; I refer to the payment of the messengers and the sessional clerks of the House. I am told that the messengers will be paid this year only \$2.50 per day for the number of days of this session, and, as the session is very short, this will be a very inadequate payment. These messengers, I may say, I think, without fear of contradiction, are generally men of great activity and honesty. They perform their duty so well that nobody can complain. When the session opens they have to give up their ordinary occupations in order to come here, and when they return to their homes they have to wait for some time before they can find other employment. I suppose that when we give them employment it is not for them to lose money. When you take into consideration that they have to pay their travelling expenses to Ottawa and back to their homes, and their boarding expenses while here, and that they have always to be properly dressed while on duty, you may find that if they are only paid \$2.50 per day for the days of the session, some of them may not have money enough to get home again this year. It was fully understood as far back as 1882, I judge by "Hansard," that the minimum salary would be \$250 for a session not exceeding a hundred days, and that if a session exceeded that period, they would receive \$2.50 a day for the extra days. Our pages, I understand, are paid \$1.50 a day; but their work is not to be compared to that of the messengers, besides which messengers are supposed to be heads of families, and to have heavier expenses. I think, therefore, that we should in justice give the messengers a minimum salary of \$250, and the sessional clerks \$300 for a minimum session of a hundred days. A requisition has been signed by the majority of the members of this hon. House in favour of this, and I am convinced that if every member of this House had been asked to sign it, very few would have refused. One petition is in the hands of one of the hon. Ministers, and another is to be presented to the hon. the Speaker. I think the Parliament of Canada is in a position to pay its officers adequately, and for my part I humbly suggest the propriety of doing this act of justice. I do not think we should allow them to suffer because the session is shorter than the average.

Mr. SPEAKER. I fully concur in the statement made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) as to the activity and diligence of the sessional messengers connected with the House of Commons; but I cannot quite agree with him in his opinion as to the amount that they should be paid. I may explain to the Committee that during the first session I was Speaker, the session of 1891, I found that the salaries

then paid to the sessional messengers was \$250 per session. That was the basis upon which they had been paid for a number of years. It will be remembered that the session of 1891 was a very long one, extending, I think, over five months. When one hundred days had elapsed, the messengers made a representation to me, through a deputation they sent to interview me, that \$250 was too small a sum for a session of the length which the session of 1891 promised to be, and they asked that, in addition, \$2.50 per day should be paid to them after the hundred days had elapsed. I thought there was a good deal of justice in the proposition they made; but I thought also that if they were entitled to \$2.50 a day for a long session, they would not be entitled to the full \$250 for a short session; and I made this proposition to them: I said that I was prepared to continue the payment of \$250 per session if they chose to accept that sum for every session, no matter what its length might be; or that, if they were not willing to continue on that basis, I would recommend to the Committee of Internal Economy to put them on the basis of \$2.50 per day, which would be paid to them no matter whether the session should be 100 days, or 150 days, or 50 days. I understood from the representatives of those gentlemen that they were willing to accede to that proposition. I made that recommendation to the Committee on Internal Economy, and it was adopted; the resolution providing for the payment of \$250 per session was rescinded, and they were put upon the same basis as the sessional clerks; and I will show the Committee the justice of adopting that course. In the session of 1887, the sessional clerks were paid \$3 per day, the messengers received a considerable sum in excess of that paid to the sessional clerks, and it seemed to me that that was not a fair basis upon which to place these two classes of officers. It may be quite true, as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has stated, that these men have to wait during the recess to be at the call of the House whenever the House meets, and perhaps they may lose some other employment in the interval, or may have to give up employment in which they are engaged in order to come here and attend to their sessional duties; but I am quite sure every member will agree that there are twenty applications for every vacancy that occurs, with the full knowledge on the part of the applicants of the amount they are going to receive, and I am unable, from my point of view, to agree with the proposition which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) submits to the Committee. It seems to me that for the kind of work that is to be done here by these sessional messengers, \$2.50 per day is pretty fair pay. It is as much as the higher class of mechanics get in any part of the country.

Mr. GIBSON. As an employer of labour in this country, I say in all fairness that Mr.

Speaker loses sight of one fact. I quite agree in what he says with regard to paying men by the day, but he loses sight of this fact, that during the first month of previous sessions we were in the habit of simply meeting and closing, so that these men have had to put in more hours during the last two months, or as many, inside this building as they would have done in an ordinary session of three months. I know, and the Speaker knows, that when he employs men beyond a given length of time per day, they are entitled to some consideration, and I think, in all fairness to the men, seeing that this has been a business session and that they have been putting in about fifteen hours a day, some consideration should be given them on that account. The principle laid down by Mr. Speaker, however, is the correct one, that the number of days should be taken, but it seems to me there is no rule which may not at times be departed from; and I think in justice to the men, some consideration should be given to the fact that they have been steadily employed since the session started about a day and a half for every day, and, therefore, I think we should be a little lax in enforcing the rule which the Speaker has laid down.

Mr. CASEY. I am not sure that this is the proper place to discuss this matter, but as it has come up, I must say that I think the men, seeing they have worked harder than usual, and have had to incur expense coming here and returning, should receive pay as for an ordinary three months session.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the Speaker whether the salaries of these men have been fixed either by custom or express agreement up to any particular period?

Mr. SPEAKER. The salaries were fixed by the Board of Internal Economy at \$250 per session. In the session of 1891, they claimed that amount was not a sufficient remuneration, and we considered their claim a just one. Everybody will agree with me that it is not fair to pay those men \$250 for five months instead of \$2.50 per day, but it would not either be quite fair to the country to pay \$250 for two months. I point out to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) the fallacy of the doctrine he has laid down with reference to the hours these men are employed. They are employed on the express understanding that they are to be here when required; and if the doctrine laid down by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), that they shall be paid an additional sum because of the length of the days they were employed this session, in all fairness it should apply to the permanent employees as well as the extra ones. We have one of our clerks here who comes to his office at ten in the morning and never leaves, no matter how late the House sits, until fifteen minutes or half an hour after it adjourns. I refer to Mr. Bowles. Perhaps, in many instances, he has to remain longer

Of course, I am not going to object if the House takes the ground that that is the basis on which the extra employees should be paid; but, in all fairness, if that principle is to be applied to sessional employees, it ought to be applied to the permanent officials as well.

Mr. GIBSON. There is a great deal of truth in what Mr. Speaker says, but I still think that I am right in my contention that as these men have done three months' work in the two, some consideration should be given them. The permanent clerks are not put to the same expense as they are residents of Ottawa, but these extra men come from distances, and when they are only employed two months in the year and have put in a day and a half every day, that should be taken into account. There is quite a difference between the permanent clerks and the extra men, because the former get their holidays during recess and are paid all the same, which makes up for the extra duties they perform while the House is in session. On the other hand the expenses of the extra men are almost just as great during a two months' session as during a three months' session, and in all fairness, I think that you, Mr. Speaker, should adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot).

Mr. TAYLOR. I may just say that I have placed in the hands of the leader of the House a petition signed by 149 or 150 members, asking that the sessional clerks may be paid \$300 for the session and the messengers \$250. These messengers and sessional clerks have to travel a long distance to come here and return home, and have to pay their fare both ways, so that paying these expenses and the cost of living in Ottawa, there will be very little remaining to them, if they are only to get \$150 for the two months. In all fairness to these gentlemen, they should be given the prices mentioned in the petition, which I presented to the leader of the House, and which just now has been placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker. Another petition signed by the same members on both sides of the House was hurriedly got up, as they learned that the first petition was addressed to the wrong party and this is signed by some seventy or eighty members, none, as I understand it, having refused to sign it to whom it was presented. I agree with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), that these gentlemen have put in from fifteen to eighteen hours a day since the session opened, and that to pay them the miserable sum of \$2.50 a day is not a fair return for their services.

Mr. LARIVIERE. We must not lose sight of the fact that our sessions are supposed to last 100 days, in fact our indemnity is based upon that basis at the rate of \$10 a day, and when the Estimates are prepared for the payment not only of sessional clerks and messengers, but also of pages and others, the amount is calculated also on the

Mr. SPEAKER.

same basis of 100 days. Therefore these people in accepting their positions and performing their work, do so with the expectation that they will get paid for at least 100 days. When our sessions have lasted five or six months, as has been the case in former years, we have been sufficiently careful of ourselves to increase our indemnity by \$500 and were very glad to accept the same as well earned. Of course we have done the same thing to the sessional employees of the House, but while we were adding six days to our own attendance to help ourselves with the public funds, I do not see why we should be so stingy about the payment of poor people who are faithful officers of this House. It may be said that we can have twenty or forty or one hundred applications to take the places of any of these who resigned, but I doubt if we could get as good and able men if we went on the cheap plan. I believe we must be more generous to these people who work sometimes not merely fourteen or fifteen, but sometimes eighteen hours a day, and I hope the House will express its opinion in this matter favourable to these people, the amanuenses and those who have sessional employment, even extending our favour to our young pages, and will do what is fair by them. Let us be generous to those who are living on small salaries when we are generous to ourselves, and I do not believe the country will blame us for such an act of generosity.

Mr. MASSON. I would call attention to one distinction between the permanent staff and the sessional employees which, it seems to me, the hon. the Speaker overlooked. He argued that if a change was made in reference to the increase of the pay of sessional clerks, the permanent staff were equally entitled to the same. But I submit that there is this distinction—the permanent staff are employed by the year; they know what their employment will be and they take chances on the length of the session. But the amount paid to the sessional staff was based upon a session of such length as would yield them \$250, and when the time was longer, that amount was increased. Now, the hon. the Speaker has referred to the fact that some of the permanent staff have to be here all the time the House is in session and for some time afterwards. I would point out that the messengers and sessional writers have to be here not only when the House sits but for many hours afterwards. When the House adjourns early, as formerly it frequently did, members expect to find messengers at their call during the whole of the day. I think that fact should not be overlooked. These men are entitled to the full time they serve and if the number of hours per day is higher on the average I think that should be considered.

Mr. METCALFE. I think we have very efficient service here and as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) or some other

statesman has said, there can be no true economy without real efficiency. We have here a very efficient staff of messengers and I think it is false economy by any quirk or quibble or by taking advantage of any previous understanding to make a reduction in this way. I think we ought to settle this question so as to give these men what is fair and right. We have been served here night and day and we have been running at high pressure for some time, and it is only fair that these efficient officers should be remunerated for their services.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to add a word to what has already been said. I think perhaps we may make a mistake in not recognizing that when work is well done it ought to be well paid. We have been voting millions for the last few days. That is all right. I do not think we can get any men to come here from a distance and do the work of these officers and remunerate them fairly with less than \$250. I think every member who has come here knows that \$250 would not be very much toward allowing him to get away in a decent way. If we bring these men here we ought to pay them fair wages. There is much in what the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) says. As to the expectation of the length of the session and as there are not so many of these men as to cause a deficit, I would be in favour of giving them \$250.

Mr. MULOCK. It is to be remembered also that you cannot put a stranger into this House at a moment's notice and get good service from him. These messengers, though they do unskilled work in a sense, have to be familiar with the run of the building, the offices and the departments and to have a good deal of local knowledge. Therefore it is in the public interest that the same men should be continued. If they are to be treated in the same way as ordinary day labourers the same efficient service cannot be expected. I quite agree with what has fallen from others that not less than \$250 should be paid to these officers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. the Speaker will soften his heart on behalf of these messengers. They have certainly done very good service, and I do not think there are any men about the Parliament buildings who work harder or who earn their money more faithfully than these men have done. I do not wish to argue with the Speaker but I simply appeal to soften his heart towards these officers.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House knows what my opinion is with regard to this matter; I have never concealed it. But after the expression of opinion by hon. members of the House, I shall certainly bring this matter before the Committee of Internal Economy. I am not going to say what they will do. I make this promise upon one condition and that is that members of the House shall not

poster me with applications for appointments to the position of messengers hereafter.

Contingent Expenses, etc., in connection with Voters' Lists.... \$2,500

Mr. LAURIER. What is this?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for by-elections.

Mr. LAURIER. But there are no lists for by-elections.

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor-General said it would be necessary to have this for odds and ends. He is the bible now.

World's Columbian Exposition--
Additional amount required... \$70,000

Mr. LAURIER. How much is the appropriation for that exposition this year?

Mr. FOSTER. This will make the total appropriation about \$190,000.

To enable the Dairy Commissioner to make purchases of cheese and butter at the several experimental stations, the proceeds of the sales of such purchases to be placed at the credit of the consolidated revenue fund..... \$36,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is to enable Professor Robertson to start the experimental dairies which he runs for the first year, taking the milk from the farmer and making them advances upon the butter that is made and marketed. After the expenses are paid, the remainder goes to the farmers. This is simply for financing the matter. In order to make the advances, he must have some money out of which to make them. All this will come back into the Treasury during the course of the year. This is for the experimental stations, chiefly in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have great objections to purchasing butter or cheese except what is made at the experimental stations.

Mr. FOSTER. Not a pound is to be purchased outside.

Military defence of Esquimalt.
B.C..... \$70,000

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This item is for the purpose of carrying out an arrangement with the Imperial Government for the fortification of Esquimalt. The understanding is that the Canadian Government purchase the sites and furnish a fixed sum of money to the Imperial Government, and the fortifications and submarine works are to be constructed by the Imperial Government. It is thought that it is a better plan than to build the fortifications and construct the submarine works by the Canadian Government, and as they will then be subject to the supervision of the Royal Engineers, it might entail great additional expense if they should vary their plans from time to time. The Imperial Government furnish the most modern armaments, at a value of £42,000.

Militia..... \$160,712 72

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). I take advantage of the presence of the Minister of Militia to call attention to a motion I had upon the Order Paper, but which we did not reach. I notice that when the militia items in the main Estimates were voted, there was a re-vote of \$2,000 for certain monuments on the battle-fields of Canada. In the conversation that occurred, when that item was passed, I understood the Minister to say that the points likely to be chosen for monuments this year—and I was glad to see that the Government contemplated immediate action—were Lundy's Lane, Stony Creek, and possibly Chateauguay. I wish to put in a word for the battle-field of Chrysler's Farm. We all know that Queenston Heights, a scene of one of the battles of the war 1812, is largely provided with a fine monument, and rightly so. I see that private enterprise has taken hold of Lundy's Lane, and I daresay the Minister of Militia would be glad if private enterprise should also erect a monument at Chrysler's Farm. Now, we have two battle-fields in the western peninsula provided for, and I think a word ought to be said for Central Canada and for the province of Quebec. When we consider what the American plan of campaign was on that occasion, when we consider that the object they had in view was the capture of Montreal, expeditions being sent from Sackett's Harbour, 10,000 men under Wilkinson, and a large force under Hampton, lying at Chateauguay, with the design of advancing when the western force had proceeded far enough—when we consider the importance of that threatened attack, I think we ought to give due weight to the battles that destroyed that combination. Wilkinson's army proceeded safely after escaping some of the British arrangements to prevent its progress. They got down the St. Lawrence as far as Chrysler's Farm, and there they halted for the night. Colonel Morrison, who was in command, managed to draw them into a battle, and there is no doubt that that battle was one of the best evidences of the prowess of the British arms which has ever been given. I will quote from Allison with regard to the importance of the battle of Chrysler's Farm. He says :

The glorious defeat of an invasion so confidently announced and so strongly supported, diffused the most heartfelt joy in Lower Canada, and terminated the campaign there in the most triumphant manner.

Christie says this :

This, called the battle of Chrysler's Farm, is, in the estimation of military men, considered the most scientific military affair during the late war, from the professional skill displayed in the action, by the adverse commanders ; and when we consider the prodigious preparations of the American Government for that expedition, with the failure of which their hopes of conquest vanished, the battle of Chrysler's Farm may probably be classed as the most important, and the best fought that took place during the war.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron)

I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to these very strong adjectives used in connection with that battle. There is no doubt that the plan of campaign on the part of the Americans was well arranged ; and although their leaders were not capable of seizing the points of the situation, further evidence was given that, although the armies matched against each other at the battle of Chrysler's Farm were very unequal in point of numbers, as soon as the British soldier gets a chance in a fair field with the bayonet, seemingly nothing can stand before him. In this connection I might quote an expression of Lord Napier regarding the battle of Albuera, in the Peninsular war, when he said : " And then was seen with what strength and majesty the British soldier fights." It sometimes happens that the ludicrous enters into the most solemn things in life, and there is one little circumstance to which I wish to call the Minister's attention. We know that the anser played an important part in the history of Rome and we find that the busy bee had a share in the glories of Chrysler's Farm. I quote from Croil's valuable and interesting history of Dundas county. Referring to what occurred at that time, the writer says :

Previous to the battle of Chrysler's Farm, the American soldiers had imprudently been feasting to excess upon honey, which they found plentiful in Matilda and Williamsburg. The consequence was, that hundreds of them were so weakened and enervated by dysentery, that they reeled and staggered like drunken men, as they were marched up through the mud, ankle deep, to face the resolute charge of the British bayonet. Even in the field of battle they could not be restrained from repeating the imprudence, in passing Bouck's farm, where stood nearly one hundred bee-hives, in consequence, before the battle was over, their bloated corpses presented a disgusting aspect, as the honey with which they were gorged oozed from their mouths, their noses, and even from their ears.

So even the bees largely aided. All the forces in the country were united for one purpose, and I hope that will always be the case. I trust I have referred to a matter on which we are all agreed, and that the Minister of Militia will consider that this is deserving of serious consideration. There is a chimney standing there still, which was a central point of the battle, and when the Minister visits the scene he will not find it very difficult to locate the battle field.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What better monument do you want ?

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). If we had ivy growing there over the ruins, or even a tablet erected, that might prove sufficient. What is desired, however, is that the matter should receive attention. Speaking of the topography of the place, I notice that one of the Kingston newspapers in attempting to locate the battle field places it opposite Ogdensburg. I think Chrysler's Farm deserves to be better marked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Militia should give a short

description of the several battle fields, stating his preferences.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Nothing could withstand the hon. gentleman's eloquence. If the matter is not attended to by private enterprise, I will be very happy to bring the matter up next session.

Lachine Canal \$50,000

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to call attention to a matter more important than even the Lachine Canal. The other day in the House, in speaking to a resolution in regard to a canal I foreshadowed. I had not the opportunity to quite finish my observations. I now wish to call the attention of the House to this matter, as I shall not have another opportunity of doing so. According to the resolution I submitted, and according to the report of the engineers I read on that occasion, the scheme foreshadowed was to build a canal from Two Creeks, on Lake Erie, in a direct course to the mouth of the River Thames in Lake St. Clair, a distance of fourteen miles. The canal, as shown by the scientific reports made on it, would pass through a comparatively level country without physical difficulties so far as regards canal construction; the soil is either sand or loam, and therefore, the canal could be cut with the most improved class of machinery used for that purpose. From the mouth of that canal the route to run through Canadian territory would pass through the fen lands on the eastern borders of Lake St. Clair, to the channel Bearte East and back of Walpole Island. When it struck that channel it would meet with a current so rapid that for all time to come it would keep the canal open by the action of the water. Further, it would only require a break lock at Lake St. Clair to regulate the flow of the water, and a lock at Lake Erie on account of the water rising and falling. The estimates of the engineers from which I quoted shows that the canal proper could be built at a cost of \$800,000, and the dyke canal, continuing the scheme through Canadian territory, was estimated to cost \$500,000. But this would be for a system of fourteen feet navigation, and my idea is that the canal should have a depth of sixteen or seventeen feet, so as to be large enough to accommodate the largest lake craft, the large steam-barges that carry 100,000 bushels of grain. That would increase the total cost to \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000. My idea in having a larger canal would be so that it might permit the passage of the largest class of American barges that pass from the upper lakes to the lower lakes, although my principal motive in introducing the resolution was to submit a scheme of a national character, to secure for Canada a complete waterway from the great lakes to the ocean through our own territory.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the matter with the Detroit river?

Mr. TISDALE. I will come to that later. I will show in what respect the canal would

give great advantages over the Detroit river. My idea was that we should have a canal large enough to accommodate the traffic of both countries, because although my object is to secure an independent route through our own territory, still I do not intend the proposal to be one of an unfriendly or offensive nature to our neighbours. If they will use our waterways and treat us as good neighbours, and as having a right to our own views and our own policy, I have every desire, as I have always said, to deal in a friendly spirit with them. If, on the other hand, they wish to be coercive, aggressive or prescriptive in regard to trade relations with us, then I wish our waterways and other lines of commerce to be such that we may be able to teach them that we can get along independently, that we will hunt up new avenues of trade and enlarge the avenues in our possession. I believe we have a country, a people, with sufficient capacity and resource to maintain our position. Moreover, in days to come, if they continue such a policy, we will be able to meet them in the markets of the world, compete with them, and I believe rival them. I need not enter into discussion as to the benefits derived from water communication. We are all agreed that for the moving of the vast grain products of the North-west, canals are indispensable. I will read one short quotation from Mr. McNabb, the engineer, which is as follows:—

It has been very often urged that in these days of rapid transit transportation by water is being abandoned by shippers and that the railways are absorbing all the traffic; such, however, on investigation is found to be very far from the true facts of the case, as we find the tonnage moving on our great lakes rapidly increasing and assuming enormous proportions; so much so that the most sanguine anticipations of one season are dwarfed by the actual increase reached in the next. During the year 1890 twenty-two million tons passed between Lakes Huron and Erie; and during the year 1891 the tonnage passing through Detroit river exceeded by ten million tons the tonnage of the two ports of Liverpool and London. The new type of lake vessel for the carrying trade aptly termed the "Whaleback" promises great results in this direction, as they are light draft and capacious, permitting of a loading whereby they can make a ton-mile with the consumption of but a fraction of an ounce of fuel. Canada possesses a national highway to the Atlantic of over two thousand miles in length, with but seventy-two (72) miles of detention by lockage, whereas the United States route *via* the Erie Canal presents three hundred and fifty-two miles of constant detention by lockage, or, as admitted by a writer on the other side of the line: "Canada retains the key of the carrying trade of the great lakes to the ocean, not only from her own, but from American shores. From Duluth as much as from Port Arthur, from Chicago as much as from Toronto, the way to the Atlantic for wheat and minerals is by the St. Lawrence. It will form a great bee line for the commerce of two hemispheres which by reason of its few obstructions and detentions, its freedom from the necessity of breaking bulk, and its minimum cost of transportation is destined to control a business which no imagination of man can picture or estimate."

Now, Sir, as to the advantages of this route. In the first place, from the report that I

read the other day, it will be seen that it will be of immense advantage in the way of the drainage of the locality in which the work is to be constructed, and in the second place—and now I come to the Detroit River—it will avoid all the great obstructions and difficulties in the way of navigation on the route, from the head of the great lakes to the Atlantic Ocean; these are Grosse Point, the Limekiln Crossing, near Amherstburg, Bar Point and Colchester Reef. Mariners will tell you what an immense advantage it is to be able to avoid these difficulties. It will shorten the round trip to Buffalo or Port Colborne by at least 130 miles. Engineer Pinney estimated it at 137 miles; but I call it, in order to be safe, 130 miles, which would be fully one-fifth of the distance, saving from 12 to 20 hours in time according to the speed of the steam-barge. The traffic in 1857, passing between the two lakes, was only 2,500,000 tons; in 1890 it was 22,000,000 tons; and in 1892, 25,000,000 tons. If we divert two-fifths of that, which would be 10,000,000 tons, that, at an estimate of 1½ cents per ton toll, almost a nominal toll, would produce \$150,000 a year. That sum would pay the interest, the cost of maintenance and operation of the canal and the sinking fund. All the advantages, the saving of time and the avoidance of the obstructions I have spoken of, the steam barges would get for nothing, because the fuel, oil and waste on this saving of time would pay all the tolls which would be necessary, supposing we only diverted two-fifths of the traffic. But I believe the advantages of the route would be so great that in a short time it would largely monopolize the traffic, so that in the hands of the Government the tolls could be reduced, I think, after a little while to 1 cent a ton. I have mentioned three advantages that would be gained by this route, and I come now to the greatest advantage of all—I refer to the advantage in a national sense. When we complete the St. Mary's canal, we will have, except this canal I am speaking of, a complete route from the great lakes to the Atlantic ocean through our own territory.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So we have.

Mr. TISDALE. We have not now, because as I explained the other day, in passing through the St. Clair Flats canal, it is partly in American and partly in Canadian territory. True, it is regulated by treaty; but this will give us a canal altogether through our own territory. We have expended \$100,000,000, and I think wisely, to procure a great transcontinental railroad from ocean to ocean through our own country, and we have the best road on the continent. When the St. Mary's canal is finished, and our canal system deepened to 14 feet to the ocean, as the Minister told us the other day it would be in three years, we will have expended from \$75,000,000 to \$80,000,000, and again I think wisely, on our great canal system. I think I showed

Mr. TISDALE.

to the House the other day by what an uncertain tenure we would hold the right to use the St. Clair Flats canal, if American political exigencies were supposed to require the contrary. I think, therefore, it will pay us to expend a couple of million dollars more to build this great channel of communication entirely through our own territory, especially as I have shown the expense of it would be easily recouped from those using it at a saving to them after such payment. We would then truly be the arbiters of the only great and speedy waterway from the head of the great lakes to the seaboard, without fear of interruption or international complications. I hope and trust that the hon. Minister—as I had not the opportunity of taking the voice of the House upon the resolution—will consider it, and will adopt it, and will give the exploration and survey I asked for, and have an estimate prepared to submit to the House. I hope more than that. I hope that the Government will take up the scheme and complete it. I have such an abiding faith in the limitless possibilities of Canada and the great North-west, that I believe that in the time to come, we will not only need fleets of vessels on this water-way, but we will need to build the Hudson Bay road and to double-track the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe that the completion of our great waterway, in the manner I have mentioned in the resolution, will not only be a national blessing, and safeguard our commercial independence, but that it will further safeguard the institutions under which we live, and which we love so well; institutions that are unequalled in my opinion on the face of the globe, for the promotion of genuine equality and actual liberty. I hope, Mr. Minister, that you will see your way to do that, and I would like to ask you to express your opinion upon the matter if you feel at liberty to do so.

Mr. MCGREGOR. At this late hour of the night, and at this late stage of the session, I will not detain the House for many moments. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) spoke of this subject very early in the session, and we fully expected to have the matter dealt with before this. But, it being an important scheme, and we being very desirous that the Government should give us a survey at an early date, I think it is but fair that we should lay some statements before the Government to enable them to see the advantages of that great work. In the first place, there would be a saving of 130 miles in one round trip. We would avoid a great difficulty in the waters of our lakes and rivers, because the most intricate passage from Chicago to Buffalo is that portion from Lake St. Clair Flats to Bar Point to the neighbourhood of Colchester Reef. The American Government, seeing the necessity of increasing the depth of the water and the width of the channel, have expended something in the neighbourhood of \$150,000,-

000 at what is called the Limekiln Crossing near Auherstburg, which is half way down on this route. We know also that the increased depth of water that a vessel can draw reduces the cost of transportation very largely. In 1859 the average cost of carrying corn from Chicago to Buffalo was 15¼ cents per bushel; in 1861 that was reduced to 10½ cents, and in 1871 to 7½ cents. When the channel was deepened so as to give 14 feet of water, and 16 feet in this Detroit district, the cost of transport was only 3.20 cents a bushel, and in 1890, when the Limekiln Crossing was so arranged that vessels could come down drawing 16 feet of water, they carried wheat for about 2 cents a bushel, and corn for 1.88 cents. In iron ore, in 1867, the cost from Escanaba to Erie was \$4.25 per ton. In 1870 it was \$2.50; but in 1890 it was only 55 cents. We now have a draft of water in the Sault Canal, and portions of the St. Mary's river, of from 14 to 14½ feet. With 20 feet of water we would reduce the present rate of freight nearly one-half, because the navigation of boats drawing 20 feet would cost but little more than that of boats drawing 14 feet. The tonnage on the lakes has increased greatly owing to the rapid development of the North-west country, and owing also to the rapid growth of the iron industry, and the waterway is the great highway for the commerce of both Canada and the United States. The growth of the tonnage on the lakes during the last few years is shown by the following figures:—

1886.....	4,219,397 tons.
1887.....	4,897,589 "
1888.....	5,130,159 "
1889.....	7,221,935 "
1890.....	8,454,435 "

These figures indicate the existence of a tremendous traffic on the great lakes. Through the Sault Ste. Marie canal, at the outlet of Lake Superior, there passed in 1890 10,557 vessels, having a net registered tonnage of 8,454,435 tons. The actual freight tonnage was 8,041,213 tons, but the registered tonnage is used for the purpose of comparison. Through the Suez canal there passed during the same year 3,389 vessels, having a net registered tonnage of 6,890,014 tons, so that nearly three times as many vessels and over 1,500,000 tons more of freight passed through the Sault canal, away in the centre of the continent, than passed through the Suez canal, which is an international work, and a highway for the commerce of the world. And it should be remembered, too, that the Sault canal was opened but 228 days for navigation, and the Suez canal was opened, of course, during the entire year. And this represents the business of one lake only. In an argument opposing the construction of a bridge across the river at Detroit, presented to Congress by a delegate to the deep waterways convention, Hon. George Ely, of Cleveland, he estimated that through the Detroit river, representing the commerce of all the lakes, except Lake Ontario, there passed, in

1889, more than 36,000,000 tons of freight. This is nearly 10,000,000 tons more than the combined entries and clearances of all the seaports of the United States, Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific, and 3,000,000 tons greater than the combined entries and clearances both coastwise and foreign, of Liverpool and London, the commercial centres of the world. To show the immense growth of the traffic on our great lakes, and its advantage to our people, I may say that the total expenditures to 1st January, 1891, on the St. Mary's river, including the new lock, were \$4,170,046.28. It is thus seen that the saving effected by this waterway in two years paid 2.400 per cent on the total cost up to 1st January, 1891, and a large portion of these expenditures, such as those on the Hay lake channel, and the new lock in the canal, are for improvements not yet available for shipping. The total cost of all the river and harbour improvements on the lakes to date has been about \$29,000,000. The saving in one year of \$147,027,514.80, as shown above in the cost of transportation, is over five times the total expenditure for improvement on the lakes. Or again, the total expenditures by the United States for harbour and river improvement, all over, from 1st August, 1790, to 3rd March, 1887, was \$157,962,762. It is thus seen that the saving effected by the lake marine in 1890 paid 93 per cent of all the river and harbour improvements to 3rd March, 1887. We are trying to show that this canal is necessary for the same reason, because it would do away with the most intricate portion of our great river and lake system; and our North-west is growing so rapidly that the shipments of wheat and other grain from that country will soon be so large that other facilities than those we have at present will be required for transporting those products to the eastern seaboard. There would be no difficulties about the construction of this canal. It would only require a dyke and one lock. A survey would be required from the St. Clair tunnel to Two Creeks, or that portion of Lake Erie where the canal would end, a distance of about 30 miles, and one engineer could do this work in a very short time. Therefore we think we are only asking the Government a small thing in asking them to take this matter into their consideration at any rate, to have a survey made during the recess; and when we meet again next session we may be in a better position than we are to-day to show that it would pay this country as well to construct the proposed canal as it will to construct the Sault Ste. Marie canal.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late hour of the session I will not go into ~~this~~ question as fully as I would like to do in reply to the speech of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who seems to have devoted a great deal of time and labour to the question upon which he spoke so well the other evening. I would like to have an opportunity of

speaking more fully on the subject, to which I have lately given a great deal of attention in connection with a memorandum which it was necessary for me to prepare for Council; but I will confine my remarks to the practical result which the hon. gentleman wishes to accomplish, and to which he has referred in the latter portion of his speech this evening, that is, the proposition to have a channel constructed on the east side of Walpole island in our own waters. I hardly think there is any necessity for that. The present channel, which was built partly by ourselves and partly by the United States, crosses the international boundary in some places; it has completely obliterated the old channel; and, I think, it is as much open to our use as it is to the Americans—we have as much right to use it as they have. As to the Detroit river, most of the principal channels of navigation going to Lake Erie are found on the north side of the river, in our own waters; but whether they are on the north side or the south side of the river, we have under the treaty an equal right of user to those channels with the Americans. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that if a canal were made through the county of Essex, it would shorten the distance considerably; but he must remember that a canal would entail the digging of a ditch $14\frac{1}{4}$ miles long. The land rises gradually from Lake St. Clair up to the centre point of the peninsula, the height of land being 38 or 39 feet; and there is a difference between the level of the water of Lake St. Clair and that of the water of Lake Erie of $5\frac{1}{4}$ feet, which would necessitate the building of a lock. All this would entail a large expenditure in dredging the canal to the east of Walpole Island. It would also entail a considerable expenditure in dredging that channel down to the proposed mouth of the canal, where it proceeds for the purpose of passing into Lake Erie; and the total further expenditure would not be under \$14,500,000. There is no doubt, as the hon. gentleman has said, that the traffic on the waterways, far from decreasing, is increasing, and that the possibilities of trade in that section of the country are illimitable. The hon. gentleman has given us some very interesting figures of the increase in tonnage along the Detroit river, and that tonnage, I believe in time will increase to a wonderful extent, and at some future day the advisability of building the canal there may become a matter of practical consideration; but at present, with the limited amount of capital at our disposal in the Dominion, I do not think it is necessary to enter into such a large expenditure. We have in the possession of the Government pretty accurate surveys of that proposed canal. There was a very interesting paper read on the subject before the Canadian Institute in 1885, by Major Laughlin, who advocated it, and I have had communications from a Mr. Roberts up there. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the scheme,

Mr. HAGGART.

but the principal thing in its favour is the saving of sixty miles. I do not attach much importance to the necessity of having the waterway entirely in our own waters, because we have just as much right to the navigation of the Detroit river as the Americans themselves, and, in case of any difficulty, it would be as easy to stop navigation above Walpole Island as at Detroit river. From a military point of view, perhaps the Minister of Militia will be able to speak on that subject better than I can. However, I promise to have a survey made by our numerous staff on the canals, without entailing any extra expense upon the country. I will try and get an accurate account of what the proposed canal would cost.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to say a word as to the merits of the canal. It may be a very meritorious work. Upon that I do not feel that I am called to express an opinion; but I hardly think I would agree with the hon. gentleman, supposing such a canal were built, that Detroit would be side-tracked and converted into a deserted village. I may say, however, one thing, that for one who expresses such an absolute and unbounded confidence in the future of the country, it did seem to me his speech was strangely at variance with himself in this particular. He spoke as if the Detroit river and the waters that are the boundaries between the two countries, were the property of the United States. Under the convention of 1818, while the boundary is marked out as regards where it shall run in that waterway, it is declared that the waterway, throughout its entire extent and from shore to shore, shall be open to the navigation of both countries. Under that convention, the United States have a right to navigate the waters on our side of the boundary, and we have a right to navigate the waters on their side. Further than that, the doubt arose, under that convention, as to whether, in case an island intervened which was the entire property of the one party, the other party would have the right to navigate the waters lying between that island and the mainland. Now, the 7th article of the Treaty of 1841, known as the Ashburton Treaty, settles that question, and it is there expressly provided that the waters which lie between the island and the mainland, and the places where doubt has arisen, shall be open to the navigation of both countries. So that, when the United States built the St. Clair Flats Canal, they built it within a waterway which we have the right to navigate; and we have the absolute right to navigate that canal, without any restriction, in consequence of that provision of the Treaty of 1841. So, when they undertook to put restrictions, by way of retaliation, upon our use of their canals, they put no restriction upon the St. Clair Flats Canal, because by the Treaty of 1841 we have as much right to navigate the waters that flow through that canal as we have the waters that flow

entirely within our own territory. I think, therefore, that when the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) spoke about the Detroit river and the waters separating the two countries as those to the navigation of which the United States had some claim more than we possessed, he minimized our rights, instead of undertaking to uphold them. If he desires to advocate this canal, well and good; but it is not necessary to undertake to show that the Americans have a greater right to these waters than we have, in order to promote that enterprise.

Public Works--Income--Ontario--
Ottawa Printing Bureau--Paid to
the heirs of the late H. Lépine for
the removal of a cottage from
Nepean Point..... \$250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should we pay for the removal of a cottage from Nepean Point? Was it erected entirely at the pleasure of the department?

Mr. OUMET. Mr. Lépine was employed by the Department of Militia and was allowed to erect a building on Nepean Point. He has been there about thirty years. But when the Printing Bureau was built, it became necessary to remove this cottage, and an agreement was arrived at with the Minister of Militia by which the department was to pay the cost of removal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted that the permission to erect a cottage there was a privilege given to Mr. Lépine.

Mr. OUMET. It formed part of his salary.

Public Works--British Columbia
--Victoria--New Post Office.. \$100,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of this building likely to be?

Mr. OUMET. About \$200,000. The site is to cost about \$82,000, but we will receive for the present post office \$70,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the size of the site?

Mr. OUMET. Perhaps I should not go quite so far as to say that the site is absolutely fixed. We had the choice of sites. One of them was the site upon which the Western Hotel was to have been built. It is a very large piece of ground, and we might not require the whole of it. Excavation has been made by the company which cost \$30,000. That, of course, would represent a saving, as the work could be used. It is a very central site, lying between the old and the new parts of the city of Victoria. The size of the site is 200 feet by 170 feet, or about 29,500 feet in all.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia.. \$7,834

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter of great importance, a matter

of such great importance that I shall not even excuse myself for claiming the attention of the House for a few moments, while I refer to it. A petition was presented to the Minister of Public Works, an acknowledgment of which I received. The petition reads as follows:—

To the Hon. the Minister of Public Works.

We, your petitioners and loyal subjects humbly show:—

That the southern shore of the Bay of Fundy, from Cape Blomidin to Digby Gut, is without a harbour of refuge, and for the want of such harbour many lives and much valuable property are annually sacrificed: two schooners and nine lives being lost near Margaretsville within the past two years, besides, a few years since, the Government steamer "Princess Louise," all of which could easily have been saved had there been a suitable place of refuge between the above named points. Fully a score of lives have been lost during the last three years.

In view of the foregoing facts and the great danger to which the coasting trade is continually exposed, and the fact that the port of Margaretsville affords good natural facilities for the construction of a harbour,

We, your petitioners, would humbly pray that a stone pier be at once built at Margaretsville, thereby forming a low water harbour and affording to the immense coasting trade of the Bay of Fundy ample protection and shelter.

Trusting that the prayers of this petition may be granted, we, your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This petition has been largely and influentially signed. It is not merely a local matter, though a great deal might be said in its favour from a local stand-point. It is a Maritime matter. This petition has been signed by merchants and owners of ships in the town of Windsor, Hants county, Truro and Five Islands, in Colchester county, Springhill, Parrsborough, in Cumberland county, also largely in St. John, Digby, Annapolis, Canning, in King's county, Wolfville, and all the places along the Bay of Fundy on both the north and south shore. Shipmasters and owners of ships generally have been looking towards the port of Margaretsville for a number of years as the place for the location of a harbour of refuge, and when the hon. Minister of Public Works, speaking on the 17th March, 1892, with reference to the public works of the Maritime provinces, made this remark:

Perhaps on some future occasion, I may bring forward a plan indicating my view, that public money should be expended on permanent works, which would be *échelonnés* on the coast so as to serve as harbours of refuge for the fishermen.

the people began a practical move in the direction indicated by the petition. In my opinion, they have acted very wisely. When hon. gentlemen take into consideration the fact that the whole coast of the Bay of Fundy, from Blomidon down to Digby Neck, is nothing but one rock-bound coast, and that the tempestuous and uncertain weather which often prevails there, not only owing to the winds, but also owing to the tide that

prevails, it will be seen that it is almost certain destruction for a vessel to be caught in a heavy gale upon that rock-bound coast. I have taken some pains to look into this matter with reference to the disasters that have happened there since 1883, and they were somewhat astounding to me. I knew that a great many disasters had happened there; I knew that a great deal of property had been lost in that Bay of Fundy from the lack of a harbour of refuge for shipping to run to, and I knew that a great many lives had been lost, but there were more disasters than I anticipated. I have here a table showing the dates and description of the vessels that were lost:

Date.	Name of Vessel.	Tons	Port of Registry.	Place Wrecked.	Cause.	Lives lost.	Amount of loss.
1891.							\$
Mar. 25.	Eureka	13	Parrsborough	Port George	Gale	(Partial)	500
1890.							
Dec. 1.	Daniel Marcy	109	Boston	Off Harbour	Cap-sized and sunk	Six, all lost	4,500
do 1.	Mizpali	25	Digby	Margaretsville	Dismasted and sunk		500
Oct. 20.	Linna	20	St. John, N.B.	Isle O'Haute	Had to run ashore		275
Nov. 11.	Annie G.	112	do	Bay of Fundy	Unknown	Five lives	1,900
1889.							
Mar. 30.	Dunrobin	55	do	Port George, N.S.	Stranded		1,000
1888.							
Jan. 15.	E. Chambers	215	St. John	Hillsboro, N.S.	Stranding		6,600
do 23.	Royal Arcanum	117	do	Port Lorne	do		5,380
do 26.	Riverside	108	St. Andrews	Near Isle O'Haute	do gale		2,000
1887.							
Mar. 26.	Flora B.	70	Parrsborough	Port George, N.S.	Gale		2,000
1886.							
Dec. 16.	Emma	98	St. John	Bay of Fundy	Stranding		1,000
Feb. 4.	Maggie Lynds	67	Moncton	Wolfville to N.Y.	do		3,700
Apl. 14.	Nesbit	440	Windsor	do	do		2,200
May 21.	St. Olaves	572	(Bark) St. John	Isle O'Haute, Bay of Fundy	do	(Partial)	3,050
1885.							
Jan. 25.	Arcana	562	(Schr.) Boston	Portland to Annapolis	do	Nine lives	10,000
Dec. 19.	Annie	123	(Brigantine) Parrsborough	Campobello, N.B.	Founding	Total	4,000
1883.	Aloe			Was abandoned			
May 15.	A. B. Baxter	73	Windsor	Quaco Reef	Stranding		2,000
Jan. 21.	Blomidin	563	(Bark) Windsor	Eatonville	do		8,000
Feb. 19.	Bouetta	114	Windsor	St. John to Cornwallis			1,800

Finally, there was the loss of the "Princess Louise," on December 3rd, 1883, with eight lives and \$30,000. That was the greatest disaster of all, and one of those of which we have a perfect record, which shows conclusively that had there been a harbour at Margaretsville, where this vessel could have run, there is not the slightest doubt but that she would have been saved. There is a full report given in the blue-book, which I will read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Don't.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). This is a matter of such extreme importance, where the lives of men are at issue, that I feel justified in taking up the time of the House in laying the facts before the House. I did not consider it of so much importance some years ago, but the more I look into it, the more I feel it is my duty to raise my voice and to draw the

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

attention of the Minister and of this Parliament to this matter:

The new Government steamship "Princess Louise," 364 tons register, was totally wrecked on the 3rd of December last, near Point Prim, Digby county, in the Bay of Fundy, while being towed to Halifax by the Government steamship "Newfield," whence it was intended she should sail to Glasgow, where she was to receive her engines. The vessel was built at Maccan and had only recently been launched. She was taken in tow on the 2nd December, off Harvey Point, in the Cumberland basin, and proceeded down the bay, with the wind from the southward and eastward. The weather continued fine until noon, but between noon and 2 p.m. the barometer commenced falling, with a dark and threatening sky, and as that aspect of the weather continued, the course of the ship was shaped for Digby—

Here is where the danger arose. The press took the matter up at that time, and thoroughly reported it, and we learn that at noon they were right off Margaretsville, and they

could easily have run into Margaretsville and waited until all the danger was over ; and the lives that were sacrificed on that "Princess Louise," in all human probability, would have been in this world to-day, and the property would have been saved to this country, if there had been a harbour of refuge at that locality :

The course of the ship was shaped for Digby, as it had been arranged between Captain Guilford of the "Newfield" and Captain D. M. Browne, who was in command of the "Princess Louise," that they would go into Digby should the weather become threatening.

Digby was then something like forty-two miles away.

At six p.m., the vessels were within one mile of Digby Gut, the light bearing S.S.W., the weather being misty, with drizzling rain and a light breeze from the south-east, but as the ships were under a weather shore, with a light breeze, Captain Guilford considered the position a safe one and stood off and on expecting the weather would clear up.

The weather was such that they could not make Digby. Digby is a place that cannot be made in all kinds of weather. It is a safe harbour in some respects, but there are times when even exceptionally fine harbours cannot be made.

Mr. WELSH. May I ask the hon. gentleman if the "Princess Louise" had anchors and chains on board ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I will come to that presently.

At 10 p.m., the wind suddenly shifted back to the east, and rapidly backed into the north-east, with a blinding snow storm. The "Newfield's" head was then put off shore by Capt. Guilford, the engines going full speed. At midnight the wind backed to the north, blowing hard, with a heavy sea, rolling the "Newfield's" waist boats under water, and as the wind increased after midnight the vessel made but little headway. At 3.30 on the morning of the 3rd the steel hawser with which the "Princess Louise" was being towed parted, and that ill-fated vessel drifted on the rocks near Point Prim, becoming a total loss. There were ten persons on board, of whom two were saved. Amongst the lost was Capt. D. M. Browne, who was in charge of the vessel. The vessel was valued at \$30,000. The "Newfield" found it impossible to render the "Princess Louise" any assistance after the hawser parted, as owing to the violence of wind and sea she had as much as she could do to save herself.

The persons saved gave a full report of the occurrence when they came on shore. Their report is set forth in the newspapers at the time, as follows :—

On reaching Digby light about 8 o'clock in the evening the night became very thick, and the "Newfield" towed them up and down the coast. Those on board the new steamer did not at first know why this course was adopted, but it was surmised that the "Newfield" was endeavouring to get the bearings of the light and then run in. As the night wore on the sea rose, and what might have been possible at 8 o'clock could not be attempted at midnight, and the only safety for the two vessels was to run for the open bay. This was attempted, and just at the critical time the cable parted, and then commenced the struggle for

life on board the new vessel. Not a sail had been bent when she was launched, and she floated toward the shore completely at the mercy of the wind and waves. They tried to bend first a jib, but the wind was too strong to admit of this. They let go anchors, but both anchors and chain went over by the run, and while they were in the act of hoisting a main staysail she struck.

I could go on and give further reports with respect to that disaster, which show conclusively that a harbour at this point would be of great advantage, but these should be sufficient to convince the Minister of Public Works that he should at once send his engineers to that place with instructions to prepare and submit estimates for the construction of a deep-water stone pier at Margaretsville. There is no doubt whatever that most of these wrecks, if not all of them, would have been prevented had there been a harbour there. The prevailing wind in the Bay of Fundy is such that Margaretsville is accessible at almost all times. There may be other harbours that would benefit some portions of the bay, but there is no other harbour that would benefit the whole bay as would Margaretsville. That is shown by the practical men who have signed the petition, by the men in St. John who have lost their ships, and also, in some cases, their friends in the Bay of Fundy, because there was no harbour of refuge for their vessels. I have here a letter from parties in Parrsboro', who wrote to the collector of Customs at Margaretsville in regard to a ship that was lost, as follows :—

March, 1892.

Collector of Customs, Margaretsville, N. S.:

DEAR SIR.—The schooner "Glengariff" sailed from this port with a cargo of coal for Digby on Friday morning, the 18th inst., and it is generally supposed that the vessel went down with all hands. The crew was composed of Charles W. Woods, Peter Woods and Patrick Kelly, and if you can furnish any particulars as to the wreckage or bodies washing ashore or any information touching on the matter, you will confer a great favour on the afflicted parents. Please write either Mr. Charles Woods or myself.

Yours truly,

E. GILLESPIE.

Mr. Landers says, with respect to this wreck :

This schooner stood close in to the wharf, Friday afternoon, but they dare not come in, but stood off their death. Last year there was a large American schooner sunk with all on board. I think the members for Cumberland, Hants and Annapolis should see to this at once and establish a harbour of refuge here.

I could say much more with respect to this matter, but I leave it in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. Let the Minister and hon. members stretch their imaginations to a great extent, and still they would not exceed the facts as I could represent them. In regard to this matter, I know I will be supported by the hon. member for King's, by the hon. member for Cumberland, if he were in his seat, and by hon. members representing counties along the shore of the

Bay of Fundy. I leave this matter in the hands of the Minister of Public Works, trusting that he will, without delay, set his officers to work to obtain a practical and scientific survey and other information with respect to the harbour proposed.

Mr. WELSH. I have always understood that the navigation of the Bay of Fundy is very dangerous, and the extracts read by the hon. gentleman fully bear out that opinion. In quoting the loss of the "Princess Louise," I must say that that loss was altogether owing to the incapacity of the men in charge. The vessel was launched, the builders undertaking to have the vessel towed down to a certain place, and I believe from all I have heard and know, and my information is no doubt correct, that the chain were not even bent in the anchor. The hon. gentleman has mentioned that the anchors ran out, there being nothing to stop them. I believe the loss of the "Princess Louise" was altogether owing to the incompetence of the parties themselves, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in that opinion. This matter relates to the Bay of Fundy, whereas the item before the committee is respecting LaHave, on the opposite side of Nova Scotia. I know the Bay of Fundy pretty well, but I will not attempt to contradict the hon. gentleman's statement that a breakwater is required.

Mr. FLINT. I do not know what the Minister of Public Works is about to say, but I know what he ought to say, and I will endeavour to state it in a few words. He should announce to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that this important question is under the consideration of the Government; and he ought further to add that, after the Government have repaired the breakwaters which they have allowed to fall into disrepair and become useless, then they will take into consideration the advisability of building new breakwaters and harbours of refuge wherever required on the coast of Nova Scotia. It would come with very ill grace from the Minister to promise more than that, when I can point to valuable public works in my county which, if repaired at a cost of \$500 or \$600 some years ago, would have proved most useful public works. But, to-day, owing to the inexcusable neglect of the Government, notwithstanding the strong representations that have been made to them from time to time by myself and others who are well acquainted with the locality, these public works are now complete ruins. I do not think they can be rebuilt now at as small a cost as if there had been no public works there at all. I do not see how the Government could give any encouragement to any applications for appropriations for harbours of refuge or for new breakwaters, until those that are out of repair and have been nearly destroyed by the tides, winds and ice of the last two or three winters, have been placed in a satisfactory condition. I make these

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

remarks particularly for the ear of the Minister, and I do trust that this scandalous neglect of the wants of the people of the county that I represent will no longer continue to be a reproach upon the Government. Considering the enormous amount of money which is paid into the public revenue by the county of Yarmouth, and considering the amount of money that the people themselves have invested in public works along the shore, their claim should have a greater degree of consideration from the Government. I will not say that other motives than those of a broad and public character have prevented the placing in the Estimates of a reasonable appropriation for the works I refer to, but I have had it from the lips of supporters of the Administration, within the constituency, that one reason why a vote of money has not been taken for this object is of a political character. I will not go so far as to say that those reasons fill the mind of the Minister of Public Works or of his leading subordinates, but I must feel that representations of an opposite character than those I have made have been made to him, or else he would have repaired the breakwater at Sandford. I ask any hon. gentleman to consider the position of a prosperous and thriving community, dependent almost entirely for a continuance of its prosperity upon a public breakwater where vessels can be moored in safety, who see this public work dropping to pieces before their eyes. When they reflect on the very heavy charges they pay into the public revenue and for which they receive no return, they have a right to complain against the Government, to insist upon appropriations for these works, and to look with the utmost disapproval upon the expenditure of public money in other quarters. I think a great deal can be said, for the work referred to by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), but if I recollect aright, the circumstances of the loss of the "Princess Louise," there was at the time a strong opinion in the line of that expressed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh), that there was gross and inexcusable carelessness on the part of those who had charge of bringing that ship from the port at which she was launched, to the port at which she was to be fitted out. Perhaps a harbour of refuge at Margaretsville might have saved that vessel. I think that no claim should be put forward with any prospect of success until the Government have repaired the breakwaters which have fallen into decay in Yarmouth county, and which demand immediate attention on the part of the Government.

Mr. BORDEN. As the member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has referred to me in the somewhat lengthened speech he has made, I will simply say that I am in sympathy with him in reference to that work. It is generally conceded in that part of the province of Nova Scotia that it is desirable that a harbour of refuge should be constructed along

the south coast of the Bay of Fundy. In fact it is not a new matter. Some twenty years ago elaborate surveys were made of the various harbours along the southern coast of Nova Scotia with the object of determining where this harbour should be located. That is a matter for engineers to settle. I know that when these surveys were made, several other points were examined not very far distant from Margaretsville, such as Harbourville, Morden and Ball's Harbour, but I think myself, speaking of course without any special knowledge of the subject, that it is probable that Margaretsville would be the most suitable place. It is perhaps nearer the centre of the coast than others, and would likely afford refuge to more vessels in distress than perhaps any other point. I do not take the optimistic view of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that every one of the disasters which has occurred in that bay would have been prevented had there been a harbour of refuge, but still, I agree with him that it would have prevented very many of the disasters, and it is a work which, in the interest of the public, should be carefully considered by the Minister.

Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I. . . . \$32,400

Mr. PERRY. I am very much surprised that the Minister of Public Works has not asked for a small amount of \$500 to repair the breakwater at the Brae.

Mr. OUMET. I think I told my hon. friend that the necessary repairs would be made there out of the general vote.

Mr. YEO. I would like to remind the hon. Minister that this is a new work, and the money is required for repairs. It is a work begun by the inhabitants of this place and will cost about \$600. The Government last year gave a contract to extend the work, but it requires a further extension. It is a matter of very great importance to the people of that locality, as may be inferred from the fact that they have spent a large amount of their own money in beginning the work. I understood the Minister to say that this work would be proceeded with, and I was very much surprised to see that there was no provision for it in the Estimates. Unfortunately the western part of that county has been completely overlooked. We hoped to have obtained a grant for work at West Point, and we certainly had every reason to expect from the assurances of the hon. Minister that this work at the Brae would be attended to. I again impress on the hon. gentleman the necessity of giving a further contract. The amount of money required is small, and the work is absolutely necessary. I would also draw the attention of the Minister to Malpeque Harbour, because if some attention is not paid to it during the coming season, it will be completely destroyed. In my opinion, a small outlay now would save that harbour, which is the most valuable that we have on the north side of Prince

Edward Island. I have spoken of it before in this House, and I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the necessity of its being attended to as early as possible after the opening of navigation. I trust that the Minister will carry out his promise and give us an expenditure at this point.

Mr. GILLIES. I intended, when we were on the items appertaining to the province to which I belong, to bring to the notice of the Minister of Public Works a work of which I think he has some knowledge, that is, the Arichat breakwater. About fifteen years ago that very important public work was constructed at a very considerable outlay. Some years ago it was found that the work had fallen into decay; an estimate was made of the cost of repairing it, and last year a sum of money was expended, but the amount appropriated was insufficient to complete the work. I would like to know now from the Minister if the amount asked for or recommended by the engineer in the province has been appropriated for the work?

Mr. OUMET. The breakwater of Arichat has been repaired for the last two years, and I understand that it was in a pretty good state of repair. The fact of the matter is that if I were to do all the works that have been asked for, I would require for the purpose about \$2,500,000 of public money.

Mr. GILLIES. The answer of the Minister is not at all satisfactory. The work is an important one, and though we may perhaps be asking too much, the simple question before the department is this: Are we entitled to have these works repaired or should they be allowed to fall into disrepair and decay, as they have been doing?

Mr. OUMET. They will be kept in repair.

Harbours and Rivers Quebec . . . \$32,100

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before leaving the estimates of the Department of Public Works, I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that, last week, he gave me to understand that the report of the engineer who has made the survey of Lavallière Bay would be communicated to me. The hon. Minister did give me communication of said report, and after examination, I found it to be incorrect in several points. For instance, the engineer reaches the conclusion that the waters which flood the commune of Yamaska are those of Lake St. Peter, and that the losses must be attributed to them. I agree that up to the 25th June or so, the Lavallière Bay is flooded by Lake St. Peter; then the water subsides and the greatest part of the bay becomes fit for pasture and raising hay. After that date, this portion of the bay is never flooded, except when heavy showers swell and overflow the waters of the St. Lawrence which flow back to the lower end of the bay. It is worth while noticing that a few acres above the dam there is a small channel through which,

prior to the construction of the dam, the waters of the lands drained into the River Yamaska. Since the dam was built, the waters of the River Yamaska drain through the channel into the Lavallière Bay, and as a consequence heavy losses have been inflicted on the proprietors of the commune by the erection of this dam; first, because it prevents the farmers sending their cattle to graze in as large numbers as previously; secondly, because it prevents them from making as much hay as they used to. In his report, Mr. Berlinguet further states that no indemnity has been granted to any of the farmers for losses suffered on account of the flooding of their lands. Now, the engineer here again is altogether mistaken, as I will show, Mr. Chairman, by the report of the Auditor-General of Canada. I now hold in my hand the Auditor's Report for the year 1887, and I see the Government have paid the following items for losses sustained: To Mr. Carlin, \$60; to Mr. St. Germain, \$193, and to Mr. Tonancourt, \$180. Here again the report of the engineer is inaccurate. As a matter of fact, Sir, I consider the engineer does not seem to have been very careful in his survey, as evidenced by this statement of his that the flooding is owing to the waters of Lake St. Peter which overflowed the commune. I am positive he is mistaken. To the waters of the River Yamaska, which flowed through this small channel, the floodings may be ascribed as to their cause as evinced by the fact that prior to the erection of the small dam the lands were almost always flooded, but since a dam has been erected at the entrance of the channel there is no longer any flooding or losses caused. The president of the trustees of the commune petitions the Government asking that the proprietors of the commune be compensated for the damages inflicted on them on account of their having been prevented by these floodings from making hay in as great abundance as usual, and further, for the loss inflicted on them by the failure of pasture, that is to say, for their being prevented from taking to pasture as many cattle as before. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would beg of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) to give new instructions with a view to have another investigation made into the extent of the damages inflicted on the owners of the commune of Yamaska. The other day the hon. the Minister of Public Works was telling me that he had promised no investigation. The hon. Minister is quite mistaken. I was in my seat when he made this promise, and further, I have ascertained, through the "Hansard," that in reply to a question asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition, he had declared that he would give orders to have an investigation made. The reply was given in French, I recollect quite right. I would secure from the hon. Minister a new promise that a full investigation shall be made this time to give satisfaction to the parties concerned.

Mr. MIGNAULT.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. member, I will tell him that the engineer in chief will proceed to Yamaska and verify the facts on the spot.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) He will hear also the parties.

Mr. OUMET. (Translation.) The hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mignault) will be notified when the engineer goes to make an investigation.

Burlington Channel—New ferry scow..... \$1,500

Mr. CARPENTER. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing this item. At the same time I want to point out to the Minister that it is not what the hon. member for Hamilton, the hon. member for Halton and myself have been asking for. We feel, in view of the importance of that section of the country and the very large amount of traffic that takes place at this point, that we are entitled to a swing bridge. I believe that last year it was estimated that \$15,000 or \$16,000 would construct a bridge there. I would like the Minister to take this matter into consideration, and possibly he can yet see his way clear to comply with the request we have made.

Mr. HENDERSON. Like the hon. member for South Wentworth, I do not oppose the vote. I concur with him in what he says. I feel that to build another ferry scow would be to perpetuate a system that should have been done away with many years ago. What was quite sufficient for traffic across this channel fifteen years ago is altogether insufficient now, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works will not ask the people of that section of the country to put up any longer with the inconvenience that they have submitted to so long, but that in another year he will arrange to build a swing bridge across that channel.

Mr. McKAY. I can endorse what the hon. gentlemen who have spoken say as to the necessity of a bridge at that point. The traffic is increasing year by year; in the summer months it is immense. Hundreds of teams cross on that ferry every day, and during the summer season the place is a great pleasure resort, and the old scow which has been in use there all these years is the first primitive method of crossing that channel, and is totally inadequate to the business now done at that point. I hope that the Minister will consider the representations which have been made to him, and which will be made later on, as to the necessity of constructing a bridge at that point. It is very much needed.

Hydrographic Surveys..... \$6,000

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the Government have committed a very serious error in taking the Hydrographic survey of Georgian Bay out of the hands of Commander Boulton, by whom it was so efficiently, thoroughly and well conducted. But as that has been de-

cided upon and the matter is at an end, there is no use in my saying anything more about it. I do not, however, like to let this opportunity pass, as Commander Boulton is on the point of leaving this country, without expressing, as a representative of a constituency very much interested in the work, what I think is due to that gentleman by all interested in the navigation of Georgian Bay. He has carried on a work of vast importance to the shipping interests of the upper lakes; he has done it in a manner not only economical, but satisfactory in every way, and I think those interested in the survey cannot do less than take this opportunity of expressing their high appreciation of the services which Commander Boulton has rendered the navigation of the upper lakes.

Towards the expenses of determining the boundary line between Canada and the United States of America; between the southernmost point of the Prince of Wales Island and the 141st meridian of west longitude \$60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that business likely to cost us altogether?

Mr. DALY. \$92,000 altogether now. That will be for the work of one year, commencing 1st April next; but I presume it will average about \$60,000 for the next two years after the first outfit. In the \$32,000 is included the purchase of a number of instruments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand you expect about \$200,000 will put through that boundary line.

Mr. DALY. About \$250,000 will be sufficient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The United States contribute a like amount?

Mr. DALY. Their part will cost more than ours.

Weights and Measures. \$289 36

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that they promised to inspect the milk cans of those parties who petitioned here last year. The petitioners asked to have a uniform can made of 8-gallon size, and that the Government should inspect them. To prove that the Government have made these promises, I wish to read a few letters addressed to the Milk Suppliers' Association by members of the Government and their supporters. I have here one addressed to Mr. Duncan, one of the delegates that were here last year:

I must apologize for not having sooner answered your letter of the 16th instant. I have now submitted the matter to our new Controller of Inland Revenue, Hon. John S. Wood, and I am sure that he will remedy the evil. I know what was done before, and the understanding with which you left Ottawa, and am surprised to hear that the law is not being effectually enforced by the Inspector of Weights and Measures. In a few days I will write you full particulars,

and hope that the information I may then be able to convey to you will be satisfactory.

This letter was written from Ottawa on the 25th February, 1893, by N. Clark Wallace. I have another letter that was written by the Controller of Inland Revenue to Mr. Maclean, the member for East York, who was interested on behalf of the farmers in that vicinity. It is dated Ottawa, March 7, 1893:

Mr. Miall has recalled the circular instructing officers as to inspecting milk cans, and is issuing one of a more peremptory character. We shall probably have no more trouble from your friends' side of the question, but expect a siege from the other.

It seems that they expected trouble from the other side, and as proof that there was some trouble, the Government have not taken any action in the matter yet, and do not intend to this session. I have another letter addressed to the Controller of Customs by the Controller of Inland Revenue, dated Ottawa, March 10, 1893:

I have your favour of the 7th inst. inclosing a letter from Mr. McPherson, and beg to say in reply that a short time ago I gave positive orders that the inspector at Toronto was to carry out instructions given him on the lines of the wishes of the deputation which waited upon Mr. Costigan, then Minister of Inland Revenue, on the occasion to which you allude in your letter. Mr. McPherson's letter hints that the inspector has no power to enforce the verification. I shall go into this matter at once.

Now, this association of farmers who are supplying milk in Toronto, have also taken the advice of an eminent lawyer, Mr. Montgomery, and here is his reply:

We have seen Mr. Piper, of the Department of Weights and Measures here, and had a conversation with him in regard to the registration of milk cans. He agrees with us in what we stated to you this morning, namely, that there was nothing in the Act or in the Regulations compelling the registration of milk cans. We have written Mr. Piper a letter in this matter, a copy of which we inclose you, which he states he will forward to Ottawa for the purpose of getting more definite instructions from the Joint Commissioners there. It appears to us that it will be necessary to have an Act passed compelling the registration of these cans. Possibly they might be compelled to register them should the Government see fit to pass an Order in Council requiring them to do so.

Now, they sent down another delegation recently, and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Carpenter) and myself waited on the Government, who promised that they would introduce a Bill giving the inspector at Toronto and elsewhere in Canada power to compel the inspection of these cans. We waited on the Controller of Inland Revenue and he drafted a Bill. That Bill was submitted to the Premier of this Government, and we understood that it would be passed as speedily as possible. One day last week I called upon the Controller of Inland Revenue, and he told me that they had abandoned it, and asked me to call upon the Premier. I did so, and the Premier also told me they had abandoned the idea of pass-

ing the Bill this session. Now, unless the Government have power by Order in Council to make some regulations that will empower the inspector at Toronto to compel an inspection, the milk suppliers will remain in the same position for another year. This promise was made last year, and twelve months have gone by, and it will be another year before any legislation can be had on the lines that are required. Now, I wish to give you an estimate of the losses sustained by the farmers in the vicinity of Toronto. In East and West York, in the immediate vicinity of Toronto, in the years 1890-91, with three branches to hear from, they estimate their loss in milk, over and above what they are supposed to supply in their cans, at \$4,000. The branches in Peel and Halton estimate, from what is reported, that they have lost \$1,500. In the county of Ontario they estimate their loss at \$1,500. Here we have a total loss in those districts of \$7,000 during those two years. The above figures do not represent one-third of the loss that the farmers in that vicinity have suffered for the last four years, which they estimate at \$21,000. Many of the milk dealers in Toronto who are opposed to this regulation being in force, are reliable men and willing to do the square thing; but they have to compete with other men who are not willing to do what is right, men who want to get nine gallons into an eight-gallon can, and when they can do that, they have an advantage over the honest dealers. For the information of the patrons of that trade, I will give the rating sheet of milk vendors in Toronto, made by J. R. E. Winters: 18 per cent are good pay; 50 per cent are only fair pay; 13 per cent are very risky and 19 per cent are no good at all. That is the class of men that these dealers have to deal with, and it is the class of men that are endeavouring now to control this traffic in milk in Toronto. I will read a report of a meeting of the Milk Dealers' Association opposed to the proposed Act of Parliament:

The Milk Dealers' Association at Shaftesbury Hall last night protested against the action of the Farmers' Supply Association in sending a deputation to Ottawa requesting that all milk cans be verified and stamped. This, it was considered, impugned the honesty of the milk dealers, and it was suggested that the farmers could avoid any difficulty by selling by the gallon and supplying their own cans just as they did receptacles for other produce. A further objection to the arrangement proposed by the farmers laid in the fact that on the trains cans would become bruised and indented, and fail to hold the exact quantity. It was complained that the farmers would not meet the dealers for a business discussion of the matter.

A resolution embodying these and expressing the hope that the Ottawa Government would not unduly oppress any one class of bread-winners was prepared and Secretary Benson instructed to forward the same to the honourable members for the city of Toronto.

Now, the hon. members for the city of Toronto have taken a stand on this question, and have endeavoured to influence the Government privately. I think they are encour-

Mr. FEATHERSTON.

aging people who are not willing to deal with the public generally. I have also a reply from one of the farmers who are interested in supplying milk. He writes to the editor of the "Globe," in which also the other appeared:

SIR,—To put the position of the Farmers' Supply Association, as it is called, in the report of the milk dealers' grievance in the "Globe" of Thursday, in its true light, an explanation of the so-called grievance is necessary.

The Toronto Milk Producers' Association, composed of farmers supplying the retail dealers of Toronto with milk, asked the Government to establish a standard milk can of a capacity of eight gallons, and also to verify those now in use, that the farmer might know without any dispute just how much milk each can he filled would hold, and could claim pay for the quantity held. Under the present conditions, very few farmers get pay for the full quantity held by the cans they fill, and, although they may sell by the gallon, there is no satisfactory way of telling how much a certain can contains, and besides, the dealers as a rule try and buy by the can, giving the farmers to understand that his cans hold about eight gallons, while in many cases they hold from eight and a half to nine gallons. Many farmers to-day are losing from a quart to four quarts on each can of milk sent to the city, and when one man sends five or six cans a day the loss is considerable.

The railways, in charging freight on milk, recognize a can as containing eight gallons, and say they will charge extra for any holding above that quantity, and nearly all the cans used some years ago by the dealers held about eight gallons, until an eight-gallon can became recognized generally as a can of milk, but some of the dealers thought they should have a quart over the quantity paid for to make up for loss in retailing, and many of them got their cans made to hold eight gallons and a quart, and from that time the cans have been getting larger, until now most of the new cans sent out to be filled by the farmer hold nine gallons, while the dealer, if he can, still makes his bargain on the basis of an eight-gallon can.

This is what has given rise to the agitation to have all cans used in shipping milk made to a standard, and verified by the inspector of weights and measures.

As a sample of the honesty that rules some of the milk-dealers in the city, in the year 1891 the losses sustained by farmers through milk-dealers failing to pay amounted to over \$5,000.

PRODUCER.

Islington, March 17.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have also a copy of a contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway for the carriage of this milk. I will read the contract they entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway:

CONTRACT.—It is understood and agreed:

1st. That each can will be addressed, stamped or marked with the names of the station shipped from and the owner and station destined to.

2nd. That delivery will be made by owner or shipper on the baggage cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway passenger trains that carry milk.

3rd. That delivery will be taken by owner or consignee immediately on arrival of trains at station to which milk is destined from the baggage cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway passenger trains.

4th. That the owner or shipper will attach one of these tickets to each can of milk of above description and if can contains more than eight gallons of milk, two tickets will be delivered with each can.

Therefore you can see, Mr. Chairman, that if a man sends a can holding more than eight gallons, he is liable to pay freight on two cans. It seems to me that the farmers are never going to get justice in this matter unless they can effect a combine, and they are not in a position to do that, and moreover, they are too honest to do it. The farmers in the neighbourhood of the city of Toronto are anxious to have a standard can. I do not see there can be any objection to that, because dealing on the basis of a standard can, the milkmen would know what they are buying. If the cans are of uniform size, they will buy at the price the milk is worth per gallon, whereas if it is a question of the can containing nine and a half or nine and three-quarter gallons, it involves book-keeping at either end, and probably disputes. If the uniform sized can is used, all the dealer will have to do will be to mark down the number of cans. If a can is not filled, it will be churned by the motion of the train, and, of course, will be sent back by the dealer. It is, therefore, to the interests of the farmer to fill every can full so that it may carry safely to the city of Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). This milk-can question ought to be settled, and I wish to say a few words in regard to it. I owe here a divided duty. I have constituents who produce the milk and constituents who sell it, only 28 per cent of whom, according to the last speaker, are honest.

Mr. FOSTER. And constituents who drink it.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). All drink it, and nothing else. This grievance has been brought up here year after year, but so far the grievance of the farmer has not been remedied, although more progress has been made this session than in any session heretofore. Before we leave the subject I want some pledge from the Government that they will consider the question and will try to give the farmers what they want. This is an immense industry, and if the Government are not prepared to deal with it they need not show their faces in any of the constituencies of York. I would like the Controller of Inland Revenue to say that this question will have attention.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman explain what the trouble is?

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The trouble is that the Government are not equal to giving the farmers what they want—a standard milk can.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. Will the hon. gentleman state what the complaint is?

Mr. MACLEAN (East York.) The complaint is that the Government undertake to inspect these cans; they have a law on the subject, but this law cannot be enforced because of

some defect in it. Lawyers have given that opinion. There is, therefore, no inspection or regulation of the cans now. Some men say you cannot have a standard milk can. But we have a standard barrel of flour, 196 pounds. The same principle can be applied in this case, and I would like to know if the Government intend to deal with the question?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. As I understand it, the practice has crept in of milk dealers insisting on paying for less milk than they actually get. I understand that you wish to have a standard can to meet that difficulty.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The farmers want a standard can of eight gallons.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Why of eight gallons?

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). As a matter of convenience, the same reason that fixes the standard of a barrel of flour at 196 pounds.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am surprised at the assertion of the hon. gentleman that there has been less progress made in this matter during the present session than in any other session during which the subject has been considered. This is the first time it has come up in this House, and the hon. gentleman is not doing me justice when he says I have not given it attention. We have, besides Toronto, other cities, Halifax, Hamilton, Montreal and St. John among the number. The farmers in no other section of the country have ever written or communicated to the Government finding fault with the present system.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). Because none of them have the milk trade that Toronto possesses.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then the hon. gentleman practically asks for special legislation. It is difficult to make the law applicable to the whole country, because in many cases the milk men deliver the milk themselves, and no retail dealers are employed. In Ottawa that is the practice, and I also believe in Hamilton. However that may be, a practice has crept in under which the retail dealer insists on getting nine gallons of milk for the price of eight gallons. I should like the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) to explain how it is that the farmers are compelled to supply nine gallons of milk for the price of eight. I intend to continue to give this matter attention with a view to arriving at a satisfactory and just conclusion to all parties.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. When the milk trade was established in Toronto, fifteen years ago, it was on a very small scale. The trade was done with eight-gallon cans. Since that time the men who receive the milk furnish the cans. This is the reason. Sup-

pose a dealer receives twenty cans from a company, they will probably come from six or eight different farmers. So he sends his own cans to the farmer, for if the farmers furnished the cans they would probably be lost. When these cans are supplied by the milk dealers, however, they are returned and there is no trouble with the railway transportation because they bear the name of the dealer. The hon. Controller wishes to know the reason why the people desire to establish an eight-gallon can. Since the trade has been established it has been done principally in eight-gallon cans, or weighing about 100 pounds, for which the railway charges a regular rate within fifty miles of Toronto, and this can weighs about as much as one man can handle. The dealers commenced to increase the quantity by having new cans made somewhat larger, and even bands put round the cans so that they would hold three quarts or a gallon more. That is what the people complain of. I am satisfied the Controller is anxious to meet the wishes of the people, but I have not heard there is any objection raised by any other city of the Dominion to the adoption of the principle of the eight-gallon cans. I do not see why a standard eight-gallon can cannot be adopted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If such a plan were adopted, people in Kingston or Brockville would be compelled to supply milk in eight-gallon cans.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Only in a wholesale manner.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is very difficult to know where to draw the line. It is, however, a matter well worthy of consideration, and I do not intend to arrive at a conclusion until I have very carefully considered it.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I had no wish to reflect on the Controller. No less than 1,000 cans of milk are brought into Toronto every day, and the number is steadily growing. At the present time there is a law which provides for the inspection and marking of cans, but it is not being carried out. A legal opinion has been given by the milk producers as to the reasons why the law cannot be carried out; and they ask not only that that law should be carried out, but that there should be a standard eight-gallon can. If it is the custom of the trade to handle milk in this way, it is the business of the department to meet the wishes of the people, and especially when we have a Government that claims to specially protect the interests of the farmers.

Increased Salary—To increase the salary of F. Hawken, Post Office Inspector of the Ottawa Division, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. \$200

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to draw the attention of the Postmaster-General to this
Mr. FEATHERSTON.

item under the head of Post Office. I see it is provided that \$200 is proposed to be voted to increase the salary of Mr. Hawken, the Post Office Inspector at Ottawa, from \$2,000 to \$2,200 a year, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. I assume, from that fact, that the Ottawa division is recognized as a first-class division, the provision of the Civil Service Act being that a salary of \$2,200 is allowed to the inspector of a first-class postal division. The point to which I want to draw the attention of the Postmaster-General is this, that this increase of salary to Mr. Hawken is an act of tardy justice. Mr. Hawken has occupied this position for the last three years, I think, and has discharged his duties very faithfully and very efficiently; and if the Ottawa division is recognized as a first-class division, I think I may fairly ask the Postmaster-General to consider the question of compensating Mr. Hawken for the amount he should have received as inspector of a first-class division, since the time he occupied that position.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it because of the great increase of population in St. John that six additional letter carriers are required?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the census pointed that out.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 131) to further amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 132) to further amend the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Foster.)

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Voters' Lists of 1893.—(Mr. Foster.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th March, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SOUTH MIDDLESEX ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown

in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Robert Boston, Esq., for the electoral district of South Middlesex.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for two or three minutes while I refer to a personal charge. This is the first occasion, in my parliamentary experience of twenty-one years, that I have done anything of this kind. The matter is a very insignificant one, at least I consider it so, but there seems to be a disposition to make it a matter of significance, almost a matter of state, and I felt called upon to refer to it. I find an article in this morning's "Citizen," which is as follows:—

The Presbyterian "Witness" is a rather solemn publication, but there is a fund of quiet humour in it which occasionally finds expression in such articles as the one cited below. In replying to the Halifax "Herald," which had made some remarks upon the pillar of the sanctuary who hails from North Norfolk, it says: "The 'Herald' has oftener than once published the statement that John Charlton, M.P., who takes a leading part in promoting Sunday legislation at Ottawa, owns steam tugs which he employs on Sundays as well as week days in tugging logs from the Canadian to the American shore, or in other similar work." For this employment of steam tugs on Sundays Mr. Charlton, as the "Herald" alleges, is responsible. Now, we are not in a position to contradict the statement. We have listened to Mr. Charlton making clear and forcible and long speeches on the Sunday question; and we would say "a priori" that the charge against him cannot be correct.

Following this is a criticism by the "Citizen," not very complimentary, which I need not read. If legislation for a good object can only be introduced by perfect and saintly men, we would have very little of it. I do not claim to be of that character, and the legislation I have introduced relating to Sunday observance was distinctly based upon physical, moral and material grounds, and I carefully avoided referring to its religious bearing at all, as a reason for urging the Bill in this House. I think the charge made, first by the hon. member for East Simcoe, and repeated by the Finance Minister, was one hardly worth noticing, because it was indefinite and general in character; but as the press seems to deem it worthy of notice, perhaps it is better for me to say just a word about it. In the first place, the charge is a very indefinite one, as I have said, and I call upon the Finance Minister, the hon. member for East Simcoe and other members, who have referred to it, to give the name of the boat, the place where that historic whistle was heard, and the place from which it was heard. I do not know whether any tug I own or am interested in has transgressed the fourth Commandment, and if it has I would like to examine into the matter. It is not necessary for me to say that when a tug is out in the open sea, prosecuting a voyage, she must continue her work on the Lord's Day, and if she is going into port

she may do so on that day. There is a great variety of work it is necessary and proper to do on the Lord's Day with tugs and vessels. It is proper to go to the relief of a wrecked vessel on the Lord's Day and to continue a voyage, but I do not know whether in the case referred to the work it was charged was being performed was necessary or not. I may say that I am the nominal owner of one tug only. I do not manage her. Throughout last season she was chartered most of the time to other parties, and was beyond my management and control. I rise to make this statement in order to put myself right in regard to this question, and, if the hon. gentleman will say what was the name of the tug that whistled, why she whistled, where she whistled and at what date she whistled, I will be able to learn whether the tug was my property, whether she was at the place intimated at the time named, whether she was under charter at the time and controlled by other parties, and whether any blame attaches to me, and lays me liable to the charge so loosely and indefinitely made.

FISHERIES—MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. FRASER. I desire to put a question to the Government, and as I see two of the Controllers present, perhaps they may be able to give me an answer. Some time ago the statement was made that a gentleman was to be brought from Scotland to look after the fishing business in the lower provinces. His name, I believe, was Mr. Ross, and he was employed by Sir Charles Tupper. I would like to know if he has arrived, and if the Government intend to put him in charge of the fishing industry, to teach the fishermen of the lower provinces their business in the curing of fish and so on?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will ask the hon. gentleman to wait until next session.

Mr. FRASER. The fishermen are anxious for information on this subject, but if the Government will give an answer some time to-day that will be all right.

POSTMASTER AT STE. ANGELE.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a question raised by me last year, in connection with a demand for the bringing forward of papers relating to the discharge of Mr. Loïselle, ex-postmaster of Ste. Angèle. I do not wish to make any lengthy remarks, I simply wish to lay before the House a fact which may prove interesting. At the session of 1891, I asked the Government whether this postmaster had been dismissed and why. The Government, through the then Postmaster-General, now Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) answered that this postmaster it appeared, had been dismissed on the complaint

of a certain Guillet, who had stated that this employee had altered the date of receipt of a letter in order to delay the delivery of this letter to the receiver, namely, Mr. Guillet. The then Postmaster-General (Mr. Haggart) went to the length of stating that a forgery had been committed by this postmaster. I regret for the sake of the hon. Minister, to have to add, since Guillet has stated under oath, that the statement of the Postmaster-General was ungrounded, and that he had never lodged any complaint.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the rules of the House provide that any declaration or statement, made under oath or otherwise, outside of this House, cannot be taken as a basis for any argument in a debate. I hope that the hon. member will not forget that rule.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) As I am not allowed by the rules of the House to make known to the House the declaration or statement made under oath by Mr. Guillet, I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I may add that in 1892, I asked for the production of all the documents bearing on the dismissal of the postmaster. An order issued from this House, enjoining on the Government to bring down these papers before the House. The session of 1893 is now drawing to a close, and I regret to have to state that the papers have not yet been brought down. I may say that last year the hon. Postmaster-General stated that the reason why the papers had not been brought down was that they had been lost—but he added that even should the report of the inspector be found on which he had decided to remove Loiseau, he would not lay the papers before the House, owing to the confidential nature of these papers, but that they might be privately communicated to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I am not conversant enough with French to understand quite well what the hon. member says, but I feel it my duty to remind him to confine himself as much as possible in his argument within the rules of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. My intention in rising was to draw the attention of the Government to a certain statement of fact, and at the same time to complain that the document asked for by me two years ago had not yet been produced before this House. It is true the Postmaster-General stated that these documents had been lost, and that there was in the department only the report of the inspector to the department, upon which report the local postmaster was dismissed. I desire to call attention to the declaration of the Minister to that effect, and I do not know if I am out of order in that. I was just reading the declaration of the Postmaster-General of last year, promising that these documents should be produced if they were found, and

Mr. BRODEUR.

that the report of the inspector, at all events, should be shown to me. I do not know if I am out of order in relating these facts to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not if the hon. member will confine himself as closely as possible to the object he has in view. If he wishes to obtain information from the Government, it is perfectly in order to ask the question, but I would ask him to confine his remarks so that what he says may not provoke discussion.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was just coming to that point, and I wanted to know whether the Government would produce that report. I desire to see that report, especially when I am informed by sworn statements that the complaint in question has never been made.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Since I am out of order, I will go no further for, when rising to speak, I desired but to make known the nature of the statement made under oath by Mr. Guillet. But, as I am not allowed to use this statement, I will just call the attention of the House to the fact that, at the last session, the hon. Postmaster-General stated that he would produce, as soon as possible, the papers relating to this removal. The session of 1893 is drawing to a close, and these papers have not yet been laid on the Table of the House. The question to be dealt with is an important one, as this postmaster has been accused of forgery. Now, I have the declaration under oath, proving the contrary, and this declaration is made by the very same party whom the Government have designated as the plaintiff. It seems strange that the Government should withhold these documents which would show that this postmaster was not guilty, such as is established to-day by the statement of Mr. Guillet, the very same man who, according to the hon. Postmaster-General (Mr. Haggart), would have charged the postmaster with forgery. Moreover, the very fact that the Government do not produce the documents asked for, goes to show that the person in question has been dismissed on other grounds not mentioned, and that unjustly too.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. LAURIER. If I may be allowed I desire to put a question to the Government, in which the Controller of Customs is more particularly interested. I see in the "Evening Star" of the 29th inst., the following paragraph:—

In reply to an inquiry, Mr. Thomas F. Wallace stated that his brother, Hon. N. Clarke Wallace, is still a member of the firm of Wallace Bros.

Now, though we have no law on the subject as they have in the United States, to prevent the officer at the head of the Customs Department being himself an importer, it has always been the tradition of this Government that the gentleman at the head of this

department should not be himself in the importing business. I remember distinctly that when Mr. Burpee was taken into Mr. Mackenzie's Administration in 1873, he severed his connection with the firm with which, up to that time, he had been connected. If it is true that the Controller of Customs is an active business man in the importing trade, I submit that it is contrary to the traditions of the Government, and contrary to good government, and I think the attention of the Administration should be at once called to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I may reply to the hon. gentleman that if the position I hold as Controller of Customs requires that I should sever my connection with any business in which I am engaged, I shall do so at once. I may state further that our firm has practically no business with the Department of Customs, as they are not importers. During the last three years, perhaps, there have been two or three importations by our firm, but I think that would be all. But, as I said, if it is necessary, I shall at once sever my connection with the firm.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is aware, as everybody else is, that it has been an invariable custom and tradition in his department, that the officer at the head of that department should not be connected with any importing business.

Mr. WALLACE. I may say that I shall at once sever my connection with the firm; but our business with the Customs Department in the past has been practically nil.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman say now whether he proposes to go on with the North-west Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to my hon. friend I may say that, owing to the crowded state of the Order Paper—we have some twelve or fourteen Orders to go through—the general agreement which seems to have been reached that we shall prorogue on Saturday, and to-morrow being a holiday, the Government will have to forego some of these measures and they propose to drop the following: Order 25, Bill further to amend the Insurance Act; Order 35, Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting land in the Territories; Order 38, Bill further to amend the Revised Statutes respecting canned goods; Order 39, Bill to amend the North-west Territories Act; Order 46, Bill to amend the Dominion Irrigation Act—which the Minister said would not be pressed, that it was introduced merely for information. These, so far as I know at present, are the Acts that will not be pressed this session.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

ROBERT BOSTON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of South Middlesex, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Sutherland.

CENSUS INDUSTRIES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Strathroy? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment?

Mr. FOSTER. Stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is the last day, working day, of the present session and I would like very much to have the answer to that question if the hon. Minister could kindly favour me. The notice has been on the Paper over two weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. If the answer is not ready and the information has not been furnished to me I would hardly like to give an answer for which I would be held responsible.

Mr. LAURIER. Could not the Government during recess issue a blue-book containing this information?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure what is to be put in the blue-book. The remaining volumes of the census will be issued from time to time, but whether these particulars are to be published or not I do not know. If they were it would make a very bulky volume. I think I may say to my hon. friend that the answer to his question may be sent to him.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would extend the same favour in relation to the second question—manufacturing establishments in Liverpool, Queen's, N.S.? This question has been on the Paper about three weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. Generally, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I will suggest that the Government publish all these particulars for every constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. That is out of the question; it would make an immensely large volume.

INDUSTRIES OF THE TOWN OF KINCARDINE.

Mr. ROWAND asked, 1. What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Kincardine, as per census returns? 2. What are the names of the several manufacturers? 3. What is the number of hands employed in each establishment? 4. What is the value of land and buildings attached to each? 5. What is the value of the output of each?

Mr. FOSTER. It was understood that no details further than the number of employees should be given. The following is the answer to the other parts of the question:

Industries.	Hands employed.
Aerated Waters—	
D. Johnston.....	1
Agricultural Implements—	
Lewis Martin.....	1
Blacksmiths—	
Richard Evans.....	2
Dan Potter.....	1
David Walden.....	1
Boots and Shoes—	
Wm. McKebbin.....	1
J. Blackwell.....	4
H. Goodwin.....	1
Joseph Hockin.....	1
Joseph Nephew.....	1
Brick and Tile Yard—	
Wm. McGibbon.....	17
Boiler-makers—	
Hunter Bros.....	7
Bakers—	
Alex. Luttrell.....	3
D. Mahaffery.....	2
Carriage Factories—	
Wood Bros.....	3
Wm. Browning.....	1
Alex. Ross.....	1
Wm. Carver.....	1
John Hotson.....	1
Coopers—	
Richard Kitchen.....	1
Levi Rightmyre.....	5
Foundries and Machine Shops—	
Gundry Bros. & Co.....	27
L. J. Fisher & Co.....	16
Dressmakers and Milliners—	
J. Kerr.....	3
M. Fraser.....	2
David Robertson.....	4
Matilda Browne.....	6
Eliza Fair.....	4
Annie McLean.....	2
Martha Carrick.....	1
Francy McKay.....	2
Mrs. D. Robertson.....	2
Flour Mill—	
R. M. Watson.....	3
Furniture Factory—	
Watson & Malcolm.....	25
Harness and Saddlery—	
John Brown.....	
Wm. Temple.....	
*Angus McLeod.....	3
Pump Factory—	
J. Campbell.....	1
Printing and Job Office—	
Wm. M. Dock.....	5
Salt Works—	
Levi Rightmyre.....	29
John Tolmie.....	16
Stone and Marble—	
P. Anning.....	1
Wm. Vanstone.....	2
Sash and Door Factory—	
A. J. Evens.....	15
Tanners—	
Seeley Bros.....	2
Tailors—	
W. B. McLardy.....	7
John Ruttel.....	25
Geo. Luan.....	10
Tinsmiths—	
Welsh & Sheilds.....	1

Mr. FOSTER.

Industries.	Hands employed.
Woollen Mill—	
J. Cunningham.....	2

POLICY-HOLDERS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Mr. TYRWHITT (for Mr. Denison) asked, Do the Government intend to prevent policy-holders and others interested in the statutory returns of insurance companies, from inspecting the same; and if so, for what reason?

Mr. FOSTER. The statutory returns of insurance companies are not public documents. From such returns a report is annually prepared and distributed for the information of the public which embodies all material information and particulars. Should a policy-holder desire to see a particular return and state his reasons therefor in writing, such return might be exhibited if the reason therefor were satisfactory.

MANITOBA AND A PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW.

Mr. DENISON (for Mr. Coatsworth) asked, 1. What action has the Government taken with reference to the petition for the passage of a prohibitory liquor law received from the Government of the province of Manitoba? 2. If nothing has yet been done or decided upon, when does the Government propose to move in it?

Mr. FOSTER. No action has been taken by the Government as yet with reference to that petition, and no action will be taken until the report of the Prohibition Commission has been received.

CIVIL SERVICE INSURANCE.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 11) respecting Government Civil Service Insurance.

(In the Committee.)

Mr FOSTER. All the sections of this Bill were passed with the exception of 15, 16 and 17. My hon. friend raised a point whether it was necessary to put in sections 16 and 17. I do not think there is any necessity, and I am quite willing to have them struck out. Then I want to amend section 18 by adding:

The provisions of this Act shall be carried out by the staff of the Finance Department, under its direction and supervision.

In reference to section 15, I will suggest that instead of "two and a half" we read "three."

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 109) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Daly.)

WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

House proceeded to consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 23) respecting Witnesses and Evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the Solicitor-General kindly explain the nature of these amendments?

Mr. CURRAN. Three amendments have been made in the Bill. Section 4 states that in every case of a person charged with an offence, wife or husband shall be competent and compellable witness. The Senate have left in the word "competent" and struck out the word "compellable." The next amendment, is a proviso to the effect that no person shall be compellable to disclose any communication made to him by his wife, and no wife shall be compellable to disclose any communication made to her by her husband during her marriage. This is an absolute change from the Bill as passed in this House, when we declared neither competent. Then the Senate has added a subsection: subsection 2 to section 4 setting forth that failure of the husband or wife of such person to testify shall not be made subject of comment by counsel for the prosecution when addressing the jury. The last amendment is in section 27. This House only authorized commissioners to take certain declarations and act in certain proceedings, but the Senate has extended the clause so as to cover all persons having power to receive solemn affirmations or affidavits.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the amendment in regard to testimony to be given by wife or husband is an amendment in the wrong direction. As the Bill left this House, wife or husband was competent to give evidence in respect to acts committed by one or the other, but not in regard to admissions made by one to the other. If I understand the explanation of the amendments, the Senate has provided that wife or husband may be a competent witness, and can be examined as to conversations between each other, the provision simply relating to a witness being compelled to answer, being applicable only if the witness chose to claim the privilege. I think that is entirely contrary to the spirit of the committee of this House, as manifested on the division taken when that point was determined. This committee determined, after thorough discussion of the point, that under no circumstance should wife or husband be a competent witness as to conversations between the two parties during marriage.

Mr. CURRAN. That is so.

Mr. MULOCK. That determination was arrived at by an overwhelming majority. Now, the Senate has amended the Bill so that

a witness may be examined not only as to acts, which we agree to, but also to conversations, and may claim the privilege of not answering if desired. That is entirely contrary to the amendment made by this House.

Mr. McCARTHY. It appears to me that the chief amendment made by the Senate is in the right direction, because it does away with the provision we inserted making it compellable on the part of husband or wife to give evidence, and leaving it free to the husband or wife to give evidence, if he or she think proper. That is the first amendment made by the Senate, and in that I most cordially concur. I agree with the observations made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the other amendment is in the wrong direction, because it was not framed in the same spirit, but in the opposite spirit, because it seems to regard the right of a witness to disclose matters that came to their, his or her knowledge, through the marital relation, as a privilege belonging to the witness, whereas it is a privilege belonging to the opposite party. I do not think we should concur in the amendment as it now stands. When the Bill was before this House I supported the Minister of Justice in making a prisoner a competent and compellable witness, but in view of the large minority in the House that opposed this, and in view of the fact that the other Chamber is opposed to it, I would not be prepared to force any division on the House. I am willing to accept the Bill in the form in which it comes from the Senate, leaving them competent witnesses but not compellable. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact, that the present Attorney-General in England, whose experience in criminal matters has been enormous, in a speech in the Imperial House of Commons some time ago, declared himself in favour of the Bill as it was introduced here. Sir Charles Russell, when speaking of the Criminal Evidence Bill, which made criminals competent but not compellable, and which was introduced by the then Attorney-General, Sir Richard Webster, said:

He did not hesitate to say that, upon his present information and judgment, he should be prepared to go, and to make the party accused not only a competent, but in some cases at least a compellable, witness. He would ask the hon. and learned Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster), whether he did not think there was, at least, one case in which a prisoner should be a compellable witness? That was the case of four or five persons jointly charged with an offence, against three or four of whom there might be cogent evidence, but as to the fifth there might be some evidence, but not of a cogent kind. As the law now stood, the fifth man might be convicted; but if he were enabled to call the men beside him in the dock, they would be compelled to say that he was not present at the commission of the crime. In the Maastricht case, many hon. members—not only those from Ireland—felt very uneasy in their minds with regard to one of the accused persons who was hanged. He knew that the Solicitor-General, the

Under Secretary of State for India, and he himself, took great pains to investigate the case, and they all three came to the conclusion that there was strong reason for doubting whether one man who was found guilty of murder with the rest, and suffered for it was guilty of or took an active part in the crime. Could that man have called his fellow-prisoners and his wife as witnesses, it would, in all probability, have saved him from death.

That is pretty strong evidence given on this point by the Attorney-General of England. I am in favour of this Bill as it was originally passed by this House, but such a large minority agree with the Senate that I do not think it would be perhaps judicious to press the thing to a further division. I may say that I cannot see why, if you accept the amendment of the Senate in the first instance, you do not accept the amendment in the other. Why would you not allow the husband or wife to disclose a communication if he or she desired to? I would give the husband and wife the privilege of disclosing the facts if they choose, but I would not compel them to shut their mouths.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Government had better drop this Bill, because owing to an oversight of the hon. and learned gentleman who had charge of it, it practically repeals an important section of the North-west Territories Act of 1891. That Act gives the Assembly of the Territories power to deal with evidence as any of the provinces has. But this Bill, if it passes, practically repeals clause 13, subsection 10 of that Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the House is considering amendments made by the Senate, and that the discussion must be confined to that.

Mr. DAVIN. I am going to move that the amendments now moved a second time shall be read a second time this day six months, and I am going to give my reasons for so doing. Section 6 dealing with section 13 of the Act, provides that the Legislative Assembly shall, subject to the provisions of this Act or of any other Act of the Parliament of Canada at any time in force in the Territories, have power to make ordinances for the Government of the Territories in relation to the administration of justice in the Territories, including the constitution, organization and maintenance of territorial courts of civil jurisdiction, including procedure therein. The latter, of course, includes evidence. Mr. Speaker, if you look at clause 2 of this Bill, you will see that it applies to all criminal and civil proceedings and over any matters whatsoever, respecting which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction in this behalf. The object evidently was that this Bill should apply to proceedings in the Exchequer Court, but it will go further than that, and it will apply to all proceedings in territorial courts, because this Parliament has jurisdiction in the North-west Territories. Therefore, if the Bill passes in its present form, it practically

Mr. McCARTHY.

tically takes away the power of the Territories under the Act of 1891, and I will move that these amendments be not now read a second time, but that they be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. In reference to the amendments made by the Senate to section 4, I may say that I am prepared to accept section 4 as it was transmitted by this House to the Senate. The first part of it is that the husband and wife shall be competent and compellable witnesses, and I am willing that that should remain in the Bill. The Senate, however, in the second portion of section 4, have made a very material alteration and one of a character, that I do not think this House is going to adopt. The change made by the Senate leaves the husband or wife competent to disclose the secrets that have passed between one or the other, it may be in their bed. Now, I do not think this House is prepared to accept that amendment. My hon. friend the Solicitor-General says we must accept it, but I certainly will never accept it. I feel that though it is quite right that a husband and wife should be competent witnesses in a criminal proceeding, neither of them should be obliged to disclose against the wish of the other secrets that have passed between them, after a lifetime together, so to speak, in one room. I can hardly understand how the Senate came to make the alteration, but as they have done so, I think it is our duty to refuse to accept it. I feel very strongly upon the matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it would be well for the hon. Solicitor-General to give us his view as to the point raised by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). We have given the North-west Assembly power to legislate in regard to civil proceedings; but we are now passing a law providing that a wife or husband shall be competent to give evidence against the other in criminal proceedings, and in civil proceedings which are under our jurisdiction, and in so far we shall be repealing the constitutional Act we have already passed in regard to the North-west Territories. That is the point raised by the hon. member for Assiniboia, and we want to know which will be the law in the North-west Territories, the North-west Territories Act or this law.

Mr. CURRAN. There is not the slightest difficulty about this matter. I think my hon. friend has not shown that this Bill in any way curtails the law of evidence in the North-west Territories. It enlarges it, if anything.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You take away the power you gave last year.

Mr. WELDON. This being the last utterance of Parliament, it would be the law. I agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe. If we had not reached this stage of the session, I would be in favour of ap-

proving of the first amendment and disapproving of the second; but I think very little harm would result from carrying the Bill through as it is. It would be a perilous thing to reject the Bill, because in a short time the Criminal Code will come into operation, and this law of evidence will be necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have a law of evidence, even if this does not pass, and the question is whether it would be better to pass it now or to allow it to stand for another year. I quite agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia. The intention was that this Act should apply to all proceedings over which we have jurisdiction. We have jurisdiction over the civil law in respect of the North-west Territories, although not in respect of the provinces, and the consequence will be that this law will override the civil law of the North-west.

House divided on amendment, six months' hoist (Mr. Davin):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Langevin (Sir Hector).
Béchar, d,	Laurier,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Lister,
Boston,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lowell,
Brodeur,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McMullen,
Campbell,	McNeill,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Davies,	O'Brien,
Davin,	Paterson (Brant),
Devlin,	Proulx,
Forbes,	Rinfret,
Geoffrion,	Semple,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Vaillancourt.—40.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Kenny,
Bain (Soulanges),	LaRivière,
Barnard,	Leclair,
Belley,	Lippé,
Bennett,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bergeron,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Boyd,	Mackintosh,
Bruneau,	Macleau (York),
Bryson,	McAlister,
Cargill,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Carignan,	McDougald (Pictou),
Carling,	McKay,
Carpenter,	McLenman,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Carscallen,	Mara,
Cochrane,	Marshall,
Cockburn,	Masson,
Corby,	Metcalfe,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Montague,
Curran,	Quimet,
Daly,	Patterson (Huron),
Davis,	Pelletier,
Denison,	Prior,
Dugas,	Reid,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Dyer,	Rosamond,
Earle,	Ross (Dundas),
Fairbairn,	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ryckman,

Foster,	Sproule,
Fréchette,	Stairs,
Gillies,	Stevenson,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),	Taylor,
Grandbois,	Temple,
Guillet,	Turcotte,
Haggart,	Tyrwhitt,
Hearn,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Weldon,
Hodgins,	White (Cardwell),
Hutchins,	White (Shelburne),
Ingram,	Wood (Brockville),
Jeannotte,	Wood (Westmoreland).—87.
Joncas.	

Amendment negatived, and House proceeded to consider the amendments.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the amendment made by the Senate in line 16 be disagreed to, for the reason that it is against public policy that husbands or wives should be allowed to disclose conversations between them during marriage.

I understand if this motion is carried, it does not defeat the Bill, but that its effect will be that the resolution is transmitted to the Senate for consideration by them.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the amendment made by the Senate in line 18 be disagreed to on the same ground.

Amendment agreed to.

On the fourth amendment,

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it in order to amend at this stage?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is perfectly in order to propose an amendment to the amendment made by the other House, provided it is consequent upon or relates to the amendment under consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the Bill as introduced by Mr. Cameron, some years ago, which received the approval of the Minister of Justice, there was also a provision that the failure of the wife or husband to testify should not be made the subject of comment by counsel or judge. The object is to prevent any comments going to the jury at all. I move that the words "or the judge" be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CURRAN moved that a Message be communicated to the Senate giving the reasons for the disagreement of this House with the amendments made by the Senate to this Bill.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HAGGART moved second reading of Bill (No. 127) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the motion passes, I wish to put myself on record with reference to the vote to the Nova Scotia Central Railway. The hon. gentleman was

kind enough to send me the papers on which he came to the conclusion that the Justice Department have passed the opinion that this money should be paid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway and not to the purchaser under the trustee deed. There is no such deduction to be drawn from those papers. The Department of Justice had not before them at all the fact of the sale by the trustees. There could be no question at all, on the papers submitted to the department, as to what opinion they should give. They merely had a power of attorney from the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company authorizing Messrs. Eisenhauer & Wade to draw the money, they also had a revocation of that power of attorney, and with those two documents they had a telegram from the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). They gave their opinion that the power of attorney having been revoked, the money must be paid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company to whom it was voted. That is all plain sailing. But now we come to this point which has not been, so far as the papers show, submitted to the Department of Justice at all. That road was bonded to secure advances made by some of the banks. The road was put in the hands of a trustee to whom a mortgage deed was given. That mortgage deed is not before the House, the House may assume that, like all other mortgage deeds, it conveys the property and franchise and rights of the company. There can be no possible doubt on that point. If that mortgage deed does convey the road, its franchise, and the rights of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, to the trustees, then when the trustee sold, the purchaser took from him all and every the rights of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company. Among these is the right to receive the balance of the subsidy. It does seem on its face most monstrous, when the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company is a bankrupt company whose property has been given to a third party, that that third party, who has got the rights, the property and the franchise of that bankrupt company, is not to receive from this Government the balance of the subsidy, but the bankrupt company is to receive it. On what possible ground of law or justice can that money be paid to a bankrupt company? They have ceased to exist for all practical purposes; their property, rights and franchise have been sold to a purchaser. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to take power in that Bill to have a fresh investigation into this matter. I would suggest that his Bill should read: "That it should be paid to the Nova Scotia Railway or to such persons as the Railway Department may find entitled to receive the money." I do not think hon. gentlemen will object to that amendment. I have no interest in the world in this matter, but I have read these papers and I listened very closely to the statements made on both sides, and I have come to the conclusion that if this item

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

is passed in such form that the money must be paid over to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, the department being allowed no discretion, injustice might be done. I do not mean to say that injustice will necessarily be done. I say it might be done. I ask the hon. gentleman in the face of these facts, to amend the Bill in the direction I have suggested and to take power to give the money to the railway company or to such other person as may be entitled to it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am quite satisfied that if the hon. gentleman had looked into this matter more closely his opinion would be entirely different from that he has expressed. I hold in my hand a copy of the mortgage deed under which this property was sold. The hon. gentleman may examine it. A document similar to this was before the department. Under that deed the trust company have no right whatever to the subsidies. It was under that deed that Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer got their present title to the road. The contract with the Government was made by the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company. Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer had nothing whatever to do with the contract. Under the contract the money was paid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company. That company gave a power of attorney to the Halifax Banking Company to draw that money. After a large proportion of it had been paid and a small balance only remained, then, by some arrangement between Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer and the Halifax Banking Company, the mortgage was foreclosed, though the road was entirely built, and the title vested in Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer in that way. Hon. members seem to think that the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company put no money into the enterprise. That is an entire mistake. This Nova Scotia Central Railway Company are the sufferers in the transaction. At present Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer have a well-constructed road which furnishes them the wherewith to get back every dollar of their money, and, if Mr. Eisenhauer's idea were carried out, I believe they would get every dollar with interest and considerable commissions. But the idea is to make a big thing out of it, to the sacrifice of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company whose members have put something like \$140,000 in hard cash into the enterprise, for which they have not one vestige of security, the whole security having been taken over for the benefit of Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer. I verily believe, as I said on a former occasion, that all Mr. Eisenhauer wants to get out of this is the amount of money he put into it. But there are other persons who are driving him on and who are endeavouring to get the property and sell it so that they may make a larger amount out of it, to the sacrifice of the members of the company, some of whom are to-day in a penniless condition by the reason of the road being in its present position. I would like hon.

members to understand that there is still a lawsuit pending with reference to this subject. My own opinion is—though I do not put it forward as carrying weight in this matter, but it is also the opinion of the Department of Justice—that the Government have only to deal with the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, because that mortgage does not cover the subsidy, which subsidy was granted for the purpose of constructing the road. The mortgage does not cover the subsidy by any manner of means. The matter was brought up in the court and it was decided that the mortgage did not cover the subsidy. The Government made the contract with the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, and the subsidy is to be paid to them. That is what the Department of Justice has decided, and I think they have decided rightly.

Mr. HAGGART. Even if the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is correct, the suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will not alter the position at all. If the subsidy was not conveyed under that deed of trust to Mr. Eisenhauer, the amendment will not alter their position in any way. I do not see any objection to the amendment, which will leave the case to be submitted to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) to the extraordinary character of the position he takes. It is admitted that a contract was made by the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company; but that company is no longer in existence; it is bankrupt, and the road is in the hands of a receiver. But the hon. gentleman claims that the company is entitled to this subsidy because the members have put cash into the enterprise. But these subsidies are part of the assets of the company, and under the circumstances must, like the other assets, go to the benefit of the creditors. The doctrine of the hon. gentleman is a most monstrous one, that a company which is bankrupt should take part of its assets and keep them to the detriment of its creditors. The suggestion of my hon. friend is the only right one: that the Minister of Justice should decide whether the money should go to the bankrupt company or to the creditors who, as well as the members of the company, have put their money into the enterprise.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) to say that the courts had decided that the subsidies were not transferred to Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer as part of their security. I have here an extract from the order of the court, which is found among the papers laid on the Table by the hon. Minister, the order of the Supreme Court of the court of Nova Scotia or of one of its judges on the 5th of

May, 1891. It decides that the receiver of the road shall have and receive all the assets of the company, including all the moneys receivable from individuals, corporations or Governments. That does not look very much as if the statement made by my hon. friend from Annapolis was correct. On the contrary, the court orders that any sums of money due from the Government shall be payable to the defendant. But the hon. gentleman has said that the case is not fully decided, that the suit is still pending. Surely, if that be true, the hon. gentleman would not urge the Government to pay over these moneys in advance of the decision of the suit. That is certainly an argument against his intention. The hon. gentleman says that the members of this company have expended a large sum of money. That may have been true in the early stages of the road. This road has been under construction for a great many years.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). There is more than one company. This is the last company that has come into the control of the road. I understand this road has been on the carpet for the last eighteen years.

Mr. BORDEN. But I understand there is a close connection between the two companies. The same man, Mr. Stern, is president of this who was president of the former company. Practically this is the same company. It is true a certain amount of money was spent by them in the early stages of the road, ten or fifteen years ago; but I believe it is equally true that not one dollar has been spent by this company in the construction of this road since this Dominion subsidy, about which the suit is pending, was granted. As a matter of fact, that subsidy was assigned to Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer, or at any rate a power of attorney was given to the Halifax Banking Company, by which they were to receive this subsidy from the Government as fast as it was earned. On the strength of that power of attorney, Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer gave their obligations to the bank, and the bank advanced the money out of which this road was built. Now, the bank contends that this company had no right to revoke that power of attorney, that they would not have advanced this money, had it not been for the power of attorney, and it is a monstrous thing to say that, after a solemn engagement has been entered into like this, and a sum of \$400,000 or \$500,000 has been paid on the faith of this power of attorney, that they could turn around and revoke that power of attorney. It is a monstrous thing, and whether it is legal or not, certainly it was not a just or proper act, and not one that this Government should encourage. I have here a telegram from Mr. Wade, to this effect:

Notice discussion *re* Central Railway subsidy. I hold positive documentary proof that the subsidy was transferred to us, and is ours now legally. I so wired

the Minister of Railways. Please try and get me a hearing.

F. D. WADE.

I am glad that the Minister has consented to the proposal made by the hon. member for Queen's, to insert in this Bill a provision by which the money shall be held until it is ascertained to whom it shall be rightly paid.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I consider I cannot let this motion pass, without entering my protest, now as the other day, when the resolution on which the present Bill is based came up for its second reading. In my opinion, the railway companies should be subsidized in proportion to the difficulties encountered in the building of their roads, as also in proportion to the importance of these railways, from both stand-points of colonization and commerce. The Government, to my mind, should they be anxious not to injure their general railway policy, ought to ascertain that the railways subsidized are not totally useless, and often also prejudicial to the best interests of colonization and commerce. They ought, prior to granting any subsidy, have an estimate of the cost of railway construction prepared by the competent engineers in the employ of the department. Nowadays the Government grant subsidies to railways without knowing whether they will be of any use. I contend that the Government would certainly not have granted a subsidy of \$102,400 to the United Counties Railway Company, had they known that the same company had received a large subsidy from the provincial Government and had they inquired about the difficulties the company was beset with to bring the enterprise to a happy termination. No such precaution was taken. The Government grant subsidies in aid to railways which are of no value from the stand-point of colonization and commerce, and in sections of the country which have already their roads, without asking themselves whether such subsidies will not be prejudicial to the interests of other railway lines as also to the municipalities concerned. The most important railway in the section of the country south of the St. Lawrence, including also my county, is beyond a doubt the South-eastern Railway. We are left without any means of communication with the town of Sorel, owing to the fact that the bridge on the Yamaska River was carried away last year, at the breaking of the ice. The hon. Minister should, previous to granting so large a subsidy to the United Counties Railway, have inquired whether it was not preferable to grant a subsidy to the South-eastern Railway. I understand how the Government may well hesitate before subsidizing new roads, whose cost of construction would involve the granting of considerable aid from the municipalities; but I do not understand how the Government may allow to remain idle railways that have

Mr. BORDEN.

been operated till within a short time, and which constitute the most important lines of communication in their district. The hon. Minister has been asked to grant aid towards the construction of a bridge on the River Yamaska, whose destruction had left without any means of communication the Richelieu district and the eastern portion of the province. In my opinion, should the Government take into consideration the report of a competent engineer, they could have ascertained that it was better to retrench a portion of the subsidy granted to the United Counties Railway and give it to the company which have undertaken to build the bridge on the river Yamaska, and thus restore to the South-eastern road its activity of old. Under the present law, the United Counties Railway is relieved from building two important bridges, one on the river Yamaska, the other on the Richelieu river, and the whole cost of construction was estimated, last year, by the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), and by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), at over \$150,000. Therefore, this company, to which is granted under the shape of a revote, a subsidy of \$102,400, is exempted, under the law, from executing one-half of the works for which a subsidy had been granted last year. While retrenching this year one-half of their obligations, the Government should also have retrenched one-half of their subsidy, and transported it to the company willing to restore the broken communication between Sorel, the eastern portion of the province of Quebec and the United States, in constructing the bridges on the rivers Yamaska and Richelieu. I do not boast, Mr. Speaker, of being perfectly acquainted with all the sections of the province; but, I contend, that were the subsidies distributed everywhere as injudiciously as in certain portions of the country, I say the Government policy which, in aiding the building of our railways, aimed at the development of our commercial wealth and the opening up of our lands, has been a total failure. Such a policy will also be prejudicial to the Government, in so far as it will thwart many works which the public are enabled to judge of and appreciate to-day, while fostering railways the usefulness of which is still very problematic. It sometimes happens that railway companies which are not of public utility, as, for instance, the United Counties Company, which has succeeded in being exempted from its obligations; it happens, I say, that these companies build the easiest portion of the road, and in order to make the operation more remunerative, they come to the municipalities for aid, and tell them: Your money or your life! as was the case of the United Counties Company in the parish of St. Damase. They will go still further. Should this road have an extension up to Sorel, clever business men will come among our credulous country people, extolling the advantages to be reaped from the building of this railway—advantages

greatly exaggerated. They will even use gold, thrown by the Government into their safe as an aid towards the construction of the road; they will, without any scruple, attempt to corrupt the municipal voters, to prevail upon them to grant subsidies towards perfectly useless purposes. Mr. Speaker, these men thus come among our credulous country people, using municipal corruption, all kinds of subterfuges, their hands and their mouths full of promises; they will magnify the so-called advantages to be reaped, should they be willing to aid such a company—and after exhausting all means of persuasion, as I said a moment ago, they will tell them: Your money or your life! Should the municipalities resist, and refuse to be bled to death for the benefit of these achievers of exploits, then it is that these companies resort to every sort of exactions against the recalcitrant municipalities, as often witnessed under similar circumstances, whenever municipalities showed themselves refractory to the exigencies of the companies. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that, should the Government deem proper to subsidize this work, and at the same time exempt them from the execution of the most important portion of their work—I mean the bridges on the rivers Yamaska and Richelieu—on the assumption that the Government did think fit to liberate the company from the obligation of building these two bridges, which constituted the only portion of the work calculated to give a commercial value to this road, and which is now reduced to the small proportions of a petty local enterprise, having no longer any direct communication with the large centres—I hope, I say, that should the Government think fit to go to this excess of liberality, they will also think fit to seriously consider the lamentable condition of the South Eastern Railway. I hope the Government shall not fail, next session, to see to it that this railway is run throughout the line, in having rebuilt, by means of a liberal subsidy, the bridge over the river Yamaska. Any one conversant with the country is aware that the South Eastern is one of the most important lines of the province of Quebec, and that so long as this bridge is not rebuilt, considerable losses will result therefrom to this section. Any one ever so little acquainted with this section of the country knows very well of what immense utility the rebuilding of this bridge will prove not only for the town of Sorel, but also for the whole district of Richelieu, as regards the shipping of fruit from this district to the United States. I hope the hon. Ministers who represent the province of Quebec in the Cabinet will bear in mind that when the Government could display so much liberality towards the United Counties Railway Company, by granting them this year the same subsidy as last year, after exempting them from building two bridges, the cost of which was estimated at \$150,000, they ought not to hesitate giving the necessary

subsidy to enable the South Eastern to rebuild their bridge on the Yamaska river, and thus restore the broken communications on that line which has a considerable commercial value. The United Counties Railway, as specified in the Bill concerning subsidies to railways, has no commercial importance, nor is it an enterprise calculated to further colonization, as the territory traversed by it is already colonized.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) This Government no longer deserves your confidence.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I do not say the Government no longer deserve my confidence, but were I to place that confidence in any one of the two parties which divide this House, I could not place it in the hon. leader of the Opposition; on the ground that, as I am well aware, he is going hand in hand with the Government and he has urged them to aid the United Counties Company. I know that he has given his full approbation to the granting of a subsidy to this railway; the hon. leader of the Opposition did not raise his voice against the granting of this subsidy, while he exerted himself in throwing obstacles in the way of more meritorious enterprises. I have heard it stated that if some of his friends were directors of a certain company, he would have full confidence in the policy of the Government.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Does the hon. member pretend to be the only good judge of the question?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) In order to judge well a question, in this House as elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, we have not to inquire as to which side belongs the majority; one need only be disinterested, and were the hon. member as disinterested as I am myself, he would see things from the unique standpoint of public interest, and like me, he would find that the subsidy granted by the Government to the United Counties Company is too large, when we consider the nature of the works to be performed in consequence of the alteration in the location of the line, an alteration which exempts them with building two bridges at a cost of \$150,000. I have, Sir, no interest to serve either for or against this company. I consider the section of country to be crossed by this railroad is already greatly benefited by the railway building industry. I am opposed on no personal grounds to this enterprise, only I tell the Government they were wrong in subsidizing it with so much liberality, as it has no commercial value, and furthermore, as by subsidizing it, you enable it to thwart other enterprises already in full operation or enjoying a greater importance. I say this is calculated to create prejudice against the Government in the public mind and tends to make people believe that the Government railway policy is defective. I say the erroneous and wrong applications of this policy as in the present instance, will result in spread-

ing the belief that this policy, which has had beneficial effects in the past, is no longer adapted to our time. And were the Government, through repeated mistakes like this, to lose ground in the public confidence so as to be brought through their own fault to the verge of ruin, and fall down, then there will be nobody to uphold it, and the hon. leader of the Opposition as also the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe will be among the first to applaud the result and to rejoice at the funerals of the Conservative party and Government. I say the hon. leader of the Opposition, as well as all those who urge on the Government in the path of a wrong application of this policy, and prevail upon them granting unnecessary subsidies, will reach a double end; they will favour their own friends and bring about the death of the Conservative party, in rendering them unpopular. I say it is a wrong application of a good policy, and that they who approve of the course followed by the Government in this circumstance are neither the friends of the Cabinet nor of the country. The day when the Government's doom will be sealed, on account of such a ruinous policy, I say on that day, the hon. leader of the Opposition with his friends who invite the Ministers giving subsidies with so little "apropos." will be among the first to reproach them with this lamentable application of their railway policy. I warn now the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), while it is yet time, and I trust the hon. Minister, and his colleagues who represent the province of Quebec in the Government, will no longer grant subsidies without reflection, that in the future they will subsidize only such roads as will have a well established commercial value, such as reported on by the Government engineer. I contend the subsidies ought to be granted only in proportion to the importance of the roads, and to the difficulties to be encountered, and that, first of all the Government ought in every circumstance to acquire information from their engineers as to the nature of the difficulties to be overcome, and as to the probable cost of the necessary works in view at the building of the projected railways, in order that equal subsidies be not indiscriminately granted to all companies, irrespective of all other claims, so as to proportion them, according to the obstacles to be overcome, and the value of the enterprise from both commercial and agricultural standpoint. It happens that railway companies meet with natural obstacles to be overcome which bring the cost of the road somewhere between twenty and twenty-five thousand dollars per mile, whereas, in other cases the cost of the building scarcely reaches five thousand dollars. Would it be fair, in a similar case, to grant a uniform subsidy to all the companies? I consider the House will share my views on the matter, and that the Government will make it their duty to render justice to enterprises of such nature, having a real value from both

Mr. DUPONT.

a commercial and colonizing stand-point. The Government ought also to take into consideration the difficulties to be overcome by the companies in carrying out their enterprise.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the appointment of commissioners to the World's Columbian Exhibition.—(Mr. Foster.)

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron) moved second reading of Bill (No. 118) to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we were promised some explanations on the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This is to legalize certain appointments and certain salaries in excess of the statutory provision in connection with the Royal Military College. Since the college was first established the statutory law has been broken in regard to the number of professors and their salaries, and I am now legalizing what has heretofore been done; but I do not purpose by this Bill to add a dollar additional expense in connection with the college, or to increase the salaries of any of the officers.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. It is provided here that the Governor in Council shall select the candidates in the order of merit. If the order of merit determines their right to enter, you do not require any Governor in Council machinery at all.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There is a Board of Examiners, and the result of the examination is submitted to the Governor in Council.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume that the Board of Examiners determine the merit, and not the Governor in Council. Then, I would suggest that their right to enter be determined by the Board of Examiners. This simply opens the door to the Governor in Council to do a lot of interfering. If you want to live up to the spirit of the matter you will not interfere with the examiners.

Mr. DENISON. There might be some physical disqualification in the way of passing a candidate.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This is the law at present. The only change we make is to increase the number of candidates who may be admitted in one year. The law provided for two candidates from each military

district. We have increased the number of military districts, so that the number of candidates has been, for years, in excess of the statutory limit. We have accommodation for thirty each year. With our ample staff it will not add to the expense to provide for them; and I am advised that we had better make thirty the outside limit. I do not think there will be any divergence from the rule laid down here as to receiving them in the order of merit. That has been the provision ever since the college was started.

Mr. MULLOCK. Perhaps this cast-iron rule providing that not more than thirty shall be admitted in each year, will sometimes interfere with the advantages of the college. For example, you have a teaching strength of 120. Assuming that the students in the senior years will always be present, you will always have ninety old students, and vacancies for thirty new ones. Suppose the ninety did not all turn up, you would have accommodation for more than thirty. Instead of saying thirty each year, you should provide that not more than 120 shall be in attendance at one time.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I think that is a very happy suggestion on the part of my hon. friend, and I will adopt it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt whether there is accommodation at present for the full number authorized by law.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Of course, if we have not the accommodation, we are not bound to admit them.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 128) further to amend the General Inspection Act (from the Senate).

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of this Bill?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is to alter the standard of apples. I may say that the change has been made at the request of the Fruit Growers' Association, of the province of Ontario. The present standard is so high as to be unworkable.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and read the third time, and passed.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS. N.B.

Bill (No. 104) relating to juvenile offenders in the province of New Brunswick, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 11,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg leave to propose the following words in the thirteenth line,

after the word "consent":—"of the parent or guardian of the boy." The provincial authorities agree to this change.

Bill reported, as amended, and read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the inspection of petroleum, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. FLINT. What is the difference between this section and the one for which it is substituted?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It simply lowers the flash test. Heretofore, the railway and steam transportation companies have been compelled, at great inconvenience and some loss, to purchase a high grade of oil. This does not refer to the illuminating oil. They require a special class of oil for their use. It was found that the test formerly in use, and which has been lowered, was the highest of any country in the world, when it was first made. In fact, the legislation went to the extreme of protection in making the test so high. The same reason applies to lowering the flash test from 95 to 90 degrees. From all the evidence I could learn—and I sent for the gentlemen who made the test in 1888, I think—and they all assured me, and I have their written statement to that effect, that the lowering of the flash test would, in no sense, endanger the public safety, but that oil would be just as safe at 90 in the one case as at 95; and, in the high grade oils, they believed it would be perfectly safe to grant this concession.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of that alteration in weights?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The weight is the specific gravity. It was found that the one followed the other. The specific gravity, as I learn, is determined by means of the petroleometer, and the whole test is made by an instrument called a barometer. It is placed in a water bath, and the water heated to the temperature of 62 degrees Fahrenheit, and when the vapour that is emptied off the oil by means of the heat attains 95, and flashes, that was considered, heretofore, the safe test. It is considered altogether too extreme a protection, and, upon a very careful examination, at the request, I may say, of all parties interested, it was considered perfectly safe to lower the test.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I refer to the paragraph whereby he requires that it shall weigh not more than 8.43 pounds, and not less than 8.14 pounds per gallon.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). When distilled, the crude oil has to go through the process of steaming, and the lighter substances are

thrown off until we get a heavy grade. It must be within certain limits of height and depth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was there a standard of weight before?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The weight under the former Act was restricted to S 23 and S 22.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whereas you had 9 of a difference before, and now you allow, roughly, 30?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. The Controller of Inland Revenue told us that these changes are satisfactory to the transportation companies. I have a little suspicion. I dare say it is not well founded, that these changes are the outcome of the reduction of the protection on oil, and that these changes are to affect principally Canadian oils, and not the imported oils. In fact, I am half under the impression that these changes are being brought about at the urgency of the oil producers of Canada.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I assure the committee in all honesty that such is not the case.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows from what sources he obtained his inspiration, I do not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). So far as high grade oil is concerned, this is an old matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know that any member in the House is individually responsible for these technical changes, but I think the public are entitled to know what would be the effect of these changes upon the quality of the various oils that will find their way into commerce.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may say that I went into that subject thoroughly and I found, as I have already said, that the test used in Canada was the highest of any country in the world. Now, anticipating the criticism which the hon. gentleman has made, I took pains to ascertain the tests in the different states. I find that in Maine it is 73; New Hampshire, 73; Massachusetts, 110, flash; Rhode Island, 63; Connecticut, 63; New York, 72; New Jersey, 72; Pennsylvania, 63; Georgia, 73; Arkansas, 83; Kentucky, 83; Tennessee, 92; Ohio, 92; Indiana, 92.

Mr. MULOCK. I should think the tests of other countries would not be altogether safe to follow here, because the tests must depend to a large extent upon the quality of the crude oil.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Not so much as that in the process of distillation.

Mr. MULOCK. Will not the effect of lowering the test be that you will have more
Mr. Wood (Brockville).

inflammable material, benzine for example, in the article that goes into commerce?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am assured on every side that it will not. If I had the least doubt in that regard I would not for one moment have allowed this change to be made.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope the Controller is correct in his views. I had been under the impression that the process of distillation was resorted to for the purpose of freeing the oil of benzine and explosive and objectionable ingredients, and that the higher the test the greater the purity of the oil. If you lower the test, you certainly run the risk of having a lower grade of oil, which will find its way on the market, and as consumers will soon find this out, the Government will be blamed for it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have fully considered that point. I sent for every person who had anything to do with the examination of oil, and I thoroughly satisfied myself that this was a step in the right direction and that advantage would accrue from it.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the advantage?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The importers will be benefited and those who use, for example, headlight oil, because they will be able to obtain oil which is perfectly safe and which has stood the test of ninety degrees and could even stand ninety-five degrees.

On section 8,

Mr. FLINT. This section is more important than any other section in the Act, and it will be received with considerable disapproval in that portion of the Dominion which obtains no advantage from the proposed changes in the law. The Maritime provinces receive a very much larger proportion of imported oils than do the upper provinces. This fact was established by the figures given by the hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden) the other evening. They show that during last year, while the total American oil imported reached 5,776,514 gallons, the Maritime provinces took 2,154,242, or three-eighths of the total importation of the Dominion. Whatever may be the cause, it is an undoubted fact that Canadian oils are not appreciated in the Maritime provinces as are American oils, and accordingly American oils are considered to be absolute necessities. In no portion of the Dominion does the protective policy in regard to oil products cause so much discontent as in the Maritime provinces. Consequently any measure of relief in that direction will receive the support of the people of those provinces. But hitherto we have found that practically no relief has been given except on the matter of inspection. I move in amendment that petroleum may be imported in tank steamers as well as tank cars. Almost all the importations of oils into the Maritime provinces are by water,

which is a more convenient and a safer and cheaper means of carriage. I have here a circular from one of the largest dealers in oils in the Maritime provinces, and in it a suggestion is made that the carriage of oil should be by tank steamers as well as by tank cars. The circular is as follows:—

Heretofore importers were compelled to import oil in American made barrels, not over fifty gallons, on which was paid a duty of (40) forty cents per barrel and (30) thirty cents per barrel inspection fee.

The Finance Minister, in his Budget address, on behalf of the Government, proposed to allow the importation of oil in bulk, but it is now reported for a fact the importation of oil in bulk will be restricted to "tank cars" only.

For the following reasons and in the trade interests of this province we ask your interference and influence with the Government to prevent such restrictions being placed on the importation of oil, and beg you to insist on no law being made that will interfere with the importing of oil in "tank steamers" or by the cheapest route and manner.

1. Owing to the long distance from American refineries, the importation of oil in tank cars only, the change proposed in the law, while benefiting the upper provinces, would not benefit this province or any of the Maritime provinces.

2. The natural route for importing goods from the United States to this country is by water, and in justice no restriction should be placed on oil that is not on other goods.

3. The presumed saving of duty on barrel and inspection fee would be more than taken up by the long distance freight. Thus the consumer of oil in Nova Scotia and the Maritime provinces would receive no benefit by the proposed change.

4. By restricting the importation of oil in "bulk," to "tank cars only," it is a clear discrimination against the Maritime provinces and in the interests of the railroads.

5. The restriction of importation of oil in "bulk" to "tank cars only" would not cheapen the price of oil here, and importing would be done as at present. Whereas, if importing could be done by "tank steamers," the industry of making barrels and the establishment of tanking stations in different parts of Nova Scotia would be accomplished.

If time permitted we could send a strong petition to the Government opposing such restrictions being placed on Maritime trade, as considerable indignation has been aroused by the obnoxious proposition.

Of course the hasty conclusion of the session has prevented the parties interested in the trade from preparing and making to the Government those representations which the importance of the occasion demanded. Consequently we have to appeal to the Government here to allow the privilege of importing oil in tank steamers. This clause also provides that the Governor in Council may designate the places at which petroleum for illuminating purposes may be imported in tanks. Now, I fear that giving the Government this power, as well as the power of making departmental regulations regarding the care and handling of this material, may impose an additional restriction to the disadvantage of the consumer. The complaint is almost universal on the part of those opposed to the high protective duties on oil, as well as on other goods, that the Government, by means of regulations framed apparently for

the purpose of protecting the public, can practically add to the protection by creating various difficulties and obstacles, thus constructively destroying the advantages to the consumers, which the reading of the law would seem to give to them. Now, if oil is to be imported in tank steamers as well as in tank cars, I do not think the power ought to be given to the Government to designate the places where it can be imported. Every port of entry should be a place at which oil could be imported. The clause, if amended as I propose, would read as follows:—

Notwithstanding anything in this section contained, the Governor in Council may make departmental regulations relating to the importation of petroleum for illuminating purposes in tank cars or tank steamers; but all petroleum so imported shall be put into packages, inspected and marked according to the requirements of section 7 of this Act.

If we are to allow oil to be imported in bulk, and if the people of the Maritime provinces are to obtain some advantage from this concession, I think the Government ought to yield to these representations and grant this privilege. The only other concession made to the consuming classes this session has been one which is deemed important to the agriculturists of the upper provinces; but this concession, small as it is, will be, to a certain extent, a concession to the whole public. It will be a concession to the agricultural and all other classes of the Maritime provinces, because an enormous quantity, relatively, of oil is used in those provinces. The people of the Maritime provinces use 2½ gallons per head, against less than one gallon per head in the upper provinces. A mere glance at the figures of the importation of American oil and the quantity of Canadian oil used, respectively, shows that, notwithstanding the inspection fees besides the high tariff restrictions in the way of duty on barrels, and which some claim to amount to 200 per cent, the imported oils have forced their way into consumption, in spite of all the efforts of the Government and the protected classes to encourage the consumption of Canadian oil. We find that in 1880 the quantity of oil imported was less than 1,000,000 gallons, in 1882 it had increased to over 3,000,000 gallons, in 1887 it was over 4,000,000 gallons, and during last year it ran up to 5,000,000 gallons, while the consumption of Canadian oil has remained almost stationary during the last five or six years. These facts, given in a general way, ought, I think, to induce the Government to make the concession to the Maritime provinces proposed in this amendment.

Mr. CHESLEY. There is evidently a difference of opinion as to whether this oil should be allowed to be imported in tank vessels or only in barrels. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has spoken for the Maritime provinces. Well, I am not going to speak for the Maritime provinces. I do not presume to speak for the Maritime

provinces on this question, because there may be quite a difference of opinion in different parts of those provinces upon the question. I think it is enough for me to deal with the question from the point of view of the people of the constituency I have the honour to represent. Hon. members may remember that during the session of 1891 there was considerable agitation in the city of St. John upon this very question, and as a result of that agitation, a petition, set on foot by parties interested in the trade and those interested in the coasting business of that city, was largely signed by the merchants and traders of the city, and also by those interested in shipping, irrespective of politics; and that petition was forwarded to the Governor in Council. I have now that petition in my hand, and in view of the remarks made by the hon. member for Yarmouth, I think it would be well to read it to the House:

ST. JOHN, N.B., 3rd June, 1892.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, Baron Stanley of Preston, Governor-General of Canada, etc.

The memorial of the vessel owners, lumber shippers, lime shippers, and others, of the Maritime provinces,

Respectfully sheweth,—

That the foreign illuminating oil imported into the Maritime provinces has been carried exclusively by our coasting vessels in barrels from New York and Boston to the Maritime province ports up to the present time, to the extent of about seventy to eighty schooner cargoes per year, being a source of very considerable income to our coasting trade.

That if the Bill now before Parliament, promoted by an agent of the Standard Oil Company of the United States, asking for the admission of foreign oil in bulk be made, it will result in serious loss to our coasting trade, as that oil would then be carried in tank steamers, the property of the said Standard Oil Company, who would not only obtain all the profit from the sale of the imported oil (at the expense of established local dealers) as a monopoly of that business by them must inevitably result, as has been the case in all other places where they have obtained the facilities, which the said petition would give them, for destroying all competition, but they would also derive all of the benefit from the transportation of oil in bulk at the expense of our coasting vessels.

That it would furthermore seriously affect the shipment of lumber from the Maritime provinces, as where our schooners which carry cargoes of lumber to the United States ports are enabled to obtain return cargoes of oil, under the present conditions, they can afford to carry the lumber at a less rate of freight than if they had to return in ballast, as would be the case if they lost the oil traffic, and the advance in rate of freight on lumber which would thereby be necessitated, would add to the cost of the lumber delivered in American markets, and make competition in those markets with that commodity the more difficult, which at present is only too formidable.

That it would also add another burden to the lime industry, which our vessels are enabled to carry at a comparatively low rate of freight at present, in consequence of their obtaining deck loads of empty oil barrels for United States ports, which traffic would be destroyed were foreign oil imported in bulk.

Your memorialists would, therefore, earnestly and most respectfully pray that this Bill be not passed,

Mr. CHESLEY.

the passing of which would result in a serious loss to the local capital, and to the advantage of a foreign corporation.

J. F. WATSON,
JOS. A. LIKELY,
D. J. PURDY,
DONALD CARMICHAEL,
J. H. HAMMOND,
D. J. SEELY,
TROOP & SON,
JAS. KNOX,
R. C. ELKIN,
B. G. TAYLOR,
N. B. & H. B. ROBINSON,
MAGEE BROS.,
TURNBULL & CO.,
JOHN A. CHESLEY,
GEO. McDONALD,
R. H. ARNOLD,
TROOP & McLAUCHLAN,
T. OUGLER,
HENRY HILYARD,
JOHN MCGOLDRICK,
GEO. S. PARKER,

E. LANTALUM & Co.,
F. A. PETERS,
W. J. DAVIDSON,
J. P. MALONEY,
N. C. SCOTT,
OLIVER, EMERY & Co.,
WM. THOMPSON & Co.,
E. B. COLWELL,
MILLER & WOODMAN,
J. E. SAYRE,
WM. THOMAS,
Master Mariner.
SCAMMELL BROS.,
G. WETMORE MERRITT,
GEO. F. SMITH,
GEO. F. BAIRD,
VROOM & ARNOLD,
E. MCGOLDRICK,
EDWIN OUGLER,
W. H. MURRAY,
PUDDINGTON & MERRITT.

This petition is signed very largely by the representative merchants of the city of St. John, not only interested in that trade, but in the coasting and lumber business as well. In addition, I may say that the day before yesterday I received the following telegram which I will read to the House:

ST. JOHN, N.B., 28th March, 1893.

J. A. CHESLEY, Esq.

We strongly deprecate any change in regulations to permit importation of oil in tank vessels, or steamers, as it would be prejudicial to the interest of the trade of the Maritime provinces, and would urge all opposition possible on your part.

D. J. PURDY,
WM. THOMPSON & CO.,
TROOP & McLAUCHLAN,
JOS. A. LIKELY,
W. H. THORNE,
F. W. WISDOM,
VROOM & ARNOLD,
TROOP & SON,
DONALD CARMICHAEL,
E. C. ELKIR,
R. C. ELKIR,
SCAMMELL BROS.,
F. E. SAYRE,
WM. J. DAVIDSON,
A. W. ADAMS,
GEO. A. SMITH,
PUDDINGTON & MERRITT,
W. H. MERRITT,
F. TUFTS & CO.,
OLIVER EMERY,
ANDRÉ CUSHING & CO.,
TURNBULL & CO.,
ROBERT JONES,
N. C. SCOTT,
J. HORNCastle & Co.,
G. S. D. FOREST & SONS.

If this honourable House knew the character of the men who signed that telegram as well as I do, they would not hesitate a moment as to what should be done with this Bill or as to any amendment offered to the House to allow this oil to be imported in tank steamers or vessels. This telegram is from the representative merchants of the city, and I daresay the hon. member for Yarmouth is acquainted with many of them and knows many of them by reputation. It is largely signed by gentlemen of his own party, Liberals in Dominion politics, and the reasons set forth in that petition are those which induced these people to send this telegram. We have in the Maritime provinces a large coasting trade with the ports of New York and Boston. Our vessels carry cargoes of lumber, lime and timber of one kind or another to these ports. Competition is keen,

freights are low, and anything in the way of a return cargo helps the vessel out. If she cannot get a return cargo, she must return in ballast, and that is the reason people interested in shipping wish to keep out tank steamers and vessels. On the other hand, the local trade in oil in St. John object to the oil being imported in tank vessels or steamers, on the ground that such a course will destroy their trade. They are residents of the city, they are large tax-payers, and their trade will be destroyed in that line by the distribution of this oil being taken out of their hands. It has been said, I do not know with what degree of truthfulness—I am not personally interested in the trade myself—that if oil were allowed to be imported into the Maritime provinces in tank vessels and steamers the Standard Oil Company would own the steamers, would bring the oil into the Maritime ports in bulk, barrel it, and distribute it, and thus destroy the local trade. That statement may not be worth anything, it may be wholly inaccurate, but they argue that such has been done in sections in the United States where the company have been allowed to bring in oil in bulk in that way. So far as I am personally concerned I am simply voicing the feelings and sentiments expressed in this petition and telegram. These gentlemen who sent this telegram evidently had the provisions of the Bill before them, and knew what they were talking about. They simply say they do not want any change made in the Act which will permit oil to be imported in tank vessels and steamers. When this question was before the House some time ago, I hoped the Government would be able to reduce the duty on the oil itself. This they have not done. They have lightened the burden to some extent by reducing the inspection fee, and I hope they will see their way clear to go a little further and reduce the duty to some extent. That they have not yet done, but the inspection being reduced to 10 cents a package will make a certain saving to the people; and if the Bill passes as it is before the House, I think it will meet the views at all events of the people I represent.

Mr. GILLIES. I regret, to a certain extent, the step I must take to-day in connection with the amendment to the Bill. I declare at once that I must vote for the amendment. I gave my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue notice of the conflict between the Bill he is now promoting and the statement made by the Minister of Finance on the 14th February. And it is a conflict between the statement of the Minister of Finance and the action of the Controller of Inland Revenue to-day that I leave them to reconcile. Now, the hon. Minister of Finance, when bringing down this measure on the 4th of February, speaking upon the very subject legislated upon here, namely, the importation of coal oil, said:

There is a straight protection on oil of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per imperial gallon, exactly equivalent to the 6 cents per wine gallon which was upon it before the present rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per imperial gallon was made. There is, outside of that, a condition imposed upon trade and transport which has the effect of protecting that industry to a large extent, possibly to the extent of 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon, arising from the fact that transport is limited to certain vessels and in certain directions, and that the oil is subject to inspection, of course. This is outside of the straight protection, and what the Government propose to do—

And I direct the attention of my learned friend to this, and ask him to reconcile his action in promoting this Bill with the statement of the Finance Minister:

—and they have thought over this matter very carefully, is to propose to the House that the transport shall be free and that the straight duty shall remain for the present as it is.

I want to know from the learned gentleman (Mr. Wood) who has proposed this Bill, how comes it that he now asks this House to pass a Bill allowing the transportation of this commodity that is used so much by the people, in one way only? Why restrict the methods of transportation? Why in the world, if my steamer—I have no steamer, as a matter of fact—happens to be on the Delaware or any other port where coal oil is shipped, with tanks on board ready to load coal oil for any point in the Maritime provinces, or any port in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, why should I be deprived, or why should any ship-owner be deprived, of the liberty to ship or load that coal oil, while the right is given to the railway, which has coal oil tanks, the same as those on board the steamer, to ship? Is not that class legislation of the worst kind? Why my hon. friend should bring down this Bill I cannot understand. What purpose does it serve? What interest does it serve? Certainly not the interests of the consumer; therefore it must be the interests of class transporters or common load carriers. I would like to draw the attention of the House to another point, and that is that there are oil merchants in the Maritime provinces who do not agree with those mentioned by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley). I could not understand the hon. gentleman's argument at all. He tried to argue a point as to return freights. We are not here legislating for return freights at all. We are here simply to see that fair-play is shown between common carriers, in the interests of the people. The moment we pass this Bill allowing the common carrier by land to carry or transport what the common carrier by water is prohibited from carrying or transporting, we establish class legislation of the worst kind. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to read a letter that was placed in my hands by a party from the city of Halifax. I think if the hon. members from that city are in the House they will recognize the names as being those of persons pretty well

up as authorities, so far as this question is concerned. I believe, for that matter, they are supporters of the present Government, and, therefore, their testimony will be taken as stronger and more impartial. This is a letter from Messrs. Shatford Bros., a very important wholesale oil firm in the metropolitan city of my province, and which I will now read to the House, and will ask the attention of hon. members to the views therein set forth :

HALIFAX, N.S., 4th March, 1893.

J. A. GILLIES, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

DEAR SIR,—We take the liberty of directing your attention, in conjunction with other Maritime members of Parliament, to the proposed change in the importation of kerosene oil.

Hitherto, importers were compelled to import oil, in American made barrels not over fifty gallons, on which was paid a duty of 40 cents per barrel and 30 cents per barrel inspection fee.

The Finance Minister, in his Budget address on behalf of the Government, proposed to allow the importation of oil in bulk, but it is now reported for a fact the importation of oil in bulk will be restricted to "tank cars only."

For the following reasons, and in the trade interests of this province, we ask your interference and influence with the Government to prevent such restrictions being placed on the importation of oil, and beg you to insist on no law being made that will interfere with the importing of oil in tank steamers, or by the cheapest route and manner.

1st. Owing to the long distance from American refineries, the importation of oil in "tank cars only," the change proposed in the law, while benefiting the upper provinces, would not benefit this province or any of the Maritime provinces.

2nd. The natural route for importing goods from the United States to this country is by water, and, in justice, no restrictions should be placed on oil that is not on other goods.

3rd. The presumed saving of duty on barrel and inspection fee would be more than taken up by the long distance freight. Thus the consumer of oil in Nova Scotia and the Maritime provinces would receive no benefit by the proposed change.

4th. By restricting the importation of oil in "bulk" to "tank cars only," it is a clear discrimination against the Maritime provinces and in the interests of the railroads.

5th. The restriction of importation of oil in "bulk" to "tank cars only," would not cheapen the price of oil here, and importing would be done as at present. Whereas if importing could be done by tank steamers, the industry of making barrels and the establishment of tanking stations in different parts of Nova Scotia, would be accomplished.

If time permitted, we could send a strong petition to the Government opposing such restrictions being placed on Maritime trade, as considerable indignation has been aroused by the obnoxious proposition.

By giving this matter your earnest and special attention, you will confer a benefit on the oil consumers of your province, and in the interests of trade generally.

All of which we respectfully submit.

Yours very truly,
SHATFORD BROS.

Mr. CHESLEY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is not quoting from the agents of the Standard Oil Company in Mr. GILLIES.

Halifax? Are these gentlemen not the agents of the Standard Oil Company?

Mr. GILLIES. I think I said from whom the letter was—Messrs. Shatford Bros., of the city of Halifax—and it is not for me or for the hon. gentleman to inquire what particular company they represent. As a matter of fact, I do not know. I state as a gentleman and a member of this House, that I do not know whether the Standard Oil Company has a single agent in the whole province of Nova Scotia, and I care not whether they have or not. I give you the names of these gentlemen; they are men prominent in the trade, and I think it is a piece of—well, I will not characterize the hon. gentleman's interruption as it deserves. But, supposing they were agents of the Standard Oil Company, has that anything to do with the question? The question is simply this: Are we going to legislate here in such a way as will increase the cost of this commodity to a people who are constantly using it? The question whether the Standard Oil Company has an agent here or there has nothing to do with the question before the House. Are you going to prevent a steamer or vessel, built for the purpose of carrying oil into this country, from doing so, while the railway may carry it freely? That is what you will do if you pass this Bill, and that course would be unjustifiable, in my humble opinion. Why should you do it? You must be playing into the hands of some party. If you are not doing that, you are trying to benefit some people better known by the Government, but not named in this Bill. I would like the Minister of Finance to say how he reconciles his action with the words of his deputy, and before this Bill passes the Minister of Finance should answer my question in this regard. In the name of common sense, why has this Bill come down here under his authority, asking us to saddle an untold and unknown imposition upon the people? Why? Simply that some hidden party or other may be benefited. Now, last year we imported into Canada, in round numbers, 5,000,000 gallons of oil, and of that quantity the lower provinces took about 2,000,000 gallons. That quantity, multiplied by 7½ cents, will give you the exact duty we pay. The Government have given us distinct promises that they would reduce the burdens upon the people in respect to the duty upon this article. With this Bill, however, they attempt to go back upon that promise. Why do you come down here on the last days of March and go contrary to the promises you made six weeks ago? I would be sorry indeed to put any views before this House that would not bear the light of day; I would be sorry indeed to make a single statement that could not be borne out by the facts. I say, if we endorse the action of the Government in accepting this Bill, we will be doing a wrong

to the country, we will be stultifying the Minister of Finance and be putting him in a false position; and I would not be willingly a party to that, and I would be sorry if he would compel me to occupy so silly a position. The fact is I would not do it for him or any other person. I say further, that if there is one single reason that can be given in support of this Bill, I will vote for it. I am not making a political question of this Bill. I am not here as a machine politician; I would not remain here five minutes as a machine politician; but I am here to look after the interests of the people of this country, and I ask members from both sides of this Chamber to vote down what I deliberately designate one of the most iniquitous measures that was ever introduced into a legislative assembly.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) says he will support this Bill, if we can give him any good reasons for doing so. At first, I shared somewhat the feelings of the hon. gentleman in regard to this measure, but, upon reflection, I have changed my opinion upon the subject, and I think the Bill is right. I will give the hon. gentleman very good reason for voting for this Bill as it stands. His objection appeared to me to rest almost entirely upon the fact that we were legislating against a certain class of shipping. Well, even if that were the case, we are simply legislating against foreign steamers, in favour of our provincial coasting schooners, and I think such legislation would justify every Maritime provinces member, at all events, in supporting the Bill. But, beside all that, there does not really appear to me to be hardship to the consumers, in allowing the matter to stand as this Bill proposes. The coasting schooners, as the hon. gentleman said, carry oil on their return cargo, and carry it at a very low rate, a rate, I believe, that seldom exceeds 20 cents a barrel, which is not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ cent a gallon. I do not think any tank steamers will carry oil at a cheaper rate than that. The only advantage in bringing it in a tank steamer, would be to save the duty of 40 cents on the barrel, which would be about 1 cent a gallon, or scarcely 1 cent a gallon. That might be an advantage to certain large centres. Tank steamers could only come to large centres, like St. John and Halifax; I do not think they could touch at any other port in the Maritime provinces. A tank steamer carrying freight at this low rate, would have to bring about three months' supply for the whole Maritime provinces in one cargo.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What of that?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I say it can be distributed to the small ports. It would have to go to one or two central ports, like St. John or Halifax, and there, perhaps, people could get the oil a fraction of a cent cheaper. But before that oil can be sold in

any outport, it has to be barrelled and re-shipped. We know that schooners now coming in from the United States, bring oil to all the different outports, in my own county, such places as Moncton, Dorchester and Sackville; they will bring it for about the same freight rate as to St. John. It might be, as I say, some advantage in a central port, where the tank steamer came, but it could be of no advantage to the consumers generally throughout the Maritime provinces to have it brought in that way. The only good I see that could be accomplished, would be to transfer the trade from the provincial coasting vessels to foreign steamers, and I think there is no good reason for us adopting legislation which would even render that possible.

Mr. CHESLEY. The hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has seen fit to read to the House a letter received from a Halifax gentleman favouring the importation of oil in tank vessels and tank steamers. I think it is only fair that the House should hear the petition received from Halifax merchants and others against the importation of oil in bulk by tank vessels or tank steamers. This petition was sent here about the same time as the St. John petition. The Halifax petition uses even stronger language than the St. John petition, protesting against the admission of foreign oil in bulk. I will read the petition:

That in the past the illuminating oil business of the Maritime provinces, both Canadian and Foreign in barrels, has largely been done through the wholesale grocers, satisfactory to consumers, who have been well served.

That the Bill now before Parliament asking for the admission of foreign oil in bulk, is promoted, as your memorialists are informed and believe, by an agent of the Standard Oil Company of New York, and not as the result of any effort on the part of the legitimate traders.

That the policy of the Standard Oil Company has been one of monopoly, and they have done everything possible at each point where they have been located, to kill off competition at any cost. In the United States they have tank wagons, not only for selling the oil in cities and towns, but throughout the country districts, to retailers and consumers, in any small quantity, with the object of destroying competition, and thereby removing trade away from its legitimate channels; and not to cheapen the cost of oil to the consumers, but so as to enable them to increase the price where they have succeeded in killing off competition. This they are enabled to do by reason of their large capital, and ability to establish stations at chosen points for carrying large stocks in bulk; as also by selling below cost, until they succeed in their object of getting control of the whole trade, when they resort to the highest price obtainable.

Your memorialists would therefore earnestly, but respectfully ask that this bill be not passed, the passage of which would result in a monopoly to a foreign corporation at the cost of legitimate trade, and a serious loss to those engaged in it.

Turnbull & Co.; S. S. DeForest; Hall & Fairweather; W. Frank Hatheway; Geo. S. DeForest & Sons; H. W. Northrup & Co.; Geo. L. Barbour; Gilbert Bent & Sons; Thomas Gorman; C. W. Bostwick & Co.; Puddington & Merritt; M. & H.

Gallagher; J. A. Armstrong & Bros.; McPherson Bros.; W. H. Thorne & Co.; F. W. Wisdom; P. Nasc & Sons; J. Horncastle & Co.; B. Vanwart; Robt. Jones; T. B. Barker & Sons; F. Beverly.

These are the views of merchants, and they constitute a fair answer to the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and the hon. member for Yarmouth in favour of bringing in oil by tank steamers.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the hon. gentleman's previous speech that he was against the amendment of the hon. member for Yarmouth; but I now understand he is also opposed to the Bill.

Mr. CHESLEY. No; I am only making those statements to show the feeling of the Maritime provinces.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the hon. gentleman in favour or against the Bill?

Mr. CHESLEY. I am against oil coming in by tank steamers or tank vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. The argument submitted by the hon. gentleman, and supported by letters read by him, applies not only to the amendment of the hon. member for Yarmouth but to the whole Bill. If his argument means anything, it is this, that there should be no importation by tank steamers.

Mr. CHESLEY. I think we are dealing with the Bill before the House as it is, and not with something imaginary.

Mr. LAURIER. Oil comes in on tank cars now.

Mr. CHESLEY. It can be brought in in tank cars from the United States and from Canada.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. In addition to the large petition read to-day, an equally large petition has been received from Prince Edward Island, including the signatures of the shippers and merchants of that province. I need not read it; but I may say that the people who have signed it are people who are largely interested in the mercantile shipping business. There are two reasons why this Bill should pass as it is. The first is, that the consumers of the Lower provinces want the Bill as it is.

Mr. MULOCK. Not the consumers.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. They do; and I may say that not only the vessel-owners, but the consumers will not be any worse off when this Bill becomes law. The only objection ever brought before this House by any representative body is by the Standard Oil Company. I will read a short extract from a newspaper in the United States representing the paints and oil interests, and which represents interests in the United States that are opposed to the Standard Oil Company. It has been stated that the effect of the legislation proposed would be to place the trade in the hands of the Standard Oil Company. If we did anything to advance that

Mr. CHESLEY.

interest we would be stirring up a hornet's nest beyond question, because wherever the Standard Company has taken possession in the United States the result has been that the price of oil has been increased. Let me now quote from this American newspaper, representing the paints and oil industry, whose remarks bear out the statements contained in the petition read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley), as follows:—

We appreciate the fact that it would be policy upon the part of this country to have free entry into Canada for its crude and refined petroleum or any and all other products of our soil and workshops. It would be considered patriotic, therefore, for the "Review" to advocate the abolition by Canada of the duty which the Standard is working to have removed. But in the present instance there is a very large nigger in the wood pile which the public do not see. If the independent petroleum interests here were as powerful as the Standard, and would receive their share of the benefit, it would be quite another thing, and would inure to the advantage of this country; but, as the petroleum industry exists in these United States, the advantages of free entry into Canada would only fill the coffers of a corporation whose existence is a menace to the prosperity of our country, an organization which violates its laws with impunity, tramples on the rights of its citizens, bankrupts all honest competitors that it can, and is un-American in all its instincts.

It is stated that refined petroleum from these states is preferred to the Canadian refined, and is purchased by the Canadian even though it costs ten cents a gallon at retail more than the product of their home-wells. If this is so—if it sells anyway—why need Canada reduce its revenue in favour of a foreign corporation which would use its newly acquired power to crush out all Canadian competition, with the eventuality of charging the public there even higher prices than they now pay?

These statements in the petition are borne out by one of the trade papers published in Chicago. I contend that this Bill should pass, in the first place because the Maritime provinces do not want vessels to come with tank oil, because one of the Standard Company's vessels would supply a whole district in one trip, and the return-carrying trade from the United States would be absolutely destroyed, and there would be no return cargoes, while at the present moment when 50,000 or 60,000 barrels are carried our coasting vessels obtain return freights; and, in the second place, because we would assist the Standard Oil corporation to obtain possession of and control our market, and to do so is to give the possession of the Canadian trade and afford them an opportunity of increasing the prices to consumers, very much to the disadvantage of the latter.

Mr. FLINT. I desire to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley). The petition read and the names given are only valuable so far as regards the weight of argument they possess. No matter how respectable the gentlemen signing the petition may be, their names add additional weight according to the force of the arguments they present. So far as I am acquainted with them, they are fair

representatives of the commercial interests connected with the oil trade. The argument that has been advanced is in the first place against the Standard Oil Company of the United States, of which I know nothing more than the information that is acceptable to the general public. The petitions that have been read to the House were not petitions prepared with respect to this Bill, but with regard to another measure altogether, and that was in opposition to the introduction of oil in bulk, and consequently the value of the petition disappears entirely. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) was under the impression that oil could be imported in bulk, previous to the passage of this resolution; but this is a new position taken by the Government that oil may be imported in tank cars. Is it not exceedingly strange that hon. members from the Maritime provinces are anxious to protect those provinces from gigantic corporations such as the Standard Oil Company, while they are willing to open the markets of Ontario to the same corporations? If the people of Ontario are to enjoy the benefits of the competition of the Standard Oil Company, the people of the Maritime provinces are entitled to that same competition. In regard to the fees paid for inspection of Canadian oil, I am satisfied that they must have been paid in other inspection districts; at all events, it is certain that the bulk of all the oil consumed in the Maritime provinces is imported American oil, and no doubt the bulk of it is the product of the Standard Oil Company. All of this oil comes in barrels imported from the United States, and is either the product of the Standard Oil Company or some other American oil company, and the change proposed, and the permission granted to bring oil in in tank cars will not affect to any extent the Standard Oil Company or any other American company engaged in the business. I desire to point out that both the petitions read were drawn up in the interest of the oil companies of Canada, and the Standard Company, being the principal company in the United States, is held up as a bogey, with which to alarm the oil consumers in the Maritime provinces. Referring again to the arguments contained in the petition, I may say they are the old arguments in the interests of certain classes of people, either steam-boat owners or schooner owners, but, at all events, they are opposed to the interests of the consuming public. I was pleased to observe that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) was careful in presenting the statement of certain petitioners, not to make those statements his own. The interests of the vast bulk of the people of the Maritime provinces, 700,000 or 800,000 people, must be consulted in preference to the interests represented by special classes, such as schooner owners, in the community. It is the old protectionist theory and policy to endeavour to place one class against another, and in the opinion of

such people, trade and commerce may be promoted by setting one class against another. I am not prepared to interfere with the interests of those engaged in bringing in oil in barrels. At all events, the interests of the consuming classes should be promoted. We contend that the concession given by the Government is so small as to be almost infinitesimal, but small as it is, we claim that the people of the Maritime provinces have as much right to that benefit as the consumers in the upper provinces. If, in conferring those benefits on the consuming classes, other classes are obliged to extend their trade in other directions, to make up for the changed circumstances, they must bear the loss. It has always been found, when any important change has been made, conferring great benefits on the people, that if it interfered with the old privileges and advantages, it would be stoutly resisted. I contend that, as regards imported goods, that are absolute necessities, if it is advantageous to the people of the upper provinces to have such goods come in in bulk, whether from the Standard Oil Company, or any other American company, then Parliament has the right to give the consuming classes of the Maritime provinces that advantage, in order not to discriminate in favour of one portion of the Dominion, as compared with the other. I am not speaking in the interests of one class, but in the interest of the whole consuming people, and I believe if the Government will so reduce the burden on this article of commerce, this household necessity in the Maritime provinces, and strike off the restrictions surrounding the trade on this article, they will be conferring a boon on the people far outweighing any injury or temporary disturbance to a small class in consequence of this change. It is on this account that I have moved this amendment, and I trust that the Committee will accept it in the interest of the people of the Maritime provinces.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I may be allowed to say a word in connection with a point which has escaped notice in this debate. The first part of the third section allows petroleum to be imported in tank cars, but the last part obliges the retail merchant to barrel it up, in order to have it tested as to quantity and quality. I would offer the suggestion that leave be given to test the oil in the tank car itself, in order to avoid this barrelling up, on which an inspection fee is collected; for some merchants are provided with large reservoirs where they might directly receive their oil. From the information supplied by certain merchants, the leakage out of a barrel of from 45 to 50 gallons amounts to two or three gallons per month, in winter, and over four or five gallons in summer. It is a waste both for the merchant and the consumer. The means how to avoid this loss would be to allow the test or inspection taking place in the tank cars;

and to allow the retail merchant to receive directly into his reservoir the petroleum as imported. The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) has told me that the Governor-General in Council was empowered to enact a regulation to the effect of remedying the drawback I have just pointed out. I call the attention of the French Ministers to this state of things, and ask a remedy for it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman was good enough to see me this forenoon regarding this matter. I have only to say that there is no objection whatever to allowing the oil to be put into tanks at the point of shipment. That is necessary, because, when it remains in barrels for a considerable length of time, there is a good deal of loss from evaporation and leakage. I may say to my hon. friend that the department has power under section 31 of the original Act to make regulations authorizing that to be done; and at the city of Winnipeg it is done to-day in the case of Canadian oil, which is taken there in tank cars. I can assure him that that request will be attended to.

Mr. MONET. Is it the intention of the Government that such a regulation will be adopted for the whole country?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes; where it is required.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the Government nothing to say with regard to the proposed amendment with reference to tank ships.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think it is quite clear that we are not prepared to accept the amendment. The arguments presented by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Chesley), and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), are quite convincing that it is in the best interest of the Maritime provinces that the Bill should pass in its present shape. With regard to the second point of the amendment relating to the designation of the places to which petroleum may be shipped; I have only to say that this is a precautionary measure. When tank cars come in, the oil cannot be inspected at the port of entry, but it can be inspected at the place to which it is transported; and that being the case, it is very necessary that an officer should be on hand who has sufficient knowledge to do the work of testing. If it were allowed to be shipped to every corner of the Dominion, it would find its way to places where there are no officers of the Inland Revenue Department. As a matter of fact, there are officers of excise in all the large places, and in most of the smaller places.

Mr. LAURIER. I apprehend that the privilege of importing coal oil in car tanks is granted for the purpose of cheapening the cost of coal oil to the consumer. If that be the object, it is manifest that the object

Mr. MONET.

will be still more promoted if the same privilege is extended to ships. This is recognized by the hon. gentlemen themselves; but they state that the Standard Oil Company would be the owners of those ships, and would flood the country with their own oil and establish the monopoly, and then raise the price. But if the hon. gentleman reflects a little, he will see that there is no argument in that. If this amendment is adopted, and the Standard Oil Company flood the country with their oil and afterwards raise the price, it will be open to the parties of whose competition we have heard to-day, to import oil in barrels. That is allowable under the law. Therefore, the very difficulty which is apprehended could be defeated at any time. The argument defeats itself.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand from the observations made by the Controller of Inland Revenue that he and the Government have come to the conclusion to resist this amendment in consequence of the arguments of the hon. member for St. John city and county (Mr. Chesley), and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). I would, therefore, like to ask the hon. member for St. John whether, in urging the House to resist this method whereby the people may get cheap oil, he is offering that advice in the interests of the consumers or not. On behalf of what class does he present that argument?

Mr. CHESLEY. I will tell the House the reasons why I am urging that. They are two. One is that some of the most representative merchants in the city of St. John have asked me. The other is that there is no petition or telegram or letter from the consumers or from anybody else representing them. Therefore, I think the feeling is that the consumers will be fairly well taken care of.

Mr. MULOCK. May I put a similar question to the hon. member for Westmoreland? I am in that judicial frame of mind that I want to know the arguments and the reasons behind them in order that I may arrive at the right conclusion. Will the hon. member for Westmoreland tell me whether he speaks on behalf of the consumers, or what class?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am advocating the interests of two classes in the Maritime provinces—first, the vessel owners, and, secondly, the general consuming public of the Maritime provinces.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not put the general consuming public first. He puts first the carriers, the favoured few, and subsequently the general many. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) does not speak for the consumers at all, because he has not heard from them, and the Controller of Inland Revenue tells us that, although one great class in the city,

interested above all others in cheap oil, the consuming class, are not represented, and have not been heard, yet he comes to the conclusion that they shall still be kept out of cheap oil. The course taken by these hon. gentlemen reminds me of the argument advanced in England against the introduction of railways. The owners of stage-coaches and the publicans who carried on business along the lines of travel were very much interested in keeping up the old state of things, and they got the farmers to petition against the introduction of railways, on the ground that the steam engines, like wild, fierce and unknown animals, plunging through the country, would so terrify the domestic animals that they would cease to be productive.

Mr. FLINT. I wish to emphasize one point, and that is that the only ground on which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Chesley) and the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Lister) objects to this amendment, is that certain petitions are here which moved their minds in that direction. It will be remembered that those petitions are against the provisions of this Bill. They are against the importation of oil in tank cars and strongly against the principle of importing oil in bulk. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Lister), in his able address, in which he reviewed the whole oil question, took strong grounds against the importation of oil in bulk, and although his pretension is overborne by the Minister of Finance, yet, he, in conjunction with his associates from the Maritime provinces, wheels around into line and supports this method of importing oil as best in the interest of the Maritime provinces.

Amendment negatived, and Bill reported.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. FLINT moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third time but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend clause 15 of section 8, by striking out the words "designate the places at which petroleum for illuminating purposes may be imported in tank cars," and substitute therefor : "making departmental regulations under which petroleum for illuminating purposes may be imported in tank cars or steamers."

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Before the second reading of this Bill is carried, I wish to say that while I have not pressed the two-cent-a-mile amendment this session I intend to bring it up next session and to go fully into it and try to carry it through the House. The

sentiment among the people in favour of this amendment is very strong. A Bill of this kind passed the New York Legislature, and in other State Legislatures the question is coming up. I shall bring it up in this House next session.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry that this Bill has come up in the House on the last day of the session. As presented in the Senate it contained one important amendment to the Railway Act which I am glad to see has been dropped, but it still contains some provisions of an objectionable character. I do not intend to weary the House with any general observations, but merely to call attention to one particular clause in the Bill. Like other legislation which will not stand criticism, this comes down at an unfortunate time, so far as the general public is concerned. I refer particularly to section 4 of the Bill, which provides as follows :—

4. Section two hundred and eighty-seven of *The Railway Act* is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

"287. All actions or suits for indemnity for any damages or injury sustained by reason of the railway or the working thereof, shall be commenced within one year next after the time when such supposed damage is sustained, or, if there is continuation of damage, within one year next after the doing or committing of such damage ceases, and not afterwards, the defendants may plead the general issue and give this Act and the special Act and the special matter in evidence at any trial to be had thereupon."

What change in the law is made by that section? It happens that the railway companies have had special legislation from time to time giving them special privileges over and above those of the general public. For example, in the province of Ontario, there are limitations of varying length to actions. In regard to railways, the limitations are much less than in other cases. On what principle of fairness is it provided that the right of action against a railway company shall expire unless action is taken within a year, and yet the cause of action survives for years if it is against any other incorporated company or against an individual. The law, as it is on the Statute-book, is I think, unfair, and if there was to be any change at all it should have been in the direction of repeal. But instead of repealing it you are now extending it. To what degree you are extending it time only can tell; but you are extending it or we would not have the Bill here to-day. The old law was that actions claiming damages sustained "by reason of the railway" must be begun within a year. You now provide for the same, if the cause of action arises "by reason of the railway or the working thereof." What cause of action is not included in these words? Is there any one can tell us the far-reaching effect of that section and why the railway company should escape if the action is not begun within a year, while a private citizen or another incorporated company would continue liable for a much longer period, accord-

ing to the laws of the various provinces. I object to this discrimination. It is very much on a par with much of the legislation that has been enacted by this House for some years past in favour of concentrated incorporate power. Such legislation is unfair and is not worthy of a representative body which is supposed, at all events, to speak on behalf of the people as a whole. I hope the Minister will not press section 4, but that when we go into committee on the Bill he will be content to drop the section and to leave the law in this respect as it is and not increase the privileges or extend the powers of corporations, but leave these corporations as nearly as possible on the same footing with all other contracting parties and liable to answer in damages for any of their shortcomings.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that instead of making the wonderful change of the law which he believes, this Bill is simply for the purpose of making the law clear, as it was intended to be. The first clause makes a mere verbal change, to make it clear that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has jurisdiction over the mode of crossing. The second clause is to make the Railway Act in respect of crossings applicable to lines of the same railway crossing one another. The third clause is to carry out an arrangement made with the Government of Ontario and this Government to leave the electric railway in the Niagara Falls Park under the control of the Ontario Government. The fourth clause changes the existing section so that instead of "all actions or suits for indemnity or any injury sustained by reason of the railway" the words "or working thereof" shall be added. Some of the courts held that "damages or injury sustained by reason of the railway" meant damages or injury sustained during the construction of the railway. This change merely makes it clear what was originally intended by the Act. In the first place, the Bill was intended to cover damages sustained by reason of the railway during construction or after its completion. This is simply to make the law clear.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that part of this clause is "ultra vires" of this Parliament. Line 12 says that no railway shall cross another railway, however incorporated, by Dominion, provincial, or other authority, without complying with certain regulations which this Bill proposes to enact. I do not think that this Parliament can control the powers that may be conferred by any other legislative body upon a corporation that it has created. Each legislative body is supreme. A legislature can incorporate a railway company and give it cer-

Mr. MULOCK.

tain powers and privileges. There is nothing in the Confederation Act saying that, where the Dominion Parliament incorporates a railway, and where the exercise of those powers might, to some extent, interfere with the exercise of similar powers of a company incorporated by a legislature—I say there is nothing in the Confederation Act saying which shall be the senior company, or which shall defer to the other. So, when we say that any railway company, no matter how created, shall bow to their will and observe the regulations we may seek to impose, I think we are attempting to enact a clause that is "ultra vires" of this Legislature. It is true, this provision is not a new one; it appears in the previous Act referred to, but nevertheless, it is equally, I think, open to the objection I have mentioned.

Mr. HAGGART. As the hon. gentleman says, it is no new provision, and it is the only clause which gives us the power of dealing with these matters before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It is thought that the language is rather involved. In the Act it was "unless the place and mode of protection of the proposed crossing." The simple effect of the Act is to leave out "of protection."

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. There is a special regulation in reference to an electric street railway track crossing another, that is all. The regulation is embodied in the general Act, and is only to make it apply to two lines of the same railway.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this provision original with this Parliament?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the same in the Railway Act, except the application to an electric railway.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a difference between applying a regulation to a street railway and a steam railway. We all know that. There are many regulations in the Railway Act that would be quite absurd, if applied to street railways. I am afraid it will be found inconvenient, and I think you will be called upon to modify it in a short time.

Mr. HAGGART. Possibly. I know of no other way than for the car to stop and the conductor to go forward and see that the track is clear.

On section 3.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this electric line of railway to the Niagara Falls Park likely to be used as a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think so. This clause was put in at the instance of the Ontario Government. Mr. Mowat was down here, and, I believe, saw the Minister of

Justice, and he wished this railway to be excepted from the general Railway Act, as they own the park and control the electric railway, I understand. There was special legislation in the Ontario Legislature, which you will remember. This railway had not to make fences or cattle-guards or any of those things, being purely an electric railway. It was thought not advisable to bring it under the provisions of the Railway Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt whether it is proper to except this road from the provisions of the Railway Act. It is a general impression there that it will be used by the Canadian Pacific Railway; in fact, there was sharp practice in getting the charter, and the Canadian Pacific Railway got the inside track of all the other lines. They have laid the line with sixty-six pound rails, which is far too heavy for an electric line.

Mr. HAGGART. I have specially guarded against the road becoming a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because I say "as long as it continues to be an electric railway." They wished the privilege of being allowed to use steam, but I refused to go so far as that.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. Why should this limitation be imposed? A farmer may have stock killed, and he may not be aware of his remedy, or he may not be in a condition to attempt to secure that remedy. I doubt the propriety of barring his action after the expiration of a year.

Mr. MULOCK. Drop this section; it will make a lot of discussion. The words are most comprehensive. They exceed any interpretation that has ever been given to a clause, so far as I know, by any court. The Minister says that the original Act from which it is taken, meant something. Well, it has received a judicial interpretation, and that is the only way we can find out what it means. Now, if the construction placed upon the Act by the courts, was that this limitation of actions applied simply to a road in process of construction, what is it proposed to do? It is a new declaration in the working of railways, that there should be a statute of limitation for one year. According to this provision, any case arising in connection with a person injured by reason of the operating of the railway, must be brought within one year. That is not the law between individuals, that is not the position of private citizens. Why should there be special legislation affecting railways in this particular? Such must be class legislation, legislation in favour of concentrated power, and made at the expense of the many. Take the case of a farmer whose lands are traversed by a railway. That railway company is obliged to operate the railway in a certain manner, and it must maintain the culverts and other works, and fulfil other

obligations connected with the operating of the road. A farmer's cattle may stray on the track, or his lands may be flooded, or other injury may be caused him, on account of the railway company not complying with the law. Yet, under this Act, the railway company will not be liable, as a citizen will be liable, but its liability will cease unless the farmer possesses such knowledge of law as will lead him to enter an action within one year. Every man knows the ordinary limitation of actions, the six-years' clause in Ontario, and shorter dates in other cases; but it is unfortunate that these should be complicated by the present provisions. I hope the Minister will take another year to consider this Bill, for this is due to the public, as the Bill only came down to this House today. This Bill was introduced into the Senate during the present month, and only very recently have its provisions become known to the public.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think there is the slightest doubt that the present law is to the same effect as this Bill, which is, in fact, only to remove doubts in regard to the law. The majority of the judges have decided in this direction, but a few other judges have expressed a contrary opinion.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a communication from His Excellency the Governor-General's Secretary, as follows:—

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
OTTAWA, 30th March, 1893.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor-General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament, on Saturday, the 1st April, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. ST. AUBYN, Major,
Governor-General's Secretary.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. LISTER. Before the business of the evening commences, I ask the permission of the House to offer a word or two in explanation of a matter affecting myself. I do so to-night, because I shall not have an opportunity of doing so again, inasmuch as I am obliged to leave Ottawa in the morning. I consider this as a matter affecting myself, as well as a very large, influential and high-minded portion of the community of this country. In the issue of the "Empire" of 30th March, there is an article headed:

"Slandering the Judiciary," which reads as follows :—

There are some noticeable and unpleasant features in the debate on the Quebec Judiciary on Tuesday. That a notorious and unscrupulous politician like Tarte should take it upon himself to attack and grossly slander the judges of his own province is perhaps not surprising. This rather nasty specimen of the free lance in politics has shown on more occasions than this that his chief, if not only, object is to acquire notoriety, no matter at what cost or what sacrifice of decency. But that a member of Parliament from this province should be so coarsely indecent as to assert, as did Mr. Lister, that "the inferior judges of Ontario have paid for their appointments," is not only surprising, but rather shocking to one's sense of what is seemly and right, especially when it is considered that Mr. Lister is himself a member of the bar. We have no hesitation in characterizing the statement as a gross falsehood and a piece of brutal cowardice in its vague generality. Our judges, and we may fervently thank heaven therefor, are above reproach and need no defence from us. But the gravity of the situation lies in this : Mr. Lister is one of the prominent men in the Grit ranks ; he has conceived this vile slander out of his own imagination, which means nothing more nor less than that in his eyes and in the eyes of his associates it would be quite feasible to appoint such creatures from among their ranks to the Bench as would be willing to buy their undeserved promotion by a round subscription to the Grit party fund.

Now, Sir, it will be seen that the "Empire" makes the statement that I said : "The inferior judges of Ontario have paid for their appointments." The language used there is not true, and if the gentleman who thought proper to pen that article had taken the trouble to read the "Hansard," he would have found I made no such statement. The statement I made was, "inferior judges in Ontario have paid for their appointments," and the statement made in the article is plainly, if there is any meaning at all to it, that I included the inferior judiciary of the province of Ontario in the statement that I made. I desire to say, in regard to so far as the judiciary of Ontario is concerned, as a body, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, in any country in the world, to find a more high-minded, upright body of men ; but I state here to-night, what I stated the other night, that certain inferior judges in Ontario had paid for their appointments. I make the statement deliberately, upon evidence that I believe warrants me in making the statement, that certain inferior judges in the province of Ontario have paid for their appointments. I make this statement under full responsibility of my position as a member of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is proceeding with the indulgence of the House. As my attention has been called to the question of order, I must rule that the hon. gentleman has no right to speak at this time as there is no question before the House.

Mr. LISTER. I understand so, but I will place myself in order by having the adjournment moved, if necessary, although I do not want to do so, for I am just through my re-

Mr. LISTER.

marks. I repeat here that the judiciary of Ontario is composed of as high-minded and as honourable a body of men as could be found in the world ; and I say, moreover, that the man who penned that article was guilty of a wilful slander, and he is a miserable, contemptible coward.

Mr. TARTE. I wish to call the attention of the House to an article in the Montreal "Gazette" of this morning, in which I read as follows :—

Mr. Tarte's is not the best record. Judging by sworn statements of those who acted in the matters, he profited out of the proceeds of two of the worst pieces of corruption that ever disgraced Canadian public life. Notes on which he was responsible, it has been testified, were paid out of the proceeds of the Baie des Chaleurs job, and money obtained from Contractor Whelan as the price of getting his claims for building the Quebec Court-house recognized, it has also been affirmed, was handed to him by the recipient.

So far as the first part of this statement is concerned, what took place was this : after the elections of 1891 I put my name on certain notes, as I have done before many times with my political friends on the opposite side of the House, to raise funds.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is going a little too far.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TARTE. As I was saying, Sir, I put my name on certain notes, the proceeds of which were to raise funds to contest elections and to protect ourselves. Our money was deposited to meet the notes when they would come due. I would do the same thing to-morrow, as I know that my opponents on the other side of the House do every day themselves. Whether Pacaud or any other person paid the notes with his money is not material to the issue, because, I say again, our money was there. I never received a cent of benefit from the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and the editor of the "Gazette" knows it. He is a member of this Chamber ; let him act like a man ; let him rise from his seat and make a statement against me. So far as the second part is concerned, it is a great deal more serious to me than the first part. The impression is conveyed there that I got money to have Whelan's claims settled. Well, Sir, it is known by the members of this House that at that time I was one of their strongest opponents of Mr. Mercier's policy. I had been asked many times to go down to Quebec as the leader of the Conservative party, because our friend Mr. Taillon did not feel disposed any longer to carry on an unequal fight. It is true, that sums of money came into my hands as treasurer of the Conservative party ; but I may say, as one of the great leaders of that party with which I have been so long connected said one day : My hands are clean. I appeal to-day to my former political friends on the other side

of the House to say whether, since I have sat on this side of the House, I have given out any secret of that party. Sir, I have suffered because I have chosen many times to be silent. But there are times when silence is no longer a virtue. I challenge any member of the House here to say that I got money from that man Whelan, who is a fair second edition of Figgott. Money came into my hands, and with regard to it I am prepared to accept a jury of honour, chosen from members on the other side of the House. Money came into my hands; but money went out of my hands—not for dishonourable purposes. I must say, but for legitimate purposes. I have paid money as the joint treasurer of the party—I say again—not for illegitimate purposes, but for legitimate purposes, and the editor of the "Gazette" knows it. He is a malicious man, because he knows that not a cent of that money remained in my hands. He knows, because I am an honourable man that I am bound by those secrets of honour that honourable men never divulge. Well, Sir, I give my word of honour to the House that I never had any financial intercourse with that man Whelan. I give my word of honour that I never had a cent of money knowing that it came from him. I give my word of honour that on the occasion alluded to here I acted with the full knowledge and consent of the leaders of the party in the Legislature of Quebec. I give my word of honour that the money which came into my hands was given to the political organization of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec—to members of the House and to lawyers in connection with making up electoral lists. Sir, I have cheques and books in my possession to prove what I say. I am very reluctant to speak of these things. I have no desire to mention names; far from it. But you will understand readily that I feel strongly about this matter, because the editor of the "Gazette," I say it again, has been warned by leaders of the party opposite that I had acted like an honest man. He knows that I cannot give names—unless I am forced to do it, by an accusation brought against me in the House; in that case I would give names. But I am quite prepared to-morrow to accept as a jury any of the members of this House. Sir, the "Gazette" has many times repeated the same accusation with the full knowledge—I say it again, because it seems to me that it is a shameful thing to do—that I was not free to speak, that I was bound by honour not to speak. I hope that my statement of to-night will put an end to these malicious accusations. Sir, we may change our political allegiance; but I hold that a man who has been something in his party, who has thought proper to change his political allegiance, and who gives out the secrets of the party to which he formerly belonged, is a traitor and a coward. I appeal to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, have I ever been guilty of such a crime? I

appeal to my hon. friends on this side. I am respected by them, because while coming among them I have kept sacred the secrets—although we have never committed crimes—of my political friends of past days—friends whose respect, and even in certain cases whose friendship, I have no doubt retained.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention at first to take part in this debate. But I am glad to see that the hon. member for L'Islet is out of temper, and on good ground too, as he contends that the Montreal "Gazette" has published untruths with regard to him. And I think he is out of temper on good ground; but he ought to bear in mind that this editorial was prompted by the attack directed by him against the judiciary of the province of Quebec. The members of the bench would be entitled also to be out of temper, as they are not at liberty to defend themselves, even outside of this House. General charges are made against them, before the country, and they must be silent. When members of this House feel indignant when wrongly accused, though free to meet face to face their accusers, how much more entitled to complain are they who are not free to clear themselves from unfair charges made against them by members of this House. Even on the assumption that the charges were true, they are, at all events, to my mind, entitled to a fair measure of fair play. When members of this House who are free to defend themselves, against their accusers, charging persons who are not at liberty to exonerate themselves, on the ground not of their being guilty, but of their occupying positions which forbid their doing so. Such members are not welcome to complain of their being open to reprisals. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) is free to justify himself before the country, either in this House or in the press, or on the hustings; he is free to prove that he is not guilty, which I am quite willing to admit; but our judges, what are they to do? They are not allowed to write in the press, to repulse the attacks against them; they are not able to address the people on the hustings; they are not free to come down and speak before popular meetings to contradict aspersions on their character. Discredit is thrown on them, and they have not the least opportunity to deny the charges laid at their door. They could well afford, in their turn, to say, like the member for L'Islet: I challenge you to prove your charges. I say all this is most deplorable; therefore, I seize this opportunity of showing my hon. friend the member for L'Islet what he is well aware of, namely, that it is always a course fraught with peril to attack one's neighbour, be he friend or foe. Who is the man thus struck who could say: As for me, I am not afraid, you may look about me as much as you please; I challenge you to find aught wrong with me. Mr. Speaker, I have always re-

marked this, namely, that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) always preached union, peace and harmony among French-Canadians, in order to make more compact and more efficacious the constituent elements of our nationality. This union he has advocated in the press and before the popular meetings throughout the province of Quebec and we all know he is a gifted speaker, and since his entrance into this House he has gone on preaching this gospel of peace and harmony among our compatriots. Now, what part is he acting? By his accusations against the judiciary, he is preaching the contempt of the most distinguished members of the Bench, of our leading citizens and business men, of our national leaders? Is it through such a course he hopes to consolidate the work of union among Canadians, he has undertaken? I regret to have to tell here the hon. member that his attack, directed the other day against the judges, was a perfect disgrace. We are a people composed of heterogeneous elements; we should always bear this in mind. The members from the province of Ontario are too wary to follow such a course. Why, only the other day, when one of them happened to drop a word leading to believe that the bar or the bench in their province were not above suspicion, and when he understood the construction given to his remark, he hastened to state that his words conveyed no such meaning, that the bar of Ontario was a credit to the whole Dominion. Did the hon. member for L'Islet do as much? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. He preaches a gospel of peace and union among compatriots, but he cares not whether he follows a course calculated to bring down on us the contempt of other nationalities. From the very moment we begin to talk respect for and confidence in our judiciary, we are hastening towards anarchy and revolution. Anarchy begets chicanery, multiplies lawsuits and perjury. They who follow closely our legal affairs before the courts, know something about it. The greater respect our people profess for the Bench, the better they will be, and the less of lawsuits, chicanery and perjury we will have. We ought to join hands to bring about the happy consummation. The other day, when the hon. member for L'Islet brought up this question before the House, I did not think it incumbent on me to address the House, not that I shared in the opinion that the hon. member was entitled to attack the Bench as he did—for I am satisfied, from what I know from personal experience, that our magistrates deserve all our respect, as I feel that more learned, more distinguished, more upright judges could hardly be found sitting on the Bench. Now, as the question comes again under debate, I avail myself of this opportunity—late though the hour, at this last stage of our debates—to say that then, as now, I deplored the attacks made on the Bench. The hon. member for L'Islet ought to repent also having brought these charges, without the

Mr. JEANNOTTE.

proper amount of deliberation and forethought. It is a most deplorable incident in every regard.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) I feel no regret.

Mr. FOSTER. Unfortunately to-morrow is a day on which we cannot work, so that the only hours left are those from now to 12 and a portion of Saturday. I hope, therefore, this discussion which has arisen impromptu will not be carried further than necessary. It might not be improper for me to say that I regret exceedingly that, just at the last hours of the session, statements should have been made such as those we have just heard. The tongue of slander, when used against an individual by name, outside of this House, is an instrument which can deal terrible harm and injury; but it can be met by the person who is slandered and whose name is given. The one who makes the charge can be punished if it be proved slanderous, and if it be proved true, the people can judge as between the two and can visit condemnation upon the person who deserves it. But when a member of Parliament rises in his place, in the last hours of the session, and sets a statement like this afloat, which cannot be investigated in Parliament for a term of six or nine months—a statement directed not against an individual who can take it up and refute it, but generally against one or more of a body of men, not one of whom is designated—he appears to me to go outside the privilege which even a member of Parliament ought to claim for himself. It seems to me that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has done neither his duty to himself nor to the judiciary when he has contented himself with uttering a general charge of this kind, and has not gone further, and done what is plainly his duty to do, that is, impeach the recalcitrant and bring the matter to a speedy determination, so that the whole judiciary may not rest under the imputation under which they must now rest during the recess. For I presume my hon. friend intends when Parliament meets again to do his duty, as a member, knowing that such a thing exists, and impeach the judge, and have the judiciary made pure as it ought to be in this country. I do not think I have taken more time than might be given to me in making these few remarks. At the same time, I hope the discussion will not take too wide a range or a longer time than is actually necessary.

Mr. LISTER. I am very much obliged to the Finance Minister for his attempt to correct or reprove me for what he thinks is not a proper course on my part. I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I think, for eleven years, and it has been my painful duty, during some of those years, to prosecute men in the employ of this very Government. For five or six long months my whole time was taken up in preferring charges against those men and in prosecuting

them before a committee of this House. It was my painful duty at the last session of Parliament to bring before the attention of the House what I considered to be, and what the country considered to be, a gross act of impropriety on the part of a county judge. I have lived to see the men whom I have prosecuted, with the exception of one, reinstated in their places. I have lived to see these men who have been proved guilty of high crimes against the state, go unwhipped and unpunished. There is no man living, who has read the evidence, who has given the slightest passing attention to the evidence, but who must see that the present Postmaster-General was guilty of the highest crimes against the commonwealth of Canada, and I have seen this hon. gentleman, who now for the time being fills the office of Finance Minister, get up in this House and whitewash the most damnable crimes that a public man in this country ever committed. What is there to induce, what is there to encourage a man to bring into the light crimes committed against the state, in the face of a party such as we have to meet here to-day? The man who brings the charges is hounded down as a slanderer, and when the charges are proved, the mechanical majority at the back of the Government get up and whitewash the gentlemen accused, and try to make him out pure and clear of all guilt. I repeat, upon my responsibility as a man, that I can prove that a judge of this country paid \$2,000 for his appointment. Nay, more, I can prove that a postmaster in the employ of the Government paid \$800 for his position.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going too far altogether in saying he can prove that a judge of this country paid \$2,000 for his commission, unless he is prepared to proceed in the ordinary constitutional manner.

Mr. LISTER. I am prepared to proceed in the ordinary constitutional manner.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the hon. gentleman had better do so before making the accusation.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Min—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman had better withdraw the expression.

Mr. LISTER. In deference to your wish, Sir, I withdraw the statement, until I make the formal charge; but I say that the Minister of Finance has no right to get up here and lecture me, in view of his past history. I have done my duty to the country, honestly and faithfully, in unearthing crimes against the state, and I have lived to see this House, by its action, whitewash the culprits and keep them in the highest positions in the gift of the Government. I ask again what encouragement is there to a member of this House to bring forward and prove charges, if the result is to be the hounding of that man, because that is what this article,

written by that cowardly correspondent of the "Empire," amounts to. He has attempted to hound me down because I have had courage enough to stand up in this House and make charges against men inside and outside, which I have proved and can prove by further evidence, if necessary. Does the hon. gentleman want to know the name? If he does, I can give it to him, and if he wants to know further, I believe the money paid went into the Conservative funds of this country for the purpose of bribing and corrupting the electorate. Therefore, I say the Minister of Finance, in view of his past history and past conduct in this House, had no right to get up and lecture an hon. member as to what he ought to do. I know my duty as well as he. I am as responsible a man as he in every sense of the word, financially and every other way. I am capable of answering for damages, if necessary, outside of this House; but I shall not be deterred from performing my duty, as a member of this House, by any lecture or by any threat the hon. gentleman can make against me. I say that the articles written by that scribe deliberately misrepresented a statement that I made, because he would have seen, by a reference to the "Hansard," that the statement I made did not apply to the judiciary as a whole, but only to certain members of it. I say here to-night that the judiciary of Canada, as a whole, is as pure, as high-minded, and as able as any judiciary in the world; but when I say that, it does not follow that in the whole body of judges there are not some unworthy ones. Having said this much, I do not think the time of the House ought to be further taken up by me, at all events in discussing a matter which I am not responsible for bringing before the House, except in so far as I believe it to be my duty to defend myself from the wanton attack of a cowardly ruffian.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

BRANDING DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Bill (No. 125) to prevent the manufacture and sale of filled or imitation cheese, and to provide for the branding of dairy products was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the hon. Minister's attention to this section. I do not speak as an expert, but it seems we are to inflict very severe penalties for what, under certain circumstances, might not be a very serious offence. The words are:

No person shall manufacture, buy, sell, offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any cheese manufactured from or by the use of skimmed milk, to which there has been added any fat which is foreign to such milk.

Does the addition of fat foreign to the milk necessarily produce a deleterious effect in all cases?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes an inferior article—yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am desirous of doing everything that can be done in reason to encourage and protect our cheese manufacture, which is one of the most important we have. Who is responsible for the legal part of this Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that this Bill was prepared by the advice, and under the direction of Professor Robertson for a purpose which is patent in the Bill itself—to prevent the production of the spurious imitations of cheese that are being put upon the market. I am not an expert any more than my hon. friend, but I know that Professor Robertson has gone over the Bill very carefully.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fine provided is "not exceeding \$500 and not less than \$50." That is a pretty severe punishment for what, under certain conditions, may be a comparatively venial offence.

Mr. FOSTER. We might consider the penalties when we come to that clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think the provisions of this section will be found to be just in their application upon all occasions. There is no definition here of what kind of fats may be used to incorporate with skim milk in the manufacture of cheese, and I believe that wholesome cheese can be manufactured in this way if the skim milk is enriched with fats that are not deleterious. This clause would absolutely prohibit the manufacture of cheese from skim milk enriched by any kind of fat whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Anything foreign to the milk.

Mr. CHARLTON. I imagine there should be some definition as to the kind of fat that might be used. Cream is a fat, and other fats might possibly be used that are nearly as unobjectionable as cream. I see that later on in the Bill it is provided that cheese may be made of skim milk, but it must be branded in some way. It strikes me that this Bill is not carefully drawn, and that the prohibition of the use of fat altogether is going a little too far.

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill is represented to be of very great importance.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who drafted the clauses of this Bill, Professor Robertson?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; they are his entirely.

On section 3,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a clause that might, under some conditions, be the means of inflicting very great hardship.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we make the maximum \$200. You must have a pretty good fine or it will not be deterrent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object where there is a deleterious adulteration, but I draw a distinction between mixing the skim milk with innocent substances, and adulterating with injurious fats, and, therefore, I think the minimum penalty ought to be considerably reduced.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time, the maximum penalty ought to be kept up, because, to a large establishment, any light fine would be a comparatively unimportant matter. I would move that the minimum penalty be \$25 instead of \$50, leaving the maximum as it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I approve of the general purpose of the Bill; but we must not forget that we are creating an absolutely new offence, and, under the circumstances, I think we had better guard against the imposition of excessive penalties. However, if you make it \$20 or \$25, I think it would not be objectionable.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the House should take into consideration that a person may be innocently selling this substance believing that he is selling cheese that is not adulterated. It seems to me it would be a tremendous hardship to subject such people to the penalties of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was just going to suggest an amendment to the first clause that would meet the objection that the hon. the Speaker has raised. I would suggest to leave out the words "have in his possession," making the clause read "no person shall manufacture, buy, sell, offer or expose for sale," etc.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be better to amend it so as to read "no person shall manufacture, or knowingly buy, sell," and so on.

Mr. LAURIER. Why not put "knowingly" after "shall."

Mr. FOSTER. A man cannot manufacture this substance without knowing it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the reason this Bill was introduced?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to keep up the credit and standard of our cheese.

Mr. CHARLTON. In some of the western states the character of their cheese is so much deteriorated by additions of that kind that it is hardly saleable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to read an extract from a letter in the "Grocers' Gazette," of England, dated 4th March, and directed to some of the Canadian operators in cheese:

In the first place, great injury has been done to the reputation of Canadian produce, as well as to the

confidence and integrity of Canadian shippers, by the unprincipled conduct of some firms who have shipped New York State and Wisconsin cheese as Canadian.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite in accord with the Government in the desire to protect the high character of our cheese. That is a perfectly legitimate protection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the member for South Oxford with regard to preventing cheese being manufactured in such a way as to commit fraud upon the purchaser elsewhere, and to discredit the cheese manufactured in Canada. That is a perfectly legitimate object. Here the hon. gentleman provides that cheese made from skimmed milk shall be marked, and so on. Now, it may be possible that by using other ingredients a fair article of cheese not deleterious might be made, but here you undertake to interfere with the manufacture of such cheese. Suppose it should really turn out that by the use of something else than the fat of cheese a superior article could be made, why should you, by legislation, interfere with that? I can well understand how you ought to insist upon its being marked, and make it penal for not marking it, so as to distinguish it from other varieties of cheese; but I do not know that you would be doing just right to say that it should not be manufactured at all. This section says:

No person shall manufacture, buy or sell, offer, or expose, or have in his possession for sale, any cheese which is manufactured from or by the use of skimmed milk to which there has been added any fat which is foreign to such milk.

Now, I say that I do not know that a cheese so produced might not be a superior article; therefore we are legislating against the production of something that might be a fair article to put upon the market. When you legislate so as to compel parties to mark their cheese in such a way as to distinguish it from the cheese of other varieties, I think you have gone as far as you ought to go.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says; but in effect he means that a compound article of food which does not contain deleterious substances, ought not to be prohibited, but should be branded, following out our legislation with regard to deleterious food. With regard to the article of lard and some other articles which are compounds, the only restriction upon their manufacture is to label them as such. But I assume that in the case of cheese there ought to be an exception because we are proud and jealous of the reputation our cheese has attained in the English market. I dare say it was in the mind of Professor Robertson that if a compound was allowed in the case of cheese, that compound would find its way to the English market, and come into competition with our cheese, and in that way injure the reputation of our pure cheese.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would call attention to the wording of this second clause. Any other than skimmed milk would not come under the operation of this Act at all. Any ingredient to strengthen, or fatten, or increase the richness of the milk, other than skimmed milk, would not come under the operation of this clause.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Other than fat, you mean.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they use ordinary milk, that is not skimmed milk, and then they can add fat.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Certainly.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order to settle the point as to their guilt, you would have to prove that it was skimmed milk; and if they do not use skimmed milk, if they use good milk, and if they make a larger amount of cheese thereby, although not as good, you cannot reach them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Act does not contemplate going so far. If by any other means they can make an article of cheese from pure milk, the Act does not contemplate any restriction of their right to do so. But I take it that the object of the Bill is to prevent any article made from skimmed milk being exported and coming into competition with pure cheese, even though it was marked compound. It may be the extreme of jealousy; but having regard to the very high character of our cheese in England, I would like the section to be retained, at all events for the present.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and of guarding the high standard of our cheese, but I think the Bill as now framed will not meet that object. Supposing a man uses good milk, and he adds something else to it that will seriously deteriorate the standing of the cheese, but will increase the quantity; supposing he puts something into good milk that will produce a good deal more cheese, but the cheese is not as good, he does not come under the provision of this Act.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Do you mean to say that by so doing it would result in the manufacture of a deleterious article?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt it might.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If so, the present law regarding the adulteration of food provides an ample remedy.

On subsection 2,

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest that the fine be increased, the minimum being \$25.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better keep that.

Bill reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is to be regretted that legislation of such an important character should not have been brought down at an earlier period of the session. We have been unable to give it that attention to-night which it should have received, and I am afraid that the Bill will prove to have been rather hasty legislation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite in sympathy with the object of the Bill, but those who attempt to administer the law will have to recommend changes in several provisions next session. I do not think any magistrate will be able to understand clause 2, with respect to the component parts of cheeses, to enable him to impose a fine. If it is anything else than skimmed milk, the man who is brought before the court will be dismissed. It will be necessary for those who bring the accusation to prove that the cheese is actually made from skimmed milk. If it is not, it does not come under the provisions of this Act at all. The hon. Controller says that it would come under the provisions of the Adulteration Act. It would not, unless it is a poisonous or injurious ingredient.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Not at all. If the substances put into the cheese are deleterious in their nature, it would not come under the Adulteration Act unless the substances are injurious to health. But I fail to see the force of the hon. gentleman's contention. He puts the case of cheese into which, fat, or something that benefits the cheese, is added. The scope of the Act does not cover such a case; but the hon. gentleman is supposing a case that is absolutely impossible. No person in his senses would ever think of doing such a thing.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to this circumstance. The Bill provides that the deduction of six days shall not apply in the case of a member who has been elected during the session; but it does not state that it shall not apply in the case of a member who has been unseated during the session, and the question may arise as to whether a member who has been unseated during the session and who has not lost any days during the time he has been sitting, should not be allowed the six days. I think that cannot be the intention of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know whether it is intended to include the case of a member who, through no act of his own,

Mr. FOSTER.

although elected before the beginning of the session, was prevented from taking his seat owing to some proceeding being taken to contest his right. Is it proposed to take from him the time that elapsed before he was actually introduced to the House? I think we have on several occasions recognized the right of a member---

Mr. FOSTER. That has only been done by an appropriation in the Estimates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may cite the case of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who was elected on the 4th January, but who was not allowed to take his seat until fourteen days after the session opened, although he was here and ready to take his seat. He was the representative of L'Islet, as declared by the result of the election; he was as much its representative the moment the election was over as he is to-day; but because of some proceedings being taken against him, the declaration was not made.

Mr. FOSTER. This Act will not cover a case of that kind.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 126) further to amend the Acts respecting the duties of customs was read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by reducing and remodelling the duties on iron.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would the hon. gentleman consent to strike out the words: "twine for harvest binders," and make it read, "twine, hemp, jute, manila," and so on. By taking out those words he will not interfere with the policy he has adopted, and will include lath yarn, which is very largely used by a large number of manufacturers, who mainly find a market for their products in the United States and have to pay duties on the value of the article which they ship, including this very twine. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that it would not at all affect the principle of his proposition to say, "twine, hemp," and so on, leaving out the words, "binder twine." That would simply widen the provision or rule he proposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to oblige my hon. friend, but I am afraid I shall have to keep that over for consideration until another session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My attention was called to the fact that a large number of manufacturers are seriously affected by the high duties on this class of twine.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

OCEAN STEAM-SHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act relating to ocean steam-ship subsidies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Please explain this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. It is to amend the Act passed three or four years ago, in which were included the China and Japan and Australian subsidies. The Australian subsidy was put in more as a tentative measure as was also the subsidy for a fast Atlantic line, the idea being that these three services together, if they could be successfully established, would make a very excellent outside steam-ship service for our trade. The sum was £25,000 for a fortnightly service or a proportionate rate for a less frequent service. The fortnightly service could not be arranged for that amount of money, and I wish to amend it by making the Bill authorize that this amount of money may be granted to assist in establishing an effective monthly or more frequent steam service between British Columbia and the Australian colonies, including New Zealand.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SPEAKER OF THE SENATE.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 114) respecting the Speaker of the Senate. He said: This Bill was passed by the Senate and affects that body entirely. It is intended to overcome the practical difficulty experienced in the Senate by the Speaker not being able to call some one to the Chair when he leaves, and by the Senate not being able, in the forced absence of the Speaker, to appoint one of its members to attend to his duties during his absence. The desirability of this power being given the Senate, from a common-sense point of view, could not be doubted, but there was considerable difference of opinion as to its constitutionality, and opinions in the Senate are very much divided. However, the Senate passed the Bill by a large majority, and it has been sent to this House. And, although it is somewhat late in the session, it seems to be an urgent matter, so far as the Senate are concerned, and I have taken the responsibility of bringing it before the House and asking the House to give it the attention it deserves and to pass it.

Mr. CHARLTON. How long have the Senate been able to get along without such a law?

Mr. FOSTER. That is scarcely an argument. The mere fact that we have got along in a certain way for a time is no argument against making a change for the better. Such an argument would have prevented the use of steam-ships or electric lights.

Mr. LAURIER. But it is an argument for not pressing the matter now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We all know about how much time the Senate has, during the past quarter of a century, devoted to the consideration of public business, and we know that they have succeeded in getting on without any serious difficulty during that time. If the Government choose to appoint an invalid to the Speakership by commission issued under the Great Seal, upon them rests the responsibility. But, Sir, I cannot, myself, see any necessity for the measure which they propose, even if we have the power to pass such a measure, and it seems to me that we have no authority, under our Constitution to pass such a Bill. And if we were to give our sanction to that measure, and it received the sanction of the Crown, I am of opinion that it would, nevertheless, be a void measure. Now, Sir, to pass a measure of this sort is a very serious business. Let me suppose, for one moment that the courts of the country and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were to hold this measure void. It might have a very serious effect upon the legislation during a whole session, or during a period of two or three sessions. It might have the effect of rendering everything that was done under such a measure a void proceeding. Now, Sir, it is far too serious a matter to be dealt with during the expiring hours of a session, and I think that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House ought to insist that this measure shall stand over until there shall be an opportunity for the representatives of the people to give it the fullest and most careful consideration. Sir, when we look at the practice in the United Kingdom, we find there that, when letters patent are issued to the Lord Keeper, or the Lord Chancellor, other parties are named in the letters patent as Deputy-Speakers. Sometimes three or four parties are so named. And, further, the House of Lords, by the law and custom of Parliament, has power, in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Deputy-Speakers, to name some one of their number to act as Speaker of the House of Lords. The question we have to consider, is not a question of convenience; it is a question of power, of capacity; it is a question whether, under the provisions of our Constitution, we have the power to create by Act of Parliament the office which we propose to create by this Bill. Sir, I can find nothing in the Constitution which gives us that authority. The British North America Act, at the very outset, declares that it is desirable to establish a federal union of the provinces named, and it is also declared

that, in order that there may be such a union, "it is expedient, not only that the Constitution of the legislative authority in the Dominion be provided for, but also that the nature of the executive government therein be declared." There are two things the Act does—it declares certain things that are law, and it enacts certain things that were not law before the enactment took place. All through the Statute you have declarations, and you have enactments, and you have this provision with regard to the Constitution, that it is to be "similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom." And what that is, you are compelled to look outside of the Act to learn. But when we come to the Constitution of the Senate and of the House of Commons, every power under the legislative authority is enacted, and not declared, and, being enacted, it exists within the Act altogether. When we look at section 34, we find this provision :

The Governor-General may, from time to time, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, appoint a senator to be Speaker of the Senate, and may remove him and appoint another in his stead.

There is marked distinction between the Constitution of the House of Lords and the Constitution of the Senate. In the case of the Constitution of the Senate there is no power possessed by any officer, other than that set out: in the Constitution of the House of Lords, the Chancellor is Speaker by virtue of his office, and the Deputy-Speakers are parties named in the letters patent. The Speaker of the Senate is not necessarily a member of the Government; he has no executive functions; his functions are those of a Speaker, as provided in the British North America Act. If the Speaker of the Senate is ill and incapable of discharging his duties, the law provides that his appointment is only during pleasure, and the Government may at any time supersede his appointment, by issuing letters patent to another party. That is what has been done heretofore, and, that being so, I contend there is no way of providing for a Deputy-Speaker in the other Chamber, other than by the authority of an amendment to the British North America Act. The section I have read, section 34, is the only one applicable to the case, and, that being so, if the Government desire that there shall be a Deputy-Speaker, they ought to have come down early in the session and asked the House to join in passing an address to the Imperial Parliament to amend that section of the British North America Act. I point out that, when we desired to acquire power to examine witnesses before our various committees, on oath, we applied by address to the Imperial Parliament to amend the 18th section of the British North America Act. That was the course open, and the hon. gentleman, if he desires to appoint a Deputy-Speaker, if he wishes to take the responsibility of declaring to-day, that a second officer, an alternative officer, is

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

necessary in the Senate Chamber, let him propose to amend this 34th section. He could do that by providing that the Governor-General may, from time to time, under the instrument of the great seal, appoint a Speaker and a Deputy-Speaker, who shall undertake the duties of Speaker, in the absence of the Speaker of the Senate. That could be done. But I would like to know how the hon. gentleman can for a moment suppose that, when the Act provides that the appointment is to be by the Crown, that the appointment is to be under the great seal, that the party must be so appointed to discharge the duties of Speaker, that they can by an Act of Parliament divest the Crown of that power and, in effect, amend the British North America Act. It is true, that, so far as measures are concerned that are within our jurisdiction, so far as we are authorized to legislate, the prerogatives of the Crown being a part of the law of the land, we can extend it, we can restrict it, we can abolish it, if we see proper. But with regard to that prerogative here given to the Crown, it is a prerogative power given under an Act which we are not authorized to amend. There is no authority given to this Parliament to amend the Act; there is no constituent authority given to this Parliament, other than that set out with regard to the election of the House of Commons. That being so, I wish to call attention to another section that seems to be relied upon in the Senate by those who favour the Bill, and that is section 91. Now, there is not a syllable in section 91, from beginning to end, that relates to this subject; there is not a syllable which provides in any way that you can alter the Constitution of Parliament, when the Crown is given the power to appoint a Speaker to the Senate, under the great seal. But you propose to appoint a Speaker in some other way, you are amending the Constitution itself, which you are not authorized to do. There is nothing in the Act warranting such a proceeding. Now, when you look at section 91, you find it is a grant of legislative power, it is not a grant of constituent power. There are a series of sections relating to the Constitution of the House of Commons. Sections 40 and 41 are constituent, and if section 91 had the meaning that some parties in the Senate have given it, then sections 40 and 41 would have been wholly unnecessary; you have a limited power in the Constitution on the subject of the constitution of this House, just as they have the inherent power in legislative assemblies to legislate upon their local constitutions. But when you look at section 92 you find the very first article is the power given to the Local Legislatures to alter their constitution. There is not a syllable in section 91 about the power of this Parliament to alter its constitution. When you look at section 91 you find a number of examples set out which shows the character

of the authority that is intended to be given. The section begins :

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Subject, of course, to the powers exclusively conferred upon the Local Legislature by the following section ; but when you come to read the detailed statement of these powers you find there is legislation with regard to the public debt and property, the regulation of trade and commerce, the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation, the borrowing of money on the public credit, and a number of other ordinary legislative powers ; but there is not a syllable relating to any power or authority to alter the Constitution itself. I think that is perfectly clear. Then when you look at section 18, you have had an interpretation given to that by two very eminent law officers of the Crown, the present Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in England, and the late Master of the Rolls, Mr. Jessel, both very eminent men, and they held that you had not power to pass an Act authorizing the taking of evidence before a committee of this House upon oath. You were compelled to go to the Imperial Parliament and to seek an amendment of that section. There was with regard to that no additional substantive authority sought ; you had power already to examine witnesses ; you had power to take evidence with regard to any matter concerning public affairs. All that you sought was an amendment to the law, as to the mode in which you were to exercise this power that you already possessed. They held with regard to that adjective law, which was not a substantive law at all, that you had not power, by an Act of this Parliament, to confer upon a committee of this House the power to take evidence on oath. That being so, how is it possible, in face of that section which says the Governor-General may from time to time, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, appoint a Senator to be Speaker of the Senate, and remove him and appoint another in his stead, that you propose by an Act of this Parliament to confer upon the Senate the power to appoint a party themselves, to discharge the duties of a Speaker. But supposing that you have power to do this you must have the power to go further, and say that the Governor-General shall not appoint the Speaker at all. If you say that another party shall act for an hour, you can say that he shall act for a whole session, and if for a session, he shall act for all time. And so you could obliterate a section of an Imperial Act by an Act of the Parliament of Canada. Now, I say that you have no power to amend a section of that Act except where the power is expressly conferred upon you in the Act, or in some other statute. How are you going to say that by an Act of this Parliament a man

may act as Speaker of the Senate who is not appointed under the Great Seal ? The Governor-General has the power, under the Great Seal, to appoint one member as Speaker. If he is disqualified by sickness, by imbecility, by negligence to discharge his duty he can appoint another, and the appointment is during pleasure only. But you cannot confer upon the Senate, by an Act of this House, the power to make the appointment. You are in effect undertaking to amend the British North America Act, which is an Imperial Act, when you are not authorized to amend that Act at all. There is a simple course open to the Government. If they had proposed at the beginning of this session an Address, asking for an amendment to this 34th section to enable them to appoint an alternative to the Speaker, as they do in England, or enabling the Senate to make an appointment in the absence of the Speaker, then the Act will be validly done. But what you propose to do here is as impossible as the constitution of a perpetual motion. You are undertaking to create a power by an Act of Parliament which is to supersede a power that is expressly given by the Imperial Act, and which you are not authorized by anything in the Act to alter or amend in any particular.

Mr. WELDON. I will detain the House at this very late period of the session but a short time in urging some reasons in answer to those advanced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and in support of the position I take that the Bill now before the House is well within the powers of the Parliament of Canada. The hon. member for Bothwell has suggested that we have an alternative remedy in cases where we have a well-grounded doubt of our power, and that that is to proceed by address and go to Imperial authorities and ask for such amendment to the Constitution as will place this matter beyond doubt. I quite agree with the hon. member that if, in the judgment of the House, there is strong reason for doubting that we possess legal competence to carry through such a measure as that before the House, we should take the course suggested by the hon. gentleman ; but I shall endeavour to show, and I trust I shall succeed in showing, that, under the Constitution of the Canadian Parliament, as embodied partly in Imperial statutes, and partly in what may be said to be in the nature of common law, we are competent to pass such a measure as that now before the House. I agree with several of the positions taken by my hon. friend in challenging the legality of the measure. I agree with that section 18, and the amendment, adopted in 1875, making the section more clear and definite, and enlarging the powers of the House and its privileges, has nothing to do with the question. I cannot so certainly agree with the hon. member when he argues that section 91, giving Parliament power to make laws for the maintenance of order and good gov-

ernment, and setting forth that a certain group shall be defined legal powers, and a certain other group undefined powers, are all legal powers, and not constituent powers. I could agree with his argument if it was that the sixteen subsections of section 92 covered co-ordinate powers, and the hon. gentleman will agree that, in a general way, those terms which characterize group 91 may be used to characterize group 92. I think, to draw a line between section 91 and section 92 is simply to go back to the powers which we have in old Canada. If it is right that the powers given Parliament in section 91 are co-ordinate with those in section 92, then it is clear that one of the powers in section 92 is, beyond all doubt, not a legal power, but rather a constituent power, for the reason that section 92, subsection 1, says that among the provincial powers set forth in that group, the province shall have power to make amendments, from time to time, to the Constitution, except as regards the office of Lieutenant-Governor. Well, then, if, under the common law, our powers are, in general terms, the same, or nearly the same, as the local powers, the provisions are not legal but constituent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The powers of the provinces were conferred on them by statute, prior to 1867. The powers since that time possessed by this Parliament have been created by compact. The powers possessed by this Parliament, as Lord Carnarvon said, are the result of treaty, and, therefore, cannot be varied, for they are the result of a compact entered into between the different provinces.

Mr. WELDON. It may be that those phrases have been used by some of the members of the British Parliament. But it is within the knowledge of the hon. member for Bothwell, and other legal gentlemen, members of this House, that this question has arisen in appeal cases, and I can specially speak of a case that was heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, from New Brunswick, ex parte Renaud, in which it was distinctly laid down that our Constitution could not be so interpreted. Take the Act as applying to New Brunswick. One of our leading New Brunswick lawyers took the ground that the courts could not construe in a liberal and free manner the terms of the Act as they could those of a treaty, and their Lordships answered that a statute like the British North America Act could be construed the same as any other Act. The hon. gentleman is wrong when he says that the provinces, before the Union were provided with statutory powers. That is not true with respect to New Brunswick, and it is also not true with regard to the province of Nova Scotia. You cannot find those powers in the statute or in the Governor's commission except in a vague and crude form, and I wish here to say that that statement is not correct. I could make

Mr. WELDON.

a verbal argument to show the absurdity of the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell. In section 34, I read that the Governor may from time to time, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, appoint a senator to be Speaker of the Senate. The moment you undertake to construe that Act in a hard and literal fashion you find yourself face to face with many difficulties. If the hon. gentleman were to press me with a technical difficulty, I could raise another one that would place him in a most difficult position. There is a clause stating that the Speaker shall preside at all meetings of the House of Commons—which would go to show that the Speaker was an essential part of the House of Commons. There is no such clause in the Act as regards the Speaker of the Senate. So, if you press the literal phrases and interpretations you are driven to most absurd lengths. Take another section of the Act, section 65. It will be remembered that in the famous Letellier case the point was taken that the Lieutenant-Governor of a province was appointed by the Governor, while his dismissal could only be made by the Governor-General in Council. Surely if there was ever an antithesis it would be that the appointing power was not the one that could dismiss. But every one knows that the law officers of the Crown admitted that the words in the first section were Governor-General in Council, and that they should be read in the same way in that regard as were the words Governor-General. I observe that these sections to which I refer are 58 and 59. The hon. member for Bothwell says this is an interference with the prerogative. In my judgment it does not in any way affect the prerogative. If I know the meaning of prerogative it is the common law power of the Queen or Executive in any country. We do not propose to interfere with that power in any event, but with the power given under a statute, and there is all the difference in the world between a prerogative power which the Crown holds at common law and an executive power which the Crown exercises which is clearly and fully defined in the terms of an Act. In this view no interference is proposed with the prerogative. It must be remembered that the Governor-General in this country represents the Queen, and is the guardian of the royal prerogative. It is his duty to guard that prerogative, and if he considered an Act invaded that prerogative he would withhold his sanction, and the Act would not become law, unless the Imperial authorities superseded his action. So it cannot be said that this measure in any way interferes with the prerogative. And if it does so, it does so by the consent or authority of the Crown which is a party to the Act—not only the Governor-General, but also the Queen herself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I might sit down with that statement and say no more, but I will add one word. In my judgment, you cannot

work a constitution for five millions of people inhabiting half a continent under such rigid and technical ruling as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has laid down. Would it not be a reproach to the makers of the Constitution to say that the Speaker of the Senate cannot leave his Chair for five minutes to take a cup of tea without throwing the whole constitutional machinery out of gear, without making it necessary to close the doors of Parliament and send the members home about their business? What an absurd conclusion this would be. Would you not say that those who made such a law were a set of children and not statesmen? I take the view that we have ample power to deal with such difficulties under the reserve power that there must be in every great body, and under the common law there is power in this Parliament to make provision in such a case as this. I have a memorandum here covering the experience of the Senate during twenty-three years and setting forth four or five cases in which, through death, illness or incapacity, the Senate has been left without a chairman, the difficulty being sometimes overcome by the election of a temporary chairman and adjournment, sometimes going to the Crown for a commission to appoint a substitute. These are the shifts they have been driven to in other times and which, under present circumstances, they cannot escape. I wish, as I sit down, to call the attention of the House and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the fact that this experience under our Constitution is not new. There are other great constitutions that have been enacted by the Imperial Parliament. There is the constitution granted to New South Wales forty odd years ago, the constitution given to the colony of Victoria—not federal, I grant you, but elaborate full, with most minute and particular provisions for the appointment of Speakers, for the organization of legislative bodies and the arrangement of their procedure. This constitution had not been working five years before this very difficulty which has arisen in Canada arose in the colony of Victoria. Opinions were divided upon it. One set of lawyers were strict and technical; they took the view advocated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and said: You have a written constitution and if there is in it a declaration that the Speaker of the Assembly must be elected he must be elected; if it enacts that the chairman of the Legislative Council must be appointed by the Crown, he must be so appointed. But there were other lawyers in these chambers who said: Let us bring common sense to bear upon this question. Is it possible that the Imperial Parliament would give a constitution to this colony made up of hundreds of thousands of people and restrict them so closely that if the Speaker of the Legislative Council wants to go out and smoke his pipe you have to go across the ocean, twelve thousand miles, to petition for an amendment of the constitution before

any person can be appointed to fill his place temporarily? That may be law, but it is not common sense. And their view so strongly prevailed that, to remove all doubts, in the year 1865, two years before our Constitution was born, an Imperial enactment to meet the case was passed. It is known as the Colonial Laws Validity Act. There is a clause dealing with this precise difficulty and giving an excellent, common sense way out of it. Here is the clause which makes it clear that we have the power to pass this Act. The Act is cited in the Law Books as 28-29 Vic., Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865, the 5th section of which reads as follows:—

Every Colonial legislature shall have, and be deemed at all times to have had, full power within its jurisdiction to establish courts of judicature, and to abolish and reconstitute the same, and to alter the constitution thereof, and to make provision for the administration of justice therein; and every representative legislature shall, in respect to the colony under its jurisdiction, have, and be deemed at all times to have had full power to make laws respecting the constitution, powers and procedure of such legislature; provided that such laws shall be passed in such manner and form as may from time to time be required by an Act of Parliament, Letters Patent, Order in Council or Colonial law for the time being in force in the said colony.

And I call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) particularly to these words: "Shall have, and be deemed at all times to have had full power," and so on. There was a difficulty like ours and a solution applied by the Legislature to make it impossible for technical and austere lawyers to say: You must go to England in order to meet any such case and provide for the smooth working of the constitution. If there were any doubt as to the Bill now before the House being within our powers, to my mind, the clause I have quoted settles the matter. What can you say in reply? You can say, to be sure, that the British North America Act was passed two years afterwards. But does it repeal this Colonial Laws Validity Act? No. Is there anything to indicate that it was the intention to repeal it? No. Was it not fresh in the memory of the Colonial office and of the legislators who enacted this Constitution? Yes; it had been passed but two years before. Does it not deal with this precise matter? Undoubtedly it does, for what could be clearer than the words I have read? Then, if the hon. member will follow me, he must show that there is a repugnance between the Colonial Laws Validity Act and this Constitution which makes the second a repeal of the first. That is an unsound view which cannot be sustained in argument. There was no failure in this case and, so long as that Act stands, so long are we relieved of embarrassment in a case like this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not like to be in a hurry when called upon to give my vote on grave constitutional ques-

tions. I would like to sleep over this question. I have a great dread of falling into constitutional man-traps on either side. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he might, with advantage, adjourn the debate for twenty-four hours and proceed with other business.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing to agree to that and to take it up on Saturday morning.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS.

Mr. DALY. When the House adjourned at six o'clock I was going to ask, by the leave of the House, the privilege of presenting the Bill of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), an Act to repeal the Homestead Exemption Act. It is provided by section 3 of the Homestead Exemption Act that:

Any man who is the owner of an estate in fee simple or for life in laud, situate in the Territories, with a dwelling house thereon occupied by him, may register as a homestead an extent of such land not exceeding eighty acres, if in a rural locality.

The Legislature of the territory undertook to extend that to 160 acres, and it has been held by the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, in the case re Claxton, that that ordinance of the North-west Territories is "ultra vires," and this places the people there in a very awkward predicament, and it is necessary, in order that the wishes of the people, as exemplified by the Legislature, should be carried out, that legislation should be had. With this view I am very desirous that this Bill should pass. I had the matter under consideration myself, but there were some legal difficulties in the way and the Bill I have brought down is not exactly similar to that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I will explain more at length in committee, and, with the permission of the House, I will move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DALY. I may explain that the Act respecting the Homestead Exemption Act of the Territories passed in 1886 provided among other things that a homesteader could register 80 acres as exempt from seizure; but the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories undertook by an ordinance to extend that to 160 acres. The ordinance remained in force about four years, and it was only last September or October that the Supreme Court of the Territories decided, in the case re Claxton that subsection 9 of section 1 of chapter 45 of the Revised Ordinances, pro-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

viding that 160 acres should be exempt from seizure under execution, was "ultra vires" of the Local Legislature. Now, by placing that ordinance upon their Statute-book the Legislature expressed the will and the desire of the people of the Territories that 160 acres should be exempted, and in order to carry out that desire this Bill is introduced. It is not intended to repeal the Homestead Exemption Act, as the Bill proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) would have done, but simply to amend section 3 by striking out the word "eighty" and substituting the words "one hundred and sixty."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Indian Affairs \$10,000

Mr. DALY. Since a statement was made yesterday by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), with reference to an account sent in by Mr. Reed, the commissioner, giving the items of certain railway fares and cab-hire on a journey he made to Kingston and the city of Toronto, I have investigated the matter, and I find that Mr. Reed went on that occasion to Kingston on the business of the department to meet the Presbyterian Synod there in connection with North-west matters. I find also that he went to Toronto to meet the superintendent of Methodist missionaries in connection with other Indian matters, at the request of the Superintendent-General, and that his railway fare and the usual charges were allowed by the department. I find further that during that time he was three days on leave, and no charge appears for any expense incurred during the three days he was on leave. I thought it only right, in justice to Mr. Reed, that I should make this statement to the House.

Kingston Penitentiary \$190,443 66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Solicitor-General was to have stated to the House, when this item came up for concurrence, the number of people he expected to employ in the binding twine manufactory, and also the location of the projected asylum and female prison.

Mr. CURRAN. With regard to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, I find a memorandum left by the Minister of Justice, which is to the effect that it is the intention that the female prison shall be erected in the field immediately to the east of the prison, and the asylum on the grounds north of the warden's residence. With reference to the other point, I find an explanation given by the Minister of Justice in the

early part of the session that 40 men are to be employed in connection with the binder twine industry.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 134) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 133) relating to granting subsidies in land to railway companies.—(Mr. Daly.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that, when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned till Saturday next at eleven o'clock in the morning, and that Government Orders have precedence on that day, and that all Senate amendments to private and other Bills be considered immediately on their receipt in this House.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has any more information to give us with regard to the Treaty with France?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a few words to say with reference to the French Treaty. The House will remember the statement I made when that treaty was laid before the House about a fortnight ago. At that time, after having explained the terms of the treaty, I said that, owing to certain points which were touched upon then, I did not propose at present to ask the House to ratify the treaty; that communications had been opened with the British Government and the High Commissioner, with reference to certain clauses and other matters in connection with the treaty, and we were waiting the result of those communications. I may say that those communications have progressed to a certain extent. With reference to two of the clauses regarding which I was in doubt at that time, the meaning appears now to be clear. The terms "Poissons conservés au naturel" and "Homards et langoustes, conservés au naturel," were badly translated, I believe, into English, and I came to the conclusion, in looking them over, that they meant simply that fish in their natural shape were admitted. They are, however, wider than that and bear out the construction given them by the papers laid upon the Table, and the despatches of Sir Charles Tupper, that canned fish and salmon and canned lobsters are allowed in, under these clauses, at the minimum rate. With regard to soaps, I am not clear. The clause, it seems to me, gives entrance to common soaps

of all kinds, although the papers distinctly showed that castile soap was what was negotiated for by the commissioners. I think it is regrettable that immediately upon the statement being made by me at that time, information was cabled to the other side, that I had positively said that the Government would not ratify the treaty, and, upon that information which was not of course correct, certain comments were made and, probably, certain impressions were received on the other side of the water, which, of course, being based on that wrong information, were not correct. It has been stated that the Canadian Government acting in that way, a way in which they did not act, had caused umbrage in London and in Paris, and I am happy to be able to state, that, so far as that is concerned, there is no foundation for the statement. All proper explanations have been made as to what was said, and neither in Paris nor in London is there any feeling which would warrant a declaration of that kind. Parliament will not be asked to ratify the treaty this year. I think it is also well to state that one of the chief points which the Government have to keep in view, is with respect to the favoured-nation clause. Whatever may have been our understanding with respect to all the other clauses of the treaty, as to articles which were to be allowed to come in, it is perfectly true that by our telegram of 12th January we assented to those clauses, whether we fully understood them here or not, and are responsible for them. But, with respect to the extension of the most-favoured-nation treatment, that was never contemplated by the Government, that was not included in our instructions, and, so far as that is concerned, was entirely beyond the wish of the Government. How that came to be, is explained by Sir Charles Tupper in the papers laid before the House. I may say, in passing, that I know no discourtesy is supposed to have been shown by the Government in its action towards France, under the explained condition of affairs, as I am quite certain, and the House well knows, no discourtesy was intended.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the Minister of Finance can be at all surprised, if, after the statement he made two weeks ago in this House, the impression was conveyed abroad that the treaty would not be ratified this session. His language fully justified the impression which was then conveyed abroad, because the hon. gentleman has just told us that the treaty is not to be ratified this session. I am at a loss to understand, notwithstanding the explanation given by the hon. gentleman, and he will pardon me for so saying, what can have been the motives that induced the bad feelings which evidently have sprung up between the Government and their Ambassador at Paris, the High Commissioner in London. Of course, I do not know whether there has been some mis-

understanding or not; but, at all events, the Government have indicated that they have not been fully represented by the commissioner, and the commissioner replied, that except on one point, he has carried out all the instructions of the Government. There is one matter that seems to me to be of more than ordinary importance: whatever may have been the cause of the difference between the Government and their ambassador, the Government have tamely submitted to be rebuked and lectured by their ambassador in a manner unknown to any civilized Government. I think it is not to be found anywhere in the history of any nation that a Government would tamely submit to be rebuked as this Government has been rebuked by Sir Charles Tupper, who has stated openly in the press of London that the Government either must ratify this treaty or resign. It is true we have no official correspondence on this point, and I am not aware that the Government have taken any steps to ascertain from Sir Charles Tupper whether the language attributed to him was uttered by him or not. In my judgment I conceive the duty of the Government under such circumstances would have been to call on Sir Charles Tupper by cable, in order to sustain the dignity of this House and of the country, and ask him whether he made use of such language or not. Of course, it is not my duty to interfere in this family quarrel, because I take it to be a family quarrel after all; but still, if the Government desired to uphold the dignity which belongs to the Government, they would not have tolerated such language as appears to have been used by Sir Charles Tupper. But it is a question for the Government and their ambassador to decide between themselves. As to the merits of the treaty, I have no suggestion to offer, since it is left in abeyance. I understand the hon. gentleman reserves to himself the right to ask the ratification of the treaty at a subsequent period if it be so decided, say next session. As to the treaty itself, I have no remarks further to offer than those I made on a former occasion. The treaty is a very unsatisfactory one, the Government have accepted it, and I think their duty under the circumstances was to have asked the House to ratify it; but the Government think it preferable to wait until another session, and so there is nothing to do but to wait until another session.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware that any exhibition of bad feeling has taken place between the Government and Sir Charles Tupper—at least, I am quite certain there has been no such exhibition on the part of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has shown no bad feeling at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has touched the kernel of the question when he has intimated a doubt as to whether Sir

Mr. LAURIER.

Charles Tupper used the language attributed to him. I am inclined to think that some ambitious and enterprising reporter has very largely added to and extended any remarks that may have been made. I certainly would not feel that any action should be taken until it was known whether the reporter was at fault or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It might have been an ambitious and somewhat disappointed ambassador.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true. But I think the Ministry would have consulted the dignity of the Government of Canada by calling, as could easily have been done, our Lord High Commissioner and inquired whether the language attributed has or has not been used by him. Ample time has elapsed to enable the Government to have communicated with him, and as this language has been repeated from one end of Canada to the other with all imaginable particularity, I think the hon. gentleman and his colleagues should, for the sake of their own dignity, have required an explanation, or at least ascertained whether the statements were true or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Slow haste is the best haste in this matter.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 1st April, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 a.m.

PRAYERS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That the final report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for the current session be now adopted, in so far as the recommendation therein contained relates to the printing and distribution of the report itself, notwithstanding that it has not been recommended by the Printing Committee.

He said: I am obliged to make this motion, because the Printing Committee has not had a meeting since the report was submitted to the House, and, therefore, they could not deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the rule will have to be suspended.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, as you say, Mr. Speaker, the rule would have to be suspended, but there is another feature of the case which, I think, the House ought to consider. If I recollect aright, the recommendation of the Committee gives a very large

order for the printing of the agricultural reports.

Mr. SPROULE. This does not refer to either the Agriculture or Dairy Commissioner's report. It refers to the Committee's work only.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the hon. gentleman's report is modified to the extent of recommending simply with reference to the Committee's own report, the printing of one hundred thousand copies. If the House would favour the idea, I would have no objection for my part to agreeing to the suspension of the rules to move to authorize the printing of fifty thousand copies of the committee's report. That is still a large order, taking into consideration that two hundred thousand copies of the Agriculture and Dairy reports have been ordered.

Mr. FLINT. How many pages will it cover?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is a very large report.

Mr. SPEAKER. The evidence will bring it up to about eighty or one hundred pages.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should think fifty thousand copies would be a pretty large order, but that will be as many copies as will be read.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is a very great deal of printing in this Agricultural Committee's work that is repeated unnecessarily, as it seems to me. We have examinations before that Committee of the head of the department and the director of Experimental Farms, and testimony given that is very interesting and instructive. But what they say to us is already dealt with in the reports. A question is asked, and the answer very frequently is: "I have already dealt with that in my report." I think it might be arranged so that a great deal would be saved in this printing by not repeating.

Mr. CARGILL. With reference to the number of the reports, I think the number asked for is little enough. There is a great deal of valuable information contained in these reports, and I have never heard any good reason why the reports should be put into the hands of half the agriculturists and the other half not supplied. Another thing in connection with the distribution of these pamphlets—the same number is given to every senator as is given to every member of the House, and I think that in many cases the distribution is duplicated. I have spoken to members of the Senate upon the subject, and they tell me that they do not care about having any of these reports, and I think if the number distributed to the senators were divided among the members of the House, the distribution to the public would be more satisfactory. I do not think the order given by the committee is an extravagant one, in

fact, I think more of these reports should be printed.

Mr. SPROULE. As the sense of the House seems to be against the printing of such a large number, I move:

That the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for the current year be now adopted in so far as the recommendation therein contained relates to the printing and distribution of the report itself, to the extent of fifty thousand copies, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES AMANUENSES.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention to this House that, having learned that the Internal Economy Commission have granted an extra allowance of fifteen days to the sessional clerks and the messengers, as well as the pages, it was my intention, had I been able to do so, to call a meeting of the Debates Committee in order that we might suggest that the amanuenses of the "Hansard" reporters, who are under the control of that committee, be put on the same footing as the other officials of the House favoured in that direction. But as it is impossible at this late hour of the session to have a meeting, and to have a quorum, I have thought it advisable to bring this matter before the House. The amanuenses work as hard as any of the other officials, and I think they should be treated with the same favour as the others are being treated. I would willingly move that they be paid at the same rate as the others are to be paid, according to the report of the Internal Economy Commission; but, as I understand that such a motion would be out of order, I ask the hon. leader of this House to advise us as to what can be done in the matter, so that these men may receive the same treatment as their brother officials of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see that anything can be done except upon a report of the Printing Committee itself, and out of its own vote. As my hon. friend says that it is quite impossible to get a meeting of that committee this year, I do not see any other course open than for the Printing Committee to take up the subject next year, when they come together, and when they can make a report, which I have no doubt the House will consider sympathetically, just the same as it would were the report made this year.

Mr. LARIVIERE. The hon. leader of the House will bear in mind that the Committee which will exist next session will not be the same as that which exists this session. Our committee is not a sessional committee, therefore there might be some doubt as to what the powers of the committee next session will be with regard to the matters that may have taken place this session.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt my hon friend who has discharged his duties so satisfactorily this year, will next year be upon that committee, and his influence will be felt in that direction.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Will the indemnity be the same next year as this year ?

Mr. FOSTER. The sessional indemnity ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No ; as chairman of that committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose about the same.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

House proceeded to consider amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 99) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to one of these amendments, I wish to say that it does not exactly carry out the intention of the Bill, and the effect of it will be to make the Commissioners appointed by the Government and those appointed by the local authorities equal in numbers upon the Commission, whilst the principle and policy has always been to have the Government appointees in a majority. I therefore move to amend by substituting "11" in place of "10," and "6" in place of "5," before the word "members," and to add the following clause :—

The Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange Association, and la Chambre de Commerce du district de Montréal, shall severally, at a meeting to be held at their respective chambers or usual places of meeting in the city of Montreal, at noon on the first Monday of August (or if that day be a legal holiday, then the next day, not being such a holiday) in each year, elect each one a person to fill the office of Harbour Commissioner ; the person having the majority of votes of those personally present at each of said several meetings, shall be held to be duly elected, and the secretary shall give him a certificate of his election, and shall also certify the same to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the following resolutions :

1. Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, the sum of \$1,471,976.58 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1894, the sum of \$25,191,646.03 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER introduced Bill (No. 135) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1893, and the 30th June, 1894, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Bill (No. 133) relating to the granting of subsidies of land to railway companies read the second time and considered in committee.

Mr. DALY moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In my opinion, a Bill of this kind cannot originate in the Senate, as it makes a grant of land, any more than can a Bill making a grant of money. The Bill states :

1. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Dominion Lands Act, the Governor in Council in all cases where authorized by any Act of Parliament to grant a subsidy in land to a railway corporation is hereby empowered to grant such subsidy wholly or in part in tracts, each comprising a township or a fractional part of a township.

It seems to me that this Bill comes within the rule.

Mr. DALY. This clause is in substitution of section 1 of chapter 12, 49 Victoria, and the whole object of the Bill is to clear up a doubt. The Hudson Bay Company will not give their consent to the townships named, being handed over as railway grants without the company's land being reserved, and it is in order to deal with that feature of the case, this Bill is required. We are not giving any power not already given by this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that it may be held that this Bill goes further than the hon. gentleman indicates. Suppose some grants have lapsed, what will be the position of the matter ?

Mr. DALY. The railway companies in question have never dealt with these lands in any way, and it is simply to remedy the defect in the present Act that this Bill is required.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 134) to amend the Revised Statutes respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. He said : The object of this Bill is to regulate the payment of printing of forms, tickets, &c., for the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island

Railways. These have always been printed, and are more conveniently printed, nearer to the points where they are needed, and the Bill guards the public Treasury by enacting that they shall be printed at no greater cost than they could be printed for at the Bureau. They are to be supervised by the Superintendent of Printing.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are allowing these Bills to go through with a great deal of facility, and I hope the hon. gentleman is not leaving another Bill to be taken up later.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE SPEAKER OF THE SENATE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for second reading of Bill (No. 114) respecting the Speaker of the Senate.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend to force this Bill through. He knows that it is liable to most serious objections. He knows that it is a Bill which under ordinary circumstances would not be allowed to pass this House without a very important debate. He knows that it involves a great constitutional question. Surely, under these circumstances, he is not going to attempt to force it through. I can assure him that if he does, he has not the power to do so. He knows that there are questions of prerogative involved in it, that the probability is that if it passed it would be reserved, and that the very strong probability is that it would be disallowed. I tell the hon. gentleman distinctly that this Bill is not going to be allowed to pass.

Mr. OUIMET. This Bill is nothing more than a matter of the internal economy of the Senate, and I think it would be an act of discourtesy on the part of this House not to pass it and allow it afterwards to be submitted to the legal test to which it must be subjected before it becomes law. If this House wanted to pass a small Bill in order to facilitate its business, I am sure that the hon. member for Bothwell would consider it a great discourtesy to us if the Senate should stop it on a legal point which after all would have to be tested and decided somewhere else. After the legal argument of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) the other night, surely there are very few minds that are not satisfied that this Bill is constitutional, and I would ask that, although it is late in the session, the Bill should be allowed to go through as a matter of courtesy to the Senate, and I am sure that there will be no

reason, from a constitutional point of view, to regret having done so.

Mr. FLINT. If this were simply a Bill regulating the internal economy of the Senate, and involving no important points such as those raised by my hon. friend from Bothwell, the argument of the Minister would be very pertinent and powerful. But, if I understood correctly the argument of my hon. friend, the questions raised by him were of very great magnitude and moment. The Bill was discussed at great length and with marked ability on the same lines in the Senate. A great many members of this House were not aware of the importance of the Bill or of the question raised by it, and it does not do for us at this stage of the session to put aside those weighty considerations and pass the Bill solely on the ground of convenience. I understand that several of the leading legal minds of the House had formed pretty strong opinions on the measure, but owing to the lateness of the session they found it inconvenient to be here to discuss it. I think it will be far better to allow this measure to stand over, inasmuch as it can create no present inconvenience, and it can be brought up again next session either in this form or in a form more acceptable, when it can be fully debated. Probably if the same object could be accomplished by a change in the rules of the Senate, there would be very little objections raised. I do trust that at this late hour of the session the Minister will not press the Bill, because there is no doubt that it would lead to the raising of questions which could only be settled at great expense to the Treasury of the country, and we should be no farther ahead at the lapse of ten or twelve months than we are to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose that anything can be gained by discussing the Bill at any greater length. Opinions differ as to its constitutionality. Very strong opinions are held on both sides of the question in the Senate, and after a full discussion there the weight of opinion was overwhelmingly in favour of passing the Bill. The Bill was discussed here, not at great length, but with marked ability by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and the House has seen these two men learned in the law expressing opinions diametrically opposed to each other. Every one admits, as a matter of common sense and business, that it would be a great convenience to the Senate if the Speaker had power to call a member to the Chair when he was forced to leave the Chamber, or if there were some means by which the Chair could be constitutionally and legally filled when the Speaker was unavoidably absent. It is under these circumstances that the Bill comes before us to-day, and I would be very glad to see it pass. Of course, the rules of the House are rules, and if hon. gentlemen are inexorable they can push their rights to the full. I would like

my hon. friend to consider, however, whether that would be best under the circumstances or not. I fail to see that any great crash or cataclysm can ensue if this Bill passes. It is the intention of the Government, I may say, to advise His Excellency to reserve the Bill, and not give his assent to it here. That prevents anything being done without the review of the British law officers of the Crown. I know that my hon. friend opposite holds very strong views on the subject, but I should be very glad if he could see his way to waive them, and allow this Bill to pass.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I feel so strongly on this matter that I do not think I would be discharging my duty were I to comply with the proposition which is now made. I asked the hon. gentleman a few moments ago whether it was his intention to press this objectionable Bill, because we were giving him great facilities to hurry through the rest of the business, and I understood him to say that it was not his intention to press it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry if my hon. friend misunderstood me. I thought he referred to new Bills coming from the Senate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. I am equally sorry if I misunderstood him, and I must withdraw what I said, as I spoke under misapprehension.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I hope the hon. gentleman will allow us to go back to the Bills we had before.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that is impossible according to the rules of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I am afraid this Bill must stand over.

Mr. McNEILL. As this is purely a constitutional question, as it is simply a matter of law (there being no difference, as I understand it, between the two sides except on this question), there can be no harm in allowing the Bill to pass, and leaving it to be decided by the authorities that must in the end decide it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the House will permit me, I would say there is very great objection to the Bill passing. Let us suppose for a moment—and I could refer the hon. gentleman to half a dozen cases—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should annul the decision given by the law officers of the Crown. In the case of the appointment of a bishop of Cape Colony, it was decided by the law officers of the Crown that the Crown had power, and letters patent were issued, but years after the Judicial Committee held that the law officers were mistaken. Let us suppose that in this case the law officers in a great hurry gave an opinion on this subject without exhaustive consideration, and that afterwards legislation passed by this Parlia-

ment was questioned, and it was found that the law officers were mistaken. What would be the effect of that upon the legislation? It might affect the rights of great corporations as well as important principles of jurisprudence. There is a perfectly clear course to take, and that is by address of this House, asking for an amendment of the 34th section of the British North America Act. I suppose the House might not permit me to enter into a discussion of the subject in reply to the speech of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) last Thursday evening, and I do not undertake to do so, but I shall take the opportunity to do so if the hon. gentleman proceeds with the Bill and the House goes into committee, I think I could show conclusively to the satisfaction of every hon. member who will not give his mind a holiday but will think upon the subject, that the hon. gentleman was wholly mistaken in the opinions which he expressed, and that the statute he read had no applicability in the most remote degree to the question now before us. I could point out that since that statute was passed in 1865, we carried through an old Bill here having reference solely to the point, that is, the question of procedure. We already had the power to examine witnesses; we simply undertook by that Act, to alter the mode of procedure. The opinion of the law officers of the Crown was that that statute was "ultra vires," and yet, if the statute which the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) quoted had any applicability at all, it would have validated that Act. But it did not validate that Act, and we were obliged to come here and address the Imperial Parliament, asking that legislation should be had to enable us to examine witnesses upon oath. Now, it does seem to me that in the face of a declaration of that sort, it would be a most monstrous proceeding to pass this Bill. Ought we to take any risk at all as to our legislation? Even if the Government could get a favourable opinion from the law officers of the Crown, it would not give that security to our legislation which is required. What we require is absolute certainty. We want to know that what we do within our jurisdiction is properly done, and if we had a man sitting in the Speaker's Chair in the Senate who had not received his letters patent from the Crown, but had derived his authority from proceedings of this House, the Senate would not be properly constituted, and would be, in fact, proceeding without a Speaker at all. That being so, I think the hon. gentleman ought not to proceed with this Bill, and I do not think he will be dealing fairly with those opposed to the Bill, after we have furnished this morning the facilities we have of going on with the business, if he presses this upon our attention. The hon. gentleman would never have reached this Bill by three o'clock if he had given us an intimation that it was the intention to proceed with the measure. When we go into Committee on the Bill, I shall go into this

Mr. FOSTER.

question exhaustively, and I will point out as I have not done yet, that it is too late. Besides, I think I can make it as clear as noon-day that we cannot confer upon the Senate the power proposed to be conferred by this Bill. The hon. leader of the House has told you that the overwhelming weight of opinion in the Senate was against this view. The overwhelming majority may have been against it, but the overwhelming opinion of those who are qualified to deal with the question was the other way, and, that being so, I trust the hon. gentleman will not proceed with this discussion, but will wait until the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) are here, and until we have an opportunity to consider this question fully at an earlier period of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will allow me, I feel that I must come to the conclusion that my hon. friend, having stated that he will go into this question exhaustively, rather rules this Bill out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I propose reading the first volume of Hallam to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that in the long speech my hon. friend made on Thursday, he had completely exhausted his side of the question, but if he has yet more to say, I think we will not be able to go further with this Bill at the present time.

Mr. DALY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

COMMANDER BOULTON.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say that I have learned with great regret, and I am sure that many other members of the House share my regret, that the country is to be deprived of the services of such an efficient officer as Commander Boulton. He is a man of great experience, of great practical ability, and has been doing a work which is appreciated in the very highest degree by those who are acquainted with it. Vessel owners and practical seamen in the Georgian Bay or on Lake Huron speak in the highest possible terms of the value of the work that Captain Boulton has performed. I think it is only right that some reference should be made to this matter before the House rises. I hope my hon. friend the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries will add his testimony to what I have said as to the high character of this officer.

Mr. SPROULE. I heartily concur in every word that has been said by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) regarding this officer. I believe every member representing a constituency along the Georgian Bay, who knows anything about the great work he has been doing, are of opinion that it is a great

pity that this man's services could not be retained until the work which he began, and has so far successfully carried on, is completed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have made inquiries in the department with regard to the officer referred to, with a result most creditable to himself. I need not assure the House that we made the change because we thought it was in the interest of the country that the work should be done by the department. I am quite certain that the House will understand that the change implies no reflection upon that officer, whose record is most favourable indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. Whilst the matter has been brought up, I would like to say a word. Commander Boulton was in the service and was conducting the survey when I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I also desire to bear my testimony to the capabilities of that officer, and to the admirable way in which he has carried on his work. I know he has given the utmost satisfaction; he has done a work which will be his best monument. But there is this to be said about it. Commander Boulton has stayed out the term for which he came here, and during the time he has been carrying on the survey, he has had under him some capable young men, one of whom has turned out to be a worthy and, I may say, a successful follower of himself, of whom he himself speaks very highly. This young man last year carried on an independent survey of a part of the British Columbia coast, and did it so well as to merit the commendations of the British Admiralty. I understand that the work is to be given over to him, and that, with Commander Boulton's opinion in his favour, he is in every way qualified to carry it on. Therefore, while we have lost the services of Commander Boulton, for which we are sorry, and for which we are very grateful, it can be said that he leaves behind a pupil of his own eminently qualified, I believe, to carry on the work successfully in the line which he himself began.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not at all question the competency of Mr. Stewart for carrying on the work begun by Captain Boulton, but there is this difference between the two men. Commander Boulton is a navigator, which Mr. Stewart is not; and it is impossible for any one to complete that survey as it ought to be completed, and to lay down the courses as Captain Boulton has laid them down, who is not a navigator. I do not at all question Mr. Stewart's competency as a surveyor, but to carry on a hydrographic survey, a want of knowledge of navigation is a serious defect. It may be said that the master of the vessel is competent for that. Then you have the two heads, a surveyor and a navigator, and which is to rule? Anybody can see that there may be cases where a difference of opinion may occur as to how the works can be carried on. Now the hon. gentleman will have a survey conducted by

two heads, and I think it will be by no means as satisfactorily performed as formerly. I regret that the Government should have taken this out of the hands of Commander Boulton until his work was completed.

Mr. McNEILL. I should have added that the Minister of Railways, had he been present, would have concurred, I know, in expressing his high appreciation of Commander Boulton's services.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is to be regretted that the Government did not retain the services of Captain Boulton. He was, according to all the information we have, admirably well qualified to discharge the duty, and I believe he was a most conscientious, a most upright, and a most painstaking man, one upon whose conduct and upon whose work, the utmost reliance could be placed. That being the case, I think it is a great pity that his services were not retained.

House rose at 1.10 p.m., to resume again at 2.30 p.m.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor-General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

Mr. SPEAKER:

His Excellency the Governor-General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber.

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

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

An Act to give effect to an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and Corporation of the City of Toronto.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."

MR. O'BRIEN.

An Act to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.
An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to amend the law relating to Holidays.

An Act to correct a clerical error in the Bank Act.

An Act to amend the Wrecks and Salvage Act.

An Act respecting the disposal of moneys paid in connection with proceedings before Parliament.

An Act for the relief of Edmund Holyoake Heward.

An Act for the relief of Martha Ballantyne.

An Act for the relief of James Balfour.

An Act respecting the Western Counties Railway Company and to change the name of the Company to the Yarmouth and Annapolis Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company, and to change the name of the Company to the St. Lawrence Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Woodmen of the World.

An Act to incorporate the Ocean Guarantee Corporation.

An Act respecting the Canadian Power Company.

An Act for the relief of Robert Young Hebden.

An Act respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.

An Act to amend an Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund.

An Act relating to the Harbour of Thornbury on Georgian Bay.

An Act further to amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Chilliwhack Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Carriage Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ocean Accident Corporation.

An Act to incorporate the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.

An Act to consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation and Railway Company, and to confirm an Agreement respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway.

An Act respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Automatic Telephone and Electric Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Company (Limited).

An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the British America Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Gas Association.

An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the province of Quebec.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.

An Act to incorporate the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.

An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company and to change the name thereof to "The Quebec and Labrador Railway and Steamship Company."

An Act to amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act.

An Act for the relief of John Francis Schwaller.

An Act for the relief of James Frederick Doran.

An Act for the relief of Annette Marion Goff.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of Timber down Rivers and Streams.

An Act to incorporate the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act to confirm the sale of the Carleton, City of St. John, Branch Railroad.

An Act to incorporate The Canadian Live Stock Insurance Association.

An Act to make further provision respecting Grants of Land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.

An Act to incorporate the British Columbia Dock Company.

An Act to incorporate the Calgary Street Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

An Act respecting the Voters' Lists, 1893.

An Act to incorporate the North American Canal Company.

An Act further to amend the Patent Act.

An Act to incorporate the Calgary Hydraulic Company.

An Act respecting the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

An Act to incorporate the Calgary Irrigation Company.

An Act to incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.

An Act respecting Government Civil Service Insurance.

An Act respecting Witnesses and Evidence.

An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

An Act further to amend the Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act relating to the custody of juvenile offenders in the province of New Brunswick.

An Act to authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act respecting the appointment of Commissioners to the World's Columbian Exposition.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.

An Act further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

An Act respecting the Drummond County Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

An Act relating to the granting of subsidies in land to Railway Companies.

An Act to amend the Revised Statute respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

An Act to amend the Homestead Exemption Act.

An Act to prevent the manufacture and sale of filled or imitation cheese, and to provide for the branding of dairy produce.

An Act respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Act with respect to load-lines.

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

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

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

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1893, and the 30th June, 1894, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service, to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal assent was signified in the following words—

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

After which His Excellency the Governor-General was pleased to close the Third Session of the Seventh Parliament of the Dominion with the following speech:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In relieving you from attendance in Parliament for this year, I congratulate you upon the energy and promptitude with which you have disposed of the duties of the session just ended.

The assembly at Paris of the Behring Sea Arbitration Tribunal gives reason to hope that the differences which have existed between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion are approaching a satisfactory adjustment, while the nomination of the Prime Minister of Canada as one of the arbitrators affords a guarantee that the interests of our sealers will be properly though not unduly safeguarded.

The treaty of commerce which was negotiated with France on behalf of Canada has been laid before you, together with the correspondence which passed during the negotiations; but owing to the late period of the session at which the treaty was received, and the pendency of communications as to its bearing in respect of most-favoured-nation treatment and the interpretation of certain of its clauses, my Government has thought it advisable to postpone for the present its ratification by Parliament.

I thank you for the ample provisions you have made to protect the country from the possible introduction of cholera, and I trust that the precautions taken will result in guarding against any danger from that source.

The liberal provisions made for the proper representation of Canada at the World's Columbian Exposition will, I doubt not, enable this country to make a worthy exhibit of her resources and progress among the nations of the world.

The various Acts which you have placed upon the Statute-book will contribute to the maintenance of public security and the continued progress of the country.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the liberal provisions you have made for the requirements of the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I feel with deep regret that the period of my official connection with the Dominion is drawing towards its close and that in all probability I am taking leave of

you for the last time. Lest this should be the case, I desire to avail myself of the present occasion to express my abiding interest in all that concerns the welfare of Canada, and my sincere affection to her people, who have never failed to testify their loyalty to the person and throne of our Sovereign, and to show kindness and consideration to her representative. It will ever be my sincere desire to be of service to the Dominion and I shall continue to cherish feelings of the warmest solicitude for the welfare and prosperity of those amongst whom I have been placed during the past five years.

I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may at all times attend you.

The Speaker of the Senate then said :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the eleventh day of May next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the eleventh day of May next.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1893.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following ;—1°. 2°. 3°. First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remark or debate ; Acta., Accounts. Adj., Adjourn ; Adj., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B. C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept. Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor-General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorpor., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I. C. R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N. B., New Brunswick ; N. W. T., North-west Territories ; N. S., Nova Scotia ; O. C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P. E. I., Prince Edward Island ; P. O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques. Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmt., Statement ; Sup., Supply, Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y. N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., Northumberland, N.B.
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°, 1743.

Allan, Mr. H. W., South Essex.
Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3181.

SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Repairs, &c.) 2947.

Amyot, Mr. G., Bellechasse.
Balfour, James, Relief B. 93 (Mr. Sutherland) on M. for 2°, 2214.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2429, 2682, 2691.

Cabinet, Constitution of the, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1710.

Coal Mines of N. S., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1659.

Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2226.

— on M. (Mr. Daly) to adjn. deb., 2243.

Compulsory Voting (B. 8) 1°, 220 ; 2° n., 471, 517 ; neg., 527.

Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3299.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3176.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1937.

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 200, contingencies, rent, &c., 206.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3436.
Militia (Cartridge Factory, Que.) 548, 3352.
Quarantine (Public Health) 2606, 2627.
Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1677.

Bain, Mr. J. W., Soulanges.
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°, 658.

Bain, Mr. T., North Wentworth.
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 230.

SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 474.
Militia (Permanent Corps) 560.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine Foreman. 3434.

Baird, Mr. G. F., Queen's, N.B.
Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 1°, 1592.

Barnard, Mr. F. S., Cariboo.
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1234.

- Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.**
 Debates, Official Rep., Translation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 547.
 Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3333.
 Judges of Sessions in Que. (B. 81) 1*, 1743.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1905.
- Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.**
 Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2228.
 Richelieu River Wharf (M. for Ret.) 2250.
 SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3392.
 Vermont Central Ry. Co., Richelieu River Bridge (M. for O.C.'s, &c. *) 356.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1423.
- Belley, Mr. L. de G., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.**
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2790.
 Criminal Code, Copies for Members (Ques.) 607.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 30) 1°, 606.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 947.
- Bennett, Mr. W. H., East Simcoe.**
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 850; (explanation) 1057.
- Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois. (See SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY.)**
 St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°, 357.
- Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.**
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2703.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2746.
 Printing Committee, 1st and 2nd Reps. (M. to conc.) 1933.
 SUPPLY:
Militia (Civil Employees) Salaries, 570; (Medical Service) 551; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 597.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 501.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1005.
- Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.**
 Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3336.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3030.
 Representation (H. of C.) B. 42 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1617.
 SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3409.
- Borden, Mr. F. W., King's, N.S.**
 Cornwallis Valley Ry., Carriage of Mails (Ques.) 1031, 1936.
 Customs Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 3261.
 Kentville, Construction of P. O. (M. for Cor. *) 2245.
 Liverpool Industries, Description, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 2245.
 Picket's Pier, Expenditure, Wharfage (M. for Cor.) 352.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com on Res., 3054; on M. for 2° of B., 3489.
 Rougemont, New Post Office (M. for Cor., &c. *) 1551.
 SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3396.
Militia (Warlike, &c., Stores) 598.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dartmouth P. O.) 2171; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2181; (Pitton P. O.) 2576; (Richmond P. O.) 2191. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2935; (N.S.) 3460.
Quarantine (Public Health) 2623.
 Treaty with France, Ratification (remarks) 2478.
- Bowers, Mr. E. C., Digby.**
 Digby and Annapolis Buoy Service (Ques.) 1320.
 — Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2465.
 — Pier, Repairs, Contract (Ques.) 504.
 Lurcher Shoal Lightship (Ques.) 505.
 — Protection of Navigation (M. for Cor. *) 866.
 Marine Food Fisheries, Propagation (Ques.) 506.
 St. Mary's Bay Bell-Buoy (Ques.) 506.
 Sandy Cove Port, Customs Receipts (Ques.) 3345.
 SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3356; (Intelligence Bureau) 1721.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Major's Hill Park) 2210; (Dartmouth P. O.) 2179; (St. John, N.B., P. O.) 2187. Harbours and Rivers (Digby Pier) 2919; (Metaghan Cove) 2925; (Negro Point) 2933.
 Westport Industries, Return (inquiry) 2901.
- Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.**
 SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 478.
- Boyd, Mr. N., Marquette.**
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1126.
- Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.**
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2765.
- Brodeur, Mr. L. P., Beauville.**
 Isle Perrot Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2645.
 Judiciary of Quebec, Judge Wurtele's successor (Ques.) 1749.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3314.

Brodeur, Mr. L. P.—*Continued.*

Labatt, Gaston P., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 724.

Lieut.-Governor of N. B. on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 93.

Pointe à Valois Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2645.

Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 3474.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2034.

Shepard, W. A., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1746.

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3424.

Justice, Administration of (Circuit Judges, Montreal) 3430.

Tariff Reform Division (remarks) 2578.

Tobacco, Excise Duty Collected (Ques.) 1748.

Vaudreuil Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2646.

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

Baie la Vallière, Dredging (M. for Ret. *) 2420.

Baillairgé, Geo. F., Superannuation (Ques.) 1131.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2448.

Fishery Overseers in Berthier, &c., Instructions (M. for Ret. *) 2679.

Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3321.

Howden, Jas., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1132.

McCarthy, Messrs., Lands leased by Govt. (Ques.) 1131.

Manufacturers in Sorel, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1132.

Mongeau, Messrs., and D. Millette, Claims (Ques.) 1132.

Richelieu Co. Fishing Privileges (Ques.) 860.

Ste. Anne de Sorel Wharf, Completion (Ques.) 1321.

St. Michel d'Yamaska Bridge (M. for Ret.) 2419.

St. Ours Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3125.

Soft Fish, Prohibition of Catch (Ques.) 607.

Sorel Town Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3122.

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2939.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1208.

Yamaska Dam, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2939.

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*

Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 255.

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1089.

A½

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1576.

Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 454.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1342.

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1233.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 229.

Blenheim Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3121.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2455.

Guilds (Ont.) Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 325.

Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3208.

Ladoga Wheat and Two-rowed Barley (Ques.) 1524.

Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 250.

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^d, 3151.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Secretary of State) contingencies, 290.

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1271; printing, 1291. *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 316.

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Brucc.*

Agriculture Com. Final Rep., on conc., 8563.

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Experimental Farms, 476.

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*

Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 2644.

Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec, on M. for Cor., 238.

Cap St. Ignace Postmaster (Ans.) 864.

Clark, Jas., Emplmt. in P.O. Dept., 2795.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2778.

Cornwallis Valley Ry., Carriage of Mails (Ans.) 1031, 1936.

Country Postmasters' Salaries (Ans.) 438.

Guilds (Ont.) Postmaster, Resignation (Ans.) 325.

Hartnedy, Timothy, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 607.

Kemptville P.O., Irregularities (Ans.) 860.

Kildare P.O., Dismissal, &c., Postmaster (Ans.) 609.

Labatt, Gaston P., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 724.

Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 611.

Lieut.-Governor of N.B. on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 92.

Liverpool (Co. L'Islet) Postmaster (Ans.) 1031.

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—Continued.

- Military Pensions, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3084.
 New Richmond and Grand Cascapedia Mail Contract (Ans.) 1748.
 Notre Dame du Rossire P.O., Location (Ans.) 864.
 Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Postmaster (Ans.) 2801.
 St. Léon, Dismissal of Postmaster (remarks) 2290.
 St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Service, Tenders (Ans.) 861.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2030.
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Government* (Post Office) computing Interest, 218; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 230.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 3395.
Militia (Military Properties) 575; (Stores) 2588; (Permanent Corps) 568.
 Two-cent Postage Rate, on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3073.
 Walkerton Mail Service (Ans.) 861.
 White, G. R., Appmt., &c., to Civil Service (Ans.) 1526.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., Kamouraska.

- Bellavance, Ferdinand, Refund on Tender (Ques.) 2383.
 Civil Service Appmts., Messrs. Trudeau and White (Ques.) 1525.
 Fraserville P. O., Amount expended (Ques.) 1526.
 I. C. R., St. Charles Branch, Construction (Ques.) 861.
 Kamouraska Piers, &c., Completion (Ques.) 861.
 St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Service, Tenders (Ques.) 861.

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., South Wentworth.

- SUPPLY:
- Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Burlington Channel) 3464.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine Foreman, 8435.

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., North Hastings.

- Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1537.
 Geological Dept., Change in Personnel (Ques.) 1611.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., South Oxford.

- Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 33.
 Armstrong, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 6.
 Bank of Montreal, Cor. re Financial Agency (remarks) 1937.
 Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 175.
- BUDGET, The (Reply) 693; (Amt.) 720; neg. Y. 72; N. 126) 1516.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

- Canadian Representation at Foreign Capitols (remarks) 1615.
 Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2905.
 Census, Enumerators' Instructions (Ques.) 1401.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1711.
 Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2664.
 Civil Service Insurance B. 11 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3282.
 — Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 540.
 — Repeal of Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMullen) 1535.
 Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 802.
 Coal Oil, Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 543.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2709.
 Consolidated Fund, Receipts, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 356.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2729.
 Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3530.
 Estimates, The (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 98.
 Exports and Imports, per *Canada Gazette* (M. for Ret.*) 356.
 Financial Agents of Can., Change of Agency in London (M. for Ret.*) 1551.
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursday, 1400.
 — Loans, Amount Borrowed (Ans.) 224.
 Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 2272, 2286.
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3005.
 Kemptville P.O., Irregularities (Ques.) 860.
 — (M. for Cor.*) 1551; (inquiry) 2479.
 Kingston Penitentiary, Papers respecting (Ques.) 1029.
 Lieut.-Governor of N.B. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 88.
 Military College B. 118 (Mr. Patterson, Huron) in Com., 3497.
 Personal Explanation re Oil Refineries, 1673.
 Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brookville) in Com., 3498.
 Private Bills, Time for Posting, on M., 2288.
 Revenue of Provs. of Dom., on M. for Ret., 2247.
 School Lands in Man. B. 109 (Mr. Daly) on M. for 2°, 3269.
 Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 3546.
 Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 2579.
 Sugar, Removal of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Langelier) 1549.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Arts, &c. (Archives) 409; (Census and Statistics) 1273, 2585, 2602; (Statistics) 421; (World's Columbian Ex.) 425.

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 3231; (Trent) 3231. *Income* (Beauharnois) 1724; (Rapide Plat) gratuity, 1724; (Rideau) 1723.

Charges of Management (Asst. Rec.-Gen.'s Office, St. John) 112; (Baring Bros. and Glyn & Co.) Commission, 1240; (Dom. Notes) 114; (Inspector) 111; (Public Debt) 100.

Civil Government (Agriculture) 121; (Extra Clerks) 2597; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 263; (High Commissioner) 193, contingencies, rent, &c., 209; (Indian Affairs) 121; (Interior) contingencies, 305; (Marine and Fisheries) 126; (Militia) 118, contingencies, 287; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 278; (Public Works) 126; (Secretary of State) 119, 1242; (Trade and Commerce) 131, 1244, contingencies, 301.

Collection of Revenue: Adulteration of Food, 3394. *Customs* (Board of Appraisers) 3390; (Salaries, &c.) 3389; (Methylated Spirits) 3393.

Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 2342; (Protection Service) 1720.

Government of N. W. T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1726; (Well-Boring Machines, &c.) 1725.

Indians: Man. and N. W. T., 3380; (Blood Reserve Hospital) 2094. *Ont. and Que.*, 1740, 3366.

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3413.

Justice, Administration of: Miscellaneous (N.W. T. and B. C.) 307.

Legislation: House of Commons (Serjt.-at-Arms Estimate) 406; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 406. *Senate* (Salaries, &c.) 399.

Militia (Compensation Claims) 2583; (Monuments) 3444; (Permanent Corps.) 555.

Miscellaneous (Arbitration, Dom. and Ont.) 3388; (Boundary, Can. and U.S.) 3465; (Costs of Litigation) 2595; (Fishing Bounty) 3343; (Gratuity to Mowatt) 2112; (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 3387; (Prohibition Commission) 2113.

Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1719.

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 311, 398, 3431, Binder-Twine Foreman, 3433; conc., 3548; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1284.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Chatham, N.B., P.O.) 2186; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2182; (Pictou P.O.) 2184, 2968; (Printing Bureau) 3453. *Harbours and Rivers* (N.S.) 2922; (Toronto Harbour) 2947. *Miscellaneous* (Major's Hill Park) 2210.

Quarantine (Public Health) 2620.

Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 3342.

Treaty with France, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3552.

— *Ratification* (remarks) 2476.

Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 2404.

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

Aylmer Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3116.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2700.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 2814.

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

Civil Service Insurance B. 11 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^d, 3278; in Com., 3282.

Controller of Customs Speech at Kingston (Ques.) 2578, 2644.

— (Notice of M.) 2681; (remarks) 2289.

— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2709.

Culverts on natural watercourses, Building (M. for Ret.*) 1551.

Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 1309.

Manufacturing Industries, Instructions to Enumerators (Ques.) 1524.

Ridgetown Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2883.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1967.

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3165.

SUPPLY :

Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 1277, 2602.

Civil Government (Agriculture, extra clerks) 2567.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3438; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 2600; (Voters' Lists) Judge *Wilkinson's* Claim, 1270; (Printing) 1268.

Miscellaneous (Costs of Litigation) 2594.

Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder-Twine Foreman, 3434.

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 2154.

Quarantine (Public Health) 2905.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2573.

Treaty with France, on Finance Min.'s Stmnt., 2286.

Voters' Lists (1893) Revision B. 123 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3273.

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

Balfour, James, Relief B. 92 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2^d, 2214.

Business of the Hse., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 2286.

Civil Service Employees, Birthplace, National Origin, &c., on M. for Ret., 355.

Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 3001; on M. to conc. in Res., 3132.

— on M. to adjn. deb., 2236.

— *Sunday Closing* (prop. Res.) 2218.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2803, 2990; on consdn. of B., 2977.

Customs Acts Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1^o, 3235.

Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3531; on M. for 3^d, 535.

Export Duties on Lumber Amt. (B. 60) 1^o, 1029.

Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal (B. 7) 1^o, 220.

Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. to take in Thursdays, 1935.

— on M. to take in Wednesday, 2467.

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

- Lord's Day Observance (B. 5) 1^o, 147; 2^o m., 516.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3177.
 Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 281.
 Personal Explanation, Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup., 358.
 Privilege (Ques. of) Sunday Observance, newspaper par., 3473.
 Railway Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 3520.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3025.
 Reciprocity in Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U. S., on M. for Cor., &c., 340.
 Representation (H. of C.) Act Amt. B. 42 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1617.
 Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2579.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Haras National Co.) 486; (Societies, N.W.T.) 484.
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2584, 2602.
Civil Government (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 269; (Post Office) 290; (Privy Council Office) 281, 283; (Trade and Commerce) 300.
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3391.
Indians: B. C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2096; Man. and N. W. T. (Red Deer Industrial School) 2095.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 2599.
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 2586; (Compensation Claims) 2591; (Permanent Corps) 556; (Stores) 2587.
Miscellaneous (Costs of Litigation) 2111, 2593; (Determining Boundaries) 2111; (Prohibition Commission) 2113; (Lord Lansdowne's Portrait) 2127.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 317.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Pictou P. O.) 2185; (Richmond P. O.) 2191. Harbours and Rivers (Piers and Breakwaters) 2932; (Que.) 2936.
Quarantine (Cattle Quarantines) 503; (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 487; (Public Health) 502, 2620, 2628.
 Two-cent Postage Rate, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3069.
 U. S. Quarantine Regulations *re* Imported Cattle (Ques.) 438.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1039.
 Works on Rivers and Streams B. 115 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3176.

Chesley, Mr. J. A., *St. John, N. R., City and Co.*

- Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1^o, 1610.
 Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3502.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1304.

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*

- Amyot, Lieut.-Col., Resignation (Ques.) 2800.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2443, 2701.
 Cap St. Ignace Postmaster (Ques.) 864.
 Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 9) 1^o, 221.
 — French Employees (Ques.) 1750.
 Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. (B. 4) 1^o, 80; 2^o, 1586.
 Gibeault, Dom. Policeman, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1133.
 I. C. R., Newspapers, &c., Tenders for Sale (Ques.) 609.
 — Section Superintendent (Ques.) 2215.
 — Tenders for Fencing (Ques.) 1746.
 Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3311.
 Montmagny Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 1131, 3128; (remarks) 2578.
 Notre Dame du Rosaire P.O., Location (Ques.) 864.
 — (M. for Pets., &c.) 867.
 Roy, Messrs. C. and Z., Claim (Ques.) 147.
 Skeffington, Detective, Complaints against (Ques.) 1745, 2643.
 Soft Fish, Prohibition of Catch (Ques.) 607.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Experimental Farms) 483.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3398.
Militia (Compensation Claims) 2591.
Quarantine (Public Health) 2606.
 Tobacco, &c., Seizures (Ques.) 610.
 Volunteer Commanding Officers, Retirement (Ques.) 2800.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 931.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

- Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2236.
 Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 463.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Experimental Farms) 473.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3406.
Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 2115.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1360.

Cleveland, Mr. C. C., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

- Coal Oil, Free Entry (prop. Res.) 527.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2771.

Coatsworth, Mr. E., Jun., *East Toronto.*

- Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1235.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2432.

Coatsworth, Mr. E.—*Continued.*

Cabinet Changes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2583.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2745.

Cruelty to Animals Prevention (B. 10) 1°, 221.

Govt. Offices at Toronto (Ques.) 1030.

Prohibition in Man. (Ques.) 3480.

SUPPLY:

Indians: B.C. (Chilliwahack Industrial School) 2110.

Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 2120.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Toronto Harbour) 2346.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2502.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°, 1824; in Com., 3017; on M. for 3°, 3105.

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2765.

Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 260.

Cockburn, Mr. G. H. R., *Centre Toronto.*

British America Assurance Co.'s (B. 78) 1°, 1673.

Electric Light Inspection, Legislation (Ques.) 1746.

Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3007.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 273.

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 3393.

Militia (Cartridge Factory, Que) 3350.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1165.

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*

Centreville Customs Collector (Ques.) 606.

I. C. R., Freight Rates on Hay, &c. (Ques.) 1322.

St. John Custom-house, Copper Roof (Ques.) 863.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (River St. John) 2334.

Woodstock Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2881, 3115.

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*

SUPPLY:

Militia (Permanent Corps) 550.

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*

Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 1535.

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

Bonne Espérance Fishery Division, Appmt. of Officer (Ans.) 437.

Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3562.

Canada and Newfoundland, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 504.

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued*

Canadian Fisheries, Yield and Value (Ans.) 1033.

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Evidence *re* Inquiry (remarks) 2212.

Cattle Transport across Atlantic (Ans.) 2643.

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 29) 1°, 605; prop. Res., 659; 2° m., 2811.

Civil Servants, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 436.

Criminal Code, Copies for Members (Ans.) 607.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2738.

Fish Hatcheries Milton and Bedford, N.S. (Ans.) 1611.

Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3328.

Franchise Act Amt. (B. 65) 2° m., 1307.

Guay, Alphonse, Transfer (Ans.) 2645.

Harbour and River Police (Que.) Act Amt. (B. 97) 1°, 2288; 2° m., 3021.

Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3199.

Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 102) 2° m., 3167.

Juvenile Offenders, N.B. (B. 104) 1°, 2646; in Com., 3497.

Lake St. Peter, catching Soft Fish (Ans.) 607, 2795.

Lurcher Shoal, N.S., Lightship (Ans.) 505.

Mackerel Nets, Repeal of O. C. (Ans.) 224.

— (remarks) 3346.

Marine Food Fisheries, Propagation (Ans.) 506.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°, 1591.

Merchant Shipping Act Amt. (B. 92) 1°, 1934; in Com., 3166.

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 504.

Modus Vivendi, Extension (Ans.) 1747.

Newfoundland, Refund of License Fees (Ans.) 1747.

Oyster Beds, Licenses for Limits (Ans.) 1525.

Parliamentary Printing, Delay in Production (remarks) 2131.

Pointe aux Anglais Lighthouse, Contract (Ans.) 437.

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1399.

Printing Bureau, Delay in printing Budget Speech (remarks) 726.

Public Officers Act Amt. (B. 103) 1°, 2635; 2°, 3022.

"Quadra," Str., Tenders for Repairs, on M. for Ret., 2247.

Returns, on inquiry (remarks) 2094, 3104.

Richelieu Co., Fishing Privileges (Ans.) 861.

Richmond and Wolfe, Revising Officer (Ans.) 327.

St. Mary's Bay (N.S.) Bell-buoy (Ans.) 506.

Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1743.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1898.

Shipping (Can.) Registered Tonnage (Ans.) 436, 860.

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*

- Sick Mariners' Fund (Ans.) 1521.
Soft Fish, Prohibition of Catch (Ans.) 607, 2705.
Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 6) 1^o*, 147;
in Com., 2579.

SUPPLY :

- Agriculture* (Experimental Farms) 479.
Civil Government (Sec. of State) 1242, contingencies, 287.
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3354; (Intelligence Bureau) 1721; (International Commission) 1722; (Isaac Newton) 1721; (Protection Service) 1720.
Legislation : H. of C. (Printing, Paper, &c.) 2601; (Voters' Lists) Printing, 1290.
Miscellaneous (Translating C. S. Inquiry) 2112.
Ocean and River Service (Dominion Steamers) 1719; (New Steamer) 3342.
- Tignish (P. E. I.) Wharfinger, Appmt., &c. (Ans.) 149.
- Type-Setting Machines, &c., Cost (Ans.) 436.
- Voters' Lists, Revision (Ans.) 506.
— (1893) Revision (B. 123) in Com., 3272.
- Walsh, T. J., Revising "Ready Reckoner" (Ans.) 2092.
- Whale Fishing in the Gulf (Ans.) 608.
- Whitely, W. H., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 608.
- Wrecks and Salvage Act, Amt. (B. 3) 1^o*, 80.

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*

- Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. to Com. of Sup., 1928.

SUPPLY :

- Miscellaneous* (Prohibition Commission) 2123.
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 918.

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*

- Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2457.
- Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2843.
- Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2741.
- Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2802, 2984; on consdn. of B., 2977.
- Doran, J. Fred., Relief B. 107 (Mr. Dickey) on M. for 2^o, 3020.
- Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3296.
- Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1863.

SUPPLY :

- Miscellaneous* (Costs of Litigation) 3412.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3432; conc., 3548.
- Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. Coatsworth) in Com., 3016.
- Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1683; on Sen. Amts., 3481.

Daly, Hon. T. M., *Selkirk.*

- Belanger, Pridime, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 863.
- Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec, on M. for Cor., 243.
- Brandon Industrial School (Ans.) 2387.
- Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (M.) to adjn. deb., 2236; agreed to (Y. 76, N. 34) 2244.
- C. P. Ry. Belt in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3285.
- Dom. Irrigation Act (B. 130) 1^o, 3344.
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 109) 1^o*, 2794.
- Geological Dept., change in Personnel (Ans.) 1611.
— Surveys, Eastern Townships (Ans.) 507.
— Montcalm Co. (Ans.) 1321.
- Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 2267.
- Homestead Exemptions Act Repeal B. 116 (Mr. Davin) 2^o m., 3547.
- Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1933.
- Interior, Appmt. of Deputy-Minister (Ans.) 1751.
— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2794.
- Land Grants* to Militia B. 74 (Mr. Daly) in Com., 3267.
— to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1540.
- N.W.T. Lands Act consolid. (B. 113) 1^o, 2977.
- Saugeen Indian Reserve, Seizure of Ties, &c. (Ans.) 448.
- School Lands in Man. (B. 109) 2^o m., 3269.
- Schools in N. W. T., Teachers' Salaries, &c., on M. for Ret., 2266.
- Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2056.
- Shepard, W. A., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1746.
- Subsidies (Land) to Railways (B. 133) 1^o*, 3549; 3^o m., 3556.

SUPPLY :

- Agriculture* (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 465.
Civil Government (Interior) 187; contingencies, 304.
- Dominion Lands—Income* (Extra Clerks) 3413.
Government of N. W. T., 3387; (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1726; (Well-boring Machines, &c.) 1724.
- Immigration* (Agents' Salaries) 3413.
- Indian Affairs*: conc., 3548. B. C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2096. Man. and N.W.T., 3390; (Blood Reserve Hospital) 2094; (Red Deer Industrial School) 2095. Ont. and Que., 1740, 3364; (Goulais River Bridge) 1743; (W. A. Mott's services) 1742.
- Militia* (Permanent Corps) 567.
- Miscellaneous* (Boundary, Can. and U.S.) 3465; (Determining Boundaries) 2111; (Costs of Litigation) 2111; (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 3387.
- Public Works—Income*: *Miscellaneous* (Art Gallery) 2953.
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 771.

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 1552, 2461, 2690.
 — on M. to place on Order Paper, 1587.
 Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2890.
 Census, Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1717.
 Centreville Customs Collector (remarks) 609.
 Chignecto Ship Ry., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1314.
 Civil Service Insurance B. 11 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 253; on M. for 2°, 3278; in Com., 3279.
 — Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 543; on M. for 2°, 3146.
 Coal Fields (N.S.) delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 795.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2993; in Com., 2999.
 Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2802, 2979.
 Doran, J. Fred., Relief B. 107 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2°, 3019.
 Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1307.
 Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. to take in Thursdays, 1936.
 Govt. Loans, Amount Borrowed (Ques.) 224.
 Hackett, Ed., Fishery Inspector, Suspension, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 866.
 I.C.R., Coal and Iron Freight Rates (Ques.) 1033.
 — Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 149.
 Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3289.
 Kemptville P.O. Irregularities (Ques.) 860.
 Lieut.-Gov. of N.B., Appmt. (remarks) 1744.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 80.
 Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 1598.
 Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 281.
 North American Canal Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 3066.
 Personal Explanation, Rep. in "Hansard" re Mr. *Hawke*, 2647.
 Prince County Judgeship Vacancy (Ques.) 1937, 2132.
 P.E.I. Ry., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 149.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3025, 3168; on M. for 2° of B., 3486.
 Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U. S., on M. for Cor., &c., 341.
 Rustico Breakwater, Survey (Ques.) 326.
 — Repairs (M. for Cor., &c.) 2414.
 School Lands in Man. B. 109 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3270.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1966.
 Shipping (Can.) Registered Tonnage (Ques.) 436, 859.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) Dairy Products, 1290.
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 411, 1290; (World's Columbian Ex.) 427.
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 115.
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures) M. Kelly's Salary, 2127.
Dominion Lands—Income (Extra Clerks, &c.) 3412.
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 295; (Geological Survey) 130; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 267; (Interior) contingencies, 304; (Marine and Fisheries) 124, contingencies, 299; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 281, extra clerks, 1263; (Public Works) 127; (Railways and Canals) 129; (Secretary of State) contingencies, 288, 291; (Trade and Commerce) 134, 145.
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3353; (Isaac Newton) 1721; (Protection Service) 1720.
Government of N.W.T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1727.
Indians: B.C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2097.
Justice, Administration of (Admiralty, Que.) 308; (Exchequer Court) 1263; (Miscellaneous, N.W.T. and B.C.) 307; (Official Arbitrators) 307.
Legislation: H. of C. (Salaries, &c.) 401; (Sess. Messengers) 1267; (Statutes) Printing, &c., 1268; (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1269. Printing, 1292. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 936.
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspe) 3410; (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 3410.
Militia (Civil Employees) Salaries, 569; (Clothing, &c.) 601; (Compensation Claims) 2561; (Military College) 602; (Military Properties) 574, 566; (Monuments) 605; (Permanent Corps) 548; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 566.
Miscellaneous (Costs of Litigation) 2111, 2596; (Lord Lansdowne's Portrait) 2127; (Prohibition Commission) 2123; (St. John's, Nfld., Fire) 2112.
Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1720.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 313, 394.
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1293, 2134. *Income*: Buildings (Lieut. Gov.'s Residence, Regina) 1301; (Pictou P. O.) 2183, 2967; (Water Supply) 2210. *Repairs, &c.* (Rideau Hall) 2960. *Dredging* (Mar. Provs.) 1304. *Harbours and Rivers* (Piers and Breakwaters) 2331. *Miscellaneous* (Art Gallery) 2350; (Major's Hill Park) 2210. *Quarantine Stations* (Minor) 1303.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 500; (Public Health) 2630.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 3211; (St. Charles Branch) 3231.
 Supreme Court, Vacancy on Bench, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 545.
 Treaty with France (remarks) 1615, 2211, 2478.
 Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Expenditure, on M. for Stmt., 2404.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1135.
 Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1679-1701; on Sen. Amts., 3484.
 Wood Island Breakwater, Govt. Surveys, on M. for Rep. 336.

Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 159, 161.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston (Ques.) 2467, 2644.

— on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2754.

Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 464.

Customs Acts Amt. (B. 18) 1°, 357.

— B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 3257.

Customs Tariff, Revision (prop. Res.) 612.

Education and Dual Language in N. W. T., Pets. *re* (remarks) 1519.

Expenditure of Provs. of Dom., on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 2247.

Grinding Grain in Bond (prop. Res.) 2266.

Herchmer, L. W., Rep., &c., *re* Charges (remarks) 865.

— (M. for Ret.)* 866.

— (Ques.) 1240, 2387.

Homestead Exemption Act Repeal (B. 116) M. to suspend Rule and 1° of B., 3067.

Personal Explanation, paragraph in *Empire* (remarks) 725.

Revenues of Provs. of Dom., on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 2247.

Schools Lands in Man. B. 109 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 2°, 3269.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2013.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Permanent Corps) 559.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2492.

Territories Real Property Act Amt. (B. 117) M. to suspend Rule and 1° of B., 3067.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1511.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts.; 3483 (Amt.) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 40, N. 87) 3485.

Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.

Alberta Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°, 787.

— Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 53) 1°, 787.

Calgary Hydraulic Co.'s incorp. (B. 36) 1°, 658.

— Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°, 658.

— Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°, 787.

Corporation, &c., of Calgary (B. 21) 1°, 435.

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., Addington.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 2714; neg. (Y. 74, N. 105) 2792.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1188.

Delisle, Mr. A., Portneuf.

Breen, Thos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2216.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weidon*) in Com., 2451.

Michaud, C. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2216.

Rosa, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2216.

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., West Toronto.

Canada North-west Land Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1°, 721.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2773.

Fort George, Preservation (Ques.) 1522.

Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3005, 3015.

Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 33) 1°, 658.

Military College Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) in Com., 3496.

Military Institute, Toronto, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 471, 605.

North-west Territories Act Amt. (B. 28) 1°, m., 606.

Policy Holders and Insurance Co.'s (Ques.) 3490.

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 2872.

Prohibition in Man. (Ques.) 3490.

SUPPLY:

Canals Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 3231.

Civil Government (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 272.

Militia (Cartridge Factory) 3347; (Permanent Corps) 553; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 596.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Water Supply) 2210.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3016; on M. for 8°, 3104.

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. D., St. Maurice.

Berlinguet, Thos. F. X., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 147.

— Employees under (Ques.) 864.

Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3331.

Lake St. Peter, catching Soft Fish (Ques.) 2794.

Yamachiche Pier, Construction (M. for Cor.) 1537.

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Ottawa County.

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association's Pet., ref. to Standing Orders Com. (M.) 1129.

— incorp. (B. 66) 1°, 1390.

Coal Contracts, Ottawa Buildings (Ques.) 536.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2717.

Du Lièvre River Locks, Expenditure (Ques.) 2888.

— Construction (M. for Cor., &c.)* 2420.

Lieut.-Governor of N. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 96.

Perkins's Mills, &c., and Hull Mail Service (M. for Cor., &c.)* 2420.

Devlin, Mr. C. R.—Continued.

Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 256.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1886.

Spanish River Improvements (Ques.) 2644.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 482; (Haras National Co.) 486.

Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, rent, &c., 215.

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3390. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 3395. *Government of N. W. T.* (Lieut.-Governor's Office) 1736.

Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 406.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 907.

Dickey, Mr. A. R., Cumberland.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) 1 m., 80; in Com., 2436, 2683, 2696.

Chignecto Ship Ry., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1315.

Criminal Code Amt. (B. 37) 1°, 659.

— B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2805.

Doran, James Fred., Relief (B. 107) 1°, 2794; 2° m., 3019.

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Commission (Ques.) 326.

Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 283.

Schwaller, John F., Relief (B. 105) 1°, 2794.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 283; (Railways and Canals) 130.

Treaty with France, Papers presented (remarks) 2646.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1675, 1689.

Dugas, Mr. L. E., Montcalm.

Geological Surveys in Montcalm Co. (Ques.) 1321.

Tobacco Duties, Change in Collecting (Ques.) 2645.

Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2682, 2692.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3029; on M. for 2°, 3491.

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 227.

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Papers, &c., re Charges (Ques.) 1402.

— Evidence re inquiry (remarks) 2212.

— on M. for Com. on Sup. (Amt.) 2822; neg. (Y. 69, N. 119) 2918.

Chignecto Ship Ry., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1318.

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

Copyright Act, Proclamation re Enforcing (Ques.) 147.

— Papers respecting (Ques.) 1618.

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 723.

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2470.

Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3004, 3014.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 9: (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 2464.

Parliamentary Fees, Disposition of Receipts B. 61 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 2133.

— Printing, Delay in Production (remarks) 2131.

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (World's Columbian Ex.) 428.

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1271.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2372.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s Bill 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3018.

Treaty with France, on Finance Min.'s Stmt., 2284.

— (remarks) 2472, 2477, 3103.

Trudeau, Mr., Superannuation, &c. (M. for Cor. *) 1550.

— Ret. (remarks) 3234.

Two-rowed Barley, Price paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1320.

Uxbridge Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2217, 3109.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 805.

— on M. to conc. in Res., 3234.

Welland Canal, New Culvert, Tenders (Ques.) 609.

Whitby Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2877.

Edwards, Mr. W. O., Russell.

Export Duty on Logs, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3318.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Digby Pier) 2921.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1502.

Fairbairn, Mr. C., South Victoria.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1563.

British Cattle Regulations (Ques.) 223.

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2255.

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., Bonaventure.

Atlantic and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 49) 1°, 786.

Dalhousie and Gaspé Mail Service (Ques.) 1031.

Gaspé and Chicoutimi Judicial Districts (Ques.) 862.

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B.—Continued.

Interior, Appt. of Deputy-Minister (Ques.) 1751.
New Richmond and Grand Cascadepia Mail Contract (Ques.) 1748.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2088.

SUPPLY:

Indians (Que.) W. A. Mott's services, 1742.
Whale Fishing in the Gulf (Ques.) 608.

Featherston, Mr. J., Peel.

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures 3465; (M. Kelly's Salary) 2128.

Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth.

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1229.

Breweries and Distilleries in Canada, Number (Ques.) 2636.

Civil Service Insurance B. 11 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3280.

Merchants' Shipping Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 3166.

McDougall, Launchin, Claim for Superannuation (M. for Cor. *) 2245.

Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brockville) in Com., 3500.

Sandford Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 326.

— Claims for Repairs (M. for Cor., &c.) 351.

Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^d, 3558.

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (Statistics) 412; (Census) 1284.

Civil Government (Marine and Fisheries) contingencies, 298; (Post Office) computing Interest, 216; (Trade and Commerce) 1250, contingencies, 299.

Government of N.W.T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1734.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Mar. Provs. generally) 2187; (Piotou P. O.) 2974; (Richmond P. O.) 2199. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 3459.

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 2952.
Quarantine (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 493.

Railways—Capital (Annapolis and Digby) 1290.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1371.

Yarmouth Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2876, 3106.

Forbes, Mr. F. G., Queen's, N.S.

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1226.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1577.

Breweries and Distilleries in Canada, Number (Ques.) 2636.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2689, 2702.

Canada Atlantic and Plant Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1st, 1591.

Fish Hatcheries, Milton and Bedford (Ques.) 1611.

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—Continued.

Liverpool Industries, Description, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 2245.

— (Ques.) 3478.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3045.

Steam Com., Halifax and St. John, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1669.

SUPPLY:

Legislation (Voters' Lists) Printing, 1292.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dartmouth P. O.) 2177; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2181; (Piotou P. O.) 2966. *Dredging* (Mar. Provs.) 1305; (New Plant) 1306, 2948.

Foster, Hon. G. E., King's, N.B.

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 51.

Agriculture, Capital Invested (Ans.) 2390.

Agriculture and Colonization Com., Final Rep., on conc., 3552.

— Deptl. Employees Payment (Ans.) 610.

— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1130.

Auditor-General's Rep. (presented) 5.

Aylmer Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3116.

Bank Act, correction (B. 76) 1st, 1673.

Bank of Montreal, Cor. re Financial Agency (remarks) 1937.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 171.

Blenheim Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3121.

Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3562.

BUDGET, THE (Annual Stmt.) 659.

Canadian Representation at Foreign Capitol (remarks) 1614.

Cattle Imports from U.S. into N.W.T. (Ans.) 863, 1131.

Cattle Scheduled in (Great Britain) (Ans.) 2643.

Census Enumerators' Instructions (Ans.) 1401; (M.) 1519.

— Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1712.

— Machines used in Compilation (Ans.) 2369.

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2262.

"Chevalier" Barley, Import (Ans.) 2368.

Chignecto Ship Ry., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Welsh) 1313.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2^d, 2815.

— Insurance (B. 11) 2^d m., 3274; in Com., 3279, 3480.

— Superannuation Act Amt. (B. 27) prop. Res. 357; in Com., 540; 2^d of B. m., 3135; in Com., 3161.

— Repeal of Superannuation Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMullen) 1535.

Clinton Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3126.

Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' (B. 124) prop. Res., 2709; M. for Com., 2688; in Com., 2999; conc. in and 1st of B., 3132.

— Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2230.

Consular Fees on Exports (remarks) 2577.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston (Ans.) 2467, 2578, 2644.
 — on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2723; (explanation) 2750, 2760.
 Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 467.
 Cotton, &c., Industries, Capital Invested (Ans.) 1751.
 Customs Acts Amt. (B. 126) 1° m., 3234, 3262; 3° n., 3536.
 Dairy Products, Branding (B. 125) 1°, 3233; in Com., 3531.
 Dalhousie and Gaspé Mail Service (Ans.) 1031.
 Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 79.
 — 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 3102.
 — Amanuenses (remarks) 3554.
 Digby, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2465.
 Estimates, The, 1894 (presented) 78.
 — Suppl., 1894 (presented) 3104.
 — Suppl., 1893 (presented) 805, 2576.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 99.
 Expenditure of Provs. of Dom., on M. for Ret., 2250.
 Franchise Act Amt. B. (Ans.) 3068.
 Governors-General since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 335.
 Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2467, 2470.
 — Friday (M.) 2976.
 — Monday (M.) 3065.
 — Morning Sitting (M.) 3233.
 — Saturday (M.) 3549.
 — (remarks) 3477.
 High Commissioner, Stmnt. in Montreal "Star" (remarks) 2794.
 Civil Service Insurance (B. 11) 1°, 251.
 Guelph Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3111.
 Hawaiian Islands (Ans.) 185.
 Indemnity to Senators and Members (B. 132) prop. Res., 3132; in Com., 3273; 1°* of B., 3472.
 Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 102) 1°*, 2576.
 Inspection Act (General) Amt. (B. 128) 1°, 3343; 2° m., 3497.
 Insurance Act Amt. (B. 100) 1°, 2465; in Com., 3002.
 Judiciary of Ont., on personal explanation (Mr. Lister) 3528.
 Kincardine, &c., Industries, Description, &c., (Ans.) 3478.
 Ladoga Wheat and Two-rowed Barley (Ans.) 1524.
 Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Commission (Ans.) 325.
 Liverpool, N.S., Industries, Description, &c., (Ans.) 3478.
 London Industries, &c., on M. for Ret., 2218.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Lord's Day Observance, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3179.
 Louisville Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2886.
 Manufactures in Montmagny and Census (Ans.) 1131.
 — in Sorel and Census (Ans.) 1132.
 — Cotton, Cloth, &c. (Ans.) 1522.
 — Instructions to Enumerators (Ans.) 1524.
 Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5.
 Meaford Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2884.
 Medical Inspector, Montreal (Ans.) 327.
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 78, 805, 1824, 1825, 2273, 2576, 3104.
 Milverton, Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2385.
 Montmagny Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3128.
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners' (B. 99) 1°, 2464; 2° m., 2988; on Sen. Amts., 3555.
 Mount Forest Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2798.
 Negotiations with U. S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1825.
 Newfoundland, Papers re Negotiations, Mess. from His Ex., 2273.
 Nickel Coinage, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclean, York) 2419.
 North-west Cattle Quarantine (Ans.) 862, 1131.
 N. W. T. Lands Act consolid. (B. 113) 1°, 2977.
 Ocean Steam-ship Subsidies (B. 129) 1°, 3343; 2° m., 3537.
 Owen Sound Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3118.
 Parliamentary Fees, Disposition of Receipts (B. 61) 1°, 1130; in Com., 2133.
 Patent Act Amt. (B. 110) 1°, 2794; in Com., 3268.
 Policy Holders and Insurance Co.'s (Ans.) 3480.
 Port Elgin Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2641.
 Port Hope Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2636.
 Prince County, P.E.I., Judgeship (Ans.) 2132.
 Prohibition in Man. (Ans.) 3480.
 Public Accounts (presented) 5.
 — Com. Meetings (remarks) 2132.
 Public Holidays Act Amt. (B. 75) 1°*, 1673.
 Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°*, 3549; 2° m., 3556.
 Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U. S., on M. for Cor., &c., 339.
 Returns, on inquiry (remarks) 2093, 3104.
 Ridgetown Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2883.
 St. Mary's Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2384.
 St. Ours Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3125.
 Seaforth Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2639.
 Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 101) 1°*, 2576.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Settlers' Cattle, Importation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3180.
 Scheduling Canadian Cattle, Great Britain and Ireland, on M. for Ret., 334.
 Sick Mariners' Dues (Ana.) 3130.
 Silver, Canadian and American, percentage of Alloy (Ans.) 1523.
 Sorel Town Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3123.
 Speaker of the Senate (B. 114) 2^m, 3537, 3558.
 Strachroy Industries, Description, &c. (Ana.) 2796, 3478.

SUPPLY (Res. for Com.) 78.

- Agriculture* (Dairy Interests) 3442, 3341; (Experimental Farms) 472, 3357, Dairy Products, 1289; (Haras National Co.) 485.
Arts, &c. (Archives) 409; (Census &c.) 1273, 2584, 2602; ("Patent Record") 411; (Statistics) 411; (World's Columbian Ex.) 425.
Charges of Management (Asst. Rec.-Gen's. Office) Halifax, 112, St. John, 112; (Baring Bros. and Glyn & Co.) Commission, 1241; (Country Savings' Banks, N.B., &c.) 114; (Dom. Notes) 114; (Inspector) 111; (Public Debt) 100.
Civil Government (Agriculture) 121, contingencies, 293, Extra Clerks, 2597; (Customs) 121; (Geological Survey) 130; (Gov.-Gen's. Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 263; (High Commissioner) 189, contingencies, rent, &c., 203; (Indian Affairs) 121; (Interior) 185; (Marine and Fisheries) 123; (Militia) 117, contingencies, 287; (Mounted Police) 120; (Printing and Stationery) 119; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 279; (Public Works) 128, Extra Clerks, 2598; (Railways and Canals) 129; (Secretary of State) 119, 1242; (Trade and Commerce) 131, 1244.
Collection of Revenues: Customs (T. J. Galbraith) 2635.
Fisheries (Protection Service) 3343.
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 3366.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 406. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 395.
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 3410; (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 3411.
Miscellaneous (Arbitration, Dom. and Ont.) 3388; (Costs of Litigation) 2593; (International Mining Convention) 2111; (Lord Lansdowne's Portrait) 2127; (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 3387; (Preparing Returns) 3388; (Prohibition Commission) 2113; (St. John's, Nfld., Fire) 2112; (Translating C. S. Inquiry) 2112.
Militia (Compensation Claims) 2593; (Drill Pay) 2634; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 597.
Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1719.
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 2135. *Income*: Buildings (Dartmouth P.O.) 2177; (Pictou P.O.) 2975; (Rideau Hall) 2961; (St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary) 2190.
Quarantine (Cattle Quarantines) 503; (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 487; (Public Health) 502, 2604-2614; (Traoade Lasaretto) 503; (Winnipeg, &c., Hospitals) 503.
Territorial Account (Rebellion, N.W.T.) 2130.
Trade and Commerce (Commercial Agencies) 3409.
Unprovided Items, 2130.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Supply (B. 135) 1st, 3556.
 Tilbury Centre Industries, Description, &c. (Ana.) 3345.
 Treaty with France, Cor. in Montreal "Star" (remarks) 2472, 2475.
 — Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1824.
 — (M. for Papers) 2464.
 — on M. to adjn. House (remarks) 2212, 3549.
 — (Stmnt.) 2273.
 — Printing Papers (M.) 2575.
 — Papers presented (remarks) 2647.
 — Papers respecting (remarks) 1615, 2289, 3068, 3103, 3346.
 Tuberculosis in Cattle, Slaughter (Ans.) 1133.
 Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 2409.
 Two-rowed Barley, Price paid by Govt. (Ana.) 1320.
 Quarantine Regulations *re* Cattle in Bond for Export (Ans.) 607.
 — Cattle for World's Fair (Ans.) 723.
 — Imported Cattle (Ans.) 438.
 Uxbridge Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2217, 3109.
 Vaudreuil Election, Returning Officer (Ans.) 2212; (remarks) 2576.
 Victoriaville, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2092, 2873.
 Voters' Lists, 1893 (B. 123) 1st 3103.
 Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 78; in Com. 3555.
 — The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1454.
 — on conc. in Res., 3234.
 Whitby Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2877.
 Woodstock Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2881, 3115.
 Yarmouth Industries, Description, &c. (Ans.) 2876, 3106.
- Fraser, Mr. D. C., Guysborough.**
 Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 372.
 Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 796.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1660.
 Fisheries, Mar. Provs. (remarks) 3474.
 Fishing Bounties, &c., Irregularities in Paying (M. for Cor.) 355.
 — Payments in Victoria and Guysborough Counties (M. for Ret. *) 867.
 Garrison Grounds, Annapolis, Preservation (Que.) 1523.
 Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1st, 859.
 Lieut.-Governor of N.B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 90.
 McDougall, Lauchlin, Claim for Superannuation (M. for Cor.) 2245.

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—Continued.

Mackerel Nets, Repeal of O.C. (Ques.) 224.

— (remarks) 3346.

New Harbour Breakwater, Survey (Ques.) 862.

Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 260.

Returns (inquiry) 2093, 2801.

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (Archives) 410; (World's Columbian Ex.) 426.*Civil Government* (High Commissioner) 202;

(Trade and Commerce) 137, 143.

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3355.*Justice, Administration of* (Admiralty, Que.) 310.*Legislation*: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3441.*Penitentiaries* (B.C.) 319; (St. Vincent de Paul) 318.*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Pilotou P.O.)

2965. Harbours and Rivers (Digby Pier) 2921;

(Ingouish Pier) 2925; (McNair's Cove) 2928, 2982.

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 2951.*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 3227.

Travelling Expenses of Judges, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 310.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 833.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1691.

Fréchette, Mr. L., alias Coté, Mr. J., Mégantic.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2768.

Geological Surveys, Eastern Townships (Ques.) 507.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3169.

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., Quebec County.

Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 2644.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2437, 2692.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2804.

Drill Hall, Quebec, Repairs (Ques.) 2643, 2887.

Labrie, Chas. I., Claim for Professional Services (M. for Ret. *) 1550.

North Canadian Atlantic Ry. and Steam-ship Co.'s Revival (B. 67) 1st, 1399.

Quebec Drill Hall, Repairs, Contract (Ques.) 2887.

SUPPLY:

Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 497.**Gibson, Mr. W., Lincoln and Niagara.**Ballantyne, Martha, Relief (B. 82) 1st, 1938.Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 1st, 1606.

Port Dalhousie Ferry Service (Ques.) 1130.

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (World's Columbian Ex.) 425.*Legislation*: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3437.*Miscellaneous* (Prohibition Commission) 2120.**Gillies, Mr. J. A., Richmond, N.S.**

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brockville) in Com., 3505.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 3482.*Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1362.**Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte.**

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1227.

Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on M. (Mr. Daly) to adjn. deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2241.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2nd, 1605.

St. John Custom-house, Copper Roof (Ques.) 863.

Girouard, Mr. J., Two Mountains.

Pointe aux Anglairs Lighthouse, Contract (Ques.) 437.

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3407.**Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier.**Automatic Telephone and Electric Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 58) 1st, 859.**Godbout, Mr. J., Beauce.**

I. C. R., Section Superintendent (Ques.) 2215.

St. Sébastien P. O., change of Location, (M. for Cor. &c. *) 1551.

Grieve, Mr. J. N., North Perth.

Experimental Farm, Rep. published (M. for Ret. *) 867.

Milverton Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2385.

St. Mary's Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2383.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 474.

Voters' Lists, Revision (Ques.) 506.

Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.

Agriculture, Deptl. Employees, Payment (Ques.) 610.

Baillairgeon P. O., Maladministration (M. for Cor., &c. *) 356.

I. C. R., Employees Discharged (Ques.) 1032.

— Tenders for Fencing (Ques.) 1746.

Liverpool (Co. L'Islet) Postmaster (Ques.) 1031.

River du Loup, Deepening, Payments (M. for Stmtt. *) 1551.

Skeffington, Detective, Complaint against (Ques.) 1745.

Gullet, Mr. G., West Northumberland, Ont.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2766.

Silver, Can. and American, percentage of Alloy (Ques.) 1523.

Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.

- Bellavance, Ferdinand, Refund on Tender (Ans.) 2383.
 Carleton Branch Ry. (B. 122) 1°, 3102; 2° m., 3269.
 Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2270, 2285.
 I. C. R., Coal and Iron Freight Rates (Ans.) 1033.
 ——— Employees Discharged (Ans.) 1032.
 ——— Freight Rates on Hay (Ans.) 1322,
 ——— Newspapers, &c., Tenders for Sale (Ans.) 610.
 ——— Receipts and Expenditure (Ans.) 149.
 ——— St. Charles Branch, Construction (Ans.) 861.
 ——— Section Superintendent (Ans.) 2216.
 ——— Tenders for Fencing (Ans.) 1746.
 Lachine Canal, Bridging Contract (Ans.) 223.
 London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. *Moneriff*) in Com., 2690.
 P. E. I. Ry., Dismissal of Trackmaster McPherson, 2218.
 ——— Receipts and Expenditure (Ans.) 149.
 Port Dalhousie Mail Service (Ans.) 1131.
 Quebec Eastern Ry. Subsidy, &c., Pets., Cor., &c., on M. for copies, 336.
 Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 540.
 Railway Act Amt. (B. 131) 1°, 3472; 2° m., 3517; in Com., 3520.
 Railway Subsidies (B. 127) prop. Res., 2887; in Com., 3023, 3067; conc. in and 1° of B., 3268; 2° m., 3486.
 Richelieu River Wharf, on M. for O. C.'s, &c., 2251.
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal Tolls, (Ans.) 1747.
 Skeffington, Detective, Complaints against (Ans.) 1746, 2644.
 Treaty with France, on Finance Min.'s Stmtnt., 2285.
 Trudeau, Mr., Appmt., &c., to Civil Service (Ans.) 1525.
 ——— Ret. re inquiry (remarks) 3234.

SUPPLY:

- Arts and Statistics* (Statistics) 413.
Canals—Capital (St. Mary's) 3450; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3231. *Income* (Beauharnois) 1724; (Chambly) 1724; (Lachine) 1723; (Rapide Plat) gratuity, 1724; (Rideau) 1723; Ste. Anne's Locks) 1290.
Civil Government (Sec. of State) contingencies, 292; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 275; (Railways and Canals) 129.
Miscellaneous (Gratuity to Mowatt) 2112.
Railways—Capital (Annapolis and Digby) 1290.
 C. P. R. (Construction) 3086. I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 3290; (St. Charles Branch) 3231
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 727.
 Welland Canal, New Culvert, Tenders (Ans.) 609.

Hazen, Mr. J. D., St. John, N.B., City and County.

- Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 379.
 Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1225.
 Canadian Live Stock Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1** and 2**, 3101.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2995.
 Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2809.
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3009.
 Lieut.-Governor of N. B., M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 87.
 Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 1599.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3043.
 SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 402.
Justice, Administration of (Admiralty, Que.) 309.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 3217.

Hearn, Mr. J., West Quebec.

- Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1227.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2788.
 Lieut.-Governor of N. B. on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 95.
 SUPPLY:
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 496.

Henderson, Mr. D., Halton.

- Cattle Scheduled by Great Britain (Que.) 2643.
 SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Burlington Channel) 3484.

Hughes, Mr. S., North Victoria.

- Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 1232.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2733.
 Military Interchanges, British and Can. (Que.) 1524.
 North-west Territories Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 606.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2075.
 SUPPLY:
Militia (Civil Employees) Salaries, 570; (Lieut.-Col. *Alger*) gratuity, 2590; (Military Properties) 561; (Permanent Corps) 560.
 Volunteer Rifle Practice, Ammunition (Que.) 223.

Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.

- Guelph Industries, Description, &c. (Que.) 3111.

Ives, Hon. W. B., Sherbrooke.

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2918.

Civil Service Employees, Mounted Police, &c. (Ans.) 436.

Herchmer, L. W.; Rep., &c., re Charges (remarks) 865; (Ans.) 1240, 2387.

Mounted Police Rep. (presented) 1673.

Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 281.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3026.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 281.

Mounted Police (Maps for Rep.) 1722.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Mounted Police) 2208; (Richmond P. O.) 2197.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2479.

Jeannotte, Mr. H., L'Assomption.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 1557, 2641, 2682, 2693.

— on M. to place on Order Paper, 1589.

Compulsory Voting B. 8 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2^d, 521.

Judiciary of Quebec, on personal explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 3526.

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., Gaspé.

Bonne Espérance Fishery Division, Appmt. of Officer (Ques.) 437.

— (M. for Cor.) 1551.

Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ques.) 437.

Cattle Transport across the Atlantic (Ques.) 2643.

Exploring Expeditions, James' and Hudson Bays (M. for Ret.) 1551.

Newfoundland Fishermen on Labrador Coast (M. for Ret.) 2679.

SUPPLY:

Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 496; (Public Health) 2624.

Whitely, W. H., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 608.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1^o, 1609.

Modus Vivendi, Extension (Ques.) 1747.

Newfoundland, Refund of License Fees (Ques.) 1747.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dartmouth P. O.) 2175; (Pictou P. O.) 2973.

Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1223.

Coal Fields (N. S.) on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1646.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2719; (explanation) 2792.

B

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—Continued.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1^o, 1602.

Sugar, Removal of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1544.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2617.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Pictou P. O.) 2973.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 3100.

Lechapelle, Mr. S., Hochelaga.

Treaty with France, Translation (remarks) 3253.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1199.

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 384.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1572.

Cabinet, Constitution of the, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1704.

Cholera, Preventive Measures (M. for Papers, &c.) 866.

Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 1748.

Clarke, C. S., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 610.

Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 803.

Customs Dept., Reorganization, Rep. to Council (M. for copies) 867.

Harkaway Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 336.

Hartney, Timothy, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 606.

Lieut.-Governor of N.B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 93.

Meaford, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2884.

Owen Sound Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3118.

Ridgetown, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2883.

Saugeen Indian Reserve, Seizure of Ties, &c. (Ques.) 148.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 477.

Arts, &c. (World's Columbian Ex.) 431.

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 283; (High Commissioner) contingencies, rent, &c., 299; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 289; (Trade and Commerce) 1245; 1259.

Indians (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2108.

Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 461.

Militia (Warlike, &c., Stores) 596.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Halifax Drill Hall) 2181; (Pictou P. O.) 2185, 2970; (Richmond P. O.) 2204.

Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 492.

Two-cent Postage Rate, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3075.

Two-rowed Barley, Price paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1320.

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Villiers, Dep. Adjt. Gen., Suspension, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 351.
Walkerton Mail Service (Ques.) 861.
Watters, Thos. J., Appmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 724.

Langelier, Mr. F., Centre Quebec.

- Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 1555, 2459, 2686.
Cap aux Corbeaux Wharf, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2937.
Isle Perrot Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2645.
Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3309.
Lieut.-Governor of N.B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 91.
Pickled Goods, Reduction of Duty (Ques.) 506.
Pointe à Valois Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2646.
Sugar, Removal of Duties (prop. Res.) 1542.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Haras National Co.) 486.
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, rent, &c., 212.
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Judges, Montreal) 3429.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2337.
(*Quarantine* (Public Health) 2009, 2625.
Vaudreuil Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 2646.
Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1678.

Langevin, Hon. Sir H., K. C. M. G., Three Rivers.

- Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec (M. for Cor.) 235.
Canadian Interests in Hawaii (Ques.) 1322.
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2832.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 2815.
— Examinations, &c., Questions (M. for copy *) 867.
— Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^d, 3149.
Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2776.
Harbour and River Police (Que.) Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 3021.
I. C. R., Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmnts.) 334.
Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3006.
Lachine Canal, Bridging Contract (Ques.) 223.
McNamee, F. B., & Co., Claims; (M. for Ret. *) 867.
Public Officers Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 3022.

Langevin, Hon. Sir H.—Continued.

- Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1856.
Soulanges Canal, Section 8, Tenders (M. for List*) 356.

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Capital* (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 2136.
Telegraphic System of the Empire (M. for Cor., &c.) 329.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provenccher.

- Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2461.
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 251.
— 2nd Rep. (presented) 434.
— 3rd Rep. (presented) 2287; conc., 2383.
— 4th Rep., conc., 3102.
— Amanuenses (remarks) 3554.
Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1st, 786.
Separate Schools (Man.) Pets., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 328.
— Judgment, H. M.'s Privy Council (M. for copy) 328.
— on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1778.

SUPPLY:

- Legislation: House of Commons* (Sessional Messengers) 3439.

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Address, on The, 17; (Amt.) 22; neg. (Y. 53, N. 103) 77.
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1224.
Canada and Newfoundland, Cor. (Ques.) 328.
— Papers *re* Negotiations, on explanation (Sir *John Thompson*) 509.
Canadian Representation at Foreign Capitols (remarks) 1615.
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Com'nr's Rep. *re* Charges (Ques.) 327.
Civil Servants and Municipal Elections (remarks) 1674.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^d, 2812.
— Employees, Birthplace, National Origin, &c., on M. for Ret., 355.
— Insurance B. 11 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^d, 3275.
— Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 540.
Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 792.
Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res. 2988; in Com., 3001.
Controller of Customs, par. in "Evening Star" (remarks) 3476.
Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 470.

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2804; on consdn. of B., 2978.
 — Cor. with Supreme Court Judges, &c. (M. for copies*) 1550.
 Customs Acts Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3^e (Amt.) 3536.
 Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2^e, 1307.
 — on adjmnt. (remarks) 3065.
 — (Ques.) 3068.
 Gordon, Mr., deceased, on adjmnt. (remarks) 942.
 Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. to take in Thursday, 1400.
 — Monday, 1613.
 — Thursdays, 1935.
 High Commissioner, Stmtnt. in Montreal "Star" (remarks) 2793.
 Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3305.
 Lieut.-Governor of N. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 84.
 London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Moncrieff) in Com., 2680.
 Lord's Day Observance B. 5 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 2^e, 516.
 Marshall, Hormidas, Claim for Injuries (M. for Ret.*) 1550.
 Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 865.
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brookville) in Com., 3511.
 Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 265.
 Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Tisdale) 1934.
 — Reps. from Com., on M. to place on Orders of the Day (objection) 2872.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3024, 3054; on M. for 2^e, 3489.
 Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U.S., on M. for Cor., &c., 340.
 Representation Act Amt. B. 42 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 1^e, 722.
 School Lands in Man. B. 109 (Mr. Daly) in Com., 3272.
 Separate Schools (Man.) Privy Council Rep. (Ques.) 328.
 — on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1977.
 — on M. to print Papers, 1128.
 — Papers respecting (remarks) 1135.
 — O. C. ref. to Supreme Court (Ques.) 1401.
 South Middlesex, Issue of Writ (remarks) 1033.
 — Returning Officer, Appmnt. (Ques.) 1134.
 — Vacancy (remarks) 1310.
 Supreme Court, Vacancy on Bench, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 545.

SUPPLY :

- Agriculture (Haras National Co.) 485.
 Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 1276.

B $\frac{1}{2}$ **Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.**

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, rent, &c., 203; (Sec. of State) 1243; (Trade and Commerce) 1244.
 Justice, Administration of (Circuit Judges, Montreal) 3427.
 Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c., the Laws) 405; (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1270.
 Militia (Cartridge Factory, Que.) 604; (Permanent Corps) 563.
 Public Works—Capital (Channel, Que. and Montreal) 2167. Income: Buildings (Dartmouth P.O.) 2169; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2182; (Pictou P.O.) 2971; (St. Vincent de Paul) 2187. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2935. Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 2951; (Sir John Macdonald's Monument) 3954.
 Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, &c., 490.
 Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2535.
 Treaty with France (Ques.) 510, 1402.
 — on Finance Min.'s Stmtnt., 2280, 3346.
 — on M. to adjn. House (remarks) 3550.
 — Papers respecting (remarks) 2289, 3068.
 Vaudreuil Electoral District, Returning Officer (Ques.) 1674.
 — Appmt. (remarks) 1745, 2092, 2130, 2212, 2576.
 Voters' Lists (1893) Revision B. 123 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 3272.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1431.
 Welland County Court Judge, Vacancy (remarks) 2289.
 Yamaska Dam, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2938.

Laverne, Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.

- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2469.
 La Couture, Jos., Claim for Damages (M. for Ret.*) 2679.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2080.
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. (B. 24) 1^e, 504.
 Victoriaville, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2092, 2373.

Leclair, Mr. P., Terrebonne.

- Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 14.
 Criminal Code, Copies for Members (Ques.) 607.

Legris, Mr. J. H., Maskinonge.

- Fishing, Prohibition in Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3328.
 Louisville Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2886.
 Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Postmaster (Ques.) 2801.
 St. Léon (Maskinonge) Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866.
 — (remarks) 2290.

SUPPLY :

- Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3419.

Lépine, Mr. A. T., East Montreal.

Government, &c., Employees, Hours of Labour Regulation (B. 12) 1^o, 324.
 Medical Inspector, Montreal (Ques.) 326.
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1520.
 Public Works, Expend. since Confederation (M. for Stmnt.*) 1550.
 Sick Mariners' Fund (Ques.) 1520, 3129.
 Type-Setting Machines, &c., Cost (Ques.) 436.

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1561.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2434.
 Canadian Fisheries, Yield and Value (Ques.) 1033.
 Census, Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1715.
 Coal Oil Duty (personal explanation) 1618.
 Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3199.
 Judiciary of Ont. (personal explanation) 3522, 3528.
 St. Thomas Postmastership, Vacancy (Ques.) 1936.
 Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Tolls (Ques.) 1747.

SUPPLY :

Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 1278.
Civil Government (Deptl. Buildings) contingencies, 304; (Marine and Fisheries) contingencies, 298; (Trade and Commerce) contingencies, 302, 1248.
Government of N. W. T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1737.
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 3384; (Ont. and Ques.) 1741, 3377.
Justice, Administration of (Admiralty, Ques.) 309; (Supreme Court Reps.) 308.
Legislation : House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3498; (Voters' Lists) Printing, 1291.
Militia (Cartridge Factory, Ques.) 608; (Civil Employees) Salaries, 570; (Clothing, &c.) 601; (Military Properties) 575; (Permanent Corps) 549; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 598.
Public Works—Capital (Kaministiquia River) 2168. *Income* : Buildings (Dartmouth P. O.) 2169, 2172; (Richmond P. O.) 2194.
 Travelling Expenses of Judges, in Com. of Sup., (remarks) 309.
 Treaty with France, Cor. in Montreal "Star" (remarks) 2471, 2475.
 Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1675, 1685.

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's (P. E. I.)

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers (Digby Pier) 2921.

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., Winnipeg.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1820.

SUPPLY :

Militia (Permanent Corps) 555.
 Winnipeg Militia Hospital (Ques.) 1130.

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

Coal Oil, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cleveland) 529.
 Customs Tariff, Revision, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 651.
 Pig Iron, Production from 1870 to 1880 and Bounty Paid (M. for Ret.*) 866.

SUPPLY :

Arts and Statistics (Statistics) 422.
 Tilbury Centre Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3344.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 867.

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., Algoma.

Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1^o, 786.

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2461.
 Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3286.

Maclean, Mr. W. F., East York, Ont.

Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 370.
 Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2228.
 — on M. (Mr. Daly) to adjn. deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2240.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2745.
 Hawaiian Islands, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 185.
 — on adjmnt. of House (Ques.) 219.
 Heward, Edward B., Relief B. 95 (Mr. Sutherland) on M. for 2^o, 2215.
 Nickel Coinage (prop. Res.) 2418.
 Order (Ques. of) Controller of Customs' Speech and Home Rule, 2711.
 Politicians and Press, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 259.
 Railway Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2^o, 3517.
 Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U.S., on M. for Cor., &c., 351.
 Representation (H. of C.) Act Amt. B. 42 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1617.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2025.

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues : Weights and Measures, 3489.
Militia (Cartridge Factory) 3350.
 Treaty with France, on Finance Min.'s Stmnt., 2283.
 Voters' Lists (1893) Revision B. 123 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 3273.

- McAlister, Mr. J., Restigouche.**
Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2809.
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3357.
Indians (Que.) W. A. Mott's services, 1742.
Railways—Capital: L.C.R., 3094; (Halifax, accommodation) 3227.
- McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.**
Canadian Representation at Foreign Capitols (remarks) 1614.
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2911.
Columbian Exhibition Commissioners, on M. for Com. on Res., 2969.
Cotton, &c., Industries, Capital Invested (Que.) 1750.
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2468.
Insurance Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3009.
Manitoba School Case, Papers respecting (remarks) 1135.
— Printing Papers (Que.) 1613.
Manufacturing Industries, Cotton, Cloth, &c., (Que.) 1522.
North-west Territories Act Amt. (B. 28) 1^o, 606.
Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 3023.
Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1825; (explanations) 2057, 2068.
Tariff Reform, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 2290; neg. (Y. 64, N. 116) 2574.
Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 3482.
- McDonald, Mr. J. A., Victoria, N.S.**
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (English Pier) 2925.
- McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.**
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Pictou P.O.) 2185, 2966.
Quarantine (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 488.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1417.
- McGregor, Mr. W., North Essex.**
Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3203.
Lake Erie and Detroit River Co.'s (B. 55) 1^o, 859.
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (St. Mary's) 3443.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 3402.
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3418.
- McInerney, Mr. G. V., Kent, N.B.**
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7.
Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2737.
Monoton and P.E.I. Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 56) 1^o, 859.
Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1699.
- McKay, Mr. A., Hamilton.**
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 32) 1^o, 658.
Coal Field (N.S.) on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1650.
Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2764.
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society's (B. 19) 1^o, 434.
Labour Bureau, Establishment (Que.) 1523.
North American Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 79) 1^o, 1743.
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Burlington Channel) 3464.
- McKeen, Mr. D., Cape Breton.**
Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 793.
- McLennan, Mr. R. R., Glenarry.**
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 891.
- McLeod, Mr. E., St. John, N.B., City.**
Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 2440, 2696.
Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2809.
Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1690.
- McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.**
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 163.
Cattle Imports from U.S. into N.W.T. (Que.) 862, 1131.
Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2255.
Clinton Industries, Description, &c. (Que.) 3126.
Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 449.
Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2271.
Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3210.
North-west Cattle Quarantine (Que.) 862, 1131.
Port Albert Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Que.) 2645.
Seaforth Industries, Description, &c. (Que.) 2639.
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairying Interests) 3340, 3442; (Experimental Farms) 472, 3337; (Dairy Products) 1289; (Haras National Co.) 435.

McMillan, Mr. J.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Arts, &c.* (Statistics) 420; (World's Columbian Ex.) 425.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 2600.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine Foreman, 3434.
Public Works: Income Harbour and Rivers (Repairs, &c.) 2947.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 981.

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

- Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 165.
 Brandon Industrial School (Ques.) 2387.
 Cabinet Changes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2580.
 Cattle Scheduled in Great Britain (Ques.) 2643.
 Civil Service Employees' Birthplace, National Origin, &c. (M. for Ret.) 354.
 — Insurance B. 11 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3279.
 — Superannuation Act Repeal (prop. Res.) 1528.
 — Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^d, 3135; in Com., 3154.
 Clark, Jas., Emplmt. in P. O. Dept. (Ques.) 2795.
 Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2225.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2774.
 Cotton Combines and the Tariff (Ques.) 1032, 1612.
 Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2980.
 Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3532; on M. for 3^d, 3535.
 Davidson, J. J., Appmnt. as Appraiser (Ques.) 1134.
 Doran, J. Fred., Relief B. 107 (Mr. Dickey) on M. for 2^d, 3020.
 Duggan, Culler at Montreal, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2215.
 Fishery Protection Service, Qualification of Commanders (M. for Ret.)* 2245.
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2470.
 House of Commons and Senate, Officers, &c. (M. for Ret.) 865.
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3006.
 Land Grants to Militia B. 74 (Mr. Daly) in Com., 3267.
 Lieut.-Gov.'s Residence, Regina, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.)* 2245.
 Lord's Day Observance, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3180.
 Military College Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Patterson, Huron) in Com. on Res., 3344.

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Mount Forest Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2798; (M. for Ret.)* 2245.
 Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 285.
 Parliamentary Printing, Delay in Production (remarks) 726, 2131.
 Pig-Iron, Production from 1881 to 1892 and Bounty Paid (M. for Ret.)* 356.
 Port Hope Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2636.
 Printing Bureau, Delay in Printing Budget Speech (remarks) 726.
 Public Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 2132.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3023.
 Returns, on inquiry (remarks) 2094, 3104.
 Saugeen Indian Reserve, Seizure of Ties, &c. (Ques.) 148.
 Strathroy Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2795, 3478.
 Sugar, Removal of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Langelier) 1547.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Dairying Interests) 3341; (Experimental Farms) 476.
Arts, &c. (Archives) 410; (Statistics) 415; ("Patent Record") 410.
Canals—Income (Lachine 1723; Rideau) 1723.
Charges of Management (Country Savings Banks, N.B. &c.) 113; (Dom. Notes) 116; (Inspector) 111; (Public Debt) 106.
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 296; (Customs, Sec. to Controller) 2597; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 264, 275; (High Commissioner) 187, contingencies, rent, &c., 203; (Interior) 185; (Inland Rev., Controller) 1262; (Marine and Fisheries) 126; (Militia) 117; (Mounted Police) 120; (Post Office) computing Interest, 217; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 285; (Public Works) 127; (Railways and Canals) 129; (Sec. of State) 1243, contingencies, 287; (Trade and Commerce) 141, 1246, 1257.
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3390; (Salaries, &c.) 3389. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 3395.
Fisheries (Isaac Newton) 1721.
Government of N. W. T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1727.
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3419.
Indians: B. C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2096. Man. and N.W.T., 3380; (Red Deer Industrial School) 2085. Que. (W. A. Mott's services) 1742.
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 403. Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 408; (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1272. Printing, 1288. Library (Salaries) 405. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 395.
Militia (Cartridge Factory) 3353; (Civil Employees) Salaries, 570; (Compensation Claims) 2590; (Military Properties) 589; (Permanent Corps) 586; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 597, 2589.
Miscellaneous (Costs of Litigation) 2593; (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 3387; (Prohibition Commission) 2126; translating C. S. Inquiry) 2112.

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Mounted Police* (Maps for Rep.) 1722.
Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1719;
 (New Steamer) 3342.
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 1265; (Kingston) 314,
 389; (St. Vincent de Paul) 318.
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour)
 2157; (Channel, Que. and Montreal) 2166; (Kam-
 iuistiquia River) 2168. *Income: Buildings*
 (Dartmouth P.O.) 2168; (Halifax Drill Hall)
 2180; (Major's Hill Park) 2209; (Montreal P.O.)
 2206; (Mounted Police) 2207; (Pietou P.O.) 2184,
 2964; (Richmond P.O.) 2190a (Rideau Hall)
 2954; (St. Vincent de Paul) 2188. *Harbours and*
Rivers (N.S.) 2922.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 3096; (Halifax, accom-
 modation) 3225.
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 472.
Treaty with France, Ratification (remarks) 2476.
 Walsh, T. J., *Revising "Ready Reckoner"*
 (Que.) 2092.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 1090.

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Atlantic Mail Service*, on M. for Com. of Sup.
 (remarks) 1230.
Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3561.
Coal Combine (personal explanation) par. in
 "Empire", 943.
Coal Fields (N.S.) *Delegation to His Ex.* (re-
 marks) 794.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1653.
Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on
 Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup.,
 2784.
Great Britain, Preferential Trade with (remarks)
 659.
Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte)
 to M. for Com. of Sup., 2066.
Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M.
 for 2^d, 3559.
 SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Statistics) 424.
Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M.
 for Com. of Sup., 2560.

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

- Boundary of Ry. Belt in B. C.* (M. for Cor.)*
 2679.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3283.
B. C. Dock Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1st, 1824.
Chilliwack Ry. Co.'s (B. 86) 1st, 1824.
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Navigation
Co.'s (B. 68) 1st, 1399.
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1st, 1591.
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1st,
 1824.
Nicola Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1st, 1824.

Marshall, Mr. J. H., East Middlesex.

- Woodmen of the World incorp.* B. (B. 84) 1st, 658.

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

- Bribery at Elections* B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com.,
 2439, 2695.
North American Canal Co.'s (B. 79) M. to place
 on Order Paper for Com., 3066.
Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com.
 on Res., 3044.
 SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Mes-
 sengers) 3440.

Metcalfe, Mr. J. H., Kingston.

- SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Mes-
 sengers) 3440.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 1496.

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., Yamaska.

- SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income—Harbours and Rivers
 (Que.) 2943, 3462.

Yamaska Dam, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2943.**Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.**

- Address, The*, on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 63.
Agriculture and Colonization Com., Final Rep.,
 on conc., 3553.
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup.
 (remarks) 1231.
Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3563.
Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec, on M. for Cor.,
 239.
Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com.,
 2426, 2682, 2697.
Census Enumerators' Instructions (remarks)
 1401.
 — *Instructions to Commissioners*, on M. for
 Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1714.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Costigan) on M.
 for 2^d, 2816.
 — *Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27* (Mr. Fos-
 ter) on M. for 2^d, 3143; in Com., 3159.
 — *Employees' Birthplace, National Origin*,
 on M. for Ret., 355.
Coal Fields (N.S.) *Delegation to His Ex.* (Que.
 of Priv.) 787, 799.
Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124
 (Mr. Foster) on M. for Com. on Res., 2990; in
 Com., 3000.
Consular Fees on Exports (remarks) 2676.
Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on
 Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup.,
 2721.
Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in
 Com., 2805, 2983.
Customs Acts Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Foster) on M. for
 3^d, 3536.
Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Costi-
 gan) on M. for 2^d, 1308.
Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr.
Davin) 2269.
Indemnity, Senate and House of Commons B.
 132 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3536.

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Inland Fisheries, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3207.
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3010.
 Judiciary of Quebec, on Ruling (remarks) 3289.
 Land Grants to Rys. (Ques.) 1541.
 — (M. for Ret.) 1538.
 Lieut.-Governor of N.B. on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 82.
 London Industries, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2218.
 Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 254.
 Public Printing, &c., B. 134 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3557.
 Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U.S., on M. for Cor., &c., 339.
 Separate Schools (Man.) Judgment of H. M.'s Privy Council, on M. for copy, 329.
 — Papers respecting (remarks) 1135.
 Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 3538, 3559.
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. 133 (Mr. Duly) on M. for 3°, 3556.

SUPPLY:

- Canals—Capital (St. Mary's) 3452.
 Civil Government (Trade and Commerce) 1250.
 Collection of Revenues: Ordnance Lands (Grand Falls Bridge, N.B.) 2129.
 Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 3416.
 Indians: B.C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2988, Ont. and Que., 3358.
 Public Works—Income: Buildings (Pictou P.O.) 2972. Dredging (New Plant) 2949. Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 2953.
 Treaty with France (remarks) 2474, 3103.
 Two-cent Postage Rate, on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3076.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1484.
 Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1676.

Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.

- Assiniboine River Water Power (B. 77) 1°, 1673.
 Can. Gas Association incorp. (B. 85) 1°, 1824.
 Catholic Mutual Benefit Association's Pet., discharge of Order (M.) 1129.
 Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2230.
 Hebden, R. Y., Relief (B. 94) M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 2289.
 Les Dames Religieuses du Sacré Cœur de Jésus, Pet. (remarks) 2607.
 Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. consolid. (B. 96) 1°, 2288.
 Private Bills, Extension (M.) 786, 1222.
 — Time for Posting (M.) 2288.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3047; on M. for 2°, 3488.

Mills, Mr. J. B.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Militia (Military Properties) 551.
 Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 3453.
 Western Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°, 721.
Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.
 Coal Oil, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cleveland) 535.
 Customs Tariff, Revision, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 619.
 London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°, 786.
 Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) in Com., 3511.
 Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1698; on Sen. Amts., 3484.

Monet, Mr. D., Napierville.

- Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brockville) in Com., 3514.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 952.

Montague, Mr. W. H., Haldimand.

- Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 374.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners, on M. for Com., on Res., 2997.

SUPPLY:

- Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3441.
 Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2342.

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

- Binding Twine, Free Entry (prop. Res.) 150; neg. (Y. 51, N. 91) 1584.
 — on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res., 225, 1558.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 1557.
 Census Enumerators' Instructions (remarks) 1402.
 — Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1712.
 — Returns re Aurora, Newmarket, &c., &c. (M. for Stmt. *) 2245.
 "Chevalier" Barley, Imports (Ques.) 2387.
 Civil Servants, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 327, 436.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) on M. for Com. on Res., 2997; in Com., 3002.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2781.
 Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2810, 2985.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 90) 1°, 1825.
 Galops Rapids Channel, Rep., Plans, &c., on M. for Ret., 1526.
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2468.

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Governors-General since Confedn., Salaries, &c. (M. for Stmtnt.) 334.
 "Household Effects" (Ques.), 149.
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3002, 3015.
 Kingston Penitentiary, Visitors' Entrance Fees, (M. for Stmtnt.) 2245.
 London and Pctt Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Moneriff) in Com., 2680.
 Military College Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Patterson, Huron) in Com., 3496.
 Militia Supplies, Contracts (Ques.) 224.
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 84.
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. 99 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1^o, 2464.
 Patent Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3268.
 Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brockville) in Com., 3499.
 Railway Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2^o, 3518; in Com., 3519.
 Reciprocity (Canal Tolls) Negotiations with U.S., on M. for Cor., 343.
 School Lands in Man. B. 109 (Mr. Daly) on M. for 2^o, 3270.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Experimental Farms) 479.
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2586, 2602.
Charges of Management (Public Debt) 106.
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 196, contingencies, rent, 204, 215; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 266, 272; (Marine and Fisheries) 123, contingencies, 289; (Trade and Commerce) 139, 1252-1259.
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3357.
Indians: B.C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2104. Man. and N.W.T., 3385; (Red Deer Industrial School) 2095. Ont. and Que., 3366.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3441.
Militia (Cartridge Factory) 3346; (Compensation Claims) 2591; (Lieut. Col. Alger, gratuity) 2590; (Stores) 2587.
Miscellaneous (Costs of Litigation) 2595.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 391, 3432.
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 2163. *Income*: Buildings (Chatham, N.B., P.O.) 2196; (Dartmouth P. O.) 2199; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2183; (Pictou P.O.) 2972; (Richmond P.O.) 2191; (Rideau Hall) 2955; (St. Vincent de Paul) 2189; (Water Supply) 2211. *Miscellaneous* (Art Gallery) 2954. Telegraph Lines, 2949.
Quarantine (Public Health) 2604, 2606-2619.
 Tuberculosis in Cattle, Slaughter (Ques.) 1153.
 Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Expenditure, on M. for Stmtnt., 2403.
 Victoria (B.C.) Marine Hospital, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1239.
 Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1687; on Sen. Amts., 3481.
- Northrup, Mr. W. B.** *East Hastings.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 820.

O'Brien, Mr. W. E. *Muskoka.*

- Agriculture and Colonization Com.*, Final Rep., on conc., 3353.
 Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Amt.) to adjn. deb., 174; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 58) 234.
 Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3562.
 Caron, Sir Adolphe, Rep. of Coman. *re* Charges, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 262.
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2^o, 2821.
 Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 801.
 Export Duty on Logs, on prop. Res. (M.) to adjn. deb., 1942.
 Floods in Queensland, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 544.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2069.
 Settlers' Cattle, Importation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3180.
 Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^o, 3557.
 SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 3401.
Hydrographic Surveys (Salaries, &c.) 3464.
Indians: B.C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2100.
Militia (Permanent Corps) 548.
 Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2642.
 Treaty with France, Ratification (remarks) 2476.

Quimet, Hon. J. A. *Laval.*

- Baillairgé, Geo. F., Superannuation (Ans.) 1151.
 Berlinguet, Thos. F. X., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 148.
 ——— Employees under (Ans.) 865.
 Breen, Thos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2216.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2453, 2706.
 Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2914.
 Cascumpeque (P.E.I.) Harbour, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 223.
 ——— Brush and Stone Contract (Ans.) 606.
 Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 1748.
 Cloutier, Arsène, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2317.
 Coal Contracts, Ottawa Buildings (Ans.) 326.
 Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 3000.
 Connolly Trial, Clerk to attend Court with Roll (M.) 2708.
 Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2807.
 Digby (N.S.) Pier, Repairs, Contract (Ans.) 505.
 Du Lièvre River Locks, Expenditure (Ans.) 2388.
 Fraserville P.O., Amt. Expended (Ans.) 1526.
 Govt. Offices at Toronto (Ans.) 1031.
 Howden, Jas., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1132.

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—Continued.

- Ile Perrot Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 2645.
 Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3288.
 Kamouraska Piers, &c., Completion (Ans.) 861.
 Lieut.-Governor of N. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 89.
 McCarthy, Messrs., Lands Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 1132.
 Michaud, C. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2217.
 Miminegash (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 222.
 Mongeau, Messrs., and D. Millette, Claims (Ans.) 1133.
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1520.
 New Harbour (N. S.) Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 862.
 Port Albert Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2645.
 Point à Valois Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 2646.
 Public Works, Depl. Rep. (presented) 859.
 Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 3024.
 Representation (H. of C.) Act Amt. B. 42 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1617.
 Rosa, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2216.
 Roy, Messrs. C. and Z., Claim (Ans.) 147.
 Rustico (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 326.
 ——— Repairs, on M. for Cor., &c., 2417.
 Ste. Anne de Sorel Wharf, Completion (Ans.) 1321.
 St. John Custom-house, Copper Roof (Ans.) 863.
 Sandford (N. S.) Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 326.
 Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2004.
 Spanish River Improvements (Ans.) 2644.
 Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 3557.

SUPPLY:

- Agriculture* (Experimental Farms) 484.
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Judges, Montreal) 3427.
Militia (Rifle Range, Ottawa) 2634.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3431, Binder Twine Foreman, 3432.
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1293, 2133, 2160; (Channel, Que. and Montreal) 2166; (Kaministiquia River) 2168. *Income:* Buildings (Chatham, N. B., P. O.) 2186; (Dartmouth P. O.) 2169; (Halifax Drill Hall) 2180; (Lieut. Gov.'s Residence, Regina) 1301; (Montreal P. O.) 2206; (Mounted Police) 2207; (Ottawa) Heating, &c., 2209; Repairs, &c., 1303, 2209, Water Supply, 2210; (Pictou P. O.) 2184, 2968; (P. O. Victoria, B. C.) 3453; (Printing Bureau) 3453; (Quarantine Stations) Minor, 1303; (Rideau Hall) 2954; (Richmond P. O.) 2190; (St. Henri P. O.) 2187; (St. Vincent de Paul) 2188; (Toronto Drill Shed) 1300; (Victoria, B. C., Drill Shed) 1302. *Dredging* (Mar. Provs.) 1304; (New Plant) 1306, 2948. *Harbours and Rivers* (N. B.) 2933; (N. S.)

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- 2920; (P. E. I.) 2929, 3461; (Que.) 2935, 3462; (Toronto Harbour) 2947; (Wascana Dam, Regina) 1306. *Miscellaneous* (Art Gallery) 2950; (Sir John Macdonald's Monument) 2954. *Telegraph Lines*, 2949.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) Salaries, 502; (Public Health) 2608-2623.
 Vaudreuil Wharf, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 2646.
 Winnipeg Militia Hospital (Ans.) 1130.
 Wood Island (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Govt. Survey, on M. for Rep., 337.
 Yamachiche Pier, Construction, on M. for Cor., 1528,
 Yamaska Dam, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2941.

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

- Census, Instruction to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1718.
 Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on M. to adjn. deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2242.
 Customs Acts Amt. B. 126 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 3264.
 Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 262.

SUPPLY:

- Arts, &c.* (World's Columbian Ex.) 430.
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 197; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 282; (Trade and Commerce) 1246.
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3390; (Sugar Testing) 3393. *Post Office* (Salaries, &c.) 3395.
Government of N. W. T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1731.
Indians: B. C. (Chilliwack Industrial School) 2108. *Ont. and Que.*, 1742, 3367.
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1271.
Militia (Military Properties) 571, 595; (Monuments) 605; (Transport and Freight) 602.
Miscellaneous (Preparing Returns) 3388.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine Foreman, 3432.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa, Heating, &c.) 2209; (Toronto Drill Shed) 1300; (Victoria, B. C., Drill Hall) 1302.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 743.

Patterson, Hon. J. C., West Huron.

- Amyot, Lieut.-Col., Resignation (Ans.) 2900.
 Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2786.
 Drill Hall Quebec, Repairs (Ans.) 2643.
 Fort George, Preservation (Ans.) 1522.
 Garrison Grounds, Annapolis, Preservation (Ans.) 1523.
 Land Grants to Militia (B. 74) 1°, 1672.
 Military College Act Amt. (B. 118) 1°, 3067; in Com. on Res., 3344; 2° m., 3496.
 Military Interchanges, British and Can. (Ans.) 1524.

Patterson, Hon. J. C.—*Continued.*

Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 80.
 — Pensions, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
 3086.

— Supplies, Contracts (Ans.) 224.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 87.

Quebec Drill Hall, Contract for Repairs (Ans.)
 2887.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 2586; (Cartridge Factory, Que.) 603, 3353; (Civil Employees) Salaries, 569; (Clothing, &c.) 601; (Compensation Claims) 2590; (Defence of Esquimaux) 3442; (Lieut.-Col. Alger, gratuity) 2560; (Military College) 602; (Monuments) 605, 3445; (Military Properties) 571; (Permanent Corps) 548; (Stores) 2587; (Transport and Freight) 602; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 596.

Volunteer Commanding Officers, Retirement (Ans.) 2800.

— Rifle Practice, Ammunition (Ans.) 223.

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*

Country Postmasters' Salaries (Que.) 438.

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., *Laprairie.*

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com.,
 2450.

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Cascumpeque Harbour, Brush and Stone Contract (Que.) 606.

— Engineer's Rep. (Que.) 222.

Kildare P.O., Dismissal, &c., Postmaster (Que.)
 609.

Miminegash Breakwater, Contract (Que.) 222.

Oyster Beds, Licences for Limits (Que.) 1525.

P.E.I. Ry., Dismissal of Trackmaster McPherson (Que.) 2217.

— of Employees (M. for Ret. *) 2420.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (High Commissioner) 194.

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists)
 Printing, 1292.

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour),

1298, 2143. *Income*: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.)

3461; (Piers and Breakwaters) 2929.

Railways—Capital: P.E.I. Ry., 3091.

Quarantine (Public Health) 2620.

Tignish Wharfinger, Appmnt., &c. (Que.) 149.

Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, Expenditure (M.
 for Stmt.) 2390.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 1403.

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 84) 1*, 1824.

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2265.

Corn, Removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 439; neg.
 (Y. 50, N. 90) 1585.

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act
 Amt. (B. 57) 1*, 859.

South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1*, 787.

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*

Expenditure of Provs. of Dom. (M. for Ret.)
 2247.

Military Pensions, on M. for Com. of Sup.
 (remarks) 3077.

"Quadra," Str., Tenders for Repairs (M. for
 copies) 2246.

Revenues of Provs. of Dom. (M. for Ret.) 2247.

Victoria Marine Hospital, on M. for Com. of Sup.
 (remarks) 1235.

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*

Cheese Branding (prop. Res.) 2252, 2263.

Galops Rapids Channel, Rep., Plans, &c. (M. for
 Ret.) 1526.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Repairs, &c. (Rideau
 Hall) 267.

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*

Agriculture, Capital Invested (Que.) 2389.

Artificial Fertilizers, Manufacturers (Que.) 3131.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com.,
 2457.

Census, Machines used in Compilation (Que.)
 2389.

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2262.

Du Lievre River Locks, Expenditure (Que.)
 2388.

Letter Postage, Reduction (Que.) 611.

St. Anne de la Parade, Postmaster (Que.) 2601.

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*

Bristol (Eng.) Board of Trade and "French
 Cheese" (M. for Cor.) 338.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on
 Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) to M. for Com. of Sup.,
 2770.

Gibeault, Dom. Policeman, Dismissal, &c.,
 (Que.) 1133.

Manufacturers in Montmagny, Names, &c.,
 (Que.) 1131.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com.
 on Res., 3175.

Richmond and Wolfe, Revising Officer (Que.)
 327.

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service)
 3409.

Roome, Mr. W. F., *North Middlesex.*

Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transporta-
 tion Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 45) 1*, 786.

Ross, Mr. H. H., *Dundas.*

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2254.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Monuments) 3413.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 1108.

Rowand, Mr. J., West Bruce.

Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 461.

Kincardine, &c., Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3478.

Port Elgin Industries, Description, &c. (Ques.) 2641.

U. S. Quarantine Regulations *re* Cattle in Bond for Export (Ques.) 607.

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Closing, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2234.

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Commission (Ques.) 325.

Private Bills, Time for Posting, on M., 2288.

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Haras National Co.) 496.

Arts, &c. (Archives) 410.

Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 2115.

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 503.

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 157.

Schools in N. W. T., Teachers' Salaries, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2265.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1113.

Smith, Sir D., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

Cool Fields (N. S.,) on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1667.

Smith, Mr. W., South Ontario.

Swine Slaughtered for Export (M. for O. C.) 338.

— (Ques.) 148.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1033.

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

Census, Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1717.

Kingston Penitentiary, Evidence *re* Investigation (M. for copies*) 867.

Newspapers, Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 279.

Separate Schools (Man.) Legal Expenses (Ques.) 325.

Supervisor of Cullers, Three Rivers (Ques.) 1747.

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 474.

Arts, &c. (Archives) 410; (Statistics) 411; (World's Columbian Ex.) 427.

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 294; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 267; (High Commissioner) contingencies, rent, &c., 213; (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 279, 280; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 287.

Government of N. W. T. (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1728.

Justice, Administration of (Official Arbitrators) 307.

Militia (Permanent Corps) 552.

Legislation : House of Commons (Printing, &c., the Laws,) 406.

Speaker, Mr. (HON. PETER WHITE) North Renfrew.

Address, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1743.

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on Final Rep., 3552.

Canada and Newfoundland, Papers on Fisheries, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 471, 504.

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Mess. from His Ex., *re* Charges (read) 325.

Chignecto Ship Ry., on M. to adjn. House (Rule read) 1319.

Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) on prop. Res., 2709; on M. to conc. in Res. (Ruling on Amt.) 3132.

Connolly Trial, Clerk of the House summoned (notification) 2706.

Controverted Elections (notification) 1, 319, 1591.

Corn Duties, Division, Members' Vote (remarks) 1614.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com. (Rule read) 2988.

Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3532.

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursday, 1400.

Internal Economy Comn., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 79.

Indemnity, Senate and House of Commons B. 132 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3536.

Judges, Impeachment, Rule and Precedents (read) 3289.

Judiciary of Ont., on personal explanation (Mr. Lister) 2523, 3529.

Les Dames du Sacré Cœur de Jésus, Pat. (Ruling) 2607.

Library of Parliament, Joint Rep. (presented) 5.

L'Islet Election, notification of Return of Member, 658.

Members, New : notification of Return, 3, 658, 3472.

Members' Remarks checked, 100, 626, 725, 945, 1221, 1599, 1614, 2236, 2289, 2647, 2760, 2762, 3475.

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 78, 79, 325, 471, 504, 806, 1743, 1825, 2273, 2576, 3104.

Negotiations with U. S., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1825.

Newfoundland, Papers *re* Negotiations, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2273.

Prorogation, Com. from Gov.-Gen.'s Sec. (read) 3522.

Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal, Remarks checked, 3475.

South Middlesex Election, Ret. of Member (notification) 3472.

Speech from the Throne (rep.) 3.

SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 474.
Collection of Revenues : Post Office (F. Hawkins, Salary) 3471.

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 402; (Contingencies) 403; (Salaries, &c.) 400; (Sergt.-at-Arms Estimate) 405; (Sessional Messengers) 3436; (Translation, &c.) 1266. Library (Messengers) 1267; (Salaries) 405. Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Law) 405; (Printing Paper, &c.) 409, 2599. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 397.

Tariff Reform, Division, Member's Vote, 2578.
Treaty with France, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1825.

Unparliamentary Language, checked, 2760.

— Member requested to withdraw, 2236.

Vacancies (notification) 2.

Vaudreuil Controverted Election (Judges' Rep.) 1591.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) on Sen. Amts., 3483.

— (Ruling) 3486.

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (J. G. H. BERGERON, Esq.)

Beauharnois.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 2681.

Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., Amt. ruled out of Order, 3001.

Order, Ques. of (remarks) 2691.

Railway Subsidies B. 127 (Mr. Haggart) unparliamentary language checked, 3050.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. Coatsworth) in Com., Amt. ruled out of Order, 3018.

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

Agriculture and Colonization Com., Examination of Witnesses (M.) 668.

— Final Rep., of Com. conc., 3552.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1579.

Boulton, Commander, Services (remarks) 3661.

Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. Weldon) in Com., 1552, 2705.

Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2255.

Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^d, 3153.

Corn, Removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 444.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2740, 2760, 2765.

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 111) 1st, 2873.

Export Duty on Logs (prop. Res.) 1324.

Grinding Grain in Bond, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 2268.

Lard Importation, Legislation re Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 250.

Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1st, 367.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Corporation's incor. (B. 46) 1st, 786.

Order (Ques. of) Controller of Customs, &c., 2762.

Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U.S. (M. for Cor., &c.) 339.

Scheduling Canadian Cattle, G.B. and Ireland (M. for Ret.) 330.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 476.

Arts, &c. (Statistics) 420.

Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 2600.

Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 2125; Public Health) 2632.

Thornbury Harbour, Georgian Bay (B. 26) 1st, 540.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 958.

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-W., Halifax.

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 232.

Eastern Can. Savings and Loan Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 98) 1st, 2383.

Eastern Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1st, 721.

Maritime Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1st, 1223.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 3356.

Quarantine (Grosse Ile) Salaries, &c., 488.

Stevenson, Mr. J., West Peterborough.

Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2509.

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 379.

Balfour, James, Relief (B. 93) 1st, 2211; 2^d on a div., 2214.

Ballantyne, Martha, Relief (B. 82), 1st, 1933; 2^d agreed to (Y. 73, N. 31) 2213.

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 20) 1st, 435.

Heward, Edmund, H., Relief (B. 95) 1st, 2211; 2^d on a div., 2215.

Insurance Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 3011.

Hebden, Robt. Young, Relief (B. 94) 1st, 2211.

Spanish River Improvements (Ques.) 2644.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Military Properties) 592.

Tuberculosis in Cattle, Slaughter (Ques.) 1133.

Tarte, Mr. J., L'Islet.

Belanger, Pridime, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 863.

Cloutier, Arsene, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2217.

Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 799.

Judiciary of Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3287.

Tarte, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Judiciary of Quebec (personal explanation) 3524.
 McGreevy and Murphy Conspiracy (M. for Cor.*) 2421.
 Separate Schools in Man., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 1751; neg. (Y. 71, N, 121) 2090.
 Treaty with France, Ratification (remarks) 2478.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1018.

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

- Automatic Telephone and Electric Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 58) 1^o*, 859.
 Canada Carriage Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1^o*, 943.
 Cheese Branding, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2260.
 Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3532.
 Drummond County Ry. Co.'s (B. 71) 1^o*, 1591.
 Lard, Importation, Legislation *re* Prohibition (prop. Res.) 244.
 Ocean Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 39) 1^o*, 721.

SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: House of Commons (Sessional Messengers) 3439.
 Tariff Reform, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2378.
 Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 3^o m., 3104.
 U. S. Quarantine Regulations, Cattle for the World's Fair (Ques.) 723

Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.

- Corn Duty, Division (Ques. of Priv.) 1614.

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K. C. M. G., Antigonish.

- Address, The, on Aint. (Mr. *Laurier*) 26.
 — Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1743.
 Agriculture and Colonization Com., addition of Names (M.) 658.
 Armstrong, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 6.
 Ash Wednesday, Adjmt. (M.) 605.
 Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1224.
 Binding Twine, Free Entry, on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 182.
 Bribery at Elections B. 2 (Mr. *Weldon*) in Com., 1554.
 British Cattle Regulations (Ans.) 223.
 Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ans.) 487.
 Canada and Newfoundland, Cor. (Ans.) 328.
 — Papers on Fisheries, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 471.
 — Printing Papers (M.) 504.
 — Papers *re* Negotiations (explanation) 507.
 Canadian Interests in Hawaii (Ans.) 1322.
 Cape Traverse (P.E.I.) Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 438.
 Caron, Sir Adolphe, Rep. of Comsn. *re* Charges on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 263.
 — Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 325.
 — Rep. *re* Charges (Ans.) 327, 1402.

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—Continued.

- Census, Instructions to Commissioners, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1717.
 Civil Servants and Municipal Elections (remarks) 1674.
 — Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 327.
 Civil Service Employees, Birthplace, National Origin, &c., on M. for Ret., 354.
 — French Employees (Ans.) 1750.
 Clarke, C. S., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 611.
 Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 797.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1651.
 Coal Oil, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cleveland*) 528; (M.) to adjn. deb., 539.
 Compulsory Voting B. 8 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2^o, 525.
 Copyright Act, Proclamation *re* Enforcing (Ans.) 147.
 — Papers respecting (Ans.) 1618.
 Cotton Combines and the Tariff, on Ques. (objection) 1032.
 — Alleged (Ans.) 1612.
 Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 43) 1^o, 722.
 Digby and Annapolis, Buoy Service (Ans.) 1321.
 Franchise (Electoral) Act Amt. B.4 (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. for 2^o, 1586.
 French Canadian Advocates Employed by Govt. (Ans.) 1525.
 Gaspé and Chicoutimi Judicial Districts (Ans.) 862.
 Gordon, Mr., deceased, on adjmt. (remarks) 942.
 Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 1612.
 — Thursday (M.) 1400, 1935.
 Great Britain, Preferential Trade with (remarks) 659.
 Hawaiian Islands, on M. to adjn. House (remarks) 220.
 House of Commons and Senate, Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 866.
 Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 79.
 Judiciary of Quebec, Judge Wurtele's Successor (Ans.) 1749.
 Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5.
 Kingston Penitentiary, Papers respecting (Ans.) 1029,
 Labour Bureau, Establishment (Ans.) 1523.
 Lard, Importation (remarks) 251.
 Lieut.-Gov. of N.B., Appmt. (remarks) 1745.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 81.
 Lord's Day Observance B. 5 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 516.
 Mess. from His Ex., 79, 325, 471, 1743.
 Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 865,
 North-west Ter. Representation Act Amt. (B. 73) 1^o*, 1591.
 Oaths of Office, Administration (B. 1) 1^o*, 3.
 Pontiac County's Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 255.
 Prince County, P.E.I., Judgship, Vacancy (Ans.) 1937.

Thompson, Hon. Sir J. — Continued.

- Printing Committee, 1st and 2nd Reprs., on conc., 1934.
- Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 251.
— on M. (*Mr. Tisdale*) 1934.
- Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U.S., on M. for Cor., &c., 342.
- Representation (H. of C.) Act Amt. (B. 42) 1°, 721; in Com., 1616.
- St. Thomas Postmastership, Vacancy (Ans.) 1936.
- Separate Schools (Man.) Legal Expenses (Ans.) 325.
- Privy Council Rep. (Ans.) 328.
- Further Papers (presented) 658.
- Printing Papers (M.) 1128, 1551.
- Papers respecting (remarks) 1135.
- O. C. reference to Supreme Court (Ans.) 1401.
- on Amt. (*Mr. Tarte*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1790.
- Precedence of deb. (M.) 1933.
- South Middlesex, Returning Officer, Appmt. (Ans.) 1135.
- Vacancy (remarks) 1310.
- Standing Committees, Select (M.) 5.
- Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 79.
- Lists (presented) 319.
- Names added (M.) 1222.
- Supreme Court, Vacancy on Bench, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 545.
- Swine in Bond, Slaughtering (Ans.) 148.
- SUPPLY:
- Arts, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 1283.
- Civil Government* (Agriculture) contingencies, 297; (Gov.-Gen.'s Sec's Office) contingencies, 298; (Privy Council) Extra Clerks, 1262; (Sec. of State) 1243, contingencies, 287; (Trade and Commerce) 1244-1259, contingencies, 299.
- Dominion Police* (Retiring allowance, Murphy) 1672.
- Fisheries* (International Commission) 1722.
- Government of N. W. T.* (Lieut.-Gov.'s Office) 1733.
- Justice, Administration of* (Admiralty, Que.) 308; (Exchequer Court) 1263, 1672; (N. W. T. and B. C.) 307; (Official Arbitrators) 307; (Supreme and Exchequer Court Reprs.) 308.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) Judge Wilkinson's Claim, 1269, Printing, 1293; (Statutes) Printing, &c., 1268. Library (Messengers) 1267.
- Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 319; (Dorchester) 1265; (Kingston) 312, 388; (St. Vincent de Paul) 318, 1264.
- Quarantine* (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 496.
- Telegraphic System of the Empire, &c. on M. for Cor., &c., 330.
- Treaty, France and Great Britain (Ans.) 510, 1402.
- Vaudreuil, Returning Officer, Appmt. (remarks) 1745.
- Victoria (B. C.) Marine Hospital, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1238.
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, Precedence of deb. (M.) 721, 1222.
- Witnesses and Evidence (B. 23) 1°, 435; in Com., 1674, 1703.

Tisdale, Mr. D., North Norfolk.

- Annexation, Mr. Charlton's Visit to Washington, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 382.
- Bribery at Elections B. 2 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 2427.
- Canadian Power Co.'s (B. 63) 1°, 1223.
- Waterway, Lake Superior to Atlantic (prop. Res.) 2648.
- Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2990.
- Criminal Code Amt. B. 4. *Sir John Thompson* in Com., 2081.
- Dom. Burglary Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 15) 1°, 357.
- G. T. R. Co., C. P. Ry. Co. and City of Toronto Agreement (B. 13) 1°, 357.
- Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°, 539.
- Co.'s (B. 50) 1°, 787.
- Goff, Annette M., Relief (B. 108) 1°, 2794.
- London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. 47 (*Mr. Moncrieff*) in Com., 2680.
- Reciprocity, Canal Tolls, &c., Negotiations with U. S., on M. for Cor., &c., 339.
- Standing Orders, 11th Rep. of Com., conc., 3102.
- SUPPLY:
- Canals—Capital* (St. Mary's) 3445.
- Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (*Sir John Thompson*) in Com., 1675, 1686.

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

- Policy Holders and Insurance Co.'s (Ques.) 3480.
- SUPPLY:
- Militia* (Permanent Corps) 563.

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., Dorchester.

- Breen, Thos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2216.
- Cloutier, Arsene, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2217.
- French-Canadian Advocates Empld. by Govt. (Ques.) 1525.
- Miohaud, C. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2216.
- Rosa, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2216.
- Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidiy, &c., Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 335.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.

- Centreville Customs Collector (Ans.) 690.
- Controller of Customs, par. in "Evening Star" (remarks) 3477.
- Speech at Kingston, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2712, 2756.
- Davidson, J. J., Appunt. as Appraiser (Ans.) 1134.
- "Household Effects" (Ans.) 149.
- Lard, Importation (M. to adjn. deb.) 251.
- Pickled Goods, Reduction of Duty (Ans.) 506.
- Sandy Cove Port, Customs Receipts (Ans.) 3346.
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Government* (Trade and Commerce) 140.
- Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Board of Appraisers) 3290; (Salaries, &c.) 3389; (Sugar Testing) 3393.
- Watters, Thos. J., Appmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 724.

Weldon, Mr. R. O., Albert.

Bribery at Elections (B. 2) 1^o, 80; 2^o, 510; in Com., 1552, 2427, 2681, 2689.

— (M.) to place on Order Paper, 1587.

Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 790, 803, 946.

— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Stmnt.) 1618.

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesday, 2468.

“Hansard” Rep. *re* J. T. Hawke (remarks) 2648.

Mines and Minerals Act (N.S.) Disallowance (M. for Cor. *) 1550.

Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society, &c., Act Amt. (B. 91) 1^o, 2130.

Personal Explanation, par. in Moncton “Transcript,” 1744.

Separate Schools in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Tarte) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1960.

Speaker of the Senate B. 114 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^o, 3542.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) on Sen. Amts., 3484.

Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P.E.I.

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1225.

Chignecto Ship Ry. (Ques. of Priv.) par. in “Free Press,” 1310.

Guay, Alphonse, Transfer (Ques.) 2645.

Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 2579.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 2134, 2148. *Income: Harbours and Rivers* (N. S.) 3459.

Quarantine (Organized Districts) Salaries, &c., 488.

Wood Island Breakwater, Govt. Surveys (M. for Ret.) 336.

White, Hon. P., North Renfrew. (See SPEAKER, Mr.)**White, Mr. N., Shelburne.**

Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2806, 2982.

Steam Com., Halifax and St. John, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1671.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Intelligence Bureau) 1721.

Witnesses and Evidence B. 23 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1696.

White, Mr. R. S., Cardwell.

Equity Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 62) 1^o, 1223.

Montreal Mining Co.'s Winding-up (B. 14) 1^o, 357.

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths Act Amt. (B. 22) 1^o, 435.

Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1084.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Ques.) 2215.

Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.

Artificial Fertilizers, Manufacturers (Ans.) 3132.

Breweries and Distilleries in Canada, Number (Ans.) 2636.

Columbian Exhibition Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Foster) on M. for Com. on Res., 2993.

Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, on Amt. (Mr. Dawson) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2751.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 43 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 2982.

Dairy Products Branding B. 125 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3533; on M. for 3^o, 3535.

Duggan, Culler at Montreal, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2215.

Electric Light Inspection, Legislation (Ans.) 1746.

Inland Revenue Rep., Adulteration of Food (presented) 5.

— Excise (presented) 5.

Inspection Act (General) Amt. B. 128 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^o, 3497.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 112) 1^o, 2977; in Com., 3498.

Supervisor of Cullers, Three Rivers (Ans.) 1747.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Inland Revenue, Controller) 1262; (Trade and Commerce) 136.

Collection of Revenues: Inland Rev. (Excise) 3393; (Methylated Spirits) 3394. Weights and Measures, &c., 3394, 3469; M. Kelly's Salary, 2127.

Tobacco Duties, Change in Collecting (Ans.) 2645.

— Excise Duty Collected (Ans.) 1749.

— Seizures (Ans.) 610.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Ans.) 2215.

Works on Rivers and Streams (B. 115) in Com., 3176.

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

Atkinson, C. A., Ex-conductor (M. for Cor. *) 2246.

Coal Fields (N.S.) Delegation to His Ex. (remarks) 796.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act Amt. B. 72 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 1^o, 1607.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Permanent Corps) 550.

Petroleum Inspection B. 112 (Mr. Wood, Brockville) in Com., 3509.

Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.

Cape Traverse Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 438.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1297, 2137, 2149, 2158. *Income: Dredging* (Mar. Provs.) 1303. *Harbours and Rivers* (P.E.I.) 3461; (Piers and Breakwaters) 2931.

Tunnel, P.E.I., and Mainland, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 2401.

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *McInerney*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Leclair*) 14.
 — Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 17; neg. (Y. 53, N. 103) 77.
 — REPLY TO : presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1743.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. See "JUSTICE."
Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 3; *pro forma*.
 ADMIRALTY COURT, REGISTRAR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 308.
 ADULTERATION OF FOOD : in Com. of Sup., 3394.
 AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES, IMMIGRATION, IN CAN. : in Com. of Sup., 3413.
 ALGER, LIEUT.-COL., GRATUITY : in Com. of Sup., 2500.
- AGRICULTURE :
 ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 409.
 BRISTOL (ENG.) BOARD OF TRADE AND "FRENCH CHEESE" : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 338.
 CAPITAL INVESTED : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2389.
 CATTLE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS. See "QUARANTINE."
 — TRANSPORT ACROSS ATLANTIC : Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2643.
 "CHEVALIER" BARLEY, IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2387.
 CLARK, C. S., Emplmt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 610.
 DAIRY PRODUCTS : in Com. of Sup., 1289, 3340, 3442.
 DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 293.
 — REP. : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1130.
 — EMPLOYEES, PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 610.
 EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2206.
 — in Com. of Sup., 472, 3379.
 — REPS. PUBLISHED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 867.
 HARAS NATIONAL CO. : in Com. of Sup., 485.
 IN COM. OF SUP., 121, 472, 484, 1289, 2597, 3340, 3379, 3442.
 LADOGA WHEAT AND TWO-ROWED BARLEY : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1524.
 MEDICAL INSPECTOR, MONTREAL : Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 328.
 "PATENT RECORD" : in Com. of Sup., 410.
 SETTLERS' CATTLE, IMPORTATION : Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) or M. for Com. of Sup., 3180.
 SOCIETIES, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 484.
 SWINE IN BOND, SLAUGHTERING : Ques. (Mr. *Smith*, Ont.) 148.
 TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 433, 1133.
 TWO-ROWED BARLEY, PRICE PER BUSHEL : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1320.
 WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 425.
- [See "ARTS," &c., "CENSUS," "SUPPLY."]
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM. : List of Members, 324.
 — NAMES ADDED : M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 658.
 — EXAM. OF WITNESSES : M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 658.
 — FINAL REP. : conc. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3552.
- Alberta Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 787; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 2380. (56 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 787; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1745. (56 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- AMANUENSES, DEBATES : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3554.
 AMMUNITION : in Com. of Sup., 2586, 3346.
 — See "Volunteer Rifle Practice."
 AMYOT, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2800.
 ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. : in Com. of Sup., 1290.
Animals. See "CRUELTY."
 ANNUAL DRILL : in Com. of Sup., 2634.
 APPRAISERS, CUSTOMS BOARD : in Com. of Sup., 3390.
 ARBITRATION, DOM. AND INT., COST : in Com. of Sup., 3388.
 ARBITRATORS, OFFICIAL : in Com. of Sup., 307.
 ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 409.
 ARGENTEUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
 ARMSTRONG, MR., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 6.
 ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, MANUFACTURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3131.
- ARTS AND STATISTICS :
 CENSUS, ELECTRIC MACHINES USED IN COMPILATION ; Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2389.
 — ENUMERATORS' INSTRUCTIONS : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1519.
 — Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1401.
 — INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSIONERS : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1711.
 — in Com. of Sup., 409, 1273, 2584, 2602.
 [See general heading "CENSUS."]
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJOURNMENT : M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 606.
 ASSISTANT RECEIVER-GENERAL'S OFFICE, HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 112.
 ATKINSON, ex-CONDUCTOR C. A., REDUCTION IN RANK : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Wood*, *Westmoreland*) 2246.

- Atlantic and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49** (Mr. Fauvel). 1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 39.)
- ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. Freemont, 2644. — Remarks (Mr. Kenny) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1223.
- Deb. (Mr. Barnard) 1234; (Mr. Campbell) 1233; (Mr. Coatsworth) 1235; (Mr. Flint) 1229; (Mr. Forbes) 1226; (Mr. Gillmor) 1227; (Mr. Hazen) 1225; (Mr. Hearn) 1227; (Mr. Hughes) 1232; (Mr. Laurier) 1224; (Mr. McNeill) 1230; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1231; (Sir John Thompson); 1224 (Mr. Welsh) 1225.
- AUBIN AND BEAULIEU**. See "TOBACCO."
- AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REP.**: presented (Mr. Foster) 5.
- AUSTRALIA, STEAM-SHIP COMMUNICATION**: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3343.
- Automatic Telephone and Electric Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 58** (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 859; 2^o, 1262; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 73.)
- AYLMER INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3116.
- BAIE LA VALLIÈRE, DREDGING**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bruneau) 2420.
- BAILLAIRGÉ, GEO. F., SUPERANNUATION**: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1131.
- BAILLARGEON P. O., MAL-ADMINISTRATION**: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Guay) 356.
- BAIN, J. W., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOULANGES**: Introduced, 3.
- Balfour, James**. See "DIVORCE."
- Bank Act Correction B. No. 76** (Mr. Foster). 1^o, 1673; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 2580. (56 Vic., c. 28.)
- BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.**: List of Members, 323.
- BANK OF MONTREAL AND FINANCIAL AGENCY**: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1937.
- BARING BROS., &c., COMMISSION**: in Com. of Sup., 1240.
- BARRETT vs. WINNIPEG, JUDGMENT, H. M.'s PRIVY COUNCIL**: M. for copy (Mr. La Rivière) 328.
- BAYFIELD BREAKWATER**: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- BAYFIELD WHARF, NEW**: in Com. of Sup., 2922.
- BEAUC CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep., 1.
- BEAUCHARNOIS CANAL**: in Com. of Sup., 1724.
- BEAUCHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3043.
- BEAULIEU AND AUBIN**. See "TOBACCO."
- BEAULIEU, A.** See "CAP ST. IGNACE."
- BELANGER, PRIDIME, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 863.
- BELLAVANCE, FERDINAND, REFUND ON TENDER**: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 2383.
- BELLEY, L. DE G., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SAGUENAY**: Introduced, 3.
- BONAVENTURE CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep. 1.
- BERLINGUET, THOS. F. X., EMPLOYEES UNDER**: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 864.
- EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 147.
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.**—(Sir John Thompson.) 1^o, 3; *pro formâ*.
- BILL (No. 2) To disfranchise Electors who have taken Bribes.**—(Mr. Weldon.) 1^o, 80; 2^o, 510; in Com., 1552; M. (Mr. Jeannotte) that Com. rise, 1558; M. to place on Order Paper, 1587; again in Com., 2421, 2681.
- BILL (No. 3) To amend the Wrecks and Salvage Act.**—(Mr. Costigan.) 1^o, 80; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 2132. (56 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 4) in further amendment of the Electoral Franchise Act.**—(Mr. Choquette.) 1^o, 80; 2^o, 1586.
- BILL (No. 5) To secure the better Observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.**—(Mr. Charlton.) 1^o, 147; Order for 2^o postponed, 516.
- BILL (No. 6) Further to amend the Steam-boat Inspection Act.**—(Mr. Costigan.) 1^o, 147; 2^o, 2578; in Com., 2579; 3^o, 2801. (56 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 7) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and to make certain provisions in place of the same.**—(Mr. Charlton.) 1^o, 220.
- BILL (No. 8) To make Voting compulsory.**—(Mr. Amyot.) 1^o, 220; 2^o m., 471, 517; neg., 526.
- BILL (No. 9) In further amendment of the Civil Service Act.**—(Mr. Choquette.) 1^o, 221.
- BILL (No. 10) To make further provisions as to the prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and to amend Chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.**—(Mr. Coatsworth.) 1^o, 221.
- BILL (No. 11) Respecting Government Civil Service Insurance.**—(Mr. Foster.) 1^o, 251; 2^o m., 3274; 2^o in Com., 3279, 3480; 3^o, 3480. (56 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 12) To determine the hours of daily labour of workmen and others in the employ of Government or of Government contractors.**—(Mr. Lépine.) 1^o, 324.
- BILL (No. 13) To give effect to an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Corporation of the City of Toronto.**—(Mr. Tisdale.) 1^o, 357; 2^o, 819; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 14) To wind up the Montreal Mining Company.**—(Mr. Tisdale.) 1^o, 357; 2^o, 819.
- BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited.**—(Mr. Tisdale.) 1^o, 357; 2^o, 471; in Com. and 3^o, 1262. (56 Vic., c. 78.)

- BILL (No. 16) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1^o, 357; 2^o, 471.
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1^o, 357; 2^o, 471; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 18) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)
1^o, 357.
- BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. *McKay*.)
1^o, 434; 2^o, 577; in Com. and 3^o, 1262. (56 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 20) To amend the Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1^o, 435; 2^o, 577; in Com. and 3^o, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 21) To confer certain powers on the Corporation of the Municipality of the Town of Calgary.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 435; 2^o, 819.
- BILL (No. 22) Further to amend the 10th Chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)
1^o, 435.
- BILL (No. 23) Respecting Witnesses and Evidence.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1^o, 435; 2^o and in Com., 1674, 1702; 3^o, 1751; consdn. Sen. Amts., 3481; Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 40, N. 87) 3485. (56 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 24) Further to amend Chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Mr. *Laverne*.)
1^o, 504; 2^o, 1587; in Com. and 3^o, 2706. (56 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1^o, 539; 2^o, 606; in Com. and 3^o, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 26) Relating to the Harbour of Thornbury on the Georgian Bay.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1^o, 540; 2^o, 606; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 27) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 357; in Com., 540; 1^o of B., 543; 2^o m., 3135; 2^o and in Com., 3154; 3^o, 3472. (56 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 28) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1^o, 606.
- BILL (No. 29) Further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1^o, 605; 2^o m., 2811; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 5 m. h., 2812; M. for 2^o withdn., 2821; Order dschgd., 3177.
- BILL (No. 30) To amend the Dominion Elections Act and the Acts amending the same.—(Mr. *Belley*.)
1^o, 606; 2^o, 1587.
- BILL (No. 31) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bain, Soulange*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 819; in Com. and 3^o, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 32) Relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McKay*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 819; in Com. and 3^o, 2213. (56 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 33) To amend the Act to incorporate the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Denison*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 819; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Marshall*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 2213. (56 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Calgary Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the Calgary Hydraulic Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 658; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 37) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1^o, 659.
- BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Western Counties Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Yarmouth and Annapolis Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*.)
1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Ocean Accident Insurance Corporation.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the Canada North-west Land Company, limited.—(Mr. *Denison*.)
1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 1969. (56 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. *Stairs*.)
1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com., 1701; 3^o, 1745. (56 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 42) To amend the Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1^o, 721; 2^o and in Com., 1616; 3^o, 1618. (56 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 43) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1^o, 722; 2^o and in Com., 2801; consdn. of B., 2977; again in Com., 2979; 3^o, 2988. (56 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

- BILL (No. 44)** Respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 45)** To incorporate the Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation and Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Roome*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To incorporate the Ocean Fidelity Guarantee Corporation.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com., 1702; 3^o, 1745. (56 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 47)** Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 2679. (56 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 48)** Respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To incorporate the Atlantic and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fauvel*.)
1^o, 786; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 50)** Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1^o, 787; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 2167. (56 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 51)** Respecting the South-eastern Railway.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
1^o, 787; 2^o, 859.
- BILL (No. 52)** To incorporate the Calgary Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 787; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 3018. (56 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 53)** Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 787; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1745. (56 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To incorporate the Alberta Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 787; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 55)** Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser*.)
1^o, 859; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 56)** To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. *McInerney*.)
1^o, 859; 2^o, 1551; in Com. and 3^o, 2421. (56 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 57)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
1^o, 859; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 58)** To incorporate the Automatic Telephone and Electric Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 859; 2^o, 1262; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 59)** To incorporate the Canada Carriage Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 943; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1969. (56 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 60)** Further to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1^o, 1029.
- BILL (No. 61)** Respecting the disposal of moneys paid in connection with proceedings before Parliament.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1^o, 1130; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 2133. (56 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 62)** To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company, and to change the name of the Company to the St. Lawrence Insurance Company.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)
1^o, 1223; 2^o, 1320; in Com. and 3^o, 2213. (56 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 63)** Respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1^o, 1223; 2^o, 1320; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 64)** To incorporate the Maritime Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Stairs*.)
1^o, 1223; 2^o, 1320.
- BILL (No. 65)** To amend the law respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1^o, 1307; 2^o, 1307; Order dschg'd., 3177.
- BILL (No. 66)** To incorporate the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Devlin*.)
1^o, 1399; 2^o, 1551; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 67)** To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steam-ship Company.—(Mr. *Fremont*.)
1^o, 1399; 2^o, 1551; in Com. and 3^o, 2421. (56 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 68)** Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Mara*.)
1^o, 1399; 2^o, 1551; in Com. and 3^o, 2421. (56 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 69)** To incorporate the Canada Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Company, limited.—(Mr. *Forbes*.)
1^o, 1591; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 70)** Respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara*.)
1^o, 1591; 2^o, 1745; in Com. and 3^o, 3019. (56 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 71)** Respecting the Drummond County Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 1591; 2^o, 1745; in Com. and 3^o, 3019. (56 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

- BILL (No. 72) Further to amend the Act respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1^c, 1591.
- BILL (No. 73) To further amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o, 1591.
- BILL (No. 74) To make further provision respecting Grants of Land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-west—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Patterson, Huron.)
1^o, 1672; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 3267. (56 Vic., c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 75) To amend the law relating to Holidays—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)
1^o, 1673; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 2580. (56 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 76) To correct a clerical error in the Bank Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)
1^o, 1673; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 2580. (56 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 77) To further amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)
1^o, 1673; 2^o, 1745; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 78) Respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)
1^o, 1673; 2^o, 1745; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the North American Canal Company.—(Mr. McKay.)
1^o, 1743; 2^o, 2213; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 3066; in Com. and 3^o, 3106. (56 Vic., c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Adams.)
1^o, 1743; 2^o, 2167; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Judges of the Sessions of the Peace for the Cities of Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)
1^o, 1743.
- BILL (No. 82) For the relief of Martha Ballantyne—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Gibson.)
1^o, 1933; 2^o agreed to (Y. 73, N. 31) 2214; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com., 3016; 3^o m., 3018, 3104; 3^o, 3106. (56 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Pope.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Canadian Gas Association.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 2213; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Chilliwack Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2681. (56 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the British Columbia Dock Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969.
- BILL (No. 89) Respecting the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2681. (56 Vic., c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 90) In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)
1^o, 1825.
- BILL (No. 91) To amend an Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Weldon.)
1^o, 2130; 2^o, 2213; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 92) To repeal certain sections of the Merchant Shipping Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1^o, 1932; 2^o and in Com., 3166; 3^o, 3167. (56 Vic., c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 93) For the relief of James Balfour—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)
1^o, 2211; 2^o on a div., 2214; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 94) For the relief of Robert Young Hebdon—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)
1^o, 2211; M. to place on Order Paper for 2^o, 2289; 2^o, 2421; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 2822. (56 Vic., c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 95) For the relief of Edmund Holyoake Heward—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Sutherland.)
1^o, 2211; 2^o on a div., 2215; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 96) To consolidate and amend certain Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)
1^o, 2288; 2^o, 2421; in Com. and 3^o, 3019. (56 Vic., c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 97) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1^o, 2288; 2^o m., 3021; 2^o in Com. and 3^o, 3022. (56 Vic., c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 98) To amend the Act to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, limited.—(Mr. Stairs.)
1^o, 2383; 2^o, 2607; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Foster.)
1^o, 2464; 2^o and in Com., 2968; 3^o, 3132. (56 Vic., c. 21.)

- BILL (No. 100) Further to amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 2465; 2° and in Com., 3002; withdn., 3477.
- BILL (No. 101) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 2576.
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 2576; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3167. (56 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 2635; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3022. (56 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 104) Relating to Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1°, 2646; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3497. (56 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 105) For the relief of John Francis Schwallier—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 2794; 2° on a div., 3021; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3106. (56 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 106) Respecting the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.—(Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*.)
1° and 2°, 2709; in Com. and 3°, 3019. (56 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 107) For the relief of James Frederick Doran—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 2794; 2° on a div., 3019; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3106. (56 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 108) For the relief of Annette Marion Goff—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1°, 2794; 2° on a div., 3021; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3106. (56 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 109) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 2794; 2°, 3269; in Com., 3270; 3°, 3481. (56 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 110) Further to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 2794; 2°, 3267; in Com., 3268; 3°, 3269. (56 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 111) Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1°, 2873.
- BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Inspection of Petroleum.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville*.)
1°, 2977; 2° and in Com., 3498; 3°, 3517. (56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 113) To consolidate and amend the Act respecting Land in the Territories.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 2977; withdn., 3477.
- BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Speaker of the Senate (from the Senate).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 3067; 2° m., 3537; deb. adjd., 3547; rsm., 3557; adjd., 3561.
- BILL (No. 115) Further to amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of Timber down Rivers and Streams—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 3067; 2° and in Com., 3176; 3°, 3177. (56 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 116) To repeal the Homestead Exemption Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)
M. to suspend Rule and 1° of B., 3066; 2° and in Com., 3547; 3°, 3548. (56 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 117) To amend the Territories Real Property Act.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron*.)
M. to suspend Rule and 1° of B., 3066.
- BILL (No. 118) To amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron*.)
1°, 3067; Res. in Com., 3344; 2° of B. and in Com., 3496; 3°, 3497. (56 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 119) To incorporate the Canadian Live Stock Insurance Association—(from the Senate).—(Mr. *Hazen*.)
1° and 2°, 3101; in Com. and 3°, 3233. (56 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 120) Further to amend the Revised Statutes respecting Canned Goods.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville*.)
1°, 3067; withdn., 3477.
- BILL (No. 121) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
1°, 3067; withdn., 3477.
- BILL (No. 122) To confirm the sale of the Carleton (City of St. John) Branch Railroad.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
1° and 2°, 3102; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3269. (56 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 123) Respecting the Voters' List of 1893.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 3103; 2° and in Com., 3272; 3°, 3472. (56 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 124) Respecting the appointment of Commissioners to the World's Columbian Exposition.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 2709; M. for Com., 2988; in Com., 2999; M. for 2° of Res., 3132; conc. in and 1° of B., 3535; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3496. (56 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 125) To prevent the manufacture and sale of filled or imitation Cheese, and to provide for the branding of dairy products.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 3233; 2° and in Com., 3530; 3° m., 3534; 3°, 3535. (56 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 126) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 2887; conc. in and 1° of B., 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3° m., 3536; 3°, 3537. (56 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 127) To authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railways therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
Res. prop., 2887, 3067; in Com., 3023, 3167; conc. in and 1° of B., 3267; 2° m., 3486; 2°, in Com. 3°, 3496. (56 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 128) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 3343; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3497. (56 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

- BILL (No. 129) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steam-ship Subsidies.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 3343; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3537. (56 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 130) Dominion Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Daly.)
1°, 3344; withdn., 3477.
- BILL (No. 131) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Haggart.)
1°, 3472; 2° m., 3517; in Com., 3519; 3°, 3522. (56 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 132) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Foster.)
Res. prop., 3132; in Com., 3273; conc. in, 3273; 1°* of B., 3472; 2°* and in Com., 3535; 3°*, 3536. (56 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 133) Relating to granting subsidies in land to Railway Companies.—(Mr. Daly.)
1°*, 3549; 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 3556. (56 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 134) To amend the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°*, 3549; 2° m., 3556; 2° in Com. and 3°, 3557. (56 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 135) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1893, and the 30th June, 1894, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 3556. (56 Vic., c. 1.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO, 3563.
- BILLS WITHDRAWN, 3177, 3477.
- BINDER TWINE FOREMAN, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY :
in Com. of Sup., 3432.
- BINDER TWINE, FREE ENTRY: prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 150; Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to adj. deb., 174; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 58) 234; Res. neg. (Y. 51, N. 91) 1584.
Deb. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 230; (Mr. Cameron) 1576; (Mr. Campbell) 229; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 175; (Mr. Davin) 159, 161; (Mr. Edgar) 227; (Mr. Fairbairn) 1563; (Mr. Forbes) 1577; (Mr. Foster) 171; (Mr. Landerkin) 1572; (Mr. Lister) 1561; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 163; (Mr. McMullen) 165; (Mr. Mulock) 225, 1558; (Mr. O'Brien) 174; (Mr. Semple) 157; (Mr. Sproule) 1579; (Mr. Stairs) 232; (Sir John Thompson) 182.
- BLENHEIM INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &c: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3121.
- BLOOD RESERVE, INDIAN HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2094.
- BOARD OF APPRAISERS, CHAIRMAN: in Com. of Sup., 3390.
- BOULTON, COMMANDER, SERVICES re HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 3561.
- BONNE ESPÉRANCE FISHERY DIVISION, APPMNT. OF OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 437, 1551.
- BOSTON, ROBT., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOUTH MIDDLESEX: Introduced, 3477.
- BOUNDARIES OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (Sir Hector Langevin) 235.
- BOUNDARY, CAN. AND U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 2111, 3465.
— C. P. R. BELT IN B. C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Mara) 2679.
— PASSAMAQUODDY BAY: in Com. of Sup., 2111.
- BOUNTIES, FISHING, EXPENSES re DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 3343.
- FRAUDS, &c., IN DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 356.
- VICTORIA AND GUYSBOROUGH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 867.
- BOUNTY PAID ON PIG IRON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 356, 866.
- BOYD, N., ESQ., MEMBER FOR MARQUETTE: Introduced, 357.
- BRANDON INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2387.
- BREEN, THOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vailancourt) 2216.
- BREWERIES AND DISTILLERIES IN CANADA, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 2636.
- Bribery at Elections, Disfranchisement B. No. 2** (Mr. Weldon). 1°, 80; 2°, 510; in Com., 1552; M. (Mr. Jeannotte) that Com. rise, 1558; (M.) to place on Order Paper, 1587; again in Com., 2421, 2681.
Deb. in Com. (Mr. Amyot) 2429, 2691; (Mr. Bervin) 2703; (Mr. Bruneau) 2448; (Mr. Campbell) 2455; (Mr. Casey) 2700; (Mr. Choquette) 2443, 2701; (Mr. Coatsworth) 2432; (Mr. Curran) 2457; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1552, 1587, 2461, 2690; (Mr. Delisle) 2451; (Mr. Dickey) 2436, 2683, 2696; (Mr. Dupont) 2682, 2692; (Mr. Forbes) 2702; (Mr. Frémont) 2457, 2692; (Mr. Jeannotte) 1569, 2421, 2682, 2693; (Mr. Langelier) 2459, 2686; (Mr. La Rivière) 2461; (Mr. Lister) 2434; (Mr. Macdowall) 2461; (Mr. McLeod) 2440, 2696; (Mr. Masson) 2439, 2696; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 2426, 2682, 2697; (Mr. Oimet) 2453, 2706; (Mr. Pelletier) 2450; (Mr. Rider) 2457; (Speaker, Deputy) 2691, 2691; (Mr. Sproule) 2705, 1552; (Mr. Tisdale) 2427; (Mr. Weldon) 1552, 2689, 2427.
- BRIDGING LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Sir Hector Langevin) 223.
- British American Assurance Co.'s B. No. 78** (Mr. Cockburn). 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 1745; in Com. and 3°*, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 75.)
- BRITISH AND CAN. MILITARY INTERCHANGES: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1524.
- CATTLE REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Fairbairn) 223.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA :
BOUNDARY, CAN. AND U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 2111, 3465.
— C. P. R. BELT IN B. C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Mara) 2679.
ESQUIMALT DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3442.
EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES BY PROVS. OF DOM.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 2247.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, CHILLIWACK: in Com. of Sup., 2096.
POST OFFICE, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 3453.
"QUADRA," STR., CONTRACT FOR REPAIRS: M. for copies (Mr. Prior) 2246.
VICTORIA DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 1302.
WALLACE, W., EXTRA ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 472.

- British Columbia Dry Dock Co.'s B. No. 87** (Mr. *Mara*). 1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BRITISH (ENG.) BOARD OF TRADE AND "FRENCH CHEESE"**: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 338.
- BRODEUR, MR., VOTE ON TARIFF REFORM**: Remarks, 2578.
- BUDGET, THE** (Mr. *Foster*) 659; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 693; Amt., 720; neg. (Y. 72, N. 126) 1516.
- Deb.** (Mr. *Béchar*) 1423; (Mr. *Bennett*) 850, 1057; (Mr. *Beryn*) 1005; (Mr. *Boyd*) 1126; (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1208; (Mr. *Calvin*) 1089; (Mr. *Cameron*) 1342; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1039; (Mr. *Chesley*) 1394; (Mr. *Choquette*) 931; (Mr. *Christie*) 1360; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1165; (Mr. *Craig*) 918; (Mr. *Daly*) 771; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1135; (Mr. *Davin*) 1511; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1188; (Mr. *Deslin*) 907; (Mr. *Edgar*) 805; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1502; (Mr. *Flint*) 1371; (Mr. *Foster*) 659, 1454; (Mr. *Fraser*) 833; (Mr. *Gillies*) 1362; (Mr. *Haggart*) 727; (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 1199; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1431; (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 1417; (Mr. *McLennan*) 891; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 981; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1090; (Mr. *Metcalfe*) 1496; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1484; (Mr. *Monet*) 952; (Mr. *Northrup*) 820; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 743; (Mr. *Perry*) 1403; (Mr. *Ross, Dundas*) 1108; (Mr. *Semple*) 1113; (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1033; (Mr. *Speaker*) 1221; (Mr. *Sproule*) 958; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1018; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1222; (Mr. *Wilson*) 1084.
- Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 20** (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1^o, 435; 2^o, 577; in Com. and 3^o, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BURLINGTON CHANNEL**: in Com. of Sup., 3464.
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**. See "GOVERNMENT."
- CABINET, CONSTITUTION OF**: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1704.
- **CHANGES**: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2580.
- Calgary Corporation (Conferring Powers) B. No. 21** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 435; 2^o, 819.
- **Hydraulic Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 658; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- **Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 658; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 2680. (56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- **Street Railway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o, 787; 2^o, 859; in Com. and 3^o, 3018. (56 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- **P. O.**: in Com. of Sup., 2207.
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ MAIL SERVICE**: in Com. of Sup., 437, 3410.
- CAN. REPRESENTATION AT FOREIGN CAPITALS**: Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1614.
- Can. Atlantic and Plant Steam-ship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 69** (Mr. *Forbes*). 1^o, 1591; 2^o, 1969 in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- CAN. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, NEGOTIATIONS**: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 328.
- See "Newfoundland."
- Can. Carriage incorp. B. No. 59** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1^o, 943; 2^o, 1074; in Com. and 3^o, 1969. (56 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- Can. Gas Association incorp. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*). 1^o, 1824; 2^o, 2213; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- Can. Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 32** (Mr. *McKay*). 1^o, 658; 2^o, 819; in Com. and 3^o, 2213. (56 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- Can. North-west Land Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40** (Mr. *Denison*). 1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com. and 3^o, 1969. (56 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- CAN. AND AMERICAN SILVER, PERCENTAGE OF ALLOY, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 1523.
- CAN. FISHERMEN ON LABRADOR COAST, TREATMENT BY NFLDRS.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 2679.
- CAN. FISHERIES, YIELD AND VALUE**: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1033.
- CAN. INTERESTS IN HAWAII**: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1322.
- **ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.**: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) 185.
- **ON ADJMT. OF HSE.**: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) 219.
- Can. Live Stock Insurance Association incorp. B. No. 119** (Mr. *Hazen*). 1^o and 2^o, 3101; in Com. and 3^o, 3233. (56 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- Can. Power Co.'s B. No. 63** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1^o, 1223; 2^o, 1320; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- C. P. RY. BELT IN B. C.**: Remarks (Mr. *Mara*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3283.
- **Co.'s B. No. 84** (Mr. *Pope*). 1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- **CONSTRUCTION**: in Com. of Sup., 3086.
- CAN. SHIPPING REGISTERED**: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 436, 859.
- CANALS**:
- BEAUHARNOIS**: in Com. of Sup., 1724.
- CANALS, &c., CONTRACTS**: inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2093.
- CHAMBLY**: in Com. of Sup., 1724.
- IN COM. OF SUP.**, 3231, 3445.
- LACHINE, BRIDGING CONTRACT**: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 223.
- in Com. of Sup., 1723, 3445.
- MISCELLANEOUS**: in Com. of Sup., 1724.
- RIDEAU**: in Com. of Sup., 1723.
- SAULT STE. MARIE**: in Com. of Sup., 3231, 3445.
- SOULANGES, SECTION 8, TENDERS**: M. for List (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 356.
- TOLLS**: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1747.
- TRENT**: in Com. of Sup., 3231.
- WELLAND, NEW CULVERT, TENDERS**: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 609.
- Canned Goods Act Amt. B. No. 120** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1^o, 3167; withdn., 3477.
- CAPE SABLE ISLAND BREAKWATER**: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- CAP ST. IGNACE POSTMASTER**: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 864.
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR**: in Com. of Sup., 1293, 2134.

- CAPE TRAVERSE (P.E.I.) HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 438.
- Carleton (City of St. John) Branch Ry. confirmation of Sale B. No. 122** (Mr. Haggart). 1st, 3102; 2nd, in Com. and 3rd, 3269. (56 Vic., c. 6.)
- CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, EVIDENCE *re* CHARGES: Aint. (Mr. Eugar) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2822; deb. rsm1., 2890; neg. (Y. 69, N. 119) 2918.
- Deb. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2905; (Mr. Curran) 2843; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2890; (Mr. Ives) 2918; (Sir Hector Langevin) 2832; (Mr. McCarthy) 2911; (Mr. Ouimet) 2914.
- Remarks (Mr. Edgar) 1402, 2212.
- presented (Sir John Thompson) 325.
- M. to print (Sir John Thompson) 327.
- Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 327.
- CARSCALLEN, A. W., Esq., MEMBER FOR NORTH HASTINGS: Introduced, 3.
- CASCUMPEQUE (P.E.I.) HARBOUR, BRUSH AND STONE CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 606.
- ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 222.
- Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Can. incorp. B. No. 66** (Mr. Devlin). 1st, 1399; 2nd, 1551; in Com. and 3rd, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 90.)
- PET.: M. (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) to discharge Order, 1129.
- CATTLE IMPORTS FROM U. S.: Remarks (Mr. O'Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3180.
- CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 503.
- SCHEDULED BY GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 2643.
- Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2633.
- TRANSPORT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 2643.
- REGULATIONS. See "QUARANTINE."
- CENSUS:**
- AURORA, NEWMARKET, &c., Returns: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Mulock) 2245.
- ATLMER INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3116.
- BLENHEIM INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3121.
- CENSUS RETURNS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1711.
- M. (Mr. Foster) 1519.
- Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1401.
- Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1524.
- CLINTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 3126.
- COTTON, &c., INDUSTRIES, CAPITAL INVESTED: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1750.
- COTTON, CLOTH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1522.
- DIGBY INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 2465.
- GUELPH INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Innes) 3111.
- INSTRUCTIONS TO ENUMERATORS: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1524.
- IN COM. OF SUP., 1273, 2584, 2602.
- KINCARDINE, &c., INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 3478.
- LIVERPOOL INDUSTRIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 2245.
- Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 3478.
- CENSUS—Continued.**
- LONDON, MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 2218.
- LOUISVILLE INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Legris) 2886.
- MACHINES USED IN COMPILATION: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 2389.
- MONTMAGNY INDUSTRIES, NAMES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1131.
- MRAEFORD INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2884.
- MILVERTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 2385.
- MONTMAGNY INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2578, 3128.
- MOUNT FOREST INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2245, 2798.
- OWEN SOUND INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3118.
- PORT ELGIN INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 2641.
- PORT HOPE INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2636.
- RETURNS *re* CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Mulock) 2245.
- RIDGETOWN INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2883.
- ST. MARY'S INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 2383.
- ST. OURS INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 3125.
- SEAFORTH INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2639.
- SOREL TOWN INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132, 3122.
- STEATHROY INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2795, 3478.
- TILBURY CENTRE INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 3344.
- UXBRIDGE INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2217, 3109.
- VICTORIAVILLE, &c., INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Laverigne) 2692, 2873.
- WESTPORT INDUSTRIES, RET.: Inquiry (Mr. Bowers) 2801.
- WHITBY INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2877.
- WOODSTOCK INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 2881, 3115.
- YARMOUTH INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Flinn) 2876, 3106.
- [See "ARTS AND STATISTICS."]
- Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31** (Mr. Bain, Soulanges). 1st, 658; 2nd, 819; in Com. and 3rd, 1320. (56 Vic., c. 42.)
- CENTRAL ONT. RT. CO. AND SUBSIDY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Corby) 1535.
- SUBSIDY prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.
- CENTREVILLE (N.B.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 608.
- Certificates.** See "MASTERS AND MATES."
- CHAMBLY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1724.
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 100, 111, 1240.
- CHARLOTTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- CHATHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2186.
- CHEESE BRANDING: prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2252.
- Deb. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2264; (Mr. Fairbairn) 2255; (Mr. Foster) 2262; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2255; (Mr. Pope) 2265; (Mr. Reid) 2263; (Mr. Rider) 2262; (Mr. Ross, Dundas) 2254; (Mr. Sproule) 2255; (Mr. Taylor) 2260.
- Cheese.** See "DAIRY PRODUCTS."
- CHESLEY, J. A., Esq., MEMBER FOR CITY AND COUNTY OF ST. JOHN: Introduced, 3.
- "CHEVALIER" BARLEY, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 2387.
- CHICOUTIMI JUDICIAL DISTRICTS. See "Gaspé."

- CHIGNECTO SHIP RV., PAR. IN "FREE PRESS": Remarks (Mr. Welsh) 1310.
- CHILLIWHACK INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2096.
- Chilliwack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 86** (Mr. Mara). 1^o*, 124; 2^o*, 1969; in Com. and 3^o*, 2681. (56 Vic., c. 43.)
- CHOLERA, PREVENTIVE MEASURES: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Lauderkin*) 867.
- CIRCUIT JUDGES, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 3427.
- CIVIL EMPLOYEES (MILITIA): in Com. of Sup., 569.
- SERVANTS IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS, O. C. PROHIBITING: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1674.
- NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 327, 436.
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 117, 185, 203, 278, 1242, 2597, 3409.
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 9** (Mr. *Choquette*). 1^o, 221.
- further Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o*, 605; 2^o m., 2811; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., 2812; M. for 2^o withdn, 2821; Order dschgd, 3177.
- **Insurance B. No. 11** (Mr. *Foster*). 1^o*, 251; 2^o m., 3274; 2^o and in Com., 3279, 3480; 3^o*, 3480. (56 Vic., c. 13.)
- **Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 357; in Com., 540; 1^o of B., 543; 2^o m., 3155; 2^o* and in Com., 3154; 3^o*, 3472. (56 Vic., c. 12.)
- FRENCH EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1750.
- COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Lauderkin*) 1748.
- EMPLOYEES, BIRTHPLACE, NATIONAL ORIGIN, &c.: Ms. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 354, 865; (inquiry) 3104.
- EXAMINATIONS, QUESTIONS, &c.: M. for copy* (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 867.
- MESSRS. TRUDEAU AND WHITE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 1525.
- SUPERANNUATION, REPEAL OF ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1528.
- CLARKE, C. S., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Lauderkin*) 610.
- CLARK, JAS., EMPLOYT. IN P. O. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2793.
- Cleveland, Port Stanley and London Transportation, &c., Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45** (Mr. *Roome*). 1^o*, 786; 2^o*, 859; in Com. and 3^o*, 2680. (56 Vic., c. 44.)
- CLINTON INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3126.
- CLOTHING, &c., MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 601.
- CLOUTIER, ARSÈNE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 2217.
- COAL AND IRON FREIGHT RATES ON I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1033.
- COAL CONTRACTS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 326.
- COAL FIELDS (N.S.): Remarks (Mr. *Weldon, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1618.
- Deb. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1659; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 802; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 795; (Mr. *Fraser*) 796, 1660; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1645; (Mr. *Lauderkin*) 803; Mr. (*Laurier*) 792; (Mr. *McKay*) 1650; (Mr. *McKeen*) 793; (Mr. *McNeill*) 794, 1658; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 787, 799; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 801; (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1667; (Mr. *Tarte*) 799; (Sir *John Thompson*) 797, 1651; (Mr. *Weldon*) 790, 803, 1618; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 796.
- COAL OIL DUTY, "HANSARD" REP.: personal explanation (Mr. *Lister*) 1613.
- Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 543.
- REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Cleveland*) 527.
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1723, 2127, 2635, 3390, 3412.
- Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 68** (Mr. *Mara*). 1^o*, 1399; 2^o*, 1551; in Com. and 3^o*, 2421. (56 Vic., c. 45.)
- Columbian Exhibition, Appointment of Commissioners' B. No. 124** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 2709; M. for Com., 2988; in Com., 2999; M. for 2^o of Res., 3132; conc. in and 1^o* of B., 3535; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 3496. (56 Vic., c. 7.)
- Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2709; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2709; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3001; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2993, 2999; (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com., 2999; (Mr. *Hazen*) 2995; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2988; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2989; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2990; (Mr. *Montague*) 2997; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2997, 3002; (Mr. *Ousimet*) 3000; (Mr. *Speaker*) 2709; (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 3001; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2990; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 2993.
- COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, SUNDAY CLOSING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2218.
- Deb. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2226; (Mr. *Bécharde*) 2228; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2218, 2236; (Mr. *Christie*) 2236; (Mr. *Daly*) M. to adjn. deb., 2236; agreed to (Y. 76, N. 34) 2244; (Mr. *Foster*) 2230; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2141; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 2230, 2240; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2225; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2230; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2242; (Mr. *Scriver*) 2234; (Mr. *Speaker*) 2236.
- Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3177.
- COMMANDER BOULTON'S SERVICES (HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY): Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 3561.
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3409.
- COMMITTEES:
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 324.
- EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 658.
- NAMES ADDED: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 658.
- FINAL REP.: conc. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3562.
- BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 323.
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 79.
- 1ST REP.: presented (Mr. *La Rivière*) 251.
- 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *La Rivière*) 434.
- 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *La Rivière*) 2287; conc., 2383.

- COMMITTEES—Continued.**
- DEBATES, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 547.
- EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 320.
- PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 321.
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 319.
- PRINTING: List of Members, 322.
- JOINT, 1ST AND 2ND REFS.: M. (Mr. *Bergin*) conc., 1933.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List of Members, 322.
- MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 2132.
- RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 320.
- SELECT STANDING: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5.
- M., Com. to prepare Lists (Sir *John Thompson*) 79.
- Lists presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 319.
- CHANGE OF NAMES: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1222.
- STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 322.
- 11TH REP.: conc. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3102.
- COMMITTEES, SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 402.
- COMPANIES:**
- ALBERTA IRRIGATION CO.
- AUTOMATIC TELEPHONE AND ELECTRIC CO.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA DRY DOCK CO.
- AMERICA ASSURANCE CO.
- BUFFALO AND FORT ERIE BRIDGE CO.
- CALGARY HYDRAULIC CO.
- IRRIGATION CO.
- CAN. ATLANTIC AND PLANT STEAM-SHIP CO.
- CAN. CARRIAGE CO.
- CAN. GAS ASSOCIATION.
- CAN. LIFE ASSURANCE CO.
- CAN. LIVE STOCK INSURANCE CO.
- CAN. NORTH-WEST LAND CO.
- CAN. POWER CO.
- CATHOLIC MUTUAL BENEFIT ASSOCIATION.
- CORPORATION, &c., OF CALGARY.
- DETECTIVE CORPORATIONS AND MERCANTILE AGENCIES.
- DOM. BURLGLARY GUARANTEE CO.
- EASTERN CAN. SAVINGS AND LOAN CO.
- TRUST CO.
- EQUITY INSURANCE CO.
- HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.
- LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER CO.
- MANUFACTURER'S ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO.
- MARITIME MANUFACTURING CO.
- MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
- MINING CO.
- NORTH AMERICAN CANAL CO.
- OCEAN ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO.
- FIDELITY GUARANTEE CORPORATION.
- [See "RAILWAYS," "SUBSIDIES," &c.]
- COMPENSATION CLAIMS, MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 2590.
- Compulsory Voting B. No. 8** (Mr. *Amyot*).
1^o, 220; 2^o m., 471, 517; neg., 526.
- COMPUTING INTEREST, P.O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 216.
- CONCURRENCE: Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 3548.
- CONNOLLY-McGREEVY TRIAL, CLERK OF HOUSE SUMMONED: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2708.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 356.
- CONSULAR FEES ON EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2576.
- CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 203, 403, 1266.
- CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS' SPEECH AT KINGSTON: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2709.
- Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) 2714; neg. (Y. 74, N. 105) 2792.
- Deb. (Mr. *Belley*) 2790; (Mr. *Bergin*) 2746; (Mr. *Boyle*) 2765; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2778; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2729; (Mr. *Cleveland*) 2771; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 2745; (Mr. *Cochrane*) 2765; (Mr. *Costigan*) 2738; (Mr. *Curran*) 2741; (Mr. *Davin*) 2754; (Mr. *Denison*) 2773; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2717; (Mr. *Foster*) 2723, (explanation) 2750, 2760; (Mr. *Fréchette*) 2768; (Mr. *Guillet*) 2766; (Mr. *Heavn*) 2788; (Mr. *Hughea*) 2733; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2719, 2792; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2776; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 2711, 2745; (Mr. *McInerney*) 2733, 2737; (Mr. *McKay*) 2764; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2774; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2784; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2721; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2781; (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 2786; (Mr. *Rivfret*) 2770; (Mr. *Speaker*) 2760, 2762; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2740, 2760, 2762, 2765; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2712, 2756; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 2751.
- REP. IN EVENING "STAR" re PARTNERSHIP: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3476.
- Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2289, 2578.
- Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2467, 2644.
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: 1, 319.
- COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION re ENFORCING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 147.
- CORN DUTIES, DIVISION: Explanation of Vote (Mr. *Temple*) 1614.
- CORN, FREE ENTRY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 430; neg. (Y. 50, N. 90) 1585.
- Deb. (Mr. *Cameron*) 454; (Mr. *Christie*) 463; (Mr. *Davin*) 464; (Mr. *Foster*) 467; (Mr. *Laurier*) 470; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 449; (Mr. *Rosand*) 461; (Mr. *Sproule*) 444.
- CORN, GRINDING IN BOND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2266.
- CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1031, 1936.
- COTTON COMBINES AND THE TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1032, 1612.
- COTTON INDUSTRIES. See "CENSUS."
- COULAIS RIVER BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1743.
- COUNTRY SAVINGS BANKS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 113.
- COUNTRY POSTMASTERS' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 438.
- Criminal Code Amt. B. No. 37** (Mr. *Dickey*).
1^o, 659.
- (1892) Amt. B. No. 43 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 722; 2^o and in Com., 2801; consdn. of B., 2977; again in Com., 2979; 3^o, 2988. (56 Vic., c. 32.)
- COPIES FOR MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *Belley, Mr. Leclair*) 607.
- AND SUPREME COURT, &c., JUDGES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1550.

- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. No. 10** (Mr. Coatsworth). 1°, 221.
- CULLER DUGGAN, MONTREAL:** Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2215.
- CULLERS, SUPERVISOR AT THREE RIVERS:** Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 1747.
- CULVERTS ON NATURAL WATERCOURSES:** M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. Casey) 1551.
- CURRAN, J. J., ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONTREAL CENTRE:** Introduced, 3.
- CUSTOMS:**
- APPRAISERS, CHAIRMAN OF BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 3390.
- BINDING TWINE. See general heading.
- CENTREVILLE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 608.
- COAL OIL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. Cleveland) 527.
- Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 543.
- CONTROLLER'S SPEECH AT KINGSTON. See general heading.
- CONTROLLER: PAR. IN EVENING "STAR" re PARTNERSHIP: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3476.
- CORN, FREE ENTRY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 439; neg. (Y. 50, N. 90) 1585.
- COTTON COMBINES AND TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1032, 1612.
- QUES. OBJECTED TO (Sir John Thompson) 1032.
- CUSTOMS DEPT. REORGANIZATION, REP. TO COUNCIL: M. for copies* (Mr. Landerkin) 867.
- DAVIDSON, J. J., APPMNT. AS APPRAISER: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1134.
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, PER "GAZETTE": M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 356.
- EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS: prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1324.
- GALBRAITH, T. J.: in Com. of Sup., 2635.
- "HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS": Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 149.
- IN COM. OF SUP., 121, 2597, 3399.
- LARD, IMPORTATION, LEGISLATION re PROHIBITION: prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 244.
- LABORATORY, TESTING SUGARS: in Com. of Sup., 3393.
- LARD, PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 244.
- MANUFACTURERS IN MONTMAGNY AND CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 1131.
- PICKLED GOODS, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 506.
- SANDY COVE PORT CUSTOMS RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 3345.
- SUGAR, REPEAL OF DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Langelier) 1542.
- TARIFF, ABOLITION OF CERTAIN DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 612.
- REFORM: prop. Res. (Mr. McCarthy) in Amt. to Com. M. for of Sup., 2290.
- TOBACCO DUTIES, CHANGE IN COLLECTING: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 2645.
- TOBACCO, &c., SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 610.
- TREATY WITH FRANCE. See general heading.
- WATERS, THOS. J., APPMNT., SALARY, &c. Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 724.
- Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 18** (Mr. Davin) 1°, 357.
- **Amt. B. No. 60** (Mr. Charlton) 1°, 1029.
- **further Amt. B. No. 126** (Mr. Foster). Res. prop., 2887; conc. in and 1° of B., 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3° m., 3536; 3°, 3537. (56 Vic., c. 16.)
- CUSTOM-HOUSE, ST. JOHN, COPPER ROOF TENDERS:** Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 863.
- Dairy Products, Branding B. No. 125** (Mr. Foster). 1°, 3233; 2°* and in Com., 3530; 3° m., 3534; 3°, 3535. (56 Vic., c. 37.)
- In Com. of Sup., 1289, 3340, 3442.
- DALHOUSIE AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. Fauvel) 1031.
- DALY, HON. T. M., MEMBER FOR SELKIRK:** Introduced, 3.
- DARTMOUTH P. O.:** in Com. of Sup., 2168.
- DAVIDSON, J. J., APPMNT. AS APPRAISER:** Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1134.
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1266.
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.:** M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Foster) 79.
- See "COMMITTEES."
- DEPUTY MINISTER OF INTERIOR, APPMNT.:** Ques. (Mr. Fauvel) 1751.
- D'ESCOUSSE WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 111** (Mr. Sproule). 1°, 2873.
- DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS BUOY SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 1320.
- **INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 2465.
- **PIER:** in Com. of Sup., 2919.
- **REPAIRS, CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 504.
- DISALLOWANCE (N.S.) MINES AND MINERALS ACT:** M. for Cor.* (Mr. Weldon) 1550.
- See "COAL FIELDS."
- Disfranchisement.** See "BRIBERY."
- DIVISIONS:**
- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH:** Amt. (Mr. Laurier) Reducing Taxation, 17; neg. (Y. 53, N. 103) 77.
- BINDING TWINE, FREE ENTRY:** prop. Res., 150; Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) to adjn. deb., 174; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 58) 234; Res. neg. (Y. 51, N. 91) 1584.
- prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 150; neg. (Y. 51, N. 91) 1584.
- CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, EVIDENCE re CHARGES:** Amt. (Mr. Edgar) censuring appmnt. as Minister of the Crown, 2822; neg. (Y. 69, N. 119) 2918.
- COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, SUNDAY CLOSING:** prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) 2218; M. to adjn. deb. (Mr. Daly) 2236; agreed to (Y. 76, N. 34) 2244.
- CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS' SPEECH AT KINGSTON:** prop. Res. of Censure (Mr. Dawson) in amt. to Com. of Sup., 2714; neg. (Y. 74, N. 105) 2792.
- CORN, REMOVAL OF DUTY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 439; neg. (Y. 50, N. 90) 1585.
- DIVORCE (BALLANTYNE, MARTHA) RELIEF B. 82:** M. for 2° (Mr. Sutherland) agreed to (Y. 73, N. 31) 2213.

- DIVISIONS—Continued.**
- SEPARATE SCHOOLS, MAN.: Amt. (Mr. Tarte) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1751; neg. (Y. 71, N. 121) 2090.
- TARIFF REFORM: prop. Res. (Mr. McCarthy) 2341; neg. (Y. 64, N. 116) 2574.
- WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Customs Tariff and Freer Trade, 720; neg. (Y. 72, N. 126) 1516.
- WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE B. 23: on consd. of Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. Davis) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 40, N. 87) 3483.
- Divorce (Balfour, James) B. No. 93** (Mr. Sutherland). 1^o, 2211; 2^o on a div., 2214; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 93.)
- **(Ballantyne, Martha) B. No. 82** (Mr. Gibson). 1^o, 1933; 2^o agreed to (Y. 73, N. 31) 2214; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 94.)
- **(Doran, James Frederick) B. No. 107** (Mr. Dickey). 1^o, 2794; 2^o on a div., 3019; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 3106. (56 Vic., c. 95.)
- **(Goff, Aunette Marion) B. No. 108** (Mr. Dickey). 1^o, 2794; 2^o on a div., 3021; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 3106. (56 Vic., c. 96.)
- **(Hebden, Robt. Young) B. No. 94** (Mr. Sutherland). 1^o, 2211; M. to place on Order Paper for 2^o, 2289; 2^o, 2421; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 2822. (56 Vic., c. 98.)
- **(Heward, Edmund H.) B. No. 95** (Mr. Sutherland). 1^o, 2211; 2^o on a div., 2215; in Com. and 3^o, 2608. (56 Vic., c. 97.)
- **(Schwaller, John Francis) B. No. 105** (Mr. Dickey). 1^o, 2794; 2^o on a div., 3021; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 3106. (56 Vic., c. 99.)
- Dom. Burglary Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15** (Mr. Tisdale). 1^o, 357; 2^o, 471; in Com. and 3^o, 1262. (56 Vic., c. 78.)
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 603, 2586, 3346.
- **Elections Act Amt. B. No. 30** (Mr. Belley). 1^o, 606; 2^o, 1587.
- **Elections Act Amt. B. No. 90** (Mr. Mulock). 1^o, 1825.
- **Irrigation B. No. 130** (Mr. Daly). 1^o, 3344; withdn, 3479.
- **Lands Act further Amt. B. No. 109** (Mr. Daly). 1^o, 2794; 2^o, 3269; in Com., 3270; 3^o, 3481. (56 Vic., c. 18.)
- LANDS, EXTRA CLERKS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3412.
- NOTES, ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 114.
- PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 115.
- POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1672.
- STEAMERS, REPAIRS, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 1719.
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1265.
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1303, 2948.
- DRILL HALL IN QUEBEC, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Frémont) 2643.
- Drummond Co. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71** (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 1591; 2^o, 1745; in Com. and 3^o, 3019. (56 Vic., c. 46.)
- DUGGAN, CULLER AT MONTREAL, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2215.
- DU LIÈVRE RIVER LOCKS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2388.
- EASTERN TOWNSHIPS GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Fréchette) 507.
- Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 98** (Mr. Stairs). 1^o, 2383; 2^o, 2607; in Com. and 3^o, 2622. (56 Vic., c. 83.)
- **Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31** (Mr. Stairs). 1^o, 721; 2^o, 820; in Com., 1701; 3^o, 1745. (56 Vic., c. 84.)
- EDUCATION AND DUAL LANGUAGE, N.W.T., PETS. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 1519.
- Electoral.** See "FRANCHISE."
- ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.'S INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. Cockburn) 1746.
- Equity Insurance Co.'s Revival Act Amt. B. No. 62** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1^o, 1223; 2^o, 1320; in Com. and 3^o, 2213. (56 Vic., c. 79.)
- ESTIMATES, THE (1893-94): presented (Mr. Foster) 78.
- SUPPL. (1893): presented (Mr. Foster) 805.
- FURTHER SUPPL. (1893): presented (Mr. Foster) 2576.
- SUPPL. (1894): presented (Mr. Foster) 3104.
- ESQUIMALT, DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3442.
- Evidence.** See "WITNESSES."
- EXCHEQUER COURT, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 308, 1263, 1672.
- EXCISE DUTY OF TOBACCO, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1748.
- OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3393.
- EXPEDITION TO JAMES' AND HUDSON'S BAYS: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. Joncas) 1551.
- EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES BY PROVS. OF DOM.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 2247.
- ON PUB. WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. Lepine) 1550.
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 472, 3379.
- REPS. PUBLISHED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Grieve) 867.
- RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2208.
- EXPIRING LAWS COM.: List of Members, 320.
- EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS: prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1324; M. (Mr. O'Brien) to adjn. deb., 1342.
- Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3318.
- EXPORT OF SWINE, REGULATIONS re SLAUGHTER: M. for O.C. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 338.
- See "QUARANTINE."
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 356.
- EXPORTS, CONSULAR FEES: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 2576.

- FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3387.
 FEES PAID NEWFOUNDLAND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1747.
 FERRY SERVICE: See "Port Dalhousie."
 FINANCIAL AGENCY: inquiry for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1937.
 FLOODS IN QUEENSLAND: Remarks (Mr. O'Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 544.
 FORCADE, ALBERT, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1031.
 FORT GEORGE, PRESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 1522.
 FINANCE:
 AGRICULTURE, CAPITAL INVESTED: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 2389.
 AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 5.
 BANK OF MONTREAL, COR. re FINANCIAL AGENCY: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1937.
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 356.
 EXPENDITURE OF PROVS. OF DOM.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 2247.
 FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 121.
 FINANCIAL AGENTS IN LONDON, CHANGE: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1551.
 GOVT. LOANS, AMOUNT BORROWED; Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 224.
 NICKEL COINAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. Maclean, East York) 2418.
 PIG IRON, PRODUCTION FROM 1870 TO 1880 AND BOUNTY PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 866.
 — 1881 to 1892 and BOUNTY PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 356.
 PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Remarks (Sir John Thompson) 659.
 POLICY-HOLDERS AND INSURANCE CO.'S: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 480.
 PONTIAC COUNTY'S INDEBTEDNESS: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 254.
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. Foster) 5.
 REVENUES OF PROVS. OF DOM.: Amt. (Mr. Davia) 2247.
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 2247.
 SILVER, CANADIAN AND AMERICAN, PERCENTAGE OF ALLOY: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 1523.
 TREATY WITH FRANCE, STMT. IN MONTREAL "STAR": Remarks (Mr. Lister) 2471.
 — See general heading.
- FISHERIES:
 BONNE ESPÉRANCE FISHERY DIVISION, APPOINTMENT OF OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 437.
 BOUNTIES, IRREGULARITIES, &c., IN PAYING: M. for Cor. (Mr. Fraser) 355, 356.
 CANADIAN FISHERIES, YIELD AND VALUE: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 1033.
 FISH-BREEDING: in Com. of Sup., 3342.
 FISHING IN MAR. PROVS.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 3474.
 — IN QUEBEC, PROHIBITION: Remarks (Mr. Bruneau) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3321.
 FISH HATCHERIES, MILTON AND BEDFORD: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1611.
 — See "Milton."
 HACKETT, ED., FISHERY INSPECTOR, SUSPENSION, &c. M. for Cor. (Mr. Davies) 866.
 IN COM. OF SUP., 1720, 3342.
- FISHERIES—Continued.
 INLAND FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. Lister) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3199.
 LAKE ST. PETER, CATCHING SOFT FISH: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 2794.
 MACKEREL NETS: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 3346.
 — Repeal of O.C.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 224.
 MARINE FOOD FISHERIES, PROPAGATION: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 506.
 MAR. PROVS.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 3474.
 NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERMEN ON LABRADOR COAST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Joncas) 2679.
 — PAPERS re NEGOTIATIONS: Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. Foster) 2273.
 — REFUND OF LICENSE FEES: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1747.
 OVERSEERS IN BERTHIER, &c., INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bruneau) 2679.
 — INSTRUCTIONS IN QUE.: M. for copies* (Mr. Bruneau) 2679.
 OYSTER BEDS, LICENSES FOR LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1525.
 PROHIBITION IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. Bruneau) on M. for Com. of Sup. 3321.
 PROTECTION SERVICE, COMMANDERS' CERTIFICATES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 2245.
 — Inquiry (Mr. McMullen) 3104.
 RICHELIEU CO., FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 860.
 SOFT FISH, PROHIBITION OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 607.
 WHALE FISHING IN THE GULF: Ques. (Mr. Fauvel) 608.
 WHITELEY, W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 608.
- Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Choquette). 1°, 80; 2°, 1586.
 — Amt. B. No. 65 (Mr. Costigan). 1°, 1307; 2°, 1307; Order dschgd., 3177.
 — AMT. B.: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 3068.
 — PRINTING VOTERS' LIST: in Com. of Sup., 1268, 1290.
 — Repeal B. No. 7 (Mr. Charlton). 1°, 220.
 FRASERVILLE P.O., EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 1526.
 FRENCH-CAN. ADVOCATES IN MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 1525.
 "FRENCH CHEESE." See "British Bd. of Trade."
 FRENCH C. S. EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1750.
 GALBRAITH, T. J., ADDITIONAL SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2635.
 GALOPE RAPIDS CHANNEL, PLANS AND SURVEYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Reid) 1526.
 GARRISON GROUNDS, ANNAPOLIS, PRESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1523.
 GASPÉ AND CHICOUTIMI JUDICIAL DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. Fauvel) 862.
 GEOLOGICAL DEPT., MINING AND MINERALOGY: Ques. (Mr. Carscallen) 1611.
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 180.
 — SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. Fréchet) 507.
 — MONTCALM CO.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1321.
 Georgian Bay. See "THORNBURY."

- GIBEAULT, DOM. POLICEMAN, DISMISSED: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1133.
- Goff, Annette Marion.** See "DIVORCE."
- GORDON, MR., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) on adjmt., 942.
- GOVT. BUSINESS, BILLS DROPPED, 3177, 3477.
- MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3233.
- PRECEDENCE ON MONDAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1612.
- THURSDAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1400, 1935.
- WEDNESDAY: Ms., 2467, 2470.
- COAL CONTRACT, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 362.
- LOANS, AMOUNT BORROWED: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 224.
- RAILWAYS (MINISTER'S STMT.): in Com. of Sup., 3066.
- BUSINESS, SUPPL. ESTIMATES: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2890.
- OFFICES IN TORONTO, CONCENTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1030.
- STEAMERS. See "Ocean and River Service."
- OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1721.
- GOVERNOR-GEN.'S SEC., LETTER *re* PROROGATION: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3522.
- SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 263.
- GOVERNORS-GEN. SINCE CONFED., SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 334.
- GRAIN IN BOND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2266.
- Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2271, 2286; (Mr. *Daly*) 2267; (Mr. *Davin*) 2266; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2285; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2271; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2268.
- GRAND FALLS (N.B.) BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 2129.
- Grand Trunk and C. P. R. and Toronto Corporation Agreement B. No. 13** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°, 357; 2°, 819; in Com. and 3°, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°, 539; 2°, 606; in Com. and 3°, 1320. (56 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2888; in Com., 3044.
- Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Can. B. No. 50** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°, 787; 2°, 859; in Com. and 3°, 2167. (56 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2887; in Com., 3023.
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2888, 2889; in Com., 3059.
- GRINDING CORN IN BOND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2266.
- GUAY, ALPHONSE, TRANSFER: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 2645.
- GUELPH INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 8111.
- GUILDS (ONT.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 325.
- HACKETT, ED., FISHING INSPECTOR, SUSPENSION, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 866.
- HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN, STEAM COMMUNICATION: Remarks (Mr. *Forbes*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1669.
- AND WEST INDIES STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 3410.
- DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2180.
- Hamilton Provident and Loan Society's B. No. 19** (Mr. *McKay*) 1°, 434; 2°, 577; in Com. and 3°, 1262. (56 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 485.
- Harbour and River Police Prov. of Que. B. No. 97** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 2288; 2° m., 3021; in Com. and 3°, 3022. (56 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 1520.
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2919, 2935, 3453, 1306.
- HARKAWAY P.O., MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 356.
- HARTNEY, TIMOTHY, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 606.
- HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, CAN. INTERESTS: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean, York*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 185, 219.
- Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1322.
- HAWKE, J. T., ARTICLE IN MONCTON "TRANSCRIPT": Remarks (Mr. *Weldon*) 1744.
- MR. WELDON'S EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2647.
- HAWKEN, F., INCREASED SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3471.
- HAY AND GRAIN FREIGHT RATES ON I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1322.
- HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2209.
- Hebden, Robt. Y.** See "DIVORCE."
- HERCHMER, LAWRENCE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2387.
- COMMISSIONER'S REP. *re* CHARGES: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 866.
- Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 865.
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 1240.
- Heward, Edmund H.** See "DIVORCE."
- HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 187, 203.
- Holidays, Public, Act Amt. B. No. 75** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1673; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 2580. (56 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- Homestead Exemption Act Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. *Davin*). M. to suspend Rule and 1° of B., 3066; 2° and in Com., 3547; 3°, 3548. (56 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- "HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS": Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 149.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *McInerney*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Leclair*) 14.
- ARMSTRONG, MR., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Lawrier*) 6.
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJMT.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 005.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

- BILLS ASSENTED TO, 3563.
 BILLS WITHDRAWN, 3177, 3477.
 BRODEUR, MR., VOTE ON TARIFF REFORM: Remarks, 2578.
 CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, 1, 319.
 CORN DUTY, DIVISION: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Semple*) 1614.
 CONNOLLY-McGEEVY TRIAL, CLERK OF HOUSE SUMMONED: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2708.
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL, FRENCH EDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 547.
 — See general heading "Committees."
 DIVISION ON TARIFF REFORM: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2578.
 GORDON, MR., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) on Adjmnt., 942.
 GOVT. BUSINESS. See general heading.
 IN COM. OF SUP., 399, 1265, 1390, 2599, 3436.
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COM., MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 79.
 MAN. SCHOOL CASE, PRINTING PAPERS: (Sir *John Thompson*) 1551.
 MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 5, 357, 658.
 PARLIAMENT 7TH, 3RD SESSION: Opening, 1; Closing, 3563.
 PRIVATE BILLS. See general heading.
 PROROGATION, 3563.
 — COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3522.
 SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS, OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 865.
 SOUTH MIDDLESEX: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1033, 1310.
 — RETURN OF MEMBER, 3472.
 SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.
 VAUDREUIL ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2576.
 — ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy in representation, 1591.
 — RETURNING OFFICER, APPOINTMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1674, 1745, 2130, 2212.
 VACANCIES, 1.
 House of Commons. See "INDEMNITY."
 — See "REPRESENTATION."
 HURON (WEST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. 1. -
 HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3464,
 — See "BOULTON."
 IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1746.
 IMMIGRATION EXPENSES, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 3413.
 IMPORTS. See "EXPORTS."
 Indemnity to Members, &c., B. No. 132 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. 3132; in Com., 3273; conc. in, 3273; 1st of B., 3472; 2nd, and in Com., 3535; 3rd, 3536. (56 *Vic. c. 11.*)
 INDIAN AFFAIRS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 121.
 — In Com. of Sup., 121, 1740, 2091, 3358.
 — DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1933.
 — BRANDON, INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2387.
 — SAUGEEN INDIAN RESERVE, SEIZURE OF TIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 148.
 INGHONISH (SOUTH) PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2924.

- INLAND FISHERIES, LAKE ERIE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Allan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3181.
 INLAND REVENUE:
 BREWERIES AND DISTILLERIES IN CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2636.
 DUGGAN, CULLER AT MONTREAL, EMPLOYED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2215.
 DEPT. REP. (ADULTERATION OF FOOD): presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 5.
 — (EXCISE): presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 5.
 — In Com. of Sup., 1262.
 KELLY, M., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2127.
 METHYLATED SPIRITS: in Com. of Sup., 3393.
 OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS' SALARIES, EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 3393.
 SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, THREE RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1747.
 TOBACCO, EXCISE DUTY COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1748.
 WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2215.
 WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS: in Com. of Sup., 2127, 3394, 3465.
 Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 2576; 2nd, in Com. and 3rd, 3167. (56 *Vic. c. 24.*)
 Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 3343; 2nd, in Com. and 3rd, 3497. (56 *Vic. c. 35.*)
 INSPECTOR, SAVINGS BANKS: in Com. of Sup., 111.
 INSPECTION OF ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.'S: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1746.
 INSTRUCTIONS TO CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1711.
 Insurance further Act Amt. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 2465; 2nd and in Com., 3002; withdn., 3477.
 INSURANCE CO.'S AND POLICY HOLDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3480.
 INTELLIGENCE FISHERIES BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 1721.
 INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
 HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3211.
 COAL AND IRON FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1033.
 EMPLOYEES DISCHARGED: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1032.
 FENCING, NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1745.
 HAY AND GRAIN FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1322.
 NEWSPAPERS, &c., TENDERS FOR SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 609.
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 149.
 REVENUE AND WORKING EXPENSES: M. for Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 334.
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 861.
 SECTION SUPERINTENDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2215.
 SKEFFINGTON, DETECTIVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1745.

INTERIOR :

- APPMNT. OF DEPUTY-MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. Faurel) 1751.
- BELANGER, PRIDIME, EMPLMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 863.
- BOUNDARIES OF PROV. OF QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (Sir Hector Langevin) 235.
- BOUNDARY OF C. P. RY. BELT IN B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Mara) 2679.
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Daly.) 2794.
- EDUCATION AND DUAL LANGUAGE IN N. W. T., PETS. re: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 1519.
- EXPLORING EXPEDITIONS, JAMES' AND HUDSON BAYS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Joncas) 1551.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. Fréchet) 507.
- IN MONTCALM CO.: Ques. (Mr. Dupas) 1321.
- GEOLOGICAL DEPT., CHANGE IN PERSONNEL: Ques. (Mr. Carcollen) 1611.
- IN COM. OF SUP., 185, 304.
- LAND GRANTS TO RYS.: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1541.
- INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1722
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex.: presented (Sir John Thompson) 79.
- INTERNATIONAL MINING CONVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 2111.
- IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.
- ISLE PERROTT WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 2645.
- ISLE VERTE PIER (QUE.): in Com. of Sup., 2936.
- IVES, HON. W. B., MEMBER FOR SHERRBROOKE: Introduced 5.
- JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 3067; in Com., 3169.
- JAMES' AND HUDSON BAYS EXPEDITION: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. Joncas) 1551.
- JOHNSTON, J., PREPARING MAPS: in Com. of Sup., 1722.
- Joint Stock Co.'s See "RIVERS AND STREAMS."
- Judges (Sessions of the Peace) Montreal and Quebec B. No. 81 (Mr. Beausoleil) 1st, 1743.
- JUDICIARY OF QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. Tarte) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3287.
- Deb. (Mr. Amyot) 3299; (Mr. Brodeur) 3314; (Mr. Choquette) 3311; (Mr. Curran) 3296; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 3289; (Mr. Langeier) 3309; (Mr. Laurier) 3305; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 3289; (Mr. Ouimet) 3288; (Mr. Speaker) 3289.
- Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) B. No. 104 (Sir John Thompson). 1st, 2646; 2nd, in Com. and 3rd, 3497. (56 Vic. c. 33.)
- JUSTICE :
- ADMINISTRATION: in Com. of Sup., 307, 1263, 1672.
- COPYRIGHT, PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 1618
- CRIMINAL CODE, COPIES FOR MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Leclair) 607.
- COR. WITH SUPREME COURT JUDGES, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Laurier) 1550.
- DEPTL. REP. (PENITENTIARIES): presented (Sir John Thompson) 5.

JUSTICE—Continued.

- FRENCH-CANADIAN ADVOCATES, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 1525.
- GASPÉ AND CHICOUTIMI JUDICIAL DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. Faurel) 862.
- GIBEAULT, DOM. POLICEMAN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Rivfret) 1133.
- HERCHMER, LAWRENCE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2387.
- COMMISSIONER, REP. re CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 865.
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 866.
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1240.
- IN COM OF SUP., 307, 1263, 1672, 3427.
- JUDICIARY OF ONT.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lister) 3522, 3528.
- QUEBEC, MR. WURTELE'S SUCCESSOR: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1749.
- Remarks (Mr. Tarte) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3287.
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1029.
- EVIDENCE re INVESTIGATION: M. for copies* (Mr. Somerville) 867.
- PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1029.
- VISITORS' ENTRANCE FEES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Mulock) 2245.
- LABRIE, CHAR. L., CLAIM FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Frémont) 1550.
- MCDUGALL, LAUCHLIN, CLAIM FOR SUPERANNUATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Fraser) 2245.
- MCGREVVY-MURPHY CONSPIRACY: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tarte) 2421.
- MARSHALL, HORMISDAS, CLAIM FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Laurier) 1550.
- MINES AND MINERALS ACT OF N.S., DISALLOWANCE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Weldon) 1550.
- "MODUS VIVENDI," EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1747.
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN., PROCEEDINGS OF CONFERENCE: presented (Sir John Thompson) 471.
- Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 328.
- Stmnt. (Sir John Thompson) 507.
- PAPERS re BAIT: presented (Sir John Thompson) 504.
- PRINCE COUNTY JUDGESHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1937, 2132.
- SEPARATE SCHOOLS (MAN.) JUDGMENT H. M.'S P.C.: M. for copy (Mr. La Rivière) 328.
- See general heading.
- SUPREME COURT, VACANCY ON BENCH: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) on M. for Com. of Sup., 545.
- WELLAND COUNTY COURT JUDGE, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 2289.
- KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2168.
- KAMOURASKA PIERS, &c., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Curroll) 861.
- KELLY, M., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2127.
- KEMPTVILLE P. O., IRREGULARITIES: M. for Cor.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1551.
- IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 860.
- Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2479.
- KENTVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Borden) 2245.

- KILDARE (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 609.
- KINCARDINE, &c., INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 3478.
- KING'S (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, EVIDENCE *re* INVESTIGATION: M. for copy (Mr. Somerville) 867.
- In Com. of Sup., 311, 388, 3431.
- INSPECTOR'S REP.: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1029.
- VISITORS' FEES, &c. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Muloock) 2245.
- LABAT, GASTON P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 724.
- LABORATORY, TESTING SUGARS: in Com. of Sup., 3893.
- LABOUR BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. McKay) 1523.
- LABRIE, CHAS. I., CLAIM FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: M. for Accts., &c. (Mr. Fremont) 1550.
- LACHAPELLE, S., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HOCHELAGA: Introduced, 3.
- LACHINE CANAL, BRIDGE CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir Hector Langevin) 223.
- In Com. of Sup., 1723, 3445.
- LACOUTURE, JOSEPH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lavergne) 2679.
- LADOGA WHEAT AND TWO-ROWED BARLEY: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1524.
- Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. Fraser). 1^o*, 859; 2^o*, 1074; in Com. and 3^o*, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 50.)
- LAKE ERIE, &c., INLAND FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. Allan) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3181.
- LAKE ST. PETER, CATCHING SOFT FISH: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 2794.
- LAKE SUPERIOR AND ATLANTIC WATER-WAY: prop. Res. (Mr. Tisdale) 2648.
- Land in the Territories consolid. Act Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. Daly). 1^o, 2977; withdn, 3477.
- Land Grants to Militia provision B. No. 74 (Mr. Patterson, Huron). 1^o*, 1672; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 3267. (56 Vic., c. 3.)
- LAND GRANTS TO RYS.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1538.
- LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
- LARD, PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 244.
- LECLAIR, P., ESQ., MEMBER FOR TERREBONNE: Introduced, 3.
- LEGISLATION FOR THE N.W.T.: M. (Mr. Davin) to suspend Rule, 3066.
- In Com. of Sup., 399, 1266, 2699, 3442.
- LESAGE, ED. See "ST. LEON."
- LES DAMES RELIGIEUSES DU SACRÉ CŒUR DE JÉSUS, PET.: presentation (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) ruled out of Order, 2607.
- L'ETANG DU NORD: in Com. of Sup., 2935.
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Rider) 611.
- LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 405, 1266.
- LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF N. B.: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 80.
- Deb. (Mr. Brodeur) 93; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 88; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 92; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 80; (Mr. Devlin) 96; (Mr. Fraser) 90; (Mr. Hazen) 87; (Mr. Hearn) 95; (Mr. Landerkin) 93; (Mr. Langetier) 91; (Mr. Laurier) 84; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 82; (Mr. Ouimet) 89.
- Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1744.
- LIEUT.-GOV.'S OFFICE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1726.
- RESIDENCE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- LIQUOR TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. Dickey) 325.
- REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Scribe) 325.
- L'ISLET ELECTION: Return of Member, 658.
- LITIGATION, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 2111, 2593, 3412.
- LITTLE RAPID LOCKS, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Devlin) 2420.
- LIVERPOOL, NEW (CO. LÉVIS) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1031.
- (N.S.) INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 2245.
- Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 3478.
- LIVE STOCK, INDIAN SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 3380.
- LOANS. See "GOVT."
- LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3318.
- prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1324.
- M. (Mr. O'Brien) to adjn. deb., 1342.
- London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. Moncrieff). 1^o*, 786; 2^o*, 859; in Com. and 3^o*, 2679. (56 Vic., c. 51.)
- LONDON, &c., RY. See "CLEVELAND."
- See "COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION."
- LONDON (ENG.) FINANCIAL AGENCY, TRANSFER: in Com. of Sup., 1241.
- LORD LANSDOWNE'S PORTRAIT: in Com. of Sup., 2127.
- Lord's Day Observance B. No. 5 (Mr. Charlton). 1^o*, 147; Order for 2^o postponed, 516.
- Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3177.
- LOUISVILLE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Legris) 2886.
- LURCHER SHOAL (N.S.) LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 505.
- PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bowers) 866.
- MCCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LANDS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1131.
- MCDONALD, W. W., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST ASSINIBOIA: Introduced, 3.
- MCDUGAL LAUHLIN, CLAIM FOR SUPERRANNATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Fraser) 2245.
- MCNAMEE, F. B. & Co., CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Hector Langevin) 867.
- MCGREEVY-MURPHY CONSPIRACY: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Tarte) 2421.
- MCINERNEY, G. V., ESQ., MEMBER FOR KENT, N.B.: Introduced, 3.
- McNAIR'S COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2928.

MACKEREL NETS: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3346.

— REPEAL OF O. C.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 224.

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAM-SHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3410.

MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 2209.

MANITOBA:

BARRETT vs. WINNIPEG, JUDGMENT H. M.'S. PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copy (Mr. La Rivière) 329.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, RED DEER: in Com. of Sup., 2095.

PROHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 3480.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS. See general heading.

WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 503.

— MILITIA HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg) 1230.

Manitoba and North-western Ry. Co.'s Consolid. B. No. 96 (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). 1^o*, 2288; 2^o*, 2421; in Com. and 3^o*, 3019. (56 Vic., c. 52.)

"MAN. SCHOOL CASE." See "SEPARATE SCHOOLS," "BARRETT."

Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. La Rivière). 1^o*, 786; 2^o*, 859; in Com. and 3^o*, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 53.)

Manufacturers' Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. Denison). 1^o*, 658; 2^o*, 819; in Com. and 3^o*, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 80.)

MANUFACTURERS IN MONTMAGNY, NAMES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1131.

— IN SOREL, NAMES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, CAPITAL INVESTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1750.

— RAW MATERIAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1522.

— IN VICTORIAVILLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 2092.

— See "CENSUS."

MARINE:

BOULTON, COMMANDER, SERVICES re HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 3561.

DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS BUOY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 1320.

HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN STREAM COM.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1669.

LAKR SUPERIOR AND ATLANTIC WATERWAY: PROP. RES. (Mr. Tvedale) 2648.

LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 505.

— PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bowers) 866.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 5.

— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 123.

MARINE FOOD FISHERIES, PROPAGATION: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 506.

POINT AUX ANGLAIS LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Girouard, Two Mountains) 437.

PORT DALHOUSIE FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 1130.

"QUADRA," STR., TENDRES FOR REPAIRS: M. for copies (M. Prior) 2246.

ST. MARY'S BAY BELL-BUOY: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 506.

MARINE—Continued.

SHIPPING (CAN.) REGISTERED TONNAGE: (Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 436, 859.

SICK MARINERS' FUND: (Mr. Lépine) 1520.

STEAM COMMUNICATION HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. Forbes) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1669.

MARTIAL, HORMIDAS, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Laurier) 1550.

[See "FISHERIES."]

Maritime Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. Stairs). 1^o*, 1223; 2^o*, 1320.

MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2889; in Com., 3059.

Masters' and Mates' (Certificates) Act Amt. B. No. 72 (Mr. Costigan). 1^o, 1591.

MEAFORD INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2884.

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2091.

— INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Lépine) 326.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

ADDRESS, REPLY TO: presented (Sir John Thompson) 1743.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND: presented (Mr. Costigan) 504.

— PAPERS ON FISHERIES: presented (Sir John Thompson) 471, 504, 2273.

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION re CHARGES: presented (Sir John Thompson) 325.

ESTIMATES (1893-94) THE: presented (Mr. Foster) 78.

— SUPPL. (1893): presented (Mr. Foster) 805, 2576.

— SUPPL. (1894): presented (Mr. Foster) 3104.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Sir John Thompson) 79.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S.: presented (Mr. Foster) 1825.

TREATY WITH FRANCE: presented (Mr. Foster) 1824.

METEGHAN COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2925.

METHYLATED SPIRITS: in Com. of Sup., 3393.

METEOLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3342.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED:

BAIN, J. W., Esq., Soulanges, 3.

BELLEY, L. DE G., Esq., Saguenay, 3.

BOSTON, ROBT., Esq., South Middlesex, 3477.

BOYD, N., Esq., Marquette, 357.

CARSCALLEN, A. W., Esq., North Hastings, 3.

CHESLEY, J. A., Esq., City and County of St. John, 3.

CURRAN, J. J., Esq., Montreal Centre, 3.

DALY, HON. T. M., Selkirk, 3.

IVES, HON. W. B., Sherbrooke, 5.

LACHAPELLE, S., Esq., Hochelaga, 3.

LECLAIR, P., Esq., Terrebonne, 3.

MCDONALD, W. N., Esq., East Assiniboia, 3.

MCINERNEY, C. V., Esq., Kent, N.B., 3.

TARTE, I., Esq., L'Islet, 656.

WALLACE, N. C., Esq., West York, 2.

WOOD, J. F., Esq., Brockville, 3.

Mercantile Agencies. See "DETECTIVE."

Merchant Shipping Act B. No. 92 (Mr. Costigan). 1^o, 1932; 2^o* and in Com., 3166; 3^o*, 3167. (56 Vic., c. 22.)

MICHAUD, C. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2216.

Military College Act Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Patterson, Huron). 1^o, 3067; Res. in Com., 3344; 2^o of B. and in Com., 3496; 3^o*, 3497. (56 Vic., c. 17.)

MILITIA :

- AMYOT, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2800.
- DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 80.
— In Com. of Sup., 117, 287.
- FORT GEORGE, PRESERVATION : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 1522.
- GARRISON GROUNDS, ANNAPOLIS, PRESERVATION : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1523.
- MILITARY INTERCHANGES, BRITISH AND CANADIAN : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1524.
- PENSIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3077.
- PROPERTIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 571.
- MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 548, 1722, 2586, 3342.
— See "LAND GRANTS."
- SUPPLIES, CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 224.
— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 84.
- VILLIERS, DEP. ADJT.-GEN., SUSPENSION, &c. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 351.
- VOLUNTEER RIFLE PRACTICE, AMMUNITION : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 223.
- WINNIPEG MILITIA HOSPITAL : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1130.
[See "SUPPLY."]
- MILTON AND BEDFORD (N.S.) FISH HATCHERIES : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1611.
- MILVERTON, &c., INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 2385.
- MIMINGASH (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 222.
- MINERALOGY, &c. See "GEOLOGICAL."
- MINES AND MINERALS ACT OF N.S., DISALLOWANCE : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1550.
- MINISTERIAL CHANGES : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2580.
- MINISTRY, CONSTITUTION OF : Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1704.
- MISCELLANEOUS, (H. OF C.) : in Com. of Sup., 3436.
— In Com. of Sup., 2111, 2593, 3387, 3412.
- JUSTICE, N.W.T. AND B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 307.
- "MODUS VIVENDI," EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1747.
- MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
- Moncton and Prince Edward Island Ry. and Ferry Co.'s Revival Act Amt. B. No. 56 (Mr. *McInerney*). 1*, 859; 2*, 1551; in Com. and 3*, 2421. (56 Vic., c. 54.)
- MONEYS, PUBLIC. See "PARLIAMENTARY FEES."
- MONGEAU, MESSRS., AND D. MILLETTE, CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1132.
- MONTFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2889; in Com., 3059.
- MONTMAGNY INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3128.
— Remarks re Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2578.
- Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Pope*). 1*, 859; 2*, 1074; in Com. and 3*, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 25.)

- Montreal Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 99 (Mr. *Foster*). 1*, 244; 2* and in Com., 2988; 3*, 3132 (56 Vic., c. 21.)
— NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 1520.
- Mining Co.'s Winding-up B. No. 14 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1*, 357; 2*, 819.
- MONUMENT TO LATE SIR JOHN MACDONALD : in Com. of Sup., 2954.
— FOR BATTLE-FIELDS : in Com. of Sup., 604.
- MOTT, W. A., LEGAL SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 1742.
- MOUNTED POLICE BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 2207.
— COMMISSIONER'S REP. : presented (Mr. *Ives*) 1673.
— CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 120.
— In Com. of Sup., 1722.
- NUMBER AND SALARIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 327, 436.
- Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s Revival Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Sproute*). 1*, 357; 2*, 471.
— INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2245.
— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2798.
- MOYLAN, J. G. See "KINGSTON PENITENTIARY."
- MOWAT, MR., GRATUITY : in Com. of Sup., 2112.
- MURPHY, CONSTABLE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1672.
- Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Mara*). 1*, 1591; 2*, 1745; in Com. and 3*, 3019. (56 Vic., c. 56.)
- NATIONAL ART GALLERY : in Com. of Sup., 2950.
- NEGOTIATIONS WITH U. S. : Papers presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1825.
- NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2933.
- Nelson and Sheppard Ry. Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. *Mara*). 1*, 1824; 2*, 1969; in Com. and 3*, 2681. (56 Vic., c. 57.)
- NEW BRUNSWICK :
- ATKINSON, EX-CONDUCTOR C. A., REDUCED RANK : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2246.
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1293, 2134.
- CENTREVILLE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 608.
- CHARLOTTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
- FISHING IN MAR. PROVS. : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 3474.
- GRAND FALLS BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 2129.
- HAY AND GRAIN FREIGHT RATES ON I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1322. ●
— See general heading.
- KING'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF N.B. : Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1744.
— on M. for Com. of Sup., 80.
- MACKEREL NETS : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3346.
- ST. JOHN CUSTOM-HOUSE, COPPER ROOF, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 863.
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 503.
[See "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY," &c.]
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA COR. : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 328.

- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA PAPERS *re* BAIT: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 504.
- PAPERS RESPECTING: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2273.
- PROCEEDINGS OF CONFERENCE: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 471.
- STUNT. (Sir *John Thompson*) 507.
- FISHERMEN ON LABRADOR COAST, TREATMENT OF CANADIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 2679.
- REPUND OF LICENSE FEES: (Ques. (Mr. *Kaulback*) 1747.
- NEW HARBOUR (N.S.) BREAKWATER SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 862.
- NEW RICHMOND AND GRAND CASCAPIEDIA MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1748.
- NEWSPAPERS, &c., TENDERS FOR SALE ON I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 609.
- NEW STEAMER, PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 3342.
- NEWTON, ISAAC, COSTS OF SUIT: in Com. of Sup., 1721.
- NICKEL COINAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) 2418.
- Nicolet Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *Mara*). 1*, 1824; 2*, 1969.
- NINE MILE CREEK PIER (P.E.I.): in Com. of Sup., 2931.
- North American Canal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *McKay*). 1*, 1743; 2*, 2213; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 3066; in Com., 3066; again in Com. and 3*, 3106. (56 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- North Canadian Atlantic Ry. and Steamship Co.'s revival Act Amt. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Frenont*). 1*, 1399; 2*, 1551; in Com. and 3*, 2421. (56 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
- CALGARY P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2207.
- EDUCATION AND DUAL LANGUAGE, PETITIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 1319.
- HERCHMER, LAWRENCE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2387.
- COMMISSIONER'S REP. *re* CHARGES: M. for copy (Mr. *Davin*) 865.
- Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 866, 1240.
- INDIAN HOSPITAL, BLOOD RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 2094.
- LEGISLATION FOR N.W.T.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to suspend Rule, 3066.
- LIEUT.-GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1726.
- RESIDENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- MOUNTED POLICE BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2207.
- NUMBER AND SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 327, 436.
- NORTH-WEST CATTLE QUARANTINE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1131.
- QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Macdowall*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3286.
- REGINA COURT HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2207.
- LIEUT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2445.
- SCHOOLS IN THE N.W.T., TEACHERS' SALARIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Semple*) 2265.
- WASCANA DAM, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 1306.
- WELL-BORING, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1726.
- [See "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY," &c.]
- North-west Territories Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Daly*). 1*, 3067; withdn., 3477.
- further Act Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 606.
- Representation Act Amt. B. No. 72 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1*, 1591.
- NORTH-WEST CATTLE QUARANTINE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1131.
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES. See "GOVT."
- NOTRE DAME DU ROSAIRE P. O., LOCATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 867.
- Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 864.
- NOVA SCOTIA:
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1290.
- BAYFIELD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- NEW WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2922.
- BOUNTIES (FISHING) IN VICTORIA AND GUYSBOROUGH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 867.
- FRAUDS, &c., IN DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 356.
- CAPE SABLE ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- COAL FIELDS, DELEGATION TO HIS EX.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 787.
- Personal Explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) 945.
- Remarks (Mr. *Weldon*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1618.
- CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1031, 1936.
- DARTMOUTH P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2168.
- DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS BUOY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1320.
- PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2919.
- REPAIRS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 504.
- INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2465.
- DISALLOWANCE, MINES AND MINERALS ACT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1550.
- GARRISON GROUNDS, ANNAPOLIS, PRESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1523.
- HALIFAX DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2180.
- INGONISH (SOUTH) PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2924.
- KENTVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Borden*) 2245.
- LIVERPOOL INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 2245.
- Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3478.
- LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 505.
- PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bowers*) 866.
- MCDUGAL, LAUCHLIN, CLAIM FOR SUPERANNUATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 2245.
- McNAIR'S COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
- METECHAN COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2925.
- MILTON AND BEDFORD FISH HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1611.
- NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 862.
- NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2888; in Com., 3045.
- NYANZA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2922.
- PICKET'S PIER, EXPEND., WHARFAGE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*) 352.
- PICTOU CONTOVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- PICTOU ISLANDS WHARVES: in Com. of Sup., 2922.
- RICHMOND P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2206.
- ROUGE MONT P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*) 1551.

NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.

ST. MARY'S BAY BELL-BUOY: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 506.
SANDFORD BREAKWATER, CLAIMS FOR REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Flint) 351.

— REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 326.

SANDY COVE PORT, CUSTOMS RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 3345.

WESTPORT INDUSTRIES: Remarks (Mr. Bowers) 2801.

YARMOUTH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

— INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: (Mr. Flint) 2876, 3106.

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop.

Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3045, 3167.

Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Society, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. Welsh). 1st*, 2130; 2nd*, 2213; in Com. and 3rd*, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 85.)

NYANZA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2922.

Oaths. See "ADMINISTRATION," "SEDITIONS."

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Kenny) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1223.

OFFICERS, &c., HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 865.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 307.

ONTARIO:

AYLMER INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3116.

BLENHEIM INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3121.

BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3464.

CENTRAL ONT. RY. CO. AND SUBSIDY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Corby) 1535.

— prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.

CLINTON INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 3126.

CHATHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2186.

FORT GEORGE, PRESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 1522.

GALOPS RAPIDS CHANNEL, PLANS AND SURVEYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Reid) 1526.

GOVT. OFFICES IN TORONTO, CONCENTRATION: Ques. (Mr. Coatsworth) 1030.

GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3044.

GUELPH INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Innes) 3111.

GUILDS (ONT.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 325.

HARAWAY P. O. MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Landerkin) 356.

HARTNEY, TIMOTHY, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 606.

HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

HURON (WEST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.

JUDICIARY, PAR. in "EMPIRE": Remarks (Mr. Lister) 3522.

KAMINISTIGUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2168.

KEMPTVILLE P. O. IRREGULARITIES: M. for Cor.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1551; Remarks, 2479. — Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 860.

ONTARIO—Continued.

KINCARDINE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 3478.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, REP. re INVESTIGATION: M. for copy* (Mr. Somerville) 867.

— VISITORS' FEES, &c.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Mulock) 2245.

LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

MEAFORD INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2884.

MILVERTON INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 2385.

MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

MOUNT FOREST INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. McMullen) 2245.

— Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2798.

ONT., BELMONT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.

ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2207.

OSHAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 3067.

OWEN SOUND INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3118.

PARRY SOUND COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2889; in Com., 3061.

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

PERTH (NORTH AND SOUTH) CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judge's Rep., 1.

PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2645.

PORT DALHOUSIE FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 1130.

PORT ELGIN INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 2641.

PORT HOPE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2636.

RIDGETOWN INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 2883.

ST. MARY'S INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Grieve) 2383.

ST. THOMAS P. O. APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 1936.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL TOLLS: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 1747.

SEAFORTH INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2639.

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

STRATHROY INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2795, 3478.

TILBURY CENTRE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McDonald, Huron) 3344.

TORONTO DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 1300, 2207.

— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2946.

UXBRIDGE INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2217, 3109.

WALKERTON MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 861.

WELLAND CANAL, NEW CULVERT, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 609.

— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

WHITBY INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2877.

WOODSTOCK INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 2881, 3115.

YORK (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

[See "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Ocean Accident Ins. Corporation in-
corp. B. No. 39 (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 721; 2^o,
820; in Com. and 3^o, 1701. (56 Vic., c. 81.)

— Fidelity Guarantee Corporation in-
corp. B. No. 46 (Mr. Sproule). 1^o, 786; 2^o,
859; in Com., 1702; 3^o, 1745. (56 Vic., c. 82.)

— Steam-ship Subsidies Act Amt. B.
No. 129 (Mr. Foster). 1^o, 3343; 2^o, in Com.
and 3^o, 3537. (56 Vic., c. 5.)

ORDER PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

JUDICIARY OF QUEBEC: Conduct of Judges impugned
by Mr. Tarte, some having paid for their appoint-
ments. Mr. Ouimet raised a question of Order.
Mr. Speaker quoted Rules and precedents, 3289;
ruled, that if the member made a special attack
upon any judge he would not be in Order, but
reference to the judiciary in general terms
would be permissible, 3291; Member requested
to withdraw unparliamentary expressions, 3292.

MAKING SPEECHES ON PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: A
Member having spoken through the indulgence
of the House, Mr. Speaker's attention was
directed to the fact that said member was
making a speech, and out of Order. Mr.
Speaker ruled: there being no question before
the House the hon. gentleman had no right to
speak, 2523.

PRIVILEGE:

ALBERT ELECTION: Article in Moncton "Trans-
cript" reflecting on Member as having secured
his seat by means of bribery. Repudiation of
statements contained in article by said member
(Mr. Weldon) 1744.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY, &c.: Paragraph in
"Montreal Gazette" accusing the Member for
L'Islet of having received moneys for certain
purposes. Explanation (Mr. Tarte) on M. to
adjourn the House, 3524.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY: Article in Ottawa "Free
Press" respecting Extension of time for com-
pletion without forfeiture of subsidy voted by
Parliament, quoted by Mr. Welsh and com-
mented on, 1310.

COAL FIELDS OF NOVA SCOTIA: Report in "Empire"
of First Minister's remarks in debate on Mr.
Mills' (Bothwell) question of constitutionality of
private members waiting on the Governors-Gen-
eral. Personal explanation (Mr. McNeill) 943.

COAL OIL DUTY: Statements as reported in "Hans-
ard," made in debate by the member for East
Grey, contradicted by the member for West
Lambton (Mr. Lister) 1613.

CORN, FREE ENTRY: Explanation (Mr. Temple) of
Vote on Division, 1614.

HAWKE, J. T.: Mr. Weldon's explanation challenged
by Mr. Davies (P.E.I.) 2647.

JUDICIARY OF ONTARIO: Article in "Empire" com-
menting on the alleged utterances of the Mem-
ber for West Lambton, re judges purchasing their
appointments, read by Mr. Lister, 3522.

PROTECTION: Mr. Davin's speech on the Tariff criti-
cized in the "Empire." Remarks on personal
explanation checked by Mr. Speaker, 725.

SABBATH DESECRATION: Article in Ottawa "Citizen"
commenting on extracts from the "Presbyterian
Witness" and Halifax "Herald" re employing

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Con. PRIVILEGE—Continued.

steam tugs on Sunday. Personal explanation
(Mr. Charlton) 3473.

TARIFF DEBATE: Letter in Montreal "Gazette" re
sugar refineries and number of hands employed.
Inaccurate figures quoted by a senator; com-
parison with Official Report suggested by Sir
Richard Cartwright, 1673.

WASHINGTON, MR. CHARLTON'S VISIT: on M. for Com.
of Sup., personal explanation, 358; on M. to
introduce B. amending the Customs Act, 3235.

PROCEDURE:

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker draws
the attention of the House to the practice of
moving the adjournment for the purpose of pre-
cipitating a discussion, and quotes Sir Erskine
May on the subject, 1319.

COAL FIELDS OF NOVA SCOTIA: Delegation of Mem-
bers to His Excellency re sale to a Syndicate by
the Local Government. Objection taken by Mr.
Mills (Bothwell) as to the constitutionality of the
delegation approaching His Excellency to advise
him, the hon. gentleman claiming that said ad-
vice should be given to the Governor-General
through the Government, his responsible ad-
visors, 787.

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION COMMISSIONERS: on M. to
conc. in Res., Mr. Charlton moved an amend-
ment, re Sunday closing, to refer back to Com-
mittee. Mr. Speaker ruled the amendment out
of Order not being relevant to the resolution,
a similar motion standing on the Order Paper.
Mr. Charlton in support of Amt. quoted Rules
88 and 89. Authorities quoted by Mr. Speaker
and ruling maintained, 3132.

SPEAKER OF THE SENATE: on M. for 2^o of B. 114.
Constitutionality of the B. questioned by Mr.
Mills (Bothwell) and debated, 3538; debate ad-
journed, 3552; resumed., 3557; further ad-
journed, 3561.

[See SPEAKER, MR.]

ORDERS DISCHARGED, 3177, 3477.

OSHAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Hag-
gart) 3067.

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:
prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3044.

— BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2208, 2954.

— RIVER, MILLES ISLES CHANNEL: in Com. of
Sup., 2936.

OWEN SOUND INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques.
(Mr. Landerkin) 3118.

OYSTER BEDS, LICENSES FOR LIMITS: Ques. (Mr.
Perry) 1525.

Parliamentary Fees (Disposition of Re-
ceipts) B. No. 61 (Mr. Foster). 1^o, 1130; 2^o,
in Com. and 3^o, 2133. (56 Vic., c. 8.)

PARLIAMENT, 7TH, 3RD SESSION: Opening, 1; Pro-
rogation, 3663.

PARRY SOUND, COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:
prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2889; in Com., 3061.

Patent Act further Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr.
Foster). 1^o, 2794; 2^o, 3267; in Com., 3268; 3^o,
3269. (56 Vic., c. 34.)

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 410.

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

PENITENTIARIES : in Com. of Sup., 311, 388, 1264, 3431.
 PENSIONS, MILITARY : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3077.
 PERMANENT CORPS, STAFF, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 548.
 PERKINS' MILLS (P.E.I.) DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES : M. for Pet.* (Mr. *Perry*) 2420.
 PERTH (NORTH AND SOUTH) CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS : Judge's Rep., 1.
 PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS. See "ORDER," &c.
Petroleum Inspection Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1^o*, 2977; 2^o* and in Com., 3498; 3^o, 3517. (56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
 PICKET'S PIER (N.S.) EXPEND. WHARFAGE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Borden*) 352.
 PICKLED GOODS, REDUCTION OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 506.
 PICTOU CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
 — ISLANDS, WHARVES : in Com. of Sup., 2922.
 — P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2123, 2964.
 PIERS AND BREAKWATERS (P.E.I.) : in Com. of Sup., 2929, 3461.
 PIG IRON, IMPORTS FROM 1870 TO 1880, AND BOUNTY PAID : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 866.
 — 1881 TO 1892, AND BOUNTY PAID : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 356.
 POINTE AUX ANGLAIS LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 437.
 POINT A VALOIS WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2645.
 POLICE. See "Dominion," "Mounted."
 POLICY-HOLDERS AND INSURANCE CO.'S : Ques. (Mr. *Turchitt*) 3480.
 PONTIAC CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 319.
 — COUNTY'S BONDED INDEBTEDNESS : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 254.
 PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2645.
Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. *Macdonell*). 1^o*, 786; 2^o*, 859; in Com. and 3^o*, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
 PORT DALHOUSIE FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1130.
 PORT ELGIN INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Rouand*) 2641.
 PORT HOPE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2636.
 POST OFFICE :
 ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 2644.
 BAILLARGEON P. O., MAL-ADMINISTRATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Guay*) 356.
 CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 437.
 CAP ST. IGNACE POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 864.
 CLARK, JAS., EMPLOYT. IN P.O. DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2795.
 COMPUTING INTEREST, P.O. DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 216.
 CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY., CARRIAGE OF MAILS : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1031, 1936.
 CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 290.
 COUNTRY POSTMASTERS' SALARIES : Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 438.

POST OFFICE—Continued.

DALHOUSIE AND GASPÉ MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1031.
 DEPTL. REP. : presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 319.
 FRASERVILLE P. O., EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 1586.
 GUILDS (ONT.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 325.
 HARKAWAY P. O., MAIL SERVICE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 356.
 HARTNEDY, TIMOTHY, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 606.
 HAWKEN, F., INCREASED SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3471.
 KEMPTVILLE P. O., IRREGULARITIES : M. for Cor. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 860; (Inquiry) 1551, 2479.
 LABATT, GASTON P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 724.
 LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 611.
 LIVERPOOL (CO. L'ISLET) POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1031.
 NEW RICHMOND AND CASCAPEDIA MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1748.
 OUTSIDE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3395.
 PERKINS' MILLS, &c., AND HULL MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2420.
 POSTMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 216.
 STE. ANGELE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Remarks checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 3475.
 STE. ANNE DE LA PERRADE, POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Lévis*) 2801.
 ST. LÉON (MASKINONGÉ) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Légris*) 866.
 ST. PASCAL AND KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 861.
 ST. THOMAS POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1935.
 TWO-CENT POSTAGE RATE : on M. for Com. of Sup. Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3369; neg. on a div., 3077.
 VICTORIA, P.O., B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 3453.
 WALKERTON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 861.
 [See "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY," &c.]
 POSTAGE ON LETTERS, REDUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 611.
 PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN : Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 659.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND :
 CAPE TRAVERSE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 438.
 CASCOMPEQUE HARBOUR, BRUSH AND STONE CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 606.
 — ENGINEER'S REP. : (Mr. *Perry*) 222.
 COAL AND IRON FREIGHT RATES ON I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1033.
 GUAY, ALPHONSE, TRANSFER : Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 2645.
 HACKETT, ED., FISHING INSPECTOR, SUSPENSION, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 866.
 KILDARE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 609.
 MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 222.
 NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2933.
 NINE-MILE CREEK PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2931.
 OYSTER BEDS, LICENSES FOR LIMITS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1525.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—Continued.

- PERKINS' MILLS, DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perry) 2420.
- PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 2929, 3461.
- PRINCE COUNTY JUDGESHIP, VACANCY; Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1937, 2132.
- P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF TRACKMASTER MCPHERSON: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 2217.
- RUSTICO BREAKWATER, STATE OF REPAIR: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2414.
- SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 326.
- TIGNISH WHARFINGER, APPMNT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 149.
- TUNNEL, EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Perry) 2390.
- WEST POINT BREAKWATER SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 222.
- WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER, GOVT. SURVEYS: M. for Rep. (Mr. Welsh) 336.
- [See "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]
- P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF TRACKMASTER MCPHERSON: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 2217.
- EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Perry) 2420.
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 149.
- Printing and Stationery Dept. Act Amt. B. No. 134 (Mr. Foster). 1st, 3549; 2^d m., 3556; 2^d, in Com. and 3rd, 3557. (56 Vic., c. 15.)**
- AND DISTRIBUTING THE LAWS: in Com. of Sup., 406, 1268.
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Costigan) 1399.
- DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 119, 3453.
- BUREAU, DELAY IN PRINTING BUDGET SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) 726.
- COM.: List of Members, 322.
- JOINT COM., 1ST AND 2ND REPS.: conc. (Mr. Bergin) 1933
- OF PARLT., DELAY: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) 2131.
- PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 406, 2599.
- PRIVATE BILLS, COM.'S REPS.: M. (Mr. Tisdale) extension of time, 1934.
- M. (Mr. Tisdale) to place on Orders of the Day, 2872.
- PETS.: M. (Sir John Thompson) extension of time, 251.
- POSTING: M. (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) reducing time, 2288.
- PRESENTATION: M. (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) to extend time, 786, 1222.
- PRESENTING REPS.: M. (Mr. Denison) 2872.
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM.: List of Members, 319.
- PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER," &c.
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 278, 1262.
- PROHIBITION COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2113.
- IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 3480.
- See "Liquor Traffic."
- PROBATION, COM. FROM GOV.-GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3522.
- PROTECTION SERVICE, FISHERY: in Com. of Sup., 1720, 3344.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: List of Members, 322.

- MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) 2132.
- REP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 5.
- DEBT, &c., COMMISSION ON PAYMENT OF INTEREST: in Com. of Sup., 100, 1240.
- HEALTH, CHOLERA, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 502, 2604, 2608.
- WORKS SINCE CONFEDN., EXPEND.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Lepine) 1550.

PUBLIC WORKS:

- BAIE LA VALLIÈRE, DREDGING: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bruneau) 2420.
- BAILLAIGÉ, G. F., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1131.
- BELLAVANCE, FERDINAND, REFUND ON TENDER: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 2383.
- BELINGUET, THOS. F. X., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 147.
- EMPLOYEES UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 864.
- BREEN, THOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2216.
- CAPE TRAVERSE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 438.
- CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, BRUSH AND STONE CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 606.
- ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 222.
- CLOUTIER, ARSÈNE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2217.
- COAL CONTRACTS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 326.
- CULVERT ON NATURAL WATERCOURSES, BUILDING: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 1551.
- CUSTOMS HOUSE, ST. JOHN, COPPER ROOF: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 863.
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Ouimet) 859.
- DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 125.
- DIGBY PIER REPAIRS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Bowers) 504.
- in Com. of Sup., 2919.
- DULIÈRE RIVER LOCKS, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Devlin) 2420.
- Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2388.
- DRILL HALL, QUE., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Frémont) 2643.
- ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, LEGISLATION.: Ques. (Mr. Cockburn) 1746.
- EXPEND. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Lepine) 1550.
- GALOPS RAPIDS CHANNEL, REP., PLANS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Reid) 1526.
- GOVT. OFFICES AT TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Coatsworth) 1030.
- HOWDEN, JAS., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132.
- ISLE FERROT WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 2845.
- IN COM. OF SUP., 1293, 2134, 2922, 3453.
- KAMOURASKA PIERS, &c., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 861.
- LA COUTURE, JOS., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Laergne) 2679.
- MCCARTHY, MESSRS., LANDS LEASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1131.
- MCNAMEE, F. B. & Co., CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Sir Hector Langevin) 867.

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

- MICHAUD, C. E., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2216.
- MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 222.
- MONGEAU, MESSRS., AND D. MILLETTE, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132.
- MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, NAMES, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Lépine) 1520.
- NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 862.
- NOTRE DAME DU ROSAIRE P. O., LOCATION: M. for Pets, &c. (Mr. Choquette) 867.
— Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 864.
- PICKET'S PIER, EXPEND., WHARFAGE: M. for Cor. (Mr. Borden) 352.
- PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, TENDERS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2645.
- POINT À VALOIS WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 2645, 2646.
- QUEBEC DRILL HALL, REPAIRS CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Frémont) 2887.
- RICHELIEU RIVER WHARF: M. for Ret., O. C.'s (Mr. Béchard) 2250.
- RIVIERE DU LOUP, DEEPENING, PAYMENTS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Guay) 1551.
- ROSA, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2216.
- ROY, C. & Z., CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 147.
- RUSTICO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS; M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2414.
— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 326.
- STE. ANNE DE SOREL WHARF COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1321.
- ST. SEBASTIEN P. O., CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Godbout) 1551.
- SANDFORD BREAKWATER, CLAIMS FOR REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Flint) 351.
— REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 326.
- SPANISH RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2644.
- TELEGRAPHIC SYSTEM OF THE EMPIRE: M. for Cor., &c. (Sir Hector Langevin) 329.
- TIGNISH WHARFINGER, APPMNT., & C.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 149.
- TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND EXPEND.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Perry) 2390.
- VICTORIA, B.C., MARINE HOSPITAL: Remarks (Mr. Prior) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1235.
- WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER, GOVT. SURVEYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 336.
- YAMACHICHE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. Desaulniers) 1527.
- YAMASKA DAM: Remarks (Mr. Langelier) in Com. of Sup., 2937.

Public Officials further Act Amt. B. 103
(Mr. Costigan). 1°, 2635; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3022. (56 Vic., c. 14.)

"QUADRA," STR., CONTRACT FOR REPAIRS: M. for copies (Mr. Prior) 2246.

QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE RY.: Remarks (Mr. Macdowell) on M. for Com. of Sup. 3286.

QUARANTINE:

- BRITISH CATTLE REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Fairbairn) 223.
- CATTLE IMPORTS FROM U.S. INTO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 862, 1131.

QUARANTINE—Continued.

- CATTLE SCHEDULED BY GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 2643.
— TRANSPORT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 2643.
- CHOLERA, PREVENTIVE MEASURES: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Landerkin) 866.
- EXPORT OF SWINE, REGULATIONS re SLAUGHTER: M. for O. C. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 338.
IN COM. OF SUP., 487, 2604.
- REGULATIONS, CATTLE FOR WORLD'S FAIR: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 723.
— CATTLE IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 438.
— CATTLE IN BOND FOR EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 607.
— STATIONS (MINOR): in Com. of Sup., 1303.
- SCHEDULING CAN. CATTLE, GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 330.
- SWINE IN BOND, SLAUGHTERING: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 148.
— M. for O.C. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 338.
- U. S. REGULATIONS re CATTLE IN BOND FOR EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. Rowand) 607.
— re IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 438.
- QUEBEC EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 335.
- QUEBEC, MONTRENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3043.
- QUEENSLAND FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. O'Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 544.
- QUEBEC:
- ADMIRALTY COURT, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 308.
 - ARGENTEUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
 - AMYOT, LIEUT. COL., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2800.
 - BAIE LA VALLIERE, DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bruneau) 2420.
 - BAILLARGEON P. O., MAL-ADMINISTRATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Guay) 356.
 - BEAUCO CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
 - BEAUBARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3043.
 - BELANGER, PRIDIME, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Tarte) 863.
 - BELLAVANCE, FERDINAND, REFUND ON TENDER: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 2383.
 - BERLINGUET, THOS. F. X., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 147.
— EMPLOYEES UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 864.
 - BONAVENTURE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
 - BONNE ESPERANCE FISHERY DIVISION, APPMNT. OF OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 437.
— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Joncas) 1551.
 - BOUNDARIES OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC: M. for Cor.* (Sir Hector Langevin) 235.
 - BOUNDARY, PASSAMAQUODDY BAY: in Com. of Sup., 2111.
 - BREEN, THOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2216.
 - BRIDGING LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Sir Hector Langevin) 223.
 - CAMPBELLTON AND GASPE BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 437.

QUEBEC—Continued.

- CAP ST. IGNACE POSTMASTER: Ques (Mr. Choquette) 864.
 CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 3427.
 CLOUTIER, ARSENE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 2217.
 CULLEBS, SUPERVISOR AT THREE RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 1747.
 DALHOUSIE AND GASPE BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Faucel) 1031.
 D'ESCOUSSE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2923.
 DRILL HALL INT QUEBEC, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Frémont) 2643.
 DUGGAN, CULLER AT MONTREAL, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2215.
 DU LIEVRE RIVER LOCKS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2388.
 — CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Devlin) 2420.
 FISHERY OVERSEERS' INSTRUCTIONS IN QUE.: M. for copies* (Mr. Bruneau) 2679.
 FISHING PROHIBITION: Remarks (Mr. Bruneau) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3321.
 FORCADE, ALBERT, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1031.
 FRASERVILLE P. O., EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 1526.
 GASPE AND CHICOUTIMI JUDICIAL DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. Faucel) 862.
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. Frechette) 507.
 — IN MONTCALM CO.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1321.
 GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888, 2889; in Com., 3059.
 GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2887; in Com., 3023.
 HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lepine) 1520.
 L. C. R. See general heading.
 ISLE PERROT WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 2645.
 ISLE VERTE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
 JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 3067; in Com., 3169.
 JUDICIARY OF QUE., APPOINT. OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1749.
 — PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks (Mr. Tarte) 3524.
 — Remarks (Mr. Tarte) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3287.
 KAMOURASKA PIERS, &c., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 861.
 LABAT, GASTON P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 724.
 LABRIE, CHAS. I., CLAIMS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: M. for Accts., &c.* (Mr. Frémont) 1550.
 LACHINE CANAL, BRIDGING CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir Hector Langevin) 223.
 LAKE ST. PETER, CATCHING SOFT FISH: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 2794.
 LA COUTURE, JOSEPH, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lavergne) 2679.
 LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
 L'ETANG DU NORD: in Com. of Sup., 2935.
 L'ISLET ELECTION: Return of Member, 658.
 LITTLE RAPID LOCKS, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Devlin) 2420.
 LIVERPOOL, NEW (CO. LEVIE) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1031.

QUEBEC—Continued.

- LOUISVILLE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Legris) 2896.
 MCCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LANDS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1131.
 MCGREEVY-MURPHY CONSPIRACY: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Tarte) 2421.
 MCNAMEE, F. B. & CO., CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Hector Langevin) 867.
 MANUFACTURERS IN MONTMAGNY, NAMES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1131.
 — SOREL, NAMES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132.
 — INDUSTRIES IN VICTORIAVILLE, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 2092.
 — See "CENSUS."
 MARTIAL, HORMIDAS, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Laurier) 1550.
 MASKINONGE AND NPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2889; in Com., 3059.
 MEDICAL INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Lepine) 326.
 MILLES ISLES CHANNEL, OTTAWA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
 MONGEAU, MESSRS., AND D. MILLETTE, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1132.
 MONTFORD COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2889; in Com., 3059.
 MONTMAGNY INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 3128.
 — Remarks re Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2578.
 MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lepine) 1520.
 NEW RICHMOND AND GRAND CASCAPIEDIA MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Faucel) 1748.
 NOTRE-DAME DU ROSAIRE, LOCATION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. Choquette) 867.
 OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3044.
 POINT AUX ANGLAIS LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Girouard, Two Mountains) 437.
 POINT A VALOIS WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 2645.
 PONTIAC CONVENTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 319.
 — COUNTY'S BONDED INDEBTEDNESS: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bathwell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 254.
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3042.
 — DRILL HALL, REPAIRS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Frémont) 2387.
 — EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Vaillancourt) 335.
 — MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888; in Com., 3043.
 RICHELIEU CO., FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 860.
 — RIVER WHARF: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. Béchard) 2250.
 RICHMOND P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2190.
 RICHMOND AND WOLFE, REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 327.
 RIVER DU LOUP, PAYMENTS FOR DEEPENING: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Guay) 1551.
 ROBERVAL PIER, LAKE ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
 ROSA, JOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2216.

QUEBEC—Continued.

- ROY, C. AND Z., CLAIM : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 147.
 STE. ANNE DE SOREL WHARF, COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 1321.
 STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE, POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. Légris) 2801.
 STE. ANGELE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 3474.
 ST. HENRI P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2187.
 ST. LEON (MASKINONGE) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Légris) 866.
 — Ret. re : Remarks (Mr. Légris) 2290.
 ST. MICHEL D'YAMASKA BRIDGE, SUBSIDY : M. for Ret. (Mr. Bruneau) 2419.
 ST. OURS INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 3125.
 ST. PASCAL AND KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 861.
 ST. SEBASTIEN P.O., CHANGE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Godbout) 1551.
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 318, 1264, 2187.
 SHEPARD, W. A., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1746.
 SHIP CANAL, MONTREAL AND QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 2165.
 SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1745, 2643.
 SOREL (TOWN) INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 3122.
 SOULANGES CANAL, SECTION 8, TENDERERS : M. for List of Names* (Sir Hector Langevin) 356.
 — CONVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep., 1.
 SPANISH RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Deelin) 2644.
 SUPREME COURT, &c., JUDGES AND CRIMINAL CODE : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 1550.
 TABOUAC PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2935.
 TOBACCO, &c., SEIZURES : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 610.
 TRUDEAU, TOUSSAINT, APPMNT. TO C. S. : Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 1525.
 UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 2888 ; in Com., 3028.
 VAUDREUIL WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 2646.
 — Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 2646.
 VERMONT CENTRAL RY. CO., RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE : M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. Béchar) 356.
 VICTORIAVILLE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lacergne) 2873.
 WEST FARNHAM P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2206.
 WHALE FISHING IN THE GULF : Ques. (Mr. Fauvel) 608.
 WHITELY, W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Jocas) 608.
 WURTELE, JUDGE, APPMNT. OF SUCCESSOR : Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1749.
 YAMACHICHE PIER, CONSTRUCTION : M. for Cor. (Mr. Desaulniers) 1527.
 YAMASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 3462.

RAILWAYS :

- ATKINSON, C. A., EX-CONDUCTOR : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 2246.
 IN COM. OF SUP., 1290, 3086, 3211, 3445.
 I. C. R. See general heading.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

- P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perry) 2420.
 — TRACKMASTER MCPHERSON : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 2217.
 — RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 149.
 SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. Mr. Choquette) 1745, 2643.
 See ALSO :
 ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
 ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
 CALGARY RY. AND COAL CO.
 C. P. R. CO.
 CENTRAL COUNTIES RY.
 CHIGNECTO SHIP RY.
 CHILLIWHACK RY. CO.
 CLEVELAND, PORT STANLEY AND LONDON TRANSPORTATION AND RY. CO.
 COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. AND NAVIGATION CO.
 DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
 G. T. R. CO., C. P. R. CO. AND CITY OF TORONTO.
 GRAND TRUNK RY. CO. OF CAN.
 LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
 LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
 MAN. AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
 MAN. AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
 MONCTON AND P. E. I. RY. AND FERRY CO.
 MOUNT FOREST, MARKDALE AND MEAFORD RY. CO.
 NAKUSP AND SLOCAN RY. CO.
 NELSON AND FORT SHEPPARD RY. CO.
 NICOLA VALLEY RY. CO.
 NORTH CAN. ATLANTIC RY. AND STEAM-SHIP CO.
 PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
 ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
 SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
 TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
 VERMONT CENTRAL RY. CO., &c.
 WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.
Ry. Act further Amt. B. No. 131 (Mr. Haggart). 1^c, 3472 ; 2^m, 3517 ; in Com., 3519 ; 3^s, 3522. (56 Vic., c. 27.)
 RY. BELT (C. P. R.) IN B. C. : Remarks (Mr. Mara) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3283.
Ry. (Land) Subsidies B. No. 133 (Mr. Daly). 1^c, 3549 ; 2^s, in Com. and 3^d, 3556. (56 Vic., c. 4.)
Ry. (Money) Subsidies authorization B. No. 127 (Mr. Haggart). Res. prop., 2887, 3067 ; in Com., 3023, 3167 ; conc. in and 1^c of B., 3267 ; 2^m, 3486 ; 2^s in Com., and 3^s, 3496. (56 Vic., c. 2.)
 Deb. in Com. (Mr. Amyot) 3176 ; (Mr. Bernier) 3030 ; (Mr. Charlton) 3025 ; (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 3025, 3106 ; (Mr. Dupont) 3029 ; (Mr. Frechette) 3169 ; (Mr. Haggart) 3023, 3067, 3168 ; (Mr. Hazen) 3043 ; (Mr. Ives) 3026 ; (Mr. Laurier) 3024, 3054 ; (Mr. McCarthy) 3023 ; (Mr. McMullen) 3023 ; (Mr. Ouimet) 3024 ; (Mr. Rinfret) 3175.
 RY. SUBSIDIES, &c. : Inquiry for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 2093.
 RYS. AND CANALS DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 129.
 RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES COM. : List of Members, 320.

- RECEIPTS AND EXPEND., CONSOLID. FUND: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 356.
 — I.C.R. AND P.E.I. RYS.: (Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) 149.
- RECIPROCITY, CANAL TOLLS, &C., NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S.: M. for Cor., &C. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 339.
- REID DEER INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2095.
- REGINA COURT HOUSE, &C.: in Com. Sup., 2207.
 — LIEUT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2445.
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- AGRICULTURE: (Mr. *Foster*) 1130.
 AUDITOR-GENERAL: (Mr. *Foster*) 5.
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 1ST REP.: (Mr. *La Rivière*) 251.
 — 2ND REP.: (Mr. *La Rivière*) 434.
 — 3RD REP.: (Mr. *La Rivière*) 2287; concd., 2383.
 INDIAN AFFAIRS: (Mr. *Daly*) 1933.
 INLAND REVENUE (ADULTERATION OF FOOD): (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 5.
 — (EXCISE) (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 5.
 INTERIOR: (Mr. *Daly*) 2794.
 JUSTICE (PENITENTIARIES): (Sir *John Thompson*) 5.
 LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP.: (Mr. *Speaker*) 5.
 MARINE AND FISHERIES: (Mr. *Foster*) 5.
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE: (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 80.
 MOUNTED POLICE: (Mr. *Joss*) 1673.
 POSTMASTER GENERAL: (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 319.
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY: (Mr. *Costigan*) 1399.
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (Mr. *Foster*) 5.
 PUBLIC WORKS: (Mr. *Ouimet*) 859.
 RAILWAYS AND CANALS: (Mr. *Haggart*) 540.
 SECRETARY OF STATE: (Mr. *Costigan*) 1743.
 SELECT STANDING COMS.: (Sir *John Thompson*) 319.
- REPRESENTATION AT FOREIGN CAPITOLS: Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1614.
- Representation (H. of C.) B. No. 42 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 721; 2^o* and in Com., 1616; 3^o*, 1618. (56 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.:
- ATKINSON, EX-CONDUCTOR C. A., REDUCTION IN RANK*: Mr. *Wood (Westmoreland)* 2246.
 BAIE LA VALLIÈRE, DREDGING*: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2420.
 BAILLARGON P. O., MAL-ADMINISTRATION: Mr. *Guay*, 356.
 BARRETT vs. WINNIPEG, JUDGMENT H. M.'S PRIVY COUNCIL: Mr. *La Rivière*, 323.
 BONNE ESPERANCE, APPMNT. OF FISHERY OFFICER*: Mr. *Joncas*, 1551.
 BOUNDARY OF RY. BELT IN B. C.*: Mr. *Mara*, 2679.
 BOUNDARIES OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 235.
 BOUNTY PAID ON PIG IRON*: Mr. *McMullen*, 356.
 — Mr. *Macdonald (Huron)* 866.
 — TO FISHERMEN, FRAUDS, &C., IN DISTRIBUTION*: Mr. *Fraser*, 356.
 BOUNTIES (FISHING) IN VICTORIA AND GUYSBOROUGH*: Mr. *Fraser*, 867.
 BRISTOL (ENG.) BOARD OF TRADE AND "FRENCH CHEESE": Mr. *Rinfret*, 338.
 CANAL TOLLS, &C. See "RECIPROCITY."
 CAN. FISHERMEN ON LABRADOR COAST, TREATMENT BY Nflds.*: Mr. *Joncas*, 2679.
 CENSUS, RETURNS re CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES*: Mr. *Mulock*, 2245.
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.—Continued.
- CENTRAL ONT. RY. CO. AND SUBSIDY: Mr. *Corby*, 1535.
 CHOLERA, PREVENTIVE MEASURES*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 867.
 CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES, BIRTHPLACE, NATIONAL ORIGIN, &C.: Mr. *McMullen*, 354, 865.
 — EXAMINATIONS, QUESTIONS, &C.*: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 867.
 CRIMINAL CODE AND SUPREME COURT, &C., JUDGES*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1550.
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS, &C.*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 356.
 CULVERTS ON NATURAL WATERCOURSES*: Mr. *Casey*, 1551.
 CUSTOMS DEPT., REORGANIZATION, REP. TO COUNCIL*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 867.
 DISALLOWANCE, N. S. MINES AND MINERALS ACT*: Mr. *Waldon*, 1550.
 EXPEDITION TO JAMES' AND HUDSON BAYS*: Mr. *Joncas*, 1551.
 EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES BY PROVS. OF DOM.: Mr. *Prior*, 2247.
 — ON PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFED.*: Mr. *Lépine*, 1550.
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM, REPS. PUBLISHED*: Mr. *Grieve* 867.
 EXPORT OF SWINE, REGULATIONS re SLAUGHTER: Mr. *Smith (Ont.)*, 338.
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 356.
 FINANCIAL AGENTS IN LONDON, CHANGE*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 1551.
 FISHERY OVERSEERS' INSTRUCTIONS IN QUE.*: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2679.
 — PROTECTION SERVICE, COMMANDERS' CERTIFICATES*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2245.
 FISHING BOUNTIES, IRREGULARITIES, &C., IN PAYING: Mr. *Fraser*, 356.
 "FRENCH CHEESE." See "Bristol Bd. of Trade."
 GALOPE RAPIDS CHANNEL, PLANS AND SURVEYS: Mr. *Reid*, 1526.
 GOVERNORS-GENERAL SINCE CONFEDN., SALARIES, &C.: Mr. *Mulock*, 334.
 HACKETT, ED., FISHERY INSPECTOR, SUSPENSION, &C.*: Mr. *Davies (P. E. I.)*, 866.
 HARKAWAY P. O.; MAIL SERVICE*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 356.
 HERCHMER, L., COMMISSIONER'S REP. re CHARGES*: Mr. *Davin*, 866.
 I. C. R. See general head.
 IMPORTS. See "Exports."
 JAMES' AND HUDSON BAYS, EXPEDITION*: Mr. *Joncas*.
 KEMPTVILLE P. O., IRREGULARITIES*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 1551.
 KENTVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Borden*, 2245.
 KINGSTON PENITENTIARY EVIDENCE re INVESTIGATION*: Mr. *Somerville*, 867.
 — VISITORS' FEES, &C.*: Mr. *Mulock*, 2245.
 LAND GRANTS TO RYS.: Mr. *Mills (Bothwell)*, 1538.
 LABRIE, CHAS. I., CLAIM FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES*: Mr. *Frémont*, 1550.
 LA COUTURE, JOSEPH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Laverne*, 2679.
 LESAGE, ED. See "ST. LEON."
 LIVERPOOL, (N.S.) INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTION, &C.*: Mr. *Forbes*, 2245.
 LITTLE RAPIDS LOCKS, CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Declin*, 2420.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- LURCHER SHOAL, PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION*: Mr. *Bowers*, 866.
- MCDUGALL, LAUCHLIN, CLAIM FOR SUPERANNUATION*: Mr. *Fraser*, 2245.
- MCGREVVY-MURPHY CONSPIRACY*: Mr. *Tarte*, 2421.
- MCNAMEE, F. B., & Co., CLAIMS*: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 867.
- "MAN. SCHOOL CASE." See "SEPARATE SCHOOLS," "BARRETT."
- MARTIAL, HORMISDAS, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1550.
- MINES AND MINERALS ACT OF N.S., DISALLOWANCE*: Mr. *Weldon*, 1550.
- MOUNT FOREST INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2245.
- NFLD. FISHERMEN ON LABRADOR COAST, TREATMENT OF CANADIANS*: Mr. *Joncas*, 2679.
- NOTRE-DAME DU ROSAIRE, P. O., LOCATION*: Mr. *Choquette*, 867.
- OFFICERS, &c., HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE: Mr. *McMullen*, 865.
- P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES*: Mr. *Perry*, 2420.
- PERKINS' MILLS, &c., MAIL SERVICE*: Mr. *Devlin*, 2420.
- PICKET'S PIER (N.S.) EXPEND., WHARFAGE: Mr. *Borden*, 352.
- PIG IRON, PRODUCTION FROM 1881 TO 1892 AND BOUNTY PAID*: Mr. *McMullen*, 356.
- FROM 1870 TO 1890, BOUNTY PAID AND IMPORTS*: Mr. *Macdonald (Huron)* 866.
- PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN. EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Lépine*, 1550.
- "QUADRA," STR., CONTRACT FOR REPAIRS: Mr. *Prior*, 2246.
- QUEBEC EASTERN RY., SUBSIDY: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 335.
- RECEIPTS AND EXPEND., CONSOLIDATED FUND*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 356.
- RECIPROCIITY, CANAL TOLLS, &c., NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S.: Mr. *Tisdale*, 339.
- REGINA, LIEUT.-GOV.'S RESIDENCE, TOTAL COST*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2445.
- REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES BY PROVS. OF DOM.: Mr. *Prior*, 2247.
- RICHELIEU RIVER WHARF: Mr. *Béchar*d, 2250.
- RIDEAU HALL, EXPEND. SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Mulock*, 334.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, PAYMENTS FOR DEEPENING: Mr. *Guay*, 1551.
- ROBERTSON, MR. See "Bristol Bd. of Trade."
- ROUGEMONT P. O., ESTABLISHMENT*: Mr. *Borden*, 1551.
- RUSTICO BREAKWATER, STATE OF REPAIR: Mr. *Davies (P. E. I.)*, 2414.
- ST. LEON (MASKINONGÉ) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL*: Mr. *Légris*, 866.
- ST. MICHEL D'YAMASKA BRIDGE, SUBSIDY: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2419.
- ST. SEBASTIEN P. O., CHANGE: Mr. *Godbout*, 1551.
- SANDFORD (N.S.) BREAKWATER, CLAIMS FOR REPAIRS: Mr. *Flint*, 351.
- SCHEDULING CAN. CATTLE, GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: Mr. *Sproule*, 330.
- SCHOOLS IN N. W. T., TEACHERS' SALARIES: Mr. *Semple*, 2285.
- SEPARATE SCHOOLS MAN., PETS., MEMORIALS, &c.: Mr. *La Rivière*, 328.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- SEPARATE SCHOOLS MAN., JUDGMENT H. M.'S PRIVY COUNCIL: Mr. *La Rivière*, 328.
- See general heading.
- STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD, &c., RY. Co. See "Vermont Central."
- SOULANGES CANAL, SECTION 8, TENDERERS*: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 356.
- SUPREME COURT, &c., JUDGES AND CRIMINAL CODE*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1550.
- SWINE SLAUGHTERED FOR EXPORT: Mr. *Smith (Ont.)* 338.
- TELEGRAPHIC SYSTEM OF THE EMPIRE: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 329.
- TRUDEAU, MR., SUPERANNUATION*: Mr. *Edgar*, 1550.
- TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND EXPENDITURE, &c.: Mr. *Perry*, 2390.
- UNITED STATES. See "Reciprocity."
- VERMONT CENTRAL RY. CO., RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE*: Mr. *Béchar*d, 358.
- VILLIERS, DEPUTY ADJT.-GEN., SUSPENSION, &c.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 351.
- WHITELY, W. H. See "Bonne Esperance."
- WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, GOVT. SURVEYS: Mr. *Welsh*, 336.
- YAMACHICHE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Desautniers*, 1527.
- RETURN: Inquiry for (Mr. *Edgar*) 3234.
- (Mr. *McMullen*) 3104.
- RETURNS, PREPARING, EXTRA CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 3388.
- REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES OF PROVS. OF DOM.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 2247.
- RICHELIEU CO., FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 860.
- RICHELIEU RIVER WHARF: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Béchar*d) 2250.
- RICHMOND AND WOLFE, REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 327.
- RICHMOND P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2190, 2206.
- RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1723.
- RIDEAU HALL, EXPEND. SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 334.
- In Com. of Sup., 2209, 2954.
- RIDGETOWN INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2883.
- RIFLE PRACTICE. See "Volunteer."
- RIFLE RANGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 2634.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, PAYMENTS FOR DEEPENING: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Guay*) 1551.
- Rivers and Streams Construction of Works Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Foster*). 1*, 3067; 2* and in Com., 3176; 3*, 3177. (56 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 2934.
- ROBERTSON, MR. See "British Board of Trade."
- ROBERVAL PIER, LAKE ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
- ROUGEMONT P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*) 1551.
- ROSS, JOS., EMPYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2216.
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 602.
- ROY, C. AND Z., CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 147.

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, STATE OF REPAIR : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2414.
 — SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 326.
 STE. ANGELE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3474.
 STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE, POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Légris*) 2801.
 STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE. See "KAMOURASKA."
 STE. ANNE DE SOREL WHARF, COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1321.
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH (I.C.R.) CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 861.
 — In Com. of Sup., 3231.
 ST. HENRI P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 2187.
 ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE, COPPER ROOF, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 863.
 ST. JOHN'S (NFLD.) FIRE : in Com. of Sup., 2112.
 St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1st, 357; 2nd, 471; in Com. and 3rd, 1701. (56 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
 St. Lawrence Ins. Co. See "EQUIT.".
 ST. LÉON (MASKINONGÉ) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Légris*) 866.
 — RETURN re : Remarks (Mr. *Légris*) 2290.
 ST. MARY'S BAY BELL-BUOY : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 506.
 — CANAL : prop. Res. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2648.
 — INDUSTRIES : Ques. (Mr. *Griève*) 2383.
 ST. MICHEL D'YAMASKA BRIDGE SUBSIDY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2419.
 ST. OURS INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3125.
 ST. PASCAL AND KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 861.
 ST. SEBASTIEN P.O., CHANGE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1551.
 ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2888; in Com., 3043.
 ST. THOMAS P.O., APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1936.
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 318, 1264, 2187.
 SABBATH DESECRATION : Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 3473.
 Sabbath. See "LORD'S DAY."
 Sacred Heart of Jesus, Ladies' B. No. 106 (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*). 1st and 2nd, 2709; in Com. and 3rd, 3019. (56 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
 Salvage. See "WRECKS."
 SANDFORD (N.S.) BREAKWATER, CLAIMS FOR REPAIRS : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 351.
 — REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 326.
 SANDY COVE PORT CUSTOMS RECEIPTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 3345.
 SAUGEN INDIAN RESERVE, SEIZURE OF TIES AND POSTS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 148.
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 3231, 3445.
 — TOLLS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1747.
 SCHEDULING CAN. CATTLE. See "QUARANTINE."
 SCHOOLS IN N. W. T., TEACHERS' SALARIES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Semple*) 2265.

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3342.
 Schwaller, John Francis. See "DIVORCE."
 SEAFORTH INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2639.
 Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 2576.
 SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 119, 287, 1242.
 SECRETARY OF STATE :
 CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS, MESSRS. TRUDEAU AND WHITE : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 1525.
 — COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1748.
 — EMPLOYEES, BIRTHPLACE, NATIONALITY, ORIGIN, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 354.
 — EXAMINATION, &c. : M. for copy* (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 867.
 — FRENCH EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1750.
 CIVIL SERVANTS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 327, 436.
 COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION re ENFORCING : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 147.
 DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 1743.
 LABOUR BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1523.
 LIQUOR TRAFFIC, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Scriver*) 325.
 PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING, DELAY : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 726, 2131.
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 1399.
 PRINTING BUREAU, DELAY IN PRINTING BUDGET SPERCH : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 726.
 RICHMOND AND WOLFE, REVISING OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 327.
 TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, &c., COST : Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 436.
 VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Griève*) 506.
 WALSH, T. J., REVISING "READY RECKONER" : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2092.
 SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3342.
 Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths (Chap. 10, Rev. Stat.) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1st, 435.
 SELECT STANDING COMS., CHANGE OF NAMES : M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1222.
 — M. for Com. to prepare Lists (Sir *John Thompson*) 79.
 — prop. M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5.
 — See "COMMITTEES."
 Senate. See "INDEMNITY," "SPEAKER."
 SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1751; neg. (Y. 71, N. 121) 2090.
 Deb. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1937; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1905; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2034; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2030; (Mr. *Casey*) 1967; (Mr. *Costigan*) 1898; (Mr. *Craig*) 1928; (Mr. *Currain*) 1863; (Mr. *Daly*) 2056; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1966; (Mr. *Davin*) 2013; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1886; (Mr. *Fawcett*) 2088; (Mr. *Hughes*) 2075; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1856; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1778; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1977; (Mr. *Laperone*) 2080; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1820; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 2025; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1825; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2086; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2089; (Mr. *Osimet*) 2004; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1790; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1960.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS JUDGMENT, H. M.'s PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 328.

— LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 325.

— MINUTE OF COUNCIL: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to Print 1551.

— Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1613.

— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) precedence of deb., 1933.

— PAPERS: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 658.

— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1135.

— PETS., MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *LaRivière*) 328.

— REF. TO SUPREME COURT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1301.

— REF. PRIVY COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 328.

— REF. OF SUB-COM. OF P. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 328.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS ESTIMATE, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 405.

SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 1266.

SETTLERS' CATTLE, IMPORTATION FROM U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3180.

SHEPARD, W. A., EMPLOYM. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1746.

SHIP CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2166.

SHIPPING (CAN.) REGISTERED TONNAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 436, 859.

SICK MARINERS' FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 3129.

— TAX ON SHIPPING: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 1520.

SILVER, CAN. AND AMERICAN, PERCENTAGE OF ALLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 1523.

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1745, 2643.

SOFT FISH, PROTECTION OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 607.

SOREL TOWN INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3122.

SOULANGES CANAL, SECTION 8, TENDERERS: M. for List of Names* (Sir *Hector Langerin*) 356.

— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. *Pope*). 1st, 787; 2nd, 859.

SOUTH MIDDLESEX, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1033, 1310.

— Return of Member, 3472.

SPANISH RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2644.

Speaker of the Senate B. No. 114 (Mr. *Foster*). 1st, 3067; 2nd m., 3537; deb. adjnd. 3547; rsmd., 3557; further adjnd., 3561.

SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 3, 3566.

STANDING ORDERS COM.: List of Members, 322.

— 11TH REP.: conc. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3102.

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD, &c., RY. CO. See "Vermont Central."

STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 411, 1273, 2584, 2602.

STATUTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 405, 1268.

Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1st, 147; 2nd, 2578; in Com., 2579; 3rd, 2801. (56 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

STEAM-SHIP COMMUNICATION WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 3343.

— SUBVENTIONS. See "Mail Subsidies."

STORES, MILITARY: in Com. of Sup., 596, 2587.

STRATHROY INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2795, 3478.

SUBSIDIES:

BEAUHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO.

CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.

GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.

IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.

JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.

MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.

MONTFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.

ONTARIO, BELMONT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.

OSHAWA RY. CO.

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO.

PARRY SOUND COLONIZATION RY. CO.

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.

QUEBEC EASTERN RY.

QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.

ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.

UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.

[See "LAND," "OCEAN."]

SUGAR REFINERIES, LETTER IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1673.

SUGAR, REPEAL OF DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1542.

SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 470.

— MR. TRUDEAU: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1550.

— See "Civil Service."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*, &c.) Lieut.-Governor of New Brunswick, 80; (Mr. *Mulock*) Militia Supplies, 84; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) Hawaiian Islands, 185; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell, &c.*) County of Pontiac's Bonded Indebtedness, 254. Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) re Washington Trip, 358. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Coal Oil Duty, 543; (Mr. *O'Brien*) Floods in Queensland, 544; (Mr. *Laurier*) Supreme Court Vacancy, 545; (Mr. *Beauvois*) Official Debates, Translation, 547; (Mr. *Kenny, &c.*) Atlantic Mail Service, 1223; (Mr. *Weldon, &c.*) Nova Scotia Coal Mines, 1618; (Mr. *Forbes*) Steam Com., Halifax and St. John, 1669; (Mr. *Landarkin*) Constitution of the Cabinet, 1704; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Census Returns, 1711. Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) Separate Schools, Man., 1751; deb. rsmd., 1825, 1937; neg. (Y. 71, N. 131) 2090. Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Tariff Reform, 2200; deb. rsmd., 2479; neg. (Y. 64, N. 116) 2574. Remarks (Mr. *McMullen, &c.*) 2580; (Mr. *Casey, &c.*) Controller of Customs' Speech at Kingston, 2709. Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) 2714; neg. (Y. 74, N. 205) 2792. Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) Caron Commission, 2822; deb.

SUPPLY—Continued.

rand. 2890; neg. (Y. 69, N. 119) 2918. Amt. (Mr. Charlton) Two Cent Postage, 3069; neg. on a div., 3077. Remarks (Mr. Prior) Military Pensions, 3077; (Mr. Charlton) Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Observance, 3177; (Mr. O'Brien) Settlers' Cattle, Importations, 3180; (Mr. Allan, &c.) Inland Fisheries, 3181; (Mr. Mara) O.P. Ry. Belt in British Columbia, 3283; (Mr. Tarte, &c.) Judiciary of Province of Quebec, 3287; (Mr. Edwards) Export Duty on Logs, 3318; (Mr. Bruncau) Prohibitory Fishing, 3321.

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1893-94, 78; Suppl., 1892-93, 905; further Suppl., 1892-93, 2576; Suppl., 1893-94, 3104.

RES. (Mr. Foster) FOR COM., 78; MS. FOR COM., 80, 185, 254, 358, 472, 543, 1223, 1618, 1704, 1751, 2094, 2133, 2290, 2580, 2709, 2822, 3009, 3283.

IN COM., 100, 185, 263, 388, 472, 548, 1240, 1672, 1719, 2091, 2094, 2133, 2575, 2584, 2608, 2793, 2919, 3086, 3177, 3211, 3346.

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."
Adulteration of Food. See "Collection of Revenue."

Agriculture:

Agricultural Societies, N.W.T. 484.
Dairy Products, 1289, 3340, 3442.
Experimental Farms, 472, 3379.
Haras National Co., 485.

Arts and Statistics:

Archives, 409.
Census, 1273, 2584, 2602.
Patent Record, 410.
Statistics, 411, 1273.
World's Columbian Exhibition, 425.

Canals. See "Collection of Revenues" and "Railways and Canals."

Charges of Management:

Assistant Receiver-Gen.'s Office, Halifax and St. John, 112.
Baring Bros., &c., Commission, 1240.
Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 113.
Dominion Notes, Issue and Redemption, 114.
—— Notes, Printing, 115.
Inspector, 111.
London Financial Agency, Transfer, 1241.
Public Debt, &c., Commission on payment of Interest, 100, 1240.

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 121, 2597.
Contingencies, Dept.:
Agriculture, 293.
Buildings, 304.
Governor-Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 263.
High Commissioner's Office, 203.
Interior, 304.
Militia and Defence, 287.
Post Office, 290.
Privy Council Office, 278.
Secretary of State, 287.
Trade and Commerce, 296.
Customs Dept., 121, 2597.
Finance and Treasury Board, 121.
Geological Survey Dept., 130.
High Commissioners Office, 187.
Indian Affairs, 121.
Inland Revenue Dept., 1262.
Interior Dept., 185.
Marine and Fisheries Dept., 123.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Civil Government—Continued.

Militia and Defence, 117.
Mounted Police, Controller, 120.
Postmaster General's Dept.:
Computing Interest, 216.
Printing and Stationery Dept., 119.
Privy Council Office, 1262.
Public Works Dept., 125.
Railway and Canals Dept., 129.
Trade and Commerce Dept., 131, 1244.
Commercial Agencies, 3409.
Secretary of State Dept., 149, 1242.

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food: General Vote, 3394.

Canals:

Beauharnois, 1724.
Chambly, 1724.
Lachine, 1723.
Miscellaneous, 1724.
Ridesau, 1723.

Customs:

Board of Appraisers, Chairman, 3390.
Galbraith, T. J., additional Salary, 2635.
General Vote, 3389.
Laboratory, Testing Sugars, 3393.

Dominion Lands:

Extra Clerks, Head Office, Ottawa, 3412.

Excise:

Officers and Inspectors' Salaries, 3393.
Methylated Spirits, 3393.

Ordnance Lands:

Grand Falls (N.B.) Bridge, 2129.

Post Office:

Salaries and Allowances, 3395.
Hawken, F., increased Salary, 3471.
Weights and Measures and Gas:
Kelly, M., increase of Salary, 2127.
General Vote, 3394; suppl., 3465.

Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."

Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."

Dominion Police:

Murphy, Constable, retiring allowance, 1672.

Dominion Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."

Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."

Fisheries:

Bounties, Expenses re Distribution, 3353.
Fish-breeding, 3342.
Intelligence Bureau, 1721.
International Fisheries Commission, 1722.
Newton, Isaac, Costs of Suit, 1721.
Protection Service, 1720, 3343.

Government of N.W.T.:

Lieut.-Governor's Office, 1726.
Well-Boring, &c., 1724.

Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."

Hydrographic Surveys. 3464.*Immigration:*

Agents and Employees, 3413.
Expenses, General, 3424.

Indians:

Man. and N.W.T.:
Hospital, Blood Reserve, 2094.
Industrial School, Red Deer, 2095.
Live stock, 3380.

Nova Scotia:

Medical attendance, 2091.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Indians—Continued.

Ontario and Quebec, 1740, 3358.

Bridge over Coulais River, 1743.

Mott, W. A., Legal services, 1742.

British Columbia:

Industrial School, Chilliwack, 2096.

Justice, Administration of:

Admiralty Court, Registrar's Salary, 306.

Circuit Court Judges, Montreal, 3427.

Exchequer Court, Registrar's Salary, 306, 1263, 1672.

Miscellaneous, &c., N.W.T. and B.C., 307.

Official Arbitrators, 307.

Supreme Court Reports, 308.

*Legislation:**House of Commons:*

Debates, Official, 1266.

Committees, Sessional Clerks, &c., 402.

Contingencies, 473.

French Translation, 1265.

Miscellaneous, 3436.

Salaries, 399.

Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 405.

Sessional Messengers, 1266.

General:

Franchise Act, Printing Voters' Lists, 1268, 1290.

Wilkinson, Judge, Posting Lists, 1390.

Printing, Binding and Distributing the Laws, 405.

Printing, Paper and Binding, 406, 2699.

Statutes, Printing, &c., 1268.

Voters' Lists, Contingent Expenses, 3442.

Library:

Contingencies, 1266.

Salaries of Officers, 405.

Senate:

Salaries and Contingent Expenses, 395.

Mail Subsidies and Steam-ship Subventions:

Campbellton and Gaspé, 3410.

Halifax, &c., and West Indies, 3410.

Militia:

Alger, Lieut.-Col., Gratuity, 2590.

Ammunition, 2586, 3346.

Annual Drill, 2634.

Civil Employees, Salaries, &c., 569.

Clothing and Necessaries, 601.

Compensation Claims, 2590.

Dominion Cartridge Factory, 603, 2586, 3346.

Esquimalt, Defence, 3442.

General Vote, 3443.

Military Properties, &c., 571.

Monuments for Battlefields, 604.

Permanent Corps, Staff, 548.

Rifle Range, Ottawa, 2634.

Royal Military College, 602.

Stores, 2587.

Transport and Freight, 602.

Warlike and other Stores, 596.

Mounted Police:

Johnston, J., Preparing Maps, 1722.

Penitentiaries:

British Columbia, 319.

Dorchester, 1265.

Kingston, 311, 388, 3431.

Binder Twine, Foreman, 3432.

Manitoba,

Regina Gaol,

St. Vincent de Paul, 318, 1264.

Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."*Public Debt.* See "Charges of Management."*Public Works—Capital:*

Cape Tormentine Harbour, 1293, 2134.

Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 2168.

Ship Channel, Montreal and Que., 2166.

*Public Works—Income:**Buildings:**British Columbia:*

Post Office, Victoria, 3453.

Victoria Drill Hall, 1302.

Maritime Provs. generally, 2187.*North-west Territories:*

Calgary P.O., 2207.

Lieut.-Governor's Residence, 1301.

Mounted Police Buildings, 2207.

Regina Court House, &c., 2207.

New Brunswick:

Chatham P.O., 2186.

Nova Scotia:

Dartmouth P.O., 2168.

Halifax Drill Hall, 2184.

Pictou P.O., 2183, 2964.

Ontario:

Orillia Public Building, 2207.

Printing Bureau, 3453.

Toronto Drill Shed, 1300, 2207.

Quebec:

Montreal P.O., 2206.

Richmond P.O., 2190.

St. Henri P.O., 2187.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 2187.

West Farnham P.O., 2206.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:

Additional Vote, 1303.

Ottawa:

Furniture, &c., 2208.

Grounds, 2209.

Heating, &c., 2209.

Majors' Hill Park, 2209.

Rideau Hall, 2209, 2954.

Water Supply, 2210.

*Dredging:**Maritime Provinces,* 1308.*New Plant,* 1306, 2948.*Experimental Farms:*

Renewals, Repairs, &c., 2208.

*Harbours and Rivers:**New Brunswick:*

Negro Point Breakwater, 2938.

River St. John, &c., 2934.

Maritime Provinces, generally, 2935.*Nova Scotia:*

Bayfield Breakwater, 2928.

— New Wharf, 2922.

Bay of Fundy, 3453.

Cape Sable Island Breakwater, 2928.

D'Escousse Wharf, 2923.

Digby Pier, 2919.

Ingouish (South) Pier, 2924.

McNair's Cove Pier, 2928.

Meteghan Cove Pier, 2925.

Nyansa Wharf, 2922.

Pictou Islands Wharf, 2922.

Ontario:

Burlington Channel, 3464.

Repairs and Improvements, General, 2947.

Toronto Harbour, 2948.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Harbours and Rivers—Continued.

Prince Edward Island :

Piers and Breakwaters, Repairs, 2929, 3461.

Nine Mile Creek Pier, 2931.

Quebec :

Isle Verte Pier, 2936.

Laprairie Ice Piers, 2936.

L'Etang du Nord, 2935.

Ottawa River, Milles Isles Channel, 2936.

Roberval Pier, Lake St. John, 2936.

Tadoussac Pier, 2935.

Yamaska River, 3462.

Miscellaneous Works :

Art Gallery, National, 2950.

Monument, late Sir John Macdonald, 2954.

Wascana Dam, Regina, 1306.

Telegraph Lines, 2949.

Quarantine Stations : Minor Stations, 1303.

Quarantine :

Cattle Quarantine, 503.

Organized Districts, Salaries, &c., 487.

Public Health, Cholera, &c., 502, 2604, 2608.

Tracadie Lazaretto, 503.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 503.

Railways and Canals*—Capital :

Canals :

Lachine, 3445.

Sault Ste. Marie, 3231, 3445.

Trent, 3231.

Railways :

Annapolis and Digby, 1296.

Canadian Pacific, Construction, 3086.

Intercolonial, accommodation at Halifax, 3211.

St. Charles Branch, 3231.

Govt. Railways (Minister's Stmt.) 3066.

Railways and Canals*—Income :

Canals :

Ste. Anne's Lock, 1290.

Scientific Institutions :

Meteorological Service, 3342.

Statistics. See "Arts, Agriculture," &c.

Steam-ship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."

Superannuation :

Wallace, W., extra allowance, 472.

Unprovided Items :

Per Auditor-Gen.'s Rep., 1891-92, 2130.

CONCURRENCE :

Indian Affairs, 3548.

Kingston Penitentiary, 3548.

Supply B. No. 135 (Mr. Foster). 1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 3556. (56 Vic., c. 1.)

SUPPLIES. See "MILITIA."

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts (Chap. 135 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 24 (Mr. Lavergne). 1^o, 504; 2^o, 1587; in Com. and 3^o, 2708. (56 Vic., c. 29.)

— JUDGES AND CRIMINAL CODE : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 1550.

— REFS. : in Com. of Sup., 308.

— VACANCY ON BENCH : Remarks (Mr. Laurier) on M. for Com. of Sup., 545.

SWINE IN BOND, SLAUGHTERING : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 148.

— M. for O. C. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 338.

TADOUSSAC PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2935.

TARIFF, ABOLITION OF CERTAIN DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 612.

TARIFF REFORM : prop. Res. (Mr. McCarthy) in Amt to M. for Com. of Sup., 2290; deb. rand., 2479; neg. (Y. 64; N. 116) 2574.

Deb. (Mr. Casey) 2573; (Mr. Coatsworth) 2502; (Mr. Davin) 2492; (Mr. Edgar) 2372; (Mr. Ives) 2479; (Mr. Kenny) 2517; (Mr. Laurier) 2535; (Mr. McNeill) 2560; (Mr. Montague) 2342; (Mr. O'Brien) 2542; (Mr. Stevenson) 2509; (Mr. Taylor) 2378.

TARTE, J. I., Esq., MEMBER FOR L'ISLET : Introduced, 658.

TAX ON SHIPPING FOR HOSPITAL PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. Lépine) 1520.

TELEGRAPHIC SYSTEM OF THE EMPIRE : M. for Cor., &c. (Sir Hector Langevin) 329.

TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2949.

Telephone, &c. See "AUTOMATIC"

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. Adams). 1^o, 1743; 2^o, 2167; in Com. and 3^o, 2822. (56 Vic., c. 61.)

TENDERS FOR FENCING, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1745.

Territories Real Property B. No. 117 (Mr. Davin). M. to suspend Rule and 1^o of B., 3066.

THREE RIVERS, SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS : Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 1747.

Thornbury Harbour (Georgian Bay) B. No. 26 (Mr. Sproule). 1^o, 540; 2^o, 606; in Com. and 3^o, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 67.)

TIGNISH WHARFINGER, APPMNT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 149.

TILBURY CENTRE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDonald, Huron) 3344.

TOBACCO DUTIES, CHANGE IN COLLECTING : Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 2645.

— EXCISE DUTY, AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 1748.

— SEIZURES : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 610.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Coatsworth). 1^o, 1824; 2^o, 1969; in Com., 3016; 3^o m., 3018, 3104; 3^o, 3106. (56 Vic., c. 62.)

— DRILL SHED : in Com. of Sup., 1300, 2207.

— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 2946.

TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 503.

TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 131, 299, 1244.

TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN PREFERENTIAL : Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 659.

TRANSLATION, C. S. INQUIRY : in Com. of Sup., 2112.

— H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 1965.

TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 602.

TREATY WITH FRANCE : Finance Minister's Stmnts., 2274, 3549.

— PAPERS BROUGHT DOWN : Remarks (Mr. Dickey) 2646.

* See "Collection of Revenues."

- TREATY WITH FRANCE: Papers presented (Mr. Foster)** 1824, 2464.
- **PRINTING PAPERS: M. (Mr. Foster)** 2575.
- **Ques. (Mr. Laurier)** 1402.
- **Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)** 1615, 2211.
- **Remarks (Mr. Edgar)** 3103.
- **Remarks (Mr. Laurier)** 519, 2289, 2890, 3068, 3346.
- **STMT. IN MONTREAL "STAR": Remarks (Mr. Lister)** 2471.
- **TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. Lachapelle)** 3233.
- TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup.,** 3231.
- TRUDEAU, Mr., SUPERANNUATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Edgar)** 1550.
- **Inquiry (Mr. Edgar)** 3234.
- **TOUSSAINT, APPMNT. TO C. S.: Ques. (Mr. Carrell)** 1525.
- TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE, SLAUGHTER: Ques. (Mr. Mulock)** 433.
- TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND, EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Perry)** 2390.
- TWO-CENT POSTAGE RATE: Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for Com. of Sup.,** 3069; neg. on div., 3077.
- TWO-ROWED BARLEY AND LADOGA WHEAT: Ques. (Mr. Campbell)** 1524.
- TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, &c., COST: Ques. (Mr. Lepine)** 436.
- UNITED STATES. See "Quarantine, "Reciprocity."**
- UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart)** 2888; in Com., 3028.
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup.,** 2130.
- UXBRIDGE INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c., Ques. (Mr. Edgar)** 2217, 3109.
- VACANCIES, 1, 1591.**
- VAUDREUIL ELECTORAL DISTRICT, RETURNING OFFICER, APPMNT: Ques. (Mr. Laurier)** 1674, 1745, 2093, 2130, 2212.
- **VAGANCY IN REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. Laurier)** 1591.
- **ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. Laurier)** 2576.
- **WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur)** 2646.
- VERMONT CENTRAL RY. CO., RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. Béchard)** 356.
- VICTORIA (B.C.) DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup.,** 1302.
- **MARINE HOSPITAL: Remarks (Mr. Prior) on M. for Com. of Sup.,** 1235.
- VICTORIAVILLE, &c., INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne)** 2873.
- VILLIERS, DEPUTY-ADJT. GEN., SUSPENSION, &c.: M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. Landerkin)** 351.
- VOLUNTEER COMMANDING OFFICERS, RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. Choquette)** 2800.
- **RIFLE PRACTICE: Ques. (Mr. Hughes)** 223.
- VOTING. See "COMPULSORY."**
- Voter's Lists (1893) B. No. 123 (Mr. Costigan). 1*, 3103; 2* and in Com., 3272; 3*, 3472. (56 Vic., c. 10.)**
- **In Com. of Sup.,** 1268, 1390, 3442.
- **REVISION: Ques. (Mr. Grieve)** 506.
- WALKERTON MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin)** 861.
- WALLACE, N. C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WEST YORK: Introduced, 3.**
- **See "Controller of Customs."**
- WALLACE, W., EXTRA ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup.,** 472.
- WALSH, T. J., REVISING "READY RECKONER:" Ques. (Mr. McMullen)** 2092.
- WARLIKE AND OTHER STORES: in Com. of Sup.,** 596, 2587.
- WASCANA DAM, REGINA: in Com. of Sup.,** 1306.
- WASHINGTON, MR. CHARLTON'S VISIT: on M. for Com. of Sup. (personal explanation)** 358.
- Deb.: (Mr. Fraser)** 372; **(Mr. Hazen)** 379; **(Mr. Landerkin)** 384; **(Mr. Maclean, York)** 370; **(Mr. Montague)** 374; **(Mr. Sutherland)** 379; **(Mr. Tisdale)** 382.
- **Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on 2^d of Customs Act Amt. B.,** 3235.
- WATER SUPPLY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup.,** 2210.
- WATTERS, THOS. J., APPMNT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin)** 724.
- WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. Foster)** 78; in Com., 3555.
- **The Tariff: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright)** 720.
- **M. (Sir John Thompson) precedence of deb.,** 721.
- **M. (Sir John Thompson) precedence of deb. on Monday, 1222.**
- **For deb., see BUDGET, THE.**
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson)** 2215.
- **In Com. of Sup.,** 2127, 3394, 3465.
- WELLAND CANAL, NEW CULVERT, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar)** 609.
- **CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.**
- **COUNTY COURT JUDGE, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. Laurier)** 2289.
- WELL-BORING, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup.,** 1724.
- Western Counties Railway Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). 1*, 721; 2*, 820; in Com. and 3*, 1320. (56 Vic., c. 63.)**
- WEST FARNHAM P.O.: in Com. of Sup.,** 2206.
- WEST POINT (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry)** 222.
- WESTPORT INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bowers)** 2801.
- WHALE FISHING IN GULF: Ques. (Mr. Fauvel)** 608.
- WHITBY INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar)** 2877.
- WHITELY W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Jones)** 608.
- WHITE, WM., APPMNT. TO C. S.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll)** 1525.
- WILKINSON, JUDGE, POSTING VOTERS' LISTS: in Com. of Sup.,** 1390.
- Winnipeg City Water Power Act Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). 1*, 1673; 2*, 1745; in Com. and 3*, 2607. (56 Vic., c. 72.)**
- WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup.,** 503.
- **MILITIA HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald Winnipeg)** 1230.

- Witnesses and Evidence B. No. 23** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o*, 435; 2^o* and in Com., 1674, 1702; 3^o*, 1751; consdn. Sen. Amts., 3481; Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 40, N. 87) 3485. (56 *Vic.*, 3. 31.)
- Deb.: in Com. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1677; (Mr. *Curran*) 1683; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1679, 1701; (Mr. *Dickey*) 1675, 1689; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1691; (Mr. *Langelier*) 1678; (Mr. *Lister*) 1675, 1685; (Mr. *McInerney*) 1699; (Mr. *McLeod*) 1690; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1676; (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 1698; (Mr. *Mulloch*) 1687; (Mr. *Tvedate*) 1675, 1696; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1674-1703; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1696.
- WOOD ISLAND (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER, GOVT. SURVEYS:** M. for Rep. (Mr. *Welsh*) 336.
- WOOD, J. F., Esq., MEMBER FOR BROOKVILLE:** Introduced, 3.
- Woodmen of the World incorp. B. No. 34** (Mr. *Marshall*). 1^o*, 658; 2^o*, 820; in Com. and 3^o*, 2213. (56 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- WOODSTOCK INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 2881, 3115.
- Workingmen, Hours of Daily Labour B. No. 12** (Mr. *Lepine*). 1^o*, 324.
- WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION:** in Com. of Sup., 425.
— See "Columbian Exhibition."
- Wrecks and Salvage Act Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o*, 80; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 2132. (56 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- WURTELE, JUDGE, APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR:** Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1749.
- YAMACHICHE PIER, CONSTRUCTION:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 1527.
- YAMASKA PIER:** in Com. of Sup., 3462.
- Yarmouth and Annapolis.** See "Western Counties."
— **CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judges' Rep., 1.
— **INDUSTRIES, DESCRIPTIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2878, 3106.
- YORK (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judges' Rep., 1.